



## **Pacific Power Community Benefits & Impacts Advisory Group (CBIAG) Public Notes**

CBI: Environmental Impact, IRP, and Charter Validation  
Thursday, March 16, 2023, 1-4 p.m. Pacific Time

*E Source, PacifiCorp's meeting facilitation partner, synthesized and summarized these notes.*

### **Executive Summary**

CBIAG's March public meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom from 1-4 p.m. PDT. Five CBIAG members representing four organizations participated. The meeting focused on the proposed Community Benefit Indicator (CBI): Environmental Impact, upcoming local Distribution System Planning workshops, validation of charter elements and closing the loop on questions and feedback, including Pacific Power's work on creating an integrated feedback tool and resources available to small business customers to prevent disconnections.

### **Meeting Objectives**

1. Continue to create a shared understanding of Community Benefit Indicators: Environmental Impact.
2. Engagement on utility and individual actions to creating a clean energy future.
3. Reengagement on charter development.

### **Agenda**

<b>TIMING</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>
1 p.m.	Land Acknowledgement Presenters, purpose & objectives Check In
1:15 p.m.	Closing the Loop from Last Meeting Communications Impact & Feedback Tracker
1:45 p.m.	Environmental Impact CBI Integrated Resource Planning

	Discussion
2:30 p.m.	Break
2:40 p.m.	Charter Validation
3:00 p.m.	DSP update
3:30 p.m.	Public Comment
3:45 p.m.	Summary and Next Steps

## Attendees

### CBIAG Attendees

Drew Farmer	Oregon Coast Community Action
Tim Lynch	Multnomah County
Alma Pinto & Sherri Villmark	Community Energy Project
Xitlali Torres	Klamath and Lake Community Action Services

### Presenters

Randy Baker	Director of Resource Planning
Lee Elder	Load Forecasting Manager
Ian Hoogendam	Manager of Distribution Systems Planning
Amy Kort	Sr. Communications Representative
Lisa Markus	E Source Managing Director & Facilitator
Christina Medina	Stakeholder Policy & Engagement Manager
Zepure Shahumyan	Director of Energy & Environmental Policy
Morgan Westberry	E Source Senior Consultant

### Public

Luca DFL	Jason Mitchell Group
Charles Lockwood	Oregon PUC

### PacifiCorp Attendees

Kimberly Alejandro	Energy Equity Analyst
Randy Baker	Director of Resource Planning
Brandon Capps	IRP & Regulatory Affairs Specialist
Cheryl Carter	Director Corporate Accounts and Community Relations - North
Lee Elder	Load Forecasting Manager
Ryan Harvey	Community Solar and Community Resiliency Manager
Ian Hoogendam	Manager of Distribution Systems Planning
Amy Hoskins	Director of Customer Care Centers
Amy Kort	Sr. Communications Representative
Ben Ludwig	Renewable Development Manager

Christina Medina	Stakeholder Policy & Engagement Manager
Stephanie Meeks	Regulatory Manager
Amy Peterson	Resource Development Director
John Rush	CBRE Consultant
Patty Satkiewicz	Sr. Product Manager – Customer Renewables
Zepure Shahumyan	Director of Energy & Environmental Policy
Shauna Thomas	Program Specialist
Jeffrey Wagner	Renewable Energy Developer

## Meeting Notes

### Introduction

Interpretation in Spanish and American Sign Language (ASL) were provided for the event. The virtual event was hosted by Zoom.

PacifiCorp’s Christina Medina welcomed the attendees, thanked them for participating, and acknowledged how much PacifiCorp has learned from attendees of the past six meetings.

E Source’s Lisa Markus provided housekeeping items, provided an overview of the agenda, and encouraged participation by members.

PacifiCorp’s Kimberly Alejandro renewed and reaffirmed the importance of native peoples as the original stewards of the land. Resources were shared with attendees for people wanting to learn more about these groups: [Native-land.ca](http://Native-land.ca)

### Check In

E Source's Lisa Markus asked CBIAG members: *How does your organization measure environmental impact (or how would you if you are not currently)?*

#### **Discussion:**

- Community Energy Project shared that through some of their more recent funding sources, like Portland Clean Energy Fund, the organization measures greenhouses gases and gas savings after weatherization measures.
- Oregon Coast Community Action (OCCA) noted no measurement currently occurs in the organization. In considering how it might be measured, OCCA shared an example of the weatherization efforts to make houses easier to insulate, which would establish a metric relative to how much heat is conserved based on measures taken and track results.
- Multnomah County indicated measuring resources and carbon impacts from internal operations and from a community-wide scale. More broadly, the Health Department looks at social determinants of health, chronic disease, and other health pathways. The County, in collaboration with community partners, has been working for a couple of years on environmental justice indicators. One challenge of this question is whether one is measuring macro level metrics (like health and well-being that have many inputs) or, by contrast, measuring metrics one has more direct control over (like programmatic input). An example of

this would be working within a community health worker model: looking at a household level, one could better understand how their organization is making an impact on peoples' lives and wellbeing in terms of their broad environment. Multnomah County noted the macro levels are tricky because often the organization does not have direct control over them. Working through data points to understand what matters, what to measure, and how to use helps guide the organization. An example of this within the environmental justice indicators is looking beyond quantitative data and doing direct survey work through community partners about: "how people experience climate change," "how is it manifesting "and "how people look to build resilience within their households and communities." There is greater desire to be more inclusive in the types of impacts one thinks of when considering the environment.

**Chat Comments** to *How does your organization measure environmental impact (or how would you if you are not currently)?*

- Klamath and Lake Community Action Services shared in agreement with Multnomah County about having an environmental justice lens, and made note that other organizations do measure health impacts, air pollution measurements, species health, etc.

## Closing the Loop from the Last Meeting

E Source's Lisa Markus shared a high-level overview of the February 16<sup>th</sup> CBIAG meeting and summarized the themes and questions resulting therefrom.

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina shared the process PacifiCorp is taking to learn how to support equity in Oregon's energy transition, affirming PacifiCorp's desire to create positive and impactful changes through stakeholder engagement, to maintain transparency, and acknowledged hearing attendees' concerns about what the outcomes of these meetings will be. Some early outcomes from the contributions in the meetings thus far: launching PacifiCorp's Feedback Tracking Tool, the robust and meaningful conversations happening across PacifiCorp, and the executive team gaining insight into the voice of the community.

Christina Medina invited attendees to ask questions. No questions were asked.

E Source's Lisa Markus added the process and feedback is informing an outreach approach to plan and move to a clean energy future.

**Chat Comment:** Klamath and Lake Community Action Services added something else to note is holistic environmental impact.

E Source's Morgan Westberry and Lisa Markus presented the Feedback Tracking Tool, which ensures that all stakeholder engagement (inclusive of CBIAG meetings, CEP engagement series, DSP public meetings, etc.) is transparent, tracked, reported on, followed up on, and informs filings, outreach approaches, and plans to address the CBIs. It allows for filtering to examine what is important to each community. Suggestions for improvements to the tool are welcome.

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina and E Source reiterated the input received is incredibly valuable and creates the codesign of changes based in equity in accordance with HB2021.

E Source's Lisa Markus highlighted a response to the feedback from February's meeting. There is a dedicated Business Center for small businesses experiencing disconnection notices. To learn more, go to <https://www.pacificpower.net/working-with-us/business-customers.html>

## CBI: Environmental Impacts

PacifiCorp's Lee Elder briefly recalled the CBIs previously discussed and began the discussion focused on the interim CBI for Environmental Impact. The CBI proposed for Environmental Impact: *Increase Energy from Non-emitting Resources and Reduce CO<sup>2</sup> Emissions to meet HB 2021 targets*. CBI qualities should be measurable, equitable, and something PacifiCorp can influence.

PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan expanded on the CBI for Environmental Impacts (noting the details can be technical and welcomed questions):

- The CBIs are rooted in HB 2021 in emissions reductions, reducing 80% by 2030 and 100% by 2040. These targets are measured against a baseline that averaged PacifiCorp's emissions from 2010-2012.
- PacifiCorp's service territory encapsulates a six-state system covering Washington, Oregon, Northern California, Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah. This diversity allows PacifiCorp to bring access to wind and solar from more prime regions in the middle of the United States to Oregon customers. PacifiCorp accounts for emissions proportional to Oregon's use of these resources.
- The CBI includes an additional component not required by HB 2021: measuring the percentage of renewable and non-emitting resources serving Oregon retail customers.

### **Questions/Discussion:**

**Q:** Multnomah County asked if given PacifiCorp's uniqueness, is there reason to be concerned about shifting renewable capacity to meet Oregon's goals and meeting those needs elsewhere?

- PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan responded that PacifiCorp's parent company has voluntary emission reduction goals to reach net zero by 2050. The portfolio across the six states is reducing emissions and increasing renewables. Oregon is slightly accelerated, but over the next few years the emissions reduction is happening on the entire system with increased renewables. PacifiCorp is committed to being in line with Oregon's interest and policies to ensure the rate of the reductions are consistent with Oregonians' expectations and do so at the best possible price with access to reliable power.
- Multnomah County highlighted that giving this additional context in the future might be helpful for others who have similar concerns about the effect to the overall system.
- PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan followed up with link to PacifiCorp's parent company BHE Sustainability website, where one can review the ESG reporting on its fixed state emissions and renewables: <https://www.brkenenergy.com/about-us/sustainability.aspx>

**Q:** Community Energy Project asked if efficiency is a part of this conversation?

- PacifiCorp's Lee Elder responded that PacifiCorp plans to review energy efficiency following the filing in March. With time constraints, the interim CBIs were proposed knowing metrics or

certain CBIs might need to be bolstered later. PacifiCorp acknowledges that other stakeholders have also expressed this concern.

- E Source's Lisa Markus added there will be discussion later in the presentation on how customers can impact emissions and reduce their carbon footprint, but it will not go into it in great depth.
- Community Energy Project described the importance of using less and inquired to understand the scope of today's conversation more.
- E Source's Lisa Markus clarified energy efficiency does include everything at the individual's and utility's disposal to lower emissions (e.g., demand response, transportation electrification, renewable energy programs). However, today's discussion is focused on Integrated Resource Planning, CBRE, and CBIs.

**Q:** Multnomah County asked if it is possible to include a stretch goal within the CBI where a percentage of non-emitting renewables come from CBREs or other smaller resources?

- PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan confirmed that PacifiCorp is including community-based projects, and this will be discussed later in today's discussion. PacifiCorp recognizes the importance of measuring the value of community and resiliency in these smaller scale projects. Because community-based projects are a smaller percentage of the overall system, it does not have as great an impact on the overall emissions and renewable goals. Therefore, it is important to create a unique metric to provide more valuable and meaningful information outside of the percent renewal footprint.
- Multnomah County agreed that this is the context for the economic impacts in the proposed CBIs.

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina thanked attendees for their questions and spoke on how it helps structure the focus for upcoming sessions.

PacifiCorp's Randy Banker discussed how PacifiCorp leverages its diverse infrastructure through Integration Resource Planning (IRP) to align its decarbonization efforts with Oregon's interests and Clean Energy Plan (CEP). Every two years, PacifiCorp creates a new IRP for all six states. It is a 20-year plan published online every two years. Topics include utility assets and energy activities within communities. To reduce emissions, carbon footprint and pollution, there are opportunities for utilities and customers through customer programs. PacifiCorp continues to work on ways to bring these customer programs to more people. [See slide 17.](#)

Through IRP modeling, PacifiCorp plans aspects such as how to bring the right technologies and the right amounts at the right time, married with the appropriate transmission and distribution planning. The two-year cycle considers changes in the planning environment, resource costs and technologies, energy and legislation requirements, and pricing. For example, large amounts of solar and wind resources have been added across the last many IRP planning periods.

Per House Bill 2021 (HB2021), utilities are required to examine the cost and opportunities of offsetting energy generated from fossil fuels with Community Based Renewable Energy (CBRE). This allows

community ownership of a renewable energy source that promotes climate resiliency and broader benefits. In Oregon, CBREs have three components: (1) renewable energy resources, (2) connects to the grid, and (3) provides community benefits.

To meet Oregon's Clean Energy Plan, PacifiCorp has three stages. This begins with the 2023 IRP preferred portfolio: the plan decided upon through the IRP process that is the least cost and risk and provides a combination of resources to meet customer needs through a 20-year planning horizon. In the second stage, PacifiCorp uses the IRP modeling to build the small-scale renewable portfolio that ensures 10% of Oregon's capacity requirements are met by small scale renewable resources (<20MW capacity). In the third stage, the Oregon CEP portfolio incorporates added resources to meet emission reduction targets in 2030, 2035 and 2040.

**Discussion:**

E Source's Lisa Markus asked *Is there anything else we should consider?*

**Q:** Community Energy Project asked Are we thinking renewable energy is better for everybody? Or more so with frontline communities because those communities are more likely to be hurt? When thinking about equity, how do IRPs relate to Community Benefit Indicators?

- PacifiCorp's Randy Baker responded that the basis of the IRP feeds into the Clean Energy Plan. The 20-year plan's purpose is to indicate in broad terms, or sometimes in more specific terms like the small-scale renewable study, the types and amounts of resources that PacifiCorp might need or be required to plug into. However, at the level of individual community action and projects, it is a level of detail PacifiCorp does not know yet in the IRP. A request for proposal is needed by going out to the market and asking who has projects available to meet the needs. After, developers bid on that process and the renewable projects and generation are examined more minutely. At that point, PacifiCorp has greater understanding of what communities are close to and the detailed benefits that are associated. There is more to this because of the equity considerations and how to investigate and assess what the potential can be. There are downstream processes that occur after producing a portfolio of resources for the CEP, and details that manifest as the process evolves.

**Q:** Community Energy Project asked for clarification is the requirement for a certain percentage of small projects an example of creating opportunities for them to be competitive in the bidding process?

- PacifiCorp's Randy Baker affirmed this and elaborated. PacifiCorp anticipates the RFP process for this CBI and CBRE to generate resources and renewables in communities will highlight the need for small-scale renewables and encourage developers and other people with program ideas to step into that process. PacifiCorp is engaged in a process soon to scope out how to present and make the need real to bidders and communities.

**Q:** Multnomah County asked is PacifiCorp evaluating from a least cost and least risk perspective in the IRP/RFP process for the smaller projects? Are there creative pathways for best value projects—in terms of return to community and impact—for smaller projects that may struggle to compete against larger scale projects?

- PacifiCorp's Randy Baker responded one answer is the 10% small scale renewables is a requirement that PacifiCorp must meet to provide small-scale capacity to Oregon customers. Because of this requirement, one of the things PacifiCorp will do in phase two (mentioned earlier) is create a small-scale renewable portfolio. The model will be presented with proxy representations of small-scale resources of diverse types and costs and told to pick X amount to meet the 10% target. It may provide numerous and varied benefits, but it also comes at a cost that does not have a utility scale cost break layered into it. There is a tradeoff of costs and benefits. By requiring the model to pick a certain amount and to do its best at optimizing how much of it, what technology (whether it is solar or wind, etc.), and where in our topology would be best, it provides key information. It meets the requirement by forcing the model to choose it even if the model looks at it and says, "this is more expensive than that," because it is required to choose a certain amount of it anyway. Then, that will inform the next steps when real world projects begin to materialize.
- PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan added that in the multi-state concept, the idea is that the state which brings forward a requirement that would not otherwise be economic, efficient, or beneficial for all six states, bears all the costs. The small-scale renewable requirement will add a large portfolio for Oregon that is 100% paid for by Oregon customers because the other states do not recognize the same value in these small-scale projects and would not otherwise need to pay for if the preferred portfolio did not select them to begin with. There is a federal law, the supremacy clause, that says one state cannot impact the business and the cost of another state. It is important to honor those laws and make sure the projects are implemented and adhered to, as that state's population voted, without imposing the same requirements on everybody else. That is done through the process of developing a preferred portfolio that is beneficial for all and then look at what requirements need to be met for Washington, Oregon, California and Utah. In the future, Oregon will receive energy and a footprint of these small-scale renewables that won't show up for the other states. Oregon will get all the renewable allocations and environmental benefits associated with these smaller projects, but the cost will come too.
- Multnomah County described the importance of small-scale projects having a substantial impact from a community scale and affirmed the complexities of fitting within the big machine, especially for even smaller scale than discussed here.
- PacifiCorp's Zepure Shahumyan shared one ray of hope is Oregon's state-funded programs to make these smaller projects more economic, and agreed leveraging small-scale projects is a real and valuable issue. It is also important to reassess later if these projects provided the expected value.
- PacifiCorp's John Rush provided additional context. There are three tiers, including the Integrated Resource Plan and then the Oregon portfolio, which is how PacifiCorp meets the needs in Oregon. This includes that 10% small-scale renewable and the small-scale renewable is under 20 megawatts, but it is meant to be serving the entire state. There is a third bucket in the Clean Energy Plan, which PacifiCorp is working on right now called Community Based Renewable Energy. Twenty megawatts likely would be big for a community-sized effort. Part of the report filed in this month will provide more background on how PacifiCorp is approaching the Community Based Renewable Energy bucket. A summary of it is there are existing programs to focus on, a lot of projects that qualify already as CBRE projects, and ideas to enhance them. However, the smaller the resource, the more expensive it becomes. Renewable benefits accrue



no matter the size. Megawatts produced by renewable energy offset fossil fuel at the same rate that a larger one does, but the cost can be two to three times as much as utility scale. It is important to work together and agree to share the above market costs when evaluating the benefits at the local level.

#### **Chat Comment:**

**C:** PacifiCorp shared a link to <https://www.pacificpower.net/savings-energy-choices/home.html>

**Q:** Klamath and Lake Community Action Services asked is workforce for building renewable sources and updating systems a consideration included in these assessments?

- PacifiCorp's Christina Medina noted the community and engagement series are a great platform to work together and amplify awareness, opportunities, approaches, and the methods that exist. This warrants a more extensive conversation, for example, PacifiCorp is talking with members of tribal nations to understand what opportunities exist relative to workforce development, training, and investment opportunities. PacifiCorp is inquiring about how to support apprenticeship programs or any other programs that might help with this development. There are many new markets now in workforce training and development relative to renewable integrations.
- Multnomah County agreed it would be good to have that conversation, and helpful to understand how the pieces fit together.

**C:** PacifiCorp's John Rush posted a link to Oregon Department of Energy's report on small-scale community renewables that provides insight into what programs exist currently, and the costs and benefits analysis: <https://www.oregon.gov/energy/Data-and-Reports/Pages/SSREP-Study.aspx>

## Charter Validation

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina and E Source's Lisa Markus revisited what was heard previously in early discussions, the operating model, and how it's been operationalized in the Charter. The charter is a living document and Pacific Power is committed to receiving feedback to improve it. The Charter development process introduced by Pacific Power's Christina Medina, which was adopted by Oregon utilities building equity groups, focused on Define, Structure, Scope, Share Best Practices, Define Processes, and Communicate. [See slide 24.](#)

### **DEFINE**

Formation of the CBIAG started with surveying, interviewing and meeting with members to guide the organization's structure, content, and prioritization of topics. The intention is to create an environment that is mutually beneficial to stakeholder needs while engaging them in utility planning, outreach and actions associated with creating an equitable clean energy future. [See slide 25.](#)

### Biannual Report

The Charter might be envisioned as an opening statement to the biannual report this group will be co-creating. That Charter provides an orientation to readers of that report on:

- What are the agreements of the CBIAG as a group?
- What is the shared vision?
- What are some of the lenses on that shared vision?
- How is the CBIAG structured and organized?
- What are the modalities for the experience?
- What are the measures taken to improve accessibility and to foster inclusion?
- What is the vision moving into the future?

## STRUCTURE

The structure for success begins with the lens of what is most important to the stakeholders and anchoring that in community beyond online forums with CBIAG members visiting sites too. Then comes mutual education, closing the loop, and manifesting growth to create a model of collaborating with intention. [See slide 26.](#)

The structure of the meeting design was based on input from the community to have a monthly meeting, always having an online venue, and alternating hybrid meetings every other month in different service areas.

## SCOPE

Revisiting the group's purpose: it focuses on equity and a clean energy future in Oregon, in accordance with HB 2021. CBIAG does this by weighing in and shaping utility clean energy planning that encompasses the entire system, from components of transmission and distribution to energy efficiency. [See slide 27.](#)

## SHARE BEST PRACTICES

The intention of the CBIAG is to share and proliferate best practices – among members and Oregon utilities – to accelerate an equitable clean energy future. Two best practices were highlighted in the creation and operation of the CBIAG: (1) having 3<sup>rd</sup>-party facilitation for an accountability partner and learning, and (2) having the lens of CBIAG members and coordination of Oregon utilities. [See slide 28.](#)

## DEFINING PROCESSES

In defining the processes, consideration is given to valuing members' time, tracking and using member feedback, shaping the approach based on CBIAG wants, needs, and interests, and planning a satisfaction survey. [See slide 29.](#)

## COMMUNICATE

The Charter also lays out communication values to provide the community with access to the content within and outside of these meetings in a way that values different communication and learning preferences. [See slide 30.](#)

PacifiCorp's Amy Kort presented an example of the communication tools available with an overview of the CBIAG website on PacifiCorp's website. It includes details on when the next meeting is, the location and virtual information, as well as details and content from previous meetings, with translation in

Spanish available. Feedback on improvements is welcome. Go here to learn more:  
<https://www.PacifiCorp.com/energy/oregon-community-benefits-and-impacts.html>

**Discussion:**

**Q:** E Source's Lisa Markus closed out asking *if there were any questions, or if this structure still reflects the mode and approach the community finds supportive and valuing of their time?*

- No questions were posed about the Charter. Responses reflected appreciation for how the Charter was formed, the direction of the group, and the accessibility of the CBIAG website and meetings, and excitement for the Feedback Tool.

PacifiCorp's Amy Kort clarified that the Feedback Tool will be accessible on the CBIAG website when the tool is finalized.

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina shared the hope to one day add highlights and storytelling on the website that showcases the work the community is doing. Discussion of this idea is welcome.

- Community Energy Project (CEP) shared less concerned with spotlighting who the organizations are and would prefer to focus on what the CBIAG are getting done to change policy and change how things are for customers. Community Energy Project also expressed excitement about next steps to make things happen on the ground and having a better understanding of where CEP can contribute, noting that is why CEP was quiet in this meeting.
  - PacifiCorp's Christina Medina followed up asking *would it be helpful in future sessions to post the key topics in advance to provoke thought, provide opportunity for others to join, and foster more inclusion?*
  - Community Energy Project agreed and asserted that sharing the key topics in advance would also facilitate making sure the right people attend the right meetings, especially given the length of the meetings and the need to shift things around to attend. The right people then would be there to provide more topical feedback.

### Distribution System Planning (DSP) Update

PacifiCorp's Ian Hoogendam introduced Shauna Thomas, a new member of the DSP team who will be helping with outreach, engagement, and valuing and establishing programs for nontraditional solutions that can address distribution grid needs.

PacifiCorp's Ian Hoogendam expressed that one of the core principles of DSP is increasing transparency and engagement with communities that PacifiCorp studies. Last month, the DSP hosted its first statewide workshop for the year and presented potential study areas for 2023. The final study areas are Prineville and Medford. DSP will be meeting with representatives of key groups of stakeholders in Prineville on April 17<sup>th</sup> and in Medford on April 19<sup>th</sup>. DSP plans to make the meeting open to the public virtually, but details are still being finalized currently. Look for a meeting announcement and presentation materials on the PacifiCorp or DSP website or, a member of the DSP mailing, via email about a week before the meetings. The primary purpose of these meetings is to provide context on what distribution system planning is, how it is changing, start discussing preliminary load forecasts, and get feedback on activities that are occurring in the community that have the potential to impact that forecast.

These April meetings are a kickoff and there will be check-ins with the communities at major milestones. Next steps are incorporating feedback on load forecasts from the kickoff meetings, running load flow analysis to forecast grid needs and solutions for 10 years, followed by a second workshop to present findings and understand how the communities value these traditional and non-traditional solution approaches. Next is a deeper cost benefit analysis and a final meeting with the communities to discuss implementation.

PacifiCorp's Shauna Thomas read a quote from the staff comments of the DSP Part 2 filing: "Pacific Power states a commitment to continuing an annual survey of Oregon's customers and stakeholders to keep in step with their needs, measure the impact of change, improve communication and engagement, and track benefits and challenges overtime. Staff supports this approach to developing a high-level understanding of the communities it serves and applauds the speed with which Pacific Power accomplishes this work." This quote reiterates the work that DSP and CBIAG are doing too.

***Discussion:***

***Chat Comment:***

*Community Energy Project asks why MS teams over Zoom? CEP has found Teams is not user-friendly to those who are not in big companies.*

- PacifiCorp's Ian Hoogendam responded this is the tool Pacific Power internally uses but would consider Zoom as an option.
- Community Energy Project mentions there are challenges with Teams where presenters cannot tell who is raising their hand, making communication on Teams more one-way. Stakeholders desire to IM each other and cannot on Teams. The app crashes regularly or, if attending via the website instead of the app, it is hard and can ask for an Outlook login, to log in on a phone, or create an account. Using Teams may limit community interaction.
- PacifiCorp's Ian Hoogendam appreciated the details and mentioned PacifiCorp will discuss internally.
- PacifiCorp's Christina confirmed that accessibility and the recording features are better on Zoom. However, security protocols on Zoom are a concern for PacifiCorp, and notes E Source assists with making it a safe space.

**Q:** Is PacifiCorp expecting the same stakeholder groups across the workshop (noting the workshops have different themes)? Is PacifiCorp hoping to capture the same people and build upon each workshop? Or are each of these going to stand alone?

- PacifiCorp's Ian Hoogendam confirmed there is a difference between the statewide and local meetings. It is a different set of stakeholders targeted in the local meetings—it is the stakeholders of the community that are the focus. PacifiCorp will make it open to the public and the statewide stakeholder meeting attendees will be invited to provide feedback.

**Public Comment**

E Source's Lisa Markus inquired *are there any public comments on what was covered today?*

No public comments were made.

## Check Out, Closing Out, and Next Steps

E Source's Lisa Markus asked *what was your biggest takeaway from today's conversation?*

- Community Energy Project responded that the biggest take away was the IRP discussion was interesting. IRP is a big giant beast, so anything to start building some context is helpful.
- Community Energy Project also really appreciated how in depth the meetings go with the feedback received, and it was helpful to hear the background on Teams v. Zoom.
- Klamath and Lake Community Action Service noted the conversations were great.

PacifiCorp's Christina Medina expressed concern about everyone's workload picking up and inquired if the meetings are too long and if this format works. There are plans to do an end of the year survey but noted that it might be important to revisit this topic sooner rather than later. PacifiCorp highlighted the upcoming CBIAG and Stakeholder Engagement meetings.

PacifiCorp welcomes all to join in person on April 20<sup>th</sup> in Coburg, Oregon, and asks that if there are any concerns or barriers in getting to the site, please do reach out so PacifiCorp can support. [See slide 37.](#)