

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

Mr. Randy Howard
General Manager
Northern California Power Agency
651 Commerce Drive
Roseville, CA 95678-6411

Dear Mr. Howard:

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 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 Brett Guthrie (R-KY)

1. We've seen in testimony and heard during this hearing that massive regional and interregional transmission, at least on paper, are supposed to deliver huge affordability and reliability benefits to the electric system, and consumers.
 - a. Do you consider this kind of transmission in your planning and, if so, why is it either getting built or not getting built?

The Honorable Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA)

1. You warn that codifying a rigid list of benefits for cost allocation purposes can create a parallel standard that increases litigation risk and confusion. But you also acknowledge that the current lack of clarity is itself a barrier. Where is the line between enough definitional clarity to enable interregional planning and so much rigidity that it creates the problems you describe?

The Honorable Diana Harshbarger (R-TN)

1. In Tennessee, transmission projects are ultimately paid for by families, farmers, and small businesses served by public power utilities and co-ops. Some of my colleagues say we need to frontload transmission projects, but what happens to electric rates in Tennessee and around the country if we build more than we actually need? Who ends up paying for that?
2. As I understand it, FERC has played an important role in improving planning through Orders 890, 1000, and now 1920, but it has never directly reviewed or approved regional plans themselves. Can you explain why moving FERC from setting planning rules to actually approving regional and interregional plans is a fundamental change to its structure? Why does TAPS believe that could work against cost-effective, consumer-focused planning?