Outlook

OSSIA comments re Organizational Expertise and Financial Assurance RAC

From Angela Crowley-Koch <angela@orssia.org>
Date Fri 9/18/2026 1:49 PM
To JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Cc SPLITT Christy * ODOE <Christy.SPLITT@energy.oregon.gov>; SCHLUSSER Amy * GOV <Amy.SCHLUSSER@oregon.gov>

1 attachment (336 KB)
OSSIA comments Org Exp Fin Assurance.pdf;

Hi Tom,

Attached please find OSSIA's comments regarding the current Org Expertise and Financial Assurance RAC. I wanted to flag that we included a proposal for salvage - essentially following three other states in including salvage value - and if you'd like to discuss that in more detail I'd be happy to talk.

Thanks,
Angela

Angela Crowley-Koch
Executive Director
Oregon Solar + Storage Industries Association (OSSIA)
Oregon Solar Energy Education Fund
503-867-3378

OREGON SOLAR + STORAGE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Oregon Department of Energy
Director Janine Benner
Tom Jackman
550 Capitol St NE, Salem, OR 97301

September 18, 2026

Director Benner and Mr. Jackman,

Oregon Solar + Storage Industries Association (OSSIA) submits these comments regarding the Organizational Expertise and Financial Assurance rulemaking. OSSIA is a trade association that promotes clean, renewable, solar and storage technologies and whose members include renewable energy businesses, non-profit groups, and other solar and storage industry stakeholders. The rulemaking will directly affect OSSIA's members.

Organizational Expertise

While OSSIA understands the agency's desire to ensure that the applicant has the expertise to follow through with the project, in the agency's 55 years of existence, only ten projects did not follow through with their project. This is because the decision to apply to EFSC is not one taken lightly: the process is expensive and time consuming. Projects applying are committing to at least $1 Million to the permitting process and must have considerable financial backing in place to even apply. Due to the high barriers for applying, OSSIA urges the Council to follow the Governor's Executive Orders 25-25 and 25-29 and simplify requirements for organizational expertise.

In addition, almost all solar projects create their own LCC for financing reasons. This is true across the country and is not unique to Oregon. These are not "shell" companies, this is standard practice in the industry and should not be treated with suspicion.

OSSIA is open to most of the ideas presented by staff but has the following concerns:

1. Operating agreements should not be required in the application. These contain confidential business information (CBI) which may put the entire financing of the project at risk. This is extremely anti-competitive in a very competitive environment; a competitor could simply file a public records request and then receive CBI which could be used to harm the applicant and the project itself. Transmission capacity for energy projects is extremely limited, and companies are very motivated to have their project jump the line to secure transmission. The risks from this requirement are too great to justify any benefits. OSSIA is strongly opposed to this option.
2. Disclosure of "adverse performance" language should be kept broad, such as "consider past compliance history." Looking at the number of violations does not tell the full story, and would be discriminatory for companies that hold multiple site certificates. A project may receive violations for minor issues that are easily and quickly remedied by the project. EFSC should only consider major violations and how quickly those violations were remedied.

PO Box 14927, Portland, OR 97293-0927
Email: admin@oseia.org
www.orssia.org

OREGON SOLAR + STORAGE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Financial Assurance

While OSSIA supports requirements for decommissioning, EFSC's current requirements are among the most expensive in the country. OSSIA urges the Council to follow the Governor's Executive Orders 25-25 and 25-29 and simplify requirements and reduce costs for Oregon ratepayers. Increased project costs end up being paid by Oregon ratepayers at a time when rates are increasing dramatically. OSSIA appreciates the need for standardization but cautions against being too prescriptive considering the different technologies that fall under EFSC's jurisdiction.

For the calculation of costs, OSSIA recommends Option 1, which increases standardization, but still allows each project to create an estimate specific to that site. Staff is correct that technology and labor costs change rapidly, so Option 2 and 3 would require increased ODOE staff needs up front and as costs change.

OSSIA recommends Option 2 for mandatory assumptions, as a technical manual provides the most flexible option as technology and costs change. Rules for nuclear facilities are extremely different than for solar, so creating rules for each technology would be time consuming, expensive, and would need to be revised frequently as new technology emerges.

Option 2 makes the most sense for who can prepare estimates. Estimates should be created by experts in the field, which ODOE does not have the capacity to hire for each type of facility. OSSIA opposes Option 3 of having the Council approve third-party reviewers. In this rapidly changing field, new companies are started by highly qualified individuals all the time. Having a set list would restrict possible expertise and may increase costs for the project.

OSSIA strongly recommends Option 2 for the inclusion of administrative overhead. Fixed percentages do not allow for differences in technology. Decommissioning a solar project is exponentially cheaper and faster than decommissioning a nuclear facility.

OSSIA believes it is very appropriate to incorporate salvage value into estimates, as steel and batteries are extremely valuable as salvage and always will be. OSSIA recommends that the rules adopt decommissioning minus salvage value and look to other states for models.

OSSIA strongly recommends Option 2 for recalculation of costs. Solar panels are warrantied for 20 years and inverters for ten years. Unlike other facilities, there is no need for a recalculation of costs while the components are still under warranty. OSSIA recommends that specific milestones are created per technology for maximum efficiency and cost reduction, in alignment with the Governor's Executive Orders and to save money for Oregon ratepayers.

OSSIA strongly recommends Option 3 for fully funded timing. There is no reason for full funding for a project that will last decades. This requirement is an unnecessary financial burden which increases the cost of energy for ratepayers. Option 2 does not allow for the differences between technology and the risk included in each. Option 3 should be adopted in a way that creates different stages for different technologies to acknowledge level of risk. A

PO Box 14927, Portland, OR 97293-0927
Email: admin@oseia.org
www.orssia.org

nuclear plant has high risk factors and a solar facility has low risk factors. This needs to be taken into consideration.

In conclusion, Oregon currently has some of the most difficult and expensive permitting in the entire country. OSSIA appreciates the Department's willingness to reexamine current practices to streamline and reduce costs that will impact Oregon ratepayers. OSSIA urges EFSC to make common sense reforms that take into account different technologies and increase efficiency.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Angela Crowley-Koch
Executive Director

PO Box 14927, Portland, OR 97293-0927
Email: admin@oseia.org
www.orssia.org

Outlook

Re: [External]Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

From Bauer, Andrew <Andrew.Bauer@nwnatural.com>
Date Mon 9/14/2026 6:56 AM
To JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>

Tom,

Here's a recommendation; the added language is underlined.

> OAR 345-022-0050
> Retirement and Financial Assurance
>
> To issue a site certificate, the Council must find that:
>
> (1)The site, taking into account mitigation, can be restored adequately to a useful, non-hazardous condition following permanent cessation of construction or operation of the facility.
>
> (2)The applicant has a reasonable likelihood of obtaining a bond or letter of credit in a form and amount satisfactory to the Council or <u>recovering such amount through an order of an administrative agency</u> to restore the site to a useful, non-hazardous condition.

Thanks,

Andy

From: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2026 3:08 PM
To: Diane Brandt <diane@renewablenw.org>; Troy Jones <mtroyjones@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindy.condon@efsc.oregon.gov>; Ann Beier (EFSC) <ann.beier@efsc.oregon.gov>; ESTERSON Sarah * ODOE <Sarah.ESTERSON@energy.oregon.gov>; Patrick G Rowe <Patrick.G.Rowe@doj.oregon.gov>; Lenna Cope <lenna.cope@pgn.com>; Lawlor, David <david.lawlor@nexteraenergy.com>; Sam Diaz <sam@friends.org>; Ryan.Hill@nexteraenergy.com <ryan.hill@nexteraenergy.com>; Sarah Buchwalter <sarah.buchwalter@pgn.com>; Bauer, Andrew <Andrew.Bauer@nwnatural.com>; JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com <jordan.grace@tetratech.com>; Wendy King <wkingproshop@gmail.com>; dibblee@hevanet.com <dibblee@hevanet.com>; Angela Crowley-Koch <angela@oseia.org>; katherine@renewablenw.org <katherine@renewablenw.org>; haley@renewablenw.org <haley@renewablenw.org>
Cc: Ann Beier <aebeier456@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindycondon@comcast.net>
Subject: [External]Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

CAUTION: This email originated outside NW Natural. Please DO NOT CLICK LINKS OR OPEN ATTACHMENTS unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

All,

They will be on the website, but in the meantime, here are the 50-state decommissioning survey I was talking about as well as the PPT from today.

The RAC has until Sept 18, to provide feedback. Try and hit that deadline, but if you need more time (this is a lot), let me know.

Thanks,

Tom

Tom Jackman
Rules Coordinator for Energy Facility Siting Council
550 Capitol St. NE | Salem, OR 97301
P: 503-551-7603

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Stay connected!

From: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 11:09 AM
To: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>; Diane Brandt <diane@renewablenw.org>; Troy Jones <mtroyjones@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindy.condon@efsc.oregon.gov>; Ann Beier (EFSC) <ann.beier@efsc.oregon.gov>; ESTERSON Sarah * ODOE <Sarah.ESTERSON@energy.oregon.gov>; Patrick G Rowe <Patrick.G.Rowe@doj.oregon.gov>; Lenna Cope <lenna.cope@pgn.com>; Lawlor, David <david.lawlor@nexteraenergy.com>; Sam Diaz <sam@friends.org>; Ryan.Hill@nexteraenergy.com <ryan.hill@nexteraenergy.com>; Sarah Buchwalter <sarah.buchwalter@pgn.com>; Bauer, Andrew <andrew.bauer@nwnatural.com>; JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com <jordan.grace@tetratech.com>; Wendy King <wkingproshop@gmail.com>; dibblee@hevanet.com <dibblee@hevanet.com>; Angela Crowley-Koch <angela@oseia.org>; katherine@renewablenw.org <katherine@renewablenw.org>; haley@renewablenw.org <haley@renewablenw.org>
Subject: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03
When: Thu 8/27/2026 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Microsoft Teams meeting

Outlook

RNW Organizational Expertise and Financial Assurances RAC Comments

From Haley Kirtland <haley@renewablenw.org>
Date Mon 9/21/2026 3:57 PM
To tom.jackman@energy.oregon.gov <tom.jackman@energy.oregon.gov>
Cc Diane Brandt <diane@renewablenw.org>; Katie Chamberlain <katherine@renewablenw.org>

1 attachment (168 KB)
21SEPT2026 RNW EFSC Financial Assurance and Organization Expertise Comments.pdf;

Hi Tom,

I hope you had a restful weekend.

Please find RNW's comments on the Division 20 RAC attached. Do not hesitate to reach out if additional information around project development and finance would be of interest to the council and staff.

Let me know if you have any questions,

Haley Kirtland
Policy Associate
Renewable Northwest

September 21st, 2026

To: Tom Jackman, Rulemaking Coordinator, ODOE
From: Diane Brandt, Policy and Legislative Director and Katie Chamberlain, Senior Policy & Regulatory Manager, Oregon | Renewable Northwest
Re: Financial Assurance and Organizational Expertise RAC (Division 22)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on staff proposals shared at the August 27, 2026, Division 22 Rulemaking Advisory Committee ("RAC") meeting. As a member of the RAC, Renewable Northwest ("RNW") would like to provide the following comments and cautions as staff drafts final rule recommendations. RNW remains concerned about potential overreach presented by the Organizational Expertise proposed changes and we offer the following comments and recommendations informed by RNW member feedback.

Organizational Expertise: Governing Agreements and "Relied Upon Entities"

RNW appreciates the re-framing of the problem statement posed in the Organizational Expertise portion of the recent RAC meeting to clarify that EFSC is evaluating where applicable financial and expertise resources are and if the applicant has access to them. While staff has expressed that they do not want to evaluate parent companies, the rules currently proposed will inherently extend applicant assessment requirements to the parent company, financial institution, or lenders involved. We are particularly concerned with the suggestion that LLCs would be required to disclose operating agreements between parent companies and LLCs or governing agreements under the proposed concept of the "relied upon entity" ("RUE").

The corporate structure through which renewable energy projects are developed is intricate. Most parent companies will form an LLC for individual projects and the LLC will apply and hold the permit for the project. As expressed in RNW's comments from April 2026, permitting happens very early on in the project development process, which often comprises only 5-10% of project cost[1]. A project would not enter a permitting process at EFSC if it was not viable to be financed or constructed. Even so, the bulk of the construction financing typically occurs after a permit is issued and after an offtake agreement is secured. This means developers are bearing the cost and risk of

[1] E.R. Yescombe, *Principles of Project Finance*, 2nd ed. (Academic Press, 2013), Chapter 3, "Project Development and Management." Page 34.

the permitting process which would only be recouped upon completion of the project. It also means that LLCs typically do not hold many assets in the permitting phase. Consequently, it is unlikely that the disclosure of a governing agreement between parent companies and LLCs would even produce certainty of access to the resources the Council is looking to evaluate as it is simply too early in the development process to have those assets fully structured and reflected in an agreement or structure.

Pragmatically, RNW is concerned that adding governing and operating agreements to an application would exceed current council and staff expertise and extend timelines - financial and organizational viability reviews are highly specialized and due diligence often requires months to perform. Equally, approving site certificate permits based on the quality of an operating agreement could exceed EFSC's statutory authority under ORS 469.501(1)(a). Depending on the scope of and information contained in the agreements the council seeks, there may be highly confidential or trade secret information involved. Requiring such disclosures potentially exceeds EFSC's statutory authority if the agreement could be classified under Oregon's trade secret rules[2]. It would also require confidentiality and non disclosure agreements in place for staff and council members reviewing the documents. For these reasons, RNW highly recommends against expanding requirements in this way - it would place undue administrative burdens on staff and council, exceed existing capacity and expertise, and potentially fall outside of EFSC's statutory authority. We suggest keeping the permitting process focused firmly on the applicant.

It is RNW's understanding that the problem EFSC council members are looking to solve is a "lack of evidence" supporting organizational expertise and sufficient financial resources. Staff have also reiterated that this "lack of evidence" has not led to material issues with projects in Oregon - and yet the RAC is attempting to solve for the concern that it could. Because of the amount of capital and expertise required to finance and construct a project, it is against the developer's best interest to enter the permitting process without confidence that the project can be constructed once it receives a permit and an offtake agreement. In the event this concern becomes a material problem in the future, it is RNW's understanding that any failure to build or construct a project to the financial or expertise standards within the allocated site certificate is a compliance issue which the site certificate holder would be accountable for, regardless of who performed or financed the work. Equally, as this occurs well after the site certification application process, this is a compliance issue, not an application issue. As such, we believe an ownership and control chart with affiliate relationships would suffice to identify affiliate relationships and responsibilities. We also believe ODOE should recognize that developers typically do not bring in all financing, operational, or ownership resources until they are needed, and the rule should preserve stage-appropriate flexibility.

[2] ORCP 36, General Rules Governing Discovery

The proposed past-performance language could disproportionately disadvantage applicants with prior development experience and operational projects in Oregon. Companies with existing operating assets are subject to ongoing regulatory oversight and are more likely to have a citation on record that could influence the current application, regardless of how small or quickly the issue was remedied. This means that companies with more experience developing projects are more burdened by this rule.

Finally, at the RAC meeting on August 27th, Commissioner Beier expressed that insight into the realities of development and project timelines would be welcomed. **RNW would be pleased to provide more information or facilitate conversations with developer members about the intricacies of project finance and development structures.**

Financial Assurance

We appreciate the tremendous effort by staff to explore option sets within the Financial Assurances Rules. Generally, we are supportive of options that will maintain flexibility in language updates to accommodate a changing field and conditions. We would like to offer the following feedback on specific options discussed in the recent RAC meeting:

1. Mandatory Assumptions: RNW recommends formalizing the existing process where applicants disclose their assumptions and remediation plans based on those assumptions, which is detailed by Option 2 proposed by staff. While we understand desires for ODOE to standardize assumptions and estimates, we share concerns expressed by staff that ODOE doesn't have the capacity to maintain these estimates as the industry changes. Using third party estimates is effective and we suggest formalizing this process.

2. Salvage Value: Financial assurance estimates discounting salvage value is a reasonable choice for Oregon. We understand staff's concerns that salvage value can be complicated and that ODOE is seeking certainty in bond values. However, bonds are only one avenue to provide this certainty. As established above, upon construction, the project itself becomes the LLC's biggest asset, partly because there is significant value in wind and solar project materials - both in salvage and scrap value.[3] Scrap metal typically retains value in a forecastable range, while salvage value is the ability to recycle and reuse components. Even though a project's salvage value is more volatile, a reasonable salvage-value credit would be appropriate in Oregon as a zero-salvage assumption pretends that recoverable materials will have no value. RNW recommends adopting decommissioning costs minus salvage value, which has been implemented in Montana,

[3] See U.S. Department of Energy's Wind Decommissioning Guide. 85-95% of wind turbine mass is recyclable.

Virginia, and Illinois.[4] This matters to energy affordability as it can be a low-risk way to reduce high financial assurance requirements that increase project costs.

3. Cost Recalculation: Recalculation of costs at major milestones or incrementally is the most appropriate option of the three given.[5]

4. Fully Funded Timing: RNW recommends shifting the full bond amount requirement from day one to a risk-based model. Once a project operates under a Power Purchase Agreement ("PPA"), risk is much lower. This approach is the most accurate and cost-effective. We recommend selecting Option 3 and implementing it in a resource-specific way.

As staff finalize these rules, RNW would like to reiterate that the existing application of the standards around assessing and holding the applicant responsible for financial viability and adherence to site certificate requirements are currently effective and in line with EFSC's statutory authority. Please reach out if additional information around project development and finance would be of interest to the council and staff.

Sincerely,

Diane Brandt
Policy and Legislative Affairs Director
Renewable Northwest

[4] NREL's Survey of Federal and State Solar Decommissioning Policies, 2021.
[5] American Clean Power recommends that financial assurance be posted in increments with the first posting date on or before the 10th anniversary of the facility commencing commercial operations and no less 5 years thereafter. See Clean Power Decommissioning from ACP

Outlook

Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

From Grace, Jordan <JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com>
Date Mon 9/21/2026 2:57 PM
To JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>

Hi Tom,

Below is feedback from Tetra Tech regarding scrap value:

Tetra Tech would like to take this opportunity to note the distinction between salvage value and scrap value. In the cost-estimating context, salvage value generally refers to the value obtained by salvaging equipment for reuse—for example, reselling solar panels for use as solar panels at another location. Scrap value, by contrast, typically refers to the value of the metals used in equipment components that can be reclaimed and reused to manufacture other metal objects.

For example, tracker systems are typically made of galvanized steel or aluminum, both of which retain value as metals regardless of the condition of the racks when the project is decommissioned. Scrap metal is a commodity that generally retains value. For forecasting purposes, ODOE may not want to use the maximum expected value; however, ferrous metal prices have fluctuated between $260 and $490 per ton over the past 20 years and are currently approximately $400 per ton. Tetra Tech sees no reason why ODOE should not allow the use of a value at the lower end of that range, provided that an applicant supplies source data supporting the proposed value. Although the value will continue to fluctuate over time, it is generally expected to increase rather than decrease.

Therefore, Tetra Tech strongly suggests that the rules, at a minimum, allow applicants to include a *scrap value* credit in decommissioning cost estimates based on a conservative valuation of the metals contained in a facility's components. Tetra Tech also suggests that this *scrap value* credit be accounted for in the required bond amount.

Thank you,

Jordan Grace (he/him)
Mobile **+1 (714) 580-9006**

From: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 11:36 AM
To: Grace, Jordan <JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com>
Subject: Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

⚠ **CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. Verify the source before opening links or attachments. ⚠

Jordan,

That's not a problem, but try to get it to me by then because I'm assembling the feedback I've received so far and I would like to get it back in front of the RAC members.

Thanks,

Tom

Tom Jackman
Rules Coordinator for Energy Facility Siting Council
550 Capitol St. NE | Salem, OR 97301
P: 503-551-7603

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Stay connected!

From: Grace, Jordan <JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 10:36 AM
To: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Subject: Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

Hi Tom,

Is it possible to submit feedback later today or tomorrow?

Thank you,

Jordan Grace (he/him)
Mobile **+1 (714) 580-9006**

From: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2026 3:08 PM
To: Diane Brandt <diane@renewablenw.org>; Troy Jones <mtroyjones@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindy.condon@efsc.oregon.gov>; Ann Beier (EFSC) <ann.beier@efsc.oregon.gov>; ESTERSON Sarah * ODOE <Sarah.ESTERSON@energy.oregon.gov>; Patrick G Rowe <Patrick.G.Rowe@doj.oregon.gov>; Lenna Cope <lenna.cope@pgn.com>; david.lawlor <david.lawlor@nexteraenergy.com>; Sam Diaz <sam@friends.org>; Hill, Ryan <ryan.hill@nexteraenergy.com>; Sarah Buchwalter <sarah.buchwalter@pgn.com>; Bauer, Andrew <andrew.bauer@nwnatural.com>; Grace, Jordan <jordan.grace@tetratech.com>; Wendy King <wkingproshop@gmail.com>; dibblee@hevanet.com <dibblee@hevanet.com>; Angela Crowley-Koch <angela@oseia.org>; katherine@renewablenw.org <katherine@renewablenw.org>; haley@renewablenw.org <haley@renewablenw.org>
Cc: Ann Beier <aebeier456@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindycondon@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03

⚠ **CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. Verify the source before opening links or attachments. ⚠

All,

They will be on the website, but in the meantime, here are the 50-state decommissioning survey I was talking about as well as the PPT from today.

The RAC has until Sept 18, to provide feedback. Try and hit that deadline, but if you need more time (this is a lot), let me know.

Thanks,

Tom

Tom Jackman
Rules Coordinator for Energy Facility Siting Council
550 Capitol St. NE | Salem, OR 97301
P: 503-551-7603

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Stay connected!

From: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 11:09 AM
To: JACKMAN Tom * ODOE <Tom.JACKMAN@energy.oregon.gov>; Diane Brandt <diane@renewablenw.org>; Troy Jones <mtroyjones@gmail.com>; Cindy Condon <cindy.condon@efsc.oregon.gov>; Ann Beier (EFSC) <ann.beier@efsc.oregon.gov>; ESTERSON Sarah * ODOE <Sarah.ESTERSON@energy.oregon.gov>; Patrick G Rowe <Patrick.G.Rowe@doj.oregon.gov>; Lenna Cope <lenna.cope@pgn.com>; Lawlor, David <david.lawlor@nexteraenergy.com>; Sam Diaz <sam@friends.org>; Ryan.Hill@nexteraenergy.com <ryan.hill@nexteraenergy.com>; Sarah Buchwalter <sarah.buchwalter@pgn.com>; Bauer, Andrew <andrew.bauer@nwnatural.com>; JORDAN.GRACE@tetratech.com <jordan.grace@tetratech.com>; Wendy King <wkingproshop@gmail.com>; dibblee@hevanet.com <dibblee@hevanet.com>; Angela Crowley-Koch <angela@oseia.org>; katherine@renewablenw.org <katherine@renewablenw.org>; haley@renewablenw.org <haley@renewablenw.org>
Subject: EFSC Org Expertise & Retirement and Financial Assurance RAC #03
When: Thu 8/27/2026 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM
Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join: https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/25848225563549?p=jm4sXskWp5Z91AAZQb

Meeting ID: 258 482 255 635 49

Passcode: Br95hh3K

Need help? | System reference

Dial in by phone

+1 503-446-4951,,951473333# United States, Portland

Find a local number

Phone conference ID: 951 473 333#

For organizers: Meeting options | Reset dial-in PIN
