1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS WALTER
3	HIF177030
4	
5	
6	THE SHIFTING GEOPOLITICS OF OIL AND GAS
7	TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 2018
8	House of Representatives
9	Subcommittee on Energy
10	Committee on Energy and Commerce
11	Washington, D.C.
12	
13	
14	
15	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:00 p.m., in Room
16	2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman of
17	the subcommittee] presiding.
18	Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
19	Shimkus, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith, Johnson,
20	Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Walberg, Duncan, Walden (ex
21	officio), McNerney, Peters, Green, Doyle, Welch, Tonko, Kennedy,
22	Butterfield, and Pallone (ex officio).
23	Staff present: Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director;
24	Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel;
25	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;
Bijan Koohmaraie, Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer
Protection; Mary Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment;
Sarah Matthews, Press Secretary; Drew McDowell, Executive
Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy; Mark
Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy;
Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Austin
Stonebraker, Press Assistant; Madeline Vey, Policy Coordinator,
Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Hamlin Wade, Special
Advisor, External Affairs; Caitlin Haberman, Minority
Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor
and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall,
Minority Policy Coordinator; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy
Analyst; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy
Advisor; and Catherine Zander, Minority Environment Fellow.

43 Good afternoon. Sorry we are a little delayed Mr. Upton. 44 in starting but we had three votes on the House floor and they 45 And so we will get started. are just finishing up. 46 So, good afternoon, and, certainly, welcome to this Energy 47 Subcommittee hearing on "The Shifting Geopolitics of Oil and Gas." 48 So this hearing is especially timely because here in D.C., 49 right now, energy ministers and CEOs from around the world are 50 gathering for the 27th World Gas Conference to examine important 51 opportunities in energy trends happening across the globe. And 52 while it's an international conference for sure, the U.S.'s role as a world leader in energy is sure to be the focus. 53 54 So, before we arrived at this current era of energy abundance, some of you may remember that as little as a decade 55 56 ago America's energy landscape was in a lot different state than 57 it is today. In 2005, American domestic oil and gas production was 58 declining and the country reached a point of peak reliance on 59 60 foreign sources of energy, and at that time we were importing eight times more energy than we were exporting and we were becoming 61 62 increasingly dependent on OPEC nations for our energy needs. 63 It was right around that time that this important technological breakthrough pioneered by American companies --64 namely, horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing --65 66 dramatically altered our energy outlook. 67 These technological breakthroughs led to a surge in domestic oil and gas production, decreasing U.S. reliance on energy imports.

As for today, and we will see that this trend has not slowed down -- in fact, energy -- EIA projects that by 2022, the U.S. will become a net energy exporter for the first time in over half a century.

It should be noted that America's emergence as a major energy supplier to the world is thanks, in part, to Congress' lifting the 40-year-old crude oil export ban in 2015, and I would note, that was bipartisan. President Obama signed it into law.

Removing the ban has enabled our companies to take advantage of global energy markets and has resulted in more American jobs for sure, a stronger economy for sure, lower emissions, indeed, and it's helping to reduce our trade deficit.

The national security and energy security benefits provided by the shale energy revolution cannot be overstated. Every day, we are less dependent on foreign nations and cartels, such as OPEC, to meet our domestic energy needs.

Instead, we are now employing American workers and American technologies to harness our own standard and abundant domestic resources in a way that is growing the economy, protecting the environment, and improving our energy security.

So today we are holding this hearing to take a closer look at how the U.S.'s growing role as a global energy leader is benefitting consumers and enhancing the nation's standing on the

geopolitical world stage.

To provide insight on these topics, we have a great panel of four witnesses with extensive experience working in and around the U.S. oil and gas industry.

As part of today's panel we have Dr. Daniel Yergin, a Pulitzer Prize-winning author and a world-renowned energy expert who many of us say literally wrote the book.

Dr. Yergin is joined by Harold Hamm, the CEO of Continental Resources, which is a highly successful oil exploration and production company that he himself founded, and he had an instrumental role in making sure that we lifted that crude oil ban.

We also have Dennis Arriola, the chief strategy officer for Sempra, a Fortune 500 energy services company that serves 40 million customers -- consumers around the world.

And rounding up the lineup, we have got Dr. Kevin Kennedy, a deputy director at the World Resources Institute, a global research organization that spans more than 50 countries and focuses on the nexus of environment economic opportunity and human wellbeing.

So I want to thank all of you for joining us, for twiddling your thumbs for 30 minutes while we cast some mighty important votes on the House floor, and I know yield to the acting raking member of the subcommittee, Mr. McNerney, our friend from California, taking Bobby Rush's place this afternoon, who's

122 Mr. McNerney. Getting married Saturday. 123 Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding to me. 124 to thank the panelists, and I think you're all interesting and 125 I am looking forward to hearing what you have to say and I hope 126 we get very diverse set of opinions about the issues here. 127 It's important to have this conversation with industry 128 leaders and with policy leaders and with people that understand 129 the business. We have world gas conference nearby and this is topical, but 130 131 the topic that's listed here -- the shifting geopolitics of oil and gas -- is a little too narrow. 132 133 We should be including other topics like renewables, 134 storage, and other resources that are impacting our energy 135 markets. LNG and crude oil exports have changed in the last 136 decade. When I first got elected in 2007, we were worried about our 137 138 dependence on foreign oil. That's changed. That's possibly a 139 good thing. But we continue to need a very diverse -- we continue to need a very diverse energy mix. It won't help us, I don't 140 think, to depend -- become overly dependent on oil and/or gas. 141 142 We need political compromise to get there. If one side or the other dominates, I think we are going to go down a path that's 143 unsustainable. So we need political compromise on this and all 144

the other issues including tax reform.

Renewables -- you know, the interesting things is that the

145

147 energy market is really shifting to electricity now. We have 148 electric vehicles growing, especially in California but in other 149 states as well. 150 So we are going to see more and more and dependence on 151 electricity as a product. It's not necessarily a resource a but 152 So we need to be -- we need to have policies that's as a product. 153 going to support that shift. 154 We have energy storage, another thing that's going to be very important in terms of shifting where we get our energy from. 155 Concerning the Paris agreement, the United States was a 156 leader in this agreement. We are still in the -- we are still 157 158 in terms of cities and states declaring that they are going to 159 continue to abide by the terms of the Paris Climate Accord. 160 think that's very inspiring to me. 161 And I want to say to the witnesses, Dr. Yergin, your 162 scholarship has advanced the field of energy. I really 163 appreciate what you've been able to accomplish in terms of 164 providing the history. And one of the things that strikes me about your scholarship 165 is that we see a cyclical market. The oil market goes in very 166 167 big cycles about every 10 or 15 years, and right now we are on 168 a low energy cost part of that cycle. But I think that's probably going to change in a another five 169 years, based on history -- nothing more. 170

Mr. Kennedy, World Resources Institute climate initiative

172 is a the gold standard for providing advice. So thank you for 173 coming today. 174 Mr. Arriola, Sempra holds utilities in my home state and has 175 a diverse generation of energy assets here and abroad. I hope 176 it stays that way. 177 And Mr. Hamm, you have been a leader and I appreciate what 178 horizontal drilling has done to the energy markets in this 179 country. We need to keep an eye on that to make sure that it 180 doesn't cause problems in our states. We know that there is problems with earthquakes. 181 that there is potential problems with groundwater contamination 182 183 So it's important to keep an eye on that. and so on. 184 At any rate, I am going to yield if any Democrats want to 185 take a minute or two, and with that I yield back to the chair. 186 The gentleman yields back. Mr. Upton. The chair 187 recognizes the chair of the full committee, Mr. Walden, for an 188 opening statement. 189 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman. Thank you for being here today and sharing 190 panelists, welcome. 191 with us on these issues that are so important. We have an 192 excellent lineup of witnesses, Mr. Chairman, and we are going to 193 learn a lot. 194 This is, of course, a big week in Washington, D.C. 195 when America hosts the World Gas Conference. They call it the 196 Olympics of natural gas, and indeed, it is.

197 It brings together hundreds -- actually, thousands of 198 participants in energy ministers and CEOs from global energy 199 companies to discuss strategic, commercial and technical issues 200 facing this really important American industry. 201 It's been 30 years. Ronald Reagan was president the last 202 time America hosted this and the energy picture was quite 203 different then than it is today. 204 So it's kind of interesting to reflect back on those times. 205 But today, the United States is the world's number-one producer 206 of petroleum and natural gas. Our markets are more open, 207 transparent, and competitive than they've ever been. 208 Prices for consumers are low and stable. There are always 209 ups and downs. But we have cut our imports by about 75 percent 210 since they peaked in 2005, and if this trend continues we will 211 be net energy exporters in just a few short years. 212 We got there by repealing the Jimmy Carter era supply and 213 price controls to encourage a free market for energy commodities. 214 We have taken steps to improve our regulatory policies --215 we know we have a lot more to do there -- and reform our outdated tax code to encourage domestic production. 216 217 Piece by piece, we have removed restrictions on energy trade 218 to allow American energy to compete in the global marketplace, 219 and Mr. Hamm's done a lot in that effort globally. 220 Most recently, as members on this committee will remember, 221 we repealed the 40-year-old ban on crude oil. Now, just two years 223 crude oil to countries around the world. 224 The shale revolution, now 10 years in the This is biq. 225 making, has had an enormously positive impact on the economy. 226 It's created hundreds of thousands of jobs, billions of dollars 227 in investment that wouldn't have happened were it not for our 228 energy abundance in the United States. 229 The jobs and investments are widespread. They are across 230 all sectors of the economy in all 50 states. It's also had a big 231 impact on our power sector and with the shift to abundant and cheap 232 natural gas we have seen a huge reduction in our carbon emissions 233 -- enormous. 234 In fact, the U.S. is leading the world in reducing carbon 235 emissions, and by a large margin. Since peaking in 2005, our carbon emissions have declined steadily and this trend looks 236 237 likely to continue. 238 This just goes to how you don't always a need a government 239 mandate to get it done if you believe in the free market system 240 and innovation that comes from it. 241 We can do a lot of clean up the environment and create great American jobs and develop American energy. So we are seeing these 242 243 benefits today, and as we emerge as the world-leading LNG exporter, our trading partners will share in this good fortune. 244 245 The outlook for American energy is bright, with plentiful 246 reserves, a highly-skilled workforce, pro-growth regulations.

later, we are exporting more than 12 million barrels per day of

247 Our energy production will continue to grow and, with this 248 growth, America will see even greater economic, geopolitical, and 249 environmental benefits along with additional opportunities to 250 help our American allies abroad who are in need of reliable and 251 affordable supplies of energy, not held hostage for their energy by less than friendly countries. 252 253 I'd like to thank the witnesses again for participating today 254 and we appreciate you sharing your experiences, your knowledge, 255 and your ideas with us about how we can continue to grow American jobs, develop American energy, and enjoy the economic and 256 environmental benefits that come from that. 257 258 [The prepared statement of Chairman Walden follows:] 259 \*\*INSERT 2\*\*\*\*\*\* 260

261 The Chairman. With that, I've got a minute and a half left. 262 If anybody on our side wants to use that I'd be happy to yield. 263 Mr. Barton, former chairman of the committee, the vice chair 264 of the full committee, I would yield such time as you may use. 265 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Barton. I, basically, just 266 want to welcome the panel. I know three of you personally and 267 the fourth one I am sure I'd love to know personally if I did. 268 So our committee, in the time I've been on it, starting back 269 when John Dingell was chairman, has led the Congress in energy legislation, and we have gone from where in the '70s and early 270 '80s we were trying to restrict the use of things like natural 271 272 gas and put price controls on various things and our natural 273 resources because we thought that we were entering an era of 274 scarcity to the point where we are now in an -- I won't say an 275 era of surplus but in an era where we are on the verge of being 276 the dominant energy producer in the world and, you know, I think 277 that's a good thing, and you gentlemen have helped lead that 278 effort. Of course, Mr. Yergin, he's probably the premier -- I won't 279 280 say statistician or historian but he's certainly one of the 281 leading experts in the world. So we are glad to have you 282 especially, sir. 283 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back my two seconds. 284 The Chairman. I yield back. 285 Mr. Upton. Time is expired. The chair would recognize the

286 ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone from New Jersey, 287 for an opening statement. 288 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After nearly two Mr. Pallone. 289 years of Republican control of all branches of government, my 290 Republican colleagues have little to show for their efforts, and the little they have accomplished is benefitting the wealthy to 291

the detriment of the middle class and the vulnerable.

Just think about it -- skyrocketing health care premiums and growing numbers of the uninsured, a widely unpopular Trump tax scam, trillions of dollars in new and mounting debt, and now a devastating Trump-inflicted policy that stripped thousands of children from their parents.

So faced with the failure of their policies, Republicans have started to retreat to their safe spaces, including proposing draconian cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security as part of their new budget and now, of course, today's old favorite -cheerleading for fossil fuels.

The latest version of this tired old story has Republicans going so far as to trying to legislatively blackmail states like New Jersey, that have stood up to the administration's oil above all agenda, by imposing sizeable fees on any state that refuses to rubber stamp President Trump's offshore drilling expansion policy.

Early this year, New Jersey governor Phil Murphy listened to our coastal communities and blocked offshore oil and gas

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

drilling in state waters.

The Jersey shore where I live is a priceless national treasure that is an engine for our tourism industry that generates \$38 billion a year and one of the largest recreational fishing industries in the nation.

That's all threatened by offshore drilling, which will destroy our coastal economy. We simply don't need to risk the health and vitality of our coastal communities for the sake of putting more fossil fuels into our energy mix.

We have seen this show before. First, rising gasoline costs or something else moves us toward reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. Then, in response, fossil fuel industry executives come to Congress to tell us that the only solution to our problems is to ramp up drilling and decrease restrictions on their industry in order to increase supply.

That's happening today, as reckless Republican policies have led to a significant jump in the price of gasoline since March. In fact, the price of gas has gone up nearly 25 percent since President Trump took office.

You'd think that would lead to an effort to support cleaner less gas-guzzling vehicles. But that logic is lost on President Trump and his ethically-challenged EPA administrator, Scott Pruitt, who have gone completely in the opposite direction.

They have moved aggressively against clean cars and a diverse 21st century energy policy. Instead, President Trump has worked

336 tirelessly to put in place a 1950s approach to energy that only 337 an oil company could love and can best be summed up by the words dig, drill anytime, anywhere, even if it's in our coastal 338 339 recreational waters. 340 Now, President Trump also made a foolish decision by announcing his intention to withdraw from the Paris Climate 341 342 That was an agreement we spent years negotiating with agreement. 343 the global community and was signed by, roughly, 200 countries. 344 By abandoning our friend and allies, we have ceded our 345 leadership on climate action and clean technology development and 346 deployment to China, and others. 347 We were the global leader, but now we don't even have a seat What does that mean? 348 at the table. That puts America last and 349 is, tragically, shortsighted. Republican "oil above all" policies have always centered on 350 one thing -- putting the profits of oil tycoons and fossil industry 351 352 donors first, and the current rerun of this cliched show should 353 have been cancelled long ago. But, obviously, it isn't. I don't know if anyone else would like my time. 354 355 will yield back, Mr. Chairman. 356 Mr. Upton. I'd like to say the gentleman's time has expired 357 but I'll be polite. 358 [Laughter.] 359 The gentleman yields back. 360 So we are ready for the testimony. I appreciate all of you sending up your testimony in advance. I was able to read it last night.

It will be made part of the record in its entirety and you'll each have five minutes to summarize that testimony and expound

And Dr. Yergin, you're first up.

how you might, and we will do questions.

365

366

367

368

Thank you. You got to hit that button to make sure that you're on.

369 STATEMENTS OF DR. DANIEL YERGIN, VICE CHAIRMAN, IHS MARKET; DENNIS 370 ARRIOLA, CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER, SEMPRA; DR. KEVIN KENNEDY, 371 DEPUTY DIRECTOR, U.S. CLIMATE INITIATIVE, WORLD RESOURCES 372 INSTITUTE; HAROLD HAMM, CEO, CONTINENTAL RESOURCES; 373 374 STATEMENT OF DANIEL YERGIN 375 Mr. Yergin. Mr. Chairman, acting ranking member, members 376 of the subcommittee, it's really an honor to be here and to have 377 the chance to talk about this just dramatic change that's happened 378 in the United States and what it means for our economy, for geopolitics, and the position of the United States in the world. 379 As the chairman pointed out and Mr. Walden pointed out, the 380 World Gas Conference is here. It's 12,000 people from around the 381 382 world who have come to Washington. 383 I have just come over from it. The theme of this conferences is fueling the future and now it's a very different future because 384 385 of the shale revolution in the United States, and that has been 386 one of the major themes. 387 This is, as was noted, the 10th anniversary, at least as we 388 see it at IHS Market, of what we have called the shale gale, which 389 was -- really changed the United States and the energy picture to have profound consequences, although I think the scale of the 390 391 consequences would have been foreseen. 392 What's changed since 2008? Well, back in 2008, we were going

to be the largest importer of LNG in the world. Now we are on

394 the road to be one of the largest exporters and, indeed, as noted, 395 the largest producer of natural gas in the world. 396 As many of you know, for four decades energy independence 397 was the cry but we always were going in the other direction. 398 question only seemed to be how high would our imports go. 399 But now in a decade, we have gone from importing on a net basis 60 percent of or oil to 16 percent. Huge change. 400 401 Everyone knows that trade is a very big issue, so it's 402 noteworthy to observe that over this decade the change in the U.S. 403 oil position, along with changes in prices, has reduced the 404 nation's annual trade deficit by \$300 billion. 405 U.S. oil production has more than doubled in the decade, and here's something striking. Next year, or maybe later this year, 406 407 the United States will become the world's largest oil producer, ahead of Saudi Arabia and Russia. 408 It's been a major stimulus to the U.S. economy, not just in 409 the oil and gas sector, but because across the entire economy 410 411 because of long supply chains, and I would say in many states that -- where shale is not permitted there are jobs that have been 412 created, we calculated 50,000 jobs in the state of New York because 413 414 of the shale revolution. Industries that were supposed to flee the United States 415 because of high energy costs are now here in the United States, 416

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

Also, this is having major geopolitical impacts that are

spending tens of billions of dollars.

417

419 constructive for the United States. I can see it as I travel 420 around the world how there is a whole new degree of influence that 421 the United States has because of this revolution. 422 The turnaround in gas is just striking. The eight-year 423 period of 2000-2007, total U.S. gas production grew by 1 percent. 424 Over the subsequent 10-year period it's grown by 40 percent, and 425 we believe that it will grow by another 60 percent over the next 426 20 years. 427 So where would we be without this? Without the shale 428 revolution, the United States would be importing large volumes 429 of oil and gas. Our trade balance would be dramatically 430 different. 431 Millions of jobs would not exist and the United States would 432 be less competitive. The domestic U.S. power markets and the 433 overall economy would look significantly different without the 434 shale revolution. 435 Similarly, the outlook would be different in terms of the 436 global economy and international relations both for countries that produce oil and gas and for countries that import them. 437 I just came from a meeting of APEC countries and the role 438 439 of the U.S. in terms of LNG is something that is now very important 440 to those Asian countries. 441 Certainly, without the shale gale we would be in a different position internationally. This has brought a new element of 442 443 influence and independence for the United States. It was so

444 evident this morning, and U.S. LNG exports are becoming a significant and positive factor in relations with many countries 445 446 and a key issue in discussions about trade. 447 So this new outlook for oil and natural gas has created new 448 possibilities for making progress towards national goals of 449 energy efficiency, cost efficiency, environmental protection, 450 global competitiveness, and energy security. 451 It is also contributing jobs and revenues to the economy at 452 the national, state, and local levels. In short, the shale gale 453 has put a powerful new wind at America's back. 454 Thank you. 455 [The prepared statement of Mr. Yergin follows:] 456 \*\*INSERT 3\*\*\*\*\*\* 457

458

Mr. Upton. Thank you. Mr. Arriola.

## STATEMENT OF DENNIS ARRIOLA

Mr. Arriola. Mr. Chairman -- Chairman Upton, Acting Ranking Member McNerney, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to testify regarding U.S. natural gas policy and how it affects our business.

My name is Dennis Arriola and I am the chief strategy officer for Sempra Energy and I also have responsibility for our external affairs in our South American operations.

Sempra, as you mentioned, is a Fortune 500 services company based in San Diego, California, and we have approximately 20,000 employees that serve more than 40,000 [sic] consumers around the world and we are the largest utility holding company with the largest U.S. customer base.

And our utilities include Southern California Gas Company, which is the largest natural gas distribution company in the United States, San Diego Gas and Electric, and Encore Electric Delivery Company in Texas.

And our energy infrastructure companies include our investments in Mexico that help import U.S. natural gas and petroleum products to that country and we have also have our Sempra LNG and Midstream business.

And as Dr. Yergin mentioned, the timing of this hearing couldn't be better as the World Gas Conference is here in our nation's capital, and with the global triennial next stopping in

the Republic of Korea and China, the conference this week in D.C. is the last time that the U.S. is going to have the opportunity to really help shape the discussion as the host country for years to come.

And I can tell you that the world truly is watching what's going on in Washington this week. The outlook for domestic and international natural gas markets has never been better because of two key developments, and one which Dr. Yergin mentioned — the shale energy boom — but also the opportunity to export U.S. liquefied natural gas, or LNG.

And we invest wisely and follow smart pro-market policies, there's little doubt that the U.S. will derive increased economic benefits, job growth, and even greater energy independence, and natural gas now serves as the leading fuel source for the industrial, commercial, and residential sectors of the U.S. economy.

And this increased consumption is providing for significant job growth, boosting the economy, and lowering air emissions, and natural gas is also ensuring greater energy security and prosperity globally as well.

Now, we own two and operate two LNG facilities and we are in the process of permitting a third. Our Cameron LNG is in Louisiana -- is under construction. We currently have 10,000 workers on site and when it's completed and starts operating in 2019, the facility is going to create approximately 130

well-paying jobs in an area that really will benefit from them.

We are also pursuing our FERC permit for an LNG export facility located near Port Arthur, Texas, and again, this is going to be employing over 3,100 construction and engineering jobs and, on average over the four- to five-year period of build out it's going to create more than 200 permanent well-paying jobs.

Both of these projects together could help reduce our overall trade deficit by, roughly, \$16 billion annually, and these and other export facilities are going to promote new pipelines and maintain natural gas production for many states that are represented here on the subcommittee, including Ohio,

Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana, and it's also going to help continue the current cost advantage that benefits U.S. consumers.

Now, we have the potential to strengthen alliances with developed and developing countries by providing a safe and reliable resource to those countries.

But we've got to be able to build the infrastructure in this country to do that, and the U.S. gas exports can also help our European and Asian allies reduce their energy dependence on Russia.

And if we are to benefit from this opportunity, we've got to take advantage of it and the time is now, and one of the things that we were looking for from this subcommittee is to, along with the administration, figure out how we can expedite in a smart

534 manner the permitting processes that are required here in this 535 country to have that infrastructure, to help export good clean 536 natural gas from the United States. 537 These delays jeopardize commercial agreements with our 538 international trading partners and you can be sure that the other 539 major LNG-exporting countries are doing everything possible to 540 enhance their competitive position, and bureaucratic delays are 541 not one of the challenges they have. 542 So I think we need to work together as a country to take 543 advantage of this window of opportunity to make sure that when 544 you enter into these contracts these are 20- to 30-year contracts. 545 If we, as an American business community, can't get in on time with these countries, we are going to get shut out and we 546 547 are not just shut out for a year -- we are shut out for decades, 548 and that means that the jobs that can be helping certain parts of our country, the economic progress won't come about. 549 550 And so what we need is to ensure that FERC maintains its 551 typical permit review schedule of no more than 18 to 24 months 552 so that we can get this going. 553 Thank you. 554 [The prepared statement of Mr. Arriola follows:] \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 4\*\*\*\*\*\* 555

Mr. Upton. Thank you. Dr. Kennedy.

## STATEMENT OF KEVIN KENNEDY

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Chairman Upton, Mr. McNerney, other members of the committee. I am very pleased to be joining you here today for this hearing.

My name is Kevin Kennedy and I am deputy director for the U.S. Climate Initiative at the World Resources Institute. WRI is a global research organization that turns big ideas into action at the intersection of the environment, economic opportunity, and human wellbeing.

As Mr. McNerney noted, as we look at the energy landscape in the United States today, it's important not just to focus on the oil and gas industry but to consider the broader context of changes that are happening across the country.

America has seen significant progress on the development and deployment of clean energy such as renewables, resulting in large part from the leadership of states, cities, and businesses, often acting with the support and cooperation of the federal government.

When President Trump announced last year his intent to withdraw from the international climate agreement, some feared that this progress might slow.

On the contrary, that announcement catalysed continued and expanded commitment from states, cities, and businesses across the country.

Within days, over 1,200 leaders joined together to say we

are still in and committed to support climate action, and as of this weekend, that declaration has been supported by over 2,800 leaders.

I have been a core member of the research team behind the America's Pledge Initiative, which was launched last July by former Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Governor Jerry Brown, to document the full range of climate and clean energy actions being taken across America.

Our report last November showed that leaders representing almost half the population and more than half of the U.S. economy have committed to bringing down their greenhouse gas emissions.

These leaders recognized that acting to support clean energy and address climate change can go hand in hand with economic growth and job creation.

While many of those signing declarations like we are still in are doing so for environmental reasons. Others are acting based primarily on the economic opportunities offered by being leaders in clean energy.

They recognize that major countries around the world are investing in renewables and other clean energy sources and the global markets are shifting fast, and they want to see their communities and the country lead rather than to follow.

This committee and Congress can be their partners in moving ahead on renewables, energy efficiency, and other clean energy sources. I want to share just a few of the stories today.

In 2017, large corporate buyers in the U.S. like Google, Kimberly-Clark, and General Motors, announced contracts for nearly 2.9 gigawatts of renewable energy -- an 80 percent increase from the previous year, and this year they've already announced deals for almost 2.5 gigawatts -- almost matching last year's total just six months in.

The Republican mayor of Georgetown, Texas, said one of the most important benefits of being 100 percent renewable is the potential for economic development. Many companies are looking to increase their green sources of power for both office and manufacturing facilities.

Mayor Ross added that the city's move to 100 percent renewables was chiefly a business decision based on cost and price stability.

Looking to energy efficiency, the private sector has, again, been a leader. Almost 200 U.S. manufacturers have committed to decreasing their energy intensity by 25 percent over 10 years as part of the Department of Energy's Better Plants program.

These companies have already saved -- already reported \$3.1 billion in reduced energy costs. We also see meaningful moves in the auto industry. Ford plans to nearly double its investment in electric vehicles in the next five years and GM is working towards an all-electric zero tailpipe emissions future with 20 new electric vehicle models to be available globally in the early 2020s.

632 The NEF projects that by 2040, 55 percent of new global car 633 sales will be electric. Those states that have put a price on 634 carbon have also seen both environmental and economic benefits. 635 The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, known as RGGI, 636 prices carbon dioxide emissions from the electric sector, serving 637 nine states from Maryland to Maine. RGGI states have 638 outperformed the rest of the country both environmentally and 639 economically. During its first five years, emissions decreased 35 percent 640 in RGGI states but only 12 percent elsewhere. At the same time, 641 642 RGGI state economies grew faster than the rest of the country. 643 These are just a few of the good news stories about state, local, and private sector movement towards renewables and other 644 645 forms of clean energy. 646 The degree of momentum behind this transformation and the resulting economic benefits to local communities across the 647 648 country would be enhanced by federal support for development and 649 deployment of clean energy resources like renewables and energy 650 efficiency. 651 As other countries invest in clean energy, it's time for this Congress and the administration to step up support for states, 652 cities, and businesses that are looking to seize the economic 653 opportunities presented by clean energy transformation. 654 655 Thank you for your time. 656 [The prepared statement of Mr. Kennedy follows:]

657

658

\*

Mr. Upton. Mr. Hamm, welcome.

## STATEMENT OF HAROLD HAMM

Mr. Hamm. Thank you, Chairman Upton, Acting Ranking Member McNerney, and other members of the committee.

My name is Harold Hamm. It's my honor to address you today on the miracle of American oil and gas and its global impact.

As chairman of the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance and CEO of the company that co-developed the first oil field ever drilled exclusively with horizontal and a company that is the largest leaseholder and most active driller and largest producer both in the Bakken play in North Dakota and the SCOOP/STACK and Springer plays of Oklahoma, I've been able to pioneer and participate in the American energy renaissance first hand.

I testified to the House Agricultural Committee on July 8th, 2015, about the American energy renaissance and, particularly, we was asking for lifting of the ban on exportation of crude oil, and it was granted. We got it signed into law. President Obama signed it into law and I appreciated that.

Of course, we have to remember back. It was on the omnibus bill -- it's a little bit hard not to sign -- and a two-year extension was given to wind and solar at that time and, of course, two years times 10. It was a very costly addition -- the cost renewals.

I said it then and I will say it again -- the American energy renaissance is the single-most defining aspect on this planet

today that will shape the next 50 years ahead of us.

In the past 10 years, the United States has undergone unprecedented transformation, as Daniel said, and thanks to the ingenuity of America's independent oil and gas natural producers — oil and natural gas producers we are transitioning from a consuming short supply nation to an energy long supplier dominating the world oil market today.

Our country has rapidly gone from fears of energy scarcity to understand that U.S. energy independence is well within our reach. I think that will happen late 2020. We are a little ahead of the IEA on that, and during this Trump administration we'll become not only energy dominant but we'll become energy sufficient and independent in the future.

And so we have had to rely on other countries to fuel our energy needs drastically in the past, primarily from the Middle East.

The instability of shifting alliances wreaked havoc on American foreign policy for decades, and that's been complicated by Russia and their involvement as well in the country's global affairs.

But the American energy renaissance is rapidly shaping those complicated dynamics to align with the U.S. to produce all the energy that it needs.

Our energy imports have dropped from over 30 percent of energy consumed in 2007 to less than 8 percent currently, and

710 because of these production gains, the U.S. no longer has to put 711 American lives in the Middle East particularly. 712 The ban on exports of crude oil was lifted in 2015 -- we talked 713 about that -- and we are now on pace to become a net energy exporter 714 and provide our allies with a reliable affordable supply of vital 715 commodities like oil, LNG, and other petroleum products, and we 716 can also impact the world with these clean fuels. 717 Rising U.S. oil production has have proven to be vital in meeting global demand as production capacity -- while 718 719 eliminating dramatic price hikes have long been a hallmark of 720 global markets. 721 Total petroleum exports are now averaging close to 7 million 722 barrels a day, roughly, 2 million of which is crude oil. 723 The commitment of the Trump administration to repealing 724 unnecessary and in many cases archaic and onerous regulations is 725 the right move for America. There are still a couple around the CAFÉ standards that was 726 727 approved back when everybody thought we was running out of oil. 728 Certainly, it is wreaking havoc with the -- on the highways today and claim an additional 10,000 lives per year due to the small 729 730 size imposed by CAFÉ standards on vehicles. 731

Also, the archaic SCC rules need to be changed that limit our production and booking just to five years. If we are to be energy dominant, we certainly need to recognize that.

And we've done it environmentally sound, no governmental

732

733

735	assistance or subsidies. It's all come from the independent
736	sector.
737	Thank you.
738	[The prepared statement of Mr. Hamm follows:]
739	
740	**************************************

741 Mr. Upton. Thank you all, and I -- you know, I remember 742 coming to Washington as a young staff -- I am still young -- and 743 I remember the gas lines. 744 I remember having a 1 at the end of my license plate which 745 allowed me to fill up, after an hour and a half, at a Shell station 746 around the corner her on Capitol Hill. 747 And, Mr. Arriola, I don't know how you did it but you got 748 one of the sharpest people in your organization in the woman behind 749 you, Maryam Brown. 750 She was one that worked hard with our Energy and Commerce staff to actually develop the strategy that, I got to tell you, 751 752 was bipartisan -- the North American Energy Independent Plan --753 and laid it out. 754 We had testimony from Dr. Yergin back then, who predicted that we could do this if you unshackle the industry, and I got 755 to tell you, nine years ago, the day that President Obama was sworn 756 757 in the gas price -- average gas price, and that was before Memorial 758 Day and before July 4th, was \$3.84 a gallon, and it hurt a lot of people, particularly the most vulnerable. 759 760 And as I recall, that summer gas prices got pretty close to 761 \$5.00 and even over -- in some areas like California even maybe 762 \$6.00 a gallon. 763 This last weekend, I was home in Michigan. I watched gas 764 prices at \$2.65. So forget inflation. I mean, it is so -- we

are so much better off, and the strategy that we laid out, which,

again, was bipartisan.

Mr. Hamm talked about it. President Obama signed it into law to lift the crude oil and there were still some, even from Texas, who voted against the omnibus, even though that was part of it, despite Mr. Barton's pleading, and he did a great job in lining up the support to get that done.

But where would we be today without this? And I guess the other quick question that I have for Mr. Yergin, you said in your testimony that we anticipate that U.S. production could grow by another 60 percent over the next 20 years.

You know, I talk to my farmers who use natural gas to dry their corn. You know, most of my constituents -- many of them, anyway -- have natural gas for heating and cooling and so those rates have gone down. They're not even a third of what they were 10, 15 years ago.

Where are we headed with this continued new production that in fact not only can we export and so help our balance of trade, but what is that going to do for the average family across the country?

Mr. Yergin. What it's meant is lower cost for electricity, lower cost for heating, and it's also, because of the impact on this economy, I mentioned in my written testimony we've added about \$120 billion of new investment directly in manufacturing, about maybe a same amount as ancillary.

So it's created a lot of jobs. It's really been beneficial

across the board.

Mr. Upton. And it's done a lot for the climate as well. I mean, we know that emissions -- CO2 emissions -- have dropped by 30 percent. I think half of that is just by the transformation to coal -- from coal, I should say.

Mr. Yergin. Well, I mean -- yes, if you look at it, our emissions today are back to the level of the early 1990s although our economy has almost doubled since that time and gas has been an important part of that.

Mr. Upton. Mr. Hamm, you indicated in your testimony that U.S. has the lowest gas and diesel prices in the developed world. What are the biggest drivers of reducing those prices and what can we do to continue to keep those prices low?

Mr. Hamm. A lot of it has to do with the product that's produced. Just like the Bakken -- you know, that's -- that oil has no bottoms to speak of, no asphalt.

Basically, a lot of middle distillates, which is gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and when that -- you know, prior to it coming into existence back in 2007, you saw diesel prices at \$4.00, \$4.50 a gallon, and that was because there wasn't much you could wring out of a barrel of bitumen coming in from Canada.

But with the addition of all this oil coming in in the Bakken, that price went to \$2.25 and it did it very quickly. And so as a result, we see both diesel and gasoline prices the cheapest that you have seen.

816 And so we have the lowest gasoline prices in the world that 817 we are enjoying and this is with some state taxes on it, and some 818 of them, like, California, get pretty high. 819 So in my remaining 15 seconds, if the oil price 820 stays about the same -- where it is today -- is that going to 821 continue to see the exploration and the drilling and the 822 production of domestic resources versus going too low and maybe 823 shutting those off? 824 You know, we have a great supply. You know, I 825 think we are all -- I am a geologist -- looking forward with natural 826 gas. 827 I think we've got a 100-year supply or more. You know, I think we can produce 10 million barrels a day of crude oil for 828 829 the next 85 years. You know, again this is an entirely new 830 reservoir to explore. 831 Basically, what we've done in the past is explored what 832 leaked off of these giant shale fields where the oil was generated. 833 And so all we could do is maybe that 15 percent that leaked off 834 into upper reservoir traps we could go after that. 835 Today, we can go into those resource beds like the Woodford 836 and the Bakken and produce the oil left in them. So there's about 85 percent available. 837 What can we get of that -- 20, 25, 30 838 percent? Sure. 839 Mr. Upton. My time has expired. Mr. McNerney. 840 Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Your time has more than expired.

Excellent presentations. I really appreciate all of your words. Dr. Yergin, the financial disclosure of climate effects for oil companies -- is that possible to make that happen? What would it -- how would it affect the economy?

How would it affect the companies and how can we get that information to shareholders if they're not going to be able to produce that information?

Mr. Yergin. I think a lot of that is being produced now.

Companies are preparing their financial disclosure reports, their sustainability reports.

The question is does it go in the financial reports, does it go in others, and I think there's a process going on with the climate-related financial disclosures to get the right framework for meaningful information that's meaningful for investors. So I think we have pointed to something that's in process and being developed.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Do you -- in my opening statement, I mentioned the cyclical nature of the oil business economically. Do you see that happening now or do you think because of the shale revolution that it's going to flatten out a little bit?

Mr. Yergin. No, I think -- I think you hit it on the nail.

It's a cyclical business. It's always been a cyclical business and if you look at the oil market today you see that we've gone

866 from that really big surplus that led to the collapse with a 867 tightening market and you have some very important geopolitical things that are happening. 868 869 One is the rapid decline and collapse in Venezuela in oil 870 production, which is something that we can feel the impact of in 871 the next several months. 872 Just to give you the numbers, Venezuela was 22 million barrels 873 three years ago. Today, it's 1.4. We think next year it'll be 874 at 800,000 and could be lower than that. 875 And the other thing that's, obviously, with the sanctions 876 coming on Iran, it's -- with a very different pacing by this 877 administration and the Obama administration, right now there's uncertainty about that. 878 879 So I think, you know, whenever they say cycles have been 880 abolished I tend to think no. Thank you. You know, I believe one of the 881 Mr. McNerney. 882 big drivers to the shale revolution was the way that ownership 883 of the minerals below the surface as handled in this country as 884 compared to other countries. Are other countries going to be able to carry on this -- pick 885 886 up the shale revolution or is that going to be continuing to be 887 driven in this country? Mr. Yergin. Well, it's in Canada, but the kind of early 888 889 thoughts that it was going to spread rapidly around the world has 890 not borne out, partly for geological reasons, partly for political

891 reasons, and partly for the reason you point to -- that the 892 resources under the grounds are owned by governments, not by the 893 farmers who work on them. 894 I would say the area now that there's the greatest optimism 895 about is what's called the Vaca Muerta, which means dead cow, which 896 is an area of Argentina and that's where the focus is. But so far, this is really a North American deal. 897 898 Mr. McNerney. How about geopolitical leverage of our oil 899 export and natural gas export versus what's happening as a result 900 of us pulling out of Paris and sort of repercussions of us pulling 901 back with regard to being a leader on climate change? 902 I think there are kind of two separate things. Mr. Yergin. 903 Obviously, Dr. Kennedy has described the latter. 904 But I am very struck when I go to a country like India to 905 see that, to them, it's very significant that there's this whole new dimension to their relationship with the United States that 906 907 we are exporting gas to them. 908 We are actually exporting oil to them and it gives a whole new strand to that relationship and a kind of dialogue that wasn't 909 there before, and I see that in many countries around the world. 910 And I think that the -- you know, I don't know where we are 911 912 on trade right now but, certainly, LNG exports to China were seen 913 as one factor that changed the trade balance between our two 914 countries.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Dr. Kennedy, could you give me

916 some indication of the job creation per kilowatt hour equivalent 917 of renewables versus oil and natural gas? 918 I don't have those numbers off the top of my Mr. Kennedy. 919 But I would be happy to sort of go back to the office and 920 gather some of that information and provide it to you, yes. 921 Mr. McNerney. Okay. 922 Mr. Arriola, I am concerned about Sempra's design of selling 923 off its renewables. Can you give me some clue where Sempra is 924 with regard to that process? 925 Mr. Arriola. I think what you're probably referring to, 926 Congressman, is a shareholder proposal that we received in the 927 last couple weeks from an investor group, and what I can tell is Sempra is totally dedicated and committed to continuing our focus 928 929 with renewables. 930 In fact, if you look at -- and you know our company, San Diego Gas and Electric, it's actually one of the leading companies that 931 932 procures renewable power on behalf of our customers. 933 In fact, last year over 45 percent of the power that we 934 procured was renewables and we are continuing to focus on what 935 we can do from the battery storage technology standpoint in 936 looking at electric vehicles. 937 So Sempra, at its core, is focused on sustainability and part 938 of that is renewable energy as well. 939 Mr. McNerney. Okay. Thank you. Yield back. 940 Mr. Olson. [Presiding.] The chair now calls upon the

941 gentleman from Texas, the vice chairman of the full committee, 942 Mr. Barton, for five minutes. 943 I thank the gentleman from Fort Bend County, Mr. Barton. 944 Texas, and I can't tell you how excited I am to have this hearing. 945 It's really exciting for me. 946 I've got all kinds of questions but I am going to -- since 947 I only have five minutes I am going to try to be as quick as 948 possible. 949 Mr. Yergin -- and this would be also for Mr. Hamm -- what's 950 -- with current technology and current resource base, what's the 951 upper limit for oil production per day in the United States as 952 compared to Saudi Arabia and Russia? 953 Well, as a famous wildcatter in Texas said about 954 around 1900, on Dr. Drill knows for sure. But I think now an 955 informed view, and I think we see it from even the Energy Information Administration and others, the U.S. today is a little 956 957 short of 11 million barrels a day. 958 It could be 14 or 15 million barrels a day. Russia is around Saudi is, like, 10.3. So we are moving into this 959 11 million. position very significant and, you know, you take the Permian in 960 961 Texas, which Mr. Hamm referred to. Eight years ago, it was 900,000 barrels a day. 962 963 We think another five years the Permian alone will be 5.4 million 964 barrels a day, which will make it larger than any country in OPEC 965 except for Saudi Arabia.

966 Mr. Barton. Mr. Hamm. 967 I don't have any change to that. Daniel is right 968 You know, this year, best guess that we are going to grow 969 about 900,000 barrels per day in the U.S. 970 So, you know, there's some infrastructure things out there 971 that, you know, will cap some of that -- that growth. 972 know, I don't see that number changing for a while. 973 Mr. Barton. Is there any other country in the world that 974 has a higher delta potential production increase than the United 975 States? 976 Well, I will say that --Mr. Yergin. 977 Mr. Barton. I hope the answer is no. 978 I don't think anywhere in Mr. Yergin. The answer is no. 979 the world has actually seen the kind of growth that we've seen 980 in the United States in the last five or six years. It just 981 doesn't happen anywhere else in the world. It's breathtaking. 982 Mr. Barton. What is China's potential oil and gas 983 production as a percent of its demand? Do they have the ability 984 to produce what they consume in oil and gas or will they -- will 985 they be a net importer of --986 No, they're going in just the opposite They are now importing 75 percent of their oil 987 direction we are. and I think IEA has just said next year they're going to be the 988 989 largest importer of natural gas, which has become a real 990 imperative for them.

991 So they're becoming more deponent and, you know, it's 992 striking to see that part of their portfolio now is from the United 993 States. 994 This next question is for Mr. Arriola, since 995 What's the 10-year outlook for LNG prices you're with Sempra. on the world market? 996 I would assume they're going to come down 997 as we ramp up our exports? 998 Mr. Arriola. No, I think -- Congressman, I think you're 999 I think what we are finding is that as demand externally 1000 continues to increase, there's more production going on here domestically and it's helping to actually keep prices relatively 1001 flat or actually continuing to push them down, and as we see 1002 additional advances in technology I think it's really good for 1003 1004 consumers long term. 1005 So what we are seeing in why countries on the outside are 1006 looking to buy U.S. natural gas is because of the stability of 1007 those prices. 1008 My assumption -- of course, I am not in the Mr. Barton. 1009 market like you are, but my assumption is that as we ramp up our 1010 expert terminal capability and capacity that those prices are 1011 going to come down, but they're going to level out, I hope, about 1012 halfway from where they were a couple years ago and where our 1013 domestic price is. 1014 So if we can get it \$7, \$8 in MCF equivalent, I think -- I 1015 hope it's somewhere in that range. Can U.S. exports be profitable in that price range?

Mr. Arriola. What we are seeing from the market is that the demand is there, and Mr. Hamm knows probably better than anyone that the U.S. production market is continuing to look for more natural gas and oil, which they wouldn't be doing it if it weren't profitable.

Mr. Barton. This is my last question and I am going to sort of pat myself on the back here. You know, I helped lead the fight, and a lot of members on the committee did, to repeal the ban on crude oil exports three or four years ago, and this committee also led the effort to make it possible to permit LNG terminals in a more timely fashion.

What's the geopolitical significance of those two congressional actions?

Mr. Yergin. I think the geopolitical position is strengthening the United States and strengthening our position in the world.

I mean, it really gives us a whole new vocabulary to talk to countries about and the degree and a whole new category of kind of respect and a deeper relationship. So it's been proved to be, I think, very positive.

Mr. Arriola. Congressman, what I would say to that is we talk to customers outside of the United States. They're looking for options. They're looking for options away from Russia and other countries and they want the United States to be one of those

1041 options. 1042 Mr. Yergin. If I could say one other thing -- it also --1043 there's a lot of contention in the relationship with China right 1044 now. 1045 But this has taken one issue of contention off the table, 1046 because if you go back eight, 10 years, there would still have 1047 to be this zero sum game between China and the United States for 1048 energy. That's completely gone, and I think that's something 1049 that improves our position. 1050 Mr. Barton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1051 Mr. Olson. Pat on the back complete. The chair now calls 1052 upon Mr. Peters from California for five minutes. 1053 Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the witnesses 1054 I will say hello to Mr. Arriola from San Diego, for being here. 1055 and congratulations on the SDG&E being at 45 percent. 1056 I say it's the highest, the most renewable. If you know of 1057 a utility that's doing better you should -- unless you know that, 1058 you should say it's the highest, not one of the highest. 1059 We'll do that in the future. Thank you. 1060 Mr. Peters. Okay. Thanks. Not that you're running for 1061 office. 1062 You referred to clean natural gas in your testimony. 1063 that implicit in that is the statement that natural gas burns

cleaner than coal and I think most people would concede that.

The thing that a lot of folks say, though, is that a lot of

1064

the benefit of natural gas is lost because of fugitive methane emissions -- that methane being a much more damaging agent to climate even than carbon dioxide in the short run.

The flip side of that is if you could contain it -- if you could -- if you could keep methane from escaping you could have a good impact on the rate of climate change.

Let me ask you kind of how do you think the United States is doing in terms of methane capture? And I would like you to address that -- I am going to ask the same questions of Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Arriola. You know, it's a great question, Congressman, because I think with all of the advancements in technology and all of the capital expenditures that we've had within our industries over the -- I would say over the last 10 years, we have been able to identify and remediate substantially a lot of the methane emissions that come from the natural gas supply chain.

And so when you compare the United States -- and this is based upon numbers that were coming out of the EPA, the United States is probably one of the lowest when you look at the overall supply chain -- probably close to 1 2 percent is the number that I've seen.

What I would tell you is that there are additional opportunities for us to be able to capture methane emissions that don't necessarily come from the natural gas supply chain but, rather, from the agricultural industry, the water supply industry, landfills, and within our company we are actually looking at new technologies to try to gather this and really create

1091 renewable natural gas by using it for either transportation fuels 1092 and/or reinjecting it into our pipelines. 1093 So I think there's more opportunities there and we are 1094 focused on those. 1095 Just in terms of natural gas collection and Mr. Peters. 1096 distribution, it's my concern that the market may not provide 1097 sufficient incentives to look after that. 1098 Mr. Kennedy, what do you -- what would you tell me about 1099 methane capture? 1100 Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Congressman. I would agree that 1101 both -- that there are many of the technologies that are available and can be used to help contain and capture the methane leakage 1102 1103 from the oil and gas industry but they are often not being used 1104 to the degree that they should be. 1105 In a recent report just last week, some academic studies 1106 looking at the degree of methane leakage across the oil and gas 1107 industry are suggesting that it is much greater than EPA had been 1108 estimating. 1109 I have not had a chance to look in any depth at that study 1110 but am greatly concerned that that is an indication that while 1111 CO2 emissions are down because of the advantages on the combustion 1112 side between natural gas and coal that the methane leakage may 1113 in fact be using up much of that advantage or even all of that 1114 advantage.

I would also agree that there's opportunities for renewable

1116 natural gas from other sources. We have done some recent work 1117 So there's other opportunities to capture other on that. 1118 methane. 1119 But the oil and gas industry has the ability, but needs a 1120 lot of attention to make sure that they really capture methane 1121 as they could. 1122 Mr. Peters. I would just say I would like to follow up with 1123 both of you or all of you about what we could do on that. I was 1124 invited to attend a conference held by Harvard Business School 1125 on America's unconventional energy opportunity, they called it. 1126 It was in -- it was in Mach of 2015 -- where they assessed 1127 that the cost of actually controlling this was very small in 1128 relation to the revenues and the profits. 1129 But I don't -- it just strikes me that we should come up with 1130 some regulatory regime because this is classic market failure, 1131 I believe, when the cost of capturing that few -- that little bit 1132 of methane gas may not be sufficient to induce someone to keep 1133 it from escaping and I think -- I think, frankly, Sempra's been 1134 pretty open to that and I look forward to working with you. 1135 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1136 Thank you. The chair now calls upon Mr. Shimkus Mr. Olson. 1137 from Illinois for five minutes, sir. 1138 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleague's 1139 line of questioning -- from California.

I do want to make a point on the renewable natural gas that

1141 in the RFS in the advanced bucket there are credits for renewable 1142 natural gas. 1143 That's actually a growing part of the advanced bucket of the 1144 So we should visit on that as we go down this route. 1145 A question I have -- I am going to focus on the refined 1146 products and exports for a minute and I would like to ask Dr. Yergin 1147 and Mr. Hamm what countries outside of North America do we ship 1148 refined products too? 1149 Mr. Yergin. Well, I don't have all of them in my head by 1150 I know Latin America is a big source, sometimes 1151 Europe, perhaps even Asia. 1152 I think in terms of LNG exports, I think so far we've exported LNG to about 26 different countries. 1153 1154 Mr. Shimkus. Mr. Hamm. 1155 You know, the refineries in this country, Yes. 1156 30 percent of it is owned by foreign governments and entities and 1157 they can ship wherever they want. 1158 They, basically, own those refineries. Much of it was built 1159 for their own oil, like the Canadians, Venezuelans, PEMEX. 1160 so that oil, basically, is coming through, refined here and where 1161 it goes is any customer that they have around the world. 1162 And so about 5 million barrels a day is refined products that 1163 go to those customers wherever. 1164 Mr. Shimkus. Can anyone talk to me the difference between 1165 the, in essence, the refined product on the gasoline side for

1166 octane ratings the difference between the United States and the European market, and is there one? Does anyone know that? 1167 1168 We've been working on it. Bill Flores and I are -- we are 1169 focusing on trying to revise the renewable fuel standard. As many 1170 of you people know, there is a push on looking at octane, and then 1171 the basic argument is this -- why not get our smartest petroleum 1172 engineers and our smartest engine engineers to work together to 1173 figure out what's the best product. It addresses maybe a CAFE 1174 It might address a little carbon issue. 1175 So in our research we found out that in the United States 1176 our regular is 91 to 92 real octane number. The European gasoline 1177 is at a 95 real octane number. 1178 So the question would be do you see any benefits of a kind 1179 of a unified octane standard in just markets as far as exporting refined product to the European market if we had the same octane 1180 1181 standard as they would have? 1182 My quess is that would be beneficial, just through simplicity 1183 of markets and commodity product. Is that farfetched? 1184 Dr. Yergin. 1185 This is new to me. I feel I need to go back Mr. Yergin. 1186 and ask my refinery -- my colleagues who work in refining that 1187 question and focus on it. I would be happy to --1188 Yes, I think -- well, we are putting a lot of Mr. Shimkus. 1189 time to it and I would appreciate any smart people looking at this. 1190 We are trying to address this -- obviously, the White House

1191 is and the secretary of ag and the secretary of energy and the 1192 EPA administrator. 1193 The industry is being whipsawed back and forth with different 1194 proposals and I think that's what happened when you don't have 1195 a legislative fix and a legislative schedule and agenda. So we 1196 have a lot of different stakeholders. 1197 The last thing for -- part of this is, and I direct this to 1198 you, Mr. Hamm, because we do talk about CAFÉ standards, and without 1199 a change in the fuel mix, as we are predicting, the way to reach 1200 CAFE standards is to have smaller lighter vehicles, which might 1201 address, one, safety issues for some, and then in rural America, 1202 a total rejection of -- because we like big trucks, big engines, 1203 big power aspects. 1204 Do you -- if -- in this issue of -- do you see a -- do you 1205 see a benefit in the aspect of CAFE if you have high-compression 1206 engines that can go further on the same amount of gas, as far as 1207 meeting CAFE standards? 1208 You can only go so far with that technology and 1209 manufacturers have done what they could with high-compression 1210 engines and fuel injection and everything that goes along with 1211 that, and what it came down to was the shadow of a car gets smaller 1212 and smaller and smaller, and it's rejected by the buyers in 1213 America.

> So pretty soon everybody's buying SUVs. Everybody is buying pickup trucks or they're buying these little cars if that's all

1214

1216 they can afford and putting their families in it. 1217 But what we've seen is that we've reduced -- we've reduced 1218 with seatbelts and airbags and everything else safety fatalities 1219 from 45,000 down to about 30,000, and that was the bottom, and 1220 now it's crept up due to the small size of these cars back up to 1221 40,000. 1222 So it's killing 10,000 Americans per year, and we have --1223 that's the number of them because you have got a huge mix of bigger 1224 vehicles out there with these little cars. And they're made out 1225 of aluminum -- they crush up like a beer can, kill everybody 1226 inside. 1227 Mr. Shimkus. Yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1228 Mr. Upton. [Presiding.] Mr. Tonko. 1229 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Earlier this month, Pope Mr. Tonko. 1230 Francis met with some of the world's largest oil and gas companies 1231 to urge them to take the threat of climate change more seriously. 1232 But the consequences of climate change are not just moral 1233 or environmental-based. Any of the world's largest investors say 1234 it is an economic concern as well. 1235 Mark Carney, the governor of the Bank of England and chair 1236 of the G-20's Financial Stability Board, has made it clear that 1237 businesses should be assessing and disclosing climate related 1238 risks. 1239 A 2016 Black Rock Investment Institute report concluded that 1240 all investors should incorporate climate change awareness into

1241 their investment process and that advice is being heeded. 1242 Investors representing trillions in assets have urge this 1243 sector to be more transparent and take responsibility for its 1244 emissions. 1245 Dr. Kennedy, I listened as there was some discussion 1246 shareholders in this whole arena, and shareholders have helped 1247 drive greater disclosures of companies' climate-related risks. 1248 How important is it for shareholders to be given this 1249 information when making decisions on how to invest their money? 1250 Mr. Kennedy. This is a topic that I've not gone into in 1251 But what I would say is that our economic system, our 1252 investment system, which is often driven by short-term returns, has a great difficulty in dealing with longer-term challenges and 1253 1254 longer-term economic risks like climate change. And so the more information that can be made available to 1255 1256 investors about the implications of the investments and what those 1257 mean in the long term is going to be very important and very 1258 helpful. 1259 Thank you. And is there a risks to the United 1260 States economy if companies fail to make these disclosures? 1261 Mr. Kennedy. The risks of climate change itself are 1262 actually very great for the U.S. as we are already seeing 1263 significant impacts. From the changing climate, from increased severe weather, 1264 1265 from increased sea level rise, storm surge, a wide variety of

59 1266 impacts are already starting to show up and we can only expect 1267 those to continue to increase over time, particulate if we don't 1268 find ways of reducing emissions. 1269 So the more that can be done from a variety of perspectives 1270 including in terms of how investment decisions are made is going 1271 to be critically important to address those real risks, going 1272 forward. 1273 Mr. Tonko.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. According to Sempra's 2015 corporate responsibility report, Sempra began responding to the annual carbon disclosure project -- CDP survey -- in 2006, which reports the emissions of major companies and releases and assessment of their potential climate risks.

Since 2015, Sempra has scored 100 out of 100 on disclosure.

Mr. Arriola, why has Sempra made this a priority and do you believe that such disclosures are important across the energy sector?

Mr. Arriola. Congressman, it's important to us because it's important to our consumers in the communities where we do business as well as to our shareholders.

As you have mentioned, there's been a trend I would say over the last decade that really started in Europe but now has come more forcefully to the United States where investors -- and I am talking about large institutional investors -- really do want to understand what companies are doing to address climate change, but not just climate change -- how they're dealing with water, how they're dealing with diversity in companies -- really, both

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1291 sustainability and corporate responsibility. 1292 And we -- this is something that we take very seriously in 1293 our company and actually on Friday we'll be releasing our most 1294 recent sustainability report, which I think continues to get 1295 better and better and it gets acknowledged by different 1296 organizations because we go beyond what we need to because we think 1297 it's important for investors to understand what we are doing on 1298 their behalf. 1299 Mr. Tonko. Thank you. And Mr. Hamm, Continental Resources 1300 is one of the largest non-responders to CDP's annual disclosure 1301 Any reason why you do not participate? request. 1302 Mr. Hamm. Excuse me. There's not any specific reason. 1303 You know, climate change -- I am a geologist. I believe that we 1304 can affect the climate and I certainly think that investors can pick or choose which company that they would want to invest in 1305 1306 and who are the best stewards of the land and water, air. 1307 Continental certainly fits in at the top of that rank. 1308 horizontal drilling, there's a lot of drilling that goes on but 1309 it certainly doesn't look like it. 1310 You know, the methane emissions that you talk about, our 1311 company has been doing green completions as long as I remember. 1312 So --But that being said, why not then respond to 1313 Mr. Tonko. 1314 CDP's annual request? 1315 You know, I don't believe we've had the specific Mr. Hamm.

1316	annual request in that regard that I recall.
1317	Mr. Tonko. Okay. I yield back, Mr. Chair.
1318	Mr. Upton. Thank you. The chair would recognize Mr. Latta.
1319	Mr. Latta. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much
1320	for holding today's hearing and thank you very much for our
1321	panellists for being with us today.
1322	It's very, very important as we go forward with energy
1323	development in this country.
1324	Mr. Yergin, if I can start my questions with you. You know,
1325	we on this committee have a great opportunity to speak with
1326	political leaders and business leaders across the world, and it's
1327	very interesting through the last several years I've had the
1328	discussions I've had with those individuals they've all asked this
1329	one question how is it the United States has been able to do
1330	what you have done and be able to accomplish it so quickly.
1331	And then the next question would be is do we have any
1332	competitors or other countries that are out there that are trying
1333	to do the exact same, maybe to duplicate, you know, what we've
1334	done in this country and are they able to do that as we did in
1335	this country.
1336	Mr. Yergin. Do you mean in terms of the unconventional
1337	revolution or in general?
1338	Mr. Latta. Correct.
1339	Mr. Yergin. I think aside from what we've seen in Canada,
1340	which is kind of like an offshoot of here, no, nobody else, and

it's a combination of the resource base, the ecosystem, our legal system, our entrepreneurial system and the fact that we have all these supply chains to respond to it.

So that's why, you know, it is something you look at and you say things don't happen normally this fast and this has really happened fast.

Mr. Latta. Well, I know someone had asked a little bit earlier a question to you and you responded back about what's happening with Iran and in Venezuela.

Where do you see the United States -- I know this has come up in some of the other questions -- but when you're looking around the world -- our place in the world, because it's hard to explain to people that don't remember the mid-1970s and understand what happened in this country, and trying to explain to people that, you know, in some areas of the country either, A, you didn't buy gas on certain days because your license plate didn't end with a even or odd number, or, you know, people were just told we didn't any energy in this country.

But where do you -- you know, where do you see this country and what that means for us geopolitically then?

Mr. Yergin. I think it's -- I mean, at that time the view was that, you know, we were just going to be held hostage -- that we'd lost control of our lives on a daily basis in terms of gas lines and in terms of our economy, and this has been such a turnaround.

1366 Ben Bernanke, when he stepped -- was at our conference just after he stepped down as head of the Federal Reserve, said this 1367 1368 unconventional revolution was one of the most positive, if not 1369 the most positive thing, to have happened since the 2008 crisis. 1370 Clearly, people who don't remember, you know, it's -- you 1371 know, they see grainy images maybe on television of gas lines and 1372 said, what is that all about. 1373 So that's why it's such a big turnaround, and I think it took 1374 a few years psychologically for people to -- you know, for many 1375 people to realize that this is for real. 1376 Mr. Latta. Thank you. Mr. Hamm and Mr. Arriola, what 1377 growth have your companies seen in job creation and career 1378 opportunities as a result of the shale revolution? 1379 Starting at Sempra Energy, if you would Mr. Arriola. Sure. 1380 have looked at our company just over 10 years ago, our LNG business 1381 really didn't exist. 1382 So we've hired, I would say, hundreds of people to help 1383 develop our LNG projects in Mexico and Louisiana, and we are 1384 looking forward to hiring even more in Texas. 1385 I think that's probably the biggest part. I can't give you 1386 an exact number but it's in the hundreds, of well-paying jobs. 1387 Mr. Latta. Mr. Hamm. 1388 Well, you know, our company, like a lot of 1389 independents, you know, we've had good growth over this period 1390 of time and the industry in total has added over a million jobs 1391 -- you know, basically, every sector from the service sectors 1392 through B and P production and exploration, and so it's been a 1393 tremendous driver of the American economy. 1394 Well, I think what was just brought up is also Mr. Latta. 1395 important because I think that sometimes when we talk about a 1396 company and how many jobs are being created it's not all the folks 1397 out there who are, you know, in -- on the steel end and those who 1398 produce the pipe, and you name all the different things that have 1399 to be done to get there, and so all of the other jobs that are 1400 the offshoots. So it's been a great boon for the economy. 1401 Mr. Arriola. Congressman, if I could also just interject 1402 that --1403 Mr. Latta. Yes, absolutely. 1404 -- the jobs I was talking about were directly Mr. Arriola. 1405 at Sempra. 1406 Mr. Latta. Right. 1407 Mr. Arriola. If you look at the projects that we've had --1408 for example, our Cameron LNG facility -- there are over 10,000 1409 people on the job today. Once we develop our Port Arthur 1410 facility, there will be over 3,000 jobs going for four to five 1411 years. 1412 So it's not necessarily just the jobs directly at our company 1413 that are important from an economic perspective but it's all of

We calculated a couple of years ago that it was

the jobs that get created by these projects.

Mr. Yergin.

1414

1416 well over 2 million jobs because the supply chain in the Middle 1417 West that was a very big beneficiary because of the supply chains, 1418 because of the manufacturing capabilities that fed into this. 1419 Mr. Latta. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My time has 1420 expired. 1421 The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green. Mr. Upton. 1422 Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the ranking member, Mr. Green. 1423 for holding this important hearing, and I am glad to know that 1424 the World Gas Conference is here in Washington. 1425 Dr. Yergin, I remember a few years ago we had one of our 1426 conferences in Houston and you interviewed our EPA administrator, 1427 Gina McCarthy, and I think that was the first time she went to 1428 an energy conference, and I appreciate the hospitality and also 1429 representing an area that deals with environmental issues every day because that's our job base, our refineries, our chemical 1430 1431 plants in east Houston and Harris County. 1432 So Texas is the largest generator of wind power in the country 1433 right now and, hopefully, we can do other things. But what we've 1434 seen, though is that the mix of the electricity -- and we do need 1435 electricity plants to produce those for those electric cars --1436 and, you know, our choices are in Texas we have 20 percent nuclear 1437 power. That's the base power. You know, wind energy -- coal has 1438 1439 actually gotten down lower because the price of natural gas is 1440 so cheap and that's why it's -- I think that mix works and we'll

continue to see renewables pick up some.

But it's easier to turn on a burner on a natural gas plant than it is to try and keep a coal storage facility.

The -- our American energy renaissance -- because I've been in Congress since 1993 and it's been amazing what's happened. Mr. Arriola, in your testimony you talk about how the U.S. regulatory certainty at FERC could hinder U.S. LNG development in comparison to countries like Russia, Australia, Qatar, or Mozambique. What changes would you like to see in the regulatory process?

Mr. Arriola. Thank you, Congressman. You know, I think we believe that it's important to have a very thorough and exhaustive review process on any permitting, especially from FERC and the DOE.

What we'd encourage is just making sure that it's as streamlined as possible -- that it's efficient but that we check the box as quickly as we can -- that we don't recreate the wheel on every project, and I will give you an example.

When we went through the process for our facility in Cameron, Louisiana, it took FERC 553 days to get through the entire project.

As we are seeking approval here for our Port Arthur LNG facility in Texas, it's essentially the same engineering design that we are trying to duplicate in Texas. Right now, we are estimating that it's probably going to take closer to a thousand days.

Now, granted, there are more projects that FERC is looking

1466 at and we've been working very constructively with their staff 1467 and everything. 1468 But I think part of it is just making sure that they have not just more resources but the right resources and that the 1469 1470 agencies like FERC and DOE work together to eliminate the 1471 bottlenecks to the extent that they can. 1472 Right now I've been told -- and if you could Mr. Green. 1473 confirm it -- the Trump administration's approval time line for 1474 LNG export permitting trails that of the Obama administration. 1475 Is that correct? 1476 Mr. Arriola. That's our understanding. 1477 Mr. Green. I think that would shock a lot of us. 1478 Mr. Arriola. Yes. 1479 Mr. Green. And I want to make sure that FERC has the staff 1480 it needs to move efficiently through the permitting process. 1481 I've also -- in fact, this committee passed legislation on 1482 cross-border pipelines to sell natural gas from Texas or New 1483 Mexico to Mexico, and Mexico has -- literally, can only refine 1484 about 60 percent of their petroleum they need for diesel and gas 1485 and 40 percent of that comes from typically the refineries along 1486 the Gulf Coast. 1487 The Eagle Ford Basin doesn't stop at the Rio Grande River 1488 either and there'll come a time in the future that Houston's 1489 petrochemical industry may need the gas from Mexico and those 1490 pipelines could benefit us in our industry and east end.

1491 Mr. Mullin and I addressed this with the cross-border 1492 pipeline that passed the House last summer, and I am pleased that 1493 Senator Hoeven introduced companion language in the Senate last 1494 week to move it quickly to conference. 1495 Mr. Arriola, could you speak how our energy relationship with 1496 Mexico has shifted recently? What benefits does the U.S. stand 1497 to gain from an integrated North American energy market between 1498 Canada, Mexico, and the United States? 1499 Mr. Arriola. Sure, Congressman. I think it's -- you know, 1500 this truly has been a win-win situation between the United States 1501 and Mexico as it pertains to energy trade. In fact, in the most recent year that I've seen the numbers, 1502 1503 there's actually been a trade surplus from U.S. products and 1504 services related to energy that go to Mexico. 1505 In fact, I think the last number what I saw was, roughly, We are continuing 1506 an \$11 billion surplus on the side of the U.S. 1507 to provide them with natural gas. We are continuing to provide 1508 them with other petro fuels sources, for example. 1509 If you look at gasoline, diesel, and other jet fuel 1510 resources, the United States has, roughly, a 90-day inventory 1511 supply. Mexico has two to three days. 1512 So there are more opportunities to build infrastructure in 1513 Mexico that can receive future U.S. products and that's one of 1514 the things that we are looking at.

Mr. Chairman, I know I am out of time but if --

Mr. Green.

1516 Mr. Upton. We are going to have votes on the House floor 1517 shortly. So --1518 Okay. Well, I was just going to say that it's Mr. Green. 1519 not just Mexico. It's also LNG exports. In fact, my joke is anybody in Louisiana and Texas who has a five-foot ditch off the 1520 1521 Gulf of Mexico they want an LNG export facility. 1522 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1523 Mr. Upton. Gentleman's time has expired. Mr. McKinley. 1524 Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for 1525 holding this meeting. 1526 As Dr. Yergin noted earlier in his testimony not only this 1527 time but previously, there is indeed an abundance of natural gas 1528 located in the Marcellus and Utica shale gases in West Virginia, 1529 Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and it's estimated that this region will produce about 37 percent of the nation's natural gas production 1530 1531 by the year 2040. 1532 These shale gases underscore this potential of a historic 1533 renaissance that he referred to in American energy. But as we've 1534 heard earlier, the naysayer continue to trot out their tired 1535 disproven talking points. 1536 Unfortunately, the facts have proved otherwise. Just the 1537 last 10 years, CO2 emissions in America have gone down by 20 1538 percent. Shale gas has given the Appalachian area a breath of fresh 1539 1540 air, perhaps a chance finally to transform and revitalize a whole region of the country, and subsequently Rick Perry and the DOE have concluded that there's a need, perhaps, to develop a second petro chemical center located in the Appalachian region.

A recent study by HSS Market have concluded that the economic advantages of extracting ethane in the Appalachian region has concluded that the resin could be produced at 23 percent lower there than being shipped down to the Gulf Coast to the crackers and back up. So I think that was interesting conclusion with that.

Now, we can achieve lower energy costs and dramatically decrease it if we take a different approach and work together.

Congress should full innovate research to reduce emissions
-- the concern, Dr. Kennedy, you're concerned about -- if we just
put the money into research.

The technology of American scientists developing higher efficiency and low emissions could be sold around the world -- marketed around the world -- and thereby address this worldwide concern about greenhouse gases, because we've got to remember the world is going to increase its energy production and use by 28 percent by 2040 and fossil fuels by will count still for 75 percent of the energy use.

So what my concern is, if that's the case, what are we doing with China and India? Isn't it time that some of our members recognize -- some of our members recognize that until the rest of the world, especially India and China, produces electricity

1566 more cleanly, continuing to over regulate fossil be in America will have virtually no effect on the global environment. 1567 1568 Therefore, shouldn't we be first -- innovate first, do the 1569 research, then regulate? So, Dr. Yergin, with this shale gas present, this revolution 1570 going on in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia, what potential do 1571 1572 you see for a potential petro chemical industry up in the 1573 Appalachian area and with projection they're saying as much as 1574 \$36 billion invested and maybe 100,000 jobs? Do you believe that. 1575 Mr. Yergin. Some people see the Marcellus, now the region 1576 in the Utica as the largest gas field or gas concentration in the 1577 world. I thought that some companies had actually committed to build 1578 1579 petro chemical facilities there. I thought Shell was doing it 1580 but you have a --1581 Mr. McKinley. Shell is doing it in Monaca, Pennsylvania. 1582 That's one portion of it, but there are others. I know they're 1583 doing some -- the ethane storage hub that we've been promoting 1584 here has been the -- the question is whether or not any of you 1585 have the realization that could this be a center of a secondary? 1586 We are not trying to replace Houston, but just is there a 1587 secondary -- is there a second -- possibility of a secondary? 1588 I mean, the resources is so Mr. Yergin. Yes. Sure. 1589 enormous there. I mean, as you said, it's going to be such a large 1590 part.

1591 Also, I did want to say -- you mentioned the R and D. 1592 of the big themes over at the World Gas Congress has been 1593 specifically about methane and applying the technologies to 1594 address methane. 1595 So, I mean, there is definitely a research agenda to address 1596 the questions you're talking about including methane. 1597 Mr. McKinley. Dr. Arriola, any comments from you? 1598 Mr. Arriola. I really don't have anything to add on that 1599 other than given the infrastructure that we have and lacking 1600 pipelines in some parts of our country, it may make sense to 1601 develop those centers that you're talking about closer to the 1602 source themselves. So from an economies of scale standpoint, that could very 1603 1604 well make sense. Mr. McKinley. Thank you, and I yield back my time. 1605 1606 Mr. Upton. Gentleman yields back. The gentleman from 1607 Vermont, Mr. Welch. 1608 Thank you very much. I thank the panel. Mr. Welch. 1609 Mr. Yergin, your opening statement indicated with the shale 1610 gale it just has been a huge game changer in jobs and economic 1611 activity in our ability to go from being an importer to an 1612 exporter, maybe the largest one. One of the other issues, though, that I would like to focus 1613 1614 on is energy efficiency. I mean, it's tremendous that we have 1615 these resources and it creates the economic activity and the jobs.

1616 But some of us are concerned also about carbon emissions and the impact that has, and my understanding is that the energy 1617 1618 efficiency policies that we've been able, and I've worked a lot 1619 with Mr. McKinley on this actually -- energy efficiency has 1620 allowed us to save on the demand for energy. 1621 The Alliance to Save Energy says that if we tried to run 1622 today's economy without energy efficiency improvements that have 1623 taken place in '73, we'd need 55 percent more energy supplies than 1624 we now use. 1625 Could you describe what you understand to be the Trump 1626 administration policies on energy efficiency, A, and, B, whether even as we exploit the shale gale, does that suggest that we can 1627 1628 take our eye off the importance of efficiency? 1629 Mr. Yergin. I am not really in a position to address what the -- you know, because I haven't studied what the Trump 1630 1631 administration's specific policies are. 1632 I do agree with you. When I began my work in energy, it was 1633 based -- focused on energy efficiency and, off the top of my head, 1634 I would say that we are probably twice as energy efficient today 1635 as a country than we were, you know, a few decades ago. 1636 So I think energy efficiency is a very important -- you know, 1637 I regard energy efficiency as another energy source. 1638 And my is the energy companies have to be part Mr. Welch. 1639 of the solution. They have to be, and I am wondering -- you're 1640 over at the meeting with the gas folks -- 12,000 people -- are

1641 there any topics that are being discussed specifically as to 1642 energy efficiency? 1643 Mr. Yergin. Well, in the speeches I heard, it was certainly 1644 said that, you know, this has to be a big part of the energy mix 1645 and, you know, if we hadn't become more efficient as a country, 1646 we would be in a -- we would also be in a very difficult place. 1647 The thing about energy efficiency so much, it's -- you know, 1648 it's -- it goes through the entire economy. It's decisions that 1649 people make when they build houses. 1650 It's new processes in industry. What's always struck me 1651 about it, it's a very decentralized activity. There has been a general trend towards being more efficient. 1652 1653 Is there a place for appropriate regulation in 1654 order to meet energy efficiency standards, Mr. Yergin? I mean, you can see it, for instance, in 1655 Mr. Yergin. Yes. 1656 housing and other places and that regulation has been part of the 1657 mix. 1658 Thank you. Mr. Arriola, would you agree with Mr. Welch. 1659 that, I mean, as the representative of a major energy company? 1660 What we see, Congressman, is a lot of Mr. Arriola. Yes. 1661 that regulation happens state by state. So, for example, in 1662 California, whether it's the housing codes or through our Public 1663 Utilities Commission, there's a lot of work that goes on in energy 1664 efficiency. 1665 So, you know, there's --Mr. Welch.

1666 Mr. Arriola. And our companies are directly involved to 1667 help facilitate that. 1668 All right. Mr. Hamm, I know you have been Mr. Welch. 1669 supportive of the president's deregulatory agenda. We've heard 1670 some testimony here about the appropriate use of regulations like 1671 Energy Star. 1672 Do you support that? 1673 Mr. Hamm. Well, you know, the best efficiencies is gained by the private sector. You know, for instance, in 2014 we had 1674 1675 1,950 rigs working. Today, we've got a thousand rigs doing the 1676 same job. 1677 So, basically, you have got one rig as efficient as five were 1678 So that's efficiencies that you can gain from the 1679 private sector 1680 Mr. Welch. Well, that's efficiency in the exploitation 1681 process, not in the use process, right? Now, do you believe that 1682 EPA has a role -- the Environmental Protection Agency -- in 1683 promulgating appropriate regulatory mechanisms for energy 1684 efficiency? 1685 I don't think they -- EPA is there to enforce the 1686 law and basically ensure that rule of law is followed, and so they 1687 have that job to do and they do it sometimes very well, most of 1688 the time very well. But as far as efficiencies --1689 Mr. Welch. Right. I just have time for one more question. 1690 What's your view on the president's tariffs on oil exports to China 1691 -- or the China retaliatory tariffs on us with respect to our oil 1692 exports? 1693 Well, right now, we don't have tariffs that apply 1694 to oil going to China, and we'll see if that happens or not. 1695 Are you -- are you okay with the tariffs? Mr. Welch. 1696 you think that's a good thing for business? 1697 Am I okay with tariffs? I do not -- I think Mr. Hamm. 1698 tariffs are counterproductive. I think everybody here believes 1699 that. 1700 What's going on right now is setting some of that straight. You know, the countries have gotten too carried away with tariffs 1701 Nothing was done about it, and so some of those 1702 1703 corrections are being made today. 1704 Mr. Welch. I yield back. Thank you. 1705 Gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Griffith. 1706 Mr. Griffith. I thank the gentleman and appreciate it. Dr. 1707 Yergin, appreciate you being here today. I got a couple questions 1708 in that regard with the geopolitical aspects of all of this. 1709 So we've heard a lot about foreign countries, and Mr. 1710 McKinley touched base on it, and we were talking with one of the 1711 foreign countries earlier today. 1712 But isn't it true that if we were suddenly to cut off American 1713 gas exports that a lot of the countries, particularly some of the 1714 developing economies, would just continue to use coal from other 1715 parts of the world?

1716 Mr. Yergin. Well, I think -- I mean, we are just part and we are still a beginning part of the LNG market. We'll have more 1717 1718 when you guys get going. But I think there is -- you know, there's a competition going 1719 on on a global basis for, you know, what's going to be the balance 1720 1721 between coal and natural gas and renewables for developing 1722 countries, and I think many of them -- you know, there's definitely 1723 a push towards using more gas. 1724 We see 15, 20 countries are going to -- that don't import 1725 LNG now will import LNG because they want to have -- clean up and 1726 not use -- clean up their electric generation. And one of the questions that I would have 1727 Mr. Griffith. 1728 as we look at this is as we go to using the LNG, are we able to 1729 compete worldwide with that? 1730 Because, obviously, and I represent a coal district like Mr. 1731 McKinley does as well -- obviously, you know, it doesn't make sense 1732 very often unless you need some good high-quality, as they called 1733 it this morning, coking coal. 1734 But the -- what we call metallurgical coal in my neck of the 1735 woods -- unless you need that, if you're just buying steam coal, 1736 it's hard to buy that for basic energy in some parts of the world 1737 -- hard for us to ship it to them and compete against the 1738 Australians, and insert about four or five other countries. 1739 But from what I understand -- you correct me if I am wrong

-- our LNG resources can reach worldwide and be pretty competitive

wherever we go. Isn't that true?

Mr. Yergin. Yes. We are quite competitive in the market. You know, we are maybe not as competitive as some pipeline suppliers in Europe.

But there's definite -- I mean, I saw it this morning at this APEC conference with all these Asian countries. They're really interested in important LNG from the United States.

Mr. McKinley. And I think that makes a lot of sense, and as a part of that, I would have to say that while I don't have any of the Marcellus.

DOE, earlier this year, announced a project in conjunction with Virginia Tech in my district to investigate the resources

-- the resource potential for reservoirs in the Nora Gas Field in southwest Virginia, and I am excited that this research is being conducted to improve our understanding.

But it appears that we are down another level from what they've looked at before and so they're drilling some deep mines or some deep wells to see what we have down there, and we are excited about that because we have coal bed methane but we haven't been doing much on any other gas.

We don't have the Marcellus or the Utica shale. But we may have this and we are excited about that. We already have some petro chemicals -- Eastman Chemical, even though it's in Kingsport, Tennessee, and people say, why are you interested in it.

They have 10,000 employees and a thousand of them drive the eight miles from my district to the plant. So we are excited about that.

But I think it's important that we realize that, as we move forward, this is important for the world. I also would echo some of the comments my colleagues have made that we need to do the research, because it's not just the United States that we are dealing with.

It's the world and we are looking at global warming, et cetera. If we don't provide the research to burn our fuels more efficiently worldwide, and something that the rest of the world can also afford and obtain, then they're going to continue to burn coal.

They're going to continue to burn all kinds of products and put stuff in the air, and I know it bores people but it's just my favourite factoid of all time.

NASA did a study. They followed a sandstorm from Central Asia in the middle of the Gobi Desert, and it takes 10 days for the air to get from the middle of the Gobi Desert to the eastern shore of Virginia, based on their satellite research.

So we need to work on this from a worldwide viewpoint and not put American jobs out of business because we are trying to set the standard, because the rest of the world is looking for jobs, period, and if they have to use something improper or less efficient they'll do it.

1791 But if we can find a way to do it through research they'll 1792 Everybody wants to have a cleaner world, but they share in that. 1793 want to have jobs first because the number-one -- the number-one 1794 thing is to have jobs and that helps your health as well. 1795 Wouldn't that be correct, Dr. Yergin? 1796 Mr. Yergin. Yes, and I love your factoid. I've never heard 1797 that before. 1798 Mr. McKinley. It's a fun factoid. All right. I yield 1799 back. 1800 Mr. Upton. Mr. Walberg. 1801 Mr. Walberg. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the 1802 panel for being here. Mr. Yergin, in your testimony you mentioned that by 2025 as 1803 1804 many as 4 million jobs -- direct, indirect, and induced -- could 1805 be supported by unconventional oil and gas activities. 1806 Could you explain in further detail for us the types of jobs 1807 that are supported by unconventional oil and gas activities? 1808 Mr. Yergin. Well, those three categories are really 1809 categories that the Department of Commerce uses. The direct jobs 1810 would be working on one of Harold Hamm's rigs, working in the oil 1811 field. 1812 Indirect would be kind of service jobs supporting that, and 1813 then the induced jobs is the money that flows into the community 1814 because, as we've seen in Pennsylvania, suddenly people are able 1815 to buy cars, are able to buy houses.

1816 Realtors service computer specialists in California, financial people in New York, and so that's kind of the methodology 1817 1818 that's used for estimating that, and what it really says that these 1819 supply chains go all the way the across the country and the money 1820 that's being spent is staying in this country and being 1821 distributed in our economy. 1822 Mr. Walberg. Moving along with that, several of you 1823 mentioned the numbers of jobs -- direct, indirect, in construction 1824 as well as exploration for finding all that go on there. 1825 Let me ask Mr. Hamm and Mr. Arriola, what types of job 1826 training and recruitment efforts are you using to meet those 1827 needs? 1828 I mean, we see all across the vocational spectrum today a 1829 real lack of people to do the jobs -- real rural jobs that we need 1830 -- and what are you doing to train people for the jobs? 1831 Mr. Arriola. Congressman, I can tell you, in the case of 1832 the LNG facilities that we are talking about, we work very closely, 1833 obviously, with our subcontractors that are hiring people but we 1834 are also working directly with the trades to train people, whether 1835 it's welders, whether it's supply procurement experts. 1836 There's a whole host of jobs, whether they're low skilled 1837 or high skilled that we are trying to do, and I think one of the 1838 great things is we are creating a pipeline of skilled workers that 1839 -- especially in some of these areas that workers that wouldn't

necessarily have opportunities that can now go from facility to

1841 facility to continue to build. 1842 So sometimes we think of these as temporary jobs but they're 1843 really skills that are being developed that can be utilized across 1844 the construction industry to continue to build energy 1845 infrastructure. 1846 So you're working with the trades. Mr. Walberg. What other 1847 -- I mean --1848 Mr. Arriola. We are working with the trades in the case of 1849 our utilities where we are enhancing pipelines to carry natural 1850 gas. We are working with the junior colleges and other 1851 1852 organizations to identify people that are coming directly out of 1853 high school or junior colleges to give them the skills that they 1854 need to be able to be productive members of our team. 1855 Mr. Hamm, I would ask you if you'd respond as Mr. Walberg. 1856 well, especially since being an innovator -- innovation in 1857 directional drilling and all of that. 1858 Thank you. What we've seen, really, that added Mr. Hamm. 1859 so many new jobs is these very expensive petro chemical plants 1860 that have been added with all the natural gas resources that we 1861 have. 1862 In fact, it's been estimated that one out of eight people, 1863 you know, have been associated with our industry. So it's very 1864 intense, particularly in Houston and some of the areas that these 1865 plants locate.

1866	And so it's very intense. Vocational technical training has
1867	helped a great deal in places like Oklahoma. As far as our
1868	industry goes, it's been a great resource.
1869	But it seems like the you know, we are down to about 3.8
1870	percent of unemployment in this country now, which is wonderful,
1871	and the closer you get to the 3 percent level, the harder it is
1872	to find those employees that you need.
1873	But so far, we've been able to do it.
1874	Mr. Walberg. Recruit and train your own? Is that how you
1875	
1876	Mr. Hamm. We recruit and we've trained. We train both at
1877	the company level and then also we use technical schools for
1878	training as well.
1879	Mr. Walberg. Thank you. I yield back.
1880	Mr. Upton. Mr. Duncan.
1881	Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, everyone,
1882	for being here. It's been a great hearing so far. As we all know,
1883	the United States is well on our way to becoming a net energy
1884	exporter by 2020 I think a natural gas exporter it was the
1885	first time last year first time since 1957, I believe.
1886	I commend the Trump administration's support for robust
1887	domestic energy production, which has consequently strengthened
1888	our leadership on the world stage.
1889	Mr. Arriola, you note in your testimony that the failure of
1890	the U.S. to seize the current LNG opportunity has international

implications.

I couldn't agree with you more, and besides the fact exporting gas to U.S. allies will contribute up to 452,000 American jobs from 2016 and 2035, add about \$73.6 billion annually to the U.S. economy. It can also provide energy security to our allies.

Prior to serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I served as chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and I utilized that role as that chairman to focus on energy opportunities in North and South America and how we can work to achieve not only America energy independence and energy security but also hemispheric energy security and independence.

In this region of the world, we have the ability through U.S. LNG exports to help the energy poor. Countries reduce their dependence on corrupt state-owned regimes and increase the quality of life for so many people around the world.

I talk about quality of life a lot of times, how energy can improve the quality of lives. Just in infant mortality rate -- through energy and a constant 24/7 baseload power supply that that energy, possibly with LNG natural gas-fired power plants providing that electricity can keep babies. Where you have intermittent power now in neonatal intensive care and incubators cannot run to keep those babies alive, you see a high infant mortality rate.

1916 A lot of quality of life issues that we, as Americans, with our energy -- abundant energy resources, exporting those to our 1917 1918 friends and allies around the world to improve the quality of life 1919 of folks elsewhere. 1920 So, Mr. Arriola, from your perspective, how can LNG terminals 1921 further open up access for U.S. LNG in these markets? 1922 Mr. Arriola. Well, Congressman, your point about natural 1923 gas and different types of energy impacting more than just the 1924 economic side is truly right on. 1925 In fact, I saw -- I spoke to a professor from the Stanford 1926 Natural Gas Initiative yesterday and he shared with me in a 1927 conference we were at that, although we don't talk about it very 1928 much, indoor air pollution is one of the largest killers in this 1929 world, and we don't think about it here in the United States 1930 because we have, for the most part, natural gas or electricity 1931 to help, from a cooking fuels perspective. 1932 But if you go to other countries -- developing countries, 1933 They use charcoal, and last year, they use wood. They use dung. 1934 roughly, 4 million people died from indoor air pollution caused by cooking fuel. 1935 1936 And I am glad you said that. I talk about that 1937 The indoor air quality is terrible when you're all the time. 1938 burning on wood, charcoal, dung, other things that people around the world have to cook on, and the fact that they don't have a 1939

24/7 baseload power supply to keep their food fresh in a

refrigerated environment.

Mr. Arriola. So not only are we impacting economic prosperity around the globe by being able to export clean U.S. natural gas, but we are changing people's lives. We are changing the health and their livelihood.

Mr. Duncan. Improving lives of so many people around the world through American resources that we take for granted. We take for granted that that light is going to come on when we flip the switch.

We take for granted that the machines of industry to produce the widgets that America produces -- that that electricity is going to be there to provide for those machineries to turn on.

But you know what? It's not just a third world problem. Even in second world and first world Europe they have problems with intermittency and power supplies.

So this is geopolitics of American energy. When I was in Spain -- and I understand Portugal is the same way -- but they want to be the LNG importer for Western Europe because right now, Western Europe is relying on who? Russia.

Russia is a gas station masquerading as a country. But they're providing that natural gas to Europe and they use the levers of influence of turning that spigot on and off to affect policy not only in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe, and as those pipelines continue to be built to provide that natural gas, Western Europe is looking west to the United States, a stable

1966 energy producer, an ally and a friend, to provide LNG so they can meet their energy needs and lessen their dependence not on the 1967 1968 Middle East for their energy but lessen their dependence on Russia 1969 and their less dependence on Russian gas and more strong 1970 dependence on, possibly, hopefully, American LNG exports to 1971 provide that energy. 1972 So the geopolitics are real. I appreciate your comments, 1973 and let's improve the lives of folks around the world through 1974 American energy production. 1975 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1976 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. I regret to say that 1977 votes on the floor have started again. They're not going to be completed, they tell us, until after 4:00 o'clock. 1978 1979 I know a couple of our witnesses have to leave by 3:45. So I am going to ask that Mr. Olson, who's next in line for questions, 1980 1981 take the chair and he will ask questions, at which point we will 1982 adjourn, and those members wishing to still ask questions will 1983 do it in writing, and if you could respond on a timely basis we'll 1984 adjourn rather than keep you here until 4:15, knowing that all 1985 of you are pretty much gone. 1986 Mr. Olson. 1987 [Presiding.] I thank the chair, and welcome to Mr. Olson. 1988 our four witnesses. 1989 I want to start by saying congratulations to our friends at

-- our good friends at Sempra. Big merger with Oncor.

1991 Congratulations. 1992 Mr. Arriola. Thank you. 1993 Mr. Olson. Mr. Arriola, your company is working on some 1994 significant LNG export terminals along the Gulf Coast. 1995 mentioned Cameron being up and running, Port Arthur coming online. 1996 Can you talk about why getting American liquefied natural 1997 gas to market is time sensitive? Why does it matter how fast we 1998 ramp this production up? What markets are in jeopardy if we delay 1999 or drag this out? 2000 Mr. Arriola. Sure, Congressman. 2001 I think, as we've discussed, when foreign countries decide to enter into contracts for LNG, they're ordinarily in the 20-2002 2003 to 30-year time frame. And so as I am buying a product or a service 2004 for 20 or 30 years, I don't need to come back every year and re-up. And so as U.S. companies, including Sempra, look at building 2005 2006 a project, whether it's in Cameron or in Port Arthur, we are really 2007 focused on trying to get all those contracts together up front 2008 so that we can get them financed and to build the project. 2009 If we can't get those projects this year or next year because 2010 somebody else has already signed up these 20- to 30-year 2011 contracts, we are out of the market, and the construction jobs 2012 that we've been talking about and the impact to the local economy 2013 goes away, or never develops, I should say. 2014 Mr. Olson. Yes. Thousands and thousands of American jobs.

Mr. Hamm, the people back home in Texas 22 want me to thank you

2016 for your efforts in the Bakken shale play to change the entire 2017 world and America's energy future. 2018 We are now an energy dominant country because of you, Mr. 2019 Hamm, and a Texan named George Mitchell at the Barnett shale play. 2020 My question is, can you talk about the most important actions 2021 that the Trump administration can take to help you with oil and 2022 gas production? 2023 You mentioned adjusting the CAFE standards, ACC. How about 2024 public lands, capturing other things? What can we do to help you 2025 out and make sure this production continues and doesn't get 2026 stifled by Washington, D.C.? Well, we have a friendly audience here that 2027 listened to us today, which is good. We need to do a lot with 2028 2029 They should also participate in this energy federal lands. 2030 renaissance, and they haven't up to this point. 2031 The bulk of what has been done has been on fee lands, 2032 particularly in the Bakken and Texas, and we need to get it where 2033 permitting could be done rapidly instead of waiting, you know, 2034 six months to a year and so that's one thing we are working on 2035 that. 2036 And we have an audience that's listening and wanting to do 2037 the right thing. So I think we are moving in the right direction. 2038 We just need to keep the ball rolling to get it corrected while 2039 we are doing it.

Yes, and thank you for your example of what the

Mr. Olson.

2041 private sector can do. The private sector developed directional 2042 drilling and hydraulic fracturing. 2043 That wasn't something that came from D.C. That came from 2044 Harold Hamm and George Mitchell. So thank you for that. 2045 My final question is for you, Dr. Yergin. Let's talk about 2046 It used to be CERADay, maybe CERAHour in 19, what, 83? 2047 You got that ball rolling, and now it rolled into the energy 2048 capital of the entire world -- Houston, Texas. 2049 Your testimony mentioned how the revolution in shale oil and 2050 gas -- the shale gale -- has had enormous impact on our 2051 relationships abroad. I've seen that firsthand. 2052 You mentioned India. I went 2053 there this past March. Their motto is, natural gas for today --2054 renewables for the future. But as you mentioned, right now they've signed a contract 2055 2056 for 20 years of liquefied natural gas I think somewhere about 14.4 2057 million metric tons from America to India. That helps them get 2058 their air cleaner. It helps them where they want to go. 2059 Also, as you mentioned, they've got, I heard, 2 million 2060 barrels of American crude oil that they haven't had for almost 2061 They are taking the wood to OPEC and Russia with our 2062 energy. 2063 And so my questions are can you tell me more details about 2064 what that means for allies? We can help out India. We can help 2065 out South Korea, Japan, even help out China getting their air

2066 How can we use this energy renaissance to make the world 2067 better? Mr. Yergin. I think, first of all, by helping to reduce 2068 2069 conflict. 2070 Secondly, I think it builds confidence. I think it really 2071 -- what's happened here in the United States is actually a big 2072 contribution to energy security for the whole world and we benefit 2073 from that. 2074 So I think it radiates out from it, and I think what you 2075 described in India -- I've seen it in other countries, too -- it 2076 gives a -- they have a deeper relationship with the United States and it connects them more to us, and I think that's very beneficial 2077 2078 for our overall political situation in the world. 2079 Mr. Olson. One example -- Mr. Shimkus signed this poster 2080 on the floor last week -- this big tanker ship called Independence 2081 was pulled into Lithuania. 2082 Probably 500 people -- normal people from Lithuania -- were 2083 greeting this tanker ship going, yay, yay. That's because they 2084 know that takes Mr. Putin's weapon away from him forever. 2085 Mr. Yergin. Well, I think it's -- I think it's true that 2086 what's happened with LNG to Europe -- and it's not only us but 2087 from others -- it's really, in a sense, depoliticized -- it turns 2088 Europe more into a gas market and takes out the kind of political 2089 implications for it. 2090 So I think it's something that's very welcome in those

2091	countries that they know that we are there and we are their
2092	friend.
2093	Mr. Olson. I am out of time.
2094	Just one warning, sir my Houston Astros will beat the
2095	Boston Red Sox again this year, going for the World Series.
2096	Mr. Yergin. What a forecaster.
2097	[Laughter.]
2098	Mr. Olson. Pursuant to committee rules, I remind members
2099	that they have 10 business days to submit additional questions
2100	for the record.
2101	I would ask that witnesses submit their answers their
2102	responses within 10 business days upon receipt of those
2103	questions.
2104	Without objection, this subcommittee is adjourned.
2105	[Whereupon, at 3:36 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]