



LYNN FINDLEY
SENATE DISTRICT 30

MARK OWENS
HOUSE DISTRICT 60

November 15, 2022

Dear Co-Chair Lieber & Co-Chair Marsh

We continue to appreciate the opportunity to participate in the ReBuild Task Force. We continue to appreciate and agree with the direction provided by the Legislature to the Task Force – come up with consensus proposals aimed at reducing GHG emissions in Oregon’s building stock. However, we continue to remain deeply concerned with the direction of the Task Force. We expressed this concern from the Task Force’s early days. Unfortunately, little if anything has been done to address these concerns. We remain frustrated and perplexed that seven months into meeting, the Task Force still does not have a coherent objective in mind, let alone one tied to something concrete, or directed by the Legislature.

Moreover, we continue to remain deeply troubled by the Task Force’s approach to modeling. The Co-Chairs decided to hire a third party to provide some modeling and analysis for the Task Force. The contract to the third-party provider, the Rocky Mountain Institute, was summarily rescinded when it became clear that hiring them in the first place violated the state’s procurement guidelines. From there, we were told that the Task Force no longer needed modeling, but instead could rely on the expertise of Task Force members. This too was reversed with the hiring of SSG to do modeling. However, no justification was provided for why the Task Force needed to hire modelers. There was also no meaningful transparency in the hiring of SSG. Was there an RFP released? What was the budget for the work? Was there a scope of work? Was the scope of work vetted by energy planners and experts? Were SSG given a big enough budget and timeframe to adequately do the work? We remain deeply concerned that even after further explanation that proper modeling of CPP compliance is not included. We also remain deeply concerned that the modeling does not adequately model peak. SSG should work directly with Oregon’s utilities and use the same data that informs the utilities’ Integrated Resource Plans.

Finally, we remain frustrated that the Task Force continues to stray from ideas based on consensus, and instead continues to return to divisive ideas that the Legislature rejected. We should not be pursuing policies that bifurcate Oregon’s building codes, nor should we pursue policies that fuel switch customers away from natural gas. If the Task Force is serious about reducing GHG emissions in buildings, it will look to consensus-driven ideas like setting up an incentive fund to help defray the costs of upgrading equipment. Additionally, the task force should focus on finding ways to move away from costly, inefficient and carbon intensive equipment like electric resistance baseboard heating. We hope the Task Force will work collaboratively with members to identify a clear, achievable, statutorily directed objective, and then craft consensus-based ideas to achieve the objective. Time is running out. We hope that seven months of work isn’t wasted in vain.

Senator Lynn Findley
Senate District 30

Representative Mark Owens
House District 60