



FROM: Kountoupes Denham Carr & Reid

DATE: Tuesday, September 16, 2025

RE: House Energy & Commerce Subcommittee on Environment Hearing on “From Gridlock to Growth: Permitting Reform Under the Clean Air Act”

Topline Summary

- On Tuesday, September 16, 2025, the House Energy and Commerce Environment Subcommittee convened for a hearing on “From Gridlock to Growth: Permitting Reform Under the Clean Air Act.”
- Republicans focused on the need to modernize and streamline the Clean Air Act and permitting process to reduce duplicative reviews, provide regulatory certainty, speed up energy and technology projects, and ensure U.S. competitiveness in areas such as AI, national security and critical mineral supply chain.
- Democrats emphasized the need to protect public health and environmental safeguards, warning that exemptions and rollbacks to the Clean Air Act would worsen pollution, harm vulnerable communities, and undermine progress. They argued for faster permitting through better resources, staffing, and modern tools, all without weakening air quality standards.

Members Attending: Chairman Gary Palmer (R-AL), Ranking Member Paul Tonko (D-NY), Full Committee Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY), Full Committee Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Vice Chairman Dan Crenshaw (R-TX), Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL), Rep. August Pfluger (R-TX), Rep. Scott Peters (D-CA), Rep. Gabe Evans (R-CO), Rep. Greg Landsman (D-OH), Rep. Rob Menendez (D-NJ), Rep. Buddy Carter (R-GA), & Rep. John Joyce (R-PA)

[Live Hearing Link](#)

Meeting called to order by Chairman Palmer

Opening Statements

Chairman Gary Palmer (R-AL): Good afternoon, I’d like to welcome everyone to today’s hearing entitled ‘From Gridlock to Growth: Permitting Reform Under the Clean Air Act.

This hearing takes place at a critical moment for our country and the Committee. If we want to remain globally competitive, we need meaningful permitting reform. That cannot happen without modernizing the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act now accounts for some of the most expensive and significant barriers in the modern permitting process. What’s worse, and what we will hear from the witnesses today, these outdated regulations fail to address the most significant sources of pollution and disincentivize companies from investing in cost-efficient and effective technology.



At the core of the Clean Air Act is the idea that we can protect our environment without sacrificing economic growth. In the decades since it passed, the Act was largely successful in accomplishing this goal. But that success is threatened by outdated provisions that do not function well today.

The Clean Air Act as it stands holds outdated provisions that punish American job creators for emissions they have no control over.

It discourages wildfire mitigation measures, threatening this country's air quality. "It risks our economy and national security because of pollution that comes from outside of the U.S.

It threatens our ability to stay competitive in the global AI race.

Most importantly, it inhibits the United States' ability to meet our domestic energy needs.

Americans care about clean air. They also care about rising electricity costs and our economy. They understand that excessive regulation and outdated statutes do not equate to good or effective regulation. They care about technological advancement and not punishing American companies who lead that advancement.

The witnesses we will hear from today have extensive experience with the challenges presented by these outdated provisions and are well suited to explain their impact. I look forward to their testimony and their feedback on the discussion drafts.

In June, we held our first hearing on the need to update the Clean Air Act. At that hearing, we heard testimony about the billion-dollar price tag from Clean Air Act regulations doing little to improve air quality and the state of our economy.

At that hearing, my colleagues across the aisle were critical of the proposals discussed because the reforms were discussed in prior Congresses. They challenged us to introduce novel ideas to reform the Clean Air Act.

It's feedback we took seriously.

I encourage the panel of witnesses before us today to give us their best solutions for modernizing the Clean Air Act. Both novel and previously discussed.

Some of these solutions may not be novel. But our permitting problem isn't novel either, and it is not getting better.

Ranking Member Paul Tonko (D-NY): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome to our witnesses. I would like to especially recognize Ms. Kunz with Micron. Micron is making historic investments in Upstate New York, creating thousands of well-paying jobs and revitalizing communities that have been rusty in recent decades into hubs for the next generation of advanced manufacturing in the United States.

I am grateful for those investments to breathe new life into our region and help secure our nation's future economic competitiveness in such an important, strategic industry.

This is an exciting time, but I also recognize there is a right way to develop these types of projects — one that allows for community engagement and mitigation of environmental harms — and there's a wrong



way — where we cut corners, take short cuts, and exempt our way out of needing to care about pollution and its health consequences.

While I do not doubt that some Clean Air Act permitting processes could be re-examined, we should not overlook how effective the law has been historically at allowing our economy to grow while reducing dangerous air pollution. And as I have said at past hearings, I do not take this past success as evidence that we require a dramatic departure from the law.

On the contrary, there is still much more work to do to ensure all Americans can breathe healthy air. More than 156 million Americans are living in places with unhealthy levels of ozone or particle pollution. This is not the first set of proposals to reform the Clean Air Act examined by the Subcommittee this year. And much like that first slate, I have serious concerns with each of the bills before us today. Of all of the bills on the docket, I want to single out the Air Permitting Improvements to Protect National Security Act, which would create a new Presidential exemption in the Clean Air Act.

Unfortunately, we have already seen EPA and President Trump completely abuse the exemption process established in Section 112(i)(4) of the Act for national emissions standards for hazardous air pollutants. EPA solicited requests for exemptions from regulated entities, and the President has granted them with essentially no public process or justification.

This is a horrible, opaque way to manage environmental regulations, allowing the President to handpick individual firms — potentially for political reasons — to receive special treatment at the expense of the people that live near these polluting facilities.

Creating another Presidential exemption process after seeing how the existing process has been so brazenly abused by this Administration would be a dereliction of our duty as the Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act. But with that said, I know there remains significant stakeholder interest in Congress pursuing some version of bipartisan permitting reform. From my perspective, those negotiations cannot happen while the Trump Administration continues to provide zero confidence that any bipartisan agreement in Congress would be honored and implemented as intended.

There is a long and growing record of the Trump Administration playing favorites among certain technologies and individual firms, doing favors for political allies, and threatening retaliation against those that object. Meanwhile, EPA is carrying out a deregulatory agenda that is eroding critical public health protections, including numerous air pollution rules that would have saved thousands of American lives.

This is not fostering a foundation that will allow bipartisan negotiations to succeed. Finally, I suspect that today it might be suggested that the Clean Air Act has gone 35 years without a major overhaul and is in need of modernization. People might be surprised to hear that I do not disagree.

But modernization of our bedrock environmental laws should not just be a shorthand for enacting a deregulatory agenda. We should consider the challenges our country is facing at this moment and develop targeted solutions for them.

The 1990 Amendments tackled many of the issues of that era, including establishing the acid rain program and putting new emphasis on addressing hazardous air pollutants. Today, we should seek to provide similar regulatory certainty to meet our current moment.



If we are serious about modernizing the Clean Air Act, let's start by enacting a long-term program to phase down greenhouse gas emissions. I would welcome the conversation with the majority about how we can provide appropriate regulatory certainty and compliance flexibility while still allowing us to reduce this dangerous pollution and grow our economy. With that, I yield back.

Full Committee Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY): Thank you Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your opening statement and my friend from New York's opening statement as well and that we can work as what we know is a common goal is that we beat China and we have to have the energy and the resources to do it and I know it's in and we have to have the permitting so we can move the energy resources to do it and so America's job traders of enforcing government burdensome in our workable regulations that cost and create unnecessary barriers to growing their businesses and today will have a panel witness thank you all for being here they will testify about the need to pass common sense clean air permitting reforms to reduce unreasonable regulatory burdens while continuing to protect our environment.

Protecting our environment and strengthen our economy are not mutually exclusive. As we heard in our hearing in June on the national and air quality standards, regulatory burdens from the Biden-Harris administration cost nearly \$1.8 trillion and more than 70% of the cost was imposed by the EPA primarily for Clean Air Act rules.

Permitting requirements under the Clean Air Act are often decided as overly complex, time consuming, and costly. They also often serve as a disincentive to building new or expanding existing infrastructure in manufacturing, even if the project would be better for the environment. Substantive permanent reform under the Clean Air Act is needed for the US to strengthen domestic manufacturing, build critical infrastructure, and meet the growing energy needs and win the AI race.

HR 161 is introduced by Rep. Griffith and our forward discussion draft we will discuss today would make targeted changes to the Clean Air Act. They would not gut the Clean Air Act instead they are sort of common sense solutions we need. Our witnesses today will share their firsthand experience with the current regulatory system and challenges they've encountered or trying to grow their business or strengthen their local economies.

This committee has a unique opportunity to enact meaningful reforms and I'm eager to collaborate with members of this committee as we were to consider achieve the necessary reforms. I appreciate the time and I will yield back.

Legislation

[H.R. 161](#), New Source Review Permitting Improvement Act (Rep. Griffith)

[H.R. _____](#), Fire Improvement and Reforming Exceptional Events Act (FIRE) Act

[H.R. _____](#), Reducing and Eliminating Duplicative Environmental Regulations Act (RED Tape) Act

[H.R. _____](#), Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability (FENCES) Act

[H.R. _____](#), Air Permitting Improvements to Protect National Security Act

Witnesses

Clint Woods, Commissioner, Indiana Department of Environmental Management

[Testimony](#)

Mark Gebbia, Vice President, Environment and Permitting, Williams

[Testimony](#)



Ashley Kunz, Senior Director, Environmental health and Safety, Micron

[Testimony](#)

Danny Seiden, President and CEO, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry

[Testimony](#)

Keri Powell, Senior Attorney for community Health and Air Program Leader, Southern Environmental Law Center

[Testimony](#)

Ali Mirzakhali, Air Quality Division Administrator, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

[Testimony](#)

Q&A

Full Committee Chairman Brett Guthrie (R-KY) asked Mr. Seiden how important the clean air act in the permitting process is, and can we have meaningful permitting reform without modernizing the clean air act. Mr. Seiden said you cannot have longer term certainty without modernizing the clean air act. He added the most meaningful way you can lock down long term investment is to create certainty and modernizing the clean air act can do that. Chairman Guthrie asked Mr. Woods to comment on the ongoing NEPA reform as part of the permitting reform landscape. Mr. Woods said he would agree, and that 35 years is a long time, and there are new modeling and technology that needs to be reflected in modernization. He added that the way EPA sets standards that are attainment, non-attainment, and reclassification includes a modern vision. Chairman Guthrie asked Ms. Kunz in Micron's experience how important is clean air act reform to their expansion and what risks will we face if Congress fails to modernize the clean air act. Ms. Kunz said they have experienced a lengthy duplicative permitting process, and at one of their key investments in New York they have not gone under environmental review in 2 years. She added by streamlining this they can continue to modernize their facilities. Chairman Guthrie asked what impact does regulatory uncertainty mean for the industry in meeting increased demand, and why permitting reform must include technological investments. Mr. Gebbia said the need is current and in front of us, without certainty the industry goes through the permitting process and then have confidence to deploy capital. He added that by driving regulatory certainty it provides the opportunity to speed up the rate at which they deploy energy generation. Chairman Guthrie asked Mr. Woods in his experience of the 309 reviews, if it is still necessary. Mr. Woods said it is not necessary in its current form, whether not providing valuable feedback or by being duplicative.

Ranking Member Paul Tonko (D-NY) asked Ms. Powell if she has been following the exemption process for hazardous materials. Ms. Powell said they have been following the exemption process closely and noted that President Trump has exempted dozens of toxic air polluting facilities. She added that it is done without a record of decision, or any public participation, and in fact many findings show the exemption is unneeded. Ranking Member Tonko asked the exemption has the chance of being misused. Ms. Powell said it can be misused because there is so little accountability in ensuring there is a reason for it to happen. She noted that many of these communities already have dangerous air quality. Ranking Member Tonko asked if she believes the recent exemptions provided a strong technical record or justification to understand why the exemptions were granted. Ms. Powell said the recent exemptions have no technical record that's available, and they have struggled to get copies of the applications the facilities have filed. She noted that the state agencies also don't have the applications. Ranking Member Tonko asked Mr. Mirzakhali if he has any concerns as a co-regulator are escaping pollution standards without oversight or having the states perspective heard. Mr. Mirzakhali said in Oregon they don't have non-attainment but added that facilities that do get waivers puts pressure on other facilities that don't qualify.



Ranking Member Tonko asked to explain some of the unintended consequences under current exemption model. Mr. Mirzakhilili said that was right, and it is the subsidy it introduces for one facility. The chair cut off the questions and asked to submit the remaining response to the record.

Rep. Dan Crenshaw (R-TX) discussed the need to permit the clean air act but noted that we cannot regulate ourselves into industrial decline if we are to remain ahead of China in AI and other innovation. Rep. Crenshaw asked Ms. Kunz, how does permitting gridlock put US innovation and national security at risk. Ms. Kunz said in their experience they have faced delays and have not been able to start meaningful construction. She added that duplicative reviews at the state and federal levels create lengthy processes, and request streamlining the process. Rep. Crenshaw asked Mr. Woods how common-sense reform that trusts states more instead of federal micromanagement speed up clean air progress and investment. Mr. Woods said we are seeing important changes with the new administration. He stated new ideas are being presented such as second guessing of states applicability of review. He continued that the title 5 review process expands to issues that are not within its intended scope. Rep. Crenshaw asked if he had any examples of the state duplicative process. Mr. Woods said there are multiple duplicative reviews that stop data centers, energy generation and many other projects. Rep. Crenshaw asked what he would prioritize for congress to codify the new policies being rolled out by the EPA. Mr. Gebbia said some of the key issues involve beginning construction before a permit.

Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL) discussed the number of deaths per year in the United States due to air pollution and questioned why we must discuss legislation that will add to that pollution. Rep. Schakowsky asked Mr. Mirzakhilili if there will be more people who get sick by making this change in what our priority is in our manufacturing. Mr. Mirzakhilili said the clean air act has saved hundreds of thousands of lives, and increasing pollution can harm people. He noted that it is a hard and painful process and stated that we need to focus on improving the process. He continued that we need to focus on shortening the process rather than giving waiver to avoid the process. Rep. Schakowsky asked Ms. Powell if it is true that there are ways for the EPA to help encourage ways to make things safer. Ms. Powell said it is true and spoke about her time at EPA and working on providing permits and helping many states and other stakeholders navigate through the process.

Rep. Gabe Evans (R-CO) noted that roughly 70 percent of emissions in the state of Colorado did not originate in Colorado and stated regulations on state economies through the clean air act did not get to the root of the problem. He asked Mr. Woods what reforms he would prioritize in the permitting process so the economy was not strangled by events outside of their jurisdiction. Mr. Woods said there were national solutions that already existed within the clean air act but could be invigorated with action from congress, such as provisions to address exceptional acts and international contributions, and other options such as core categorical grants for cooperative federalism. Rep. Evans highlighted ozone non-attainment standards and asked Mr. Seiden what happened to the economy of a region when there is a heavy hand of regulation that does not clean up the environment because it was targeting the wrong emissions. Mr. Seiden said capital went where it was most wanted and stayed where it was most welcome so an uncertain regulatory environment would result in loss of investment, and they typically saw those investments going to other countries with less environmental standards and pollution that still ended up in America. Rep. Evans asked Mr. Gebbia what congress could do to make sure states were not intentionally ignoring existing waiver processes or exceptions to the Clean Air Act around certain regulated industries like natural gas. Mr. Gebbia said that the Clean Air Act had been extremely successful to date, but it had diminishing returns, so congress could solidify new source review and facilitate expansion of projects.

Full Committee Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ) said the bills before them implied that the only way to build in America was to exempt various polluting industries from environmental laws permit



by permit and called this a false choice. He asked Ms. Powell why effective permitting was so critical to the success of the Clean Air Act and in her experience, what was causing permitting delays for major projects. Ms. Powell said permitting was incredibly important in achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act because it was predominantly how standards were set for facilities, and delays were caused by a myriad of things outside the Clean Air Act such as companies failing to file complete permitting applications. Full Committee Ranking Member Pallone asked Mr. Mirzakhali if rote exemptions were necessary or could they have a permitting system that worked for industry while adhering to environmental safeguards. Mr. Mirzakhali said that they could have a system that operated without exemptions as they did nothing but complicate applicability to emissions. Full Committee Ranking Member Pallone expressed concerns that Republican's push for permitting reform was not happening in a silo, it was happening alongside the rollback of environmental standards by the Trump administration. He asked Ms. Powell taken collectively how the administration's proposal to weaken the PM 2.5 NAC standard along with additional rollbacks and exemptions being proposed in the legislation impact the health and safety of communities nationally. Ms. Powell said the rollbacks would undoubtedly undermine public health and result in increased deadly air pollutants. Full Committee Ranking Member Pallone said everyone had the right to breathe clean air but the bills undermined that right.

Rep. August Pfluger (R-TX) stated that the FENCES Act aims to address the problem that Mr. Woods discussed regarding how states can be unfairly penalized for air pollution that they cannot control. He asked Mr. Woods how clarifying section 179 (b) as the FENCES Act proposes, would reduce permitting delays or protect the environment better than the current process. Mr. Woods said the FENCES Act goes a long way, and he said there are several points where the EPA can consider changes: when it sets the standards, when it does designations of an area initially, when it redesignates those areas into attainment or not attainment, and as it further classifies. Mr. Wood said as there are higher classifications, the penalties become much more heavy-handed and are at the core of the permitting issues. He said the 179 (b) provision is to avoid classification being bumped up above marginal to the more significant penalties, and it could clarify for the EPA and have an incredible impact on the opportunity for eliminating delays in permitting, economic activity, and innovation. Rep. Pfluger asked Ms. Kunz her thoughts on Micron building multiple large semiconductor fabrication facilities across the country, and how the Clean Air Act permitting timelines influence the schedule and costs of the projects without achieving the desired goals. Ms. Kunz said they have seen a lengthy permitting and review process where there are duplicative reviews, interagency coordination up to tens of agencies with conflicting guidance. She said streamlining this process would be critical to ensure that construction can stay on time and needs can be delivered on. Rep. Pfluger asked Ms. Kunz what kind of regulatory clarity or legislation action would help alleviate the problem where wildfire smoke is an uncontrollable factor in meeting the new PM 2.5 standards. Ms. Kunz said in this space, the definitions of "natural" versus "human" caused wildfire need to be codified further. Rep. Pfluger concluded by noting the importance that the Chevron deference case had on the topic at hand.

Rep. Scott Peters (D-CA) began by expressing support for his bill with Rep. Westerman, the Fix our Forests Act, and noted that it almost passed the House under suspension earlier this Congress. He expressed support for the Senate moving quickly on their version of the bill. He then discussed his work with Sens. Kelly and Cruz on the Building Chips in America Act and the permitting certainty it provided to semiconductor manufacturers. He also mentioned his bill, the ePermit Act, which was discussed last week in the Natural Resources committee. He noted that these three bills are bipartisan opportunities for NEPA reform and emphasized that NEPA does not contain substantive environmental protections like the bedrock environmental laws do. He noted that he is cautious about making changes to environmental standards, although he noted that he would like to advance the speed. He asked Ms. Kunz what environmental laws were causing the delays for her project and how the ePermit Act could address these



challenges. Ms. Kunz responded that the delays are being caused by the environmental impact review process and the duplicative nature of it, as well as complicated reviews during the Clean Air Act permitting process. She added that there are ways to modernize the Clean Air Act permitting process, allowing applicants to use modern tools and electronic databases to achieve accuracy and a more streamlined process. Rep. Peters responded that he is cautious about lowering standards but noted that there is no reason why the speed can't be increased with less drag on industry and the economy. He then asked Mr. Mirzakhali if there are ways that the federal government can reduce regulatory burden for states that are trying to use prescribed fire as a wildfire tool and if the Fire Act addresses these challenges. Mr. Mirzakhali responded that prescribed fires can provide resiliency to the landscape and that they are working with state agencies to expand its use. He noted that the exceptional events exclusion is a tool for this but that there is a burden for agencies to submit this that can be eased by the EPA. He also noted that EPA considers some fires non regulatorily significant and this is important area to focus on.

Rep. Rob Menendez (D-NJ) argued that the Clean Air Act helps the U.S. achieve clean air and a strong economy. He asked if it's true that particular matter is among some of the most dangerous forms of pollutant. Ms. Powell said yes. Rep. Menendez then asked if the Clean Air Act has been successful in reducing the concentration of particular matter in the air. Ms. Powell said yes. Rep. Menendez argued that it is extremely dangerous to consider changes to the Clean Air Act at this moment due to cuts to Medicaid in OBBBA. Rep. Menendez noted that those depending on Medicaid may also be in communities that are at a higher risk of particulate matter exposure and pollution. He asked Ms. Powell if she agreed that the intersection of these two efforts is especially dangerous. Ms. Powell said yes. Rep. Menendez then referenced recent testimony from a Natural Resources Defense Council representative who argued that he would support expedited permitting rules and processes so long as the Clean Air Act's protections remain in place. He asked Mr. Powell if she agreed. Ms. Powell said yes and argued that policies which expedite permitting are worth consideration so long as they do not negatively impact health. Rep. Menendez argued that Democrats want to help in permitting reform but not at the expense of communities. He then asked Ms. Powell if she believed the legislation being considered would achieve permitting reform. Ms. Powell said no and argued that the legislation being considered would primarily strip Clean Air Act protections. Rep. Menendez noted staffing and funding cuts at EPA and asked whether building staffing capacity at state agencies could help drive more expedited permitting. Mr. Mirzakhali said yes.

Rep. Greg Landsman (D-OH) began by stating that there is a commitment to do bipartisan permitting reform. He questioned where the reforms would lead to dirtier air and dirtier water. He stated that the office of research and development at the EPA that help businesses and municipalities. He exclaimed his frustration by the EPA's decision to shutter the Office of Research and Development and threaten the jobs of 1200 public servants. Rep. Landsman asked Ms. Powell how the EPA's work within ORD before the EPA's decision around ORD, how did it support the EPA's ability to address toxic air pollution. Ms. Powell responded and stated that the ORD was essential in evaluating the health effects of air toxics, played an important role in people understanding the risks of the pollutant, while also affecting legislation and regulations. Rep. Landsman continued and asked Mr. Mirzakhali if he could talk about the specific tools that ORD has provided to states. Mr. Mirzakhali responded that they provide crucial resources for state permitting agencies such as modeling tools which are improved through the ORD. Rep. Landsman asked Mr. Mirzakhali and the rest of the witnesses if it is important of the scientists at ORD to remain independent from political pressure. Mr. Mirzakhali and all of the witnesses responded yes.

Chairman Gary Palmer (R-AL) began by talking about the AI arms race with China and how important it is that we remain at the forefront. He asked Mr. Woods why it is so important to have regulatory certainty and permitting reform for data centers given this. Mr. Woods said that certainty is essential for investment, and when the permitting process is too difficult to navigate, it deters investment in our own



country. Chairman Palmer then talked about the importance of domestic processing and refining capabilities of critical minerals to secure our supply chain. He asked Ms. Kunz whether her product requires any rare earth elements. She said that she wasn't sure of those details and would get back to him on that. Chairman Palmer said that he can tell her with a high degree of certainty that it does. He went on to discuss the fact that there are no refineries in the western hemisphere. He asked Mr. Seiden whether the outdated provisions within the Clean Air Act restrict our ability to build up processing and refining capabilities. Mr. Seiden responded that they absolutely do. He said that within Arizona, that holds 8% of the U.S. copper supply, the need for smelters and availability and reliability is extremely important. The Chairman then asked Mr. Gebbia how flaws in the Clean Air Act inhibit our ability to generate sufficient power and stay ahead in the AI arms race. Mr. Gebbia said that there is a major need for permitting reform to deploy power in a timelier fashion.

Rep. Buddy Carter (R-GA) discussed the lengthy permitting process involved in expanding the port of Savannah that started in 1996, with the project finishing in 2022; he noted that China has finished 3 ports during that time. Rep. Carter asked Ms. Kunz how wildfires in and around Idaho make it hard for her to comply with the clean air act. Ms. Kunz said when they look at wildfires they are advocating for more definitions around human and natural events, which can help the permitting process by providing the needed clarity. Rep. Carter asked what some of the consequences are we may see in terms of domestic AI development if we don't reform the clean air act. Ms. Kunz said they are the only US-based memory manufacturers with leading edge technology that supports everything across the AI ecosystem. Rep. Carter asked how CLEAR Act is, which allows for changes to state plans, and review timeline would allow them to do their jobs more effectively. Mr. Woods said the implementation tools would be helpful for state planning and as the core implementors of the clean air act. Rep. Carter asked for his thoughts on the FIRE Act. Mr. Woods said he would agree that it is good common-sense legislation that provides good categorical exemptions. He added driving down wildfires and managing our forest will have a tremendous impact on our national clean air.

Rep. John Joyce (R-PA) began by discussing the importance of permitting reform to the economy and national security. He asked Mr. Seiden to explain the consequences of outdated provisions of the Clean Air Act and how they can impact the ability of industries to build in the US. Mr. Seiden responded that industries have stalled in their decisions to invest in the US and there is little certainty which makes planning difficult. He noted that this will lead the US to be hamstrung in competition with other countries, including foreign adversaries. Rep. Joyce agreed, emphasizing China's role in the AI race. He added that overburdensome regulations threaten the US globally and encourage companies to build in other countries, like China. He asked Ms. Kunz what consequences the US will face if it fails to enact permitting reform and how urgently the reform is needed. Ms. Kunz responded that reform is needed to maintain US competitiveness. Rep. Joyce asked if permitting reform will restore competitiveness in the US and globally. Ms. Kunz responded that for her US investments, extended timelines impact manufacturing timelines and the ability to bring chips to market. She added that reform will help the success of the semiconductor industry. Rep. Joyce asked if ceding investment opportunities to foreign adversaries that do not have the same clean air requirements harms the US economically and is incompatible with protecting the environment. Ms. Kunz responded that delays and extended timelines impact manufacturing processes. Rep. Joyce then discussed how the uncertainty of when the new source review process will be triggered and how the expense has discouraged investment. He asked Mr. Gebbia how narrow NSR reforms would reduce regulatory burdens on the economy while still protecting health and the environment. Mr. Gebbia responded that NSR is duplicative and outdated. Rep. Joyce added that this slows the ability to be competitive and it is necessary to balance the need to protect public health and clean air with the need for innovation.



Chairman Palmer brought the hearing to a close.