Pacific Power's Community Benefits & Impacts Advisory Group (CBIAG) Meeting Public Notes

Thursday, September 17, 2026, 1:00 – 4:00 p.m., Pacific Time

These notes were synthesized and summarized by E Source, Pacific Power's meeting facilitation partner.

Executive Summary

September's Community Benefits and Impacts Advisory Group (CBIAG) meeting was conducted in partnership with the E Source Facilitation Team via the Zoom platform to continue planning for the Biennial Report. The meeting was held on Thursday, September 17, 2026, from 1:00-4:00 pm Pacific Time. At the September engagement, six CBIAG Members represented six organizations. The meeting provided an opportunity to continue the conversation around the development of Biennial Report components.

Meeting Objectives

1. Continue conversation on community-based renewable energy and engage Members on resilience pilot program
2. Share how the company is approaching 'Co-Benefits'
3. Discuss what Members can expect from the upcoming Biennial Report Draft

TIMING	TOPIC
1:00	Objectives & Presenters
1:10	Check In & Closing the Loop
1:20	Community-Based Renewable Energy (CBRE)
2:00	Co-Benefits & the EJC Index
2:30	Break
2:40	EJC Index Demonstration
3:15	Biennial Report (BiRep): Review & Next Steps
3:45	Public Comment

3:50	Check Out, Summary & Next Steps

Attendees	Organization
2026 CBIAG Members	
Joy Lark	IVCanDo
Erica Ledesma	Vision Comunitaria
Tim Lynch	Multnomah County Office of Sustainability
Anahi Segovia Rodriguez	Verde
Erubiel Valladares	Rural Development Initiative
Sara Wallach	Community Energy Project
Presenters	
Cara Glennon-Olsen	CBI Advisor, Clean Energy Planning
Cassandra Hales	Coordinator, Community Affairs
Ryan Harvey	Program Manager, Customer Innovations
Christina Kruger	Manager, Stakeholder Policy & Engagement
Morgan Westberry	E Source, Facilitation Team
Zanya Morgan	E Source, Facilitation Team
Public Attendees	
Karen Chase	Energy Trust of Oregon
Charles Lockwood	Oregon Public Utilities Commission
Samantha Thompson	PGE
PacifiCorp Affiliated Attendees	
Kimberly Alejandro	Regulatory Manager, Clean Energy Planning
Christian Marble	Senior Specialist, Communications
Tag Galvin-Darnieder	E Source, Facilitation Team

Meeting Notes

Opening

Pacific Power's Christina Kruger, Stakeholder Policy and Engagement Manager, welcomed participants to the September Community Benefits and Impacts Advisory Group meeting. Pacific Power is seeking to offer a space for meaningful dialogue and an opportunity to help offer lenses on the work that is happening at the utility, as well as anywhere consultation can help to influence that work. Morgan Westberry, from the E Source facilitation team, then opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda, introducing presenters, and sharing meeting experience items.

Check In

Zanya Morgan "checked-in" with meeting attendees by asking: *What about your role are you most proud of?*

- Being able to amplify community voices in policy and programs that directly affect them
- Being able to help build trust with community members by showing that our organization can follow through
- Centering EJ communities in work by supporting the capacity of organizations and individuals to engage in complex policy spaces; and demanding that policies prioritize and reflect community needs
- Seeing how the delivery of programs can start influence their generational wealth and how their skills can be for their profit
- Being able to stay true to myself and the communities represented
- Proud of my regional role in southern Oregon and being able to build new relationships in Klamath county and learn about the needs and priorities of the communities in different counties
- What feels the most rewarding is the act of connecting individuals to information or resources, so they (hopefully) feel empowered to make their own informed decisions. I also love connecting people (bringing them together) to share their life experiences and perspectives.

Closing the Loop

Zanya Morgan, facilitator, recapped the August Joint CBIAG engagement, highlighting the following topics, feedback, and next steps:

Topics:

- Tribal Liaison & Regulatory updates
- RFP Non-Price Scoring next steps
- Washington Transaction recap
- DSP & Understanding Grid Investments
- Wildfire Mitigation Plan
- Community-Based Renewable Energy

Next Steps:

- Continued dialogue around Section 6 Items A-H to develop upcoming Biennial Report

Feedback:

- Advisors were asked to participate in an activity to bring the CBIAG voice into wildfire mitigation planning by answering the question: ***Looking ahead, what three words (e.g., topics, ideas, or priorities) should Pacific Power keep in mind to shape future work and Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP) Filings***
    - Communication, Responsiveness, Resilience
    - Affordability, Safety, Reliability
    - Communication, Cost, Impact
    - Cost, Equity, Resilience

Ms. Morgan centered the group on recently implemented advisory tools such as purpose statements at the beginning of each segment and the participation meter. These tools came from direct feedback that advisors wanted more clarity on how they can expect to engage with the content.

Ms. Morgan informed the group of what to expect from today's Biennial Report discussions on HB2021 Section 6 (C) and (E):

> C. Actions within environmental justice communities within the electric company's service territory intended to improve resilience during adverse conditions or facilitate investments in the distribution system, including investments in facilities that generate non-emitting electricity;
>
> E. Social, economic, or environmental justice benefits that result from the electric company's investments, contracts, or internal practices;

For each SME segment focused on Sections 6 (C) and (E) advisors are invited to share their community-level perspective, including key observations and experiences from their work.

Community-Based Renewable Energy

Ryan Harvey, Customer Innovations Program Manager, provided a refresher on what a Community-Based Renewable Energy (CBRE) project is, shared progress on the CBRE-RH Pilot, and engaged advisors on future pathways of the pilot.

Community-Based Renewable Energy (CBRE) projects are defined as one or more energy systems, and may be combined with microgrids, storage systems, demand response measures, or energy-related infrastructure that promote climate resiliency. In Oregon, CBRE has three components: renewable energy resources, connects to the grid, and benefits flow to the community.

1. Renewable Energy Resource(s):
    - Solar, wind, or other renewable energy
    - Microgrids, RE projects with storage systems
    - Potential for demand response, VPPs
2. Connects to the Grid:
    - Interconnects to power company distribution or transmission assets
3. Benefits Flow to the Community:
    - Can include Community benefits agreements, ownership, or other form of direct benefit
    - Benefits may include increased resilience, community stability, local jobs or economic development

An example of a CBRE project is a recipient of a Blue Sky grant award, which is a PacifiCorp grant program that has been in effect for 20+ years. Blue Sky has funded over 140 different projects, which all qualify as CBREs before the term was coined. Other examples include the Oregon Community Solar Program and more generically an irrigation piping project that generates hydropower, decreasing utility costs for the associated irrigators. A resilience hub CBRE project can include solar and battery storage components that allow for maintaining electricity during an outage event. Different types of community facilities that can benefit from a CBRE-RH program would be emergency services such as a fire station, 911 dispatch center, or community warming and cooling shelters. PacifiCorp realized that the support of these types of projects are needed in the community.

Meeting Discussion:

- Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability, noted that the Blue-Sky program is NOT funded by Pacific Power or from utility rates. Rather, it is funded by customers who voluntarily participate in an optional renewable energy program. It is important to note that as we think about how to support more projects in the state. Blue Sky is managed by Pacific Power, and they do a good job with that! Additionally, CBRE in general is a concept that is difficult for the community to understand. When talking about the kinds of projects they want to see come out of CBRE programs, the context does not match the definition of CBREs.
    - Mr. Harvey noted better outlining the origin of funding sources as an area of improvement.
        - Christina Kruger added the importance of acknowledging where funding comes from because it tells the story of where the opportunities to influence decision-making are. Regarding Blue Sky, Ms. Kruger asked if customers that are contributing to Blue Sky program funding have a say in programmatic or grant qualification changes or is that made only by PacifiCorp?
            - Mr. Harvey offered to find the answer and return to the group to detail the opportunities there.

The first step is learning more about what these kinds of projects mean, what they require, and what they can do, which is where the CBRE-RH pilot program is derived from. About 1.5 years ago, the CBRE-RH was approved for a 3-year run, putting PacifiCorp at the halfway point, and prompting considerations around a potential program restructuring. Within the pilot and with the help of Oregon advisory groups, PacifiCorp identified the need for three different support pathways for communities considering CBRE-RH projects: 1) Feasibility studies 2) Ongoing project support and 3) Grant matching.

1. Feasibility studies
    a. 7 delivered to date
    b. Police Department used data for state funding request
    c. Fairgrounds opting not to submit for a grant
2. Ongoing project support
    a. 5 currently in active coordination
    b. University data center system impact study
    c. Tribal Nation microgrid concept
3. Grant matching
    a. 3 community projects awarded funding
    b. Community center solar+storage project (with Blue Sky)
    c. Solar+storage co-located at elem. school and fire station (with ETO)

As the program evolves, PacifiCorp is considering additional potential pathways to better assist program participants. The current options include sticking to the **status quo** by continuing to offer feasibility assessments to communities early in the process of considering resilience projects to communities early in the process of considering resilience projects and provide modest financial support to a handful of additional projects. Another potential pathway is a **pivot** to funding additional assistance for applying to C-REP, PCEF, Eto funding streams and/or providing funding for management of project construction. The last option would be a **traditional grant** to utilize the remaining funding to offer a more traditional grant award to a small number of sites to ensure success.

The corresponding pros and cons of each potential pathway are identified below:

Status Quo

- **Pros:**
  - Addresses initial barrier to entry
  - Raises awareness of options
  - Further stretches funding
- **Cons:**
  - Provides support to projects that may not be pursued

Pivot

- **Pros:**
  - Helps to bridge the funding gap
  - Supports administration burden of organizations to manage project
- **Cons:**
  - Still relies on other funding to ensure completion
  - Concern of 'playing favorites'

Traditional Grant

- **Pros :**
  - Larger funding amounts for selected projects
  - Follows complete lifecycle of a resilience hub
- **Cons:**
  - Limits breadth of community impact

Advisors were polled on which potential pathway they would rather see in the CBRE-RH Pilot. 6 attendees participated, the results are as follows:

- 3 advisors suggested the **pivot** pathway
- 2 advisors suggested the **feasibility** pathway
- 1 advisor suggested the **traditional grant** pathway

Meeting Discussion:

- Sara Wallach, Community Energy Project, suggested adding a fourth option to poll to indicate a mixed funding source combining pivot funding and small grant award cycles. An option like such would allow additional funding to help meet the capacity needs of already established programs.
  - Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability, agreed with Ms. Wallach and shared an additional suggestion – extending project development support to communities that have completed a feasibility assessment and where there is promise.

The table below details the forecast for additional CBRE pathways going live over the next few years.

CBRE Pathway	Current Operational Solar Capacity	Forecasted Incremental Future Solar (by 2032)	Forecasted Annual Future Storage (by 2032)
Oregon Community Solar Program	36.2 MW	57.8 MW	-
Blue Sky Grants	11.1 MW	0.6 MW	0.8 MWh
CBRE-RH Pilot*	-	1.0 MW	6.0 MWh
ETO-supported**	-	25.2 MW	-
ODOE C-REP Grant Awards***	0.1 MW	7.7 MW	6.1 MWh
TOTAL	**48.3 MW**	**92.3 MW**	**12.9 MWh**

**Includes projects currently in progress.*
***Data sourced from PacifiCorp's 2025 Clean Energy Plan.*

***Includes initial data provided by projects awarded funding in Pacific Power service area and assumes a 50% project completion rate.*

Meeting Discussion:

- Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability, assuming the goal is create more CBRE projects with expanded options for funding and support, what would PacifiCorp need from this pilot phase to be able to demonstrate to decision makers and the Public Utility Commission, that these are worthwhile investments that the community wants to see happen. How can advisors work with the utility to help make that happen? Is it a cost-effectiveness determination? Is it a scale of interest from the community?
    - Mr. Harvey explained that developing a better understanding of trust costs and actualized benefits of these projects is helpful, but hard to quantify. Going back to the 3 components that comprise CBRE projects, one component is ongoing partnerships to understand what it took to get them across the finish line and how they are actually benefiting the surrounding community and the larger utility grid which directly ties into cost-effectiveness. More to come on that as the CBRE pathways are inventoried and as the development of the 2027 Clean Energy Plan progresses.

The CBRE team has opened an opportunity for everyone to share ideas on what they would like to see with community-based renewable energy through a Request for Information (RFI) open from 9/15 – 12/31. This is a great opportunity to directly hear about where communities have the most interest and for PacifiCorp to record and track those ideas to potentially implement going forward. The RFI asks seven simple questions, which some being optional, so it is by no means a difficult form to complete as the intention is to be able to capture interest. Completing an RFI does not necessarily equate to a contract; it is truly just a request for information and inspiration.

More information can be found on the Pacific Power website: https://www.pacificpower.net/community/oregon-clean-energy-plan/community-based-renewable-energy.html or by contacting communityresiliency@PacifiCorp.com.

Advisors can help expand awareness of the CBRE RFI by spreading the word to promote the RFI through their networks to reach communities, local leaders, and other interested parties, by making introductions to connect interested developers and project partners with communities or organizations that could benefit, and by enabling participation to help communities understand the opportunity, explore project ideas, and prepare an RFI response.

Building the Environmental Justice Community (EJC) Index

Cara Glennon-Olsen, CBI Advisor, highlighted the importance of member input in building the EJC index, demonstrated how the EJC index can help advance equitable distribution of co-benefits and how the index can be used to support HB 2021 compliance.

The Environmental Justice Community (EJC) index uses several terms that are closely related but not interchangeable. These terms are defined by HB 2021 and UM 2417 language which PacifiCorp has analyzed to better understand the impacts of utility actions and the potential gap or what about communities that numbers alone might miss. The EJC index tells PacifiCorp about housing, health conditions, and environmental exposures – just to name a few, but when coupled with business decision

making is missing something. The index cannot independently tell PacifiCorp whether they are making decisions that really incorporate communities, which is where the Oregon advisors come in to add context and contribute to the lived experience. A spreadsheet or data set does not tell the story of community-engaged data science. Community-engaged data science is an established approach to data science conveying the idea that people and communities that are affected by the questions PacifiCorp is studying can actively contribute to how the questions are framed, how the data is interpreted, and how the tools and methods can be improved. Advisors do not have to possess technical expertise to participate in community-engaged data science.

The table below outlines the terms, associated anchors, definitions, and why advisor feedback matters.

Term	Anchor	Definition	Why Advisor feedback matters
Environmental justice	HB 2021	"… equal protection from environmental and health hazards and meaningful public participation in decisions that affect the environment in which people live, work, learn, practice spirituality and play."	As community representatives, members can help ensure the EJC Index, CBIs and companion metrics **are meaningful, accessible, relevant, and informed by lived experience.**
Environmental Justice (EJ) communities	HB 2021	"…communities of color, communities experiencing lower incomes, tribal communities, rural communities, coastal communities, communities with limited infrastructure and other communities traditionally underrepresented in public processes and adversely harmed by environmental and health hazards."	Members can help us understand whether the EJC Index **appropriately captures** the community experience of vulnerability.
Distributional equity	UM 2417	"… to advance clean energy development in manner that centers affordability, reliability, and community impacts." A concept anchored in answering one key question**: How can the equity impacts of our investments be evaluated alongside traditional cost-benefit considerations?**	Member feedback helps to ensure that assessments of distributional equity **reflect how the impact of utility investments are felt by affected communities.**

Meeting Discussion:

Advisors were asked to participate in an in-Zoom poll to answer the questions: *Two communities receive similar scores in the EJ Community index; does that mean they have the same needs? What else would you need to know before recommending action? What would you want to understand not just barriers?*

- The data to reflect the true vulnerability of communities do vary; especially in rural cities and un-incorporated populations. For less technical and less capacity cities, I wonder how they can use this EJ community index when not sure if they can see themselves on the index but people are no longer trusting the surveys, especially for those migrant communities that are part of the economy environment systems but usually not recognize as such. Rural communities do struggle to be counted

- Staff would need to break down the score and see where the communities are receiving "lower or high scores." Potentially even doing on the ground survey to see what the communities are saying and if it supports that score.
- No, they will have different needs. I would like to understand more about their capacity, what the support they will need, and the demographic of the people who are driving the project and for who.
- Environmental factors, maybe history of the community
- I think they could have wildly different needs that happen to add up to the same score. I would want to know the factors that added up to receive that score, because a community of people of color would have very different needs from a rural community of senior citizens. In addition to barriers, I think it would be helpful to know the strengths and personality of the community, because they may want help in a different way than an outsider thinks it should be provided.
- Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability, suggested using community data from local partners at CCC: https://www.coalitioncommunitiescolor.org/research-and-publications/introducing-community-data
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen is familiar with the CCC data, but for the development of the EJC index PacifiCorp relied on heavily established data sets from the American Community Survey, FEMA, CDC, and other public agencies.
        - Morgan Westberry asked if there will be an opportunity in the future to include other data sets such as the CCC data?
            - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen is open to using additional data sets but emphasized the importance of first doing background research.
- Anahi Segovia, Verde, asked how implicit biases are being managed. Will PacifiCorp do an in community survey to collect direct responses through expanded outreach?
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen noted that the team is still exploring ways to apply the index, but agreed with the importance of community input to fill the gaps with modeling.
        - Ms. Segovia works closely with the OPUC and suggested that they use a meat map to illustrate high energy burden areas. Is there a way for PacifiCorp to use that research to build on the EJC index?
            - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen explained that the EJC index does just that; it provides a map at lower-level spatial granularity that helps PacifiCorp understand community vulnerabilities for smaller communities identified by census block groups. One purpose of the EJC index is to better understand patterns around disconnections using community demographics.
                - Ms. Segovia emphasized the importance of deepening the level of understanding with OPUC data in connection with utility data and suggested specifically identifying which data points PacifiCorp is using to build out the EJC index. For example, HB 2021 defines “health hazards” very broadly, so it would be helpful to know what PacifiCorp considers a health hazard.
                    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen assured the group that the methodology document, including definitions, will

present all information around the EJC index development.

- Christina Kruger, Stakeholder and Engagement Policy Manager, resurfaced feedback received around community lens and the opportunity for more context around community profiles. It takes a trusted community partner to gather such information, which is especially evident in interactions with Oregon Tribes. Ms. Kruger questioned if the intention around using certain data sources would be analyzed with advisors? Can CCC's data be revisited through an alternate lens?
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen cited complications around analyzing the data as a complete set. Using housing status as an example, the data available on houselessness is generally limited. While some localities may do a good job tracking houselessness, that is not always the reality when completing an exploratory analysis. Including CCC's data poses the question of whether it is appropriate for the study area, which does not mean it will not be considered, it just means the team might look for a proxy variable to supplement the data.

Section 6 of HB 2021 calls for community participation and attention to how utility actions affect environmental justice communities. The EJC index helps carry questions that come out of digging into Section 6 into planning. The EJC Index can be used to provide a distributional lens for discussing customer energy affordability and service continuity, grid resilience and distribution system investments, other infrastructure and grid upgrades, areas that may require more targeted outreach, and other social, economic, and environmental justice benefits that could be impacted by utility actions. The environmental justice community index can help resolve questions about the distribution of benefits and impacts.

HB 2021 requires the biennial community benefits and impacts report to describe:

- Community benefits from utility investments, contracts, and practices
- Where the benefits occur and who is affected

The EJ Community Index:

- Provides a consistent framework for this analysis
- A lens for measuring distributional equity

The table below details the interconnectedness of biennial report mapping, CBI mapping, and the EJC Index.

Biennial Report Mapping	CBI Mapping	Where the EJC Index Fits
§6(2)(a)(C): improve resilience during adverse conditions **§6(2)(a)(D):** infrastructure/grid investments and upgrades in EJ communities	**CBI 1:** Improve resilience of vulnerable communities during long duration outages **CBI 2:** Reduce frequency and duration of energy outages	Provides community vulnerability evaluation alongside CBI metrics when exploring **the distribution of reliability and resilience benefits**

§6(2)(a)(C): system-wide investments in non-emitting and renewable generation **§6(2)(a)(D):** distributional review of investments in EJ communities **§6(2)(a)(D):** grid/infrastructure investments supporting clean energy targets	**CBI 3:** Increase energy from renewable and non-emitting resources **CBI 4:** Reduce CO_2 equivalent emissions **CBI 5:** Reduce NO_x and SO_2 emissions **CBI 11:** Public charging station installations	Can provide a geographic vulnerability lens for exploring how **modeled CBI outcomes** vary across communities
§6(2)(a)(H): resulting social, economic and EJ co-benefits **§6(2)(a)(A):** energy affordability and service continuity for residential and small business customers	**CBI 6:** Decrease residential disconnections **CBI 7:** Decrease proportion of households experiencing high energy burden	Provides additional context for identifying communities that **experience high energy burden or increased risk of disconnection**
§6(2)(a)(B): Increase opportunities for businesses from historically underrepresented communities **§6(2)(a)(E):** economic benefits for communities that arise from the company's investments, procurement activities, and internal practices	**CBI 8:** Increase residential and small business energy efficiency in EJ communities **CBI 9:** Reduce barriers to participation in energy efficiency programs in EJ communities **CBI 12:** Pre-apprenticeship and educational program participation **CBI 13:** Local workforce development **CBI 14:** Diverse business expenditures	Provides a geographic lens for exploring how the distribution of CBI outcomes tied to renewable and non-emitting investments **could create opportunities for economic development** in EJ communities

Meeting Discussion:

- Anahi Segovia, Verde, questioned how PacifiCorp measures prolonged poverty or the reality that it is unlikely that customers receiving energy assistance will one day come into sudden wealth. Is it acknowledged that customers do not just leave assistance programs?
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen explained that as a utility there are just some areas that PacifiCorp cannot influence. The EJC index data on utility program participation can lead to more targeted outreach and impact program structure. Regarding prolonged program participation, it is a known issue.
        - Christina Kruger, Stakeholder and Engagement Policy Manager, explained that the utility is not going to impact upstream causation. However, this does not dismiss the opportunity to adequately document what is being learned and seen through the data.
            - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen acknowledged that poverty is cyclical, and it is very difficult for individuals to break that cycle. Unfortunately, the utility cannot impact the cycle of poverty, but it can provide support through assistance programs.

    - Morgan Westberry, Facilitator, suggested tracking program re-enrollment in addition to total participation.
- Erubiel Valladares, Verde, first thanked Ms. Segovia for bringing light to some of these hard conversations. Second, PacifiCorp recently sent out an email about reimbursement for certain home upgrades. However, the upfront cost is what deters customers from participating, especially migrant community members who are living paycheck to paycheck. As an advisor, Mr. Valladares understands the utility industry and how it is regulated, but customers are faced with making difficult decisions.
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen agreed that upfront costs are affecting program participation.
- Ms. Segovia urged PacifiCorp to think about what will happen when higher low-income or lower middle-class customers can no longer afford utility bills, as that is the reality of the near future.
    - Mrs. Glennon-Olsen expressed the seriousness of having the conversation and noted that PacifiCorp does their best to keep rates affordable.

Break

Building the Environmental Justice Community (EJC) Index: (Con.)

Section 6 begins with communities, not a model. HB 2021 calls for meaningful community participation and attention to energy burden, resilience, utility investments, and social, economic, and environmental justice co-benefits. This raises the question: How can planning better reflect the benefits, burdens, priorities, and lived experiences of environmental justice communities? The EJC Index was developed to support answering that question.

The development of the model began by asking what communities are experiencing through listening sessions with the advisory groups which help ground the work in community priorities and concerns. Members and advocates helped to identify what mattered, what the available data might miss, and where a technical tool could create blind spots. That input established an essential principle; the index should make patterns easier to identify, while leaving room for community knowledge and input. Community input was part of the building, not a final check after the index was built.

From the listening sessions, advisor and advocate input clarified what the index needed to do; make differences more visible and acknowledge limitations. The differences include looking below broad regional averages, recognizing that adjacent communities can experience different conditions, and reflecting local barriers that affect access to services, health, and resilience to hazards. Advisors emphasize the limitations associated with treating data as if it tells the whole story. The goal became more than just arriving at a label or definition; it evolved to establish a common understanding of community vulnerability.

Input collected through advisor engagement has shown that people facing the greatest challenges are often experiencing multiple vulnerabilities at the same time. Understanding these compounding factors is critical to identifying communities most at risk. Communities facing language, transportation, internet, and resource barriers are at greatest risk of being underserved, including cultural communities, low-income households, older adults, and people with disabilities. Individuals facing displacement risks and

environmental exposures were identified as particularly vulnerable due to the potential for compounded impacts on health, stability, and well-being. Lastly, historical trauma, such as broken treaties, loss of revenue, government intervention and war, displacement pressures, and access barriers were identified as significant drivers of vulnerability with Tribal communities. Communities face the greatest risk when multiple barriers and vulnerabilities of interest.

The buildout of the index was approached in layers. The first step began with grouping multiple indicators into layers, or dimensions, of vulnerability with the goal to group similar measures together, put all measures on the same scale, find the underlying patterns in each group, confirm what each group is telling us, and combine the results into one overall index. The index was designed to preserve meaning and honor community complexity.

Currently, the development of the index is still ongoing to include what was heard from the January special session and other 2026 engagements. Presenting the index made its strengths and blind spots visible. The input collected from advisors and interested parties include:

- Beyond informing investment decisions, the data illustrates the significant gap between community needs and available resources.
- Rapid neighborhood change may leave vulnerable residents concentrated in small pockets that are not reflected in broader area averages.
- Immigrant communities face unique economic vulnerabilities, highlighting the need for data and partnerships that help identify and respond to emerging hardships.
- Traditional demographic and income measures may overlook important Tribal community realities, underscoring the value of incorporating local conditions, housing affordability, and Tribal data where possible.
- Understanding historical and systemic inequities can help identify communities that may face greater challenges and barriers.

The input received was translated into specific improvements to the data, geography, and methodology for the index by asking questions like “Can we represent differences in communities more precisely?” “Are we really measuring the factors that stakeholders identified as meaningful to vulnerability?” “Does the model behave consistently across communities?” and “Can we better represent access, beyond simply what exists within a geographic boundary?” Refinement is an important part of the overall process. From the feedback received, the team learned that geographic scale matters – census tracts can mask meaningful differences between communities, how we measure access matters – proximity to essential services is more complex than simply counting the number of resources within a tract boundary, and each dimension of vulnerability needed to be tested individually – conducting quality checks at the dimensional level could reveal patterns that are difficult to identify in the overall index.

Key index improvements include the shift from census tracts to block groups, stronger quality checks within dimensions, and facility counts shifted to proximity to health services. These changes mean that local differences become more visible; each part of the model is examined before combining scores, and access is represented more directly. Listening moved the work closer to community experience.

Mrs. Glennon-Olsen shared a demonstration of the first iteration of the EJC model, highlighting actual and potential EV charging station locations. Each segment on the map represents a census tract with different shades of green used to indicate levels of vulnerability.

The Biennial Report Reimagined

Christina Kruger, Stakeholder Policy & Engagement Manager, updated the advisory group on status, timeline and key milestones of the Biennial Report process, provided opportunities for engagement, and aligned expectations to reduce surprises.

Past milestones leading up to the 2026 Biennial Report include House Bill 2021 filed in 2021, the Clean Energy Plan filed in 2023, inaugural biennial report filed in 2024, and Clean Energy Plan filed in 2025. Upcoming milestones along with the 2026 CBIAG Biennial Report, and the Integrated Resource Plan and Clean Energy Plan in 2027.

The Biennial Report will function as a communication companion to the Clean Energy Plan. The report aims to center a frontline community impact lens across Pacific Power programs and processes, present Customer Benefit Indicator (CBI) metrics at an elevated level focusing on clarity and relevance, use a visually accessible summary format including pictographs to support clear and effective frontline communication, and incorporate qualitative context and perspectives that reflect the lived experiences and feedback of frontline communities, Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), and Tribal Nations.

The report is moving beyond a traditional template. With the addition of deeper qualitative analysis and a community-informed lens, the process now involves more synthesis, interpretation, and engagement to accurately reflect the experiences and priorities of the communities Pacific Power serves. Based on feedback provided by the Advisory Groups during the inaugural Biennial Report 2024 filing, both the process and content of future reports include:

- Extending the comment period to allow for more thorough review.
- Providing a meaningful executive summary that clearly communicates key points and Advisory Group member contributions.
- Continuing to honor and center the member experience throughout the process.
- Improving feedback loops to better demonstrate how input informs refinements.
- Offering broader opportunities for perspective sharing across Advisory Group spaces.

The Biennial Report will document engagement with Oregon Community Benefits and Impacts Advisory Groups and illustrate how community and Tribal perspectives inform Pacific Power's clean energy transition planning and decision-making. The intended audience would be community members, Tribal Nations, regulators, policymakers, customers, and other interested parties.

The report serves as a record of engagement and a resource for understanding how community and Tribal perspectives shape the benefits, impacts, opportunities, and challenges for Oregon's clean energy transition. Each topic of the report follows a consistent structure to address regulatory foundation, why this topic matters, what PacifiCorp shared, what PacifiCorp learned, engagement-informed decision making, community benefits, community impacts, and looking ahead.

The image below illustrations the 2026 agenda in relation to Section 6 items A – H.

CBIAG	Tribal Nations CBIAG
Jan-15 – CBI 2026 Roadmap & Biennial Report Table Setting	Jan-30 – CBI 2026 Roadmap & Biennial Report Table Setting
Apr 16 – **Section 6.A & F** Energy Burden & Disconnects + Customer Experience CBI- Health and Community Wellbeing	Apr 24– Section 6.A & F Energy Burden & Disconnects + Customer Experience CBI – Health and Community Wellbeing
May 20– Joint Session **Section 6. G** Actions to Encourage Customer Engagement CBI: Energy Equity; EJC Index and CBI Report Card	
Jun-18 – **Section 6. B** Contracting Opportunities for Diverse Owned Businesses **Section 6. G** Actions to Encourage Customer Engagement	Jun-26– Section 6. B Contracting Opportunities for Diverse Owned Businesses Section 6. G Actions to Encourage Customer Engagement
July-16 – **Section 6. B.** Contracting Opportunities for Diverse Owned Businesses	July-31– Section 6. B. Contracting Opportunities for Diverse Owned Businesses
Aug 19 Joint Session: **Section 6. D**. Distribution of Grid and Infrastructure Investments in EJ Communities **Section 6.C**. Actions in Environmental Justice Communities to Improve Resilience	
Sep 17- **Section 6. E** Co-Benefits of Utility Investments and Practices	Sep 18 - **Section 6. E** Co-Benefits of Utility Investments and Practices
Oct-15 – Internal & External Review Cycles Begin*	Oct-16 - Internal & External Review Cycles Begin*
Dec-17 – Report Filing Final Announcement	Dec-18 - Report Filing Final Announcement

Public Comment

Morgan Westberry opened the floor for public comments and concluding thoughts asking *what was your biggest takeaway from today's conversation?*

- There were no closing thoughts nor public comments.

Next Steps

PacifiCorp's Christina Kruger closed the meeting by sharing the schedule for next month's CBIAG meetings and thanked the advisors for their participation.

October 15, 1:00 – 4:00pm| Oregon CBIAG Meeting hybrid on site at IVCanDo and online via ZOOM:
https://esource.zoom.us/s/89466499154?pwd=MudXiyYndWKSYzY2aJc8u5YFDwMkJo.1

For more information:
Oregon Clean Energy Plan Updated Engagement Strategy

Email comments to:
ORCBIAG@pacificorp.com

Link: Oregon Community Benefits and Impacts Advisory Group (pacificorp.com)