

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 28, 2026

The Honorable Tony Clark
Executive Director
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
1101 Vermont Ave. NW
Suite 401
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, to testify at the hearing entitled “Wires, Rates, and States: Permitting Transmission for Reliable and Affordable Power.”

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 Tuesday, August 11, 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, reading "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 Bob Latta (R-OH)

1. You have reviewed and approved numerous transmission cases at the state commission and regulated transmission service at the federal level. Does FERC have the expertise or capacity to take over permitting for interstate transmission lines?
2. Currently, 29 states have implemented large-load tariffs designed to protect ratepayers from paying for infrastructure associated with electricity demand growth coming from large energy users.
 - a. How many of these states have only focused on data centers and how many also include large-loads such as industrial and manufacturing facilities?
3. Across RTO regions, states have varying degrees of input over the cost allocation process for interstate transmission. Under Order 1920-A, the Commission sought to bolster the states role in this process.
 - a. How can a state positively impact cost allocation discussions in these regions?
 - b. Should states have more of a say in the cost allocation process?
4. FERC recently issued 206 show cause orders for the interconnection of large loads onto the bulk power system. Traditionally, load interconnection has been an authority of the states.
 - a. Given your experience as both a state utility commissioner and commissioner of FERC, how do these orders impact the role of states?

The Honorable Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA)

1. You describe a dynamic where state commissions are legally required to pass along costs that originate outside their jurisdiction, from wholesale markets, federal reliability requirements, and supply chain factors. Is this a new problem or a structural one that has always existed?
 - a. As demand has grown, has the share of a retail bill that sits outside state commission control grown with it?
 - b. Are state commissions being asked to protect consumers from cost pressures they have progressively less authority to address?
2. You raise the concern that large transmission investments can crowd out non-wires alternatives at greater cost to customers. I am a strong advocate for advanced transmission technologies, which can unlock significant capacity on existing infrastructure at a fraction of the cost of new lines. But aren't advanced technologies a complement to new transmission, particularly in a rapid load growth environment?
 - a. Isn't it dangerous to treat different technologies as "in conflict" when we clearly need all of the above to meet growing demand?

3. You make a compelling case throughout your testimony about the value of local knowledge and relationships in transmission planning, from pole by pole route discussions with farmers to community input during construction and reclamation. Are you aware of any analysis that has attempted to quantify the cost of bypassing that local knowledge, whether through project delays, litigation, landowner disputes, or failed applications?
 - a. If that research does not exist, what does its absence tell us about how we are evaluating the true cost of different permitting approaches?

The Honorable August Pfluger (R-TX)

1. What are the best practices for ensuring that landowners and local communities have a meaningful voice in transmission siting decisions?
2. When states evaluate major transmission projects, how should regulators balance reliability benefits with impacts to private property owners and rural communities?
3. In your testimony you note that transmission planning should evaluate alternatives and not treat transmission as “a good unto itself.” Are utilities and grid operators doing enough to maximize the capacity of existing infrastructure before proposing entirely new transmission corridors?
 - a. Do current regulatory structures create enough incentive for utilities to pursue those options?