```
Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1
    RPTS GONZALEZ
2
3
    HIF037030
4
5
    POLITICS OVER PEOPLE: HOW BIDEN'S LNG EXPORT BAN
6
    THREATENS AMERICA'S ENERGY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY
    TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024
8
    House of Representatives,
9
    Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security,
10
    Committee on Energy and Commerce,
11
    Washington, D.C.
12
13
14
          The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:04 a.m. in
15
    Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jeff Duncan
16
     [Chairman of the Subcommittee], presiding.
17
18
          Present: Representatives Duncan, Latta, Guthrie,
    Griffith, Bucshon, Walberg, Palmer, Curtis, Lesko, Pence,
19
    Armstrong, Weber, Balderson, Pfluger, Rodgers (ex officio);
20
    DeGette, Peters, Fletcher, Matsui, Tonko, Veasey, Kuster,
21
```

22 Schrier, Castor, Sarbanes, Cardenas, and Pallone (ex officio). 23 24 Also present: Representatives Allen, Carter, Joyce, Miller-Meeks; and Barragan. 25 Staff Present: Kate Arey, Digital Director; Sarah 26 Burke, Deputy Staff Director; David Burns, Professional Staff 27 Member; Marjorie Connell, Director of Archives; Nick Crocker, 28 29 Senior Advisor and Director of Coalitions; Sydney Greene, Director of Operations; Rebecca Hagigh, Executive Assistant; 30 Nate Hodson, Staff Director; Tara Hupman, Chief Counsel; 31 Daniel Kelly, Press Assistant; Patrick Kelly, Staff 32 Assistant; Sean Kelly, Press Secretary; Alex Khlopin, Staff 33 Assistant; Peter Kielty, General Counsel; Emily King, Member 34 Services Director; Elise Krekorian, Counsel; Mary Martin, 35 Chief Counsel; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel; Kaitlyn 36 Peterson, Clerk; Karli Plucker, Director of Operations 37 (shared staff); Carla Rafael, Senior Staff Assistant; Peter 38 39 Spencer, Senior Professional Staff Member; Michael Taggart, Policy Director; Dray Thorne, Director of Information 40 Technology; Waverly Gordon, Minority Deputy Staff Director 41 and General Counsel; Brian Hall, Minority Energy Fellow; 42

- 43 Kristopher Pittard, Minority Professional Staff Member; Emma
- Roehrig, Minority Staff Assistant; Kylea Rogers, Minority
- 45 Policy Analyst; Tuley Wright, Minority Staff Director,
- 46 Energy, Climate and Grid Security; and Jessica Zhao, Minority
- 47 Intern.

48

*Mr. Duncan. The Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and 49 Grid Security will now come to order. 50 51 The chair will now recognize himself for five minutes for an opening statement. 52 I want to thank you all for being here today, and 53 welcome to the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security 54 Subcommittee hearing titled, "Politics Over People: How 55 56 Biden's LNG Export Ban Threatens America's Energy and Economic Security.'' 57 Ignoring science and heeding the loudest of his 58 political base, President Biden recently moved to ban exports 59 of U.S. liquefied natural gas, or LNG, and he did this over 60 the best interest of the American people. Less than two 61 weeks ago the Biden Administration announced that it would 62 impose an indefinite ban on the issuance of LNG export 63 permits to non-free-trade-agreement countries where it 64 conducts while it conducts a review to consider the climate 65 66 impacts of natural gas. The Biden Administration did not issue an executive 67 order or request Congress to enact legislation, but instead 68 issued this major policy shift through a fact sheet and a 69

70 press release. The announcement indicates no endpoint or a timeline for this indefinite pause. 71 72 We invited the Department of Energy to testify, but they declined to send anyone to this hearing. They left America 73 and communities throughout Louisiana and Texas with many 74 unanswered questions and unrecognized concerns. 75 I am thankful, however, we will get to hear from 76 77 witnesses who can speak to the benefits of U.S. LNG and how the ban on LNG exports will harm the American economy, our 78 energy security, and our national security. 79 LNG exports strengthen energy security, create jobs, 80 decrease energy prices here at home, and lower emissions 81 globally. U.S. LNG exports could support up to 452,000 82 additional American jobs and add up to \$73 billion to the 83 U.S. economy by 2040. They can also create billions of 84 dollars in revenues for Federal, state, and local 85 governments. 86 87 In addition to undercutting our domestic energy industry, President Biden's decision is a gift to Vladimir 88 Putin. Global demand for natural gas is expected to increase 89 46 percent by 2050, and our European and Asian allies, who 90

want to do business with the United States, will now look to 91 Qatar, Russia, and Iran to meet their growing energy needs. 92 93 The Biden Administration's energy policy has been a handout to our adversaries. 94 The happiest person when Biden took office was Vladimir 95 Putin. He knew he could continue to exploit the stranglehold 96 the well-funded radical climate lobby has on this 97 98 Administration. These radical environmentalists don't seem to care about the economic and environmental benefits of 99 exporting U.S. gas has, especially to countries desperate to 100 escape energy poverty. 101 Under current law, any person wishing to import or 102 export U.S. natural gas must first obtain approval from FERC 103 to construct and operate an LNG facility. This requires 104 applicants to complete an environmental and safety review. 105 After FERC issues the certification, DOE conducts a public 106 interest review of the project. DOE is required to do this 107 108 for all exports going to non-free-trade-agreement countries. DOE is required to grant the export application, unless it is 109 found that the proposed exportation and importation of LNG is 110 not in the public interest. 111

112 Congress intended the public interest requirement to consider economic factors when it originally enacted the 113 114 Natural Gas Act. The Biden Administration has weaponized this review in order to pursue climate objectives. 115 Ironically, Biden and the environmental radicals are going to 116 achieve the opposite because a ban of U.S. LNG exports will 117 increase global emissions. 118 119 Republicans have a solution. My colleague, Congressman Pfluger, recently introduced H.R. 7176, the Unlocking Our 120 Domestic LNG Potential Act. This is a bill formerly led by 121 representative Bill Johnson. This bill would lift all DOE 122 restrictions on the import and export of natural gas. Export 123 facilities would still have to receive certification from 124 FERC, but DOE would no longer be able to halt exports based 125 on this Administration's weaponized public interest test. 126 DOE has consistently found that U.S. LNG exports serve 127 the public interest because they contribute positive economic 128 benefits and strengthen energy security for the American 129 These exports also have the potential to reduce 130 global greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Pfluger's bill is a 131 solution to pushing back on yet another awful Biden energy 132

133	policy, and I urge all my colleagues to support that effort.
134	[The prepared statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]
135	
136	*********COMMITTEE INSERT******
137	

138 *Mr. Duncan. So I look forward to hearing from all of our witnesses today, hearing all the member questions and 139 140 answers, and I will now recognize member the Ranking Member DeGette for five minutes for an opening statement. 141 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 142 The United States leads the world in both the production 143 and exportation of liquefied natural gas, also known as LNG. 144 145 According to the Department of Energy, the U.S. harnesses enough LNG energy capacity to export 14 billion cubic feet 146 per day. Based on FERC's latest report, there are enough LNG 147 facilities under construction that are fully permitted to 148 nearly double our current export capacity and enough 149 facilities that have not yet started construction, but are 150 fully approved by both DOE and FERC to more than triple our 151 current export capacity over the next decade. 152 These efforts will keep the U.S. on track to lead the 153 world in LNG exports for years to come. Each proposed LNG 154 155 export facility must undergo a rigorous permitting process outlined by the Natural Gas Act, beginning with FERC and 156 ending with DOE. Applicants must obtain authorization from 157 FERC to construct and operate a proposed LNG facility. Once 158

159 approved by FERC, DOE considers whether the proposed export of natural gas is consistent with public interest. 160 161 It is important to note that DOE is required to grant the application unless it is found to be inconsistent with 162 public interest, so this sets a high burden of proof for 163 denying a project. 164 So many people may be curious as to what defines the 165 166 "public interest.'' It is a purposefully broad phrase, and it encompasses both economic and environmental 167 considerations. It is imperative for DOE to include 168 pertinent factors like domestic energy prices, greenhouse gas 169 emissions, and impacts on communities that have been hit 170 hardest by pollution throughout our history when considering 171 how a project will affect our nation. 172 As everybody here knows, this past month the Biden 173 Administration announced a temporary pause on pending 174 approvals of new LNG exports. This pause was announced to 175 176 fulfill the Administration's duty to protect America's interests under the Natural Gas Act, and to allow DOE to 177 update its underlying analysis for LNG authorizations, 178 analysis which was last updated in 2018 when the U.S. was 179

180 exporting only one third of the capacity that we have today. Now, that was pre-COVID, and the impact of the pandemic on 181 182 our economy and communities must be taken into consideration. The fact that our nation's production has ramped up so 183 quickly must be considered, especially since the U.S. 184 currently has enough approved capacity to fulfill the world's 185 energy needs in the short and medium terms. Continuously 186 187 increasing LNG exports without updating guidelines to account for new information is a fundamentally unserious proposal. 188 The Administration's pause will allow them to update guidance 189 to make sure we are not approving additional LNG exports to 190 support other countries at the cost of Americans back home. 191 192 This is responsible policy-making. In short, this pause will allow the Biden Administration 193 to better assess what future projects actually are in the 194 public interest, while taking into account every aspect of 195 these projects, including, critically, the emissions and 196 197 pollution they create. The majority is attempting to rebrand this temporary 198 pause as a "ban on issuing LNG export permits,'' which is 199 false, and I am sure we are going to have I am going to 200

```
201
     have to repeat that over and over again today. So let me
     repeat it right now. The majority is attempting to rebrand
202
203
     this temporary pause as a "ban on issuing LNG export
     permits,'' which is simply not true. Their plan is to give
204
     full authority over LNG exports to FERC, and completely cut
205
     out any consideration of the public interest.
206
          I find it frustrating that the majority has labeled this
207
208
     temporary pause as harmful to American interests, when
     unfettered production of LNG and the pollution that comes
209
     with it is what will harm our communities, both in the short
210
     and in the long term.
211
          The Biden Administration's temporary pause only directly
212
213
     impacts 6 projects that have been approved by FERC and are
     pending at DOE, 6 projects when we are already on track to
214
     increase production by 200 percent in the next decade.
215
          So these harmful mischaracterizations of the
216
     Administration's action omit so many important facts it is
217
218
     just simply hard not to be cynical about the purpose of this
     hearing. And so I think we should get serious here in
219
     Congress.
220
           [The prepared statement of Ms. DeGette follows:]
221
```

222		
223	*********COMMITTEE	INSERT*******
224		

225 *Ms. DeGette. I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The chair will now recognize the chair of 226 227 the full committee, Chair Rodgers, for five minutes for an opening statement. 228 *The Chair. Good morning. The U.S. is blessed with 229 tremendous natural resources which we have been able to 230 harness as a result of free markets and an entrepreneurial 231 232 spirit that is uniquely American. We have harnessed the power of nuclear energy, electrified millions of rural 233 Americans' homes with clean hydropower, and ushered in the 234 shale revolution which unleashed clean natural gas. 235 As a result of this, America is the number-one producer 236 and exporter of liquefied natural gas in the world. 237 helped us shift markets and bolster our own energy security 238 and that of our allies away from adversaries like Russia and 239 Iran, and has enabled the U.S. to reduce emissions more than 240 any other nation both at home and abroad. Leadership 241 242 matters. American leadership matters. Rather than celebrating this legacy, President Biden is 243 heeding the calls, as he puts it, of radical environmental 244 activists who are intent on shutting down American energy. 245

246 The President's recent decision to impose a moratorium on new permits for clean U.S. natural gas exports is the latest 247 248 example of his Administration putting politics over people. The Administration has made its intentions clear. 249 not a pause, as they claimed. This is a ban. 250 The Administration is ignoring the fact that natural gas 251 continues to create millions of new jobs, bring manufacturing 252 253 back to the U.S., and provide and revitalize our communities across the country. In 2022 in Pennsylvania 254 alone, the natural gas industry supported \$41.4 billion in 255 economic activity, the shale gas development supported over 256 120,000 jobs. And these are there are similar experiences 257 258 in states and communities across the country. President Biden's LNG export ban will end these benefits 259 for local economies, kill American jobs, and increase energy 260 prices for people across the board. It will send 261 manufacturing overseas, increase our dangerous dependance 262 263 upon China, and discourage investment in future American energy production. 264 This ban is not only bad for our country, it is bad for 265 our allies. The U.S. LNG has been the lifeline to Europe 266

- 267 ever since Russia's invasion of Ukraine. It has helped reduce natural gas prices in Europe by over 83 percent since 268 269 2002 levels following Russia's invasion. In December 2023 alone, 61 percent of U.S. LNG exports went to Europe, keeping 270 their homes heated, their businesses running, and their 271 lights on. 272 And it has also helped them reduce emissions. Not only 273 274 is U.S. LNG more than 40 percent cleaner than Russian natural gas, it is a better option for power generation than other 275 alternatives currently being used. 276 U.S. exports spurred our European allies to quickly 277 invest in new LNG import facilities in order to further wean 278 themselves off of Russian natural gas. This decision to ban 279 exports is a gift to Putin, and we all know Putin is using 280 energy as a weapon. This is giving the Russians greater 281 leverage over our allies, while further funding their evil 282 activities including the aggression against the Ukrainian 283 284 people. It will destabilize Europe's energy market and signal to our allies that we are no longer a dependable 285 partner. 286
- 287 From day one President Biden has mobilized bureaucrats

288 across the Federal Government to force an energy transition on Americans. From efforts like the Clean Power Plan 2.0, 289 290 which will force states to change fundamentally how they generate electricity and raise costs across the board to 291 electric vehicle mandates that force Americans to buy 292 electric vehicles more expensive, less reliable 293 alternatives, this Administration's rush-to-green agenda is 294 295 shutting down American energy production, driving up costs to consumers, costing people their jobs, and making us more 296 reliant on China and our allies more dependent upon Russia. 297 America's abundant energy resources are critical to our 298 economic and national security. Instead of shutting down 299 300 American energy, we must ensure energy security for us and our allies. President Biden's keep-it-in-the-ground policies 301 are unsustainable, and they are harming America's future. 302 Only by standing up for American values of free market 303 competition, innovation, and environmental stewardship can we 304 305 protect our future. 306 Today's hearing will give all the members an opportunity to hear from some perspectives that are currently being 307 intentionally left out of the conversation, and we will hear 308

309	about important solutions like H.R. 7176 led by
310	Representative Pfluger, which will immediately end the Biden
311	Administration's ban on LNG exports.
312	The President must stop putting politics over people.
313	He must reverse this reckless decision and stop the attacks
314	on American energy independence.
315	[The prepared statement of The Chair follows:]
316	
317	**************************************
318	

*The Chair. With that I yield back. 319 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back, and I now 320 321 recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for five minutes. 322 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 323 Today's hearing will look at the Biden Administration's 324 recent action to ensure that exports of liquefied natural 325 326 gas, or LNG, benefit all Americans. This is a common-sense action. 327 Before we send our energy resources abroad, it is only 328 right that we first confirm doing so is in the American 329 people's best interest, not the interests of our competitors. 330 We should examine the impacts of LNG exports on energy 331 prices, global greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental 332 justice communities. China is also a leading destination for 333 American LNG, and that deserves scrutiny. The President's 334 action is not in China's interest. If you oppose China, you 335 336 should favor the President's action. Furthermore, the law requires the Department of Energy 337 to determine that LNG exports to non-free-trade-agreement 338 countries are in the public interest before approving them. 339

340 The Natural Gas Act is crystal clear in this regard, and the Biden Administration's actions are designed to ensure that 341 342 the Department of Energy is following the law. After all, the LNG market is completely different in the 343 United States now than it was six years ago. Back in 2018 344 there were only two operating LNG export terminals in the 345 United States for a combined capacity of 4.8 billion cubic 346 347 feet per day. Now there are seven operating facilities with the ability to export triple that amount, and DOE has already 348 approved enough export permits to triple our LNG exports 349 again. 350 Today the United States is also far and away the largest 351 natural gas producer in the world. We alone account for 25 352 percent of the entire world's production every day, out-353 producing the next two biggest producers combined. If we are 354 evaluating whether LNG exports are in the public interest in 355 2024, we should be using 2024 data and analysis to make that 356 357 determination. There are a lot of reasons why the law does not allow 358 for unfettered exports of LNG without review. The first 359 reason is that LNG exports can drive up energy prices for 360

361 American consumers. Two years ago we saw natural gas prices here at home tripled to levels not seen since 2008, all 362 because of Putin's invasion of Ukraine and the subsequent 363 European energy crisis. According to one estimate, the price 364 increases due to American LNG exports cost Americans more 365 than \$100 billion over 16 months. This alone is a perfect 366 example of why the DOE review is necessary. 367 368 And the DOE's examination is also necessary considering that a huge amount of our nation's LNG exports go to China. 369 In 2021 China was the second-most popular destination for 370 American LNG exports. Republicans say they are tough on 371 China, but in their pursuit of unlimited LNG exports they are 372 not only increasing prices on American consumers, but 373 providing cheap natural gas to fuel China's industrial 374 economy that is contrary to American interests. 375 Finally, DOE must examine the impacts of LNG exports on 376 greenhouse gas emissions and on front-line environmental 377 378 justice communities. Expanding LNG export infrastructure could drastically increase greenhouse gas emissions, and it 379 is unclear if LNG exports are cleaner than other fossil 380 fuels, once you properly account for methane leakage during 381

382 liquefaction. And these are questions that DOE must also 383 answer. 384 Studies also show that communities located near oil and gas facilities face serious adverse negative health impacts, 385 including increased rates of asthma, lung cancer, and 386 premature deaths. We can't ignore these impacts, and DOE 387 must include them in any public interest test so that we can 388 389 better protect these communities in the future. Now, we are likely to hear a lot of misinformation from 390 the Republican majority today. So let me set the record 391 straight. This pause will not change the current export flow 392 of LNG to Europe. It will not affect the LNG facilities 393 currently under construction or the facilities that are 394 already approved and have yet to begin construction. If the 395 Department of Energy never approved another permit, our LNG 396 exports could still triple from now until the end of the 397 decade, and that is more than enough to ensure that Europe 398 399 gets all the gas it needs. It is also ironic that Republicans are voicing concern 400 for Europeans when they have refused to provide support to 401 our Ukrainian allies as they continue to suffer from a 402

```
403
     barbaric invasion by Putin. Well over a majority of
     committee Republicans opposed the Ukraine aid package when it
404
405
     came up for a vote. Instead, House Republicans continue to
     do the bidding of their corporate polluter friends, pushing
406
     H.R. 1130, legislation that would remove all public interest
407
     determinations from LNG exports. It is just another example
408
     of Republicans putting polluters over people.
409
410
          The Biden Administration is rightfully taking a
     different approach, making sure any additional LNG exports
411
     benefit the American people, and this action builds on the
412
     Administration's commitment to lowering energy costs for
413
     Americans and protecting them from corporate polluters, the
414
     practice of corporate polluters of putting profits over
415
416
     people.
417
418
           [The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]
419
420
     *********************************
421
422
```

423 *Mr. Pallone. So thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back. 424 425 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back, and that concludes the members' opening statements. 426 The chair would like to remind members that, pursuant to 427 the committee rules, all members' opening statements will be 428 made part of the record. 429 430 We will now move into the witness testimony, and we want to thank all of our witnesses for being here and taking time 431 to testify before this subcommittee. 432 Each witness will have the opportunity to give an 433 opening statement, followed by a round of questions from 434 435 members. There are some lights in front of you: green, red 436 green, yellow, red. It is kind of self-explanatory. It gets 437 to red, you need to wrap up. If not, I will start gaveling, 438 and then you will need to wrap up. 439 440 Our witnesses for today: Mr. Toby Rice, president and CEO of EQT Corporation; Mr. Eric Cormier from southwest 441 Louisiana, senior vice president of entrepreneurship and 442

strategic initiatives with the Southwest Louisiana Chamber of

443

```
444
     Economic Development Alliance and I want to applaud
     Louisiana for electing Jeff Landry, a former colleague, as
445
446
     your new governor, I look forward to good things in
     Louisiana; and Ms. is it Gillian or Jillian?
447
          *Ms. Giannetti. Gillian.
448
          *Mr. Duncan. Gillian Giannetti, senior attorney with
449
     the Natural Resources Defense Council.
450
          And lastly, Brigham McCown, senior fellow and director
451
     of initiative on American energy security at the Hudson
452
     Institute.
453
          So we appreciate you being here today. I will now
454
     recognize Mr. Rice for a five-minute opening statement.
455
456
```

457 STATEMENT OF TOBY Z. RICE, PRESIDENT AND CEO, EQT CORPORATION; ERIC CORMIER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF 458 459 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND STRATEGIC INITIATIVES, SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA CHAMBER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE; GILLIAN 460 GIANNETTI, SENIOR ATTORNEY, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE 461 COUNCIL; AND BRIGHAM MCCOWN, SENIOR FELLOW AND DIRECTOR, 462 INITIATIVE ON AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY, HUDSON INSTITUTE 463 464 465 STATEMENT OF TOBY Z. RICE 466 *Mr. Rice. Chair Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, and 467 members of the subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to 468 participate in today's hearing. My name is Toby Rice. I am 469 the president and CEO of EQT, America's largest natural gas 470 producer. 471 You know, I find myself in disbelief that I am seated in 472 front of Congress today responding to a moratorium on 473 474 authorizations of U.S. LNG exports less than two years after this industry literally kept the lights on in Europe 475 following Russia's invasion on Ukraine. That alone should be 476 the end of the discussion. 477

And for those of you that say Europe today is in the 478 clear, it is worth noting that this is the second time I had 479 480 to defend against calls to curtail us LNG arguments on both climate and cost impact. The first time was a letter I sent 481 to Secretary Granholm just eight days before Russia's 482 invasion of Ukraine. 483 That U.S. LNG saved Europe is just the latest in a long 484 485 list of monumental achievements by the U.S. natural gas industry. It wasn't too long ago that our country was 486 importing natural gas. Today, thanks to the shale 487 revolution, our country finds itself in a position of energy 488 and dependance, power, and wealth, as opposed to relying on 489 Russia, Iran, or Qatar for our natural gas needs. Thanks to 490 the shale gas revolution, we have had so much abundance that 491 we have been able to power our allies in Europe and Southeast 492 Asia, fostering trade and geopolitical alliances through the 493 export of LNG. 494 495 And thanks to the shale gas revolution, over the last two decades not only has the U.S. had the lowest energy costs 496 in the world, resulting in one of the strongest economies in 497 the world, it has led the world in emissions reduction. The 498

499 shale gas revolution single handedly contributed to over 60 percent of the emissions reduction in the United States since 500 501 the turn of the century by doing one simple thing: displacing coal with natural gas. 502 The announcement from the Biden Administration has sent 503 shock waves across both sides of the Capitol and both sides 504 of the aisle. You see both Republicans and Democrats, in a 505 506 welcomed moment of bipartisanship, urgently calling for the Biden Administration to undo this decision, a decision that 507 will undoubtedly have short, medium, and long-term impacts on 508 our allies and our climate. 509 Let's call this what it is. The Biden Administration's 510 511 decision was pure politics. The moratorium was made under the guise of updated research and a claim that we needed 512 updated studies on the environmental and economic impact of 513 U.S. LNG. But we all know what it really is, and that is an 514 election-year stall designed to garner votes. The Biden 515 516 Administration is touting the moratorium as a win for climate. In reality, it is significantly a blow backwards 517 towards climate. 518 As anyone that has taken the time to look at the data 519

520 knows, we are hitting all-time highs for global emissions year over year. And outside of the United States nearly half 521 522 of these emissions are coming from international coal. Over the last two decades it has become clear that the fastest, 523 most impactful way to address this problem is to replace 524 international coal with domestic natural gas. But still 525 there are those who say, "What is the big deal? We are still 526 527 the largest producer of natural gas, we are the largest exporter of LNG. Is it not enough?'' 528 Well, let me ask you this question. Is replacing only 529 seven percent of the world's largest source of emissions 530 enough? Not to me. And I think a lot of our friends pushing 531 for climate solutions would agree. Now is not the time to 532 slow down LNG. Now is the time to accelerate it. 533 This is not to say that this industry is giving itself a 534 free pass. We are doing everything we can to continue to 535 provide Americans and our allies with abundant, affordable, 536 537 reliable, and particularly cleaner energy. Take EQT, for example. Since 2019 we have cut our methane intensity by 538 roughly 70 percent, and by the end of this year we expect to 539 be the first traditional energy company of scale in the world 540

541 to achieve net zero on a scope 1 and scope 2 basis. It is this gas, not Russia's gas, not Iran's gas, and not Chinese 542 543 coal that the Administration is seeking to block from entering global markets. 544 The markets work. And if our cleaner, more affordable, 545 more reliable gas is taken out of that market, it is Russia, 546 Iran, and Chinese coal that will benefit, not the climate. 547 548 And this gas is not the government's. It is owned by companies like mine and millions of American citizens. Since 549 2020 the gas that my company sold has resulted in billions of 550 dollars being paid directly to landowners and in rural 551 Appalachia and in the form of state taxes. That money has 552 funded family farms, schools, hospitals, roads, and community 553 foundations in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, all for 554 simply allowing us to provide the cleanest form of 555 traditional energy in the world. 556 557 We are fortunate to live in a country that is blessed 558 with abundant resources, a country that has a top-of-the-line workforce, and the ingenuity of the American people. We are 559 privileged to be able to argue over our energy mix and the 560 weighting of various energy sources over others, but this is 561

```
562
     not the case for so many outside our borders. We have the
     opportunity to provide energy security to the globe and to
563
     show how other countries can eventually follow our footsteps
564
     in reducing emissions. This is what the United States does.
565
     We lead.
566
567
          Let's stop playing politics with energy. Let's follow
     the data. And instead of pausing LNG, let's unleash it.
568
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Rice follows:]
569
570
     *******************************
571
572
```

*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now recognize Mr. Cormier for five minutes.

576 STATEMENT OF ERIC CORMIER 577 578 *Mr. Cormier. To the honorable members of the committee I want to offer greetings from the residents and business 579 community of southwest Louisiana. Again, my name is Eric 580 Cormier. I am senior vice president of entrepreneurship and 581 strategic initiatives for our agency. 582 583 Southwest Louisiana comprises five parishes Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, and Jeff Davis for a total 584 of 301,978 people. I want to tell you more about us, but 585 time does not permit. Today I am here to offer insights from 586 our Chamber of Southwest Louisiana perspective regarding the 587 Biden Administration's decision to pause decisions related to 588 the export of liquefied natural gas to non-free-trade-589 agreement countries, pending a Department of Energy review of 590 project evaluation policy. 591 On January 26, 2024, when the Administration announced 592 593 its decision, my cell phone rang quite a bit. It was members of our regional Main Street calling. Small business owners 594 were panicking. These folks have built business plans for 595 the expected final investment decisions for Venture Global 596

597 CP2, Commonwealth LNG, Magnolia LNG, and Lake Charles LNG, representing 28.5 billion in projected projects. If those 598 599 companies are able to make a final investment decision, we are looking at 7,200 permanent and temporary jobs, 600 construction up to 25,000 employees, and 500 million in labor 601 That is old-fashioned American business that trickles 602 down to Main Street. 603 604 LNG has been part of the southwest Louisiana economic tapestry since 1981, when Trunkline LNG imported natural gas 605 for regasification from Algeria. Due to the shale revolution 606 and Federal policy changes, America decided to allow 607 companies to readily export this natural resource to the 608 world market. That process started in 2016. As a result, 609 the Lake Charles MSA, which is Calcasieu and Cameron 610 parishes, has become a strategic area of LNG expansion and 611 investment due to our region's extensive pipeline system, the 612 Calcasieu River Ship Channel, workforce, and a strong 613 614 community connection to industry going back to the early 1900s. 615 Today Cheniere, Sabine Pass LNG, Sempra, Cameron LNG, 616 and Venture Global Pass Calcasieu Pass are exporting this 617

important product on the world market. According to the Lake 618 Erie Industry Alliance, those three companies combine for a 619 620 total of \$34 billion in investment in our region, which created over 3,000 direct jobs, 16,000 construction jobs, 1.2 621 billion in labor costs, and \$1 billion gross domestic 622 product. That is important because in 2020 and 2021 we 623 suffered COVID, Hurricane Laura, Hurricane Delta, Winter 624 625 Storm Uri, along with a major flooding event which resulted, for instance, in Laura, \$17 billion in damages, 44,000 homes 626 damaged by Laura and Delta, and an unemployment rate hit at 627 14.1 percent just in September 2020. 628 Louisiana economist doctor Lawrence Scott stated that 629 Lake Charles has the distinction of having the worst COVID 630 recovery in the nine MSAs in the state. As of July 2023, the 631 MSA had recovered only 45 percent of the post-2019 losses. 632 By the way, Dr. Scott noted that Lake Charles's MSA was the 633 fastest growing between 2012 and 2018 for a city of our size. 634 635 That is when our industrial base really got really burning going, and LNG was the biggest factor. 636 Regularly, our community members and business 637 stakeholders ask Chamber of southwest Louisiana members, 638

```
639
     "When are those final investment decisions going to be
     made?'' Why? Because they have their businesses on the
640
641
     line. They have made those business plans. I have had
     parents call me. Their kids are going to McNeese State and
642
     SOWELA Community Technical Community College, and they are
643
     asking, "Can my kid get that LNG job,'' because we have
644
     worked with them to develop that workforce.
645
646
          So just so you know, southwest Louisiana is in the early
     stages of a clean energy future. Right now our office is
647
     working with our governmental partners, developers, and
648
     innovators to pave the way for solar, wind, and hydrogen
649
     energy development. Yet we are not there yet. Natural gas
650
651
     is the gap filler to alternative forms of clean energy.
          The Chamber of Southwest Louisiana adamantly disagrees
652
     with the Biden Administration's decision to indefinitely
653
     pause LNG projects going forward. This decision has
654
     unintended consequences which impact our community.
655
656
     Street is upset and scared. We want to move forward and
     progress. Thank you for your time.
657
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Cormier follows:]
658
```

659

```
*Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman, and I now just want
to recognize former United States Senator Mary Landrieu from
the great State of Louisiana attending.

Thanks for your leadership on this issue.

[Applause.]

*Mr. Duncan. I will now go to Ms. Giannetti for five
minutes.
```

670 STATEMENT OF GILLIAN GIANNETTI 671 672 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Chair Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, and members of the subcommittee. My name is Gillian 673 Giannetti, and I am a senior attorney for the sustainable 674 FERC project at the Natural Resources Defense Council. 675 I specialize in natural gas law. Before I joined NRDC I 676 677 was an oil and gas attorney in private practice representing the LNG industry. I started my career as a public school 678 teacher at East Saint John High School in Reserve, Louisiana. 679 Reserve is located in the heart of Cancer Alley and the 680 fossil fuel industry. A disproportionate number of my 681 682 students had asthma and other respiratory conditions. I care deeply about the Gulf, its culture, and its ecosystem. 683 Today I will discuss the Biden Administration's 684 important but moderate January 26, 2024 decision to pause the 685 Department of Energy's reviews for some liquefied natural gas 686 687 I would like to explain what this policy is, what it isn't, and why this pause is an important, common-sense 688 measure that all Americans should support. 689 The relevant law here is the Natural Gas Act. Under the 690

691 Natural Gas Act, LNG exports are treated differently depending on whether the U.S. has a free trade agreement with 692 693 the destination country that addresses natural gas. Countries with such an agreement are called FTA countries and 694 the rest NFTA countries. DOE must approve all gas exports to 695 FTA countries, period. And nothing in the Administration's 696 January 26 announcement changes that. All current and future 697 698 FTA exports are unaffected by the pause. The pause also does not affect any current LNG exports, 699 whether FTA or NFTA, or any project that DOE has already 700 approved. These projects alone are expected to double the 701 U.S.'s LNG export capacity by 2027. 702 703 And the pause has zero effect on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's authority to review applications to 704 build new natural gas export terminals or pipelines. 705 Instead, the Administration's pause relates exclusively 706 707 to prospective gas exports to NFTA countries. Under the 708 Natural Gas Act, DOE must evaluate whether a proposed gas export is consistent with the public interest. If 709 consistent, they must be approved, and if not they must be 710 denied. DOE has never found a proposed NFTA gas export to be 711

712 inconsistent with the public interest. And that brings us to the reason for the pause. Put 713 714 simply, DOE's tools for assessing whether future gas exports are consistent with the public interest are both obsolete and 715 inapplicable. 716 717 First, DOE has never published guidelines for evaluating the public interest for LNG exports. Never. In 1984 the 718 719 Reagan Administration published guidelines for LNG imports, but this is the closest the DOE has come to speaking on the 720 subject, even though the U.S. is now the world's leading LNG 721 exporter. Trying to assess 2024 LNG exports based on 722 quidelines written for 1984 LNG imports is like trying to 723 stream Netflix over a Betamax. 724 Second, the studies DOE relies on need revision. 725 Although these studies date to 2018 and 2019, LNG exports 726 have increased by nearly 200 percent since then, and these 727 728 studies also include outdated analyses of the domestic 729 pricing, consumer, and climate impacts of LNG exports. Administration's January 26 pause enables DOE to update these 730 updated tools, receive public comment, and avoid issuing 731 decisions that are legally unsound. 732

```
733
           In other words, the Administration's pause puts the
     horse back in front of the cart. To that end, the pause
734
735
     wisely does not prescribe, recommend, or pre-determine what
     the final analysis will look like, nor does it prematurely
736
     declare a position on any pending application.
737
          Remember, this action does not pause any current LNG
738
     exports, any already approved LNG exports, or any future FTA
739
740
     exports, and yet it represents the boldest action that any
     administration has ever taken to ensure that DOE is properly
741
     assessing the impacts of exporting LNG on the U.S. public
742
     interest.
743
          In short, the January 26 pause is a common-sense move
744
     that both respects our allies and puts the U.S. public
745
     interest front and center. And that is exactly what the
746
     Natural Gas Act demands.
747
          Thank you.
748
           [The prepared statement of Ms. Giannetti follows:]
749
750
     *******************************
751
```

752

753 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 754 to Mr. McCown for five minutes. 755

756 STATEMENT OF BRIGHAM MCCOWN 757 758 *Mr. McCown. Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to 759 appear before you this morning. 760 In addition to Hudson, I also serve as a professor at 761 Miami University in Ohio, and I have spent nearly three 762 763 decades on active and active reserve duty as a naval officer and naval aviator. And I have also held multiple senior 764 appointments in the executive branch, working directly for 765 cabinet members from both parties. The views I express today 766 are mine, and do not resent represent any other entity. 767 We are experiencing significant geopolitical risks 768 emanating across multiple theaters of operation. 769 strategic challenges seek to undermine our democratic values 770 by those actors with significant control and influence over 771 772 energy resources. America has long provided the tools, equipment, and 773 resources that make freedom possible. The arsenal of 774 democracy wasn't just about our innovation, our industrial 775 base, or agricultural industry. These have always been 776

777 certainly very important, but the glue for these efforts has always been American energy, which, for example, supplied our 778 779 allies with 85 percent of all the oil and gas used during World War II. 780 International events have brought into sharp focus the 781 intrinsic relationship between energy, economics, and 782 national security. It has also highlighted the degree to 783 784 which an important American strategic asset, abundant energy resources, has been undermined by dramatic shifts in U.S. 785 policy, which have often failed to consider such decisions' 786 full and long-term implications. 787 Last year marked the 50th anniversary of the Arab oil 788 embargo, reminding us of the short-lived past energy policies 789 that gave away our energy independence and the resulting 790 dependencies that remained for decades. 791 We are also reminded of the short-sighted energy 792 policies as Europe struggled following Russia's invasion of 793 794 Ukraine. Last month natural gas spot prices for EU countries averaged \$9.56 per million BTUs. Lower but still impactful 795 as Europe's economic competitiveness and deindustrialization 796 caused by these high energy prices continues. That said, 797

798 Europe fares far better off than it would have been absent American LNG. By contrast, yesterday's U.S. Henry Hub price 799 800 stood at \$2.26 per million BTUs. Europe should not be allowed to recede into the 801 background. Energy security highlights the need for a 802 comprehensive approach and a stable policy environment 803 coupled with innovation, technology, and international 804 805 cooperation. Our allies would like to be able to have energy security, as well. 806 It has also highlighted the degree to which a strategic 807 American asset has come to the rescue. Energy security, of 808 course, is the ability to ensure the uninterrupted 809 availability of reliable and affordable energy for 810 consumption. It encompasses not only the supply of energy 811 resources, but the resiliency of the energy infrastructure 812 and the ability of a country to meet its current and future 813 projected energy demands while also dealing with emergencies, 814 815 natural disasters, geopolitical tensions, and other issues that could disrupt supplies. 816 This, in turn, requires a predictable and stable policy 817 environment. Some have suggested that Europe or our other 818

819 allies have enough LNG. Still, it is prudent to note that our rather stoic allies have expressed real frustration with 820 821 this decision, which for them directly undermines the very definition of energy security. 822 Energy requirements in Europe, Japan, and elsewhere are 823 expected to increase, not decrease. Additional LNG supplies 824 required to continue lowering prices for Europe so they can 825 826 become competitive again. Every Russian molecule that we remove reduces the money and the ability of the Kremlin to 827 wage war. The need for redundancy to account for planned 828 outages and other unforeseen events cannot be overlooked. 829 The concern that America is seen as using energy as a policy 830 weapon in global trade is real, and that an unreliable 831 America pushes buyers and purchasers of LNG to other 832 suppliers or, in the absence of availability, revert to 833 higher emitting sources. 834 The factors I just mentioned are not theoretical, but 835 836 highly probable should this de facto ban not be reversed. Energy policies don't exist in isolation. They are not in a 837 They are inextricably linked to domestic and foreign 838 policy principles. 839

840	Finally, the very premise of the Administration's	
841	decision seems counterintuitive, given the plethora of	
842	scholarly research on the subject to date.	
843	Thank you, and I look forward to addressing your	
844	questions.	
845	[The prepared statement of Mr. McCown follows:]	
846		
847	**************************************	
848		

849 *Mr. Duncan. I thank you each for your testimony, and we will now move into the question-and-answer portion of the 850 851 hearing, and I will begin the questioning and recognize myself for five minutes. 852 Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, 853 Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, 854 Jordan, Korea, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaraqua, Oman, Panama, 855 856 Peru, Singapore, and the USMCA, those are the countries we have free trade agreements with. What is missing from that 857 list is the Czech Republic and Poland, and a lot of other 858 Eastern European countries that are historically been 859 reliant upon Vladimir Putin and Russia for gas and energy in 860 general. Also, Japan and Taiwan and others around the world 861 that are looking to the United States to help them provide a 862 clean, stable supply of energy to meet their growing needs 863 and their energy security needs. 864 I mentioned Poland and Czech Republic. In one year's 865 866 time they built a pipeline from Norway after Putin invaded Ukraine. One year, a pipeline from Norway to provide natural 867 gas to Poland. Imagine if we could do that in the United 868 States of America to deliver gas to our communities and to 869

```
870
     export terminals to help our friends and allies around the
     world.
871
872
          What signal does this send from the Biden Administration
     to the world? The signal I think it sends is we don't care
873
     about your energy security. We have never manipulated
874
     natural gas or any energy source for political gain like
875
     Vladimir Putin has by manipulating the spigot for European
876
877
     countries to influence political policy there. They faced a
     reality check when Putin invaded Ukraine. They need to meet
878
     the energy needs of their constituents and their citizens,
879
     and they have looked west to the United States of America
880
     because they have always known they could count on us to
881
     provide their needs in the energy sector when called upon.
882
          I want to start by entering in the record a letter
883
     opposing President Biden's LNG export ban signed by 152
884
     Republican Members of Congress. I coauthored this letter
885
     with Chair Rodgers, the Speaker of the House, House
886
887
     leadership. This letter expresses opposition to the DOE's
888
     ban on LNG export.
          So without objection, so ordered.
889
          [The information follows:]
890
```

891		
892	*********COMMITTEE	INSERT*******
893		

894 *Mr. Duncan. There is bipartisan outrage over President Biden's election year stunt. The President received a 895 896 similar letter from House Democrats by our colleagues on this committee, and I commend them for that. 897 As our letter states, this decision is economically and 898 strategically dangerous and unnecessary. Under both Democrat 899 and Republican administrations the DOE has consistently found 900 901 that U.S. LNG exports serve the public interest because they contribute positive economic benefits and strengthen energy 902 security for the American people, and they also have the 903 potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. 904 Mr. Rice, how does this announcement impact American 905 energy workers, including in Pennsylvania? 906 And what signal does this send to investors and job 907 creators? 908 *Mr. Rice. Well, it is certainly not helpful, and it is 909 actually destructive. You know, these facilities require 910 911 billions of dollars of investments to make happen. And any sign that there is going to be political force introduced 912 into market forces is going to make it very difficult to 913 invest. 914

```
915
          You can look at what we are doing in our company and the
     impact this has for our communities. You know, natural gas
916
917
     exports represent about 15 percent of the production. I
     think it is really important for everybody to understand this
918
     production only exists to meet market demands, and exports
919
     are that market demand. So you could make an argument that,
920
     of the billion dollars of royalties that we pay directly to
921
922
     our landowners in Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania,
     about 15 percent of those royalties are directly attributable
923
     towards meeting LNG exports, so $150 million directly going
924
     to our landowner payments.
925
          These are big deals to the people that we have in
926
     Pennsylvania, on top of all of the jobs that we talk about.
927
          *Mr. Duncan. Thank you for that. This latest move to
928
     ban exports is part of a broader campaign to undercut
929
     American energy production.
930
          Following the announcement, the Sierra Club executive
931
     director stated, "The Biden Administration is listening to
932
     the calls to break America's reliance on dirty fossil
933
     fuels.''
934
```

Another example of this is the campaign by radical

935

936 environmentalists to block pipelines. This especially hurts states like South Carolina, where I represent. Our 937 938 population growth is outpacing our energy supply, and we need to expand our infrastructure to deliver affordable natural 939 gas from the Marcellus. 940 Or from Louisiana and Texas, both the Atlantic Coast and 941 Mount Valley pipelines face these challenges which ultimately 942 943 ended up in the cancellation of the ACP. How do you view these politically-driven decisions, Mr. 944 Rice, to ban exports and ban pipelines? 945 *Mr. Rice. I think the biggest concern with the pause 946 on the LNG exports is that this is the start of the playbook 947 to block American energy infrastructure, and this playbook 948 has been used successfully to block pipelines. And that has 949 been incredibly destructive and caused rampantly high, 950 unnecessarily high energy prices in America. Sowing doubts, 951 concerns, fear has translated is the first step. Calling 952 953 for unnecessary studies is the second step. Ultimately, this just leads to more delay tactics, and 954 you can see the result of what has happened in pipelines. We 955 have blocked almost seven BCF a day's worth of pipelines that 956

```
957
     would deliver gas to places that you just mentioned, and as a
     result you have got bizarre situations like in Boston. They
958
959
     are paying $30 for their natural gas when we are producing
     that same natural gas in Pennsylvania for a price of $3. The
960
     only way you can explain those high prices is the lack of
961
     pipeline infrastructure.
962
          And the biggest issue that I see in this whole equation
963
964
     comes down to accountability. Who is accountable for these
     higher energy prices? When energy prices are high in Boston,
965
     quess who gets the letter from Senators about the high energy
966
     prices? I do, not the person that was responsible for
967
     blocking that pipeline infrastructure.
968
969
          So I think one of the important elements here that we
     need to bring in is we need to bring more accountability on
970
     these decisions that are being made.
971
                        Thank you for that. My time has expired.
972
          *Mr. Duncan.
     I will have some additional questions we will submit for you
973
974
     guys to answer.
          [The information follows:]
975
976
     *********COMMITTEE INSERT******
977
978
                                    55
```

979 *Mr. Duncan. I now recognize the ranking member, Ms. DeGette, for five minutes. 980 *Ms. DeGette. Well, I can't help but sitting here 981 thinking that the silly season has begun because my 982 colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very, very, 983 very concerned what is going to happen in the areas around 984 Ukraine, and in that part of the world, and places where we 985 don't have treaties. And if we can't supply the energy, 986 these are the self-same people who are about to walk down to 987 the U.S. House of Representatives floor later this afternoon 988 and vote for an aid package that doesn't include aid for 989 Ukraine. And Ukraine is under continuous threat from Russia 990 991 every single day. So I would suggest that we get serious. And if we want 992 to support democracy in that region, including energy 993 supports from the United States, that we get together in a 994 bipartisan way and we support not only aid to Israel, which I 995 support, not only humanitarian aid around the world, but also 996 aid to Ukraine. The best thing we can do to support 997 democracy in that region is to support that aid, and also to 998 support continuing U.S. LNG exports and other energy exports 999

1000 to that area. And I am getting sick of this because it is campaign 1001 1002 season but we are talking about real lives and we are talking about international democracy right here today. 1003 I am going to ask you, Ms. Giannetti, a couple of 1004 questions. I said this in my opening statement, that the 1005 majority is going to keep talking about a ban on issuing LNG 1006 1007 export permits. And lo, it was true. The chairman mentioned that about three or four times in his questions just now. So 1008 I am going to ask you, is the Biden Administration's pause 1009 some sort of a ban on LNG exports? 1010 1011 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you for the question, 1012 Congresswoman. No, it is not. 1013 *Ms. DeGette. And can you confirm that this pause will have no impact on the LNG export facilities that are 1014 currently operating? 1015 *Ms. Giannetti. That is correct. 1016 1017 *Ms. DeGette. And can you confirm this will have no impact on the LNG export facilities that are currently under 1018 construction? 1019 *Ms. Giannetti. That is correct, or ones that are not 1020

1021 yet under construction that are already with their DOE authorizations. 1022 1023 *Ms. DeGette. Right. And can you and I think this is what you are referring to can you confirm that this will 1024 have no impact on the LNG export facilities that are not 1025 under any construction, but are fully permitted? 1026 *Ms. Giannetti. That is correct. 1027 1028 *Ms. DeGette. And finally, just so we can get a sense of the numbers here, given the amount of permits DOE has 1029 issued, can you confirm that we could triple U.S. LNG exports 1030 without issuing a single new permit? 1031 *Ms. Giannetti. That is correct. We are on track to 1032 1033 double our exports by 2027 and triple into the early parts of the 2030s without any new authorizations. 1034 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you. 1035 Now, Mr. McCown, I just want to ask you about the 1036 significant geopolitical risks that are emanating across 1037 1038 multiple theaters of operation that you talk about in your written testimony. And you also mention if we don't give aid 1039 to Ukraine, aside from the energy issue, this is going to 1040 continually destabilize American interests in that region, 1041

1042 isn't that correct? *Mr. McCown. Ranking Member DeGette, I agree with you 1043 1044 on that. *Ms. DeGette. Thank you. 1045 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1046 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I now 1047 recognize the chair of the full committee, Mrs. Rodgers, for 1048 1049 five minutes. 1050 *The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. McCown, America's security and prosperity is my 1051 number-one priority as chair of the Energy and Commerce 1052 Committee. The world is entering a period of increasing 1053 1054 conflict and unrest. We have seen global supply chains grind to a halt as a result of the COVID pandemic. Russia's war on 1055 Ukraine has dealt a major blow to Europe's economic and 1056 energy security. Hamas terrorists brutally attacked Israel, 1057 and Iran-backed militias are spreading violence throughout 1058 1059 the Middle East. Through all of this, American energy has supported our economy and provided a lifeline to our allies 1060 in Europe and around the world. 1061 We know dictators like Putin use energy as a weapon, so 1062

1063 it is deeply troubling for the Administration to voluntarily disarm the U.S. and our allies with policies like these. 1064 1065 my question is President Biden's political LNG export ban is dangerous and shortsighted at least that is what I believe. 1066 Do you agree that this decision puts America's security and 1067 prosperity at risk? 1068 *Mr. McCown. Chair Rodgers, yes, I do, and I think we 1069 1070 have to keep this in context, that every LNG facility that has been permitted will not necessarily ever get built. 1071 we can't count on that, number one. This is a private market 1072 economy. Some projects succeed, others fail. 1073 Second, it sends a terrible signal to our allies. I 1074 1075 mentioned during my opening that gas prices are still highly 1076 elevated in Europe. They need more supply to bring that down. 1077 And we can't forget about our Asian allies, Japan and 1078 others, given the instability in the South China Sea that 1079 1080 require raw materials from outside. So if we want to study, make additional studies, great, 1081 but let's not make decisions until those studies have come 1082 1083 out.

1084 And we all make mistakes. And I hope that we can convince the Biden Administration to reverse course and not 1085 1086 gloat, but yet it is the wrong call. *The Chair. Thank you. As a follow-up, you mentioned 1087 the impact on our allies. I really see this as a gift to our 1088 adversaries: Putin, Iran. So would you speak to what the 1089 impact will be if America withdraws from global energy 1090 1091 markets? *Mr. McCown. Yes, if America becomes unreliable and 1092 even this decision calls into question our continued 1093 reliability countries will seek other options, other more 1094 1095 stable options so as to not have their eggs in one basket. 1096 We should keep in mind that the Qataris have along 1097 with the Iranians, share the largest natural gas reserve in the world. And so that point is not lost on me, and that we 1098 produce LNG in a more responsible, more environmentally clean 1099 manner than any other country in the world. 1100 1101 *The Chair. Yes, yes. The reason that America leads 1102 the world in bringing down carbon emissions is because of natural gas. And it has and we have done that more than 1103 any other nation in the world. So it really begs the 1104

1105 question: What is President Biden doing and why? Why is he imposing this natural gas export ban? 1106 1107 Mr. Rice, U.S. LNG exports delivered to Europe are 41 percent cleaner than Russian gas. The science is clear on 1108 this. Can you set the record straight on the environmental 1109 benefits of natural gas? 1110 *Mr. Rice. Well, very simply, on a scope 3 basis, 1111 1112 natural gas is between 40 to 50 percent cleaner than combusting coal, which is the largest source of emissions on 1113 the planet. You know, the numbers that you cited, 1114 specifically on the emissions associated with making our 1115 product, are really centered on the biggest environmental 1116 1117 issue we have on our industry today, which is methane 1118 emissions. And I will tell you what I told Secretary Granholm 24 1119 months ago. If you are concerned about methane emissions, 1120 keep the target there because our industry is going to knock 1121 1122 methane emissions out of the park. This is why it is important. We cannot let the emissions associated with 1123 making our product overshadow the emission reduction benefits 1124 when people use our product. 1125

```
1126
           As an example, at EQT our carbon footprint is about
      350,000 tons. That is the emissions it takes for us to run
1127
1128
      our operations to create produce our natural gas.
      includes methane emissions. But that amount of operations is
1129
      going to produce an amount of product, when put on the world
1130
      stage to replace foreign coal, is going to have an emissions
1131
      reduction benefit of over 150 million tons.
1132
           *The Chair. Thank you.
1133
           *Mr. Rice. So a 350,000-ton benefit
1134
           *The Chair. Yes.
1135
           *Mr. Rice. for a 150-million benefit.
1136
           *The Chair. Thank you, thank you. So it is clearly not
1137
1138
      about reducing carbon emissions. The Department of Energy
      has already conducted numerous studies also about the
1139
      economic benefits, the life cycle of greenhouse gas
1140
      emissions.
1141
           So the Obama Administration and the Trump Administration
1142
1143
      did not stop issuing permits when they were conducting their
      reviews. What signal does this send for President Biden to
1144
      reverse trade policy in an election year?
1145
           *Mr. Rice. I think it sends a message that the U.S. is
1146
```

1147 willing to override market forces with political force, and I think that is a very dangerous I think it is very dangerous 1148 1149 to set that precedent. *The Chair. Thank you. 1150 Thank you, I yield back. 1151 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I now 1152 recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. 1153 1154 Pallone, for five minutes. *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have to 1155 say I just don't understand this Republican line that 1156 limiting LNG exports helps China. It is just the opposite. 1157 It may cripple China's industrial output, but I am frankly 1158 1159 fine with that. Bring the manufacturing back to the United States. Isn't that what we should be striving to accomplish? 1160 In any case, when Congress wrote the Natural Gas Act it 1161 was clear in requiring that the government find that exports 1162 of natural gas be in the public interest before allowing 1163 1164 Republicans have pushed to automatically assume that all gas exports are in the public interest, allowing gas to 1165 flow based on what most benefits fossil fuel companies, 1166 rather than what benefits everyday Americans. So let me my 1167

1168 question are of Ms. Giannetti. Can you discuss why Congress originally required this 1169 1170 public interest determination for LNG exports to non-freetrade-agreement nations? 1171 And can you talk about why making sure that 1172 determination is thorough and defensible is so important, if 1173 you will? 1174 1175 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Congressman. The public interest standard actually dates to the 1176 1880s, with state statutes affecting railroad permitting. 1177 For as long as we have been permitting infrastructure in this 1178 country we have understood that it is important to look at a 1179 1180 holistic group of factors in evaluating whether that decision is correct. Going back to that time, environmental impacts 1181 were part of the consideration, for example, looking at the 1182 view shed or impact of infrastructure on a beach. 1183 standard and understanding was universally understood in the 1184 1185 1930s, and is part of the reason why this Congress rightfully 1186 copied it into the Natural Gas Act. *Mr. Pallone. Thank you. Now, just a few years ago we 1187 saw proof that LNG exports have a clear impact on consumer 1188

prices when domestic natural gas prices dropped by 10 percent 1189 in the wake of an explosion at the Freeport LNG export 1190 1191 facility, and then when they increased again once that facility was restarted. 1192 So Ms. Giannetti, can you discuss the impacts that LNG 1193 exports have on consumer prices, and how those impacts must 1194 be accounted for in any public interest determination? 1195 1196 *Ms. Giannetti. Natural gas is like any other commodity, where ebbs and flows of supply and demand affect 1197 the price. And when the Freeport terminal had its explosion, 1198 went offline, eventually, actually, prices dropped 1199 domestically by 25 percent. They then went back up once the 1200 1201 Freeport terminal went back online. There is demonstrated evidence time and again that when 1202 there is more gas being exported overseas, that domestic 1203 pocketbooks are affected. And in fact, there was a study 1204 even that came out last night that said if all of the 1205 1206 facilities that are affected by the pause were built, that it could raise domestic U.S. consumers' gas prices by up to 14 1207 percent. 1208 *Mr. Pallone. And then finally, I wanted to note that, 1209

despite what the majority says, it is not clear that American 1210 LNG exports are always displacing coal in other countries, 1211 1212 and therefore reducing emissions. So can you discuss the climate impacts of increased LNG exports? 1213 Why is it critical for DOE to have the most up-to-date 1214 research on methane emissions from American LNG facilities, 1215 pipelines, and producers as it makes a public interest 1216 1217 determination, if you will? 1218 *Ms. Giannetti. With respect to the relationship between LNG and coal, Europe is actually an instructive 1219 example. Most of the gas that is going to Europe is being 1220 used to heat homes, which does not use coal for that kind of 1221 1222 electricity. 1223 Additionally, when we are looking at Asia, Japan is not looking to build any coal power plants or anything of that 1224 nature. This is not in their system. It is not being 1225 affected by the decision of LNG one way or the other. 1226 1227 In terms of the climate impacts of LNG, it is a potent fossil fuel. It is methane. It has an extremely powerful 1228 GHG impact, and there are impacts across the entire value 1229 chain from the extraction of gas, transportation, 1230

- 1231 liquefaction, regasification, and eventual burning.
- 1232 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you. I will just, you know,
- 1233 conclude.
- I really don't understand my colleagues on the other
- 1235 side. It is almost as if they are afraid that if China
- doesn't get enough energy resources, that that is going to
- 1237 hurt their industrial impact and their ability to manufacture
- 1238 goods. Frankly, I could care less. I would almost prefer
- 1239 I would prefer if their industrial impact input is reduced,
- 1240 and there is an incentive to manufacture here as opposed to
- in China. It seems to me that is exactly what we are trying
- 1242 to do here. We want to do more manufacturing here and less
- 1243 there.
- But thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
- *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now go to
- 1246 Ohio's Mr. Latta for five minutes.
- 1247 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to
- 1248 our witnesses for being with us today. This is a really
- important topic not only for our country, but for my
- 1250 district.
- 1251 In the 5th district of Ohio we have 86,000 manufacturing

1252 jobs. And, you know, if we don't have affordable energy, we can't compete. And what has made this country great in the 1253 1254 last several years is our ability to produce this natural gas that makes our companies out there being able to and make 1255 what they got to make. 1256 There is an article that was in the or editorial that 1257 was in the Wall Street Journal the other day, and I would 1258 1259 like to get, Mr. McCown and Mr. Rice, your opinion on this. This is what it says and I am not going to read the whole 1260 article: "The White House says the pause will only affect a 1261 handful of projects that are currently seeking Energy 1262 Department permits, but this is dishonest. It will also 1263 1264 freeze about a half-dozen projects seeking FERC approvals, and could halt another dozen or so that may have been 1265 permitted by previous presidents. That is because the Energy 1266 Department in December announced that projects not yet 1267 operating will have to reapply for permits, and it has been 1268 1269 seven years since they were authorized, so projects in the works could get deep-sixed, even if they have billions of 1270 dollars committed in capital and contractual agreements with 1271 customers.'' 1272

Mr. McCown, your thoughts? 1273 *Mr. McCown. Thank you very much. My understanding is 1274 1275 that there is a shelf life on the permit of seven years, and then you have to go back through the process. But I will 1276 defer to Mr. Rice on that. 1277 But I think what is clear from this is that the policy 1278 is cloaked in this pause. A pause is something I do before 1279 1280 answering your question. It is a very short period of time. This is not a pause, this is a ban. And I don't think we are 1281 going to see the pause end until after the presidential 1282 election. And so I wish they would just call it what it is. 1283 It is imparting environmental goals into stopping a very 1284 1285 successful industry. 1286 *Mr. Latta. Thank you. Mr. Rice? 1287 *Mr. Rice. Yes, I mean, after listening to some of 1288 these questions and some of the answers here, I mean, the 1289 1290 question that I have is, if this isn't a if this is just a pause, why do we and doesn't impact any of the markets, why 1291 do we even have to do this? Why do we have to send this 1292 signal that America is going to play games with the energy 1293

```
1294
      security of our allies?
           Again, I think this is a signal that is going to chill
1295
1296
      investments, and it is I was in Europe last week, and we
      have to have many conversations that to reassure our allies
1297
      that America will be able to they will be able to depend on
1298
      America to deliver the energy security that they have relied
1299
1300
      on in the past.
1301
           *Mr. Latta. Let me follow up, Mr. Rice. What happens
      to these companies that might be and as the Wall Street
1302
      Journal said, might get deep-sixed? What happens to these
1303
      companies out there and their ability in the future to
1304
      produce natural gas?
1305
1306
           *Mr. Rice. Well, I will tell you the playbook on
      pipelines, which I think is trying to be played here on the
1307
      LNG front, ultimately these delays, stalls ultimately
1308
      increase the cost of these energy projects with the hope that
1309
      these projects never get funded, never get built. This is
1310
1311
      exactly what happens with pipelines, and we need to prevent
      that from happening again because blocking energy
1312
      infrastructure in this country is the thing that has crippled
1313
      our energy security not only here in America, but preventing
1314
```

us from providing more energy security to our allies. 1315 *Mr. Latta. Well, let me ask you this. Let's go down 1316 1317 the stream a little bit. What happens to the companies that produce the pipe and the equipment? Do they stay in business 1318 if they don't have anybody out there drilling? 1319 *Mr. Rice. Well, you without these projects, these 1320 companies do not exist. 1321 1322 We have seen billions and billions of dollars be destroyed because of the environmental activism that have 1323 blocked pipelines, which are the safest way to move energy 1324 around this country. And so, you know, just look at MVP as 1325 an example. It took an act of Congress to get a pipeline 1326 1327 built in this country. Like, people ask me am I excited about MVP getting passed by Congress. It is exciting for one 1328 second until you realize we are in a country where it takes 1329 an act of Congress to get a piece of energy infrastructure 1330 built in this country. Americans should be shaking their 1331 1332 heads at that, and looking for a fix. *Mr. Latta. Mr. McCown, you know, do you think and 1333 believe that we have enough sufficient natural gas to supply 1334 not only our domestic needs and keep prices low while also 1335

```
1336
      meeting the growing demand that is out there, not only in
      this country but around the world?
1337
1338
           *Mr. McCown. Yes, sir, we absolutely do, and the bottom
      line is there are short-term price fluctuation swings as
1339
      markets realign. But the trend line for our own domestic
1340
      pricing is continuing downward while we are continuing to
1341
      export more. There is not a direct it is an it is not a
1342
1343
      direct relationship, so it is not costing American consumers.
           *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much.
1344
           Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to ask unanimous
1345
      consent to submit for the record the Wall Street Journal
1346
      article from February the 4th of this year for the record.
1347
           *Mr. Duncan. So without objection, so ordered.
1348
           [The information follows:]
1349
1350
      *********************************
1351
1352
```

1353 *Mr. Latta. Thank you, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. The chair will 1354 1355 now go to the gentleman from California, Mr. Peters, for five minutes. 1356 *Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have to say 1357 I certainly think that the ranking member pointed out made 1358 an important point when she noted that people will be anti-1359 1360 Putin in this room, and then go down to the other building and vote for Putin. And I think it is it makes it really 1361 hard to comprehend. 1362 But anyway, I and that is where this place is. I have 1363 never seen it in a worse spot. And here you are, having to 1364 1365 deal with us. So I appreciate you being here today. I think that the controversy stems from a wider issue that we have 1366 struggled to grapple with, at least on our side of the aisle, 1367 which is what is the role that natural gas and LNG play in 1368 the resource mix in the short and medium term and in the long 1369 1370 term as we seek to decarbonize quickly, as efficiently as 1371 possible. Our goal is to eliminate or minimize the harmful 1372 emissions of methane and other pollutants into our atmosphere 1373

in order to stop the current pace of warming and avoid the 1374 worst impacts of climate change. But it is clear that 1375 natural gas is not going anywhere anytime soon and, in my 1376 view, natural gas and LNG. 1377 Mr. Rice, you made the only case to me in my office 1378 about what we are going to do about powering up the rest of 1379 the world that doesn't involve coal. And I am concerned. 1380 think we all ought to be what we really ought to be 1381 concerned about is pulling lignite out of the ground and 1382 burning it for, you know, the developing world. 1383 And so I would like someone to come up with a better 1384 case than yours, but I have not heard from the nuclear 1385 1386 industry. I have not quite heard how renewables are going to cover this by themselves. So I take it seriously. And, you 1387 know, we need we have to keep our lights on and our allies' 1388 lights on while displacing dirty and expensive generation. 1389 But my focus is on emissions, and whether we are really 1390 1391 reducing emissions of harmful pollutants, including methane, through a significant increase in LNG exports. And I think 1392 that does mean looking at the life cycle from production to 1393 transport to liquefaction and to shipping, and I think it is 1394

1395 reasonable for us and the Biden Administration to examine those impacts, and I think that is right. 1396 1397 Now, I take your point about whether it is a pause or a ban. I don't believe that limiting supply is how you create 1398 an energy policy. I mean, we fight over pipeline by pipeline 1399 and we win these so we win these battles over a pipeline. 1400 What good does that do? It doesn't really change the mix. 1401 1402 And if we don't export to Europe, they are going to buy from Russia. It is not like they are not going to use fossil 1403 1404 fuels. So I think it is just a little bit more ambiguous than 1405 both sides are saying. But let me just drive at one point, 1406 1407 Mr. Rice. You were quoting tons of emissions. Are you putting methane and carbon dioxide in the same bucket? 1408 *Mr. Rice. Yes, that would include the CO2 equivalent. 1409 So you would convert methane into a CO2 equivalent and 1410 *Mr. Peters. So you are giving credit to the much more 1411 1412 harmful impact in the short run that methane has on global 1413 warming. *Mr. Rice. By taking a factor of, I think it is, 84 1414 times for the methane emissions, yes. 1415

1416 *Mr. Peters. All right. And I ask Ms. Giannetti, is that fair? 1417 1418 What is wrong with that? What is wrong? What is he getting wrong on that, in terms of looking at displacing 1419 dirtier gas or even coal? Why is he not right? 1420 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you for the question, 1421 1422 Congressman. 1423 You know, one of the key questions that we need to analyze is the net effects of LNG export on our overall 1424 carbon footprint. There are pros and cons, depending on 1425 where we are looking at and what countries we are talking 1426 1427 about. *Mr. Peters. I think we I completely agree on that. 1428 Just to put a fine point on it, if he is displacing dirtier 1429 gas and coal with cleaner gas, is that not is that what 1430 is the objection to that? Or do you think that is not true? 1431 *Ms. Giannetti. When we are looking at displacement, 1432 1433 the methods of U.S. extraction vary from company to company. *Mr. Peters. Yes. 1434 *Ms. Giannetti. Even within the U.S. value chain we 1435 have deep concerns about methane leakage 1436

*Mr. Peters. Right. 1437 *Ms. Giannetti. and the impacts that that can have on 1438 1439 the overall carbon footprint. But, you know, to go back to something that might 1440 *Mr. Peters. Do you think he is not accounting for that 1441 in his calculations? 1442 *Ms. Giannetti. Pardon? 1443 1444 *Mr. Peters. Do you think he is not accounting for that leakage in his calculations? 1445 *Ms. Giannetti. I think that, you know, candidly, I am 1446 not familiar with all of the data that Mr. Rice is talking 1447 1448 about. 1449 *Mr. Peters. Yes. 1450 *Ms. Giannetti. But I do think that in our analyses at DOE we do not currently DOE does not currently do that. 1451 And, you know, to go back to a comment that Mr. McCown 1452 said earlier, you know, he said let's do the studies and 1453 1454 let's make sure that we are not making decisions until those studies are out. That is exactly what the Department is 1455 doing through this decision. 1456

*Mr. Peters. Well, okay, we are going to run out of

1457

- 1458 time. But it would be interesting to actually have you guys
- 1459 have a conversation.
- Mr. Rice, what is why is do you think she is not
- 1461 correct?
- *Mr. Rice. Yes, so we get a question a lot: Why do we
- 1463 need LNG? We have got other solutions like solar. We have
- 1464 got wind. Why do we even need LNG? The biggest
- 1465 misconception, I think, is that people don't really
- understand how much energy demand there is in this world.
- 1467 *Mr. Peters. Yes.
- 1468 *Mr. Rice. I don't blame them. That is a big thing to
- 1469 get your head wrapped around. But the reality is this: when
- solar and wind cannot meet the world's demand for energy, the
- 1471 world is going to use coal.
- 1472 *Mr. Peters. All right, I am sorry, we are getting away
- 1473 from the finer point I was trying to make, but anyway, I
- 1474 appreciate it.
- 1475 Mr. Chairman, my time is expired, I yield back.
- 1476 *Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentleman and I will go to
- 1477 Kentucky's Mr. Guthrie for five minutes.
- 1478 *Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. I apologize, there is two

```
hearings going on for our full subcommittee hearings. I have
1479
      been upstairs with FDA and foreign inspections, which are
1480
1481
      important for our drug supply chain. But this is also
      critically important.
1482
           And I just want to talk about we are in the middle of
1483
      debate on Ukraine funding and what is moving forward here in
1484
      the House and the Senate. And I was in a meeting, and it was
1485
1486
      all I can say, really a major European ally. And it was
      someone who certainly spoke for the government, left of
1487
      center, who said in the meeting to a group of Members of
1488
      Congress that, "If you want peace, produce gas.'' That was a
1489
      quote.
1490
           And someone, one of my colleagues, immediately said,
1491
      "Well, we understand all of the terminals in Europe are full.
1492
      So even if we produce more LNG, you wouldn't be able to
1493
      receive it.''
1494
           And this person said, "Well, sell it elsewhere, sell it
1495
1496
      the Pacific, I don't care, I just need the price to come
      down.'' That is what he said. That is a direct quote from
1497
      somebody who spoke certainly spoke for a government of a
1498
      major, major ally in Europe.
1499
```

1500 And it really struck me that the high price of natural gas or energy funds Putin's army, literally funds his army, 1501 1502 and we are sitting here debating about sending money to Ukraine to fight the army we are funding because we don't 1503 1504 produce enough gas. And so, if you look at just the policy if you look at 1505 if you are in the Biden White House, and you are looking at 1506 1507 I want to restrict exports of LNG, which will raise the price, at the same time asking our charging taxpayers, 1508 hard-working taxpayers to fund and I am for our friends in 1509 Ukraine, I want destroying Putin's army in Ukraine is a 1510 thing that would be good for America without American men and 1511 1512 women doing it. And so Mr. McCown, I would like to ask you if you would 1513 comment on that, just the national security implications of 1514 not exporting liquid natural gas. 1515 *Mr. McCown. Yes, Representative Guthrie, thank you. 1516 1517 Thank you very much for that question. Yes, you know, the world is going to get its LNG from 1518 somewhere. And if not from us, it is going to be from other, 1519 less stable, less reliable partners like Russia. Russia 1520

1521 has *Mr. Guthrie. But even if they don't get it from 1522 1523 Russia, the price goes up. *Mr. McCown. Correct. 1524 *Mr. Guthrie. So when Russia sells it to somebody other 1525 than our European friends, they are getting money. 1526 *Mr. McCown. Yes. And choking off Russia's cash to 1527 1528 fund its war effort through decreasing the molecules they are able to place on the market is very important. 1529 *Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Rice, would you like to comment? 1530 *Mr. Rice. Yes, I would just like to talk about how big 1531 this opportunity is that we have in the United States. I 1532 1533 mean, just real high level. We have studied this. We have a resource that would 1534 allow us to be able to support quadrupling our LNG exports to 1535 about 60 BCF a day. To put that in perspective and that 1536 would imply a \$4 gas price here in the United States, putting 1537 1538 it on the doorstep of Europe for a cost of less than \$12.60. Sixty BCF a day does not mean a lot to the normal person, but 1539 from an energy security perspective, sixty BCF a day is the 1540 energy equivalent of adding ten million barrels a day, which 1541

1542 is going to be a decarbonizing force to the world stage. The United States has the opportunity to essentially add 1543 1544 a Saudi Arabia of clean energy to the world stage. about the amount of peace, prosperity, and influence that can 1545 bring from America to the world. It is world-changingly 1546 impactful is what we have here in the U.S. 1547 *Mr. Guthrie. So what would that do to the Russian or 1548 1549 Putin's government's ability to wage war? *Mr. Rice. Well, it certainly would replace their 1550 influence in Europe. And if you want to mitigate the 1551 influence of petro-dictators because guess what, Putin is 1552 not the only bad actor on the world stage we need to worry 1553 1554 about bring more energy into the world, lower the cost of energy. You lower the dollars that they are able to get from 1555 their selling energy. 1556 So again, I mean, there are so many benefits of how LNG 1557 can actually increase the security of our allies and also the 1558 1559 influence the security of Americans *Mr. Guthrie. But you would agree with the comment of 1560 this European person that said if you want peace, produce 1561 1562 gas.

```
1563
           *Mr. Rice. A hundred percent.
           *Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. I want to switch really
1564
1565
      quickly to Mr. Cormier.
           Is that how you say it correctly? I would like to
1566
      briefly so I am pivoting to you would you like would
1567
      you comment on how this decision will impact jobs here at
1568
      home and communities like those in southeast Louisiana?
1569
           *Mr. Cormier. When these announcements are made, your
1570
      universities, your small business people, it is a very
1571
      interrelated and intermingled type of marketplace. So when a
1572
      decision is made, you have folks who come down, we talk about
1573
      building jobs, we talk about linking supply chain, we talk
1574
1575
      about connecting people from jobs to small business.
           And one of the things that is really impressive in our
1576
      part of the world, southeast Texas is our like our cousins
1577
      over there, right, with the Sabine River. So when we sneeze,
1578
      they sneeze, we all catch a cold. So what is really
1579
1580
      important is that you have this intermingling of culture,
      people, and a mindset and in for really, really important,
1581
      I want the committee to understand southeast Texas and
1582
      southwest Louisiana are still rebuilding from natural
1583
```

```
1584
      disasters that increased what do I want to say it
      impacted how much people have lost. We have lost houses.
                                                                  We
1585
1586
      have lost job opportunities that have been had to move
      because people had to move out.
1587
           So we are trying to build this thing back up, and LNG is
1588
      a very, very, very important part of this piece. We are
1589
      talking billions in money
1590
1591
           *Mr. Guthrie.
                          Thanks.
           *Mr. Cormier. and in job opportunities.
1592
           *Mr. Guthrie. I appreciate it. My time has gone over,
1593
      so I will yield back.
1594
           *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired. I will
1595
1596
      now go to Ms. Matsui for five minutes.
1597
           *Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and
      thank you for all the witnesses for being here today.
1598
           Natural gas has been hailed as a bridge fuel replacing
1599
      coal and providing backup power for renewables as we
1600
1601
      transition to 100 percent clean electricity. However, the
      value of natural gas as a bridge fuel is premised on the
1602
      belief that gas is cleaner than coal and that the reliance on
1603
      gas will be short-lived, with clean energy largely replacing
1604
```

1605 natural gas by 2050. Burning natural gas emits roughly half the amount of CO2 1606 1607 that burning coal emits. However, if natural gas is released directly into the atmosphere and not burned, it becomes a 1608 very significant driver of global warming. This means that 1609 the value of natural gas as a replacement for coal depends on 1610 how much gas leaks directly into the atmosphere. 1611 1612 Ms. Giannetti, can you describe where natural gas leaks occur across the supply chain, and how prevalent these leaks 1613 are? 1614 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Congresswoman. 1615 So the problem of gas leaks is a significant aspect of 1616 1617 the question of the carbon intensity of gas and LNG. unfortunately, they have been found to happen across the 1618 supply chain from the original extraction to transportation 1619 both via pipeline and via ship and actual regasification and 1620 use. 1621 1622 *Ms. Matsui. Okay. Do we really know how much methane is leaking into the atmosphere across the United States? 1623 *Ms. Giannetti. No, which is part of the reason why we 1624 need to update our studies to consider that. 1625

1626 *Ms. Matsui. Taking into account about these methane leaks, is there a point at which natural gas becomes worse 1627 1628 for the planet than coal? *Ms. Giannetti. If you take in even minor gas leaks, 1629 the carbon footprint of gas can actually be worse than coal. 1630 But additionally, we are also looking at a bit of a 1631 misnomer here, because it is questionable at best, especially 1632 1633 looking at Europe, whether gas is even displacing coal. 1634 *Ms. Matsui. Okay. Sending natural gas to Europe and Asia by ship requires the gas to be super cold and liquefied 1635 before being regasified at the destination. This is an 1636 1637 energy-intensive process and also creates new opportunities 1638 for leakage. Ms. Giannetti, accounting for all of these processes, 1639 how does the emissions impact of liquefied natural gas 1640 compare to coal? 1641 *Ms. Giannetti. The climate impacts of the entire LNG 1642 1643 value chain are enormous and need to be considered when factored into a public interest assessment, and they 1644 currently are not. 1645 *Ms. Matsui. Okay. Clearly, the climate impact of 1646

1647 natural gas depends on the degree of leakage. This is a solvable problem, though. The Inflation Reduction Act 1648 1649 established a pollution fee for methane and provided funding to help detect leaks and reduce emissions. And in December 1650 the Biden Administration finalized a rule requiring oil and 1651 gas companies to detect and fix leaks and reduce intentional 1652 flaring. However, some in the oil and gas industry wants to 1653 1654 repeal this methane fee and roll back the recent rule on 1655 methane leaks. Ms. Giannetti, what would you say to those who claim 1656 natural gas is reducing emissions but refuse to address 1657 methane leaks? 1658 1659 *Ms. Giannetti. If we want to take climate change seriously and have a real discussion about the impact of 1660 natural gas on that discussion, we cannot do so without 1661 focusing on methane leaks and trying to eliminate them to the 1662 maximum extent possible. 1663 1664 *Ms. Matsui. Okay. Even if LNG had lower lifestyle emissions and we knew it was replacing coal, the 1665 International Energy Agency has found that the current build-1666 out of LNG export infrastructure is not compatible with the 1667

1668 Paris Agreement goal of limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. 1669 1670 Ms. Giannetti, can you describe how U.S. LNG export capacity compares to expected LNG demand if countries meet 1671 their Paris Agreement targets? 1672 *Ms. Giannetti. Currently we are meeting Europe's 1673 In fact, Europe has gas storage of 96 percent, which 1674 1675 is some of the highest storage that it has ever had. Additionally, we expect our European allies to continue 1676 to transition away from gas as it revitalizes its system and 1677 improves energy efficiency. Accordingly, most studies 1678 strongly suggest that the LNG that we produce today and that 1679 1680 we will produce tomorrow, with this pause having no effect on them, will more than supply the European need. 1681 *Ms. Matsui. So what would you say to the oil and gas 1682 industry about the future return on investment for new LNG 1683 export facilities? 1684 1685 *Ms. Giannetti. Given that these facilities can last up to 40 years, it is an extremely risky investment to build LNG 1686

*Ms. Matsui. So you are saying there would be stranded

facilities in the 2030s.

1687

1688

1689 assets? *Ms. Giannetti. It is high risk of stranded assets. 1690 1691 Yes, Congresswoman. *Ms. Matsui. Okay, thank you, and I yield back. 1692 The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 1693 *Mr. Duncan. to Indiana's Dr. Bucshon for five minutes. 1694 *Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know 1695 1696 what to say. It is like we are in two different universes. Look, I support an all-of-the-above energy strategy. I 1697 think we should pursue everything. Honestly, I really do. 1698 I also support Ukraine funding, as the vast majority of 1699 Republicans do. We also support, though, securing our 1700 1701 southern border and preventing people from 160 different countries, including known terrorists, from coming across the 1702 southern border. And until this Administration tries to 1703 address that and we can get our colleagues on the other side 1704 of the aisle to realize that, we are going to be at a 1705 1706 crossroads here. So it is a false narrative we don't support Ukraine. We do. We also support the people that we 1707 represent. It is a representative republic, and the people 1708 are telling me that they want to do both. 1709

Look, an indefinite pause is a ban. Make no mistake 1710 about it. And it is going to be lifted. It is going to be 1711 1712 lifted in November of this year, after November 5 or, honestly, on January 20 in 2025. This is about politics, and 1713 everybody in this room knows it. 1714 Thanks to American innovation and energy technologies, 1715 the United States is the world's largest producer of natural 1716 gas and exporter of LNG. A lot of this has been said. All 1717 the good questions have been asked, unfortunately. American 1718 LNG is a critical asset that not only keeps our energy sector 1719 secure and competitive, but also helps reduce global 1720 emissions, as has been described, and the global dependance 1721 on energy and its our dependance on global energy from 1722 adversarial nations, Russia. 1723 I have been in Japan recently. I have been in Poland 1724 recently in the last year. All you have to do is talk to 1725 people offline when you are not at some conference, sitting 1726 1727 at the table, and just stand on the side and talk to people. And you want to talk about uncertainty amongst our allies? 1728 They are in a full-blown panic over this type of energy 1729 reaction in the United States for politics. I mean, that is 1730

```
1731
      not my opinion. I just hear that from those folks.
           U.S. energy sources are some of the cleanest in the
1732
1733
      world. We take the cleanest natural gas in the world out of
      global market I mean, trying to say that trying to twist
1734
      this around and in some way say that natural gas is dirtier
1735
      than coal from China I am talking about coal from China and
1736
      the way they produce it is just I can't understand how
1737
1738
      that could happen.
           I mean, geopolitically, this decision by the White House
1739
      is just foolish economically, also. So for Mr. Rice and Mr.
1740
      McCown, again, I know you have said this, but, I mean, our
1741
      allies around the world are going to turn to Russia, China,
1742
1743
      and Iran for natural gas if we don't produce it, and Qatar.
1744
           *Mr. Rice. Congressman, it is important to realize that
      two-thirds of the world's natural gas is contained in four
1745
      countries: Qatar, Iran, Russia, and the United States.
1746
      if who is going to provide the energy security to the
1747
1748
      world? If the United States doesn't do it, it should not be
      Russia, it should not be Iran. Qatar, a little bit small.
1749
      It has to be the United States to provide this energy
1750
      security to the world.
1751
```

```
1752
           *Mr. Bucshon. Talk about the geopolitics also on this.
           *Mr. McCown. Sure. I was just going to mention
1753
1754
           *Mr. Bucshon. A lot of that.
           *Mr. McCown. We have letters from the Chamber, from
1755
      Business Europe that have gone to the Administration, from
1756
      the Asia Natural Gas and Energy Association, from Japan, from
1757
      others, from Euro Gas. They are all aghast, literally, with
1758
1759
      what is going on.
1760
           *Mr. Bucshon. Yes.
           *Mr. McCown. It is a problem. And from the
1761
      geopolitical implications and by the way, it is not just
1762
      coal, right? It is fuel oil, it is wood, it is other things
1763
      that are being burned that are equally as worse. And Europe
1764
      does burn all those things.
1765
           But from a geopolitical standpoint, yes, there are only
1766
      a few countries that do this. But they are going to go to
1767
      the Qataris, they are going to go to others because for their
1768
1769
      energy security they require regulatory certainty and
      stability
1770
           *Mr. Bucshon. Correct.
1771
           *Mr. McCown. \_ as well.
1772
```

1773 *Mr. Bucshon. Let me just say this. When we were in Eastern I was in Eastern Europe about a year ago. Do you 1774 1775 realize that the Russians Russian propaganda in those countries is at a fever pitch, probably Cold War era or more? 1776 What are they saying? "Your government is causing you 1777 higher energy costs because they refuse to buy our natural 1778 gas that is cheaper than American natural gas.'' And guess 1779 1780 what is happening? There are protests in those countries 1781 from people who live in those countries who happen to be communists. And they remember when the countries were 1782 Eastern Bloc. And their governments are under tremendous 1783 pressure to open up the spigot from Russia into their 1784 1785 countries. If America backs away, they will be forced to do it. And guess what? It fuels Putin's war machine. 1786 I yield back. 1787 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 1788 to my friend, Mr. Tonko, for five minutes. 1789 1790 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The question is to Ms. Giannetti. 1791 Will DOE's announcement impact approval of LNG exports 1792 to countries that have a free trade agreement with the United 1793

1794 States? *Ms. Giannetti. No, Congressman. And the repeated 1795 1796 references to this action as a ban, as a fan of The Princess Bride, makes me think of Inigo Montoya. They keep saying the 1797 word "ban,'' but I don't think they know what it means. 1798 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you. Well, clearly, we are exporting 1799 record levels of LNG with even more capacity in the pipeline. 1800 1801 If the Biden Administration is trying to ban LNG exports, they are not doing a very good job, and that is because this 1802 is not a ban or a de facto ban, either. It is an 1803 acknowledgment that export approvals have grown tremendously 1804 in recent years, meaning an increasing share of total U.S. 1805 1806 production is being earmarked for export. I believe the responsible course of action is to take a 1807 breath and see if additional exports would continue to be in 1808 the public interest. And that should, of course, include an 1809 updated understanding of the impacts on U.S. consumers, the 1810 1811 economy, the environment, and communities that host these facilities, amongst other factors. 1812 So Ms. Giannetti, also I want to clear something here 1813 that I have heard repeated by some of my colleagues across 1814

the aisle with suggestions that they are making. Given that 1815 the pause has no short or even medium-term impact on LNG 1816 exports, will there be a near-term impact on the price Russia 1817 gets for the gas today? 1818 *Ms. Giannetti. This pause has zero effect on all 1819 current LNG exports and all LNG exports that have already 1820 been approved by the Department of Energy, so it would be 1821 1822 highly unlikely for there to be any of those effects. *Mr. Tonko. And I would also ask about the myth-versus-1823 fact document issued by the majority yesterday which stated 1824 increasing LNG exports will also encourage investments in 1825 other industries like manufacturing, which will help ensure 1826 that we beat China. And honestly, I am having a hard time 1827 making sense of this. 1828 So, Ms. Giannetti, do we currently export LNG to China? 1829 *Ms. Giannetti. Yes. 1830 *Mr. Tonko. And with recent contracts should we expect 1831 1832 the volume of exports to China to increase in the future? *Ms. Giannetti. Yes, China is the single largest 1833 identifier purchaser of future natural gas, totaling almost 1834 14 percent. 1835

1836 *Mr. Tonko. And what could LNG be used for in China? Is it potentially a lower cost input for China's 1837 1838 manufacturing sector? *Ms. Giannetti. It could. Yes, Congressman. 1839 *Mr. Tonko. So, Ms. Giannetti, are there risks that 1840 unfettered LNG exports to China could undermine a potential 1841 advantage of American manufacturers? 1842 1843 *Ms. Giannetti. Yes. 1844 *Mr. Tonko. So time and time again we have heard Republicans on this committee state their concerns about 1845 China leading in some strategic manufacturing sectors. And 1846 without an updated understanding of LNG exports' impacts, we 1847 1848 could be further disadvantaging domestic companies. Personally, I believe we should be supporting U.S. 1849 manufacturers trying to compete for these industries of the 1850 future, as we have done in items like the Inflation Reduction 1851 Act, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Infrastructure 1852 1853 Investment and Jobs Act. Trying to determine what is in the public interest is 1854 complicated, but we know it does not just mean what is good 1855 for fossil fuel executives. So I applaud the Administration 1856

1857 for taking the time to do this review and get it right. There is a lot of documentation that I think would serve us 1858 1859 well as we move forward with the pause. So with that I thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back. 1860 *Mr. Curtis. [Presiding] Thank you. The gentleman 1861 yields. The chair recognizes Mr. Walberg. 1862 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I must say 1863 1864 something initially here. It does bother me a bit to hear us challenged on this side of the aisle in not supporting 1865 Ukraine, when in fact we do support Ukraine. We have shown 1866 that in our votes. We also support securing our border, 1867 which is an awfully important thing. I would say to my 1868 Democrat colleagues that if you support our border we could 1869 join you in supporting Ukraine and the both. 1870 *Voice. Will the gentleman yield? I have got an idea. 1871 *Mr. Walberg. I don't have time right now, and you know 1872 I don't state that angrily. But the bottom line, I am sick 1873 1874 of hearing us not supporting Ukraine. And we do support that, and have supported you support the border, and we 1875 will join together, I guess, in supporting Ukraine, as well. 1876 Last week I met with several delegations from around the 1877

```
world.
              They were here for the National Prayer Breakfast.
1878
                                                                  Ι
1879
      will have to pray to get released from my anger right now.
1880
      But in talking with them, they were here for the
      international portion of that prayer breakfast. A number of
1881
      them expressed worry, literal worry and concern about
1882
      President Biden's decision to indefinitely ban U.S. LNG
1883
      exports and what it means for their energy, their security,
1884
1885
      their economy.
           And I have got to say, with all due respect, uncertainty
1886
      breeds insecurity. Uncertainty breeds insecurity, and that
1887
      is not good for this time and place in our world.
1888
      security is national security, plain and simple. The Biden
1889
      Administration is turning their backs on our friends and
1890
      allies abroad, not to mention American consumers and
1891
      communities in order to secure a few political points on
1892
      their left flank. And this is what that is all about.
1893
           Mr. McCown, it seems short-sighted to me to upend an
1894
1895
      entire industry that millions depend on to appease
      environmental activists on TikTok. How important is policy
1896
      stability for the global energy market, and what are the
1897
      long-term national security consequences of this type of
1898
```

1899 rapid policy shift? *Mr. McCown. Yes, thank you very much for that 1900 1901 question. They can be significant. Far too often we make policy decisions in the short term 1902 without fully understanding the medium and long-term 1903 implications for these decisions. Private markets abhor 1904 risk. Capital deployment abhors risk. When you make these 1905 1906 changes, when you are in the middle of the football game and 1907 the rules change, that translates to unacceptable risk. then keeps capital on the sidelines, it keeps people from 1908 investing, it has people calling into question the regulatory 1909 regime, the regulatory certainty that is absolutely and 1910 fundamentally required in this and other areas. 1911 1912 *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. McCown. I will leave it there. 1913 Secretary Granholm has indicated that there will be 1914 exceptions to the White House's policy in the case of 1915 national and I quote "national security emergencies,'' 1916 and their fact sheet claims that we will still be able to 1917 supply essential LNG to our allies in the near term. Are 1918 these exceptions and assurances sufficient to address global 1919

1920 energy needs, Mr. McCown, from the Energy Secretary? *Mr. McCown. No, they are not. I mean, you know, 1921 1922 frankly, the damage has already been done. The way to undo this damage is to admit that it was premature and reverse 1923 course, and I would like to see that, and that would be my 1924 recommendation to the Administration. 1925 And at the same time, I think we could avoid gloating 1926 1927 and say, okay, we all make mistakes, got it. You can pursue your studies, but upending the private market economy like 1928 this is terrible not only for America, but for our standing 1929 in the world. 1930 The ability just a year and a half ago Secretary 1931 1932 Blinken was saying, "You can count on America, you can count on America's LNG,'' and here we are. 1933 *Mr. Walberg. Yes, thank you. 1934 Mr. Cormier, are you hearing concerns like this from 1935 companies in your community? And what is the impact? 1936 1937 *Mr. Cormier. What we are hearing is constant panic, simply because folks have built their plans for the future to 1938 hire people, to build restaurants, to build apartment 1939 complexes and housing. So it is a trickle-down effect. So 1940

1941 folks are on standstill. *Mr. Walberg. And they have contracts, right? 1942 1943 *Mr. Cormier. They have contracts. I know of someone right now who has worked on a project for over 12 years, 1944 because it takes that much time to make these type of 1945 projects move forward. Friday morning he called me and said, 1946 "What am I supposed to do?'' 1947 1948 And I had to sit and tell him, "Be patient, we are working on it.'' 1949 *Mr. Walberg. And do I have to renew and go through the 1950 whole process again? It is frustrating to see that this 1951 take place, and I hope we wake up to it. 1952 1953 I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back. I 1954 now go to Ms. Kuster for five minutes. 1955 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1956 I want to make clear for the record, Mr. Walberg, I 1957 1958 would ask unanimous consent to enter into the record today the New York Times, "Biden to Make Case for Immigration and 1959 Ukraine Aid Bill. The President is expected to plead with 1960 Congress to pass a bill marrying an immigration crackdown to 1961

1962	delivering emergency aid to Ukraine and Israel. Republicans
1963	have turned against the plan, likely dooming its chances.''
1964	I ask unanimous consent.
1965	*Mr. Duncan. Without objection.
1966	[The information follows:]
1967	
1968	**************************************
1969	

1970 *Mr. Walberg. We have sent them the plan already. Act on it. 1971 1972 *Ms. Kuster. We are just waiting for it to come to the floor. It is your Speaker that refuses to bring it up. 1973 At the outset I want to commend the Biden Administration 1974 for its recent decision to pause new liquid natural gas 1975 export authorizations until it can evaluate if those LNG 1976 export authorizations are and I quote "in the public 1977 interest.'' 1978 Today the United States is the world's largest exporter 1979 of LNG. And between now and 2027 the United States is set to 1980 nearly double its LNG export capacity. 1981 1982 One point I want to emphasize in this hearing is that LNG exports have a significant cost to American consumers. 1983 As Ms. Giannetti's testimony notes, over a 16-month period 1984 from September 2021 through December 2022, LNG exports cost 1985 U.S. consumers more than \$100 billion. This study is part of 1986 1987 a growing body of evidence that demonstrates LNG exports increased domestic gas prices, driving up the cost of 1988 cooking, heating, and electricity for U.S. consumers and 1989 businesses. 1990

```
1991
           Ms. Giannetti, my first question is for you. How does
      the Administration's announcement protect Americans from
1992
1993
      foreign gas buyers?
           *Ms. Giannetti. The Administration's announcement
1994
      allows it to be able to revise outdated and obsolete studies
1995
      that do not factor in U.S. consumer impacts to make sure that
1996
      those very real and serious impacts are being evaluated in
1997
1998
      determining whether a project is in the public interest.
           *Ms. Kuster. Thank you. I want to put an even sharper
1999
      point on your answer. Natural gas is the largest source of
2000
      fuel for electricity generation in New England. When natural
2001
      gas prices go up so does the price of our electricity.
2002
2003
           My next question again to you. I hope you can keep the
      answer brief. If the U.S. builds more natural gas export
2004
      capacity, will electricity prices in New England increase as
2005
      a result?
2006
           *Ms. Giannetti. All of the evidence suggests that yes,
2007
2008
      it would.
           *Ms. Kuster. And I also want to talk about the economic
2009
      reality of who truly benefits from LNG exports. As an
2010
      illustrative example, Cheniere Energy, one of America's
2011
```

2012 largest LNG exporters. In February 2016 Cheniere was the first American company 2013 2014 to export LNG. At that point in time its stock price was \$30 per share. And today, with LNG exports at record-high 2015 levels, Cheniere stock is trading near an all-time high of 2016 2017 \$160 per share. While the market should reward innovation, risk-taking, and business acumen, lawmakers should be 2018 2019 vigilant about who benefits from LNG exports and who pays the price, my constituents. 2020 Ms. Giannetti, do big fossil fuel companies like 2021 Cheniere benefit from increased natural gas exports, while 2022 Americans, particularly in New England, pay more for 2023 2024 electricity? *Ms. Giannetti. Exporting natural gas is a very 2025 profitable business for companies like Cheniere. 2026 Unfortunately, it can have a very disproportionate impact on 2027 gas-reliant consumers in the United States, particularly low-2028 2029 income. *Ms. Kuster. I represent my constituents who suffer 2030 from high energy prices, and I am proud that President Biden 2031 is putting electricity customers in New Hampshire ahead of 2032

2033 the interests of big fossil fuel companies and their share prices. 2034 2035 And with that I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 2036 to Mr. Palmer no, Mr. Curtis for five minutes. 2037 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2038 Mr. McCown and I hope I am pronouncing that correctly 2039 2040 I had an experience to travel to COP this year, and before I went I noticed with great interest the delegate from 2041 Germany had circulated a letter that some of our members in 2042 the House and Senate signed that would ban these LNG exports. 2043 So imagine my interest when I found myself in a room with 2044 2045 her, and heard her explaining how grateful she was that they had been able to move off Russian natural gas to U.S. natural 2046 gas. And I, of course, raised my hand and I said, "Can you 2047 help me understand why you don't want to allow others to do 2048 that?'' And she didn't have a good answer. 2049 2050 And I am just curious, from your perspective, why is it that it is okay for Germany to brag about doing that, but 2051 then insist that others not have that opportunity? 2052 *Mr. McCown. Yes, that is a very good question, Vice 2053

```
2054
      Chair Curtis.
           You know, Germany has always pursued their own version
2055
2056
      of Germany-first policy when it comes to energy, and has for
                They have decoupled geopolitical decisions with
2057
      economic decisions. And, you know, I have had the CEO of one
2058
      of Germany's largest utility companies say, "We didn't think
2059
      we needed to worry about energy security. We didn't think it
2060
2061
      mattered.''
           But there is this duplicity of thought in Germany that
2062
      is inconsistent across what others do.
2063
           *Mr. Curtis. Can I ask you? I have this is only just
2064
      speculation on my part, but I have thought perhaps are
2065
2066
      there greenhouse gas emissions more today than there were
      before they started down this road?
2067
           *Mr. McCown. They are. And, you know, the United
2068
      States has reduced its GHG emissions.
2069
           *Mr. Curtis. Dramatically.
2070
2071
           *Mr. McCown. Dramatically through the shale revolution,
      whereas EU countries and Germany, in particular has spent
2072
      billions, if not trillions of public money
2073
           *Mr. Curtis. Yes.
2074
```

```
2075
           *Mr. McCown. with other EU countries, and have not
      significantly
2076
           *Mr. Curtis. I would love to just hear more, but we are
2077
      so limited on time
2078
           *Mr. McCown.
2079
                         Sure.
           *Mr. Curtis. I am going to move us forward.
2080
           Mr. Rice, can we discuss this concept a little bit?
2081
2082
      Sometimes it feels to me like people hate fossil fuels more
      than they hate emissions. And as we talk about this
2083
      cleanliness issue, it is my impression and I have actually
2084
      said it, and so tell me if I am wrong that we do produce it
2085
      cleaner here than Russia, and not just by a little bit.
2086
2087
           Can you talk about that, and also this feeling like it
      is more important to kill fossil fuels than it is to kill
2088
      emissions?
2089
           *Mr. Rice. Yes, sure. So, yes, I can confirm that the
2090
      energy that we produce here in America is the cleanest in the
2091
2092
              There is a lot of steps that EQT, America's largest
      natural gas producer, is taking that will actually bring the
2093
      much-needed transparency because we agree with our colleagues
2094
      here from the NRDC. We need to take care of methane
2095
```

2096 emissions, and we need to showcase that to the world. *Mr. Curtis. Yes. 2097 2098 *Mr. Rice. I am encouraged that the work because I was at COP, as well. And we heard climate leaders speak, 2099 specifically Climate Envoy John Kerry, saying that we have a 2100 choice. Either eliminate fossil fuels or capture the 2101 emissions. That was a positive step for me. And 2102 2103 fortunately, this industry is hearing the world's call for 2104 cleaner energy. *Mr. Curtis. So would you agree with this statement, 2105 that we can keep energy prices low, that we can keep energy 2106 reliable, we can not just be energy independent but energy 2107 dominant, and reduce emissions? 2108 2109 *Mr. Rice. Yes, and we could look at the track record of success that the American oil and gas industry has laid. 2110 Keep in mind, 20 years ago we were in a situation where 2111 we were energy dependent. We were thinking about importing 2112 2113 What happened? We cracked the code on shale. innovation. And now we have turned America into an energy 2114 powerhouse. We have made the energy we produce in this 2115 country cheaper, more reliable. We hear the world's call for 2116

```
cleaner energy. And we have are shifting that innovation
2117
      towards making the energy
2118
2119
           *Mr. Curtis.
                         Thank you.
           *Mr. Rice. we produce cleaner.
2120
           *Mr. Curtis. Thank you.
2121
           Mr. Cormier, I represent a part of my district that is
2122
      oil and gas. It is rural Utah. They often feel like we
2123
2124
      don't just demonize fossil fuels, we demonize the people. Is
2125
      that something that you can connect with and have any
      experience with?
2126
           And by the way, these are the same people who helped us
2127
      win World War II, who make sure that when we go over to the
2128
2129
      light switch it flips on, and that we keep our homes at 70
2130
      degrees.
           *Mr. Cormier. There is a sense of pride that the
2131
      workers and the folks that live in our area have about being
2132
      home to producing America's cleanest energy. In fact, we
2133
2134
      have worked on actually branding ourselves as the clean
      energy capital of the world, especially here in America.
2135
      when our folks get up in the morning we are a hard-working
2136
      people, like a rural area
2137
```

2138 *Mr. Curtis. Yes. *Mr. Cormier. that is what we do, and 2139 2140 *Mr. Curtis. And I am out of time, but I would love to just go on. Maybe we should initiate some sister city 2141 relationships because my people are just like that, right, 2142 hard-working, good people. 2143 *Mr. Cormier. We will switch and give you some boudin 2144 2145 and some crawfish etouffee. *Mr. Curtis. All right, I regret I am out of time. 2146 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield. 2147 *Mr. Duncan. I will now go to Ms. Schrier, Dr. Schrier, 2148 2149 for five minutes. 2150 *Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Chair Duncan, and thank you to the witnesses who are here today. 2151 I would first just like to re-emphasize that my 2152 Republican colleagues are generating outrage based on what 2153 is, at best, a misunderstanding of facts. We are talking 2154 2155 about a pause in permitting, not a ban. More than 14 billion cubic feet of liquefied natural gas 2156 is being produced every day, and more than twice of that 2157 capacity is already permitted, and DOE has already approved 2158

2159 over 3 times our current export capacity. That is a whole lot of methane to meet near-term, even medium-term demand. 2160 2161 So what this order does do is pause the permitting of new and pending LNG export applications, and calls for a 2162 study to determine the climate and economic impacts of LNG 2163 exports as elements of the public interest, which has not 2164 been clarified. Since DOE has last examined the analysis of 2165 2166 public interest, LNG exports have tripled. 2167 And as our tools and research for tracking life-cycle emissions continues to advance, our emissions accounting 2168 looks grimmer and grimmer. Some studies even show that total 2169 greenhouse gas emissions of natural gas are worse than coal. 2170 2171 So it is important that we take a step back while we are already miles ahead in LNG export capacity, and fully 2172 understand the environmental and economic impacts as elements 2173 of the public interest. 2174 This is also a really good opportunity as I am 2175 2176 focusing on emissions, it is a good opportunity to set the record straight on some of my colleagues' comments that the 2177 U.S. has decreased carbon emissions more than anywhere in the 2178 world because of this transition to methane. But carbon does 2179

not include methane, and methane is a more potent greenhouse 2180 gas. So the comment is really quite misleading, as leaks, 2181 2182 even small leaks, will have a more detrimental impact. Ms. Giannetti, I would like to ask you about what we 2183 know about how leaks contribute to the life-cycle emissions 2184 of natural gas, of methane, and what does the latest evidence 2185 tell us about emissions in greenhouse or and warming? 2186 2187 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you for the question, 2188 Congresswoman. Leaks can offset any potential benefits of LNG, and make 2189 it actually as bad as coal, if not worse. And unfortunately, 2190 we see leaks all along the value chain, from initial 2191 2192 extraction to transportation and use. *Ms. Schrier. And we have been able to detect more of 2193 those leaks with recent technology, acknowledging that there 2194 are more of them. 2195 Now, as of 2023, we are the largest LNG exporter in the 2196 2197 So pause or no pause, we should be doing everything in our power to reduce domestic life-cycle emissions in our 2198 existing natural gas infrastructure. And I was proud to pass 2199 the Methane Emissions Reductions Program, and I am glad to 2200

2201 see the EPA announce a new rule to curb methane emissions from this sector. 2202 2203 It is important to note, I think, as many of my colleagues have pointed out, that the U.S. can only impact 2204 leaks at home, and not abroad. Can you talk about both the 2205 values of the initiatives we have taken here in the U.S., and 2206 perhaps about what we need to think about as we consider the 2207 2208 entire supply chain, and where those leaks might happen, even though they might not happen in the U.S.? 2209 *Ms. Giannetti. There are critical measures that we 2210 have started to take and that we need to continue to take to 2211 improve the efficiency and reduce leakage domestically. 2212 2213 Unfortunately, as you mentioned, Congresswoman, it is impossible for us to regulate those leakage rates abroad, 2214 which can contribute significantly to the overall carbon 2215 footprint of LNG export. And of course, because air is 2216 transparent, the air that is polluted from those leakage 2217 2218 rates overseas does affect us here in the United States, as 2219 well. *Ms. Schrier. Thank you. So I just wanted to emphasize 2220 that we are talking about emissions, and we are talking about 2221

2222 greenhouse gases and climate change and emission-free options, whether it is nuclear, hydropower, solar, wind. 2223 2224 They need to be more of a larger energy mix, and we should 2225 encourage other countries to move toward that path, as well. And we do need to be mindful about energy security and 2226 not turn off sources as we until we have developed new 2227 ones, but there is no urgency, and this pause seems 2228 2229 appropriate to me. Thank you, and I yield back. 2230 *Mr. Duncan. I thank the gentlelady and I now go to Mr. 2231 Palmer from Alabama for five minutes. 2232 2233 *Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just 2234 like to respond in regard to whether or not this is a pause 2235 or a ban. It takes years to get permits for an LNG facility. 2236 There are billions of dollars in capital investment involved. 2237 And what is really happening here is this Administration 2238 2239 understands that. They don't understand a whole lot about science, but they understand a whole lot about politics and 2240 permitting. And I think they are deliberately creating 2241 uncertainty about permit approval. 2242

2243 I mean, the Department of Energy in December announced that the projects not yet operational will have to reapply 2244 2245 for their permits if their permit was approved more than seven years ago. That is billions of dollars in investments 2246 that could go down the drain. But they have created 2247 uncertainty in order to stifle investment and to discourage 2248 foreign governments from entering into contracts with 2249 2250 companies that might not be able to provide the product. 2251 So in regard to whether it is a pause or a ban, it is a ban. 2252 I want to ask point out a couple of things. One, we 2253 probably saved countless numbers of lives in Europe over the 2254 2255 last couple of years because we have been able to provide LNG. Even with that said, because of the move to renewables 2256 in Europe and their and their reliance on Russian gas, 68,000 2257 Europeans died last winter in what was a relatively mild 2258 winter because they couldn't afford to adequately heat their 2259 2260 These were people with cardiovascular respiratory issues. And I have repeated this time and time again, it 2261 gets no response from the other side. The same thing has 2262 happened in the UK. 2263

```
2264
           But what I want to get into is, Mr. McCown, in your
      testimony you made the comment about this being a national
2265
2266
      security issue. I think it is, it absolutely is. You even
      mentioned something that doesn't get mentioned around here
2267
      very often, that America is the arsenal of democracy. I
2268
      think a significant part of that arsenal is our enormous
2269
      energy capacity to aid our allies and emerging economies.
2270
2271
           Would you like to comment on that briefly?
           *Mr. McCown. Yes, thank you very much. It is, and, you
2272
      know, we have always been the supplier. I mentioned that I
2273
      mentioned earlier today that we supplied most of the oil and
2274
      gas used during World War II.
2275
2276
           You know, we export a lot of things that is very
      helpful, and we do it in an environmentally friendly way.
2277
      are more highly regulated than almost any other country in
2278
      the world. And we do it safely. And by removing that, what
2279
      we are going to see is increases in emissions from around the
2280
2281
      world, not decreases. And I think it is something we have to
      take very seriously.
2282
           *Mr. Palmer. But you also understand that China is an
2283
      adversary. And I have told people this many times: the war
2284
```

```
2285
      in Ukraine didn't create the energy crisis, it exposed it.
      And the thing that everybody should learn from that is that
2286
2287
      no nation should be reliant on an adversarial nation for
      something as critical to its economy and its national
2288
2289
      security as energy.
           You see what is happening right now, is that you have
2290
      got a number of non-governmental organizations and non-profit
2291
2292
      groups pushing for an energy transition in the United States,
      and they did the same thing in Europe, being funded by
2293
      Russian and Chinese dollars. And
2294
           *Mr. McCown. Yes, that is true. And, you know, the
2295
2296
      transition is not an overnight occurrence.
2297
           I think we all agree we want clean, cheap, affordable,
      and responsible fuel sources. The issue of pushing a
2298
      premature transition upends our economic and national
2299
      security. We need a I am an all-of-the-above kind of guy,
2300
      but we need a responsible pathway toward net zero.
2301
2302
           *Mr. Palmer. Well, I worked for two international
      engineering companies, did everything from environmental
2303
      systems to refuse to energy to aerospace. And there are some
2304
      fundamental physics involved in an energy transition that
2305
```

```
2306
      that apparently my colleagues across the aisle do not
      understand. We are not going to get to net zero by 2050
2307
2308
      under any scenario. It is not possible. What we will do is
      wreak unimaginable destruction on the American economy.
2309
           And going back to the what has happened in Europe, in
2310
      the UK, in 2008 they wanted to be the model for shifting to
2311
      renewables. They wanted to be that set the model for
2312
2313
      Europe. Well, in terms of peacetime economic growth, their
      growth is the slowest since 1780. That is not a that is
2314
      not 1980 or 1880, that is 1780, the year before Yorktown.
2315
      And that is where we are heading.
2316
           And just one Mr. Chairman, just one point here.
2317
      Venture Global's Gulf Coast CP2 would supply about 5 percent
2318
      of the world's LNG by 2026. That would have a bigger impact
2319
      on the U.S. economy than any green energy project. It would
2320
      produce about $600 billion in revenue over the lifespan of
2321
      the project, thousands of jobs, and reduce greenhouse
2322
2323
      emissions by 140 million tons a year. I cannot imagine for
2324
      the life of me why we have got groups funded by Chinese money
      and Russian money that they are really about reducing
2325
      emissions, when I am really concerned that it is really
2326
```

2327 about a threat to our national security. With that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back. 2328 2329 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. Before I recognize the next person I want to ask you to help me 2330 welcome a Special Olympics medalist, a good friend of mine, 2331 Rachel Lewis in the back of the room. Rachel is here for a 2332 Special Olympics Advocacy Day. 2333 2334 [Applause.] 2335 *Mr. Duncan. Welcome, Rachel. I will now recognize Mr. Sarbanes for five minutes. 2336 *Mr. Sarbanes. It is not fair, Mr. Chairman. I have to 2337 follow Rachel now. 2338 2339 [Laughter.] *Mr. Sarbanes. But welcome. 2340 LNG terminals impacted communities in which they are 2341 located. We have heard about economic opportunity, as well, 2342 of course, as communities that use the LNG that passes 2343 2344 through them. But there is a lot of ways in which communities are impacted. There is jobs, there is the 2345 environmental impacts and other things that need to be 2346 considered. 2347

2348 And DOE's pause and considering pending LNG export permits is not going to affect current operations at places 2349 2350 like Cove Point LNG terminal, which is just south of my district in Maryland, but it will allow the Department, 2351 rightly, to reassess the economic and environmental analysis 2352 it uses to better determine if future LNG exports will be a 2353 net benefit, a net benefit considering everything to all 2354 affected communities in other words, if they are in the 2355 public interest. And certainly, one critical measure of 2356 whether LNG exports are in the public interest is if these 2357 exports help or, conversely, harm our efforts to meet our 2358 local domestic and international policy goals such as our 2359 2360 climate commitments. 2361 Two asides quickly. One is the notion that it is this is politics to have this pause where DOE is trying to bring 2362 more things into the picture, I think, is unfair. I mean, we 2363 are at the beginning of the second year of a two-year term 2364 2365 that Members of Congress serve in. If we are going to have to swear off the whole second year of our two-year terms in 2366 terms of being able to take steps or endorse or support this 2367 kind of agency activity because we are in a campaign year, 2368

2369 and therefore it is political, we are losing half of our capacity to do our jobs as Members of Congress and as people 2370 2371 in these responsible Federal agencies. So I take the Administration at its word that it is just 2372 trying to incorporate broader perspective into the way these 2373 decisions are being made. And frankly, it is a sign of the 2374 maturing or the maturity of the industry, too, that you would 2375 2376 have a pause. I mean, this LNG industry has been moving forward pell-mell, to their credit, with a lot of benefits 2377 associated with it. There is tremendous capacity in the 2378 permits that already exist that aren't being interrupted 2379 here. To say let's pause and examine all of the kind of 2380 externalities and other factors that need to go into this, 2381 that is in some ways, that is a nod to the industry that we 2382 understand you are here to stay, in many respects, and 2383 therefore these other factors need to be considered. So I 2384 don't view it as an attack on the industry, frankly. 2385 2386 The State of Maryland has a climate pollution reduction plan that targets net zero emissions by 2045. As we know, 2387 the Biden Administration's greenhouse gas reduction target 2388 aims to have nationwide emission levels by 2030 relative to 2389

2390 2005 levels. At COP 28 in Dubai, the U.S. and nearly 200 other countries committed to transitioning away from fossil 2391 2392 fuels and cutting methane emissions. Ms. Giannetti, can you please explain how U.S. LNG 2393 exports impact our ability to meet these climate targets at 2394 2395 all levels? How do you anticipate, if you do, that the Biden 2396 2397 Administration's pause will have a positive impact on our work to meet these policy goals, both at home and abroad? 2398 And again, we are trying to get to these goals because 2399 they mean something, and we understand the implications of 2400 not getting there. And there is lots of industries, not just 2401 the LNG industry, that are needing to be brought into that 2402 broader way of thinking here. So if you could, speak to 2403 whether you think the pause can positively impact the 2404 progress we are trying to make towards these larger goals. 2405 *Ms. Giannetti. The pause is a critical step to 2406 2407 ensuring that the criteria we are using when evaluating far future LNG exports incorporate the known climate and economic 2408 impacts of those exports. If all proposed projects were 2409 built, the U.S. would overshoot its climate targets by 41 2410

percent, and 67 members of European parliaments have actually 2411 written a letter congratulating the Biden Administration on 2412 2413 this pause, and specifically stating that they do not want to be used as a pawn by the fossil fuel industry to continue to 2414 build exports that are not going to be used for their daily 2415 security needs. 2416 *Mr. Sarbanes. Thanks very much. 2417 2418 I yield back, Mr. Chair. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 2419 to Mrs. Lesko from Arizona for five minutes. 2420 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to say I 2421 *Mrs. Lesko. have a lot of eye rolling going on over here, so I apologize. 2422 I have to deal with bad decisions this Administration 2423 makes on a daily basis, but stopping the progress of building 2424 U.S. LNG terminals is just simply an irrational decision. 2425 cannot imagine a worse conceived idea that is more 2426 detrimental to reducing worldwide greenhouse gas emissions, 2427 2428 and it also decreases world energy security and U.S. national 2429 security.

Banning LNG exports does the opposite. Let's start off with

President Biden claims he wants to reduce emissions.

2430

2431

2432 some facts from Biden's own Department of Energy, his own Department of Energy. 2433 2434 The U.S. has been the world leader in lowering carbon emissions. How did we do it? Primarily by substituting 2435 natural gas for coal power generation. We reduced our power 2436 sector emissions by 36 percent, over a billion metric tons of 2437 CO2. By 2050, worldwide coal consumption will increase 2438 2439 increase from 8 billion tons to 9 billion tons, an increase of over 1 billion tons. If the Biden Administration would do 2440 the smart thing and increase LNG exports to Europe, India, 2441 and Asia we can help them reduce their coal consumption by 2442 the same percent, which would be 3 billion metric tons, and 2443 2444 reduce CO2 emissions many billions of tons. It is a common-sense and easy task to substitute U.S. 2445 natural gas for Russian natural gas that continues to flow to 2446 our allies in NATO and the EU. Russian natural gas exported 2447 to Europe has a life-cycle emissions profile 41 percent 2448 2449 higher than U.S. LNG exported to Europe. If the European Union switched all of their natural gas imports to 2021 in 2450 2021 from Russia to the U.S., emissions would have been 2451 reduced over 218 million tons over the course of its life 2452

2453 cycle. Biden has waged a war on American energy, while ignoring 2454 2455 the fact that even his own Energy Information Agency has said global demand for energy will increase by 50 percent between 2456 now and 2050. Embracing cleaner U.S. technology, U.S. 2457 resources, and free market principles is what allowed the 2458 U.S. to reduce emissions while ensuring reliable and 2459 2460 affordable energy. President Biden and his Administration 2461 have consistently opposed American energy development. Rather than restricting domestic energy and mineral 2462 production, we need to unlock American resources to provide 2463 2464 energy security here at home and for our allies abroad. 2465 Mr. Rice, this so-called pause was a political decision taken by DOE. Given that DOE has now politicized a process 2466 that is clearly in our national interest, and FERC is 2467 supposed to be an independent, and not subject to pressure 2468 from the White House or the Department of Energy, do you 2469 2470 think this committee should consider revoking DOE's review for these projects and give sole authority to FERC? 2471 *Mr. Rice. I would defer to you all on what you think 2472 is best, but I would give this perspective for you to 2473

2474 consider. The pipeline cancellations that have taken place in this 2475 2476 country and the pushback has obviously shown that there is a sign, there is a need for us to take actions to reform the 2477 permitting process. And hopefully, we can get it right 2478 because without it we are on the brink of an energy another 2479 energy crisis. 2480 2481 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Rice. Mr. McCown, Mr. Pallone earlier said exporting more LNG 2482 from the United States will help China. Can you give your 2483 thoughts on that comment? 2484 *Mr. McCown. Yes. Well, with China building a coal-2485 fired power plant every other sorry, a couple a week, it is 2486 hard to see how that is the case. 2487 And what is curious to me is if we care about emissions, 2488 we should be talking about China and India a whole lot more, 2489 and less to the United States. But U.S. LNG abroad is 2490 2491 reducing greenhouse gas emissions through substitution of not only coal, but other even higher-intensity burning products. 2492 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you. And Mr. McCown, I have been 2493 told Germany is very upset that we are doing this so-called 2494

2495 pause on LNG permits because, quite frankly, they were promised by the Biden Administration that we were going to 2496 2497 help them if they got rid of Russian national gas. what you understand, and what are your thoughts on that? 2498 *Mr. McCown. That is what I understand, as well. 2499 let's remember that Germany runs on natural gas, not 2500 renewables just yet. 2501 2502 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you very much. 2503 And I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 2504 to Mr. Cardenas for five minutes. 2505 *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Chairman Duncan and Ranking 2506 2507 Member DeGette for holding this important hearing, and I appreciate the opinions of the witnesses and you sharing your 2508 expertise with us. 2509 Under the Natural Gas Act, Congress required the 2510 Department of Energy to ensure that LNG shipments to non-2511 2512 free-trade-agreement countries are in the public's interest. This requirement was intended to put Americans and the 2513 communities we represent first. However, guidance on how the 2514 Department makes the determination on what is in the public's 2515

2516 interest has not been reviewed in over 40 years. Not only that, but the data that the Department has been using in its 2517 2518 analysis is outdated and inadequate. 2519 The Administration's recent pause on LNG exports is an opportunity for the Department to conduct a long-overdue 2520 analysis to better reflect updated climate and economic 2521 realities that face our nation and the world. As a result, 2522 2523 this process will allow for a more accurate determination on 2524 what is in Americans' best interest, including the people who will be most affected by these consequences. 2525 Ms. Giannetti, we know that LNG terminals burden the 2526 communities that host them. This has been made clear by 2527 2528 science, Federal court decisions, and what we have heard directly from communities. In your testimony you said that 2529 the LNG exports have critical environmental justice impacts 2530 that DOE does not currently analyze. Can you explain how the 2531 DOE currently considers the short and long-term impacts of 2532 2533 LNG exports on frontline communities, if at all? And even if the DOE doesn't currently consider them, can 2534 you talk about the impacts that these LNG terminals have on 2535 frontline communities? 2536

2537	*Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Congressman.
2538	The Department of Energy does not consider environmental
2539	justice impacts of LNG export to date. That is part of the
2540	reason why it is important to update the criteria by which we
2541	do a public interest assessment.
2542	LNG can have a significant impact on environmental
2543	justice. The terminals are, by and large, built in
2544	communities that are disproportionately minority communities
2545	and lower income. It can cause issues with asthma,
2546	respiratory illnesses, and release of toxic compounds into
2547	the air, and these impacts have extremely serious effects
2548	that can compromise the vitality and economic security of the
2549	regions that are directly affected.
2550	Environmental justice is one of the most important
2551	issues that we need to look at today, and unfortunately, the
2552	Department currently doesn't do that.
2553	*Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much, Ms. Giannetti. How
2554	will the Administration's pause enable the DOE to better
2555	incorporate environmental justice impacts into its decisions?
2556	And why is this reassessment potentially a big step
2557	forward for environmental justice?

```
2558
           *Ms. Giannetti. The pause enables the Department to not
      only work with scientific studies and with the national labs,
2559
2560
      but also to solicit feedback from community members that are
      affected by LNG development to ensure that we are properly
2561
      accounting the disproportionate impact on environmental
2562
2563
      justice communities.
           *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you. Unfortunately, throughout
2564
2565
      this Congress, Republicans have built upon a decade-long
      effort to remove public interest determinations from LNG
2566
      exports. If Republicans were successful in their efforts,
2567
      only FERC would need to approve LNG export terminals.
2568
           Can you talk about why this would be concerning, given
2569
2570
      FERC's recent history of ignoring climate and environmental
      justice impacts in its certificates under the Natural Gas
2571
2572
      Act?
           *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Congressman.
2573
           I will first note that FERC is also subject to the
2574
2575
      public interest determination under the Natural Gas Act.
      FERC also is required to look at all elements of the public
2576
      interest in determining whether a project should be approved.
2577
      Therefore, the concerns about whether the public interest is
2578
```

2579 properly being assessed affect both the Department and FERC. To date, FERC has failed to properly account for the 2580 2581 climate, economic, and environmental justice impacts of LNG 2582 infrastructure. There are some reasons to potentially be hopeful that that could change, but so far we haven't 2583 actually seen anything happen. 2584 *Mr. Cardenas. Well, thank you. One of the original 2585 2586 reasons why I ran for office almost 30 years ago was because I grew up in a neighborhood where all of the dump sites in 2587 Los Angeles were on my side of town, and the power plants to 2588 this day still exist on my side of town. 2589 But it is really interesting. Though that trash and 2590 2591 that energy goes to all towns, all sides of the towns in my community, but yet on the west side of Los Angeles you don't 2592 find these facilities. Yet we service all of them. So 2593 equity is very important, and these reviews are very 2594 2595 important, too. 2596 With that, my time having expired, I yield back, Mr. 2597 Chairman. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 2598 to the gentleman from Houston, Texas, where they know how to 2599

```
2600
      export energy, Mr. Weber, for five minutes.
           *Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get
2601
2602
      started I wanted to ask unanimous consent. I have four
      letters from Port Arthur, Texas, which, as you know, is west
2603
      Louisiana. Mr. Cormier? You bet. And they are from the
2604
      Chamber of Commerce, the county judge, the President of Lamar
2605
      College, and also from I am sorry, Port Arthur Chamber of
2606
2607
      Commerce, Lamar State College, Mayor of Port Arthur, and from
      the county judge to enter them into the record.
2608
           *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, so ordered.
2609
           [The information follows:]
2610
2611
      ********************************
2612
2613
```

*Mr. Weber. Thank you. 2614 Mr. Cormier, I want to come to you. I am a little put 2615 2616 out with you. You offered to give somebody boudin and crawfish etouffee, but you didn't say nothing about gumbo. 2617 2618 [Laughter.] *Mr. Cormier. You want a chicken and sausage, or shrimp 2619 and crab? 2620 *Mr. Weber. Well, both. All three of them. Well, my 2621 bride of 47 years grew up in a little town called Nederland 2622 over there by Beaumont. So we watched southeast Texas or 2623 southwest Louisiana, if you will you said if one of us 2624 sneezes, the other catches cold. We appreciate what you all 2625 2626 are doing. Port Arthur has been the victim of a blight. And so 2627 what is happening with Sempra Energy and others not just 2628 Sempra, but others in Port Arthur, Texas southeast Texas, 2629 as we call it, is actually helping with the community, 2630 2631 helping rebuild the community, that city. You know, I have got the four coastal counties of Texas 2632 starting at the Louisiana border, going down the south down 2633 the curve of Texas. We produce we have seven ports, more 2634

```
2635
      than any other Member of Congress, some have four. We
      produce 65 percent of the nation's jet fuel, 80 percent of
2636
      the nation's military grade fuel. Energy for us is a big,
2637
      big deal.
2638
           I am going to say real quick, Ms. Giannetti, if I can,
2639
      if in fact the LNG is capable of helping to lower greenhouse
2640
      gas emissions in the world, that would be a good thing. Yes
2641
2642
      or no, it would be a good thing if it does it?
2643
           *Ms. Giannetti. One of the reasons why we need to
      properly reassess our tools
2644
           *Mr. Weber. That is
2645
           *Ms. Giannetti. is to be able to evaluate the impact
2646
2647
      of LNG
           *Mr. Weber. Either LNG does a good job of reducing
2648
      versus when you are talking about coal, you are talking
2649
      about oil, you are talking about other things, LNG helps
2650
      reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I got to move on, I am
2651
2652
      short of time.
           Back to you, Mr. Cormier. Can you elaborate on the
2653
      jobs, from your vantage point, both direct and indirect, the
2654
      tax revenues and all that these LNG exports by the way, I
2655
```

```
2656
      didn't say, we have two LNG plants in our district. We have
      Freeport LNG and we have I mean, sorry, we have Golden Pass
2657
2658
      LNG, Sempra on the boards. And as you know, Cheniere is
      right across the road from the Sabine-Neches waterway, and
2659
      Sabine-Neches Navigation District has a contract to export
2660
      their LNG out. So we in Texas are responsible for a lot of
2661
2662
      that.
           Tell us about the direct both the direct and indirect
2663
      impact on jobs, the tax revenues, and all that these LNG
2664
      export facilities bring home. Tell us about that.
2665
           *Mr. Cormier. This is directly from McNeese State
2666
      University's H.C. Drew Center for Economic Development.
2667
2668
      terms of completed and operating LNG facilities, construction
      resulted in impacts of almost 17,000 jobs, over 1.2 billion
2669
      in labor income, almost 1.5 billion in real GDP. Operations
2670
      resulted in annual impacts of over 3,000 jobs, almost 350
2671
      million in labor income, and over 1 billion in real GDP.
2672
2673
           In terms of the announced LNG facilities, construction
      will result in impacts of over 25,000 jobs, almost 2 billion
2674
      in labor income, over 2 billion in real GDP, and operations
2675
      would result in almost 4,000 jobs, almost 440 million in
2676
```

labor income, and over 1.3 billion in real GDP. 2677 That is the numbers that we have locally. 2678 2679 *Mr. Weber. And that says a whole lot that we are doing a good job just creating jobs. It is reducing greenhouse gas 2680 emissions, whether some here want to admit that or not. 2681 Mr. McCown, I am going to jump over to you. In your 2682 testimony you laid the path forward for counties that rely on 2683 2684 us LNG if this export ban remains. And this is an election year, and let's make no it is funny that our friends across 2685 the aisle want to talk about we are making it a political 2686 thing for whether it is Ukraine funding and blah, blah, blah. 2687 This is an election year. 2688 2689 Can you speak to the environmental benefits that U.S. 2690 LNG provides, especially as it compares to producers worldwide? 2691 I have got about 35, 40 seconds. 2692 *Mr. McCown. Yes, absolutely. I mean, it significantly 2693 2694 reduces greenhouse gas emissions. And we talk a lot about coal, which is about a 50 2695 percent emission reduction. But when we talk about fuel oil, 2696 wood, other things, it is 2697

2698 *Mr. Weber. Dung. I wasn't going to say it, but yes. 2699 *Mr. McCown. 2700 *Mr. Weber. Yes. *Mr. McCown. Absolutely. 2701 *Mr. Weber. Well, and we appreciate that. And let's 2702 see, in the last 19 seconds, Mr. Rice, energy security is 2703 national security. What are you doing to help with it? You 2704 2705 got 10 seconds. *Mr. Rice. We are promoting the Unleash U.S. LNG, I 2706 think, is calling that out as the biggest green initiative on 2707 the planet, which it is, to make sure that everybody 2708 understands the key to lowering global emissions and 2709 increasing energy security is the same answer. 2710 *Mr. Weber. I appreciate what you do. 2711 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2712 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. We will stay 2713 in Texas and go to Mrs. Fletcher for five minutes. 2714 2715 *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to our witnesses for your insights today. This issue 2716 is important, and I am glad that we are having this hearing. 2717 Obviously, sitting through all of this hearing I have a 2718

2719 lot to say, but only five minutes to do it, so I am going to be quick and be on time. 2720 2721 Look, I agree with a lot of the comments that have been made today about the benefits of U.S. LNG. And those of us 2722 in Houston, which I am proud to represent, and all along the 2723 Gulf Coast have a lot to say about them. 2724 I have also heard several things that I disagree with 2725 2726 today, and I am going to first take a minute to disagree with what we heard from Chairwoman McMorris Rodgers and others and 2727 the very title of this hearing, that last week's announcement 2728 from the Biden Administration is an export ban. 2729 It is not. Several people have made that observation today, too. But as 2730 2731 we know, it is a temporary pause on the approval of export permits at DOE while it reviews and updates its public 2732 interest determination process. 2733 I think Ms. Giannetti explained the process very well in 2734 her testimony. So thank you for that very clear explanation 2735 2736 of what is involved. But certainly, what we have seen is that this pause has 2737 caused concern and uncertainty in industry and in 2738 communities, and I think this is really an opportunity for us 2739

2740 to focus on that, but I think that it is really not helpful to our efforts to call it a ban, because then we are not 2741 2742 talking about what is really happening and we are not talking about what we should do next. 2743 As I see it, this is an opportunity to address what I 2744 see are the three principal issues that are driving this that 2745 have been raised as concerns today: climate, cost, and 2746 2747 communities. Those are the three things that I think we are 2748 talking about. I think it is also an opportunity to address some of the 2749 issues and get the market in order, addressing issues of 2750 supply, ensuring confidence of our European allies and 2751 others, and enforcing our existing permits. So as I said, I 2752 disagree with the framing. 2753 I also disagree with some of the things we have heard 2754 today about costs for consumers and the effects of LNG on 2755 domestic prices. A 2012 report from the Obama Administration 2756 2757 found that U.S. economic welfare consistently increases as the volume of natural gas exports increases, and that 2758 includes scenarios on which there are unlimited exports. 2759 I think that is really important to note when we are talking 2760

2761 about costs for consumers. Since 2016, when LNG exports began in earnest, the Henry 2762 2763 Hub natural gas spot price has remained stable, and it is an average of \$2.5 per million BTU. So we simply have not seen 2764 a domestic price impact at this point, and I think that that 2765 is an important part of our conversation. 2766 I am hopeful that DOE, in its review of the data, will 2767 2768 reach these same findings that multiple administrations in both parties have found, that exporting LNG is in the public 2769 interest. 2770 LNG exports, as we have discussed today, really ensure a 2771 future that is marked by affordable, accessible, reliable, 2772 2773 and sustainable energy that promotes global stability at a moment when we desperately need it, and advances the energy 2774 And these are things that we are very focused on transition. 2775 Houston is the energy capital of the world. 2776 in Houston. touch every part of what is going on in LNG and in other 2777 2778 areas. And so, while we have touched on it already, I really do 2779 think it bears repeating that it has only been eight years 2780 since the United States began exporting LNG, and we have 2781

```
2782
      become the world's top exporter of natural gas. And the
      growth that we have seen from the shale revolution really has
2783
2784
      powered our economy and increased our national security.
      it is not just ours, as we know, it is critical for our
2785
      allies' security. There has been a lot of discussion about
2786
      impacts in Europe and the impacts in Ukraine, in particular.
2787
           And I want to associate myself with the comments of our
2788
2789
      Ranking Member DeGette on the issues facing Ukraine in this
2790
      moment, and the importance of American leadership both in
      energy exports, as well as in securing aid to our allies and
2791
      partners in Europe.
2792
2793
           I also will note that this is why I introduced the
2794
      American Gas for Allies Act in the last Congress, which would
      extend the automatic public interest determination to
2795
      countries where we don't have a free trade agreement, but we
2796
      would include NATO members, and I really hope this committee
2797
      will consider it if we can.
2798
2799
           But I don't have a lot of time left for my questions, so
      I am going to submit them for the record.
2800
           [The information follows:]
2801
```

2802

2805 *Mrs. Fletcher. But as I said, I really see these three pillars of the challenges in front of us, and one of the ones 2806 2807 that I really want to focus on is the impact on communities. There is a lot of work we can do here. 2808 Just because we have cleaner American natural gas that 2809 is more competitive on the world market doesn't mean that our 2810 work to reduce emissions and safeguard our communities where 2811 2812 that gas is exported from or developed is complete. We really need to engage and make sure that communities 2813 neighboring these facilities are confident that their needs 2814 are being met, that their concerns are being addressed in the 2815 permitting process. And I think there is an opportunity here 2816 2817 to do that. 2818 And so I am going to submit questions for the record, Ms. Giannetti, and also, Mr. Cormier, I specifically want to 2819 address them to you. I have a couple of others that I will 2820 send to you all, but I do really appreciate hearing from you 2821 2822 all today, and I appreciate the time. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I yield back. 2823 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 2824 to Ohio's Mr. Balderson for five minutes. 2825

```
2826
           Oh, hold on, hold on, Troy. Okay, Mr. Balderson is
      recognized for five minutes. You fine with that?
2827
2828
           Okay, Mr. Griffith is recognized for five minutes.
      Let's go.
2829
           *Mr. Griffith. All right, sorry. As I think Ms.
2830
      DeGette said earlier, she parachuted into my hearing, I have
2831
      now parachuted into your hearing, and I apologize to all of
2832
2833
      you for not having been here the whole time, but I have been
      upstairs, along with others in another subcommittee hearing.
2834
           So Mr. Rice, my colleague mentioned that it is that
2835
      what the White House position was of last week or the last 10
2836
      days or so was not a ban, but merely a pause as they study
2837
      things. But am I not correct that the world is looking to
2838
      the U.S. for more and more natural gas to supplant other
2839
      natural gas providers, or just to supplant other fuels?
2840
           *Mr. Rice. Yes. I mean, regardless of whether you call
2841
      it a pause, a ban, it has a chilling impact on investors. It
2842
2843
      has a chilling impact on our ability to get these projects
      built, and it has not stopped the desire for more energy from
2844
      the United States.
2845
           Just yesterday the UK signed up for a 3 million-ton-per-
2846
```

```
2847
      annum deal with Venture Global on the CP2 facility. So all
      it has done is create a lot of confusion in the marketplace
2848
      and, quite frankly, is appearing to be not necessary.
2849
           *Mr. Griffith. And doesn't that confusion lead to an
2850
      instability in the reliance on American natural gas?
2851
           *Mr. Rice. I mean, confusion is going to cause people
2852
      that have expected to the security from the United States
2853
2854
      to look elsewhere. And it is a lost opportunity for us, and
      something that we are going to have to reassure our allies
2855
      that we are here to help provide energy security, because
2856
      your energy security is our energy security.
2857
           *Mr. Griffith. And if they start looking elsewhere
2858
2859
      because we have instability or we are not reliable to provide
      them not only what we are currently giving them, but
2860
      additional natural gas, what choices do they have, other than
2861
      us or Russia? I mean, I know there is a couple of small
2862
      actors, but
2863
2864
           *Mr. Rice. Yes.
           *Mr. Griffith. Aren't we the big actors, the United
2865
      States and Russia?
2866
           *Mr. Rice. I mean, the United States is the largest,
2867
```

```
2868
      but we do need to understand we do not control the market.
      There are other options, and some of these options may not be
2869
2870
      as friendly to the United States as we would like. Russia,
      Iran are two other large producers of gas that have a lot of
2871
2872
      potential.
           And the other big alternative that people can run into
2873
      is foreign coal. So whether we have an energy security issue
2874
2875
      or we start having a emissions rising, I mean, that is what
      is happening. If the United States does not supply this LNG,
2876
      that means there is going to be more coal.
2877
           *Mr. Griffith. So if we get a request from India and we
2878
      can't provide it, they will burn their coal, which is not
2879
2880
      nearly as clean as the coal in my district. Isn't that true?
           *Mr. Rice. That is absolutely correct, and I think that
2881
      is the biggest thing that people need to understand. Less
2882
      LNG means more coal. Less LNG does not mean more renewables,
2883
      it simply means more coal and higher emissions.
2884
2885
           *Mr. Griffith. Now, we talked about how, when we
      started and we had an example here in Congress when we
2886
      started exporting oil again, the prices didn't go up. My
2887
      colleague from Texas just talked about how people worried
2888
```

2889 when we started exporting LNG that, you know, our prices would go up, and they have been relatively stable. 2890 2891 But if we don't export, do you think prices might go up, as opposed to the reverse, which most people would think is 2892 that if we export more prices would go up, but in reality 2893 that instability in the market stops exploration, or stops 2894 new wells from being committed to and, therefore, doesn't 2895 2896 that actually have the inverse effect? 2897 *Mr. Rice. Yes. Let me give you an example. I mean, it is real simple for me. Exports mean surplus, and surplus 2898 means lower volatility protection from price shocks. 2899 Listen, the world is energy short. And as you have seen 2900 2901 what happened in with Russia and Ukraine and Europe's energy security had trickle impacts over to us in the United 2902 States. So what happens around the world is going to impact 2903 2904 us. How do we protect ourselves? More exports, create more 2905 2906 surplus here in America. And exports are the only reason for us to create that surplus. 2907 How can this help us respond to high prices? Right now, 2908 by the time I push the button on my desk to add rigs to go 2909

2910 out and add if I see a price signal, it takes 18 months to go and make sure that production hits the market to help 2911 2912 relieve prices. In an unleashed U.S. LNG scenario, where that production is flowing through our pipelines to supply an 2913 export market, we can divert that production and respond to 2914 that price signal in 18 hours. That is how we keep prices 2915 low from everybody, and protect Americans from really the big 2916 2917 problem, which is the really volatile price shocks. Exports are going to be the key to providing the surplus and keeping 2918 energy secure here for Americans. 2919 *Mr. Griffith. I appreciate you being here today, and I 2920 yield back. Thank you. 2921 2922 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now go to Mr. Veasey from Texas for five minutes. 2923 *Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chair, thank you very much, and I want 2924 to thank the panel for being here today. 2925 As you know, these discussions that we have around 2926 2927 energy become very contentious. I like to compare them as a lifelong Fort Worth native, I could almost compare them to 2928 the same sort of tension that we see every twice a year, 2929 when the Eagles and the Cowboys play each other. It is 2930

almost like that sort of black and white. But we know that 2931 it is really not that black and white, that this is a very 2932 2933 complicated story, that is not an easy story. For many, the way that it is presented to the media and to organizations 2934 and what have you, it is presented as easy, simple, binary, 2935 black-and-white choices. But this is some complicated stuff. 2936 And, you know, I have been a proponent of LNG exports 2937 2938 because I do think that they hold significant benefits for the U.S., our economy, our energy security. And in addition 2939 to our energy security, our efforts to combat climate change, 2940 because the energy security piece and the climate change 2941 piece go hand in hand, you absolutely cannot separate them, 2942 2943 they go hand in hand. 2944 And so I hope that we can move the needle more in that direction, and start moving the discussion more in that 2945 direction. We have a long way to go, obviously, but it is 2946 something that I think the world needs to start embracing. 2947 2948 That is one of the reasons why I led a letter with my Democratic colleagues to urge the White House to refocus 2949 policies that support continued LNG exports. 2950 And while we are here today we cannot forget that we are 2951

2952 making great investments to reduce methane emissions from oil from the oil and gas sectors, as well. The IRA provided 2953 2954 1.5 billion for grants, rebates, contracts, loans to support emission monitoring and methane reduction efforts. 2955 coupled with the proposed Waste Emissions Charge and Subpart 2956 2957 W revisions from EPA aimed at getting a real empirical emission data. 2958 2959 And all of this suggests that, along with the incentives for other forms of cleaner energy passed in the IRA, we 2960 should consider environmental benefits of U.S. gas production 2961 and exports to already be a part of the strong geopolitical 2962 2963 and domestic reasons for greater gas production in the near 2964 term. And so I hope that the Administration pauses, but I am confident that this ensuing study will demonstrate the clear 2965 merits of LNG exports. 2966 And I wanted to ask Ms. Giannetti, what happens after a 2967 company receives an export license? Is there a significant 2968 2969 regulation or oversight once someone has received a license to ensure that all exporters are abiding by the terms set 2970 forth in the license or contracts? 2971 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you for the question, 2972

2973 Congressman. Typically, in an approval from the Federal Energy 2974 2975 Regulatory Commission, there will be a variety of expectations and requirements that the LNG terminal is 2976 expected to meet. 2977 *Mr. Veasey. Okay. I wanted to ask Toby Rice. 2978 You stated in your 2022 10-K filing that you do not 2979 2980 believe that EQT will be subject to EPA's waste emission 2981 charge. Now that EPA has released its proposal, do you still believe that to be the case? 2982 And if so, can you elaborate on how EQT is going to meet 2983 2984 that 0.2 percent threshold? 2985 *Mr. Rice. Specifically what regulation are you talking 2986 about again? *Mr. Veasey. It is the EQT and the 10-K filing. It 2987 says that EQT will not be subject to EPA's waste 2988 *Mr. Rice. Sure. 2989 2990 *Mr. Veasey. emission charge. *Mr. Rice. Sure. Yes, so EQT, the reason why we won't 2991 be subject to a penalty is because our methane emissions will 2992 be so much better from a performance perspective than the 2993

2994 limit set by the EPA. For perspective, you know, we have reduced our methane 2995 2996 emissions by 70 percent in just the last 18 months. it quickly, cost effectively, and our methane emissions are 2997 going to be about 10 times better performing than the EPA 2998 2999 limits. It shows you the power of this modern *Mr. Veasey. Let me ask you this. 3000 *Mr. Rice. development. 3001 3002 *Mr. Veasey. Okay, and let me ask you this real quick, before while I still have a couple of seconds left. Even 3003 if you are not subject to the charge, do you support EPA's 3004 Methane Emissions Reduction Program, including the Waste 3005 3006 Emissions Charge, Subpart W revisions, and the reporting requirements? 3007 *Mr. Rice. EQT has been supportive of methane 3008 regulation and refreshing that. 3009 *Mr. Veasey. Thank you very much. 3010 3011 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 3012 to Mr. Balderson for five minutes. 3013 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for 3014

3015 having this hearing today, and thank all of you from the panel for being here today. 3016 Mr. McCown, I do have to say I have three or two 3017 RedHawks in my office. Glad to see someone from Miami 3018 University of Ohio here. So thank you for being here. 3019 Mr. Rice, thank you for being here today. You mentioned 3020 that over the past few years EQT has averaged nearly \$1 3021 3022 billion in payments to Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania landowners. Is that correct? 3023 *Mr. Rice. That is correct. 3024 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. If the ban on LNG exports 3025 remains in place, how would the impact the benefits how 3026 will that impact the benefits that those communities are 3027 seeing from natural gas production? 3028 *Mr. Rice. It would be would mean a reduction in 3029 those royalty payments, specifically because the we would 3030 not have the need to produce more to fill the export demand. 3031 3032 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. Mr. Cormier, thank you for being here, sir. Would you 3033 like to add anything on how this ban would impact communities 3034 in Louisiana? 3035

3036 *Mr. Cormier. It impacts business decisions, whether from the LNG companies, but everyone else under that. Again, 3037 3038 I want to reemphasize business decisions are made by people planning with certain degrees of expectation. 3039 Lastly, what I would like to do, I would invite the 3040 whole committee to Lake Charles, Louisiana, Cameron Parish so 3041 you can see exactly the impact, the positive impact, the 3042 3043 things that are going on in our community as we build from the disasters that we have dealt with, along with how this 3044 industry is very important in making us become stronger 3045 because we are a strong people and we like working and making 3046 things happen and moving forward. 3047 3048 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. I have seen the impacts of the shale revolution firsthand. It has been an absolute game 3049 changer in Appalachia, Ohio. 3050 Mr. Rice, thank you. I am well aware of what you have 3051 done in southeastern and eastern Ohio. And just recently, 3052 3053 the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, which covers most of my congressional district, released a report showing 3054 revenues from Utica shale leases have raised the region's 3055 economy by nearly \$1 billion. When I look at the lifeline 3056

3057 that natural gas has given my district and the Appalachia, Ohio, it makes the Biden Administration's decision even more 3058 3059 puzzling. Mr. Rice and Mr. McCown I will go with Mr. Rice first 3060 I understand that a new major Russian LNG export facility 3061 is scheduled to come online this year. At the same time, 3062 Iran is hoping to complete a new LNG export facility next 3063 3064 year. Is that correct, Mr. Rice? *Mr. Rice. There are multiple LNG facilities across the 3065 entire world that we, the United States, is competing with. 3066 *Mr. Balderson. Okay. 3067 Mr. McCown, in 2022, 64 percent of the U.S. LNG exports 3068 3069 went to Europe, and last year only 10 percent of Europe's natural gas needs were met by domestic productions. 3070 I apologize, this is for Mr. Rice. Mr. Rice, despite 3071 increased U.S. LNG exports to Europe in recent years, is 3072 Europe still burning Russian LNG and Russian national gas 3073 3074 delivered by pipelines? *Mr. Rice. Russia still is consuming sorry, Europe is 3075

*Mr. Balderson. Did you want to add anything to that,

still consuming Russian energy.

3076

3077

```
3078
      Mr. McCown?
           *Mr. McCown. No, that is completely accurate. So
3079
      Russia is still getting money out of Europe to conduct its
3080
      war activities in Ukraine.
3081
           *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. Do either of you think
3082
      Mr. Rice and Mr. McCown, do either of you think it is in
3083
      America's best interest for Europe to continue relying on
3084
3085
      Russia to meet its energy needs?
3086
           Mr. McCown, I think you just answered it, but is that
           *Mr. McCown. Yes.
3087
           *Mr. Balderson. correct?
3088
           *Mr. McCown. No, it is of course, it is not.
3089
           *Mr. Balderson. Thank you.
3090
           Mr. Rice?
3091
           *Mr. Rice. I would say that, ultimately, it is up to
3092
      Europe to determine where they need to get their energy from.
3093
      But as we have seen, they prefer American resources.
3094
3095
      America has the ability, the resource to replace Russian
      energy on the world market when it when we are talking
3096
      about natural gas.
3097
           *Mr. Balderson. Okay, I will just go with one more
3098
```

3099 question. Mr. Rice, you mentioned that EQT has cut methane 3100 3101 intensity by roughly 70 percent since 2019. Can you discuss specifically we talked a little bit about it from the last 3102 question what steps your company has taken to reduce 3103 methane emissions and enhance operational efficiencies? 3104 *Mr. Rice. Sure. I will be very brief. 3105 3106 Number one, massive operational efficiencies from being 3107 able to drill faster, that has happened across the entire industry. You see we used to run 2,000 rigs, now we are 3108 having record productions with just 600 rigs. 3109 The second thing is pinpointing is electrifying the 3110 oil field, replacing diesel equipment with natural gas 3111 3112 equipment. The third thing is replacing pneumatic devices for 3113 natural gas as the biggest source of equipment. For methane 3114 emissions we have pulled all 9,000 of those out in less than 3115 3116 18 months for a cost of less than \$10 per ton. 3117 It is important to understand that these opportunities that we are doing at EQT to lower our methane emissions are 3118 available for other natural gas operators, and we are working 3119

3120 open source with operators to showcase the world that methane emissions will be knocked out of the park. 3121 3122 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you for what you have been doing, and thank you, everybody, for being here. 3123 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 3124 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back, and I will now 3125 go to the gentlelady from Florida that both imports and 3126 3127 exports natural gas, Ms. Castor. 3128 *Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, it has only been since 2016 that Congress authorized the export of 3129 fossil gas. It has grown exponentially. It has had some 3130 positive benefit of displacing dirty coal, but I think now, 3131 3132 looking out to the future, as the estimates are that the exports could double, it is an appropriate time for the 3133 Administration to take a hard look on the what the impacts 3134 are going to be. 3135 Is it going to continue to raise prices on my folks back 3136 3137 home? Because my neighbors in the Tampa Bay area, we are being socked. Our electric bills, primarily tied to gas, are 3138 out of sight. Is it going to create additional environmental 3139 risks for the people of the Gulf Coast? 3140

3141 What does it mean for our national security? I am sure that unfettered exports are great news for gas companies. 3142 3143 They will benefit. But really, what impact does it have on American families and on our national security and pollution? 3144 And especially as we know that a lot of these exports go to 3145 China I serve on the select committee on kind of 3146 confronting the Chinese Communist Party. Is this going to 3147 3148 fuel what they are doing right now? Ms. Giannetti, do U.S. LNG companies send a significant 3149 amount of their product to China? 3150 *Ms. Giannetti. Yes. Currently, China ranks around 3151 seventh in overall, but in terms of future LNG exports, it is 3152 3153 the single largest identified consumer, amounting to up to 14 3154 percent. *Ms. Castor. It is interesting that so many seem so 3155 eager to fuel Chinese industry without weighing potential 3156 energy and national security risks. 3157 3158 And Ms. Giannetti, how do the how does the LNG boom impact energy bills for American families? 3159 And do you think the massive growth of exports has 3160 contributed to U.S. inflation by raising energy costs for 3161

3162 American families? *Ms. Giannetti. Energy costs are one of the most 3163 3164 important things for American pocketbooks. And as we have seen, when there is a increase in exports it has a 3165 disproportionate impact on gas-reliant energy consumers and 3166 raises energy bills. So it has a negative impact on the U.S. 3167 public interest and the U.S. economy. 3168 3169 *Ms. Castor. And I have one study in front of me that 3170 found that gas exports cost U.S. consumers \$100 billion over a 16-month period. 3171 But I go back to what I hear from my neighbors in the 3172 Tampa Bay area every day. Because we are not tapping lower-3173 3174 cost, cheaper energies like solar power, they have been overly reliant on gas and it has been an enormous drag on 3175 their economic well-being. The electric bills are out of 3176 sight because we are tied to gas. It is too volatile. 3177 Also, I want to emphasize that the Biden Administration 3178 3179 closely considered Europe's energy security in making this decision, which followed a letter January 25 from over 60 3180 members of the EU Parliament in support of taking a look at 3181 this. The letter clearly states that Europe should not be 3182

3183 used as an excuse to expand LNG exports that threaten our shared climate and have dire impacts on U.S. communities. 3184 3185 Do you think it is important to consider our other policy-makers overseas? 3186 *Ms. Giannetti. Certainly, Congresswoman, and that is 3187 part of the reason why this is an extremely measured, common-3188 sense announcement from the Administration, because it has 3189 3190 zero effect on current LNG exports or already-approved LNG exports, the ones that are going to Europe. 3191 *Ms. Castor. And didn't recently at the Conference of 3192 Parties all countries on the planet agree that it was time to 3193 transition away from fossil fuels? 3194 3195 *Ms. Giannetti. Yes, at COP 28. 3196 *Ms. Castor. And part of the reason is because that there are significant burdens on many communities across the 3197 So many of the communities along the Gulf Coast 3198 have long carried the burden of these dirty industries. 3199 3200 Do communities along the Gulf Coast benefit from rising exports to countries like China, or are there significant 3201 environmental risks associated with expansion of LNG export 3202 terminals? 3203

3204 *Ms. Giannetti. As a former resident of Gulf communities in Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, I have seen 3205 3206 firsthand the impacts of energy expansion on the energy security and climate security of the Gulf. 3207 It is super important that we focus on the impact of 3208 these projects on Americans, both in terms of their 3209 pocketbooks, but also in terms of their overall energy and 3210 3211 climate security. And the Administration's pause will enable 3212 us to do that. I wholeheartedly agree, and I compliment 3213 *Ms. Castor. the Administration for their willingness to take this look at 3214 our national security, affordability, and the incredible 3215 3216 environmental impacts of what is going on. Thank you, and I yield back. 3217 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go 3218 to Mr. Pfluger from Texas for five minutes. 3219 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am proud to 3220 3221 sponsor the bill that would push back on the Administration. Let me read you a quote from September 6, 2019: "Kiddo, 3222 I want you to look at my eyes. I guarantee you, I guarantee 3223 you we are going to end fossil fuels.'' That was candidate 3224

3225 Joe Biden. And to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this is not a ban, give me a break. 3226 3227 Administration has used every weapon available for three years, and this is the latest, but this is the most 3228 3229 egregious. Let's talk about the impact. And by the way, for our 3230 Democrat witness, I do agree it is measured. I actually say 3231 3232 it is calculated. It is very calculated. This decision is very calculated. So let's just talk about the impact of what 3233 this will do to not only our domestic production and our 3234 country, our economy, but to the geopolitical scene, and I 3235 will start with Mr. Rice. 3236 3237 Thank you for your testimony today. Has time been used as a weapon both previously, and is this another use of that? 3238 And what is the impact to EQT, what is the impact to 3239 your buyers? Tell us the story that you are facing. 3240 *Mr. Rice. Yes, I mean, this is the playbook. 3241 3242 delay, introduce uncertainty. And the playbook has been proven to be incredibly impactful and incredibly effective. 3243 Pipeline cancellations are probably one of the most 3244 destructive forces that are causing energy prices to be 3245

3246 extremely erratic. And unfortunately, we are starting to see the beginning of that playbook on the LNG industry. 3247 3248 *Mr. Pfluger. For Mr. McCown, talk about the geopolitical impacts. How does this affect our national 3249 3250 security? And by the way, it has been said that this doesn't 3251 impact FTA countries. Well, there is 195-plus countries in 3252 3253 the world, and only 14 of them are FTA. So let's just make that point, that that is 7 percent of the countries. And the 3254 rest of them and I will get to a question for Ms. 3255 Giannetti, but talk to us about geopolitical and national 3256 3257 security impacts. 3258 *Mr. McCown. Yes, well, it undermines that. I mean, it undermines American credibility both from the reassurances 3259 that were just recently given to countries. But more 3260 importantly than that, it potentially deprives our allies and 3261 friends of fuel sources they need for their own energy 3262 3263 security. And if I may, real quickly, this we study things to 3264 death, right? That is how you get rid of things. And so 3265 fool me once, fool me twice. KXL, DAPL, MVP. It is a little 3266

3267 hard to take the Administration at its word right now. *Mr. Pfluger. I take them at their word when President 3268 3269 Biden, before he was President, said he was going to kill fossil fuels. That is exactly what he intended to do, and 3270 3271 this is the playbook. I will talk to Mr. Cormier. It has been mentioned, 3272 environmental justice. Some of the colleagues on the other 3273 3274 side of the aisle talked about it, but they have concerns. What is your perspective on what LNG and what the 3275 opportunities in some of these export facilities and plants, 3276 you know, like the Commonwealth project has for your 3277 community? 3278 3279 *Mr. Cormier. When you look at the FERC map and this is something I think is very important, that is why I would 3280 love to have our agency host the committee these LNG plants 3281 or LNG facilities are not anywhere near folks that are spoken 3282 of as being impacted. I am from what you would call North 3283 3284 Lake Charles, which is the urban part of Lake Charles, born and raised there. There is no industrial facility anywhere 3285 in our community. 3286 These facilities on the coast granted, Cameron Parish, 3287

```
you have 230 people in Cameron proper. Cameron is a very
3288
      small place, a very important place, historically part of
3289
3290
      Louisiana's culture. Hackberry has about 1,000 folks where
      Cameron LNG is at. Cheniere, right across you have Port
3291
      Arthur right over the Sabine River. These impacts that we
3292
      are talking about, especially when it comes to these the
3293
      populations that is being focused on, it is not in their
3294
      backyard.
3295
3296
           *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you.
           Ms. Giannetti, what percentage of the Louisiana grid is
3297
      serviced by LNG?
3298
           *Ms. Giannetti. What percentage of the Louisiana
3299
           *Mr. Pfluger. Electrical grid.
3300
           *Ms. Giannetti. I do not know the answer to that.
3301
           *Mr. Pfluger. Fifty-plus percent. So these are the
3302
      people that we are worried about, all of us are worried
3303
      about.
3304
3305
           So what I want to ask you is, if the law says that they
      must approve, as your testimony states, why is DOE stalling?
3306
           We go from a 90-day approval process during the Obama
3307
      Administration to an average of 60 days during the Trump
3308
```

3309 Administration, to an average of 365-plus days during this Administration. But yet you say that that they must approve, 3310 3311 as your testimony states. Why are they stalling? *Ms. Giannetti. What I said, Congressman, is that DOE 3312 is required to approve FTA authorizations. It is not only 3313 within its right, but it is actually in the legal requirement 3314 for it to do a public interest assessment for an NFTA. 3315 3316 *Mr. Pfluger. I think what we know is what candidate Biden said, was he wanted to kill fossil fuels. And he is 3317 making good on that promise. And we are going to stand in 3318 the gap to push back on a really egregious bad decision. 3319 That is why I am proud to sponsor 7176 to push back on this 3320 Administration and to strengthen our country's energy 3321 security because we know it is national security. 3322 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 3323 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now go to 3324 Mr. Pence from Indiana for five minutes. 3325 3326 *Mr. Pence. Thank you, Chairman Duncan and Ranking Member DeGette, and thank you to the witnesses for being here 3327 today. 3328 The Biden Administration's ban on exports of LNG is 3329

another misquided decision to add to their disastrous and 3330 anti-American energy track record. By banning further LNG 3331 3332 exports, this Administration makes it clear that they favor radical environmentalists over Hoosiers and all Americans. 3333 American LNG exports are critical to our nation's energy 3334 security, and this decision plainly shows that President 3335 Biden and his Administration lacks a competent understanding 3336 3337 of global energy markets. This action could severely impact necessary investment in international gas infrastructure over 3338 the next decade and beyond. Businesses need certainty that 3339 they can produce, distribute, and sell their products. 3340 In the three years since Biden took office, this 3341 3342 Administration has made it more difficult to produce energy, nearly impossible to distribute, and now have taken steps to 3343 ban the sale of American products abroad. Unfortunately, 3344 decisions affecting natural gas production and distribution 3345 affect long-term investments and could take years to be fully 3346 3347 realized. And this is in an industry that has spent over 100 years delivering energy where it needs to be, when it needs 3348 to be, and in an affordable way. 3349 Mr. Rice, my question is for you. I spent my career 3350

3351 distributing petroleum products across the country. As you well know, the gas supplies underneath your feet, Marcellus, 3352 3353 are only worth your ability to deliver it to end users and monetize that. Your testimony talks about the infrastructure 3354 inefficiencies that are borne onto the consumer. How have 3355 decisions by this Administration, including efforts to ban 3356 LNG exports, impacted investment in the distribution chain, 3357 and how does that affect the consumer? 3358 *Mr. Rice. To have an environment where over, I would 3359 say, almost 10 percent of the pipeline capacity of projects 3360 would be canceled, to have an environment where it requires 3361 an act of Congress to get a pipeline built, ask yourself 3362 which pipeline company is actually what is it going to take 3363 to actually step out and invest in another project? 3364 It is going to take a whole heck of a lot, and so it has 3365 been absolutely chilling. And unfortunately, the approach 3366 that is if we are taking that same approach with 3367 3368 infrastructure in the form of LNG, it is going to have the same end result, and it is going to be unnecessarily high 3369 energy costs, and it is going to be a lost opportunity for 3370 our communities in this country. 3371

```
3372
           *Mr. Pence. And the delay is going to be costly for
      your company, and you are just going to have to get your
3373
3374
      investment back.
                        Is that correct?
                       That is correct, and that means that we are
           *Mr. Rice.
3375
      not going to be able to share this amazing, decarbonizing
3376
      resource that we have, that we are blessed with, with the
3377
      world. And what that means is that the world is going to
3378
3379
      continue to use more coal, emissions are going to continue to
      skyrocket, and we are going to sit here maybe happy that we
3380
      stopped energy infrastructure in this country, but we have
3381
      done nothing to meet our objective to lower global emissions.
3382
      We have done nothing to provide energy security to the world
3383
3384
      and Americans as long as we don't get smart about getting
      back to building things in this country.
3385
           *Mr. Pence. Okay, thank you, Mr. Rice.
3386
           *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield?
3387
           *Mr. Pence. I am going to yield the balance of my time
3388
      to _
3389
           *Mr. Duncan. Will the gentleman yield?
3390
           *Mr. Pence. Mr. Armstrong.
3391
           *Mr. Duncan. You are next. Can I get it?
3392
```

3393 *Mr. Armstrong. Yes. *Mr. Duncan. Yes, just for a couple of seconds. 3394 3395 thank the gentleman. You know, American energy, energy production, delivery, 3396 utilization, and export means jobs. We have heard a lot 3397 about social justice and whatnot. I can tell you Mr. Cormier 3398 understands this in Lake Charles and southwestern Louisiana. 3399 3400 But I have traveled from Lafayette to Houma to Thibodaux down to Port Fourchon, a four-lane highway on both sides of the 3401 road, business after business after business 3402 after business supports what goes on onshore and offshore, 3403 people going to jobs in the energy sector. 3404 3405 But guess what? Those companies support the YMCA and the United Way and the Chambers of Commerce, and they eat at 3406 the local restaurants, they tip the waitresses, and they 3407 tithe at their churches. Jobs, that is what the energy 3408 sector provides. And this policy shuts down export terminals 3409 3410 and the ability of energy producers to help change global emissions and support our allies around the world. 3411 what it means. But jobs here at home is more important to 3412 3413 me.

I yield to Mr. Armstrong. 3414 *Mr. Armstrong. Thank you. I just have a really quick 3415 3416 question, because it has been brought up a couple times. are talking about this EU letter, parliament letter that was 3417 signed, by my understanding, if not most, if not all of the 3418 people who signed that, are actual communists. Mr. McCown, 3419 are you aware of this letter? 3420 3421 *Mr. McCown. I am aware that at least some of the signatories are members of the Communist Party, members of 3422 the Green Party, other far left parties in Europe. 3423 You know, this is very instructive, though, because 3424 whether I thought it was 76, but maybe it is 67. Whatever 3425 it is, there are 705 members of Parliament. So obviously, a 3426 decision didn't go over very well. 3427 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time has expired, I will 3428 now recognize Mr. Armstrong for five minutes. 3429 *Mr. Armstrong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3430 3431 I serve on committees that get a little more heated, and we are here, and I have a hard time, but with some of this. 3432 But I just want to be clear. Environmental justice is not a 3433 policy position. It is a buzzword that you can use at a 3434

3435 cocktail party at MIT or in Manhattan or Minneapolis. you know how I know that? Because there is no environmental 3436 3437 justice to the 14-year-old slave going into a cobalt mine in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. There is no 3438 environmental justice to the Uyghur community that is 3439 building these solar panels, because we disallow the ability 3440 to do the mining for these products at home. 3441 3442 Environmental justice is the emotional hook to drive up the cost of traditionally cheap and reliable energy, combined 3443 with how we continue to create the Federal subsidy market in 3444 order to reset the American energy production. 3445 And I don't know where the environmental justice is in 3446 3447 communities like Beulah and Hazen and Washburn and Underwood 3448 in North Dakota if Representatives Pallone and Peters have their way and we shut down lignite energy production in North 3449 Dakota, particularly when we have EPA primacy and are working 3450 on some of the most advanced carbon capture technology in the 3451 3452 world. And I sure as heck don't know where the environmental 3453 justice is in western North Dakota when it is 70 degrees 3454 below zero and the heat goes off because the wind isn't 3455

3456 blowing and the sun isn't shining, and we have become far too reliable on intermittent power. 3457 But the Biden Administration recently decided to take 3458 place a temporary pause on pending decisions to export 3459 liquefied natural gas. We have heard the Administration 3460 claims that this pause is to reevaluate the current economic 3461 environmental analysis DOE uses to underpin its LNG export 3462 3463 authorizations. And the natural gas that is relied on by our allies in 3464 Europe and I would talk if I have time, Mr. Rice, I am 3465 going to talk about not just displacing natural gas with 3466 coal, but these infrastructure projects all across the world 3467 are being built out right now, and we are sending signals 3468 that are saying that our LNG is not going to be available, 3469 and they are going to get it from somewhere else, often times 3470 from people who are no longer are not necessarily friends 3471 and allies of the United States. 3472 3473 But whatever the new criteria is and used to evaluate CP2 would be expected to be applied to the other 16 proposed 3474 natural gas terminals that are awaiting approval. This will 3475 have major impacts on domestic LNG production. CP2 alone 3476

would export up to 20 million tons of natural gas per year, 3477 increasing the current amount of exported American gas by 3478 3479 about 20 percent. And earlier we had some of my colleagues on the other 3480 side of the aisle talk about the maturity of this decision. 3481 In advance of announcing this major policy change with huge 3482 international national security and economic impacts, the 3483 3484 White House took a meeting with a man named Alex Harris. According to the New York Times, Mr. Harris is a 25-year-old 3485 Colorado social media influencer who has led a TikTok and 3486 Instagram campaign aimed at urging young voters demand that 3487 Mr. Biden reject the project. 3488 3489 He is also the creator of a popular YouTube video entitled, "How I Live in My Car Full Time,'' where he has 3490 described how to live full-time in a 2015 Subaru Outback SUV. 3491 3492 I ask unanimous consent to introduce a New York Times article, Daily Caller article, and the home page of this 3493 3494 man's YouTube channel. And I can't believe I am talking about this while we are 3495 talking about LNG exports and national security. 3496 In fact, his social media work has gotten the attention 3497

3498 of Ali Zaidi and John Podesta, senior advisors to Mr. Biden on climate policy, and helped influence that decision. 3499 Mr. Harris, according to his LinkedIn, is primarily a 3500 professional photographer who apparently, again, lives in his 3501 car full-time. I don't see any further substantial 3502 qualifications for environmental science or energy policy for 3503 him. 3504 3505 Mr. Cormier, do you think it is proper to have Mr. Harris, a 25-year-old Internet star, to be influencing such 3506 national such monumental national security and economic 3507 decisions? 3508 *Mr. Cormier. He has a right to express his opinion. 3509 *Mr. Armstrong. Absolutely. 3510 *Mr. Cormier. All I would ask is that if anyone has 3511 anything to say about how southwest Louisiana and southeast 3512 Texas are impacted, come visit and talk to everyone. 3513 *Mr. Armstrong. The National Gas Act establishes a 3514 3515 rebuttable presumption that a proposed export of natural gas meets the public interest requirements to DOE to grant an 3516 export application, unless DOE can overcome that presumption. 3517 The Administration has end-runned the entire system by 3518

3519	forcing DOE to reevaluate its evaluation criteria. The point
3520	of all of this process is to ensure that the political whims
3521	do not interfere with the export processes that have been
3522	carefully crafted by Congress.
3523	I have two seconds. So Mr. McCown, I will have to
3524	submit this question to the record.
3525	[The information follows:]
3526	
3527	**************************************
3528	

3529	*Mr. Armstrong. I yield back.
3530	*Mr. Duncan. The gentleman's time is expired.
3531	Without objection, the articles that he wants to submit
3532	for the record will be entered into the record.
3533	Without objection, so ordered.
3534	[The information follows:]
3535	
3536	**************************************
3537	

3538 *Mr. Duncan. And now I will recognize Dr. Joyce for five minutes. 3539 3540 *Mr. Joyce. First I want to thank Chairman Duncan for holding today's hearing on Biden's disastrous decision, and 3541 thank the witnesses, especially those from Pennsylvania, for 3542 appearing. 3543 Last night, during a special order, we had 14 Members of 3544 3545 the House take time to speak on how important liquefied natural gas exports are to their constituents, to our 3546 national economic security. 3547 In my district exporting LNG means jobs. Chairman 3548 Duncan just recently emphasized that in his just moments 3549 ago. The shale revolution has unlocked the resources under 3550 the feet of my constituents. The boom in natural gas 3551 production has brought jobs and hope back to so many small 3552 towns across Pennsylvania. 3553 Our nation has been blessed with abundant natural gas 3554 3555 reserves, and the ability to export LNG has given companies the certainty that they need to continue to invest in natural 3556 gas production. 3557 Mr. Rice, do you have any idea what the average salary 3558

3559 for an employee of EQT in Pennsylvania is, or what the range is for a worker at your company, what they can expect to 3560 3561 make? *Mr. Rice. EQT offers very high-paying jobs, most 3562 entry-level positions starting in that 70 to \$80,000 range, 3563 but many north of six figures. 3564 And I would say in the field for our service providers, 3565 3566 we offer jobs where are close to six figures, with just a couple of years of experience. So it is an amazing 3567 opportunity that we share. The success of this shale goes 3568 beyond our company to the thousands and thousands of service 3569 providers in our industry. 3570 *Mr. Joyce. Family-sustaining wages, jobs that my 3571 3572 constituents rely on. Mr. Rice, what would be the impact on your business if 3573 there were no new LNG construction applications in the 3574 pipeline? And how would this affect your ability to plan for 3575 3576 workforce development and hiring? *Mr. Rice. Well, I think that the industry would be 3577 paused and be standing still. 3578 And unfortunately, the pressures against our industry 3579

```
3580
      would probably grow because a lot of the pressures that we
      face are out of people's concerns over climate. And when you
3581
      pause LNG and you pause American natural gas, you pause the
3582
      world's ability to make an impact with climate. And that
3583
      would have a negative impact, which is ironic, because the
3584
      one thing that people are looking to block is the one thing
3585
      because of their concern for the environment is the one
3586
3587
      thing that people should be supporting because of their
      concern for the environment.
3588
           *Mr. Joyce. Mr. Rice, I know you have been asked many
3589
      questions here today, but I would like to give you the
3590
      opportunity to address any of the issues that we haven't
3591
3592
      adequately touched on in this hearing.
3593
           More simply, what should we in Congress take away from
      this hearing?
3594
           *Mr. Rice. Yes, I mean, let's talk about the security
3595
      part. You know, there is a lot of discussion about price and
3596
3597
      exports increasing pricing. When is that going to start
      happening? We are the largest exporter of natural gas in the
3598
      world, and natural gas prices are below $3. So when is the
3599
      rise in natural gas prices going to happen?
3600
```

3601 And to put this in perspective, a \$3 natural gas price is the energy equivalent of an \$18 barrel of oil. So this is 3602 3603 the most affordable energy that we can put on the planet, and it is also the cleanest, and it is also the most reliable. 3604 But speaking to the larger benefit of LNG, you know, we 3605 hear a lot of talking points on the Hill that we are the 3606 largest producer in the world, we are the largest exporter. 3607 3608 But the question that we need to ask ourselves: Is that 3609 enough? Rampant inflation, wars in Ukraine, global emissions 3610 skyrocketing, energy security of our allies is crippled. 3611 Clearly, we need to be doing more. And from an energy 3612 security perspective, we can only the world can only 3613 contain so much chaos before it starts spilling over and 3614 impacting Americans. Well, American LNG can help relieve 3615 some of this pressure that this world is facing by lowering 3616 global emissions and providing energy security to our allies. 3617 3618 Those things are going to help America achieve the goals that 3619 we seek to achieve. *Mr. Joyce. Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the witnesses 3620 for being here today, and I yield the remainder of my time. 3621

3622 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now go to Mr. Allen for five minutes. 3623 3624 *Mr. Allen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for allowing me to waive on to this important hearing today. 3625 I want to thank the witnesses. 3626 Mr. Rice, I met you back while I served on the House 3627 Energy Action Team, and I was really intrigued by some of the 3628 3629 things that you shared with us that day. I was just looking in fact, we might enter this into the record, but our trade 3630 deficit this is an article in the New York Times. Our 3631 trade deficit has exceeded \$1 trillion, the most in history. 3632 And I believe you said and shared with us at that 3633 meeting that if you could get permits for pipelines to ship 3634 LNG out of off the coast of Louisiana, that we could power 3635 the entire continent of Europe. Is that still a possibility? 3636 *Mr. Rice. Yes, based on the work we have done to 3637 quantify the resource, we have the ability to quadruple our 3638 3639 LNG exports to support 60 BCF a day of natural gas production through exports. And that would require a \$4 natural gas 3640 price to be able to unlock the drilling and development of 3641 that resource. And we can put it on the doorsteps of our 3642

3643 customers around the world for a cost of less than \$12. And for perspective, the European market is around 55 3644 3645 BCF a day of natural gas. So 60 BCF a day of exports is a tremendous amount of energy 3646 *Mr. Allen. Yes. 3647 *Mr. Rice. equivalent to adding a Saudi Arabia to the 3648 world stage, a decarbonizing force. 3649 3650 *Mr. Allen. Let's look at the situation. So if we do that, we are burning 42 percent cleaner than we are currently 3651 burning over there? 3652 *Mr. Rice. Yes, the estimate should be between 40 to 50 3653 percent, at a minimum. And if we target some of the worst 3654 emitting coal plants in the world, 5 percent of the world's 3655 worst coal plants are responsible for 30 percent of the power 3656 emissions. If you target the displacement of those coal, the 3657 environmental impacts are significantly greater than 40 3658 *Mr. Allen. Why is the climate lobby not going nuts 3659 3660 about this ban? I mean, when we can actually reduce carbon footprint I 3661 mean, the equivalent of that would be I have heard, I have 3662 been told it is more than every American driving an EV. I 3663

```
3664
      mean, it is extraordinary, what we could do. And it is
      basically because of what you have done for this country.
3665
3666
      have actually reduced our carbon footprint substantially
      here. And guess what? We are getting no love for it. All
3667
      they are doing is trying to put you out of business. This is
3668
      this is amazing to me, it just baffles me.
3669
           The other thing that is at stake here is national
3670
3671
      security. If we starve Russia, they are not going to have
      the money to fight the war. So we bring about peace in
3672
      Ukraine. And quess what? We stop Iran. Then we have peace
3673
      in the Middle East.
3674
           All of a sudden it is three years ago when this
3675
      country dominated this country set the cost of a barrel of
3676
      oil and the price for natural gas. Folks, that is power.
3677
      And if you don't have that in this world today, then we are
3678
      going to look just like we are right now.
3679
           I do have one quick question for Mr. Cormier.
3680
3681
      mentioned how important LNG exports are for your region
      economically, as far as job creation and revenues and just
3682
      benefits to your local communities. What does it mean to
3683
      them?
3684
```

```
Mr. McCown?
3685
           *Mr. McCown. Go ahead.
3686
3687
           *Mr. Cormier. Okay. Repeat the question, if you don't
      mind.
3688
           *Mr. Allen. Okay. You had mentioned that how
3689
      important LNG exports are in for your region economically,
3690
      and how the investments through job creation and revenues
3691
3692
      benefits your local communities.
3693
           *Mr. Cormier. And it brings pride because in our neck
      of the woods people want to work.
3694
           *Mr. Allen. Wow.
3695
           *Mr. Cormier. We have kids at McNeese, we have kids in
3696
      our community college. They are being trained, they are
3697
      ready to work. They want to rebuild, stay home, and continue
3698
      moving forward. It is real with our community, it is it
3699
      comes down to one thing: We want to take care of ourselves
3700
      and take care of our community, and this is one way we do it.
3701
3702
           *Mr. Allen. The greatest privilege I had in business
      was the opportunity to do just what you are talking about,
3703
      and that is to give people the dignity and respect they
3704
      deserve with a good job to allow them to provide for their
3705
```

```
3706
      families, their church, their communities, and yes, this
      country. How could we deny that with this great opportunity?
3707
3708
           This thing has been teed up by the creator of the
      universe for this country, and we are ignoring it. I mean,
3709
      we were created to adapt, and we were created to work.
3710
      anything this government perpetrates other than that will not
3711
      work, and we will see the destruction and chaos, and we are
3712
3713
      seeing it right now in this nation.
           Thank you all for being here. Thank you. Keep the
3714
      faith, and keep working at this. And hopefully, the American
3715
      people are listening, and we will change the behavior out
3716
      there. Thank you so much.
3717
           I yield back.
3718
           *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. We are going
3719
      to pause for just a second. There is one member who is
3720
      handicapped, there is another that is on her way. So just
3721
      bear with us just a second.
3722
3723
           *Mr. Rice. Are you pausing or are you banning?
           [Laughter.]
3724
           *Mr. Duncan. Carter is handicapped in more ways than
3725
      one, but
3726
```

3727 *Ms. DeGette. We are going to have a debate over that just now, while we are waiting. 3728 3729 *Mr. Duncan. He is on a cycle for his foot, but just give us a second. 3730 3731 [Pause.] *Mr. Duncan. I am glad we talked about you before you 3732 got here. All right, Mr. Carter from Georgia is recognized 3733 3734 for five minutes. *Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize, we 3735 lean around here these days. 3736 But thank you all for being here today. LNG is 3737 extremely important, extremely important in my district. 3738 3739 My district includes Elba Island, which has been converted from an import facility to an export facility. 3740 Right now we are trying to increase the amount of export we 3741 can do there, yet this Administration is stopping that, 3742 stopping that with what I consider to be and many of my 3743 3744 constituents consider to be poor policy and poor planning. Look, we I believe in climate change. I am chair of 3745 the Environmental Subcommittee, and I believe in climate 3746 change. I served on the climate change the Select 3747

3748 Committee on Climate Change. I represent the entire coast of Georgia. Environment is extremely important to us, I get it. 3749 3750 And I do believe that man has an impact on it. However, I do believe it is cyclical, too, and I believe we have to take an 3751 all-of-the-above energy strategy approach to this. 3752 LNG and look, this is a global problem. We all 3753 understand that. I don't think anybody disagrees that this 3754 3755 is a global problem. We have some of the cleanest gas here in America, and yet we are going to stop sending it? This is 3756 another example of the Administration picking winners and 3757 losers. So I just I am baffled by this. 3758 And of course, I don't understand the economics of it, I 3759 3760 don't understand the environmental impact of it, of this decision. 3761 So we know that this is probably more than just a pause, 3762 and we know that the ultimate aim here is to end LNG exports. 3763 Let me ask you, Mr. Rice, first, what is wrong with 3764 3765 investing in innovations that can mitigate and reduce emissions from reliable fuel sources like LNG or coal which 3766 still make up almost 80 percent of our energy consumption? 3767 *Mr. Rice. We should continue to innovate and make the 3768

```
3769
      energy we produce cheaper, more reliable, and cleaner.
      that is exactly what U.S. LNG is. It is the cleanest, most
3770
3771
      reliable form and most affordable form of energy that we can
3772
      deliver to the world.
           And to your point about it is about it is a global
3773
              The reason look at what has happened right now in
3774
      the United States. We are the world leader in lowering
3775
3776
      global emissions, but global emissions are still
      skyrocketing. What does that tell you? We cannot solve this
3777
      problem by just focusing inside of our borders. We have got
3778
      to start asking bigger questions: What can the United States
3779
      do to lower emissions outside of our borders? And American
3780
3781
      LNG is the biggest, most impactful, powerful tool that we
      have to move us forward and start helping our allies meet
3782
      their climate goals.
3783
           *Mr. Carter. I couldn't agree with you more. You know,
3784
      the United States of America in the last 10 years has
3785
3786
      decreased our carbon emissions more than the next 12
      countries combined while growing our economy. And I am often
3787
      critical of the fossil fuel industry because I don't think
3788
      they do a good enough job of telling the public the
3789
```

```
3790
      innovations and the progress that they have made, and they
      have made great progress. Emissions are down with fossil
3791
3792
      fuels, and they need to be telling that story. And I think
      they are selling themselves short with that.
3793
           Mr. McCown, let me ask you, what is wrong with again,
3794
      what is wrong with investing in innovations that can mitigate
3795
      and reduce emissions from reliable fuel sources like LNG?
3796
3797
           *Mr. McCown. Well, there is not. In fact, we should be
      doing that. And we are starting to do that with carbon
3798
      capture technology for difficult-to-decarbonize industries.
3799
           We have both the government and the private sector has
3800
      added to reducing methane leaks and emissions, and it has
3801
3802
      done a pretty good job. Despite some of the earlier
3803
      testimony, methane, CH4, has gone down. It has not gone up,
      despite added production.
3804
           So we are on the right trajectory. The question is,
3805
      what is a realistic pathway to net zero that can be sustained
3806
3807
      without ruining the economy or destroying our national
      security? A transition period is not overnight.
3808
           *Mr. Carter. That is a great point, and I appreciate
3809
      you making that.
3810
```

3811 Let me ask you and go back to you, Mr. Rice. What has changed? What has changed since the last LNG studies that 3812 3813 were done in 2018 and 2019 to warrant the Department of Energy to reconsider exports? 3814 *Mr. Rice. There have been some changes. Methane 3815 emissions have actually gotten better from this industry. 3816 And you will see us do a much better job with the 3817 3818 transparency so we can showcase as I mentioned, we need to 3819 knock methane emissions out of the park. Some of the things that we are doing that have taken 3820 place in the last few years, you are seeing responsibly 3821 certified gas. That is bringing in third-party environmental 3822 auditors to come in there and actually say the environmental 3823 results we are achieving are actually happening. We are 3824 taking to the skies to measure methane emissions. 3825 And for perspective, in Appalachia we are monitoring the 3826 entire basin. And just to give some people some color on 3827 3828 that, we are going to be monitoring for methane emissions across an area the size of France. We take this very 3829 seriously. And then we will end by providing full cycle 3830 carbon intensities from the time the gas comes out of the 3831

3832 ground, through the pipes, through the downstream facility, to the doorstep of customers. We will have a full cycle 3833 3834 carbon intensity score. These are going to be the things that we need to do and 3835 showcase the environmental communities to address their 3836 concerns over methane emissions. 3837 *Mr. Carter. Great. Well, thank you all for being 3838 3839 here. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for this great hearing 3840 today, and thank you for allowing me to waive on. 3841 yield back. 3842 *Mr. Duncan. Thank you for being here, and the 3843 gentleman's time has expired. I will recognize Ms. Barragan 3844 for five minutes. 3845 *Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3846 Ms. Giannetti, I want to first start by thanking you and 3847 NRDC for all the work that you all do on environmental 3848 3849 issues, environmental justice issues. LNG exports are an environmental injustice and a climate 3850 disaster. They pollute minority and low-income communities 3851

along the Gulf Coast, which is already overburdened by

3852

3853 pollution. We have heard directly from communities in these regions that they do not want any LNG facilities to be built 3854 3855 in their backyards. Hilton Kelley, a resident of Port Arthur, Texas, gave 3856 this description of the impact of two nearby LNG export 3857 terminals on his community, with two more planned: "We have 3858 a disproportionate number of people here with cancer and 3859 3860 respiratory problems. I have two grandkids who suffer from 3861 respiratory problems. One in five households has a child or elder person who uses a nebulizer for asthma. Our babies are 3862 literally suffering and we are suffering.'' 3863 How much is too much for one community? No community 3864 3865 should have to deal with this. My question to you is, can you talk through how the Department of Energy does not 3866 properly account for the impacts of LNG exports on frontline 3867 communities and how the Department should evaluate these 3868 impacts in future public interest determinations? 3869 3870 *Ms. Giannetti. Thank you, Congresswoman. As someone who previously lived in Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, I have 3871 seen this firsthand, as a high school teacher with students 3872 who had disproportionate asthma or other respiratory 3873

3874 illnesses. And environmental justice is not just a buzzword. It is 3875 a legal requirement and a critical element of determining 3876 whether a project is in the public interest. 3877 Unfortunately, to date, the Department of Energy does 3878 not incorporate environmental justice impacts into its 3879 assessment, and so the ability to be able to take a second 3880 3881 pause and revisit those studies to make sure that the very important impacts on especially low-income and minority 3882 communities are taken into account is a critical and common-3883 3884 sense step. *Ms. Barragan. Thank you. So how is this pause on a 3885 new permit approvals of the proposed LNG export terminals in 3886 line with Biden with the Biden Administration's commitment 3887 to environmental justice and protections for frontline 3888 communities? 3889 *Ms. Giannetti. The Administration's pause is a 3890 3891 balanced approach that respects Gulf communities. All current LNG export facilities will continue to operate, and 3892 all facilities that already have their DOE authorizations 3893 will continue to operate. 3894

3895 But by being able to take a look and evaluate on the environmental justice impacts of continually siting these 3896 3897 facilities in the same locations over and over again, many of which are disproportionately low-income and communities of 3898 color, will make sure that we are not making some of 3899 America's best pay the price of energy development. 3900 *Ms. Barragan. Thank you. Now, I serve on the 3901 3902 Environment Subcommittee, and a few weeks ago we had a hearing where Republicans opposed EPA's methane regulations 3903 for oil and gas wells. They opposed the Methane Emissions 3904 Reduction Program in the Inflation Reduction Act, and they 3905 3906 attacked a pipeline safety program to detect and repair 3907 methane leaks. If Republicans were successful in their efforts to let the fossil fuel industry emit as much methane 3908 as they wanted, how would that make us LNG exports even 3909 dirtier? 3910 *Ms. Giannetti. Leakage is a serious problem when it 3911 3912 comes to evaluating the carbon footprint of natural gas. unfortunately, leakage happens at all parts of the value 3913 chain, from upstream extraction to midstream transportation 3914 to export and eventual use. We should be doing everything 3915

that we can at this moment to make sure that we are ensuring 3916 that leaks are minimized to the maximum extent possible, 3917 3918 because they have a serious impact on the overall carbon footprint of these types of projects. 3919 *Ms. Barragan. Great. And in closing, Ms. Giannetti, 3920 thank you for being here today to testify. Is there anything 3921 any other points or anything else you want to say as we 3922 3923 close out the hearing? 3924 *Ms. Giannetti. I think it is important for us to remember what we are talking about and what we are not 3925 talking about. Again, as has been raised numerous times, the 3926 Administration's pause has zero effect on all current LNG 3927 exports, regardless of what country they are going to; has 3928 zero effect on all approved LNG exports, including ones that 3929 would nearly double our LNG export capacity by 2027 and 3930 triple going into the 2030s. It only impacts far into the 3931 future LNG export potential for NAFTA countries. 3932 3933 It is important that when we are looking at facilities that will not be built until the 2030s or beyond, that we are 3934 factoring in 2024 data and 2024 science and information into 3935 those analyses. And so this pause is a common-sense step to 3936

```
3937
      make sure that we are doing that.
           *Ms. Barragan. Thank you.
3938
3939
           I yield back.
           *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go
3940
      to Mrs. Miller-Meeks from Iowa for five minutes.
3941
           *Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you very much.
3942
           And I would just say, Ms. Giannetti, that a
3943
3944
      fascinating comment. The reason why it affects now, not in
      the future, is capital investment in an industry. If an
3945
      industry knows it is being shut down, the intensive capital
3946
      investment that is needed will not be put in place.
3947
           I am come from the State of Iowa. I also happen to be
3948
3949
      the vice chair of the Conservative Climate Caucus. Iowa has
      over 50 percent of its energy from renewables to include
3950
      biofuels, biomass, compressed renewable, natural gas, manure,
3951
      you name it. We have over wind and solar, and did have
3952
      nuclear until that plant was shut four years ago. Sixty
3953
3954
      percent of our electricity is from wind, and we are a net
      exporter of energy. We can both have a cleaner and healthier
3955
      planet and climate, as well as grow our economy and have
3956
      affordable, reliable, secure, and abundant energy.
3957
```

3958 The greatest sense of environmental injustice to me is not allowing poor people or disadvantaged communities to be 3959 3960 able to heat their homes because we make electricity In fact, more than five million people die unaffordable. 3961 every year due to exposure to excessively hot or cold 3962 temperatures. This is globally. Heat death is responsible 3963 for 1 percent of global fatalities, around 600,000, but cold 3964 3965 kills 8 times as many people, 4.5 million annually. A 2019 study from the National Bureau of Economic 3966 Research estimates that driving down natural gas prices, the 3967 fracking revolution saved more than 11,000 American deaths in 3968 the winter per year. Per year, 11,000 deaths were saved from 3969 3970 2005 to 2011. During that time, the U.S. was and still is a leader in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, all while 3971 increasing energy production and keeping prices low. 3972 Since 2005, the U.S. has reduced net greenhouse gas 3973 emissions by 17 percent, all while primary energy production 3974 3975 in this country increased by 48 percent. And the use of natural gas played an irreplaceable role in this fact. 3976 Globally, according to the Energy Information Agency, primary 3977 energy consumption is expected to increase through 2050. 3978

3979 in all the COPs I attended, which have been three, every single COP has said energy demand is increasing, not 3980 3981 decreasing. So through 2050, somewhere between 16 and 57 percent and 3982 global demand for natural gas will increase by 41 percent in 3983 In fact, I was in Vietnam just last week, and they 3984 were talking about the Biden Administration's policy on LNG 3985 3986 is hurting them because they had an energy crisis last year. Further, a study from the National Energy Technology 3987 Laboratory found in 2019 that U.S. LNG often produced fewer 3988 greenhouse gas emissions than other types of coal or gas used 3989 around the world, which means that U.S. LNG exports could 3990 actually be beneficial for climate change if the U.S. 3991 replaced those of other fossil fuels. 3992 And I have had this conversation with Special 3993 Presidential Envoy on Climate John Kerry. We are not 3994 studying the greenhouse gas emissions or the life-cycle 3995 3996 carbon analysis of other types of renewable energy such as wind or solar. All of us think that it should be done. And 3997 I am sure those children in the Congo having to dig out rare 3998 earth minerals out of the Earth in the Congo think that it 3999

```
4000
      would be environmental justice for them to not have to do
      that to create solar panels and wind turbines.
4001
4002
           So Mr. McCown or Mr. Rice, if the U.S. limits our LNG
      exports, will that result in lowering the use of LNG
4003
      globally, or will it only result in more LNG exports from our
4004
      adversaries like Russia, China, or other countries that have
4005
      dirtier oil and natural gas?
4006
4007
           *Mr. McCown. It will result in usage of LNG from
      dirtier fuel sources. And if you look at the IEA or any
4008
      other forecast, natural gas usage is going to climb out
4009
      through 2050, not decrease. So we will do nothing.
4010
           *Mr. Rice. I agree, the energy demand is going to grow.
4011
      And to put this in perspective, because we are talking about
4012
      how big and how much LNG does the world need we have heard
4013
      a couple of congresspeople talk about this today if you
4014
      care about lowering global emissions and replacing foreign
4015
      coal, the biggest source of emissions, it would require 170
4016
4017
      BCF a day of incremental natural gas LNG. If you care about
      eliminating energy poverty, which you cited, and replacing
4018
      the 120 BCF a day of biomass that is used as a primary energy
4019
      source, that is another 120 BCF a day. The world needs 300
4020
```

```
4021
      BCF a day more natural gas. And both of those things would
      be decarbonizing because it is it would be lower emissions
4022
4023
      than coal, and replacing biomass is also going to have a
      decarbonizing impact, as well. Massive opportunity.
4024
           *Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you for that. And I am
4025
      agnostic of the energy source. I think we should be talking
4026
      about lowering emissions, and how we do that, and have
4027
4028
      create a better environment, rather than talking about the
      energy source that we want to eliminate.
4029
           And for any of the panel, what benefits do U.S. LNG
4030
      exports provide to our allies and those who are supportive of
4031
4032
      us?
4033
           *Mr. Rice. Sure, I will say one thing. I think energy
      security is the natural answer. And you can look at what
4034
      happened in Europe as a great example of how American LNG
4035
      energy provides that energy security.
4036
           But the other lesson that we learned in 2022 is that,
4037
4038
      without energy security, you cannot transition. So if you
      care about climate and making progress on that front, energy
4039
      security is the foundation of making that happen, and
4040
      American energy is the foundation of that security.
4041
```

```
4042
           *Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Mr. Cormier?
           *Mr. Cormier. It is making a difference. Our people
4043
4044
      are stronger. Our people have a future. And by expanding
      LNG and making this industry as strong as it can be, America,
4045
      Louisiana, Texas, and all states in between benefit.
4046
           *Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you so much. My time has
4047
      expired. I apologize, Mr. McCown.
4048
4049
           Thank you for indulging me, Mr. Chair.
           *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady's time has expired.
4050
           I would like to thank all of our witnesses.
4051
      conclude the hearing today. Members may have additional
4052
      written questions for you all. I remind members they have 10
4053
4054
      business days to submit additional questions for the record,
      and I ask that witnesses do their best to submit responses
4055
      within 10 business days upon receipt of the questions.
4056
           I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record the
4057
      documents included on the staff hearing documents list.
4058
4059
           Without objection, that will be the order.
4060
4061
           [The information follows:]
4062
```

4063		
4064	*********COMMITTEE	INSERT*******
4065		

```
*Mr. Duncan. And without objection, the subcommittee

4067 will stand adjourned.

4068 [Whereupon, at 1:35 p.m., the subcommittee was

4069 adjourned.]
```