INDIANA ENERGY TASK FORCE

Strategic Energy Growth Plan

A Collaborative Framework for Indiana's Energy Future

2026 | Version 4.6

Prepared by the Strategic Doing Institute

In collaboration with the Indiana Energy Task Force

Established by Executive Order 25-66

Competitiveness Analysis | Community Voices | 20-Year Outlook | Strategic Action Plan

StrategicDoing™
Do More Together.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Why This Matters

1.1 The Complexity of Indiana's Energy Challenge

Indiana's energy transition does not fit inside any single organization's boundaries. A CEO controls her company. A utility commission regulates the firms in its jurisdiction. A county commissioner serves a defined constituency. None of those roles controls enough of the system to move it forward.

The interdependence is the challenge. When utilities, regulators, developers, communities, landowners, and local officials all affect the outcome — and none can act alone — traditional leadership approaches stop working. You cannot direct your way out of a trust deficit. You cannot regulate your way into community support.

1.2 A Different Starting Point

Progress requires a different starting point. Instead of asking who has the authority to decide, ask who needs to be genuinely involved before a decision will hold. Instead of announcing plans and managing opposition, build relationships before projects arrive — so communities have reason to engage rather than resist.

Measure success not by approvals granted, but by whether the people most affected believe the process was honest and the outcomes real. This calls for a more disciplined approach to leadership — one grounded in Strategic Doing, where collaborative networks replace command-and-control hierarchies, and complex challenges are addressed through adaptive management.

> *"You won't remember what somebody said, but you always remember how they made you feel. That's what we're dealing with. People aren't actually… it's not about what we're saying; it's about how we're making people feel."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Community Workshop, March 2026*

1.3 Why Adaptive Management

This report is the product of an adaptive management process, not a static consulting plan. Executive Order 25-66 established the Strategic Energy Growth Task Force to develop a State Energy Growth Plan. The Strategic Doing Institute guided a collaborative

process through which Task Force members built shared understanding, formed trusted relationships, and created a framework for ongoing action.

The process ran from December 2025 through April 2026: five facilitated sessions, plus a dedicated community workshop in March. Each session built on the last. The plan reflects the expertise and dialogue of the Task Force members and dozens of community stakeholders. It is a living document — designed to be updated as conditions change and new information comes in from the field.

Strategic Doing: The Underlying Discipline

Strategic Doing is a strategy discipline designed for open, loosely connected networks where no one can tell anyone else what to do. Unlike traditional strategic planning, which assumes a single decision-maker with authority, Strategic Doing works by identifying and linking existing assets in new combinations to create shared value. The discipline is built around ten skills for agile leadership, and it produces strategies that are tested, adapted, and scaled through fast cycles of action and learning. This is the discipline that guided the Task Force's process and that shapes the recommendations in this report.

1.4 The Structure of This Report

This report follows the logic of the process that produced it. It opens with a shared vision of Indiana's energy future, then provides the analytical foundation — a competitiveness analysis grounded in Porter's Diamond framework, enriched by community voices from across the state. A twenty-year outlook extends that analysis forward. A five-year action plan identifies the concrete moves needed now. An ecosystem map and strategic recommendations complete the picture.

Each section builds on the last. A structural diagnosis without a vision produces paralysis. A vision without a plan produces fantasy. A plan without an ecosystem produces isolation. This report is designed to move from diagnosis to action.

Indiana has the people, the institutions, and the economic stakes to get this right. What it needs is shared leadership willing to work differently — to convene rather than direct, to listen before proposing, and to trust that genuine partnership outperforms managed compliance.

Section 2: What Success Looks Like

2.1 The Visioning Process

Before designing a strategy, the Task Force needed a shared picture of success. This is not a prediction of what will happen. It is a declaration of what Indiana intends to build — a destination that organizes action, aligns investment, and provides a standard against which every policy decision and infrastructure project can be measured.

The visioning process moved in two directions: forward through scenario exploration, testing which forces and tensions persist across multiple plausible futures; and backward from a twenty-year horizon, identifying what must be true at each stage for the vision to hold.

2.2 The High-Level Goal: Building an Energy-Focused Economy

Across groups and sessions, Task Force members converged on a shared direction: Indiana's best future starts with building an energy-focused economy. This is not merely an energy plan. Energy is the organizing principle of an economic strategy.

> *"Indiana is THE place to go for big power."*
>
> *— Task Force Member, December 2025 Workshop*

The energy-focused economy rests on five interconnected pillars:

- An advanced energy workforce pipeline, K through university. Energy education starts in elementary school, builds through high school trade pillars, and connects to university programs that prepare graduates for an advanced energy economy. People who grow up understanding the technology are far more likely to embrace it
- A reliable base of dispatchable capacity. A minimum foundation of generation that can be called on when needed, regardless of conditions. This is the backbone everything else builds on.
- All-in on distributed energy resources. Renewables, battery storage, geothermal, and solar deployed in ways that fit each area's specific needs — layered on top of the dispatchable base.

- Integrated state-level planning. A planning framework that bridges utility, regional, and state planning into a single, coherent picture. No more siloed processes that miss the whole system.
- Regional energy and industrial hubs. Areas ready to welcome large-load development. The state designates those areas, supports the design of their energy future, and rewards the communities that host new development.

The five pillars define Indiana's destination. Understanding what it takes to reach that destination requires a clear-eyed analysis of where Indiana stands today. The following section provides that analysis — grounded in Porter's Diamond framework and the collective intelligence of the Task Force.

Section 3: Industrial Competitiveness Analysis

Diamond Framework Applied to Indiana's Energy Sector and Key Competitiveness Tensions

3.1 Why a Competitiveness Framework Matters

The Task Force was convened to develop a long-term energy strategy for Indiana. That strategy must rest on a clear-eyed understanding of where Indiana stands — not in abstract terms, but in relation to the structural forces that determine whether the state's energy sector can deliver reliable, affordable, future-ready energy to its industrial, commercial, and residential users.

Porter's Diamond framework, developed to explain competitive advantage at the national level, provides a powerful lens when applied at the state and sector level. It identifies four mutually reinforcing determinants of competitive advantage, plus the role of government:

- **Factor Conditions:** the inputs and capabilities available to the industry — workforce, infrastructure, capital, technology, natural resources, and institutions.
- **Firm Strategy, Structure & Rivalry:** the context in which firms are created, organized, and compete, including the regulatory structures that shape incentives and behavior.
- **Demand Conditions:** the nature, sophistication, and trajectory of domestic demand for energy products and services.

- **Related & Supporting Industries:** supplier industries, service firms, universities, workforce institutions, and collaborative bodies that strengthen or weaken the core industry.
- **Role of Government:** public policy that can enhance or undermine any of the four determinants.

This analysis draws on the Task Force Competitiveness Workshop held in February 2026, supplemented by IURC data and relevant state and federal energy reports.

3.2 Factor Conditions: Inputs and Capabilities

Natural Resource Base and Geography

Indiana has a diversified and historically abundant natural resource base. Significant coal reserves in the southern counties have long underpinned low-cost electricity generation. Natural gas access through regional pipeline infrastructure provides flexible dispatchable capacity. The state's location — in the heart of the Midwest, with access to major industrial corridors, dual membership in MISO and PJM, and proximity to Great Lakes water resources — is a structural geographic advantage no competing state can replicate.

Workshop participants identified Indiana's geography and coal endowment as competitive anchors. They also noted that federal policy uncertainty and the long-term trajectory toward decarbonization constrain these legacy advantages. Coal dependency is a transition risk to manage deliberately — not a reason to abandon the asset base.

Physical Infrastructure

Indiana's energy infrastructure was built for flat or slowly declining load growth. The workshop identified a critical mismatch: the existing system was not designed for the pace of expansion now required. Indiana's utilities face the prospect of doubling generation capacity within three to five years.

Specific vulnerabilities include: transmission bottlenecks between generation and major industrial load centers; supply chain shortages of transformers, generators, substations, and critical metals; interconnection queue congestion in both MISO and PJM; and gaps in digital grid infrastructure, including grid monitoring, real-time data systems, and advanced metering. IURC and NERC resource adequacy projections suggest Indiana could face generation shortfalls beginning as early as 2030 if investment is not accelerated.

Human Capital and Workforce

Indiana's manufacturing heritage has produced a technically skilled workforce with deep experience in industrial operations, mechanical systems, and field engineering. Purdue University's nuclear engineering program and Ivy Tech Community College provide genuine pipeline assets.

> *"I think that there is a definite need for an advanced energy workforce program that is taking all these stakeholders… building the workforce of the future in Indiana."*
>
> *— Task Force Member, February 2026 Workshop*

A structural gap is widening. Demand for advanced digital operations skills, software-enabled grid management, and specialized nuclear construction and commissioning expertise is growing faster than educational infrastructure can supply. An aging lineworker and field operations workforce will compound the shortage over the next decade.

Technology and R&D Capacity

Indiana's energy R&D capacity is an underappreciated asset. Purdue's nuclear engineering and research ecosystem is a genuine differentiator. The Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campus initiative illustrates the state's ambition to be at the frontier of next-generation nuclear energy. Indiana University's geology department has direct applications in subsurface resource mapping, carbon storage, rare earth recovery, and nuclear siting. Notre Dame's energy research adds further depth.

The gap is not capability — it is translation. The connection between university R&D and commercial energy investment is inconsistent. The research is there; the mechanism to move it toward application is not fully developed.

Institutional and Regulatory Capacity

Indiana's regulatory architecture, centered on the IURC, is a defining factor condition. The vertically integrated utility model has delivered stable, affordable electricity for decades. Workshop participants identified this stability as a genuine competitive advantage.

But the regulatory compact was designed for a different era. It does not easily accommodate new entrant generation models. The pace of regulatory decision-making is

misaligned with market speed. Federal regulatory unpredictability compounds the institutional risk.

Competitive Advantages	Structural Weaknesses
Diversified natural resource base (coal, gas, renewables, nuclear potential)	Infrastructure designed for flat/declining load — inadequate for demand spike
Dual RTO membership (MISO + PJM): geographic flexibility	Equipment supply chain constraints (transformers, substations, metals)
Purdue nuclear R&D: nationally competitive asset	Workforce pipeline gap for future energy roles
Stable state-level regulatory environment	R&D-to-industry translation mechanisms underdeveloped
Strong manufacturing heritage workforce base	Federal regulatory unpredictability
Favorable Midwest geography and industrial corridor access	Regulatory compact not designed for new entrant generation models

3.3 Firm Strategy, Structure & Rivalry

Indiana's energy market is organized around vertically integrated, regulated investor-owned utilities, electric cooperatives, and municipal utilities. This structure has delivered remarkable stability for over a century. The IOUs — AES Indiana, CenterPoint Energy, Duke Energy Indiana, Indiana Michigan Power, and NIPSCO — hold territorial franchises and an obligation to serve.

This structure concentrates investment and planning authority in incumbent utilities, producing stability and predictability at the cost of speed and flexibility. NIPSCO's creation of a separate entity to serve large-load customers is one organizational attempt to bring commercial agility to a structure optimized for universal service.

> *"The costs for a load that might double our system are not going to be absorbed by my customers. But if a data center wants to come and be a load there, and they're going to pay their way and add some value, then we're interested."*

— Cooperative Utility Leader, February 2026 Workshop

The traditional cost-of-service regulatory model creates a fundamental tension: the demand shock requires rapid, large-scale capital deployment, but the model creates institutional pressure to move carefully.

3.4 Demand Conditions

The defining demand-side event is the explosive growth of digital infrastructure — hyperscale data centers and the AI computation that drives them. Multiple Indiana utilities are projecting load doublings within three to five years. This rate of demand growth is without precedent in the modern history of Indiana's electricity system.

The Boone Power / Wabash Valley Power Alliance / Meta case illustrates the scale: a single customer commitment would double the load on a cooperative utility. Traditional demand forecasting now spans a range of approximately 700 megawatts to 3 gigawatts in annual additions — not a narrow forecasting band, but a fundamental uncertainty about Indiana's economic trajectory.

A recurring concern throughout the workshop was the impact on existing ratepayers. The principle that new large loads must pay their own way — plus a contribution to system costs — was endorsed broadly. Energy affordability has become a kitchen table issue, and the political risk of rate increases limits the risk appetite of both regulators and elected officials.

3.5 Related and Supporting Industries: The Energy Ecosystem

Indiana's research university ecosystem is one of its most important and underutilized supporting assets. Purdue's nuclear engineering program, State Utility Forecasting Group, and ongoing energy firm collaborations are the core. Indiana University's geology department and Notre Dame's energy research add depth.

> *"The universities are a very integral part of our ecosystem on energy. Purdue, of course, has nuclear, they have the State Utility Forecasting Group that provides our demand forecasting."*

— Task Force Member, February 2026 Workshop

Indiana's sector has well-established trade associations representing investor-owned utilities, rural electric cooperatives, and municipal utilities. These associations are effective and frequently collaborative. They are not yet functioning as joint innovation platforms — driving shared R&D, coordinated workforce development, or integrated infrastructure planning across the sector.

3.6 Synthesis: Indiana's Overall Competitive Position

Indiana's competitive position is best understood as conditionally strong. The state has the foundational assets to compete. The structural and institutional conditions needed to deploy those assets at required speed and scale are not yet in place.

Indiana's competitive advantage is not in building a new energy system from scratch. It lies in deploying and combining what it already has — geographic position, nuclear capability, regulatory stability, industrial demand, and university research — faster, more coherently, and more visibly than competing states can match. The strategic priority is recombination and coordination of existing assets, not creation of new ones.

3.7 Six Fundamental Competitiveness Tensions

The Diamond analysis identifies where Indiana stands. Strategy requires something more: identifying the specific structural conflicts that must be resolved. These are not problems with simple solutions. They are genuine contradictions embedded in the design of Indiana's energy system.

Tension 1: Speed vs. Stability

The regulatory compact cannot simultaneously reward caution — protecting ratepayers from stranded assets — and reward speed — competing for time-sensitive investment opportunities. Resolution requires an explicit, bifurcated regulatory strategy that maintains traditional protections for the existing customer base while creating an expedited pathway for qualifying large new load interconnections. Indiana's opposition history makes the urgency plain: community resistance began with wind, moved to solar, then battery storage, then data centers — each cycle following the same sequence of silence, surprise, and organized opposition. Nuclear is next in line. Breaking that cycle requires getting ahead of it, not responding to it.

Tension 2: Growth vs. Affordability

The infrastructure investment required to serve new large loads will increase system costs. Resolution requires a clearly articulated, publicly communicated cost-allocation framework that establishes who bears growth-driven infrastructure costs, and over what time horizon.

Tension 3: State vs. Local

Indiana's tradition of local land-use control is creating systematic veto points that block energy infrastructure of state-level strategic significance. Resolution requires both a state-level appeal mechanism and a sustained community engagement program that builds the trust needed for informed siting decisions. The state has attempted legislative solutions to this gap multiple times and failed each time. Every stalled project sends the same signal to investors: Indiana markets itself as open for business but cannot reliably deliver.

Tension 4: Long-Term Investment vs. Short-Term Risk

Energy infrastructure requires 30- to 40-year investment horizons, while demand signals are uncertain over a 6- to 9-month window. Resolution requires structured demand commitment frameworks and accelerated planning processes. A compounding factor: federal energy policy has oscillated between divergent positions for twenty years, making investments with thirty- to forty-year lives sound in one administration and uncertain in the next. Indiana cannot fix Washington. What it can do is build enough regulatory predictability at the state level to insulate long-term investors from federal cycles. An all-of-the-above portfolio is not a compromise — in this environment, it is the only rational strategy.

Tension 5: Speculation vs. Commitment

The demand spike has attracted speculative actors who consume planning capacity without delivering real load. Resolution requires a standardized large-load intake process that screens for financial commitment and realistic load profiles.

Tension 6: Institutional Inertia vs. Ecosystem Innovation

Indiana has the components of a strong energy ecosystem but lacks the coordination architecture to make those components work together. Resolution requires a dedicated energy ecosystem coordination function.

The through-line connecting all six tensions is this: Indiana's core competitive strength — institutional stability and regulatory predictability — has a structural downside. It makes the system slow to adapt. Indiana must learn to be both stable and fast. That is not a contradiction to manage around; it is the central design challenge of the next five years.

Summary

The competitiveness analysis identifies Indiana's structural assets and tensions at a macro level. But strategy without grounding in lived experience risks missing the realities that determine whether plans become reality. The following section brings the voices of communities, local officials, ratepayer advocates, and energy practitioners directly into the analysis.

3.8 From Tensions to Action: The Four Opportunity Questions

The six competitiveness tensions are not merely problems to manage. They are the basis for the questions that structured the Task Force's visioning work and the community workshop that followed. Each tension points toward a specific area where Indiana can perform better.

The Task Force organized its visioning sessions around four opportunity-framed questions, each drawn directly from the tensions identified above:

Opportunity Question	Tensions It Addresses	What It Asks
1. Legitimacy, Trust & Local Alignment	T1 (Speed vs. Stability), T3 (State vs. Local)	What if Indiana became the national model where communities actively support energy infrastructure because they understand it, trust it, and benefit from it?
2. Proactive Infrastructure vs. Regulatory Certainty	T2 (Growth vs. Affordability), T4 (Long-Term Investment vs. Short-Term Risk)	What if Indiana could lead the country in building energy capacity proactively while maintaining its reputation for regulatory certainty and ratepayer protection?

3. Fragmented System vs. Whole-System Coordination	T6 (Institutional Inertia vs. Ecosystem Innovation)	What if Indiana could operate with a fully integrated view of its energy future, where all actors shaping supply and demand co-design the system together?
4. Business Speed vs. Infrastructure Reality	T1, T4, T5 (Speed, Long-Term Investment, Speculation)	What if Indiana could match the speed of industrial investment with equally responsive energy infrastructure delivery?

These questions did not replace the tensions. They reframed each tension as a direction for action — and carried that direction into both the Task Force's visioning sessions and the community workshop that followed.

The competitiveness analysis identifies Indiana's structural assets and tensions at a macro level. But strategy without grounding in lived experience risks missing what actually determines whether plans become reality. The following section brings the voices of communities, local officials, ratepayer advocates, and energy practitioners directly into the analysis.

Section 4: Community Voices

Ground Truth from Indiana's Energy Frontlines

4.1 The Community Workshop

On March 23, 2026, a community workshop brought together county commissioners, AARP advocates, renewable energy developers, planning professionals, consumer advocates, and representatives from agricultural, manufacturing, and environmental organizations. The goal was to surface the practical realities of Indiana's energy transition from the people closest to it.

The workshop was organized around four roundtable conversations — each grounded in the same opportunity questions that had structured the Task Force's analysis, and each addressing a tension the competitive analysis had identified:

4.2 Major Findings

Finding 1: Indiana Is Operating in a Zero-Trust Environment

> *"We're operating in a zero-trust environment."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Siting and Decision Authority Table*

Communities do not trust the state, developers, or often their own local governments. This distrust is not irrational — it is a learned response to a system that has kept communities in the dark, promised benefits that did not materialize, and stripped local officials of the authority they need to act on their constituents' behalf. Trust is a structural problem, not a communications problem. Fix the structure and the communication follows.

Finding 2: The Information Vacuum Is Being Filled by Misinformation

> *"People are responding to a void of no information, of being strong-armed into accepting a project they don't understand."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Community Trust Table*

Communities are making consequential decisions about energy development with almost no reliable, accessible, locally credible information. That vacuum fills with social media, opposition messaging, and rumors. The solution is not a state-produced information

campaign. The trusted messenger is the neighbor, the county commissioner, the person you see at the grocery store.

Finding 3: Local Control Is Both Essential and Inadequate

The current system — 92 counties, 92 sets of rules, no shared baseline — is failing both communities and developers. County commissioners are expected to evaluate complex energy proposals without technical expertise. The moratorium epidemic is the clearest symptom: counties pass moratoriums not because they have weighed the evidence, but because they do not know what else to do. Workshop participants noted that opposition is not holding steady — it is accelerating. The same organized resistance that began with wind moved to solar, then to battery storage, then to data centers. Nuclear will be next, and it will arrive in communities that have had no preparation and no reason to say yes.

Finding 4: Indiana Has No Statewide Energy Plan

> *"What the state's missing is an objective of how much renewable we want, how much nuclear, how much traditional coal, fossil fuels."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Planning Table*

Without stated goals, development is random. Counties that happen to say yes get development. Counties that say no get moratoriums. Nobody asks whether the overall pattern serves the state. This absence fuels the moratorium spiral and signals to developers that Indiana is not a place where projects reach completion.

Finding 5: Ratepayers Are Exposed — and They Know It

> *"Customers, especially residential, should be at the front of mind and protections should be put in place to ensure they are not impacted by new, large load customers." By*
>
> *— Ratepayer Advocate, Ratepayer Protection Table*

Indiana ratepayers have no reliable mechanism to learn whether a large new load customer will raise their electric bill, no enforceable protections if it does, and no clear channel to raise the concern. Infrastructure costs built to serve data centers and large industrial users can be socialized across all customers — including costs on projects that are never completed — and ratepayers recognize the arrangement, distrust it, and are increasingly vocal about it.

Finding 6: Communities Need a Reason to Say Yes

> *"It's not just a promise. There has to be something on the back end that proves that everything that we said was going to happen is happening."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Community Trust Table*

Community benefit accountability — a public reporting system where anyone can verify whether promised benefits materialized — emerged as one of the most concrete and broadly supported ideas from the workshop. Not a promotional website. A transparent ledger: tax revenue delivered, jobs created, water usage measured against projections.

Finding 7: The Secret-Dealing Problem Is Actively Destroying Trust

Nondisclosure agreements between developers and local officials surfaced at multiple tables as one of the most corrosive elements of the current system. A developer who arrives in a community already angry about secrecy faces longer timelines, higher costs, and greater political risk than one who arrives in a community that knew it was coming.

4.3 What the Community Told Us

The people in that room agreed on more than anyone expected. They agreed that the current system is failing everyone it is supposed to serve. They agreed that trust is a structural problem. They agreed that communities need a genuine reason to say yes — not just the threat of being overridden if they say no. And they agreed that the gap between Indiana's energy ambitions and local willingness is not closing. It is widening.

> *"This would be a great system, but current winners in the status quo are entrenched."*
>
> *— Workshop Participant, Planning Table*

The community workshop made the stakes concrete: Indiana's energy future will be built — or blocked — at the intersection of state ambition and local willingness. The question is not whether the transformation is coming, but whether Indiana will shape it or be shaped by it. The following section looks ahead twenty years to map what success requires.

Section 5: Twenty-Year Outlook

Indiana's Energy Future: 2026–2046

The competitiveness analysis identifies where Indiana stands today. The community workshop makes the stakes concrete. This section asks a harder question: where does Indiana need to be in twenty years, and what will it take to get there?

The Task Force used four scenario exercises to stress-test assumptions and identify what must hold across multiple plausible futures. Those insights are drawn together into a long-range vision. The section closes with a set of guideposts — the specific conditions that must be met at each stage for the vision to remain credible.

5.1 Futures Thinking: Four Scenarios

Indiana's energy future will not arrive as a single clean trajectory. Federal policy will shift. Technologies will surprise. Demand will arrive faster than projected. Community responses will not follow any model. The Task Force explored four plausible futures — not as choices to make, but as tools to surface assumptions, expose tensions, and design Indiana's best possible path forward.

Scenario 1: Managed Continuity

The closest approximation to the current path. Discussion quickly surfaced a problem: continuity may not be possible. If demand growth continues, the existing system cannot simply hold its present trajectory. A catastrophic reliability event may be what generates public urgency — and that is not a strategy.

Scenario 2: Nuclear-Enabled Export State

A coal-to-nuclear pivot reorients Indiana toward data centers, universities, and an emerging nuclear industrial ecosystem. The central opportunity: becoming a hub for nuclear investment. The central risk: the valley of death between coal retirements and nuclear deployment, during which natural gas must serve as the bridge fuel.

Scenario 3: High-Renewables Industrial Growth

Judged less realistic for Indiana's conditions, but it contributed a critical insight: the need to integrate utility forecasting, renewable resource plans, and economic development strategies into a single state-level planning framework.

Scenario 4: Fragmented Transition

Policy whiplash and missed opportunities produce systemic dysfunction. This is the outcome to prevent.

5.2 Key Insights from Scenario Exploration

The four scenarios do not point toward a single preferred future. They point toward conditions that must hold across all of them.

- **Stability and flexibility must coexis**t. Managed continuity without flexibility fails. Rapid transformation without stability erodes trust.
- **Energy export is a byproduct, not a goal.** When export capacity drives investment decisions, it pulls resources away from in-state needs.
- **The speed mismatch is real and unresolved.** Twenty- to forty-year capital investments are being planned against six- to nine-month demand forecasts.
- **Certain actors matter in every future.** Ratepayers, utility regulators, large-load users, and communities show up in every scenario.
- **Public energy literacy determines success or failure.** It is the capability essential to every scenario.

5.3 Vision of Success: Indiana in 2046

Drawing on the scenario work and backcasting from a twenty-year horizon, the Task Force developed a concrete picture of what Indiana looks like when the transition succeeds. This is not a prediction. It is a design target — a destination that makes the path visible and gives every near-term decision a twenty-year standard to meet.

The 2046 Vision in Brief

Indiana has a diversified, layered grid with deliberate reserve capacity. The regulated market has been preserved but expanded to accommodate new actors. A permanent state energy body coordinates planning across utilities, regulators, and large-load users. Communities support energy infrastructure because they are informed and benefit directly. Private capital funds new development while ratepayers fund the grid they use. A K–16 workforce pipeline produces the workers the system needs. Regional energy campuses connect large consumers with co-located generation in communities that welcomed development.

Physical Infrastructure and Technology

Indiana in 2046 has slightly more energy than it needs, and that margin is deliberate. The generation portfolio is diversified: proven nuclear technologies for baseload; coal plants converted or sold; combined-cycle natural gas in the mix; renewables, battery storage, and distributed generation in their niches. Each source does what it does well. No single source is asked to do everything.

The grid is layered: large-scale baseload anchors the system; regional transmission moves power across distances; distributed resources serve localized demand; microgrids provide resilience where it matters most. Energy campuses co-locate large consumers with generation, reducing transmission costs and creating self-contained economic hubs in rural communities.

Policy and Regulatory Framework

The regulated market has been preserved — no serious analysis supports deregulation for Indiana. What has changed is the space within that framework for new actors and new arrangements. The regulatory framework is consistent, dependable, and adaptable. Permits are fast and high quality. Investment policies are technology-neutral and fuel-neutral. The state has resolved the tension between local autonomy and statewide energy needs.

Institutional Capacity and Coordination

A permanent state-level body focused on energy policy operates as an enduring institution within state government — not a crisis-response mechanism, but a continuous function. It brings utilities, regulators, large-load customers, legislators, and executive branch agencies together to work on energy questions routinely. A project sherpa team guides every major energy project through the permitting process.

Research and Innovation

Indiana is a national leader in nuclear research and manufacturing. At least one national laboratory, focused on the intersection of energy and agriculture, operates in the state. The gap between discovery and deployment has been bridged. Universities and utilities operate under incentive structures that move knowledge toward application.

Community Engagement and Public Support

In 2046, communities want to be engaged because they are informed. Energy infrastructure is an accepted part of community life. Community benefit packages direct a share of development value into schools, parks, and local infrastructure. Property taxes flow to host communities at fair rates. Transparency protocols provide real information before projects are announced.

Financing and Capital Mechanisms

Capital flows to Indiana because the regulatory environment makes investment predictable and the permitting process makes timelines reliable. Ratepayers fund the grid they use. Private capital funds new generation and large-load service.

Workforce and Expertise

A K–16 pipeline leads the nation. The program starts in middle school, runs through high school trade pathways and community college certification programs, and connects to university engineering degrees. Trades are not stigmatized. Companies partner with schools before students graduate.

5.4 Guideposts: What Must Be True

Time Horizon	Key Guideposts
Short-Term (2026–2029)	Establish political will and launch statewide communication plan. Define community benefit frameworks. Initiate state energy plan and baseline the energy ecosystem. Set regulatory foundations including feasibility study mandates. Fund IURC and Office of Energy Development. Establish project sherpa function. Begin joint ownership discussions and seed research programs.
Medium-Term (2029–2036)	SMR technology consolidates around proven designs. Joint ownership produces operational assets. Energy campuses move from concept to construction. Coal-to-nuclear conversion timelines activate. Cultural shift around trades takes root. Capital deploys at scale. Community engagement shows measurable results.
Long-Term (2036–2046)	Nuclear generation comes online. Grid supports connect-and-manage operations. Self-generation policy supports manufacturing growth. National laboratory operates or is underway. Transmission buildout is complete. System absorbs new large loads without disruption. Regulatory environment remains predictable.

Short-term guideposts are about foundation-building: the planning body, the communication plan, the regulatory frameworks, and the community benefit structures that everything else depends on. None of the medium- or long-term outcomes hold if these are not in place by 2029.

Medium-term guideposts are about demonstrated results — not aspirational outcomes, but documented evidence that the new approach is working. Energy campuses in construction. Joint ownership agreements producing operational assets. Community engagement with measurable results on the ground.

Long-term guideposts are about scale. Nuclear generation online. Transmission buildout complete. A regulatory environment that has remained predictable through the full arc of the transition. At this stage, the 2046 vision is no longer a design target — it is a description of what exists.

Section 6: Five-Year Strategic Focus Areas

2026–2031: The Foundation Years

The twenty-year outlook establishes the arc. But the arc must begin somewhere. The following section translates the long-range vision into a five-year action plan — the concrete moves that must be made now to keep the long-term trajectory credible.

6.1 The Logic of the Five-Year Horizon

The twenty-year vision describes a destination. The five-year plan describes the foundation that must be laid for that destination to remain reachable. These are the years when political will must be established, institutional capacity must be built, community trust must begin to be restored, and the first tangible projects must demonstrate that a different approach is possible.

The five-year plan is organized around six strategic focus areas. In this harmonized version, those focus areas are explicitly designed to build toward a common outcome: the incubation and early operation of two to three Regional Energy Innovation Hubs — campuses that serve simultaneously as infrastructure investments, innovation platforms, workforce development engines, and community trust-building mechanisms.

This is the plan's unifying logic: each focus area creates conditions that the hubs require. Institutional architecture gives the hubs a governing home. Regulatory evolution makes co-location financing viable. Community trust infrastructure makes willing host communities findable. Siting reform gives campuses legal certainty. Workforce development connects campuses to the local labor pipeline. Research and innovation links campuses to the university ecosystem. The hubs do not succeed in the absence of any one focus area. And none of the focus areas fully realizes its potential without the hubs as a landing zone.

The Regional Hub as Integration Point

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs do not replace any of the six focus areas. They integrate them. Every focus area's action is more powerful when designed with an actual campus in mind — a specific place, a specific community, a specific set of co-located assets that converts policy into visible, verifiable reality.

6.2 Focus Area 1: Institutional Architecture

The institutional actions in this focus area create the governance infrastructure that Regional Energy Innovation Hubs require to function. Without a permanent planning body, hubs lack a coordinating home. Without a project sherpa function, they lack a navigation system. Without adequate IURC and OED capacity, they cannot be regulated. Without a state energy plan, they cannot be sited against a coherent statewide framework.

- **Establish a permanent state energy planning body** distinct from the IURC's rate-case function, with its own energy modeling capacity and adequate staffing. Assign this body explicit responsibility for coordinating the Regional Energy Innovation Hub program. (Year 1)
- **Create a project sherpa function** — a small team of state navigators that guides hub development through permitting, utility interconnection, and regulatory processes. The sherpa function is the hub's single point of contact with state government. (Year 1)
- **Fund the IURC and Office of Energy Development** at levels commensurate with the complexity of co-location financing, SMR siting, large-load interconnection, and community benefit framework oversight. (Year 1–2)
- **Initiate the state energy plan** with explicit targets for the energy mix. Use the hub program as the implementation vehicle: each hub's asset configuration contributes to the state's generation mix targets in a tracked, verifiable way. (Year 1–2)
- **Designate a Hub Development Authority** — the entity responsible for identifying willing communities, coordinating technical assistance, and managing the learning cycles that allow the hub model to scale. (Year 1)

6.3 Focus Area 2: Regulatory Evolution

The regulatory actions in this focus area create the legal and financial structures that make hub economics viable. Co-location of generation and large loads requires bifurcated regulatory pillars. The cost-causation principle protects ratepayers from subsidizing hub development. Feasibility studies prevent premature retirement of assets that could anchor campus sites. Large-load intake standards create the pipeline of anchor tenants that hubs require.

- **Design a bifurcated regulatory pathway** that maintains traditional ratepayer protections while creating an expedited process for qualifying large new load interconnections at designated hub sites. (Year 1–2)
- **Codify the cost-causation principle:** large loads at hub sites pay their own incremental generation costs plus a contribution to system costs, consistent with House Bill 1007's intent that large-load users fund at least 80% of dedicated capacity. (Year 1)
- **Require feasibility studies before plant retirements,** with explicit evaluation of each retiring coal plant's suitability as a hub anchor site. The eight sites already identified by OED as SMR candidates provide the starting inventory. (Year 1–2)
- **Develop a standardized large-load intake process** coordinated among Indiana's utilities and the IURC, with hub site designation as an explicit eligibility criterion. (Year 2)

6.4 Focus Area 3: Community Trust and Engagement

Trust is not a precondition for hub development — it is something hubs must be designed to build. This Pathway's actions create the civic infrastructure that makes willing host communities findable and that equips local officials to make informed decisions about hub participation.

- **Build a statewide network of trusted local messengers** equipped with accurate technical information and supported by Purdue Extension. Frame the Energy Ready Community program explicitly as the on-ramp to hub participation: communities that complete the program become eligible for hub designation. (Year 1–2)

- **Fund the Energy Ready Community program** as the pipeline into the hub ecosystem, not as a standalone initiative. (Year 1)
- **Define community benefit frameworks** with structural requirements, accountability mechanisms, and renegotiation provisions as standard infrastructure for every hub, not optional design elements. (Year 1–2)
- **Create a public project information dashboard** that tracks hub development progress, community benefit delivery, and generation capacity milestones in real time. (Year 2)
- **Launch a community benefits accountability ledger** for each hub, where any resident can verify whether promised benefits — jobs, tax revenue, infrastructure investment, energy price commitments — materialized as promised. (Year 2–3)

6.5 Focus Area 4: Siting Reform

Indiana's home-rule tradition is simultaneously one of its greatest civic strengths and its most significant infrastructure constraint. Hubs cannot be built through top-down override of local authority. But neither can they be left to 92 separate county ordinance regimes that vary unpredictably and can be retroactively changed. Siting reform creates the conditions under which willing communities can say yes with confidence and under which that yes carries legal permanence.

- **Adopt statewide baseline siting standards** applicable to all hub components — generation facilities, transmission corridors, large-load structures, and associated water infrastructure — across all 92 counties. (Year 1–2)
- **Establish a state-level appeal mechanism** for hub siting decisions that meet defined criteria of state strategic importance, providing hub investors with regulatory certainty without overriding the local process. (Year 2)
- **Create a geographic suitability map** overlaying agricultural land quality, grid infrastructure capacity, water access, and existing industrial brownfields. This map becomes the site-selection tool for the hub identification process. (Year 1)
- **Protect approved hub projects from retroactive ordinance changes,** with explicit carve-outs for sites that have completed the community benefit negotiation process and received formal hub designation. (Year 1)

6.6 Focus Area 5: Workforce Development

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are workforce development infrastructure as much as they are energy infrastructure. Every campus connects to the K-16 pipeline through specific training programs tailored to the technologies deployed at that site. The workforce development actions in this Pathway are designed with hub co-location in mind: programs are not generic statewide initiatives but place-based partnerships between each campus and the educational institutions in its region.

- **Launch K-16 energy workforce pipeline programs** in partnership with Purdue, Ivy Tech, and industry partners at each hub site, with curricula designed around the specific technologies — SMR operations, grid management, battery storage, advanced manufacturing — deployed at that campus. (Year 1–3)
- **Establish teacher internship programs** at hub sites, giving educators firsthand knowledge of the specific energy careers available in their region. (Year 2–3)
- **Design middle school experiential career exploration programs** anchored at hub facilities — field visits, shadow days, and hands-on demonstrations that build regional energy identity from an early age. (Year 2–4)

6.7 Focus Area 6: Research and Innovation

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are Indiana's answer to the university-industry translation gap. Academic research in nuclear technology, smart grid, battery storage, and energy-agriculture convergence has value only if it can be piloted, tested, and scaled in real-world conditions. Hubs are those conditions. They serve as landing zones for university innovations — places where Purdue, Indiana University, Notre Dame, and Ivy Tech can move from laboratory to deployment without leaving the state.

- **Seed multi-university research collaboration** on nuclear technology, smart grid, and energy-agriculture convergence, with each research thread tied to a specific hub site where pilot deployment is planned. (Year 1–3)
- **Begin joint ownership discussions** for nuclear assets across multiple utilities, using hub sites as the specific investment platforms around which co-ownership structures are designed. (Year 2–3)

- **Pursue national laboratory designation** at the intersection of energy and agriculture, siting the laboratory function within or adjacent to a hub campus to maximize research-deployment integration. (Year 2–5)
- **Establish a 30-day innovation cycle discipline** at each hub: rapid testing of new technologies, transparent result reporting, and structured learning loops that allow innovations from one campus to propagate across the network. (Year 1–ongoing)
- **Create a hub-to-hub learning network** connecting the campuses to each other and to analogous energy campus initiatives nationally — including Homer City in Pennsylvania, the Western New York ZNE District, and DOE's Advanced Energy Communities program. (Year 2–3)

The five-year action plan identifies what must be done. But actions do not happen in isolation — they happen within an ecosystem of actors, institutions, and relationships. The following section maps that ecosystem and identifies where the critical linkages must be strengthened.

Section 7: Indiana's Energy Ecosystem

7.1 The Ecosystem Concept

Indiana's energy sector does not operate in isolation. It functions within an ecosystem of interconnected actors, institutions, and relationships that either enable or constrain the state's capacity to respond to the challenges identified in this report. The ecosystem includes utilities, regulators, universities, trade associations, workforce institutions, financial institutions, community organizations, and state and local government agencies.

The competitiveness analysis revealed that Indiana's energy ecosystem is not failing because its individual components are weak. It is underperforming because the institutions and mechanisms that would coordinate those components are insufficient for the current moment. The strategic priority is therefore not to create new components, but to build the coordination architecture that connects existing assets in new and more productive combinations.

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs serve as the primary coordination architecture. They are not ecosystem actors — they are ecosystem structures: bounded places where the actors, assets, and relationships that currently exist in isolation are brought into productive

contact. Each hub is a microcosm of the ecosystem Indiana needs to build at the state level. What works in a hub can be replicated across the state. What fails in a hub is a learning signal, not a system failure.

7.2 Key Ecosystem Actors

Actor Category	Key Players	Role in the Ecosystem	Hub-Specific Function
Investor-Owned Utilities	AES Indiana, CenterPoint Energy, Duke Energy Indiana, Indiana Michigan Power, NIPSCO	Primary generation, transmission, and distribution; investment decision-making; regulatory compliance	Hub anchor investor; co-location agreement partner; generation asset owner
Cooperatives & Municipals	Wabash Valley Power Alliance, Hoosier Energy, IMPA	Rural and suburban service; cooperative generation; community-scale innovation	Community-scale hub partners; bridge to rural willing-host communities
Regulatory Bodies	IURC, Office of Energy Development	Rate-setting; resource planning oversight; policy implementation	Bifurcated pathway regulator; hub designation authority; cost-causation enforcer
Research Universities	Purdue, Indiana University, Notre Dame, Ivy Tech	Nuclear R&D; workforce pipeline; demand forecasting; geological research	Research landing zone; workforce pipeline feeder; SMR site assessor
Trade Associations	Indiana Energy Association, Indiana Statewide Assn. of RECs	Industry representation; cross-sector collaboration; policy advocacy	Cross-hub convener; innovation network facilitator; national narrative builder

Actor Category	Key Players	Role in the Ecosystem	Hub-Specific Function
Community Organizations	County commissioners, Farm Bureau, Purdue Extension	Local decision-making; trusted messenger networks; community engagement	Hub host-community partner; community benefit framework co-designer
Large-Load Customers	Data centers, manufacturers, defense-adjacent industries	Demand signals; co-investment; workforce partnerships	Hub anchor tenant; dedicated generation customer; co-investment partner under HB 1007 cost structure
Regional Transmission	MISO, PJM	Transmission planning; interconnection; regional coordination	Grid integration for hub generation assets; interconnection queue coordinator
Hub Development Authority	State-designated entity (new)	—	Hub program coordinator; community identification; technical assistance deployer; learning cycle manager

7.3 Ecosystem Gaps

The Task Force's analysis identified four critical ecosystem gaps that must be addressed:

- **University-Industry Translation:** While major research universities exist in Indiana, there is little obvious coordination on energy issues across the university system. World-class research capabilities are not well connected with the industry.
- **Public-Private Partnership Infrastructure:** More public-private partnership infrastructure is needed at greater speed. Trade associations function primarily as advocacy bodies rather than innovation platforms.

- **Community-Level Capacity:** County commissioners lack technical expertise, independent information, and financial resources to evaluate energy proposals and negotiate fair terms.
- **Narrative and External Communication:** Indiana lacks a coherent external communication of its energy ecosystem offer. The state's competitive assets are genuine but invisible to the market.

Ecosystem Gap	Diagnosis	Hub Model Response
University-Industry Translation	Research capabilities not connected to industry deployment	Each hub has a formal university partnership; research innovations are piloted at the campus site before statewide scaling
Public-Private Partnership Infrastructure	Trade associations function as advocacy, not innovation platforms	Hub governance structure is a public-private partnership by design; the Hub Development Authority convenes across sectors
Community-Level Capacity	County officials lack expertise, independent information, and negotiating resources	Energy Ready Community program is the hub on-ramp; community benefit frameworks are standard hub infrastructure, not negotiations from scratch
Narrative and External Communication	Indiana's competitive assets are genuine but invisible to the market	Each hub is a visible, verifiable proof point; the hub network is Indiana's external energy narrative, not a marketing campaign

7.4 The LEAP Innovation District and the Hub Model

The LEAP Innovation District in Lebanon, Indiana offers the closest existing Indiana analogue to what Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are designed to become. LEAP is a 9,000-acre advanced manufacturing and life sciences campus with dedicated infrastructure, utility partnerships, and a deliberate economic development thesis. Its model — concentrated assets, co-location of complementary users, purpose-built

infrastructure, and state-level coordination — is the structural template the hub program adapts for the energy transition.

The differences are instructive. LEAP is a greenfield development driven by state-selected industries. Regional Energy Innovation Hubs begin with existing assets — retired coal plants, established transmission nodes, existing water infrastructure — in communities that have already expressed willingness to host. They add innovation and workforce functions to an industrial base rather than creating it from scratch. This makes them politically more achievable, financially more efficient (OED estimates co-location on coal sites cuts SMR costs by 7–26% vs. greenfield), and community-benefit-oriented by design.

The LEAP model answers the question of what Indiana can build at scale when it chooses to. The hub model answers the question of how to build it in the communities that actually want it.

Section 8: Strategic Action Plan for Regional Hubs

Where We Are. Where We Want to Go. How We Get There.

8.1 Where We Are

Indiana enters 2026 at a critical strategic juncture. The state possesses genuine competitive assets — geographic positioning, nuclear R&D capability, regulatory stability, a sophisticated industrial demand base, and world-class university research. These assets, properly deployed, constitute a defensible foundation for long-term energy competitiveness.

But Indiana's energy ecosystem faces structural challenges that are compressing its capacity to respond. An unprecedented demand spike driven by digital infrastructure and artificial intelligence is straining a system designed for flat or declining load growth. The regulatory and institutional architecture inhibits the speed and flexibility the moment requires. A fracture between state-level economic ambition and community-level trust is producing a siting environment that systematically blocks energy infrastructure. And the coordination architecture that would connect Indiana's assets into a coherent competitive offer does not yet exist.

The Central Diagnosis

Indiana is in a genuine competition for the defining energy investments of the next decade. The digital infrastructure build-out is happening now. The states that establish infrastructure readiness, regulatory agility, and community receptivity in the next two to three years will capture disproportionate shares of that investment for a generation.

8.2 Where We Want to Go

Indiana's destination is an energy-focused economy where energy is the organizing principle for economic strategy, workforce development, community investment, and institutional design. By 2046, Indiana has a diversified, layered grid with deliberate reserve capacity. Communities actively support energy infrastructure because they understand it, trust it, and benefit from it. A permanent state energy body coordinates planning across all actors. Private capital funds development while ratepayers are protected. Regional energy campuses connect generation, consumption, and community benefit in places that chose to welcome growth.

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are the physical manifestation of that destination. They are the places where the 2046 vision becomes visible before 2046. Every hub that opens is a proof of concept. Every campus that delivers on its community benefit framework is a trust-building event. Every university research project that moves from laboratory to campus deployment is a demonstration that Indiana's innovation capacity is real.

8.3 How We Get There: The Strategic Architecture

The path from here to there runs through three phases. In this harmonized framework, Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are present in all three phases, not introduced as a Phase 2 or Phase 3 concept. The hub program begins in Phase 1 because community identification, asset mapping, and design work require the full span of the Foundation years to produce campuses that are ready for construction investment in Phase 2.

Phase 1: Foundation (2026–2028)

Establish the institutional architecture, set the regulatory foundations, launch the trust-building infrastructure, and begin the hub incubation process. This is the phase where the

credibility of the entire effort is established through actions that are specific, visible, and accountable.

- Create the permanent state energy planning body with explicit Hub Development Authority responsibility
- Adopt statewide baseline siting standards and launch the geographic suitability mapping process
- Codify cost-causation and ratepayer protection framework for hub co-location economics
- Launch the trusted messenger network and fund the Energy Ready Community program as the hub on-ramp
- Initiate the state energy plan with explicit generation mix targets tied to hub site configurations
- Identify and convene two to three pathfinder hub communities through an open, voluntary process
- Complete asset mapping and hub design for each pathfinder community
- Launch first workforce pipeline partnerships at identified hub sites

Phase 2: Acceleration (2028–2031)

Deploy the institutional capacity built in Phase 1. Move hub campuses from concept to construction. Demonstrate tangible results in communities. Expand the hub program based on Phase 1 learning.

- First pathfinder hub campuses move from design to construction
- Joint ownership structures for nuclear assets finalized at hub sites, using coal-plant SMR candidates as the investment platform
- Workforce pipeline programs produce first graduates with place-based hub credentials
- Community benefit accountability mechanisms publish first verified results
- University-industry R&D translation produces first commercially piloted innovations at hub campuses
- Hub network expanded to five to seven campuses based on Phase 1 demand and learning

Phase 3: Scaling (2031–2036)

Expand what works. Adapt what does not. Maintain the adaptive management discipline. The hub network becomes Indiana's primary innovation infrastructure.

- Regional energy hub network replicates across the state, with each hub contributing to Indiana's generation mix targets
- SMR technology consolidates and nuclear construction begins at hub sites with completed permitting and community benefit frameworks
- Hub community engagement shows measurable, independently verified results in trust, local economic benefit, and energy literacy
- Indiana's hub network is recognized nationally as a competitive differentiator and a model for other Midwest manufacturing states
- Cross-state learning network initiated with Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, positioned around the hub model as exportable framework

The strategic action plan provides the architecture. The following section translates that architecture into specific recommendations for the next phase of work — including the design of regional hubs and clusters that could serve as incubation platforms for the broader ecosystem strategy.

Section 9: Recommendations and Next Steps

Regional Hubs, Ecosystem Incubation, and the Path Forward

9.1 The Emerging Opportunity: Regional Energy Hubs

Throughout the Task Force process, a concept emerged with increasing clarity and broad support: the idea of regional energy and industrial hubs — specific places around Indiana that want to grow in the energy direction, with communities ready to welcome large-load entities and major energy development. This concept represents the convergence of the Task Force's analysis, the community workshop's findings, and the twenty-year vision's institutional architecture.

Regional Energy Innovation Hubs are no longer an emerging concept in this harmonized framework — they are the confirmed conclusion of four sections of analysis. Section 6 showed that every focus area of the five-year plan creates conditions that hubs require. Section 7 showed that every ecosystem actor has a distinct function within the hub

structure. Section 8 showed that hubs appear in all three strategic phases, not as a late addition but as the implementation mechanism that makes each phase tangible.

The concept has deep roots in Indiana's own policy landscape. Secretary Jaworowski's framing of Indiana's "Hoover Dam / Manhattan Project moment" is an implicit articulation of what the hub model makes explicit: concentrated, place-based, multi-asset energy infrastructure that combines firm generation with large-load users under a financing structure where those users fund the incremental capacity. OED's identification of eight retired coal plant sites as SMR candidates provides the site inventory. House Bill 1007's cost-causation framework provides the financing logic. The Energy Ready Community program provides the community engagement pipeline. The hub model assembles these existing strands into a coherent operational structure.

> *"Find places around the state that want to grow in a certain way. Want to have these large-load entities there and want to have large energy hubs developed. So finding those places and being able to designate and reward the communities that host those energy industrial complexes."*
>
> *— Task Force Leadership, Visioning Session*

The regional hub concept is not a top-down designation imposed on unwilling communities. It is an invitation — an ecosystem strategy where communities that choose to participate receive the institutional support, technical assistance, workforce investment, and community benefit frameworks that make energy development a genuine opportunity rather than an imposition.

The Hub Model in National Context

Indiana is not inventing the hub model from scratch. It is adapting a well-established pattern:

- Homer City Energy Campus (Pennsylvania): Decommissioned 2-GW coal plant repositioned as a data-center campus with 4.5 GW of new gas generation. Direct structural analogue to Indiana's coal-to-hub vision.
- Western New York ZNE District (Lackawanna): Former Bethlehem Steel plant redeveloped as a zero-energy industrial district with shared infrastructure. Model for the public-private partnership governance structure.
- DOE Advanced Energy Communities Program: A decade of district-scale energy integration projects that provide both technical templates and federal partnership pathways.

Indiana's differentiation is not the concept. It is the scale, the brownfield asset base, the nuclear option, the Strategic Doing discipline, and the deliberate integration of community trust infrastructure from the beginning.

9.2 The Hub Model: Five Interconnected Elements

The hub model integrates five elements that, taken separately, each have value but do not produce the systemic effect the plan requires. Taken together, they constitute an innovation platform that can serve Indiana's energy transition for a generation.

1. **Community Readiness:** Hubs begin with communities that have expressed willingness to host energy development. The Energy Ready Community program is the on-ramp: communities that complete it become eligible for hub designation and receive the institutional support, technical assistance, and community benefit frameworks that make energy development a genuine opportunity. Readiness is not presumed — it is built.
2. **Infrastructure Co-Location:** Energy campuses within hubs co-locate firm generation (SMRs, natural gas) with large-load users (data centers, advanced manufacturing, defense-adjacent industries) on single sites, reducing transmission costs, enabling dedicated financing structures, and creating self-contained economic systems.

Water infrastructure is co-located where coal-plant intake and discharge capacity exists.

3. **Workforce Pipeline Integration:** Each hub connects to the K-16 workforce pipeline through training programs tailored to the specific technologies deployed at that campus. Companies partner with schools before students graduate. Purdue, Ivy Tech, and local school districts are embedded in the hub design from inception.
4. **University-Industry R&D Translation:** Hubs serve as landing zones for university research — places where academic innovations can be piloted, tested, and scaled in real-world conditions without leaving Indiana. Each hub has a formal relationship with at least one research university. The university-industry translation gap is closed hub by hub, in specific places with specific projects.
5. **Financing Architecture:** Hub financing separates ratepayer-funded grid infrastructure from hub-specific investment. Large-load users fund their dedicated generation (minimum 80% of incremental capacity, per HB 1007 intent). Joint utility ownership structures enable nuclear asset investment across multiple balance sheets. Community buy-in mechanisms provide local financial participation. Federal energy community tax credits and nuclear incentives supplement private capital.

9.3 The Incubation Process

The hub model should be incubated through a structured process that mirrors the adaptive management discipline used throughout the Task Force's work. This is not a program that scales overnight. It begins with pathfinder projects — two to three initial communities that volunteer and receive intensive support — and expands based on demonstrated results.

Stage 1: Identification and Convening (Months 1–6)

Identify willing communities through an open process. Convene local stakeholders — county commissioners, utility representatives, school superintendents, business leaders, and community members — to assess readiness and co-design the hub concept for their specific geography and economic conditions.

Stage 2: Asset Mapping and Design (Months 6–12)

Use Strategic Doing's asset-based approach to identify what each community already has that can be linked in new combinations: available land, grid infrastructure, workforce training facilities, university partnerships, and community organizations. Design the

specific energy campus configuration, workforce pipeline, and community benefit framework for each hub.

Stage 3: Pathfinder Projects (Months 12–24)

Launch the first tangible projects within each hub. These are not the final build-out — they are small, visible, fast-cycle initiatives that demonstrate the model works and build the credibility needed for larger investments. Examples include: a community solar installation with transparent benefit tracking; a workforce training partnership between a local school and an energy employer; a pilot energy campus co-locating a data center with dedicated generation.

Stage 4: Learning and Scaling (Months 24–60)

Evaluate the pathfinder hubs against clear metrics. Adapt the model based on what works and what does not. Expand to additional communities using the refined approach. Build the evidence base that demonstrates to other communities that the model produces real, verifiable, sustained benefits.

9.4 Specific Recommendations for the Next Phase

The following recommendations are structured for immediate action. They are sequenced by urgency and interdependence, not alphabetically or by sector.

- **Recommendation 1: Designate the Hub Development Authority (Month 1–3)** Create or designate an entity — anchored at the intersection of OED, the research universities, and the utility sector — to own the hub program. Assign staff, define authority, and establish the first operating budget. This is the single highest-leverage institutional action because everything else requires it.
- **Recommendation 2: Launch the Geographic Suitability Mapping Process (Month 1–6).** Overlay OED's eight coal-plant SMR candidates with agricultural land quality data, existing transmission capacity, water infrastructure, and population-center proximity. Produce a public map that identifies the top hub candidate sites and provides the factual foundation for community identification.
- **Recommendation 3: Issue an Open Invitation to Pathfinder Communities (Month 3–6).** Publish criteria for hub participation and invite communities to express interest. Communities that have completed or are completing the Energy Ready Community program receive prioritized consideration. Include explicit incentive structures: tax

base enhancement, infrastructure co-investment, state technical assistance, and workforce training investment.

- **Recommendation 4: Launch Two to Three Pathfinder Hubs (Month 6–12).** Select communities that represent different geographic, economic, and utility contexts. Include at least one rural community adjacent to a coal-plant candidate site and one community near existing industrial infrastructure. Begin the asset-mapping and hub-design process with each community.
- **Recommendation 5: Embed Workforce Pipeline from Day One.** Every hub design process includes Ivy Tech, Purdue Extension, and the local school district from the first convening. Workforce programs are not added to hub designs after the fact — they are co-designed with the campus configuration.
- **Recommendation 6: Establish Metrics and 30-Day Learning Cycles.** Every hub operates on 30-day action cycles with clear metrics, transparent reporting, and structured learning events. This is Strategic Doing at the community level. The Hub Development Authority manages the learning cycle across all hubs and publishes quarterly cross-hub insights.
- **Recommendation 7: Build Indiana's Energy Narrative.** Indiana's competitive assets are genuine but invisible to the national investment market. Each hub is a proof point. The Hub Development Authority commissions a deliberate narrative strategy that communicates Indiana's energy transformation to the national and international investment community through the hub program's measurable results.

9.5 The Road Ahead

This report is the product of an extraordinary collaborative process. The Task Force members and dozens of community stakeholders contributed their expertise, their experience, and their candor to produce a document that is simultaneously rigorous in its analysis and grounded in lived reality. The process itself — the relationships built, the trust established, the shared understanding developed — is as valuable as the document it produced.

But a plan, however well-crafted, is only the beginning. The real work starts now — in the communities, the state agencies, the utility boardrooms, and the university labs where the ideas in this report will be tested against reality. The adaptive management discipline that guided the Task Force's process must now guide the implementation.

Indiana stands at an inflection point that will define its competitive position for a generation. The structural diagnosis is clear. The vision is shared. The actions are identified. The question is whether Indiana can build the political will and the collaborative capacity to execute — not perfectly, but persistently, adaptively, and together.

"Indiana has the people, the institutions, and the economic stakes to get this right. What we need is a shared leadership willing to work differently — to convene rather than direct, to listen before proposing, and to trust that a process built on genuine partnership will outperform one built on managed compliance every single time."

Appendices

Appendix A: The 6-Month and 12-Month Action Plan

The following action plans operationalize the first two stages of the hub incubation process. They are organized by work stream, assign clear accountability, and specify observable deliverables. They are designed to be tracked on 30-day cycles by the Hub Development Authority.

> **Design Principle for Both Action Plans**
> Every action in the 6-month and 12-month plans is designed to move the hub program from concept to place — from a policy framework to a specific community, a specific site, a specific set of actors, and a specific set of initial projects. Abstraction is the enemy of implementation. Every action names who is doing what, in which community, by when.

The 6-Month Action Plan: Stage 1 — Identification and Convening

April – October 2026 | Months 1 through 6

The 6-month plan has a single strategic objective: identify two to three willing hub communities and convene the initial local stakeholder coalitions that will co-design the campus concept for their specific geography. By the end of Month 6, Indiana has named its pathfinder hub sites and has an active working group in each community.

Work Stream	Key Actions (Months 1–6)	Lead Actor	Deliverable
1. Institutional Setup	Designate or create Hub Development Authority. Assign staff and initial budget. Establish governance charter and first operating protocols. Define hub eligibility criteria.	Governor's Office / OED	Hub Development Authority operational by Month 2
2. Geographic Suitability Mapping	Overlay OED's 8 coal-plant SMR candidates with grid capacity, water infrastructure, ag land quality, and proximity data. Produce public-facing hub suitability map. Identify top 5–7 candidate sites.	OED + Purdue Research Partners	Public suitability map published by Month 3

Work Stream	Key Actions (Months 1–6)	Lead Actor	Deliverable
3. Regulatory Foundation	Draft bifurcated regulatory pathway language for IURC consideration. Codify cost-causation principle for hub co-location economics. Brief IURC commissioners on hub model.	IURC + Legislative Counsel	Draft regulatory framework circulated by Month 4
4. Community Outreach & Invitation	Publish hub participation criteria and open invitation. Brief county commissioners, economic development organizations, and Farm Bureau leaders in candidate regions. Fund Energy Ready Community program continuation.	Hub Development Authority + Purdue Extension	Open invitation published by Month 3; 15+ county briefings by Month 5
5. Community Selection	Evaluate expressions of interest using suitability criteria. Conduct site visits to top candidates. Select 2–3 pathfinder communities representing geographic, economic, and utility diversity.	Hub Development Authority	2–3 pathfinder communities announced by Month 6
6. Initial Stakeholder Convening	In each selected community: convene county commissioners, utility representatives, school superintendent, business leaders, community organizations, and large-load prospects. Use Strategic Doing facilitation to assess readiness and begin co-design.	Hub Development Authority + Strategic Doing Institute	First community convening held in each pathfinder site by Month 6
7. Narrative & Communications	Develop Indiana hub narrative and initial investor-facing materials. Identify national energy media and investment community targets. Brief national laboratory partners.	OED + Governor's Communications	Hub narrative and investor brief completed by Month 5

6-Month Milestones: What Must Be True by October 2026

- ✓ Hub Development Authority is operational with designated staff and budget
- ✓ Public geographic suitability map published identifying top hub candidate sites
- ✓ Draft bifurcated regulatory pathway circulated for IURC consideration
- ✓ Energy Ready Community program funded and expanded
- ✓ Two to three pathfinder hub communities named
- ✓ First community stakeholder convening held in each pathfinder site
- ✓ Indiana hub narrative and investor brief completed

The 12-Month Action Plan: Stage 2 — Asset Mapping and Design

October 2026 – April 2027 | Months 7 through 12

The 12-month plan has a single strategic objective: for each Hub community, complete the asset mapping and campus design process and produce a Hub Development Plan — a community-owned document that specifies the campus configuration, financing architecture, workforce pipeline, university research partnership, and community benefit framework. By the end of Month 12, Indiana has investment-ready hub designs for each pathfinder community, and the first Stage 3 pathfinder projects are ready to launch.

Work Stream	Key Actions (Months 7–12)	Lead Actor	Deliverable
1. Asset Mapping	For each hub community: inventory available land, grid capacity, water infrastructure, existing workforce training facilities, university partnerships, and large-load prospect pipeline. Produce asset map using Strategic Doing methodology.	Hub Development Authority + Purdue Research Partners	Asset map for each hub site by Month 8
2. Campus Configuration Design	Working with community stakeholders and utility partners, design specific campus configuration for each hub: generation mix (SMR candidate, gas, renewables), large-load tenant mix, site layout, and phased	Hub Dev. Authority + Utility Partners + IURC	Campus configuration design for each hub by Month 10

Work Stream	Key Actions (Months 7–12)	Lead Actor	Deliverable
	build-out plan. Engage MISO/PJM on interconnection.		
3. Workforce Pipeline Design	Partner with Ivy Tech, Purdue Extension, and local school districts in each hub community to design training programs tailored to the campus technology mix. Identify teacher internship placements at hub employer partners.	Ivy Tech + Purdue + Local School Districts	Hub workforce program design for each community by Month 10
4. University R&D Partnership	Formalize research partnership between each hub community and at least one research university. Identify first pilot research project for each campus. Connect SMR site assessment work to specific hub configurations.	Purdue / IU / Notre Dame + OED	Signed research partnership MOU for each hub by Month 11
5. Community Benefit Framework	Co-design community benefit framework with local stakeholders in each hub community. Define specific benefit commitments: local hiring requirements, tax revenue sharing, infrastructure co-investment, energy price provisions. Establish benefit accountability ledger structure.	Hub Dev. Authority + County Commissioners + Community Orgs	Signed community benefit framework for each hub by Month 12
6. Financing Architecture	Develop hub-specific financing plan: large-load cost-causation structure, joint utility ownership term sheet, federal incentive eligibility analysis (energy community tax credits, nuclear incentives), and community co-investment mechanism.	OED + Utilities + Legal Counsel	Hub financing plan for each site by Month 11
7. Regulatory Submission	Submit bifurcated pathway petition to IURC. Initiate formal hub site designation process. File interconnection queue applications for hub generation assets.	IURC + OED + Utility Partners	IURC petition filed by Month 9; hub designations issued by Month 12

Work Stream	Key Actions (Months 7–12)	Lead Actor	Deliverable
8. Hub Development Plan Publication	Compile asset map, campus design, workforce plan, university partnership, community benefit framework, and financing plan into a public Hub Development Plan for each pathfinder community.	Hub Development Authority	Hub Development Plan published for each pathfinder site by Month 12
9. Stage 3 Pathfinder Project Launch	Identify first visible, fast-cycle initiative for each hub — a project that demonstrates the model works and builds credibility. Examples: community solar with transparent benefit tracking; workforce training partnership between school and energy employer; utility-community MOU for campus pilot.	Hub Dev. Authority + Community Partners	First Stage 3 project launched in each hub by Month 12
10. 30-Day Learning Cycles	Establish formal 30-day check-in cycle for all hub work streams. Hub Development Authority publishes monthly learning briefs. Convene cross-hub learning session at Month 9 and Month 12.	Hub Development Authority	Monthly learning briefs and two cross-hub sessions by Month 12

12 - Month Milestones: What Must Be True by April 2027

- ✓ Asset maps completed for each pathfinder hub community
- ✓ Campus configuration designs completed and community-validated
- ✓ Workforce pipeline programs designed and first partnerships signed
- ✓ University research MOU signed for each hub community
- ✓ Community benefit frameworks co-designed and signed
- ✓ Financing plans developed and federal incentive eligibility confirmed
- ✓ IURC bifurcated pathway petition filed; hub designations issued
- ✓ Hub Development Plans published for each pathfinder community
- ✓ First Stage 3 pathfinder projects launched
- ✓ Monthly learning cycles operational; two cross-hub learning sessions held

Appendix B: Process and Methodology

The Strategic Energy Growth Task Force was established by Executive Order 25-66 to deliver a State Energy Growth Plan. The Strategic Doing Institute was engaged to guide a collaborative process spanning five facilitated sessions from December 2025 through April 2026, complemented by a dedicated community workshop in March 2026.

Session 1 (December 2025) focused on launch and alignment — establishing shared purpose, clarifying desired outcomes, and identifying initial strategic focus areas through participant voting and group deliberation. Session 2 (February 2026) applied Porter's Diamond framework through a structured competitiveness workshop with digital survey and blackboard-based collective intelligence capture. Session 3 (February 2026) extended the ecosystem mapping and developed the twenty-year vision through scenario exploration and backcasting. The community workshop (March 2026) brought diverse community voices into the analysis through a four-table design with full transcription. Session 4 (April 2026) synthesized findings into the strategic action plan and recommendations presented in this report.

All sessions employed Strategic Doing's discipline of agile leadership for open, loosely connected networks. Data collection methods included real-time whiteboard capture, digital surveys, structured participant workbooks, full session transcription, and photographic documentation. Analysis methods included thematic coding of transcripts, cross-table synthesis of workshop findings, and iterative validation with Task Force members.

Appendix C: Workshop Participation

The Task Force comprised members representing investor-owned utilities, rural electric cooperatives, municipal utilities, state regulatory agencies, research universities, trade associations, large industrial customers, economic development organizations, and legislative stakeholders. The community workshop brought together approximately thirty participants representing county commissioners, ratepayer advocates, environmental organizations, renewable energy developers, planning professionals, consumer advocacy groups, and agricultural organizations.

All participant contributions have been anonymized in this report. Quotes are attributed to role descriptions and workshop contexts rather than individual names, unless participants provided explicit consent for attribution in the workshop record.

Appendix D: Priority Focus Areas from December 2025 Workshop

Task Force members identified and voted on priority focus areas during the inaugural December 2025 session. The results reflect participant input as captured on the workshop wall and in workbooks, with each participant having three votes:

Priority Area	Votes	Key Components
Public Policy	8	Legislative evaluation, IPP accommodation, performance-based regulation, transparency
Siting	6	Strategic siting, siting reform, community assessment, local government roles
Community Outreach	5	Public education, industry outreach, articulating energy value
Investments	4	Capital investment, energy export capacity, federal assistance
RTO / Transmission	3	Streamlined permitting, interconnection improvements
Cost Alignment	2	Aligning costs with cost causers
Forecasting	1	Load forecasting, disruptive demand
Workforce	1	Workforce development, availability, competitiveness beyond rates

Appendix E: Community Workshop Recommendations Summary

The community workshop generated thirty-five specific recommendations organized into six areas. These recommendations are not reproduced in full here but are summarized by area:

- **Planning and Governance (4 recommendations):** Establish statewide energy goals, create geographic suitability maps, establish an independent energy planning body, require comprehensive plan updates to include energy infrastructure.
- **Siting Process and Regulatory Certainty (5 recommendations):** Adopt statewide baseline siting standards, protect approved projects from retroactive changes, adopt cooperative siting frameworks, create clear timelines, establish developer quality standards.
- **Community Engagement and Communication (10 recommendations):** Replace adversarial hearings with open-house formats, require early developer engagement, build trusted messenger networks, fund the Energy Ready Community program, use Purdue Extension as technical resource.
- **Transparency and Accountability (5 recommendations):** Create public project dashboards, build community benefits accountability ledgers, reform NDA requirements, require annual public reporting, create community entities with early sign-off authority.
- **Ratepayer and Cost Protection (6 recommendations):** Require large loads to pay full costs, impose exit penalties, reform pre-completion cost recovery, develop model cost allocation agreements, expand community solar access, open generation to competition.
- **Community Benefits (5 recommendations):** Make benefit plans structural requirements, build renegotiation mechanisms, create state incentive funds, share success stories at scale, address local fiscal vulnerability.

Appendix F: Glossary of Key Terms

Term	Definition
Strategic Doing	A strategy discipline designed for open, loosely connected networks where no single actor has authority to direct the others. Produces strategies through agile cycles of action and learning.
Adaptive Management	A systematic approach to improving strategy through iterative learning — testing actions, measuring results, and adjusting course based on evidence.
Porter's Diamond	A framework for analyzing the competitive advantage of nations or regions, identifying four mutually reinforcing determinants: factor conditions, firm strategy, demand conditions, and related industries.
Energy Campus	A co-located complex where large energy consumers are sited alongside dedicated generation, reducing transmission costs and creating self-contained economic hubs.
Pathfinder Project	A small, visible, fast-cycle initiative designed to test a concept, build credibility, and generate learning before larger-scale investment.
Regional Energy Hub	A designated geographic area where willing communities, energy infrastructure, workforce development, and research institutions converge to create an integrated energy ecosystem.
Project Sherpa	A dedicated state navigator function that guides energy projects through the permitting process, connecting developers with local officials and regulatory requirements.
Cost-Causation Principle	The principle that those who cause infrastructure costs should bear responsibility for them, protecting existing ratepayers from costs driven by new large loads.
IOU	Investor-Owned Utility — privately owned companies regulated by the IURC that provide electricity service within defined territories.

Term	Definition
RTO	Regional Transmission Organization — entities (MISO and PJM in Indiana's case) that coordinate, control, and monitor the electric grid across multi-state regions.
SMR	Small Modular Reactor — next-generation nuclear reactor designs that are smaller, factory-built, and potentially deployable at coal plant sites.
IURC	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission — the state body responsible for regulating Indiana's electric, gas, steam, water, and wastewater utilities.

Appendix G: The Six Competitiveness Tensions — Summary Matrix

The following matrix summarizes the six fundamental competitiveness tensions identified through the Porter's Diamond analysis and the Task Force deliberations. Each tension represents a genuine structural conflict between legitimate competing values. These are not problems with simple solutions — they are design contradictions embedded in Indiana's energy system that require strategic choices.

Tension	Core Conflict	Resolution Pathway	Hurdle If Unresolved
1. Speed vs. Stability	The regulatory compact rewards caution while the market rewards speed. Data center developers choose states based on fastest interconnection timelines.	Bifurcated regulatory strategy: maintain traditional protections for existing customers while creating an expedited pathway for qualifying large new load interconnections.	Projects walk into the same organized opposition every time — and the cycle is accelerating.
2. Growth vs. Affordability	Infrastructure investment required to serve new large loads will increase system costs. Ratepayers should not bear this burden, but the political salience of rate increases constrains action.	Clearly articulated, publicly communicated cost allocation framework validated by the IURC, endorsed by the legislature, and explained to the public.	Rate increases become politically untenable, constraining the risk appetite of regulators and elected officials.
3. State vs. Local	Local control over siting creates systematic veto points blocking energy infrastructure of state strategic significance. Twenty states have adopted state-level	Two-track approach: legislative action for state-level appeal mechanism; sustained community engagement program building trust required for informed siting decisions.	Indiana cannot reliably deliver what it promises investors. Every stalled project reinforces that signal.

Tension	Core Conflict	Resolution Pathway	Hurdle If Unresolved
	fallback mechanisms; Indiana has not.		
4. Long-Term Investment vs. Short-Term Risk	Energy infrastructure requires 30-40 year horizons. Demand signals are uncertain over 6-9 months. This mismatch paralyzes investment decisions.	Structured demand commitment frameworks — off-take agreements, letters of commitment, financial assurance requirements — combined with accelerated IRP cycles.	Utilities cannot build ahead of demand. Indiana loses time-sensitive investment to states that can pre-position capacity.
5. Speculation vs. Commitment	The demand spike attracts speculative actors consuming planning, interconnection, and regulatory capacity without delivering real load.	Standardized large-load intake process requiring demonstration of financial commitment, development feasibility, and realistic load profiles before entering planning queues.	Planning, interconnection, and regulatory capacity is consumed by speculative actors who never deliver real load.
6. Institutional Inertia vs. Ecosystem Innovation	Indiana has the components of a strong energy ecosystem but lacks coordination architecture. Trade associations aggregate	Dedicated energy ecosystem coordination function with mandate to coordinate R&D translation, maintain public-facing asset inventory, deploy public	Existing assets — universities, utilities, research programs — operate in isolation and

Tension	Core Conflict	Resolution Pathway	Hurdle If Unresolved
	and advocate but do not drive joint innovation.	narrative, and facilitate structured coordination.	produce less than their sum.

Appendix H: Process Timeline

The following timeline documents the Task Force's collaborative journey from inception to this report. Each session built on the previous one, accumulating insights and building the relationships that make collaborative strategy possible.

Date	Session	Focus	Key Outputs
December 15, 2025	Session 1: Launch & Alignment	Establish shared purpose, clarify desired outcomes, identify initial strategic focus areas	Priority focus areas identified through voting; "Indiana as the place for big power" vision emerged; additive strategy concept articulated; cost-causation principle established
February 2026	Session 2: Competitiveness Analysis	Apply Porter's Diamond framework through structured workshop with digital survey and collective intelligence	Full competitiveness analysis; six fundamental tensions identified; factor conditions, firm strategy, demand conditions, and ecosystem mapped
February 2026	Session 3: Ecosystem Mapping & 20-Year Vision	Scenario exploration, backcasting from 2046 vision, ecosystem mapping	Four plausible futures explored; vision of success for 2046; energy-focused economy concept; regional hub model emerged

Date	Session	Focus	Key Outputs
March 23, 2026	Community Workshop	Four-table design surfacing community perspectives on trust, siting, ratepayers, and planning	Eight major findings; 35 specific recommendations across six areas; zero-trust diagnosis; community benefit accountability concept
April 2026	Session 4: Strategic Action Plan	Synthesize all findings into strategic architecture and implementation framework	Five-year action plan; three-phase strategic architecture; regional hub incubation model; seven specific recommendations for next phase

Appendix I: Guiding Principles for Implementation

The following principles emerged from the Task Force's process and should guide the implementation of the recommendations in this report. They reflect both the Strategic Doing discipline and the specific lessons learned through five months of collaborative work.

Process over Plan

This report is not a static document to be filed and forgotten. It is a framework for ongoing collaboration. The relationships built through the Task Force process are as valuable as the document itself. Implementation must preserve and deepen those relationships through regular convening, transparent communication, and shared accountability.

Start with Assets, Not Deficits

Indiana's competitive advantage is not in building a new energy system from scratch. It is in deploying and combining the assets it already has in new and more productive combinations. Every implementation action should begin by asking: what do we already have that can be linked to create new value?

Pathfinder Projects Before Grand Plans

The discipline of Strategic Doing emphasizes small, visible, fast-cycle initiatives that demonstrate what is possible before committing to large-scale investment. Every major initiative in this report should begin with a pathfinder project that tests the concept, builds credibility, and generates learning.

Thirty-Day Action Cycles

Strategic Doing operates on thirty-day action cycles — short enough to maintain momentum, long enough to produce meaningful results. Implementation teams should commit to specific actions with clear deliverables on thirty-day horizons, with regular check-ins to evaluate progress and adjust course.

Narrative Is Strategic Infrastructure

Indiana's competitive assets are genuine but invisible to the market. A deliberate narrative strategy — communicating Indiana's energy transformation to the investment community, to communities within the state, and to the national policy conversation — is as essential as physical infrastructure. The narrative is not marketing. It is how Indiana makes its competitive position legible to the actors whose participation is required.

Trust Is Built Through Structure, Not Communication

The community workshop's most important finding was that trust is a structural problem, not a communications one. Implementation must change structures — information flows, decision-making authority, benefit distribution, accountability mechanisms — before expecting communication to rebuild what secrecy and exclusion have eroded.

Adaptive, Not Rigid

The energy landscape will change in ways no analysis can fully predict. Federal policy will shift. Technology will surprise. Markets will restructure. The implementation framework must be adaptive — designed to absorb new information and adjust course without abandoning the strategic direction. Rigidity in the face of complexity is not discipline. It is fragility.