

BRETT GUTHRIE, KENTUCKY
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-3641

Minority (202) 225-2927

July 31, 2026

Ms. Whitney Muse
President
Muse Energy
1717 N Street NW
Ste. 1
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ms. Muse:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy on Wednesday, April 29, 2026, to testify at the hearing entitled “AI and the Grid: Meeting Growing Power Demand While Protecting Ratepayers.”

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Friday, August 14, 2026. Your responses should be mailed to Seth Ricketts Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed to Seth.Ricketts@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Robert E. Latta". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Robert" being the most prominent.

Robert E. Latta
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy

cc: Kathy Castor, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Energy

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Kathy Castor (D-FL)

1. How can Congress promote forward-looking, scenario-based transmission planning that incorporates large load growth without overburdening existing ratepayers?
2. What barriers are preventing the development of interregional transmission, and what federal actions could unlock more efficient, multi-region solutions?
3. How are incremental, local transmission project investments impacting ratepayers?
4. How can we ensure that utility planning focuses on and prioritizes more efficient regional and interregional solutions and discourages a default to costly local solutions?
5. What policy or regulatory barriers are slowing the deployment of grid-enhancing technologies (GETs) and advanced conductors that could increase capacity on the existing system?
 - a. Should Congress require or incentivize transmission providers to evaluate and deploy these technologies before pursuing new infrastructure investments?
 - b. How can regulators and system operators improve transparency around the cost effectiveness and performance of these technologies?
6. What policies are needed to enable customers to deploy on-site generation, co-location, and “bring your own power” solutions without shifting costs to other ratepayers?
7. How should markets and regulators value customer-provided flexibility, including demand response, on-site generation, and hybrid solutions?
8. Can customer-led solutions serve as a bridge to power while larger transmission and generation infrastructure is developed—and if so, how should policy reflect that role?
9. If current structures limit the ability of large loads to pay directly for grid infrastructure needed to serve them, does that increase the risk that existing residential and small business customers will bear costs associated with new large load growth?
10. Would clearer rules allowing large customers to fund certain transmission upgrades help reduce stranded cost risk and improve planning certainty?
11. Do current planning and cost allocation frameworks adequately account for the possibility of customer-funded or customer-driven transmission solutions, or are they largely built around utility-led investment models?
12. Would enabling more customer participation in transmission investment help protect existing ratepayers?

13. To what extent do current RTO/ISO planning and cost allocation processes accommodate non-utility or customer-backed transmission proposals?
14. Are there reforms Congress should consider ensuring that RTO/ISO planning processes are open to alternative financing or sponsorship models, including customer-supported generation and transmission?
15. To what extent are merchant transmission models being used, and what roadblocks remain to expand them?
 - a. Should Congress consider a legislative response to unlock these kinds of arrangements?
16. What targeted reforms—at the state or federal level—could enable customer-funded transmission solutions while still protecting other ratepayers from cost shifts?
17. Should Congress encourage the development of optional frameworks that allow large customers to assume more cost responsibility in exchange for greater certainty and faster access to power?
18. What guardrails are needed to ensure that expanding customer participation in transmission investment does not undermine system planning, preserves reliability, and maintains fairness across customer classes?
19. If large electricity customers are willing to pay for the infrastructure needed to serve them, what are the specific legal or regulatory barriers today that prevent that from happening—particularly in bringing your own generation and transmission—and what should Congress do to address them?