

Minutes of a Meeting of the Clean Sustainable Energy Authority (CSEA) Technical Committee  
Held on December 8, 2021, at approximately 8:30 a.m.  
DMR West Conference Room, 1000 East Calgary Avenue, Bismarck

Present: Lt. Governor Brent Sanford, Chair  
Tom Erickson, SERC/EERC  
Dave Glatt, Department of Environmental Quality  
Lynn Helms, Department of Mineral Resources  
Justin Kringstad, North Dakota Pipeline Authority  
James Leiman (Remote), Department of Commerce  
Rachel Retterath, Outdoor Heritage Fund Representative  
Todd Steinwand, Bank of North Dakota  
John Weeda (Remote), North Dakota Transmission Authority

Also

Present: Al Christianson, CSEA Member (remote)  
Al Anderson, Industrial Commission  
Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission  
Kelvin Hullet, Bank of North Dakota  
Katie Haarsager, Industrial Commission  
Andrea Pfennig, Industrial Commission (remote for portion of meeting)  
Brock Wahl, Industrial Commission  
Members of the Press  
A complete list of attendees is unknown as the meeting was held on TEAMS

Lt. Governor Sanford called the meeting of the Clean Sustainable Energy Authority (CSEA) Technical Committee to order at approximately 8:30 a.m. with a quorum being present.

**It was moved by Rachel Retterath and seconded by Lynn Helms that the December 8, 2021 meeting agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried unanimously.**

**It was moved by Todd Steinwand and seconded by Rachel Retterath to approve the CSEA Technical Committee September 1, 2021 meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.**

Ms. Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission Executive Director/Secretary provided the following financial summary and noted that the \$25 million appropriation from the General Fund had been deposited into the CSEA account.

**Clean Sustainable Energy Fund  
Financial Statement - Cash Balance  
2021-2023  
December 8, 2021 CSEA Technical Committee Meeting**

		<b>Cash Balance</b>
July 1, 2021 Beginning Balance	\$25,000,000.00	
Interest Income through October 31, 2021		\$2,109.59
Other revenues through October 31, 2021		<u>\$0.00</u>
Total Revenues		\$2,109.59

Grant Awards		\$0.00
Administrative Expenditures through October 31, 2021		<u>\$431.92</u>
Total Expenditures		\$431.92
Cash Balance as of October 31, 2021		<u><u>\$25,001,677.67</u></u>

---

Outstanding contracted Project Commitments	\$0.00	
Estimated administrative expenses for 2021-2023 biennium	<u>-\$50,000.00</u>	
		<u>-\$50,000.00</u>
Non-committed Cash Funding		\$24,951,677.67

---

Known and Potential Revenues for 2021-2023 Biennium		
General Fund (House Bill 1452)	\$25,000,000.00	
Federal Funds.State Fiscal Recovery Fund - hydrogen development grants (Senate Bill 2345, subsection 36)*	\$20,000,000.00	
Interest & Other Income	<u>\$25,000.00</u>	
		\$45,025,000.00

\*There is appropriated from federal funds derived from the State Fiscal Recovery Fund, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000,000, or so much as may be necessary, to the Industrial Commission for the purpose of providing **hydrogen development grants**, as approved by the Clean Sustainable Energy Authority, for the period beginning with the effective date of this Act, and ending June 30, 2023. The effective date of the Act was December 1, 2021

Lt. Governor Sanford introduced Senator Dale Patten and Representative Glenn Bosch, sponsors of House Bill 1452, to provide a legislative perspective on the CSEA program. Following the meeting they provided the following summary of their comments:

1. *The project should be game changing or a precursor to game changing technology and/or concepts.*
2. *The proposed project should have relevance to the industry, not just an individual company.*
3. *It should not be just a capital injection to the company requesting the grant/loan.*
4. *It should result in or lead to commercialization of existing research or concepts.*
5. *The CSEA does not have to give out all of the money available in the first round.*
6. *The funding should target A grade type projects. We do not want it to be a stretch of the guidelines or legislative intent to fund a project.*

7. *The technical review committee should help determine if the project is technically feasible and financially viable. It can provide input regarding compliance with the intent of the law.*
8. *The CSEA voting board should not be a rubber stamp of the work done by the technical review committee. They should ask the hard questions and ultimately make the determination of the ability of the proposed project to achieve the goals of the CSEA as intended by the legislature.*
9. *If a project is rejected because it does not help achieve the goals of the CSEA it will help send a message to future applicants regarding what will be considered in successful applications.*
10. *Both the technical review committee and the voting CSEA board should be looking for ways the existing legislation can be improved in the next legislative session.*
11. *The goal of the funding of the projects is to ultimately make ND energy competitive with other energy sources from a marketability, production, price, carbon footprint, emissions, reliability, resilience, etc. standpoint.*
12. *If the energy markets want to buy energy with a reduced carbon footprint we want to be able to sell them that type of energy from all of our energy sources.*
13. *If the proposed project is also utilizing other state resources, that should be considered in the recommendation. Other sources of state funding should be complimentary in nature not redundant. The total scope of state funding can be considered.*
14. *Availability of federal funding should and can be considered in both approval and level of approval of CSEA funding.*
15. *Timeliness of the use of grants/loans is important.*

In addition, Representative Bosch stated that this program is a partnership. A financial commitment needs to be made from the private sector. Applicants should have “skin in the game” or shared risk with the state. The project should have an impact on the state. What does the project bring to the state over time—will it help attract other industries. Questions that need to be answered are will it have an impact on the environment and also have other side benefits to the citizens of North Dakota. He stated that when the word clean was defined in the bill it was not specific to the words carbon zero; any opportunity to lower the carbon footprint is what is important. Carbon reducing or carbon marketable energy.

Lt. Governor Sanford thanked them for their comments and asked Senator Patton and Representative Bosch to provide feedback to CSEA and staff if they identify any areas of concern in the CSEA process.

There was discussion regarding the roles of the Independent Technical Reviewers, the Bank of North Dakota and now the CSEA Technical Committee. From the Bank’s perspective their role was to determine the economic viability of the project, does the applicant include “skin in the game” and provide input on those aspects of the projects. The Bank did not weigh in on does it meet the CSEA mission. The CSEA voting committee and the Industrial Commission makes the ultimate decision on whether the project is meeting the CSEA goals.

It was noted that the Independent Technical Reviewers are experts in their field. The Technical Reviewers did look at goals of the program but are not necessarily from ND. Each group – independent technical reviewers; Bank of North Dakota reviews all have to come together to this CSEA Technical Committee to recommend whether the project is game changing and the commercialization of an “A” transformational project. This meeting is to determine if the project actually works technically and if there are any serious financial concerns.

Part of our job as a Technical Committee is to analyze how well these projects align with the legislative goals for the Authority and to provide that information to the voting members. It is more than just is the project feasible, how does it plug in to oil and gas production and oil and gas extraction taxes for the future of the state or how does it plug into making ND the leader in a new area of energy. It was suggested that

the role of the Technical Committee is to do the analysis and to discuss the alignment of the Authority's goals.

Looking for transformative projects that meet market demand but are very well grounded in their financial position and carbon neutral energy is the goal.

Lt. Governor Sanford asked that the Technical Committee members declare if they have any conflicts of interest and hand in their forms. CSEA Technical Committee members not having any conflicts were: Leiman, Weeda, Steinwand, Helms, Kringstad, and Glatt.

The question was raised by Mr. Erickson whether he would have a conflict if the EERC is doing work on a project that is before the Committee. It was suggested that he state what the role of the EERC would be on those applications and the committee can decide whether he should be able to vote on those applications.

Ms. Retterath stated that any conflicts she may have would be because of employment. In regard to the application C-01-08 her employer, Great River Energy, is the majority owner of the companies within MidwestAg Energy Group. In regard to C-01-09 her employer, Great River Energy, is the current owner of Coal Creek Station and she may also be working with Rainbow Energy Center in the future.

**It was moved by Mr. Helms and seconded by Mr. Steinwand that CSEA Technical Committee member Rachel Retterath has declared her conflict and she be allowed to vote on Application(s) C-01-09 – Front-End Engineering and Design for CO2 Capture at Coal Creek Station and C-01-08 – Commercial Deployment of Carbon Dioxide Capture & Geological Sequestration in McLean County. On a roll call vote Helms, Steinwand, Erickson, Glatt, Kringstad, Leiman, Weeda and Retterath voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Erickson, based on the suggestion to declare the role of the EERC in the applications being discussed today, provided the following information regarding the applications:

**It was moved by Mr. Leiman and seconded by Mr. Steinwand that CSEA Technical Committee member Mr. Tom Erickson be allowed to vote on Application(s) 1,3,5,8,9**

- C-01-01: EERC has been a resource for the applicant, but the EERC has no financial involvement in this project. The EERC is working with the applicant on a separate project that was authorized by the Legislature
- C-01-03: no financial involvement, but the applicant is considering investing a very small amount in the PCOR program.
- C-01-05: have done work for Marathon in the past and continues to do so but is not involved in this particular project
- C-01-08: The EERC is directly involved in the proposal and would have a role in the subsurface characterization and permitting part of the project.
- C-01-09: the EERC is the applicant and is directly involved in the research work.

It was noted by Mr. Steinwand that this is a technical review committee, and they are technical experts. This Technical Committee is not the funding decision.

Mr. Glatt agreed with the discussion that has taken place but did not believe it was appropriate for a Technical Committee member to vote on the one proposal that was submitted by the EERC. He is fine with Mr. Erickson being allowed to vote on the other applications.

Ms. Retterath noted that EERC is the applicant because the ownership transaction has not been completed yet. There is financial commitment from both parties – GRE and Rainbow Energy Center.

Mr. Leiman and Mr. Steinwand amended their motion that Mr. Erickson be allowed to vote on all the applications except for the application which was submitted by the EERC. The motion was restated as follows:

**It was moved by Mr. Leiman and seconded by Mr. Steinwand that CSEA Technical Committee member Mr. Tom Erickson be allowed to vote on Application(s) C-01-01, C-01-03, C-01-05, and C-01-09. On a roll call vote Glatt, Leiman, Weeda, Kringstad, Helms, Retterath, Todd, Erickson voted aye. The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Al Anderson, CSEA Director presented a summary on the applications submitted in Grant Round 1. He stated that 10 applications had been submitted with funding requests. One application was determined to be ineligible, and two applications were withdrawn. He provided comments on the remaining seven applications as follows, asking members to think about potential conditions throughout the discussion. He noted that significant effort has been made to keep the process as transparent as possible, but some information is confidential.

*C-01-01 – Dakota H2 Hub; Submitted by Bakken Energy LLC; Total Project Costs: \$1.75 billion; Amount Requested: \$10 million (grant) \$100 million (loan)*

The purpose of the Dakota H2 Hub is to establish one of the largest and the lowest cost clean hydrogen production hubs in the country in the shortest amount of time, continue employment of the Synfuels Plant jobs, become a center of innovation and economic development, reduce site CO2 emissions by 6 million tons/yr. and put North Dakota on a path to permanently solving its natural gas flaring problem.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	204	
	Technical Reviewer 2	276	
	Technical Reviewer 3	219	
	Average		233

#### Technical Reviewers' Comments

- 2 Reviewer scored the project as technically good with 1 Reviewer scoring it as fair. All Reviewers noted the goals and objectives of establishing a clean hydrogen production facility from natural gas feedstock via steam methane reforming as very clear and that the project would greatly contribute to ND's energy industry and environment sustainability.
- The \$10M grant request is 1% of the project (\$1754M) costs. The applicants' intention is to spend the grant on a 1:1 basis (matched with private) during the Pre-FEED and FEED stage (\$29.8M). The loan (\$100M) will be in addition to a DOE loan (1149.7M) and \$493.9M of private equity.
- 2 Reviewers noted the significant impact to ND's economy, not only avoiding the potential shuttering of the DGC facility but in the development of a major hub of clean hydrogen production regionally and even nationally. 1 Reviewer said it would likely impact the state's economy but they would have provided a higher score if an economic model had been run.
- All Reviewers indicated the quality and clarity of the methodology to be average. The project proposes the use of known technologies combined with currently undervalued natural gas resources. Additional detail would have been beneficial to scoring especially around the carbon capture and storage facility plans.
- All Reviewers noted the facilities and equipment available to be notably or exceptionally good. The repurposing of an existing facility should ultimately reduce costs relative to a greenfield project supports this rating.

- The proposed budget is likely to be most likely sufficient. Two risks were identified and dealt with the dependence on federal loan guarantees and the assumed price of natural gas at \$3/MMBTU. A significant upside was also identified dealing with the impact of the current Reconciliation bill that could significantly increase the tax credit value of H2.
- Reviewer ratings varied from adequate to exceptional on strategic partnerships. Noteworthy was the technical and project management capabilities and plans with Mitsubishi. Risks were identified dealing with concrete offtake purchase agreements and no specific technology for the CCUS portion of the project.
- The technical and market goals are assumably achievable with the expertise and experiences of the project team. Starting with the site and infrastructure in place at the synfuels plant greatly reduces this risk. Market goals are less well defined.
- The scientific and technical contribution of the project would greatly contribute to the advancement in the clean energy sector and are aligned with the CSEA goals.
- 2 Reviewers rated the project management plan as inadequate. They indicated a robust technology map and site plans were included but the application lacked a robust budget model, as well as no offtake agreement which are significant deficiencies. 1 Reviewer was comfortable with the financial plan and milestone chart but had some uncertainty associated with the DOE loan covering 80% of the project.
- The project principles background scoring ranged from adequate to exceptional. The team was viewed as strong and diverse in mainly business aspects with little discussion on the technical personnel expertise.
- Overall:
  - 1 Reviewer noted the use of an existing site at the Synfuels plant is a strong positive aspect, the proposed technology is well known, and the project is technically sound. The most significant risk from this Reviewer deals with the reliance on the federal loan guarantees.
  - 1 Reviewer indicated this is an exciting and practical project with a strong business case. The local employment and economic benefits as well as the longer-term viability of the H2 economy gives confidence to the recommendation of this as a strong candidate for funding. The biggest risk identified surrounded the lack of detail in CCS operations costs and potential.
  - 1 Reviewer said the proposed work is a great project that addresses the demand for clean energy and a sustainable environment and impacts the ND economy and should be funded by CSEA.

The Technical Committee discussed the following points:

- Is it clear that the current owner is moving forward with either the sale or the closure of the DGC facility?
- The CCUS project is well underway.
- Will there be an impact on the oil extraction tax?
- In response to a question it was indicated that the applicant will be able to source the volume of natural gas needed and that would result in freeing up space on the Northern Border pipeline.
- It was suggested that the applicant discuss at the next meeting whether they will have a connection to the Northern Border Pipeline.
- The applicant should discuss their go/no go decision process. With world markets changing and a demand for more natural gas, would that impact this project.
- Will this project result in decreasing the value of natural gas in North Dakota? Does the applicant have a signed letter of intent? These are questions that should be answered by the applicant at next week's meeting.

- This is an exciting project. Not going to come up with a lower priced way of creating hydrogen.
- There is some concern about the market demand for hydrogen going forward. There is considerable interest in having access to hydrogen. In some cases this is a result of the 2030 goals for reduced emissions.
- There isn't a need for hydrogen in North Dakota but there are options to move the product out of state.

*C-01-02 – SAFuels X; Submitted by AIC Energy Corp; Total Project Costs: \$357,101,430; Amount Requested: \$10 million (grant)*

Mr. Anderson stated that this application was withdrawn last night.

*C-01-03 – Cerilon GTL; Submitted by Cerilon GTL ND Inc; Total Project Costs: \$2.8 billion; Amount Requested: \$10 million (grant) \$50 million (loan)*

The proposed Gas to Liquids (GTL) plant will utilize 240 MCFD of natural gas inside of ND to convert to high value products. This will help to ensure ND oil production can continue and will not be constrained by lack of local customers of gas and constraints in pipeline infrastructure to move gas to distant customers. The proposed GTL facility recycles natural gas into products that are more green and environmentally friendly. The GTL facility will do carbon capture and underground sequestration to capture up to approximately 2 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>/year.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	228	
	Technical Reviewer 2	165	
	Technical Reviewer 3	192	
	Average		195

Technical Reviewers' Comments

- 2 Reviewers scored the project as technically questionable while 1 Reviewer scored it as Good.
- The Reviewers noted the commercially viable technologies associated with the gas-to-liquids technology as well established and logical with regard to increasing the sustainability of energy production in ND. However, 2 of the Reviewers did not find enough supporting documentation for the CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration portion of the project to justify the proposal.
- The \$10M grant request and \$50M loan request is just 2.1% of the project (\$2.8B) cost. The early project timing (FEL 1-3) where the dollars will be used are 59% of the early project cost (\$102M) with the remainder coming from \$2.4M private and other funding sources.
- Successful achievement of all proposed work would make a good impact to ND. Not only the creation of several high paying careers but also increased economic activity in some of ND's most influential sectors. Short term construction jobs, with long term permanent jobs (77) during operations.
- Reviewers noted GTL's proven technology and the quality of the project team with these technologies. All 3 Reviewers indicated the application lacked any description of how CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration will be managed and technical capability descriptions of the partners which impacted the scoring.
- Reviewers noted combination of GTL and CCS technologies make this a meaningful venture. The GTL is viewed as low technical risk and the limited description of the CCUS aspects again impacted the scoring on facilities and equipment.
- Overall, the proposed budget is likely sufficient with time and budget. 1 Reviewer again wanted more information on the CCUS aspect of the project, and another highlighted the need for more secured funds earlier in the project.

- All reviewers indicated the strategic partnerships were adequate. However, all 3 indicate there was insufficient data on the potential partnerships to score the application due to confidentiality and 1 Reviewer indicated there is insufficient data on purchase price agreement for either the feed or product.
- The goals of the project range from possibly achievable to certainly achievable in the reviewers scoring. 1 Reviewer indicated the site selection and permitting timeline are likely unrealistic.
- The GTL technology is proven and utilized in many places. Establishment of a GTL facility in ND with a CCUS portion would make a significant impact in the State.
- The project management plan was scored as adequate and considered realistic by 2 Reviewers and would have been higher with additional detail surrounding LCFS credits, partners. 1 Reviewer scored it inadequate due to lack of details and made the following comment: Considering the \$10M grant from CSEA is a major resource for keeping the project on-going (in addition to a confirmed loan of \$3M from NDDF), a more specific budgeting and management plan may better justify the request for support.
- All reviewers noted the excellent team with extensive knowledge and business expertise.
- Overall:
  - 1 Technical Reviewer stated the project has excellent potential as a demonstration of both GTL technologies as well as the utilization of carbon capture and sequestration to avoid emissions. This is relevant to ND's energy future to maintain a balance of fossil fuel extraction and sustainability. Major downsides that stopped a full recommendation are:
    - Insufficient categorization of CTUS capacity, costs, as well as technical and bureaucratic feasibility.
    - Lacking transparency on money being spent and revenue coming from operations.
  - 1 Technical Reviewer noted the GTL portion of the project utilizing well know technology and a selection of vendors who can guarantee performance. Consequently, this portion is technically feasible. This Reviewer did not view the material submitted as sufficient around the CCUS aspects of the project. There was also a concern that the project is not "green" energy as claimed but rather a cleaner fuel with the sulfur removal (not GHG emissions).
  - 1 Reviewer viewed the proposal as largely a planning/feasibility study. The overall project concept is sound, but the reviewer did not believe the request for grant support was fully justified. It is recommended that the proposal be funded by CSEA if a solid implementation plan could be appended.

The Technical Committee discussed the following points:

- Does the match funding that is coming from Williams County and Development Fund meet the legislative intent of having private sector match? Mr. Leiman indicated that the Development Fund is a 501c3. It was stated that if the company is required to repay a loan with the Williams County then it should qualify as private match investment.
- In response to a question, it was indicated that the applicant has an agreement with a supermajor for purchase of product.
- The applicant needs to provide more information on the CCUS aspect of their application. They have not yet approached the Department of Mineral Resources about CCUS. There may be synergies with work that is being done to prepare for Enhanced Oil Recovery.
- Mr. Erickson stated the applicant has made a commitment to join the EERC's PCOR program.



*C-01-05 – Vapor Recovery Units to Capture Fugitive Gas Emissions from Oil & Gas Locations; Submitted by Marathon Oil Company; Total Projects Costs: \$6.4 million; Amount Requested: \$3.2 million*

The proposed project is to purchase a fleet of 32 Vapor Recovery Unit's (VRUs) that will be installed on applicant operated oil and gas production facilities. In a typical facility, low-pressure gas that is processed by the production equipment is not an acceptable pressure to be sent into the third-party natural gas sales system. The project has the potential to eliminate over 1 BCF/year of natural gas flaring for each year they are in operation.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	183	
	Technical Reviewer 2	192	
	Average		188

Technical Reviewers' Comments

- Both reviewers technically sound score was questionable. Commercial use of VRU's for flare mitigation and emission reduction is well characterized and would contribute to reduced emissions.
- The \$3.2M grant request is 50% of the project (\$6.4M) cost with the remainder coming from the applicant.
- 1 Reviewer indicated a significant impact due to additional revenue from the sales of vapors. 1 Reviewer indicated the impact is 1 BCF/yr from a total of 32 VRUs on 18 facilities.
- The methodology of the project is clearly stated but 1 Reviewer wanted more detail on the tasks required.
- VRU's are commercially available but additional attention is required to operate in a cold climate. The applicant has already gained experience with rental equipment.
- The budget was likely sufficient with 1 Reviewer requesting additional detail and a letter of commitment for installation support.
- Both reviewers felt the partnerships required were adequate for short and long-term success.
- 1 Reviewer indicated the proposed technology is commercially available from multiple vendors and with applicant's experience is likely achievable from a technical and market approach. 1 Reviewer scored possibly achievable with applicant's experience but stated the evaluation was not possible for installation and testing without more details on the time and budget.
- The contribution is potentially extremely significant in improved emission reduction. 1 Reviewer indicated the proposed technology is commercially available and CSEA funding is not needed to promote the use of this technology and the result could be that every oil company applies for similar flare mitigation equipment funding.
- 1 Reviewer thought the project management plan was adequate while 1 Reviewer wanted more specific schedules, dates and costs. However, both indicated the team very experienced.
- Overall:
  - 1 Reviewer stated the proposed project is technically sound, achievable and meets the requirements of the program. The work is not unique and does not address the scale-up or technology demonstration need for the entire ND well inventory. The addition of an optimization task or some effort to improve the performance or efficiency of this technology or drive down the cost of deployment would better justify the use of ND CSEA funding.
  - 1 Reviewer indicated the technical contribution is likely extremely significant. However, the proposal needed more task structure, milestones and deliverables included but a recommendation of consider funding should be considered if that detail and a letter of commitment is provided.

Technical Committee discussion included:

- Suggestion that the funding be in the form of a loan rather than a grant.
- This is something that the industry will do without the CSEA funding.
- This project is worthy of consideration.
- This project will have an impact on the industry overall.

*C-01-07 – Unlocking the Full Potential of Produced Water as a Key Component of Clean Sustainable Energy; Submitted by Wellspring Hydro; Total Project Costs: \$2.2 million; Amount Requested: \$1.1 million (grant)*

The project would utilize a unique feedstock from oilfield brines (produced water) that presently is treated and injected into disposal wells in ND. If successful, the applicant will produce three commercially essential commodity products and lithium in ND that will aid in diversification of the economy and bolster existing industries through lower prices while reducing waste and harmful emissions. ND currently produces about 1.6 MBPD of water.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	237	
	Technical Reviewer 2	222	
	Average		230

Technical Reviewers' Comments

- Both reviewers score would indicate a recommended fund and the objectives of the project are consistent with the CSEA goals.
- The \$1.1M grant request is 50% of the project (\$2.2M) cost with the remainder coming from the applicant.
- The long-term objectives will impact ND produced water and the economy. However, the size of the planned plant will handle only a relatively small amount of produced water.
- Both reviewers rated the quality and clarity of the methodology as average. Concerns with input costs and sourcing of limestone as well as Terracoh's involvement were questioned.
- The facilities and equipment to be purchased for the pilot were rated as notably good even though it is going to be the first of its kind facility with ND produced water.
- The budget and timetable were viewed as most likely to be sufficient although aggressive.
- The team seems to have the necessary engineering and technology vendors in place to achieve the short-term goals of the studies and design. Scoring would have been higher if there was more documented interest from strategic customers and distributors of chemicals for the long term.
- 1 reviewer indicated the idea is clear, but technology is a huge hurdle for the produced water feed stock stream  
1 reviewer noted the schedule seems aggressive, but not impossible and the team has identified strategic customer agreements as important milestones.
- 1 reviewer indicated that if successful, the outcome will be great but there are a lot of unknowns.  
1 reviewer noted that the approach is novel and could lower costs for ND industries but no "very significant" to ND's overall energy economy.
- Project management plan was clear, understandable and notably good.
- The project principles had relevant diverse and significant experience. There doesn't seem to be specific experience in the chlor-alkali or bulk chemical business at this time which may be necessary for the long term.
- Overall:
  - 1 Reviewer said the project will have a positive impact on the diversification of ND but there is a huge hurdle in pushing current technology to handle the produced water feed.

- 1 Reviewer believes the project technically sound but limited due to a single facility (use only 1% of ND produced water).
  - Merits
    - New potential business (55 jobs)
    - Makes use of produced water waste.
    - Possibly flex user of electricity to help balance grid
  - Concerns
    - Unlikely to scale larger or be replicated elsewhere in the state given the limited local market for the primary chemicals this plant would produce.
    - Little documented support from strategic customers and/or distributors that currently handle these chemicals.

Discussion by the Technical Committee included:

- Produced water is a significant issue in North Dakota. Need to make sure we understand where they are going to dispose of this water.
- There could be potential radioactive issues.
- Although the applicant talked about reusing water for agriculture there would be significant amounts of energy required to be able to do that.
- Would like to see a clean-up bond requirement for this project.
- This project falls into the “demonstration” area and grant funding is appropriate. Having this funding may assist the applicant in raising capital for the project.
- The amount of produced water is going to continue to grow.
- Could be a transformational project for salt water disposal. Currently 99% of produced water ends up in the disposal. This project will also show if there is a potential use for the product.
- There are references in the proposal related to a pilot scale project. Some of those aspects of the project should be funded through the Oil and Gas Research program.
- The applicant has done some research; they are making a 50/50 match and are working towards commercialization.

*C-01-08 – Commercial Deployment of Carbon Dioxide Capture & Geological Sequestration in McLean County; Submitted by Midwest AgEnergy Group; Total Project Costs: \$58.8 million; Amount Requested: \$5.2 million (grant)*

The project is to capture and permanently sequester the CO<sub>2</sub> stream associated with an ethanol biorefinery. The production of renewable fuels has had a marked impact on the economy of ND and these facilities provide a value-added market to agricultural producers. There are numerous markets for biofuels that have aggressive carbon reduction goals. This translates into a financial opportunity for renewable fuel producers who can reduce the carbon intensity of the fuel they produce. Success in such an endeavor would ensure market access and enhance the financial stability of existing biorefineries.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	288	
	Technical Reviewer 2	282	
	Average		285

Technical Reviewers' Comments

- Both reviewers scored the project as technically good and the objectives of the project are consistent with the CSEA goals of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration at an ethanol biorefinery.
- The \$5.2M grant request is only 8.85% of the project (\$58.78M) cost with the remainder coming from the applicant.

- The proposed CO2 sequestration will improve competitiveness and continued operation. The decarbonization within the ethanol industry will have a positive impact on the State’s economy and industry.
- Both reviewers felt the methodology was well developed and the quality of the project partners was high and uniquely skilled.
- This commercial-scale project relies on well-proven technology and has an overall low project risk.
- 1 reviewer felt the budget was most likely sufficient to achieve the proposed objectives but is ambitious with the current supply chain crisis and inflation.  
1 reviewer felt the budget was certainly sufficient and comprehensive and indicated the entire project may benefit further from the current “Build Back Better Act” proposals.
- Both reviewers felt the team established was exceptional with strong support from the North Dakota farming community.
- Both reviewers noted the technical qualifications and competence of the principals although one noted the specific personnel who will be leading the project have not been identified.
- The overall project has clear and tangible goals within their management plan.
- Overall:
  - 1 reviewer highlighted this is a compelling project to incorporate state-of-the-art carbon capture, storage and sequestration (CCSS) technology into an ethanol facility important to ND’s economy. This project is exemplary in terms of technology development for other biorefineries and energy production facilities to reach the goal of carbon neutrality and recommended the project be considered for funding.
  - 1 reviewer indicated the project was technically sound, low-risk and high-impact decarbonization activity that ND can bring to commercial scale. The project has strategic importance to ND and the broader ethanol industry and highly recommends its support.

Technical Discussion included:

- A good and interesting project.
- Already a commercial process underway at a different ethanol plant so it is not new.
- This is a benefit to a specific company.
- A loan may be more appropriate than a grant.
- CCUS is a good thing but CSEA may not be the appropriate source for the funding.

*C-01-09 – Front-End Engineering and Design for CO2 Capture at Coal Creek Station; Submitted by EERC; Total Project Costs: \$15,065,200; Amount Requested: \$7,532,600 (grant)*

Carbon capture and storage is vital to continued operation of Coal Creek Station and is an important step toward the goal for the state to reach carbon neutrality by 2030. Implementing carbon capture technology allows fossil fuels to continue to meet the nation’s energy demand, while also reducing CO2 emissions. The proposed study is the next step in a due diligence process in project development and is intended to assist in securing financing for CO2 capture at Coal Creek via the 45Q tax incentive program of the Federal Government.

The project is the next step for the lignite industry and if it moves forward commercially, the technology will positively impact all ND energy industries. The technology is slightly different than Project Tundra but provides an alternative solution and has been supported by Lignite Research Council funding (Pre-FEED).

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	282	
	Technical Reviewer 2	285	
	Average		284

### Technical Reviewer Comments

- Both Reviewers scored the project as technically good which had goals that were very clear with an objective to complete a FEED study for a CO<sub>2</sub> capture system (CCS) that would capture 95% of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.
- The \$7.5326M grant request is 50% of the project (\$15.0652M) cost with the remainder provided by the plant owner.
- Carbon capture in ND power plants is critical and significant to sustaining and growing the economy and optimizing the use of ND resources.
- The quality and clarity of the methodology was rated at average to well above average. The average scorer would have liked more detail on where the ongoing State supported work is at and the identification of leading risks like supply chain issues. The other Reviewer noted the information supplied by the participants provided detail and specifics that were above average.
- Both Reviewers indicated the facilities and equipment were notably good and the partners were leaders in CCS technology development construction and facility operation.
- Both Reviewers noted the budget is sufficiently comprehensive and detailed for this project.
- Both Reviewers indicated the strategic partnerships made a very strong team from R&D through the commercial aspects of the work.
- Both Reviewers noted that the likelihood that the project will achieve the technical goals is most likely achievable.
- Both Reviewers highlighted the project as the next step for the lignite industry and if it moves forward commercially, the technology would positively impact all ND energy industries. The information available from this project could be applicable for other CO<sub>2</sub> emission sites and is extremely significant.
- The project management plan is notably good and the multiple participants present a unique challenge for this project. Some success metrics would be beneficial such as economic evaluation and FEED results.
- Both Reviewers indicated the organizations and project leads involved are all experienced and well equipped to lead this important project and their technical qualifications and competence are exceptional.
- Overall:
  - 1 Reviewer indicates this is an important project for ND and fits well within CSEA. The team is strong, well-qualified and the work plan well organized to complete the project goals. The reviewer believes that the project should move forward. Requests include;
    - Sensitivity analysis in the economic evaluation.
    - More measurable standards of success
    - Clarification on where the current project is in the development cycle and how this work will take that effort to the next level of detail and confidence.
    - Additional discussion on risks associated with solvent losses and degradation.
  - 1 Reviewer highlights the quality of the individuals and organization involved in this project and the industry's need for the technology associated with this project. The Reviewer believes the project is technically sound and merits support and funding. Key challenges and potential flaws of the project are the efficient operation and control of demister, amine emission reduction, solvent regeneration, and reagent consumption.

### The Technical Committee discussion included:

- Good project. Anything this study can do about cost effectiveness would be beneficial.
- Concerned about the parasitic load and how that can be reduced.
- Not available just yet commercially.

- The Pre-Feed study was funded partially by the Lignite Research Fund. That study was just completed.
- The Project Tundra is moving forward with a different technology solution to some of the issues being discussed. What this study would provide is a different set of information with different considerations. More and more information is becoming available from other projects that are doing similar work.
- Would the results of this project have a broad application for other facilities? Is the results of this work going to be confidential? These questions should be answered at the next meeting with CSEA.
- The geology for storage has some challenges but initial results are positive.
- This work is expanding options for the lignite industry.

*C-01-10 – Solving North Dakota Flaring: Mobile Flare Gas Capture & Fueling Platform Expansion; Submitted by Valence Natural Gas Solutions; Total Project Costs: \$44 million; Amount Requested: \$2.5 million (grant) \$15 million (loan)*

The applicant is proposing to accelerate deployment of its fleet of mobile flare gas capture plants. The company is proposing to invest an additional \$44M by year-end 2022 in its established equipment fleet and service platform to enable the capture of 24.5 MMCFD by 2023 of ND natural gas that would otherwise be flared representing approximately 10% of the average 2021 YTD statewide total of approximately 245 MMCFD.

Scores:	Technical Reviewer 1	204	
	Technical Reviewer 2	189	
	Average		197

#### Technical Reviewers' Comments

- 1 reviewer rated the project as technically fair, meets the objectives of emissions reduction but the technology is currently being deployed.  
1 reviewer rated the project as questionable technically but meets the objectives of CSEA.
- The \$2.5M grant request and \$15M loan request is 40% of the project (\$43.9M) cost. \$19M is being provided by the applicant with \$7.3M coming from other sources.
- Both reviewers noted the business model expansion will have a positive impact on the capture of natural gas. However, they disagreed on the size of the impact.
- Both reviewers indicated the methodology was clear, being utilized today and that the project is basically a way to expedite capital deployment and associated gas capture.
- The project is not a pilot but rather an expansion of an existing business that should be based on historical and projected flare gas availability.
- The budget is likely to most likely sufficient and comprehensive with the applicant's business background.
- 1 reviewer indicated there are partnerships in place for the equipment suppliers and vendors but there was limited information on pending contracts with customers.  
1 reviewer stated that there was not sufficient detail about business partnerships for additional oil producer customers.
- Both reviewers indicated a likely or most likely achievable time and budget approach to the project.
- 1 reviewer stated that the expansion of a single business currently in operation is not a revolutionary development.  
1 reviewer indicated that the applicant's approach appears to be a step change in optimization of gas capture.

- The project management plan is clear, adequate and well presented. The only area not clear is the customer's desire and acceptance.
- The background and experience of the principles is relevant and there are no concerns.
- Overall:
  - 1 Reviewer states the project is technically sound, the budgets reasonable and well thought out with the only concern tied to the expansion of an existing business, not the implementation of a new non-commercialized technology.
  - 1 Reviewer noted the proposal to be well written, goals aligned with CSEA but unclear why state funds are needed to expand a profitable business.

The Review Committee discussion included:

- Supportive of efforts to reduce gas flaring. However, this is not new technology, and the request is to help a business expand.
- Is not appropriate for a grant but indicated the funding of a loan would be appropriate.

**It was moved by Mr. Glatt and seconded by Mr. Helms that under the authority of North Dakota Century Code Sections 54-63.1-06 and 44-04-19.2(1) the Clean Sustainable Energy Authority Technical Committee enter into executive session for the purpose of considering Clean Sustainable Energy Authority confidential information. On a roll call vote Erickson, Glatt, Helms, Kringstad, Retterath, Steinwand, Weeda voted aye, no one voted nay. The motion carried. Mr. Leiman was not present.**

Lt. Governor Sanford stated The Clean Sustainable Energy Authority Technical Committee is meeting in executive session to consider confidential information. Only CSEA members and Industrial Commission staff will be present during the executive session. Any formal action will occur after reconvening in open session. I remind those present in the executive session that the discussion must be limited to the announced purpose which is anticipated to last approximately 1.5 hours—to return to open session at approximately 12:30 p.m. The executive session will begin at 11:05 a.m.

During Executive Session the CSEA Technical Committee met with the following individuals being present:

Lt. Governor Sanford  
Tom Erickson, CSEA member  
Dave Glatt, CSEA member  
Lynn Helms, CSEA member  
Justin Kringstad, CSEA member  
James Leiman, CSEA member  
Rachel Retterath, CSEA member  
Todd Steinwand, CSEA member  
Kelvin Hullet, CSEA member designee for Mr. Steinwand  
John Weeda, CSEA member  
Al Christianson, CSEA member  
Al Anderson CSEA Director  
Karlene Fine, Industrial Commission staff  
Katie Haarsager, Industrial Commission staff  
Andrea Pfenning, Industrial Commission staff (remote) for a portion of the meeting.  
Brock Wahl, Industrial Commission staff

During the Executive Session the CSEA Technical Committee took up the following agenda items:

Review of Confidential Information

Report on Economic Review Results

Discussion regarding the confidential information and completion of scoring sheets

Lt. Governor Sanford stated the executive session has ended at 12:55 p.m. and the CSEA Technical Committee is reconvened in open session. Lt. Governor left the meeting at this time. Mr. Steinwand had also left the meeting and stated the Mr. Hullet would be his designee.

C-01-01 – Dakota H2 Hub – Submitted by Bakken Energy LLC – Request for \$10,000,000 grant and a \$100,000,000 loan. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 good; 1 fair; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that all Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible:

Erickson:	37* Feasible with conditions.
Glatt:	44
Helms:	40
Kringstad:	42
Leiman:	45
Retterath:	41* Feasible with conditions.
Steinwand:	41
Weeda:	48

Average 42.25

Mr. Anderson noted that during prior discussions two conditions had been identified as possibilities:

- a. Completion of sale of DGC to Bakken Energy
- b. Bakken Energy receive a Department of Energy loan

**C-01-01:**

**It was moved by Mr. Glatt and seconded by Tom Erickson that the CSEA Technical Committee determines that the Dakota H2 Hub application submitted by Bakken Energy LLC be funded with \$10,000,000 grant funding and a \$100,000,000 loan.**

The Technical Committee discussed whether this committee should be making any recommendations on funding levels or conditions.

- Mr. Weeda indicated that it was his position that there not be a condition requiring the applicant to have received a DOE loan. He noted that he did not believe the Committee should be recommending a level of funding—that determination needs to be made when the CSEA meets and has a total picture of all the applications.
- Mr. Helms suggested that one of the conditions be that the grant funding come from the Hydrogen funding appropriated during the legislative special session.
- Ms. Retterath noted that she had concerns when completing the scoring sheet that some projects may be technically feasible and/or economically viable but may not meet the mission of the CSEA and should not be funded.
- Question was raised as to whether voting on a funding level would result in exceeding the funding that is available—how should the Technical Committee avoid exceeding the funding availability.
- Options were discussed regarding whether to have two votes or one vote on feasibility and one vote on funding levels and/or conditions.

Ms. Fine noted that the law states the Technical Committee's role is to determine feasibility.



After further discussion it was stated that the Technical Committee will not be addressing dollar amounts but will be voting to determine if a project is feasible and fund, feasible consider funding, or feasible and do not fund, or feasible and fund with conditions.

After discussion the motion was withdrawn.

**It was moved by Mr. Erickson and seconded by Mr. Leiman that the Bakken Energy LLC project is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend funding with the conditions that the grant funding come from the hydrogen appropriation and the loan funding be available upon completion of the sale of DGC to Bakken Energy. On a roll call vote, Erickson, Leiman, Glatt, Weeda, Kringstad, Helms, Retterath and Hullet voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

C-01-03 – Cerilon GTL – Submitted by Cerilon GTL ND Inc. Request for \$10,000,000 grant and a \$50,000,000 loan. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 Good and 1 Fair; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that all Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible:

Erickson:	39* Feasible with conditions.
Glatt:	40
Helms:	40* Feasible with conditions. Recommend \$5 million grant & \$55 million loan.
Kringstad:	44
Leiman:	46
Retterath:	39* Feasible with conditions.
Steinwand:	36
Weeda:	47
	Average 41.38

Mr. Anderson noted that during prior discussions two conditions had been identified as possibilities:

- a. Change in the funding amount
- b. 1:1 private equity match on grant and loan portion

The question was raised as to whether it is typical to have a 1:1 private equity match on the loan portion. The response was that this is a new program so it could be done either way. Mr. Erickson stated that he was anticipating it would only be on the grant portion. Mr. Hullet stated that when the Bank was looking at the project, they were looking at the other funding that the applicant would be raising to complete the project.

**It was moved by Mr. Erickson and seconded by Mr. Kringstad that the Cerilon project is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend funding with the condition that there be a 1:1 match on the grant funding. On a roll call vote, Erickson, Kringstad, Leiman, Glatt, Weeda, Helms, Retterath and Hullet voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

C-01-05 – Vapor Recovery Units to Capture Fugitive Gas Emissions from Oil and Gas Locations – Marathon Oil Company. Request for \$3,200,000 grant. Al Anderson noted that the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 questionable and the Bank of North Dakota had determined the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that 7 Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible and 1 Committee member stated it was not feasible:

Erickson: 37\* Feasible with conditions.  
Glatt: 35  
Helms: 42\* Feasible with conditions. Recommend loan vs grant.  
Kringstad: 36  
Leiman: 41  
Retterath: 36\* Feasible with conditions.  
Steinwand: 28 (not feasible)  
Weeda: 43\* Doesn't seem to align with CSEA goals.  
Average 38.57 feasible; Not feasible 28

**It was moved by Mr. Glatt and seconded by Mr. Hullet that the Vapor Recovery Units to Capture Fugitive Gas Emissions from Oil & Gas Locations is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend do not fund.**

Mr. Hullet stated that Mr. Steinwand had indicated not feasible because this type of project is part of normal business. Mr. Weeda stated that was consistent with his condition. Mr. Helms stated that is consistent with his comments and that should there be funding it be in the form of a loan rather than a grant.

**On a roll call vote, Glatt, Hullet, Kringstad, Erickson, Leiman, Weeda, Helms, and Retterath voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

C-01-07 – Unlocking the Full Potential of Produced Water as a Key Component of Clean Sustainable Energy – Submitted by Wellspring Hydro. Request for \$1,100,000 grant. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 Good; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that all Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible:

Erickson: 37\* Feasible with conditions.  
Glatt: 38  
Helms: 41\* Feasible with conditions.  
Kringstad: 33  
Leiman: 44  
Retterath: 39\* Feasible with conditions.  
Steinwand: 36  
Weeda: 38\* Feasible with conditions. Lacks evidence of pilot test work.  
Average 38.25

**It was moved by Mr. Helms and seconded by Mr. Hullet that the Unlocking the Full Potential of Produced Water as a Key Component of Clean Sustainable Energy project is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend grant funding with the condition that 50% of the funding not be made available until the applicant has initiated the permitting process with the appropriate permitting/regulatory authorities.**

In response to questions regarding the status of the company in seeking a permit and would this condition be holding up funding, it was stated that they are not at the permitting stage process, Mr. Helms stated that after looking at the application it appears the applicant will be at the point of procuring equipment by the beginning of 2023.

Mr. Weeda stated his concern was whether the company was ready to build a facility of the size they are discussing in their application. Some of the work is still pilot-scale testing. Are they ready to go forward

with the permitting process? It was suggested that the applicant be asked to discuss this question at the meeting before the CSEA.

**On a roll call vote, Helms, Hullet, Kringstad, Leiman, Glatt, Weeda, Erickson, and Retterath voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

C-01-08 – Commercial Deployment of Carbon Dioxide Capture & Geological Sequestration in McLean County – Submitted by Midwest AgEnergy Group. Request for \$5,200,000 grant. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 Good; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that 6 Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible and 2 Technical Committee members stated the project not feasible:

Erickson:	35* Feasible with conditions.
Glatt:	39
Helms:	32* Feasible with conditions. Loan preferred over grant
Kringstad:	37
Leiman:	40
Retterath:	38
Steinwand:	32 (Not Feasible)
Weeda:	43 (Not Feasible) Not in line with CSEA goals. BND loan vs CSEA loan
	Average 36.83 Feasible; Not Feasible 37.5

Mr. Weeda clarified his comments on the scoring sheet that if it doesn't meet the qualifications of the CSEA program then the applicant should seek a loan from the Bank of North Dakota.

**It was moved by Mr. Helms and seconded by Mr. Glatt that the Commercial Deployment of Carbon Dioxide Capture & Geological Sequestration in McLean County project is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend the project not be funded. On a roll call vote, Helms, Glatt, Leiman, Erickson, Weeda, Kringstad, Retterath and Hullet voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

**C-01-09:**

C-01-09 – Front-End Engineering and design for CO2 Capture at Coal Creek Station. Request for \$7,532,600 grant. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 2 Good; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that all Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible:

Erickson:	Abstain
Glatt:	44
Helms:	42
Kringstad:	46
Leiman:	42
Retterath:	43* Feasible with conditions.
Steinwand:	41
Weeda:	50
	Average 44

The condition that had been previously discussed was that the funding be pending until the sale of the Coal Creek plant from Great River Energy to Rainbow Energy Center had been completed.

**It was moved by Mr. Hullet and seconded by Mr. Helms that the Front-End Engineering and Design for CO2 Capture at Coal Creek Station project is determined feasible and economically viable and recommend funding with the completion of the transaction between Rainbow Energy Center and Great River Energy.**

Mr. Weeda raised the question whether there is work that needs to be funded that would assist the project during the interim while the sale is being finalized. It was indicated that this could be addressed at next week's CSEA meeting.

**On a roll call vote, Hullet, Helms, Kringstad, Leiman, Glatt, Weeda, and Retterath voted aye. No one voted no. Mr. Erickson abstained. The motion carried unanimously.**

C-01-10 – Solving North Dakota Flaring: Mobile Flare Gas Capture & Fueling Platform Expansion – Submitted by Valence Natural Gas Solutions. Request for \$2,500,000 grant and a \$15,000,000 loan. Al Anderson stated the Independent Technical Reviewers had 1 Fair and 1 Questionable; Bank of North Dakota review was that the project was economically feasible. He reviewed the information from the CSEA Technical Committee Scoring Sheets as follows noting that 7 Technical Committee members stated the project was feasible and 1 stated the project was not feasible:

Erickson:	33* Feasible with conditions.
Glatt:	36
Helms:	38* Feasible with conditions. Recommend loan over grant
Kringstad:	36
Leiman:	42
Retterath:	36* Feasible with conditions.
Steinwand:	27 (not feasible)
Weeda:	31* Feasible with conditions. More in line with a loan (BND) than a grant.
Average 36	

**It was moved by Mr. Helms and seconded by Mr. Erickson that the Solving North Dakota Flaring: Mobile Flare Gas Capture & Fueling Platform Expansion project is feasible and economically viable and recommend that it not be funded as a grant and consider funding of a loan. On a roll call vote, Helms, Erickson, Kringstad, Leiman, Glatt, Weeda, Retterath and Hullet voted aye. No one voted no. The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Anderson thanked the Committee members for their hard work in reviewing the applications and participation in the meeting. He encouraged the Technical Committee members to forward any recommendations on how this process could be improved and scoring documents revised.

Lt. Governor Sanford rejoined the meeting and stated that the full Clean Sustainable Energy Authority will be meeting on December 14, 2021 in the State Capitol Pioneer Room. At that meeting each of the eight applicants will have an opportunity make a presentation to the CSEA.

With no further business, Lt. Governor Sanford thanked the Committee members for their work and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:00 p.m.



---

Lt. Governor Brent Sanford, Chairman