1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS SHIPLE
3	HIF172030
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF H.R. 1320, NUCLEAR UTILIZATION OF
7	KEYNOTE ENERGY ACT; H.R. 6140, ADVANCED
8	NUCLEAR FUEL AVAILABILITY ACT; H.R,
9	ADVANCING U.S. CIVIL NUCLEAR COMPETITIVENESS
10	AND JOBS ACT; AND H.R. 6141, TO REQUIRE THE
11	SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO DEVELOP A REPORT ON A
12	PILOT PROGRAM TO SITE, CONSTRUCT, AND
13	OPERATE MICRO-REACTORS AT CRITICAL NATIONAL
14	SECURITY LOCATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES
15	THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2018
16	House of Representatives
17	Subcommittee on Energy
18	Committee on Energy and Commerce
19	Washington, D.C.
20	
21	
22	

23	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m.,
24	in Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton
25	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
26	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
27	Shimkus, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith,
28	Johnson, Long, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Cramer,
29	Walberg, Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters,
30	Green, Doyle, Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Tonko, Loebsack,
31	Schrader, Kennedy, Butterfield, and Pallone (ex officio).
32	Staff present: Jennifer Barblan, Chief Counsel,
33	Oversight & Investigations; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff
34	Director; Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler,
35	Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly
36	Collins, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Margaret
37	Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of
38	Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk,
39	Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce and Consumer
40	Protection; Theresa Gambo, Human Resources/Office
41	Administrator; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator,
42	Environment; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Mary
43	Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment; Sarah Matthews,
44	Press Secretary; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel,

45	Energy; Mark Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Peter Spencer,
46	Professional Staff Member, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press
47	Assistant; Madeline Vey, Policy Coordinator, Digital Commerce
48	and Consumer Protection; Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk,
49	Communications & Technology; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor,
50	External Affairs; Andy Zach, Senior Professional Staff
51	Member, Environment; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director;
52	Elizabeth Ertel, Minority Deputy Clerk; Rick Kessler,
53	Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and
54	Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy Coordinator; Dan
55	Miller, Minority Policy Analyst; Alexander Ratner, Minority
56	Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief Counsel; Tuley
57	Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; and
58	Catherine Zander, Minority Environment Fellow.

59 Mr. Upton. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the Subcommittee on Energy markup of four bills addressing the 60 61 development, deployment, competitiveness, and regulation of 62 nuclear energy technologies. 63 You know, throughout this Congress we have repeatedly 64 heard about the immense challenges facing all parts of our nation's nuclear industry. And while individual states have 65 66 taken steps to preserve specific nuclear power plants, the underlying intellectual and industrial nuclear infrastructure 67 is at risk of further atrophy in the absence of a coherent 68 69 and defined policy from the federal government. 70 The bills today take some important steps to establish 71 that policy. At a hearing on these four bills last month, 72 the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and industry 73 leaders discussed the urgent need to take action now due to 74 75 the time-consuming and complex requirements associated with 76 licensing and developing nuclear facilities. 77 So the bills before us address that need. 78 been developed in coordination with feedback from members of 79 this committee, the Department of Energy and NRC, and a broad range of stakeholders. I look forward to continuing 80

81 bipartisan collaboration to advance these four proposals. 82 The first proposal that we are going to consider this morning is the committee print titled Advancing U.S. Civil 83 84 Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act offered by Congressman 85 This bill will assist our U.S. nuclear industry's 86 ability to compete successfully in an increasingly 87 competitive global market. The proposal provides a more 88 predictable and efficient authorization process for the review and approval of low proliferation risks and 89 technologies, and such steps will help level the playing 90 91 field for American companies in the international competition 92 of nuclear energy. 93 The next bill, H.R. 1320, the Nuclear Utilization of 94 Keynote Energy, or NUKE Act, is a bipartisan bill sponsored by Representative Kinzinger and Doyle to make targeted 95 reforms to the NRC's fee structure and streamline certain 96 97 licensing and regulatory actions. This bill will increase transparency, predictability, and efficiency in the 98 99 regulatory process which, for sure, will benefit our 100 constituents who fund the NRC through user fees embedded in 101 the cost of nuclear generated electricity. The more 102 efficient streamlined decisionmaking process established by

103 this legislation will lay the groundwork for more predictable 104 timing for our current and future nuclear infrastructure. 105 Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act, H.R. 6140, is a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives Flores and 106 107 McNerney to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a 108 program to make high-assay, low-enriched uranium available for use in the first of a kind advanced nuclear reactor 109 110 This fuel will enable the development and deployment of a new generation of innovative nuclear technologies in the 111 112 U.S. 113 And, lastly, H.R. 6141, a bipartisan bill again 114 sponsored by Representatives Hudson, Peters, Wilson, and 115 Norcross directs the Secretary of Energy in collaboration 116 with the NRC, Department of Defense, and GSA to identify key 117 components of a pilot program to site, construct, and operate 118 very small nuclear reactors known as microreactors to provide 119 energy resilience for mission-critical national security 120 Such a pilot program could capture some of the functions. 121 unique and revolutionary characteristics of tomorrow's 122 nuclear reactor designs and provide additional benefits for 123 revitalizing the U.S. nuclear industry. 124 More work remains to be done to reassert the global

125	leadership of American nuclear know-how for the next
126	generation, but this legislation before us today is a good
127	and essential step towards a multifaceted strategy.
128	I yield for an opening statement to the ranking member
129	of the subcommittee, my friend Mr. Rush from Chicago.
130	Mr. Rush. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.
131	Mr. Chairman, before I get into this suite of nuclear
132	bills that is before us today, I just want to reiterate my
133	position that I touched on in yesterday's hearing. As I
134	mentioned, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Pallone and I along
135	with all 24 Democratic members of the full committee, sent a
136	letter to Chairman Walden and Health Subcommittee Chairman
137	Burgess on yesterday requesting an immediate hearing on the
138	Trump administration's misguided policy of separating
139	immigrant children from their parents at our southern border.
140	While the President, Mr. Chairman, may have suddenly
141	shifted his stance and signed an executive order undoing this
142	abominable policy for the time being, who knows when he might
143	change his mind on a whim and reverse himself once again.
144	Mr. Chairman, it is critical that we hear from key
145	Administration officials on how this loathsome policy came
146	about. More importantly, as the elected representatives we

147 need answers on how many of these children were ripped from 148 their parents, where are all of these children now, and what 149 is the Administration's procedure for assuring that all of 150 these babies will indeed be reunited with their parents. 151 This is an important issue that is of the utmost concern 152 to many, if not all, Americans regardless of their political 153 leanings or religious affiliations, so hopefully we can 154 schedule this hearing sooner rather than later. With that being said, Mr. Chairman, as I stated in the 155 156 hearing on these four nuclear bills, it is my desire that we 157 work with the majority side to attempt to find consensus so that these bills are forwarded on the full committee with 158 159 bipartisan support. 160 Mr. Chairman, the most problematic of these three bills, 161 four bills, rather, for me is the Advancing U.S. Civil 162 Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act. This bill will, among 163 other things, revise DOE's review of the Part 810 process by 164 expediting procedures for transferring civilian nuclear technology including to foreign powers. I can tell you, Mr. 165 166 Chairman that I have even less confidence in the Trump 167 administration than I had a few weeks ago when we held a 168 hearing on this bill so I do not see the wisdom in this

169 moving this bill at this time. 170 With that Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of 171 time. Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. 172 chair would recognize for an opening statement the chairman 173 of the full committee, Mr. Walden. 174 The Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for 175 his leadership and for acknowledging me on these energy 176 Good job to the committee. This morning we are issues. going to continue to advance our legislative efforts to 177 178 modernize the Department of Energy to better reflect the 179 Department's current national and energy security missions. Now throughout this Congress, as you all know, we have 180 181 sought specific DOE authorities to update in light of an 182 ever-changing energy landscape and evolving national security 183 Today's subcommittee markup continues these 184 efforts; also includes modernizing nuclear policies that 185 Congress originally embedded in DOE's predecessor agency, the 186 Atomic Energy Commission. When the Atomic Energy Act was amended in 1954, those authorities now reside at both DOE and 187 188 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 189 Our nation's expertise in nuclear energy from safely 190 operating reactors to the application of technology to the

strong regulatory regime is the best in the world. However,
our foreign competitors are making strategic investments to
directly support their respective nuclear interests to gain
an advantage in emerging markets. So we should recognize
that foreign government support for expansion of their
nuclear industries into new markets is driven by more than
economic interest. There are profound national security and
strategic implications for dominance in the civil nuclear
space and so we must appropriately consider the implications
of losing our leadership position in developing markets and
align our national policy accordingly. The thoughtful
legislative proposals we will consider this morning target
specific challenges facing America's nuclear scientists,
innovators, suppliers, and reactor operators. So the bills
will help deploy advanced nuclear technologies, enhance our
nuclear supplier industry's ability to effectively compete in
global markets, and establish transparency and predictability
in our regulatory framework. Each of these bills can
help reinvigorate different components of our nuclear
ecosystem and in doing so the legislation will facilitate
innovation and competition which provides the dual benefits
of both being good for consumers while protecting our

213	national security interests. So I really want to thank
214	members on both sides of the aisle who worked on these bills,
215	including Representatives Kinzinger and Doyle, Hudson,
216	Peters, Flores and McNerney, and Johnson. Your leadership
217	has really made a difference and we are going to move these
218	common sense, bipartisan policies forward. It is
219	appreciated.
220	Thank you for your work and I look forward to supporting
221	this effort. I yield back the balance of my time.
222	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair would
223	recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr.
224	Pallone.
224	Pallone. Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
225	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
225 226	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear
225226227	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed
225226227228	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed concern with two of the proposals before us. First, the
225226227228229	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed concern with two of the proposals before us. First, the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act
225226227228229230	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed concern with two of the proposals before us. First, the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act makes changes to the Part 810 process by which the Secretary
225226227228229230231	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed concern with two of the proposals before us. First, the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act makes changes to the Part 810 process by which the Secretary of Energy authorizes the transfer of nuclear energy

235 technologies to countries that are not nuclear weapon states 236 and I am uncomfortable with expediting the review process for 237 Part 810 at a time when there is so much global uncertainty 238 with regard to nuclear proliferation. 239 H.R. 1320 introduced by Representatives Kinzinger and 240 Doyle makes several major changes to the NRC budgeting 241 process and fee structure and I have concerns with the 242 provision of the bill that sets up an expedited timeline for NRC review of nuclear reactors because inflexible deadlines 243 244 could jeopardize the environmental and safety review process 245 for more complex applications. And I am also concerned with a provision requiring NRC to issue a construction permit for 246 247 a nuclear facility even if an entity has filed a formal 248 request for a hearing objecting to the project. And I think stakeholders should have a chance to voice their concerns 249 250 publicly before a project permit is issued. 251 But despite those concerns, I appreciate our colleagues' 252 efforts to address the financial strain currently facing the nuclear industry and I want to continue to work with them on 253 254 this bill. 255 But if I could just say I want to reiterate in the time 256 I have left what Ranking Member Bobby Rush said about the

children separation. I would strongly request that this committee hold a hearing immediately on the President's family separation policy that has led to more than 2,300 children being separated from their parents. yesterday's executive order puts an end to the barbaric separation of families. But I am concerned that these families will continue to face inhumane treatment at the hands of the Trump administration. All of us on this committee should demand that the Administration must now immediately reunite each of the more 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents. I actually saw some of them this Sunday on Father's Day and I think the Department HHS has been sending conflicting signals as to whether it will reunite these families. I know that every Democrat on this committee made a request to Chairman Walden and Burgess for a hearing as soon as possible, so I was just going to ask if I could, Mr. Chairman -- well, I guess he left. All right, well. All right, let me just say that we are hoping and I am going to follow up with both Chairman Walden and Chairman Burgess to see if we can have a hearing as soon as possible because I

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

279	think this policy has created real trauma for thousands of
280	kids and we have to get answers from the Department of Health
281	and Human Services.
282	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
283	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
284	I would note for all members that their opening
285	statements could be made part of the record as a UC. Are
286	there other members wishing to give an opening statement?
287	Seeing none on the Republican side, on the Democratic
288	side? The gentleman from California is recognized for an
289	opening statement.
290	Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just briefly. I
291	appreciate having my bill, H.R. 6141, on the agenda for the
292	markup today following a successful legislative hearing in
293	May and I thank Mr. Hudson for his work on the bill.
294	As I have said before, our nuclear energy technologies
295	are an important part of increasing zero emission energy
296	sources. We need this energy generation and the clean air
297	standards that they can help us achieve. We also need to
298	ensure those energy solutions are being best utilized by our
299	armed forces. Just this week, in fact, I spoke to the
300	Association of Defense Communities about the future of energy

301 use in the military and this importance cannot be stressed 302 enough. 303 This bill would direct the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to work together in analyzing how 304 305 microreactors can bolster energy resiliency for national 306 security. Doing so is an important step in developing the energy resources our armed forces need. In my home district 307 308 in San Diego the DOD has been a willing and helpful partner in developing and testing innovative energy resources and I 309 think the partnership in this bill makes sense and I 310 311 appreciate my colleagues' supportive vote on it today and I 312 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. vield back. 313 chair would recognize Mr. Johnson for an opening statement. 314 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening Mr. Johnson. 315 this important markup today relating to nuclear energy. I would like to briefly highlight one of the four important 316 317 bills, a discussion draft titled The Advancing U.S. Nuclear 318 Competitiveness and Jobs Act. The Department of Energy plays a critical role in 319 320 America's nuclear industry's engagement in international commerce through the Part 810 permitting process. With 321

almost 200 gigawatts of new nuclear energy capacity projected

323	to be added throughout the world by 2050, it is incumbent on
324	Congress to ensure the Part 810 process is efficient and that
325	it continues to maintain our strong nuclear nonproliferation
326	posture.
327	The U.S. nuclear industry faces intense foreign
328	competition within the international civil nuclear market.
329	Many foreign enterprises with state backing like Russia and
330	China, those countries see getting a toehold in nuclear
331	energy as a strategic tool to leverage themselves into a 100-
332	year, state-to-state relationship with other countries. The
333	discussion draft before us today ensures DOE's 810 process
334	remains robust, safe, and predictable.
335	It takes common sense steps towards ensuring U.S.
336	leadership and civil nuclear commerce continues to be
337	competitive abroad without sacrificing national security
338	concerns. I am hopeful that we can put politics aside today,
339	focus on the policies of this draft, and pass it with
340	bipartisan support. And with that I yield back.
341	Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. Other
342	members wishing to give an opening statement?
343	Mr. Green?
344	Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we are

345 marking up four different nuclear energy bills that would 346 address many of the challenges faced by the nuclear sector. 347 It is important that we clear the way for the new technology and limit burdens and regulatory structures where possible. 348 349 I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1320, the Nuclear Utilization 350 Keynote Energy Act, introduced by Mr. Doyle and Mr. 351 Kinzinger. The bill makes several drastically necessary 352 changes to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's budget and fee structure as well as the license applications process. 353 354 As we lose more and more zero emission clean energy 355 sources with the closure of nuclear plants across the 356 country, the NRC fee structure faces an undue financial 357 burden on the plants which remain in operation. 358 important that we address this issue now and give existing 359 nuclear plants a fee framework that reflects the 21st 360 century. I am proud to support this bill and recommend the 361 excellent work of both my colleagues Mr. Doyle and Mr. 362 Kinzinger. 363 I also support H.R. 6140, the Advanced Nuclear Fuel 364 Availability Act introduced by Mr. Flores and Mr. McNerney. 365 The bill directs the Secretary of Energy to establish a 366 program for support of high-assay, low-enriched uranium that

367 is required by newer, advanced reactors. While supply of 368 this fuel is still at issue, this bill takes many needed 369 steps that will direct the Secretary to study questions that will put us on the path to a modern nuclear fleet in the 370 371 2030s. 372 Microreactors are another technology that I am excited 373 to see this committee look into. I support H.R. 6141 by 374 Representatives Wilson, Norcross, Hudson, and Peters to direct the DOE Secretary to develop a report for a pilot 375 376 program for microreactors at critical national security 377 This technology has the potential to strengthen in sites. some of our most important sites for nuclear security. 378 379 Sustainable, clean onsite power at these sites ensures that 380 our nation's security will be protected in the event of an 381 attack allowing these important sites to function as they 382 were meant to be without interruption. 383 While I support many of the goals of Mr. Johnson's 384 Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act there is still some outstanding issues with the bill as it 385 386 currently stands that permits me from supporting it today. U.S. nuclear technology is best and safest in the world. 387 There is a reason we see so many foreign countries wishing to 388

389	develop their infrastructure with out expertise. While I
390	feel that section 810 does
391	Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expiring.
392	Mr. Green. Okay. I think 30 days is too short, Mr.
393	Chairman, and hopefully before we go to markup in the full
394	committee that could be changed. And I appreciate your
395	patience, thank you.
396	Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. Other
397	members wishing to give an opening statement?
398	Seeing none, the chair will call up the discussion draft
399	entitled Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and
400	Jobs Act and ask the clerk to report.
401	[The Bill follows:]
402	
403	************INSERT 1*******

404	The Clerk. Discussion Draft, to amend the Atomic Energy
405	Act of 1954, to improve the process by which the Secretary of
406	Energy authorizes the transfer of civilian nuclear commerce
407	technology and assistance and for other purposes.
408	Mr. Upton. And, without objection, the first reading of
409	the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for
410	amendment at any point, so ordered.
411	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?
412	Are there any other amendments to the bill?
413	Seeing none, the gentleman from Oregon
414	Mr. Schrader. Can I comment on the bill, Mr. Chairman?
415	Mr. Upton. Strike the last word, the gentleman is
416	recognized for 5 minutes.
417	Mr. Schrader. Yes. I would just like to thank my
418	friend from Ohio for introducing this bill and organize the
419	810 process. I am an all-above member when it comes to
420	energy policy, and if we want to pursue an aggressive
421	strategy to curb the effects of carbon it is going to have to
422	include not only renewable energy, but I believe nuclear as
423	well. I also want U.S. companies to be competitive not only
424	here at home, but internationally too.
425	With that said, I am not quite sure we are here yet with

426 this bill. I am not comfortable with the idea we are going 427 to be mandating the Secretary review these applications or 428 delegate his authority or make a determination within just 30 429 days especially when we are talking about sending sensitive 430 nuclear technology to non-nuclear nations. 431 completely unrealistic and, I believe, unsafe. 432 In addition, I think it would be more prudent if we had 433 DOE also report back to Congress about the 810 process in making it more effective before we pass legislation 434 435 expediting the program. As a result I will be voting no 436 today, but I would like to continue to work with Mr. Johnson 437 and members of the committee to improve the bill before a 438 full committee. And I thank the chairman and yield back. The gentleman yields back. The chair would 439 Mr. Upton. 440 recognize to strike the last word, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson. Move to strike the last word, Mr. 441 442 Chairman. 443 When Congress amended the Atomic Energy Act in 1954 to provide for the commercial use of nuclear technology, the 444 445 United States was one of only a few countries who had nuclear energy capacity. Today, countries throughout the world have 446 access to nuclear technology and the United States is no 447

longer the only game in town. Today, our domestic nuclear suppliers face very stiff global competition mainly from nuclear state-owned vendors who use nuclear energy projects to implement national policy objectives and as a job creator back home. These state-owned entities will offer nuclear project debt with better terms than market rates and even use these projects as part of a larger deal and not simply a standalone commercial deal.

[Chart.]

Mr. Johnson. As the graph shows that you will see here, over 50 percent of new nuclear builds are currently going to China and Russia. That is concerning to me and it should be concerning to every member of this committee, especially considering nuclear power plants last a very long time. I don't know about everyone else in the room, but I prefer countries engaging with the United States rather than Russia to meet their peaceful nuclear energy needs.

So this discussion is about giving DOE and its staff the tools they need to safely and efficiently consider these specific authorizations, thereby helping our domestic nuclear

suppliers to more effectively compete within this intensely competitive world market. Importantly, DOE has recognized the need for a timely review process for these authorizations and has made progress over the last several years to improve the efficiency and transparency of the Part 810 process.

This has been under both Democratic and Republican administrations. In fact, in February 2015, DOE published efficiency revisions to the 810 regulations, the first such revision since 1986. Those revisions were based on recommendations that stemmed from a Government Accountability Office report requested by Chairman Upton.

This discussion draft builds upon that work through sensible statutory reforms, many of which DOE is unable to accomplish through further rulemakings. Specifically, it directs the Secretary of Energy to establish procedures for predictable and timely consideration of exports of certain low-risk technologies. It permits the Secretary to delegate the approval of certain low-risk authorizations to reduce the paperwork and the workload for the Secretary, and it requires the Department of Energy to process authorizations concurrently during the interagency review.

This draft ensures important safeguards are in place and

upheld, such as maintaining the current interagency review process, and still requires the State Department to receive assurances from a foreign government regarding the use and transfer of nuclear technology. I urge my colleagues to support this important draft and if my colleagues object to any of the policy provisions contained within the draft, I stand ready and willing to work on those provisions. As the ranking member acknowledged during the legislative hearing on this draft, the 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive within the civil nuclear marketplace. This draft is a step towards achieving that goal and is crucial that we separate these common sense policy reforms from politics. I would also like to point out that there is bipartisan language contained within the Senate fiscal year 2019 NDAA aimed at improving the 810 process, so I would hope we would find some common ground on the House side as well. There is clearly the need for this language and with

There is clearly the need for this language and with that I urge my colleagues to support the draft. And now I would like to yield some time to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Doyle, to speak on behalf of this bill.

Mr. Doyle. And I want to thank you for your work to

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

address the 810 process. I have heard from several companies in my district who have faced challenges navigating the process to export nuclear technology. The demand for nuclear technology is growing in international markets and this presents a great opportunity for jobs not only in Pittsburgh but across the United States.

When we are exporting nuclear technology to other countries we must protect our national security and our nonproliferation goals. But there are also some common sense changes that can be made to this process for low-risk technology. This legislation takes important steps to do so. You know, if we are not able to export our technology other countries will step in to fill the void and American jobs will suffer. It is far better to have American technologies and companies on the ground in other countries than to have countries such as Russia building nuclear plants throughout the world.

I appreciate my colleague's effort to address this important issue and believe that we can streamline the process without sacrificing national security or our nonproliferation goals. And I share the gentleman's comment that if we have members that want to see some changes or have

536	some concerns with this bill, let's work together and get
537	this bill out of the committee. I thank you and I yield
538	back.
539	Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is this. We
540	are either, if we are going to be competitiveness we have got
541	to be responsive. If we are not responsive other nations
542	like Russia and China are going to be, and we are going to
543	lose our lead, our edge in nuclear nonproliferation. So with
544	that I urge a yes vote on this legislation and I yield back.
545	Mr. Upton. The gentleman time is expired. The chair
546	recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr.
547	Pallone, to strike the last word.
547 548	Pallone, to strike the last word. Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
548	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
548 549	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I
548549550	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the
548549550551	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive in the commercial nuclear space,
548549550551552	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive in the commercial nuclear space, but the bill establishes this brief 30-day frame for the
548549550551552553	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive in the commercial nuclear space, but the bill establishes this brief 30-day frame for the Secretary to approve the transfer of certain low
548549550551552553554	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive in the commercial nuclear space, but the bill establishes this brief 30-day frame for the Secretary to approve the transfer of certain low proliferation risk nuclear technologies to countries that are

pursue building nuclear weapons.

So I am uncomfortable with expediting the review process for Part 810 at a time when there is so much global uncertainty with regard to nuclear proliferation. Thirty days, I think, is just too short of a timeframe in the current climate to properly address security questions regarding the use of these nuclear technologies.

I also believe that DOE can improve this process on its own without congressional involvement. DOE testified at the legislative hearing on this bill that it has made numerous improvements to the process through its Part 10 process improvement plan. Further, DOE testified, and I quote, that the lengthiest part of the authorization process remains the time it takes partner countries to provide the required governmental nonproliferation assurances which can result in processing delays of 6 months to well over a year, unquote.

So it seems as if the goal of this bill is to be more competitive by being less secure and that is troubling. I am not saying that is what you want, but that is my concern.

And I understand the desire for predictable Part 810 review process. This is just not the right time, in my opinion, to possibly cut corners on oversight of these technologies and

580	the potential for nuclear proliferation.
581	And I know that Mr. Johnson put up that chart. I don't
582	know where it went. I don't know if we have to put it up
583	again. But Mr. Johnson argued that China and Russia are
584	dominating the global nuclear industry in exporting their
585	technologies to more countries, but of course China and
586	Russia do not have the stringent export and licensing
587	policies like the U.S.
588	And once again it seems as if the goal of the bill is to
589	be more competitive I am concerned that we not be more
590	competitive by being less secure. That is what troubles me
591	here. So I do ask that my colleagues vote no on the
592	legislation. I yield back, Mr. Chairman, unless someone
593	wants my time. I don't think so. Thank you.
594	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to speak on the bill?
595	Seeing none, no amendments being offered, the question
596	now occurs on forwarding the discussion draft to the full
597	committee.
598	All those in favor will you ask for a roll call?
599	A roll call has been requested. The clerk will call the
600	roll. This will be on passage of the discussion draft.
601	The Clerk. Mr. Olson?

602	Mr. Olson. Aye.
603	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes aye.
604	Mr. Barton?
605	Mr. Shimkus?
606	Mr. Shimkus. Aye.
607	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
608	Mr. Latta?
609	Mr. Latta. Aye.
610	The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.
611	Mr. Harper?
612	Mr. Harper. Aye.
613	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes aye.
614	Mr. McKinley?
615	Mr. McKinley. Aye.
616	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes aye.
617	Mr. Kinzinger?
618	Mr. Kinzinger. Aye.
619	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger votes aye.
620	Mr. Griffith?
621	Mr. Griffith. Aye.
622	The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
623	Mr. Johnson?

624	Mr. Johnson. Aye.
625	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
626	Mr. Long?
627	Mr. Long. Aye.
628	The Clerk. Mr. Long votes aye.
629	Mr. Bucshon?
630	Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
631	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
632	Mr. Flores?
633	Mr. Mullin?
634	Mr. Mullin. Aye.
635	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.
636	Mr. Hudson?
637	Mr. Hudson. Aye.
638	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.
639	Mr. Cramer?
640	Mr. Cramer. Aye.
641	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes aye.
642	Mr. Walberg?
643	Mr. Walberg. Aye.
644	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
645	Mr. Duncan?

646	Mr. Duncan. Aye.
647	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes aye.
648	Chairman Walden?
649	Mr. Rush?
650	Mr. Rush. No.
651	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes no.
652	Mr. McNerney?
653	Mr. McNerney. No.
654	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes no.
655	Mr. Peters?
656	Mr. Peters. No.
657	The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
658	Mr. Green?
659	Mr. Green. No.
660	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes no.
661	Mr. Doyle?
662	Mr. Doyle. Yes.
663	The Clerk. Mr. Doyle votes aye.
664	Ms. Castor?
665	Ms. Castor. No.
666	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.
667	Mr. Sarbanes?

668	Mr. Sarbanes. No.
669	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.
670	Mr. Welch?
671	Mr. Welch. No.
672	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes no.
673	Mr. Tonko?
674	Mr. Tonko. No.
675	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.
676	Mr. Loebsack?
677	Mr. Loebsack. No.
678	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes no.
679	Mr. Schrader?
680	Mr. Schrader. No.
681	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes no.
682	Mr. Kennedy?
683	Mr. Kennedy. No.
684	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes no.
685	Mr. Butterfield?
686	Mr. Pallone?
687	Mr. Pallone. No.
688	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes no.
689	Chairman Upton?

690	Mr. Upton. Votes aye.
691	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes aye.
692	Mr. Upton. Vote Mr. Barton?
693	Mr. Barton. Vote aye.
694	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
695	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to cast a vote or
696	change their vote?
697	All right, seeing none how does Mr. Walden?
698	The Chairman. Aye.
699	The Clerk. Chairman Walden votes aye.
700	Mr. Upton. Anybody else?
701	The clerk will report the tally.
702	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 19
703	ayes and 12 noes.
704	Mr. Upton. Thank you ayes.
705	Oh, how is Butterfield recorded?
706	Mr. Butterfield. No.
707	Mr. Upton. Oh man, maybe you all right. Mr.
708	Butterfield is recorded as no.
709	The Clerk. Butterfield votes no.
710	Mr. Upton. It is not 2:00 in the morning nor is it
711	going to get there. So on that the clerk will report 19

712	ayes, 13 noes.
713	Oh, and Mr. Flores?
714	Mr. Flores. Aye.
715	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes aye.
716	Mr. Upton. 20. I will let the clerk report now just to
717	make sure.
718	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 20
719	ayes and 13 noes.
720	Mr. Upton. 20 ayes, 13 noes. The bill is favorably
721	reported. The draft is favorably reported.
722	The chair will now call up H.R. 1320 and ask the clerk
723	to report.
724	[The Bill H.R. 1320 follows:]
725	
726	**************************************

727	The Clerk. H.R. 1320, to amend the Omnibus Budget
728	Reconciliation Act of 1990 related to Nuclear Regulatory
729	Commission user fees and annual charges and for other
730	purposes.
731	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the
732	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment
733	at any point, so ordered. And Mr. Kinzinger and Doyle are
734	seeking recognition to offer an amendment in the nature of a
735	substitute.
736	Mr. Kinzinger. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
737	desk.
738	[The amendment offered by Mr. Kinzinger follows:]
739	
740	********INSERT 3******

741	Mr. Upton. So the clerk will report.
742	The Clerk. An amendment in the nature of a substitute
743	to H.R. 1320 offered by Mr. Kinzinger.
744	Mr. Upton. And, without objection, the first reading,
745	or it is considered as read and the gentleman from Illinois
746	is recognized for 5 minutes.
747	Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
748	I am pleased to see this being included today, the NUKE
749	Act, which my colleague, Mike Doyle, and I have been working
750	on for well over a year including today, and I thank him for
751	his help. We have worked on this bill for so long because we
752	both realize that this is a pivotal moment for nuclear power.
753	This is technology that was invented in my home state of
754	Illinois so, you know, it makes us better than everybody
755	else on that and continues to provide my constituents with
756	reliable, carbon-free electricity.
757	Unfortunately, the fate of our nation's nuclear fleet is
758	not guaranteed and the consequences of continued early
759	retirement from the loss of good jobs to ceding our global
760	leadership on safety and nonproliferation are all too real.
761	And as was discussed on the prior bill, there are a lot of
762	issues we have to deal with in terms of continuing our world

763 leadership in a very different world than when the rules were 764 written. 765 This legislation provides reasonable reforms to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to increase accountability, 766 767 transparency, and predictability in regulation. Reducing the 768 regulatory burden on existing plants while still maintaining the NRC's gold standard of safety will make it easier for not 769 770 only our current fleet of nuclear plants but also the next generation of nuclear to thrive. 771 772 This amendment makes several changes to H.R. 1320, many 773 of which are based on technical feedback from the NRC and 774 based on feedback from my colleagues on this committee. 775 Specifically, this amendment extends several compliance and 776 reporting dates to account for the passage of time since the bill was introduced in March of 2017. Further, section 8 is 777 778 replaced with a sense of Congress to reflect the NRC's 779 progress towards a rule on plant decommissioning. 780 With many licenses and local communities awaiting 781 quidance from NRC on this process, the previous language would have further delayed this by requiring NRC to restart 782 783 the rulemaking process. Additionally, based on concerns from 784 Ranking Member Pallone during last month's hearing, the

785 deadlines in section 7 have been modified to provide 786 additional flexibility and recognition that unforeseen 787 circumstances may arise to prevent those deadlines from being 788 met. 789 I look forward to continuing to work with members on 790 both sides of the aisle to further refine this bill. 791 Overall, this amendment in the nature of a substitute 792 provides improved clarity and additional flexibility in this great underlying bill. With that I encourage my colleagues 793 to support this amendment. And if Mr. Doyle wants my time or 794 795 to claim his own I am happy to yield to him. 796 Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman. And I appreciate the 797 opportunity to speak about the NUKE Act that I cosponsor with 798 my colleague and friend Adam Kinzinger. Nuclear energy provides nearly 40 percent of 799 Pennsylvania's electricity and employs thousands of skilled 800 801 workers in Pennsylvania. And despite being a carbon-free and 802 reliable source of baseload power, the nuclear energy industry is facing pressure from a variety of factors such as 803 804 increasing NRC fees and uncertainty in the export process. 805 Addressing some of these issues will be necessary not only to 806 protect jobs in Pennsylvania and across the country, but as

well to meet our nation's climate goals.

I want to thank my colleague Adam Kinzinger for his leadership and work on the NUKE Act. This bipartisan legislation will take important steps to modernize the NRC's fee structure, set achievable and flexible timelines for application reviews, and look to future reforms that will ensure the NRC can continue to effectively protect public health and safety.

The bill addresses a serious reality facing the nuclear industry. As nuclear power plants retire, the remaining fleet will be faced with increasing fees from NRC. We need to support our existing nuclear plants while ensuring that the NRC is able to fulfill its mission. I believe this legislation accomplishes those goals. And I would remind all of my colleagues that if we start to lose our nuclear portfolio in this country it will be impossible to meet our climate change goals.

So those of us that believe climate change is real and want to see that problem addressed, we dare not continue to lose nuclear facilities especially before their time. And that is why I think this legislation is necessary and I support it and I thank Mr. Kinzinger. I yield back.

829	Mr. Kinzinger. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.
830	I yield back my time.
831	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
832	wishing to speak? The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr.
833	Pallone, to strike the last word.
834	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate
835	the efforts of my colleagues to address issues relating to
836	the licensing of nuclear power reactors here in the U.S.
837	H.R. 1320 makes a number of changes to the NRC budget process
838	to the NRC budget process and fee structure and I do worry
839	that several of the provisions could arbitrarily limit the
840	resources the NRC needs and adversely affect its ability to
841	do its job. I appreciate that several changes made in the
842	amendment in the nature of a substitute give NRC more
843	flexibility, but I still have concerns about limiting NRC's
844	resources.
845	The bill also sets time limits for NRC to complete major
846	milestones in the licensing process. NRC is given 24 months
847	to complete a draft environmental impact statement and 42
848	months to complete the technical review process. While this
849	timeline may be realistic for most projects, it doesn't give
850	the Commission the necessary flexibility, in my opinion, to

851	take the time it may need to study relevant issues if it
852	receives a more complex application.
853	As I said in my opening statement, I am also concerned
854	with a provision requiring NRC to issue a construction permit
855	for a nuclear facility even if an entity has filed a formal
856	request for a hearing objecting to the project. The
857	stakeholders have testified that it is already extremely
858	difficult to intervene in the licensing process for a nuclear
859	facility especially if you are not an expert.
860	So I don't think we should be limiting the opportunity
861	for stakeholders to have their views heard in the licensing
862	process. I am not able to support the bill if this provision
863	remains when the bill is considered at the full committee.
864	But my concerns aside, I do support making common sense
865	changes to the NRC licensing process that can ease the
866	pressure on the nuclear industry without jeopardizing safety
867	or the environment. And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
868	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
869	wishing to speak? The gentleman from Vermont.
870	Mr. Welch. I move to strike the last word.
871	Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. Kinzinger and Mr.
872	Doyle for their work on this. I would like to speak briefly

on a measure contained in the bill dealing with the nuclear plant decommissioning process. Vermont has a decommissioned nuclear plant more and more are going offline. There will be the issues that Mr. Doyle mentioned that we have to contend with, but one of the things that we have to focus on is the impact on the communities in the rulemaking process at the NRC.

The provision in the bill that I am speaking about, section 8 of INS contains a sense of Congress provision stating that a safe, effective, and efficient decommissioning process for nuclear reactors that supports the principles of good regulation including openness, clarity, and reliability is vital to all licensees and local communities and that the NRC should complete the final rulemaking in the next 18 months. I am very happy that that provision was included by Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Doyle. The impact of the decommissioning on local communities is very significant.

As you know, the NRC is currently developing a draft regulatory guidance to determine how a nuclear plant decommissioning should unfold. We have regulation in place that is guiding the development of new nuclear reactors, but Vermont's experience with Vermont Yankee has shown that we

lack a coherent structure on how reactors should be taken down after their useful life. And to that end this is an important rulemaking that I was pleased to see the NRC update.

Yet I am concerned by the direction the NRC is heading. While the Commission appears to be inclined to use rulemaking to sign off on the nuclear industry's wish list of costsaving measures such as streamlined safety exemptions, it fails to address the concerns of state and local communities across the country that are hosting nuclear reactors and want a seat at the table.

There are several specific concerns that I have with the current approach at the NRC, and other members who have plants that are going to go offline might share these: lack of state and local stakeholder involvement; questionable use of the decommissioning trust fund such as for spent fuel management; the reality that the use of safe stored decommissioning procedures will effectively delay a full cleanup and redevelopment of nuclear sites for decades; the reduction of emergency planning functions during periods when spent fuel remains in spent fuel pools.

It is apparent that the industry would like to narrow

917	the scope of this rulemaking to only what they deem the most
918	pressing matters. I believe we must push back on that. We
919	are at a critical point that will shape how communities deal
920	with decommissioning for decades. It is imperative that the
921	NRC take a comprehensive approach to this that guarantees
922	host communities a seat at the table.
923	I want to work with Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Doyle to see
924	if we can build on section 8 in their bill of this
925	legislation to encourage NRC to address these issues as part
926	of the rulemaking. And I hope, Mr. Doyle and Mr. Kinzinger,
927	we can work together on that going forward. Thank you and I
928	yield back.
929	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
930	wishing to speak?
931	Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment in the
932	nature of a substitute. All those in favor will signify by
933	saying aye. Aye.
934	Those opposed, say no.
935	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The
936	amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.
937	The question now occurs are there further amendments?
938	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R.

939	1320, as amended, to the full committee.
940	All those in favor will say aye. Aye.
941	Those opposed say no.
942	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it and the
943	bill is agreed to.
944	The chair now calls up H.R. 6140 and ask the clerk to
945	report.
946	[The Bill H.R. 6140 follows:]
947	
948	**********INSERT 4******

949	The Clerk. H.R. 6140, to require the Secretary of
950	Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the
951	availability of high-assay, low-enriched uranium for domestic
952	commercial use and for other purposes.
953	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the
954	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment
955	at any point.
956	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?
957	Are there any amendments to the bill?
958	Mr. Flores. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last
959	word.
960	Mr. Upton. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.
961	Mr. Flores. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
962	Most of today's nuclear reactors are very similar in
963	nature and they operate on a fuel that generally is enriched
964	below five percent. The next generation of advanced reactors
965	is currently under development. However, they vary in size
966	and operation and they will need greater flexibility and
967	efficiencies from an advanced fuel. This fuel is known as
968	high-assay, low-enriched uranium or HA-LEU for short, and it
969	is enriched at higher levels than what is currently available
970	in the commercial market.

The Bipartisan Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act, which I introduced with my friend Mr. McNerney, establishes a public-private partnership through the Energy Department's Office of Nuclear Energy to support the availability of highassay, low-enriched uranium for domestic commercial use. This bill as introduced also includes updates to the discussion draft from last month's legislative hearing including, first, a clarification that members of the consortium may include entities involved in any state of the nuclear fuel cycle; second, that the applicability of secretarial determinations on uranium transfers will be set; and third, it incorporates other technical feedback. A March 2017 survey of 18 U.S.-based advanced nuclear developers found that a lack of availability of advanced fuel is the foremost factor that would impede the development and deployment of advanced nuclear technologies. Simply put, this bill would ensure that there is a robust supply of advanced fuel available for the domestic commercial industry to purchase for the advanced nuclear reactors of tomorrow.

I want to again thank my friend Mr. McNerney for working with me on this bill and I look forward to seeing H.R. 6140 advance to the full committee for consideration. I yield

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993	back the balance of my time.
994	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
995	wishing the gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, to
996	strike the last word.
997	Mr. McNerney. Strike the last word. I thank the
998	chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to
999	the committee and I am glad to work with Mr. Flores to
1000	advance nuclear technology. We need a diverse energy mix and
1001	nuclear energy provides a zero carbon emission electricity.
1002	The availability of high-assay, low-enriched uranium is
1003	critical to these efforts.
1004	Federal investments and protocols regarding the
1005	transportation, fuel fabrication, and enrichment to
1006	effectively bring this fuel to the market are encouraging.
1007	Small modular reactors, or SMRs, will be useful in a variety
1008	of settings and this type of fuel needs to be available by
1009	the time SMRs are more widely available. The consortium that
1010	is formed here is the type of partnership that will be useful
1011	in kickstarting this industry and then turning it over to let
1012	industry take the reins.
1013	However, I do have some proliferation concerns that
1014	still need to be addressed. I am glad to see the authorizing

1015	language included here that was not included in the previous
1016	discussion draft. I look forward to working with my
1017	colleague Mr. Flores in moving this legislation along through
1018	the committee and on to the floor to help us meet our
1019	nation's complex energy and environmental needs. I yield
1020	back.
1021	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
1022	wishing to speak?
1023	Seeing none, the question now occurs in forwarding H.R.
1024	6140 to the full committee.
1025	All those in favor will say aye. Aye.
1026	Those opposed, say no.
1027	In the opinion of the chair the ayes have it. The bill
1028	is forwarded to the full committee.
1029	The chair calls up now H.R. 6141 and asks the clerk to
1030	report.
1031	[The Bill H.R. 6141 follows:]
1032	
1033	*********INSERT 5******

1034	The Clerk. H.R. 6141, to require the Secretary of
1035	Energy to develop a report on the pilot program to site,
1036	construct, and operate microreactors at critical national
1037	security locations and for other purposes.
1038	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the
1039	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment
1040	at any point.
1041	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?
1042	Are there any amendments to the bill?
1043	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R.
1044	6141 to the full committee.
1045	All those in favor will say aye. Aye.
1046	Those opposed, say no.
1047	In the opinion of the chair the ayes have it and the
1048	bill is favorably reported.
1049	So I would like to recognize one of our counsels on the
1050	Energy Subcommittee staff, Jason Stanek. After spending 15
1051	years at FERC, Jason joined the staff last year. He has done
1052	tremendous work on electricity issues, particularly with our
1053	Empowering America series. He is leaving us tomorrow. He
1054	has been appointed as the chairman of the Maryland Public
1055	Utility Commission.

1056	Mr. Sarbanes, he is a guy that you well know, so.
1057	[Applause.]
1058	Mr. Upton. It is well deserved. We know that he has a
1059	wonderful background. We look forward to working with him in
1060	the days and months ahead. Best of luck, you are great.
1061	Thank you.
1062	And with that, without objection, the staff is
1063	authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the
1064	legislation approved by the subcommittee today, so ordered.
1065	And, without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.
1066	[Whereupon, at 10:53 a.m., the subcommittee was
1067	adjourned.]