	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MILLER
3	HIF056000
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF:
7	H.R. 4596, SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND
8	DEPLOYMENT ACT;
9	H.R. 4583, TO PROMOTE A 21ST CENTURY ENERGY
10	AND MANUFACTURING WORKFORCE;
11	H.R. 1268, ENERGY EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT
12	TECHNOLOGY ACT;
13	H.R. 2984, FAIR RATES ACT;
14	H.R. 3021, AIR SURVEY ACT OF 2015;
15	H.R. 3797, SATISFYING ENERGY NEEDS AND
16	SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT (SENSE) ACT;
17	H.R. 4238, A BILL TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF
18	ENERGY ORGANIZATION ACT AND THE LOCAL PUBLIC
19	WORKS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT
20	OF 1976 TO MODERNIZE TERMS RELATING TO
21	MINORITIES;
22	H.R. 4427, A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 203 OF
23	THE FEDERAL POWER ACT;
24	H.R. 4444, EPS IMPROVEMENT ACT;

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
25	H.R. 4557, BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE
26	FROM CLOSING KILNS (BRICK) ACT;
27	H.R. 2080, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
28	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A
29	HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING
30	CLARK CANYON DAM;
31	H.R. 2081, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
32	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A
33	HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING
34	THE GIBSON DAM;
35	H.R. 3447, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
36	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A
37	HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING
38	THE W. KERR SCOTT DAM;
39	H.R. 4411, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
40	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A
41	HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING
42	THE GATHRIGHT DAM;
43	H.R. 4416, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
44	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A
45	HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT INVOLVING
46	THE JENNINGS RANDOLPH DAM;
47	H.R. 4412, A BILL TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR
48	COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF A

Cardenas.

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

73

Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Will Batson, Legislative Clerk, Energy and Power and Environment and the Economy; Ray Baum, Senior Policy Advisor for Communications and Technology; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Leighton Brown, Deputy Press Secretary; Allison Busbee, Policy Coordinator, Energy and Power; Rebecca Card, Assistant Press Secretary; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Patrick Currier, Senior Counsel, Energy and Power; Andy Duberstein, Press Secretary; Gene Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; Kelsey Guyselman, Counsel, Telecom; Tom Hassenboehler, Chief Counsel, Energy and Power; A.T. Johnston, Senior Policy Advisor; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Grace Koh, Counsel, Telecom; Ben Lieberman, Counsel, Energy and Power; David McCarthy, Chief Counsel, Environment and the Economy; Brandon Mooney, Professional Staff Member, Energy and Power; Mary Neumayr, Senior Energy Counsel; Tim Pataki, Professional Staff Member; Graham Pittman, Legislative Clerk; Annelise Rickert, Legislative Associate; Chris Santini, Policy Coordinator, Oversight and Investigations; Chris Sarley, Policy Coordinator, Environment and the Economy; Charlotte Savercool, Professional Staff, Communications and Technology; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Dylan Vorbach, Legislative Clerk, Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade; Gregory

Watson, Legislative Clerk, Communications and Technology; Jen Berenholz, Minority Chief Clerk; Christine Brennan, Minority Press Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, Minority Deputy Clerk; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Jerry Leverich, Minority Counsel; Josh Lewis, Minority EPA Detailee; Lori Maarbjerg, Minority FCC Detailee; John Marshall, Minority Policy Coordinator; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief Counsel; Ryan Skukowski, Minority Policy Analyst; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services; and Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor.

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
111	The Chairman. Committee will come to order.
112	At the conclusion of opening statements yesterday the chair
113	called up H.R. 4596 and the bill was opened for amendment at any
114	point.
115	[The Bill H.R. 4596 follows:]
116	
117	 *******TNSERT 1*******

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
118	The Chairman. The chair would recognize Mr. Walden for the
119	purpose of offering an amendment.
120	Mr. Walden. I thank the chairman, and we have a bipartisan
121	amendment to offer to H.R. 4596 and I would ask the clerk to call
122	up the amendment.
123	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4596 offered by Mr. Walden.
124	Page 2, after line 11 insert the following.
125	[The amendment of Mr. Walden follows:]
126	
127	**************************************

The Chairman. The staff will distribute the amendment and considered as read and the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Walden. I thank the chairman.

Over the past two months, our Subcommittee on Telecommunications has worked to craft a bill that would achieve two goals that are central to this full committee's mission -- relieving regulatory burdens for small businesses and protecting consumers.

So the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act would extend the Federal Communications Commission's existing exemption for small businesses from the enhanced transparency reporting requirements to the 2015 open Internet order as well as increase the threshold for defining what a small business is.

At our January legislative hearing on this subject, we heard from a small Internet service provider who shared the dilemma that many small ISPs face in these circumstances.

Should they put up new equipment or should they hire a lawyer to help with compliance? Should they improve service for customers or should they devote their financial resources to sifting through regulatory language and drafting extensive reports on packet loss?

Our discussion draft would seek to alleviate the unnecessary burden associated with these requirements. The ISPs are still

subject -- they are still subject to the 2010 transparency rules and customers are still provided with all the information about their service they have come to expect.

By extending the existing exemption, however, we're giving certainty to small businesses seeking to make budgetary and operational decisions in a long-term fashion.

We have also increased the threshold for the definition of small business, bringing it closer in line with some of the commission's previous definitions that were blessed by the Small Business Administration.

I especially want to thank Congressman Loebsack and his staff as well as the minority committee staff for their work on this bill and especially on this amendment.

These negotiations have produced what I think is a strong bill that helps protect these vital small providers who serve constituents like those in my district in eastern Oregon or in Mr. Loebsack's district in Iowa who might otherwise not have the robust Internet service that small ISPs provide.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment we have before us today reached the compromise we always hoped to reach.

It would sunset this provision after five years and requires the FCC after six months to submit a report to our committee and other relevant committees regarding the exemption, whether it should be made permanent and whether our definition of small

176 | business makes sense.

And, further, we said that not more than -- this would apply to ISPs that have 250,000 subscribers. That seemed to be a better number than the 100,000 the FCC picked. And so I was glad we were able to reach a conclusion in a fair and balanced way on this bill.

I thank Mr. Loebsack especially for his work on this and I would yield what time I have remaining to the gentleman from Iowa if he'd like to comment on that.

Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Walden, and thank you for working on this. I want to thank you and your staff and subcommittee ranking member, Ms. Eshoo, and her staff for working so well with me and my staff.

The staff really did a lot of work on this, as is always the case. It's a common sense agreement and I think this is a tremendous example of how we can work across the aisle, which is what, I think, folks in our districts really want us to do to make sure that we can get things done and do something that makes sense for our constituents and I do thank you.

As I said when I offered my amendment in subcommittee, my goal throughout this process has been to strike a careful balance between the important consumer protections in the FCC's transparency rule and the cost for smaller Internet service providers and I think what we have achieved with this amendment is in fact that goal.

For me, the legislation is really about rural broadband development. I've often mentioned that I have well over a hundred separate Internet service providers in Iowa and this amendment will allow those providers, along with small providers throughout the country, to focus their limited resources on deploying more broadband, which rural America desperately needs, and offering new and improved services while giving them the time they need to comply with the FCC's additional requirements.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all of your great support on this and the ranking member as well, and I'm really happy that we did come to this agreement today and hopefully everyone's going to vote for this, and thank you and I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. Walden. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I ask our members to support the amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman. Chairman yields back.

Other members -- and the chair will recognize the gentlelady from California, Ms. Eshoo, for five minutes.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I move to strike the last word. I'm very pleased that the -- that we've reached a compromise on H.R. 4596. I think all the good reasons have been stated by both Chairman Walden and Representative Loebsack.

We did an informal survey -- this is for members that aren't part of this subcommittee, and I think you'd find it interesting

And they suggested that an exemption of the FCC's enhanced transparency rules for companies with 250,000 or fewer subscribers would adequately address the vast majority of their membership.

So this has been realigned from the original proposals and I think that it makes sense. This is, obviously, a bipartisan amendment and it reflects this data by protecting the nation's smallest ISPs.

But it also continues to ensure that the majority of consumers receive the full set of benefits promised by the enhanced transparency rules including clear disclosure of promotional rates, fees, surcharges and data caps.

And this is very important to preserve these benefits for consumers. They are battles that were waged and heavily sought.

So I think by -- additionally, by including the five-year sunset the amendment gives the FCC further time to study whether or not the exemption should be made permanent and how a small ISP should be defined.

So I think that, very importantly, the broadband providers of all sizes will continue to be responsible for following the FCC's bright line, and it is a bright line, against blocking, throttling and paid prioritization as well as the transparency

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Chair would now call up H.R. 4583 and ask the clerk to report.

The Clerk. H.R. 4583, to promote a 21st Century Energy and

Manufacturing Workforce.

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
272	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
273	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
274	any point.
275	[The Bill H.R. 4583 follows:]
276	
277	**************************************

The Chairman. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are there amendments to the bill? Chair -- the question now occurs on favorably reporting. The chair would recognize the gentleman from Illinois to sponsor the bill.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Chairman. The chair recognizes you.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you and Chairman Whitfield, Ranking Member Pallone and the committee staff for working with my office to include the 21st Century Workforce legislation within the package of bills that we will be marking up here today.

You stated, Mr. Chairman, that workforce development must be an essential component of any comprehensive energy policy.

So I look forward to working with you to ensure that even as we move out of the committee process the 21st Century Workforce bill is part of any discussion moving forward regarding the nation's energy policy.

Mr. Chairman, I must also publicly acknowledge the leadership role of my colleague, Mr. Hudson of North Carolina, and his staff for their help in bringing us together on this important piece of legislation that's before the committee together -- today, rather.

The good-faith talks between my office, the majority and the committee staff -- and minority and committee staff and Mr.

Hudson's office have resulted in a bipartisan jobs bill that will go a long way in helping our nation's economy to get back on track by providing working opportunities for everyone.

And why is this 21st Century Workforce bill so necessary? Mr. Chairman, just last week my office had yet another meeting, this time with an energy company out of the great state of North Carolina, with representatives who informed us right now today as we speak that they have over a thousand job openings that they cannot fill because they cannot find qualified skilled workers.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, my office has been holding many of these types of meetings over the past four years with a variety of different energy and manufacturing industries who are facing this very same problem.

At a time when African-American and Latino unemployment rates are still too high, when too many female heads of households cannot find adequate employment to take care of their families, when veterans who are returning home from defending their country still cannot find work, it is a travesty that eager employers cannot find the trained workers that they need even at this very precise moment.

Mr. Chairman, this common sense jobs bill will help us to match up the trained skilled qualified candidates with the good paying jobs and careers that would help lift up their community, strengthen the energy industry and bolster the entire American

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

economy as a whole.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you. I want to thank Chairman Whitfield, Ranking Member Pallone, Mr. Hudson and all my colleagues who helped get us to this point this morning with this focus not only on the underserved communities such as minorities and women and veterans but also displaced and unemployed, rather, coal miners and other out of state energy workers.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that when this legislation passes through the committee and ultimately becomes law, it will go a long way in helping not only communities that look like the one I represent on the south side of Chicago but help every community in every district throughout this nation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman. Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes.

Mr. Sarbanes. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to -- I just want to congratulate Representative Rush for his efforts on this bill and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support of it.

I'm very excited. Just recently, Mr. Rush was able to participate in a meeting in Baltimore involving the Department of Energy and the city of Baltimore and a number of partners to

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 18 350 explore the opportunity for low-income solar installation and 351 training in Baltimore. 352 This would accelerate home weatherization, the deployment 353 of solar panels and energy with a focus on low-income housing in 354 the city of Baltimore to reduce the utility costs of people living 355 in Baltimore and at the same time it's an opportunity to train 356 unemployed or underemployed community members to become part of 357 the energy industry workforce. It's a win-win situation. 358 It's going to mean a great deal to the city of Baltimore. 359 It's bringing in some of the premier workforce training nonprofit 360 organizations in the city, teaming them up with the expertise that 361 the Department of Energy can provide and other partners as well. 362 And it's exactly the kind of project that I think this bill 363 that we are hopefully about to approve here today would help to 364 support across the country. 365 So I applaud you for these efforts. We look forward to the 366 opportunity that this will present for cities like Baltimore all 367 across the country, and I yield. 368 The Chairman. Gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak? Seeing none, the vote 369 370 occurs on H.R. 4583. All those in favor will say aye. 371 (Vote was taken) 372 Those opposed say no. Opinion of the chair the ayes have

The bill is agreed to.

it.

	inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 19
374	The chair will now call up H.R. 1268 and ask the clerk to
375	report.
376	The Clerk. H.R. 1268, to amend the Energy Independence and
377	Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information
378	and competing technologies and for other purposes.
379	[The Bill H.R. 1268 follows:]
380	
381	************INSERT 4*******

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
382	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
383	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
384	any point.
385	The chair will recognize Ms. Eshoo for offering the
386	amendment.
387	Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
388	I do have an amendment, yes.
389	The Chairman. Clerk will report the title of the amendment.
390	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1268 offered by Ms. Eshoo of
391	California.
392	The Chairman. And the staff will distribute the amendment.
393	It will be considered as read and the gentlelady will be recognized
394	for five minutes in support of her amendment.
395	[The amendment of Mr. Eshoo follows:]
396	

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this markup.

It's always good to come into the room to write a bill and know that we're going to pass it out of the full committee and today, it includes H.R. 1268. It's the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act that's on the committee's docket.

This is a bipartisan amendment that's being offered with my legislative partner, Congressman Kinzinger. It makes minor technical and conforming changes to H.R. 1268 to ensure that the version the committee approves today is identical to the language that -- it's hard for me to concentrate with the side conversation right next to me.

The -- it makes minor technical and conforming changes to H.R. 1268 to ensure that the version the committee approves today is identical to the language that already passed the House in this Congress as part of H.R. 8.

The act will make the federal government's IT and data centers more energy efficient by requiring federal agencies to, number one, utilize the best technologies and energy management strategies, formulate specific goals and periodically evaluate their energy efficiency, and three, make data center energy usage statistics public in a way that empowers further innovation.

This is a, I think, a powerful statistic. Data centers are the backbone of the 21st century economy but they could be highly

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

The Department of Energy estimates that implementation of best practices alone could reduce the government's data center energy bill by 20 to 40 percent.

So I think that this is something that's going to move us ahead. Again, this is a technical change and once again I want to thank Chairman Upton, our ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, and Mr. Kinzinger, who's been a partner in this and urge everyone to support it.

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

The Chairman. Gentlelady yields back.

I would just reiterate that the chair does support her amendment. I think it's a good amendment, good improvement, bipartisan addition to the bill and I would support the amendment. Are there other members wishing to speak on the amendment?

Seeing none, the vote will occur on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from California. All those in favor will say aye.

(Vote was taken)

Those opposed say no. Opinion of the chair the ayes have it. Amendment is agreed to. Are there other amendments to the bill?

Seeing none, the vote occurs on H.R. 1268 as amended. All those in favor will say aye.

	inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
446	(Vote was taken)
447	Those opposed say no. In the opinion of the chair the ayes
448	have it and the bill as amended is agreed to.
449	The chair will now call up H.R. 2984, Fair Rates Act. The
450	clerk will report the title of the bill.
451	The Clerk. H.R. 2984, to amend the Federal Power Act to
452	provide that any inaction by the Federal Energy Regulatory
453	Commission that allows a rate change to go into effect shall be
454	treated as an order by the commission for purposes of rehearing
455	and court review.
456	[The Bill H.R. 2984 follows:]
457	
458	**************************************

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
478	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
479	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
480	any point.
481	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are there
482	any amendments to the bill?
483	The chair would recognize the gentleman from New Jersey to
484	offer the amendment. Clerk will report the title of the
485	amendment.
486	The Clerk. It's the amendment one or two? One?
487	Mr. Pallone. O1, I think.
488	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 3797 offered by Mr. Pallone
489	strikes sections 2(a)(6), 2(a)(8) and 2(b) and redesignate
490	accordingly.
491	[The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]
492	

The Chairman. And with that, the amendment will be considered as read. The staff will distribute the amendment and the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is a targeted amendment that strikes section 2(b) from the bill. Section 2(b) of the bill deals with EPA's cross-state air pollution rule, also known as CSAPR, and this is one of the most important Clean Air Act rules in recent years.

It protects the health of millions of Americans by requiring upwind states in the eastern and central United States to reduce power plant emissions that cause air quality problems in downwind states.

An important feature of CSAPR is the trading program that allows sources in each state to meet emission budgets in many different ways including trading of emissions allowances.

This approach reduces the cost of compliance while ensuring reductions in air pollution. As we heard at the legislative hearing on this bill in written testimony provided by EPA and by John Walke from the Natural Resources Defense Council, there are a number of policy and technical issues with this section of the bill and I just want to touch on a few of them.

First, by providing allocations to coal refuse units that cannot be traded, the SENSE Act would remove economic incentives

to reduce emissions at coal refuse units.

By reallocating allowances from other sources within the state to coal refuse units and then limiting the ability of these coal refuse sources to transfer allocated allowances to other facilities, the bill would choose winners -- that is, the coal refuse units -- and losers -- that is, all other coal plants in a given state.

By interfering with market conditions, compliance costs would increase for facilities. The SENSE Act would also remove states' rights when determining their method of compliance with CSAPR.

As EPA notes in their testimony, the Clean Air Act gives states the authority to replace interstate transport federal implementation plans with approved state implementation plans.

Further, CSAPR provides states with opportunities to reallocate allowances among their affected units. The SENSE Act would deny states control over allocations of allowances by rendering any submitted state plan with a different allocation to these units unapprovable.

And why supporters of this bill would want to change its successful EPA program to make it less flexible and more costly is simply beyond me.

So I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to strike the CSAPR portion of the SENSE Act and I yield

back, unless one of my colleagues would like to talk.

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

I guess -- okay. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Chairman yields back. Other members who wish -- -- the chair would recognize the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Whitfield.

Mr. Whitfield. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully oppose Mr. Pallone's amendment.

We do have a difficult situation here. First of all, there are only 19 of these coal refuse plants in the country and I guess about 14 of them are in the state of Pennsylvania.

There's a lot of waste product out there from coal mining operations and these coal refuse plants clean those -- that waste up. So there's a significant environmental advantage in cleaning them up.

Now, I would also mention on the SO2 -- sulfur dioxide -- this does not change the overall limits whatsoever. It simply provides some additional allocations for these coal refuse plants.

This amendment by Mr. Pallone would strike all of the provisions in this legislation relating to the cross-state air pollution rule and these plants, most -- the majority of them simply cannot meet those rules.

And as I said, the 19 plants only provide 100 megawatts. And so you have one big benefit of cleaning up these wastes versus

if we don't do something closing, basically, these plants down and there are a lot of jobs with these plants as well.

So there's a significant benefit of keeping them operating, and that's what the purpose of the bill is, to simply allow continued operation which provides significant environmental benefits by remediating the coal refuse problem.

The bill reallocates emission allowances under the cross-state rule from other plants to coal refuse to energy facilities in order to help their continued operation.

And so this is not a big issue per se when you're only talking about 100 megawatts. But the environmental benefits and the job benefits are very important.

So for that reason, I would respectfully oppose and if the gentlemen -- I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to weigh in and support with you against the amendment for the stated reasons.

For my colleagues who don't serve on this subcommittee, a picture is worth a thousand words, and if you could just picture these coal refuse areas and the ability to reclaim a lot, to generate electricity and then clean up this so it doesn't affect the groundwater, it is a, as Chairman Whitfield said, is a -- there are significant environmental benefits to this.

	inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
590	And so with that I just want to, you know, be supportive of
591	the underlying bill and, of course, supportive of the chairman's
592	discussion in opposition to the amendment.
593	Mr. Whitfield. Will the gentleman yield back?
594	Mr. Shimkus. I will give back time to
595	Mr. Whitfield. And I may say I know that this is of
596	significant concern and I know that Mr. Doyle has a real interest
597	in this area because his area of the country is really affected
598	by this as well.
599	And although we opposed or I, certainly, oppose this
600	particular amendment, I would welcome the opportunity to continue
601	working with the other side to see if there's some way before the

bill gets to the floor or amendment could be brought that would recognize the needs on both sides.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Pallone. Would the gentleman yield just for 30 seconds?

Mr. Whitfield. Yes. Yes.

Mr. Pallone. I mean, my basic problem is -- I guess I've already said -- is that this SENSE Act picks winners and losers and it tips the scales in favor of coal refuse plants at the expense of all other plants within a state.

And that's my basic problem here and that's why I put forth this amendment. Regardless of anything else, I just think that this idea of picking winners and losers is just not the right way

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

amount of waste coal in our state.

Industry estimates that waste coal piles cover 170,000 acres in the state of Pennsylvania, and because of their impact these plants have enjoyed bipartisan support in Pennsylvania for many

614

615

616

617

618

619

62.0

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

638 | years.

However, I have to oppose the SENSE Act as it's currently written today. It's not our job here at Energy and Commerce to pick winners and losers and this bill uses the cross-state air pollution rule to help prop these plants up while hurting others.

That's right. This bill would actually make it more difficult for other power plants including coal-fired power plants to comply with these regulations.

The SENSE Act also infringes on states' ability to craft their own implementation plan to comply with the cross-state air pollution rule.

Now, it's unfortunate that my state hasn't yet submitted their own plan like a plan that would help these coal refuse plants. But we should continue to uphold their ability to do so.

We can't just come up with an alternative standard for important rules and regulations that protect the air we breathe and that's what the second part of this bill does. It sets a bad precedent for future regulations as we try to protect our air and stop global warming.

There are coal refuse plants in my home state that can and will be able to operate under the cross-state air pollution rule and the mercury air toxic standards -- the two regulations addressed in the SENSE Act.

We need to make the processing of fossil fuels cleaner in

701

700

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

702

703

704

Mr. Lance. No.

705

The Clerk. Mr. Lance votes no.

706

Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Olson.

707

Mr. Olson. No.

708

The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.

709

Mr. McKinley.

733

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes no.

Mr. Flores. Ms. Brooks.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

759

760

761

762

763

765

766

767

768

769 770

771

772

773 774

775

776

777

779

778

780

781

Mrs. Capps. Aye.

The Clerk. Mrs. Capps votes aye.

Mr. Doyle.

Mr. Doyle. Aye.

The Clerk. Mr. Doyle votes aye.

Ms. Schakowksy.

Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

Mr. Butterfield.

Mr. Butterfield. Aye.

The Clerk. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.

Ms. Matsui.

Ms. Matsui. Aye.

The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.

Ms. Castor.

Ms. Castor. Aye.

The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

Mr. Sarbanes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mr. Schrader.

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
806	Mr. Schrader. Aye.
807	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes aye.
808	Mr. Kennedy.
809	Mr. Kennedy. Aye.
810	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
811	Mr. Cardenas.
812	Mr. Cardenas. Aye.
813	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
814	Chairman Upton.
815	The Chairman. Votes no. How does Mr. Burgess Dr.
816	Burgess?
817	The Clerk. Burgess votes no.
818	The Chairman. The other members Mr. Guthrie?
819	Mr. Guthrie. No.
820	The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes no.
821	The Chairman. Mr. Walden.
822	Mr. Walden. No.
823	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes no.
824	The Chairman. Mr. Flores.
825	Mr. Flores. No.
826	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes no.
827	The Chairman. Other members wishing to change their vote
828	or cast a vote?
829	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

	inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 40
830	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 22 ayes
831	and 29 nays.
832	The Chairman. Twenty-two ayes, 29 nays. The amendment is
833	not agreed to.
834	Are there further amendments to the bill?
835	Mr. Engel. Mr. Chairman?
836	The Chairman. Chair will recognize the gentleman from New
837	York.
838	Mr. Engel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
839	I have an amendment at the desk, Amendment D(2).
840	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 3797 offered by Mr. Engel, Page
841	7 after line 14 insert the following new paragraph.
842	[The amendment of Mr. Engel follows:]
843	
844	**************************************

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

The Chairman. The amendment will be considered as read.

The staff will distribute the amendment and the gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Engel. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate it. Earlier this month, the Energy and Power Subcommittee held a hearing where we identified numerous flaws in the SENSE Act. Those flaws still exist and my amendment would correct two of them.

In a written statement submitted for our hearing, Janet McCabe, the acting assistant administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation at EPA, argued that the SENSE Act would remove the economic incentives to reduce emissions at waste coal plants because emissions allocations for those plants could not be traded under the cross-state air pollution rule.

I questioned the witness about her assertion and I received confirmation that the bill would likely result in less efficient and more costly compliance with CSAPR.

Moreover, the SENSE Act would interfere with a state's right to determine how to best comply with CSAPR by favoring waste coal-burning plants over other in-state power plants.

So this bill would take longstanding state authority, transfer it to the federal government and then use that authority to pick winners and losers.

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

My amendment would allow the state to remove applicability of section 2(b), application of CSAPR to certain coal refuse electric utility steam-generating units if the state determines that implementation of the subsection would increase the state's overall compliance costs.

My amendment addresses the issue of more costly compliance with CSAPR and returns the power to the states, something that we hear from both sides of the aisle that the states should retain the power.

So I urge a yes vote, and I yield back.

The Chairman. Gentleman yields back.

Other members wishing to speak? The chair would recognize the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise to speak against the amendment just to make a couple points. The newest coal-fired power plant in my congressional district is 1,600 megawatts.

So the other thing that people need to understand these are very small -- these are 100 megawatts. They're small. They're really designed to create some energy but also really to clean up these sites, as people have talked about. And so that's why we continue to be supportive of the underlying bill.

The other thing I'd like to put forward is that when you address costs what are going to be the costs of the closure of

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

these small generating facilities?

894 895

896

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

You'll lose -- in Illinois it would be to lose the property

tax base, you'll lose the jobs, you'll lose the income, you'll

43

897

county.

In my area a loss of even a plant that's this small would be devastating to a rural community that I would have. So I have a problem with the cost benefit analysis debate of this amendment and I would ask my colleagues to vote against it, and I would yield to Chairman Whitfield.

lose the money that goes to the local school districts or the local

Thank you very much. Mr. Whitfield.

I just want to make one comment about this picking winners The SENSE Act has been said that it's picking winners and losers. and losers here.

Let me just say that EPA really is the one that picked the winners and losers. In the cross-state air pollution rule, the bituminous coal-fired refuse plants EPA picked them to be the losers and they also picked the bituminous coal-fired refuse plants to be the losers in MATS as well.

These anthracite refuse plants can meet the alternative O2 So those plants that can meet these standards are using standard. anthracite and that's because the sulfur content of the coal refuse in the anthracite region is lower.

So all we're doing here in the SENSE Act is giving the

916

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
917	opportunity to those plants that can't quite meet that standard
918	to give them a little help in meeting the standard without raising
919	the overall SO2 caps so that they can keep cleaning this up, keep
920	these jobs.
921	And, certainly, this is not going to go on forever because
922	eventually it will be cleaned up. And I just wanted to point that
923	out and with that I would yield back the balance of Mr. Shimkus'
924	time.
925	Mr. Shimkus. And I yield back the time.
926	The Chairman. Gentleman yields back.
927	Other members? The gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko.
928	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
929	I speak in support of the Engel amendment. I agree with what
930	my colleague expressed my colleague from New York expressed
931	his concerns that are real about there being a number of policy
932	and technical issues with the CSAPR provisions in the SENSE Act.
933	One that I want to reiterate and certainly expand upon is
934	regarding states' rights. The SENSE Act would block a state from
935	determining their best compliance pathway as it applies to CSAPR.
936	And let me say that another way. If this bill were to become
937	law it would actually take power away from the states and give
938	it to the EPA.
939	And as John Walke from the Natural Resource Defense Council

pointed out in his written testimony for the recent legislative

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be

987 Mr. Harper. No. 988 The Clerk. Mr.

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes no.

The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

Mr. Hudson.

No.

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1055

1056

1057

1058

The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

1059

Mrs. Capps.

1060

Mrs. Capps. Aye.

Mr. Welch.

Mr. Welch.

Aye.

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 52
1109	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
1110	Chairman Upton.
1111	The Chairman. Votes no. Other members wishing to cast a
1112	vote? Mr. Walden?
1113	Mr. Walden. No.
1114	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes nay.
1115	The Chairman. Other members wishing to vote or change their
1116	vote?
1117	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
1118	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 22 ayes
1119	and 29 nays.
1120	The Chairman. Twenty-two ayes, 29 nays. The amendment is
1121	not agreed to.
1122	Are there further amendments to the bill?
1123	Seeing none, the vote occurs on the bill itself, H.R. 3797.
1124	A recorded vote has been asked for. The clerk will call the roll.
1125	The Clerk. Mr. Barton.
1126	Mr. Barton. Aye.
1127	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
1128	Mr. Whitfield.
1129	Mr. Whitfield. Aye.
1130	The Clerk. Mr. Whitfield votes aye.
1131	Mr. Shimkus.
1132	Mr. Shimkus. Aye.
	NEAL P. GPOSS

Aye.

Mr. Harper.

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1175

1176

1177

1178

The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

1179

Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. Johnson.

1180

Mr. Johnson. Aye.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1199

1200

1201 Mr. Hudson. Aye.

1202 The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.

1203 Mr. Collins.

1204 Mr. Collins. Aye.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

Mr. Doyle.

No.

Mr. Lujan. No.

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 59
1277	vote, change their vote?
1278	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
1279	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 29 ayes
1280	and 22 nays.
1281	The Chairman. Twenty-nine ayes, 22 nays. The vote is
1282	favorably reported from the committee.
1283	The chair will now call up H.R. 4557 and ask the clerk to
1284	report.
1285	The Clerk. H.R. 4557, to allow for judicial review of any
1286	final rule addressing national emissions standards for hazardous
1287	air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay
1288	ceramic manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.
1289	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
1290	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
1291	any point.
1292	[The Bill H.R. 4557 follows:]
1293	
1294	**************************************

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.

The Chairman. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?

Are there any amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the vote will occur. Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman.

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

The Chairman. The chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois for five minutes to strike the last word.

Mr. Rush. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in describing the need for this bill stated it is necessary in order to delay the Environmental Protection Agency's BRICK MACT rule until all judicial review has been completed.

However, that's completely false. The courts already have the ability to issue a statement of any compliance dates in a final rule as necessary to protect the public interest. That is their job and we should let them do it.

We all know that there have already been charges filed regarding this final rule. It will be up to the D.C. Circuit when they review these challenges to decide whether to stay in the rule. Well established legal factions exist for granting a stay.

These factions take into account whether there's a likelihood of success on the merits, this prospect of irreparable harm to the moving parties and other parties and, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, whether granting a stay is in the

This is an unedited transcript.	The statements within may be	
inaccurate, incomplete, or misa	ttributed to the speaker.	61

1319 | public interest.

The courts have used these factors time and time again to determine whether to stay or to issue a grant to stay or for how long. There's no reason for Congress to override this process.

There's no reason for Congress to question the judgment of the court. I think that before we rashly conclude on behalf of the D.C. Circuit that the compliance deadlines for the BRICK MACT final rule should be extended, we should let them take a final look at this final rule.

And ultimately, Mr. Chairman, if a stay is necessary the court can grant the stay and not the Congress, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

The Chairman. Gentleman yields back.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the recognition and I certainly understand our colleague from Illinois and his comments.

But it basically boils down to this. When is enough enough? Certainly, the brick industry could file lawsuits and pump millions of dollars into court cases to have something remedied that actually should not need a remedy in the first place.

Brick companies have already been through this already. If you recall, the EPA finalized similar standards in 2003. The brick industry spent hundreds of millions of dollars to comply and put

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1362

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1363

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1365

1364

The BRICK Act extends compliance deadlines for EPA's brick and clay rules until all legal challenges are resolved by the

1368

courts.

1369 1370

1371

1372

1373 1374

1376

1375

1377

1378 1379

1380 1381

1382

1383

1384 1385

1386

1387

1389

1388

1390

But delaying the rule should not be taken lightly and the blanket extension in the BRICK Act would only serve to incentivize frivolous litigation in an effort to stall and avoid compliance with EPA's rules.

Now, I appreciate that there are special circumstances related to this particular rule. I know there's a long history regarding this rule that dates back to a final rule in 2003 that was later vacated by the courts.

And I also know that the majority of these plants are small businesses and these plants often employ large numbers of workers from the surrounding communities.

So I'm sensitive to the impact a rule like this can have on plants and jobs. What I've gathered from the recent legislative hearing on this bill and from the subcommittee markup is that it's too early to know what the compliance picture looks like for the BRICK MACT rule.

In fact, this rule just became effective in late December of 2015 so we're about two months into a three-year compliance period and there's an option for a fourth year if necessary to finish installation of controls.

Rather than rushing to approve a bill to indefinitely delay a Clean Air Act rule, something that I do not take lightly, I would suggest we encourage the brick industry to continue investigating 1391 | its options for complying.

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

I've heard industry estimates that this rule will cost about \$100 million per year to comply with. But I've also heard that individual plants are still investigating their options for how to comply.

EPA noted in their written testimony for the recent legislative hearing on the bill that in the final BRICK rule they developed flexible compliance options and also made distinctions between requirements for small and large kilns in order to reduce the impacts of the rule on small businesses.

I'm hopeful that the industry will look at these flexibilities and figure out ways to comply that are less costly than their initial estimates.

And I understand the industry recently met with the EPA to discuss the rule and compliance with it. I encourage these talks to continue.

If the industry determines they need additional help, then under existing law they have the right to seek a stay through the courts.

But I continue to think that this combination, that is, the industry working with the EPA using existing authority to seek a stay if absolutely necessary, is a better path than pursuing a legislative fix.

As with the case when we considered a similar provision for

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1415	power plants in the Ratepayer Protection Act, the litigation delay
1416	in the BRICK Act creates a very bad precedent and therefore I
1417	oppose this bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.
1418	I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
1419	The Chairman. Gentleman yields back.
1420	Other members wishing to speak on the bill or offer
1421	amendments?
1422	Seeing none, the question now occurs in favorably reporting
1423	H.R. 4557 to the House. A roll call has been requested. The
1424	clerk will call the roll.
1425	The Clerk. Mr. Barton.
1426	Mr. Barton. Aye.
1427	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
1428	Mr. Whitfield.
1429	Mr. Whitfield. Aye.
1430	The Clerk. Mr. Whitfield votes aye.
1431	Mr. Shimkus.
1432	Mr. Shimkus. Aye.
1433	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
1434	Mr. Pitts. Mr. Walden.
1435	Mr. Walden. Aye.
1436	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes aye.
1437	Mr. Murphy.
1438	Mr. Murphy. Aye.

Mr. McKinley. Aye.

Mr. McKinley.

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

Mr. Flores.

1463

1464

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

1478

1479

1480

1481

1482

1483

1484

Ms. Castor.

No.

1511

1512

1513

1514

1515

1516

1517

1518

1519

1520

1521

1522

1523

1524

1525

1526

1527

1528

1529

1530

1531

1532

1533

NEAL R. GROSS

No.

Mr. Loebsack.

1535

1536

1537

1538

1539

1540

1541

1542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

1549

1550

1551

1552

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1559	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes no.
1560	Mr. Schrader.
1561	Mr. Schrader. No.
1562	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes no.
1563	Mr. Kennedy.
1564	Mr. Kennedy. No.
1565	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes no.
1566	Mr. Cardenas.
1567	Mr. Cardenas. No.
1568	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes no.
1569	Chairman Upton.
1570	The Chairman. Votes aye.
1571	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes aye.
1572	The Chairman. Other members Dr. Burgess, how does Dr.
1573	Burgess record?
1574	The Clerk. Burgess votes aye.
1575	The Chairman. Are there other members wishing to cast a vote
1576	or change a vote?
1577	Seeing none, the clerk will report the tally.
1578	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 28 ayes
1579	and 22 nays.
1580	The Chairman. Twenty-eight ayes, 22 nays. The bill H.R.
1581	4557 is favorably reported.
1582	Chair would now call up H.R. 4238 and ask the clerk to report.

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1583	The Clerk. H.R. 4238, to amend the Department of Energy
1584	Organization Act and the Local Public Works Capital Development
1585	and Investment Act of 1976 to modernize terms related to
1586	minorities.
1587	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
1588	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
1589	any point.
1590	[The Bill H.R. 4238 follows:]
1591	
1592	*********** INSERT 11*******

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1593	The Chairman. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the
1594	bill? Are there any amendments to the bill?
1595	Seeing none, the question now occurs of favorably reporting
1596	H.R. 4238 to the House. All those in favor will say aye.
1597	(Vote was taken)
1598	Those opposed, say no. Opinion of the chair the ayes have
1599	it. The bill is favorably reported.
1600	The chair will now call up H.R. 4427 and ask the clerk to
1601	report.
1602	The Clerk. H.R. 4427, to amend section 203 of the Federal
1603	Power Act.
1604	[The Bill H.R. 4427 follows:]
1605	
1606	*********INSERT 12******

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1607	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
1608	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
1609	any point.
1610	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are there
1611	any amendments to the bill?
1612	Chair would recognize the gentleman from Illinois to offer
1613	an amendment. The clerk will report the title of the amendment.
1614	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4427 offered by Mr. Rush. At
1615	the end of the bill add the following new sections.
1616	[The amendment of Mr. Rush follows:]
1617	
1618	********INSERT 13******

yield back.

The Chairman. Gentleman yields back and a vote will occur on the amendment. Those in favor will say aye.

(Vote was taken)

Those opposed say no. Opinion of the chair the ayes have it.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1619

1620

1621

1622

1623

1624

1625

1626

1627

1628

1629

1630

1631

1632

1633

1634

1635

1636

1637

1638

1639

1640

1641

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1643	Further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the vote
1644	occurs on the bill H.R. 4427 as amended.
1645	Those in favor will say aye.
1646	(Vote was taken)
1647	Those opposed say no. Opinion of the chair, the ayes have
1648	it. The amendment the bill is favorably reported.
1649	The chair now calls up H.R. 4444 and asks the clerk to report.
1650	The Clerk. H.R. 4444, to amend the Energy Policy and
1651	Conservation Act to exclude power supply circuits, drivers and
1652	devices designed to be connected to and power light-emitting
1653	diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination
1654	from energy conservation standards for external power supplies
1655	and for other purposes.
1656	[The Bill H.R. 4444 follows:]
1657	
1658	**************************************

The Chairman. That is about the longest title I've ever heard. But without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with and the bill will be open for amendment.

The chair will recognize the gentlelady from Tennessee for a colloquy.

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank everybody for their hard work in drafting H.R. 4444 and I know it will alleviate some of the regulatory burden on entrepreneurs, and we all want to encourage energy efficiency and this bill will allow that to happen by giving the LED lighting industry and direct current ceiling fans greater flexibility with the external power supply efficiency level six.

Universal Lighting is headquartered in Nashville. They employ about 100 Tennesseans and this is important to them and, of course, our ceiling fan manufacturers are important to them.

There are other niche industries that will be adversely affected by EPS regulation. One of those is the music performance industry.

Music recording and performance is made possible because of external power supplies and they are only effective as long as they do not interfere with musical instruments and audio devices.

It is impossible for external power supplies to meet efficiency level six without generating more electromagnetic interference and adding noise to audio circuits.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1683	I wish we could work this out before this bill goes to the
1684	floor. It is important to the performance industry, to the
1685	concert industry, to the recording industry to get this right,
1686	and knowing that they're going to be facing additional regulation
1687	to make certain that there is a way to waiver them out of that.
1688	I look forward to working with my colleagues. I feel like
1689	we have to find a solution to this issue in order to enable those
1690	that are in the performance concert and music recording industry
1691	to be able to continue without that kind of electromagnetic
1692	interference in their daily work, and I yield back to the chairman.
1693	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back.
1694	The chair recognizes
1695	Mrs. Ellmers. Mr. Chairman, could I move to strike the last
1696	word?
1697	The Chairman. Is that yes. The chair recognizes the
1698	gentlelady from North Carolina.
1699	Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1700	I appreciate so much the committee working with us on this
1701	issue. I do look forward to it moving swiftly to the floor because
1702	of the time constraints that are approaching.
1703	But I would like to work with the gentlelady from Tennessee
1704	on this if there's a way that we can, you know, move swiftly on
1705	helping that situation.

I certainly understand this situation and as complicated as

Mrs. Blackburn. If the gentlelady will yield.

Mrs. Ellmers. It's Mrs. Ellmers' time.

Mrs. Blackburn. Yes, it is important and lighting is

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

1728

1729

important to your concert and performances into the LED innovation.

1733

1734

1735

1736

1737

1738

1739

1740

1741

1742

1743

1744

1745

1746

1747

1748

1749

1750

1751

1752

1753

1754

But what we have to realize is the electromagnetic fields and the static that that calls -- sometimes you call it white space and the feedback that you get in that is vitally important that we address this because there are already rule makings in place and we have to ask for the forbearance or amend it onto the bill or quickly separately legislatively address this.

I yield back to Mrs. Ellmers.

Mrs. Ellmers. Both of my colleagues and for the other members on committee that have worked on this, and I really would like to say that if there's a way that we can move swiftly I truly want to remedy this problem.

And what I can say is if we can't find that sweet spot where we can amend what we have or bring it to the floor in such a manner that I will be with you on this issue as well, keeping in mind again that there are time constraints in, you know, all the different industries.

The Chairman. Yield back?

Mrs. Ellmers. I yield back unless someone else --

The Chairman. The chair would recognize the gentlelady from California, Mrs. Capps.

Mrs. Capps. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I move to strike the last word just simply to underscore the importance of and the

	inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.
1755	fact that this legislation is very overdue and I appreciate that
1756	we're having this markup today.
1757	I've spoken multiple times regarding the importance of LEI
1758	research and innovation for both improving efficiency options for
1759	the lighting sector and advancing our knowledge of this critical
1760	technology.
1761	And H.R. 4444 is essential to ensuring that we are providing
1762	a regulatory framework that recognizes the importance of LEDs ir
1763	meeting our energy efficiency needs for lighting while at the same
1764	time allowing the industry to continue striving to improve upor
1765	this technology.
1766	It's making leaps and bounds. The bill will ensure that
1767	companies like Cree Lighting in my district will continue working
1768	to innovate and implement this revolutionary technology. So I
1769	urge our colleagues all to vote yes on this bill. I hope we car
1770	work to bring this legislation to the floor as quickly as possible.
1771	And I can yield to anyone else or yield back.
1772	I yield back.
1773	The Chairman. Gentlelady yields back.
1774	Other members wishing to speak on the bill? The chair would
1775	recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone.
1776	Mr. Pallone. Thank you.
1777	In support of the bill, I just want to say that LEDs get swept

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be

up in the energy conservation standards for external power

supplies because they are powered by solid state lighting drivers that bear superficial similarities to the kind of chargers that Congress directed DOE to set standards for.

However, LED drivers aren't designed to operate when disconnected from LEDs and so they can't be tested in the same way as other external power supplies.

This means that even though they are very energy efficient, they can't comply with the standards and the same is true of the new generation of energy efficient ceiling fans.

So this legislation still holds these devices accountable to energy conservation standards and it makes DOE's authority to prescribe separate energy conservation standards for LED drivers explicit.

And ceiling fans with direct current motors would still be required to meet DOE's energy conservation standards for ceiling fans. I just wanted to point out I know we've had some discussion that during the last couple of weeks we've been made aware by Representative Blackburn that a small specialty business in her district might be irreparably harmed by the new EPS standards.

Both the Democratic and Republican committee staff have been working with her office, her constituents, Department of Energy and stakeholders to try to address this situation and I think we all agree that Representative Blackburn's constituent has a legitimate problem and we all want to help.

As we all tried in good faith to draft a potential legislative solution, it became abundantly clear that this situation could more quickly and efficiently be remedied through an administrative route rather than a legislative one.

It also became clear that we could not readily put together a legislative fix without running the risk of offending the careful balance struck in the bill and derailing the fast track to enactment that we all hope this bill is on.

So I just wanted to thank Representative Blackburn for recognizing this and agreeing to forego amending the bill. I want to make clear to her that I will work with her, her constituent, our colleagues and DOE to ensure that her constituent gets the administrative waiver we all believe the company deserves.

In fact, I believe that ACEEE, the lead organization for the efficiency community in this bill, is willing to help your constituent navigate the waiver process if you so desire.

We'll also work to ensure that no enforcement action is taken against your constituent as the company pursues this administrative remedy, and although we think this effort to obtain administrative relief will succeed, we could, of course, work with you on a legislative fix on the chance that this effort somehow falls short.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to conclude by commending Representatives Blackburn and DeGette along with

	This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker.	85	
1851	**************************************]

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 86 The Chairman. Chair asks unanimous consent that the 1852 1853 committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 2081, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of 1854 a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam. 1855 1856 Without objection, so ordered. 1857 [The Bill H.R. 2081 follows:] 1858 1859 **********INSERT 16******

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 87 The Chairman. Chair would ask unanimous consent that the 1860 committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 3447, a 1861 1862 bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of 1863 a hydroelectric project involving the W. Kerr Scott Dam. 1864 Without objection, so ordered. 1865 [The Bill H.R. 3447 follows:] 1866 ***************************** 1867

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 88 The Chairman. Chair asks unanimous consent that the 1868 committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 4411, a 1869 bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of 1870 1871 a hydroelectric project involving the Gathright Dam. 1872 Without objection, so ordered. 1873 [The Bill H.R. 4411 follows:] 1874 **************************** 1875

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. The Chairman. Chair asks unanimous consent that the committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 4416, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement of a construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Jennings Randolph Dam. Without objection, so ordered. [The Bill H.R. 4416 follows:]

**********INSERT 19******

1883

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. 90 1884 The Chairman. Chair would ask unanimous consent that the committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 4412, a 1885 bill to extend the deadline for a commencement construction of 1886 a hydroelectric project involving the Flannagan Dam. 1887 Without objection, so ordered. 1888 1889 [The Bill H.R. 4412 follows:] 1890 **********INSERT 20****** 1891

inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. The Chairman. Chair would ask unanimous consent that the committee adopt and favorably report to the House H.R. 4434, a bill to extend the deadline for commencement of a construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Cannonsville Dam. Without objection, so ordered. [The Bill H.R. 4434 follows:]

**********INSERT 21******

1899

This is an unedited transcript. The statements within may be

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The Chairman. That now concludes the legislative activity of the committee for the morning. I would like to insert for the record under unanimous consent a letter from FERC, a letter written to myself and Mr. Pallone regarding views on 4411 and 4412 and also a letter from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to myself and Mr. Pallone regarding H.R. 2984, the Fair Ratepayer Accountability Transparent Act.

Without objection, the letters will be included as part of the record, and without objection, the staff is authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the committee today. So ordered.

And without objection, the committee stands adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913