



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



550 Capitol St. NE

Salem, OR 97301

Phone: 503-378-4040

Toll Free: 1-800-221-8035

FAX: 503-373-7806

www.oregon.gov/energy

MEETING SUMMARY

ODOE Oregon Energy Strategy Advisory Group Meeting #4; October 17, 2024

Attendees

Present Advisory Group members: Aaron Orłowski, Andrea Kreiner, Bryan Adams, Charity Fain, Christine Golightly, Cory Scott, Emily Griffith, Erin Childs, Fred Heutte, Ivy Quach, Jeffrey Roy Hammarlund, Jennifer Bies, Jennifer Hill-Hart, Jimmy Lindsay, Joshua Basofin, Juan Barraza, Laura Tabor, Mary Moerlins, Elaine Prause, Nate Hill, Patrick Ford Mills, Rakesh Aneja, Rebecca Smith, Scott R. Simms, Shannon Souza, Timothy L. McMahon, and Tucker Billman

Absent Advisory Group members: Andrew Mulkey, Cathy Ehli, and Robert Wallace

Oregon Department of Energy staff: Abby Reeser, Alan Zelenka, Edith Bayer, Hugh Arceneaux, Jessica Reichers, Jillian DiMedio, Joni Slinger, Josh Price, Lauren Rosenstein, Mary Kopriva, Michael Freels, and Ruchi Sadhir

Consultant team: Ben Duncan (Kearns & West), Gillian Garber-Yonts (Kearns & West), María Verano (Kearns & West), Eileen Quigley (CETI), Ruby Moore-Bloom (CETI)

Number of members of the public in attendance: 1

Welcome and Agenda Review

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, opened the meeting. Elaine Prause, Energy Trust of Oregon, greeted the group and shared meeting room logistics. Edith Bayer, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), welcomed the group, expressed gratitude for the participants' work on the Oregon Energy Strategy, and emphasized statewide nature of the strategy.

Edith outlined the goals of the meeting:

- Present Alternative Scenarios and answer clarifying questions
- Gather feedback on Alternative Scenarios
- Present and collect initial feedback on energy wallet, air quality modeling, and geospatial mapping analysis
- Define the next steps

Ben reviewed the group agreements, led the members of the group through introductions, and introduced the ODOE project team, the Clean Energy Transitions Institute (CETI) team, and the Kearns & West team.

September Meeting Summary Approval

Ben introduced a process for formally approving meeting summaries and noted that the process will be a standing agenda item at future Advisory Group meetings. Participants were asked to share any requested updates to the September Meeting Summary. No updates were shared, and the meeting summary was approved as final.

Overview of Process and Model

Edith provided an overview of the Advisory Group's objectives and a status update on the technical analysis, reminding the group that this work informs us of the next steps in Oregon's Energy Strategy development. The CETI team has begun to model simulations but has not yet incorporated Alternative Scenarios. Edith explained that the finalization of these Scenarios is crucial for informing policy discussions in early 2025.

Edith shared an overview of the three phases of the Oregon Energy Strategy process.

- **Phase 1 - Technical analysis (current stage):** Develop a summary of the potential pathways to achieve Oregon's energy policy objectives.
- **Phase 2 - Policy discussions:** Use the output from Phase 1 to develop policy recommendations.
- **Phase 3 - Report:** Draft report to include policy recommendations, a description of stakeholder engagement, and a description of how stakeholder perspectives informed the strategy.

Edith presented slides relating the Strategy process to HB 3630 language, the goal of identifying optimized pathways to energy policy objectives and the engagement elements of the bill. Edith reviewed a slide illustrating factors that should inform the report, stating that some non-energy factors in the right-hand column of the slide will be addressed in complementary analyses outside of the technical modeling.

Working Session: Discussion of Alternative Scenarios

Introduction

Edith shared that the Advisory Group will be comparing different Scenarios to understand the implications of achieving Oregon's energy policy objectives. The modeling will look at five Alternative Scenarios, each testing different challenges: lower energy efficiency and electrification in buildings, lower electrification of transportation, constrained transmission, constrained utility-scale renewable, and higher hydrogen availability. Edith shared that the Alternative Scenarios will help ODOE and the Advisory Group explore "what-if" questions regarding potential costs, sector-specific impacts, and economic shifts. Edith added that the Reference Scenario is intended to inform policy discussions by showing pathways for Oregon to meet its clean energy goals.

Advisory Group members shared the following questions:

Question: Are the more ambitious Scenarios broken down by sectors, like transportation and buildings?

Response: Yes, the Oregon Climate Action Commission's 95% reduction goal for 2050 is used, with results presented sector by sector, including transportation and buildings.

Question: Does the higher hydrogen availability Scenario include all forms of hydrogen, not just renewable hydrogen?

Response: The focus is on green hydrogen, with flexibility for low-carbon options based on emissions constraints. Hydrogen production is optimized by the model based on economic factors as well as the emissions constraints built in based on Oregon climate policy. While there are no requirements that the model only choose clean hydrogen, the emissions constraints in place due to Oregon climate policy in conjunction with higher incentives for clean hydrogen are likely to result in hydrogen that has a low carbon intensity.

Question: Will the constrained transmission Scenario include details like grid capacity and storage?

Response: The model will address some details like reconductoring, but the policy discussions beginning next year will include more details.

Question: Is large industry included in the model? Amazon signed a deal for nuclear energy, is that level of detail included? Is load-growth resulting from increased data center energy consumption included?

Response: Yes, industry is included. The model incorporates the Northwest Power Conservation Council's mid-high power trajectory to account for expected data center growth. Reliance on the mid-higher case has been selected on the basis of commenter feedback.

Question: The Scenarios are broad. When will you drill down into specifics, and how do you ensure that important details are not lost?

Response: The model provides a macro-level understanding. Specifics will be discussed in the policy phase, including grid policies that are still being worked out with consultants.

Question: Is biomass gasification included in the Higher Hydrogen Availability Scenario?

Response: Yes, the model can select biomass gasification depending on cost and feasibility, with Carbon Capture and Storage (CSS) as an option under emissions constraints.

Question: Why is there so much focus on 2050 when we also have a 2030 milestone?

Response: We are modeling to achieve midterm milestones and will present results in five-year increments, starting in 2025.

Question: When can we expect to see baseline data?

Response: We are not modeling a base scenario but will use the best available data for current conditions during the policy phase.

Question: How do we know the Reference Scenario is realistic and reflects current conditions?

Response: The 2025 starting point uses the best available data, though we may need to rely on national data if Oregon-specific data is unavailable.

Question: Where are we currently with heat pump sales, and how big is the lift to reach future targets?

Response: Current data points will be incorporated into the policy discussions, but the model will not fully represent business-as-usual. Starting points for 2025 will be based on the best available data.

Question: Should offshore wind projects recently delayed by the governor be included as potential renewable development options?

Response: The model considers offshore wind in terms of cost competition, but the specifics will be part of future policy discussions.

Question: How will the findings from this process be carried forward if certain gaps exist, especially if some questions remain unanswered?

Response: The findings will guide future research areas and policy recommendations. Results will be broad but will highlight where more research or policy action is needed.

Question: Does the model account for carbon capture technologies?

Response: Yes, carbon capture is included in the model's economic balancing, but only if it is cost-effective under the constraints applied.

Question: How does the model handle technologies that are available but may not be cost-effective?

Response: The model is based on a least-cost approach. If a technology is not cost-effective, it will either not be selected or be selected later in the process.

Lower Energy Efficiency & Electrification in Buildings

Edith highlighted several key points regarding the impacts of lower efficiency and electrification in buildings. She noted that high levels of electrification and energy efficiency are based on projected sales of electric and hybrid technologies. Edith then gave an overview of the Alternative Scenarios and noted that there is potential for reductions in industrial electrification. Additionally, Edith cited a potential decrease in industrial process efficiency from 1% to 0.5% annually.

Advisory Group members shared the following questions and comments:

Question: Where do new buildings fit into the Lower Energy Efficiency and Electrification Scenario? Does the model consider building certifications that go beyond building codes, such as LEED Platinum buildings? If there is a percentage of buildings currently exceeding the code, and this Scenario assumes that will not continue, that seems problematic. Is there a data source to track how many buildings exceed current codes?

Response: The current model focuses on renovations and does not explicitly include new builds, especially those exceeding code. This is a point that will be checked with the modeler to see if data on such buildings can be incorporated. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification could serve as one data source, and there may be other databases that could help.

Comment: There should be a double-check of energy efficiency projections to ensure the model accurately reflects the number of efficient buildings.

Response: The modeler will verify the average energy outputs and ensure they align with current efficiency efforts.

Question: The expansion of natural gas into Oregon is a significant concern that needs to be addressed. How do we incorporate this into our Energy Strategy, especially given potential greenhouse gas emissions?

Response: The model will consider both demand and supply changes across the western region, acknowledging that some gas may be sent from outside Oregon. ODOE also encourages participants to raise this subject in Phase 2 policy discussions.

Comment: There is a need to recognize the uncertainty around the future of natural gas supply and its potential impact.

Response: The modeling will account for regional gas supply changes and their implications, looking at how they might affect demand in Oregon.

Question: Are we examining the barriers that might delay electrification and energy efficiency improvements? It is important to identify these barriers to avoid delays and find effective policies.

Response: The model has considered potential barriers and will serve to frame the discussion around electrification rates including why electrification may not progress as quickly as desired. The model is designed to explore higher and lower electrification scenarios. Policy discussions will focus in more detail on barriers and potential actions.

Question: Is the model considering upgrades needed for distribution networks regardless of the pathway chosen?

Response: Yes, the model will provide high-level estimates for necessary upgrades, though it will not detail specific lines.

Question: What is the definition of benefits under this project?

Response: the Strategy will consider economic benefits and well as non-economic co-benefits including equity, environmental justice, jobs, and air quality and health; co-benefits will primarily be addressed by complementary analyses to the technical modeling and through Phase 2 policy discussions.

Question: Can you clarify what “sales shares” refers to in the model?

Response: Sales shares represent the percentage of purchases of electric or hybrid heating technologies, similar to market share in retail.

Question: How does the model account for ambitious energy efficiency assumptions? If we fall short of these goals, will it be reflected?

Response: The model assumes ongoing efficiency improvements across all technologies and will track impacts if efficiency goals are not met in the Lower Efficiency and Electrification Scenario.

Question: Are we also looking at different levels of weatherization in these Scenarios?

Response: This is something that could be considered, but the current focus is on the biggest levers, particularly electrification, which offers substantial efficiency gains.

Comment: It seems that focusing on electrification could overshadow the importance of other efficiency measures.

Response: While electrification is a key lever, the model aims to balance various factors and provide a comprehensive comparison between Scenarios.

Lower Electrification of Transportation

Edith presented the Lower Electrification of Transportation Scenario which focused on lower electrification in transportation, particularly medium and heavy-duty vehicles. Edith shared that in the Reference case, sales shares are set to achieve 100% zero-emission vehicles by 2040 (and 2036 for transit and school buses), with a distribution between battery electric and hydrogen vehicles. The Alternative Scenario extends this timeline to 100% zero-emission by 2050 for medium and heavy-duty vehicles.

Limited Demand Response

Edith presented an overview of the Limited Demand Response Scenario which serves as a counterpoint to the aggressive but achievable Reference assumptions. She shared that in the Reference case, high levels of demand response are anticipated. The Reference Scenario expects 50% of homes and businesses to participate in firm demand response programs. In contrast, the Alternative Scenario reduces this participation to just 5%. The Alternative Scenario also scales back managed charging, with only 20% of residential EVs participating.

Edith added that the Scenario aims to address questions about the implications of maintaining current demand response levels, the reliance on supply-side solutions to integrate variable renewable resources, and the effects of electrification if new electric loads are not managed flexibly.

Constrained Transmission

Edith shared that the Constrained Transmission Scenario explores the implications of delaying the Greenfield transmission development until 2045. This Alternative Scenario aims to assess the impacts of constrained transmission on the ability to clean up the power sector and explores questions such as the effects of delayed construction across the West, reliance on reconducting to meet transmission needs, and a greater dependence on in-state resources for electricity generation. The Scenario also limits the construction of utility-scale renewables. This includes avoiding development in areas of high conservation, cultural value, prime farmland, and key habitats.

Higher Hydrogen Availability

Edith shared that the Higher Hydrogen Availability Scenario tests the implications of increased hydrogen access. This Scenario proposes to accelerate the build-out of hydrogen pipeline infrastructure from 2035 to 2030, focusing primarily on interstate lines. Additionally, it aims to increase the rate of hydrogen supply chain infrastructure development compared to the Reference Scenario, thereby enabling greater availability of hydrogen. She added that the Scenario seeks to answer questions about the role of hydrogen in energy storage and the decarbonization of the power sector.

More Aggressive Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction

Edith shared that the more aggressive GHG Scenario aims for a 95% reduction in GHG emissions by 2050. Edith added that this has been temporarily set aside for re-evaluation, pending insights from the ongoing modeling effort. There has been a lot of feedback received, prompting a need for further consideration of the inclusion of federal IRA tax credits, the nature of fixed versus flexible load electrolyzers, the role of fuel turbines, and the definition of green hydrogen. There has also been interest in the potential for a dedicated offshore wind scenario, as well as inquiries about the impact of extreme weather and the desire for a scenario addressing this. She added that questions have arisen around transmission and grid-enhancing technologies, as well as levels of electrification and demand response in both the Reference and Alternative Scenarios.

Discussion

Ben introduced the discussion activity and noted that this will be the last chance for input since the written comment period has closed.

The Advisory Group Members had the following questions and comments:

Comment: Reiterated written comments concerning hydrogen, electrolyzers, hydrogen fuel production, and treatment of Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) hydrogen tax credits.

Comment: I have a request for more comprehensive discussion on what an energy pathways model is and how it differs from a singular model, especially regarding its role in policy discussions.

Comment: Some of the alternatives can provide proactive insights into greenhouse gas efforts.

Question: A group member expressed as to how cost-effectiveness and other benefits are included, in the model from the standpoint of fishery and tribal resources; the group member asked if those perspectives are addressed in the Reference or Alternative Scenarios.

Response: the current modeling has limited analysis of co-benefits. These issues of tribal and fishery resources will be further examined in complementary analyses. Additionally, ODOE requests that stakeholders should raise these perspectives during Phase 2 policy discussions.

Comment: I would like to focus more on carbon capture processes and understanding how inputs evolve into outputs in the modeling.

Comment: There are challenges in comprehensive modeling, and it is important to not skew results. Community benefits and burdens will be important to discuss in light of heat risks posed by climate change.

Response: There is a necessity to consider various scenarios, including worst-case, to inform future pathways.

Comment: I support the discussion on energy markets and their potential impacts on energy policy, however I would like there to be a deeper understanding.

Comment: I suggest that we analyze competing market scenarios to better understand their implications.

Response: Ongoing market studies are occurring and incorporating different market constraints into the modeling is difficult.

Comment: There is a need for discussion on markets, recognizing that there are limitations to the current modeling approach regarding market constraints.

Comment: It is important to emphasize the cost-effectiveness of renewable hydrogen in conversations.

Question: What are the economic impacts of extending transmission development timelines from 2035 to 2045? Can we include the potential increases in electricity costs for residents?

Response: We will consider modeling cost impacts, including inflation, to assess the economic consequences.

Comment: I would like to confirm that distributed renewables, particularly smaller systems, are included in the transmission constraints section.

Comment: It is very important to include the value proposition of electrolytic hydrogen in models, especially regarding its impact on in-state renewables and potential overbuilding.

Question: Can you model the land requirements for renewable energy generation? I am interested in seeing what the potential impacts on wildlife would be for these initiatives.

Response: We plan to assess land requirements in different Scenarios..

Question: What is the feasibility of accelerating hydrogen pipeline construction compared to the realistic timeline for new transmission lines?

Response: We will take that into consideration.

Question: To what degree will energy storage be included in existing infrastructure to enhance resilience and electricity supply during crises?

Response: Relevant technologies are included in the model, and energy security plans will complement the strategy discussions.

Comment: We need to be certain that existing residential and commercial energy storage can support the grid during emergencies.

Question: Does the model have the ability to acknowledge the uncertainties and their potential use in future policy iterations?

Response: Modeling uncertainties for future exploration will be a part of this process.

Comment: There is a need to capture the added value of distributed solar and storage in the context of energy efficiency.

Response: We are striving for more renewable generation and the need to evaluate its value.

Comment: I am concerned about land availability. I would also like to highlight the importance of Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plans for solar and wind development.

Comment: ODOE should consider merchant transmission alongside utility transmission to enhance opportunities without conflict.

Comment: I have concerns about permitting constraints and the need for balance between community opposition and climate change goals.

Comment: There is a disconnect between Oregon and Washington regarding climate goals and policy frameworks. Oregon should coordinate more with Washington State in planning around energy and environmental objectives

Response: The modeling includes regional interactions and competition for resources. ODOE encourages participants to continue to raise policy questions regarding regional coordination during the Phase 2 policy discussions.

Question: How will constraints on utility-scale development influence resource selection in modeling? I am also concerned about policy timelines.

Response: There is a need to revisit policies as they develop, and we will need to follow how trends will influence modeling outcomes.

Question: Do the Scenarios consider ambitious or less constrained Scenarios beyond the Reference Scenario?

Question: What is the definition of prime farmland? What will its impact on constraints be for utility-scale projects?

Response: We will review this and provide clarification on the definition used for prime farmland at a future date.

Comment: A focus on medium and heavy-duty vehicle constraints without addressing light-duty vehicles does not make sense because of ambitious vehicle electrification expectations.

Response: The model assumes no light-duty constraints because of the Advanced Clean Cars II policy objective constraint of 100% sales of light-duty electric vehicles by 2035.

Question: How will the model account for the interplay between electrification infrastructure and consumer purchasing decisions?

Response: The model assumes infrastructure will drive consumer purchases but acknowledges that real-world behavior may differ.

Comment: Why are all Scenarios based on worse-case assumptions, except for hydrogen? Why not include best-case Scenarios for other options?

Response: The Reference Case builds in aggressive but achievable levels of uptake for many technologies, and the alternative scenarios "test" these levels with a comparison of "what if" we don't achieve those high levels of uptake. Hydrogen is treated differently due to uncertainties around it being a newer, emerging technology, leading to a preference to test a higher level of hydrogen into the alternative scenario rather than building it into the Reference..

Comment: There is a need to consider cultural, social, and health impacts alongside the economic costs in the modeling conversations. “Co-benefits” should not be distinguished or treated as distinct from benefits generally; doing so devalues these benefits and spoke to the importance of non-economic benefits. An Advisory Group member agreed, adding that the model should prioritize cost-effectiveness across the model.

Comment: I do not think that there should be barriers to fuel switching in energy efficiency measures at the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

Comment: There are challenges in analyzing scenarios without clear baseline assumptions.

Question: What is the definition of "cost-effectiveness" beyond monetary terms?

Response: There are broader implications for cost-effectiveness and the potential for the Scenarios to reflect benefits beyond just financial costs.

Comment: The Higher Hydrogen Availability Scenario may be overly ambitious for residential customers compared to other sectors. An Advisory Group member shared alignment and added that there is a need to consider different scenarios for various sectors, including transportation and residential.

Comment: Constraints relevant to renewable energy generation, such as land use impacts, should be considered in the Higher Hydrogen Availability Scenario.

Response: Yes. We are exploring slower hydrogen rollout scenarios.

Question: I am confused about the transportation electrification focus, as it seems to constrain only medium and heavy-duty vehicles, not considering the broader context of light-duty vehicles. How does the model account for the infrastructure needed for electric vehicles (EVs)?

Response: We are assuming existing policies that push for 100% sales of EVs by 2035, which will influence infrastructure development.

Question: We should not overlook the significant non-economic benefits of electrification, as these social and health factors are crucial. How are these considered in the model?

Response: We recognize these benefits but are focused on economic modeling. However, we are interested in exploring the household-level impacts later.

Question: Understanding baseline assumptions would help us analyze the Scenarios better. How can we incorporate broader impacts beyond just cost-effectiveness?

Response: We will look into including a more comprehensive analysis of costs, including those impacting Environmental Justice communities.

Question: Regarding transportation electrification timelines, how do the ambitious goals in California relate to our baseline scenarios?

Response: The California goals do not directly apply to Oregon's policies. We can provide further clarification offline.

Question: Cost of ownership is crucial for consumer decisions. How does the model account for variations in hydrogen and electric energy prices?

Response: We need to explore this further in the model, as interdependencies like pricing are critical but may not be fully captured.

Question: Why not consider shifting loads closer to power sources instead of focusing solely on transmission?

Response: This idea is valuable and could potentially improve efficiency; we will consider it in our analysis.

Question: Localized hydrogen production might reduce transportation costs. Are there plans to explore this in the Scenarios?

Response: We are aware of the potential for localized systems and will consider this in future conversations.

Question: Resiliency is vital; we need to discuss backup options for rural areas reliant on electricity. Are these considerations included in the modeling?

Response: We recognize the importance of resilience and will incorporate this into our analysis.

Question: Is the model considering overall air quality and impacts from events like wildfires, which affect public health?

Comment: We should explore the effects of less restrictive land use policies as well, and how upcoming legislation might impact our analysis.

Comment: We must consider load growth from data centers and other industries when discussing transmission capabilities.

Response: Load growth is a significant factor that we will address in the transmission modeling.

Comment: It is crucial to identify co-benefits in grid solutions, like water conservation and wildfire prevention.

Comment: I believe the term “co-benefits” might be too technical and recommended using simpler language to ensure the concept is clear to all stakeholders and to ensure that social, cultural, health, and other non-economic benefits are adequately appreciated.

Question: The timing of the legislative session will influence policy recommendations; how will this be managed?

Response: We will need to navigate the relationship between ongoing legislative developments and our modeling work carefully.

Comment: Policy discussions should be iterative in order to account for policies passed in the interim and throughout the Energy Strategy drafting process.

Response: To clarify - current modeling efforts will not inform the upcoming legislative session, but will be used in drafting a report due Nov 1, 2025, that will be able to inform policy in the 2027 legislative session. ODOE calls on advisory group members to help work as ambassadors regarding the modeling and Oregon Energy Strategy during the upcoming legislative session.

Comment: I appreciate the work done, but I have concerns about the Constrained Utility-Scale Renewables Scenario. It seems we have not fully explored its implications.

Response: We will reconsider how we frame this Scenario, particularly regarding distributed renewables and their impacts.

Comment: I want to ensure we are not conflating land-use rigor with speed in our analysis. We should explore ways to expedite processes effectively.

Question: I am curious about the model's ability to stress-test resilience under different weather conditions. What tools will we use for this?

Response: We are taking this into consideration.

Comment: The Scenarios do not seem to consider cost variability, which is influenced by global events. I am interested in analyzing sensitivity to these changes.

Question: Are we assuming all market scenarios are optimized? Can we analyze potential inefficiencies?

Response: Yes, we are analyzing optimization, but we will consider your suggestion about exploring potential inefficiencies.

Comment: I appreciate the focus on the Constrained Transmission Scenario and its importance across the West. Prioritization of this Scenario is crucial.

Question: I am interested in how the results will help calibrate costs and inform policy choices.

Response: Comparisons between the Reference and Alternative Scenarios will provide insights into potential outcomes and costs.

Question: Is there a reason constrained utility-scale renewables are paired with constrained transmission in the modeling? Should they be separate?

Response: The assumption is that similar factors constrain both. We considered separating them, but our consultants advised keeping them together.

Comment: The electric vehicle landscape is shifting from a divide of "haves" and "have-nots" to a focus on "will" versus "will-nots," affecting adoption rates in various areas.

Response: This is an important consideration, especially given the diverse demographics and psychographics of facility territories.

Comment: BC Hydro conducted significant work in the electric vehicle sector, focusing on demographics to inform investments in infrastructure upgrades.

Response: We should learn from such models to identify where to enhance the system for better growth.

Comment: It is crucial to distinguish between the factors that limit electricity transmission and those that limit utility-scale solar, as they are not the same.

Energy Wallet, Air Quality Modeling, Geospatial Mapping

Edith highlighted the ongoing work of the Environmental Justice and Equity Working Group and noted that the group is engaging in discussions around energy wallets, air quality modeling, and geospatial mapping. She shared that ODOE plans to present modeling results that will identify five representative households from various demographics. Public comments will be accepted starting October 31st. She added that the ODOE will analyze employment effects and workforce needs related to these initiatives with the goal of gathering public feedback by November 22nd.

Edith asked the Advisory Group members to share any written comments with ODOE. She added that the modeling is currently underway, with results expected in early 2025. As a next step ODOE will initiate policy discussions.

Upcoming Meetings and Next Steps

Edith Bayer, ODOE, shared that the next meeting is scheduled for November 20 from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm. Edith thanked the attendees for their participation.

Ben expressed his appreciation for Advisory Group members and adjourned the meeting.