1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MASSIMO
3	HIF108030
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF: H.R. 4606, H.R. 5174,
7	H.R. 5175, H.R. 5239, AND H.R. 5240
8	WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 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, Cramer, Walberg, Duncan,
22	Walden (ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters, Green, Doyle,
23	Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Tonko, Loebsack, Schrader, Kennedy,
24	Butterfield, and Pallone (ex officio).
	1

Staff present: Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director;
Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler, Staff Assistant;
Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins, Legislative
Clerk, Energy/Environment; Zachary Dareshori, Staff Assistant;
Jordan Davis, Director of Policy and
External Affairs; Wyatt Ellertson, Professional Staff,
Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant;
Melissa Froelich, Chief Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer
Protection; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali
Fulling, Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital
Commerce and Consumer Protection; Jordan Haverly, Policy
Coordinator, Environment; Zach Hunter, Director of
Communications; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Ryan Long,
Deputy Staff Director; 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; Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk, Communications &
Technology; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs;
Everett Winnick, Director of Information Technology; Jeff
Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, Minority
Deputy Clerk; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and Environment Policy

Advisor; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Deputy Staff Director and
Chief Health Advisor; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Professional
Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy
Coordinator; Dan Miller, Minority Policy Analyst; Alexander
Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief
Counsel; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications,
Outreach and Member Services; and Tuley Wright, Minority Energy
and Environment Policy Advisor.

Mr. Upton. Good morning, Mr. Shimkus. So the subcommittee is going to come to order. And the chair recognizes himself for an opening statement.

Before we get started, I want to wish our friend, Dan Schneider, where is Dan? There he is. One of our press secretaries farewell. He has been here 3 years. This is his last week at Energy and Commerce. He did a wonderful job in that role for me, as chair of the full committee, and he has continued to do a terrific job under Chairman Walden. Thank you for your hard work. We look forward to seeing you again, but not with your hand up like that. So welcome and thank you.

[Applause.]

So today's markup is going to include five important energy bills addressing cyber, emergency preparedness, energy security. All five bills are bipartisan and build upon the committee's impressive record of oversight hearings in previously enacted bills aimed at protecting and strengthening our nation's energy infrastructure.

I want to start by focusing my comments on one of the bills that we are calling up today, H.R. 5175, the Pipeline and LNG Facility Cybersecurity Preparedness Act which I introduced with Mr. Loebsack. And as we have learned in classified hearings and a good number of other events, certainly through the recent testimonies of Secretary Perry and FERC Commissioners, cyber

attacks are a real and a growing threat.

To quote Secretary Perry: "As the nation's top 100 pipelines alone supply nearly 84 percent of the nation's energy, pipelines represent a critical part of North America's energy backbone. A coordinated government approach to the cyber and physical security of pipelines, led by the DOE, is essential to ensuring the safe and reliable flow of energy across the U.S.

My intent with this legislation is to strengthen DOE's role to coordinate cyber-response, collaborate, and build capacity within States and the energy sector. This is not a regulatory program, and we are not authorizing DOE to develop mandatory minimum standards. This bill is about conducting research, communicating threats, and coordinating the response across government.

Today's markup will include four other bills focused on these same themes, including a bill introduced by Mr. Walberg and Mr. Rush that updates the DOE Organization Act to strengthen its emergency response capabilities.

Mr. Latta and Mr. McNerney have taken the lead on two important bills related to the cybersecurity of our nation's electricity grid. H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense Act, establishes a voluntary DOE that tests the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system. H.R. 5240, the Enhancing Grid Security through Public-Private

106 Partnerships Act, requires DOE to establish a program to 107 facilitate and encourage public-private partnerships to promote 108 and advance the physical and cybersecurity of electric utilities that have fewer resources due to size or region. 109 And finally, Mr. Johnson's bill which will streamline DOE's process for 110 111 approving small-scale shipments of LNG, which will open new 112 markets in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America for 113 cleaner-burning natural gas. 114 Collectively, these bills represent an important step in the 115 right direction in better protecting our nation's energy 116 infrastructure against cyber and physical threats and 117 strengthening our nation's security. 118 I want to thank all members for their work and I recognize 119 Mr. Rush for an opening statement. 120 [The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:] 121 122 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 1\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

123 Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Rush. 124 Chairman, this is a quite important markup today on the 125 legislation addressing cybersecurity and emergency response issues on H.R. 4606 ensuring small scale LNG projects. 126 127 I support the four cybersecurity bills that are before us 128 and they will help to address one of the most pressing issues we 129 face, attacking our energy grid from those who might wish to do 130 us harm. 131 And thank you, Mr. Chairman, as you know, in our hearing with 132 FERC Commissioners yesterday, Chairman McIntyre cited 133 cybersecurity issues as one of the biggest concerns confronting 134 him and the agency. 135 So Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend all the sponsors and the co-sponsors of the cybersecurity bills being marked up 136 137 today, for their thoughtful attention to this critical issue. 138 I want to specifically acknowledge Mr. Walberg of Michigan 139 for working with my office on the Energy Emergency and Leadership 140 As you know, Mr. Chairman, this bill will establish a new 141 DOE Assistant Secretary position with jurisdiction over all 142 energy emergency and security functions relating to energy

With all the focus on protecting our infrastructure, I believe it is fitting and appropriate to elevate the person responsible for this task up to the assistant secretary level in

supply, infrastructure, and cybersecurity.

143

144

145

the Department of Energy.

Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that all five of these bills are bipartisan agreement, but unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I am not able to support H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. This bill would amend Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act to consider application for exports of small volumes of natural gas consisting of 0.14 billion cubic feet per day or less to be in the public interest.

This bill appears to be nothing but a pretty obvious legislative earmark and I can't support it.

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

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone from New Jersey.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today, the subcommittee will consider four cybersecurity bills and one bill addressing liquefied natural gas exports. I was hoping this would be a bipartisan markup of consensus cybersecurity legislation. But unfortunately, the majority added the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act to this markup just before it was noticed and that is a bill I can't support.

The four bipartisan cybersecurity bills before us today will enhance the Department of Energy's efforts to strengthen the

cybersecurity of our nation's electricity grid and pipeline network. It is critical that we ensure our nation's energy infrastructure is sufficiently protected from cyber threats and I support these four bipartisan bills and commend my colleagues who have taken leadership on this issue.

But the small scale LNG bill is another situation. My opposition to LNG exports is probably no surprise to anyone. I have long voiced my concern that an unrestricted export policy could significantly impact domestic natural gas prices and adversely affect American consumers and manufacturers. This bill appears to be an attempt to codify the Trump administration's recently proposed rule to expedite the approval of small scale natural gas exports. In my opinion, that rule is already problematic. But this bill is even worse to the environment than the proposed rule.

Let me speak to that. It would allow expedited approval of small LNG facilities so long as the proposal is below a certain threshold and does not require an environmental review under NEPA. That is the Trump administration rule. And that rule is also a concerning carve-out for a subset of LNG applications, specifically it declares that all small scale exports are always in the public interest, removes long standing consumer protections, and prevents the public from having an opportunity to know about or provide input on export proposals. But despite

its flaws, the administration's small scale LNG rule is a far better option than this legislation which would keep the volume limit, but completely abandon the requirement that applications qualify for a categorical exclusion from NEPA. In other words, this bill would allow for the approval of facilities that would currently undergo serious environmental review. And I adamantly oppose any efforts to remove these environmental protections.

But leave it to the Republican leadership of this committee to mark up the bill that has even fewer environmental safeguards than a Trump administration's proposal. Who is going to benefit from this legislation? According to the Congressional Research Service, only one project currently meets the capacity requirements of the administration=s small scale LNG rule, but does not qualify for a categorical exclusion and that is Eagle LNG Partners in Jacksonville. It is essentially a private bill, an earmark, which I thought Republicans opposed.

I brought this up during our legislative hearing and still to this day, no one has been able to explain why this particular project deserves such special treatment. I am still waiting for an answer.

So Mr. Chairman, I think that bill is unnecessary. It is bad policy. And it is a legislative earmark and we should not advance it to the full committee. And I urge my colleagues to oppose it. I yield back.

219 The gentleman yields back. The chair Mr. Upton. 220 recognizes the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Walden, for 221 an opening statement. 222 Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank Mr. Walden. 223 you for this markup. And the five bipartisan bills, I think, 224 reflect two key themes in our DOE modernization effort: ensuring 225 the Department of Energy has the tools it needs to execute its

226 core energy security mission, and reorienting DOE's approach
227 towards domestic energy infrastructure to capitalize on our

27 towards domestic energy infrastructure to capitalize on our

228 nation's energy abundance.

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

2.41

242

The potential for cyber attacks by foreign nations and other actors against our nation's business and energy systems highlights one of the significant and growing threats to the reliable supply of energy in the United States.

When you consider the rapid deployment of digital technology, the interconnected nature of our oil and gas and electricity systems, and the role of electricity across all sectors of our domestic economy, DOE's responsibilities for ensuring the reliable delivery of energy is much more complicated than the fuel supply disruptions of the late 1970s.

We have heard from Secretary Perry and the FERC Commissioners that we can, and should, do more to combat cyber threats to our nation's energy infrastructure.

Four of the bills we will consider today take practical steps

243 to ensure the Department of Energy can more effectively carry out 244 its emergency and security activities in the energy sector and 245 ensure the continued safe and reliable flow of energy across the 246 United States. 247 H.R. 5174, the Energy Emergency Leadership Act, by Mr. 248 Walberg and Ranking Member Rush, elevates the leadership of DOE's 249 emergency response and cybersecurity operations to the assistant 250 secretary level, which reflects the importance of this mission 251 across the department and in interagency coordination. 252 H.R. 5175, the Pipeline and LNG Facility Cybersecurity 253 Preparedness Act, by Chairman Upton and Mr. Loebsack, establishes 254 DOE's leadership in coordinating the government and energy 255 sector's approach to cyber and physical security of pipelines. 256 H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense Act, by Chairman Latta and Mr. 257 McNerney, establishes a voluntary program to help utilities and 258 other stakeholders identify and promote cyber-secure products for 259 use in the bulk-power grid and industrial control systems. 260 And H.R. 5240, the Enhancing Grid Security through 261 Public-Private Partnership Act, also introduced by Mr. McNerney 262 and Mr. Latta, would help bring DOE's technical know-how through 263 public-private partnerships to help improve the cybersecurity of 264 electric utilities, especially those utilities that have fewer 265 resources due to their size or region of the country.

Finally, turning to the energy abundance issue, we are also

267 considering H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and 268 Access Act, introduced by Mr. Johnson. This bipartisan bill would 269 codify a proposed DOE regulation to encourage small shipments of LNG to countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, putting small 270 271 scale LNG exports on a level playing field with pipeline exports 272 to Canada and Mexico. 273 Taken together, these bills represent important energy 274 security and energy infrastructure reforms that will better 275 position the Department of Energy to serve the nation's interests 276 going forward. I commend our members for working on this 277 legislation and I urge my colleagues to support these measures. 278 And Mr. Chairman, before I yield back, I want to draw special 279 attention and thank you for the service of Dan Schneider who has been a terrific member of our committee staff for the last 3 years 280 281 and will be leaving. He has been a real important part of our 282 communications team and in fact, I think he is longest-serving 283 member of the communications team. And while we hate to see him 284 leave, we are excited for his new opportunity. And so I hope the 285 committee will join me in thanking Dan for service to the Energy 286 and Commerce Committee. 287 [Applause.] 288 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:] 289 290 \*\*TNSERT 2\*\*\*\*\*

292 The chair would remind members that pursuant to Mr. Upton. 293 committee rules, all members' opening statements will be made part 294 of the record. Are there further opening statements? 295 Mr. Latta is recognized for 1 minute. 296 Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank the 297 chairman for holding today's markup. I am pleased to see the 298 markup of two bills I have introduced and worked on closely with 299 Congressman McNerney, the first being H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense 300 Act; and the second, H.R. 5240, the Enhancing Grid Security 301 through Public-Private Partnerships Act. 302 H.R. 5239 directs the Secretary of Energy to establish a 303 voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of 304 products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power At recent subcommittee hearings, both Secretary Perry 305 306 and the FERC Commissioners expressed support for this policy as 307 a way to help improve the grid's resiliency. 308 We are also considering H.R. 5240 which would direct DOE to 309 facilitate and encourage public-private partnerships in order to 310 improve cybersecurity of electric utilities. These bills will foster a collaborative relationship between DOE and the utilities 311 312 and ensure that our grid becomes increasingly resilient in the 313 face of cyber attacks. 314 And Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the markup today and look

forward to moving these bills.

316 Mr. Upton. Mr. McNerney.

Mr. McNerney. I thank the chair. I am going to basically say the same thing as Bob Latta. But I am going to say it anyway. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on the bills that we have before us today.

I have worked closely with my colleague, Bob Latta, on both of the Cyber Sense Act and the Enhanced Grid Security through Public-Private Partnerships Act. These bills work to ensure that our grid is protected against cyber attacks. We have recently seen how vulnerable our society and internet are to foreign interference. If an outside entity were to attack our electrical grid, we could go dark without electricity for months.

Cyber Sense requires the Department of Energy to determine a testing process for Cyber Sense products and to establish a cybersecurity vulnerability reporting process database, though currently, a voluntary program. I hope the public and private energy holders recognize the importance of being secure against cyber threats. The Enhancing Grid Security through Public-Private Partnerships Act provides cybersecurity training to electric utilities and promotes sharing best practices and data collection in the electric sector.

While this is also voluntary. I hope that if it proves successful, Congress will fund this program in the future. It also instructs the Secretary to update the internet cost estimate

340 calculator at least every 2 years. This calculator is used by 341 electric utilities in planning for interruption costs and 342 estimating cost benefits associated with the reliability 343 investments. 344 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 345 Mr. Upton. Mr. Johnson. 346 Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues 347 to support H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and 348 There is interest and potential in the Caribbean and Access Act. 349 Central America for American LNG although not in the large 350 quantities that the current large scale domestic exporting 351 facilities were built to address. 352 Creating regulatory certainty around small scale exports 353 will help encourage industries involved in this technology to 354 strongly consider further investments and new opportunities. 355 This bill is about helping to fully realize that potential 356 and can bring about positive geopolitical, economic, and even 357 environmental benefits as Venezuelan fuel oil is displaced which 358 has been used to gain influence in the region. 359 This should not be a partisan vote. The previous 360 administration recognized the need for U.S. energy engagement 361 with its creation of the Caribbean Energy Security Initiative. 362 This bill helps achieve these goals.

Lastly, H.R. 4606 is about updating the Natural Gas Act which

currently does not differentiate between large and small scale LNG projects. In this day and age, when the U.S. has become the world's leading producer of oil and natural gas, does that really still make sense? I think not, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important bill. I yield back.

Mr. Upton. Any members wishing to speak? Mr. Green.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today, we are marking up four different cybersecurity bills. It will strengthen the grid and our country's security in a variety of ways. We also are considering H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. H.R. 5174, the Energy Emergency Leadership Act by Mr. Walberg and Mr. Rush, would create a new assistant secretary of DOE tasked with overseeing all energy emergencies and security functions related to the energy supply, infrastructure, and cybersecurity. A coordinated approach to these issues would help us defend against the new emerging cyber threats we have seen in the last year and I support the bill and thank both of our colleagues, Mr. Walberg and Ranking Member Rush, for their hard word.

H.R. 5175, the Pipeline and LNG Facility Cybersecurity

Preparedness Act by our chair of our committee and Representative

Loebsack, will establish a program that further strengthens the

physical and cybersecurity of the natural gas transmission and

distribution system in our country. I support that bill.

Representative Latta's and Representative McNerney's Cyber Sense Act of 2018 will create a voluntary Cyber Sense program in DOE to identify cybersecure products that could be used in the bulk-power system and I support the bill.

I also support H.R. 5240 the Enhancing Grid Security through Public-Private Partnerships Act. The security of the grid cannot be guaranteed by the Federal Government alone. A cooperative effort is the best way to move forward in ensuring secure energy for all Americans.

Unfortunately, at this point I cannot support the last bill being considered, H.R. 4606 Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. The bill would codify the recently proposed program at DOE which expedites the export of LNG from small-scale facilities. I am a proponent of this DOE program, but this bill removes protections that are currently in place at the Department. The Department of Energy currently requires any small scale LNG facility that wants to use this expedited approval to qualify for this categorical exclusion under DOE's National Environmental Policy Act regulations.

As it is currently written, this protection will no longer be required and it is for this reason I cannot support the bill in its current form.

I hope to clarify here that I am a big supporter of LNG. I want to support this bill and I think the rule at DOE is a

412 well-balanced approach and I wish the legislation reflected that. 413 I hope the majority will work with me on this issue so the bill 414 might move forward in the future in a bipartisan basis. possible to remove barriers and increase competition for 415 416 small-scale operators in the LNG market while still following 417 standard environmental regulations. 418 I thank you and I yield back my time. 419 Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair 420 recognizes Mr. Walberg. 421 Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A lot has changed 422 in cyber and in energy since Mr. Latta was born on this day, many 423 years ago. And I am glad to see you. 424 Mr. Upton. At least his time has not expired yet. 425 Mr. Walberg. I was going to say that, Mr. Chairman. 426 glad to see this committee is taking a hard look at cybersecurity 427 at DOE. My colleague, Mr. Rush, and I introduced H.R. 5174, the 428 Energy Emergency Leadership Act. This is a bipartisan and 429 practical amendment to DOE's core statute to elevate DOE's energy 430 security emergency functions to a level and agency leadership that 431 is reflective of its importance across the agency, the government, 432 and the nation. 433 DOE is creating a new Office of Cybersecurity, Energy 434 Security, and Emergency Response which the Secretary plans to 435 assign to an assistant secretary. Our bill complements this

436	effort while recognizing that because this energy emergency
437	mission will remain vital to the nation for years to come, it
438	should be established in the Department of Energy Organization
439	Act so we can have continuity of leadership through future
440	administrations with the appropriate level of accountability. I
441	urge its support and thanks to the chairman for bringing it up.
442	I yield back.
443	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
444	wishing to give an opening statement? The gentleman from Texas,
445	Mr. Olson.
446	Mr. Olson. Very briefly, for the record, Maria Latta works
447	at my alma mater, Rice University. She just sent me a text message
448	to tell the committee, her dad, Bob, turned 62 years old today.
449	That is 3 score and 2 years, for the record. I yield back.
450	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back and the chair would
451	now call up H.R. 5174 and ask the Clerk to report.
452	[The bill follows:]
453	
454	**************************************

455	The Clerk. H.R. 5174 to amend the Department of Energy
456	Organization Act with respect to functions assigned to assistant
457	secretaries and for other purposes.
458	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill
459	is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any
460	point. So ordered. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the
461	bill? Seeing none, are there any other amendments to the bill?
462	Seeing none, the question now occurs in forwarding H.R. 5174
463	to the full committee. All those in favor will say aye.
464	Those opposed, say no?
465	The ayes have it and the bill is agreed to.
466	The chair now will call up H.R. 5175 and ask the Clerk to
467	report.
468	[The bill follows:]
469	
470	**************************************

471	The Clerk. H.R. 5175 to require the Secretary of Energy to
472	carry out a program relating to physical security and
473	cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities.
474	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill
475	is again dispensed with. The bill be open for amendment at any
476	point. So ordered. And the chair will recognize himself to
477	offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute and the Clerk
478	will report the amendment.
479	[The amendment offered by Mr. Upton follows:]
480	
481	**************************************

482	The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R.
483	5175 offered by Mr. Upton.
484	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the reading of the amendment
485	is dispensed with and the chair is recognized for 5 minutes in
486	support of his amendment.
487	This amendment clarifies that the policies and procedures
488	to coordinate federal agencies, states, and the energy sector
489	includes councils or other entities engaging and sharing analysis
490	or sector coordinating. The amendment also clarifies that the
491	Secretary of Energy shall provide technical tools to help the
492	energy sector evaluate, prioritize, and improve physical security
493	and cybersecurity.
494	Are there any bipartisan amendments to this amendment in the
495	nature of a substitute?
496	Seeing none, are there any amendments?
497	Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote
498	occurs on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.
499	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
500	Those opposed say no.
501	The amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.
502	The question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 5175, as amended,
503	to the full committee.
504	All those in favor will say aye.
505	All those opposed say no.

506	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it and the bill
507	is agreed to.
508	The chair now calls up H.R. 5239 and ask the Clerk to report.
509	[The bill follows:]
510	
511	**************************************

512	The Clerk. H.R. 5239, to require the Secretary of Energy
513	to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to identify and
514	promote cybersecure products intended for the use in the
515	bulk-power system and for other purposes.
516	Mr. Upton. Without objection the first reading of the bill
517	is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any
518	point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?
519	The gentleman from Ohio.
520	Mr. Latta. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature
521	of a substitute.
522	[The amendment offered by Mr. Latta follows:]
523	
524	**************************************

525 The Clerk will report that amendment. Mr. Upton. 526 The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 527 5239 offered by Mr. Latta. Without objection, the reading of the amendment 528 Mr. Upton. is dispensed with and Mr. Latta is recognized for 5 minutes in 529 530 support of the amendment. 531 Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Latta. amendment in the nature of a substitute, H.R. 5239, the Cyber Sense 532 533 Act makes several changes to clarify the scope of the program under 534 the proposed language. The amendment focuses the intent of the program on testing 535 536 the cybersecurity of products and technologies for the use in 537 bulk-power systems. The amendment also ensures that 538 technologies are included in the testing and not only products. 539 These changes reflect technical assistance that can be received 540 from the Department of Energy. The Cyber Sense program 541 complements and builds upon the DOE program currently under 542 development related to cybersecurity testing. And I would move 543 the amendment in for acceptance. 544 The gentleman yields back. Are there any 545 bipartisan amendments to the amendment in the nature of a 546 substitute? 547 Seeing none, are there any amendments? Seeing none. Τf 548 there is no further discussion, a vote occurs on the amendment

549	in the nature of a substitute. All those in favor will say aye.
550	Those opposed, say no.
551	The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.
552	The question now occurs on H.R. 5239, as amended, to the full
553	committee. All those in favor will say aye.
554	Those opposed say no.
555	The ayes appear to have it and the bill is agreed to.
556	The chair now calls up H.R. 5240 and asks the Clerk to report.
557	[The bill follows:]
558	
559	**************************************

560	The Clerk. H.R. 5240 to provide for certain programs and
561	developments in the Department of Energy concerning the
562	cybersecurity and vulnerabilities of and physical threats to the
563	electric grid and for other purposes.
564	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill
565	is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any
566	point. So ordered.
567	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are there
568	any amendments to the bill? The question now occurs on forwarding
569	H.R. 5240 to the full committee.
570	All those in favor will say aye.
571	Those opposed say no.
572	The ayes have it and the bill is agreed to.
573	The chair calls up H.R. 4606 and ask the Clerk to report.
574	[The bill follows:]
575	
576	**************************************

The Clerk. H.R. 4606 to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay.

Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any point. So ordered. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Any amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question now occurs -- the gentleman from New Jersey strikes the last word. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. As I noted, Mr. Chairman, in my opening, this bill appears to be an attempt to codify the Trump administration's proposed rule to expedite the approval of small scale natural gas exports and that rule would deem certain lower volume exports to be non-FTA countries in the public interest, so long as DOE's approval of the application does not require an environmental review under NEPA. I have a lot of concerns about the Trump rule, but it is a model of restraint compared to this legislation which would keep DOE's volume limit, but completely jettison the requirement that applications qualify for a categorical exclusion from NEPA.

The bill also fails to prevent applicants from using this new process to evade the public interest determinations required for large-scale exports by segmenting a large volume

gas export into a series of smaller proposals.

And I said earlier, this bill is essentially a legislative earmark. Only one project currently meets the capacity requirements of the administration=s small scale LNG rule, but at the same time does not qualify for a categorical exclusion and that is a project being developed by Eagle LNG Partners in Jacksonville, Florida.

Unless you happen to be an investor in that project, there appears to be no useful purpose to this legislation except to make the Trump administration's policy look enlightened by comparison and this is legislating at its worse. I even compare it to a private bill. And I would urge my colleagues to vote against the bill for all these reasons.

Mr. Green. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Pallone. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Green. I thank my colleague and ranking member for yielding. Our office has looked at the DOE and over the years, some of you may remember, I wasn't a fan of the DOE in our effort to export LNG, but DOE's language is much better than in the bill. And it also concerns me that this one exclusion may only impact one company and I just ask the majority if you would work with us to see how we can go from what the DOE language is instead of the language that is in this bill before we get the markup. I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. Pallone. I yield, I guess I still have time, to the gentlewoman from Florida?

Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Mr. Pallone, and I believe you are correct. This bill also is not needed. As far as I have heard, there is no backlog right now for permitting of these type of projects. And it isn't appropriate to carve out some special dispensation to a single company per the legislative process.

According to the Congressional Research Service, this is the only project that does not merit a categorical exclusion, but would still meet the capacity requirements of the small scale LNG rule. And they say explicitly would be the only current project to benefit from this new expedited process.

And I would also just a word of caution. If you believed in the importance of liquefied natural gas as part of our energy mix and being able to support it, you don't want to undermine safety standards and environmental standards because then something is going to happen. There is going to be a backlash with the greater regulation. It is important to stick with the current process, allow people to have an opportunity to comment, allow the public to have notice, allow for a public interest determination.

There is also another problem here. This is kind of masquerading under the term small, but actually there is no limit on the number of small-scale applications an entity could have

and an applicant could skirt requirements for larger exports by breaking a proposal into smaller pieces.

There is also a concern we are hearing from manufacturers that this could lead to higher domestic natural gas crises and adversely affect manufacturing operations and consumers. So for that reason, I agree with Mr. Green. There might be an opportunity to work on something here, but Mr. Pallone is, in the end, very correct. It is inappropriate to have a bill for a single project. I will yield back my time.

Mr. Pallone. Just reclaiming my time in the few seconds remaining, it is just sort of totally hypocritical in my opinion to deem something in the public interest that has avoided all these things. In other words, the whole process is to have some kind of review before you say that this project is in the public interest and this is just being completely nullified, the way this bill sets it up. It just says okay, well, this is clearly in the public interest without having any of these reviews. So I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair recognizes Mr. Johnson from Ohio.

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

Again, this is about realizing our full economic potential on small scale LNG technology. It is about what can be accomplished.

There is interest and potential in the Caribbean and Central

America for American LNG, although not in the large quantities that the current large scale domestics exporting facilities were built to address. Creating regulatory certainty around small-scale exports can help encourage the industries involved in small-scale technology to move forward with investments and new opportunities.

This is especially crucial when you consider that currently in the Caribbean exporters can only freely ship to the Dominican Republic. Small scale American LNG can provide the Caribbean and Central America with a stable source of energy as many are reliant on Venezuelan fuel oil which has been used to gain influence in the region. As that fuel is displaced, American LNG will help reduce emissions throughout the region and that is a fact that I think is lost on those who say this bill would gut NEPA.

Additionally, renewables can become possible when you have access to American natural gas. This should not be a partisan issue. Former Vice President Biden was a proponent of helping the Caribbean use more clean energy including natural gas.

Recognizing the need for U.S. engagement, the former administration formed the Caribbean Energy Security Initiative.

Additionally, U.S. LNG exports to the Caribbean were a recommendation of the first quadrennial energy review undertaken by the Obama administration. Neither side of the aisle can deny that American small scale LNG provides geopolitical, economic,

and environmental benefits.

I also think it is important for my colleagues to remember that the Natural Gas Act does not specify an amount threshold for requiring a public interest determination. So projects, whether exporting small or larger amounts natural gas, undergo the same process.

In this day and age when the U.S. has become the world's leading producer of oil and natural gas, and we are projected to become a net energy exporter in just a few short years, I don't think that makes sense. Natural gas production is at an all-time high and reserves are so large that they are predicted to meet domestic demand for almost a century. And we have already begun to see the enormous benefits of LNG exports at home and abroad. I think it is about time that we better define the Natural Gas Act's involvement in LNG exports within this age of abundance, especially as it relates to small scale LNG.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill and I yield back.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Let me go to Mr. Rush and then Mr. Barton to strike the last word.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you. I am not able to support H.R. 4606. The bill would amend section 3 of the Natural Gas Act to consider application for exports of small-scale volume of natural gas consistent of 0.14 billion cubic feet per

721 day or less to be in the public interest. 722 At first glance, Mr. Chairman, this legislation appears to 723 be an attempt to codify DOE's small scale LNG rule. However, this 724 bill does not include the requirements that applications must 725 quantify for categorical exclusion from NEPA. This bill, Mr. 726 Chairman, will be nothing. It would end run NEPA and allow for 727 future projects to do the same. 728 Mr. Chairman, this is an extraordinary example of proverbial 729 and perpetual carve-out which undercuts and undermines NEPA. 730 Mr. Chairman, according to the CIS, there is really only one 731 project that would meet the requirements underlining H.R. 4606, 732 the Eagle LNG Partners, Jacksonville LLC. 733 Mr. Chairman, this seems to me, private legislation and a carve-out from NEPA, and therefore, I am absolutely opposed to 734 735 this bill. Unless someone else wants to use my time, then I yield 736 back. 737 Mr. Barton. Mr. Chairman? 738 The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Barton, is Mr. Upton. 739 recognized to strike the last word. 740 Mr. Barton. I appreciate that. I want to ask some 741 questions of the counsel. I am not a co-sponsor of this bill. 742 I am generally aware of it, but I don't really have a dog in the 743 It seems that the minority concern is that it would affect 744 only one company. Is that true?

745	Counsel. The legislation doesn't name any one company
746	specifically. It may be true that there is only one company with
747	an application before DOE at this moment, but it is staff's
748	impression that this legislation is forward looking and that it
749	could potentially encourage other companies and other
750	applications.
751	Mr. Barton. So there may be only one applicant, but there
752	is no prohibition against other applicants if they wanted to
753	comply with this .14 billion cubic feet per day limitation, is
754	that correct?
755	Counsel. That is correct.
756	Mr. Barton. Okay, does the counsel happen to know what an
757	average natural gas well produces in a day?
758	Counsel. Good question. I don't have that number in front
759	of me, but what I do have
760	Mr. Barton. I will ask Mr. Flores. He is an expert. Mr.
761	Cramer may be. Mr. Green may be.
762	I am told an average natural gas well in South Texas is about
763	10 million cubic feet a day. Is that correct?
764	Counsel. What I do have is CIA says that on average in 2018
765	we are expected to produce 81.1 billion.
766	Mr. Barton. Billion, but that is generic. That is for the
767	whole country. I am just trying to get how much one average
768	natural gas well, and I should know. I think it is

10 million cubic feet a day is a good number.

Mr. Flores. Well, it varies by basin and it also varies by the age of the well. So I don't know that I can give you a number at this point in time.

Mr. Barton. Well, if it is 10 million cubic feet a day, that would be 14 gas wells. That is not a lot. This is obviously small and if somebody wants to put the capital in to building, since it is exporting of LNG -- it says natural gas, but to export it, you have got to condense it. You have got to liquefy it. You have got to cool it. So you are going to put quite a bit of money in for not a lot of natural gas to be exported. And if somebody wants to do that, well, I understand my minority friends= concern about helping one company. I don't really see that that should be a limitation because if collectively the subcommittee wanted to create a natural gas export company and apply for this, we would be able to do so, because there is no prohibition.

So I think we ought to pass the bill and then work with the minority to clarify language in the full committee.

Mr. Upton. If the gentleman will yield, and the clock isn't right, so I just wanted you to know. But if the gentleman will yield, I am hearing a couple of concerns from all sides. I am willing to listen to a couple of ideas. And one of the things that particularly a number of us saw when we went down to the Caribbean to look at the hurricane damage and they still don't

793	have electricity in good parts of it, they don't have they are
794	not generating electricity from natural gas. They are using
795	other means that are more expensive, more harmful to the
796	environment, and maybe there are some things that we can do to
797	our friends and neighbors down there. So let's it is a little
798	while before we get to full committee, there are a couple ideas
799	that I think we can bounce back and forth between the two of us
800	and I am willing to listen.
801	Mr. Barton. If I can reclaim my time briefly, I will say
802	this.
803	Mr. Upton. The gentleman from Texas has the time.
804	Mr. Barton. I will say this. In some of these Caribbean
805	nations, their primary fuel for generating electricity is fuel
806	oil. Fuel oil is orders of magnitude, like 10 to 15 to 20 times
807	more expensive than natural gas.
808	Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
809	Mr. Barton. If I have time.
810	Mr. Upton. You do.
811	Mr. Barton. I will yield to Mr. Green.
812	Mr. Green. I agree with my colleague from Texas. Fuel oil,
813	of course, that is where New England a lot of their electricity
814	generated from fuel oil because we can't get a pipeline up there.
815	But
816	Mr. Barton. That is a bill in itself.
	1

817 We will fight that battle and I will let Joe take Mr. Green. 818 care of that. But there is a need in the Caribbean. In fact, 819 with Puerto Rico, to rebuild their grid and to get them on to 820 something that is much less expensive and natural gas would be 821 the one. But my concern is the Department of Energy and like I 822 said over the years, I complained about their slowness in getting 823 export facilities. But they actually have some rules that are 824 addressing this. I don't know why we would put in a statute until 825 we at least see how those rules are working. That is all I want 826 I want to make sure this -- there is an environmental to do. 827 process and I don't want to have John Dingell walk into this room 828 and say we messed with the NEPA process. 829 Mr. Barton. I think John Dingell would agree with Mr. 830 Johnson that it is always good for Congress to tell the Executive 831 Branch what it needs to --832 Mr. Green. I don't have any problem with that. 833 Dingell be for what Mr. Johnson is --834 Will the gentleman yield? Mr. Rush. 835 I am loving this. So I would be happy to yield Mr. Barton. 836 to Mr. Rush. 837 I want the gentleman and others to understand that Mr. Rush. one of my concerns is the future. And I am feeling that if we 838 839 pass this legislation, then you will have what is to prevent a 840 large project from subdividing to become a smaller project and

841 still end run or subvert NEPA? And so it is not just this project 842 which I don't see the reason or the rationale of the project 843 especially in light of when the gentleman --844 Mr. Barton. If I can reclaim my time. I feel very 845 comfortable between now and the full committee with Mr. Walden 846 and Mr. Upton, if you have got a NEPA concern and Mr. Johnson, 847 the sponsor of the bill, that is a whole different kettle of fish, 848 but we can address that. I still think it is a good bill to pass 849 in subcommittee. 850 Will the gentleman yield one more time? Mr. Pallone. 851 Mr. Barton. Sure. 852 The problem that I have is that this came up Mr. Pallone. 853 the last minute. It was added to a consensus agenda. We had four 854 I think what you should do is pull it and let's have an 855 opportunity to see if there is something we can work out. 856 I mean at this point we can't support this. We would have 857 So if you think you want to send it up there and we 858 are going to vote no, and you try to work on it between now and 859 then, but I don't even know why we are moving it all. I mean the 860 bottom line is it just came up the last minute and we haven't had 861 a chance to really confer with you. Why don't you just pull it 862 and we will --863 Well, the bill was introduced on December 11th. 864 Mr. Pallone. But it wasn't put on the agenda though until

865	the last minute at the time of notice. We weren't notified you
866	were going to put it on.
867	Mr. Upton. If I just might correct the gentleman. I think
868	we had both the legislative we had a couple of different
869	hearings on this. We pulled the larger one off. This is the
870	smaller one and I am willing to entertain some discussions between
871	now and when the full committee markup
872	Mr. Pallone. That is fine, but I am just saying we can't
873	support the bill as currently
874	Mr. Upton. I understand. I understand. But I am just
875	telling the gentleman, we are willing to listen to a couple
876	different ideas that might improve it and may get some of your
877	members on your side to be for it.
878	Mr. Barton. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
879	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Are there
880	additional members wishing to speak? If not, the question occurs
881	on forwarding this bill, H.R. 4606 to the full committee. All
882	those in favor will say aye.
883	Mr. Rush. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman.
884	Mr. Upton. A roll call is requested. the Clerk will call
885	the roll.
886	The Clerk. Mr. Olson?
887	Mr. Olson. Aye.
888	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes aye.

889	Mr. Barton.
890	Mr. Barton. Aye.
891	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
892	Mr. Shimkus.
893	Mr. Shimkus. Aye.
894	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
895	Mr. Latta.
896	Mr. Latta. Aye.
897	The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.
898	Mr. Harper.
899	Mr. Harper. Aye.
900	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes aye.
901	Mr. McKinley.
902	Mr. McKinley. Aye.
903	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes aye.
904	Mr. Kinzinger.
905	Mr. Kinzinger. Aye.
906	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger votes aye.
907	Mr. Griffith.
908	Mr. Griffith. Aye.
909	The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
910	Mr. Johnson.
911	Mr. Johnson. Aye.
912	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
	1

913	Mr. Long.
914	Mr. Long. Aye.
915	The Clerk. Mr. Long votes aye.
916	Mr. Bucshon.
917	Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
918	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
919	Mr. Flores.
920	Mr. Flores. Aye.
921	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes aye.
922	Mr. Mullin.
923	Mr. Mullin. Aye.
924	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.
925	Mr. Hudson.
926	Mr. Hudson. Aye.
927	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.
928	Mr. Cramer.
929	Mr. Cramer. Aye.
930	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes aye.
931	Mr. Walberg.
932	Mr. Walberg. Aye.
933	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
934	Mr. Duncan.
935	Mr. Duncan. Aye.
936	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes aye.

937	Mr. Walden.
938	Mr. Walden. Aye.
939	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes aye.
940	Mr. Rush.
941	Mr. Rush. No.
942	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes no.
943	Mr. McNerney.
944	Mr. McNerney. No.
945	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes no.
946	Mr. Peters.
947	Mr. Peters. No.
948	The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
949	Mr. Green.
950	Mr. Green. No.
951	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes no.
952	Mr. Doyle.
953	Mr. Doyle. No.
954	The Clerk. Mr. Doyle votes no.
955	Ms. Castor.
956	Ms. Castor. No.
957	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.
958	Mr. Sarbanes.
959	Mr. Sarbanes. No.
960	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.

961	Mr. Welch.
962	[No response.]
963	Mr. Tonko.
964	Mr. Tonko. No.
965	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.
966	Mr. Loebsack.
967	Mr. Loebsack. No.
968	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes no.
969	Mr. Schrader.
970	Mr. Schrader. No.
971	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes no.
972	Mr. Kennedy.
973	Mr. Kennedy. No.
974	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes no.
975	Mr. Butterfield.
976	Mr. Butterfield. No.
977	The Clerk. Mr. Butterfield votes no.
978	Mr. Pallone.
979	Mr. Pallone. No.
980	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes no.
981	Chairman Upton.
982	Mr. Upton. Votes aye.
983	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes aye.
984	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to vote? Mr. Welch?

985	Mr. Welch. No.
986	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes no.
987	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to cast a vote. Seeing
988	none, the Clerk will report the tally.
989	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 14 nos and
990	19 ayes.
991	Mr. Upton. Nineteen ayes, 14 nos. The bill is passed and
992	without objection the staff is authorized to make technical and
993	conforming changes to the legislation approved by the
994	subcommittee today. So ordered.
995	Without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.
996	Thank you.
997	[Whereupon, at 10:53 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]