```
Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1
2
    RPTS MORRIS
    HIF206030
3
4
5
    THE FISCAL YEAR 2025
6
    FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION BUDGET
    WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2024
8
9
    House of Representatives,
    Subcommittee on Energy, Climate, and Grid Security,
10
    Committee on Energy and Commerce,
11
    Washington, D.C.
12
13
14
15
          The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:33 a.m. in
16
    Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jeff Duncan
17
     [Chairman of the Subcommittee], presiding.
18
19
          Present: Representatives Duncan, Latta, Guthrie,
    Griffith, Walberg, Palmer, Curtis, Lesko, Pence, Weber,
20
    Allen, Balderson, Pfluger, Rodgers (ex officio); DeGette,
21
    Peters, Fletcher, Matsui, Tonko, Veasey, Kuster, Schrier,
22
```

```
Castor, Sarbanes, Cardenas, and Pallone (ex officio).
23
24
         Also present: Representatives Joyce and Miller-Meeks.
25
26
          Staff Present: Sarah Burke, Deputy Staff Director; Nick
    Crocker, Senior Advisor and Director of Coalitions; Sydney
27
    Greene, Director of Operations; Nate Hodson, Staff Director;
28
    Tara Hupman, Chief Counsel; Sean Kelly, Press Secretary;
29
    Peter Kielty, General Counsel; Emily King, Member Services
30
31
    Director; Elise Krekorian, Counsel; Drew Lingle, Professional
    Staff Member; Mary Martin, Chief Counsel; Brandon Mooney,
32
    Deputy Chief Counsel; Kaitlyn Peterson, Clerk; Karli Plucker,
33
    Director of Operations (shared staff); Peter Spencer, Senior
34
    Professional Staff Member; Dray Thorne, Director of
35
    Information Technology; Waverly Gordon, Minority Deputy Staff
36
    Director and General Counsel; Margaret McConville, Minority
37
    Press Intern; Sanjana Miryala, Minority Intern; Kristopher
38
    Pittard, Minority Professional Staff Member; Kylea Rogers,
39
    Minority Policy Analyst; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of
40
41
    Communications, Outreach, and Member Services; Tuley Wright,
    Minority Staff Director, Energy, Climate, and Grid Security;
42
    and C.J. Young, Minority Deputy Communications Director.
43
44
```

- *Mr. Duncan. The Subcommittee on Energy, Climate and
 Grid Security will now come to order.
- The chair recognizes himself for five minutes for an opening statement.
- First off, I apologize for being a few minutes late.
- I want to thank you to the five commissioners for
- appearing before the Energy, Climate and Grid Security
- 52 Subcommittee today to discuss the recent activities of the
- 53 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
- Chairman Phillips, Commissioner Christie, welcome back,
- it is good to have you.
- Commissioners Rosner, See, and Chang, congratulations on
- your recent confirmations, and we are glad you are here
- today, as well.
- Chairman Phillips, I would like to take a moment to
- 60 commend you for your efforts to clear some of the backlog of
- 61 major natural gas pipeline projects, as well as your recent
- vote in support of U.S. LNG exports. And I am glad you got
- 63 your wife back from overseas, and we were happy to
- 64 accommodate that.
- So America is blessed with significant natural
- 66 resources, and FERC plays a key role in dictating the

```
trajectory of our energy economy. Despite our abundance of
67
    fossil fuel, nuclear, and renewable energy resources,
68
    consumers have been hammered by soaring energy costs,
69
70
    particularly electricity. The latest inflation data from
    June shows that electricity price inflation exceeds the
71
    Consumer Price Index by 47 percent, and electricity rates
72
    have increased by approximately 20 percent since President
73
    Biden took office.
74
75
         FERC's mission is to -- and I quote -- "assist consumers
    in obtaining reliable, safe, secure, and economically
76
    efficient energy services at a reasonable cost through
77
    appropriate regulatory and market means and collaborative
78
    efforts.'' Despite the positive steps forward on natural gas
79
    pipelines and LNG facilities, we are concerned that the
80
    Commission is failing to adhere to this mission in other
81
    aspects. No portion of FERC's mission lends itself to being
82
    an environmental regulator, yet we are concerned the
83
    Commission has strayed from its responsibility as an economic
84
    regulator to an entity focused on assisting the build-out of
85
    so-called green energy technologies. This is happening
86
    despite the continued alarms from the North American Electric
87
    Reliability Corporation and other grid operators across the
88
```

country. 89 90 NERC's 2024 Summer Reliability Assessment highlighted five regions of the country that are at risk of insufficient 91 92 operating reserves and above-normal weather conditions. Grid operators around the nation are sounding the alarm. 93 recent Order 1920 on regional transmission planning and cost 94 allocation, which Energy and Commerce Republicans have 95 opposed, will drive up costs and make the grid less reliable. 96 97 Now, I understand we will hear from a different opinion from the -- on the order from our Democratic colleagues 98 today, and that is fine. This committee is a place for 99 debate on all issues that we cover. However, it is important 100 to clarify that a recent letter sent by 33 state utility 101 commissioners supporting Order 1920 represents only a small 102 fraction of the 238 utility regulators around the country. 103 One of Republicans' main concerns with Order 1920 is 104 that it pursues a skewed, categories-of-factors approach to 105 transmission planning, prioritizing blue state renewable 106 107 portfolio standards, green power subsidies designed to shift the generation mix, corporate emissions reduction 108 commitments, and the Biden Administration's goal of achieving 109 a carbon-free power sector by 2035. The ultimate purpose 110

here is clear: prioritize those projects meant to serve an 111 112 environmental agenda while creating a set of seven broad benefits designed to assist transmission developers and 113 114 socializing costs across a broader rate base. Republicans are not opposed to critical transmission 115 projects that are needed to keep the lights on and utility 116 bills affordable. But unfortunately, American consumers have 117 seen their utility rates go up. And with this rule they are 118 119 going to see even higher rates because that cost will be shifted onto certain ratepayers. However, we are opposed to 120 an agency -- to agency actions that will raise prices on 121 consumers without reliability or cost benefits. 122 Transmission is an increasingly costly component of 123 electricity rates. The nation's largest grid operator, PJM, 124 has reported that the transmission component of wholesale 125 power costs has tripled over the last 10 years, and now makes 126 up almost one-third of wholesale power cost. Order 1920's 127 categories of factors for transmission planning skirts the --128 129 this reality by not mentioning a factor every member of Congress and public utility commissioner should care about, 130 and that is reducing cost for the ratepayers. 131 This concerning transmission planning policy is 132

occurring in concert with a slew of EPA regulations that will 133 134 result in reliable generation closing before the end of its useful life, and I think it is going to create a reliability 135 136 crisis in this country. Members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce have 137 heard time and again how low EPA's -- how EPA's actions, such 138 as Clean Power Plan 2.0 Revised Particulate Matter Standard, 139 the Interstate Transport for Ozone, Mercury, and Air Toxics 140 141 Rule, coal ash disposal and effluent elimination -limitation guidelines will increase costs on utilities, push 142 them to retire reliable assets, and ultimately increase 143 energy costs on the American people. 144 I will just say that we are going to have a reliability 145 crisis, and we have a constant need -- because demand for 146 power is going up -- of dispatchable energy build-out versus 147 retirement. 148 Chairman Phillips, publicly you have emphasized that you 149 care deeply about affordability and reliability, and we do, 150 151 as well. I take you at your word, and view that this is an opportunity to have a candid discussion about how FERC's 152 actions are impacting those two essential goals. 153 So I want to thank Chair Rodgers for allowing us to hold 154

155	this hearing today, and I look forward to today's questions.
156	[The prepared statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]
157	
158	**************************************
159	

*Mr. Duncan. And with that, my ranking member is on her 160 way, so how do you all want to play this? 161 We will go to the ranking member of the full committee, 162 163 Mr. Pallone, for his opening statement. Then I will come back to Chair Rodgers. Mr. Pallone is recognized for five 164 165 minutes. *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to 166 welcome also all five FERC commissioners here this morning, 167 168 especially Commissioners Rosner, See, and Chang, who were just sworn in over the last month, and who haven't yet 169 appeared before the committee. And I am pleased that FERC is 170 back to its full complement of five commissioners. 171 Now, FERC's role is to ensure that Americans have access 172 to reliable and affordable energy. For nearly a century FERC 173 and its predecessor, the Federal Power Commission, have been 174 charged with ensuring that electricity and gas prices remain 175 affordable. But how the Commission ensures that rates are 176 just and reasonable has evolved over the decades. Over a 177 quarter century ago FERC issued Order 888, bringing 178 competition to power markets across the country and lowering 179 prices while ensuring that the bulk power grid remains 180 reliable. FERC then issued Orders 890 and 1000, which aimed 181

to eliminate discrimination and increase transparency in grid 182 planning. And finally, just two months ago, FERC issued 183 Order 1920, which builds upon those three earlier rules to 184 185 focus on grid planning for the long term. FERC's authority to take these actions is clear. 186 Federal Power Act is explicit in conveying authority to FERC 187 over the transmission of electricity in interstate commerce, 188 and FERC's actions have repeatedly been upheld in the courts. 189 190 In fact, courts have long deferred to FERC on its rate-making authorities without relying upon Chevron deference that the 191 far-right majority of the Supreme Court threw out last month. 192 Now, failing to plan is planning to fail. And the basic 193 principle of Order 1920 is that grid planning is essential to 194 maintaining just and reasonable rates. I agree, and I have 195 been encouraged by the reception the rule has received from 196 nearly every corner of the political world except from 197 congressional Republicans. It seems Republicans would prefer 198 that their constituents be slapped with higher power bills 199 200 because utilities are not required, for example, to plan for the impacts of severe weather on the grid. 201 But more broadly, I am deeply concerned that FERC's 202 independence, which is critical to its ability to set rates, 203

is under threat. During the Trump Administration, Secretary 204 205 of Energy Rick Perry ran roughshod over FERC's independence by pressuring it to adopt a rushed proposal that would have 206 207 increased power prices to pay old, polluting coal plants to Thankfully, FERC unanimously repelled that stay online. 208 attack on its independence. 209 But if Republicans get their way next time, it will be 210 much worse. Trump's Project 2025 is a plan to consolidate 211 212 power in the White House, gut checks and balances, and eliminate the independence of agencies like FERC. Trump's 213 Project 2025 calls independent commissions like FERC 214 "constitutionally problematic.'' 215 And I would like my GOP colleagues -- I would like to 216 remind them that Trump himself posted on his own website that 217 he wants to bring independent regulatory agencies back under 218 presidential authority, and that means that the next time a 219 Republican president pressures FERC with a disastrous idea 220 that would increase electricity prices for Americans, that 221 222 FERC won't be able to fight back, the president would just fire any commissioner who disagreed with him. And Trump's 223 Project 2025 is a way for extreme Republicans to take control 224 over Americans' lives and freedoms. 225

Trump has proposed requiring FERC to submit any proposed 226 227 regulations for review, forcing every compliance order, every tariff revision, and every request to adjust rates to the 228 229 White House for review. It is not enough they are using the Supreme Court to destroy the government's ability to 230 function; they want to now use the power of the White House 231 to do it, too. And that is dangerous, considering that Trump 232 has absolutely no problem putting polluters over people. 233 234 So I certainly hope that all of the commissioners before us today agree that FERC's independence is vital to its 235 mission. But the reality is that, even if FERC is under 236 attack -- or the reality is that there, like so many 237 agencies, independent agencies are under attack from extreme, 238 far-right Republicans, and much has been made of Commissioner 239 Christie's dissent to Order 1920, and I have to say I 240 disagree with it, and I think it misses the mark. But he has 241 a fundamental right to file that dissent, despite the 242 chairman's disagreement. 243 244 If Republicans get their way, there might not be any more dissents on FERC orders. I like the fact that you can 245 file a dissent and you don't get fired, frankly, but that may 246 change. And commissioners that refuse to follow the party 247

```
line may simply be ousted from the Commission entirely under
248
249
     what Trump is proposing.
          So the issues FERC deals with are complex, yet they
250
     impact every American's monthly energy bill. And that is why
251
     Congress chose to have an independent agency deal with these
252
     issues, rather than one firmly embedded within the
253
254
     presidency. And I think it is vital that we keep it that
     way.
255
256
           [The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]
257
     ********************************
258
259
```

*Mr. Pallone. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 260 261 Thank you. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now 262 263 recognize the chair of the full committee, Mrs. Rodgers, for five minutes. 264 *The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good morning. 265 Good morning, everyone. 266 Just listening to the ranking member, I am thinking I am 267 268 concerned about the independent agencies being currently attacked by well-funded far left. So we are doing our job 269 today in the Energy and Commerce Committee as the elected 270 representatives of the people in Congress. This isn't about 271 the Administration, this is about us and an independent 272 agency that is before us. And I am really pleased that all 273 five commissioners are here today. I would like to offer a 274 warm welcome to the newest members also. 275 FERC was established by Congress as an independent 276 agency within the Department of Energy through the Department 277 of Energy Organization Act of 1977. And while FERC is an 278 independent agency, it still answers to Congress, and must 279 carry out the mission that Congress directs it to. Congress 280 established FERC as an economic regulator to ensure that 281

electricity, natural gas, and oil is delivered to the 282 American people safely, securely, and at a reasonable price. 283 In order to achieve this, we need solutions that bring down 284 285 costs for Americans who are currently suffering under the burden of exploding costs across the board, including rising 286 electric and utility rates. 287 Expanding energy with an all-of-the-above strategy will 288 ensure Americans won't have to worry about rationing energy 289 290 in the summer or winter months, or having to make tough choices about whether to pay the electric bill or buy 291 groceries for their family. That requires FERC, all of you, 292 to adhere to the core mission, especially as America's energy 293 and economic security is increasingly under attack. 294 295 Over the past four years this Administration, what we have seen from this Administration and the Democrats, has 296 really wreaked havoc on a nation's economy, energy prices, 297 and our grid and pipeline infrastructure. The Administration 298 and Democrats have chosen to prioritize the interests of 299 300 radical environmental activists at the expense of the American people, eliminating jobs and investments for 301 American energy workers, making us dangerously dependent on 302 the Chinese Communist Party for our energy supply chains, and 303

forcing early retirement of our most affordable and reliable 304 305 power plants. Given FERC's independence and mission, you must step up 306 307 and take action to protect consumers. But sadly, it seems FERC has lost sight of its mission. FERC has the 308 responsibility to ensure that rates for the interstate 309 transmission of electricity and natural gas are "just and 310 reasonable.'' It also has a responsibility to issue timely 311 312 permits for pipelines, hydropower projects, and LNG export facilities when they are in the public interest of Americans. 313 The Commission must do more to exercise your responsibility 314 as an independent agency and refocus on the core 315 congressionally-directed mission. After all, we do believe 316 317 in a government of the people, by the people, for the people. FERC also recently announced a new transmission rule 318 which advanced along partisan lines. The new rule will raise 319 energy prices and trample on states' authority over energy 320 infrastructure. It will force some states to shoulder the 321 322 cost for transmission lines with no actual benefits for their own communities, especially in rural areas. 323 The Commission has also slow-walked permitting for 324 pipelines and LNG facilities, which directly impact the 325

supply and price of natural gas. At a time when more than 326 327 half the nation is at an elevated risk for blackouts, we must do more to unleash American energy rather than throttle it. 328 329 That means starting with meaningful infrastructure permitting reforms that reduce energy costs for Americans, and ensure 330 the U.S. can reach its full energy potential. 331 I cannot say this enough: energy is foundational to 332 everything we do. It is what keeps the lights on; it heats 333 334 our homes; it cools our homes; powers hospitals, businesses, transportation. It has been energy -- it has been American 335 energy, access to affordable and reliable energy over the 336 past 100 years, that has made America the leader, raised our 337 standard of living for Americans all over this nation, driven 338 technological innovation, and improved the health and well-339 being of all Americans. We need to continue protecting and 340 building on that legacy. 341 Today's hearing is an opportunity for the members to 342 hold FERC accountable, understand how recent actions like the 343 344 new transmission rule will impact people's financial security and our nation's energy security. I thank you again for 345 being here. This is an important discussion on behalf of 346 every person in this nation. 347

348	[The prepared statement of The Chair follows:]
349	
350	**************************************
351	

352	*The Chair. I yield back.
353	*Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. Ranking
354	Member DeGette is running because of the time change
355	running behind, so she is going to submit her opening
356	statement for the record.
357	[The prepared statement of Ms. DeGette follows:]
358	
359	**************************************
360	

*Mr. Duncan. So we are going to move right into our 361 362 witnesses, and that -- so that concludes members' opening statements. 363 364 The chair would like to remind members, pursuant to committee rules, all members' opening statements will be made 365 part of the record. 366 Again, I want to thank all the witnesses for being here 367 today and taking the time to testify before the subcommittee. 368 369 Each witness have an opportunity to give an opening statement, followed by a round of questions from the members. 370 There are a set of lights in front of you. As you give 371 your statements -- and this is probably for the new 372 commissioners -- green, you are good to go; yellow, time to 373 start wrapping up; red, I am going to give you a little 374 leeway, but you probably need to wrap up, and I don't want to 375 have to raise the gavel. So let's keep it within five 376 minutes in the essence of time. 377 Our witnesses today are the commissioners of the Federal 378 379 Energy Regulatory Commission, the Honorable Chairman Willie 380 Phillips. Welcome back, Mr. Chairman. 381 The Honorable Mark Christie, commissioner. 382

383	Welcome back, Mr. Christie.
384	And the Honorable David Rosner, the Honorable Lindsay
385	See, and the Honorable Judy Chang, new commissioners to FERC.
386	Welcome to the committee hearing. We appreciate you
387	being here.
388	I will now recognize Chairman Phillips for a five-minute
389	opening statement.
390	

STATEMENT OF THE HON. WILLIE L. PHILLIPS, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL 391 392 ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HON. MARK C. CHRISTIE, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HON. 393 394 DAVID ROSNER, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HON. LINDSAY S. SEE, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL 395 ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; AND THE HON. JUDY W. CHANG, 396 COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION 397 398 STATEMENT OF WILLIE L. PHILLIPS 399 400 *Mr. Phillips. Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, 401 Chair Rodgers, Ranking Member Pallone, and members of the 402 subcommittee, thank you for inviting us here today to testify 403 regarding the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and our 404 work on behalf of the American people. I am particularly 405 pleased to appear before you alongside my three new 406 colleagues, as well as Commissioner Christie, as part of a 407 full, five-member bipartisan Commission. 408 409 FERC's mission is to ensure that Americans have access to reliable, safe, secure, and economically efficient energy 410 at a reasonable cost. Energy is the single most important 411 commodity we produce as a nation. Access to reliable and 412

affordable supplies of energy is necessary for American 413 414 families, and for our nation's economy to remain the largest and most dynamic in the world. With that in mind, I am 415 416 pleased to share with you some of the most important steps that the Commission has taken to ensure reliability and 417 affordability during my year-and-a-half tenure as chair. 418 Let's begin with electric transmission. The electric 419 transmission grid is the backbone of the American economy and 420 421 an essential aspect of our national security. Electricity demand continues to grow, and ensuring that we have a robust, 422 well-planned electric transmission grid is a reliability 423 imperative. It is also an affordability imperative. 424 grid is what gives those same consumers access to diverse, 425 426 low-cost sources of electricity that are necessary to ensure energy bills remain just and reasonable. 427 Earlier this year, to address those imperatives, the 428 Commission issued Order Nos. 1920 and 1977. Together, these 429 two rulemakings represent a tremendous step forward in how we 430 431 plan, pay for, and permit the electric transmission infrastructure we need so badly for the reliability and 432 affordability of our grid. Order No. 1920 requires utilities 433 to plan today for the factors that we know will drive 434

tomorrow's reliability and affordability needs, while 435 requiring that customers pay for new transmission only to the 436 extent that they benefit from that infrastructure. 437 438 Let me say that again: If you don't benefit, you don't pay, period. 439 Order No. 1977 implements Congress's amendments to the 440 Federal Power Act and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs 441 Act, which clarified the Commission's limited role in siting 442 443 electric transmission in a manner that respects and accommodates states' primary role in siting electric 444 transmission. 445 Those two rulemakings build on the success of Order No. 446 2023, the generator interconnection rulemaking we issued last 447 summer. Order No. 2023 took several important steps so that 448 generating resources can interconnect to the grid in a timely 449 and cost-effective manner, including a shift to a first-450 ready, first-served model and the establishment of firm, 451 steady deadlines. 452 453 In addition, in the years since we last appeared before the committee, the Commission has taken several other 454 critically important actions to ensure reliability and grid 455 security. That includes approving new mandatory reliability 456

standards for inverter-based resources, approving new 457 mandatory reliability standards covering generators and cold 458 weather preparedness operations. We have worked to further 459 460 investigate and promote best practices regarding physical security, cybersecurity, extreme weather events, and black 461 start capabilities, among others. 462 It is also important that electricity market mechanisms 463 are designed to address electric reliability. That is why we 464 465 held two forums on resource adequacy, and we have approved various market reforms that ensure that generating resources 466 are appropriately compensated for the reliability benefits 467 they provide to the system. 468 As I have mentioned and maintained since the day I 469 joined the Commission, reliability is and it always must be 470 the Commission's job number one. I am confident that these 471 and other actions we have taken over the past year put that 472 promise into practice. 473 Finally, I will close by noting that we have continued 474 475 our efforts to streamline the Commission's permitting processes and timely approve new projects. When assessing 476 whether an infrastructure project is in the public interest, 477 the Commission considers environmental impacts, including 478

```
those related to environmental justice. As chairman I have
479
480
     made it a priority that environmental justice communities and
     landowners are able to meaningfully participate in our
481
482
     processes and have their voices heard. I am happy to report
     that the Commission is continuing to do everything we can
483
     within our authority to facilitate the development of
484
     infrastructure we need to unlock the nation's energy
485
486
     resources.
487
          Thank you so much for your time. I look forward --
488
489
490
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Phillips follows:]
491
492
     493
494
```

495	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Chair Phillips.
496	Commissioner Christie, you are recognized for five
497	minutes.
498	

```
STATEMENT OF MARK C. CHRISTIE
499
500
          *Mr. Christie. Chair Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette --
501
502
          *Mr. Duncan. Maybe pull that mike just a little closer
     for the --
503
          *Mr. Christie. Okay.
504
          *Mr. Duncan. Thank you.
505
          *Mr. Christie. How is that?
506
507
          Okay, Chair Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, Ranking
     Member Rodgers, who has left, and -- no, Chair Rodgers,
508
     Ranking Member Pallone, who is still here, and members of the
509
     subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity again. I have
510
     been here on FERC three years, and I think this is the third
511
     time I have been here. So thank you again for the privilege
512
     of appearing in front of you.
513
          I will deliver essentially the same message I have been
514
     delivering previously in previous appearances and also on the
515
     other side, and that is we, as the United States, are heading
516
517
     for potentially catastrophic consequences in terms of the
     reliability of our electric power system. I am not trying to
518
     be melodramatic in using a term like "potentially
519
     catastrophic,'' but I think everyone would agree when we have
520
```

power outages that go on for hours or days, that is 521 522 catastrophic. It is -- not only has severe economic consequences but, as we saw during Uri in Texas, Winter Storm 523 524 Uri, it actually is life-threatening. So what is the essence of this threat? What is leading 525 us to these potentially catastrophic consequences? It really 526 boils down to two things: one is on the supply side and one 527 is on the demand side. On the supply side, we are losing 528 529 dispatchable generating resources with many years of useful lives remaining. They are retiring far too quickly, and they 530 are retiring in quantities that threaten our ability to keep 531 the lights on. Now, the supply problem is not the addition 532 of intermittent resources like wind and solar. The supply 533 problem is the subtraction of the dispatchable resources like 534 coal and gas at a pace that is really just simply not 535 sustainable. 536 Now, it is not just my opinion. The nation's largest 537 grid operators, PJM, SPP, MISO, have all been warning about 538 539 this, and they have also been warning, all three of the largest grid operators, that the EPA's new power plant rule 540 is going to exacerbate this problem. It is going to cause a 541 lot more dispatchable resources to close or shut down. 542

this is what we are heading for. And let me just illustrate 543 544 an example of what I am talking about. So last week, eight days ago, right here in PJM -- and 545 546 we are in PJM, that electricity keeping the lights on is being dispatched by PJM -- PJM last Tuesday at 5:35 was the 547 hottest day of their -- of that heat wave. PJM was 548 dispatching 153 gigawatts of power to meet load. Of that 153 549 qiqawatts last Tuesday -- Tuesday, a week from yesterday --550 551 86 percent of the power that was keeping the lights on in PJM to hit that peak was either gas, nuclear, or coal, 86 552 percent. And these are the resources, particularly coal, 553 that PJM is warning us -- okay, so remember that number, 153 554 gigawatts it took to meet peak -- PJM is saying they are 555 going to lose 40 to 50 gigawatts of that capacity in just the 556 next 3 to 4 years. So the arithmetic is just -- it doesn't 557 work, okay? 558 Now, that is on the demand side. On the supply side, 559 everyone -- on the demand side everyone knows what is 560 561 happening with the tremendous increases in demand that we are seeing from data centers, including artificial intelligence, 562 which, you know, dramatically ramps up the demand, as well as 563 cryptominers. So it is really supply and demand. On the 564

supply side we are losing the dispatchable resources we need. 565 566 On the demand side we are seeing load increases like we have never seen in the last 20 years. So the numbers are just 567 568 simply not adding up. Now, PJM again is telling us that in the gueues, in all 569 the -- in PJM's queue, as well as most of the queues, 97 570 percent of the resources that are in the queues are 571 intermittent. So simply clearing the queues doesn't really 572 573 solve the problem that we have because a -- one gigawatt of an intermittent resource is simply not equal to one gigawatt 574 nameplate of a dispatchable resource. 575 So really, the problem we are facing is loss of supply, 576 increase in demand. And that is what is leading us -- and 577 all the RTOs, all of them, have been very clear about this. 578 NERC, the North American Energy Reliability Organization, 579 also has been very clear about this. We are simply coming to 580 a situation where we are not going to have enough power to 581 meet the demand increases that we are seeing. 582 583 And so, with that, I will be happy to answer questions about reasons this is coming, what can be done about it. But 584 that is the core problem. I mean, we are heading for a --585 and again, I don't like to be melodramatic, but we are 586

587	heading for potentially catastrophic circumstances where we
588	simply cannot meet demand. And that means we don't keep the
589	lights on. And that will be definitely catastrophic.
590	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
591	[The prepared statement of Mr. Christie follows:]
592	
593	**************************************
594	

595	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Commissioner Christie.
596	Commissioner Rosner, welcome, and you are recognized for
597	five minutes.
598	

STATEMENT OF DAVID ROSNER 599 600 *Mr. Rosner. Thank you, Chair. Well, good morning, 601 602 Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member DeGette, Chair Rodgers, and Ranking Member Pallone, and also members of the 603 subcommittees. I am humbled to appear before you today 604 alongside my colleagues to testify on behalf of the Federal 605 Energy Regulatory Commission regarding its important work for 606 607 the American people. As a new commissioner, I am proud to join with my 608 colleagues to uphold FERC's tradition as an independent, 609 expert body that continuously strives to live up to 610 Congress's vision for an independent, bipartisan regulator of 611 our increasingly complex energy system. FERC's leaders and 612 civil servants work tirelessly to quide the Commission's 613 decisions towards sound, legally durable outcomes that hold 614 true to the agency's statutory authority and make our country 615 and our allies more energy secure. 616 The Commission's core responsibility, it is job number 617 one, is to ensure the reliable operation of the country's 618 electrical grid. None of our economic or policy priorities 619 can be achieved without energy reliability. Consumers expect 620

it, they deserve it, and it is FERC's most sacred duty to 621 622 ensure it. It is undeniable that the U.S. energy system is in 623 624 transition, and that the pace of change on both the supply and demand side is unprecedented. Maintaining reliable 625 operation of the electric grid at reasonable cost to 626 consumers as this transition unfolds is both a challenge and 627 an opportunity for the Commission and for the country. It is 628 629 a task that I am both honored and humbled to take on. means many things, but especially it means that the 630 Commission must remain vigilant and respect the realities of 631 the resources that power our economy today. 632 But that alone is not sufficient. The Commission must 633 also keep its eye on the horizon to ensure that its legacy of 634 providing reliable, safe, secure, and affordable energy to 635 all Americans continues. That means continuing to faithfully 636 implement the Commission's longstanding policy of resource 637 and fuel neutrality to allow the next generation of 638 639 technologies to play their role in the energy system. means continuing to harden the energy system to withstand 640 evolving threats to reliability including weather, physical, 641 and cyber risks. And it means continuing to ensure energy 642

```
affordability, safety, and reliability through timely review
643
644
     of needed energy infrastructure while considering the views
     from all parties. And finally, it also means protecting
645
646
     consumers by honoring the Commission's obligation under the
     Federal Power Act to ensure rates are just and reasonable.
647
          I look forward to working with my fellow commissioners
648
     on these important issues.
649
          That concludes my remarks today, Mr. Chairman, and I
650
651
     look forward to your questions.
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Rosner follows:]
652
653
     *********COMMITTEE INSERT******
654
655
```

656	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Commissioner Rosner.
657	Commissioner See, you are recognized for five minutes.
658	

STATEMENT OF LINDSAY S. SEE 659 660 *Ms. See. Good morning, Chair Duncan, Ranking Member 661 662 DeGette, Chair Rodgers, Ranking Member Pallone, and all the members of the subcommittee. Thank you for inviting me and 663 my fellow commissioners at FERC to appear before you today. 664 I am grateful for the opportunity to testify, and especially 665 that I am able to do so as part of the newly full, five-666 667 member Commission. 668 As one of those --*Mr. Duncan. Yes, could you pull the mike up just a 669 little bit? We transcribe everything, and want to make sure 670 everyone can hear. 671 *Ms. See. Of course. 672 *Mr. Duncan. 673 Thank you. *Ms. See. Is this better? There we go. All right. 674 Well, as one of those newest commissioners here, it is 675 an honor and a pleasure to serve with my distinguished 676 677 colleagues, both the two who have served so well for the past few years, and the two who were sworn in immediately before 678 and after me this past month. My three weeks now officially 679 on the job have also deepened my respect for the FERC staff 680

and their expertise and commitment to the Commission's 681 682 mission. I am humbled by the chance to add my experience to the mix as I join my new colleagues, and I am eager to jump 683 684 into the timely and critical issues facing the Commission today. 685 And as I get started doing just that, staffing up my 686 office and preparing to vote on the Commission's upcoming 687 matters, I am keeping at the center of my vision the same 688 689 focus you have heard from all of my colleagues: reliability and affordability are the Commission's most important jobs. 690 Keeping the lights on is an economic necessity, and it is 691 essential to American's day-to-day lives, health, and 692 security. I take that mission seriously as I am beginning to 693 analyze the important and complex matters ahead of me as a 694 commissioner. 695 I am also mindful that my colleagues and I are taking on 696 that task in a time of dynamic change. New technologies and 697 generation sources are offering real promise at the same time 698 699 many baseload plant retirements are raising real alarms. the increasing demand loads from data centers, 700 electrification, and other consumer and policy-driven changes 701 heighten the stakes for what ensuring reliability needs to 702

look like in today's markets and tomorrow's. I appreciate 703 704 the subcommittee's focus on all of these changing realities. They are and will remain areas of intense focus for me, too, 705 706 as I continue diving into my new role as a commissioner. I am mindful that how FERC goes about this work is 707 critical, too. My prior role as a state attorney gave me 708 great respect for the balance in the energy sector between 709 Federal and state authority. The state's decisions on 710 711 generation and local distribution matters reflect important local priorities and strengths, and I had the opportunity to 712 see firsthand the way that Federal regulations can affect 713 real Americans, both for good and sometimes for bad. 714 aim to bring those lessons with me as I transition now to the 715 Federal side, approaching FERC's different responsibilities 716 with both support for the states as they carry out their 717 functions, and an eye for how their decisions affect the 718 nation's overall energy mix and needs. 719 720 I also take seriously the changing legal landscape 721 facing the Commission and other Federal agencies today. believe accountability matters as my colleagues and I do the 722 public's work. So, for instance, in response to the Supreme 723 Court's recent decision limiting agency discretion in 724

reducing the margin of error for agency orders, I welcome the 725 726 important check judicial review offers in our separation of powers system. 727 728 But perhaps most importantly, when it comes to how I view my -- as a commissioner on the front end when it comes 729 to making decisions, as opposed to that scope of judicial 730 review on the back end, I continue to view my duty as 731 fundamentally the same. As a commissioner, my responsibility 732 733 is to approach the law and the facts before me with a fair and open mind, striving to reach the best results with my 734 colleagues in each case. And that approach mirrors my 735 overall philosophy in not going beyond the authority Congress 736 has entrusted to FERC, but not constricting that authority 737 738 either. Understanding jurisdictions limits should lead to more 739 clarity on what matters most. And especially given the many 740 urgent issues facing the Commission and the energy sector, 741 742 many of which we have already discussed -- and I know that we 743 will be fleshing out more today -- it is an understatement to say that plenty of mission-critical work falls within FERC's 744 statutory lanes. So I am eager to work with my colleagues as 745 we respond to all of these changes. 746

747	As one of the newest members of this non-partisan,
748	independent Commission, I deeply appreciate the different
749	perspectives and sets of experience we bring with us, and I
750	am confident we will be up to the task.
751	I also look forward to discussing more of these issues
752	with you all today, and working with you and your staffs in
753	the months ahead. So thank you again for the opportunity to
754	be here, and I look forward to answering your questions.
755	[The prepared statement of Ms. See follows:]
756	
757	**************************************
758	

759	*Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Commissioner.
760	Commissioner Chang, you are recognized for five minutes.
761	

762 STATEMENT OF JUDY W. CHANG

763

*Ms. Chang. Good morning, Chairman Duncan, Ranking 764 765 Member DeGette, Chair Rodgers, and Ranking Member Pallone, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you very much for the 766 invitation to testify this morning, and thank you for the 767 valuable oversight role that you undertake. This is my first 768 opportunity to testify before this subcommittee, and I am 769 770 honored to appear here today with my colleagues as part of a fully-staffed Commission. 771 To just briefly introduce myself, I recently joined the 772 Commission after more than two decades working in the energy 773 industry in a variety of roles. I did spend my formative 774 years in developing countries, which provided me with a deep 775 appreciation and -- for the value of reliable and resilient 776 grid. This value is even more critical today, as our country 777 experiences and anticipates rapidly growing electricity usage 778 779 from manufacturing facilities and data centers, plus 780 electrification of transportation and heating, just as Commissioner Christie had just mentioned. We must meet these 781 demands while keeping our systems resilient to increasingly 782 frequent extreme weather events as we are witnessing around 783

the country. 784 785 This is a major challenge, and has been a focus of the Commission for some time now, and I commit to help address 786 787 these topics. I have deep experience in analyzing the economics and the public policy implications around our 788 energy systems. I have worked with private companies, 789 including all types of public utilities across the country, 790 and in developing strategies for meeting the energy needs of 791 792 customers. I had held a leadership role in Massachusetts's state government, where I experienced firsthand the 793 importance of having adequate infrastructure, efficient 794 market mechanisms and frameworks, and viable approaches to 795 796 grow our economy while navigating policies and programs that 797 reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Drawing on my background and professional experience in 798 both the private sector and in state government, I appreciate 799 the foundational importance of ensuring the reliability and 800 the affordability of our energy systems. These imperatives 801 802 are, for good reasons, front and center in every utility executive and government leader's mind, and they are 803 prerequisites for a robust economy and the successful 804 execution of the energy transition in which this country 805

finds itself today. 806 807 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, given its responsibilities in the electric, gas, and oil sectors, plays 808 809 a crucial role in ensuring both reliability and affordability of our energy systems. As a commissioner, one of my 810 priorities is to ensure a robust and reliable transmission 811 system, including the use of advanced technologies to deliver 812 affordable energy for all consumers. This is paramount to 813 814 the economic growth of our nation, and this is how the United States will continue to lead the world and compete on the 815 global stage in technological innovation and infrastructure 816 development. 817 I also commit to working closely with my colleagues and 818 collaboratively with them to ensure that we provide clear, 819 timely, and thoughtful guidance for the industry to develop 820 and retain the energy infrastructure needed to advance our 821 economy and reliably serve the American people. 822 Again, thank you very much for having me here today, and 823 824 I am happy to answer any questions that you may have. [The prepared statement of Ms. Chang follows:] 825 826 ********************************* 827

46

828

```
*Mr. Duncan.
                        Thank you, and thank all the commissioners
829
830
     for your testimony. We will now move into the question-and-
     answer portion of the hearing, and I will begin the
831
832
     questioning. I recognize myself for five minutes.
          FERC Order No. 1920 makes sweeping and controversial
833
     changes to the regional transmission planning and cost
834
     allocation rules over the objections of the National
835
     Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and dozens of
836
837
     individual states.
          Opposition by NARUC is significant, and they represent
838
     the interests of all 50 states, and they only engage on
839
     regulatory matters based on resolutions passed by its 238-
840
     member commissioners. They wrote, "Opposition is a serious
841
     blow to Order 1920, and it is concerning that FERC dismissed
842
     serious flaws with such blatant disregard.''
843
          I would like to insert for the record NARUC's request
844
     for a rehearing, which FERC recently denied.
845
          With unanimous consent, so ordered.
846
847
          [The information follows:]
848
     ******************************
849
```

850

*Mr. Duncan. I would also like to -- now that FERC has 851 852 denied a rehearing, at last count 19 states have filed for appeal in Federal court: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, 853 854 Georgia, Kansas -- the list goes on, including my state of South Carolina, Texas, Utah, West Virginia. 855 Chairman Phillips, I want to ask you about Order 1920. 856 Do you think that it is "just and reasonable' to force 857 residents in one state to pay for the renewable electricity 858 mandates of another state? 859 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you for the question, Chair 860 Duncan. 861 First of all, let me be clear. We had -- we just 862 received a letter, I think it was, 2 days ago from 33 863 commissioners around the country, geographically diverse, 864 bipartisan, both Republicans and Democrats, praising Order 865 No. 1920. 866 I was a state regulator for over seven years. I have 867 never, never seen that many commissioners come together and 868 869 say the same thing and praise anything. So this alone is evidence. And I have been traveling all around this country, 870 and I can tell you that I have received such great feedback. 871 There are so many people excited about the work that FERC is 872

- doing to expand our grid, to meet the reliability, and
- 874 affordability challenges that we have.
- You talked about cost. Our Order No. 1920 adheres to
- our cost causation principle, which has decades-long been
- recognized by the courts and bipartisan majorities of the
- 878 Commission. That is, that costs have to be allocated roughly
- 879 commensurate with the benefits.
- Again, to put it another way --
- *Mr. Duncan. So I --
- *Mr. Phillips. -- if you don't benefit, you don't pay.
- *Mr. Duncan. Just -- so in your opinion it is okay for
- 884 residents of other states to have higher rates to pay for
- transmission and green initiatives and other mandates in
- 886 other states?
- *Mr. Phillips. That is a great question, and I think it
- is important to correct the record a little bit. That is not
- what Order No. 1920 does.
- *Mr. Duncan. That is what cost allocation is, Mr.
- 891 Chairman. The letter you mentioned, that is just a small
- fraction of the 238 utility regulators around the country.
- I am going to move on, in essence of time. Do you
- 894 believe the Federal Power Act authorizes FERC to override

- states on regional planning cost allocation?
- *Mr. Phillips. When it comes to cost allocation, costs
- are roughly allocated -- roughly commensurate with benefits.
- 898 That is our cost causation principle. Nothing has changed.
- No one has rewritten the rule book when it comes to cost
- 900 allocation.
- 901 *Mr. Duncan. Thank you for that.
- 902 Commissioner Christie, you offered a strong dissent to
- Order 1920. Will you comment on the ways the order violates
- 904 the Federal Power Act?
- 905 *Mr. Christie. I don't think it is going to produce
- just and reasonable rates, and that is our duty under the
- 907 Federal --
- 908 *Mr. Duncan. Your mike, please.
- 909 *Mr. Christie. Overall, I don't think it is going to
- produce just and reasonable rates, and that is our core duty
- 911 under the Federal Power Act. The Federal Power Act is, at
- 912 its very essence, a consumer protection statute. And our job
- 913 is to be a consumer protection agency. I don't think this
- 914 rule fulfills that role.
- 1915 Let me mention to you, if I -- you have a little bit of
- 916 time, about the context of this rule. So this rule was not

adopted in a vacuum. It was adopted two years after we did a 917 proposed rule. And the proposed rule gave the states a far 918 more robust role than what ended up in the final rule. 919 920 And with regard to NARUC, I would also say this. I was a state regulator for 17 years, and I participated in all the 921 NARUC processes, and I know how NARUC works. And NARUC works 922 by consensus, and it works by vote. And NARUC files its 923 comments in proceedings at FERC. And they filed very well 924 925 considered -- it took them a long time to get their comments, they go through multiple committees, and when they come out 926 with a position, that is NARUC's position, and they represent 927 the overwhelming majority of state regulators. 928 There is no question that the overwhelming majority of 929 state regulators do not like Order 1920. They have been very 930 clear about that. The reason they don't like it is the 931 reason I don't like it, which is because the state role that 932 was promised in the proposed rule, which I voted for -- I 933 voted for it, the chair voted for it, every member of FERC 934 voted for it, it was a bipartisan compromise -- the state 935 role was effectively gutted from the proposed rule 2 years 936 ago to what ended up in Order 1920. So that is why the state 937 regulators don't like it, and that is why I don't like it, 938

and for a number of other reasons. 939 940 And we can go into -- we could spend many hours talking about detail, because there is a lot of detail. But 941 942 fundamentally, it takes away the state regulators' ability to protect their consumers. And the reason I am so adamant 943 about the state role is because, as a state regulator for 17 944 years, I know that state regulators are the front line and 945 the last line of defense for consumers, and that is why it is 946 947 so important that state regulators have the authority to play the role that they were promised in the proposed rule and 948 which was taken away in the final rule. 949 *Mr. Duncan. Thank you for that. I am out of time. 950 am going to have some additional questions that I will submit 951 on gas pipelines and the position of FERC, but that will be 952 submitted. I ask you guys to respond. 953 [The information follows:] 954 955 956

957

*Mr. Duncan. I will now recognize and welcome the 958 959 Ranking Member DeGette for five minutes. *Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 960 961 Chairman Phillips, now it is true that transmission siting is going to be critical to our nation's electrical 962 grid over the next decade, isn't it? 963 964 *Mr. Phillips. Yes. *Ms. DeGette. And the Regional Planning Rule Order 965 966 1920, that marks the first time the Commission has ever squarely addressed the need for long-term transmission 967 planning. Isn't that correct? 968 *Mr. Phillips. That is correct, in the way we addressed 969 970 it. 971 *Ms. DeGette. Now, so the chairman was saying to you that Order 1920 makes some states pay for other states, and 972 you said that is not true and you tried to explain why and he 973 wouldn't let you. So would you like to clarify your answer 974 on that, sir? 975 976 *Mr. Phillips. Certainly. We rely upon the longstanding cost causation principle that FERC has adhered 977 to for decades. It has been recognized by the courts. 978

know that costs have to be allocated roughly commensurate

979

```
with the benefits, the benefits to our consumers.
980
981
     the rule that we -- that is the foundation of our cost
     causation rule in Order No. 1920.
982
983
          *Ms. DeGette. So you are not essentially robbing Peter
     to pay Paul. You are figuring out the causation, and then
984
     you are allocating it according to that.
985
          *Mr. Phillips. Absolutely, just as we did under Order
986
     No. 1000. Yes, ma'am.
987
988
          *Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now, you testified that 33 state
     regulatory commissioners recently submitted a letter in
989
     support of the regional planning rule. Is that correct?
990
          *Mr. Phillips. That is correct.
991
          *Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to
992
     put that letter into the record.
993
          *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, so ordered.
994
          [The information follows:]
995
996
     997
998
```

*Ms. DeGette. Thank you. 999 Now can you, Mr. Chairman, can you share your 1000 perspective on how the transmission siting rule and the 1001 1002 regional planning rule will support the reliability and security of our power grid, which is so deeply needed? 1003 *Mr. Phillips. Certainly. Order No. 1920 is, at its 1004 heart, about reliability. We know that what is happening 1005 right now, what we are doing to build out our system, it is 1006 1007 not going to get us where we need to go. We know that there 1008 are drivers putting pressure on our system. Some of them have been mentioned. We have data centers, AI, quantum 1009 computing, the return of industrial manufacturing. 1010 all things that we know -- demand is going up. And 1011 1012 Commissioner Christie is right, there is a concern about retirements going down. By building out the transmission 1013 that we know we are going to need over a long term, a 20-year 1014 time horizon, you have no choice but to identify solutions to 1015 address these problems. 1016 1017 *Ms. DeGette. And if we don't identify these solutions, what is going to happen? 1018 *Mr. Phillips. We will be facing a difficult, difficult 1019 reliability problem in our country. 1020

- *Ms. DeGette. We are already facing issues with our 1021 grid, which we see in times of extreme weather and other 1022 times all the time now, right? 1023 1024 *Mr. Phillips. That is right. We --*Ms. DeGette. So if we don't address this, is it going 1025 1026 to get better on its own? *Mr. Phillips. It is not. And we have to weigh the 1027 cost of inaction. 1028 1029 *Ms. DeGette. Why is addressing cost sharing in the manner that the regional planning rule does so crucial to the 1030 future of our grid? 1031 *Mr. Phillips. It is important. Right now, we know if 1032 we do nothing costs are going to continue to go up. I was a 1033 1034 state regulator, as I mentioned, for many years. I saw the cost for transmission go up every single year. It was -- it 1035 seemed that it was out of our control. We are taking 1036 control. We, the Commission, under 1920, we are looking out 1037 over the long term, doing what we know the reality on the 1038 1039 ground requires.
- 1040 *Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
- 1041 Commissioner Rosner, I am wondering if you can talk to
 1042 me a little bit about interregional transmission, because to

- me that is really one of the most important things we can do
 to enhance electrical reliability and to make power more
 affordable.
- 1046 *Mr. Rosner. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
- 1047 Interregional -- I guess I would say that I agree with
- 1048 NERC, that interregional transmission is a key solution to
- 1049 some of the reliability challenges that the country is
- 1050 facing. That alone is not enough. We also need generation
- 1051 on those lines.
- *Ms. DeGette. Great. And Commissioner Chang, I just
- want to ask you if you can magnify that and tell me what
- steps do you think might be necessary towards interregional
- 1055 transmission to improving that.
- 1056 *Ms. Chang. Thank you for your question.
- 1057 Interregional transmission will be important, as it has
- 1058 been in the past, and our current regulation and the process
- 1059 used by many grid operators limits the way interregional
- 1060 transmissions are being developed. So I definitely look
- 1061 forward to having an opportunity to work with my colleagues
- 1062 to really start thinking more seriously about interregional
- 1063 transmission planning.
- And I think, you know, starting with regional makes a

```
lot of sense, and then we will tackle and really grow the
1065
1066
      ability for regions to interchange and increase their
      interchange amongst adjacent regions.
1067
1068
           *Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
           I have a question here about the roundtable that
1069
      Chairman Phillips convened on environmental justice and
1070
      equity in infrastructure permitting decisions, but I am out
1071
      of time, Mr. Chairman, so I will submit that for the record
1072
1073
      and look forward to your answer. Thank you.
           I yield back.
1074
           *Mr. Duncan. I was giving you a little leniency, but
1075
1076
      yes, she will submit that for the record.
           [The information follows:]
1077
1078
      ********COMMITTEE INSERT******
1079
1080
```

*Ms. DeGette. Do you want to hear the answer? 1081 1082 *Mr. Duncan. No, I will now recognize the chair of the full committee, Chair Rodgers, for five minutes. 1083 1084 *The Chair. Clearly, we are facing a growing grid reliability crisis that is jeopardizing our economy and our 1085 safety. According to the North American Electric Reliability 1086 Corporation, two-thirds of the nation is facing an elevated 1087 risk of outages. The nation's grid operators agree that 1088 1089 causes are state renewable mandates, bans on natural gas, lack of pipeline capacity, and new EPA regulations that will 1090 close power plants. 1091 Chairman Phillips, do you agree with our nation's grid 1092 1093 operators? 1094 *Mr. Phillips. Yes, I share the concern about the 1095 reliability challenges that we have ahead. *The Chair. You testified in previous hearings that you 1096 had very limited interaction with EPA in the development of 1097 new regulations for power plants. What steps have you taken 1098 1099 to improve coordination and communications between FERC and 1100 EPA? *Mr. Phillips. So I am glad to report that last fall we 1101 had a technical conference at FERC, where we invited EPA, 1102

- their leadership, as well as utility leadership around the
- 1104 country to talk about their potential rules. We took
- 1105 feedback, gave it to them, submitted it in their record, and
- 1106 EPA actually changed the final rule to include a reliability
- 1107 emergency off-ramp based upon the feedback that they got from
- 1108 FERC.
- *The Chair. Are you concerned about the new EPA
- 1110 regulations and their impact on closing power plants across
- 1111 this country?
- *Mr. Phillips. We are always concerned about
- 1113 reliability. It is job number one.
- To be clear, we provided feedback. That feedback was
- incorporated. We believe FERC is doing all that we can to
- 1116 protect the reliability of our grid.
- 1117 *The Chair. Thank you.
- 1118 Chairman Christie, do you believe there is more work
- 1119 that we could do to improve coordination between FERC and
- 1120 EPA?
- 1121 *Mr. Christie. I think we should have weighed in much
- more with EPA than we did. We sent them a transcript of a
- 1123 hearing, and I think that was it.
- 1124 The problem with the power plant rule -- and again, the

grid operators, PJM, SPP, ERCOT, MISO, they all filed comment 1125 at EPA, and they were very blunt about what the rule was 1126 going to do, the EPA power plant rule. They were very blunt 1127 1128 it was going to materially degrade reliability. So they stood up and let EPA know that. We submitted a transcript 1129 which had some testimony that went both ways. 1130 But the worst testimony was from Mr. Goffman of EPA when 1131 I asked him, "Have you done any analysis of whether 1132 generating units can finance the compliance, '' because if you 1133 can't finance compliance it doesn't matter what the timelines 1134 1135 are. And he essentially admitted, "No, we haven't done any 1136 serious analysis of whether they can finance compliance,'' 1137 1138 because if you can't finance compliance, these generating units are going to close down. So I think that that is going 1139 to have a tremendously deleterious effect on our grid 1140 reliability. 1141 *The Chair. Thank you. 1142 1143 Hydropower, the original source of renewable energy, produces far superior power to weather-dependent Chinese 1144 solar panels and batteries. Hydropower keeps the lights on, 1145 powers our economy in the Pacific Northwest. Seventy-five 1146

percent of our electricity is hydro in Washington State. 1147 is reliable, it is renewable, and it is imperative when the 1148 wind isn't blowing, the sun isn't shining. So we see EPA 1149 1150 shutting down power plants, and we also see efforts by this Administration to tear out dams in the Pacific Northwest. 1151 None of this makes sense to me. 1152 Chairman Phillips, as you know, I have led an effort for 1153 multiple congresses to reform FERC's hydropower licensing 1154 1155 process to preserve our existing fleet and expand hydropower 1156 production where it can. I think you agree that the FERC licensing process could be modernized. I wanted to ask, 1157 since hydropower is so critical to grid reliability, 1158 especially in a state like Washington State, what is FERC 1159 1160 doing to prioritize the relicensing of these existing hydropower facilities? 1161 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you, Madam Chair. I too agree, 1162 and I support our hydro facilities around the country, 1163 including pumped storage, as well. 1164 1165 We know that there are a lot -- we have over -- almost a third of our hydro facilities around the country will be up 1166 for relicensing between now and 2030. We are aware of it. 1167 We are working hard to staff up. We are hiring. Everybody 1168

here and everybody watching, FERC is hiring and we want you 1169 to come and be a part of our team. But we are getting 1170 prepared, and we are ready to address this need. 1171 1172 *The Chair. Thank you. Clearly, it is critical infrastructure. The Columbia-Snake River system is critical 1173 infrastructure, amazing investments made by the Federal 1174 1175 Government. What specific actions do you believe, Chairman Phillips, 1176 1177 Congress can take to simplify the process and ensure reasonable timeframes for decisions, and that these decisions 1178 are met? 1179 *Mr. Phillips. So I have made streamlining our 1180 processes regarding infrastructure across the board a 1181 1182 priority, and we have seen those timelines come down with regard to hydro. We instituted -- I call it a fast lane. 1183 Ιt is like an expedited process. 1184 *The Chair. Okay, I am going to interrupt real quick, 1185 because I -- and I want to hear more. We can talk about that 1186 1187 separately. What would you say to those who suggest we should tear out the dams in favor of solar power? 1188 *Mr. Phillips. I am not aware of anyone making that 1189 particular request, but I am an all-of-the-above. I have an 1190

- 1191 all-of-the-above approach. I believe we need every tool that
- we can get to help America address our concerns and continue
- to be the leader in the world when it comes to energy.
- *The Chair. Thank you. I look forward to working with
- 1195 you.
- 1196 I yield back.
- *Mr. Duncan. I think we have had a hearing where that
- 1198 comment was actually made by someone.
- But Ranking Member Pallone is recognized for five
- 1200 minutes.
- 1201 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 1202 And for the sake of time -- and I want to cover a lot --
- 1203 I am just asking my questions of you, Chairman Phillips, and
- 1204 I wanted to start off by talking a little bit about Order
- 1205 1920 and FERC's authority.
- 1206 In the Federal Power Act Congress directed FERC to
- 1207 ensure power rates are just and reasonable. It also
- 1208 explicitly granted FERC regulatory authority over interstate
- 1209 transmission. And while it grants FERC discretion on how to
- 1210 best carry out those responsibilities, that is not deference,
- 1211 it is an explicit grant of power to the agency. So Chairman
- 1212 Phillips, could you talk about how the Commission's authority

to issue Order 1920 flows from these facts that I mentioned? 1213 *Mr. Phillips. Yes, sir. Under the Federal Power Act 1214 the Commission is tasked with having jurisdiction over 1215 1216 electric transmission rates, interstate rates, and the practices that affect those rates. It is clear that Order 1217 No. 1920 concerns long-term regional planning and cost 1218 allocation. Those are practices that impact transmission 1219 1220 rates. 1221 *Mr. Pallone. And building upon that, in South Carolina Public Service Authority versus FERC the D.C. circuit 1222 explicitly found that FERC had the authority to issue Order 1223 1000, which also dealt with regional grid planning. So 1224 again, Chairman Phillips, given that Order 1920 deals with 1225 1226 regional grid planning over the long term, is there any reason to suspect that Order 1920 would be on different legal 1227 footing from Order 1000? 1228 *Mr. Phillips. No, Order No. 1920 builds upon Order No. 1229 1000. 1230 1231 *Mr. Pallone. All right. Now I want to turn to a topic I discussed in my opening statement, and that is FERC's 1232 independence. And Chairman Phillips, could you briefly 1233 discuss why it is so important to FERC's core 1234

```
responsibilities that the Commission retain its independence?
1235
1236
           *Mr. Phillips. You know, I talk all the time,
      Congressman, about how FERC is an independent agency, and
1237
1238
      that we quard that independence jealously. I think it is a
      part of our trust relationship with the public that they know
1239
      that, when it comes to FERC, that we will act independently
1240
      and in the best interest of the public.
1241
           *Mr. Pallone. All right. And then finally, I wanted to
1242
1243
      ask -- you have spoken a lot about how the electric sector is
      only as reliable as its least reliable component, and how the
1244
      lack of mandatory gas reliability standards could threaten
1245
      electric reliability. So studies have shown that natural gas
1246
      plants and pipelines are disproportionately vulnerable to
1247
1248
      failure, with significant outages occurring during Winter
      Storms Elliott and Uri. So again, Chairman Phillips, could
1249
      you talk about how gas reliability impacts electric
1250
      reliability, and if you think Congress should enact
1251
      legislation to mandate reliability standards for gas?
1252
1253
           And actually, I thought -- I didn't think I would have
      this much time, so you have two minutes if you would like.
1254
           *Mr. Phillips. So thank you for the question.
1255
           When it comes to reliability of our system, again, it is
1256
```

job number one. We make the -- when it comes to our gas, 1257 natural gas, you don't have to look any further than Winter 1258 Storm Uri, Winter Storm Elliot, some of the extreme weather 1259 1260 events that we have seen on our system that have caused unplanned outages. You can call them unplanned, but when 1261 something happens every other year you cannot call it 1262 unexpected. It is critical that we maintain the reliability 1263 of our gas. 1264 1265 We have these two systems. We have the electric side and the gas side, and we treat them as if they are completely 1266 separate. But in reality, they are increasingly 1267 interdependent upon each other. Now, we have an ERO, an 1268 Electric Reliability Organization for the electric side. 1269 don't have a reliability organization that is required to 1270 maintain the reliability of our gas side. 1271 I believe that is a gap in our reliability regime, and I 1272 believe that there should be some agency responsible for that 1273 gap. It doesn't have to be FERC; it could be like NERC, an 1274 1275 independent agency that has delegated authority. But someone has to fill that gap. It is too important to the -- our end 1276 users and our consumers that we make sure that when you go 1277 over and hit that switch, that the lights come on, and that 1278

is what this is about. 1279 That is also why Order No. 1920 is so important. And I 1280 am so excited about the work that got us here for 1920, 1281 1282 because we are going to bring on more of the resources that we know we need for our system. 1283 *Mr. Pallone. All right. Thank you so much. 1284 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1285 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 1286 to Mr. Guthrie from Kentucky for five minutes. 1287 *Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, thank you. 1288 So Commissioner Christie, I want to talk about your 1289 opening statement. The example that you gave us is stark, 1290 and it is real. And this is the greatest catastrophe --1291 1292 could be one of the greatest catastrophes in American history that we can avoid if we react to it. And so when you bring 1293 those examples -- I am sure they had those kind of examples 1294 in Europe. We know they just had elections in Europe and 1295 almost everybody in power, regardless of your political 1296 1297 party, was thrown out. And a big part of it was their climate policy. I know my family is in the manufacturing 1298 business. People in similar industries in Germany have three 1299 times the power costs that we have here in the United States. 1300

It is absolutely uncompetitive. And so it is a big concern. 1301 1302 And, you know, they put in a lot of these policies based on the fact -- predictions years ago that there would be no 1303 1304 polar ice caps by 2016. I think we still have polar ice There would be -- the Earth would be uninhabitable by 1305 2023. Obviously, that is not true; we are here. And so when 1306 they take these -- I call it climate exaggerators, and they 1307 take those comments, and they put in policies that hurt their 1308 1309 economies, I can tell you that the German -- people in the German Government are begging us to send more exports of 1310 natural gas and liquid natural gas because of what they have 1311 done to their own economy. So it is a concern. 1312 And then we look at China. We did the Paris Accords, 1313 which essentially exempted China. And when it got to the 1314 time that China was supposed to participate, where they kind 1315 of committed somewhere in the future, Secretary Kerry's 1316 enforcement mechanism was we will shame them into it if they 1317 choose not to. That was the enforcement mechanism. 1318 1319 what -- that is a quote from Secretary Kerry. 1320 So here we are with China. Here we are, our great global competitor who view themselves as the -- you know, 1321 China means Middle Kingdom, the center of the world, and that 1322

is what they are trying to do. And that is where they are 1323 trying to go. And we are competing with a country that has 1324 increasing -- what, an average of two power plants per week? 1325 1326 So as we -- as the economy that -- of the future demands more power, as you said, and we are providing less supply, 1327 those two things cannot work. And so my question, knowing 1328 that, I know what Congress needs to do -- I feel strongly 1329 about Congress -- how can FERC address these challenges of 1330 1331 electricity needs, from your perspective? *Mr. Christie. Well, the first role, of course, is 1332 primarily as a rate regulator under the Federal Power Act. 1333 One thing that is important to understand is we are a 1334 reliability regulator from the standpoint of setting 1335 standards for NERC. Well, NERC sets the standards, we 1336 approve them. The states are the ones who decide what 1337 generating units get built and what generating units get 1338 That is a state matter. FERC's role is largely to retired. 1339 say, because we regulate the regional transmission 1340 1341 organizations, if there is a reliability problem on the horizon, we are sort of like -- it is our job to point it out 1342 and say, "Look what is coming.'' 1343 Now, in regulating the markets we have a direct 1344

regulatory authority. And if the markets are one of the 1345 reasons that we are losing dispatchable resources, that we 1346 1347 are not building sufficient dispatchable resources, then that 1348 implicates FERC's reliability authority because we are regulating the markets, and their market designs and rate 1349 structures can determine what -- in those -- where you have a 1350 market. 1351 Now, a large part of this country are not in an RTO 1352 1353 market. The Southeast is not in an RTO market. They are in what is called an IRP type of structure. And those decisions 1354 in the non-RTO regions are clearly up to state regulators 1355 because they approve the integrated resource plan which 1356 determines what their utilities build or don't build. 1357 1358 So FERC's role is -- from reliability is, number one, raise the alarm when we see the trends that we see; secondly, 1359 regulate the national standard setter, which is NERC; and 1360 then thirdly, in our regulation of the markets look at how 1361 those markets are affecting not only prices but also how they 1362 1363 are affecting reliability. *Mr. Guthrie. Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. 1364 And Commissioner See and maybe Commissioner Christie, I 1365 doubt I will have time, but I want an answer to this, as 1366

- We have heard some people already here on 1367 well. Chevron. this committee apologize that the Supreme Court gave us back 1368 our -- the authority that we should exercise. So just in 1369 1370 Chevron -- I am not going to regurgitate what Chevron is, but where might there be opportunities for Congress to be more 1371 explicit in legislating and affecting your authorities? 1372 *Ms. See. I think one of the things that the Supreme 1373 Court said in the decision that did away with Chevron 1374 1375 deference is that certainly this is Congress's responsibility when Congress is clear in a statute. 1376 Sorry, I will try this again. 1377 *Mr. Guthrie. Okay. 1378 *Ms. See. When Congress is clear in a statute that it 1379
- *Ms. See. When Congress is clear in a statute that it
 wants an agency to exercise its expertise and discretion, it
 can say so. And the Supreme Court was clear that courts can
 and must respect that. So I think there is certainly room
 for Congress to speak clearly when it comes to that sort of
 agency, expertise, and discretion, even in light of that
 decision.
- 1386 *Mr. Guthrie. Okay, thank you.
- Mr. Christie, I don't have time left, so I will yield back.

The gentleman yields back. I will now go 1389 *Mr. Duncan. to my friend from California, Mr. Peters, for five minutes. 1390 *Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1391 1392 And I want to thank you -- start out by thanking you, Chairman Phillips, for the strong action as chair over the 1393 past year. Orders 1920 and 1977, focusing on transmission 1394 planning and backstop siting for national interest 1395 transmission will be essential for industry to improve 1396 1397 reliability, build resilience to extreme weather events, and add necessary generation resources to meet America's 1398 electricity needs into the future. Now, that is not my 1399 opinion, that is a quote from the North American Reliability 1400 Corporation, the national entity in charge of ensuring a 1401 1402 reliable and secure grid. 1403 And I just want to say, like, we are facing an undeniable spike in the need for electricity. And when we 1404 talk about "all of the above, '' it has got to include 1405 transmission, not just generation. I don't think we should 1406 1407 be in this false battle between the two. We are going to need both. And we also know that a robust grid that is 1408 interregional can provide benefits in terms of reliability 1409 and cost competition for consumers. 1410

1411	So I think we should take advantage of being the United
1412	States of America. I think sometimes my colleagues look at
1413	the in the energy context, and read it as the Untied
1414	States of America. But united is better.
1415	And I want to just emphasize that these rules do not
1416	mandate a single transmission line gets built, or provide any
1417	new authority to impose costs. I appreciate your assurance,
1418	Chairman Phillips, that the people who benefit from these
1419	investments will be the ones who pay for them. And so this
1420	talk about everybody paying for California's crazy
1421	experiments is not true. Cost allocation should take care of
1422	that. And if we want to be bold and maybe over exuberant,
1423	that is our cost to bear, and that is fair. But it simply
1424	ensures that region, states, and utilities take all relevant
1425	facts into account when planning ahead.
1426	There were some good reforms left on the cutting room
1427	floor. For example, FERC has never used its backstop
1428	authority for national energy transmission, which you updated
1429	in Order 1977, because it requires unnecessary and
1430	duplicative environmental reviews at FERC and DoE, and that
1431	takes legislation to fix. We should fix it.
1432	FERC also declined to start environmental reviews for

qualifying lines concurrent with state reviews. And there is 1433 no reason you should have to wait for a state to finish its 1434 review and deny the permit, or for a state to sit on an 1435 1436 application for a year. These and other inefficiencies add time and cost to proposed lines, on top of how hard it 1437 already is to permit large, linear infrastructure-like 1438 transmission and pipelines. Our Speed and Reliability Act 1439 would correct these inefficiencies and cut at least five 1440 1441 years from the existing siting and permitting process for high-impact transmission lines, and I am thrilled that it is 1442 now bipartisan, and I thank Representatives Garbarino and 1443 Curtis for supporting this common-sense policy. 1444 I was also excited to see the core components of this 1445 1446 bill and my BIG WIRES Act included in the bipartisan Senate permitting deal. Permitting reform is not dead. We got a 1447 great start from the Senate. We have got some work to do 1448 here to keep it bipartisan and to pass it through. 1449 would invite all members of the committee to support these 1450 1451 bills and join me in finding other ways to make permitting 1452 work smarter. Chairman Phillips, now that you have pushed out a strong 1453 rule on regional planning, I want to turn attention to the 1454

interregional transmission planning. The Fiscal 1455 1456 Responsibility Act directed NERC to complete a study on the benefits that interregional transmission would bring to 1457 1458 reliability. It is clear to me, however, that the benefits of interregional transmission and potential minimum transfer 1459 requirements have already been well documented. 1460 In your view, does the Commission need to wait for the 1461 results of that study to move forward on a potential 1462 1463 rulemaking on interregional transmission or minimum transfer 1464 requirements? *Mr. Phillips. No, and we are not waiting. I have 1465 directed our staff to continue with our proceeding. 1466 parallel, NERC will deliver their study at the end of the 1467 year. We will pick up the ball, carry it to the finish line. 1468 *Mr. Peters. Great. And existing interregional 1469 transmission planning, to say the least, is not living up to 1470 its full potential. It is clear the more we can do to ensure 1471 regions are working collaboratively to minimize -- maximize 1472 1473 reliability and minimize costs, particularly through finding a balance between new transmission, new generation, and 1474 innovation. 1475

1476

transfer requirements which would ensure that regions can 1477 transfer a certain amount of energy among each other reduce 1478 customer costs and improve reliability? 1479 1480 And how would that work? *Mr. Phillips. I completely agree with the benefits of 1481 interregional. It is the next step on our transmission 1482 reform journey. We are turning to that now, and I look 1483 forward to working with my colleagues to determine what is 1484 1485 the best course of action to address it. But it is 1486 critically important to the reliability of our system. *Mr. Peters. I want to just thank you, finally, for 1487 giving me the assurance about Order 1920 not providing new 1488 authority to allocate costs of transmission. We have been up 1489 1490 against this allegation that other states are going to pay for each other and without respect to benefit, and that is 1491 not the case. I appreciate your assurance on that, and hope 1492 we can use that information to move forward. 1493 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1494 1495 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you. 1496 *Mr. Duncan. Thanks, Mr. Peters. Now we are going to do one more Republican, and then we are going to recess. 1497 They have called votes on the floor. Chairman Griffith is 1498

recognized for five minutes. 1499 1500 *Mr. Griffith. All right, Commissioner Christie. February 18, 2000, you are giving me advice and counsel on 1501 1502 the floor of the Virginia House of Delegates. I have been taking your advice for more than a quarter of a century. 1503 Give me advice on the cost of allocation for electric 1504 transmission lines that was referenced in your previous 1505 comments and in Order 1920. 1506 1507 *Mr. Christie. First, you have never filed a malpractice claim, so I take that as the advice must have 1508 been --1509 *Mr. Griffith. I do note that we also both had a lot 1510 more hair. 1511 1512 *Mr. Christie. At least -- the advice was at least not actionable, and you are right about the hair. 1513 Let me address this thing about the cost allocation, 1514 because I have heard this repeatedly, the sound bytes about, 1515 well, no one is going to be forced to pay for somebody else's 1516 1517 -- state's policy. Clearly, Congressman Peters in California, that is not the case. I don't know who said 1518 that. California is in your own ISO and New York is in its 1519

own ISO. So it is -- the issue is not in the single-state

1520

No, no one is going to pay for California's policies 1521 1522 or New York's because you are in a single-state ISO. The problem is in the multi-state RTOs. And I spent 17 1523 1524 years as a Virginia regulator in PJM, and it absolutely will result in the socialization of public policy costs from one 1525 state to others. And here is how it will do that. 1526 First of all, Order 1000 said that you can cost allocate 1527 public policy projects separately from reliability projects. 1528 1529 This rule says no, you cannot. That is a major radical change from Order 1000. So it didn't build on Order 1000, it 1530 is a radical break from Order 1000. 1531 Now, that was important because then what the rule says 1532 is we are going to throw public policy projects into the same 1533 bucket with reliability projects, and then we are going to 1534 mandate one cost allocation formula for all those projects. 1535 Now the thing about the benefits and the sound byte that, 1536 well, no one is going to pay for the benefits they don't get, 1537 there is no transparency. 1538 1539 What the rule says is -- first it mandates -- and states have no ability to approve this or not approve it -- it 1540 mandates a list of factors that have to be used in the 1541 planning of the projects that get into the regional plan, 1542

where the money starts to flow. And among those factors that 1543 1544 are mandated are state mandatory renewable portfolio standards. So it is mandating state public policies be used 1545 1546 in the planning. On the other end of the process, it mandates benefits. 1547 And by mandating benefits -- and again, states have no 1548 ability to say yes or no, or we don't agree, or we -- with 1549 these mandated benefits. What the mandated benefits do is 1550 1551 there is a disconnect between the factors and the benefits which has -- which is going to have the inevitable result of 1552 spreading the costs of public policy projects, which are 1553 mandated at the front end in the planning factors, it is 1554 going to spread the costs across multiple states in the 1555 1556 multi-state regions. Again, it is not a problem in California, it is not a problem in New York. It is the 1557 problem in the multi-state regions like PJM. 1558 And my position was in the NOPR if you want to include 1559 public policy projects with reliability projects in the same 1560 1561 bucket, which Order 1000 did not require, then I think that the state's policy maker, the policy makers or regulators, 1562 ought to have the authority on the public policy part to say 1563 whether they agree with the cost allocation or not. Not to 1564

veto and not to say, "Dictate a cost allocation,'' but the 1565 1566 states ought to have the ability to say, okay, if we are going to throw these in one bucket, which Order 1000 did not 1567 1568 do, then the states have got to have the ability to say, "Is this good for our consumers?'' 1569 This whole thing is about really -- again, I get back to 1570 my original point. State regulators are the front line and 1571 the last line of defense for their consumers. 1572 1573 *Mr. Griffith. All right, and I get that, and you did a great job of explaining it, and I appreciate it. And let me 1574 break it into terms that I can understand. 1575 So when Dominion Power builds their plant in Saint Paul 1576 -- you are on State Corporation Commission, that plant was 1577 built in APCo territory, Appalachian Power territory, as 1578 opposed to Virginia Power territory -- the customers in Wise 1579 and Russell and in APCo territory in southwest Virginia 1580 didn't have to pay for Richmond to have power, did they? 1581 *Mr. Christie. No, they didn't because, as a customer 1582 1583 of Dominion, which I am and still am, we paid for the network upgrades to interconnect that plant. So -- but the cost 1584 stayed within Virginia. That is the important point. 1585 And in PJM, PJM has been doing a good job of planning 1586

```
reliability lines for the entire 17 years I was there.
1587
1588
      reliability lines are cost allocated according to a formula
      across all of PJM, and everybody pays in PJM, and no one
1589
1590
      really complains across the whole 13-state region about the
      cost allocation for the reliability projects because we are
1591
      getting benefits from those.
1592
           What this rule does -- and it is a fundamental break
1593
      from Order 1000 and the construct we had before -- is it says
1594
1595
      we are now going to make you pay for public policy projects
1596
      because we are going to hide them in this bucket with the
      reliability projects, and then we are going to mandate an ex-
1597
      ante -- what is called an ex-ante cost allocation, and
1598
1599
      whether the states agree or not. And the states can even
1600
      agree on a different formula, and the rule says the
      transmission provider can just ignore it. So I don't think
1601
      that is fair, quite frankly.
1602
           And again, if you separated out the public policy
1603
      projects, which is the way it has been done in PJM for the
1604
1605
      last decade -- let me say one more thing. PJM is a good
      example, okay?
1606
           *Mr. Griffith. You got -- time is up.
1607
           *Mr. Christie. Okay, well --
1608
```

*Mr. Griffith. Hopefully, somebody else will give you 1609 another chance. I appreciate your wise counsel, as always. 1610 And I yield back. 1611 1612 *Mr. Christie. Okay. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. 1613 We are now going to stand in recess until probably 1614 around 11:15, but it will be within 10 minutes of the last 1615 vote being called. So the committee will stand in recess. 1616 1617 [Recess.] *Mr. Duncan. All right, I am going to call the 1618 subcommittee back to order. I appreciate your patience on 1619 the vote series there. 1620 And we will now recognize the gentlelady from Texas, 1621 Mrs. Fletcher, for five minutes. 1622 *Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Chairman Duncan, and thanks 1623 to you and Ranking Member DeGette for organizing today's 1624 hearing. Thank you to Chairman Phillips and all of the 1625 commissioners for being here today and taking the time to 1626 1627 testify. FERC is at its best when it has a full complement of 1628 five commissioners, and I am glad that we have a full 1629

Commission before us today. FERC's work is vital to ensuring

1630

that every American has access to reliable and affordable 1631 1632 energy through the projects it authorizes. And its work is particularly important to the people 1633 1634 that I represent in Houston, which, as we all know, is the energy capital of the world. I have heard from many of them 1635 that -- many times over the last year, in particular -- items 1636 on FERC's docket have taken longer to be processed than in 1637 the past. And I am sure that you know that companies rely on 1638 1639 their expected timelines when negotiating with their customers, and that the uncertainty around permitting, which 1640 has a lot of layers and a lot of challenges, but --1641 uncertainties in the permitting and tariff approval process 1642 can otherwise create issues delivering reliable and 1643 1644 affordable energy to consumers. So it is with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, that I would 1645 like to direct a few questions to you first. First of all, 1646 in your view, does FERC have the necessary budgetary 1647 resources to meet expected timelines in processing matters on 1648 1649 its docket? *Mr. Phillips. Thank you for the question. 1650 Yes, I do believe that we have the resources that we 1651 need. We have outstanding staff. I think we have the best 1652

staff in all of government -- present company excluded, of 1653 1654 course. And to be clear, we do know that we have industry that poach our staff because they are so good. So to the 1655 1656 extent that Congress can provide resources so that we could have salaries that are, you know, equal to those of industry, 1657 that would be very welcome. 1658 *Mrs. Fletcher. Well, Mr. Chairman, you anticipated my 1659 second question that I was going to ask you about whether you 1660 1661 needed additional hiring authority for certain positions, as well as whether you needed additional funding to have 1662 competitive salary commensurate with private industry, 1663 because I know it is hard to attract and retain the talented 1664 1665 technical staff that you need to get the sufficient amount of 1666 expertise. So in addition to funding for salaries, is there 1667 anything else that you might need us to be -- other 1668 authorities that you might need us to provide? 1669 *Mr. Phillips. We are ready, willing, and able to 1670 1671 implement -- and I defer to Congress when it comes to, you know, any changes to our statutory authority. What I ask is 1672 this, is that to the extent that you ask us to do something 1673 new, to be clear. Because we know that FERC is one of the 1674

most litigated agencies in all of government, and I think 1675 that is critically important. 1676 *Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Well, thank you so much, Mr. 1677 1678 I want to turn quickly to a question about the recently-released Equity Action Plan to address environmental 1679 justice concerns in the pipeline certification and siting 1680 1681 process. In my view, increased community involvement and 1682 1683 engagement early in the process, and a directed outreach program is going to provide a greater opportunity for 1684 community input into the permitting and siting process, and 1685 really make it possible to lay a solid foundation for future 1686 decisions and allow projects to move forward. Mr. Chairman, 1687 1688 can you tell us when FERC plans to publish the external quidance for the EAP infrastructure proceedings? 1689 *Mr. Phillips. So environmental justice -- I issued 1690 three top priorities when I first was named chairman, and 1691 environmental justice was one of them. I am extremely proud 1692 1693 of the record that we have had. You know, we have had the first-ever roundtable. We established a working group within 1694 our OGC focused on environmental justice. We selected a new 1695 environmental justice senior counsel, and we continue to do 1696

We are working on outward-facing public guidance on 1697 work. environmental justice, and I expect to issue that in the very 1698 near future. 1699 1700 *Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Well, thank you for that. I think we are all looking forward to seeing that, and I do 1701 think it is important to engage communities, and I think that 1702 there is a great opportunity to help bring people together 1703 early in the process and be able to move projects that are 1704 1705 critical forward. 1706 And, you know, before I yield back my time I want to say something about this and some of the things we have talked 1707 about this morning, because in Texas we are no strangers to 1708 the reliability challenges that each of you have talked about 1709 1710 this morning and that you addressed in your testimony, especially as the result of extreme weather events. 1711 And I appreciate your acknowledgment of Winter Storm 1712 Uri, Chairman Phillips and also Commissioner Christie, as 1713 well as your, I think, very clear explanation of the supply 1714 1715 and demand challenges that are in front of us, and some of the drivers of those challenges. And I don't say this 1716 lightly, but I do want everyone here to remember that, as we 1717 do this work, during Winter Storm Uri in Texas, less than an 1718

hour from where I live, Americans froze to death inside their 1719 own homes when the power went out. The things that we are 1720 talking about here are issues of life and death, and they are 1721 1722 critically important. So I thank you for your work. And, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your work on this 1723 committee. It is really important that we get this right and 1724 that we work together to get it done. Thank you. 1725 *Mr. Duncan. Agreed. Thank you so much. I will now go 1726 1727 to Mr. Walberg from Michigan. *Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks the 1728 panel for being here. It is great to have all the 1729 commissioners in front of us, and a full group. 1730 The Environmental Protection Agency's finalized 1731 1732 greenhouse gas emissions standards on fossil fuel generators require existing coal-fired power plants planning to operate 1733 past 2039 and new or substantially modified natural gas 1734 plants that generate at least 40 percent of their maximum 1735 annual capacity to capture 90 percent of their carbon dioxide 1736 1737 emissions by 2032. This requirement will impose billions of dollars of requirements on generators and other entities to 1738 construct carbon capture systems, build out CO2 pipelines, 1739 and permit sequestration sites. 1740

Companies will not pursue these technologies, I believe, 1741 1742 if they are a cost that cannot be recovered. And so, Commissioners Rosner, Chang, and See, in your opinions, will 1743 1744 the costs of carbon capture facilities and associated infrastructure borne -- and associated infrastructure be 1745 1746 borne by taxpayers? *Mr. Rosner. Thank you for the question, and here is 1747 where I will start. 1748 1749 There is strength in diversity, and we saw that in the last couple of winters where we had winter storms, where if 1750 we didn't have all the resources on the system running we 1751 would have had greater problems than we had. So I am an all-1752 of-the-above person. I think it is essential. 1753 1754 To your question about the specific cost of those facilities, that is something that I would have to get back 1755 to you. But as a general matter, I think we need them all. 1756 Thank you. 1757 *Mr. Walberg. Commissioner See, will it be borne by 1758 1759 taxpavers, the cost? *Ms. See. I agree, these are also very important issues 1760 when we are looking at both what it takes to power the nation 1761

today and looking at promising technology in the future.

1762

```
I think we look at these rules in particular, there is a
1763
      lot of areas of potential concern when we see the
1764
      consequences that they may have, and we are looking at the
1765
1766
      whole regulatory landscape on the existing power sources that
                This is an important issue, one that I am committed
1767
      to looking at closely to the extent that it affects FERC's
1768
1769
      jurisdiction, and working closely with my colleagues on.
           *Mr. Walberg. Commissioner Chang, will the cost be
1770
1771
      borne by ratepayers?
           *Ms. Chang. Yes, thank you for your question.
1772
      a great concern regarding both the cost and the reliability
1773
      of the system, and I am beginning to look into the potential
1774
      implications of some of the rules that you had just
1775
1776
      mentioned. And I look forward to having an opportunity to
      work with my colleagues to really dive in to understand the
1777
      near-term and longer-term implications. Thank you.
1778
           *Mr. Walberg. I thought it was a simple question.
1779
           As a follow-up, many existing generators will likely
1780
1781
      close their operations because of the EPA's rule.
      generation sources are unlikely to be in the footprint of
1782
      existing generators. As new members of the Commission, do
1783
      you believe it is just reasonable and not unduly
1784
```

discriminatory or preferential for ratepayers to bear the 1785 1786 transmission rates that will be required because of this forced generation shift? I strongly believe -- Commissioner 1787 1788 Rosner? *Mr. Rosner. Well, thank you for the question, sir, and 1789 here is what I think. 1790 I think that, you know, I am a yes-and. I think we need 1791 everything we have today. That is guite clear. And I think 1792 1793 we need some new things. And I think when we build new things, we need to make sure that we are building the least-1794 cost set of resources, and that we are compensating those 1795 resources in response to the services that they actually 1796 1797 provide. Thank you. 1798 *Ms. See. In my role as a new commissioner I am looking very closely at costs when it comes to the Commission's 1799 authority for just and reasonable rates. I think those are -1800 - these are important factors to take into account. 1801 I certainly have respect for other agencies and their 1802 1803 responsibilities, but as an energy regulator I think it is important to look at consequences for reliability and 1804 otherwise for some of these rules that you are talking about. 1805 And that is something that I think is important for us, as 1806

commissioners, to continue to look closely at for all of the 1807 reasons you mentioned and others. 1808 *Mr. Walberg. Ms. Chang? 1809 1810 *Ms. Chang. Thank you for the question. I take the economics of these energy systems, including 1811 generation and transmission, very seriously. Historically, 1812 we have built in this country generation and then 1813 transmission to bring the power from generation to very near-1814 1815 by load centers. And as the resources shift, we -- FERC and, really, the industry -- need to look at the -- essentially, 1816 the platform and the network that is needed to support the 1817 generation that we need not just today, but into the future. 1818 Thank you. 1819 1820 *Mr. Walberg. Well, I agree with all of that, but I 1821 think there is an answer that was missing here for 1822 ratepayers. And I have another question for Commissioner Christie, 1823 but I will submit that in concern about the idea of a shell 1824 1825 game that is going on. So Mr. Chairman, I yield back and I will submit that question later. 1826 [The information follows:] 1827 1828

The gentleman yields back. I will now go 1831 *Mr. Duncan. 1832 to Mr. Tonko for five minutes. *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Chair Duncan. 1833 1834 It is wonderful to see a full complement at FERC, and I congratulate and welcome the newly sworn-in commissioners. 1835 So thank you for your service. I would also like to 1836 recognize and thank Chair Phillips for his leadership on 1837 Order 1920. It is much appreciated. 1838 1839 Having better, longer-term planning of our transmission system at a time of tremendous change and evolving risks to 1840 our electric infrastructure is common sense. It should not 1841 surprise anyone that groups from across the political 1842 spectrum have praised this order, including Republican former 1843 1844 Chair Chatterjee. This is a reasonable approach, I believe, that will undoubtedly result in a more reliable and 1845 affordable electricity system. So again, I thank you, Chair 1846 Phillips. 1847 We know there are many different tools to improve the 1848 1849 reliability and affordability of our grid, including getting better performance out of our existing infrastructure through 1850 the adoption of cost-effective grid-enhancing technologies 1851 and advanced reconductoring. So Mr. Chair, why was it 1852

important that Order 1920 requires grid planners to consider 1853 1854 these types of alternatives to new transmission? *Mr. Phillips. Thank you so much for the question. 1855 1856 We require in Order No. 1920 that grid planners consider grid-enhancing technologies, and this is why it is so 1857 important. It is because we know that we can't just build 1858 our way to where we need to go, so it is going to provide 1859 more reliability sooner, and lower costs for customers. 1860 1861 Because when you talk about things like advanced reconstructing, actually replacing the lines, the wires 1862 within an existing transmission facility, you can save up to 1863 60 percent of efficiency and just as much when it comes to 1864 cost. It is critically important. 1865 1866 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you. These technologies are continuing to improve, as we all know. New innovations are 1867 becoming commercially available, and I would encourage the 1868 Commission and grid planners to continue to update their 1869 understanding of these technologies so that the most 1870 1871 beneficial, cost-effective options are properly considered. I also want to ask about FERC's workforce. Yesterday we 1872 had a hearing with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the 1873 NRC acknowledged that a significant portion of its workforce 1874

is eligible for retirement. And I know that you had answered 1875 some of the questions of my colleague, Congresswoman 1876 Fletcher, but, Chair Phillips, we know that FERC is 1877 1878 consistently rated as a top place to work in the Federal Government. But does FERC also have the same retirement 1879 1880 risks? And can you give us a sense of the long-term plan to 1881 maintain that robust workforce that we require? 1882 1883 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you. We have an outstanding workforce, as I said. We are consistently rated as one of 1884 the best places to work in government. I believe we have a 1885 great culture at FERC. We do have a lot of our senior 1886 leaders that are at or near retirement. And even beyond 1887 that, I get emails every week, every other week of someone 1888 who is critical to our mission who has been -- taken a job 1889 somewhere else. This is something that we need to continue 1890 to focus on. 1891 *Mr. Tonko. Well, it is an arena that is under 1892 1893 transformation, so it makes it even more exciting and compelling to establish a work career there. 1894 In recent years at NRC there have been major efforts 1895 supported by broader hiring authorities to reduce the 1896

percentage of employees eligible for retirement by recruiting 1897 that next generation of NRC staff. Now, I know that in the 1898 exchange with Congresswoman Fletcher you talked about making 1899 1900 it -- responded to the ease by which you can recruit that staff. But what about competitive compensation? 1901 When we look at some of these issues, obviously, we want 1902 the best that we can get at a time of, again, transformation 1903 and perhaps more reliance on FERC as an authority. But what 1904 1905 about that competitive compensation? *Mr. Phillips. It is a huge issue that we have. 1906 know that our staff is recognized as the best. There are 1907 companies out there that are constantly looking to approach 1908 them, to bring them inside their organizations, and they are 1909 1910 willing to pay them more than we could ever pay. And a lot of the staff at FERC, they don't do it for the pay. Let me 1911 be honest. They do it because they want to support the 1912 mission. But to be clear, it helps us to retain the staff we 1913 need if we can pay them competitively. 1914 1915 *Mr. Tonko. Well, I do not believe it matters whether you care about transmission, electricity markets, hydropower, 1916 or pipelines; we should all want FERC as an entity to have 1917 the personnel necessary to carry out its responsibilities. 1918

- We are in a critical stage of energy innovation. So if there
 are barriers for FERC to hire and adequately compensate
 scientific, and technical, and engineering, legal, and other
 specialized roles, we should try to address them as has been
- 1923 done with NRC.
- 1924 And so I look -- stand ready to assist in that effort.
- 1925 And with that I thank you all.
- 1926 And Mr. Chair, I yield back.
- *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go
 to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Weber, for five minutes.
- 1929 *Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 1930 And Chairman Phillips, as you probably know, I represent
- 1931 a significant portion of the LNG export industry with
- 1932 Freeport LNG. We have seven ports -- the upper Gulf coast of
- 1933 Texas, one-third of the Gulf Coast. Freeport LNG, Golden
- 1934 Pass, Port Arthur LNG, as well as many employees of Cheniere
- 1935 Energy over in Louisiana, that other foreign country, which
- 1936 is just across the Sabine Neches.
- 1937 However, we are concerned about FERC's overlapping,
- 1938 duplicative, and sometimes conflicting requirements with
- 1939 other agencies. I hear from our LNG people and our energy
- 1940 people all the time, and it is extremely important. For

example, FERC appears to be asking operators to implement 1941 1942 additional emergency response measures along the waterway that go way beyond what is actually required -- now, we are 1943 1944 talking about waterway, we are talking about exporting LNG out from the Gulf Coast -- that is actually required by the 1945 Coast Guard. And they do a jam-up job of actually making 1946 sure that we export LNG safely, cleanly, responsibly. 1947 So FERC also requires semi-annual operations reports, 1948 1949 which ask for exactly -- much of it is the same information in PHMSA's required annual operations report. Earlier this 1950 year I authorized -- I authored a bipartisan bill requiring 1951 FERC, PHMSA, and the Coast Guard to produce additional 1952 memorandums of understanding -- let's get this tied together 1953 -- seeking to mitigate regulatory overlap and duplication so 1954 that there is not quite so much paperwork involved. I don't 1955 know if you are aware of that. 1956 So my question is, how is FERC coordinating with other -1957 - those other agencies to reduce that regulatory overlap? 1958 1959 And would you support that proposal, my proposal for FERC, PHMSA, and Coast Guard to produce additional 1960 interagency agreements to address duplicative and conflicting 1961 agency requirements? 1962

Does that sound like it could save some man hours, some 1963 1964 effort, and some money? *Mr. Phillips. I will say this: We have been focused 1965 1966 at FERC on bringing down the timelines to actually permit infrastructure that we know we need. 1967 When it comes to working with our sister agencies, this 1968 is something that we do on a staff level all the time. Are 1969 there opportunities for improvement? Absolutely. I haven't 1970 1971 had a chance to review the legislation that you are talking about, but I would be able to provide technical assistance 1972 and I will make my staff available to you, sir. 1973 *Mr. Weber. Well, we want you to do more than just look 1974 into it. We want you to, of course, act because it is 1975 1976 important. And so I appreciate your response there. I would go to all the rest of the commissioners here 1977 with my second question. Despite the Biden Administration's 1978 acknowledgment of the importance of natural gas in supporting 1979 global energy security, DoE announced a ban on LNG exports. 1980 1981 You all are aware of that. This pause impacts United States energy's infrastructure development, especially in my 1982 district along the Gulf Coast, where we produce 65 percent of 1983 the nation's jet fuel, 80 percent of the nation's military 1984

```
grade fuel, and 3 LNG plants. We have actually got Port
1985
1986
      Arthur LNG, which is on the drawing board, if you will. They
      have phase one, now they want to go phase two also, and they
1987
1988
      have a big, red flag, a stop sign. So what we are -- earlier
      this month a Federal court in Louisiana granted a request, as
1989
      you all probably know, from 16 states to stay DoE's ban,
1990
      effective immediately.
1991
           A simple yes-or-no question, and I will -- actually, I
1992
1993
      will start down here with Commissioner Chang: Does the U.S.
      have a fundamental interest to advance needed infrastructure
1994
      to match our country's abundant natural gas supply with
1995
      international demand? It is a yes or no.
1996
                        Thank you for that question. I do think
1997
           *Ms. Chang.
1998
      the U.S. has a critical role to play in international and
      global energy issues, including the --
1999
           *Mr. Weber. So, yes, the U.S. has a --
2000
           *Ms. Chang. -- export of LNG --
2001
           *Mr. Weber. -- fundamental interest.
2002
           Commissioner See?
2003
           *Ms. See. Yes, matching infrastructure with demand is
2004
      important.
2005
           *Mr. Weber. Okay.
2006
```

*Mr. Rosner. Yes. 2007 2008 *Mr. Weber. And we don't want to be the minority down 2009 here. 2010 Commissioner Christie? *Mr. Christie. Yes. And if I could add something to 2011 your earlier question, this chairman has done a great job on 2012 handling section 3 and section 7 applications under the 2013 Natural Gas Act. He has shown tremendous leadership. 2014 2015 *Mr. Weber. Don't tell him that, he is going to want a 2016 raise. [Laughter.] 2017 *Mr. Christie. Well, that is up to you all. 2018 2019 *Mr. Weber. Yes, yes. 2020 *Mr. Christie. For the rest of us, too, by the way. *Mr. Weber. So --2021 *Mr. Christie. But he has done an absolutely fantastic 2022 job in moving these applications --2023 *Mr. Weber. We are running out of time, I have got to 2024 get to him. 2025 *Mr. Christie. Okay. 2026 *Mr. Phillips. First of all, I want to thank my friend, 2027 Commissioner Christie, for what he said. 2028

And the answer to your question is yes. 2029 2030 *Mr. Weber. Thank you. Yes or no, do domestic LNG facilities bolster international energy supply that is 2031 2032 competitive, accessible, and environmentally friendly? I am down to seven minutes. I think you all would 2033 2034 agree. And my last one is, does U.S. LNG export capacity afford 2035 our nation a competitive advantage? I think so. 2036 2037 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. And I now go 2038 to Ms. Kuster for five minutes. 2039 *Ms. Kuster. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to 2040 2041 dive right in. 2042 We all know that hydropower and pumped storage are critical to our clean energy future. And I want to ask a few 2043 questions that I asked Secretary Granholm when she came 2044 before this committee in May. 2045 First, do you agree -- and this -- we will just go right 2046 2047 down the line -- that hydropower is a key part of our clean 2048 energy system? *Mr. Phillips. Yes, absolutely. 2049

*Mr. Christie. Yes.

2050

```
*Mr. Rosner. Yes.
2051
2052
           *Ms. See. Yes.
           *Ms. Chang. Yes, absolutely.
2053
2054
           *Ms. Kuster. Great, thank you. Should Congress work to
      ensure that the relicensing process is not driving reliable,
2055
      dispatchable, clean energy projects offline?
2056
2057
           *Mr. Phillips. Yes.
           *Mr. Christie. Yes.
2058
           *Mr. Rosner. Yes.
2059
           *Ms. See. Yes.
2060
           *Ms. Chang. Yes.
2061
                          Thank you very much. And do you think it
2062
           *Ms. Kuster.
      is prudent for Congress to empower FERC to work with agencies
2063
      and stakeholders in the relicensing process to resolve
2064
      inconsistent or conflicting licensing terms?
2065
            *Mr. Phillips. Yes.
2066
           *Mr. Christie. Yes.
2067
           *Mr. Rosner. Yes.
2068
2069
           *Ms. See. Yes.
           *Ms. Chang. Yes.
2070
           *Ms. Kuster. Thank you very much.
2071
           All right, Commissioner Christie, this next question is
2072
```

for you. In the Western Navajo Pumped Storage 1 and 2 order, 2073 2074 FERC denied an application for a preliminary project for two new pumped storage facilities that had not adequately 2075 2076 consulted with the tribe on whose reservation the projects would be sited. Should Congress do more to ensure that 2077 tribal consent in the FERC hydropower licensing process? 2078 *Mr. Christie. I think that is for the chairman. 2079 *Ms. Kuster. That is for you. 2080 2081 *Mr. Phillips. Sorry. *Ms. Kuster. No worries. 2082 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you so much. We take very serious 2083 our trust responsibility when it comes to our tribal nations. 2084 What we did when we issued that rejection for the preliminary 2085 2086 permit is consistent with what we have done with other Federal land managers for over a decade. This doesn't close 2087 the door. We can still have our applicants come back with a 2088 full application. 2089 And to be clear, I don't think this is going to slow 2090 2091 down the process at all. But we have to do more when it comes to our relationship with our tribal nations. 2092 *Ms. Kuster. Great, thank you. 2093

Commissioner See, do you agree with Commissioner

2094

Christie, Congress should do more to ensure tribal consent in 2095 2096 the hydropower licensing process? *Ms. See. I think the tribe's voice is critical in 2097 2098 these processes. I think it is very important to receive that input, and that is something that is very important to 2099 me as I am getting up to speed and learning this new 2100 I certainly welcome any additional clarification 2101 or direction from Congress, and would be committed to working 2102 2103 to implement that, as well. 2104 *Ms. Kuster. Great. Thank you so much. Moving on, in New England there are many small, 100-2105 plus-year-old hydropower facilities that may have outlived 2106 their useful life. It may be more economical for those asset 2107 2108 owners to surrender their licenses than operate the facilities that are potentially hazardous to the community 2109 and no longer profitable. Should FERC consider ways to make 2110 it easier for obsolete facilities to make end-of-life 2111 2112 decisions? 2113 *Mr. Phillips. Yes, absolutely. When we know that we have a decreasing number of these requests regarding small 2114 hydro, they are critically important but we should find ways 2115 to streamline our processes for these facilities. 2116

*Ms. Kuster. Great. Thank you very much. It is clear 2117 that Congress and the Administration agree on many issues, 2118 and I look forward to working with FERC and my colleagues on 2119 2120 this committee to get a bipartisan hydropower licensing reform bill signed into law. That is something that has been 2121 a priority for me. 2122 Last, I want to mention one of our hydropower producers 2123 in New England -- this is called Great River Hydro -- is 2124 2125 working with you on certification of incremental hydropower generation for production tax credits. I know our staffs 2126 have been in touch on the issue, and I look forward to 2127 working with you and Great River Hydro to ensure that we are 2128 2129 able to continue to grow our renewable energy portfolio in 2130 New England. 2131 All right, one minute. I would like to talk a little bit about the Natural Gas Act. While the Federal Power Act 2132 allows FERC to order refunds when it determines utilities are 2133 overcharging for electricity, the Natural Gas Act does not 2134 2135 allow the same refunds when companies are caught overcharging for natural gas, meaning large, interstate pipelines can 2136 over-recover billions of dollars in excessive rates that 2137 should be flowing back to everyday Americans. We are very 2138

focused on lowering costs for everyday Americans. 2139 2140 Chairman Phillips, does this lack of refund authority impact the energy rates that Americans pay? 2141 2142 And if Congress granted FERC the authority to issue refunds, would FERC exercise this authority to protect 2143 consumers and keep prices just and reasonable? 2144 *Mr. Phillips. Affordability is a top priority. It is 2145 always top of mind. I have a personal relationship growing 2146 2147 up -- we call -- before "energy poverty'' was a term. To be clear, we defer to Congress in their judgment on 2148 what to do with regard to refunds. I think accountability is 2149 important. If Congress gives us that authority, we will 2150 faithfully execute it. 2151 2152 *Ms. Kuster. Great, thank you. And I will just close by saying I am proud that in this Congress Senators Hyde-2153 Smith and Blumenthal are leading a charge to solve the 2154 problem. And I am very supportive of the Making Pipelines 2155 Accountable to Consumers and Taxpayers Act. Both the 2156 2157 Industrial Energy Consumers of America and the American Public Gas Association have written to the committee using it 2158 to fix this issue, and I will insert their letters in the 2159 record. 2160

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2161 2162 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I will now go to Utah's Mr. Curtis for five minutes. 2163 2164 *Mr. Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. FERC's stated mission is to assist consumers in 2165 obtaining reliable, safe, secure, and economically efficient 2166 energy at a reasonable cost. That is awesome. I would like 2167 to simplify that a little bit to we need affordable, 2168 2169 reliable, clean energy. And I think the market is actually driving that, in my opinion, actually quicker than government 2170 is, and those three things will be paramount as we move 2171 forward. 2172 To get there we all know we need to innovate. We need 2173 2174 to find abundant, affordable, reliable, clean energy sources. And this is becoming increasingly challenging. In Utah we 2175 have a data center, AI data center that wants to come in, and 2176 they are asking for 1.5 gigawatts of energy 24/7, with 2177 backup. And my local utility likes to remind them it took 2178 2179 them a 100 years to get 1 gigawatt for Wyoming. And these are the challenges, right, that we face and that we are 2180 looking for. And I think it is important that we are clear. 2181 Like, we don't want to hamper this growth, and we want to 2182

```
figure out how to do that. And we need more energy.
2183
2184
           One of the ways that has been suggested to do this is
      collocating facilities. And I think more and more I hear
2185
      people talking about, you know, a small nuclear reactor next
2186
      to a data center. And Commissioner Christie, I would like to
2187
      ask you about particularly -- there are differences in
2188
      collocating. Some could work and some couldn't. I don't
2189
      know if you have read an article by Michael Kormos that I
2190
2191
      would like to submit for the record on the topic. Do you
      have any thoughts on this, when it is good, when it is bad,
2192
      and how we can make this work?
2193
           *Mr. Christie. I do have thoughts, Congressman, but we
2194
2195
      have a pending case that is a really big case, and it is
2196
      pending right now. And so to give you my thoughts, I am
      afraid somebody would accuse me of pre-judging it. But it is
2197
      a -- that is a humongous issue --
2198
           *Mr. Curtis. Yes.
2199
           *Mr. Christie. -- the issue of collocation, and --
2200
2201
           *Mr. Curtis. I am at a loss because I have never had a
2202
      witness give as good a reason not to answer my question as
      you just gave me.
2203
           [Laughter.]
2204
```

*Mr. Christie. I am afraid I have to, because that case 2205 is a huge case that comes out of PJM, and it is just -- it is 2206 one we are going to have to act on. And there is no way I 2207 2208 can even talk generically about the issue of collocation 2209 without --*Mr. Curtis. All right. I would love to just put down 2210 a marker this is a conversation we need to have, right? And 2211 2212 2213 *Mr. Christie. I agree with you on that. *Mr. Curtis. And hopefully, we can do that forward and 2214 find answers to some of these difficult questions. 2215 And Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit that Kormos 2216 report for the record. 2217 2218 Well, in the little bit of time I have I want to talk about -- we get it. Permitting for new transmission is just 2219 incredibly difficult and slow. So that puts an added 2220 emphasis on making our current transmission more productive, 2221 2222 more efficient. And there is technology such as advanced 2223 conductors that can double capacity. I am curious if anybody 2224 would like to comment on that or what we are doing, FERC is doing, to try to -- Chairman, you are ready to jump in on 2225 that. I would love to have your comments on that. 2226

*Mr. Phillips. I love to talk about grid-enhancing 2227 technology, sir. 2228 Both in our Order No. 2023, which is our interconnection 2229 2230 queue reform order, as well as Order No. 1920, we require our transmission providers to consider grid-enhancing 2231 technologies like advanced reconductoring, both in the 2232 interconnection process and in the planning phase for new 2233 transmission. We know that we can't build our way to where 2234 2235 we need to go. We have to get as much as we can out of the 2236 existing system. *Mr. Curtis. That is very good. 2237 Yes, Commissioner Christie. 2238 *Mr. Christie. I would just say, Congressman, grid-2239 2240 enhancing technology, speaking generically, have tremendous potential. What I have been told by engineers in the field 2241 is there are -- and, of course, there is a whole array of 2242 what are now called GETs, that is their acronym, so you can't 2243 even really talk about it too generically -- but what 2244 2245 engineers have told me is there are times they work and times they don't; there are places they work and places they don't. 2246 And so what is important is, when you deploy GETs -- and 2247 again, you are going to charge consumers for the cost. 2248

number one, both from a consumer cost standpoint and from a 2249 2250 reliability standpoint, we have to make sure that the deployment at the times and the places are driven by 2251 2252 engineering decisions so that we are using them where and 2253 when they work, and you are not sticking consumers with the cost just to, you know, to buy something that may not work a 2254 large part of the time. So it is a decision that needs to be 2255 driven by engineers. 2256 2257 *Mr. Curtis. So I think that is fair. I would also like to point out thank you for not just assuming because 2258 they don't work in some instances that we shouldn't allow 2259 them. And I would love the ingenuity and the incentive being 2260 on let's find answers, let's get to a yes, if that makes 2261 2262 sense. So thank you very much. I yield my time, Chairman. 2263 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 2264 to Dr. Schrier for five minutes. 2265 *Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2266 2267 commissioners, for being here today, and a special welcome to our three new commissioners. 2268 In May the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference 2269

Committee released its annual 10-year forecast for the

2270

region, which anticipates a massive surge in demand that 2271 outpaces even previous projections, as we have heard from 2272 several of my colleagues today. Much of this is attributed 2273 2274 to high-tech manufacturing growth, data center expansion, and the trend toward electrification, which is especially quick 2275 in Washington State. Other regional power planners in the 2276 public sector have seen this similar trend. And if we are 2277 going to meet the energy needs for decades to come, we need 2278 2279 to build out transmission for new generation to come online and make the existing grid more flexible and make it easier 2280 for surplus energy in one area to be transferred to areas 2281 with the highest demand at any given time. The FERC 2282 Commission rule in discussion today provides a fantastic 2283 2284 framework for each region to make that happen. 2285 Chair Phillips, as you know, transmission planning in the Pacific Northwest is a pretty unique effort taken up by 2286 many different entities and stakeholders, including public 2287 utility districts and privately-owned utilities, and then 2288 2289 unusual and giant Federal agencies like the Bonneville Power Administration. So only some of these entities are actually 2290 FERC-regulated, which has implications for the transmission 2291 rule and other FERC orders. 2292

```
So my question is, how are you balancing your approach
2293
2294
      to ensure that both areas under your jurisdiction and non-
      jurisdictional entities can coordinate efficiently,
2295
2296
      especially in Washington State, where these two states could
2297
      be right side by side and need to interconnect themselves?
           *Mr. Phillips. So when it comes to our non-FERC
2298
2299
      jurisdictional utilities across the country, we meet with
             I meet with their leadership as often as I can. I
2300
2301
      have met with the leadership of Bonneville. We talk to them.
2302
      We know they are facing the same issues that other utilities
      are around the country.
2303
           We also have time. When you think about Order No. 1920,
2304
2305
      there is a state consultation period that is required by
2306
      transmission providers. States can save and allow time to
      actually engage with folks like Bonneville, as well, when it
2307
      comes to how we are going to select and how we are going to
2308
      pay for the transmission we need.
2309
           *Ms. Schrier. So this is good to hear, because I just
2310
2311
      want to make sure that every consumer, ratepayer in
      Washington State and beyond has the benefits of having this
2312
      interconnection.
2313
```

Now, on a related topic, earlier my colleague,

2314

Representative Peters, has already discussed how important 2315 progress on interregional transmission is. And as, 2316 Commissioner Chang, you noted, with extremely and 2317 2318 increasingly common extreme weather events that cause frequent outages, we are going to require this flexible grid 2319 that can transfer adequate power from other areas quickly. 2320 One way to increase that capacity between different 2321 regions is to connect transmission between regions, 2322 2323 particularly by building out the interties between the northwest and the southwest, and the eastern and western. 2324 we focus a lot on the eastern and western. I was wondering 2325 if you could comment about maybe what FERC could do to 2326 encourage northwest and southwest. 2327 2328 *Mr. Phillips. Is this question for me? I am so sorry. *Ms. Schrier. It is a question for you, unless you feel 2329 like somebody else is more capable of --2330 *Mr. Phillips. No, no --2331 *Ms. Schrier. -- or in that lane. 2332 2333 *Mr. Phillips. No, I am glad -- you know, it is really what is at the heart of what we have done with Order No. 2334 1920. 2335

resources that we know need to be connected to where the 2337 people are, and this is why we are planning for the long 2338 term, so that we can identify the best and the most cost-2339 2340 effective solutions to address the transmission needs up and down the scale. 2341 Thank you. I look forward to more 2342 *Ms. Schrier. emphasis on connecting these regions and the ability to 2343 really have that flexibility, you know, at the drop of a hat, 2344 2345 to be able to get energy where it is needed, when it is 2346 needed. Thank you. I yield back. 2347 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. I now will go 2348 to Mr. Allen for five minutes. 2349 2350 *Mr. Allen. Thank you, Chair Duncan, for holding this hearing with the Federal Regulatory Commission. I want to 2351 thank the commissioners for being here today. 2352 Obviously, we are talking about ensuring a reliable and 2353 affordable energy. It is critical, and I am glad to have 2354 2355 this opportunity to discuss how this impacts my home state of Georgia. My district is home to Plant Vogtle, which I quess 2356 this committee is going to get tired of me talking about, but 2357 we are very proud of the fact that we have just completed the 2358

first new nuclear power plants built in over 30 years in the 2359 2360 United States. Units 3 and 4 are now in commercial operation, bringing reliable, affordable power to Georgians 2361 2362 for decades to come. Commissioner Christie, last year we discussed the 2363 positive and negatives of vertically integrated markets, 2364 Regional Transmission Organizations, and Independent System 2365 Operators. One benefit of a vertical integrated --2366 2367 vertically integrated structure is that if the public -- the state public service commission values reliability, then 2368 utilities must adhere to the priority placed on reliability. 2369 I am concerned that EPA's suite of regulations such as 2370 the Clean Power Plan 2.0, Revised Particulate Matter 2371 2372 Standard, Interstate Transport Rule for Ozone, Coal Ash regulations and others will result in reliable sources of 2373 energy being pushed off the grid. Should public service 2374 commissions that highly valuable -- value reliable services 2375 of energy and vertically integrated markets be concerned 2376 2377 about forced retirements and the ability of utilities to provide firm generation? 2378 *Mr. Christie. They should, and they are. 2379 talked to a lot of regulators in your region, and they are 2380

extremely concerned about the cost of the EPA power plant 2381 rule on the generating resources that they need to keep the 2382 lights on in Georgia and your neighboring states in the 2383 2384 South. You know, you are primarily IRP, vertically integrated 2385 You are not in an RTO. What that means is a lot of 2386 those generating units that you depend on, especially coal, 2387 gas, and nuclear, are in what is called rate base, and your 2388 2389 consumers are paying the cost of those units. And so if EPA 2390 comes out with a rule that -- it puts state regulators, really -- it gives them a Hobson's choice: You can approve a 2391 huge compliance cost for needed generation, and it is going 2392 to be passed through dollar for dollar plus what we call an 2393 2394 ROE, a profit to your consumers, or the regulators have to say, well, we can't pass these humongous costs onto 2395 consumers, so we are going to have to say no to the cost 2396 recovery, and then they are going to shut the generating unit 2397 down. 2398 2399 And another, you have a lot of southern co-op members. You have a lot of electric co-ops serving the rural South. 2400 Co-ops, of course, are not owned by stockholders. Co-ops are 2401 owned by the very members who are both consumers and members. 2402

And the National Electric Co-op Association for -- the Rural 2403 Electric Co-op Association has been very vocal that they 2404 can't ask their members, who are already hard pressed to pay 2405 2406 their bills, to pay the compliance costs for the power plant rule. And so they are really between a rock and a hard 2407 They are -- you know, they are having to either 2408 consider shutting down the generating units they need for 2409 reliability or pass through these huge costs to their own 2410 2411 members. So it -- yes, and they are very aware of that, 2412 Congressman, both your regulators and the people who run your 2413 electric co-ops. 2414 *Mr. Allen. What options do state public service 2415 2416 commissions have in vertically integrated markets if the government steps in and shuts down reliable generators 2417 without an adequate supply of firm generation to replace it? 2418 *Mr. Christie. Well, again, they are facing a Hobson's 2419 choice because, if they allow the compliance costs to go 2420 2421 through to keep those plants open, that is going to cause tremendous rate increases to their consumers. 2422 So as a regulator who did this for 17 years, you don't 2423 want to do that. 2424

*Mr. Allen. Right. 2425 *Mr. Christie. But on the other hand, you are talking 2426 about the generating units that your integrated resource plan 2427 2428 shows are essential to keeping your lights on. So really, you are giving them a hell of a choice: Keep the lights on 2429 or burden your consumers with costs that they can't pay. 2430 it is a terrible choice. 2431 *Mr. Allen. Yes. Well, you know, FERC recently 2432 finalized the -- which we talked about -- the Order 1920 --2433 and I have just got about 30 seconds left -- and we have 2434 heard from our colleagues about a letter from 32 state public 2435 utility commissions supporting the rule. They assert that 2436 this letter shows support for FERC's actions. 2437 2438 As Chair Duncan noted, 238 state utility commissions across the country, just 32 have signed the letter. Most are 2439 from locations that have carbon-free electricity and net-zero 2440 economy goals. And I will submit this for the record, since 2441 I am out of time. You know, in my opinion, this letter just 2442 2443 confirms the Republican argument that Order 1920 is designed to facilitate expensive electricity transmission products 2444 while socializing the cost onto ratepayers from states 2445 without the same policy goals. 2446

2447	So if you would respond to me in writing on that, I
2448	would appreciate it because I am out of time.
2449	[The information follows:]
2450	
2451	**************************************
2452	

*Mr. Allen. And Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2453 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will now go 2454 to the gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Castor, for five minutes. 2455 2456 *Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to our FERC commissioners, Mr. Chairman, and a special 2457 welcome to our new commissioners. I look forward to working 2458 with you all. 2459 I think under the leadership of Chair Phillips the FERC 2460 2461 has done a very good job of with a focus on making energy reliable and affordable for American families and businesses. 2462 And special kudos for Order 1920 that requires the regional 2463 grid operators to engage in long-term regional planning for 2464 2465 the first time. 2466 Who would be against long-term planning in this everchanging world now, especially with the predictions for 2467 energy usage going up, energy demand because of a booming 2468 economy, and new data centers and electrification across the 2469 economy, and then these increasingly costly and more frequent 2470 2471 extreme weather events? It is very important that all energy producers and the RTOs think about planning for the long 2472 term. 2473 But -- and you all should know -- yesterday there was an 2474

amendment offered to the Energy and Water appropriations bill 2475 to not fund implementation of Order 1920, and it failed here 2476 in this -- in the House. So for what that is worth, I think 2477 2478 that is a good sign going forward. But the job of FERC is not over. We have got to do more 2479 to deploy low-cost, grid-enhancing technologies that -- I am 2480 glad to hear how enthusiastic you are, Mr. Chairman -- and 2481 clear up the interconnection backlogs. There are 2,600 2482 2483 gigawatts of generation and storage capacity currently seeking connection to the grid, often with wait times of 5 2484 years or more. These wait times are driving up costs for 2485 consumers, for ratepayers, and present an immense challenge 2486 to the grid in the era of rising energy demand. 2487 2488 Order 2023, the interconnection order, was a strong first step, but we need additional action. So Chair 2489 Phillips, what else are you doing to improve interconnection 2490 times and alleviate the backlog? 2491 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you so much, and thank you for 2492 2493 your comments. We are focused on interconnection. We had Order No. 2494 2023, which I think is a great first step, but we are not 2495 done. We have more work to do on interconnection. We are 2496

going to have a workshop this fall, in September, where we 2497 are going to focus on automation, using artificial 2498 intelligence, and other ways to continue to bring those 2499 2500 unacceptable wait times down that you mentioned. *Ms. Castor. So for our new commissioners, you have a 2501 2502 fresh perspective here. Commissioner Rosner, what do you -- have you been giving 2503 thought to identifying promoting queue management best 2504 2505 practices such as advanced computing, and automation, and standardized study criteria? 2506 *Mr. Rosner. Well, thank you for the question, 2507 2508 Congresswoman. I am looking forward to the technical conference that 2509 2510 Chairman Phillips has noticed for September. I look forward to engaging with participants there, with the record that is 2511 developed there, and with my colleagues to see if there are 2512 solutions. 2513 You know, in general, you know, I think about GETs and, 2514 2515 you know, and all these ways to unlock more efficiency. If there is ways to unlock efficiency in the process by doing 2516 more with less, that is just common sense, and I would be 2517 interested in pursuing that. So thank you for the question. 2518

*Ms. Castor. And Commissioner See, how about speeding 2519 up interconnection queues? 2520 What interests you, and what do you anticipate, looking 2521 2522 ahead? *Ms. See. I think this is certainly an important issue, 2523 and I am really looking forward to diving into that more, 2524 especially as I am getting started in this role. I think it 2525 is important to look at where we are at today and where we 2526 2527 are going in the future, and looking at all of the different pieces that go into that puzzle. So I agree that that is a 2528 very important issue, and one that I am looking forward to 2529 looking at in a lot more depth as I get started. 2530 *Ms. Castor. So Commissioner Chang, you also have --2531 2532 you have experience. What has worked that you see could bring some benefits to tackling this interconnection queue 2533 problem in the backlog? 2534 Thank you very much for your question. 2535 *Ms. Chang. One thought I have on this is that different regions --2536 2537 and I fully very much respect regional differences across the country -- different regions have different and unique needs 2538 and priorities. And when it comes to interconnecting new 2539 resources, some regions also might have differences in the 2540

way they analyze them and approach. But accelerating and 2541 2542 streamlining the interconnecting resources is paramount and is very important. 2543 2544 And I also just want to add using advanced technology is really the way we move forward and we lead in the world of 2545 new technologies. So that includes some of the newer 2546 technologies on the transmission system, but also any kind of 2547 assistance that artificial intelligence and other sort of 2548 2549 technological solution would bring to interconnection approaches. I think I welcome those opportunities to hear 2550 that from industry, but also to work with my colleagues to 2551 engage in that. Thank you. 2552 2553 *Ms. Castor. I look forward to your work here. And I yield. Thank you. 2554 *Mr. Duncan. 2555 The gentlelady yields back. I will go to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Balderson, for five minutes. 2556 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you 2557 all. Congratulations to those that have joined FERC, and I 2558 2559 look forward to working with you. I want to direct my first question to Commissioner Christie and Commissioner See. 2560 Last month I held an energy roundtable event at a nearly 2561 2,000-megawatt natural gas-fired plant in Guernsey County, 2562

Ohio, right in the middle of the Ohio's 12th congressional 2563 2564 district. The roundtable featured local co-ops, utilities, independent power producers, manufacturing, and business 2565 2566 groups, and natural gas producers. 2567 The overwhelming message from the roundtable participants was that, one, our baseload generation is 2568 2569 retiring too quickly, largely due to Federal and state policies; number two, power demand is rising at historic 2570 2571 levels; and three, we need more natural gas transportation infrastructure. 2572 Commissioners See and Christie, would you generally 2573 agree with this assessment? And ladies first, Ms. See. 2574 2575 *Ms. See. I do, I think these are very important 2576 issues. Certainly, it is the states who have primary responsibility when it comes to generation, but I think when 2577 we are looking at reliability concerns, it is very important 2578 to look at all those pieces, stressors on the supply side and 2579 certainly increased demand. So I think those are very 2580 2581 important issues. 2582 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. Commissioner Christie? 2583 *Mr. Christie. Congressman, in my opening statement I 2584

made the point that last week when PJM peaked in the heat 2585 2586 wave, 46 percent of the generation in PJM to meet that peak was gas. And the generating unit that you had your forum 2587 2588 forearm near, if it was a combined cycle plant running at base load, meaning it is probably running at a capacity 2589 factor of, let's say, 80 percent or more, the EPA power plant 2590 rule is going to essentially make it virtually impossible to 2591 build those types of plants. 2592 2593 *Mr. Balderson. Yes. 2594 *Mr. Christie. And we are going to desperately need them. 2595 Thank you. The EPA's -- since you 2596 *Mr. Balderson. 2597 brought it up -- most recent power plant regulations create 2598 mandates that all but ensure coal-fired power plants will shut down before 2032. It makes it virtually impossible to 2599 get new, natural gas plants built and connected to the grid. 2600 At the same time, the EPA is actively pursuing a separate 2601 effort to further regulate our existing fleet of natural gas-2602 2603 fired power plants. We were already worried about the long-term reliability 2604 of the electric grid before the EPA's Clean Power Plan 2.0 on 2605 existing coal and new natural gas plants was finalized. As 2606

the Federal regulator charged with electrical grid 2607 reliability, can you discuss what FERC's existing natural gas 2608 generation is being developed by the EPA? 2609 2610 Commissioner See and Commissioner Christie? *Ms. See. I think that relates to your first question. 2611 I think that these are serious concerns, and taking seriously 2612 the consequences that regulations have on critical sources of 2613 generation matters. I applaud FERC's efforts last year with 2614 2615 the technical conference to give a particularly important insight to EPA in developing that rule. I think it is 2616 important for FERC, as you say, as the agency charged with 2617 reliability, to be raising these concerns and voicing this 2618 important perspective as other agencies go about their work. 2619 2620 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. Commissioner Christie? 2621 *Mr. Christie. Well, again, the EPA power plant rule is 2622 going to make it virtually impossible to build new, combined 2623 cycle gas that runs this baseload, so -- but yet that is 2624 2625 exactly what we are going to have to have, because the same power -- the same rule is going to force the retirement of 2626 virtually the rest of the entire coal fleet. 2627 So again, if you look at what PJM was doing last week to 2628

keep the lights on, 20 percent was coal. If you take 20 2629 percent of the resource mix and just evaporate it, and then 2630 you don't allow the construction of new combined cycle gas, 2631 2632 which the power plant rule will -- essentially will not, the numbers don't add up. You simply -- it is just -- you are 2633 not going to be able to keep the lights on. I mean, that is 2634 just plain arithmetic. 2635 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. Can you briefly discuss 2636 2637 what the impact would be on the reliability if the EPA were to finalize that rule? And I think you have already answered 2638 that. 2639 The other technology is mandating carbon capture and 2640 storage technology that would require plants capture and 2641 storage 90 percent of their emissions within a decade. 2642 that feasible, Commissioner See? 2643 *Ms. See. I think there is certainly a lot of promise 2644 with that technology. 2645 I think one of the concerns that I would have sitting 2646 2647 here today is how deployable is that technology right now and on the timeframes of the rule. 2648 Again, other agencies have their own statutory lane, but 2649 looking from a perspective of reliability and resource 2650

adequacy, I would have concerns, especially with those 2651 aggressive timeframes. 2652 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you. 2653 2654 Did you want to add anything, Mr. Christie, or --*Mr. Christie. No, it is not feasible. Every expert in 2655 the field and engineers who talk about this say you cannot 2656 use -- the carbon capture technology is simply not there on 2657 the timeframe that this rule requires, or a commercial 2658 2659 feasibility. *Mr. Balderson. I will address a couple of my other 2660 questions to you because I am out of time. But my colleague 2661 from Florida talked about the queue, and I have been working 2662 with PJM about this queue issue, so I look forward to working 2663 2664 with all of you. 2665 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. *Mr. Duncan. I appreciate the gentleman. I will now 2666 recognize Mr. Sarbanes from Maryland for five minutes. 2667 *Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all 2668 2669 for being here today, and thank you for your critical work. There is a lot of expertise assembled here. I very much 2670 appreciate it, and the work you do throughout the year to 2671

assist energy consumers and foster their access to

2672

reasonably-priced, reliable, and secure power is obviously 2673 2674 indispensable. I would like to discuss the situation that led to your 2675 2676 recent decision to deny the Maryland Public Service Commission's motion to reopen docket No. ER 13-19, which 2677 concerns PJM's flawed 2024-2025 capacity auction for a 2678 portion of the Delmarva Peninsula. You are probably not 2679 surprised that I am bringing this up. 2680 2681 As many of you are aware, when this auction took place 2682 in 2022 a mistake in the parameters PJM set resulted in highly inflated capacity prices, and more than four times the 2683 just and reasonable rate with no commensurate electric 2684 reliability benefit to the consumers. Recognizing the 2685 2686 mistake, PJM petitioned the Commission to amend the auction, a request that the Commission granted, finding that the 2687 initial rates were "unjust and unreasonable.'' However, in 2688 subsequent litigation, the Third Circuit held that PJM's 2689 amendments to the rate auction were in violation of the filed 2690 2691 rate doctrine, and so PJM petitioned and was granted permission by FERC, thank you, to return to the initial 2692 flawed rates. 2693 From our witnesses today, only Chair Phillips and 2694

```
Commissioner Christie were on the Commission in May when this
2695
2696
      decision was made. But in your concurring statements you
      each expressed that, while you believe the court's ruling to
2697
2698
      be binding, the outcome of reapplying a knowingly flawed
      market design will be inequitable, unjust, and unreasonably -
2699
      - result in unreasonably high prices for ratepayers,
2700
      including some in my state of Maryland.
2701
           Mr. Chairman, by the way, without objection, I would
2702
2703
      like to enter into the record a letter from bipartisan
      Members of the Maryland delegation to the Commission
2704
      requesting a rehearing of this decision based on the
2705
      acknowledgment that the outcome is unreasonable and
2706
2707
      inequitable.
2708
           *Mr. Duncan. Without objection.
           [The information follows:]
2709
2710
      ******************************
2711
2712
```

*Mr. Sarbanes. And, you know, this letter has come and 2713 gone, and I understand where things have landed, and that 2714 FERC declining the request believes the court's decision 2715 2716 binds you in this case, I get that. So given that, my question for you, Chair Phillips -- and then I would love to 2717 hear from Commissioner Christie, as well -- is pretty simple. 2718 What do we need to change to ensure that an unacceptable 2719 situation like this never occurs again? 2720 2721 Even as I can't believe that we have to live with the 2722 decision that I just discussed, but looking forward, like, how do we stop this kind of thing from happening? 2723 *Mr. Phillips. First of all, I want to agree with you, 2724 Mr. Sarbanes. It is absolutely unacceptable. There was an 2725 2726 error, and it was an uncontroverted fact that it was an error. And the court came back and said, "Well, the equities 2727 don't matter.'' 2728 Sir, I will tell you this. For me, the equities always 2729 matter. I believe the most important function of our 2730 2731 Commission is to protect consumers, and that is what we tried to do in this order. 2732 Now, the court came back and said we have to do it 2733 differently. We will abide by the court's ruling. But we 2734

are encouraging PJM and other markets to correct their 2735 2736 tariffs to allow time to fix these errors so that this never happens again. 2737 2738 *Mr. Christie. Congressman, at the time those results came in, I think my comment was in no universe would these 2739 results be considered just and reasonable. I still think 2740 that, but the appellate court told us we had to accept them. 2741 As to your other question about what do you do about 2742 2743 this, I think there are -- I have been very vocal about this, I think there are a lot of flaws in the PJM capacity market 2744 that really date back many, many years to my time as a state 2745 regulator. I think they are working on trying to fix this 2746 construct known as the capacity market. 2747 2748 Maryland, you know, made a choice to divest, to "deregulate,'' which sort of exposed your consumers more than 2749 in Virginia, where we didn't do it, to the vagaries of the 2750 PJM capacity market. That is sort of a global way to 2751 respond. 2752 2753 But I think there is going to have to be constant effort to try to make sure that it doesn't happen again, and that 2754 the PJM capacity market, if that is going to be the resource 2755 adequacy construct for states like Maryland, that these 2756

- 2757 results don't happen again.
- 2758 *Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you.
- I do want to just mention, before my time expires,
- 2760 another instance of FERC's responsibility to protect
- 2761 ratepayers. And thank you for the June rejection of Tallinn
- 2762 Energy's petition to charge ratepayers hundreds of millions
- of dollars for a costly reliability must-run contract at the
- 2764 Brandon Shores power plant in Anne Arundel County. I applaud
- 2765 you for preventing the imposition of such significant costs
- on energy customers in the Baltimore region. So some good
- 2767 things and some challenging things to discuss. Thank you all
- 2768 very much.
- 2769 And I yield back.
- 2770 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I now go to
- the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Joyce, for five minutes.
- *Mr. Joyce. Thank you, Chairman Duncan and Ranking
- 2773 Member DeGette, for allowing me to waive on today, and thank
- you for the commissioners for appearing.
- 2775 Mr. Chairman, first I would ask unanimous consent to
- 2776 submit for the record former Chairman Barton's affidavit on
- 2777 the RTO adder for utilities.
- 2778 *Mr. Duncan. Without objection.

2779	[The information follows:]
2780	
2781	************************************
2782	

```
*Mr. Joyce.
                        Thank you.
2783
2784
           The electric industry is going through a significant
      transition as intermittent resources are being added to the
2785
2786
      grid. It is critical to continue transmission investment in
2787
      investor-owned utilities that are and will continue to play a
      large part in this effort.
2788
2789
           FERC is considering certain policy changes that would
      sunset the RTO adder for utilities. I am concerned that this
2790
2791
      action will add uncertainty to the market and would harm the
      ability for these companies to invest in improving the grid.
2792
           Mr. Chairman, I would also ask unanimous consent to
2793
      submit for the record a paper by Michael Kormos, the former
2794
      CEO of PJM utilities.
2795
2796
           *Mr. Duncan. Without objection, so ordered.
           [The information follows:]
2797
2798
      ********************************
2799
2800
```

Thank you. As data centers and AI expand 2801 *Mr. Joyce. across America and in my home state of Pennsylvania, they are 2802 providing economic growth and family-sustaining jobs. 2803 2804 also use, as we all know, large amounts of energy, adding significant demand to the grid for the first time in decades. 2805 This is all happening at a time when supply to the grid of 2806 baseload power is being threatened by draconian rules 2807 promulgated by President Biden's EPA. Closing coal power 2808 2809 plants and restricting new natural gas power plants will 2810 stifle the capacity of the grid. Given this environment, we need to look at ways to ease 2811 the strain on the grid. One potential solution, as detailed 2812 in Mr. Kormos's paper, could be using a collocated, behind-2813 2814 the-meter configuration with nuclear generators. Chair Phillips, the race with China and Russia for AI supremacy is 2815 simply one that we in the United States cannot afford to 2816 lose. What is FERC doing to ensure that the U.S. can 2817 facilitate this load growth, either by tapping into the power 2818 2819 grid or collocating at plant sites? *Mr. Phillips. We have a pending matter, Congressman, 2820 and I wish I could answer your question. We can't talk about 2821 -- when you talk about the issue of collocation. 2822

```
As a general matter, this is something that we are going
2823
      to have to deal with, for sure. What we are doing, though,
2824
      to address the need regarding data centers, artificial
2825
2826
      intelligence, quantum computing, all these issues, the best
      thing that we can do is plan for it in the long term.
2827
      is --
2828
           *Mr. Joyce. Does that include collocating --
2829
           *Mr. Phillips. -- exactly what we are doing --
2830
           *Mr. Joyce. -- and tapping into additional power
2831
      sources such as nuclear power?
2832
           *Mr. Phillips. Again, I really cannot get into the
2833
      details when it comes to that particular issue which is
2834
      pending before us. We may get challenged and say that we are
2835
      pre-judging the issue and won't be able to actually sit for
2836
      that particular proceeding, so I can't go any further than
2837
      the general matter that I talked --
2838
           *Mr. Joyce. Moving on, then, in September of 2023 this
2839
      committee heard from representatives of the nation's major
2840
2841
      grid operators, including PJM, which manages the grid in
      Pennsylvania. PJM warned about an expected shortfall in
2842
      power generation by the end of the decade, due largely to
2843
      what they classify as policy-driven retirements of reliable
2844
```

fossil fuel plants. 2845 In response to one of my questions, all the grid 2846 operators agreed that continuing to use fossil fuel plants, 2847 2848 especially natural gas, is crucial for maintaining grid reliability. The head of New England ISO described it as, 2849 "the only practical solution.'' Since then, the outlook has 2850 only worsened with the EPA's introduction of the problematic 2851 Clean Power Plan 2.0. 2852 2853 Mr. Christie, given these concerns from PJM and other grid operators, what actions can FERC take now within its 2854 current authority to address this resource adequacy issue? 2855 And further, what additional powers or authorities would 2856 you like to see Congress grant to better address the 2857 2858 anticipated shortage of dispatchable generation in PJM and in 2859 other regions? *Mr. Christie. As you mentioned -- we have talked about 2860 this a lot today -- PJM is losing dispatchable resources at a 2861 rate that is simply not sustainable, and they are not going 2862 2863 to be able to keep the lights on if they continue to lose them. And it is primarily coal and gas that they are losing. 2864 FERC's role in reliability, first and foremost, we are 2865 the regulator of NERC, which sets reliability standards, and 2866

that includes effectively raising the alarm on resource 2867 adequacy shortfalls as part of the reliability assessments 2868 that NERC does and that we, you know, we do. So one big role 2869 2870 we have is what we have done today, which is to raise the alarm about what is going on. 2871 We don't have the authority to order the construction of 2872 a single generating unit in America, because those are the --2873 it is the states that do that. And of course, in 2874 2875 Pennsylvania, where you are from, Pennsylvania is in the PJM market, and you have given up the IRP process. So basically, 2876 what gets built in Pennsylvania is only going to get built if 2877 the investors build generating units based on whether they 2878 think they can get enough revenue from the PJM markets, 2879 2880 especially capacity. 2881 FERC regulates the capacity market, and this has been an ongoing source of concern about whether that PJM capacity 2882 market is procuring sufficient capacity resources and the 2883 right type of capacity resources with the attributes. 2884 2885 that is going to be an ongoing issue -- that is under FERC's purview -- to look and see whether that capacity market is, 2886 in fact, working to get the resources they need. 2887 *Mr. Joyce. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I do 2888

*Mr. Joyce. I thank again the commissioners for 2895 attending, and I thank you for allowing me to waive on today. 2896 *Mr. Duncan. Yes, sir. The gentleman yields back. 2897 2898 will now go to Mr. Cardenas for five minutes. *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Chairman Duncan and Ranking 2899 Member DeGette, for holding this hearing today. And the --2900 also, the chairman and commissioners of the Federal Energy 2901 Regulatory Commission for being here today and discussing in 2902 2903 full view of the public the answers to our questions. As we know, our lives largely depend on electricity. It 2904 keeps the lights on, powers our devices during the hottest 2905 days, it cools our homes, and during the coldest months it 2906 heats them, as well. As something so integral to our lives, 2907 2908 it is easy to take it for granted. FERC has played a critical role in ensuring that that is the case, that our 2909 nation's grid and electricity is secure, reliable, and 2910 affordable. 2911 That said, the climate crisis and accelerating climate 2912 2913 disasters threaten our grid and have already highlighted that our aging power infrastructure needs to be updated. 2914 safeguard our power system long term and protect communities, 2915 we must update our planning processes and our nation's power 2916

infrastructure without losing focus on the transition to 2917 affordable and reliable, cleaner energy. The Bipartisan 2918 Infrastructure Law and Inflation Reduction Act both made 2919 2920 unprecedented, once-in-a-generation investments that do just that, all while advancing the environmental justice, and FERC 2921 will play an essential and unique role in unlocking the truly 2922 transformational benefits embedded in both of those laws. 2923 Chairman Phillips, last year I spoke to you about the 2924 2925 criteria that would have to be satisfied for the Commission to withhold or deny the approval of a project on 2926 environmental justice grounds. During our conversation you 2927 said that under NEPA and the Natural Gas Act environmental 2928 impacts include environmental justice communities, and that, 2929 2930 hypothetically, there could be significant-enough impacts to communities to consider withholding or denying approval of 2931 certain projects. 2932 Just a few weeks ago, however, FERC approved CP2 LNG, 2933 despite objections from former Commissioner Clements. 2934 2935 dissent, former Commissioner Clements expressed that FERC failed to -- and I quote -- "meaningfully assess the 2936 project's enormous greenhouse gas emissions and adequately 2937 consider how the full range of adverse project impacts will 2938

affect environmental justice communities.'' 2939 2940 With all of that in mind, can you talk about how FERC is making sure that its rules are legally durable, 2941 2942 environmentally sound, and meeting the obligations set forth in NEPA and the NGA? 2943 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you so much for the question. 2944 Under section 3 and section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, 2945 FERC is required to consider environmental impacts on the 2946 2947 communities, environmental justice communities that you talked about. I am extremely proud of our record, this 2948 Commission's record, when it comes to environmental justice. 2949 I made it a priority. We had the first-ever roundtable. 2950 have established a working group within our Office of General 2951 2952 Counsel. We established -- appointed a new senior counsel on environmental justice. We had commission-wide training on 2953 environmental justice and equity. 2954 We also are looking to issue forward-facing public 2955 guidance regarding environmental justice. When it comes to 2956 2957 making these decisions, though, it is a delicate balancing act, and we have over 100 conditions on almost any project 2958 that we approve under the NGA. And some of those conditions 2959 include environmental justice conditions, and we have sua 2960

sponte taken action on our own, as a commission, to protect 2961 2962 environmental justice communities. No commission in the history of FERC has done more for EJ than this commission. 2963 2964 *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you. FERC established the Office of Public Participation over three years ago. We have heard, 2965 however, that frontline communities impacted by FERC's 2966 decisions often have trouble participating in FERC processes, 2967 given lack of capacity and resources. Congress was explicit 2968 2969 in section 319 of the Federal Powers Act, and -- that one of the duties for OPP is that it may "provide compensation for 2970 reasonable attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, and other 2971 costs of intervening or participating in any proceeding 2972 2973 before the Commission to any person whose intervention or 2974 participation substantially contributed to the approval, in whole or in part, of a position advocated by such person.'' 2975 Chairman Phillips, can you comment on the status of the 2976 rulemaking or other efforts to provide such intervenor 2977 compensation to qualifying public interest intervenors? 2978 2979 *Mr. Phillips. First of all, let me just say how pleased I am with our Office of Public Participation. We are 2980 now into the second year of that office. We have a new, 2981 confirmed office director who is doing an outstanding job. 2982

- 2983 And I want to point everybody to our website, in particular.
- 2984 They have explainers that are on our website, which are just
- 2985 outstanding. When I read those explainers I learn.
- 2986 With regard to intervener funding, this is something
- 2987 that we have a new -- three new commissioners. I would like
- 2988 to speak with my colleagues on -- to the extent we move
- 2989 forward with that, I would like to do it in a bipartisan
- 2990 manner as best we can.
- 2991 *Mr. Cardenas. Thank you.
- 2992 Rosner, See, and Chang, congratulations on your recent
- 2993 confirmation in the Senate.
- 2994 Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I yield back.
- 2995 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back. I will go to
- 2996 Mrs. Lesko from Arizona for five minutes.
- 2997 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for
- 2998 being here today.
- 2999 You know, I am from Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona, so we
- 3000 have a huge expansion of demand for electricity in the
- 3001 metropolitan area. We have the new TSMC -- Taiwan
- 3002 Semiconductor Manufacturing Corporation is being built in my
- 3003 congressional district in north Phoenix. We have data
- 3004 centers. And so, you know, I just want to make sure that we

- have enough electricity on the grid, and so I appreciate your 3005 3006 work on that. To that end, what new authorities does FERC need to make 3007 3008 sure that the right type of new baseload power generation is built? Because I want to make sure that it is good, baseload 3009 energy for the data centers and semiconductor plants. And we 3010 need to make sure we have enough baseload. Would anybody 3011 like to take that, either Chair Williams [sic] or 3012 Commissioner Christie? 3013 *Mr. Phillips. I will certainly address that issue. 3014 *Mrs. Lesko. Okay, Commissioner Phillips. 3015 *Mr. Phillips. You know, I agree with you 100 percent. 3016 3017 We need to make sure that we have the power to -- the energy 3018 to power our American economy that is available. We know 3019 that we need resources that can provide that baseload power. When it comes to FERC, we are resource-neutral. I mean, 3020 we don't make any particular decisions that favors any one 3021 kind of resource. But I can tell you this. I am an all-of-3022 3023 the-above person. I believe we need to have all the tools on 3024 the table when it comes to the resource adequacy for our
- 3026 *Mrs. Lesko. Well, thank you.

nation.

3025

```
Anyone else?
3027
3028
           Yes.
           *Mr. Christie. I would just add, Congressman, that the
3029
3030
      decision on what generating units to build and what types of
      generating units is going to be made by your Arizona Utility
3031
      Commission. That is going to be their decision. And I know
3032
      a lot of them, and I think they are very aware of this issue,
3033
      and they are going to do what they think is best for the
3034
3035
      consumers of Arizona. But that is going to be their
      decision, what to build and what type to build, because that
3036
      is how it works in the United States.
3037
           *Mrs. Lesko. Yes. The thing is that, because of some
3038
      of the mandates from either the Biden Administration or local
3039
3040
      regulators, there is mandates on using solar or wind or
      whatever it may be. Then, you know, they are sometimes
3041
      incentivized to use those, and that might not always be the
3042
      best solution.
3043
           So I have another question, and this is for Commissioner
3044
3045
      Christie, as well.
                           What policy changes are being made at
      FERC in light of the Loper ruling?
3046
           *Mr. Christie. In light of the what?
3047
           *Mrs. Lesko. Loper, L-o-p-e-r, ruling.
3048
```

```
*Mr. Christie. Oh, you are talking about the --
3049
3050
                I think the effect will be, over time, as we have
      cases that get appealed -- and I can't speak to a future case
3051
3052
      because, you know, it will have to be argued at the time, but
      I think that, as long as FERC is within its statutory
3053
      authority, I don't think the Loper case will have any effect
3054
      at all. I think it will only come when FERC is out on the
3055
      edge, pushing the envelope. And then I think it will have an
3056
3057
      effect. But I think, as long as FERC -- or any agency, for
3058
      that matter -- is in their lane, I don't see Loper having a
      big effect.
3059
           *Mrs. Lesko. Okay. And Commissioner Christie, how is
3060
3061
      FERC coordinating with the EPA to address the premature
3062
      retirements of fossil generators that are creating
3063
      significant reliability issues in the United States, if they
      are?
3064
           *Mr. Christie. We are not because they went ahead with
3065
      their rule, and they put it out there. And now we and other
3066
3067
      utility regulators are going to deal with the consequences,
      which are going to be pretty negative to reliability.
3068
           *Mrs. Lesko. You know, Mr. Chair, I am going to yield,
3069
      and so these fine folks can get on with their day's work and
3070
```

we can go on to our hearing that we have, the joint hearing 3071 on the floor. Thank you, and I yield back. 3072 *Mr. Duncan. The gentlelady yields back. It looks like 3073 3074 we have expired all the members --*Voice. Under the wire, under the wire. 3075 3076 [Pause.] *Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and --3077 The gentleman from Texas --3078 *Mr. Duncan. *Mr. Veasey. I am sorry. I thought, when you gave me 3079 the nod there -- Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. 3080 I want to thank the panel for being here today. 3081 that this is a very well-timed committee hearing that we are 3082 having on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and some 3083 3084 of the challenges that the United States is facing now and in the future when it comes to load growth. 3085 On load growth, it seems like -- and DFW -- there is a 3086 announcement that we have, like, almost daily it feels like 3087 now, on data centers that are groundbreaking in the area. 3088 3089 There has been some back and forth today, but multiple things can be true at once. Load growth is not the end of the 3090 world. And yes, the rate of demand increase is expected to 3091 be higher due to AI and data centers. But this country has 3092

seen periods of load growth before, and there is no denying 3093 3094 that we are currently unprepared for load growth and need to mobilize. 3095 3096 ERCOT alone expects an additional 40,000 megawatts of load growth by 2030, and AI will continue to gain efficiency, 3097 as well. And since 2008, demand has been up just 1.4 3098 percent, but that is an increase -- that is a total increase 3099 over 16 years, and not the average gain. 3100 3101 And AI is not the only source of load growth, of course. Thanks to the IRA and CHIPS, we are seeing industrial load 3102 growth in the form of hydrogen hubs, direct air capture of 3103 carbon dioxide, and semiconductor manufacturing plants. And 3104 fortunately, we can still do some things in this country. I 3105 think a great example of this is ERCOT's connect-and-manage 3106 process for bringing a new generation of sources online. 3107 contrast to other RTOs and ISOs invests in managed processes, 3108 ERCOT allows resources to connect to the grid in an 3109 expeditious way, and addresses any immediate transmission 3110 3111 bottlenecks through generation redispatch and curtailment, and manages grid uprates through a centralized evaluation 3112 process. 3113

3114

rapid and realistic interconnection process with a more 3115 proactive, holistic transmission planning process, we think 3116 that we can create a grid of the future in a way that quickly 3117 3118 and cost effectively connects new, clean resources and enables economy-wide decarbonizations and, of course, keeps 3119 the lights on, which brings me to the comment that Chairman 3120 Phillips had made in recognizing that this extraordinary 3121 growth needs to be funded fairly so the cost of connecting 3122 3123 these data centers to the grid won't be shifted to consumers. 3124 There are several interesting concepts that are being looked at, and one is collocating these facilities at 3125 existing nuclear plants, where the facility owner carries the 3126 burden of cost rather than transmission users. And I know 3127 that this has been a topic of conversation today, and I would 3128 3129 just like to add my voice to those that are watching the issue. 3130 And also to Chairman Phillips, we heard testimony last 3131 month that AI data centers could bring economic development 3132 3133 to historically and disadvantaged rural communities. But the testimony also indicated that Congress should act to ensure 3134 access to opportunities created by these increasing loads. 3135 Chairman, you have championed environmental justice issues 3136

- 3137 during your time at FERC, and I was hoping that you could
- 3138 give us your thoughts on how Congress can ensure that access.
- 3139 *Mr. Phillips. Thank you so much. You know, it is -- I
- am glad that you came, and thank you for your leadership, Mr.
- 3141 Veasey --
- 3142 *Mr. Veasey. Thank you.
- 3143 *Mr. Phillips. -- because it is important that we know
- 3144 that the load that we are talking about, it is for America,
- and it will provide jobs, and it will power the future of our
- 3146 economy, and it is not just about data centers, although I
- 3147 did read a report recently that we add a new data center like
- 3148 every three days. And for many of these communities, this is
- 3149 a good thing.
- One other thing I want to say. When we talk about what
- 3151 we are really planning for here, I am not an expert on
- 3152 quantum computing, but we know that there is a lab in the
- 3153 United States that is leading that research for the world.
- 3154 It has to maintain a temperature of -460 degrees. They call
- 3155 it the coldest place in the universe. That requires a lot of
- 3156 power.
- 3157 *Mr. Veasey. A lot.
- 3158 *Mr. Phillips. We have to plan for it. And we can, and

we will. With Order No. 1920, we are going to get this done. 3159 I am looking forward to the future. 3160 *Mr. Veasey. Good, good. 3161 3162 I wanted to ask Commissioners Rosner and Chang -- I want to switch gears to the gas side a little bit. And we have 3163 seen how the U.S. has become a significant player in the 3164 natural -- as a natural gas producer. And I know that FERC 3165 is going to play a critical role when it comes to the 3166 3167 permitting process. How are each of you evaluating the positive impacts on local communities and benefits to 3168 consumers of natural gas infrastructure projects, while 3169 factoring in GHG emissions and some of the other 3170 environmental issues? 3171 3172 *Mr. Rosner. Well, thank you for the question, Congressman, and I would say this: timely infrastructure 3173 approvals are a priority for me, and something that I will 3174 work towards. 3175 My approach will be this. It will be, first and 3176 3177 foremost, follow the statute. We have got pretty clear definition on what that statute means from the Supreme Court, 3178 which has said that the purpose of the statute -- the 3179 relevant statute here is Natural Gas Act, and that is to 3180

- encourage the orderly development and plentiful supply of natural gas at a reasonable price.
- Courts have also told the Commission that they have to
- 3184 consider certain impacts. My approach will be to follow the
- 3185 statute and follow the court precedent in making decisions,
- 3186 also looking at the record and listening to the views of all
- 3187 parties. Thank you.
- 3188 *Mr. Veasey. Yes, thank you very much.
- *Ms. Chang. Thank you for your question.
- 3190 Certainly, natural gas plays an important role in our
- 3191 energy resource mix. And like Commissioner Rosner, I will
- 3192 also take into consideration of -- all the facts of cases
- 3193 that come before me, and certainly consider case example --
- 3194 court cases and statute when considering each case that comes
- 3195 before me. So --
- 3196 *Mr. Veasey. Yes, thank you very much.
- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your patience.
- 3198 *Mr. Duncan. The gentleman yields back, and I let him
- 3199 go a little longer because the new commissioners actually got
- 3200 some questions there at the end.
- 3201 So I want to thank all the witnesses for being here. It
- 3202 looks like we are finished with all the member questions.

3203	Members may have additional written questions for you
3204	all. I will remind members they have 10 business days to
3205	submit the additional questions for the record, and ask the
3206	witnesses to do their best to submit responses within 10
3207	business days upon receipt of the questions.
3208	I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record the
3209	documents included on the staff hearing documents list.
3210	Without objection, that will be the order.
3211	[The information follows:]
3212	
3213	*********COMMITTEE INSERT******
3214	

3215	*Mr. Duncan. And let me just welcome the new
3216	commissioners to FERC.
3217	We wish you the best from this subcommittee and the full
3218	committee in your efforts, in your duties there at FERC.
3219	Chairman Phillips and Commissioner Christie, again,
3220	welcome back, and thank you for being here today. We
3221	appreciate the work you guys do because it is vitally
3222	important to energy security, reliability, affordability for
3223	our nation. So thanks for being here.
3224	And with that we will stand adjourned.
3225	[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the subcommittee was
3226	adjourned.]