1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS WALTER
3	HIF107030
4	
5	
6	OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY
7	COMMISSION AND THE FY 2019 BUDGET
8	TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2018
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Energy
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
17	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman
18	of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
20	Shimkus, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith, Johnson,
21	Long, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Walberg, Duncan, Walden
22	(ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters, Green, Doyle, Castor,
23	Welch, Tonko, Schrader, Kennedy, Butterfield, and Pallone (ex
24	officio).

Staff present: Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel
Butler, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly
Collins, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Wyatt Ellertson,
Professional Staff, Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty,
Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions;
Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator, Environment; Zach Hunter,
Director of Communications; Mary Martin, Chief Counsel,
Energy/Environment; Drew McDowell, Executive Assistant; Brandon
Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy; Mark Ratner, Policy
Coordinator; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Dan Schneider,
Press Secretary; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member,
Energy; Jason Stanek, Senior Counsel, Energy; Austin Stonebraker,
Press Assistant; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs;
Everett Winnick, Director of Information Technology; Priscilla
Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff
Director; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and Environment Policy
Advisor; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy
Coordinator; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim
Robinson, Minority Chief Counsel; Andrew Souvall, Minority
Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services; Tuley
Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; and C.J.
Young, Minority Press Secretary.

Mr. Upton. Good morning, everybody. Oh, man. Becoming a theme. That's good.

So we are lucky to have all five members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission at our hearing today to discuss the priorities of this independent agency and the challenges of regulating industries that are undergoing significant transformation.

Since our last oversight hearing in 2015, FERC itself has also experienced a number of changes with addition of four new members, so I welcome all of you here today and look forward to hearing your individual perspectives on some very complicated and technical issues ranging from grid resilience to battery storage to cybersecurity.

The past year has been challenging for the commission, having struggled without a functional quorum for more than six months, and during that period utility filings became backlogged and decisions were delayed on matters ranging from utility rate applications to million-dollar interstate natural gas pipeline proposals.

Fortunately, I understand that FERC operations have returned to near normal, having cleared much of that backlog, allowing the commission to turn its attention towards a host of issues ranging from controversial changes to the RTO capacity markets to how new energy infrastructure projects should be evaluated under FERC's

certificate policy.

As we recently heard at your hearing on energy infrastructure, building new pipelines and electric transmission towers is not a easy or simple task.

Affected landowners know their rights and they have organized campaigns to oppose new energy projects, sometimes protesting at FERC's doorstep.

I understand that Chairman McIntyre announced that the commission is now taking a fresh look at its 1999 policy to evaluate the need for new natural gas pipelines.

Obviously, a lot of changes have occurred over the last 20 years in the way infrastructure is developed. So I would be interested to hear what may come from that review.

Another topic that has consumed much attention in the industry and at FERC recently involves the question of the bulk power system's ability to anticipate, withstand, and recover from disruptive events.

This topic of grid resilience became a source of much heated debate we heard from Secretary Perry just last week that the national security of this country is jeopardized -- those are his words -- if we don't take steps to protect the grid.

I understand that FERC is flagged as a top priority and has directed each of the RTOs and ISOs to provide detailed information regarding the state of grid resilience.

The committee is reviewing the RTO's submissions to FERC and will seek and track the anticipated responsive comments through early next month. FERC's jurisdictional electricity markets have also been a topic of frequent discussion during our Powering America hearing series.

We have heard concerns from market participants that range from the need for updated PURPA regs to changes to FERC's transmission planning rules under Order 1000.

Additionally, recent pricing proposals developed by the RTOs and ISOs aimed at accommodating state policies represent a fundamental shift in how resources set prices in the wholesale markets.

Commissioner LaFleur deserves credit for focusing on that issue last May when she was chairman. But, as these federal-state jurisdictional issues play out in filings at FERC and in litigation at the various courts of appeals, we should consider the differences between an impact of the wholesale and retail electricity markets.

So these are tough issues and I recognize that you've got a lot on your agenda right now. However, despite the tough work and challenging issues FERC faces, I'd like to point out that the commission is consistently ranked among the best places to work in the federal government, based on employee surveys and your success in maintaining such high marks by your 1,500 staff members

120	is noted.
121	With that, I want to thank the commissioners again for
122	appearing today. I look forward to your testimony and the
123	questions and interactions that we have between us.
124	[The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]
125	
126	**************************************

Mr. Upton. With that, I recognize the ranking member of
Energy Subcommittee, Mr. Rush, my friend from Illinois.

Mr. Rush. I certainly want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for
holding this very timely hearing today. I look forward to hearing

133 | electric grid.

131

132

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

Mr. Chairman, just last week this subcommittee heard from Secretary Perry on what he considers a very real concern regarding grid reliability, specifically, Mr. Chairman, the topic of DOE intentionally using its emergency authority under Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act to grant the request made by First Energy to issue an emergency must-run order for 85 coal and nuclear plants within the PJM interconnected came up more than once.

from the FERC commissioners on some of the more pressing issues

regarding the reliability and the resiliency of the nation's

In fact, Secretary Perry, Mr. Chairman, seemed to be sounding the alarm that we are quickly heading toward a point of no return when the imminent retirement of several coal and nuclear plants would leave our nation in a situation where we would be unable to meet our energy demands if we do not act soon.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to hearing the commissioner's views on these critical issues. Another topic of great debate during last week's DOE hearing focused on the March 2018 study by the National Energy Technology Laboratory, or NETL.

That report highlighted the use of coal during the prolonged

cold snap that the nation experienced between December 2017 and January 2018.

The NETL study concluded that within the PJM region, coal provided the most resilient form of generation during this cold blitz and went on to say that without the available capacity from coal facilities then PJM would have experienced power shortfalls and widespread blackouts.

However, Mr. Chairman, just this past Friday, PJM issued its own response to the NETL study refuting those conclusions and stating that PJM indeed had adequate amounts of resources to supply power and then not need to invoke emergency procedures.

PJM also noted that, while coal and nuclear played an important role during this period, that was more due to economic factors and it really never faced any reliability threats.

Mr. Chairman, and the agency responsible for ensuring the reliability of the nation's electrical grid, I look forward to hearing directly from the FERC commission on this and other important issues.

Specifically, I would like to commend the agency for its recent unanimous vote finalizing the rulemaking allowing for distributive energy resources to compete in wholesale markets. This vote marks an important step in the right direction by allowing advanced technologies such as demand response, energy storage, electric automobiles, and photovoltaics potentially in

175 the wholesale market. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I also have some concerns 176 177 regarding the recent study -- recent, rather, policy change 178 determining how impacting stakeholders may intervene in pipeline 179 review. I'd like to hear from the commission on its justification 180 181 for a less lenient in allowing interveners to join proceedings that are, quote, "out of time" and how these new changes might 182 183 impact public input and participating in the pipeline review 184 process. 185 That said, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to engaging the 186 commissioners today and I will yield back the balance of my time. 187 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. 188 The chair would recognize the chair of the full committee, 189 the gentleman from the good state of Oregon, Mr. Walden. 190 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman. 191 Welcome to our FERC commissioners. Good morning. 192 delighted that you're here. I think the last time we had all the 193 commissioners before the committee was in 2015, and so we are 194 delighted that you're here. 195 But this is the first time under the chairmanship of 196 Commissioner McIntyre. So we look forward to the discussion that 197 will take place.

FERC oversees, as you all know, many critical aspects of our

nation's energy infrastructure and industry, and through the authorities provided by Congress, namely, the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act, the commission regulates the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil and reviews proposals to build LNG terminals, interstate natural gas pipelines, and oversees the licensing of hydro power projects, all of which are very, very important to our country and to my state.

Our nation's energy industry is at the forefront of an unprecedented period of change driven in part by changes in fuel mixes, technological innovation, and market competition.

Declining natural gas prices, stable demands, zero cost generation resources, greater efficiency -- they've all led to a generation mix differentiated not solely by cost but through operational characteristics such as dispatchability flexibility and ramping.

So a well-functioning energy system is dependent on competitive markets. However, in some wholesale electricity markets, certain generation resources such as coal and nuclear are struggling to recover costs and remain competitive.

In some cases, under wholesale market rules, inflexible generation units are not permitted to set price. This presents real challenges for cost recovery, which could, ultimately, have an impact on the reliability and resiliency of our electricity

2.2.1

223 grid. 224 So I am hopeful that FERC will take this matter seriously 225 as it conducts its review of comments regarding resiliency in the 226 organized electricity markets. 227 At the same time, advances in digital information 228 technologies are driving real change, creating new opportunities 229 for more intelligent and dynamic energy systems. 230 Many of these advanced energy technologies have applications 231 on the distribution side and behind the meter beyond the 232 regulatory reach of FERC. However, given the interconnected nature of our grid, we are 233 234 235 wholesale electricity markets.

beginning to see their impacts on the bulk power system and

Of course, as our generation mix shifts toward natural gas, we are going to need more pipelines to transport gas from producing wells and user consumers.

New England is especially feeling that crunch, as we have heard, as we saw when they had to import LNG from Russia on two occasions this year to meet market demands.

So I am hopeful that Chairman McIntyre's review of FERC's procedures for evaluating applications for new gas pipelines will result in more efficient and timely decisions.

I understand that FERC will be taking formal action on this review at its open meeting on Thursday. With our abundant shale

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

247 resources, we can be entirely self-sufficient on natural gas. 248 But we must construct new pipelines to do that. While cross 249 border trade with our neighbors in Canada and Mexico may be a 250 win-win, we should never have to be reliant on the Russians for 251 imports again. 252 Since taking the gavel as chairman of this committee, I've 253 made it my promise to always put the consumer first in everything 254 that we do. The modern consumer expects greater control, 255 convenience, and choice when it comes to their energy consumption. 256 I am excited about the changes taking place and the 257 opportunities that it presents to our nation's economy and energy 258 security. 259 With that, I'd like to thank all of you for willingness to 260 participate in this public service and in this hearing and I look 261 forward to your testimony. 262 As you all well know, we also have another subcommittee 263 meeting at the same time on telecommunications issues so you will 264 have members, including myself, coming and going. 265 We really value your testimony and your long public service 266 and we look forward to a partnership together for America's 267 future. 268 With that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back the balance of 269 my time. 270 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]

271

272

\*

273 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. 274 The chair would recognize the ranking member of the full 275 committee, Mr. Pallone, from New Jersey. 276 Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 277 I am pleased that there is finally a full slate of five 278 commissioners at FERC. Last year, I voiced my concern that a lot 279 of important work was put on hold for an extended period of time because the commission lacked a quorum, and it's a pleasure to 280 281 have all five of you here with us today. 282 First, I'd like to thank the commission for its decision to 283 reject Secretary Perry's notice of proposed rulemaking to provide 284 cost recovery for certain coal and nuclear facilities that are 285 no longer economical. 286 This proposed rule is a threat to competitive electricity 287 markets and would have led to higher energy prices for consumers. 288 With Secretary Perry's proposed rulemaking now behind us, 289 we must turn our attention to the feedback that the commission 290 receives from the regional transmission organization as it 291 relates to current resiliency risk. 292 I would also like touch briefly on FERC's authority to review 293 applications for the construction of interstate natural gas 294 pipelines. 295 For years I've expressed concern with the process FERC uses 296 to review pipeline applications and its tendency to green light

297 the construction of potentially unnecessary pipeline projects. 298 Overbuilding our natural gas pipeline system has many 299 negative impacts on the public. Ratepayers ultimately foot the 300 bill for the construction of these pipelines whether they are 301 necessary or not. 302 Homeowners in the path of a pipeline also have little 303 recourse to stop pipeline companies from seizing their land 304 through eminent domain. 305 It's time for a new approach. I believe a more regional 306 review of these projects should be implemented rather than the 307 current process where every pipeline appears to be reviewed 308 individually without any consideration of other pipelines in the 309 area. 310 And I was encouraged by Chairman McIntyre's announcement in 311 December that FERC will review its 1999 pipeline policy statement. 312 I hope this review leads to a new pipeline policy that provides 313 greater protections to property owners and more holistic review 314 process that looks at all pipelines in a given region. I've also heard from many property owners and advocacy groups 315 316 that FERC is not nearly responsive enough to the public. 317 needs to be done at the commission to provide a greater role for the general public and the FERC process. 318 319 My colleague, Representative Schakowsky, had introduced a 320 common sense bill that would create an office of public

321 participation in consumer advocacy at FERC and such an office 322 would provide an important resource for everyday citizens who 323 typically lack the ability to navigate the complex FERC process. 324 And finally, I'd like to address FERC's grid storage order 325 number 841, which was issued in February. I've long advocated 326 for finding ways to introduce more distributed energy and energy 327 storage into our electric grid and removing the many barriers 328 preventing storage benefits from reaching consumers. 329 And so I am fully aware that there are some technical changes 330 that grid operators and utilities will have to overcome, it can 331 be done and I am pleased that FERC has directed the RTOs to evaluate 332 how storage can add value to our electricity markets. 333 So, again, let me conclude by welcoming everyone here today. Thank you, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman. 334 335 Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired. 336 We are now prepared to hear testimony from each of the 337 commissioners. We welcome you. Thank you for submitting your 338 testimony in advance. It'll be made part of the record. 339 We will let you spend five minutes each summarizing your 340 statements and at that point we will go to guestions on both sides. 341 So Mr. McIntyre, welcome. Good to see you.

342	STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE KEVIN J. MCINTYRE, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL
343	ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE CHERYL A. LAFLEUR,
344	COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE
345	HONORABLE NEIL CHATTERJEE, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY
346	REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. POWELSON,
347	COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION; THE
348	HONORABLE RICHARD GLICK, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY
349	COMMISSION
350	
351	STATEMENT OF MR. MCINTYRE
352	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Chairman Upton. Likewise.
353	Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Upton and Ranking Member
354	Rush, and distinguished members of this subcommittee.
355	My name is Kevin McIntyre, and since December I have had the
356	privilege of serving as the chairman of the Federal Energy
357	Regulatory Commission, FERC.
358	FERC is an independent federal agency that regulates
359	important aspects of our nation's electric, natural gas, hydro
360	power, and oil pipeline industries.
361	As chairman, I am particularly pleased to be serving
362	alongside my esteemed fellow commissioners who are also appearing
363	before you today.
364	I could not have hoped for a more engaged, better informed,

and more public spirited group of colleagues than these.

My goals as chairman include the fostering of continued excellence at FERC, which was recently recognized as you, Chairman Upton, mentioned -- recognized in a prominent national ranking of the best places to work in the federal government as the number-one mid-sized agency.

My goals also include making FERC's actions as open, transparent, fair, and efficient as possible. A top substantive priority of mine is to protect and promote the resilience of our bulk power system, as has been mentioned here this morning.

On January 8, we initiated a proceeding to evaluate the state of that grid resilience. We are still receiving the incoming public comments in response to our issuance in that proceeding, and as we are informed by those comments and deliberate on them, we will make determinations as to whether additional action by FERC is warranted in this critical area.

I also am pleased that FERC is beginning a review of our 1999 policy statement on the certification, our term for the approval process for interstate natural gas pipeline facilities.

As a matter of good governance, I believe that it is appropriate for us, as with any other governmental body, to review our policies and processes from time to time to explore whether any improvements can be made.

Our review of gas pipeline certification processes is timely in light of the many changes that the natural gas industry has

390 witnessed in the past 20 years. 391 In addition to these specific goals and priorities, as 392 chairman, FERC is continuing to consider many other important 393 issues. My fellow commissioners will address some of those in 394 their testimony before you here this morning. With that, I thank you for this opportunity to be -- to appear 395 396 before you. 397 [The prepared statement of Mr. McIntyre follows:] 398 399 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 3\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

400 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

401 Ms. LaFleur, welcome.

STATEMENT OF MS. LAFLEUR

Ms. LaFleur. Thank you, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Rush, and members of the subcommittee.

My name is Cheryl LaFleur. I've been a commissioner at FERC for nearly eight years and have appeared before this committee several times. Got a little lonely last year so I am extremely happy to be here this morning with the full commission.

What I am going to discuss today is FERC's regulation of our wholesale electricity markets and I will also touch briefly on our oversight of interstate transmission planning. Both areas are covered more fully in my written testimony.

The organized markets that provide electricity to more than two-thirds of Americans are, roughly, 20 years old now and I believe they've done a very good job for the nation's electric customers, promoting efficiency and innovation and protecting reliability at least cost by deploying resources over a broader regional footprint.

As the committee knows, there are different market structures in different regions of the country, reflecting varied state and regional regulatory choices.

Perhaps the most prominent difference is that the eastern markets -- PJM, New York ISO, and ISO New England -- use mandatory capacity markets to ensure resource adequacy because all or most

426 of the states in those regions chose to deregulate generation in 427 the 1990s. 428 By contrast, the Midwestern and Western markets -- MISO SPP 429 and CISO -- rely primarily on state resource planning for resource 430 adequacy. 431 The markets have grown dramatically since I've joined FERC 432 In 2013, the Entergy companies and others in the 433 mid-south became part of MISO, nearly doubling its size. 434 Two years later in 2015, the integrated systems and part of 435 the Western Area Power Administration in the upper Midwest joined SPP, marking the first time a federal power marketing 436 437 administration chose to join the market. 438 The big story in 2018 is the expansion of markets in the west. 439 The western energy imbalance market operated by the California 440 ISO has expanded in recent years to include utilities in five 441 Western states including several public power entities and now 442 represents the load of 55 percent of the western interconnection. 443 Several more entities are scheduled to join in the next two 444 years when two-thirds of the electricity in the West will be shared 445 and balanced by that market. 446 In addition to the group of companies primarily in Colorado 447 and Wyoming, and are known as the Mountain West Transmission 448 Group, have indicated their intent to join the Southwest Power 449 Pool.

450 I think it's really important that these market expansions 451 are being driven at the state and regional and company level, not 452 driven by FERC. In fact, I strongly believe that's the only reason they're 453 454 happening is that the choices are being made in the regions. 455 reflect the increasing and increasingly broad recognition that 456 sharing resources over a large footprint can sustain reliability 457 and save money for customers, especially at a time of substantial 458 resource change. 459 FERC has worked hard to make sure the markets do what they're 460 supposed to do. We've taken a number of steps to make sure that 461 markets are fair for all resources including emerging 462 technologies. 463 We've also worked to ensure grid resilience by overseeing 464 capacity market changes to increase compensation to the resources 465 including baseload that keep the lights on at times of system 466 stress. 467 In the energy markets, we've taken a number of steps on market 468 mechanics to improve price formation. The most challenging issue 469 currently confronting the wholesale markets is their interplay 470 with state policy initiatives, which my colleague, Mr. Powelson, 471 will discuss and which I touch on in my testimony. 472 Finally, I will comment briefly on our work on interstate

transmission. It's been nearly seven years since FERC issued

474	Order No. 1000 to require regional transmission planning and cost
475	allocation and require competitive transmission selection over
476	some projects.
477	All regions of the nation are in some stage of implementing
478	Order 1000 at this point. Five of them have had competitive
479	transmission processes and have proven that it saves customers
480	money.
481	They've also proven that it's hard to do and that we have
482	a lot more work to do on this, and it's something the commission
483	is going to continue to monitor and work on.
484	And with that, I will thank you again for the opportunity
485	and look forward to your questions.
486	Thank you.
487	[The prepared statement of Ms. LaFleur follows:]
488	
489	*********INSERT 4*******

490 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

Mr. Chatterjee, welcome. Good to see you.

## STATEMENT OF MR. CHATTERJEE

Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you. Great to see you, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Rush, distinguished members of the subcommittee.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the important work FERC is doing to ensure that the American people have access to reliable and affordable energy.

As a former congressional staffer, it's always a pleasure to be back on Capitol Hill, and I would like to note that while I came to the commission from the Senate, I began my career here in the people's house and never allowed myself to become a Senate snob. I can't say the same for all of my former colleagues.

I appreciate the subcommittee's attention to the major energy issues facing our nation as well as its interest in the role the commission plays in addressing them.

I would like to focus my remarks today on our efforts regarding reliability and the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, or PURPA, and to touch briefly on a few of my other priorities.

I will begin with a look in the area of energy policy affecting families and businesses across the nation on a daily basis -- reliability.

Congress delegated the FERC the responsibility to approve

and enforce mandatory reliability standards for the grid, and with
our partners at the North American Electric Reliability

Corporation we remain committed to that endeavor.

Our reliability standards have progressed considerably
since they first became mandatory and enforceable just over a

decade ago, and today they form an effective baseline for

since they first became mandatory and enforceable just over a decade ago, and today they form an effective baseline for addressing day-to-day grid reliability issues like tree trimming, relay setting, communications, system planning, and emergency operations.

Another way the commission works to maintain reliability is through our oversight of jurisdictional wholesale energy capacity and ancillary services markets.

For example, the commission has recently taken a number of actions to ensure all new generators provide essential reliability services such as voltage and frequency control.

Those efforts are a good start but more work remains.

Because of historically low natural gas prices and technological innovation, our country is experiencing rapid unprecedented changes in its generation resource mix.

These trends promise tremendous benefits to consumers through lower prices and greater choice. But they also highlight a need for vigilance as we ensure that reliability is not adversely impacted.

I've been pleased to see the important work that ISO New

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

540 England has done in this regard through its assessment of fuel 541 supply vulnerabilities in its footprint. Its analysis is an 542 excellent example of how RTOs and ISOs should proactively evaluate 543 the specific regional risks. 544 I expect that the implications of fuel security for grid 545 reliability and resilience will continue to be areas of interest 546 for the commission. 547 Finally, the commission is also taking action to address

Finally, the commission is also taking action to address other emerging threats such as physical security, geomagnetic disturbances, and electromagnetic pulses.

FERC and NERC have made important strides on these issues and the commission remains actively engaged with our government partners and other stakeholders to improve our knowledge of these threats and evaluate creative ways to address associated risks proactively.

Now, turning to the second topic I would like to address, which is PURPA, today's energy environment is fundamentally different from that of 1978, when PURPA was enacted.

Because of this, many stakeholders are rightly asking whether changes to PURPA are needed to better align it with our modern energy landscape.

While significant changes will require congressional action, I believe the commission should review our existing regulations to ensure they fulfil PURPA's mandate of fostering

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

564 the development of renewable and co-generation resources while 565 protecting customers and competition. Before I close, I would like to take a moment to talk to you 566 567 on a couple of additional issues that I view as priorities. 568 First, the commission's current review of the 1999 569 certificate policy statement. As FERC considers how we evaluate 570 natural gas pipeline applications, I am committed to ensuring that we have an efficient and transparent process that encourages 571 572 landowner participation. 573 From my perspective, our review should build upon our process 574 improvement efforts under the recently signed MOU implementing 575 Executive Order 13807, one federal decision policy. 576 Second, I would like to emphasize my continued commitment to securing our grid against cyberattacks. 577 578 administration has taken laudable steps already, I believe these challenges will continue to grow. 579 580 I strongly support the commission's approach to addressing 581 cyber threats which consists of mandatory standards as well as 582 voluntary best practices and information sharing. Still, more work remains and I look forward to continued 583 584 cooperation with my colleagues at the commission and our partners 585 across the government. 586 I want to take my final seconds to commend this committee 587 in particular for the work that you guys have done to really look into these significant issues, not just by holding this hearing
but, Chairman Upton, under your leadership the past couple of
years this committee has done tremendous work to bring focus to
these enormously complex issue areas.

As an alumnus of Congress, I believe firmly in the
legislative branch's co-equal role in our government. And now
having the good fortune to serve the American public at the

commission, I have come to realize that in dealing with these enormous challenges we are constrained by the statutes that govern

But you all can take a leadership role in addressing some of these complex issues and I look forward to working with you and your colleagues to do that in the future.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Chatterjee follows:]

602

603

597

598

599

600

601

us.

| \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 5\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Upton. Well, thanks for your kinds words. I know that those are shared on both sides of the aisle so appreciate that.

Mr. Powelson, welcome.

## STATEMENT OF MR. POWELSON

Mr. Powelson. Good morning, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Rush, and members of the subcommittee. I also want to echo what my colleagues have said earlier in thanking you for inviting us here this morning.

My name is Robert Powelson. I am honored to serve as the commissioner on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. In fact, I was honored to go through the process with my colleague, Commissioner Chatterjee, and let me just say it's an honor to serve in this capacity.

Before joining the commission in August, I spent nine years as a member of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. I spent four and a half years as chairman and I also served -- I had the honor in 2017 as serving as president of the National Association of Regulatory Commissioners.

So it's -- when I look to my right and my left, the people I serve with here, it's a collegial body and the people that represent this agency are world class, as demonstrated in recent rankings as a federal agency.

My experience, Mr. Chairman, as a state regulator and my interaction with colleagues at the state commission level across the country, have informed in my appreciation and understanding of the FERC's role in interfacing with the states.

631 Since joining the commission, I've approached each of my decisions with an understanding of how the determinations impact, 632 633 as was mentioned earlier, families and businesses nationwide. 634 I've also prioritized my engagement with stakeholders from all backgrounds and geographic regions to ensure that I hear a 635 variety of viewpoints and my decisions are fully informed. 636 637 For purposes of my testimony here this morning, I am focusing First, I will discuss the evolving grid, in 638 639 particular, how the nation's generation resource mix has changed 640 in just the last decade. 641 The second issue is one of just a huge priority for all of 642 us, and that's the proactive cybersecurity work that the FERC is 643 doing. 644 Now, when we talk about the changing electric grid, or some 645 would call it the evolving grid, what's interesting is I look at 646 my experience in Pennsylvania where, in 2008, most likely 50 647 percent of our dispatch was from coal. 648 And now, with the evolution of shale plays like Marcellus, 649 Utica, and the plays in Louisiana and Texas and Arkansas, there 650 has been a drastic shift in our power mix and it's having a profound 651 impact on wholesale power prices in a good way. 652 It's actually, in my home state, has brought a \$5 billion 653 investment in ethylene cracker to Beaver County, Pennsylvania. 654 It's also changed at the local -- we'll call burner tip --

where customers with gas purchase costs in LDCs across

Pennsylvania -- seven LDCs -- have dropped over 70 percent, a

direct pass-through savings to customers in the states -- in the

state of Pennsylvania.

When we talk about the evolving grid, though, it's also important to mention the impact that new resources are having. As mentioned earlier by Chairman Walden, the evolution of the -- the evolution of battery storage, renewable energy, and the impact it's also having on the grid is critically important.

Last year in our bulk power system, 10 percent of our dispatch power came from renewable energy resources. A number of states over the last decade have adopted very successful renewable portfolio standards.

I should note for my good friends from the Republic of Texas, the state of Texas is the number-one wind producer in the country -- shout out to Mr. -- Chairman Barton and Ranking Member Olson as well -- and it speaks to the ovulation, again, of our modern-day grid.

Now, another tectonic shift is also taking place in our grid and, unfortunately, it has to deal with the flat demand for electricity.

As I like to say, the way we generate, transmit, and distribute power in this country is ever changing. The fact of the matter is the grid is getting more efficient, it's getting

more resilient, and it's clearly getting cleaner.

But we are also offering tools to customers. Those tools include things like energy efficiency, real-time pricing -- as mentioned earlier, in certain states like Texas and Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the ability to go out and shop for retail energy supply.

And I note that because a lot of customers are out in the market -- residential and industrial customers.

The last item I want to touch on in cybersecurity, and I think cyber is really one that keeps us all up at night, and I am just very proud of the work that this commission has done, going back to our former chairman, Commissioner LaFleur, and really working with the states, Mr. Chairman, to develop protocols and cyber capacities within the state public utility commissions, and I will talk about that later on here in the hearing.

There's been a number of changing threat vectors in the bulk power system. There are a number -- as you know, a number of bad actors out there that want to infiltrate industrial control systems and wreak havoc on our bulk power system.

But I am proud to report, again, to the work of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, working with the Department of Homeland Security. More recently, the leadership demonstrated by Secretary Perry with the launch of the Office of Cybersecurity within DOE is another great step forward in addressing overall

709 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

710 Commissioner Glick.

STATEMENT OF MR. GLICK

Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member Rush, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

As a former minority general counsel to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee -- and maybe I am a snob, according to Commissioner Chatterjee -- but as a former counsel to the committee, it's nice to be back on Capitol Hill and it's good to see some familiar faces from the Joint House and Senate Energy Bill Conference that took place during the last conference.

I've been a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory

Commission for almost five months. During this short period of time, the commission has been called upon to consider a number of challenging matters.

Although FERC is not typically an agency that receives a substantial amount of public attention, the commission's actions have a significant impact on the lives of everyday Americans.

I witnessed this first-hand while at the Department of Energy at the end of the Clinton administration. The commission's inability to come together on a unified response during the height of the Western energy crisis in 2000 caused consumers to pay significantly more for electricity and natural gas than they should have. It is imperative that the five of us safeguard --

work together to safeguard to public's interest.

As everyone here knows, we are in the midst of a dramatic transformation in the ways Americans produce and consume energy. This revolution has the potential to substantially improve our energy efficiency, reduce emissions, grow the economy, and create millions of new jobs. FERC can help facilitate this transition by removing the barriers to participation and competition that exist in the wholesale markets.

For instance, the commission can examine market rules to ensure that they are not unduly discriminating against new technologies.

In February, FERC voted 5-0 to approve a final rule requiring RTOs and ISOs to facilitate energy storage participation in wholesale electric markets.

Storage technologies such as batteries and pumped hydro have the potential to play a leading role in the transition to the electricity system in the future.

As the cost of energy storage continues to decline, these resources are poised to become a bigger part of the generation mix, leading to the development of a more robust grid that can, among other things, help to accommodate the ever increasing demand for clean renewable resources from states, corporations, and residential customers.

In addition, these storage resources will enhance the

759 reliability and resilience of the grid by also reducing electric 760 rates. 761 Today, the cost of using lithium ion battery is less than 762 one-quarter of what it was at the start of the decade. 763 as a result of those declining costs, industry forecasts project 764 that the nation's installed energy storage capacity will increase 765 by 750 percent in just five years. 766 The commission's action to reduce barriers to help storage 767 -- reduce barriers to energy storage resource participation in 768 wholesale markets will help to further this remarkable 769 trajectory, all the while reducing consumer energy bills. 770 I believe FERC, pursuant to the Federal Power Act, should 771 also identify and eliminate other barriers to participation of 772 new energy technologies and wholesale markets. 773 For example, the commission last week held a technical 774 conference to examine the potential participation of aggregated 775 distributed energy resources in wholesale markets and the 776 benefits these resources could provide. 777 Chairman Upton and Ranking Member Rush, thank you again for 778 the opportunity to appear before the committee today. 779 forward to answering your questions and the questions of your 780 colleagues. 781 [The prepared statement of Mr. Glick follows:]

783

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 7\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Upton. Well, thank you all. Appreciate you being here, and the first thing that I want to raise -- I don't know if you saw today's Washington Post. This is a copy of it. I should have made copies for you.

But it's entitled -- the headline is "U.S., British

Governments Warn Businesses Worldwide of Russian Campaign to Hack

Routers," and it quotes the Homeland Security assistant secretary

for Cybersecurity, and she says, "Once you own the router you own

the traffic that's traversing the router."

And it's pretty clear in this story -- it starts off the U.S. and British governments on Monday accused Russia of conducting a massive campaign to compromise computer routers and firewalls around the world from home offices to internet providers for espionage and possible sabotage purposes.

And as you may know, we are planning to markup tomorrow a bill that's going to help coordinate things with the Department of Energy that I believe at least at this point looks to have pretty widespread bipartisan support by virtually all of the members of this subcommittee is what I am told in advance, but, you know, got to wait until you get there.

So, Chairman McIntyre, my question is it's my understanding that DOE has offered an open invitation for FERC commissioners to receive intelligence briefings on cyber-related threats and I am curious to know how many of you -- how many of those have

you might have taken up with you and your fellow commissioners
in terms of the briefings that have been offered?

Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know the
exact number.

Mr. Upton. Obviously, this is an open setting so I caution

Mr. Upton. Obviously, this is an open setting so I caution everyone in terms of what they might say.

Mr. McIntyre. Yes, sir. But let me just note up front that the issue that you have raised here it would be -- we would be hard pressed to identify one of greater concern to us as an energy industry, as regulators of that industry, and, indeed, as a nation in terms of national security in this threat of cyberattacks from bad actors, in many cases, state actors such as you have identified.

We are increasingly working with DOE and other components of the federal government on a daily basis, mostly at the staff level, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that we stay on top of these issues and take all appropriate measures that are available to us, and I know that the staff of each and every one of my colleagues here has been very much engaged in that process.

You are correct that we have been offered personal briefings that we are I think in the process of scheduling and taking. Very, very helpful. DOE has been very helpful in this regard -- DHS, TSA -- and our level of engagement on this I think will only continue to increase.

832 Mr. Upton. Do you believe that there's any additional 833 statutory authority that FERC may need, as you look to the future? 834 Mr. McIntyre. That's a good question. In 2005, we were 835 given the role of ensuring that reliability is intended to --836 through our oversight of the electric reliability organization 837 of the nation and the reliability standards promulgated by it. 838 And I believe that we are making good use of that authority. 839 I don't have a specific area right now that I can identify as 840 something where we would need broader statutory authority. 841 I am very pleased with this level of increased federal 842 engagement that I described. My colleagues may wish to add their 843 own --844 Mr. Upton. Yes, and maybe also can you shed any light on the degree and frequency of cyberattacks on the energy 845 846 infrastructure? 847 Mr. McIntyre. Attacks are constant, but the degree of 848 severity and the, from the perspective of the perpetrators, 849 success, that is what varies. But every day, not just 850 governmental entities but, indeed, the companies that we regulate 851 are subject to attacks and attempted attacks. 852 I would appreciate hearing from the other Mr. Upton. 853 commissioners as well. 854 Mr. Chatteriee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 855 I think in terms of the interactions that we've had with DOE

and other agencies, I have the good fortune to represent the
commission at an ESCC -- Electric Sector Coordinating Council -meeting with a number of stakeholders across the government and
industry looking at these serious issues.

I also got to participate in a delegation that included DOE,
DHS, and FERC to travel to Israel to learn about best practices
and ways to stay ahead of these ever-evolving threats.

It's something that I think my colleagues and I all take very seriously. It is the new reality that we must contend with. As we benefit and gain from the technological innovation that's taking place in this space we have to be cognizant that it comes with that downside risk of increased cyber vulnerability and my colleagues and I will all remain vigilant on this.

Mr. Upton. Commissioner LaFleur.

Ms. LaFleur. Thank you, Chairman.

I've received a number of briefings -- classified briefings at the Department of Energy over the years. I actually have one scheduled tomorrow, and I appreciate Secretary Perry continuing to make them available.

In answer to your other question, hacks on the grid are constant. The National Center for Cybersecurity and Communications Integration -- whatever NCCIC stands for -- every year electric grid attacks are either a slight majority or slightly below 50 percent in the public numbers they put out every

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

year.

Fortunately, in part because of the strong standards that I believe we put in place for the high voltage electric grid on perimeter security and password security and other things, they're infrequently successful -- very infrequently successful with the electric grid.

In terms of what this committee has done, I think this committee had done an excellent job on the electric grid side. I used to participate, when I was chairman in some kind of committee that was across government of heads of the different agencies, and I think where there's more we can do that's across the different infrastructure sectors, among electricity, water, gas, finance, and others, that's where there's real, I think, weaknesses in sharing information and learning from each other because they're all quite -- they're looked at individually on the Hill and in government. But we all have a lot we have in common.

Mr. Powelson. Mr. Chairman, let me also pick up on that.

The outreach that the FERC has done through our Office of Energy Infrastructure and Security, outreaching the state public utility commissions and helping state PUCs build their internal capacity to address cyber, I am very proud of the work of our Office of Electric -- Energy Infrastructure and Security along with our Office of Electric Reliability.

904 State public utility commissions have used us as a resource 905 to go through trainings and we've developed this checklist that 906 PUCs can use with their regulating utilities to help in a 907 management audit. 908 It's been a great collaborative. I will tell you it's very 909 difficult. When you asked about resources, we could certainly 910 use more boots on the ground. 911 I am not here to get ahead of my chairman on that but I will 912 make the request. The work getting out to 50 states and doing 913 that kind of training requires a lot of boots on the ground. 914 good news is we are doing it in a collaborative approach with 915 NARUC. 916 Commissioners have come into Washington for read-ins. These are all good things that are evolving. But to the earlier 917 918 points, these threat vectors are changing every day and working 919 -- trying to break down the silo mentalities between the different 920 federal agencies I think we've come a long way in the last eight 921 years as a nation to address these emerging threats. 922 Thank you. I know my time has expired so I will Mr. Upton. 923 yield to Mr. Rush. 924 Mr. Chairman, Chairman McIntyre, back in January Mr. Rush. 925 the commission voted unanimously to reject Secretary Perry's 926 notice of proposed rulemaking that sought to prop up coal and

nuclear facilities.

Instead, the commission wanted grid operators to submit additional information regarding their ability to judge and I quote you, "naturally occurring and man-made threats," end of quote, to their system within 60 days.

Where does the agency currently stand on this issue? Does the commission believe that we are truly heading past the point of no return when the retirement of coal and nuclear facilities will leave us in a situation where we will soon be unable to meet our energy demands if we do not act quickly?

Does the agency support action by states and RTOs, the markets, or Congress? Or does it -- does the commission have the means and the authority to act on this issue if and when it becomes a problem?

Mr. McIntyre. Well, thank you for the question, Ranking Member Rush, and also thank you for acknowledging the steps that we as a commission have taken thus far.

As you note, our January order did raise the issue of the grid resilience and, specifically in terms of steps forward, we directed our nation's operators of our regional grids -- the regional transmission organizations and independent system operators -- to take the first step in helping us to build our record on which we would base our decision making by submitting to us their own perspectives on resilience within their respective footprints.

952 And those -- that initial round of comment has come in from 953 the original transmission organizations and independent system 954 Now we are in the subsequent commenting phase. operators. 955 The questions you raised are among the very important issues 956 that we will have to grapple with. Are there categories of 957 resources or, indeed, even perhaps specific important resources 958 that if they were to retire on a permanent basis simply go away 959 and exit the scene of resources that are available to contribute 960 to the energy that serves our nation's energy needs? Would that 961 be something that would be harmful to American interests? 962 A very important issue and a tricky one. So that is very 963 much within the scope of the matters that we will be looking at 964 as we make our decisions, going forward. I would like to ask any of the other commissioners 965 966 would you care to comment on my question? 967 Well, I think, broadly, the commission has two Ms. LaFleur. 968 major sets of our responsibilities that really are directed to 969 the resilience of the electric grid. 970 The first is the market rules to make sure that there's enough 971 resources in the market, that there's enough of the type of 972 resources that are needed to keep the lights on at any given time 973 and that they're properly paid and the markets are stable so

Secondly, the commission has put in place a number of broad

they'll continue to attract investment and resources.

974

977 some of the rules that Commissioner Chatterjee referred to, for 978 example, on frequency response or voltage to make sure that if there is an essential reliability of services that's in demand 979 980 because of all the changes on the grid, we have it for customers. 981 I think that Chairman McIntyre really covered very well the 982 ongoing resilience proceeding. In terms of specific resources 983 that are needed, all of the market operators have in place 984 reliability must-run tariffs so if a resource wants to retire a 985 test is done to make sure that its retirement will not put customer 986 reliability at risk. If there are changes needed in those tariffs we'll look at 987 988 them. But I think that's a good place to start. 989 Mr. Rush. Mr. Chatterjee. 990 Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. 991 I initially was sympathetic when Secretary Perry proposed 992 the notice of proposed rulemaking to the commission. 993 Kentucky, having worked for Leader McConnell, I saw first-hand 994 the devastating impact that coal plant shutdowns had on coal 995 communities throughout Appalachia. 996 I also believe in climate change and man's role in it and 997 believe that we need to mitigate emissions and I believe nuclear 998 power will plan an essential role in that. 999 And also am cognizant of the security concerns that Secretary

standards, both the reliability standards we oversee as well as

1000 Perry himself laid out before this committee last week. 1001 That said, none of those issues were relevant to the docket 1002 that was before us, and I agree with all of my colleagues in voting 1003 to reject it because the record simply did not support 1004 compensating plants based on the availability of 90-day supply 1005 of fuel. 1006 That doesn't mean that Secretary Perry didn't ask the right 1007 question and I do believe the question of resilience that we are 1008 examining in this current docket is an essential one and I think 1009 over the course of time Secretary Perry will be proven right. 1010 We are going to ultimately have resilience challenges in this 1011 country and we need to be prepared for that, and I think that this 1012 docket will allow for that. 1013 Finally, I will say, to build on the point that Commissioner 1014 LaFleur made about, you know, existing tariffs for reliability 1015 must-runs, we've got to evaluate whether they work or not. 1016 You know, while Secretary Perry asked the right question, 1017 perhaps the NOPR was not the right solution. There may be other 1018 necessary solutions and we may in the coming days, weeks, months 1019 be confronted with situations where the existing tariffs do not 1020 allow for, you know, some of the accommodations that may be 1021 necessary. 1022 I had pushed for a show-cause order that I included in my

concurrence to the NOPR that I think, as we look back in time,

1024	may have been the right thing to do.
1025	Mr. Rush. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
1026	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
1027	Mr. Barton.
1028	Mr. Barton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1029	I am going to ask my questions directly to the chairman. But
1030	if any of the commissioners wish to add their comments they're
1031	very welcome to.
1032	The first question, Mr. Chairman, is can you give the
1033	subcommittee a general idea of what the variances in retail cost
1034	of electricity in this country is by region from, say, the lowest
1035	region to the highest region?
1036	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
1037	No. I am afraid I don't actually have that information at
1038	hand. It does vary very much by region and that, in turn, is often
1039	a function of the fuel type that is generally consumed within that
1040	region.
1041	Mr. Barton. Does anybody on the yes, sir, Mr. Powelson.
1042	Mr. Powelson. This is not real time, Mr. Chairman, but
1043	Mr. Barton. I don't I don't need down to the exact
1044	Mr. Powelson. Okay. So let's start with probably the
1045	highest distribution rate in the country is at about 43 cents a
1046	kilowatt hour on the island of Hawaii.
1047	When we go more inland to the lowest cost of energy, I think

1048	the Republic of Texas, through retail competition, customers are
1049	paying less for power today than they were prior to electric
1050	restructuring.
1051	So Texas has low rates. The state of Florida, from my last
1052	anecdotal meeting with officials from their utility, a nine-cent
1053	kilowatt per kilowatt hour all in price. That's transmission,
1054	distribution, and generation.
1055	So you from Hawaii, we know, at 43 cents to your state, maybe
1056	Florida, at a low distribution of nine cents.
1057	Mr. Barton. Well, let's exclude Hawaii, since they're 3,000
1058	miles from the mainland. Is it is it fair to say in the lower
1059	48 the price difference at retail the highest would be three
1060	times the lowest? Is that a fair generalization?
1061	I know I am close. The right answer would be to say yes,
1062	but if you disagree with me
1063	[Laughter.]
1064	Mr. Powelson. I don't want to get ahead of my chairman so
1065	
1066	Mr. Barton. I mean, it's at least two to one and I think
1067	if you look at California and compare California to Oregon, you're
1068	going to it's going to be close to three to one. Or if you
1069	compare Texas to New York, it's going to be close to three to one.
1070	Would you all agree with that?
1071	Now, the reason I ask that question is because ultimately

what the committee and the Congress and the president are responsible for is, for lack of a better term, retail electricity prices that the average citizen can pay.

We also want it to be reliable, and we've developed a mix of energy sources in this country. You know, some states have regulated markets. Some states have deregulated markets. Some states pretty much rely on coal. Some states have a -- like Texas, we've got a mix of coal, natural gas, wind, and some nuclear power and a little solar power.

But our nuclear plants and our coal plants are in distress. And my second question is the distress primarily caused by market forces, natural gas prices being very low, or is it caused by regulatory constraints on the nuclear industry and the coal industry?

Mr. McIntyre. Congressman, I will begin. Thank you for the question.

Certainly, the low prices of natural gas today that we experience in this country due in large measure to the revolution in natural gas production methods make for significant head winds for coal and nuclear because it's very, very difficult for them to compete in our open and competitive wholesale markets against that cheap natural gas resource.

As to the regulatory role, hard to say. Certainly, nuclear compliance and everything associated with the prospect of

building a new nuclear generating facility today makes for
enormous costs that probably has an all but prohibitive effect
at short-term competition with natural gas prices.

Mr. Barton. My time is about to expire.

I asked the first question to bring to the attention of the
commission and the committee that retail prices vary greatly in
this country. The cost of generation of electricity varies,

commission and the committee that retail prices vary greatly in this country. The cost of generation of electricity varies, depending on the fuel source, and the regulatory burden, obviously, on nuclear is very high and you can argue that it's also very high on coal plants.

If we look for solutions to keep our distressed nuclear plants and coal plants in service, we should first look at regulatory relief and only then look at market relief.

When you start, in my opinion, to mess with the market, which some of these proposals do, in the long run it hurts the consumer because you either have to subsidize that price, which drives the retail price up, and eventually you can't -- you can't sustain it.

So I respect my good friend at the Department of Energy,
Governor Perry. But I don't think his proposed solution -- while
it's well meaning, I personally don't think it would work in the
long run.

I would encourage the commission, to the extent you can, to look on the regulatory relief side, you know, before we begin to

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1120 look at market -- the market solutions. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1121 1122 Mr. Upton. Gentleman yields back. 1123 Mr. Pallone. 1124 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Pallone. 1125 In my opening statement, I noted that I've long advocated 1126 for finding ways to introduce more distributed energy and energy 1127 storage into our electricity grid, and one of the reasons for that 1128 is that I see too many transmission projects needlessly rubber 1129 stamped in the name of reliability. 1130 There are certainly other ways to address reliability than 1131 just gold-plating the transmission system. But perhaps when 1132 you're a hammer everything looks like a nail. 1133 So today, newer and bigger transmission lines aren't always 1134 the answer to the question of reliability. Distributed energy 1135 resources, renewable and otherwise, along with efficiency and 1136 demand response should be equally large tools in the box and 1137 technology has dramatically transformed the possibilities for 1138 cost-effective generating and efficiently delivering electricity 1139 to homes, businesses, and manufacturing facilities from a variety 1140 of sources. 1141 So I want to commend the commission for recognizing this with 1142 its recent order regarding storage. With storage and distributed 1143 generation, both fossil and renewable base, along with improving storage options, smart meters, micro grids, and other technologies have altered the possibilities for effectively and economically ensuring reliability, and these technologies have also called into the question the most basic tenets of rate making and have challenged the longstanding financial model for utilities.

Now, two years ago -- I want to talk about a local issue -two years ago, First Energy JCP&L determined that its Monmouth
County -- where I live -- that its Monmouth County reliability
project is necessary to retain reliability for the entire regional
transmission grid and specifically for New Jersey, and they
proposed a 10-mile transmission line that would run through the
district I represent along New Jersey Transit's north Jersey
coastline.

Ever since JCP&L proposed this project, I've articulated concerns about whether constructing this Monmouth County reliability project is necessary to accomplish JCP&L's stated reliability goals.

Recently, this view was echoed was New Jersey Administrative Law Judge Gail Cookson, who ruled that JCP&L failed to demonstrate that the transmission line is necessary and noted that JCP&L has not seriously considered alternative corridors and ignored non-transmission solutions entirely.

In the past, building a new transmission line may have been

1168 the only way to increase reliability. However, now there clearly 1169 are other options available. Other options include distributing 1170 -- distributed generation storage, various new grid technologies. 1171 They can only -- not only increase reliability but also 1172 modernize the grid. So this -- Judge Cookson's decision which, 1173 you know, I will send to you, but I am going to, you know, probably 1174 get back to you further, if that's okay, on this -- but her decision 1175 supports my long-held suspicion that often projects like this 1176 Monmouth County reliability project are more about the rate of 1177 return for shareholders than reliability for consumers. 1178 So my question to all of you is -- whoever wants to ask it 1179 -- how can you change this dynamic to ensure that utilities look 1180 at more than just new transmission lines -- that they look at 1181 non-transmission alternatives to ensure reliability? 1182 And how can we change incentives so that these 1183 non-transmission alternatives are still financially attractive 1184 to utilities? Can anybody, you know, take a guess? 1185 Sure. 1186 Mr. Powelson. Congressman Pallone, your home state, 1187 working with your state BPU -- and we are seeing it across other 1188 states like New York with their reinventing the energy vision in 1189 Ohio, their Power Four docket, is to address exactly your point, 1190 getting at these non-wire solutions that we are seeing now with 1191 customer -- greater customer engagement behind the meter.

1192 Your state is a leader in that because of the lessons learned 1193 in the post-Hurricane Sandy where a grid resiliency bank has been 1194 launched under the BPU's leadership a lot of microgrid investment 1195 in your home state. 1196 And these are all good outcomes. It goes back to my earlier 1197 point of this evolving grid. We are not building 1,200 megawatt 1198 We are doing things behind the meter and, cathedrals anymore. 1199 yes, in front of the meter -- cleaner, more efficient. 1200 Mr. Pallone. Can PERC -- I mean, can FERC play a role in 1201 this, though, because, you know, everybody says oh, it's --1202 where's the federal government --1203 Mr. Powelson. Well, to the wholesale piece, and this is just 1204 my quick observation, we are finding in certain jurisdictions 1205 where, one, there is a lack in the post-FERC Order 1000 world of 1206 not really seeing competitive transmission being built, and 1207 that's a PJM problem. 1208 The other thing is addressing cost caps associated with these 1209 I have a concern when industrial customers come in to projects. 1210 the commission as energy users telling us that they're seeing a 1211 400 percent increase in transmission costs as wholesale prices 1212 are dropping. 1213 That tells me that the RTOs at the That's alarming. 1214 wholesale level of transmission planning are not doing a very good

job with cost containment, and we are all paying for that as

1216 | consumers.

So these are the things that I plan to work on with my colleagues, and I know Commission LaFleur wants to jump in on that.

Ms. LaFleur. Well, just adding to that, first of all, legally the transmission planning tariffs that First Energy and others live within require consideration of non-transmission alternatives. That is what's legally is supposed to happen.

I think the problem is sometimes that it's more difficult to see the company making money from some of the non-transmissional alternatives.

That's where things like our storage rule comes in to make sure that those things are fairly paid for, and also the work -- I was in New Jersey on Friday at an all-day meeting on New Jersey's energy future and the work that's being done at the state level to make sure those technologies are rewarded so that everyone has an incentive to install them like the wonderful work you have done on solar already, where New Jersey's a leader.

I also think that the -- we've done a lot of work on the planning processes to make sure that a company can't just go off and plan something. There has to be an open process.

We issued an order last month about supplemental transmission projects in PJM requiring more sunlight in the planning to make sure that all the alternatives were considered including by consumer reps and state representatives and others,

1240	and those are some of the kind of detailed things we can do to
1241	make sure that the process doesn't ineluctably force in a certain
1242	direction.
1243	Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, if I could I don't know if
1244	we are out of time but I would like to be able to get back them
1245	further on this, with your permission.
1246	Mr. Upton. Yes, absolutely. Absolutely.
1247	Mr. Pallone. All right. Thank you.
1248	Mr. Upton. Perhaps I know written questions and written
1249	answers.
1250	Mr. Pallone. Yes.
1251	Mr. Upton. Is that all right? Is that okay? Great.
1252	Thank you.
1253	Mr. Pallone. Yes.
1254	Mr. Upton. Mr. Olson.
1255	Mr. Olson. I thank the chair and welcome to our friends at
1256	FERC.
1257	I want to discuss pipelines and the MLPs that many companies
1258	use to finance getting steel in the ground. None of the things
1259	we talked about today, whether it's gas turbines or exports of
1260	liquefied natural gas, can happen without pipelines.
1261	And this is not the Ways and Means Committee and nor do I
1262	ever want to be a tax litigator or a tax legislative person. But
1263	I've heard from a number of Houston area companies that are worried

1264 by the changes that FERC did of whether pipelines can recover their 1265 costs under MLP structures. 1266 Companies like Ambridge -- Ambridge, who has merged with 1267 Spectra, said, I quote, "They intend to ask for rehearing of this 1268 policy change at FERC, " end quote. 1269 Their argument is that FERC made this move without a long 1270 enough time for debate and you all didn't take into account that 1271 not all MLPs are created equal. 1272 Chairman McIntyre, welcome. You talked about this ruling. 1273 Do you think your approach was appropriate? Mr. McIntyre. Yes, Congressman. 1274 Happy to address that. 1275 The ruling you referenced is actually -- it was a series of 1276 steps we took in response to a court of appeals case called SFPP 1277 and we had before us fairly clear direction from the court of 1278 appeals to address the so-called double recovery issue of 1279 taxation. 1280 We felt we had no choice but to take decisive action in a 1281 manner that we read as being directed by the court. It doesn't 1282 surprise me that a number of companies out there affected 1283 adversely monetarily by that would have a quarrel with it and 1284 they're not bashful in sharing their views with us on that, I 1285 assure you. 1286 Mr. Olson. Their texts aren't bashful at all. 1287 Mr. McIntyre. Perfectly legitimate. It is their right,

1288 under their governing statutes, to seek rehearing where they are 1289 aggrieved by an order of ours. And so we would look forward to 1290 processing those in accordance with our law and procedures. 1291 Mr. Olson. Thank you. 1292 And Commissioner Chatterjee, putting your House thinking hat 1293 on, any thoughts about this situation with the MLPs and the changed 1294 law? 1295 Yes, sir. Mr. Chatterjee. I agree substantively that the 1296 chairman is correct that our hands were tied by the courts. 1297 Coming from the legislative branch, you know, we focus a lot 1298 on process and I think -- look, I am new to the commission. 1299 of the five of us are new to the commission. 1300 I am not afraid to say that, you know, we are all still learning and progressing, and procedurally I do now recognize, 1301 in looking back, that perhaps there were some things that we could 1302 1303 have done differently. 1304 For instance, voting during the market day was perhaps 1305 I think we incorrectly assumed, once we posted our unfortunate. 1306 Sunshine Act notice, that that was enough of a sort of disclaimer 1307 that this was coming and that the markets would factor that in. 1308 Clearly, that was a misread. I am sympathetic to the 1309 argument that beyond an NOI process that took place a couple -you know, in the past, maybe a technical conference, some more 1310 1311 process, you know, could have been necessary.

1312 And so I am always learning and trying to do my job better 1313 and will try and learn from this experience as well, going forward. 1314 Mr. Olson. Thank you. That's the man of the house. 1315 My final question is you all know I am not shy about 1316 supporting LNG exports. In fact, I was in India two weeks ago. 1317 I left there being -- they called me the congressman for LNG 1318 exports from America. 1319 I spoke to Secretary Perry last week about how important 1320 these exports are to Texas, our country, and our world. 1321 Despite that, I've heard some concerns back home that you 1322 are slipping behind schedules of some very viable Gulf Coast LNG 1323 projects. 1324 I've heard rumors that FERC had only six to eight employees targeted with approving these booming permits. I've heard you 1325 1326 actually approached the DOE for new members to help out with the 1327 backlog of approving LNG permits. 1328 To the whole panel or the chairman, is that true? 1329 we help you get these things rolling as quickly as possible? 1330 Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman. 1331 We are paying very close attention to the pending 1332 applications, not only for LNG export infrastructure but also for 1333 natural gas pipeline infrastructure. 1334 It's consuming an enormous amount of attention and manpower 1335 within the agency. We are looking to beef up the ranks of our

Office of Energy Projects and we are actively pursuing hiring in
that regard right now.
But if there's any suggestion that we are somehow not giving
it our full effort right now, I can assure you that that is
not the case at all.
It's consuming a huge amount of attention and effort in
Energy right now.
Mr. Olson. Thank you.
Mr. Powelson, a quick question. Can you say you all?
Mr. Powelson. You all.
Mr. Olson. Very good. Welcome to Texas.
Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time has expired.
The gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney.
Mr. McNerney. I thank the chair and I thank the commission,
and your opening statements were interesting and useful. It's
good to see a body working together like this and I appreciate
that.
Last year, we narrowly dodged the bullet at the Oroville Dam
when a section of the emergency spillway collapsed. Evacuation
of over 100,000 people was ordered and there was considerable
damage to the dam, associated structures, the river, and many
downstream communities.
In January of this year, a FERC-required independent
forensic team issued their report on the Oroville incident and

1360 the report is not flattering at all to the agencies responsible 1361 for the dam safety. 1362 So I will read you a summary of the report. Although the 1363 practice of dam safety has certainly improved since the 1970s, 1364 the fact that this incident happened to the owner of the tallest 1365 dam in the United States under regulation of a federal agency with 1366 repeated evaluation by reputed outside consultants in a state with 1367 leading dam safety regulatory program is a wake-up call for 1368 everyone involved in dam safety. 1369 Challenging current assumptions on what constitutes best 1370 practice in our industry is overdue. So that's the quotation from 1371 the report. 1372 So this calls into question the adequacy of the FERC Part 1373 12(d) regulatory for ensuring comprehensive reviews of dam 1374 designs and construction. 1375 Mr. Chairman, is the commission planning to revise Part 12(d) 1376 regulations to improve the inspection process? 1377 Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman. 1378 We don't have a specific plan to address the 12(d) regulation 1379 process right now. I certainly acknowledge the importance of the 1380 issues you raise and, in fact, it wasn't only the emergency spillway but, indeed, the main spillway that was very much called 1381 1382 into question -- the integrity of that. 1383 Our office of energy projects is working, literally, daily 1384 hand in hand with the appropriate California authorities to ensure that the remediation process is completed in an appropriate 1385 1386 fashion so there's complete safety all around. 1387 And my understanding, based on conversations as recently as 1388 yesterday, is that that is -- that that is from our perspective 1389 going very well and that all involved on the Oroville end are doing 1390 their job very well. 1391 Mr. McNerney. Okay. Is the commission reconsidering its 1392 policies with respect to the ways in which information is 1393 submitted by participants to the license process that 1394 specifically deal with questions of safety? Will that be 1395 evaluated? I can tell you that that will be a 1396 Mr. McIntyre. Yes. 1397 matter of internal deliberation and whether that proceeds to any 1398 formal commission action is something that I can't say right now. 1399 I do know my colleague, Commissioner LaFleur, may want to 1400 chime in here. 1401 Well, I was at the -- commission and chairman Ms. LaFleur. 1402 -- when Oroville happened and spent some time out at the dam and 1403 it was really an extraordinary event. We were very fortunate not 1404 to have had loss of life when the spillway ruptured. 1405 We really have been responding on three levels and the first 1406 is the actual facility itself, closely working with the Division

of Water Resources and the California agencies.

1408 We've had people on site ever since that happened, 24/7, for 1409 several months to make sure they do what they need to do over a 1410 two-year period to correct that and, of course, the relicensing 1411 is pending as well, which we can't talk about, but that these 1412 issues are being brought in there. 1413 Secondly, looking at other spillways of common construction 1414 in California, there were several and elsewhere to make sure 1415 they're all closely inspected and we directly learned the lessons 1416 of the forensics panel that you mentioned. 1417 And third is our own safety program, and in addition to the 1418 forensics panel that you mentioned, we also set up a team of 1419 outside people to look at how we do our inspections and we are 1420 waiting for their report and we'll be taking action, just as you 1421 suggested. 1422 Mr. McNerney. Okay. 1423 To change gears a little bit here, we are experiencing more 1424 What steps is FERC taking to ensure the extreme weather events. 1425 resiliency of the grid? 1426 Again, Mr. Chairman. 1427 Mr. McIntyre. Well, we are in the process of doing the 1428 comment intake I referenced earlier on our grid resilience 1429 proceeding. 1430 The recent extreme weather events have been instructive in 1431 this regard and it's varied by region. But, certainly, just to 1432 pick a region, in New England it's particularly challenging --1433 this bomb cyclone event over the passage of last year into this 1434 year where increasing amounts of oil-generating resources, 1435 oil-fired generating resources were needed to be called upon in 1436 order to ensure the electricity needs of that region, triggering, 1437 of course, not only environmental concerns but significant cost 1438 increases. 1439 So these weather events are directly tied to our statutory 1440 obligation to ensure that the rates are just and reasonable and 1441 also directly tied to our need to ensure reliability of our bulk 1442 power system. 1443 Mr. McNerney. Thank you. 1444 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1445 Mr. Upton. Gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus. 1446 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1447 It's great to all you all here today. Thank you for coming, 1448 and you have got a big portfolio of things that you deal with. 1449 I am going to stay on the electricity side. 1450 But I just want to mention that New England, the Northeast, 1451 needs more natural gas pipelines. Just -- you know, especially 1452 with home heating oil and stuff like that, we just got to -- that's 1453 why you're in power to help resolve the difficulties of crossing 1454 state lines and siting and that stuff because it just -- just needs 1455 to happen.

1456 Let me move to the -- obviously part of your mission statement 1457 is regulates the transmission and wholesale sales of electricity 1458 and interstate commerce. 1459 So the first one is, hopefully to you all, is with the states 1460 intervening to some extent in wholesale market support 1461 generation, how are you handling that? 1462 I mean, what -- that kind of addresses a couple things --1463 reliability possibly. If you're trying to ensure low-cost 1464 reasonable prices in the wholesale sector, they -- the two issues 1465 kind of conflict, do they not? And if -- relatively quickly, because I want to go down on 1466 1467 a couple other questions. 1468 Mr. McIntyre. Well, you have gone directly to one of the 1469 trickiest areas that we deal with, Congressman. The states have 1470 their valid role in making policy choices as to energy resources 1471 that are preferred by the state and they reflect that through their 1472 legal decision making. 1473 We have an obligation at the FERC level to ensure that the 1474 electricity generated by those resources that makes its way onto 1475 our grid is sold at rates that are just and reasonable. 1476 The costs behind that generation are affected by the resource 1477 policy choices. So we have to be respectful of the states' roles 1478 while ensuring that we do our federal role right of ensuring just 1479 and reasonable rates.

1480	Mr. Shimkus. So does everyone, quickly, agree with that
1481	analysis?
1482	Mr. Glick. Mr. Shimkus, if I could just butt in here for
1483	a second.
1484	I think that it's true that we actually have to a balancing.
1485	But the Federal Power Act gave the states the authority over
1486	resource decision making, not the generation resource decision
1487	making, not the FERC.
1488	And so I think it's up to the commission within our
1489	responsibilities to ensure that rates are just and reasonable
1490	wholesale rates are just and reasonable, and also that the markets
1491	are reliable to accommodate those state policies, not to override
1492	those state policies, and I think that's an important objective
1493	important objective for us.
1494	Mr. Shimkus. Go ahead. Chime in.
1495	Mr. Chatterjee. I support states' rights.
1496	Mr. Shimkus. I testified to that, I think.
1497	[Laughter.]
1498	Mr. Powelson. I come from a market state, now recognizing
1499	those regional differences in these markets, as Commissioner
1500	LaFleur mentioned. Some markets have capacity. Some are energy
1501	only.
1502	But I am having an epiphany now as a new FERC commissioner.
1503	States are, clearly, to my colleagues' point, are allowed to

1504 design things like renewable portfolio standards. 1505 But what's happening, Congressman, is we are creating -- we 1506 are bastardizing these markets in such a way where the states are 1507 picking winners and losers. 1508 They're allowed to do that. But now it's coming at the 1509 consequences of the capacity market construct. And let me just 1510 say, Secretary Perry was right. That -- these constructs are 1511 bastardizing these markets and the availability of generators to 1512 receive adequate compensation for that resource. 1513 And so I might be Debbie Downer here in my approach, but it 1514 is a concern that we have to be cognizant of to the point of giving 1515 states flexibility I will say within reason of Federal Power Act. 1516 Mr. Shimkus. Okay. Let me throw another one and I -- sorry 1517 to not go to Commissioner LaFleur, but RTOs and ISOs are struggling 1518 to find consensus to drive the needed investments that we say they What can you all do about that? 1519 all need. 1520 So if we need -- I've been in this on the committee for a 1521 So I understand when we had regulated markets and we long time. 1522 went to competition and now we are schizophrenic -- some 1523 regulated, some competition -- transmission going across state 1524 lines. I think we need to continue for reliability is to make sure 1525

that we have needed pathways. But we are being told we can't fund

them.

1526

1528	Do you have a role? Is there something you can do to help
1529	in the process of the build out?
1530	Mr. McIntyre. In terms of transmission?
1531	Mr. Shimkus. Yes.
1532	Mr. McIntyre. Yes. Well, Commissioner LaFleur mentioned
1533	the importance of attention to our transmission planning
1534	processes.
1535	I think that's something that is ripe for evaluation as to
1536	whether it's working as well as it should, as well as was hoped
1537	for when we issued our landmark Order 1000.
1538	I think it's a valid question that does indeed cry out for
1539	attention.
1540	Mr. Shimkus. Okay. If anyone wants to jump in.
1541	My time has expired, but go ahead.
1542	Mr. Glick. I would just add quickly, you know, as you know,
1543	as you worked on this in 2005 Energy Policy Act, it added a
1544	provision that provided incentives or allowed FERC to provide
1545	incentives to provide incentives for transmission.
1546	And I think it's a good time maybe now to revisit that policy
1547	and are we really incentivizing what we need to do are we
1548	incentivizing the right investments and are we incentivizing the
1549	actual investments that are needed.
1550	And so I would I would that's what I would look at first
1551	is the incentives for transmission.

1552 My time has expired. I would just say Mr. Shimkus. Yes. 1553 if we ever move on infrastructure, expansion of the transmission 1554 grid might be a good thing to put an infrastructure package to. 1555 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 1556 Mr. Upton. Mr. Green. 1557 Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and since our 1558 commissioner talked about the Republic of Texas, being a Texan and I have the Houston area, and if you look at your maps on 1559 1560 pipelines you don't see anything. It might be white in outer 1561 parts of the country but in my area in southeast Texas, pipelines 1562 are the way we move product, and crude oil will come in or natural 1563 gas to come to in to make chemicals out of it. 1564 Texas was an independent nation for 10 years and some of us 1565 still think we should be. But we lost that battle in 1865, too. 1566 But we got a pretty good deal in Texas. We -- the federal 1567 government in 1845 paid off our \$10 million of state debt and we 1568 got to keep our state lands. And so that's why some of our Western states friends have problems. But we kept those lands and the 1569 1570 federal government didn't get them. 1571 But we are in the middle of a revolution almost, I quess, 1572 in generation, and our subcommittee has held a number of hearings 1573 about looking at how other markets do. 1574 And one of the things I want to say is that Texas, a decade 1575 ago, produced 492,000 megawatts of wind power. This last year,

1576 Texas produced 58 million megawatts of hours a year. 1577 And so we are benefiting from the wind power. In fact, there 1578 are certain days that wind power actually is producing more 1579 electricity than coal in Texas. Of course, we also benefit from 1580 the regional price of natural gas. It's in our back yard. 1581 One of my concerns, and we've heard the talk of resiliency, 1582 and I disagree with Secretary Perry, even though I served in the 1583 legislature with him many years ago, and he -- Texas went the route 1584 we have when he was governor for so many years. 1585 But many supporters of the proposed subsidies have said that 1586 we are on the brink of resiliency crisis. 1587 Chairman McIntyre, can you elaborate on the commission's 1588 views about the state of resiliency in the grid and do we face 1589 an immediate crisis due to future closing of coal and nuclear plants? 1590 1591 Mr. McIntyre. Resilience is now a matter of declared 1592 priority for the FERC, and we are proceeding in that fashion. Wе 1593 are assembling the record that I referenced earlier. 1594 We've heard already from our nation's operators of regional 1595 transmission organizations and independent system operators --1596 their perspectives and we are awaiting further input from 1597 stakeholders on it. 1598 It's a critical issue, and there are different ways of 1599 looking at it. One is operational in terms of is there equipment

1600 or are there facilities that would be needed to help shore up the 1601 resilience of the grid. The other is economic and, in effect, a market -- a need to 1602 1603 ensure that our markets are properly compensating the resources 1604 that we regard as important to ensure resilience of our grid. 1605 So we are looking very hard at those issues now. We'll 1606 continue to examine the materials submitted to us in the record 1607 and in the hope of getting this right. 1608 And you're looking at alternatives too, because Mr. Green. 1609 I know the same problem -- we get about 20 percent of our 1610 electricity in Texas from nuclear power. We couldn't expand it 1611 because the investment is not available now. 1612 And so there are other ways and, of course, from Texas, as 1613 my colleague from Fort Bend County would say, we'd be glad to put 1614 another pipeline up to the northeast to send them some more natural gas or export it around the coast for them. 1615 1616 My colleague, Pete Olson, mentioned -- my next question is 1617 on the concern about United Airlines Inc. versus FERC, and I 1618 apologize -- I haven't read that case. 1619 But I always view that mastered limited partnerships, it's 1620 been so successful in capitalizing pipelines, particularly, it's 1621 almost like a Chapter S corporation. 1622 You pass through that so it's not corporate double taxation, and -- but that would -- if we cannot use that as an investment 1623

1624 instrument I don't know how we are going to continue the expansion 1625 of growth -- that I think FERC recognizes we need more pipelines 1626 to get product to the market where -- so we won't have a resiliency 1627 problem. 1628 Mr. Chairman, I realize FERC's public policy as precipitated 1629 by the D.C. Circuit Court's opinion, I would like to know if FERC 1630 has conducted its own analysis of whether or not double recovery 1631 existed before the decision. 1632 Has FERC thought there was a problem at the policy prior to 1633 the United case. 1634 That's a matter that was in effect handed to Mr. McIntyre. 1635 us by the court so we had no choice really as a regulatory agency but to take it at face value and to act upon it. 1636 1637 We had no independent analysis of the double recovery issue 1638 as is customary under the statutes that govern our actions. 1639 We act in accordance with the arguments that are put forward 1640 for us by the litigants, in most instances, and this was such a 1641 situation. 1642 I thought the court directed the FERC to consider Mr. Green. 1643 how it could demonstrate there was no double recovery. 1644 looking at that particular issue to be able to answer whatever 1645 the circuit court said? 1646 Well, here too, back to legal processes, I Mr. McIntyre.

suspect that we will have no choice but to look closely at that

1648 issue in light of further procedural steps that the parties will 1649 have a right to invoke, such as request for rehearing. 1650 Okay. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I know the Mr. Green. 1651 jurisdiction of that typically is in Ways and Means. But since it deals with FERC we have some jurisdiction in our own committee. 1652 1653 So we might look at that to make sure we don't eliminate this 1654 ability for investment in the pipelines that the whole country 1655 needs, and I will yield back my time. 1656 Thank you. 1657 Mr. Upton. Thank you. 1658 Gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta. 1659 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thanks Mr. Latta. to the commissioners for being with us today. Really appreciate 1660 1661 it and hearing your views. 1662 Commissioner Powelson, if I could start my questions with 1663 As you point out in your testimony, under the Energy Policy 1664 Act of 2005, FERC was given the authority to oversee the 1665 reliability of the bulk power system. 1666 This included the authority to improve mandatory 1667 cybersecurity reliability standards and first -- during the first 1668 half of 2018 we have seen new stories about hackers working to 1669 undermine the safety and security of our nation's energy 1670 infrastructure including cyberattacks launched by Russian agents 1671 against the power grid energy, nuclear, and commercial facilities and critical manufacturing sectors.

Mr. Powelson.

measures.

Would you go into more detail about what FERC is doing to address these attacks and how will you work with the North American Electric Reliability Corporation to reassess and, if necessary, revise the reliability standards?

First and foremost, these reliability standards, which apply to users, owners, and operators of the bulk power system, were developed, as you mentioned, by NERC, and I think we continue to

collaborate with other federal agencies in those compliance

Thank you, Congressman, for your question.

You also have on top of that the critical infrastructure protocols, or CIP standards, and I mentioned earlier in my testimony the collaborative effort with NERC and working with the ISACs and the collaborative effort around the utilities, the gas industry, and the other impacted entities, working in collaboration together.

Some have reported back they think these -- some of these reporting requirements are a little onerous. I would refrain from saying that because, again, we can't really cut corners on cybersecurity.

We've got to give you all peace of mind that we are protecting and applying the needed resources to protect the bulk power system. And as I mentioned earlier, these threat vectors are

1696 changing radically, daily, and it's important that we continue 1697 to work with the other agents. That's why I gave a nice shout 1698 out this morning to Secretary Perry and the leadership that DOE 1699 has shown on this issue with the launching of their new Office 1700 of Cybersecurity. 1701 Mr. Latta. And we appreciate it. When the secretary was 1702 here when he gave his testimony, let me just follow up, because 1703 to address the threat of cyberattacks to our energy grid, I am 1704 working with my colleague, Representative McNerney, introducing 1705 two bipartisan pieces of legislation. 1706 These bills, H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense Act, and H.R. 5240, 1707 the Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnership 1708 Act, was the subject of a legislative hearing in the subcommittee 1709 last month. 1710 Under H.R. 5239, the secretary of energy would be directed 1711 to establish a voluntary cyber sense program to test cyber secure 1712 products intended for use in the bulk power system. The secretary would then maintain a database on these 1713 1714 products and the technologies and provide technical advice to 1715 energy stakeholders to develop solutions to mitigate identified 1716 Cybersecurity vulnerabilities. 1717 You mentioned in your testimony that FERC has worked closely with DOE to maintain an awareness of emerging cyber threats. 1718

Do you think this policy would help improve the safety and

1720 security of our energy infrastructure and would help address these 1721 threats? 1722 Mr. Powelson. Congressman, I think it is a wonderful effort 1723 that we -- any type of legislative construct that recognizes, one, 1724 collaboration in the cyberspace; two, adequate capacity building even in -- even at the state level. 1725 1726 So I can just at first glance tell you I would be very 1727 supportive of a bipartisan bill to give those resources to DOE. 1728 Working with the FERC, as Chairman McIntyre mentioned, we 1729 do have a strong collaborative effort in place with TSA, FMSA, 1730 DOT, Homeland Security, and I think this is another example of 1731 how we can build on those capacities. 1732 Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1733 Chairman McIntyre, I've long believed in an all of the above 1734 energy policy. Our nation has vast energy resources that need 1735 to be utilized and we should be doing everything we can to make 1736 sure that our energy industries grow. 1737 By doing this, we can make sure that we are truly energy 1738 independent. Mr. Chairman, do you believe that it is of vital 1739 importance to our national security that we continue to maintain 1740 a diverse portfolio of energy sources for electricity generation? 1741 Mr. McIntyre. Very much so, Congressman. 1742 I, too, express my view in the same terms. All of the above 1743 is the appropriate approach to how we should satisfy our

1744	electricity needs as a nation.
1745	All different types of electrical generating resources and
1746	other resources indeed storage, distributed energy resources,
1747	and the like.
1748	Where this will be tested is in the very tricky area that
1749	a number of us have addressed here today the interplay between
1750	state resource choices and our federal role of ensuring that our
1751	markets operate properly.
1752	If we really do mean that we are committed to an all of the
1753	above resource policy, can we be content to see a category
1754	resources go away and exit the scene?
1755	Very, very tricky public policy question that we are
1756	grappling with as we proceed with our grid resilience work.
1757	Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much.
1758	Mr. Chairman, my time is expired and I yield back.
1759	Mr. Upton. Mr. Doyle.
1760	Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1761	Good morning and thank you all for appearing before us today.
1762	Many of us are running between two hearings simultaneously. So
1763	I apologize that I wasn't here to hear your testimony.
1764	Commissioner Powelson, as a fellow Pennsylvanian, I am going
1765	to pick on you first. At your confirmation hearing last year you
1766	said, what I learned from my experience in NARUC is that what works
1767	in Pennsylvania might not work in other jurisdictions, and you

1768 highlighted the proud appreciation that we all have for individual 1769 states' rights in supporting our state energy policies. 1770 However, I also read that you may have some reservations 1771 explaining that state interventions come with consequences to 1772 reliability and I can't argue with Secretary Perry's point that 1773 these markets aren't pure but the policies all sound good and I 1774 respect that. 1775 But the reality is the policies aren't synchronizing with 1776 the system and therein lies a significant challenge. 1777 testimony highlights an inherent tension -- the oversight role 1778 of FERC with the independence of the states. 1779 And I know my good friend, Representative Shimkus, asked for some additional clarification here. 1780 But I wasn't present for that. 1781 1782 So I understand you said you felt the commission should 1783 respect states' rights within reason. Do you think FERC 1784 oversight or potential intervention will or should be applied on 1785 a case by case basis? Do you think that Congress ought to provide 1786 additional clarity here also? 1787 Congressman Doyle, I will start -- well, I 1788 think the FERC is well equipped, if you look at some cases that 1789 we've had over the last decade -- Talen Energy v. Hughes in 1790 Maryland, Talen Energy v. Solomon in New Jersey -- recent 1791 constructs of addressing in the post-Polar Vortex, we had an issue 1792 in PJM with a 24 percent forced outage rate. We dealt with 1793 capacity performance. 1794 So I think the markets and the work that the FERC does, we 1795 have the tools to address these issues. When you say case by case 1796 basis, if I look over those cases where we had to send a loud and 1797 clear message to the state of New Jersey and the state of Maryland 1798 on capacity resources being subsidized in the market and, by the 1799 way, it would have had with generation in Pennsylvania, we -- the 1800 FERC, in terms of a rule of law, did its job and the court 1801 recognized that. 1802 I have said it earlier. I am very proud of my Pennsylvania 1803 experience. Pennsylvania has a very successful renewable 1804 portfolio standard led under Governor Rendell and former DEP 1805 Secretary Katie McGinty. 1806 Let me give you, as a former state senator, what happened. 1807 In that construct, we looked at picking -- the state picked really 13 categories of what qualifies for a renewable portfolio 1808 1809 standard. 1810 Well, guess what? Back then I remember there were pushes 1811 to get nuclear as part of that RPS. It was outright rejected. 1812 So here we are today is we are having conversations. 1813 state construct in Pennsylvania, as an example, did not recognize 1814 the value of nuclear power. 1815 And if the state wants to go down that path, we are seeing

1816 it more recently this past week in New Jersey, they're more than 1817 willing to do so. 1818 My drawing the line in the sand is how it impacts the 1819 wholesale power markets. And once we surrender that flag it's 1820 -- you know it's -- we are out of business. We've got to protect 1821 the sanctity of those organized markets. 1822 So I recognize that as a Pennsylvanian but I also recognize 1823 in my new role that oversight of those highly functioning well 1824 organized markets. 1825 And many Pennsylvanians, including myself, are Mr. Doyle. 1826 strong supporters of nuclear power. It both satisfies 1827 reliability issues and it's also carbon free, and I think there 1828 should be alarm bells going across the country as we see how many 1829 of these plants may not go through relicensing and they're going 1830 to be replaced mostly for baseload capacity with -- whether it's 1831 natural case or something else that emits greenhouse gases and 1832 it makes it almost impossible for us to meet our climate change 1833 goals. 1834 Commissioner LaFleur, I want to quote from your statement 1835 regarding the NOPR because I think it's exceptional in describing 1836 the current situation we face. 1837 The commission -- and this is your quote, "The commission

from the past but on easing the transition to the future.

should continue to focus on its efforts not on slowing transition

1838

1841 reliability and resilience within a system that is likely to be 1842 more cleaner, more dynamic and, in some instances, more 1843 distributed, and deployed by an efficient market for the benefit 1844 of customers." 1845 I am amazed by the technological developments we've 1846 witnessed in the energy sector. The pace has gone from a walk 1847 to a jog to a sprint. 1848 And looking into the next decade or two decades from now, 1849 how do you think the regulatory bodies or agencies need to change 1850 to better reflect and adapt to these changes and what can we do 1851 here at our committee to facilitate those changes? 1852 Ms. LaFleur. Well, thank you for the question and for the 1853 compliment. 1854 I think one of the points of stress in the future is going 1855 to be the line between federal and state, not because of any 1856 overweening ambition on the part of this commission or the federal 1857 government but because we are seeing more distributed resources, 1858 even behind the customer meter, collectively behaving just like 1859 a central station resource. 1860 And sometimes even more resilient because of the ability to 1861 modularize them if there's any kind of a weather event or an 1862 attack. 1863 So I think that we -- as has been mentioned, we had a two-day

We must continue to quide grid operators in sustaining

1864	tech conference last week. But I think figuring out how we best
1865	deploy those resources for the future is where we are the where
1866	the public policy people, like everyone in this room have to be
1867	working now because the technology is coming so quickly.
1868	Mr. Doyle. Thank you.
1869	Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
1870	Mr. Upton. Mr. Harper.
1871	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1872	Thanks to each of you for being here and for the dedicated
1873	job that you're doing on important issue.
1874	Maybe as a follow up to Mr. Doyle's questions, Mr. Chairman,
1875	if I could ask you, traditionally the regulation of DERs had been
1876	the jurisdiction of states and localities.
1877	However, with the issuance of Order No. 841 and its proposal
1878	for the aggregation of DERs for the purpose of participating in
1879	wholesale electricity markets, FERC could expand its authority
1880	at the expense of states and localities.
1881	So my question would be was how will you deal with any
1882	jurisdictional challenges that may come about?
1883	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you for the question, Congressman.
1884	There are a couple of different things going on here. One
1885	is electricity storage resources and then, separately from that,
1886	distributed energy generating resources.
1887	As to each category, honestly, I am not particularly troubled

1888 by any sort of jurisdictional creep because that power would make 1889 its way onto our grid in a way that we could regulate it only after 1890 it had been aggregated and put forth to a market that we regulated 1891 -- a wholesale electricity market. 1892 And there certainly is no attempt on the part of this 1893 commission to in any way thwart the ability of the state, for 1894 example, to determine in a retail level transaction what the owner 1895 of the generating resource would be -- what level that owner would 1896 be compensated. 1897 And so, honestly, I don't see that as being a particularly 1898 great concern. 1899 Mr. Harper. Well, thank you for that answer. 1900 And Mr. Chairman, if I may ask you, you know, certainly, as you know, we talk about energy infrastructure. 1901 1902 capital intensive venture, and Wall Street investors require a 1903 very high degree of regulatory certainty and sound rate making 1904 policies before committing capital. 1905 Does FERC currently have a methodology in place to set 1906 transmission ROEs? 1907 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, we do, sir, longstanding. 1908 Mr. Harper. Okay. Longstanding. And how many complaints 1909 are currently pending regarding transmission ROEs? 1910 Mr. McIntyre. We have a number of them pending. 1911 Mr. Harper. A ballpark. You said a number.

1912	Mr. McIntyre. A dozen or so.
1913	Mr. Harper. Okay. So what is the timetable for resolving
1914	those complaints that you just mentioned?
1915	Mr. McIntyre. Those matters are actively being worked upon
1916	within our agency right now. They are not subject to a specific
1917	timetable. They are something are we are paying attention to.
1918	Our most important job, obviously, is to get it right.
1919	Mr. Harper. Obviously, and we want you to do that. That's
1920	good.
1921	Under EPACT 2005, FERC developed a policy, and that's in
1922	Order 679, I believe, which provides for incentive rate treatment
1923	to encourage the development of transmission line infrastructure.
1924	While this policy had been in effect since 2006, can you
1925	elaborate on the status of this incentive policy now?
1926	Mr. McIntyre. It's something that Commissioner Glick
1927	mentioned as in his view as something that probably is ripe
1928	for some fresh attention.
1929	In a general sense, I would agree with that.
1930	Mr. Harper. Commissioner Glick, do you care to comment?
1931	Mr. Glick. Thanks, Mr. Harper.
1932	I you were exactly right. So in 2005 Congress did provide
1933	FERC the authority to provide incentive rate making and the
1934	commission did have an incentive rate making policy and there was
1935	a believe that the commission was going too far in providing

1936 incentives for too many activities. 1937 So the commission subsequently issued an new policy 1938 statement that somewhat retransformed that particular policy and 1939 I think that the criticism may be that the commission may have 1940 gone too far in the other direction. 1941 I think that we need to take a fresh look at the policies 1942 or are we incentivizing the right things. 1943 For instance, we incentivize RTO participation but a lot of 1944 people already -- utilities are participating in RTOs regardless 1945 of whether they have an incentive or not. But we really should 1946 be incentivizing are we using transmission capacity more efficiently -- are we using new technologies to make transmission 1947 1948 capacity more efficient. 1949 Those are the type of things that I think Congress gave us 1950 the authority to do and I think it's a good idea to take a look 1951 at it. 1952 Are we still seeing our transmission developers 1953 still filing applications for incentive rates? Is that still 1954 happening? 1955 Mr. Glick. Absolutely. We do often. 1956 Okay. And are you -- do you believe it's at Mr. Harper. 1957 the appropriate rate and amount? 1958 I think there are -- we have to take that on a 1959 case by case basis. I actually dissented from one of those

1960	particular cases. But for the most part, I think the commission
1961	has approved those those incentive rates.
1962	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Commissioner Glick.
1963	And with that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
1964	Mr. Upton. The chair recognizes the lady from Florida, Ms.
1965	Castor.
1966	Ms. Castor. Thank you, Chairman Upton, and welcome to our
1967	FERC commissioners, thank you for being here today.
1968	In the hearing last week on the Department of Energy budget
1969	with Secretary Perry, I asked him about research and development
1970	investments in energy storage because energy storage is so crucial
1971	to increasing America's renewable energy sources, incorporating
1972	them, and modernizing the electric grid.
1973	And even though the budget doesn't really match what we'd
1974	like to do, I think the Congress will come back and say we are
1975	committed to doing this just like we did in the omnibus bill.
1976	In fact, I noticed the Department of Energy just this morning
1977	issued a big press release on solar technology and investments.
1978	So but I have to say I was heartened by FERC's recently issued
1979	order, a 5 to 0 vote to remove market barriers for energy storage
1980	to participate in wholesale markets in the bulk power grid,
1981	because allowing energy storage should compete with fossil fuels
1982	like gas and coal will enhance competition.

It will help us develop more clean energy resource and

1984 hopefully keep electric rates affordable for the average 1985 American. And experts say that the number-one issue in clean 1986 innovative technologies is being able to integrate renewable 1987 energy with the large bulk transmission grid. 1988 So I commend you on your recent efforts to accommodate the 1989 growing clean renewable energy sources. 1990 However, the commission declined to also eliminate barriers for distributed energy resources, something that we were just 1991 1992 talking about, which would help further integrate renewable 1993 sources into the electric grid. 1994 I saw in one press report it said that the commission was 1995 disappointed that you could not issue an order similar to your 1996 storage decision for distributed energy resources. 1997 So Mr. Glick, why did the commission not remove market 1998 barriers for distributed energy sources, like it did for energy 1999 storage, and what's the next step? 2000 Thank you for your question, Ms. Castor, and I 2001 agree with you, I think the technologies origin and distributed 2002 energy resources are the wave of the future and are going to 2003 provide significant amount of benefits. 2004 I think the commission had a number of -- there's still some 2005 questions that were left during the rulemaking process about 2006 reliability and how we interact with the states in terms of the 2007 distributed resource aggregation.

2008 So we actually had a technical conference last week. 2009 a two-day conference, seven panels. I think we had enough 2010 information, in my opinion, to address the issue. 2011 The commission has a statutory responsibility to make sure 2012 that we don't -- that there's no undue discrimination again as 2013 any particular technologies and I think this is a good example 2014 where I think we are required to address this matter. 2015 So what are the next steps? You have the 2016 technical conference. Mr. McIntyre, what's next on your agenda 2017 on this? 2018 Mr. McIntyre. We did, indeed, have the technical 2019 It was a two-day technical conference. A lot of conference. 2020 very, very good input from stakeholders of various roles within 2021 the industry and I anticipate -- I agree with Commissioner Glick 2022 that the record that we are assembling through that process will 2023 enable us to take steps comparable, I would suggest, to the steps 2024 that you noted with regard to storage. 2025 That's -- I am not intending to forecast a particular 2026 I am just saying that we've got enough now to go on the 2027 make a determination about what the appropriate steps forward are. 2028 So would stakeholders still have the ability Ms. Castor. 2029 to weigh in with FERC? 2030 Mr. Glick. Yes, ma'am. 2031 Ms. Castor. Okay.

2032 Ms. LaFleur, where do you think this is going? What advice would you give to stakeholders and folks in the public who are 2033 2034 interested in weighing in? 2035 Ms. LaFleur. Well, the advice I always give is to be as 2036 specific as possible to help us and that's true even more so in 2037 this docket because of the real complexity of what we are looking 2038 at. 2039 There are only two macro issues. The first is the money 2040 issues, you know, where you have these deployed distributed 2041 storage resources that can be paid at the state level. 2042 be used by the customer or they can be paid at the wholesale level. 2043 Who pays what to whom, how do we figure out we don't have 2044 double counting and so forth -- I think that'll require some very 2045 But the more suggestions we get, the better. 2046 The second is the operating issues of how the different 2047 control centers talk to each other. We've got some great 2048 testimony on that. I think one of the big issues we are going 2049 to have to think about as a body now is how uniform we make the 2050 rules as we put them out versus allowing regional variation. 2051 We heard a lot from the people -- some of the people who 2052 testified about wanting different regions to go in different 2053 directions here. 2054 I am somewhat of the belief that the technology is marching

so quickly that we should try to figure out what best practices

2056 But that's what we'll be debating and I think we'd like are now. 2057 input on that. 2058 Well, thank you very much. I think it is an Ms. Castor. 2059 exciting time for the development of clean energy technology and 2060 I commend you on your interest in pushing this forward. 2061 you very much. 2062 Mr. Upton. Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2063 2064 Over the past eight years on this committee, we've heard a 2065 lot of comments in hearings about the -- our aging coal and nuclear 2066 fleet -- that it's out there, and unfortunately, in many regards, 2067 it's very expensive to upgrade those facilities and, in so doing, 2068 when they do make those upgrades, sometimes they lose their 2069 competitiveness and it puts them in a dilemma. 2070 Now, what we are talking about now is, again, is we have 2071 across this country a 531 coal-fired power plants shuttered in 2072 the last 10 years. 2073 We've had 11 nuclear power plants have closed down during 2074 that period of time, and we keep having hearings -- keep discussing 2075 it -- but I want to move from the abstract to something concrete. 2076 I've got a power plant in Pleasants County, West Virginia. 2077 It's a 1.3 -- 1,300 megawatt -- 1.3 gigawatts of power. They tried 2078 to sell that plant back in -- because it's a merchant plant --2079 they tried to move it over to the regulated and they were denied.

2080 So as a result, the operator now is seriously considering 2081 -- and I believe it'll happen before the end of the year -- of 2082 declaring bankruptcy and shutting that plant down. 2083 Just follow the ramifications of that. This is a small 2084 Thirty percent of the tax revenue comes from that power 2085 plant -- 30 percent. So 30 percent, that's an overnight reduction 2086 that's going affect their school system. 2087 What about their EMS? What about their hospital? 2088 the things that the country provides services are now a 30 percent 2089 reduction as a result of this. 2090 We can further this domino effect. Ιf It goes further. 2091 this power plant closes down, there's a very high likelihood the 2092 coal producer that supplies that power plant will similar declare 2093 bankruptcy. 2094 If he declares bankruptcy, his relief will be to get away 2095 from his pension, is UMWA pension responsibility, which currently 2096 now funds 120,000 retirees. 2097 Now, the object would be, if that's reduced, they would fall 2098 -- they would be shifted over likely to the federal pension 2099 quarantee fund. 2100 But I've got a letter from the pension guarantee fund that 2101 says don't put those 120,000 on us because then we'll go under. 2102 So you see the domino effect of this. A mere request --2103 somehow provide some assistance so they could be an existing power

2104	plant and have been have been rebuffed.
2105	So I am just curious about you know, wouldn't just
2106	wouldn't it be more efficient and prudent to try to find a vehicle
2107	a means, whether it's a 403, whether it's a 2028 some
2108	modification of that so we can keep some of our marginal power
2109	plants operative?
2110	So, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask you, when FERC denied the
2111	403, was there a did anyone come up with what the cost to the
2112	consumer could have been if we had if 403 had been imposed on,
2113	let's say, in Pleasants County power plant?
2114	Do any does anyone have an idea what the costs could be
2115	just to keep it operating?
2116	I guess the answer is none of you know.
2116 2117	I guess the answer is none of you know.  Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.
2117	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.
2117 2118	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth
2117 2118 2119	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?
2117 2118 2119 2120	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?  Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that power
2117 2118 2119 2120 2121	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?  Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that power  plant operating. Are you talking about \$50 a year per customer?
2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?  Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that power  plant operating. Are you talking about \$50 a year per customer?  Mr. McIntyre. I do not have that figure.
2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?  Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that power  plant operating. Are you talking about \$50 a year per customer?  Mr. McIntyre. I do not have that figure.  Mr. McKinley. Could you get that to me? Because this
2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124	Mr. McIntyre. I am sorry, Congressman.  You refer to the costs of the secretary of energy's fourth  NOPR directed to us?  Mr. McKinley. Just what would it cost to keep that power  plant operating. Are you talking about \$50 a year per customer?  Mr. McIntyre. I do not have that figure.  Mr. McKinley. Could you get that to me? Because this  we have reason to believe it's less than \$50 a year per customer

2128	that could be lost for our miners and our steelworkers, all that
2129	would be affected with this.
2130	I think we have a moral responsibility to look at this thing
2131	holistically rather than just an ideological fight against what
2132	we think is a free market and I think too many of you have said
2133	both publicly and privately that we really- are questioning
2134	whether we have a free market system in energy.
2135	Would you agree let me just ask you, do we have a free
2136	market system in energy?
2137	Mr. McIntyre. We do not have a perfect market system in
2138	energy, that is certain.
2139	Mr. McKinley. Okay. Because I think, Mr. Powelson, you
2140	said in Pennsylvania that without the subsidy for wind and solar
2141	there wouldn't have been any build up there. Is that correct?
2142	Mr. Powelson. I put it in the context of the renewable
2143	portfolio standard, how it was designed.
2144	Mr. McKinley. Okay.
2145	Mr. Powelson. We also, though, in our RPS I believe we have
2146	a requirement set aside for waste coal in that RPS.
2147	So yes, your point to the chairman's point and to and
2148	to Secretary's point, these are not pure markets. There's been
2149	
2150	Mr. McKinley. Thank you. I don't think they are either.
2151	So I will just close with again, I am asking look seriously at

2152	the bigger picture what we are going to do to communities like
2153	Pleasants County. A 30 percent overnight loss of tax revenue
2154	how are they supposed to meet their education demands, their
2155	health care needs?
2156	Thank you. I yield back.
2157	Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Congressman.
2158	Mr. Upton. Mr. Tonko.
2159	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Chair
2160	McIntyre and all of our commissioners for appearing here this
2161	morning.
2162	Last month, I held a round table with a variety of
2163	stakeholders interested in storage, and everyone agreed that
2164	Order 841 was a necessary step forward to lower barriers for
2165	storage's participation in the markets.
2166	Chairman McIntyre or Commissioner Glick, do you believe that
2167	reducing barriers and enabling greater storage deployment will
2168	be beneficent to grid reliability and resilience?
2169	Mr. McIntyre. I will jump in first.
2170	I think every avenue for reliable energy that can make its
2171	way to our grid can only help resilience and reliability, hence
2172	my expression earlier of my support for an all of the above
2173	approach to satisfying our nation's energy needs.
2174	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, and Commissioner Glick.
2175	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Tonko.
	1

2176 There are numerous benefits with access in I agree. 2177 distributive resources and aggregating distributed resources. 2178 I would point out that, too, would be one, increased 2179 competition in the market will certainly lower wholesale electric 2180 prices, but secondly, I think it gives RTO and ISO operators more 2181 input, more understanding of what's going on behind the meter, 2182 which is certainly, I think, an increasing concern with regard 2183 to the reliability of the grid. 2184 Adding aggregation to the mix would actually increase and 2185 enhance reliability on resilience. 2186 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. That's good to hear, because I 2187 believe it has a number of significant benefits -- reduction of 2188 peak demands, integration of variable renewable energy, frequency 2189 of regulation and congestion relief. 2190 So it's encouraging. As this order moves forward, I hope 2191 you will continue to seek to reduce barriers for emerging 2192 technologies and work to resolve issues from the distributed 2193 energy resources technical conference. 2194 But I also want to address another recent issue that was 2195 considered by the commission. The relationship between FERC 2196 electricity markets and state policies is not a simple one. 2197 certainly, states have a significant role in determining their 2198 generation mix. 2199 I want to ask about ISO New England's competition auctions

2200 with sponsored policy resources proposal. In paragraph 22 the 2201 commission's order states, we intend to use the minimum offer 2202 price rule to address the impacts of state policies on the 2203 wholesale capacity markets, and minimum offer price rule will be 2204 the, quote, "standard solution" to manage the impact of state 2205 policies. 2206 I know that there's been some discussion about state 2207 opportunity, state rights. But Commissioner Glick, I would like 2208 to hear from you. 2209 I know you dissented due to this section. Can you explain 2210 your concerns about the use of MOPR to interfere with state 2211 policies? 2212 Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Tonko. 2213 Yes, I did dissent and dissent in large part to that paragraph 2.214 22 that you referenced. 2215 In large part, I don't believe the Federal Power Act gives 2216 FERC the ability to make resource decision making -- resource 2217 decisions. 2218 I think it's up to the states to do that. In addition to 2219 that, I have some grave concerns that it's actually going to 2220 dramatically increase the cost of electricity in these regional 2221 markets as well because states may still choose to pursue these 2222 policies, but if their -- if those resources have been replaced 2223 with another generation of resources it's just going to lead to

2224 overbilling and then consumers are going to pay more. 2225 Mr. Tonko. And thank you for that. 2226 And do you believe there's a role for governmental programs 2227 to address legitimate policy considerations that arise as a 2228 consequence of power generation such as clean air or climate 2229 change, if I dare mention that? 2230 Absolutely. These electric markets, for the Mr. Glick. 2231 most part, don't take into account externalities. So I think 2232 states and the federal government both have a role in ensuring 2233 externalities such as greenhouse gas emissions need to be 2234 addressed in another manner. 2235 Mr. Tonko. And I believe you're indicating this, but just 2236 for clarity, if MOPR is a standard solution, could it result in 2237 consumers paying more to prop up generators that run counter to 2238 the policies adopted by those states? 2239 Mr. Glick. Absolutely. That's one of my significant 2240 concerns, yes. 2241 In my home state of New York, we recently Mr. Tonko. 2242 implemented a clean energy standard to make significant 2243 reductions in greenhouse gas pollution, which is not currently 2244 priced into the market. 2245 Should New York have the right to determine its energy future 2246 and protect its citizens from environmental impacts? 2247 Mr. Glick. Certainly New York should have the right and I

2248 think one of the concerns if you are supportive of these capacity 2249 markets is that if state policies are then overturned by FERC 2250 decision making those states are going to cause their utilities 2251 to pull out of these capacity markets. 2252 Uh-huh. And I know you all supported the Mr. Tonko. 2253 storage order. But similarly, we are seeing states enact or 2254 consider mandates and incentives for storage resources. 2255 Like you all, states have recognized the benefits of these 2256 technologies including reliability benefits and want to see them 2257 as part of their resource mix. As storage resources are able to participate in capacity 2258 2259 markets, might some of these state policies come into conflict 2260 with the MOPR solution? Mr. McIntyre. I think there's a very little danger of that 2261 2262 under paragraph 22. 2263 Mr. Chatterjee. If I could just add to that, Congressman, 2264 in regards to specifically paragraph 22. 2265 I voted for the underlying CASPR order because I thought it 2266 was important and a necessary step in ISO New England. I put a 2267 great amount of time and effort into it. 2268 Having worked in this chamber before, you don't always agree 2269 with every single word of legislative text on a bill that you vote 2270 for and I think, going forward, I thought it was more important 2271 that CASPR pass than to focus on, you know, every word of paragraph

2272 two, what's in there, and I agree with the valid concerns that 2273 you're raising. 2274 So with that being said, is there a need for Mr. Tonko. 2275 addressing this as we go forward? 2276 Mr. Chatterjee. I think that, as the chairman quite 2277 eloquently spoke to earlier, that juxtaposition, that collision 2278 between market forces and our wanting to uphold these markets with 2279 state policy rights and state interventions that is going to be 2280 something that we continue to juggle with and I, for one, believe 2281 that, you know, some accommodation is necessary. 2282 Well, I am proud of the efforts my state is making 2283 and as a downwind state we don't want to be impacted by poor policy. 2284 So with that, I appreciate all of your comments and I yield 2285 back, Mr. Chair. 2286 Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired. 2287 The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger. 2288 Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2289 Thank you all for being here and spending some time with us 2290 We appreciate it, and I just want to thank you also for today. 2291 your commitment to making sure that our homes and businesses have 2292 reliable energy. 2293 I think we all recognize how vital your mission is to our 2294 nation's economic and national security. That being said, our 2295 main concern about the resiliency and reliability of our energy

2296 supply.

For years now, we've recognized the precarious situation that our nuclear plants are in. My district is home to four nuclear power plants and -- which is the most in the country and it accounts for 12 percent of the nation's nuclear power.

These plants provide good jobs. They're good for our environment and I think we've seen that they're proven performers during extreme weather events, whether it's Polar Vortex, hurricanes, things like that.

Yet, two plants in Illinois are still almost closed. Thousands of jobs and a significant amount of clean energy were almost lost. The state of Illinois had to step in to recognize the important role that these plants play in our state economy but also in the reliability of our energy supply.

Unfortunately, now other plants in other states are facing the same fate. So to the whole panel, as you know, in some wholesale energy markets certain resources like nuclear are struggling to recover costs and remain competitive, which has led to the earlier retirement of plants that could otherwise continue to run for decades.

Do you think energy markets can better value resource attributes for all types of energy generators and what about resiliency and reliability specifically?

Mr. McIntyre. Congressman, I will jump in first here.

2320 Thank you for the question. 2321 Mr. Kinzinger. Sure. 2322 Mr. McIntyre. We have acknowledged here the importance of 2323 ensuring that states are able to exercise their legitimate role 2324 in making resource decisions and expressing resource preferences 2325 through law, such as you have acknowledged that Illinois has done 2326 with regard to the nuclear fleet there, and we just have to ensure 2327 that with regard to the wholesale markets that we oversee that 2328 rates are indeed just and reasonable, which is our longstanding 2329 statutory standard, and that nothing done at the state level 2330 amounts to a pressing of the thumb on the scale or, as my colleague, 2331 Commissioner Powelson has said, picking winners and losers in a 2332 way that we would regard as inconsistent with the statutory role 2333 2334 Mr. Kinzinger. But let me ask you, like, kind of more deeply 2335 on that, if you look at -- is there a value to the reliability 2336 Are we just -- I mean, is there a value to resiliency, 2337 reliability, things along that line? Mr. McIntyre. As to nuclear? 2338 2339 Mr. Kinzinger. Yes. 2340 Mr. McIntyre. Certainly my view is we very much need to be an all-of-the-above. We need an all-of-the-above policy in terms 2341 of satisfying our nation's generating needs and I certainly 2342 2343 personally include nuclear in that mix.

2344 Mr. Kinzinger. Well, I mean, that's great. I appreciate 2345 that. 2346 But the question is do you think that you can better value 2347 resource attributes like that to nuclear, for instance? 2348 That's a question that's before us now in our Mr. McIntyre. 2349 ongoing proceeding on grid resilience. Are there resilience 2350 attributes that are present but are not being adequately 2351 compensated? 2352 If the answer to that question is yes, then I think we've 2353 got to decide what steps are appropriate. 2354 Okay. Anybody else want to add to that? Mr. Kinzinger. 2355 I would pick up on it. I heard earlier from Mr. Powelson. 2356 Chairman Walden we talked about customers and customers having 2357 choice in these competitive markets. 2358 In your state, your former governor and your legislature 2359 adopted electric restructuring. Those nuclear plants you 2360 referenced, customers paid a competitive transition charge as 2361 part of a stranded cost investment. 2362 And so where we are today in my state and your state where 2363 we have -- we are the second largest nuclear production state --2364 where something that was, quote, "too cheap to meter" is coming 2365 back into the market, whether it's a value around resiliency, and 2366 we are being asked -- theoretically, your constituents are being 2367 asked to do another stranded cost for those assets.

2368 So if I am a gas operator or I am an emerging technology in 2369 the market, I am not getting any type of backstop for my resource, 2370 and I could be clean and efficient and resilient. 2371 So I think, to the chairman's credit, we are looking at that 2372 and developing this record. There are characteristics of nuclear 2373 plants that will clear in these markets. 2374 It's a concern that I've seen in my state that where a 2375 standalone nuclear reactor like Three Mile Island is under 2376 tremendous stress, and why is that? 2377 Well, it's because 100 miles north up the 83 corridor is gas 2378 coming out of the ground at \$1.21 per MMBTU and a power plant that 2379 has a much lower cost to run and can provide baseload resource 2380 on the grid. 2381 Mr. Kinzinger. And I -- but I think the question is long 2382 How do we value the fact that that may change? It may go 2383 from \$1.20 to a billion dollars, right? In which case now we find 2384 ourselves, as some European markets and other markets have that 2385 undervalued nuclear power in a tail chase against the cost of 2386 electricity. 2387 Specifically, I just got back from Australia and they're, 2388 like, finding themselves in that kind of a situation as well. 2389 So my time has run out. I thank you all for being here and, 2390 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2391 Mr. Upton. Thank you.

2392 The chair would recognize Mr. Griffith. 2393 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Griffith. I appreciate it 2394 very much. A lot of good information floating around here. 2395 I want to go talk about pipelines. We've talked about how 2396 we need pipelines to get the natural gas where it needs to go, 2397 particularly in the northeast. 2398 But in the Commonwealth of Virginia, we have two pipelines 2399 coming through right now pretty much at the same general area, 2400 and people have a lot of questions and I have a lot of questions, 2401 and FERC can do a better job. 2402 And I talk to you all about this because a lot of you all 2403 are new and we got to figure it out. And so I appreciate, Mr. 2404 Chairman, you revisiting the 1999 standing policy on pipe --2405 policy on pipeline applications. But let me just tell you about 2406 the one coming through my district. 2407 One comes through my district and one doesn't but they're 2408 fairly close together. I learned about when a member of a board 2409 of supervisors in the county called me up and said there's surveyors all over the county. Nobody knows what they're doing 2410 2411 but they claim it has something to do with a gas pipeline. 2412 Now, that's not your all's fault. I get it. 2413 somebody else's fault -- the folks who were, you know, not 2414 informing the elected officials. But I didn't know anything 2415 about it. The county didn't know anything about it. Nobody knew 2416 anything. 2417 Then comes FERC, adding insult to injury. Had two public 2418 Goodlatte, Hurt, who was here then, and myself begged 2419 for more public hearings so that people could travel a shorter 2420 distance to get to these hearings because it was affecting their 2421 communities. 2422 Crickets. And so I am glad you're looking Didn't happen. 2423 at it and I -- and I am going to assume, Mr. -- or Chairman McIntyre, 2424 that this new plan that you're looking at will review the public 2425 comment meeting process as part of your evaluation. 2426 Is my assumption correct? Yes or no. 2427 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, it is correct. That's very much within 2428 the scope of what we intend to review. 2429 Mr. Griffith. And can I further assume that you are 2430 committed to working to ensure there's a method by which FERC 2431 offers full and transparent comment from the public about 2432 potential projects? Can I make that assumption as well? 2433 no. 2434 Mr. McIntyre. Yes. 2435 Mr. Griffith. I have a bill and it's been so frustrating 2436 that Senator Tim Kaine and I -- we don't generally agree on a lot 2437 of things -- we both have bills in. Now, we got different versions

because we don't always agree on things, but we have bill in on

this.

2438

2440 Mine is H.R. 2893, the Pipeline Fairness and Transparency 2441 2442 2443 frustrated. 2444 2445 2446 2447 the lines in the same corridor. 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454

Act, and this is to express these concerns that our constituents have been living with now for several years and still feel very

But I would like to even look at going further than that. So I want your -- you all's input on that. But I would also like input on things that we can do like on placing the lines, on putting

While the folks in that corridor may not appreciate it, you don't have two different sets of communities all across the Commonwealth of Virginia being disrupted, and then maybe taking a look at where are -- where are the companies and what are the policies where the companies are placing not only the pipeline but the pumping facilities to move the pipe down the line and do they need to be quite as big. A lot of folks are concerned about that.

So as we go forward, are you all willing to work, and I would ask each of you, are you willing to work with us to try to get some legislation that makes folks feel like it's not just being crammed down their throats but they actually have input and that somebody out there is actually listening?

Mr. McIntyre. We welcome the opportunity to work with you I don't want to leave you with the false impression that we don't have mechanisms in place today for proper public input

2455

2456

2457

2458

2459

2460

2461

2462

2464 because we certainly do, and one of the key issues that's before 2465 us even in our -- under our existing policy is to make a 2466 determination as to whether a particular project is needed and 2467 that's to root --2468 Mr. Griffith. Okay. 2469 Mr. McIntyre. Sorry to interrupt, sir. 2470 Well, and I will be happy to give more answer, Mr. Griffith. 2471 but my time is running out and I've got another subject to hit. 2472 But will just tell you the frustration level in Virginia is 2473 so high, that while you all have a system I appreciate you looking 2474 at it because it apparently isn't working to give confidence to 2475 the public, and I appreciate that. 2476 Now I've got to move on to some issues related to businesses and homes that are on that -- on non-federal hydropower project 2477 2478 facilities. 2479 I have gotten a lot of questions from Friends of Claytor Lake 2480 that I will submit for the record and hope that you all will answer 2481 after the fact because we have some real issues related to 2482 shoreline management plans. 2483 This issue didn't really develop until in the last 10 or 15 2484 years and so we have some questions about how that goes forward. 2485 I picked up Robert Hurt's bill on shoreline management, the 2486 SHORE Act, which is H.R. 1538, and I hope that you all give us 2487 some input on that.

2488	But I think this is something that we need to work on
2489	together, because a lot of folks feel their property rights have
2490	been affected and, of course, economic development has been
2491	affected as well.
2492	So I look forward to working with you all on those issues
2493	as well, and I see that my time is up and, Mr. Chairman, I yield
2494	back.
2495	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back.
2496	Dr. Bucshon.
2497	Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2498	Chairman McIntyre, in your testimony you state that one of
2499	your top priorities is to protect and promote the resilience of
2500	the bulk power system.
2501	I am pleased to hear that we share this same priority. But
2502	I remain concerned with the lack of urgency to address properly
2503	valuing reliable and fuel security energy sources.
2504	There are many sources of energy that can power the grid and
2505	I am a supporter of an all-of-the-above energy strategy.
2506	However, after every major winter storm, whether it be the 2014
2507	Polar Vortex or the most recent bomb cyclone, studies conclude
2508	that coal-fired electricity was needed to prevent major
2509	blackouts, establishing coal-fired electricity as one of the most
2510	reliable, fuel-secure, and affordable energy sources available.
2511	Just so you know, every coal mine in the state of Indiana
	1

2512 is in my district and many of the coal-fired power plants. 2513 Even with its reliability, coal-fired power plants continue 2514 to retire in alarming numbers for many of the reasons we've already 2515 Thirty-nine coal-powered generating units have been 2516 forced to close in my home state of Indiana alone. 2517 I am supportive of the efforts you're taking to properly 2518 value traditional baseload generation that provide our nation 2519 with a more reliable and secure grid. 2520 But I am concerned that if we don't act soon, more coal plants 2521 will continue to retire prematurely, leaving my constituents in 2522 my state without reliable energy and many of the risks -- that 2523 risk of losing their jobs, as was outlined by the -- Congressman 2524 McKinley about how that goes down the line. 2525 This is why I have introduced H.R. 5270, the Electricity 2526 Reliability and Fuel Security Act, which would create a temporary 2527 tax credit covering only a small portion of the cost to operate 2528 and maintain existing coal-fired power plants. 2529 And in fact, just yesterday, Senator Capito from West 2530 Virginia introduced a companion bill to H.R. 5270 in the Senate 2531 showcasing the urgency of this matter. 2532 I believe the temporary tax credit, which would last for five 2533 years, is necessary to maintain the reliability and resilience 2534 of the grid while policy makers work together to agree on a 2535 long-term plan for the grid.

2536 We need a little bit more level playing field. Chairman 2537 McIntyre, can you provide an update on FERC's efforts on this issue 2538 and are you supportive of congressional action to maintain a reliable grid while the commission collects comments on how to 2539 2540 best address grid reliability. 2541 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, sir. 2542 The question you have raised about coal is very much wrapped up within our grid resilience work, particularly given the way 2543 2544 that the grid resilience topic was teed up for us in the first 2545 instance by Secretary Perry with the Section 403 action -- the 2546 NOPR that was presented to us for our consideration. 2547 So we have to look at this and ask ourselves the question 2548 whether those coal-fired generating resources are contributing 2549 grid resilience attributes in a way that cries out to be 2550 compensated at levels higher than they currently are receiving 2551 in the -- in the marketplace. 2552 If the answer to that question is yes, then I think we have 2553 to address the very difficult question of what are -- what is it 2554 appropriate for us to do about that. The question is completely 2555 legitimate and, as you suggest in your statement, Congressman, 2556 this is broader than just grid resilience. 2557 I mean, there are economic issues here in play as well. So 2558 we understand how important the issue is.

Yes.

Mr. Bucshon.

2559

I mean, when we are buying -- when we

2560 are important LNG for energy sources and we are using a lot of 2561 energy from our friends in Canada, you know, to turn a blind eye 2562 to our own ways to generate energy, at least in the short run, 2563 is not the right thing. 2564 Mr. Chatterjee. 2565 Mr. Chatterjee. Congressman, I just want to echo that I 2566 share your sense of urgency. I am optimistic about the resilience 2567 proceeding and the docket that we have ongoing. 2568 But I am concerned that it'll take time and that's why, during 2569 the course of our consideration of Secretary Perry's NOPR, I had 2570 advocated for an interim solution. 2571 What I've come to learn in the subsequent months since we 2572 dealt with that NOPR is there are real challenges and in sight 2573 of the situation in New England -- the ISO New England fuel 2574 security study, you know, highlights that and I do think the moment will come sooner rather than later when we are going to have to 2575 2576 confront this and your sense of urgency is right on and look 2577 forward to seeing how the legislative effort you have progresses. Mr. Bucshon. 2578 Thanks. 2579 And also just because -- all of the above, earlier this 2580 Congress the House unanimously passed my bill 2872, the Promoting 2581 Hydropower Development at Existing Non-Dams Act. 2582 You probably are -- may or may not be aware of that.

it would promote hydropower development at existing non-power

2584 dams by establishing an expedited licensing process for 2585 qualifying facilities that would result in a decision on an 2586 application two years or less. 2587 Senator Portman and Senator McCaskill just recently 2588 introduced a companion bill in the Senate and I think we have 2589 good chance of getting that across the finish line so that we can 2590 convert some non-hydro power generating dams across this country 2591 in ones that produce long-standing clean energy. 2592 I yield back. Thank you. 2593 Mr. Upton. Mr. Johnson. 2594 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the Mr. Johnson. 2595 commission for being here with us today. 2596 I've been closely following the discussion surrounding DOE's 2597 NOPR that the commission rejected. As some of you probably know, 2598 my district in eastern and southeastern Ohio is home to an 2599 abundance of natural energy production, particularly natural gas 2600 and coal. 2601 So these issues hit especially close to home and I take notice 2602 when major employers in my district speak out on this issue. For 2603 instance, the CEO of Murray Energy recently stated that FERC did 2604 not do its job when it rejected this proposal -- that is, the DOE 2605 NOPR. 2606 Commissioner Powelson, I believe you recently made some 2607 comments indicating that you disagree with Mr. Murray.

2608 expound on that? 2609 I take offense to the word feckless being used Mr. Powelson. 2610 to colleagues that I serve with here, and as I mentioned earlier 2611 2612 That term was what again? Mr. Johnson. 2613 Mr. Powelson. Feckless, used to describe the FERC, my 2614 colleagues, and the 1,320 employees that show up to work every 2615 day to do their job around safety and economic regulation and 2616 making sure our wholesale power markets are functioning. So --2617 Mr. Johnson. I think your testimony -- I mean, your 2618 statement on social media, though, was more about conducting a 2619 debate, right? 2620 Mr. Powelson. I refrain from going down that path. 2621 thought it was inappropriate and I dialled it back rather quickly. 2622 Mr. Johnson. All right. 2623 Commissioner Chatterjee, I've read your testimony and 2624 wondered if you had any further thoughts on this issue. 2625 Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, sir. Obviously, throughout our 2626 consideration of the DOE NOPR, I expressed great sympathy with 2627 what Secretary Perry had proposed and I saw first-hand during my 2628 time serving Leader McConnell and working in the Kentucky 2629 delegation, working with folks like yourself through various 2630 energy caucuses in the Congress the impact -- the severe impact 2631 that was taking place in whole communities throughout Appalachia,

2632 throughout Kentucky, throughout Ohio.

The challenge we had is, you know, serving at the commission at the independent regulator. We have to work based on the record that was before us and, unfortunately, the record did not support compensating fuel sources based on having that onsite fuel capability.

That doesn't mean that the question that was posed by Secretary Perry wasn't the right question and that doesn't mean that in our further work we won't be able to address these sensitive issues.

But speaking to the manner in which the NOPR was handled, I am a conservative. I believe in a narrow interpretation of statute and my narrow reading of the record in this case was it simply didn't support it, and while I have deep sympathy for the sentiments that Mr. Murray, folks in your community, are expressing and the concerns they have about the economic impact, the job impact, the cultural impact of these shutdowns from the seat I sit in now, our records simply didn't support taking action at that time.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you for clarifying.

Moving on to another subject, we've also discussed cyberattacks and data policy violations have been issues recently and frequently highlighted in the news -- attacks on U.S. government agencies and universities including FERC, for example,

2656 the recent Energy Services Group attack, and the platform policy 2657 violation by a Facebook developer. 2658 In light of these events, what are the commission's thoughts 2659 on its current security practices for protecting sensitive 2660 information such as CEII, Critical Electric Energy Infrastructure 2661 Information, that FERC collects and regulated -- from regulated 2662 energy companies and shares with third parties? 2663 Is there any discussion on evaluating methods to strengthen 2664 those practices? And let me -- let me go back to you, Commissioner 2665 Powelson, in light of your focus on cybersecurity in your 2666 testimony. Do you have any insight on this issue? 2667 Mr. Powelson. Well, I think the work that's being done right 2668 now working with NERC and refining some of these standards, one, 2669 there's kind of four points we are looking at. One is the vendor remote access to data, also software 2670 2671 authenticity and information system planning, and then vendor 2672 risk management. 2673 This all coincides with what I call the, say, best practices 2674 around cyber hygiene, and to your point of that critical 2675 infrastructure information being lockboxed and protected is 2676 critically important. You mentioned the situation that unfolded 2677 at the FERC where our internal system was violated. 2678 We are still looking at that issue, making assessments on

what kind of data might have been exposed, and I think to the work

2680	of the folk at the FERC, we seem to be in a good spot in developing
2681	proper protocols around fishing expeditions and making sure that
2682	we are hygiene proficient as well, and that's what happened in
2683	that particular case.
2684	Mr. Johnson. Okay. Well, thank you very much.
2685	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
2686	Mr. Upton. Mr. Long.
2687	Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for
2688	being here today and for your testimony.
2689	Chairman McIntyre, recently City Utilities of Springfield,
2690	Missouri, has seen a substantial rise in transmission costs in
2691	the Southwest Power Pool. Most of these costs are related to
2692	funding transmission projects outside of Missouri.
2693	Some of the projects allow utilities to access renewable
2694	energy located outside the state. However, the benefits far
2695	outweigh by the rise in transmission costs for the projects
2696	located far away.
2697	Southwest Power Pool's own studies have shown the City
2698	Utilities' transmission costs and energy prices are substantially
2699	higher than other customers in the Southwest Power Pool.
2700	What will FERC do to address the issue of rising transmission
2701	costs in the Southwest Power Pool's footprint?
2702	Mr. McIntyre. I am not familiar with the study you
2703	reference, Congressman. But I will say that, as a general matter,

2704 our transmission costs allocation is subject to policies under 2705 a landmark order we call Order 1000 that governs our transmission 2706 planning processes and the determination of how to allocate the 2707 cost of transmission projects across their geographic footprint. 2708 Generally speaking, it would be surprising that a particular 2709 entity paying those transmission costs is paying significantly 2710 higher than other entities served by the same facility. 2711 These are studies that Southwest Power Pool --2712 they had their own study, City Utilities -- Southwest Power Pool 2713 did. So I will get you that information, and if you can have your 2714 folks look into it and get with my people, I would really 2715 appreciate it because --2716 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, I was going to make that offer. We'd 2717 be delighted to. 2718 Mr. Long. It sounds like an egregious situation. So what will FERC -- will FERC address the concerns that some 2719 2720 customers like the City Utilities are paying for assets for which they have no benefits? 2721 2722 Mr. McIntyre. Well, we do have processes in place today that 2723 enable any entity that feels that it is paying for something it 2724 should not have to pay for -- in effect, to initiate a complaint 2725 proceeding with us -- and our role at that point would be to address 2726 the merits of the complaint and determine whether there is

legitimacy to it and, if so, what steps we should take to remedy

	<b>1</b>
2728	the situation.
2729	Mr. Long. Okay. Well, I know you have
2730	Mr. McIntyre. This is also something we can follow up on.
2731	Mr. Long. Yes. I know you have some good folks and I have
2732	some good folks so, hopefully, we can get them together and I think
2733	we are going to be in close contact for a while on that until we
2734	get some answers.
2735	Mr. McIntyre. I would welcome that.
2736	Mr. Long. Thank you.
2737	And Commissioner Chatterjee, in May or on May 22nd in 2011
2738	I had been in Congress for five months and we had an F5 tornado
2739	ravage through Joplin, Missouri, in my district killed 161
2740	people, took out 8,000 homes, 500 businesses, leaving over a
2741	hundred well, I already said that 161 people dead and
2742	thousands without power.
2743	In your testimony, you talk about the importance of planning
2744	for potential catastrophes as it relates to electric
2745	vulnerabilities in a region and you highlight the work being done
2746	by IOS New England.
2747	Can you talk about the proactive working being done to
2748	mitigate these risks and how other RTOs and ISOs can plan for
2749	catastrophic weather events?
2750	Mr. Chatterjee. I want to start, Congressman, with saying
2751	that, you know, I mean, such events like that are just they're

2752 They can devastate communities and, obviously, we all 2753 need to work collectively to get ahead of these kinds of tragedies. 2754 We at the commission, you know, focus on electric reliability 2755 and in ensuring that power remains available, that the lights stay 2756 on. 2757 The reason we are undergoing this resilience proceeding is 2758 we want to make sure that in the event that the power goes off 2759 that it can be restored quickly. I think as these types of severe weather events become the new normal, we've got to take great steps 2760 2761 to get ahead of that. 2762 I was actually in Georgia last week meeting with folks from 2763 Georgia Power about the extensive efforts that they take in advance of storm preparation and afterwards. 2764 And so I think the 2765 private sector will continue to do a tremendous job. I think our linemen and women are some of the bravest people 2766 2767 in this country. They should be honored and recognized for the 2768 sacrifices that they make and we at the commission will continue 2769 to do our job to maintain electric grid reliability and I am 2770 counting on the great linemen and women of our country to be responsive in the light of tragic events like, unfortunately, to 2771 2.772 your district. 2773 Thank you. Mr. Long. Okay. 2774 And I am running close to be out of time so, Chairman

McIntyre, I have a question that I will get to your folks from

2776	my folks, once again, concerning the Iranian hackers' attempt to
2777	breach FERC's computer systems and I know we are in an unclassified
2778	setting here.
2779	I was going to have you explain as much in a unclassified
2780	setting as you can. But I will submit that in writing to your
2781	office and I would like to have some answers on that. And also
2782	what steps are being taken to prevent this from happening again?
2783	Mr. McIntyre. Absolutely, sir. I look forward to
2784	following up with you and your staff on that.
2785	Mr. Long. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
2786	Mr. Upton. Mr. Walberg.
2787	Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the
2788	panel.
2789	This is a panel we've looked forward to for a long time. It's
2790	good to have you all here.
2791	I want to I want to dive right in with a fairly
2792	straightforward question which I hope will be just a simple yes/no
2793	answer. We can all agree that the energy landscape is vastly
2794	different than it was back in 1978 and even in 2005.
2795	Do you believe that PURPA should be updated or modified to
2796	reflect today's energy environment? Yes or no, and beginning
2797	with the chairman.
2798	Mr. McIntyre. Yes, I believe it's time for us to look at
2799	that issue.

2800 Ms. LaFleur. Yes. I think it would be timely for Congress 2801 to look at PURPA. 2802 Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, but I think not only should Congress 2803 look at PURPA but FERC should look at our own regulations and see 2804 what steps we may be able to take. 2805 Mr. Powelson. Yes, PURPA needs to be modernized. 2806 I think it's -- I think it's appropriate for FERC Mr. Glick. 2807 to take a look at some of the issues of PURPA but I think the major 2808 issues that were addressed in the 2005 Energy Policy Act need to 2809 be addressed by Congress in terms of PURPA's future. 2810 Mr. Walberg. Well, I appreciate the fact that it's a 2811 generally yes answer. I think PURPA right now is holding us back 2812 on an all-of-the-above energy plan. 2813 It's intentions, certainly, assisted in moving forward 2814 renewables. But right now, we are holding back some of the 2815 renewables in being more efficient in the process. So I 2816 appreciate that. 2817 Chairman McIntyre, I am pleased that FERC held a PURPA 2818 technical conference in June 2016. The docket has been open for 2819 nearly two years now and I am curious as to the time line for acting 2820 and what possible actions you believe the commission could take. Mr. McIntyre. There are a number of different actions we 2821 2822 As has been referenced, any significant overhaul of 2823 PURPA would have to come from the Congress. Within the scope of

127 2824 FERC, some of the issues that we look at and that we hear from 2825 constituents on -- constituencies, I should say -- stakeholders 2826 on, are have we properly treated the question of how a particular 2827 project is measured. 2828 Some accuse some of the players in industry as engaging in 2829 gamesmanship in how they slice the size of a project -- to take 2830 a project of a certain size and break it into smaller components 2831 for purposes of PURPA treatment so that it gets the benefit of 2832 being considered to be a so-called qualifying facility under 2833 PURPA. 2834 That's one of many examples I could give you. 2835 have a role here too because it is the states that determine the 2836 rate at which PURPA generators are compensated -- the so-called 2837 avoided cost rates. 2838 So I think that these are issues that we can look at within 2839 our existing statutory authority. 2840 I appreciate hearing that. I would agree with Mr. Walberg. 2841

Mr. Walberg. I appreciate hearing that. I would agree with you and I agree in looking at PURPA myself that while Congress I think ought to take action on it, yet there are significant changes -- significant upgrades, modifications that I believe FERC can make on your own, and then we can follow on and be an asset to you.

Commissioner Chatterjee, you stated in your testimony that significant changes related to PURPA would require congressional

2842

2843

2844

2845

2846

action, as we agree. But I am under the belief that FERC can address many issues with PURPA right now, including problems with the one-mile rule, which I think goes into gaming, as you talked about, Chairman, and reduce the 20-megawatt threshold of a QF in organized markets if the FERC decided to do.

So would you consider, Mr. Chatterjee, fixing the one-mile rule and adjusting the megawatt size of QFs in organized markets a significant change?

Mr. Chatterjee. Thank you for the question, Congressman. Just to clarify, what I said in my testimony was that major structural changes to PURPA need to come from Congress but that does not mean that we can't look at things within FERC's own regulations and I do believe both issues that you have identified the one-mile rule and the 20-megawatt threshold are things that FERC could consider and address.

I think the record is already there to potentially act on the one-mile rule and while additional development of the record could be helpful on the 20-megawatt threshold, there is already arguably enough in the existing record that the commission could proceed on it.

And in the limited time I served as chairman I stated that this was a top priority of mine and I hope to work with Chairman McIntyre and my colleagues to work on these and other elements of it.

2872	While you have an excellent bill, the likelihood of that bill
2873	getting through my former colleagues in the United States Senate
2874	could be a challenge and therefore I think it's incumbent upon
2875	us to do what we can.
2876	Mr. Walberg. Don't curse the project.
2877	[Laugher.]
2878	Thank you. I see my time has expired so I yield back.
2879	Mr. Upton. Mr. Duncan.
2880	Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2881	Commissioner Powelson, you mentioned in your opening
2882	statement I believe that FERC is aware of the frequency of cyber
2883	and physical threats to the nation's infrastructure and that you
2884	believe that threat is only increasing.
2885	And I want to commend the commission for making cyber and
2886	physical security a top priority. How can Congress work together
2887	with you and with the administration to make this a top priority
2888	in our upcoming infrastructure reform bill?
2889	Mr. Powelson. Congressman, great question, and I think it
2890	starts with where we've evolved over the last eight years with
2891	cyber building these cyber protocols. Interagency
2892	cooperation has been critically important.
2893	It started off really as a silo mentality, and now the
2894	dissemination of that information and that capacity building, as
2895	I mentioned earlier, down to the states, your state included,

2896 that's a big challenge, going forward. 2897 But I think it's a resource issue. Resources as -- you know, 2898 our operation at the FERC there's probably 20 to 25 people who 2899 are fully engaged in this effort -- the effort that Secretary Perry 2900 is undertaking with his Office of Cybersecurity another step 2901 forward. 2902 But I just think it continues to evolve. There's no silver 2903 bullet to this, if I could use that expression lightly. 2904 Mr. Duncan. Are you all working with any private entities? 2905 And I guess the question is are you familiar with what Clemson 2906 University is doing with grid simulator and infrastructure 2907 simulator down in Charleston? Are you all familiar with that? 2908 Mr. Powelson. So two things that you're seeing across the states that we are involved with -- one is the GridX exercise, 2909 2910 which I understand is run by NERC. We also have these tabletop 2911 exercises in my home state. We did what we call a black sky event 2912 and you look at all these different scenarios and under I guess 2913 Chairman --2914 Is it primarily looking at cyberattacks when 2915 you do that? 2916 It is all part of that, yes. Mr. Powelson. 2917 Because, I mean, you're familiar with the Mr. Duncan. 2918 geomagnetic storm that have hit in the northeast and Canada --2919 power outages and -- you know, we've got to be prepared for both

2920	natural GMDs but also EMPs manmade because we've got "Rocket
2921	Man" in North Korea that could definitely send a nuclear weapon
2922	into the atmosphere and create an EMP and I hope that you guys
2923	are looking at that as well.
2924	Mr. Powelson. I think from a preparedness posture, I think
2925	we I can say we are. But it is again, it's evolving. Again,
2926	another great step is the work at DOE in their cyber office, and
2927	collaborating with the states. I firmly believe we are helping
2928	states build much-needed capacity.
2929	Mr. Duncan. Can we drill down on that, helping states? And
2930	let me ask how you're helping, say, the private or the small
2931	cooperative electrical cooperatives in the states. What are
2932	you doing to help those guys?
2933	Mr. Powelson. I don't know. That's a good question. The
2934	reason I don't know is some of these entities are not regulated
2935	by a state public utility commission. They're part of public
2936	power.
2937	But I do know that public power is participating in these
2938	cyber protocols. So
2939	Mr. Duncan. Just bringing it up with Duke Energy then, and
2940	you're working with companies like Duke and Southern?
2941	Mr. Powelson. We are.
2942	Mr. Duncan. Okay. In what ways? I mean, technical
2943	advice, you know, inviting them to these simulations?

2944 Well, Southern -- under their chairman and Mr. Powelson. 2945 CEO Tom Fanning, he's a leader in the ISAC. We also do it through 2946 an audit process. 2947 Lynn Good, who runs Duke Energy, is also active in that. 2948 We've had through the working groups at EEI, the evolution of a 2949 cyber mutual assistance protocol which, again, was a newly tasked 2950 effort. 2951 So these are -- again, these are merging resources that are 2952 coming out of the discussions here in Washington. I think it's 2953 a good -- it's a good posture for us to be -- to be leading. 2954 But there are challenges and I think those challenges start 2955 with providing those resources to build up these capacities. 2956 Mr. Duncan. As we work on the infrastructure bill. I am 2957 one member of Congress that hopes we will look at grid hardening 2958 as part of the infrastructure package that we do. 2959 Let me just ask one further question. Duke Energy has the 2960 Bad Creek project in northern Pickens County, which has a hydro 2961 storage facility to pump water from Lake Jocassee to a hydro 2962 storage facility, release it. Turns the turbines during peak 2963 demand, provide electricity for that demand, and then during low 2964 peak it'll pump the water back up, reverse the turbines, and store 2965 that water. 2966 It's a great energy storage concept. I know we are doing 2967 that with solar power. How active are you all involved with --

2968 I think Ms. Castor asked that question -- with the hydro storage 2969 for basically battery capacity for wind and solar? 2970 Mr. Glick. Mr. Duncan, if I may, I think we actually issued 2971 a rule several weeks ago which actually provides -- and it's not 2972 only for battery storage but also for pump storage in terms of 2973 facilitating their participation in the wholesale markets and I 2974 think that's -- I think in addition to that, the commission has 2975 authority over the licensing of hydro projects as well. 2976 be involved in that. 2977 For the most part, it's actually just facilitating or ending 2978 or eliminating those market barriers that currently exist for 2979 those types of technologies participating. 2980 Mr. Duncan. I thank you for that. 2981 My time is expired. I yield back. 2982 Mr. Upton. Mr. Lance. 2983 Mr. Lance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank you 2984 and Ranking Member Rush for permitting me to participate today. 2985 I am a member of the full committee but I am not a member of this 2986 subcommittee. 2987 Chairman McIntyre, on January 19th, FERC issued a 2988 certificate of public convenience and necessity to the PennEast 2989 Pipeline Company authorizing a natural gas pipeline through 2990 Pennsylvania and New Jersey, including in the congressional 2991 district that I serve.

2992 The certificate also gave PennEast the legal ability to file 2993 eminent domain lawsuits against private landowners. As FERC opens 2994 a docket to re-examine the pipeline certification policy, what 2995 kinds of measures will you consider to ensure a robust economic 2996 analysis of public need, especially in those instances when 2997 precedent agreements are largely signed with affiliates of the 2998 owner like in the case of PennEast? 2999 Well, as you know, Congressman, we have Mr. McIntyre. 3000 initiated a fresh look at our 1999 certificate policy statement 3001 that addresses some of these issues. 3002 We are looking forward to robust public input, input from 3003 stakeholders and the public on the important issues involved here 3004 including the ones that you have cited. 3005 Mr. Lance. I thank you. 3006 Commissioner LaFleur, how will you ensure a project's 3007 environmental impacts are sufficiently considered, a topic you 3008 discussed in your concurring opinion? Ms. LaFleur. 3009 I think that's one of the main issues we will 3010 be teeing up for looking at when we look at the policy statement, 3011 both how we best do our environmental work on the traditional parts 3012 of the pipeline but also downstream impacts of the end uses that 3013 the pipeline contributes to, including climate impacts. I think 3014 that'll be directly to that.

Commissioner Chatterjee, what steps will you

Mr. Lance.

3016 take to prevent negative consequences on landowners, a concern 3017 you described in your concurring opinion? 3018 Mr. Chatterjee. Yes, sir. 3019 I did have concerns about landowner protection and it's 3020 something that as we explore the revisitation of our pipeline 3021 certificate process I want to ensure that landowners' voices are 3022 heard, that they understand the steps available to them to 3023 potentially, you know, mitigate concerns that they may have --3024 rerouting and other types of elements. 3025 I want to make sure that they feel that their voices are 3026 recognized as part of that process and there's a commitment. 3027 Thank you. Mr. Lance. 3028 Commissioner McIntyre -- Chairman McIntyre, as FERC reviews 3029 the pipeline certification policy, how will you ensure state and 3030 local rights are adequately protected? 3031 This past June, the New Jersey Department of Environmental 3032 Protection denied PennEast a freshwater wetlands individual 3033 permit and a water quality certificate, which are required to 3034 begin construction under the Natural Gas Act. 3035 What steps, if any, will FERC take to safequard state and 3036 local autonomy? 3037 Mr. McIntyre. There are certain actions that are well 3038 beyond our reach in terms of our ability to restrict state roles 3039 assigned to them by statute.

3040 Often, it is the case that these questions that come up have 3041 to be resolved by the courts and I do not expect that to change 3042 anytime soon. But, certainly, we are reflective of and 3043 respectful of the state's role. 3044 Thank you. It's my considered judgment that Mr. Lance. 3045 this is not in the best interest of the United States. It's 3046 certainly not in the best interest of New Jersey, and we in New 3047 Jersey -- our state officials have significant concerns with this. 3048 Some of the pipeline would be under preserved land and there 3049 is in the underlying statute I think written in the 1930s a belief 3050 in comity with state statutory law and I would hope that the 3051 commission would re-examine all of this. 3052 On a completely unrelated issue, Chairman McIntyre, with regard to FERC's March 15th revised policy statement on the 3053 3054 treatment of income taxes for masters limited partnerships, could 3055 you please explain your rationale in advancing a blanket 3056 prohibition of recovering of an income tax allowance for oral 3057 You may have discussed this previously. 3058 respectfully ask you that question. 3059 Mr. McIntyre. Yes, that's fine, Congressman. 3060 We were faced with an appellate court decision directing us 3061 to address that specific issue. We took action that we regarded 3062 as appropriate in light of the directives from the court.

Mr. Lance. Does any other member of the commission wish to

3064 discuss that? 3065 Commissioner LaFleur. 3066 I would just say that even before the United 3067 Airlines case that led to the March order there was an earlier 3068 case where we were chastised by a court for double taxation. 3069 It's been brewing ever since then. We did a notice of 3070 inquiry and took a lot of testimony from people in the pipeline 3071 industry and others to try to build a full record and did not find 3072 any way to achieve the requirements of the court other than the 3073 way that we --3074 Thank you for your responses, and I yield back And thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 3075 three seconds. 3076 Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired. 3077 Mr. Kennedy. 3078 Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank all our witnesses for being here. 3079 It's nice 3080 to have a full complement of the commissioners testifying before 3081 Congress. Grateful for your service. Grateful for the time. 3082 For those of you that I have not met yet, I look forward to 3083 working with you. For those of you who I have, welcome back. 3084 Over the past five years, I've become very familiar with FERC 3085 processes, more so than I ever thought I would. I've appreciated 3086 the willingness of both members from the commission and, 3087 critically, your staff to engage with both me and my staff on this

3088 issue and I look forward to continuing that cooperation in the 3089 future. 3090 As you all know, the issue of transparency and the 3091 opportunity to be heard have been a focal point of my work here 3092 in Congress and with the commission, and you have heard the issue 3093 about transparency come up a number of times from my colleagues 3094 today. 3095 Several years ago, ratepayers in my home region, ISO New 3096 England, were shut out of the administrative and judicial review 3097 processes due to an unintended consequence in the Federal Power 3098 Act. 3099 Chairman McIntyre, I gratefully appreciate your comments in 3100 your written testimony describing your commitment to transparency, sir, and as I've said before, if there's any lesson 3101 3102 that I've learned from Washington is that the more complex an issue 3103 is, the more likely that someone's being taken advantage. 3104 So we've worked on a bipartisan basis on this committee to 3105 advance, in my estimation, a straightforward bill to address that 3106 We are working with our colleagues in the Senate to try issue. 3107 to find agreement on the legislation. 3108 Under Section 205, the rates are allowed to take effect by 3109 operation of law if the commission does not act within a statutory 3110 time period of 60 days. 3111 To start, I guess, with Mr. Glick, to the extent that you

3112	know, sir, how often does that happen? How often does it take
3113	do rates take effect by operation of law? Are you familiar
3114	at all?
3115	Mr. Glick. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
3116	I don't I couldn't give you an exact number. I will supply
3117	that for the record.
3118	I can tell you it is it is relatively rare, although it
3119	is certainly foreseeable. We have five commissioners now, you
3120	would think, but the commissioners do recuse themselves on certain
3121	occasions and you could very well have a 2-2 vote, in which case
3122	the commission would actually not be able to stop or either
3123	or prevent a particular proposed change in the tariff under
3123	
3124	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.
3124	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.
3124 3125	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance,
3124 3125 3126	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the
3124 3125 3126 3127	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?
3124 3125 3126 3127 3128	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?  Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as you
3124 3125 3126 3127 3128 3129	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?  Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as you pointed out, that the party that feels itself aggrieved doesn't
3124 3125 3126 3127 3128 3129 3130	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?  Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as you pointed out, that the party that feels itself aggrieved doesn't have the ability to seek rehearing or take it on appeal to the
3124 3125 3126 3127 3128 3129 3130 3131	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?  Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as you pointed out, that the party that feels itself aggrieved doesn't have the ability to seek rehearing or take it on appeal to the D.C. Circuit.
3124 3125 3126 3127 3128 3129 3130 3131 3132	Section 205 of the Federal Power Act from becoming law.  Mr. Kennedy. And is there a difference if, for instance, the commission fails to act within 60 days? A difference in the actual distinction?  Mr. Glick. The only distinction is that, and I think as you pointed out, that the party that feels itself aggrieved doesn't have the ability to seek rehearing or take it on appeal to the D.C. Circuit.  Mr. Kennedy. And how do we know if a commission actually

3136 again, if the commission doesn't act at all within 60 days it 3137 automatically -- the tariff change automatically goes into 3138 effect. 3139 And so, Mr. Glick, what is the commission doing Mr. Kennedy. 3140 to ensure that aggrieved parties are not locked out of that review 3141 process? 3142 Well, again, I think -- I think that, at least Mr. Glick. for this particular issue, I think it does require a congressional 3143 3144 change, and I know you have a bill and there's a bill in the Senate 3145 as well Mr. Markey has put forward. 3146 But I think that -- I think the best we can do is actually 3147 ensure as much transparency as possible and involve public 3148 participation. But if there is a 2-2 deadlock we are unable --I don't think we have the authority currently to address that. 3149 3150 Mr. Kennedy. And I appreciate that, sir, and I guess I would 3151 go back to Mr. McIntyre, given your comments about transparency. 3152 Your thoughts on this issue and whatever else the commission 3153 should be doing or can be doing to take on that issue of 3154 transparency. 3155 Mr. McIntyre. Thank you, Congressman. 3156 It's a valid concern, but I personally am heartened by the 3157 fact that it arises very, very rarely, and I don't have a figure 3158 for you either. But the one I've heard informally within the 3159 agency is once every dozen years or so.

3160 Mr. Kennedy. And, Mr. McIntyre, and I appreciate that, sir. 3161 I don't mean to make light of that. The fire hydrants outside 3162 my street haven't been used all that frequently either. I am glad 3163 they're there because when they do need to be used I hope they 3164 work. 3165 And so, respectfully, and understood that it doesn't happen 3166 very often, but when it does, it comes with a fairly big 3167 consequence, as we saw if -- in FCCA for residents in 3168 Massachusetts. 3169 And so just because it doesn't happen very often I don't think 3170 -- well, we can be heartened by it -- doesn't mean that we shouldn't 3171 address the fact because when it does it can be a big deal. 3172 Mr. McIntyre. I agree with you. In terms of legislative 3173 approach, if this is something where it would be helpful for us 3174 to work with you on language, we'd be happy to do that, because 3175 language wise right now under existing law, unless a party is aggrieved by a commission order -- an order of the commission --3176 3177 it cannot go forward to judicial review. 3178 And so the lack of an order is what would be a stymieing factor 3179 there. 3180 Mr. Kennedy. Yes, I agree. 3181 Ms. LaFleur. 3182 Well, I am on record in favor of the Fair Rates 3183 I believe I've testified or done it in a QFR or something Act.

3184	before.
3185	I think it would be a good improvement to the Federal Power
3186	Act. I was on the commission. I was the chairman of the
3187	commission when we split 2-2.
3188	We did put out statements of the underlying views in dispute
3189	to provide transparency and I think we worked very hard to avoid
3190	deadlocks.
3191	I did believe I was in the group that thought that the
3192	rates were just and reasonable but I think the act would be a good
3193	improvement.
3194	Mr. Kennedy. I appreciate that.
3195	Thank you, Chairman.
3196	Mr. Upton. Thank you.
3197	Be that there are no further members wishing to ask
3198	questions, I would like to thank all of our witnesses for appearing
3199	today for sure.
3200	Before we conclude, I want to ask unanimous consent to submit
3201	the following documents for the record: a letter from the
3202	Utilities Technology Council and a joint letter from the American
3203	Public Power Association and the National Rural Electric
3204	Cooperative Association.
3205	[The information follows:]
3206	
3207	**************************************

3208	And in pursuant to committee rules, I remind members that
3209	they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the
3210	record. I would ask that the witnesses submit their response
3211	within 10 days upon receipt of those questions if you can.
3212	Without objection, this subcommittee stands adjourned.
3213	[Whereupon, at 12:53 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]