

Board Meeting Minutes—151st Meeting

June 7, 2017

Board members present: Susan Brodahl, Heather Beusse Eberhardt, Ken Canon, Melissa Cribbins (phone), Dan Enloe, Roger Hamilton, Lindsey Hardy, Mark Kendall, Debbie Kitchin, Alan Meyer, John Reynolds, Eddie Sherman, Steve Bloom (OPUC ex officio), Janine Benner (Oregon Department of Energy special advisor)

Board members absent: Anne Root

Staff attending: Mike Bailey, Gwen Barrow, Erik Braddock, Sarah Castor, Quin Cherf, Scott Clark, Amber Cole, Mike Colgrove, Hannah Cruz, Lindsey Dierksen, Sue Fletcher, Fred Gordon, Mia Hart, Jed Jorgensen, Corey Kehoe, Erika Kociolek, Steve Lacey, Debbie Menashe, Thad Roth, Dan Rubado, Rob Strange, Greg Stokes, Andrew Shepard, Julianne Thacher, Sam Walker, Jay Ward, Peter West

Others attending: JP Batmale (Oregon Public Utility Commission), Jason Eisdorfer (OPUC), Andria Jacob (City of Portland), Anne Snyder-Grassman (Portland General Electric), Whitney Rideout (Evergreen), Brian Lynch (AESC), Rick Hodges (NW Natural), Chaz Branson (AESC)

Business Meeting

Debbie Kitchin called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Reminder that consent agenda items can be changed to regular agenda items at any time. There were no changes to the agenda.

General Public Comments

The president may defer specific public comment to the appropriate agenda topic. There were no public comments.

Consent Agenda

The consent agenda may be approved by a single motion, second and vote of the board. Any item on the consent agenda will be moved to the regular agenda upon the request from any member of the board.

MOTION: Approve consent agenda

Consent agenda includes:

1. April 5, 2017, board meeting minutes
2. Conflict of Interest Policy 5.02.000-P-R804
3. Committee Assignments-R805

Moved by: John Reynolds

Vote: In favor: 12

Opposed: 0

Seconded by: Alan Meyer

Abstained: 0

President's Report

Debbie reflected on recent trip to Japan, which is still rebuilding infrastructure following the 2011 tsunami. Oregon and Japan have similar tsunami risks and resiliency needs. She was part of a delegation of 55 Oregonians visiting Japan, including the state resiliency officer and representatives from cities and counties.

Debbie toured a smart district development in a suburb of Tokyo. The community is certified with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Neighborhood Development Platinum.

Several facilities share a district energy system, including a university, a hotel, commercial businesses and residences. The district energy system uses solar power and includes backup generation onsite. Most of the buildings feature solar panels. The district straddles a rail line and includes a bicycle storage facility, parks and community gathering spaces.

Debbie also visited several coastal communities on her trip. Japan's coastal communities are very similar to Oregon's coastal communities in terms of tsunami risk and economic dependence on fishing and tourism.

Japan is also building a protective sea wall. The wall is 30 feet tall, which is not quite as tall as the 2011 tsunami. Japan experiences a tsunami roughly every 40 years. The country is also building the ground up nine feet for coastal towns, taking soil from nearby mountains.

Debbie met with several businesses that had rebuilt following the tsunami. Fishing businesses recovered fairly quickly, but buildings were destroyed for many other businesses. Some entrepreneurs started new businesses to meet needs in recovering communities.

Debbie provided an update on the cross-laminated timber project in Portland, which will be the tallest cross-laminated timber building in the U.S. Owners are Albina Bank and Beneficial Bank. Construction is expected to complete in 2018. Cross-laminated timber is much faster than traditional construction. The cross-laminated timber is from DL Johnson, not Freres Lumber in Oregon.

Ken Canon shared a story about Oregon Tool and Supply, a business in Roseburg and Coos Bay. It recently upgraded to all LED lights. The owner was thrilled to share that his power bill dropped from \$750 per month to \$450 per month. The lighting system included occupancy sensors and controls. Ken noted that business owners are eager to tell their stories and are important advocates for Energy Trust. The project had a one-year payback. The owner said he could not have upgraded without Energy Trust incentives.

Committee Reports

Compensation Committee, Dan Enloe

The Compensation Committee met in April to hear an update on Energy Trust's retirement plan. The committee also looked at employee turnover. The year to date turnover is about 1 percent, which is better than prior years. Retention efforts are working. The committee also looked at 401(k) accounts. The median balance is high and the average contribution rate is 8.6 percent. On average, staff are on track to save enough money to make up 69 percent of their current salaries in retirement. The standard is about 80 percent.

Staff asked if Energy Trust should conduct a competitive solicitation for its retirement plan savings manager. While the committee is satisfied with the current manager, it recommends a competitive solicitation as a best practice.

Home Scoring Report

Andrew Shepard, residential senior project manager, and Andria Jacob, senior manager for energy programs and policy at the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, provided an update on changes to home energy scoring in Portland.

Andrew gave background on Energy Trust's work to support new home construction with EPS™, Energy Trust's home energy performance score. EPS indicates energy consumption for a home, with zero being the least and 200+ being the most. A typical score for an average Oregon home is 100. EPS new homes are constructed in the 50 to 70 range. Energy Trust has offered EPS for new homes since 2009, and has

rated over 13,000 new homes to date. Energy Trust introduced EPS for Existing Homes in 2012, and has scored more than 2,200 existing homes.

For new homes, the incentive paid to the builder is based on how far the home is built above Oregon energy code. Energy Trust's role in EPS has been to train trade allies, verifiers and realtors.

Changes are expected to home scoring in Oregon. Energy Trust will no longer offer EPS for existing homes beginning in approximately July 2017. At that time, the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Home Energy Score will be introduced to the Oregon market, largely meeting the need previously met by Energy Trust's EPS. The Home Energy Score is the Oregon Department of Energy's (ODOE) approved score. The score will be delivered by the same network of verifiers that delivered EPS. Energy Trust will work with ODOE to ensure new scores will be HB 2801 compliant.

There will be no changes to EPS for new homes. EPS will become a designation of an efficiently constructed new home.

The board asked how safe it is to rely on the U.S. DOE to maintain home energy scores. Andrew responded that technical development and further program enhancements could be slower than expected, but Energy Trust expects the U.S. DOE to move forward on its Home Energy Score as planned.

The board asked how EPS or the Home Energy Score will contribute to efficiency in Existing Homes. How does labeling a home make the home more efficient? Andria will address this later in the presentation. In summary, it is a tool to educate and engage homeowners.

The board asked how Energy Trust plans to migrate the 2,400 existing homes rated with EPS to the new Home Energy Score. Andrew responded that most of the scores were produced by Enhabit, formerly Clean Energy Works. Enhabit will re-engage Existing Homes customers with EPS and re-issue Home Energy Score scores to those homes as a customer re-engagement strategy. Energy Trust is also conducting an evaluation to understand how EPS ratings translate to Home Energy Scores.

The board asked if Home Energy Score considers home size. Andria responded that Home Energy Scores are partly based on housing size.

The board asked if the score is a BTU per square foot index. Andrew responded no.

Andrew continued that on January 1, 2018, Home Energy Scores will be required for all City of Portland homes listed for sale. The implementation partner is Earth Advantage. Energy Trust will continue to work closely with Earth Advantage and the City of Portland.

Andria provided an overview of policy development for home energy scoring in the City of Portland. Portland City Council passed the home energy score ordinance in December 2016. The score originates from the city's Climate Action Plan, which was adopted in its most recent version in 2015.

The city's goal is to reduce emissions 80 percent by 2050 from 1990 levels. Carbon emissions in Multnomah County are roughly 40 percent from transportation, 19 percent from residential buildings, 23 percent from commercial buildings, 17 percent from industrial buildings and 1 percent from solid waste. The residential sector needs to be addressed to reduce carbon emissions significantly. The majority of Portland's housing stock is owner-occupied single-family units.

The home energy scoring policy requires homeowners and home builders to obtain a home energy report including a Home Energy Score from a licensed assessor and must disclose that score at or before time of listing. Realtors are required to disclose a Home Energy Score in the listing. If a home is not sold, the policy is not triggered.

The board asked if the city received pushback from the Regional Multiple Listing Service, RMLS™. Andria responded that RMLS already has a field for energy score. The city has authority to regulate realtors.

The board asked if a home seller can turn on his or her listing without a Home Energy Score. Andria responded that a homeowner can list their home without a Home Energy Score, but they will be in violation of the policy. The code gives the city authority to send warning letters and then issue a fine. The city plans to focus instead on education and market engagement. The policy is long-term and focused on the next 15 years. The city expects it will take time for the market to adjust to this policy. The first check-in with city council to assess results is in 2020.

The board asked about cost of a Home Energy Score. Andria responded it's market-driven, and is expected to cost about \$150 to \$250 per score. In Austin, costs went down over time and settled at about \$125.

The board asked if Earth Advantage has a monopoly. Andria responded that Earth Advantage is not the assessor. Earth Advantage provides quality assurance.

The board asked about how it will work with EPS going away. Andrew responded there's a network of EPS raters using a software platform provided by Earth Advantage. The platform will begin outputting HES scores rather than EPS scores in July 2017. The process is expected to be seamless.

The board asked how long it takes to receive a score. Andria responded that it takes about one hour.

The board asked if Portland is the first city to require home energy scoring. Andria responded that other cities have passed requirements, but all are slightly different. Austin, Boulder and Santa Fe have ratings, but their requirements and mechanisms are different. There are six or seven other cities. Portland is the first city in the nation to require disclosure at time of listing. The city will not work with short sales or disclosure sales. These homes are exempt.

The board asked if for-sale-by-owner homes without an RMLS are required to have a Home Energy Score. Andria responded that these homes are exempt.

Andria presented the draft Home Energy Score document design. The Home Energy Score and annual energy costs are listed prominently at the top. The document also lists carbon footprint. The backside of the document includes a list of most cost-effective upgrade recommendations.

The board asked if Energy Trust is listed. Andria responded that Energy Trust is included as a resource to find a trade ally contractor.

The board asked if the Home Energy Score lists other fuel sources like wood fireplace. Andria responded yes.

The board asked how a homeowner knows what score is good or bad. Andria responded a low score is bad and a high score is good. Andria described efforts to make the document clear and easy to read.

The board asked if carbon footprints were about the home energy use only and have nothing to do with transportation and proximity to work and community. Andria responded that the scores are about home energy use only.

The board asked if the community's average score is listed. Andria responded no.

The board asked if energy costs are modeled. Andria confirmed energy costs are estimated. Mike Colgrove noted that another entity could compile scores and create a public map or database.

The board asked if a homeowner would get a new score after upgrades. Andria responded that scores are a snapshot in time and homeowners can get a new score at any time.

Mike asked how the city will treat low-income customers. Andria described the city's engagement of equity stakeholders. Based on recommendations from these stakeholders, the city is exploring ways that the city can cover Home Energy Score costs for low-income homeowners. The city could also exempt these customers.

Andria continued that EPS for new homes will stay in the market. It will be allowed to continue under the new city policy under a waiver. The city recognizes EPS has value as a brand and should not be immediately discontinued. At some point in the future, the city would like to transition EPS to HES for new homes.

Andria summarized the benefits of Home Energy Scores, including better information about full costs of a home, ability to compare energy costs between homes, knowledge of home improvements in advance of purchase and long-term household savings from an energy-efficient home.

The board asked how the city will measure the energy savings results and cost of results. Andria responded that the city has an evaluation plan as part of this program. The first evaluation period will end on June 2020.

The board asked if neighboring communities are interested. Andria responded there are several jurisdictions in the metro area and Oregon in expanding the score to their communities. Any other community could adopt and implement the same policy.

The board noted that the Oregon Department of Energy has a podcast called Grounded, and the second episode features Andria talking about the Home Energy Score.

The board took a break from 11:50 a.m. – 12:21 p.m.

Utility Customer Information (UCI) Data Presentation

Erika Kociolek, evaluation project manager, provided an update on Energy Trust's Utility Customer Information (UCI) Data Project. Energy Trust has been receiving data from partner utilities for several years following updated data sharing agreements. The data include monthly energy consumption for customers, as along with customer name, mailing addresses, building type, and other datapoints.

In addition, Energy Trust received information about large customers using more than 1 aMW and large customers that have opted out of data sharing.

Energy Trust can use UCI data to develop lists for targeted marketing. Staff will continue to use UCI data for billing analysis and other evaluation activities. Staff are prohibited to use UCI data for telemarketing or marketing that promotes electric space heating to NW Natural customers, which is consistent with Energy Trust's fuel neutrality policy. Staff are combining UCI data with Energy Trust's data as well as data from third-party datasets for analysis.

Energy Trust began receiving new UCI data in 2013, but there were challenges importing the data into our systems.

Energy Trust scoped out the UCI Data Project in 2015, and began by gathering feedback from more than 30 users. In 2016, staff reviewed and inventoried more than 900 raw files provided by utilities. Staff

developed and vetted a new database structure to house data, and developed and vetted a new automated data load process. Staff loaded 150 million records and linked those records to sites in Energy Trust's CRM system. In 2017, staff developed reference materials and delivered nine trainings to over 100 staff from Energy Trust and Program Management Contractors. Erika added that a data sharing agreement with Avista was executed mid-way through this project.

The board asked how Energy Trust ensures security of UCI data. Erika responded that security has been a high priority throughout this project. People and companies accessing the data sign non-disclosure agreements and we have policies and procedures for how UCI data must be handled.

The board asked if the data lives in the cloud or in a physical data system onsite. Scott Clark, director of IT, explained that the data is in Energy Trust's physical data center in the office. Backups are in the Microsoft cloud. There are rules about how data can be aggregated, stored and shared.

Erika summarized key project deliverables, which included a new database, new tables, and new views. Staff aligned data with Energy Trust's systems, applied business rules (including rules to remove duplicate records), and loaded it all in Energy Trust's database. This new process improved the transparency and traceability of the data; it's now easier to identify where data errors originate. Energy Trust now also has improved links between UCI data and site information in Energy Trust's CRM system. Another key deliverable was a wiki resource and data dictionary. Erika acknowledged project contributors.

Now that the UCI Data Project is complete, staff can begin using the data. In 2017, staff gathered input from users and created a roadmap for enhancements to further facilitate use of UCI data. Users' ideas for how to use UCI data included: verifying eligibility; identifying, targeting and segmenting customers; analyzing measure penetration and saturation; and conducting large-scale trend analysis. The roadmap also includes the creation of a centralized space for third-party datasets; exploring tools to facilitate data visualization, especially geographically; and exploring opportunities to receive additional data from utilities.

The board asked what data could be added. Erika responded that interval-level data and additional datapoints for monthly data (such as number of days in the billing period) are examples of additional data that are of interest to Energy Trust staff.

The board asked if Energy Trust will do a study to understand customer participation or site participation over time. Erika affirmed there are opportunities for this type of analysis. However, it would be difficult to link UCI data to customers. Energy Trust currently links UCI data at a site level.

The board asked if sanitized or aggregated data sets are available. Erika responded that staff have been focused on improving the state of the raw data, but this could be addressed at a later date.

The board asked if UCI data could be used for pay for performance, and Erika responded that it hasn't been used this way to date.

The board asked if the project was on time and under budget. Erika responded that a significant portion of the project involved analyzing how best to approach improving the processes to load and clean the data, and designing new structures to house the data. Given this, the project did not start out with a specific timeline or budget.

Eddie Sherman re-joined the meeting at 12:47 p.m.

Evaluation Programs – Authorize a Contract for Impact Evaluation Services with KEMA, Inc.

Sarah Castor, senior evaluation project manager, presented a proposed impact evaluation that would cost more than \$500,000 and requires board approval. Energy Trust conducted a request for proposals, (RFP) and received eight proposals. Staff selected KEMA, Inc. as the most qualified candidate to conduct the evaluation.

The board asked if the combined cost of two evaluations is cheaper than evaluating two programs separately. Sarah confirmed this and added that Energy Trust will gain efficiencies through consolidation. Fred Gordon, director of planning and evaluation, added that this also reduces the number of evaluators reaching out to customers.

The board asked if the cost of evaluation is appropriate for the size of the program and what the benefits are of the evaluation. Sarah responded that the evaluation would be about 0.6 percent of program costs. The Planning and Evaluation budget is about 2.5 percent of Energy Trust's total budget. This data will help forecast future energy savings and adjust assumptions about measures. Fred added that the industry benchmark is roughly 3-5 percent of funds spent on evaluation, so Energy Trust is at the lower end of the cost spectrum. This evaluation is important because the commercial Strategic Energy Management (SEM) offering is in its infancy and this will aid program design.

The board asked if evaluation results will be used to true up results, and Fred responded that true up numbers will be used to ensure accuracy of our cumulative savings and progress to Energy Trust's 2015-2019 Strategic Plan goals. The board noted the evaluation ensures quality for a large program.

The board asked if KEMA was competitively priced, and Sarah responded that KEMA's cost was comparable to other bids but included evaluation of many more sites.

Melissa Cribbins left the meeting at 1:22 p.m.

Moved by: John Reynolds
 Vote: In favor: 11
 Opposed: 0

Seconded by: Ken Canon
 Abstained: 0

Energy Programs – Contact Extensions for Three Production Efficiency Custom Track Program Delivery Contractors

Peter West, director of energy programs, and Sam Walker, industrial senior program manager, presented on contract extensions for the Production Efficiency custom track Program Delivery Contractors (PDC). In 2016, staff conducted an RFP for two standard track PDCs. Today, staff requests board support for final contract extensions for the three custom track PDCs. Contracts would be extended through 2018 and will rebid for 2019.

Sam continued that Energy Trust has three custom track PDCs: Energy 350, Portland General Electric-CTS and RHT. These PDCs provide account management and technical expertise for capital projects, operations and maintenance upgrades and industrial Strategic Energy Management. Staff recommends extensions for all three PDCs.

All PDCs have met extension criteria, including delivery budget management, project pipeline development, data management, customer service, marketing coordination, quality control and project reporting. The success of custom PDCs is based on customer relationships, and all three PDCs have strong customer relationships.

Sam addressed energy savings performance. PDCs have not met all savings goals for all years. This is because savings are variable due to the nature of serving large customers. Staff believe goals have been set too high for Production Efficiency. This has to do with a shift of savings from primarily large customers to primarily small- and mid-sized customers. Staff have seen a decline in SEM savings from large industrial sites, an increase in number of projects and a decline in savings per project. Megaprojects are excluded from this data.

The board asked why the number of SEM customers declined. Sam responded this had to do with saturating large SEM customers and beginning to serve mid-sized customers. Staff also reduced new customer recruitment to focus on refining SEM curriculum. The number of SEM participants is expected to increase in the future. The board speculated that Strategic Energy Management may be less appealing during a booming economy.

The board noted that Energy Trust treats the three companies roughly similarly. One PDC had weak performance in 2016, and another one appears to have weak performance this year. The board recommended that Energy Trust update and incent the weak company's contract similar to the other two, and Peter responded that this has already been done.

There were no board objections to extending the contracts.

Committee Reports Continued

Finance Committee, Susan Brodahl

PGE represents one-half of Energy Trust's revenue, and revenue from PGE is slightly low. Energy Trust has eroded its reserves and revenue needs to be watched carefully. Energy Trust is not expected to overspend or access PGE reserves. Pacific Power is ahead of revenue by 20 percent year to date.

Reserves are much lower than in past years. The goal is to end 2017 with about \$36 million in reserves. Note Pacific Power reserves are building up substantially.

Incentive spending is strong year to date, indicating strong results.

Policy Committee, Roger Hamilton

The committee reviewed three policies, including a conflict of interest policy, equity policy and annual review of contractors receiving more than \$500,000. The committee revised the conflict of interest policy to change the economic interest form, which had previously been ambiguous.

A consultant is helping the committee update the equity policy, and discussions are underway regarding how Oregon Public Utility Commission (OPUC) commissioners should be engaged.

There will be no change to the annual review of contractors receiving more than \$500,000.

Program Evaluation Committee, Alan Meyer

Free riders and spillover evaluation will be a topic for a future board meeting. The committee reviewed the OpenEEmeter tool.

Dan Rubado explained that CLEAResult has hired OpenEEmeter as a subcontractor to apply weather normalization to UCI data and program data and provide a dashboard of measures over time for program managers.

The board noted the tool provides faster feedback, and evaluations are done by independent contractors.

The committee also reviewed the Existing Multifamily process evaluation, which was largely based on interviews with customers, market experts and program management staff. The program is complex and varied. Existing Multifamily is more like Existing Buildings than it is like Existing Homes. Existing Multifamily has worked to tailor its offerings to customer types and building types. Existing Multifamily also recently began serving smaller 2-4 unit buildings that were previously served by Existing Homes. The program has increased emphasis on custom and prescriptive measures in addition to free installation of energy-saving lighting and water devices. Satisfaction was extremely high from customers, trade allies and Allied Technical Assistance Contractors. Staff gained insight into how owners and managers think about energy-efficiency investments, which is different from other capital investments. Existing Multifamily owners and managers tend to make energy-efficiency upgrades only when equipment breaks and needs to be replaced.

Strategic Planning Committee, Mark Kendall

The committee was pleased with the effective, useful and well-managed retreat. At the retreat, the board identified 27 key issues about which more information is needed prior to developing the 2020-2024 Strategic Plan. At the next board meeting, members will discuss these identified issues and hear insights from staff and Management Team.

Executive Director Review Committee, Debbie Kitchin (for Melissa Cribbins)

A survey on Mike's performance has been sent to staff and stakeholders for input.

Staff Report

Highlights (Mike Colgrove)

Mike shared a brief success story of Energy Trust's work with the Coos Head Food Co-op, a cornerstone business in Coos Bay. Energy Trust made a big impact on this and other small customers.

Mike reviewed quarter one (Q1) results. Savings and generation are typically very low in the first half of the year. Energy Trust was off to a strong start in Q1, thanks to strong new construction, a strong economy, strong LED uptake, strong solar demand and a colder-than-normal winter making energy bills top of mind for customers. In Q1, Energy Trust served 10,439 customers, the majority of which were residential customers. All but one of the 319 renewable sites were solar, with a small wind project in Coos Bay. Expenditures were on track.

In Q1, Energy Trust expanded on-bill financing for residential energy-efficiency upgrades, released a Request for Proposals for management and delivery of residential programs, launched two commercial Strategic Energy Management (SEM) cohorts, launched a second industrial SEM cohort and supported a fast-paced new commercial construction market. Energy Trust enrolled more new commercial construction projects than in any other quarter to date. Staff launched access for commercial and industrial customers to a diagnostic tool lending library offered by Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships. Work with cannabis facilities continued at a fast pace. Phase 1 of a megaproject budgeted to complete in 2018 may complete early in 2017.

Two large Southern Oregon solar projects are expected to complete by year-end. Demand for commercial solar incentives was especially high. Demand was also high for hydropower and biopower project development assistance and incentives. There are 57 Other Renewables projects currently receiving project development assistance.

Energy Trust met with partner utilities for strategic planning meetings. These annual discussions are designed to identify mutual interests and collaboration opportunities. Topics of interest included targeted demand-side management, expanding moderate-income services and identifying data to support diversity strategies.

Staff are working on an organizational assessment project, with recommendations expected prior to the 2018 Board Strategic Planning Workshop. Staff are currently engaging internal stakeholders and are planning to engage external stakeholders.

Energy Trust's budget review project is also underway, including engagement with internal and external stakeholders. A recommendation is expected by the end of the summer. The recommendation will focus on next year's process, and quick wins may be applied to this year's budget.

Lean startup training will complete on July 10. Staff will report out on results at the September board meeting.

Two hours of the July board meeting will be a follow-up discussion to the board strategic planning retreat.

State Legislative Update (Jay Ward)

Jay Ward, community relations manager, provided an update on the current legislative session. Energy Trust does not take a position on legislative issues, and monitors policy activity potential intersections with Energy Trust's work. Last Wednesday, a hearing was held on HB 2017, a new statewide transportation bill. Passing it will require a three-fifths majority. The bill would need bipartisan votes to pass. One section of the current bill amends SB 1149, including adding transportation electrification efforts to the use of public purpose funds. The legislature will adjourn on or before July 10.

Staff interpreted the bill as funding transportation electrification out of the energy efficiency portion of the public purpose charge, capped at 25 percent of the public purpose charge funds. This could add up to roughly \$22 million annually, using 2016 public purpose revenues as a proxy. More information is needed to understand the potential impacts on Energy Trust. Some stakeholders have expressed concerns.

Commissioner Steve Bloom shared that the OPUC read the bill and is reviewing the Energy Trust provisions. The OPUC is concerned about moving funds from proven energy-efficiency savings to electric vehicles, which are an unknown and new source for investments. Many amendments are expected and the bill is likely to change.

Mike added that Energy Trust staff prepared early for various legislative scenarios, and a team of staff meet daily to understand developments and anticipate information requests. Energy Trust is not promoting any position on the HB 2017 or any other bills.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

The next meeting of the Energy Trust Board of Directors will be on Wednesday, July 26, 2017, at 10:30 a.m. at Energy Trust, 421 SW Oak, Suite 300, Portland, Oregon.

s/s Alan Meyer

Alan Meyer, Secretary