



OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

Oregon Energy Planning Council

November 30, 2010

Portland, Oregon

Meeting Summary

Members present:

Ron Adams, (Chair), Jim Piro, Bob Jenks, Bill Blosser, Tom Potiowsky, Ray Baum, Marty Sedler, Pat Reiten, Angus Duncan.

Staff Present

Lisa Pinheiro, staff to OEPC, Oregon Department of Energy, Kathy Stuttaford, Oregon Department of Energy, Paul Hoobyar, Consultant.

Others Attending:

Tom O'Connor, Vijay Satyal, Peter Cogswell, Sunny Radcliffe, Joe Esmonde, Brendan McCarthy

Chair Adams called the meeting to order at 1:25 p.m.

After introductions, Chair Adams reviewed the council's deliberations of the direction and content of the Energy Report since its June 1, 2010 meeting.

The intent of today's meeting is to get agreement on the October 20th revision to the Oregon Energy Report.

Paul Hoobyar, Consultant reviewed the day's agenda and the Council's adopted meeting agreements,

The intent is to accomplish drafting of the executive order by email correspondence with the Council.

Paul Hoobyar: It didn't make sense to work on the Exec summary until we were sure the council was comfortable with content.

Some council members are scheduled to join the meeting by teleconference to participate in Council action (vote) on the draft report. That is scheduled at 4:00. Members were reminded that the report outline, which was circulated to members in September, was used to draft this latest version. At that time, members decided that much of what was in the original draft has been included at attachment.

The Council then discussed the draft report. The recommendation at last meeting was to move background to appendix so report could be shorter and more focused on recommendations from working group working on transmission siting.

Received comment from Mark Mares, he would like to see greater clarity of the interconnection of groups working together on renewable resources in the western connection

Jim Piro: Context seems thin. Report does not reflect what we have done OR has done a lot: Carbon emissions standard 1149 etc, we should reflect these so it does not look like RPS is the only thing we have ever done. PGE will supply more history to council staff.

Members noted the need to expand on the draft's content on energy efficiency programs and investments, and resulting savings.

Jim Piro: The report's introduction does not fully describe all the state's efforts toward reducing its carbon footprint. There are numerous programs and policies to achieve reductions. Portland General Electric committed to providing language for the report that describes these efforts.

Bob Jenks: No where does the report mention the efforts and programs administered by the Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO). Also, SB 838 and the predominant programs funded by the Public Purpose Fund. 95% of what is funded by public purpose isn't included in this draft. Further, he doesn't agree that Oregon has lowered its carbon footprint. That's not factually true. We have stopped or slowed the rate of growth.

Blosser: That could be explained as a per capita metric.

Reiten: It may probably be true that we've only slowed the rate of growth, but we've reduced the carbon intensity based on economic output.

Jenks: Want the paragraph to be factually true, reduced the carbon intensity.

Sedler: Conservation has been left out generally. There is a huge effort by the ETO. If we're talking about energy use, we need to talk about reducing our use or using it more efficiently, not just renewable, there were programs before ETO

Jenks: Public Power, Eugene Water and Electric Board, and other entities outside of ETO territory that run energy efficiency programs. The report should emphasize those.

Reiten: ETO could provide that data.

Sedler: There's also no mention of BETC. It has funded renewable energy, and driven the reduction in carbon.

JENKS: BETC, RETC could contribute to energy efficiency.

Sedler: There are places throughout the document where this should be included.

Hoobyar: The information provided by PGE can be included in the introduction.

Jenks: In the areas where goals are called out, recommended eliminating the paragraph specific to the schools program, then talk about the Public Purpose Fund, SB 1149, put a section on public purposes, call out ETO, then add a sentence or a small paragraph on the schools program. Detail on public purpose savings. It is a small percent of the public purpose charge. More conservation discussion in the intro, add history, OR energy goals and policy

Pat Reiten: indicated that company by company savings data is readily available, and committed to providing text for inclusion in the draft report.

Bob Jenks: Pointed out Oregon's reputation as the leading state on energy efficiency expenditures, as extolled by energy efficiency organizational statistics. If this is indeed true, we should document it. If the resources are available, we should verify these statistics. Distribute these to policy makers.

Adams: Oregon's Workforce Investment Board (OWIB) has comparative data on green jobs, through the Green Jobs Council, which demonstrates where Oregon stands compared to the rest of the U.S.

Blosser: We are not starting from nothing, there is a lot for OR to celebrate foundation for building

Marty Sedler: Oregon doesn't step back and take inventory of what we've done.

Reiten: Equilibrium Capital has ranked states.

Jenks: Will get information on rankings of states and other source information to Hoobyar

Tom Potiowski: Asked whether it is apparent how energy efficiency fits within the scope of the report. Council members affirmed the relevance is the lessons learned and progress made will inform future direction. To talk about what we've done is to know where we're going. That why we need a comprehensive energy plan

Jenks: Another point is that it's important that we do not mess up what we've already done. "Do no harm".

Adams: We've already pointed to efficiency as where we go next. We need to document that.

Sedler: The report should point out how the utilities, e.g., PacifiCorp and PGE, are engaging customers. Oregon has engaged customers in energy efficiency through utility programs.

Reiten: While the Global Warming Commission (GWC) Report has been released, for clarity, on page 5, the Council report should reference that the GWC report has not been officially adopted.

Other points of clarification needed in the draft report: Clarify on charts on pp 6 and 7 that figure 1 is "energy use"; Place dates as reference points on figure 2.

Jenks: Should mention that looking forward, transportation would not be segregated from overall energy use. Due in part to Electric Vehicle's

Hoobyar: This is in the appendix.

Piro: Agreed. Should include a sliver in the pie for electric transportation fuels.

Sedler: Is there any use to include "capacity"?

Jenks: I believe that is getting too technical.

Sedler: It should be understood at some point that there is a difference.

Blosser: Change reference (in figure 2) to aviation, propane, etc. that is currently 0% to "less than 1%" or say all others less than 1%.

Adams: Don't overstate the GWC reporting coming from commission

Reiten: "Greenhouse" should be either one word or two in the document.

Jenks: The section on the Feed-in-Tariff is too extensive as this program is merely a pilot program.

Hoobyar: Do you want the text on the Feed-In-Tariff shorter?

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

At 1:57 p.m., Chair Adams called for public comment. No one signed up to comment.

Chair Adams closed the public comment period.

The Council resumed discussion of the draft report at 1:58.

Sadler: Do we want to put in ETO Conservation programs here.

Jenks: Put Public Purpose, Energy Trust others earlier in the document, reduce the amount of text on the schools program. RPS program should be included.

Reiten and Piro offered to send language and other edits

Jenks: Include RETC in the paragraph on the BETC program.

Piro: Should also reference the scheduled sunset of the program. How this could affect market transformation.

Jenks: We might want to add that to the challenges, the fact that we don't know what's going to happen to the BETC program. Challenge to programs and projects currently running.

Reiten: As far as this council we are not taking a position on this with regard to budget but noting that it has been a successful program

Sedler: Don't show a sentence of results here on the BETC. The report needs a one or two sentence on results such as the number of projects and energy saved, which are effective.

Pinheiro: How far back do want to go on BETC numbers?

Sedler: Don't want to compare or justify programs, just these programs have been positive, one or two sentences. It was noted that ODOE is in process of evaluating the BETC program as required by legislation.

Pinheiro: If the council wishes, we could provide information on the Small Scale Energy Loan Program (SELP) and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).

Sedler: Yes we can include these.

Adams: Need to be careful to have a disclaimer that this is not an exhaustive list of all programs.

Sedler: You can use a standard formatted disclaimer. Not inclusive list.

Piro: Discusses language on page 14 under the title of "Ensuring Continuous Progress..." It sounds like we're not monitoring the progress. Compliance requirements already exist.

The council then discussed the Challenges section of the report:

Jenks: Oregon doesn't have a carbon policy, but we're trying to accomplish greenhouse gas reduction (GHG) without explicit policies. That's the challenge.

Adams: Bottom line is we're missing a carbon policy.

Jenks: Clarified that he wasn't calling for it, merely point out that it is a challenge. Without a policy, we're not accountable to meeting defined goals. With aspirational goals, we play along the edges. How do we meet aspirational goals? Who has the responsibility? None of that policy has been set. It's clear we don't have it.

Hoobyar: How does the council feel about that?

Reiten: Fundamentally that is correct, but there is evolving administrative policy at the Federal (EPA) level. There is also state law over emission requirements. They are piecemeal, and not overarching.

Bill Blosser: Referring to Page 8, items 4 and 5, Questioned the reference to meeting state commitments. If, in actuality they're aspirational goals, not commitments it sounds like we're not meeting them.

Ray Baum: We are doing things relatively well. We don't have overall policy that drives this broadly. But we are out front of a lot of states.

Reiten: We intentionally left out language regarding specific policy as that is not the purview of this council.

Hoobyar: Should we include the term "goal"?

Sedler: They're commitments, but may not be quantified.

Jenks: Perhaps we should use “progress” as the descriptor.

Angus Duncan joined the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

Duncan: If we can only show progress as a slope, is it meaningful? If you’re not going to meet the goal, then you get all the adjectives and modifiers, e.g., “continuous progress”.

Jenks: I’m asking if “meets state commitments” is meaningful.

Reiten: The paragraph on page 14 under the heading of “Ensuring Continuous Progress Toward Cleaner Energy” should be very definitive. “Progressing toward renewable energy” goals is RPS linked, where there is accountability for this and accountability for what utilities are doing with GHG. They are definitive goals. Need to comply with state requirements, state policy.

Duncan: Did you include reference to the GHG reduction goals in the Challenges section?

Reiten: Need to have a plan to meet whatever the state’s policy is.

The Council then discussed content on page 15, under the title of “Lack of Coordinated Planning” and the charge of the Oregon Department of Energy in developing a comprehensive energy plan.

Pinheiro: The “plan” as required in statute, ORS 469.060 and .070, is an assessment of the current energy use consumption and need, and identifies emerging trends related to energy supply, need and conservation and public health and safety factors over a 5, 10 and 20 year period.

Rather than talking about the fact that no single group or agency is charged with developing a plan, the report should stress the lack of an overall energy strategy. Should reflect need for coordination between agencies.

Blosser, Baum, Duncan, Reiten, and other members continued discussion about a lack of comprehensive energy planning.

There is not a citizen commission that can work across various state agencies to coordinate policy and formulate strategy.

Sedler: Uncomfortable with this paragraph as it is written. It says no agency exists and the state would be hard pressed to create an energy strategy without it.

Duncan: Suggest taking out reference to no single group or agency.

Sedler: Agrees to remove the reference to organization, but should retain assertion of a lack of strategy. Should mention lack of integration across agencies.

Duncan: Pages 9-10 should reference the “road map” that GHG commission adopted.

The Council then proceeded to the report’s section on Transmission Siting.

Piro: One concern is that the section has no context vis a vis the beginning of the report. There is no transition and no context to the topic. There is enough detail, but need more context.

Peter Cogswell: It does get lost. There are specific recommendations, therefore, would recommend this goes to the front of the report. It's a deliverable. Then transition into the other energy issues.

Jenks: This was not the charge of the council, however.

Sedler: Reference in the introduction that transmission is the main recommendation, focus and contained on pages XXX, etc.

The executive summary will state the recommendations and it will be clear in the executive summary why the focus on transmission. Reader can find the section for more information.

Duncan: Recommendation should be in the summary.

Jenks: leave the siting where it is or it becomes a transmission report, list page numbers in executive summary, also include in challenges.

Ensure the reference to the challenges, particularly siting are included in the executive summary. Want more than the page 4 introduction. It should be clear that it was a decision to focus on transmission.

The Council then proceeded to the Recommendations section (Page22): Council directed paragraph #2 be deleted. Council recommends deleting reference to the legislature, it should be assumed the statutory authority (legislation) is there or not.

Reiten: Not saying who will be delegated to put together the energy plan, strategy. Let Governor know we need a comprehensive energy plan and figure out how to do it.

Putting together a plan requires coordination of DOE, PUC, DLCD to make this cross agency cooperation paragraph #2, page 22

Reiten: Refers back to page 8, change the term plan to strategy. Go beyond adequate.

Baum: Is the strategy referenced here similar to the NWPCC?

Blosser: ODOE plan is not mandatory, no requirements, sets overall needs.

Duncan: The NWPCC only looks at electric utilities. We're talking about something that is comprehensive to energy policy including transportation, industrial, etc.

It's not mandatory unless it is imbedded in the IRP and it is acknowledged.

Duncan: confirms including items i – x on pages 22-23.

Baum: Affordability and Reliability are important.

Jenks: There needs to be some reference to affordability when comparing one element against another.

Reiten: In pursuit of this we recommend coordination with multiple agencies. At a minimum PUC, ODOE, DEQ and ODOT.

Sedler: We should mention that Oregon's efforts should be integrated with and/or acknowledge federal policy. Perhaps on page 22.

Replace second bullet with "coordination and resource needs" on page 22, add affordability for residential and businesses as bullets.

Baum: Take a broad view and have revision cycles.

Sedler: Integrate with Federal policy in the introduction or someplace in plan, on page 22, under policy issues.

The Council then determined a vote on the draft plan was premature given the proposed revisions.

Chair Adams asked council members to provide additional content to Paul Hoobyar by close of business Friday, December 3. Chair Adams then directed staff to prepare revisions and submit to council members through electronic mail on or before December 7th.

Council members will have until December 10 to review the December 7th revision.

Any further revisions will be reflected in the final report issued to Council member on or before December 15 at which time voting opens immediately.

Members will have 48 hours to cast their vote. Voting will close 48 hours later (December 17th, 2010).

The council then reviewed the format and content for the executive summary. It was determined that all recommendations should be summarized there.

Chair Adams adjourned the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Lisa Pinheiro
Staff to the Oregon Energy Planning Council
Government Relations Manager,
Oregon Department of Energy