LADWP Power Strategic Long-Term Resource Plan (SLTRP)

Advisory Group (AG): Meeting #1

Thursday, September 23, 2021
10:00 am – 12:00 pm
WebEx Platform (Virtual)

Meeting Summary (Draft)[1]

Attendees:

Advisory Group Members/Observers

1. California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA), Jin Noh
2. California State University, Northridge (CSUN), Loraine Lundquist
3. Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT), John V. White
4. City of Los Angeles – Climate Emergency Mobilization Office, Marta Segura
5. City of Los Angeles – Council District 02, Councilmember Paul Krekorian, Aaron Ordower
6. City of Los Angeles - Council District 03, Councilmember Bob Blumenfield, Jeff Jacobberger
7. City of Los Angeles - Council District 05, Councilmember Paul Koretz, Andy Shrader
8. City of Los Angeles – Office of the City Attorney, Priscila Kasha
9. City of Los Angeles – Office of the Mayor, Paul Lee
10. City of Los Angeles – Office of the Mayor, Lauren Faber O'Conner
11. City of Los Angles – Office of the Mayor, Rebecca Rasmussen
12. City of Los Angeles – Office of Public Accountability (OPA), Frederick Pickel
13. City of Los Angeles – Office of Public Accountability (OPA), Camden Collins
14. Food and Water Watch, Jasmin Vargas
15. Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), Adam Lane
16. Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), Arielle Lopez
17. LADWP Advocacy Committee, Jack Humphreville
18. LADWP Board of Commissioners, Mia Lehrer
19. LADWP Board of Commissioners, Susana Reyes
20. LADWP Memorandum of Understanding Oversight Committee, Tony Wilkinson
21. National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Amanda Levin
22. Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance (NCSA), Dan Kegel
23. Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance (NCSA), Ravi Sankaran
24. Port of Los Angeles (POLA), Carlos Baldenegro
25. Port of Los Angeles (POLA), Dac Hoang
26. RePower LA (LAANE), Agustin Cabrera
27. Sierra Club, Francis Yang
28. University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Nurit Katz
29. Pacoima Beautiful, Veronica Padilla
30. Water and Power Associates, William Barlak
31. Water and Power Associates, Bill Engels
32. University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Bonny Bentzin
33. University of Southern California (USC), Zelinda Welch

[1] This summary, prepared to the best ability of the notetakers, is provided as synopsis of the meeting for review of topics covered, and is not intended to represent an official record or transcript of all matters presented or discussed. Not all attendees may be reflected due to early log-offs, no self-identification, and other factors.

34. 6264****35

LADWP Staff

1. Stephanie Spicer
2. Dawn Cotterell
3. Glenn Barry
4. Scott Briasco
5. Michael Buck
6. Norman J. Cahill
7. Kai Choi
8. Pjoy Chua
9. Eric Montag
10. Jonathon Flores
11. Paul Habib
12. Hassan Motallebi
13. Matt Hone
14. Zaw Htin
15. Greg Huynh
16. Alan Hwang
17. James Barner
18. Carlos Jimenez
19. Jimmy Lin
20. Leilani Johnson
21. John Levy
22. Jay L Lim
23. Nicholas John Matiasz
24. Monique Earl
25. Scott Moon
26. Haik Movsesian
27. Linda Novoa
28. Denis Obiang
29. Mark Padilla
30. Paul Schultz
31. Kevin Peng
32. Bernardo Perez
33. David Rahimian
34. Robert Hodel
35. Jason Rondou
36. Nermina Rucic
37. Steve Swift
38. Arash Saidi
39. Armen Saiyan
40. Ann Santilli
41. Faranak Sarbaz
42. Mark Sedlacek
43. Steve Ruiz

44. Luke Sun
45. Jonathan Tang
46. Louis Ting
47. Douglas Tripp
48. Carol L. Tucker
49. Jeremiah Valera
50. Julie Van Wagner
51. Andrea Villarin
52. Virginia Cormier
53. Jesse Vismonte
54. Winifred Yancy
55. Lisa Yin
56. Lister Yu
57. Simon Zewdu
58. Luisjose Martinez

Project Team

1. Joan Isaacson, Kearns & West (Facilitator)
2. Alyson Scurlock, Kearns & West (Polling)
3. Brady Cowiestoll, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)
4. Megan Day, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)
5. Paul Denholm, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)
6. Gary Dorris, Ascend Analytics
7. Zach Brode, Ascend Analytics

Note: The meeting presentation slides are posted at ladwp.com/sltrp.

1. Welcome and Introductions

- Joan Isaacson, meeting facilitator from Kearns & West, welcomed the advisory group to the kick-off meeting for the 2022 LADWP Power Strategic Long-Term Resource Plan. Isaacson introduced LADWP General Manager and Chief Engineer, Martin Adams, Los Angeles (LA) Councilmember and Chair of the Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and River Committee (ECCEJR), Mitch O'Farrell, City of LA Chief Sustainability Officer, Lauren Faber O'Connor, and recognized LADWP Board of Commissioners, Vice President Susana Reyes and Mia Lehrer, in attendance.

- Adams thanked the AG for their continued support in LADWP's power planning process, from the recent completion of the LA100 Study, to the continuation of the 2022 SLTRP, and touched on the goal of reaching 100% carbon-free energy by 2035, as recently approved by the LA City Council and directed by the Mayor. Additionally, Adams highlighted how these goals and achievements put the City of LA on the map, both locally and nationally, as a leader in decarbonization.

- O'Farrell expressed optimism at the ongoing process and the engagement of the community towards achieving the 100% carbon-free goal. Furthermore, O'Farrell encouraged all to work together in concert with a solution in mind, and not be afraid to speak their thoughts in a judgement-free zone.

- O'Connor reflected on how the first SLTRP process she attended set a goal for 65% renewable energy by 2036, and how LA has progressed from there and the world is watching the City's efforts, both nationally and internationally.

- Isaacson introduced LADWP Director of Resource Planning, Development, and Programs, Jason Rondou, and LADWP Manager of Resource Planning, Jay Lim, as points of contact for the process, with Jay Lim as the main point of contact.

2. Meeting Purpose and Agenda Overview

- Isaacson explained that four more meetings are planned for September-October 2021, and that the meetings are currently scheduled to be on Thursdays, generally from 10am-12pm. Next Thursday (September 30) will be slightly different, as an optional LA100 Study Review will be held at 9am, for any AG members who many not have been a part of the LA100 Study or would like to review the high-level key takeaways. The goal is to ensure everyone has a good, basic understanding of the LA100 Study.
- Isaacson also mentioned that the SLTRP process will be using more tools, such as pooling, to gain more of the AG's valuable input, feedback, and perspectives.

3. Protocols, Roles, and Responsibilities of Advisory Group

- Isaacson reviewed the protocols and operating principles for the AG, highlighting the "Role and Responsibilities of the Advisory Group" section as the most important to review in the corresponding document that was sent out, as LADWP seeks the input and expertise from the many organizations joining in the process.

- The protocol for identifying an alternate was also discussed, welcoming alternate representatives to also attend meetings concurrently primary representatives, if they participate as an observer.

4. LADWP Overview & Progress

- Rondou spoke on the complexities that the Power System planning process entails and acknowledged the invaluable perspective the AG brings, through the vast experience of its members. Furthermore, he touched on LADWP's unique position as a vertically-integrated utility, to repurpose its diverse set of resources to achieve rapid decarbonization for its 1.5 million customers and 4 million people in the City of LA.

- Highlights included recent LADWP accomplishments such as being named top solar city in the US for six of the last seven years in 2019, including three years in a row leading up to that (2013-2015, 2017-2019), as well as achieving 37% renewable and 55% carbon-free energy in 2020, and reaching the state 2030 greenhouse gas emission (GHG) reduction goal 14 years ahead of the deadline. With regards to specific projects and programs, even while the SLTRP planning process was paused to finish the LA100 Study, monumental accomplishments were achieved. Such achievements include the signing of the Eland Solar + Storage Center (one of the largest and cheapest projects of its kind, nationwide, at the time of signing) and Red Cloud Wind project (among the country's high capacity factor, low cost wind resources), as well as expansion of local solar programs such as Feed-in Tariff Plus (FiT+) and Virtual Net Metering (multi-family sector), in addition to advancing local electric vehicle infrastructure, and exploring green hydrogen opportunities, both through modernization of the Intermountain Power Project and advertisement of a Request for Information (RFI) in the City of LA.

- An overview of the LA100 effort was also covered, including completion of the LA100 Study (Los Angeles 100% Renewable Energy Study) in March 2021, the in-progress LA100 Next Steps (a series of common investments identified in the LA100 Study that must be completed over the next 10 years), the 2022 SLTRP (LADWP's 25-year power resource plan to achieve goals and mandates inclusive of human resource requirements, construction implementability, technical feasibility, operations and maintenance, and procurement and supply chain risk) and the upcoming LA100 Equity Strategies Study (ensure transition to 100% clean energy prioritizes energy equity through community input and procedural, recognition, and distributional justice).

- Main takeaways summarized from the LA100 Study include: multiple pathways theoretically indicate 100% renewable energy is achievable (including as early as 2035); electrification of the transportation and building sectors is critical to ensure affordability and counteract upwards pressure on rates; an investment of approximately $57-$87 billion is estimated necessary, in addition to existing LADWP debt obligations such as those of the Power System Reliability Program (PSRP); and that there is a potential for significant job creation (up to ~9,500 jobs).

- Regarding completion of the LA100 Study however, while groundbreaking and monumental, it is important to note that the study, in itself, is not a plan. Thus, the annual SLTRP process will resume, picking up where the study left off, by looking at technical feasibility of resource options, as well as requirements for human resources, and the realities of policies, permitting procedures, and supply chain risks, among others, to put together a robust and actionable power plan. In parallel, the LA100 Equity Strategies Study aims to begin this month, and will address historical energy injustices through implementation of procedural, recognition, and distributional justice elements to ensure LADWP's plan to decarbonize its power system is reliable, affordable, and equitable. Also highlighted was the new City of LA goal to reach 100% carbon-free by 2035, a full decade ahead of the state mandate, as recently approved by City Council and announced by the Mayor in the 2021 State of the City.

- <u>Major Themes from Advisory Group Member Discussion and Questions</u>
    - Will documents be available for review on our own time?
        - *A: Yes, LADWP will upload meeting documents, including meeting summaries, onto the http://www.ladwp.com/sltrp website*
    - What explains the difference between 37% renewables and 55% carbon-free?
        - *A: Carbon-free includes other zero-emitting resources that are not classified as "renewable" by the California Energy Commission (CEC) such as large hydro and nuclear*
    - It would be helpful to have a list of the AG participants and affiliations.
    - What is the timing of the Long-Term Hiring and Workforce Plan? Will that process occur independently of the SLTRP group?
        - *A: We hope to develop the hiring and workforce plan concurrent with the SLTRP, and are aiming internally to have a draft in 2022*
    - How will the confidentiality of the AG process be balanced with our strong belief in engaging the public in dialogue regarding the LA100 Study and other efforts?
        - *A: The meeting summaries will be written without AG attribution, and will be available, thus resulting in a very transparent process. The non-attribution will allow for confidentiality and respect of the safe space for all AG members.*
    - How does one get more information on the LA100 Equity Strategies process, and what

is the next step in determining how the steering committee will be selected? Will participation of AG members in this SLTRP process inadvertently rule out their eligibility for participation in the LA100 Equity Strategies process, as to not "double-dip"?
    - *A: LA100 Equity Strategies was approved by the LADWP Board of Commissioners in late June, however due to additional approval processes, additional efforts for the study have just begun to move along as of very recently. There is an internal LADWP kickoff next week to answer that very question, and after that, we hope to have more answers. The process will go beyond just the Power System, and the hope is to see interaction between the two efforts (SLTRP and LA100 Equity Strategies). The steering committee has not yet been established, and we will provide updates on that.*
- Is the SLTRP the Power System's supply-side analysis to the LA100 Study's demand-side analysis, and will we be addressing "No-regrets" investments first?
    - *A: A lot of these questions will be answered in the upcoming presentation by Jay Lim. The LA100 Study did not make a recommendation moving forward, thus the SLTRP will take the findings and result in a path forward, via an actual plan with more details on how to achieve the goals studied.*
- The press should have access since we are discussing spending up to ~$87 billion over the next decade.
    - *A: The meeting materials will be posted on LADWP's website and will be made available to the public, including the media*

5. 2022 SLTRP Orientation

- Lim spoke on how LADWP will be picking up where the LA100 Study left off, and explained that NREL will assist in the SLTRP AG process to maintain consistency, while the technical modeling will be performed in-house by the Integrated Resource Planning group.

- Lim continued on to give an overview of the SLTRP, explaining that it is a roadmap to meet LA's future energy needs and regulatory mandates while maintaining reliable service and reducing emissions in a cost-effective manner. Traditionally, utilities would produce an integrated resource plan (IRP) to address load growth and lay out plans for new resources. The outcome of the SLTRP will be to develop a recommended scenario that guides LADWP's near-term actions and future energy planning through 2045 (addressing how to meet the local 100% carbon-free by 2035 goal in the process) to align with state goals.

- Guiding the SLTRP will be the following trifecta of core principles: balancing reliability and resiliency; affordability and rates impact; environmental benefits and equity. The 2022 SLTRP will be looking at new metrics relating to resiliency and equity, to help guide decisions relating to future power system. On the resiliency front, the SLTRP process will analyze the effects of extreme weather events such as wildfires, resulting in loss of critical transmission corridors. On the equity front, there will be a focus on reducing the impact of Valley Generating Station on surrounding communities, and the potential benefits of distributed energy resource (DER) deployment.

- Historically, LADWP has engaged in comprehensive planning to meet future energy needs since the 2000 Power Integrated Resource Plan, charting the course for a cleaner, more reliable power future. In 2017, the SLTRP replaced LADWP's traditional IRP, as the IRP became a regulatory

requirement submitted to the California Energy Commission (CEC) once every 5 years to comply with CA Senate Bill 350. LADWP was one of the leading utilities among the Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA) members, in the initial IRP filings to the CEC. For the SLTRP, the data is updated yearly, with extensive public outreach conducted every two years. Since the year 2017, however, the SLTRP has been paused in order to allow the LA100 Study to conclude, to incorporate the study findings into the process.

- Regarding the recommended case, the IRP/SLTRP has traditionally been a technical engineering document that focused on utility business practices, however as the urgent need has emerged to address climate change, this will be the first that focuses on the environment via a predetermined goal of 100% carbon-free by 2035.

- Notable direction from past recommended cases includes: divesture from Mohave Generating Station (coal; 2000 IRP), 20% renewables by 2010 (2007 IRP), repowering of 1,661 MW of ocean-cooled units to comply with the Environmental Protection Agency Clean Water Act (2010 IRP), eliminating coal from the Intermountain Power Project by 2025 (2013 IRP), 800 MW local solar by 2023 (2014 IRP), divesture from Navajo Generating Station (coal) and planning for electrification (2015 IRP), and accelerating renewables to 50% by 2025, 55% by 2030, and 65% by 2036, along with an additional 15% energy efficiency from 2017-2027 (2017 SLTRP). This year's SLTRP (2022), will aim to achieve the 100% carbon-free goal ten years ahead of the state mandate.

- Key considerations for the 2022 SLTRP will include public engagement via multiple fronts, such as input from the AG and their constituents, as well as wider-spread public outreach, and engagement with the LA100 Equity Strategies effort. Other planning elements will include defining program revenue requirements to support programs and projects, addressing equity and resiliency, looking at how to address the retirement of firm local capacity from ocean-cooled units, as well as human resource and procurement requirements, supply chain risks, and tracking of emerging technologies through partnerships with research institutions, industry, and academia. Furthermore, the 2022 SLTRP will focus on incorporating the LA100 Next Steps that need to be put in place by 2030, to maintain LADWP on track towards meeting 100% carbon-free by 2035.

- Regarding process schedule, unlike the LA100 Study process that took three to four years, the SLTRP process will be condensed to one year. Eight meetings across five phases are planned between September 2021-2022, as follow:
    - Phase 1 (Launch & Laying Foundation): AG meetings #1 to #3 from September through early October 2021
    - Phase 2 (Scenario Development): AG meetings #4 to #6 from mid-October 2021 through early November 2021
    - Phase 3 (Modeling): November 2021 through January 2022
    - Phase 4 (Results): AG meeting #7 in February 2022, as well as a potential field trip in March-April 2022, and public community outreach meetings from May-June 2022
    - Phase 5 (Outreach): AG meeting #8 in July 2022, review of draft 2022 SLTRP in August 2022, and submittal of final 2022 SLTRP for approval in September 2022

- Major Themes from Advisory Group Member Discussion and Questions
  - NREL (National Renewable Energy Laboratory) used very advanced tools in the LA100 Study. Will LADWP use the same tools for this process?
    - *A: LADWP has followed the modeling process closely for the LA100 Study and traditionally has conducted production cost modeling in-house since the first IRP. However, since the incorporation of renewables has progressed, we have incorporated stochastic modeling capabilities. Several of the tools NREL used in the LA100 Study are beyond the scope of bulk power planning, however the distribution resource planning section will take a closer look at distribution-level impacts.*
  - President Biden's Administration has referenced the LA100 Study as a model for the country; have we been in talks with the Biden Administration about potential funding for our transition to 100% Clean Energy?
    - *A: We are in talks with the Department of Energy regarding potential funding opportunities for LA100 projects and will continue efforts to have those conversations.*
  - Where can we find a link to the 2017 SLTRP?
    - *A: www.ladwp.com/sltrp*
  - What does PSRP stand for?
    - *A: Power System Reliability Program*
  - NREL's modeling made optimistic assumptions relating to several resources such as levels of in-basin customer solar, that some do not think are reasonable. In comparison, the SLTRP is a real operational plan instead of an academic model. Will we assume the same economic modeling assumptions as NREL unless there are reasons to deviate?
    - *A: Thanks for the question, next meeting we'll discuss more on aspects such as the role of the customer and implementation. The LA100 Study looked at bookends of different pathways possible, such as focusing on new transmission corridors or distributed energy resources, among others. Through this SLTRP process, we hope to refine a lot of the assumptions for the resource mix, as well as update load forecasts, among others.*
  - Local solar implies homeowners will pay for rooftop solar and battery storage. These investments have a poor return on investment. The issue of distributed solar is based on the economic incentive to do it. Hopefully the City's power becomes greener while maintaining good reliability and reasonable cost.
  - One of the biggest challenges with the 2035 target date is that the only NREL scenario consistent with that target date is by far the most expensive.
  - Not all AG members think that the LA100 Study assumed unreasonable amounts of local solar.
  - Who creates the final SLTRP before it goes to the Board for approval? Will this AG see that final draft before it goes to the Board?
    - *A: Historically, the AG provides input to the SLTRP and the staff presents it to the Board of Commissioners and City Council. Historically there has not been an actual approval over the plan by the Board of Commissioners, however all of the projects and programs would still have to get approved via the existing structures, processes, and appropriate protocols. This is something we are aiming to address with this process.*
  - Can we not have meetings in conflict with the City Council's ECCEJR Committee

Meetings?
    - *A: Thanks for flagging that conflict, we will follow up with updated scheduling.*
- Local infrastructure efforts such as those ongoing by SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments), are important to consider.

6. Discussion (SLTRP Priorities) and Polling

POLLING RESULTS[2]

Question: What do you think is most important to test and study in the SLTRP? Please make the answers concise, and multiple answers can be submitted.

1. Rates and reliability
2. Modeling scenarios of the cost to consumers
3. Effects of climate change on carbon-free generation and storage
4. The reasonableness of the politically-driven demand (environmental purism) for no fossil fuel combustion at in-basin power plants when they may only be used 5% of the time in order to cover emergencies. This is a reliability issue. Batteries will not provide sufficient reserves to avoid blackouts if out of basin power is cut off.
5. The full GHG lifecycle of energy sources included in assessments
6. Use of green hydrogen in generation and storage
7. Cost estimates by year for the more theoretical and less known technologies
8. Conversion of all existing carbon based generation to carbon free
9. Transparency to those beyond the Advisory Group before the final vote is taken to approve SLTRP
10. How can water conservation efforts help reduce energy use?
11. Uncertainties in technologies and their adoption on both the supply and demand sides
12. Transparency
13. Addressing sources of renewable natural gas
14. Resources (labor) to able to meet the road map set forth
15. How can the Cool City Challenge/Cool Blocks neighborhood by neighborhood energy and water efficiency efforts best assist in this effort?
16. Timing of new/expanded transmission and deliver ability of in basin and imported renewables
17. The balance between the cost for achieving the difference between 85% and 100% carbon-free power and the investment of the same amount of money in electrifying transportation for a much greater GHG reduction and almost ALL of the promoted health benefits
18. Local grid reliability
19. The role of green hydrogen for reliability and long-duration storage
20. Program design to support distributed generation, energy efficiency goals
21. Technical and practical capacity benefits OG hybrid solar+storage and behind the meter solar+storage
22. Long duration energy storage
23. Grid reliability
24. Building and transit electrification
25. The role of demand response, electrification, and energy efficiency
26. Investments to energy efficiency parallel to infrastructure investments
27. Transmission investments

[2]Comments and poll results shown are informal and should not be considered a representative nor complete illustration of the Advisory Group's opinion at large.

28. Equity and rate impacts
29. Reliability and resiliency
30. Grid and rate impacts
31. A scenario with no nuclear
32. Back up scenario in the event the 2035 cannot be met
33. To transform DWP to a 100% renewable energy provider at the lowest cost to ratepayers while maintaining the existing level of reliability
34. As we move toward electrification of housing and transportation, how will SLTRP address demand side issues (e.g., are we planning for electric SUVs or e-bikes)?
35. Reliability and feasibility
36. Emergency response
37. The reasonability of the politically-driven 2035 goal given that it will result in the highest cost to power customers and the adoption of technologies that are not yet commercially mature.
38. Load forecast scenarios re: building and vehicle electrification
39. Impact on rates
40. Energy affordability
41. Reliability
42. Feasibility of new technologies
43. The intersection of increased electricity use and transmission transformation while we rapidly transition to electric vehicles, particularly as price parity is expected within a year or so.
44. Reliability and rate impacts
45. Necessary upgrades to the local distribution grid
46. Community leadership
47. Extreme weather scenarios
48. Reliability and affordability
49. Equitable investments, track and monitor addressing previous disparities, in an effort to reduce costs to those who can least afford rate increases
50. Fuel mix over time by year (i.e., carbon/kWh)
51. Long duration storage - multi-day
52. Resource deployment timelines
53. I believe it is most important to test equity throughout the SLTRP. We need to prioritize communities most affected by pollution and climate change.
54. Multiday demand response study
55. Feasibility of new technologies
56. Feasibility
57. Distribution overloads and solutions
58. Reliability and resiliency
59. Total monthly energy bills (including gas and gasoline) for low-to-middle-income households
60. Rate impact
61. Reliability
62. Resource deployment timelines
63. Rate design strategies
64. Demand response options

SURVEY RESULTS

Question 1: What do you think is most important to test and study in the SLTRP?

1. Rates and reliability.
2. A pilot followed with post pilot analyses
3. Customer programs to encourage deep energy efficiency, electrification, distributed generation programs, testing demand respond as an alternative to untested clean fuels
4. Feasibility and timeline of implementation . Timeline of technology development. Long term weather patterns.
5. Preparedness for emergency response and affordability
6. Transition to 100% energy provider by striking a balance between the lowest BILL (not only rates, but including pass throughs) and maintaining the existing reliability
7. Reliability and overall system impacts
8. Distribution overloads and methods to mitigate
9. Feasibility
10. How to avoid increasing total monthly energy bills for low-to-middle income households. (Will there be efficiency upgrade and fuel switching programs?)
11. Developing a clear target for the fuel mix per year. This helps organizations project carbon footprint over time.
12. Reliability and resiliency

Question 2: As you prepare for involvement in the SLTRP, what kinds of information would you find helpful?

1. Better financial information and the impact on rates, the balance sheet, the income statement and cash flows. Also, what is the path for 100% renewables?
2. Goals and road map to achieve them
3. Analysis of key barriers to getting projects done, realistic assessments of risks to success
4. Any limitations we need to consider in or planning process.
5. Have the study team send out results in advance of meetings for the AG to review
6. Overall timeline, system impacts, future of power generation, and energy storage
7. Realistic goals based on experience and past productivity in large construction projects. Environmental permitting and resource availability to complete envisioned work and projects.
8. Potential resources, technologies available, models
9. Details about how RFPs will be written to reduce environmental impact (e.g. desert water consumption and/or habitat bulldozing)
10. A concise set of options

Question 3: What do you think will be the greatest challenge(s) for LADWP to overcome in order to be successful in achieving 100% carbon free by 2035, in a way that is equitable and has minimal adverse impact on ratepayers?

1. The impact on all ratepayers will not be minimal. We need to study the impact on all ratepayers, including the middle class, homeowners, and employers. We need greater transparency which includes the media.
2. Consistency in priorities
3. Significant ramp up and deepening of customer programs, transmission and other no-regrets projects that are already behind schedule
4. Internal process with long lead times such as procurement. External process such as EIR process. Lack of internal resources. Challenges with using acquiring external resources due to union process.

5. To transform the power system in a very short time with the existing environmental impact regulatory process
6. It is important to properly assess our Power System to provide reliability power to customer. The biggest challenge is balancing the transition between more renewable and traditional power generation
7. Resources (manpower, capital, etc.)
8. Resource delivery in relation to transmission and distribution capacity, and implementation of necessary upgrades
9. Getting past mistrust of people who feel this is politically driven and/or are primarily worried about their bills.
10. Ability to deliver without huge impacts on rates.
11. Upgrading and increasing transmission capacity

7. Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Next meeting will have an LA100 Study review (9am), for AG members who may not be familiar with the details of the LA100 Study or want a review.

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 30, 2021; 10:00 am-12:00pm, WebEx Platform (Virtual)