RPTR MOLNAR

EDTR ZAMORA

BACK IN ACTION: RESTORING FEDERAL

CLIMATE LEADERSHIP

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2021

House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change,

Committee on Energy and Commerce,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 12:01 p.m., via Webex, Hon. Paul Tonko [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Tonko, Schakowsky, Sarbanes, Clarke, Ruiz, Peters, Dingell, Barragan, McEachin, Blunt Rochester, Soto, O'Halleran, Pallone (ex officio), McKinley, Johnson, Mullin, Hudson, Carter, Palmer, Curtis, Crenshaw, and Rodgers (ex officio).

Also Present: Representatives Castor and McNerney.

Staff Present: Jeff Carroll, Staff Director; Jacqueline Cohen, Chief Environment Counsel; Adam Fischer, Professional Staff Member; Waverly Gordon, General Counsel;

Tiffany Guarascio, Deputy Staff Director; Anthony Gutierrez, Professional Staff Member; Caitlin Haberman, Professional Staff Member; Perry Hamilton, Deputy Chief Clerk; Zach Kahan, Deputy Director, Outreach and Member Services; Rick Kessler, Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Mackenzie Kuhl, Press Assistant; Brendan Larkin, Policy Coordinator; Dustin Maghamfar, Air and Climate Counsel; Elysa Montfort, Press Secretary; Kaitlyn Peel, Digital Director; Tim Robinson, Chief Counsel; Chloe Rodriguez, Deputy Chief Clerk; Nikki Roy, Policy Coordinator; Andrew Souvall, Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services; Rebecca Tomilchik, Policy Analyst; Sarah Burke, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Jerry Couri, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel for Environment; William Clutterbuck, Minority Staff Assistant; Theresa Gambo, Minority Financial and Office Administrator; Nate Hodson, Minority Staff Director; Peter Kielty, Minority General Counsel; Emily King, Minority Member Services Director; Bijan Koohmaraie, Minority General Counsel; Mary Martin, Minority Chief Counsel, Energy and Environment; Brandon Mooney, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel for Energy; Clare Paoletta, Minority Policy Analyst, Health; Brannon Rains, Minority Policy Analyst, Consumer Protection and Commerce, Energy, Environment; Peter Spencer, Minority Senior Professional Staff Member, Energy; and Michael Taggart, Minority Policy Director.

Mr. Tonko. Okay. The Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change will now come to order.

Good morning, good afternoon, depending on where you are located, and welcome to the subcommittee's first hearing of the 117th Congress. Today's hearing is entitled, "Back in Action: Restoring Federal Climate Leadership."

I would also like to welcome our subcommittee's new ranking member, Mr. David McKinley. I have done great work with Congressman McKinley in the past and look forward to a great partnership on the subcommittee. Welcome aboard, and look forward to what will be, I think, a very energized bit of hearings this year.

Due to the COVID-19 public health emergency -- and by the way, we also have new members on the subcommittee, and I welcome each and every new member. So thank you.

Due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, today's hearing is being held remotely. All members and witnesses will be participating via video conferencing. Microphones will be set on mute to limit background noise. The members and witnesses, you will need to unmute your microphone each time you wish to speak.

Documents for the record, by the way, can be sent to Rebecca Tomilchik at the email address provided to staff. All documents will be entered into the record at the conclusion of the hearing.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

We began the 116th Congress with a hearing called "Time for Action." It allowed us to understand the latest climate science, the opportunities to grow America's economy by deploying clean energy technology and better, safer, more resilient infrastructure, and the consequences that will befall future generations of Americans should we fail to act

swiftly and with boldness.

We have already begun to see those future generations pass unfavorable judgment on current elected leaders for doing so little, so slowly, at a time when the science and the stakes for them personally could not be more clear.

That is why, in the 116th Congress, the committee held a series of hearings focused on achieving economywide, net zero emissions no later than 2050. It is why we brought in stakeholders from far and wide and used their insights to write and release the CLEAN Future Act, a discussion draft for national climate legislation spanning our economy.

We saw the need for urgent and ambitious Federal policy supporting a wide range of technologies that could help us achieve necessary decarbonization targets in an efficient and cost-effective way.

This is also why many of us are excited that, in its first days, the Biden administration has started to build the foundation for the kind of bold climate action America requires and needs now. In today's hearing, we can expect to learn more about the underlying strategies in that first set of executive orders, as well as gaps Congress will need to fill to complement executive action.

Achieving net zero emissions will mean transforming our economy. We know this will not be an easy task. President Biden knows this too and is calling for a whole-of-government approach, directing every agency to use existing authorities and budgets to the fullest to, not only reduce climate pollution, but also spark a new age of innovation, of environmental justice, of support for workers and their families and communities, through America's energy transition, to grow well-paying jobs and to always to put science at the heart of our public policy.

The executive order signed by President Biden last month established for the first

time a White House Office of Domestic Climate Policy, led by the national climate adviser, a national climate task force, and a special Presidential envoy for climate.

These will be critical to coordinate across agencies in both domestic and foreign policy. These are wise and welcome steps, but on their own, they are not enough. Congress cannot turn away from its responsibility any longer. We must act.

At its core, President Biden's Build Back Better agenda is about making Federal investments and implementing pollution-reducing standards to drive America's economic recovery and put millions of Americans to work, modernizing our infrastructure, and making us a healthier, more competitive, and more just Nation. This approach will create sound-paying jobs building America's next generation infrastructure, produce affordable clean energy, protect public health through cleaner air and water, and breathe new life into American manufacturing.

Importantly, this agenda recognizes that America can and should manufacture products with the lowest emissions in the world. If we don't, America's competitors will make those same products with much weaker environmental and labor standards.

Our approach must keep America's energy-intensive industries operating here in the United States, employing American workers, and moving toward a decarbonized future. And Congress can help make that happen.

Similarly, the Build Back Better agenda drives these investments beyond the small confines of existing centers of wealth and power to reach all neighborhoods, so that low-income Americans, communities of color, and indigenous communities, not only share in America's prosperous future, but bring it to life.

But we cannot stop there. We need rural, deindustrialized, and communities that have historically relied on fossil fuels to know they have a big role to play in building America's future. While sharing the investments and the benefits of America's climate

transformation will be part of the solution, people must have a seat at the table to be heard and to participate in the decisions to determine the future economic development strategies for their own communities.

I look forward to our witnesses' perspectives on the Biden administration's climate executive orders and the role for Congress in moving forward. I am certain that this will be just the first of many conversations this year focused on how to get the entire Federal Government tackling climate change with the needed urgency and scale necessary.

With that, I yield back, and I recognize the newly appointed ranking member of our subcommittee, Representative McKinley, for 5 minutes.

Representative McKinley?

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tonko follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. McKinley. Thank you.

First, let me congratulate you, Paul, on your return as chairman. It is an honor for me to have the opportunity to lead this panel for the Republicans. Look, even if we disagree on the approach to our country's problems, Paul, I am confident you too will consider the cost to families and communities and the overall impact of executive orders.

Efforts to transform our energy sector should be mindful of the failures of past regulatory overreach and an inability to pivot to renewables. Look at the coal industry. When the war on coal was underway, there was no transition to renewables, but, rather, those workers adapted their skills for jobs in the natural gas sector, which is now being threatened.

Or what about the American steel industry? During the eighties and nineties, excessive government regulations devastated steel towns and families. Think about it. Just 45 years ago, America was producing five times the amount of steel as China, but, now, America is producing less than 90 million tons while China has exploded to manufacturing a billion tons, 11 times more than America.

What happened to the tax base, the school systems, and the healthcare in the communities that have lost these high-paying jobs of Kaiser, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, McLouth, National, Bethlehem Steel, and others? The companies and jobs are gone. The communities have never recovered. Where was the compassionate transition for those communities and families?

Based on these experiences, neither a President, nor Congress, should ever put a regulation in place before a bipartisan transition plan has been adopted.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans are ready to work to develop renewable energy with you, but the lack of sufficient battery storage is enormous, and you and I have talked

about that. Even former Secretary Moniz has said dependence on 100 percent renewables is not yet realistic and certainly not cost-effective.

The path to developing sufficient battery storage in America will be complex, and I look forward to examining solutions to that in future hearings.

Mr. Chairman, these new executive orders will divide -- increase the divide between big cities and rural America, not foster unity. Think about it. Seventy percent of Alaska's State revenues comes from fossil fuels; Wyoming, 52 percent; North Dakota, 45 percent. That money funds their schools, emergency services, health departments, and pensions. It is how States operate.

Mr. Chairman, you and I would agree that climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution. So hopefully our panelists today won't insult us by saying that rejoining the Paris Agreement will solve all of America's environmental dilemma.

Look at paragraph -- article 4, paragraph 4 of the agreement, which says, China, quote, should try to reduce its emissions. There is no must or shall. There is no enforcement or penalties when they violate. Meanwhile, according to financial economists, China is aggressively building these additional coal-fired power plants that will equal the entire coal fleet of Europe.

Furthermore, it should be noted that ill-thought policies to rush to green in the United States will not improve the global environment and will actually undermine our national security and decimate our jobs, families, and communities.

We will hear testimony today from Mark Mills of the Manhattan Institute, who will explain considerations about the scale and reality of hurriedly replacing America's energy infrastructure with renewable energy.

Don't forget that when Joe Biden was a candidate, he said that executive orders could become an abuse of Presidential power.

The solutions to energy and climate change should not be pursued through executive orders but, rather, through consensus and bipartisan policies that accelerate innovation, ensure affordable, reliable energy, and enable our American communities and families to thrive.

But if members of this committee naively think the other nations are waiting for America to lead, they are wrong. Nations have not been following. As a result, John Maxwell summed this up by saying, he who thinks he leads, but has no followers, is merely a man taking a walk.

So, Mr. Chairman, remember, your party controls the House, the Senate, and the White House. You can do almost anything you want, but please don't forget, just because you can doesn't mean you should.

I look forward to a thoughtful discussion, and I yield back.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McKinley follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. And again, welcome, as ranking member to the subcommittee.

The chair now recognizes the chair of the full Energy and Commerce Committee, our great chair, Representative Pallone. You are recognized for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Tonko.

Two years ago when Democrats became the majority, the first hearing our committee held was on the climate crisis, and throughout the Congress, we worked tirelessly to develop the legislative solutions needed to address the climate crisis. And the committee followed up that first hearing with a dozen more hearings on deep decarbonization, met with countless stakeholders, and drafted the first comprehensive climate legislation in the House in a decade, the CLEAN Future Act. And now as we begin this new Congress, one of this committee's top priorities remains combatting the climate crisis.

The science is clear. We must achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 if we are to avoid the most catastrophic consequences of climate change. And we must take decisive action this decade to ensure we are on a path to reaching that target.

Now, with this urgency in mind, I am thrilled that the Biden administration has hit the ground running on climate. Before stepping into the White House, President Biden promised an ambitious, sweeping approach to tackle the climate crisis. Within his first week in office, he began making good on that promise.

On day one, the President rejoined the Paris Agreement, reestablishing the U.S. leadership on the global stage. He then signed a suite of additional actions on climate and environmental protection, and these measures include steps to reverse the Trump

administration's climate rollbacks and move us forward to a clean electricity, clean cars, and conservation, while pursuing environmental justice and economic revitalization.

So for too long, communities of color, low-income communities, fence-line communities, and others on the front lines of climate change have borne the brunt of environmental injustice without equal opportunity to participate in the regulatory process.

But I am really encouraged by the Biden administration's approach because it balances immediate steps to advance equity and environmental protection with a robust consultation process for environmental justice communities to plan future actions. And as that process moves forward, this committee will play an essential role in enacting legal protections for overburdened communities to empower this administration and ensure equity.

President Biden's early actions also underscore what we have long argued, that climate action presents a unique opportunity to revive our economy and create good, well-paying jobs in promising new industries.

The world is moving towards a clean energy future. The question is whether we choose to lead to ensure our workers actually benefit from that transition. And the President's early climate actions are an important part of his jobs agenda.

President Biden is working to ensure that as we Build Back Better, we create opportunities for all Americans. And his administration's early actions put workers at the heart of the clean energy transition, including by applying strong labor and wage standards.

This committee will play a critical role in advancing legislation to revitalize our Nation's infrastructure using well-paid workers and clean materials made in America. An infrastructure package similar to the Moving Forward Act from last Congress will

modernize our crumbling infrastructure, help rebuild our economy, and combat climate change.

President Biden also recognizes that the transition to a clean future will affect different communities in different ways. That is why he established an interagency working group, focused on creating economic opportunities for communities impacted by the shift away from fossil fuels.

And, again, this committee will play an important role in fostering economic revitalization for communities undergoing these energy transitions.

So taken together, Chairman Tonko, the President's early actions to address the climate crisis are a welcome change from the previous administration. It is a new day for climate and environmental action in the U.S., and this committee, as I said, is ready to lead.

Today's witnesses will highlight the significance of President Biden's climate actions, but they will also highlight the role that Congress and this committee will have to play. The administration has many tools at its disposal, but the fact is, without additional legislative action, we can't fully address the scale, scope, and urgency of the climate crisis, and legislative action can provide even more tools to ensure our communities and workers are well positioned to benefit economically from the ongoing transition to a clean energy economy.

So I look forward to hearing from our witnesses and how or where Congress is going to step in, including new legislation like the CLEAN Future Act that can advance our climate goals.

And I just wanted to say, you know, I heard from our ranking member of the subcommittee, his concern about, you know, how changes and moving away from fossil fuels may impact communities. We are very aware of that, and we understand that we

can't leave anybody behind as we move to this clean future. And I just want to assure you that I and Paul and all of us are very cognizant of the fact that if a community is impacted by the changes, we want to make sure that they share in those changes and that they have a good job and they are not left behind.

So thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Pallone follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. Well, thank you, Chairman. And the gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes Representative Rodgers. Mrs. Rodgers has been appointed as ranking member of the full committee. Congratulations. And you are now recognized, Mrs. Rodgers, for 5 minutes for opening statement.

Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is good to see the subcommittee back in action, and I look forward to working with you and all of the members of this subcommittee and the full committee to keep our energy costs low and to protect our environment.

I want to congratulate my colleague and my friend, Mr. David McKinley, for taking the reins for the Republicans on this subcommittee. I know that he is going to be a powerful advocate for the people of West Virginia and all of America to secure our energy future.

When we work together thoughtfully, we can win the future with policies that serve American families. And this is especially the case as we advance climate solutions that are going to work for all regions of the country and our diverse communities.

Today in America, we are celebrating American energy independence. It was a goal first promoted by President Jimmy Carter and Congress when the Department of Energy was established in the seventies. And in addition, we have met this goal, while reducing our carbon emissions more than any other country in the world and keeping our energy costs lower than any other country, for our families and our businesses.

For too long the discussion about climate policy has been dominated by the view that there is only one way -- the relentless government-knows-best approach of the environmental extremists, you know, but a one-size-fits-all, a Green New Deal-style approach with mandates that never yield the best results is not going to serve our

families or our businesses.

Yet we see that type of thinking time and time again in proposals that would undermine hydropower, weaken nuclear energy, kill fossil fuel energy, including clean energy, clean natural gas. A prime example are policies that would tax and cap and trade away our affordable and reliable energy, our industries and our manufacturing base.

President Biden declaring a return to global leadership is proposing this path and weakening the backbone of America's economic and national security. His executive orders signal a push to close off large portions of our oil and natural gas resources.

This administration is threatening millions of jobs, billions of State tax revenue, and our Nation's energy security. It doesn't make sense, especially as we rebuild and restore our way of life in this pandemic recovery.

The administration has also signaled a slew of executive orders that would raise more barriers to affordable energy and crush our economic opportunity. These actions signal a rapid push to build out renewable energy at a pace, as we will hear in this testimony, that I fear is going to hurt low- and middle-income families the most, renewable technologies that are a key component of our clean energy future. But top-down mandates that pick winners and losers are not the way.

I would encourage this committee to look at California with its renewable energy and electrification mandate. Energy prices are rising seven times faster than the rest of the Nation -- seven times. High electricity bills hurt our most vulnerable population, and they drive away the good-paying jobs that we seek for everyone.

California's energy policies have failed to meet their most fundamental purpose -- keeping the lights on -- and we cannot afford to go down that path. Rather than a plan that is going to nationalize California's mandate and weaken our grid and

raise prices and export our jobs to other nations, let's explore a more positive and responsible path. Let's capture all of the advantages of our abundant resources, including hydro, fossil fuel, and nuclear technologies.

We can expand our energy. We can provide more opportunity and prosperity. And the good news is that there is bipartisan policy. For example, there is opportunity zones and brownfield reforms to attract new jobs, and licensing reforms to accelerate LNG exports, nuclear technology, and hydropower, these can be true game-changers.

In Washington State, Energy Northwest is collaborating to support nuclear technology -- TerraPower's Natrium, NuScale's, and X-energy's small modular reactors. We have opened doors to carbon capture technology.

In the recently passed Energy Act, in the USE IT Act, we support bipartisan technological innovations across the energy landscape. That is what we should be talking about today. Let's work together. Let's win the future. We can lead a new era of innovation, a new era of hope in the American Dream. Let's not let regulations hold us back and crush our chances of achieving this.

I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Rodgers follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. You are welcome. The gentlewoman yields back.

The chair reminds members that pursuant to committee rules, all members', witness' opening statements shall be -- or their written opening statements shall be made part of the record.

So, with that, now we will move to our witnesses, and we welcome them all. We thank them for participating in today's hearing and look forward to their message.

We begin with Ms. Christy Goldfuss, senior vice president of energy and environment policy at the Center for American Progress. Next, we have Ms. Kerene Tayloe, Esq., director of Federal legislative affairs with WE ACT for Environmental Justice. We are going to have Ms. Anna Fendley, MPH, director of regulatory and State policy with USW, the United Steelworkers. And finally, Mr. Mark Mills, senior fellow with the Manhattan Institute.

We, again, welcome each and every one of you, and thank you for your input in advance.

At this time, I recognize Ms. Goldfuss for 5 minutes to provide her opening statement.

STATEMENTS OF CHRISTY GOLDFUSS, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS; KERENE N. TAYLOE, ESQ., DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS, WE ACT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE; ANNA FENDLEY, M.P.H., DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY AND STATE POLICY, UNITED STEELWORKERS (USW); AND MARK MILLS, SENIOR FELLOW, THE MANHATTAN INSTITUTE

STATEMENT OF CHRISTY GOLDFUSS

Ms. Goldfuss. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Rodgers, Subcommittee Chairman Tonko, and Subcommittee Ranking Member McKinley, for inviting me to participate in this important discussion.

I am the senior vice president for energy and environment policy at the Center for American Progress, and ran the White House Council on Environmental Quality during the Obama administration.

I am incredibly excited to be here today to discuss how the Federal Government can build a hundred percent clean future that addresses the climate, economic, racial justice, and public health crises faced by our country.

These crises are inextricably linked. The many extreme weather events last year were fueled by climate change and hit during a devastating pandemic that created the economic crisis and further laid bare the racial injustices in our society.

Former President Donald Trump exacerbated these crises through policies that moved the country backwards and stymied nearly all growth toward a clean energy

future. But since then, building on the bold foundation laid by previous congressional proposals, the Biden administration has acted swiftly to reverse the damage, restore public health and environmental protections, and move the country quickly and ambitiously forward.

These crises cannot be ignored, but they can be addressed together by acting on climate, through both the executive and legislative branches of government, and we now have the political opportunity and the moral obligation to do so.

For so long, climate action and climate policy have been focused on costs instead of opportunities, sacrifices instead of gains. We must recognize that investing in climate action not only reduces emissions but is critical to economic recovery and can directly and meaningfully improve people's lives.

Sustained climate investments, designed correctly, will create good-paying, high-quality unionized jobs here at home in the U.S. that all people can access, especially people in underserved communities.

The Biden administration has stated that its planned $2 trillion investment program in infrastructure could create as many as 10 million new good-paying jobs, including for workers in industries displaced by the transition to a clean future, such as fossil fuel workers.

Investing in climate action will also promote equity and help dismantle systemic racism and economic inequality. Low-income communities and communities of color have for too long suffered from a toxic legacy of unjust pollution in their neighborhoods.

The Biden administration's dedication to directing 40 percent of all of these investments benefits to communities sets a new standard for equity and justice. Today's climate policy centers on the immediate benefits and returns, both in terms of emissions and economic recovery that can come from large-scale public investment in

clean energy.

The introduction of legislation such as this committee's own CLEAN Future Act and 100% Clean Economy Act, complemented by last year's House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis report, have set the stage for swift and long-lasting climate action that matches the scale and scope of the challenges we face.

The ambitious climate commitments that the Biden administration has initiated through executive order in his first weeks in office are excellent. However, as you all know, to fully address the current crises and achieve the much needed and permanent clean energy future, congressional action will be necessary.

The first and most significant congressional action needed to tackle climate change is the enactment of a major, long-term investment program following the American Rescue Plan to create good-paying, clean jobs. This will help to build the economy back, to be more just and equitable, and to set the country up for a successful transition to a hundred percent clean future, starting with hundred percent clean electricity by 2035.

These investments need to be focused on long-term recovery, not relief. Congress now has the opportunity to use every tool in its toolbox to tackle climate and the economy, including but not limited to a clean energy standard, a clean energy and sustainability accelerator that targets 40 percent of investments to disadvantaged communities, the Environmental Justice For All Act, and major investments such as through long-term predictable clean energy tax credits, the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, or the Low Income Housing and Energy Assistance Program.

Climate change has accelerated over the last 4 years, and the level of action that is needed has also shifted. But scientifically and politically, the Biden administration's actions on climate reflected this change in consensus. President Biden's day one actions

began to restore global leadership on the climate crisis and roll back harmful Trump regulations.

In conclusion, this is a turning point. Congress must act boldly to create the hundred percent clean future we need, one that supports families sustaining, good-paying jobs, cuts pollution in communities that have suffered too long, and creates a just and equitable clean energy economy.

Thank you for inviting me today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Goldfuss follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. Thank you very much, Ms. Goldfuss, for your participation.

Next, we will move to a 5-minute opening statement from Ms. Tayloe, please. You are recognized for 5 minutes. Please unmute.

STATEMENT OF KERENE N. TAYLOE

Ms. Tayloe. Good afternoon, Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Rodgers, Chairman Tonko, and Ranking Member McKinley. My name is Kerene Tayloe, and I am director of Federal legislative affairs for WE ACT for Environmental Justice.

WE ACT was founded more than 30 years ago and responds to overt environmental racism impacting our community in West Harlem. Since then, we have grown to a staff of 16, with offices in both D.C. and New York. We are one of the first people of color-led EJ organizations in New York State and the only grassroots EJ organization with a permanent presence in D.C.

To address the climate crisis and environmental injustice, Congress must pass equitable and just legislation that will provide tangible benefits to communities targeted by pollution. I urge Congress to pass the Environmental Justice For All Act that was introduced by Congressman Raul Grijalva and Congressman Donald McEachin.

This comprehensive bill reflects more than a year of engagement with grassroots environmental justice advocates, and more importantly, requires consideration of cumulative impacts in permitting decisions under both the Clean Water and Clean Air Act. This will ensure the protection of human health in communities that are inundated with industrial toxic emissions.

The bill would also codify Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice, which

ironically turns 27 this week, directing Federal agencies to create a working group on environmental justice compliance and enforcement, something that is long overdue.

Secondly, we must address legacy pollution. Last year, a study from the Shriver Center on Poverty Law found that 70 percent of hazardous waste sites on the national priority list are located within 1 mile of federally assisted housing. A Harvard University study found that counties with high exposure to particulate matter also experienced high COVID-19 mortality rates.

Substantial investments into remediating Superfund sites, brownfields, abandoned coal mines, and former defense sites, and lead pipe replacements are desperately needed.

Last Congress, we supported the Environmental Justice Legacy Pollution Cleanup Act, supported by Senator Cory Booker and Representative Deb Haaland, which would invest $100 billion to clean up legacy pollution sites across the Nation. This is a substantial amount of money, and in order to address historical environmental injustices, we need bold action, particularly to make up for decades of Federal inaction that has permitted industry to pollute without repercussion.

We will continue to support this bill and hope that other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee will do the same.

The clean energy sector in the United States lost 429,000 jobs last year due to the economic impacts of COVID-19. That is 12 percent of that sector's workforce since March, with women, Black, Latinx workers disproportionately impacted.

Environmental justice leaders understand that we must remediate our communities and create good-paying jobs. At WE ACT, our own Solar Uptown Now program has trained more than 125 local residents in solar installation and has helped 2,000 residents get their OSHA cards and begin careers in the construction industry.

We must also address the failures of our education system and incorporate climate literacy in our public schools. Teenagers in the United States continue to lag behind East Asia and Europe in reading, math, and science. Latinx and African-American students are less likely to pass Algebra I and less likely to attend high schools that offer up advanced math or science classes than their White and Asian peers, according to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights.

How can we address the climate crisis and create good-paying jobs if we are not equipping all children with the skills needed to get the certifications required to install solar and wind technology?

Last year, we also supported Congressman Bobby Rush's Blue Collar to Green Collar Job Development Act, which would reauthorize and expand the Department of Energy's Office of Minority Economic Impact to improve the education and training of underrepresented groups for employment in energy-related industries, including manufacturing, engineering, construction, and retrofitting jobs. Of particular interest is the bill's emphasis on grants to schools and nonprofits like our own who already have workforce development and solar training programs.

These suggestions that I have provided today only scratch the surface of what is needed to really bring climate and environmental justice to our communities. I have submitted a number of documents to the record, including our policy agenda, our green jobs report, and our report on extreme heat. And I hope that you all will take a look at those.

But most importantly, I want to thank you for the time for allowing me to testify today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Tayloe follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. You are most welcome, and the participation is most appreciated.

Next, we will go to Ms. Fendley for 5 minutes for your opening statement, please, and remember to unmute.

STATEMENT OF ANNA FENDLEY

Ms. Fendley. Yes, thank you.

Good afternoon, Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Rodgers, Chairman Tonko, Ranking Member McKinley, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the members of the United Steelworkers Union.

Since January 20, President Biden has taken some important actions to address climate change, such as rejoining the Paris Agreement, creating an interagency working group on energy communities in transition, and prioritizing environmental justice.

The Biden administration's early actions have demonstrated that efforts to address climate change are largely economic policies. The whole-of-government approach outlined in the President's executive orders sets up a promising framework in which climate policies will not be designed and implemented in a vacuum by environmental policy experts. Instead, appointees and career staff across the Federal Government will work to ensure that climate action is paired with sound economics. Our hope is that this framework retains and grows middle-class union jobs in a diversity of sectors and geographies, an immense challenge that we cannot overstate but what must be our ultimate policy goal.

This is why our union views the executive orders on climate, in conjunction with the order on Buy America policy. The newly created Made in America Office must be

empowered to fulfill the rhetoric of the order and to bring better consistency and organization to procurement preferences throughout the Federal Government.

Congress can and must hold the administration to this goal. This is critical, not only for the economic crisis, but the climate crisis as well. Buying American is a commonsense way to show Federal leadership. If necessary materials are not produced here, they will be produced elsewhere. And in most cases, that production will result in more greenhouse gas emissions.

For example, research found that among major steel-producing nations, the United States is among the lowest in terms of both energy intensity and carbon intensity. And this pattern doesn't just hold for steel.

As our union has seen, when U.S. production is disincentivized, it is most often replaced by imports from China. Failure to prevent this in the development of climate policies would be doubly catastrophic, causing a loss of jobs here in the U.S., paired with an increase in greenhouse gas emissions associated with the products consumed here.

Now, these are good first steps, but there is more to be done. Both Congress and the administration must place a special emphasis on infrastructure and investing in manufacturing competitiveness. Americans need aggressive investment in a modernized infrastructure to address the climate crisis and recover from this economic crisis, because American jobs depend on our infrastructure's strength.

Throughout infrastructure investment, policymakers should direct funding to programs that already apply a strong buy-America preference and include Buy America in new funding authorizations. This way, policy will create both construction and manufacturing jobs across the country.

Congress should look to invest in all types of infrastructure, including all forms of transportation, water, buildings, energy, and technology.

In addition to Buy America, Congress and the administration should implement a buy clean consideration within procurement programs. Similar policies are being considered around the world, making low emissions manufacturing a necessity to remain globally competitive in the long term.

Buy clean should begin with transparency and investment in manufacturing facilities, which leads to a second major goal for climate policy -- growing a more efficient domestic manufacturing base.

American leadership in inventing and in manufacturing the most advanced technologies was once a cornerstone of a strong and growing middle class. However, there is much to be done to innovate and transform existing industry, invest at scale in manufacturing, and ensure that our economic recovery is built to work long term for workers, communities, and our Nation's competitiveness.

We need a national strategy on industrial transformation and clean technology supply chains that is coordinated among Federal agencies and expands funding in existing programs, particularly those at the Department of Energy. And as Congress discusses spending for economic recovery, access to capital will be critically important to achieving emissions reduction goals in industry.

And, of course, policymakers must address leakage in the global marketplace for manufacturers. This speaks to the importance of the Biden administration's whole-of-government approach where economists and trade experts must be at the table.

In conclusion, Congress and the administration must invest in rebuilding our infrastructure and our manufacturing base to ensure that working people are at the center of our Nation's climate ambition and economic recovery.

I thank you again for the opportunity to be here today, and I look forward to your

questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Fendley follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Ms. Fendley.

And, finally, we will move to Mr. Mills for your opening statement, please, 5 minutes, and remember to unmute, please.

STATEMENT OF MARK MILLS

Mr. Mills. Thank you.

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify. And as you know, I am a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, where I focus on science, technology, and energy issues. And I am also a faculty fellow at the McCormick School of Engineering at Northwestern University, where the focus is on future manufacturing technologies.

And for the record, I am a strategic partner in a venture fund that is focused on software startups -- startup companies that focus on energy markets.

Since the purpose of this hearing is to explore actions directed in the main at changing the energy supply system of the United States, permit me to highlight some of the realities anchored in the science of energy.

As the committee knows, 80 percent of the Nation's energy comes from hydrocarbons -- oil, natural gas, and coal -- and internal combustion engines account for 99 percent of all transportation miles. Meanwhile, at the moment, wind and solar supply are less than 4 percent of U.S. energy, and electric cars today are under half of 1 percent of road miles.

Given the scale of our economy, changing that status quo presents some rather daunting economic, environmental, and geopolitical challenges, I think must be

considered.

First, the cost of a complete grid restructuring would be far greater than popularly acknowledged. The administration has proposed spending $2 trillion on climate programs across seven large domains. But for the electric grid alone, analyses show that we would have to spend at least $5- to $6 trillion in wind, solar, and battery hardware and systems to replace the existing hydrocarbon generation. And doing so by, say, 2035, would require a continuous construction program, at least 600 percent bigger than any single peak year for utility construction that has occurred in the United States or China or Germany in any time over the past half century.

It is true, of course, this would create jobs, but I think it is important to point out that the final product remains unchanged, so -- and it uses more labor and capital.

So in economic terms, the way economists think about this, this reverses a long-run goal of increasing productivity. And as you know, productivity is the single most important feature of any economy. It is the one that expands overall wealth for all of the citizens. And none of this includes the need for the enormous expansion of our grid if a significant share of cars do, in fact, shift -- and they will shift -- from oil to electricity.

In the end, it bears noting that there is an arithmetical outcome in this. The new grid, the decarbonized grid, would reduce global carbon dioxide emissions by less than 6 percent and at rather substantial cost to America's economy.

Grid restructuring and accelerating electric cars also means exporting jobs and offshoring of environmental consequences. Some 90 percent of solar panels in America are imported, as are 80 percent of the key components for wind turbines.

Asian companies, and China in particular, utterly dominate global battery production and account for 80 percent of all the planned new factories for battery

production. They also dominate the mineral production, the cat(ph) mineral fining and materials production for batteries and its components.

Even if we expand domestic manufacturing, which I endorse, our import dependencies will remain. In fact, they will increase because of the need for the critical minerals and materials that are inputs to all those machines.

On average, it is important to know that scientifically the per unit of energy delivered, the quantity of materials extracted from the Earth and processed for clean technologies is 500 percent to 1,000 percent greater than the quantity of materials associated with producing the same quantity of energy from hydrocarbons.

It stands today, China dominates the firms that produce and process all the critical materials and their rare earth elements, which have been in the news a lot of late.

And nearly all of the growth in mining to supply the clean tech industries is expected to occur offshore and, frankly, increasingly in the fragile and biodiverse wilderness areas, which is of some concern to the United Nations Environment Program.

So, of course, more mining can be done in an environmentally responsible way, but so far, I haven't seen much evidence of support for opening new mines in America.

These are just some of the kinds of challenges I think we should be aware of and are part of the calculus for Congress as we seek new ways to meet society's energy needs in the future.

With that, I thank you very much. Look forward to talking about this further.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Mills follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. Mr. Mills, thank you. And thank you to each of our four panelists. Thank you for your time. Thank you for your input. And we will now move to questions that members have of our panel. I will begin by recognizing myself for 5 minutes.

We have mentioned the President's executive order on tackling the climate crisis, but that same day, he also signed an order on scientific integrity and evidence-based policymaking.

Ms. Goldfuss, can you explain briefly how these two executive orders are intended to complement each other and the importance of relying on scientists and experts in developing climate policy and setting pollution reduction targets?

Ms. Goldfuss. Thank you for the question, Subcommittee Chairman Tonko. What we saw over the last 4 years with the Trump administration was an unprecedented persecution of scientists in the Federal Government, and really what that has led to is removing science and data and facts from our policymaking.

So by accompanying this scientific integrity executive order with the climate change executive order, what President Biden was saying is, whether it is addressing the pandemic and looking at the data necessary to do that in a meaningful way or addressing climate change, we know and understand that science needs to drive those decisions.

In addition to all the other data and information that we get about how a policy impacts people's lives, science has to be at the center, so that we can look around the corner and do and make the best decisions possible for the American public.

So really it was the two of these executive orders together that put us on the strongest footing in terms of our climate policy.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. And I believe also that climate targets should be based

on sound science. Our committee's efforts have focused on achieving economywide, net zero emissions by no later than 2050, based on the scientific consensus of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

So, Ms. Goldfuss, that same 2050 target, I believe, is included in President Biden's climate executive order. Is that correct?

Ms. Goldfuss. Yes. There is an embrace of the net zero by 2050 target. He has also committed in his plan that was released over the summer to a hundred percent clean energy, clean power, in the power sector by 2035. And it is really important that we focus on that power sector goal if we are going to achieve the mid-century goal.

Mr. Tonko. Well, with the 2050 target, why does that matter? What do we risk if we don't meet that target?

Ms. Goldfuss. What we saw in the 1.5 degree special report is that we have locked in a lot of the warming that we have already seen to date. So even if we meet that mid-century target, this is not like a car that immediately turns around and we can reverse all of the impacts.

It will take time for the warming to stop and for us to stabilize our climate impact. So this is what science tells us we need to do by mid-century in order to stabilize the warming and then reverse course where possible.

Mr. Tonko. Well, we know that it is not going to be an easy task, but it requires transforming certainly of every sector of our economy. We can't do that overnight. So, Ms. Goldfuss, if we want to achieve that 2050 target, how important is it for us to make significant progress toward that goal in the next 10 years, in the 2020s?

Ms. Goldfuss. We are at a race against time right now. This next decade is our last best opportunity to make progress here. And we understand this isn't going to -- our economy is not going to change. So we are looking at a transition over the next

several decades that really shifts the entire way we power our country. And the importance of getting this right and doing this in the next 10 years is essential to meeting those goals by mid-century. If we lose that time, we really don't have the chance to get back on track.

Mr. Tonko. And as this committee considers climate change legislation, do you think we should recognize the importance of action this decade by setting an interim target for 2030?

Ms. Goldfuss. Absolutely. I mean, you can't succeed without tracking and measuring your success along the way. So we really need to have benchmarks so we know how successful we are being, whether or not we need to change course in our policy recommendations or our policy decisions.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you.

And, Ms. Tayloe, should a 2030 target, and all of our climate goals for that matter, be informed by the voices of environmental justice communities?

Ms. Tayloe. Definitely. Unfortunately, historically when we look back at the treatment of Black, Brown, and indigenous communities in the United States, we have typically been the sacrifice zone for the energy choices and the choices we made in our government and our country. If we are serious about addressing the climate crisis, environmental justice must be integral in network.

Mr. Tonko. Well, I couldn't agree more, and I just want to say how refreshing it is to hold a hearing on positive actions the administration is taking to affirm science, address climate change, and pursue environmental justice. So honored by all of that.

So I have exhausted my time. I will now move to our ranker of the subcommittee. Representative McKinley, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I have submitted a document for

the record. Has it been approved?

Mr. Tonko. Well, let me check.

Has the document been approved?

They are reviewing it as we speak, and we will --

Mr. McKinley. Okay, good. The document is fairly --

Mr. Tonko. Okay. We are going to address all the documents at the end of the hearing.

Mr. McKinley. Okay. The document is fairly simple. It is just a document indicating that -- from the United Steelworkers, that we are just showing that over the last recent years, numbers of years, that they have not worked with us in unity and bipartisan -- 99.6 percent of their contributions have gone to the Democrats.

So I appreciated their remarks, because I agree, coming from a steel area, I can relate to the steelworkers.

But let me just -- let me get to my primary remarks and questions, because what I was hearing, Mr. Chairman, was that Biden's transition from fossil fuels is going to -- we got to have alternative employment if we are going to do that. But we look at what John Kerry said. He says, President Biden wants workers to have alternatives. He goes on to say, to make solar panels.

Gina McCarthy says, workers from coal communities will be, quote, put to work making solar panels. And even Vice President Harris said, displaced workers, coal miners, can work, quote, reclaiming abandoned land mines. I am not sure she meant to say that, but, nevertheless, that is what was said.

So I am saying that, Mr. Chairman, let's be fundamental. There are no solar panel or wind turbine manufacturing plants in Gillette, Wyoming; Hazard, Kentucky; Cadiz, Ohio; or Welch, West Virginia. These are communities that are based on fossil

fuels with downstream jobs in steel fabricating, concrete plants, machine shops. So I don't understand what these alternatives -- these towns and these workers don't have other alternatives. You have to understand, these are small towns. They don't have choices.

So I guess they have three choices, if they have any. One is be underemployed, go from $85,000 job to 20. They could commute hundreds of miles to find some other job someplace else and leave their families. Or the third option, I guess, is relocate.

So if I could, to the Steelworker Union, are these the best options we have? Anna?

Ms. Fendley. Thank you for the question. Sorry, it took me a moment to come off mute.

I think we see this slightly differently. I mean, there certainly historically has been a discrepancy between where renewable jobs have been created and some of the devastation we have seen, particularly in coal communities. In a --

Mr. Mills. Okay. I am not getting a straight answer on that. I am saying that the same thing is, yeah, this may happen over a period of time, but I am saying that, where was this transition plan for the workers of the Keystone Pipeline or the Atlantic Coast Pipeline or the Mountain Valley Pipeline? Their jobs were cut overnight. They don't have a transition. So I am very concerned about our idea of having a transition plan.

So now if I could go back to -- with Mr. -- with the Manhattan Institute. Wouldn't it be better to be investing in innovation and research, like, dealing with carbon capture, rather than importing and relying on other countries like China for rare earths and critical materials? I would like to hear his comments. Mr. Mills?

Mr. Mills. Well, let me first go on record with saying, and as I have said before, I

am fully supportive of building more factories in America that can make solar panels and batteries. I am in support, and have asked many times in the past, the Congress to think about encouraging more mining and mineral processing in America and more steel production in America. So I am an unabashed endorser of more of all of these jobs in America.

As a practical matter, that takes time, as you said, and over the coming years, as we accelerate the incentives and requirements for wind, solar, and batteries, that necessarily means exporting jobs. It just does. Because, as I said in my opening remarks, 90 percent of solar panels are now imported. We can't build factories fast enough. We surely can't open mines fast enough to get the critical minerals for batteries.

So as a practical matter, in the coming decade, you know, it is arithmetically and scientifically and economically impossible to have any other consequence but exporting the environmental consequences of those activities to other countries and exporting the primary jobs for those machines to other countries. So I think it is a very thorny problem for Congress to deal with. I fully endorse the idea of, you know, encouraging more production in America. But this is -- we have to be honest about what it will mean right now.

Mr. McKinley. If I could, Mark, just jump in, but what happens to Gillette, Wyoming; Hazard, Kentucky; Cadiz or Welch? What happens to those in the meantime? There are no other alternatives.

Mr. Mills. Look, we know the -- you laid out the three answers. There are no other answers. If jobs disappear overnight, which they can when bans are enacted or things are cancelled obviously.

But I am slightly more optimistic about the ability to do retraining in the modern

era than we were in the last 30 years, but that takes time too, right? You can, quote, repurpose workers to other things, but that doesn't -- they have to have a factory. We don't make solar panels in any significant quantity in America, so there is no place to go. You can install more of them, but those are, as everybody knows, important jobs, but they are very low-wage jobs.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the chairman of the full committee, Representative Pallone, for 5 minutes for questioning.

The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Tonko.

As I mentioned in my opening, the committee drafted comprehensive climate change legislation last Congress, the CLEAN Future Act, and I have been pleased to see significant similarities between the CLEAN Future Act and the early climate actions that have come out of the White House. Both approaches emphasize environmental justice, both seek to use climate action as a means to create jobs -- good jobs -- and both recognize that different industries and sectors will require different solutions.

So I wanted to start with Ms. Goldfuss. Are there some industries or sectors that will be able to decarbonize more quickly, and which ones and how quickly, recognizing that, you know, this is not a one-size-fits-all situation? Ms. Goldfuss.

RPTR DEAN

EDTR HUMKE

[1:00 p.m.]

Ms. Goldfuss. Absolutely. Thank you for the question, Chairman Pallone.

The power sector is really going to be the key during the Biden administration, how quickly can we deploy as much renewable energy as possible. President Biden referenced clean electricity standard, as you all did as well in your legislation, as a really promising policy approach that sets goals for the amount of renewable energy deployment. It sets a standard. We have seen more than 17 States deploy similar styles of this policy and have been really successful. It is focused on the outcome that we want to see, not punitive measures.

So we are pretty optimistic that a clean electricity standard could be a key component of this proposal. Also investments, the ICC and PPC in wind and solar have been some of the most promising climate policy that we have seen over the past decade, they have had an incredible impact on the cost of renewables.

We need to expand, make those tax credits more reliable longer term so that wind, and solar, and other clean forms of energy really can expand at the rate that we need.

So I think it is the power sector, the power sector, the power sector. We also have to be supportive of transportation, but the shifting change will be slower than what we can see over the power -- in the power sector over the next had decade.

The Chairman. And I want to get to Ms. Fendley, but let me just ask you quickly, what is Congress' role in moving the electricity sector to de carbonize by 2035?

Quickly because I want to get to Ms. Fendley.

Ms. Goldfuss. It is those investments. And then really if we are going to reach

those targets, it is paramount that Congress take action to give EPA the full authority and to explore a full policy like a clean electricity standard.

The Chairman. All right. So the President's early actions included significant efforts to use Federal Government's purchasing power to support decarbonization in some sectors. Ms. Fendley, how can President Biden's early actions on procurement help decarbonize these challenging sectors? And how can Congress go further?

Quickly, because I have one more question of you.

Ms. Fendley. Sure. Quickly his early actions showed the leadership of creating markets and buying from manufacturers and we think that this can be paired with action from Congress on a buy clean policy, which we have talked to many companies and industry associations about the manufacturing to really show and buy from American manufacturers who are cleaner than their foreign counterparts.

The Chairman. All right. So just as in a follow up, we know that COVID-19 has done, you know, a lot of damage. And there is maybe an opportunity now to bolster our economy by investing in infrastructure which will hopefully require a lot of American made steel and cement. You know I want to see a major infrastructure bill.

So how can a preference below emissions materials to a buy clean program for example you mentioned help decarbonize these sectors? And can we design such a program to ensure that imported products are held to the same emission standards as domestically manufactured products?

Obviously I would prefer made in America, but I don't want these other things to be awful either if they are imported.

Ms. Fendley. Right. Well, we have proposed starting with transparency on the embodied carbon or the emissions associated with production of materials used in major infrastructure project -- products and materials. And using the data collected from that

to direct investment into decarbonizing sectors, manufacturing sectors that really need help decarbonizing. And then eventually only having the Federal Government purchase materials that meet very reasonable standards for embodied carbon.

The Chairman. All right. Well thank you very much. I really think we have to use every tool we can, you know, to address climate actions, but obviously anything that is done should be oriented towards American products.

So thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. You are welcome. The chairman yields back. The chair now recognizes ranking member of the full committee, Representative Rogers. Mrs. Rodgers you are recognized for 5 minutes of questions, please.

Mrs. Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to all of our witnesses. I think that we need to recognize the tremendous advances in the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and meet clean air goals. There is no question the United States is leading the world in greenhouse gas emissions.

Last November, EPA released some data showing that between 2018 and 2019 total greenhouse gas emissions from large facilities in the United States fell by nearly 5 percent, so for power plants we are leading the world. Greenhouse gas emissions from power plants decreased by 25 percent between 2011 and 2019. You know, we have brought down our carbon emissions to the lowest that they have been since 1992, and per capita emissions are the lowest since 1950. And it is accomplished through this tremendous free enterprise system and the benefits our shale revolution, not because the Paris Agreement.

And I think it is interesting to note that right now not a single European Union country is within 80 percent of its target for emission reductions. All but five haven't even achieved 50 percent of their current target. It continues to be China and India that

is driving global carbon emissions, accounting for nearly half of the increase. China continues to be the world's biggest polluter, increasing millions of tons of emissions every year.

Meanwhile, in the United States we continue to improve our air quality to record levels, helping all communities. EPA air standards have significantly reduced industrial toxic air pollution. And over the last 50 years dramatically cut dangerous tailpipe emissions from vehicles and engines.

From 1970 to 2019, emissions of key six pollutants have dropped 77 percent while our economy has grown 285 percent proving that clean air policies and a robust economy can go hand in hand.

Mr. Mills, can you just speak a little bit to what the United States may be trading? You think about, you know, trading our strategic advantage in fossil energy for more reliance on supply chains from China and other countries.

I would like you to just speak to how U.S. domestic policy decisions relating to energy and climate tied roughly to our national and economic security interests.

And if you believe that China views America's climate policy decisions as a strategic economic and security matter and how it might use these decisions to take advantage of the United States.

Mr. Mills. Thank you, Congressman. Sorry I apologize, Congresswoman. I think it is obvious what the challenges are and I just repeat and I emphasize what you said, repeat again that we need to be honest about what we are undertaking.

And since 80 percent of America's energy is provided, all of our energy is provided by hydrocarbons we are self sufficient, essentially a net exporter of hydrocarbons. Not using that and using mineral based machines completely reverses, it essentially shuts down that part of the economy and reverses us from being self-sufficient and an exporter

to an importer -- not a net importer but a significant importer.

And that will be the case for years. It is not as if we can change that overnight. So it is indisputable that we are now importing or de facto importing minerals and materials made all over the world, but largely in China and to the carbon balance issue since it is a goal-able issue, it is indisputable that we have enormous hidden, if you like, export carbon dioxide emissions associated with let us just say batteries and solar panels.

It takes about 100 to 200 barrels of oil of energy to make a battery that could store barrels of oil's worth of energy. Those battery materials is where our energy intensive the process. They are mainly processed in China on a grid that is two-thirds coal fired. There are no plans, China tells us, that they are going to get rid of those coal-fired power plants for decades.

So I think it is obvious the Chinese -- this the trade, they are net importers of oil and gas so the biggest importers of oil in the world now. So as dependent importers of oil and gas I think they made a strategic decision to make the world dependent on them for the purchase of these energy minerals and materials.

It is a non trivial trade in economic and geopolitical terms, but importantly from a climate perspective, we will call them the hidden emissions that are associated with this are unavoidable, they are significant, and they are possible to get rid of or change in your term.

But certainly, we don't have any means to change that. Now, if we say we are not going to import things made with coal-fired electricity from China, we could say that, since their grid is two-thirds coal fired, that would mean that we would have to consider banning the imports of pretty much everything that China fabricates for us from electronic components, and air conditioners, to cleaning products and t-shirts. They all have huge carbon burdens associated with them by virtue of our importing them. They

do that, by the way, to make their power cheap for their industries. China has some of the cheapest electricity in the world. And the reason they have cheap electricity is because they are doing it with coal fire.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. That is okay.

Mrs. Rodgers. I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back. The chair now recognizes Representative Jan Schakowsky of Illinois. You are recognized, representative, for 5 minutes for questioning, please.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I think I feel sometimes that we are not beginning at the same place in believing that we what we face right now with the climate is an existential challenge to life on this planet that is going to require some major changes, some disruptive. And I agree totally that we have to think about those things that may be disrupted, including jobs of everyday people.

But at the same time, you know, when the tobacco industry realized how it was causing death and still does, we still felt that we had to take action. And I think it is so important that we acknowledge that and get a grip on the kind of changes that need to be made while we help those people who are caught in the transition.

I wanted to ask Ms. Fendley some questions. You know, I have really dedicated much of my life or at least in public service to the importance of domestic manufacturing and achieving our climate goals at the same time. And I wanted to ask you -- I wanted to ask you this, can you discuss the importance of domestic manufacturing to achieve our climate goals, putting those two together, by producing clean energy technologies and essential materials to rebuild our infrastructure?

Ms. Fendley. Yes. Thank you for the question.

These two crises, climate and the economy, have to go hand in hand. And manufacturing is, in our view, the only way to do this. It is an enormous challenge, but we already know that domestic manufacturers are among the cleanest in the world. And we can use innovative policies to drive the onshoring and reshoring of the manufacturing of some of these clean energy technologies like solar panels that were designed, that were conceptualized at the U.S. Department of Energy and are now primarily not manufactured here.

We certainly have steelworkers in the glass industry who used to make class for solar panels. They lost that business to China. But that factory is still open and we should figure out a way to make sure that those folks are making products for the economy of the future.

Ms. Schakowsky. So the people who may have lost their jobs because of the glass industry, those plants are still there. And those workers could be in those plants, is that what you are saying?

Ms. Fendley. Absolutely, absolutely. And we represent a lot of members who make components that are currently sold to the oil and gas industry or the coal industry and those facilities could be retooled. Those workers could make things for different industries. Those companies could be helped with new technology innovations in their factories.

It is not simple. There is not a one size fits all solution, but this is the challenge that we have before us that we have to tackle together.

Ms. Schakowsky. And what you are saying too, is that it is not a zero sum gain. There are things that we can do.

Ms. Tayloe, I wanted to talk to you about the issue of environmental justice. We

know that the victims of environmental pollution are greater in communities of color. So how do we make sure that the benefits of moving toward a cleaner economy also go to those communities?

Ms. Tayloe. That is a really great question. In the executive order there was the language around the Justice 40. And we are very happy to see the Biden administration make that commitment.

I think it would be critical to have very strong engagement with the communities for us to articulate how we would like to see that 40 percent. As mentioned, we have a solar worker training program in Harlem. And we have been very underfunded for years and there are similar programs throughout the country with an emphasis on workforce development and helping underemployed individuals get jobs. So having us at the table to discuss how we would like to see that money would be critical.

In addition to transportation, in New York we have MTA, that has been underfunded as well, and many of our residents depend on transportation. So having, you know, assistance there and also looking to electrify bus fleets would I think be critically important in terms of how to determine what that 40 percent he should look like.

Ms. Schakowsky. Absolutely. We have to build it into our legislation.

And if I could, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one thing to Mr. McKinley, a friend of mine. I absolutely think we can't just slop over the words transition, but we have to have real answers to that. What do we mean? What do we think will happen to the people who inevitably will lose their jobs in the fossil fuel industry if we move toward a much cleaner environment? And I don't feel like we are exactly there yet. And I think that answer is deserving.

And I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. The gentlewoman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the Representative Bill Johnson of Ohio for questioning for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter two items into the record. The first is a statement from the Laborers International Union of North America, LIUNA, and a second is a collection of comments from the AFL-CIO, both condemning the Biden administration's cancelation of the Keystone XL pipeline and the good paying jobs that are being canceled along with it.

[The information follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Johnson. I have to say, I find it disturbing that my colleagues are actually talking about disrupting the livelihoods and the jobs for I think this term was "everyday people." I mean, I didn't know who those everyday people are, but I suspect those everyday people are the hardworking people in my district, places like where I live whose jobs are being threatened by the Biden administration's policies.

You know, the Biden administration has been arrogant and dismissive in response to questions about these workers that are losing their jobs. As the Special Presidential Envoy for Climate, John Kerry, recently said when asked, what these workers will do now, he stated they could, and I quote, "Be the ones to make the solar panels." Seriously?

I mean, to Mr. Kerry and those who share this view, these are human beings, not machines that can simply be retooled. They have livelihoods, families, homes, and work that they take pride in. And does Mr. Kerry also recommend these workers pick up and move to China? Because that is where most solar panels are being manufactured today.

In my home State of Ohio the oil and gas industry supports over 200,000 jobs, many of which are located in my Appalachian district in the eastern and southeastern part of the State. These hardworking men and women who get up every morning to keep our lights on, keep our homes heated, our cars and trucks running, and who provide us with products that make modern life possible, and our environment cleaner with the use of natural gas, they deserve more respect than this.

So Mr. Mills, if the Biden administration eliminates more oil and gas infrastructure along with the good paying jobs that go with it and plows trillions of dollars into rapidly switching to renewables, is it fair to say that China would be the one, the top geopolitical and financial beneficiaries of such a policy?

Mr. Mills. Certainly the short answer is yes. And other than that, Russia and

the Middle East. But let me just briefly point out that the International Energy Agency, which is no -- they are certainly bullish and advocates of alternative energy sources and have -- the head is very much an advocate of following the Paris accord there is forecast pointed out that the world which is use more oil and gas in the future and not less. For the usefully foreseeable future, I mean the next decade or 2.

And if we produce less of it, others will produce that supply. That is the path that we are on, just given the inertia in the systems. Those that are the principal beneficiaries of us exiting the production of gas and oil are China -- not China sir -- China because of the price issues. The producers will be Russia and the Middle East primarily, some from Iran.

So geopolitics of this are unavoidable. The world is going to keep using oil a long time no matter how much effort we put into it.

And let me just say for the record, we should put more effort into it. Technology matters, transitions happen, they take a very long time.

Mr. Johnson. Yeah.

Mr. Mills. Beneficiaries will be China, in terms of exporting the so-called green products, minerals and Russia and the Middle East in terms of exporting the oil and gas the world will continue to use.

Mr. Johnson. Okay. You know, as you have mentioned, there are serious human rights, national security, and environmental consequences to the staggering increase in minerals and rare metals required for large-scale solar and wind energy.

But I want to touch an additional often overlooked point. As the Biden administration declares war on fossil fuels where do they think the energy-intensive production and transportation of millions of tons of plastics, concrete, steel, glass, and batteries will come from? Would clean energy even be possible without robust oil and

gas production, Mr. Mills?

Mr. Mills. Well, no. I mean, that is the challenge that Bill Gates has talked about. Even if you quote, "decarbonize" the electric grid, that is about 30 percent of the direct emissions in America for carbon dioxide. But it leaves the other two-thirds, which is exactly the subject you talk about, as well as the embodied carbon dioxide emissions if we don't produce the plastic here or the steel here, which we don't. The embodied emissions that we import are coming in from China and other countries.

France, by the way, is the only country I am aware of that has looked at, honestly at the real emissions of their citizens. And their client ministry issued a study at the end of last year and pointed out that the real per capita of emissions of carbon dioxide counting imported products in France has almost doubled the domestic emissions.

Mr. Johnson. Okay, all right.

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. My time has expired, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes Dr. Raul Ruiz, Representative Ruiz. You have 5 minutes for questioning, please.

Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

After 4 years of constantly defending attacks on clean energy and the environment, this hearing establishes a night and day difference in priorities in leadership on climate and the environment. In particular, I would like to focus on the needs and voices of underserved communities, communities of color and frontline communities, the people and neighborhoods like the ones in the eastern Coachella Valley in my district in southern California.

For decades these areas have born the brunt of environmental pollutants and the

subsequent health effects without the opportunity to participate in the very decisions affecting their health and safety.

President Biden's executive order on tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad takes important steps towards strengthening our environmental justice and public health protections. And it does so in a way that takes into account the voices of the people who are most affected. Specifically the order creates a consultation process to develop recommendations, to update the original environmental justice Executive Orders 12898 from 1994.

Ms. Tayloe, from your perspective, how important is it to make sure impacted communities have a voice in updating Executive Order 12898?

Ms. Tayloe. Thank you for that question, Congressman Ruiz. And I also would like to just thank you for your leadership around environmental justice. I know you had a bill that was released in I believe 2019 that we thought was very helpful for our issues.

As it relates to having an opportunity to engage around Executive Order 12898, which turns 27 years old on the 11th, I think it is critical. Unfortunately with it being an executive order and depending on the President in office at the time it doesn't always get the I think attention and Federal support that we need.

And so one, in addition to updating and strengthening the executive order, we also think it is critical to codify that order so that regardless of the President, it becomes law and that we have ability to --

Mr. Ruiz. So how would you strengthen that order?

Ms. Tayloe. Well, for sure right now taking the emphasis away from not only the EPA, but making sure that other Federal agencies understand that incorporating environmental justice into their work isn't something that only the EPA does.

I think historically unfortunately we have not seen the same level of interest in

environmental justice, policies and implementation across the agencies. And so that would be one of the key steps that we would want to see in terms of addressing the executive order.

Mr. Ruiz. And so that is a very key component. So I will be reintroducing the Environmental Justice Act of 2021, which is with Senator Booker which with codify parts of that executive order that you just mentioned, 12898.

And this bill passed the House last year as part of the Clean Economy Jobs and Innovation Act. I am hoping it will get signed into law this Congress because codifying the order will strengthen compliance and protection, and doesn't leave it vulnerable to the whims of an administration that may not prioritize environmental justice protection as you said.

I have another question for you, Ms. Tayloe. If President Biden issues a new, stronger executive order on environmental justice following this consultation, do you believe we should work to codify that order so that it will really be followed?

Ms. Tayloe. Definitely. Again, depending on the President in office, executive orders are at their whim. So having laws on this will truly protect environmental justice organizations and communities is critical.

Mr. Ruiz. Thank you. And I agree. I look forward to working with President Biden to incorporate improvements into my legislation. And I look forward to working with Chairman Tonko and Chairman Pallone of the full committee to move that legislation. These early climate leadership actions from the President are encouraging and I look forward to more to come. This is an equity issue on the environment.

If we talk about environmental equity, then it is precisely the environmental justice communities that we need to support, because the brunt of the pollutions in our country are near underserved communities, working poor, and communities of color.

And it is no wonder why they also have the highest rates of asthma, the highest rates of COPD, the highest rates of public health issues because environmental health is clearly demonstrated in the public's health.

And so that is why when we talk about climate change, we must talk about how it is over burdening its health impact in working class poor and communities of color throughout America.

And with that, I yield back my time.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the Representative Buddy Carter of Georgia for questioning for 5 minutes plates.

Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank all of the panelists for being here and participating in this.

Mr. Mills, I want to start with you. We have all heard some of the facts that have been cited here about how the U.S. has done such an outstanding job of decreasing or carbon emissions over the last decade. In fact, over the last decade carbon emissions have decreased in the United States more than the next 12 countries combined.

I don't understand why we don't give ourselves more credit for that. I just find that baffling. But even in EPA's 2020 report, they showed that emissions had fallen since 2005 the national greenhouse gas emissions had fallen by 10 percent and that power sector emissions had fallen by 27 percent, all the while that our economy has grown by 25 percent. So it has been proven that we can decrease our carbon footprint, decrease our carbon emissions, and still grow our economy and we have been doing that. And we have been doing it through the private sector, through the private sector innovation and through their investment. And that is what we need to continue to do in my opinion.

Mr. Mills, I wanted to ask you on January 27, President Biden signed an executive

order that would push the energy sector towards decarbonization by 2035. In reality, how are our utilities going to be able to do that? How are they going to be able to realistically meet those goals of decarbonization by 2035?

Mr. Mills. Well, I appreciate that question. As I have pointed out in my opening remarks, if I were guessing, and this is just a guess, I don't think it will happen, not whether it should happen, this is not a judgment call, the rate at which new capacity has to be added to the grid to replace existing capacity, it is a construction program.

Wind farms are big, solar farms are big, battery arrays are huge. These are physically large things that involve a lot of concrete, steel, plastic, and other metals. We know how long it takes to build these things. It would require genuinely a World War II level of effort, which is certainly in theory possible, I am not disputing that, but it is a 600 percent faster construction program that any grid construction program at peak has occurred in America in the last half century, or in Germany, or in China. It is one heck of a big construction program. So if we do this massive push to try to do that, I just don't think we have either the capacity, infrastructure or economic appetite for it.

To your point about the decarbonization so far, it has come entirely as we all know from switching from cheap coal to cheaper gas, the fracking revolution. One thing we could do, which again it I will refer to the head of the IEA, who has said numerous times, is the United States could help decarbonize the world by exporting more of its cheap gas and replacing coal.

Last year's China commission brought on the line new coal plants in the entire world combined. We could export natural gas and replace coal. This is for some people an interim solution, but it is a very real solution. It has a significant impact.

Mr. Carter. Let me ask you, Mr. Mills. When we talk -- a great point about gas plants and about natural gas and how we have done that. Here in my district we have

converted a liquid natural gas import to an export for. And that is the kind of -- I mean, that is good for the economy, good for the United States, good for the environment. And that is what is working here.

But let me ask you about the role of nuclear. As you know there are only two nuclear reactors -- four nuclear reactors I should said under construction right now, and they are under construction in Georgia. What role do you see nuclear playing in all of this?

Mr. Mills. Well, I will give a short answer. I am extraordinarily important I am a nuclear ball. For the record, I was at the accident at Three Mile Island during the week of the accident, spent the next decade of my life and career arguing for new classes of nuclear reactors that were easier and cheaper to build, inherently and transparently safe. We are clearly on that track as we have heard earlier from the Congresswoman from the State of Washington there is some very exiting technologies. This will take time, but I think is it is an extraordinarily important area of investment.

Mr. Carter. One last thing real quickly. As we push toward more renewables, and we talk about the supply chains and we know that rare Earth minerals are being processed in China, but as China enacts more legislation to prohibit the export of those, what is that going to mean for America?

Mr. Mills. Well, China has in fact put in their plan to consider strategic constraints on exports of rare minerals. It does mean that we are very dependent and at risk

geopolitically for that.

Mr. Carter. Thank you very much.

And I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. You are welcome.

The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the representative from New York, Representative Yvette Clarke for 5 minutes worth of questioning.

Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank our Ranking Member McKinley for holding this very important hearing, very timely on Federal climate leadership.

Let me first say that I believe we are standing at an inflection point in our civil society. Not only are we facing interrelated crises around COVID-19, the economy, racial injustice and climate change, but these crises have also forced us to come to terms with the disparities that stem from deeply rooted systemic racism and inequality which continue to plague our institutions, our society, and indeed our policies.

Our constituents are now demanding for us to be bold, to rise up and meet the magnitude of this moment. And we must heed their call. The Biden-Harris administration has already released several executive orders on climate change and environmental justice, including a Justice 40 initiative to target Federal investments towards disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Tayloe, why is it so important that we prioritize low-income communities, communities of color, the Tribal communities as we invest in a clean energy future?

Ms. Tayloe. Thank you for that question, Congresswoman Clarke. It is critical that we prioritize communities of color for the Justice 40 initiative, because for years we have been disproportionately impacted by climate change. While we are all the experiencing extreme heat and storms, unfortunately our communities get the brunt of that. And unfortunately there hasn't always been the same level of support in helping us to recover from these major climate experiences that we have had, whether that be extreme storms, heat, et cetera.

So moving forward with the Justice 40 initiative that the Biden administration has

laid out in terms of how they believe we should operate within the executive order, we think it is critical that again EJ organization, similar to React, be at the table to talk about what we believe those investments should look like, whether that is air monitoring in our communities, access to electric buses and school buses for our communities to reduce air pollution, access to workforce training opportunities to increase our access to the green jobs, the future that we see coming forward.

So this Justice 40 initiative must center environmental justice communities again because we have been disproportionately impacted.

Ms. Clarke. Yes. In addition to having its own 40 percent goal, New York State's recent Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act establishes a climate justice working group comprised of community stakeholders and government experts to help guide the allocation of clean energy investments.

Ms. Tayloe, do you think that a similar climate justice working group at the national level could also help ensure that Federal investments and programs appropriately prioritize climate burdened communities.

Ms. Tayloe. Definitely. And for the New York version that you spoke of, we asked serves on the Climate Justice Working Group and the Transportation Advisory Panel and so having a similar mechanism for Federal engagement I think is really critical.

We are really proud of work that we did around the CLCPA to get that passed and for New York to lead the country in the creation of such important climate policy I think shows what we can also duplicate at the Federal level. So again, having that working group for communities to be a part of is critical.

Ms. Clarke. I thank you. I think this is something that we should be seriously looking into. And I look forward to discussing this matter further with you.

You know, the Biden-Harris administration

has also publicly stated their commitment to a clean energy sector by 2035. And I believe it is critical that Congress support this effort with bold legislation. In particular, we must ensure that renewable sources of energy like wind and solar are central these goals.

Ms. Goldfuss, do you think that adopting an ambitious renewable energy standard at the national level could be complimentary to the proposals that we are seeing for a clean energy standard and help us to more rapidly and equitably achieve a zero emission energy sector?

Ms. Goldfuss. Yes, absolutely. I think figuring out the role and how much renewables we have and actually getting a goal of 2030 is crucial to making sure that the policy actually works and we deploy the right amount of energy to achieve those goals.

Ms. Clarke. Absolutely. And Ms. Fendley, a recent study conducted by Wood MacKenzie found that reaching a majority renewable thread would support 1 million energy sector jobs. Do you agree that a strong Federal push towards renewables would create substantial good paying union jobs?

Ms. Fendley. Yes. It would certainly create many, many good paying union jobs. I think the other thing that Congress has to do to ensure that those are union jobs is past the PRO act as well.

Ms. Clarke. Thank you.

Back in December Congressman Peter Welch and I introduced legislation to set bold nationwide renewable energy targets over the next 10 years. And I look forward to reintroducing that legislation with my colleague in the coming weeks. It is time for Congress to rise up, meet its obligations and meet the magnitude of this moment, our future depends on it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back. The chair now recognizes the Representative Gary Palmer of Alabama for questioning for 5 minute, please.

Representative Palmer. Welcome to the subcommittee.

Mr. Palmer. Am I unmuted now? Can you hear me?

Mr. Tonko. Yes.

Mr. Palmer. Am I unmuted?

Mr. Tonko. We can hear you, sir.

Mr. Palmer. Okay. Thank you.

I just want to talk a little bit about some of these policies that concern me and that is how they impact low-income families. I grew up in a family basically dirt poor. We heated our house with a coal-fired heater. And as we pursue these policies, it is going to have a disproportionate impact on low-income families.

And particularly in regard to being able to keep their homes heated. There is a huge disparity between people who die from cold than heat. There is a Lancet report that came out a few years ago that said that basically 17 times more people died from cold than from heat. Mr. Mills, I would like you to comment on that.

Mr. Mills. So, Congressman, I think you put your finger on it is important. I know everyone in Congress is keenly aware of this is affordability of energy for people who are in the lower income brackets. It is easy if you are wealthy to afford your electric bill and your gas bill. These have always been difficult issues. It is clearly the case, we have done this experiment before, is we restrict oil production of oil and gas in a significant way, the price of gasoline and oil will go up. It is already happening, I think it may accelerate.

If we push hard to increase the use of wind solar, which is a principle of clean energy technologies being proposed and subsidized, it will increase the cost of electricity.

It already has. We have in our European neighbors the experiments that have been done. We have far more higher penetrations of wind and solar and far more expensive electricity.

In U.K., and Germany, and other countries that talk about energy poverty where the cost to heat a home their electric bill is their single largest bill, it overwhelms all their other bills. These are serious issues. I think we can't ignore them. They are hard to avoid. It isn't the case that we had enough with the cheaper grid if we mandate replacement inexpensive power with more expensive power.

I will give you an example. The Reverend Jesse Jackson has been advocating for the construction of a natural gas pipeline to serve the Pembroke Township in Illinois. It is a town of 21,000 people who have no access to natural gas. And without the pipeline, some of those residents have been using appliances like wood burning stoves to heat their homes.

And so, Ms. Fendley, do you support or oppose that effort to bring national gas to Pembroke, Illinois.

Ms. Fendley. I am not familiar with that particular issue. But I will say that as I included in my testimony, climate policies are economic policies. We have to work to raise people's --

Mr. Palmer. Ms. Fendley, the question is would you support or oppose bringing a natural gas pipeline to Pembroke Township our do you think that Jesse Jackson's wrong?

Ms. Fendley. Congressman, I am not at all familiar with this particular --

Mr. Palmer. I will take that as an effort to try to filibuster with your answer.

Let me also point out that extreme weather events -- let me go back to something else, because I am running out of time. Candidate Biden said during a debate that he

would not ban fracking. Do you think he should keep his word or what he misleading the American public? I will ask Ms. Goldfuss that.

Ms. Goldfuss. His comment was that he would not been fracking on private lands. He does not have the authority to do that. He made very clear that he was going to put in place a moratorium for fracking on public lands, which is what he did in his executive order that came out on climate change.

Mr. Palmer. Well, actually, his campaign put out a statement that he said he would ban new fracking. So I think he has already kind of backed away from what he originally said.

I would also like to point out that your efforts to eliminate the fossil fuel industry, particular natural gas, is going to have a major impact on the employment of women, African Americans, and Hispanics. Maybe you consider that collateral damage, I hope not. But I think you have to take that into account. And as someone who grew up like I said pretty much dirt poor, these policies will make an enormous difference to the lives of people.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes Representative Scott Peters from California, Representative Peters you are recognized for questioning for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start by acknowledging the calls of my friends Mrs. McMorris Rodgers and Mr. McKinley for bipartisanship on this panel. I would just point out that the Green New Deal is a talking point on both sides of the aisle. I would remind my colleagues that fewer that half of the congressional Democrats have cosponsored it. Yet, we all recognize that we have real work to do on climate change.

And I want to thank Mr. McKinley for partnering with me and coauthoring my bill the USE IT Act on carbon capture and utilization, which was passed in a bipartisan way as part of a year end package. And I want to thank and reiterate my support for working with Mrs. McMorris Rodgers on hydropower, next generation nuclear, and on fighting wildfires, which are not only an effect of climate change, but are also major contributors of warming black carbon soot, which is a major climate pollutant. And I think we have to deal with that and we can work on that together.

It is quite correct, though, we can't win this global battle without the rest of the world. And that is exactly why we need to be engaged in leading the world in climate policies through the Paris Agreement and other international engagements.

And I finally, I do have to stand up for California. I am really proud of California's leadership in this deal. Today, 45 percent of the pour that come out of my wall outlet from San Diego Gas & Electric Company is renewable and that number is headed up. And if California is first, if you are first, you won't always get it right, we get that. But it is really deceptive to talk about costs in the way that is being discussed now and no one has mentioned this before. People are talking about today's cost without thinking about the cost of doing nothing. This will be an expensive effort, but it will a much less expensive effort if we act now and I think that is the right thing to do.

One other point, there has been a lot of talk about carbon here lately, carbon dioxide, which is essential. I want to remind everyone that short-lived climate pollutants, primarily HFCs, methane, and black carbon soot deserve at least as much attention from this subcommittee as they are causing warming today. And because constraining these short-lived pollutants would give us the fastest impact on slowing warming.

And this talk about carbon emissions being down, and that is true, but mostly that

is because of cheap natural gas. And just about all the climate benefits of going from coal to cheap natural gas are lost unless we can control fugitive methane emission and I hope we can work on that in this committee.

I do have two questions with respect to carbon dioxide. First is with respect to high voltage transmission. According to recent studies from UC Berkeley and Princeton, we may need about 70 new gigawatts of clean electricity added to our energy mix every year for the next 15 years. Last year we deployed about half of that.

Mrs. Goldfuss, can you explain how transmission can be a limiting factor in bringing renewable resources on board, especially when they are in remote parts of the country?

Ms. Goldfuss. It is a matter of hooking up the actual generation with basically the areas that can transmit the electricity to people's homes. So if you put wind and solar in places where there aren't access to hookups for transmission, then we can't get the electricity to people's homes.

So this is a crucial part of the puzzle. And we have seen some interesting policies, Senator Heinrich has a bill out right now that actually incentivizes those tax credits for transmission. But this will need to be a core part of our strategy, because if you can't transmit the renewable energy to where it needs to, go then we won't be successful in building it out obviously.

Mr. Peters. Right. Every credible study indicates a significant need to build new interstate transmission lines to enable geographically constrained renewables to be built for that electricity to be used where it is needed. It can be done in a way that grows jobs across our national geography and socioeconomics in a way that enhances the grid's resilience and reliability and reduces pollution and energy prices and I think that could be a bipartisan effort.

My second question I think I will pose this also to you, Ms. Goldfuss. I really appreciate your emphasis on science-based decisionmaking. I think that is very welcome. Recently I saw that none of the National Academy of Sciences in its report on accelerating decarbonization of the U.S. energy system recommends that economy-wide price on carbon to help transition away from fossil fuel energy.

Now we in Congress anticipate a big infrastructure bill to be sent from the administration with a focus on battling climate change and with an emphasis on environmental justice. Historically we have used the gasoline tax to fund those efforts. Don't you agree that an economy-wide tax on carbon would be a logical and effective way to help pay for infrastructure investments going forward?

Ms. Goldfuss. I don't think it is appropriate to start with an economy-wide carbon tax. It does not reach certain sectors, like the transportation sector. Really we need to focus on incentivizing the behavior we need to see first to get to those communities, get the 40 percent of benefits right to get the jobs right. And right now, a carbon tax has not proven to be either politically viable or really effective in the way that we know a --

Mr. Peters. I just --

Ms. Goldfuss. -- standard or deployment of renewables could be.

Mr. Peters. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, that is not the advice of scientists or economists and it that is going to a problem for me going forward. I just want to let folks know. I think that is critical to saving this planet.

And I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman John Curtis of Utah for the purpose of questioning for 5 minutes.

Representative Curtis, please.

Mr. Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and our ranking member. I am so happy to be on this subcommittee.

Mr. Tonko. Welcome to the subcommittee.

Mr. Curtis. Thank you.

I just would like to compliment my colleagues who called for bipartisan action. My colleague in San Diego, thank you not only for the call for bipartisan, but really your tone. I appreciate that. My regret today is that I only have 5 minutes to discuss this topic. Because of its nuances it is so important to Utah. I would like to think that all of us can agree on some common goals when it comes to the environment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I am getting some background noise there.

Mr. Tonko. I ask everyone to please mute yourselves.

Mr. Curtis. Thank you.

I would like to think that we could all agree on some common goals when it comes to the environment. Now let's pause for just a minute. We can all agree that less pollution is better than more, less carbon in the air is better, less plastic in the ocean is better, cleaner water is better, cleaner air is better.

We can all agree that we shouldn't waste resources and we should be more efficient. I can't imagine that there is really even a member on this committee would disagree with these points.

With that in mind, I have watched the fury of executive orders dealing with the environment and questioned if anybody has really defined the exact goal. Now what I mean by that is I kind of think the goal is less carbon in the air. And if that is so, and if that is the goal, I think it is fair to evaluate these executive orders in light of how well they meet that goal.

Mr. Chairman, you have encouraged this, as others have, to put science at the heart of our decisionmaking. And I would love to look at the executive orders from a science fact based perspective, particularly the Keystone pipeline. Much has been said about the loss of jobs. I would also like to point out that the company set aside hundreds of millions of dollars in contracts in Canadian indigenous communities who saw the pipeline as a once in a lifetime opportunity to build infrastructure.

Some say canceling the pipeline is a little bit like taking the head off to fix the headache. But jobs and infrastructure site does the science of evidenced based evaluation claim will fix the headache or in other words does the science point to reduce carbon in the air because of the cancellation of the pipeline.

I recently spoke to a member of parliament from Canada who expressed strong concern. In his opinion, we didn't increase demand, therefore we will be now trucking that oil in or it will be coming from sources around the world that produce it in a dirtier environment.

Mr. Mills, is it fair to say that canceling Keystone XL Pipeline won't significantly decrease the demand for oil and that the oil will simply be provided in a different manner such as trucking or from a source that will likely produce more carbon?

Mr. Mills. The short answer is yes. The oil will move both by truck and rail into markets, unless there is a legal mechanism, I don't know one to stop that, but in which case the oil will be produced elsewhere. Because the world isn't overnight going to stop using oil. I think most everybody recognizes that. So the carbon footprint of the oil that is used to fuel airplanes, and cars, and trucks is relevant.

And of course the Keystone folks, as you clearly know, not only have gone out of their way in Canada -- I confess I am Canadian so I might be bragging here a bit -- but the premier of Alberta who I will be talking to tonight as a matter of fact on a [Inaudible] to

the event is adamant that they are leaders in the world in decarbonizing oil production. That may sound oxymoronic, but it is essential in this path that we have talked about. And also they had also contracted for the pumps that move the oil to be powered by wind and solar machines.

Mr. Curtis. Let me be really specific then. In your opinion, and if we looked at science, and evidence-based facts, canceling the pipeline will not decrease our carbon output in the air?

Mr. Mills. No. It clearly will not. There is no arithmetic or science that gets to you that point. You have to cancel the use of oil everywhere to reduce that footprint.

Mr. Curtis. In other words, we have got to work on the demand.

Mr. Mills. You have to work on the demand globally, because we are talking about a global issue, exactly.

Mr. Curtis. Yeah. Now I only have just have a few second left, but I regret that part of this conversation villainizes fossil fuels. And you touched on this earlier, but I wanted to emphasize it. If our goal of less carbon in the air, using U.S. natural gas, could dramatically reduce carbon around the world?

I know that is hard, because a lot of people don't want to use fossil fuels. But using fossil fuels to reduce carbon, should that be part of our strategy?

Mr. Mills. Well, I think it should be. I can say that Bill Gates has gone on the record saying it should be. And Fatih Birol, the head of IEA, have gone on the record saying it should be.

Mr. Curtis. I regret we are out of time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. And The chair now recognizes the Representative from Maryland, John Sarbanes for 5 minutes for questioning.

Representative Sarbanes, please.

It appears as though we may have some technology problem with unmuting.

Brenden do we --

Voice. You can go ahead to Mrs. Dingell and come back to him.

Mr. Tonko. We are trying to solve the problem with Representative Sarbanes. And we will go to Representative Dingell of Michigan for 5 minutes, please. Representative Dingell.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for convening today's hearing.

For the past 2 years this committee has been working day in and day out to address the climate crisis. Now we have an administration that recognizes the urgency of the crisis and has already taken actions to tackle it head on. But the real work has really got to begin and that is what we are about today.

As the President has said, climate change presents substantial challenges, but it also offers a vital opportunity to invest in our economy, in our workforce, in our future.

Last week, I reintroduced legislation to establish a national clean energy and sustainability accelerator to start making those investments and help us achieve a clean net zero emission economy by 2050. I am very proud to say it is bipartisan.

My colleague, Brian Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania is one of cosponsors and we are going to keep working to try to make this a very bipartisan effort.

The accelerator's based on a highly successful green bank model that has been deployed across the United States, supported against by Democrats and Republicans. It would leverage public and private funding to invest in our clean energy future.

Financing projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions across sectors and across the countries. And it would also support the development of new State and local green

banks. Importantly, the accelerator would direct 40 percent of the investments to communities that are on the frontlines of climate change, which is a key pillar of the THRIVE agenda.

So let me start with you, Ms. Goldfuss. If I could, recent research, including findings released just last week by the National Academy of Sciences, has identified this exact type of financing institution as a critical tool to help decarbonize the United States economy. Can you please speak to the role that the national clean energy and sustainable accelerator can play in helping the U.S. meet its goals?

RPTR MOLNAR

EDTR ZAMORA

[1:59 p.m.]

Ms. Goldfuss. Absolutely. Thank you, Congresswoman, and thank you for the legislation. It is really exciting to see this move forward and to see the shift from the 20 percent investment in communities to the 40 percent, which matches where the President and Vice President are right now.

It is critical that we have investment opportunities like this that allow us to invest in new innovation and really the new technological opportunities. What an accelerator like this does is it really helps, bridges the gap in some cases for where deployment needs to happen and some types of technology to give them a better leg up than they might be able to get in other types of financing.

So this has been, as you mentioned, a really crucial tool at the State level to investing into those solutions and making the leaps that need to happen in technology. And this would only back up other States that need to take that step themselves or work with some of the infrastructure that is already on the ground in States to deploy clean energy. So it is a really exciting advancement that has been tested both in the States and internationally and been successful.

Mrs. Dingell. I had another question for you, but I am going to do it on the record, because I want to get to Ms. Fendley.

Ms. Fendley, how would a national finance institution like the accelerator stimulate investment in infrastructure, including a clean energy infrastructure?

Ms. Fendley. Well, as Ms. Goldfuss said, this is an important tool that could be used to invest in the right kinds of infrastructure, the kinds that we need to make sure that we move goods efficiently and productively and the kinds of infrastructure that are

resilient to the extreme weather events that we are expected to see moving forward. We would just want to make sure that domestic content preferences, Buy America, buy clean, were part of any policy like that.

Mrs. Dingell. So I am running out of time, so I am going to put questions on the record for both of you.

I really want to switch quickly to electric vehicles, because we have got to -- the shift is taking place to electrifying transportation. It is going electric. You have heard GM and Ford in the last week, the announcements that they have made. It is a major milestone.

I would like to ask both of you in the remaining time what you think this means for a clean energy transition, but what are the challenges, and how do we ensure that, one, we are doing the battery development here, building those batteries here, and that we are creating green jobs, not losing jobs? Whichever of you wants to go first.

Ms. Goldfuss. Ms. Fendley, why don't you start. The jobs are so important on this one.

Ms. Fendley. Yeah. I agree that this presents an enormous opportunity, and we should avoid the pitfall, the potential pitfall, that a shift to EVs is used as an opportunity to offshore the domestic supply chain for others, which is a crucial industry that spans across many geographies.

I think that as far as batteries goes, we have a real challenge to develop a Federal strategy, to make sure that we do that production here, that we build those technologies.

Mrs. Dingell. I am out of time, but I am going to ask you both for the record because I totally agree on all fronts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back.

The chair now recognizes Representative Dan Crenshaw of Texas for 5 minutes for questioning. Representative, welcome to the subcommittee.

Mr. Crenshaw. Well, it is great to be here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for being here and holding this hearing.

Protecting the environment is incredibly important, and we should use all the tools in our toolbox to do so. I firmly believe that. But I also want to read you a quote. Quote: A job is about a lot more than a paycheck. It is about dignity. It is about respect. It is about being able to look your kid in the eye and say, everything will be okay.

President Joe Biden said that countless times on the campaign trail, and I fully agree with him, but I can't tell you how many of my constituents, my neighbors, people in my community, oil and gas workers in my district, who have told me that they can't look their family in the eye and tell them everything will be okay. They don't know if they are going to be able to put food on the table or afford to put a full tank of gas in their car or if they will have to leave Texas in search of the, quote/unquote, green jobs they are being promised by John Kerry after their industry is destroyed.

But at least we could hope that they would sleep well knowing they are sacrificing their job to save the environment, to save the world, right? Well, no, and I think we all know that.

According to the U.N. projections, if the world's richest countries stopped emitting carbon right now, stopping economies in their tracks, we would lower global temperatures by just 0.8 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century. Moreover, ceding our energy leadership will do nothing to stop global energy demand from

increasing. This point has been made over and over again on this hearing.

That demand will get filled; it just won't get filled by us. It will get filled by countries like Russia and Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. As many of our witnesses have already pointed out, I would also point out that they emit a lot more carbon dioxide as they produce oil and gas. So we are doing nothing to help the environment at all. We are just destroying lives and we are not getting anything in return.

The conversation today is not about whether there is climate change caused by man-made emissions. That is not the debate. The conversation is about the solutions. And for all the talk of science I have heard, it seems that science has no place in the solutions being offered by many of my colleagues.

The reality is my constituents in the oil and gas industry are the only ones that have made meaningful change in reducing our emissions. It is U.S. fracking that has brought U.S. emissions down to 1992 levels.

If we want to reduce emissions globally, and I think we do, we need to be exporting more U.S. liquid natural gas. Even Energy Secretary nominee Jennifer Granholm believes that exporting LNG has an important role in reducing global emissions. She said so. Fatih Birol, executive director of the International Energy Agency, said, from an emissions point of view, U.S. LNG, if it replaces coal in Asia, can lead to significant emission declines, both in terms of CO2 emissions but also for air pollution.

I just want to know if we all agree on that baseline. For all the witnesses, do we agree, shouldn't we export more natural gas, or does anyone disagree with that?

Going once, going twice. If no one disagrees, then --

Ms. Goldfuss. I disagree. I was -- sorry, I just have to say --

Mr. Crenshaw. Let's have that conversation. Tell me why. Because, Ms. Goldfuss, you were very emphatic earlier that you were happy that the science is

back. So tell me how the sciences support your position.

Ms. Goldfuss. Because if you lock in the natural gas infrastructure now, you are talking about decades of deployment. It is really a question about where we are investing and this particular turning point. So, you know, that being said --

Mr. Crenshaw. These experts seem to disagree with you, and basic logic disagrees with you, because, again, global demand will increase for energy by at least 25 percent over the next two decades. That will be met by somebody. Okay? You cannot replace it with just green energy. That is a fact.

It is also a fact that we have reduced our emissions to 1992 levels because of the fracking revolution. Again, it is not just science; it is engineering and it is common sense. It is looking back at what has worked and what hasn't. So the experts disagree with you, the ones I just mentioned, the new Secretary of Energy disagrees with you, I disagree with you.

I want to move on.

Ms. Goldfuss. I just want to make one last point. Okay, go ahead.

Ms. Tayloe. I would like to say --

Mr. Crenshaw. I have heard a lot about environment -- I wish I had more time, because I would love to do this with you guys all day long.

I have heard a lot about environmental justice today. Seems to me there is a belief that hydrocarbons are particularly dangerous for Black and Brown communities. Here is the thing: Effective emissions are color-blind, but the radical solutions being proposed are not and, in fact, hurt low-income citizens the most.

Ms. Tayloe, I would like to know, how is it that in California it is primarily leaders from communities of color that are pushing back against the radical environmental policies of Governor Newsom? These include the California Black Chamber of

Commerce; The Two Hundred, which is a coalition of Latino civil rights leaders; two minority Democrat California legislators, Jim Cooper and Blanca Rubio; and the UCLA Center for Environment and Sustainability. So I am just wondering, who should we listen to, you or them?

Ms. Tayloe. You should always listen to community voices. So I would hope that when you are talking about these organizations that are against it, they are speaking from the community.

And I would also like to say that climate scientists say that the rising production of natural gas is emerging as one of the biggest drivers of climate change. So while you want to put that as a priority, we also have to think about the public health impacts to communities.

So make sure that you are doing the meaningful engagement when you are quoting communities -- quote communities instead of just organizations. I think that is where you are going to have the real solutions and the real honest impacts of how hydropower, or what you are speaking to there, or even natural gas, how that impacts us.

Mr. Crenshaw. I am sorry, but you didn't answer the question. Are they wrong? Do these people not represent Black and Brown communities? Because that is your implication.

Ms. Tayloe. No. What I am saying is make sure that when you are listing up voices that you are including communities in doing that.

Mr. Crenshaw. Okay. Well, I have family who -- I have a Latino stepbrother who works in the oil and gas industry, but I guess his voice matters too?

Oh, I am out of time. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tonko. Okay. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the Representative from Maryland, Representative John

Sarbanes. Hopefully, the connection is better.

Mr. Sarbanes. Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me?

Mr. Tonko. I can.

Mr. Sarbanes. Okay. Great. I appreciate your indulgence here. I want to thank you for this hearing today, emphasizing, I think, in many respects, how different the Biden administration approach is going to be from the last administration in important ways.

Certainly, communities across the Nation, including in my own district, have gotten tired of a system that seems to put the special interest ahead of the public interest and the interest of the people, and I think that is the focus that the Biden administration is trying to restore.

I am very pleased that the executive order that President Biden issued on tackling the climate crisis here at home, as well as abroad, focuses, among other things, on enforcement of environmental laws and environmental justice communities, just to kind of pick up on the theme of the last exchange. I think that is very important to put that environmental justice lens in place.

In particular, section 222 of the executive order, would outline new duties for the EPA and the Department of Justice to strengthen enforcement of environmental violations with disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Tayloe, do you think that these early actions that have been taken by President Biden with respect to enforcement for environmental justice communities is significant -- is a significant step?

Ms. Tayloe. I will say for surely that last -- well, January 2017 was a very important day for environmental justice communities. The executive order reflected a lot of recommendations that we have been making, not only within the transition, but

beyond. I would say for decades.

Having an Office of Environmental Justice within the Department of Justice would be a very important step, and so we are happy to see that included in the executive order, in addition to changing the name of the Office of Energy and Natural Resources to the Office of Environmental Justice and Natural Resources.

So that level of commitment we do see as something very valuable, in addition to the creation of the advisory council at the White House level on environmental justice. That is something we really appreciated. And just even the language that was used in the executive orders, looking at legacy pollutions, that is very strong language that really denotes a really strong understanding from the Biden administration about how to address climate injustice issues.

Mr. Sarbanes. Thanks very much. You know, when we look at environmental justice in the context of climate action, one topic often overlooked, it turns out, is waste, and more specifically, plastic waste. But this is an issue that is central both to the climate crisis and to environmental justice.

The U.S. produces inordinate amounts of plastic each year, and that is expected to ramp up, unfortunately, in the years ahead. By 2050, global greenhouse emissions are expected to account for as much as 13 percent of the global carbon budget from waste and plastic. But 9 percent of all plastic waste ever produced has been recycled. So there is a lot of work to do here. The rest of it ends up in landfills as litter, or incinerated, and we got to get that under control if we are going to address the climate crisis.

Ms. Goldfuss, why is it important that we broaden our approach to climate action to include these sorts of issues like plastic production and disposal that some might view, I guess, as secondary contributors to climate change?

Ms. Goldfuss. The issue of expansion around petrochemicals is becoming an incredible concern. We expect it to drive about half of the growth in fossil fuel demand over -- until the mid-century. So the pollution that we see from petrochemical plants, which are commonly -- as Ms. Tayloe knows, surround communities of color. Mossville, Louisiana, is a particular community that has 12 petrochemical plants that are being sited around it.

But we also see, if there is a disaster, like extreme weather, in Houston, there was a facility where the toxic chemicals actually spilled out and exposed the communities around the area. So it is both a matter of the emissions and the pollution in creating plastics that make it a serious concern. And then obviously, as you mentioned, all of the plastics end up in the ocean. We do not have great strategies for cleaning up plastic pollution at this time, and we will need to address that as we look at the ocean getting more and more damaged due to climate change.

Mr. Sarbanes. Ms. Tayloe, I only have about 20 seconds, but I would love your thoughts on this issue with respect to frontline communities.

Ms. Tayloe. Definitely. I think immediately of Cancer Alley in Louisiana, which is home to a number of petrochemical facilities, in addition to just the whole Gulf South that has, unfortunately, been the seat of a number of our most polluting industries. And if we are truly going to address environmental justice and the climate crisis, we need to make sure that when we think about permitting, you know, the Clean Air and Clean Water Act, that community impact is considered.

Mr. Sarbanes. Thanks to all of you.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the Representative from Delaware, Representative Lisa

Blunt Rochester, for 5 minutes of questioning, please, and welcome.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this important hearing. Congratulations to Ranking Member McKinley. And I want to thank the witnesses also for their important testimonies.

Every part of our country is seeing the impacts of climate change, from the devastating wildfires ravaging the West, to the rising sea levels and higher temperatures right here in my home State of Delaware. We are all impacted by the changing climate.

But climate change is not the only challenge that we have faced this past year. We are also facing an ongoing public health crisis, an economic disruption, and systemic racism. And these crises are not occurring in a vacuum. They are all interrelated, and our solutions to address them must be as well.

And I want to say thank you so much to the responses, particularly yours, Ms. Tayloe, regarding the fact that, of course, those other communities, like the Black Business Chamber, are all welcome to the table and represent people, but what is different about this moment and why this is so significant what this administration is doing is that there is a focus on bringing the people who are most impacted, not just their livelihoods, but their lives and the quality of their lives to the table.

President Biden ran on a platform to Build Back Better, and I can't agree more, which is why I introduced the Open Back Better Act last year and why I plan to reintroduce it in the upcoming weeks.

The Open Back Better Act invests in retrofits to public buildings, such as our hospitals, libraries, and community centers, making them more energy efficient and more resilient. And it prioritizes investments in environmental justice communities which are disproportionately burdened by the health and economic impacts of the COVID

pandemic.

My first question is for Ms. Fendley. First, I want to thank you and the Steelworkers for all of the work that you do. Both of my grandparents were able to get great paying jobs and raise our families in the quality of life as steelworkers. I just found my grandmom, Lillian Lucille Jackson's card, her life membership card as a steelworker.

And in the first days of President Biden signed these executive orders, it included measures to make the country's infrastructure more sustainable. Why is this policy guidance so important, and how might investments in energy efficiency and resiliency in schools, hospitals, and other public buildings help Americans get back to work?

Ms. Fendley. Thank you for the question. And it is always wonderful to hear about a family legacy of membership in our union.

As you have said, energy efficiency is incredibly important. This is a great bucket of infrastructure investment that we can and must do. And I will reference a study that I mentioned in my written testimony about the importance of Buy America in energy retrofits, of buying the windows that we are replacing with windows made by American workers, and the potential to create 170,000 jobs if we are doing those deep energy building retrofits as both this climate strategy to reduce our emissions, but also as you said, an economic development strategy to help with those interlocking crises.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you. Thank you.

Ms. Tayloe, how will these investments help communities, and specifically, how can we ensure that these investments reach environmental justice communities?

That is one question I have. And the other, in the interest of time, is really about how folks can do a better job engaging the communities that are least at the table. So one is, how can we ensure that the investments go to the right places?

Ms. Tayloe. Well, quickly, to retrofit public buildings, I think, is an easy way to

utilize our Federal and State funding to create the transition to a more renewable energy future. In addition, there are so many children and teachers who spend so much time within schools, within libraries, et cetera, so having more energy efficiency kinds of implementation within those buildings speaks to creating more healthier environments for them as well.

So when we think about how all those communities have been impacted by COVID, et cetera, with air quality, asbestos, all of these issues happen in our schools, and so retrofitting them to make them a healthier place for everyone, I think, is critical to communities.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. Great. Thank you so much.

I just want to end up by saying that, again, I am glad that there is a focus on bringing more people to the table to make better decisions about the future of our country and to make sure that our health, our environment, and our economy are all strong.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership, and I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Representative Darren Soto, 5 minutes for questioning, sir, and welcome.

Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairman.

Years from now, schoolchildren will learn about the climate crisis we face. At this very moment, they will learn about how we had until about 2050 to substantially reduce fossil fuel pollution. Either they will read how we came together to solve this existential threat to the human race or that a partisan divide hindered our response, dooming us to failure.

And we are charged with challenging and addressing this climate crisis in this

committee, at this moment. Polluting nations like China and India do not set the standards for American excellence. We do.

And what is the cost of inaction? Florida will be largely under water, or surrounded by seawalls, and suffer over 100 extremely hot days a year by 2050. Tourism and agriculture jobs in my State would be decimated by this. Millions of Floridians would become climate refugees as well, and this will play out throughout the sunbelt States.

I keep hearing about job losses in the fossil fuel community. What about my State? What about our job losses in Florida by continuing to go on this path? The jobs you are arguing for destroy the jobs in my State. They destroy the economy and our way of life in my State. That is why we believe we have to act.

And the good news is the majority of Americans are already with us, especially our young people. I mean, the private sector -- we keep on hearing about that -- they are already moving forward. Do you think it was by accident that GM booked a Super Bowl ad talking about how they are moving away from gas vehicles to electric-powered vehicles by 2035, and how they are boosting 30 new electric vehicles by 2025? They are getting with the program, as is Ford with the $29 billion investment in electric vehicles and even producing an electric F-150, a workhorse of American industry, by 2022.

President Biden is doing his part with the climate accord, the Paris climate accord, pausing new Federal oil and gas leases, converting our Federal fleet to electric vehicles, like private industry, reserving 30 percent of Federal lands for conservation, and most importantly, boosting the Buy American rules to boost our Federal purchases of U.S. goods.

And we have to do our effort here in Congress -- the Moving Forward Act, with a $1 trillion infrastructure plan, including the LIFT Act that we worked on to upgrade our

grid, boost renewable potential, hospital infrastructure, and broadband, included all the recommendations of the Climate Change Plan, the bipartisan Clean Economy Jobs and Innovation Act, and the CLEAN Future Act, to have an economywide solution.

Ms. Goldfuss, we talked already a lot about moving solar, wind, and other renewable energy equipment manufacturing to fossil fuel country to mitigate job losses. What about building and siting new nuclear power plants in these areas as well? Would this be a help to mitigate job losses? Ms. Goldfuss.

Ms. Goldfuss. Yeah, sorry about that, took me a minute to get off mute. I think it really depends on what communities you are talking about. We are strongly supportive of continuing to provide support to existing nuclear, but there is still a lot of concern about expanding access to nuclear energy around the country. And so you have seen particular States really say that it is not for them.

So I think it depends on the community, the cost, and -- but it is true that if we lose all existing nuclear and it is replaced by natural gas, we are not going to be able to reach our climate goals. So it is -- it is definitely one of those complex problems.

Mr. Soto. Thank you so much. And that is why President Biden included it in his plan.

Ms. Fendley, if we want to upgrade our infrastructure, boost American manufacturing, and combat climate change, can we do it all with the Moving Forward Act and Buy American rules?

Ms. Fendley. I think we can make significant progress with the Moving Forward Act. But as we have talked about this afternoon, there is so much investment that has to happen in our infrastructure to get it up from a failing grade and to really have the economy of the future.

Mr. Soto. Thanks so much.

And, Attorney Tayloe, we know that communities of color have been more vulnerable to climate change. How can you explain it to the committee, why that is true?

Ms. Tayloe. Well, the data is very clear that race has historically been the biggest indicator of the location of our most polluting facilities, whether that is our landfills, power plants, et cetera, incinerators, you name it. Race is still the biggest indicator historically. And, unfortunately, we have seen time and time again that when it comes to really empowering communities to have a say in the creation of sound and fair environmental policies, that we don't always have that access.

But I will say, with the Biden administration, we have already seen within just less than a month the real commitment to making sure that environmental justice is lifted to a national priority, so we are very hopeful.

Mr. Soto. Thanks so much. My time is expired.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Representative Tom O'Halleran. Welcome to the subcommittee, sir, and you are recognized for 5 minutes for questioning.

Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member. And it is great to be on the committee. I really appreciate it.

Today marks the first hearing of this subcommittee in the 117th Congress. It is my hope we can come together and build on the success of the bipartisan Energy Act of 2020, signed into law late last year, and the first major Federal climate action in 13 years.

The Energy Act provided over $5 billion in research, development, and demonstration resources to advance renewable energy and energy storage technology -- much more needs to be done -- established a timeline to eliminate harmful

HFC gases from the atmosphere, supported the development of essential carbon capture, and renewable technologies and much more.

I could not agree more with the words shared by President Biden's nominee to lead the EPA, Michael Regan. During his confirmation hearing last week, he said: To address complex challenges, you must first be able to see them from all sides. You must be willing to put yourself in other people's shoes. He continued: The best way to do that is by convening stakeholders where they live, work, and serve, fostering an open dialogue, rooted in respect for science, a clear understanding of the law, and a commitment to building consensus around solutions.

We can't simply regulate our way out of every problem we face. More work on climate change can and should be accomplished if we work on policies with broad consensus to meet the needs of the movement -- moment. I am sorry.

If we look at the state of our climate, we must recognize that climate change is not just a domestic problem, but it also is an international problem. Going forward, it is essential no energy worker and no community is left behind. This is a bipartisan area of concern.

My district was home to the largest coal-fired generation facility in the country until the Navajo Generating Station closed in 2019. Today, my district is home to three other coal-generation facilities, which produce over three gigabits -- three megawatts of electricity for Arizonans and countless good-paying jobs for workers and families in their communities.

I am determined to ensure economic opportunity and reliable energy is available to all those in the front lines of the energy transition. I will also be introducing legislation to provide that necessary economic process.

Ms. Fendley, your testimony also discusses where certain technologies and

products within the energy industry are produced. In your view, do you foresee any emerging industries or manufacturing sectors where dislocated energy workers in the United States could compete in? What barriers may exist for workers this committee should be aware of? Thank you.

Ms. Fendley. Thank you for that question. It is a very complex one. I think we have a lot of challenges to help workers in those communities impacted by potential job loss that we have historically failed.

There are new technologies that we should be aiming to make sure that we are developing and manufacturing here, like direct air capture, like building out carbon capture transportation infrastructure, batteries manufacturing and storage. There are all kinds of possibilities. I think the challenge is making sure that we utilize both technology, to make sure we don't lose jobs where we don't have to, and then making sure that we do that economic development in the places where jobs are lost, that we are bringing blue collar jobs to blue collar communities.

Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you. And a follow-up question to you -- and I have a longer question, but I am going to get down to this -- how important is it for there to be White House staff focused on addressing worker and community impacts from the energy transition and coordinating interagency work? It is complicated, there is a lot of people out there, it is disconnected right now. So I would like to hear your thoughts on that.

Ms. Fendley. It is indeed complicated, and I think that is why we need to have that centralization at the White House to be thinking about that, to be garnering the resources from so many Federal agencies, because the goal is to keep communities intact. You know, the goal is not to displace workers where we don't have to, and as I said, to bring those good blue collar jobs to blue collar communities.

And the centralization of that interagency working group that the Biden

administration is setting up is going to be critically important. It will also be important for Congress to help hold them accountable.

Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you. Let's not remember the people of America also.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield.

Mr. Tonko. Okay. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from California, Representative Nanette Barragan, thank you for joining us, and 5 minutes for questioning, please.

Need you to unmute, Representative. Not hearing you yet.

Okay. We are going to go to the -- can we hear you, Representative Barragan?

Okay. We will go to Representative McEachin, and we will be back to you. We have a technical problem.

So the chair will recognize Representative Donald McEachin of Virginia. You are recognized for 5 minutes for questioning, sir. And thank you for your work on environmental justice too.

Mr. McEachin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you and Chairman Pallone for convening this hearing.

I want to take a moment just to applaud the Biden administration for its swift and bold action in the area of -- excuse me -- in the area of the climate crisis, particularly the executive orders which are bringing to bear a whole-of-government approach which, I think, is exactly what we need to get our country on the right foot going forward.

I also want to thank our witnesses for their time and their expertise. Some of you I have had the privilege of working with in the past, and I want to thank all of you all for your commitment to equity and justice.

In my view, for far too long, communities of color, indigenous communities, and poor communities have been on the frontline of bearing the burden of the climate crisis.

And, tragically, we see that the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare for all to see how pollution impacts health and the economies of what we have called environmental justice communities.

I have been very pleased to see that the early actions of President Biden emphasize the importance of environmental justice and specifically the importance of ensuring government benefits reach these communities where the need is enormous, where the centerpieces of the President's environmental justice effort is the Justice 40 initiative, which has been talked about previously. It states that 40 percent of the benefits of Federal investments should go to disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Tayloe, you have talked about how WE ACT works alongside various EJ communities. Can you tell us how these organizations and how your organization would benefit from these targeted investments?

Ms. Tayloe. Thank you for that question, Congressman McEachin. In terms of the Justice 40 initiative, we see a lot of potential in it to address some long-standing issues that we have experienced, not only within Harlem, but in the broader environmental justice community.

In terms of what we would think that this could look like, it could be anything from investments in LIHEAP, in Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, weather assistance programs, more opportunities for grants at the Department of Energy for workforce development or for community solar, and also, of course, to clean up the legacy of pollution that exists in our communities.

So we are very excited about the Biden commitment to investing 40 percent in communities, and look forward to articulating what that will look like in the future.

Mr. McEachin. Ms. Tayloe, as you know, the President's executive orders have tasked the Council on Environmental Quality to develop a new screening tool for climate

and economic justice. This keeps me up at night, because we have got to make sure that this 40 percent lands on the target, that we have defined things correctly.

Can you speak briefly about the importance of improving our tools for identifying environmental justice communities and how can Congress support this effort?

Ms. Tayloe. Thank you for that question, again. And data, again, is critical to helping to articulate where the communities are that are experiencing the most harm. And so having really -- well, for sure, updated data that talks about, not only census-level data, but health indicators, like low birth rate, high rates of asthma, respiratory conditions, heart conditions, et cetera, I think is critical in terms of articulating where the 40 percent should go.

And we look forward to seeing that data come to life, so that we can also use it to articulate where we -- you know, for the programs we think are beneficial but then also where the investments should be made. So thank you for that question.

Mr. McEachin. Thank you.

And, Mr. Chairman, that concludes the questions that I have. I appreciate your time and the attention of the witnesses. And I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. We thank you for your questions.

And we are going to go back to the Representative from California, Representative Nanette Barragan, 5 minutes for questioning, please.

Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me better now?

Mr. Tonko. Very well.

Ms. Barragan. Okay, good. I am on my phone, so I apologize if the connection isn't as good.

So I want to start by thanking all the witnesses for being here today, and to thank you, Chairman Tonko, for holding this important hearing on restoring Federal climate

leadership.

The recent actions of the Biden administration to address the climate crisis and environmental justice bring hope that meaningful progress is possible. The damage of the last 4 years by the Trump administration to our planet and to our communities of color was devastating. We have a tremendous amount of work to do to ensure our commitments and, most importantly, our actions rise to the challenge we face. It is almost impossible to be too bold on climate or on justice. So thanks for doing this, again, today.

Ms. Tayloe, I would like to start with you. I represent the Port of Los Angeles, it ports the country, and as you know, they bring a lot of jobs, but they also bring pollution. I recently reintroduced legislation called the Climate Smart Ports Act to invest in zero emissions technology for cargo-handling equipment and trucks at ports and shore power for idling ships.

Nearly 40 percent of Americans live within 3 miles of a port, including my constituents near the Port of L.A. Can you speak to how investing, how important it is for us to invest in climate smart ports and how that can help combat environmental injustice and create good-paying green jobs?

I think you are on mute, Ms. Tayloe.

Ms. Tayloe. Sorry about that. I would like to also just thank you and both Congressman McEachin for just coming in as junior Congressmen at the time and founding the United for Climate and Environmental Justice Congressional Task Force.

But to your question about ports, even looking at California specifically, due to poor zoning and regulations, unfortunately, communities of color, low-income communities are homes to, not only ports, but just really poor transportation systems that have trucks coming in and out of our communities all of the time.

The transportation sector, not only is one of the larger emissions of greenhouse gas emissions, but because of the fuels that they use and the type of work that they do, they also increase particulate matter, which causes ozone and other kinds of air quality issues. So having some type of regulation over port systems, as you have indicated, would be very critical to helping improve the air quality for our communities. So thank you for introducing that legislation.

Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

Ms. Fendley, is there anything you want to add on this about investing in --

Ms. Fendley. Sure. I will just say that ports are critically important to making sure that our goods can move in and out of the country. There is certainly a lot of investment going on in ports to help reduce emissions from them. I would just caution that we do need to make sure that, again, those technologies are not used as excuses to displace workers in that process.

Ms. Barragan. Well, thank you, Ms. Fendley, because I specifically have a provision in the bill that will make sure that we are saving union jobs and that we are not phasing human labor jobs for automated labor. So thank you for bringing that up. Our bill does cover that, and it is a huge issue for me as well and your workers. Thank you.

Ms. Goldfuss, a year ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee released a draft CLEAN Future Act to get the U.S. to a hundred percent clean energy [inaudible] 2050. Are there any specific improved changes you would like to see the Clean Future Act that our committee members can consider as we work to pass clean energy and climate legislation this year?

Ms. Goldfuss. I think the one improvement that the committee might consider is the 2030 target that could be more consistent with what President Biden and Vice President Harris have put forward. We know where we need to get by mid-century, but

we need to make sure we have a check along the way. So what is an appropriate target by 2030 that really shows that we are on that path.

Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

Ms. Tayloe, anything you want to add in my last 20 seconds on that last question?

Ms. Tayloe. I think we just have to focus on how to create green jobs and also do it with a lens for communities to address legacy pollution. And I think with the Biden-Harris commitment to -- that we have seen within the executive orders, we are on the right path.

Ms. Barragan. Great. Thank you, again, to the witnesses.

Thank you, Chairman, for this very important hearing. As I stated at the beginning, we can't be bold enough; the last 4 years with the disastrous policies, so we got to move forward and move wholly. Thank you, and with that, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlewoman yields back.

We have a few members who have waived on to the subcommittee. We thank them for their patience. We next go to the Representative from Florida, Representative Kathy Castor, who chairs the Select Committee on Climate Crisis. And 5 minutes, Representative Castor, for questioning, please.

Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Chairman Tonko. I am looking forward to working with you hand in hand in the coming session, and to Rep. McKinley, my good friend, you as well, on a bipartisan basis.

Thank you to our outstanding witnesses today. Everyone is focused on the opportunities in clean energy, especially the power sector. It really is, as Ms. Goldfuss stated right off the bat, it is the linchpin to so much of what we want to do to meet our scientific imperative, to meet our moral obligation to our kids and our grandkids.

And then there is a study out just today, out of Harvard and other research

institutes, that says that it has determined that pollution from dirty fuel sources is responsible for one out of five deaths globally today. That is more than had been previously understood. So there is a very significant public health interest in us moving forward on clean energy.

So let's -- I want you all to make some recommendations to us on -- and it is good Rep. Barragan got into it on clean futures -- what we need to do to update that.

So, Ms. Tayloe, we know environmental justice communities are burdened inordinately by pollution. We understand that we have to build in engagement and consultation along the way and force the Clean Air and Clean Water protections on the books, create a civil rights cause of action. As we are thinking, though, of building the macro grid, the big new modern grid, great job-creating initiative, jobs that cannot be outsourced anywhere, what else do we need to keep in mind when it comes to equity and environmental justice?

Ms. Tayloe. Thank you for that question, Congresswoman Castor. I would like to lift up the solar investment tax credit. I think it plays a very critical role in creating the investment potential for the solar industry. I think it is one of the single most effective current policies available to encourage clean energy deployment. And in addition to that, we want to make sure that the opportunities available for people of color and women to enter into the green job sector is there in terms of diversifying those opportunities.

Beyond the job side, of course, the legacy of pollution that we experience in our communities requires that we start thinking about cumulative impacts and how to think about the application of both the Clean Air and the Clean Water Act in terms of permitting. And this has just been something that EJ communities have been demanding for a very long time. Thank you for your question.

Ms. Castor. And, you know, you reminded me when you said community solar, there are so many families and small business owners that want to access energy efficiency and clean technologies, but there is a real problem with that upfront cost. But, boy, we could put money back into the pockets of consumers and small businesses, don't you think, if we could help address that?

Ms. Tayloe. For sure. You know, there was an earlier comment about solar in Florida. And, frankly, sometimes utilities have monopolized and limited the availability of solar opportunities for people, whether it is putting the panels on their roofs or providing the benefits in terms of net metering. So expanding, I think, the policies around that would be critical in making it affordable for everyday people who really do want to lessen their dependence on fossil fuels to start seeing solar as a viable option for their homes and also for their businesses.

Ms. Castor. Boy, you are right about that, and I can tell you, in the so-called Sunshine State, we have a ways to go on that.

So, Ms. Fendley, let's talk about what we need to do when we are talking about good-paying union jobs. Building the macro grid across the country, it has got to be combined with prevailing wage, with Davis-Bacon, project labor agreements. What else? And how do we incorporate that into law as we move forward?

Ms. Fendley. Thank you for that question. It is, of course, the great challenge that we have as we build the clean future. One of the important policy levers that Congress has is the support it gives to many of these industries. And I think we need to look at, when we are giving public money to renewable energy, the renewable energy industry, or any industry, whether it is through tax credits or grants or loans, we need to make sure that the spending of that money is done to support those high-quality union jobs, to support domestic manufacturing. And we have been working with a number of

stakeholders, with Senator Merkley and Congressman Boyle, on legislation to try to make sure we do just that, particularly with tax credits.

Ms. Castor. Thanks so much.

I yield, Rep. Tonko.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. The gentlewoman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the, again, patient Representative from California, Representative Jerry McNerney, for 5 minutes for questioning, please, sir.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your allowing me to participate in this hearing. And I want to congratulate my friend from West Virginia for elevation to ranking member. I look forward to working with you, David.

There is a clear tension between the urgency to transition to a low carbon economy and the cost of carrying out that transition. Mr. Mills made a good case of that actually, but, clearly, the transition will not be easy or cheap -- or necessarily cheap. But I believe that American innovation will open up tremendous opportunities in the future.

Ms. Goldfuss, do you think it is possible to get to net zero by 2050, or even earlier, with strong economic growth in the meanwhile?

Ms. Goldfuss. Absolutely. This is our moonshot. This is the opportunity. We don't have all the technology now, but it will come if we invest in the right areas and we set those goals.

Mr. McNerney. And Congress has a big role to play in that, I presume?

Ms. Goldfuss. Yes. I mean, ARA, the American Recovery Act, is still seen as the biggest climate bill we have had to date. Those investments led us to the point we are now, where renewables are really competitive with fossil fuels.

Mr. McNerney. And I agree. I spent 20 years developing wind energy

technology, and it was a lot of fun and we did a lot of progress.

Ms. Tayloe, what are the consequences if we just throw up our hands, like we are being urged to, and let the fossil fuel industry run the day?

Ms. Tayloe. The consequences will be more lives lost, whether we are seeing that with more extreme heat, types of issues in the summer, more wildfire, more destructive storms, people unable to rebuild their homes. We are still seeing that even in New York after Superstorm Sandy. So the consequence is just a continuation of harm and lack of support for communities who are on the front line of our climate crisis.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Honestly, I don't believe that reducing emissions will be enough to prevent catastrophic change, and we need to prepare for all the possible actions that we could take, including climate intervention.

Ms. Tayloe, do you agree with that?

Ms. Tayloe. It cannot be the only solution. We have to think about -- thinking about things through the lens of environmental justice and remediating communities. I mentioned the opportunity to clean up brownfields and closed coal mines, et cetera. We have to remediate communities, we have to create resiliency funding and opportunities.

There is also an issue with people who aren't able to qualify for home loans, to cover them during, you know, all the storms, et cetera. So having some type of support for low-income communities who might want to purchase home insurance but can't afford it.

So we have to have all levels of protection, because what we are seeing every single year is that we are having hotter summers, colder winters, more extreme temperatures. And so we have to prevent and be prepared through investments federally and at the State level.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Thank you for speaking up on that.

Ms. Fendley, as you noted in your testimony, grid modernization is critical to improving efficiency, performance, and resiliency. How important is grid modernization to manufacturing?

Ms. Fendley. It is very important. I appreciate the question. You know, energy intensive trade exposed industries need high quality reliable power, and without that, you know, without a grid modernization, we won't be able to live up to the manufacturing goals that we have been talking about today.

Mr. McNerney. Well, lastly, Ms. Fendley, could you elaborate on the need to tie climate policy to economic recovery?

Ms. Fendley. Well, these two things are just inextricably linked. As we deal with climate change, we need to be looking at our long-term economic situation, and the rest of the world is addressing emissions.

In order for our economy to continue to be globally competitive, we also have to lower emissions, lower embodied carbon in manufactured goods. It is a part of how we are going to remain economically competitive into the future and make sure that workers are at the center of these policies.

Mr. McNerney. And so what would be the benefits of investing in American-made climate and energy infrastructure?

Ms. Fendley. The benefits are putting our money back into the American working class. The benefits are that our manufacturers make things more cleanly than other manufacturers around the world. And it is putting a down payment on our manufacturing base for the future.

You know, technologies and manufacturing infrastructure doesn't get replaced for decades because it runs for so long, and it is so important that we invest now and invest

early in manufacturing and in industrial emissions to make sure that we are building the facilities, retaining the facilities, retaining the jobs long into the future.

Mr. McNerney. And I think that is something we can all agree upon.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.

I believe, unless there is anyone we have missed here, I think all of our colleagues who chose to ask questions have been recognized. And I would remind members that pursuant to committee rules, they have 10 business days by which to submit additional questions for the record.

In the effort to cooperate here, we are asking that our witnesses respond promptly to any such questions that you may receive.

So we thank everyone. We thank Ms. Tayloe, Ms. Fendley, Ms. Goldfuss, and Mr. Mills for your participation today. It has been a lot of information exchanged, and it is a start of a great session addressing climate change and economic recovery and environmental justice.

We also do have a number of documents that have been requested to be entered into the record, and I will do that now. Again, welcoming Mr. McKinley to our subcommittee as the ranker. So I request unanimous consent to enter the following into the record.

We have a letter from the retail fuel community trade associations; we have a letter from Our Children's Trust; we have a letter from Industrial Energy Consumers of America; we have a letter from Portland Cement Association; an article from Axios on Keystone Pipeline jobs; an article from EE News on Keystone Pipeline jobs. We have an article from Globe Energy Monitor on China coal plant development; we have an article from Reuters on China's coal plants capacity; we have a letter from American Exploration

and Production Council; we have a report from DOE on natural gas; we have a report from North America's Building Trades Union on energy job quality; we have a report from North America's Building Trades Union on key findings of quality study; we have a report from National Energy Technology Laboratory on LNG lifecycle; we have a report from the University of Wyoming on Federal leasing, drilling ban policies; a report from West Energy Alliance on permitting ban costs; the statement from LiUNA on Keystone Pipeline; we have an article from CBS News on Keystone Pipeline jobs; we have a statement from Representative Diana DeGette; we have a letter from Biotechnology Innovation Organization; and also a document on political contributions from Mr. McKinley, which can be included in the record, pending a citation. We require that citation.

But all those that I have listed, I would ask, without objection, to include those in the unanimous consent.

Without objection, they are so ordered.

[The information follows:]

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

Mr. Tonko. And, again, the document on political contributions --

Mr. McKinley. What is he saying?

Mr. Tonko. -- from Mr. McKinley --

Staff. We can include that.

Mr. Tonko. -- will be included -- did we receive --

Staff. Yeah. We can include that.

Mr. Tonko. We can include it. Okay. So that also is made in order, with the request of the several items that I listed, the several documents.

So any objection?

Mr. McKinley. Mr. Chairman? No objection, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to thank you for this hearing and welcoming all of the members on both sides of the aisle, the new members that we add to this. And I thought it was very beneficial to hear their perspectives from all sides on this. Thank you.

Mr. Tonko. Well, it has been my pleasure. It is great to have you on as ranker. I enjoyed the great participation from our panelists today and so many colleagues. So we are off to a good start.

And, you know, again, any questions received, we ask that be done in 10 days by committee rules and that our witnesses respond promptly.

With that, the hearing is closed -- or let me say, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:57 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]