

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

Session 6: DCAC Additional Considerations and Deliberations July 31, 2026 – Facilitator Summary

The following Facilitator Summary is intended to capture general discussion, reflections, concerns, and insights shared at the Data Center Advisory Committee's public session. This summary also indicates actions or issues that the DCAC may need to discuss further in the future. This summary is not a transcript of the session. For more details on the DCAC's work, and to view the session [agenda](#), presentations, and [recording](#), please visit the ODOE's [DCAC website](#).

Welcome and Introduction to the Process and People

Facilitator, **Donna Silverberg**, opened the session and welcomed the Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC), speakers, and attendees. She reviewed the agenda, framing this last substantive session as a transition from fact-finding into the final stretch of the Committee's work, before they begin drafting their Preliminary Findings Report (PFR) based on what has been learned throughout these sessions. Donna [presented](#) an overview of the DCAC process, highlighting that the Governor convened the DCAC to run an open, public process on the opportunities and challenges tied to data centers. She outlined the committee's scope: to review legal and regulatory frameworks in other states, gather facts on the drivers of data center growth in Oregon, hear from vested and affected parties on jobs, economy, energy, water, and land use, energy affordability, tax and revenue impacts, and then to develop recommendations for the Governor. She reiterated the DCAC's process is to listen carefully, stay open-minded, and use this session to further address key issues the DCAC, and the public, identified as needing more information.

DCAC co-chairs **Michael Jung** and **Margaret Hoffmann** welcomed the group, thanking the public and staff for their comments, engagement, and support throughout the process. They clarified that ECONorthwest study in today's presentation was commissioned independently from the Governor's office, though it is still useful work for the Committee to review. The Committee introduced themselves and acknowledged the serious wildfire emergencies occurring throughout the state, expressing support for all affected communities and emergency services.

Air Quality

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Regional Air Permitting Manager, **Ania Loyd**, and Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program Manager, **Elizabeth Elbel**, [presented](#) how Oregon regulates air emissions from data centers, how risks are identified or mitigated, and what challenges, if any, these may pose for DEQ.

Ania explained that the major permitted clusters of Oregon data centers are located in Hillsboro (16), Boardman/Hermiston/Umatilla (16), The Dalles (3), and Bend/Prineville (4). She noted that DEQ permits data center campuses as single facilities, not each building

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

separately (which explains count differences). With permitting data from 2025-2026, the agency tracked a rapid increase in permitted backup generator capacity in Oregon, from around 135 MW (2012) to 6,328 MW, and around 2,400 large generators.

Diesel emergency generators are the primary sources of air pollutants (nitrogen oxides/NO_x, carbon monoxide/CO, particulate matter/PM, volatile organic compounds/VOCs, sulfur dioxide/SO₂), plus hazardous air pollutants such as diesel particulate matter (DPM) and greenhouse gases (GHGs). Biodiesel is currently disallowed for data center engines. Instead, traditional ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) and renewable diesel are allowed. From DEQ's evaluative perspective, renewable diesel has a similar emissions profile to ULSD (no pollutant class higher), but lifecycle and black carbon questions remain (DEQ can provide background materials to the DCAC, if requested).

Operation categories include:

- Readiness testing / non-emergency operation (frequent, but typically short tests).
- Annual load testing (more extensive, around 1 hour).
- Dispatch (utility-called operation to support grid reliability): federally limited to 50 hours/year (counts toward the 100-hour non-emergency cap).
 - DEQ reports very few facilities with dispatch permission (only one known); dispatch is not requested by most applicants.
- Emergency operation, for grid loss. This is not generally regulated by DEQ for non-major sources; federal regulation caps non-emergency testing / operations at 100 hours/year per generator.

For data centers, DEQ issues complex Standard Air Contaminant Discharge Permits (as synthetic minor sources). Oregon currently has no Title V (i.e., major) data center sources, and permitting maintains facility-wide enforceable emission limits (e.g., a cap below the 100-ton/year major source threshold for criteria pollutants such as NO_x). Permits include enforceable plant-side annual emission limits (tons/year), new source performance standards (NSPS) (g/kWh) for new/large engines, toxic air contaminant risk assessment (Clean Air Oregon/diesel particulate matter), and ambient National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) compliance modeling that accounts for nearby sources and background concentrations.

Federal and state rules do not require emission controls for emergency engines because they are infrequent, though control technologies exist for non-emergency engines, including selective catalytic reduction (SCR) for NO_x, diesel particulate filters, and diesel oxidation catalysts. DEQ offers a "streamlined" permit option that incentivizes use of all three emission control technologies; use is limited by market availability and costs.

Plant-wide GHG thresholds (triggering a reporting requirement) appear in permits for non-emergency operations. DEQ's GHG reporting threshold is 2,500 metric tons/yr, while the EPA federal threshold is 25,000 mt/yr. DEQ noted that in 2025 data center facilities mostly did not exceed the 2,500 mt/yr reporting threshold. For compliance and

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

enforcement, DEQ inspects facilities, requires emissions testing and report review. Enforcement varies by violation severity (warnings, corrective actions, penalties, orders). Historically, eastern Oregon has generally high compliance, with isolated permit overrun incidents (e.g., a construction-phase fire pump ran for around 150 hours). DEQ fees include application fees, Cleaner Air Oregon fees, modeling fees, and annual operating fees, all paid by applicants/permittees. Permit denial is possible only if the applicant cannot demonstrate compliance with all applicable state and federal requirements.

DEQ manages data center air pollution mainly through permit limits, operating restrictions, modeling, and monitoring. Diesel generators remain the main concern. Following discussion with the DCAC, DEQ committed to following up on renewable diesel details, emergency-operation timing questions, dispatch treatment, and the recent Federal policy announcement affecting power generation.

Committee Discussion and Q&A

- **Q: What does “permitted” mean for data centers?**
 - A: DEQ clarified it means the facility has an air permit because they may exceed certain emissions or generator thresholds.
- **Q: Is DEQ permitting each building or the whole campus?**
 - A: DEQ permits the campus as one facility, so multiple buildings can sit under one permit.
- **Q: Can DEQ deny a permit?**
 - A: Yes, but only if the applicant cannot show compliance with all applicable state and federal rules.
- **Q: What is the difference between normal operation, testing, dispatch, and emergency use?**
 - A: Readiness testing involves short routine testing; annual load testing is a more formal test; dispatch is utility-requested operation and is limited by federal rules; and emergency use is for an actual power loss.
- **Q: How long can generators run?**
 - A: Non-emergency use is limited under federal rules to 100 hours per year per generator; dispatch use must be within that limit.
- **Q: Is dispatch allowed at most data centers?**
 - A: No, it is only permitted at a small number of facilities, and most applicants do not request it.
- **Q: What about mobile generators on wheels?**
 - A: DEQ regulates stationary sources; if a mobile unit is left on site long-term, it can be treated like a stationary source
- **Q: Are data centers using renewable diesel? How does it compare to regular diesel?**
 - A: DEQ suggested it is treated for GHG purposes as from renewable sources and therefore not emitting GHGs; DEQ will follow up with background materials on lifecycle questions.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- **Q: Are backup generators controlled with pollution technology?**
 - A: Controls generally are not required for emergency engines, but technologies like SCR, Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF), and oxidation catalysts exist and can greatly reduce emissions.
- **Q: Do permits consider cumulative impacts from clustered facilities?**
 - A: Yes, DEQ considers nearby sources and ambient background pollution in modeling for new facilities.
- **Q: What happens if a facility violates permit limits?**
 - A: DEQ responds with warnings, corrective actions, penalties, or enforceable orders depending on severity.

Impacts of Data Center Incentives: Effects on School Funding

State School Fund (SSF) Program Administrator **Vanessa Clark**, Oregon Department of Education (ODE), [presented](#) how the current data center tax incentive structure affects statewide school funding.

The SSF comprises both state and local revenues and equals around 80% of school district operating revenue. For baseline context, the 2024-2025 K–12 public school resource breakdown was 57% state, 35% local & intermediate, and 8% federal. “Local resources” within the SSF formula include property taxes (including revenue in lieu), enterprise zone school support fees, Common School Fund, County School Fund, and state-managed timber. Excluded are local option taxes and capital bonds.

The SSF distribution follows a statutory formula rooted in 1) *equity* (student weights/average daily membership with weights, or ADMw), 2) *equalization* (state/local blend yielding a rate per weighted student), and 3) *adequacy* (legislative appropriation). The formula first computes the statewide funding ratio (based on state appropriation and carveouts), then school district calculations that include ADMw and weights to derive a general-purpose grant (still includes local revenue at that stage). Vanessa noted that local revenue stays local: the formula computes a general-purpose grant including assumed local revenue; the jurisdiction’s actual local revenues are then subtracted, and the net constitutes the state share distributed to each district. Thus, local revenues are counted in the calculation but are not physically redistributed by ODE.

For enterprise zone school support fees: local taxing districts may set a school support fee tied to tax abatements (a statutory floor of 15% up to 30% is possible). That fee is local revenue counted in the SSF formula and affects the statewide rate per ADMw when aggregated across the state. However, local districts directly retain local revenue. The 15% vs 30% setting affects what flows into the “local revenues” line used in statewide calculations. If many districts exercise abatements at lower support fee levels, that can reduce the statewide formula rate because the total formula revenue changes. Local districts largely will be backfilled by the state if local revenues fall, unless a district

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

receives all its revenue locally. A few districts get 100% local revenue and are directly affected.

Vanessa noted that every \$1 million added to or subtracted from the SSF changes the rate per ADMw by around \$1.50 (95.5% to school districts; 4.5% to Educational Service Districts / ESDs). For example, a \$100 million biennial change would translate to roughly a \$73 / ADMw change for a single year (49% first year / 51% second year split), which when multiplied by a district's ADMw yields the district-level impact. Vanessa emphasized that the legislature sets the state appropriation and the state reconciles data to actuals about one year after the school year ends (e.g., reconciliations and audited local revenues).

It was noted that ODE receives audited final local revenue figures (including school support fee receipts), but ODE does not collect detailed line items for tax-abatement agreements. As such, this produces a data gap. ODE recommends the DCAC follow up with other agencies (e.g., Business Oregon, Department of Revenue, Legislative Revenue Office) to clarify enterprise zone flows and the practical local fiscal impacts.

In closing, DCAC Members requested that ODE review the DCAC Session 5 Facilitator Summary for accuracy to ensure past information was presented accurately.

Committee Discussion and Q&A

- **Q: How does local revenue affect school funding?**
 - A: Local revenue is part of the SSF formula, but it stays local and is used to calculate the statewide rate per weighted student.
- **Q: What counts as local revenue? What does not?**
 - A: Property taxes, revenue in place of property taxes, school support fees, timber-related funds, and certain other statutory sources. Local option taxes and capital bonds do not.
- **Q: How does the formula work?**
 - A: The formula is based on equity, equalization, and adequacy. Legislature sets the appropriation, and the formula calculates a rate per ADMw.
- **Q: Does an increase in local revenue help or hurt schools?**
 - A: It can increase the statewide rate per ADMw, but the actual district impact depends on the size and spread of the revenue change.
- **Q: What about the school support fee in enterprise zones?**
 - A: The fee affects how much local revenue flows into the formula. The committee discussed the statutory range of 15% to 30%.
- **Q: Who sets the formula?**
 - A: The formula is set in statute; the legislature can make changes through budgeting and lawmaking.
- **Q: Does ODE have enough detail to track all abatements?**
 - A: No, ODE receives final revenue totals but does not have full line-by-line visibility into all abatement structures.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- **Q: Can ODE tell whether a district gets 15% or 30%?**
 - A: Not from its data alone; ODE suggested that Business Oregon or the Department of Revenue would be better sources for this detail.

[Facilitator's Note: Following the session, Vanessa provided the following clarifications to a presentation made in Session 5 on Oregon school funding and how the school support fee mechanism (under HB legislation) interacts with data center tax incentives:

- The SSF is equal to the State appropriation set by the Legislature plus the sum of Local revenues defined in ORS 327.011.
 - The Legislature sets a total State appropriation but does not set a per student or per ADMw funding amount for distribution. The rate per ADMw that is used to calculate a school district's allocation is determined through the formula calculation defined in statute.
- Increase to Local revenues equals an increase to the total dollar amount of the SSF.
- A small increase in Local revenues by a single school district is largely not felt as an increase to the SSF due to the many variables that are adjusted throughout a school year. This can lead to misunderstandings such as those expressed in the previous committee meeting.]

Economy and Workforce Impacts: Economic, Workforce, and Resource Implications Assessment of Oregon Data Centers

Economist and Senior Project Manager, **Terry Wirkkala**, ECONorthwest (ECONW), and Acting Director of the Center for Economic and Policy Studies, **João Ferreira, Ph.D.**, Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia, [presented](#) preliminary findings from their study to provide an objective, comprehensive evidence based review of Oregon data centers' inventory, economic contributions, workforce, and resource implications to help inform public discussion and policy. Funded by the Lemelson Foundation, their goal was to provide a fact base on the Oregon data center industry separate from advocacy. They emphasized that while these results are preliminary, they are unlikely to change dramatically.

The primary commercial database they used is S&P Global (S&P) and its 451 Research (451) (subscription licensing). ECONW used S&P's classification of operational, under construction, and planned centers; S&P historically shows that around 95% of "planned / under construction" entries end up being built. ECONW identified 144 operational or under-construction data centers in Oregon (this number excludes decommissioned data centers). Western Oregon has 41 operational and 23 future facilities; Eastern Oregon has 70 operational and 9 future facilities. It was noted that the dataset lacks some very recent permit filings such as a late filing run in Washington County and some smaller facilities.

Data center types include retail (multi-tenant small centers), telco, wholesale (developer-owned shell leased to tenants), hyperscale (owner-operator giant sites, e.g., big cloud / AI players), and "power shell" (a large shell built while awaiting tenant). Since 2018, the market has shifted from smaller retail / telco centers towards large hyperscale, wholesale

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

and smaller legacy facilities with substantially larger footprints and energy demands. Terry and João emphasized that Oregon's cumulative square footage is projected to approach around 30M ft² by 2030. For statewide context, Eastern Oregon has concentrated hyperscale clusters (high MW, large footprint e.g., Umatilla / Boardman), while Western Oregon growth is a mix with more wholesale / power shell development around Portland suburbs of Hillsboro and Washington County.

The study found an estimated 2,630 operational (onsite) workers at Oregon data centers; this includes a facility-level count, excluding corporate HQ, remote staff, and many third-party contractors. Direct labor income is around \$622M, although averages are skewed by high outliers. Data center employment is a small share statewide but regionally significant in less populated eastern communities like Morrow County. The total economic contribution (direct, indirect, and induced) from operations is around 10,400 jobs and around \$3.49B in value-added. Direct construction employment is around 3,900 jobs, with direct value added around \$1.1B; in total around 6% of Oregon's construction industry, or \$1.87B total value added. Construction impacts are concentrated in the east, with sustained waves of construction stretching what otherwise would be short-term peaks. ECONW emphasized pipeline and IT refresh cycles (on average every 5 years) contribute recurring construction activity, which are not fully captured in snapshots.

ECONW compiled county-level property tax receipts attributable to data centers (FY 2025–26 snapshot) with a total around \$60M statewide. This includes around \$22.6M in the west and around \$37.6M in the east. Terry cautioned: this is a point-in-time snapshot and abatements (enterprise zones, etc.) dramatically affect these figures year to year. She emphasized that these property tax numbers do *not* capture other direct community investments negotiated in development agreements (e.g., water infrastructure, substations, other off-site community benefit investments) and asked that any fiscal picture include those negotiated community payments (for example: large investments in water infrastructure for a Umatilla area project that exceeded tens of millions of dollars).

On average, IT power per facility has been increasing. Cumulative installed IT power is projected to grow from 1 GW (2020) to 4 GW by 2030 (cumulative IT power). ECONW estimates that cumulative energy demand could increase to 25,000 GWh (25 TWh) by 2030 under their load assumptions, representing around 40% of Oregon's current total electricity demand, if other demand remains constant. They emphasized that this projection depends strongly on assumptions and load factors. ECONW used a conservative average load factor around 61% (less than the 90% used in some analyses), derived from large-market observed data (e.g., Virginia utility data). Terry and Joao cautioned that load factors vary by facility type such as hyperscale vs. retail.

ECONW emphasized the significance of “spatially apportioning” increased demand across East / West Oregon because energy flows are regional and power can cross utility and regional transmission organization (RTO) boundaries (imports / exports); A rigorous capacity and grid modeling exercise (beyond the study scope) would be needed to allocate

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

resource impacts by locality. It was noted that cooling can be air-cooled (electricity demand) or water-cooled (water demand). Even electrical cooling indirectly uses water at thermoelectric generation sites or upstream.

Data on actual water consumption by data centers is sparse and often under non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) with utilities, which significantly complicates statewide assessment and planning. Data and transparency gaps limit “modeling fidelity,” creating a major problem for policymaking. Data centers’ facility types, IT power, load factors, water use, contractor / workforce details, negotiated community investments, and local tax / abatement accounting are all areas with limited public data. From ECONW’s perspective, improved transparency to support local planning is critical.

Committee Discussion and Q&A

- **Q: What data source are you using?**
 - A: The S&P 451 dataset for facility inventory and status.
- **Q: What counts as a “future” data center?**
 - A: S&P includes projects only when there is a strong probability of being built based on survey and market evidence, not just public announcements.
- **Q: How are Eastern and Western Oregon different?**
 - A: Eastern Oregon has a greater number of large hyperscale facilities and much larger regional concentration; Western Oregon has more wholesale and legacy retail/telco centers.
- **Q: How many data centers are there?**
 - A: Terry and João cited 144 operational or under-construction facilities in the Oregon inventory they used.
- **Q: What is the operational workforce?**
 - A: ECONW estimated about 2,630 on-site workers at Oregon data centers.
- **Q: Why is employment hard to measure?**
 - A: Because data centers are spread across multiple North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) categories and include contractors, corporate staff, and on-site employees.
- **Q: How much economic activity do data centers create?**
 - A: ECONW estimated roughly 10,400 jobs and about \$3.49 billion in value added from current operations statewide.
- **Q: What about construction?**
 - A: They estimated around 3,900 direct construction jobs and about \$1.87 billion in total value added.
- **Q: How much electricity could they use?**
 - A: Under the study’s assumptions, data centers could reach a very large share of state electricity demand by 2030.
- **Q: Why are their projections different from others?**
 - A: The study uses more conservative assumptions and better isolates what is actually local versus what is imported or supplied elsewhere.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- **Q: Can you separate cloud vs AI use?**
 - A: No, not reliably. Usage inside modern data centers is too dynamic and proprietary to separate cleanly.
- **Q: What data would you want that you don't have?**
 - A: More detailed data on water use, electricity use, workforce, contractor counts, tax abatements, and negotiated community investments. Better transparency is needed to support strong policy decisions.

DCAC Discussion with ALL Speakers

After a break, the DCAC focused on follow-up questions and synthesis from the earlier presentations with presenters still in attendance. The discussion was exploratory with the DCAC working to determine what Oregon should measure, what it still doesn't know, and what kind of statewide structure might help manage data center growth without overcomplicating the system:

- DCAC Members asked again about the East / West split. João noted Eastern Oregon resembles Texas-style data center growth, while Western Oregon looks more like metro markets such as Chicago or Columbus.
- DCAC Members asked what a smart statewide system might look like for a state with such different regional patterns. João emphasized that policy should be tailored to local conditions and Oregon should avoid a one-size-fits-all approach.
- DCAC Members asked how Oregon compares to other states on tax incentives?
 - João noted that Oregon is attractive because of land, fiber, power, and tax advantages, but comparing incentives is hard because programs are changing quickly.
- Vanessa's school finance explanation led to more discussion of the school support fee, enterprise zones, and how local revenue is shared through the formula. DCAC Members wondered how much money is really at stake and whether local communities are being made whole.
- Several DCAC Members noted that Oregon would benefit from better cross-agency data sharing on taxes, water, energy, jobs, and permits. One idea suggested was a centralized clearinghouse or intake process.
- Several DCAC Members emphasized that statewide averages hide major regional differences, especially in Eastern Oregon where data centers represent a much larger share of employment, wages, and value added.
- DCAC Members discussed whether data center proposals might first go through a state-level technical review before local approval, while still preserving local decision-making.
- The group discussed load growth, transmission constraints, water use, and whether the state has the tools to manage fast-growing demand.
- The idea of a temporary pause or moratorium was brought up as one way to provide time for better data, rules, and coordination.

Committee Discussion and Q&A

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- **Q: Do we have all the tools we need to manage this?**
 - A: DEQ and ECONW both said: not fully; better data, transparency, and coordination would help.
- **Q: Can Oregon compare itself to other states?**
 - A: ECONW said yes, but with caution because incentives and market conditions change quickly and differ widely by state.
- **Q: Should Oregon create a centralized process or clearinghouse?**
 - A: This was discussed as an idea, not an answer. DCAC Members floated a central intake or technical-assistance model to help both developers and local governments.
- **Q: Should Oregon consider a moratorium?**
 - A: Not answered as a recommendation, but the Committee heard repeated calls from the public and discussed it as one possible policy option.

Public Comment & DCAC Listening

The DCAC offered members of the public an opportunity to provide public comments focused on the topic of the session in 2–3-minute timeframes. DCAC staff are compiling all written public comments for inclusion as an appendix in the DCAC's final Report to the Governor. DCAC heard public comments, listed in the order they spoke, from: Mackenzie Springer, Brenna Yellowthunder, Kathryn Chambers, Jody Wiser, Lori Baumann, Deren Ash, Leslie Kochan, Erika Maria Mosesón, Emily Waldron, Candice Crawford, and Howard Bell.

DCAC Roundtable: Connecting the Dots

DCAC members reflected together, synthesizing the information presented during today's session. They emphasized that this meeting marked a turning point from fact-finding to deliberation. The discussion focused on how to turn everything the Committee has heard and learned into possible preliminary findings: better data, clearer state/local roles, stronger guardrails, and whether Oregon needs a more coordinated process for future data center development. Main themes included:

- **Data gaps and transparency:** Several DCAC Members emphasized that Oregon lacks a shared, usable data system for tracking data centers' impacts across air quality, water quality and quantity, jobs, taxes, and energy. One suggestion was a centralized reporting/clearinghouse approach.
 - Consider developing improved, consistent public reporting on property tax receipts attributable to data centers, enterprise zone school support fee receipts, negotiated community investments (water, transmission, capital), and construction / refresh cycles.
 - Consider whether Oregon needs better centralized data/reporting or technical assistance for future data center siting proposals.
- **School funding clarity:** ODE's presentation was described as eye-opening. DCAC Members noted they now better understand how local revenue, abatements, and school support fees affect the SSF.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- **Air quality and diesel generators:** DCAC Members discussed the limits of emergency backup generation, concerns about diesel pollution, and whether current guardrails are enough if federal protections were to change.
- **Energy and load flexibility:** One DCAC Member looped back to load flexibility at peak; Members discussed whether data centers should be incentivized or required to be more flexible.
- **Water, land use, and cumulative impacts:** DCAC Members talked about cumulative impacts, especially those from water use, land constraints, and whether the state has the right tools to manage large-scale siting.
- **Centralized state role vs local control:** A significant portion of the discussion focused on whether Oregon should create some kind of state-level intake / coordination / technical assistance process for data center proposals, while still preserving local decision-making.
 - Consider a centralized, coordinated reporting/clearinghouse approach (or one-stop technical assistance) for prospective data center projects that can assemble: power availability & transmission needs, water availability, air permitting/controls, local fiscal impacts, and Tribal/government-to-government consultation requirements, with the dual aims of giving developers clarity and preserving local/state values and resources.
- **Moratorium / pause:** Several DCAC Members noted the Committee should consider carefully whether a temporary pause is warranted while better standards and data systems are developed.
 - Consider identifying a practical, implementable set of minimum standards (e.g., emissions controls, backup power alternatives, water management plans, and workforce/community benefits) to recommend as short-term measures;
 - Examine whether a time-limited pause in approvals is necessary to allow policies to be put in place.
- **Need for simplicity:** Some DCAC members cautioned against making policy more complicated, while others offered that a more coordinated structure could help developers and local governments alike.
- **Transparent deliberations:** DCAC Co-Chairs emphasized that the Committee has openly debated these ideas in public, rather than privately drafting conclusions. This transparency is intentional and critical to the Committee's work.

Next Steps, Process Notes, and Action Items

- To begin converting fact-finding into preliminary findings, the DCAC will hold a final Committee work session, "**Committee Discussion and Deliberation of Draft Report,**" on Tuesday, August 4, 2026, at 9:00 am PT. Members will prepare topic recaps of the eight subject areas covered across the six sessions and discuss what they found and still need to find; staff will consolidate these ideas into initial findings and queries that will be shared with and approved by the DCAC before being released to the Governor and the public.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

- August 4th work session will be a public webinar without public comment.
- Members of the public may continue to submit subject matter-related comments via email to: datacenter.ac@oregon.gov.
- **The written public comment deadline for consideration in the PFR runs through Friday, August 7, 2026.** The DCAC will pause public comment review while drafting their PFR.
- **A 30-day public comment period will follow the issuance of the draft PFR,** which is anticipated for the second week of September.
- **“Public Listening Session #3”** will be held online on Wednesday, September 23, from 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm PT. For easier accessibility, participants will NOT need to register for this webinar.
- **ACTION:** Committee members requested follow-up materials be circulated before their August 4 deliberation session as best possible.
 - **DEQ** technical follow-ups on renewable diesel and emergency operation metrics, dispatch treatment, and the recent federal policy announcement affecting power generation.
 - **ODE / DSC** corrections and clarifications in Session 5 Facilitator Summary regarding school funding and enterprise zone school support fees.
 - Final **ECONW / UVA** report (slides & data), when available.
 - **DCAC** will coordinate with Business Oregon / Dept. of Revenue / Legislative Revenue Office on enterprise zone accounting clarifications.
- **ACTION: Oregon Dept. of Energy / DCAC Staff:** Post slides, meeting materials, and session recording to the ODOE website — *due asap / ongoing*.
- **ACTION: DCAC Staff:** Finish compiling executive summary of written public comments to-date – *due by August 4 session*.

Adjourn Public Meeting

Committee Co-Chairs reminded attendees about the final public listening session and next week's **Discussion and Deliberation of Draft Report**. In closing, Mike emphasized that the DCAC should aim for outcomes that reflect Oregon's values, while also recognizing that Oregon is not an island and state decisions could push impacts elsewhere if they're not handled carefully. The Committee agreed that the goal of all this work should be to make Oregon better tomorrow than it is today.

Donna thanked the speakers, public commenters, Committee Members, and staff for their thoughtful, respectful, and engaged discussion on this important work, and adjourned the session.

The Facilitation Team has prepared this summary to help the DCAC track issues discussed and follow-up actions between sessions. All DCAC Members reviewed the summary and offered refinements that have been integrated into this final version. Questions or comments may be sent to colby@dsconsult.co.

Oregon Governor's Data Center Advisory Committee (DCAC)

Participants Present for All or Part of Session 6 (in alphabetical order):

DCAC Members: **Dan Dorran**, **Greg Dotson**, **Bill Edmonds**, **Margaret Hoffmann**, **Michael Jung**, **Tim Miller**, and **Jean Wilson**.

Speakers: **Elizabeth Elbel** (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality), **Vanessa Clark** (Oregon Department of Education), **João Ferreira** (Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia) **Ania Loyd** (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality), **Terry Wirkkala** (ECONorthwest).

Technical Support: **Maeve Hogan** (Committee Staff, Environmental Planner), **Michael Kluz** (Committee Staff), and **Douglas Quirke** (University of Oregon).

Facilitation Team: **Donna Silverberg**, facilitator, and **Colby Mills**, facilitation & online support, DS Consulting.