



Illinois Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity

JB Pritzker, Governor

State of Illinois Energy Transition Workforce Commission December 8, 2022 11:00 am – 1:00 pm Minutes

Locations:

In-person

Discovery Partners Institute (DPI)
200 South Wacker Drive
Room 2032
Chicago, IL 60606

Virtual

Zoom Video Conference

Meeting ID: 876 3122 9109

Access Code: 139961

Video Link: <https://uis.zoom.us/j/87631229109?pwd=T1RDWkk2S2ZCd3BrYm9CZ3FkTHNXZz09>

One Tap Mobile: +13092053325,87631229109# US

Agenda:

- I. Call to Order at 11:06 am by Jason Keller, Chair, Energy Transition Workforce Commission
 - a. Roll was called by Tonda Reece (UIS), the following were present:
Angela Morrison, Chicago Jobs Council (via Zoom)
Sameer Doshi
Pat Devaney, AFL-CIO
Paul Noble (via Zoom)
Director Sylvia Garcia
Jason Keller, IDOL, Chair, Energy Transition Workforce Commission
Lisa Jones (via Zoom)
- Chair Keller went on to give clarity that Lisa Jones was appointed on Tuesday I believe to the commission as a new commission member bringing our total to seven. Chair Keller also acknowledged Director Jane Flanagan from the Department of Labor was on the Zoom call being present.
- Chair Keller gave instructions for the members of the public regarding public comment saying, "I will then just remind folks who are here from the public that we will be taking comments at the end of this meeting, each person seeking public comment will have 3 minutes to speak. And for those on the Webex

(Zoom), please use the chat function in Webex (Zoom) to inform us of your name, title, organization, email, and phone number.” With that the first item on the agenda is the approval or correction of the minutes. I know we just had a little bit of discussion before we started here, just want to make sure everyone’s comfortable with this. For clarity we would be looking at approving the minutes from the last three meetings: September 16th, October 5th, and November 18th meetings. Those should have been distributed to you earlier this week, is there any discussion from commission members on the

- Commissioner Doshi to Chair Keller, could I say something? The minutes that Ms. Molly Lamb circulated to commission members early this morning contained those edits that I sent to Ms. Lamb and others, last night after I went through the original draft minutes, and I also listened to parts of the audio from the October 5th and November 18th. I made what I believe are edits to make the transcripts more accurate.
- Chair Keller asked if there were any other discussion or questions on the minutes that have been distributed? I would ask for a motion, then to approve the minutes from the last three meetings. Chair Keller asked is there such a motion? Okay Director Garcia moves, is there a second?
- Commissioner Lisa Jones said second the motion
- Chair Keller said that Lisa Jones seconded, all in favor, please say aye. The ayes have it. The minutes from the last three meetings are approved. So then, the next item on our agenda, the main purpose of gathering today is to bring the Commission back together to discuss and potentially approve the report produced by Dr. Kriz and UIS. At our last meeting, held virtually on November 18th, the Commission was given a draft report to review we received technical comments from Rachel Powell with the DCEO. We received more substantive comments from Commissioners Doshi and Devaney. Commissioner Doshi you made a request that our last meeting to, I’m sorry I’ll skip that, and I’ll just hold on. I do in full disclosure, want to tell the full group that, Dr. Kriz and I met with Commissioners Devaney and Doshi to go over some of their changes and what could be expected to be placed in this report, and what may have to be pushed off to the later report next year. I believe we’ve come to an agreement of what can be done, and I think Dr. Kriz is prepared to speak to those different elements that will be delayed. So, with that I would ask Dr. Kriz to come up with his presentation.

II. Phase I Report – Dr. Ken Kriz

- Dr. Kriz began with saying thanks to Chair Keller, and I also want to show my or express my appreciation for the comments from Commissioners Devaney and Doshi and Ms. Powell on the draft report that I submitted. I think the revisions, I made, made it a substantially better report. I’m also aware, Commissioner Doshi submitted some technical changes this morning. I just had since I got here, I was on the road when it was sent, so I haven’t had a chance to look over those entirely. But face they look like they are very straightforward kind of editing type of revisions and I’m fully prepared to make those after the meeting after I get home. Unfortunately, I didn’t bring my laptop so, but with that I will give a short presentation about what the current version of the report contains and then take any questions. Asked Tonda to pull up the Powerpoint please?
- Dr. Kriz before starting the presentation stated that he was going to go through some of this fairly quickly, because it’s in the previous report and my previous presentation. But just to remind you what we did in this analysis, we prepared estimates of electricity, capacity loss from fossil fuel, plastic, coal mines. Actually, coal mines are part of capacity loss but then capacity gain from increased renewable generation as well as translating the estimates of the capacity changes to job changes and then examine, broadly speaking demographic characteristics of different jobs along with unionization. Statistics then estimated environmental gains and tax revenue changes. Then proceeded to continue with the presentation.

- Director Garcia said it just says solar, is there wind or other renewables included in there?
- Dr. Kriz said he should make that clear that it is total renewables. It's just the assumptions for wind we do have enough of a record, and it's pretty certain that the labor intensity I use, there is 0.12 jobs per megawatt, and I can produce all the documentation for that. I use a quarterly census of employment and wages data from the BLS and electrical generation data from Energy Information Administration, both for Illinois itself and for the nation as a whole. So, the .12 is for the last five years before the COVID pandemic for Illinois. That's actually a little bit higher wind, nationally averaged 0.09 jobs per megawatt for the last like 10 years.
- Director Garcia asked is that both of them just I saw it.
- Dr. Kriz replied by saying so the wind assumption is the same in both of these scenarios. It's just in this one we use different for solar because solar, we have such little information around it's only been available at a utility scale in Illinois, the data going back to 2015, I think it is. So, we have to make some assumptions. This is the assumption that I used in the first report, which is 0.55 jobs per megawatt. That's a reasonably conservative assumption it does have a higher labor intensity than wind. But the question is, how much? If you use the median of the data going back to 2015, that's 1.85 jobs per megawatt, and so you can see there's a big discrepancy. But again, they have the same wind assumption. So, my take away from this slide is we're going to get a lot of jobs from the law. Okay, we're going to get several 1,000 extra jobs. How many 1,000 extra jobs I know that's a really bad way to put it, but the size of that is dependent on the realization of labor intensity and solar as well as, again, going back, this is depends on the capacity. So, what happens to capacity?
- Director Garcia said so related to that I mean, so you're saying the major difference on the curve of the arc though is the number of jobs per megawatt, not necessarily the uptick or adoption rate.
- Dr. Kriz replied by saying yes, but no they use both the same adoption rate.
- Chair Keller asked what were your thoughts on the methodology for measuring construction jobs in the next report is that kind if too....?

Dr. Kriz replied saying so what you have to do in construction jobs is, you have to sort out temporary jobs from permanent jobs and you have to be careful about double counting. So, for instance, let's just say that the number of construction jobs per megawatt is or per gigawatt is a 1,000. Okay we'll just pick a number a round number. So, let's say you have a gigawatt, of power that is generated, you know we need to have a gigawatt of wind or solar generated in 2024. Okay, so that 1,000 jobs we can go with that. Let's say in 2025, we have another gigawatt that we have to generate. The way that the studies that were referenced before seem to treat it is they treat that as a 1,000 new jobs. But in consulting some sources on construction of wind and solar facilities a lot of them can be done in a year if they're particularly large or probably complex, it may take up to 2 years. The point is that second year those aren't 1,000 new jobs like are treated in a lot of studies. Okay. It's somewhere between a 0 and 1,000 depending on if the workers are freed up from the first round and was constructed in 2024, they can then be used in 2025. And so, it takes a lot of careful analysis to pull out construction jobs from overall activity. A lot of the things you see from groups that have put out studies, implicitly are assuming that, for example, I've seen a number of 3,000 jobs per gigawatt. They're assuming that all those are permanent new construction jobs that essentially would go through 2045. I'm dubious of that, and I want to take the time now, do I wish it was like that, yeah, this curve would be off the screen. We'd be talking hundreds of thousands of jobs. I mean, it would make all of your jobs really easy, and would you know provide enough money to keep me in my job for a while? I hope it's that way. I but given everything I've taught this, I've done this

for years on different projects. I want to make sure with my own eyes that I'm comfortable with that figure before I proceed.

- Dr. Kriz continued with his presentation.
- Director Garcia was inaudible but asked if that's the net total job losses or is it board data that were on the map in the PowerPoint that showed the geographic impact of jobs losses.
- Dr. Kriz replied by saying this is all the losses we don't know, unfortunately, where the job gains are going to be from renewable, sorry I should have been more clear about that. Anecdotally, I probably shouldn't resort to anecdotes, but as I was driving up here Logan County, this is Grundy, they have a lot of wind development, there's a lot of new solar in Logan County right along I-55. That was nice to see. But then by the time you get to Will, it's all-natural gas.
- Director Garcia said I know, and again anecdotally dangerous. But I think what you know kind of what I've heard is a lot more in the southern region of the state, you don't see as big. I was expecting that to be redder, I guess in kind of the old coal areas in the southern area of the state.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah, I mean coal, you know that's why some of the areas, even within Sangamon, but it's Christian County, there's some coal losses there, too, so some of it is in here. But yeah, a lot of it is in this type of area down here.
- Director Garcia said I just expected it to be more red.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah, I'm glad to provide figures, calculation if necessary.
- Dr. Kriz continued with his presentation.
- Commissioner Devaney chimed in and said in one of the discussions we had over jobs numbers and I can't remember which component of the report it was, but you were evaluating only utility scale, solar development.
- Dr Kriz replied yes
- Commissioner Devaney continued by saying are all of these solar numbers only based on utility scale? So just an important note and that's something that perhaps in phase 2 and I don't know if we talked to briefly about but, I don't know if we ever circled back, there are a significant number of RECs available for community solar as well as small and large DG. Which is you know commercial, and you know big box stores down to single family residential. I again I wouldn't I don't know how to evaluate that, but there will be additional developments and I saw that was reflected in one report.
- Dr. Kriz said I'll try and see how they did it the problem is so the way I got these was by NAICS code based upon the industries. My guess is that a lot of those are probably in the construction or another, if you're talking installers or I would just have to locate where they are at within the, these are what are called SOC standard occupational classification codes. Is that right? It's something like that, its SOC codes and so I'm not sure of the mapping. There's something called the national industry to occupation crosswalk, and that's what Emsi essentially does is crosswalks this data but I'm not sure that they break out installers necessarily separately, I'll look at the data.
- Dr Kriz replied yes, sir.
- Commissioner Doshi said Dr. Kriz, a couple comments, first which was on my mind, before Commissioner Devaney spoke and then something else that occurs to me based on his comment. My impression in the wind and solar industry is both for utility scale wind and solar as well as with onsite or rooftop solar.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah
- Commissioner Doshi continued by saying is that a large number of jobs a relatively large share of jobs are in sales, land acquisition, permitting which sometimes may not come to any transaction. Therefore, and I

correlate to the actual megawatts in the ground. So, as you refine these estimates perhaps in the next report, I think it will be, it'll be helpful to get a sense of how many jobs per successful megawatt deal or unsuccessful megawatt deal there are in these sectors.

- Dr. Kriz said I will try and do that, Tonda can you make a note of that? Especially because I mean it exactly, so it's the concept is jobs per....
- Commissioner Doshi chimed in by saying just perhaps to truth check jobs anything that's available about jobs per megawatt...
- Dr. Kriz replied with I know what you're saying. All the reports I read, and I think Commissioner Devaney, you said you found this too is everything talks about installed capacity. So, deals that are made that don't result in, I'll try... How's that for a vague comment, I'm trying to in my brain, figure that out so it's like the jobs per deal proposed jobs per proposed capacity. Just put it that way, I'll remember that. If you...
- Commissioner Devaney added and if I could go back just a minute to our coal comment in regards to Illinois coal versus like your job lost, I had a previous communication on this, I probably been told that about 90%, probably 94% of Illinois coal is used in states other than Illinois and that only CWLP in Springfield and Prairie State actually burn Illinois coal it's just because of the advanced technology versus other places. And so, I don't know, I think probably if we work a little bit more with the industry for the phase 2, figure that out you can do maybe able to do that.
- Dr. Kriz said I will say this I'm not trying to just move on it.
- Commissioner Devaney said no, no, no I'm just add what you say,
- Dr. Kriz said I will say this, what I'll just say is I know that at least one of the mines, I forget which county it's in, I had to track it down because I couldn't find it on my map, and it was specifically associated with one of the plants that like it was a sole provider of coal for that planet.
- Commissioner Devaney answered by saying it was Prairie State they pull the coal out right there and use it right on site.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah, so I don't know I'll investigate it.
- Commissioner Devaney said I just wanted, I told you before I would come up with that number, when we had the discussion, I failed to do so, so I just wanted to mention to you.
- Dr. Kriz said I will look into that again. Then acknowledged that Commissioner Doshi had another comment.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you Dr. Kriz and mentioned from a citizen in the comments asked for the members in the room to please identify ourselves. So, Sameer Doshi speaking. On the issue of rooftop and onsite solar that we discussed a minute ago. I just looked at State law again the renewable goals in the CEJA call for 50% of new solar in State going out for the next 10 plus years to be from the rooftop or onsite for community solar programs all of which are defined to go to 5 megawatts of capacity.
- Dr. Kriz said wow, that doesn't seem like that's seems really high, but that's a lot. It's certainly more than one home might be neighborhoods or something,
- Commissioner Doshi added: it could be a commercial or a community solar facility on a large property. He continued by saying so I think that's just something to keep in mind. If we're finding job as...
- Dr. Kriz said sure I will do my best to
- Commissioner Doshi added rooftop solar industry, and community solar industry have different job proportions compared to utility scale.
- Dr. Kriz said thanks Tonda if you could write that down a rooftop solar. I'll know what that means. So yes, I will make every attempt to tease that out in next year's anymore comments on the nature of work?

- Dr. Kriz continued with his presentation.
- Commissioner Doshi said just a couple of comments to Dr. Kriz, just speaking just to clarify one thing the commercial wind and commercial solar evaluation methodologies that you incorporated in your report chart, we're not introduced for the first time in CEJA, they predated CEJA, the solar property tax statute, I think comes from or was last updated in 2018, I think, and wind property tax law was enacted in 2007. Although CEJA extended that through 2035. Previously it was going to expire in 2021. Another question I have is for your estimates of new property taxes for wind and solar are you using the same estimates of new renewable capacity that you have in... try to find the right table the right graph, looks like you're figure 7 of your report.
- Dr. Kriz said yes and went on to say so that's the crossover what I call a cross over chart. Yeah, I am. So obviously, again, getting back to your point. If capacity growth is larger in out years that's those are actually going to be conservative estimates. This will, not this will go up, but the calculations of total property tax revenues are going to go up as capacity goes up.
- Commissioner Doshi asked you're stating for the wind and solar new property tax revenue you're stating the cumulative or I should say the total new annual revenue as of 2045? Would that be...
- Dr. Kriz said so what I had to do is I had to project out to 2045 because the valuation uses a trending factor. So, I had to project what my projections of capacity up to 2045 would do taking into account that and the depreciation factor. So, I did that I have this all on a massive spreadsheet where I have you know aging of the infrastructure done along with the depreciation and the trending factor. Then I so that will give me pretty accurate gain figures. In order to make the figures comparable for the losses I went back and trended that using the same trending factor as the just assuming the alternative was to keep the existing infrastructure in place. That answer your question?
- Commissioner Doshi answered yes, thanks.
- Chair Keller said just real quick I just want to open it up and make sure people on the Webex (Zoom) have an opportunity to ask questions so just want to pause and see if any Commission members have questions for Dr. Kriz?
- Tonda started to say the only question I see is from Prairie Rivers Network...
- Chair Keller said I might hold off on that to public comment, if that's alright. I just want to open it up to any Commission members real quick. Chair Keller asked if have questions. Okay. Just wanted to make that available.
- Dr. Kriz continued with his presentation finished presentation at minute 48:03 mark opened up the floor to questions and comments.
- Director Garcia said she guess one of her comments is generally on the report. Is it... I feel like it's a progress report not necessarily a final report, right? Like with that list of all these things that are missing, and I think that's the piece that I'm struggling with a bit is just how, I think we created this self-imposed deadline of like we're going to do something by the end of the year. But I think there's still a lot of work that needs to happen and so I guess the question to me is kind of the final format of this. This iteration is there something we could do to acknowledge like, there are a lot of other requirements, a lot of other pieces that are in progress. Especially like the modeling related to like incorporating what Commissioner Doshi is highlighted and like these are some of the things that like CEJA requires and does the analysis include that level of detail? So, I think to me I'm nervous about putting a report out there, it seems like it's a final work product when there we all know that there's a lot of additional pieces that need to come together.

- Dr. Kriz said I think there's a fair comment. It tried to include a section at the end that says limitations and there are limitations.
- Director Garcia said I'm wondering if there's just like maybe at the beginning or like I don't know if the Commissioners want to put together a letter or something of like I just want to make sure that folks don't think that the Commission thinks that our work here is done, right? So, I think the report is one piece but I think there's kind of how do we account for like all of these things that need to happen? And all of these things that you just listed. But we're going to include next time, or how do we? I especially the pieces that are requirements of CEJA, I just want to make sure that it doesn't appear that or were not acknowledging or trying our best.
- Dr. Kriz said I will say this one thing, and this might be controversial or whatever I wish that somebody had consulted on what was possible before they passed the law. For example, layoffs versus early retirements, that data, I have never seen good data on that, so I will do my best. I might in the end have to just estimate that and I thought about doing that for this report, but it would be a scientific wild guess at this point.
- Chair Keller said he proposed to add, just like a cover page. It says additional work done over the next year and just basically very plain statement saying that there's more work to be done.
- Director Garcia added by saying something like that definitely. It is specifically acknowledging some of the topics that have come up that was kind of on that list for the next time. But just I think for all of us, for me reading the report I had a lot of questions, a lot of thoughts I know that it's a work in progress and I know there's a lot of analysis to be done but I want to make sure, I know folks are really interested in what this report has to say. But there are limitations as you mentioned. I think as Commissioners it is important for us to acknowledge that it's coming from a separate group... became inaudible
- Chair Keller acknowledged that Commissioner Doshi wanted to speak
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and continued by saying first I would note that the statute asked for this commission to produce its report within 240 days, which would be May of 2022, which were obviously well past but in light of that timing I'd be comfortable... it's tipping my hand a little voting to approve this report today. I think the potential cover letter suggested by Director Garcia acknowledging there are some missing elements that may come next year is a good idea. I would also encourage the DCEO to work carefully with Dr. Kriz and his team to line up the contractual piece on the scope of work and timing and budget whatever is needed to make sure that all these pieces can be done when we'd like them to be done.
- Director Garcia jumped in and said I mean I think definitely, and I think part of that other piece to me is I don't know if we have to wait until they got another full year? I think there's a question too, on the sequencing of the work of the statement of work or the partnership here, of which things could be deliverable sooner that we could potentially amend the report over the course of the next year as opposed to waiting to go you know as it's done kind of bringing it back to this group.
- Dr. Kriz said I'm not sure and I thank you both for your comments. I'm not sure what the contract says, but I'm more than willing... I think Commissioners Doshi and Devaney can say I'm more than willing to work with people as things are identified to make this the best report possible and so I can easily see submitting a draft to it much earlier than next year. Certainly, I think one of the things and this is on me is that I underestimated the amount of work that would come in and so you know and the amount of time which I was not part of the original, I was the, I'm the pinch hitter here so that was all negotiated out before I ever became involved and so I would have asked for more time for this report.

- Director Garcia said right, I mean I think that's my inclination is like to give it more time. But knowing what the Commissioner Doshi just said about were already behind the ball, so I know that's why we wanted to get something done by this year, but I just looking at the report, it doesn't feel done to me. It's a work in progress and so acknowledging that making sure folks aren't taking it, be like oh you're done! It's like, no there's a lot we've all acknowledged, there's pieces that are missing.
- Dr. Kriz agreed with her by saying no I would gladly acknowledge that.
- Chair Keller said I think Commissioner Jones may have made a comment. I don't know if you could.
- Tonda read her comment which said, "I agree, we should put something on the beginning to acknowledge this is not final."
- Chair Keller said okay and thank you.
- Commissioner Noble had a comment and then a question. Someone asked the question or made the comment that they thought the losses would be greater. And the reality is, they are greater, but this report doesn't consider anything prior to that 2022. You've had substantial loss due to regulatory uncertainty and other market forces that have already transpired. The question I had was when considering new renewable capacity gains, are you looking at nameplates of capacity? Are you considering the inefficiency of the renewable when compared to base load? Because its not really the same thing saying we're taking 8 megawatts offline and we're adding 8 megawatts of renewable it just doesn't work that way.
- Dr. Kriz said no, I appreciate that Commissioner Devaney brought that up in his comments also Commissioner Noble, and we had a discussion about it, I fully recognize that. That's why I added net generation also, so there would be some data in the report on net generation. So, what you're speaking of, I assume is capacity factor and you're absolutely right, the capacity factor of wind and solar tends to be lower. But the one thing I would say about that is that it's driven by a couple of different things. One is the availability of the plant to be used in the absence of the fuel for the plant, so, wind or sun that reduces capacities down but also demand does, so one of the things you have to deal with if you do that right now in natural gas, the average capacity factor. And I calculated this from the energy information database, the average capacity factor for natural gas in the state is 0.11. Now I know that theoretically it's higher, but a lot of the plants are peaking plants that are kept offline. So, a lot of the loss is going to be in the natural gas sector. But it's going to be in ones that have relatively low-capacity factors in the whole. I calculated for the existing wind plants in the state and the existing wind plants have capacity factor of 0.29 and the solar is very low, it's 0.07. So, I tried to look at that as much as possible. The other things I will say again, quite frankly is that every report I looked at from N.Rel or the Energy Information Administration, they use capacity as their metric and so I'm just using the metric that other studies have used. If there's a metric that you think is better again, I'm more than willing to consider it. But I have to do what I think is right and based upon what other people have done and so I'm going to look at capacity. With respect to your first comment. I recognize that there are losses that have incurred in the past but as I understand it, this is supposed to be a forward-looking comparison between what we're going to lose in the future and what we're going to gain in the future from renewables. So again, if that's not correct somebody can correct me on that. But that was my understanding.
- Commissioner Devaney added did the chart where you showed what the capacity is versus the capacity factor. So, people can reference that if in fact they look at the chart and say we're going to be replacing all of what's going offline in fossil fuel with a capacity of all the renewable. However, we can then cross-reference it but it's only .07 for solar that made it to the final report, correct?

- Dr. Kriz, said I didn't put the figures for capacity factor in the final report. I reference it as a footnote. In response to your comment, I foot noted it. Yeah, again that's something I'm more than willing to do. I've got the calculations ready, but yeah.
- Commissioner Devaney asked Dr. Kriz you showed that...?
- Dr. Kriz replied by saying I have that I have the capacity data and generation data. So, you could calculate the capacity factor as net generation divided by the nameplate capacity times 8760.
- Commissioner Devaney said if somebody makes a motion, or I'm happy to do so, and whatever point to adopt this report I would like to add hopefully, it's a friendly amendment to add the chart that shows the capacity factors to the final version before it's made publicly available. And again, I'm just throwing it out there, so nobody's surprised.
- Chair Keller said I'm fine with it.
- Commissioner Doshi said to Commissioner Devaney you're saying the capacity factors of all the existing fossil fuel plants...?
- Commissioner Devaney replied by saying the chart that he showed us when we were going through our revisions. I would just like that added as a as a reference point.
- Dr. Kriz said you mean a table or chart? I think I showed you a table...
- Commissioner Devaney said you will have to explain to me the difference first, I don't remember which it was.
- Dr. Kriz said a table is just numbers, a chart is like a graph.
- Commissioner Devaney said no the table. The table that you showed that is already produced that you've already produced. I didn't realize in my review that it did not make it to the final report.
- Dr. Kriz said I will make sure that... if its approved I will make sure that it goes in the final report.
- Commissioner Doshi added this would be from EIA data to...
- Dr. Kriz said well, it's eGrid but I cross-reference it with the EIA. So, it's essentially from EIA. Okay
- Commissioner Devaney said so, I'd make a motion to adopt this phase 1 report.
- Dr. Kriz said can I interrupt you for just a second. There were also again the technical comments that were made by Commissioner Doshi this morning so I don't know if that can come into an amendment, someplace or something.
- Chair Keller said I think that's fine. If he wants to, I would like you to explain if you don't mind.
- Commissioner Devaney said I did not see these distributed it this morning?
- Dr. Kriz said I'm sorry, Commissioner Devaney, I just wanted to make sure that we all... became inaudible
- Chair Keller said and this is part of this meeting is going to be a little bit rough because there were several emails floating around. So, I do want you to fully explain those before we take any action on those.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and I believe Ms. Molly Lamb emailed my proposed edits to all commissioners around 10 o'clock or 10:30am this morning.
- Dr. Kriz asked was that the report?
- Commissioner Doshi said it was 10:30am this morning.
- Dr. Kriz said now I missed that one
- Commissioner Devaney asked if it was edits redline?
- Commissioner Doshi replied yeah
- Commissioner Doshi went on to say so I circulated a limited number of fairly surgical really superficial, I would say proposed edits, but should I go through them?
- Chair Keller said I would suggest. Yes, so there's no surprises, and everyone understands what going on.

- Dr. Kriz asked Tonda, do you have that email?
- Tonda said yes
- Dr. Kriz said I think that'd be easiest.
- Commissioner Doshi said I think it would be easiest maybe for us in the room if we could put the proposed final report on screen share or maybe Tonda if you could like toggle between this document with my edits and the proposed final report. Does that make sense?
- Tonda asked do you want your edits?
- Chair Keller said you're only going to be able to share one screen now.
- Dr. Kriz said I mean if you want to you can. I know what you're talking about in most cases...
- Commissioner Doshi said so actually I think we'll just give my proposed edits that's fine
- Dr. Kriz said ok so you can go to the top of the first page
- Director Garcia said I just got a note from Lisa Jones, I think the new commission member she didn't receive it, I'm forwarding it to her. But just making sure that we add Lisa to all our distribution, you know.
- Chair Keller said thank you.
- Commissioner Doshi proceeded to go over his proposed edits #1 on page 2 of the proposed final report, saying I'm going to try to speak quickly about these fairly narrow generally non-substantive, but not very substantive proposed edits. Then went on to point 1 in the document.
- Dr. Kriz replied by saying yeah, this I apologize. I was trying to combine your comments with Rachel's comments and so yeah, I'm fine with that. I'm not a lawyer...
- Commissioner Devaney said I just want to make a suggestion to procedure on each one of these points. Could you ask the Commissioners if there's any objection to it and then we can move quickly through it? So, number one...
- Commissioner Keller said yes. Went on to ask so, on number one. Is there any objection to removing the reference to Public Act 102-0662 from commission members?
- Commissioner Doshi interrupted and said sorry. No, removing the reference to energy transition act.
- Chair Keller I'm. Sorry. Okay. That would be removing the words Energy Transition Act
- Commissioner Morrison said no objection
- Chair Keller asked is that correct?
- Commissioner Doshi said yes, we're deleting the words Energy Transition Act from page two of the proposed final report.
- Chair Keller said but we would leave the reference to 102-0662? I'm not hearing any arguments again, so we will go ahead and approve that.
- Commissioner Doshi said okay, thank you Chair Keller and moved on to his proposed edit #2 on page 3 of the proposed final report figure 2 graph. He proposed adding Annual to the Figure title to read Historical Electrical Total Annual Generations, instead of it just being Historical Electrical Total Generations.
- Dr. Kriz said that's correct those are annual numbers
- Chair Keller asked if there were any objections from Commission members on that? Hearing none we'll approve that.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you then moved on to his proposed edit #3 on page 5 of the proposed final report. (See proposed edits document)
- Dr. Kriz said that yeah
- Dr. Kriz said yes okay I make that mistake all the time. Sorry.
- Chair Keller said I assume no objection to that. It's a grammatical change

- Commissioner Doshi said okay and thank you. Moved on to his proposed edit #4 on page 6 regarding Figure 4 and read through the proposed edits to be made to the draft report. (See proposed edits document)
- Dr. Kriz agreed by saying yes, I think it's currently unlabeled. So...
- Chair Keller said any objection to that? I feel silly asking but want to make sure. Hearing none we'll move forward.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you. Moved on to his proposed edit #5 on page 7 of the proposed final report and proposed to inserting the word Annual to the figure title to read Historical Annual Net Generation, instead of it just being Net Generation. (See proposed edits document)
- Dr. Kriz said yes I believe... Yes, I that's correct
- Chair Keller asked if there were any other objections from commission members? Hearing none, we'll move forward.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and moved on to his proposed edit #6 on page 11 in the proposed final report (See proposed edits document)
- Dr. Kriz said oh that's the publicly I apologize. Yes, that should be in there
- Commissioner Doshi said zero emissions were publicly owned yet power plants and cogeneration
- Chair Keller said that it is technical it's just stating what's in the statute I think that's fair.
- Commissioner Doshi said okay, thanks and moved on to his proposed edit #7 on page 13 in the proposed final report (See proposed edits document) said so I propose a utility funded.
- Dr. Kriz said yes that's fine with me then.
- Chair Keller said then I will stop and ask any objections to that from commission members? That is a more substantive change. Hearing none I will move forward then.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and moved on to his proposed edit #8 on page 25 regarding Table 12 in the proposed final report (See proposed edits document)
- Dr. Kriz interjected and said I changed it in table one, but I did not change it in Table 12.
- Commissioner Devaney added yeah, it's changing the county for the Prairie State power plant was...
- Dr. Kriz said you are absolutely correct.
- Commissioner Devaney said technical, correct?
- Chair Keller said yeah we're good.
- Commissioner Doshi said okay thanks and moved on to his proposed edit #9 on page 25 regarding a change to footnote 16 in the proposed final report (See proposed edits document)
- Commissioner Doshi said I very much appreciate Dr. Kriz you're acknowledging my comment, I just proposed changing community effects to localize effects, to be a little more precise.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah I have no problem with that. I said community because the title that requires that section is community impacts, so that's my mistake. Yeah, but I have no problem with making a change.
- Chair Keller said and I'm just going to stop real quick any objections to that from Commission Members
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and moved on to his proposed edit #10 on page 29 regarding Figure 10 in the proposed final report (See proposed edits document) proposed to insert the word Annual to Property Tax Revenue Losses to be clear what the numbers implied on the graph are about. Also, proposed inserting from fossil fuel power plant closures to make clear that this is not a net tax revenue change, considering new renewables and fossil fuel losses.
- Dr. Kriz said yes, I would be glad to make that, that would also help clarify Commissioner Garcia's comment about whether it's both the losses and the gains, it's just losses.

- Commissioner Devaney said it's the same thing, we're good.
- Chair Keller asked we're good there? Okay.
- Commissioner Doshi continued to read the proposed edit by saying changing 2022 to say 2022 through 2045.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah, I projected forward.
- Commissioner Doshi said thank you and moved on to his last proposed edit #11 on page 32 of the proposed final report (See proposed edits document)
- Commissioner Devaney asked its the same thing as before? Right? We're good with 11
- Chair Keller said okay we ready to approved that. Then asked if there was an edit 12. Good.
- Commissioner Doshi said the other ones are about my other document which you can take on a little later. Sorry about the trouble everyone. Thank you.
- Dr. Kriz said thank you for your comments
- Commissioner Morrison thanks Commissioner Doshi for those edits and your attention to detail. So, I'm able to follow that it's able to have no problem following that on my screen here. But just when this is made publicly available will those will the final draft have, like page numbers in it for the public in case they print these out or reviewing that?
- Dr. Kriz said yes, I apologize. I'll insert page numbers also.
- Commissioner Morrison said that comment seemed to fit in this section. Thank you very much.
- Chair Keller asked are there any other questions from Commission members?
- Commissioner Doshi asked so Chair Keller if we are to vote on this final report it would be including all the comments, I proposed including Commissioner Devaney's proposed addition about capacity factors on fossil fuel power plants.
- Chair Keller said that's the chart correct,
- Dr. Kriz said no table.
- Chair Keller said I'm sorry, I said chart. Yes, I didn't need interrupt go ahead
- Commissioner Doshi continued and said and page numbers
- Chair Keller added and Director Garcia's' cover page as well, explaining it's preliminary...
- Dr. Kriz said okay, yeah,
- Director Garcia said there is something that I've been struggling to understand. Maybe I'm just slow. But it's the one that talks about the 50% of electric generation and nuclear power. There's kind of an editorial comment in there and then kind of trying to explain it. But I'm not tracking of like, so can you talk about that plan
- Dr. Kriz said so total generation. So, in megawatt hours or gigawatt hours, is a function not only of the capacity of plants, but also the demands on plants. So, the nuclear plants are almost all in this area serving Chicago that has a lot of activity. They're going to be running, and this is also somewhat goes to the comment that Commissioner Noble made about the efficiency. The most efficient plants we have are nuclear, so they run as baseload units. They're running all the time, at near full capacity. And so, their generation is huge that Isn't necessarily going to be the case at all times. They have big capacity. They have big generation. It's just that I'm always cautious of using generation numbers because it includes a supply side element, which is how much they can generate and demand side element, which is how much is demanded of them. That's up to the RTOs, you know whoever's balancing the loads are trying to decide whatever the lowest cost. you know most reliable is. And so that number is a is a product of a lot of

different processes. And so, I think it's just, it's too simplistic to say that, and that's what I was trying to emulate.

- Director Garcia said what I've been told anecdotally has been that we're a net exporter of nuclear energy. And so, I just I'm trying to figure out if we're saying that we're overstating that...
- Dr. Kriz said again I didn't look at. I didn't look at any balance. I do not have a load balancing equation in my model. It's simply because the location of the plants, as well as their relative efficiency means they run full out most of the time, whereas a lot, for example, the natural gas, a lot of those are peaking units, so they only kick in when there's peak. And so that's why they have really low-capacity factors cause they only run when you know hot summer days, or you know when there's a large load demand. Does that help? Hurt? Painful?
- Director Garcia said I think I'm just. I feel like I'm trying to make sure I'm understanding the chart itself. So this is like figure 2 in the presentation, where it says total generation. And I think I'm just trying to make sure. I'm understanding. You're basically saying the generation is a big... like... nuclear is a big part of generation but it's doesn't align with demand? (Became inaudible)
- Dr Kriz said I'm sorry to interrupt. It doesn't align with demand at any one given point in time. So this is part of the problem that you know, when I responded to Commissioner Noble, about what you use as a metric. Capacity is the ability of a plant to meet demand at a given point in time. Generation is the sum of all those over the 8,760 hours of the year. Okay, so think of it this way on a hot summer day, you know July fifteenth. at 2 in the afternoon, all of your baseload plants. So, the nukes, the coal, and everything are running at full capacity plus the natural gas. But these you know, a lot of the natural gas may be idle or in hot standby, ready to be dispatched if they need to be. And so, there's no generation happening at that time, whereas the new plants are probably still running because they're the cheapest, the cheapest, most efficient form that, in fact, there's trying to go back to my brief spell of nuclear engineering training. But I think it's actually more expensive to run those down to minimal power but that that's another thing we'd have to get an expert on electrical generation.
- Director Garcia said so I guess, so I'm understanding this. Your footnote is trying to convey that nuclear maybe 50% generation, but that it's always on and so like that may fluctuate in the way that it's a what this share of generation, because others kind of turn up and down.
- Dr. Kriz said exactly, yes. Continued to say I mean so the capacity figures that are released by EAA are nameplate capacity, which is what I use. Summer are peak capacity which tends to be right at nameplate, because, like I said, everything's running full bore, or at that point, and then winter peaks which tends to be lower because all of your peaking plants the ones that are less efficient, aren't running.
- Director Garcia said I would propose, maybe, because we work on some clarifying that language a little bit to figure out. I just looking at it now. I'm trying. I can't come up with a maybe I could take a minute and come up with some edits, but to me it's trying to figure out how to how to bring that point across. I've read it like 15 times, I and didn't understand it. So, I'm wondering if there's a better way to
- Dr. Kriz said I'm trying to think of whether it's necessary for the report. I was just trying to anticipate a concern about the generation figure.
- Chair Keller asked you were thinking about removing the footnote?
- Director Garcia asked on the new version or the... (be inaudible)
- Dr. Kriz said I don't think it refers to any particular figure or amount...
- Director Garcia said the footnote was on the chart I think, and I (inaudible)
- Dr. Kriz said footnote 2 on page 4.

- Director Garcia said It's in a sentence, it said in 2015, coal-fired power plants were the leading source of electrical capacity, accounting for over a third of total capacity. In then the footnote talks about how folks always say 50%. It's talks about how folks always say 50% is nuclear but doesn't capture the entire picture.
- Dr. Kriz said I was trying to contrast generating capacity with net generation.
- Director Garcia said I just got wrapped around the axle like trying to understand the footnote, and how it related to what was in that text.
- Dr. Kriz said I could remove that second part, because that that was just trying. I was trying to explain, and I guess I just confused when the graph speaks for itself. That is the mix of generating capacity.
- Chair Keller asked would it be easier if the footnote was removed?
- Director Garcia said that would make more sense.
- Dr. Kriz said but the entire footnote does have some, I think the first sentence is in 2015, the first does explain the graph, I believe. I'm sorry I should have anticipated that there would be these types of questions.
- Director Garcia said it's okay. To me it was actually the first 2 sentences seemed more editorial because it's like much has been made of the data showing that 50%, so then when you get to like total generation captures not only the capacity of the system. I think that's more, related, but more trying to understand what to me was, how does it relate back, and maybe go up to the footnote where it is in, the sentence.
- Dr. Kriz said yeah, I was trying to explain the difference between capacity and capacity generation, and so I could remove that. If people feel the Commission feels that that's understandable without that footnote. Director Garcia said either that or clarifying it to make it more clear.
- Commissioner Devaney added by saying I think, just get it. It's not that it seems unnecessary to me. I agree with the Director. Is there any? Would there be any objection? Do you think, of removing footnote 2 in its entirety?
- Chair Keller said not for me. Any discussion from the Commission members?
- Commissioner Jones said no, not for me. I don't think we should have editorial statements in it anyway so if you can, that you should at least take that out.
- Dr. Kriz said I do try. I also try and explain it in little bit in figure, or footnote one.
- Director Garcia was inaudible
- Commissioner Devaney said understandable and relevant.
- Chair Keller said so the proposal is to remove footnote number 2 on page 4 in its entirety. Not hearing any objections. I will add that to the list of amendments to be made. I do want to be mindful of time, and we have a little bit more to do beyond approving this report. So, I would at this point ask for a motion to approve this report, with the request from Director Garcia on the cover page we will draft something very non-controversial, essentially saying, this is a work in progress and add that to the report. Commissioner Devaney's requested table and then we will add I believe Commissioner Morrison asked for page numbers, we will add those. And then Director Garcia again is removing footnote 2 on page 4. So those would be the amendments...
- Dr. Kriz added and Commissioner Doshi's edits
- Chair Keller said yes sorry, I have that I didn't read that off but his edits, I apologize. But those are the 5 amendments we will make. Any motion to or excuse me is there a motion to approve with those edits?
- Commissioner Doshi made a motion to accept the edits made to the proposed final report
- Commissioner Morrison seconded the motion

- Chair Keller asked for a vote to accept the edits and the motion passed for the initial report is approved.

III. New Business

- Chair Keller moved on to discuss the list of state and federal resources Commissioner Doshi volunteered to put together in an earlier meeting of communities that might be impacted by closures or energy transition. Asked him to go up and go over the list. Also, mentioned that he may rely later, on Rachel Powell from DCEO just to make sure that we're taking the appropriate action, whether or not it's going to be added to the report or simply added to the website itself? But I do wish to have Commissioner Doshi present his report if possible.
- Commissioner Doshi thanked Chair Keller and asked Tonda, do you have access to the list of State and Federal transition programs that I most recently circulated on Tuesday the 6th? Asked her to screen share the document.
- Commissioner Doshi went on to say I thought it would be helpful to prepare as a resource a list of all the State and Federal programs available to support workers and communities experiencing energy sector transition in the State of Illinois. With the enactment of the Climate and Equitable Jobs Act last year Public Act 106-0662, as well as the Federal infrastructure law in November of last year, and the Federal Inflation Reduction Act this year in August of this year, and some other programs that log predate the recent legislation. There's a large amount of state and federal programs available to support transition. I also think communities seeking to avail themselves of these benefits should seek as much as possible to coordinate among multiple programs and think about how the benefits of different programs can work together. To that end. I thought it would be helpful to put all the information in one place. So, I prepared this 20 page document as I discussed with Chair Keller earlier I thought it could be helpful to include this as an appendix to the report alternatively, if the DCEO or our Commission decides not to do that if it could be published on the DCEO or Commission website, not formally as part of the report. I think that could also be very helpful. So basically, for each program I list the legal authority the responsible State and or Federal agency or agencies, sometimes multiple agencies are in charge of a program website, eligible beneficiaries, and a description of how the program works, including in most cases, the budget so I'm not going to go through all the programs.
- Commissioner Doshi asked Tonda to scroll through the document so everyone in the room on viewing on Zoom can get a sense of how it is organized. Went on to say I've listed a number of state programs. There are about 15 different state programs that I've listed in here, including, for example, Illinois Unemployment Insurance a basic program that log predates, CEJA, for example, but can certainly support workers undergoing energy related transition. As you can see on this page, for example, the Illinois Power Agency administers certain procurements for renewable energy credits that are targeted for communities undergoing energy transition, such as the coal to solar program. So, the DCEO is certainly not the only agency with responsibility in this area.
- Commissioner Doshi asked Tonda to scroll to page 12 or 13 where the list of federal agencies start. Went on to say, so the recent Inflation Reduction Act created, for example, on this page something called the... if you can scroll up slightly, the Energy Infrastructure Reinvestment Program, which provides 250 billion of loan guarantees for the retooling, re-powering, repurposing, or replacing of energy infrastructure that has ceased operations. As well as enabling operating infrastructure to avoid reduced utilization sequester air pollutants or greenhouse gases. That's just one such program that was in the recent Inflation Reduction Act. So, I go through many more Federal programs and also believe

this is about a twenty-page document that lists all the different programs that are now available. And in the list of edits, I circulated later today, excuse me earlier today. I caught some additional provisions I want it to include. So, if the Commission we're going to vote in any way in my document, I'd ask that the Commission also consider the new points that I included as edits 12, 13, and 14 on the edits document. I circulated earlier today. Oh, and then one more thing after I circulated my list of edits around 8:30 this morning to the UIS team at 10 o'clock in the morning I got an email from the DCEO saying that the DCEO just released multiple requests or information on workforce training programs. So, I would ask that I could include those also in here just the fact that the RFIs were released.

- Chair Keller said so what I would like to ask is Rachel Powell, can you advise us, whether or not we can vote on this to add it to the report, or should we vote on it, to send it to the website?
- Rachel Powell from DCEO said can you hear me?
- Commissioner Jones said yeah.
- Chair Keller said there we go you can.
- Rachel Powell at DCEO said great yeah, I don't believe it can be voted on at this point because it wasn't specified on the agenda. There's nothing wrong with discussing it but you did want to add it later you would have to specify on the agenda.
- Chair Keller said okay. I don't know that there would be a vote necessary to add it to the website, because it's all publicly available information, it's just consolidated.
- Commissioner Devaney said so let's make this easy like without objection. Let's make the report with the addendum and the addition that Commissioner Doshi just described, publicly available, because it is, and just as a comment, I've never seen a comprehensive document where all of these things are in one place, I think it will be very helpful. So, I appreciate you taking the time to put it together.
- Director Garcia said I think I agree. I don't think we have any objections to it, I think we'd like a little bit of time more time to review it, and, as you said it's a living, breathing organism in some ways on the topic. There are things changing and happening in real time. So, I think we've we'd love to get some Just a little bit more time before we make it public. But I agree there's no it's great to have it as a resource, and I appreciate you taking the time to put it together.
- Commissioner Devaney said regardless of when that happens, I know they have to go through a process, but when you have the additions, will you please, send it to the Commission members that wish to receive it so we could share it with our constituents, and I know I definitely would.
- Commissioner Doshi said sure. Yes, so later today probably I'll incorporate it to a single document the additions I mentioned. Commissioner Devaney, I'll send it to you. I know there's open meetings, act issues around sending an email to the whole commission. But I'll certainly send it to you, Commissioner Devaney and anyone else who'd like to receive it please let me know.
- Commissioner Morrison said I would definitely like to receive it. I also have a comment for that when I acknowledged and just thank you for compiling this, I think it is a great resource for us to have and make available. I do want to just ask if we think adding it to the report might make it somewhat confusing to the public as some of these resources that you've captured here are not exclusive to the communities and people that we are focused on as part of this commission, like some of those Federal resources like for WARN and the National Dislocated Worker, grants are not exclusive to the workers that we would see showing up here, and if it might be more appropriate to be a resource on the website versus attached to the report.

- Chair Keller said I think that's a fair request. if there is no objection, we can just plan moving forward that way once the DCEO is comfortable and has a chance to look for it.
- Dr. Kriz said to just provide it as a resource.
- Chair Keller said I don't think there's a vote that is necessary but to your point about the Open Meetings Act, maybe if you want to share the report with either Tonda or Molly, and perhaps I think it's okay for them to distribute to the Commission members I think that's the appropriate way to handle this.
- Commissioner Doshi said sure.
- Director Garcia said and with the appropriate potential DCEO edits before it gets sent around.
- Commissioner Doshi said makes sense.
- Director Garcia was inaudible but last part of statement was I know how hard this is to compile all these things really appreciated.
- Chair Keller asked is there someone that you seeking comment?
- Tonda asked are we opening the floor to public comment?
- Chair Keller said not yet. Okay

IV. Public comments Jason Keller, Chair, Energy Transition Workforce Commission

- Chair Keller moved on to public comments. Continued to say I know there's some that have made comments in the chat. Why, don't we start there just for the sake of order. If there is any to be read off.
- Tonda read that Dale wants to receive a copy of the Powerpoint.
- Chair Keller said yeah, the present the report I assume is what he's referring to. That will be made publicly available once all the edits are made.
- Tonda read comment from TO Poke stating that, "he can't wait to comment. But, however, he would like to comment on the following: I'm currently involved on several rooftop solar projects located within Cook County for the a roof size 2MW. There are 3 equal size buildings on one site for total nameplate capacity up to 6MW.
- Tonda read comment from Andrew Rehn said he has to leave. I recommend also putting the median salary in the table of salaries. It's possible that the highest earners are skewing the numbers up, and either way, the median is interesting and useful. I'm wondering if the scale of the Energy Transition Community Grants meets the scale of the lost property tax. Those grants will be about \$26mil/yr if you don't count the \$14million for Zion. Thank you all for your hard work on this report.
- Chair Keller replied by saying so can I stop there in the median salaries, I because I think that's probably a question to Dr. Kriz whether or not that could be included in a future report?
- Dr. Kriz said quarterly Census employment wages. The only thing they report is average annual salary per employee. I'll look at the Emsi data does have median earnings. But when I tried to use that last time, it came up with figures that were too low. People perceive that they were too low. I'll try to look at median, see if I can find it an authoritative source for median salary, so I'll leave it at that, thank you. What was the other?
- Tonda read if the scale of the energy transition community grants meet the scale of the total property tax. Those grants will be about \$26 million/yr if you do not count the \$14 million for Zion.
- Dr. Kriz replied saying so our estimates of the loss in property tax revenues would be \$55 million per year. So, it won't, it will cover about half of them, and I'm not sure about that graph. That actually would be a

question for what Commissioner Doshi found as far as far as the... I'm not sure if they go to communities, or if they go to individuals within the community which would obviously have a different impact.

- Director Garcia asked are you talking about the Energy Transition grants? I think, Jason Horwitz is on the phone. He could probably talk about that and more detail than I can.
 - Chair Keller asked does Jason wish to speak on that?
 - Jason Horwitz said so there is a one-time distribution of funds to, if are we talking about the comment by Andrew Rehn.
 - Yes.
 - Jason Horwitz okay. There's a one-time distribution of grants to Zion totaling \$14 million is low actually, it's going to be higher than that. But each year annually there will be a 40 million dollars allocation of funds to the Energy Transition Community Grants program. So, I know I'm not, I'm we haven't done the work of comparing that amount, and who would be eligible over time to the numbers that Dr. Kriz has done in his report. But I think that would be an interesting analysis. Something we could look into
 - Dr. Kriz said I'll communicate with Jason next year.
 - Chair Keller said I think you can move to the next comment.
 - Tond said you already spoke on the source document being added to the website and Amanda, and who wants to make a comment.
 - Amanda Pankau with Prairie Rivers Network said she had a question. Then kind of a question slash comments. My question is on the property tax revenue assessment that you did was that specifically for coal-fired power plants? Or did you look at lost tax revenue or other funding sources from coal mines as well?
 - Dr. Kriz said I've looked at only coal fired plants and natural gas plants.
 - Amanda Pankau replied saying okay, and I honestly don't have a big understanding of coal mines and tax revenue they pay so it just might be a flag, for the future is determining kind of the lost revenue to communities from coal mine closures as well. And then I think this is a question of if you guys are planning any engagement around this report? I think there is great information here and I think for those counties that were identified in bright red or orange. Doing some targeted outreach to community leaders, community elected to be able to sit down and have a conversation with authors of the report or members of the Commission to walk through some of the things that you guys found about their community. You know they all have an understanding of the energy transition that's happening. But you know, I think, having the opportunity to see some of these numbers could be very valuable for them to walk through the document that Doshi put together. So, I was just, I guess it's a question and a suggestion of are you planning any targeted outreach to communities? Is there an opportunity to do a public facing webinar on the report, with maybe a panel discussion. Any thoughts on that?
- V. Upcoming Meetings – Discuss upcoming meetings and potential tentative dates among membership
- Chair Keller replied by saying it's a good segue into what we were going to discuss shortly before adjourning. But as far as future meetings of the task force are concerned, or speaking of the commission, we're in a little bit of a vague territory. I probably will allow the DCEO to kind of drive that a little bit, because the statute's a little unclear as to whether or not the Commission needs to continue to meet to push the report in 2023 forward. So, I think at this point, at least for the next couple of months, we're going to take a step back. But I would certainly I don't know if you guys wish to speak on that.

- Director Garcia said I don't know if Rachel or Jason on the line want to talk a little bit about kind of statutorily where we are, and then kind of what we think that looks like, so I'll try it to them.
- Chair Keller that was a tossing to Jason, or Rachel on how this might move forward?
- Director Garcia asked when would we meet next and what that meeting schedule for next year would look like?
- Rachel Powell from DCEO said as Commissioner Doshi mentioned, we're a little bit off on the statutory schedule, anyway. So, we're kind of trying to get this done, I guess, as quickly as we can. The statute says the Department shall conduct a comprehensive re-evaluation of the report and publish a modified version on each of the following years following initial publication; and the first one is 2023. So since this was supposed to be published in 2022, I believe. So really, we're kind of in uncharted territory unfortunately, they might have to have some discussions on that.
- Chair Keller said so I think Amanda an answer to your question is if you can give us a little bit of time, we need to kind of huddle internally. I will be taking direction from DCEO on how they want to proceed as well. I think I see Jane making a comment as well about outreach to different communities. That is something we've discussed in the past but if you give us a little bit of time. We'll try to be transparent about our next meetings.
- Commissioner Doshi said I don't mean to jump the queue with the public comment. But I think a commenter, Amanda Pankau, raised a question that might implicate what is the DCEOs immediate strategy for press, outreach or other public outreach when this report is published in the very near future?
- Director Garcia replied by saying I think we can do some outreach. I mean, I think that's part of today. With passing the report. We need to then think about the details that are in there in the final report and think about what that outreach looks like. I think in general we will be making it public. But I don't know for sure what additional outreach will be happening, and we want to see what was in there, and then figure out, if there are specific communities or others that we should be having conversations with as part of part of the outreach is always an important part of all of the things that we do. Yeah, I think making it all publicly available... (became inaudible).
- Chair Keller asked if you want to move to the next public comment. That's right.
- Andrew just said. Thank you for answering his question and that he did not realize that the Zion money was one time. Also, Jane, she just agreed with Amanda that outreach to the most impacted fossil fuel transition communities on the report's findings would be very helpful.
- Chair Keller said that is it? Okay? and no one is from the public is present in the room seeking testimony. We're going to go ahead close out the Webex public comment. I think we've already covered. Give us a little bit of time as far as the next meeting is concerned and maybe you'll hear. I don't know if you might hear from either DCEO or UIS as far as the next meeting. With that I before we move to adjourn. I do want to say thank you to the DCEO. I want to say thank you to Dr. Kriz for all the work and hours that you put in and I think Molly is still on, so I want to say thank you to Molly. And certainly, Tonda you've done a lot of work, and I'm going to say, thank you for all of your work as well.

Adjournment

- Chair Keller asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting
- Director Garcia motioned that the meeting be adjourned
- Commissioner Devaney seconded the motion

- Chair Keller went to vote to pass the motion and the motion passed to adjourn the meeting
- Meeting was adjourned at 12:48 pm

Minutes submitted by: Tonda Reece, UIS on 12/19/2022

Materials:

- I. Final Phase I Report
- II. PowerPoint presentation
- III. State and Federal Energy Transition programs
- IV. Commissioner Sameer Doshi Redline Edits
- V. 12/8 meeting audio
[Energy Transition Workforce Commission meeting 12/8 - Zoom](#)