

Appendix N Public Outreach

N.1 Overview

This section outlines the public outreach that will be carried out as part of the 2010 IRP process to provide information and increase awareness of LADWP's long-term power resource plans.

N.2 Community workshops

A series of regional public workshops are being scheduled in mid-July 2010 throughout Los Angeles.

Workshops will be publicized through newspaper advertisements, press releases, a dedicated Website and social media.

A dedicated, interactive Website, www.LAPowerPlan.org, will be established and will enable visitors to provide comments directly online.

The workshops will be professionally facilitated.

Following the workshops, LADWP will summarize feedback and post frequently asked questions and responses on the Website.

N.3 Public Comments

This section will address comments received during the Public Outreach effort related to the 2010 Integrated Resource Plan.

N.4 Questions and Answers

This section will address questions received during the Public Outreach effort related to the 2010 Integrated Resource Plan. These will be posted on the Website as well as presented to the Board of Water and Power Commissioners.

(This page intentionally left blank)

2010 INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN
Community Outreach Summary

Prepared for:
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
111 North Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Prepared by:
AECOM
1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101

October 12, 2010

Table of Contents

I. REPORT OVERVIEW	5
II. COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM.....	6
Purpose	6
Public Workshops	6
Website and Online Survey	11
Stakeholder Meetings	12
Elected/Appointed Officials Briefings	12
III. DISCUSSION THEME SYNTHESIS.....	14
Methodology for Identifying Discussion Themes	14
Discussion Themes	14
Emphasize a Variety of Energy Sources	14
Maximize Energy Efficiency and Conservation to Meet Future Energy Needs	14
Eliminate Coal from LADWP’s Energy Portfolio	15
Expand Local Solar Generation	16
Avoid Adverse Impacts to Vulnerable Communities	16
Clarify Costs of IRP Implementation and Potential Impacts to Ratepayers	17
Reduce Environmental Impacts	17
Provide Proactive Leadership and Transparency	18
IV. EXHIBITS	20
A – Project Fact Sheet	20
B – Workshop Agenda	20
C – Discussion Group Notes	20
D – Comment Cards	20
E – Online Survey	20

Report Overview

This report provides a summary of input received through the community outreach program conducted for the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's (LADWP's) 2010 Power Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The community outreach program consisted of a series of regional public workshops, a website (www.lapowerplan.org), and an online survey, along with stakeholder meetings, which were intended to inform the public about the 2010 IRP and to solicit feedback.

The kickoff public workshop was held on August 12, 2010, at the LADWP headquarters in downtown Los Angeles. Seven regional workshops were held between September 11, 2010, and September 30, 2010. The regional workshops were held throughout Los Angeles to gather input that reflects the City of Los Angeles' geographic and demographic diversity and to maximize participation opportunities. A website was also created for the 2010 IRP; it included an electronic version of the 2010 IRP and associated documents, promoted the public workshops, and provided an interactive online survey consisting of questions similar to the workshop discussion questions. All the presentation materials from the public workshops were also made available on the website. A series of stakeholder meetings were also held in August through October, 2010, with representatives from business and environmental groups with a specific interest in the 2010 IRP.

This summary is arranged into four sections: Report Overview, Community Outreach Program, Discussion Theme Synthesis, and Exhibits. The information contained in each of the remaining sections is described below:

- **Community Outreach Program:** Provides an overview of all aspects of the outreach related to the 2010 IRP, including the public workshops, website, stakeholder meetings, and elected/appointed official briefings.
- **Discussion Theme Synthesis:** Contains a summary of the input contributed during the community outreach program. The input has been synthesized to reflect the breadth and depth of the input received and incorporates reoccurring themes that were expressed by participants.
- **Exhibits:** Includes the project fact sheet, a transcription of the notes from the public workshops, comment cards submitted at the workshops and through the website, and online survey results, as well as other comments collected as part of the community outreach program.

Community Outreach Program

Purpose

The community outreach program was designed to collect broad input on issues, ideas, and concerns related to the 2010 IRP. Input was collected with the intention of providing guidance to LADWP staff in the formulation of a final long-term strategy, and to inform the LADWP Board of Commissioners prior to adoption of a final document. An overview of the 2010 IRP is provided in Exhibit A, Project Fact Sheet.

Specific objectives of the community outreach program were to:

- Prioritize transparency and inclusiveness in the 2010 IRP process.
- Receive feedback and public comments to be incorporated into the Final 2010 IRP document.
- Educate and create awareness about the 2010 IRP among stakeholders and community members.
- Communicate strategies for reducing carbon emissions and integrating renewable resources, while meeting forecasted demand, maintaining reliability, and keeping costs as low as possible.
- Communicate the potential impact on costs and customer rates for various alternative cases analyzed in the 2010 IRP.

To achieve these objects, LADWP developed a multipronged outreach approach to allow community members and stakeholders different opportunities to provide input on the 2010 IRP. Community involvement opportunities were provided through a website, stakeholder meetings, and a series of public workshops. Elected and appointed official briefings were also held to keep local representatives abreast of outreach opportunities and the community's contributions. Input collected through each of these programs is considered of equal importance when considered by LADWP staff.

Public Workshops

The public workshops were held in different locations throughout the city to reflect the geographic and demographic diversity of Los Angeles. Workshops were also held on various days of the week at different times to allow many options for participants to find a convenient workshop schedule.

Workshop Schedule and Location

A kick-off workshop was held in Downtown Los Angeles on August 12, 2010, in the LADWP headquarters. Seven regional workshops were held between September 11, 2010, and September 30, 2010, throughout Los Angeles. Table 1 shows the meeting location and schedule.

Table 1: Location and Time of Community Workshops

<p>Downtown <i>Thursday, August 12, 2010</i> 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm <i>LADWP John Ferraro Building</i> 111 N. Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90012</p>	<p>East Valley <i>Saturday, September 11, 2010</i> 10:00 am – 12:00 pm <i>Los Angeles Mission College</i> 13356 Eldridge Avenue Sylmar, CA 92342</p>	<p>West LA <i>Monday, September 13, 2010</i> 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm <i>Stephen Wise Temple</i> 15500 Stephen S Wise Drive Los Angeles, CA 90077</p>
<p>South LA <i>Tuesday, September 14, 2010</i> 6:00 pm – 8:00pm <i>California African American Museum—Exposition Park</i> 600 State Drive Los Angeles, CA 90037</p>	<p>East LA <i>Wednesday, September 15, 2010</i> 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm <i>California State University</i> 5151 State University Drive Los Angeles, CA 90032</p>	<p>Harbor <i>Monday, September 20, 2010</i> 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm <i>Crowne Plaza Los Angeles Harbor</i> 601 South Palos Verdes Street San Pedro, CA 90731</p>
<p>West Valley <i>Wednesday, September 22, 2010</i> 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm <i>Holiday Inn—Warner Center</i> 21101 Ventura Blvd Woodland Hills, CA 91364</p>	<p>Northeast LA <i>Thursday, September 30, 2010</i> 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm <i>Glassell Park Senior & Community Center</i> 3750 Verdugo Road Los Angeles, CA 90055</p>	

Attendance

Attendance varied between each of the public workshops as shown in Table 2. Most attendees identified themselves as customers of LADWP when they signed in, although individuals were not required to be customers to attend the meetings and provide input. Several attendees also identified themselves as being associated with industry groups or environmental organizations, such as solar developers or the Sierra Club. There were also a number of people who attended multiple meetings.

Table 2: Workshop Attendance by Location

Meeting	Attendees
Downtown	96
East Valley	41
West LA	34
South LA	38
East LA	17
Harbor	19
West Valley	50
Northeast LA	17

Workshop Publicity

LADWP conducted extensive publicity to maximize inclusiveness and diversity among participants. To publicize the workshops, meeting information was detailed on the project website, advertisements were placed in local and regional newspapers, and press releases and Twitter messages were issued. Targeted outreach was also conducted to inform the Council Districts and engage the Neighborhood Councils.

Web, Email, and Social Networking

LADWP placed electronic advertisements on the City Watch Website, which averages between 220,000 and 500,000 hits daily, beginning August 23 and running through the final workshop September 30. LADWP also used Twitter to send messages (“tweets”) about the entire workshop series and to promote each individual workshop; issued Neighborhood Council and stakeholder email blasts; and included the workshop series in customer e-newsletters (*LADWP at Work* and *At Home*), which are emailed to all LADWP residential and commercial customers.

Media

Advertisements that featured the locations and dates of all workshops were placed in community and regional newspapers, including:

- *Daily News*
- *Daily Breeze*
- *L.A. Watts Times*
- *L.A. Sentinel*
- *Korean Daily*
- *Chinese Daily*
- *La Opinion*
- *Philippine Media*
- *Downtown News*
- *Korean Times Daily*
- *Beverly Press/Park La Brea News*
- *Larchmont Chronicle*
- *Tolucan Times*
- *L.A. Business Journal*
- *San Fernando Valley Business Journal*
- *Wave/Independent/Equal Access Media*
- *Eastern Group Publications*

A general news release was issued to announce the first workshop followed by a second release announcing the entire workshop series, emphasizing the desire for public feedback on the 2010 IRP, which included an invitation to the IRP website to take the online survey. Media advisories were also issued the morning of each workshop.

Additional Outreach

To reach additional members of the public, LADWP distributed flyers at public libraries throughout the city. Flyers announcing the workshops, along with fact sheets, were distributed to all Council District field offices, at the Mayor's Office, and at the Council District 2 National Night Out Finale community event at Valley Plaza Park.

LADWP conducted extensive outreach to engage Neighborhood Councils, including announcements at Neighborhood Council meetings, distribution of flyers, and email blasts, which encouraged Neighborhood Councils and community members to attend the regional workshops. LADWP staff also made announcements about the regional workshops to over 30 Neighborhood Council meetings throughout the city in August and September.

Workshop Format

The community workshops consisted of four main components: (1) a presentation on the 2010 IRP by Michael Webster, LADWP Assistant Director of Power System Planning and Development; (2) small group discussions led by facilitators; (3) report back and workshop wrap up; and (4) written comment cards. Please see Exhibit B for the workshop agenda.

Presentation

The workshop presentation established a foundation for the community to get a better understanding of the 2010 IRP. Important contextual information was presented, which provided a historical overview of LADWP's mission, operations, and vertical approach to service; background and objectives of the IRP; and challenges of balancing the objectives. The presentation also outlined specific strategies for reducing carbon emissions and integrating renewable resources, while meeting forecasted demand, maintaining reliability, and keeping costs as low as possible. A video of the presentation was posted on the project website for all community members to view the presentation outside of the workshops.

Small Group Discussions

After the presentation, participants joined smaller breakout sessions ranging from 10 to 15 people, depending on the number of attendees. Through a guided discussion, the small groups provided a forum for participants to provide input and identify issues, share ideas, and voice concerns related to the 2010 IRP. The small groups were also designated to make the complex and technical information in the IRP more accessible by creating an environment where all attendees felt comfortable asking questions and sharing thoughts about the complex technical information in the long-range plan.

Each group was led by a facilitator and an LADWP staff member familiar with the details of the 2010 IRP. Each of the group discussions began by having the group's LADWP staff member lead attendees through the 2010 IRP Executive Summary, which was distributed to each participant as they entered the meeting. The staff member presented the details for each of the six case options, including the mix of resources, estimated costs, estimated reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and the potential impact on customer rates. This overview was followed by a question and answer period. The LADWP staff member answered technical

questions and provided clarification on the 2010 IRP.

Following the LADWP staff presentation and the question and answer period, participants were then given the opportunity to share their perspectives related to the 2010 IRP. Participants were eager to express viewpoints on many issues during the group discussion session.

Discussion Questions

The facilitator assisted the group in communicating priorities, issues, and concerns related to the 2010 IRP by asking the following questions:¹²

1. What priorities does LADWP need to consider when making a recommendation on the IRP long-term strategy?
2. How much more per bill are you willing to pay to implement some of the types of concepts in the IRP?
 - 5%?
 - 15%?
 - 25%?
 - 0% (Nothing)?
3. Are there any other comments or ideas you would like LADWP to consider related to the 2010 IRP?

The facilitator maintained a record of the participant responses to each question. After a period of sharing the priorities that were important for consideration in the 2010 IRP as part of the discussion on Question 1, four sticky dots were distributed to each member of the group. Group members were asked to use the dots to identify the priorities, or priority, that were most important to them out of those that were shared among the group. Each dot represented an identification of a priority, and participants were allowed to place multiple dots on a priority to indicate relative importance of a topic over another. The priorities identified by each group were considered in the development of the Discussion Themes.

Exhibit C contains detailed transcriptions of all the notes collected during the discussion group for each public workshop, as well as the results of all the input collected during the dot prioritization exercise.

Additional Notes on Question 2

After the group members finished with the prioritization exercise, the facilitator asked Question 2. Participants were asked if they were willing to pay 5%, 15%, 25%, or 0%

¹² The following questions were asked at the August 12, 2010, meeting and modified in subsequent workshops: (1) What priorities does LADWP need to consider when making a recommendation on the IRP long-term strategy? (2) What level and mix of renewables should LADWP strive for (solar, wind, geothermal, etc.)—and at what cost? (3) How should LADWP transition away from high carbon emitting resources—and at what cost? (4) Are there any other comments or ideas you would like LADWP to consider related to the 2010 IRP? The questions were modified to eliminate redundancy between Questions 2 and 3, and because of time limitations.

(nothing) more per bill to implement some of the types of concepts in the IRP. Attendees were asked to raise their hand to indicate support for any amount they felt comfortable supporting. Some group members were uncomfortable answering the question and asked to provide comments instead of, or in conjunction with, raising their hand. This question was intended to understand group members' sentiment about costs. There is no statistical significance associated with the informal poll that was taken during each group discussion. Instead, this question is more appropriately understood as feedback from a focus group that identified larger opinions and attitudes of group members that relate to costs, as well as the priority participants placed on renewable energy development.¹³

Report Back and Wrap Up

To allow participants to get a sense of the discussions that occurred in the other groups, participants reconvened as an audience at the conclusion of the breakout session, where a representative from each group recapped his/her group discussion. To accomplish this, a volunteer from each group reported back on the top three priorities that were collectively identified by the group as the topics with the most dots from the prioritization exercise.

The workshops concluded with an explanation of how workshop input and input collected by other outreach programs would be documented into a summary. It was also explained that the summary would be considered by the project team in formulating the 2010 Final IRP that would be presented to the LADWP Board of Commissioners, and posted on the project website.

Written Comment Cards

At the beginning of the meeting, attendees were also provided a comment card with questions that mirrored the small group discussion questions. The comment card provided a medium for detailed written comments to be submitted. The comment cards were collected at the conclusion of the meeting or could be mailed afterwards to LADWP. In addition, participants were invited to submit additional comments through the website or directly to LADWP. All comment cards, letters, and other input received electronically can be found in Exhibit D.

Website and Online Survey

A project website (www.lapowerplan.org) was created specifically for the 2010 IRP. The website provided access to a complete version of the 2010 IRP and associated technical

¹³ To provide some context to Question #2, the following statement was made to participants at each of the regional meetings:

As the LADWP staff member explained, one of the goals of this public outreach process is to gauge how much more you would be willing to pay to increase renewable energy and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. The graph on P.12 [of the Executive Summary] indicates that LADWP electric rates will go up a certain percentage over the next 20 years under all six cases. However, let me emphasize that these are hypothetical outcomes based on all the various assumptions used to model the cases. Also it should be noted that energy efficiency/energy conservation can reduce your bill. No matter what happens with the rates, you can choose to use energy more efficiently –buy energy efficient refrigerators and other appliances, or use energy during “off peak” hours. All these strategies can help you reduce electricity costs. The Department is only interested in getting your feedback; your “vote” is NOT an endorsement of a rate increase. Think of yourselves as part of a focus group. Maybe you are willing to pay a little more steadily over 20 years to help the DWP get off of coal power by 2020. Or maybe you prefer not to pay anything now because of financial issues. You can pick 5%, 15%, 25%, or 0% (nothing). Or, you can choose not to vote at all. The main thing is to let LADWP know how you feel regarding this issue.

appendices, as well as a stand-alone version of the Executive Summary, which was formatted to improve readability for the public. A fact sheet about the IRP, which was prepared to convey the complex material in visual and written format, was also made available on the website. The website included a schedule of public workshops, and a section that allowed the public to submit comments and questions about the plan online. Comments submitted through the website can be found in Exhibit D.

In addition, the website contained an online survey that mirrored the questions asked in the public workshops, as well as the comment card distributed during the workshops. Members of the public who were unable to attend a public workshop were given the same opportunity to provide input on the 2010 IRP through the website survey. There were 55 responses to the online survey, all of which can be found in Exhibit E.

Stakeholder Meetings

LADWP conducted meetings targeting specific stakeholders, including business and industry representatives, as well as environmental groups. These meetings were conducted in a similar fashion as the public workshops. Input collected at these meetings is included in the discussion themes found in the next section of this document, and discussion notes can also be found in Exhibit C.

Business and Industry

LADWP offered presentations for the following business and industry stakeholders:

- Central City Association – meeting on September 21, 2010
- LA Business Council – meeting on September 24, 2010
- Large Commercial Customers – meeting on September 30, 2010
- Valley Industry and Commerce Association – meeting on October 6, 2010

Environmental Groups

Representatives of key environmental groups—including the Sierra Club, National Resources Defense Council, Environment Now and the Green L.A. Coalition—were invited to briefings and contacted directly to attend the kick-off workshop and regional workshops.

Elected/Appointed Officials Briefings

LADWP also met with various elected and appointed officials to provide an overview of the contents of the 2010 IRP and to inform them about the community outreach process. The briefings were intended to inform decision makers about the 2010 IRP and the process, and are not reflected in the discussion themes found in the next section of this document.

- Board of Water and Power Commissioners – Presentation to Board, July 22, 2010.
- Briefings were conducted for staffs of City Council members, Mayor's office, Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA), and Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) on August 12, 2010, and September 16, 2010. A follow-up briefing will be scheduled in October.

- Neighborhood Council Memorandum of Understanding Oversight Committee – briefing August 7, 2010.
- Additional Outreach:
 - A summary of the first workshop was emailed to Council staff.
 - An additional IRP summary after the first week of regional workshops was emailed to Council staff.
 - LADWP requested a special IRP briefing with Councilmembers (Energy & Environment Committee), Mayor, CLA, CAO.
 - LADWP requested to have a special IRP outreach meeting with stakeholders selected by Council members.
 - LADWP requested that the IRP workshop schedule be placed in individual Council community newsletters (it was placed in newsletter of Councilmember Bernard Parks.
 - A final IRP analysis will be provided to Mayor/Council/CAO/CLA staff.

Discussion Theme Synthesis

The public workshops, stakeholder meetings, online survey, and comment cards yielded a significant amount of information from LADWP customers related to the 2010 IRP. This information has been synthesized into a set of discussion themes that reflect the major ideas provided by participants during the community outreach program.

Methodology for Identifying Discussion Themes

During the community outreach program, attendees provided broad input about issues, ideas, and concerns related to the 2010 IRP. The discussion themes provide a synopsis of this input and represent expansive discussion topics for the community outreach program. For a comprehensive understanding of the richness and range of input, the major discussion themes should be reviewed in conjunction with the transcription of the notes from the small group discussions and stakeholder meetings, the comment cards, and responses to the online survey.

An initial series of broad themes was first identified to categorize all of the statements gathered during the public outreach program. Coding strategies were then used to validate and refine the themes.¹⁴ Using AtlasTI, a computer software program for qualitative data analysis, codes were established for each theme and applied to all of the public input that was collected through the community outreach program. Codes were applied to individual comments and enabled comparison between different comments relating to the same topic. For example, a statement such as “Educate consumers about how to conserve,” was ultimately coded as (1) “Energy Efficiency and Conservation” because it was one of many statements provided by workshop participants that related to using less energy or using energy more efficiently, and (2) “Education and Community Outreach” because it relates to efforts by LADWP to inform and engage the community.

After coding all the input, the initial set of themes was refined. A narrative on each theme was also created to provide context and understanding. The narrative is based upon the comments that were tagged with a code relating to specific themes. The comments were reviewed to understand the frequency of certain discussion topics, the breadth of all discussion topics, and the relationships between the topics.

Discussion Themes

The discussion themes listed below are not representative of the city at-large, and only encompass input from participants in the public workshops, attendees at the stakeholder meetings, and members of the public who completed the online survey or comment card. All the ideas that were prioritized during the public workshops are included within the discussion themes; however, each theme is considered to be of equal importance, and the themes are not listed in any order of priority.

¹⁴ For more information on the methodologies employed to identify themes, please see Ryan, Gery W. and H. Russell Bernard. 2003. “Techniques to Identify Themes.” *Field Methods* 15(1):85–109.

Emphasize a *Variety* of Energy Sources

Many participants were supportive of the resource strategies presented in the 2010 IRP. Recognizing that overreliance on a single energy source could lead to instability, attendees advocated for a strategy that integrates a variety of resources. In particular, participants were concerned that natural gas was especially subject to fluctuations in price and relied heavily on delivery pipelines, which could jeopardize reliability. Some attendees expressed a desire to see a wider variety of energy sources beyond wind and solar. Some of the suggested energy sources included:

- Algae
- Biofuels
- Fuel Cells
- Geothermal
- Hydroelectric
- Natural Gas
- Nuclear
- Solid Waste
- Wave

The discussion of these other energy sources varied greatly. Nuclear and geothermal sources were mentioned by various participants. Many attendees indicated that LADWP should stay on the forefront of new advancements, and all viable sources of energy should continually be evaluated as modern technology evolves.

Maximize *Energy Efficiency and Conservation* to Meet Future Energy Needs

Energy efficiency and conservation efforts were strongly supported by participants and were recognized as necessary components in meeting the future energy needs of Los Angeles. Participants expressed that LADWP could use several strategies to encourage customers to use less energy, as well as take steps to make the entire power system (both customer-side and utility-side) more energy efficient.

Many participants recommended that LADWP incorporate additional financial incentives to customers who use less energy. Suggestions included the installation of smart meters to provide information about real-time energy use, enabling customers to make smarter

decisions about how they use power. In addition, some attendees believed that an increase in energy rates would also lead to an overall reduction in energy consumption. Participants also suggested that charging higher prices during peak periods than during off-peak periods could encourage conservation when demand is highest, and could potentially shift energy use to periods with a lower demand.

Participants also emphasized the need for education programs for customers on the importance of conservation and ways to conserve energy. Political and cultural challenges in encouraging energy efficiency and conservation were identified as well.

In addition, many participants recommended that LADWP look for ways to improve the efficiency of the power system as a whole. This included suggestions to improve the efficiency of generating and transmitting energy. Several attendees also commented that technical improvements on the customer-side could lead to more efficient energy use, such as using more energy-efficient appliances. There was support for requirements that newly constructed buildings be designed for energy efficiency and it was suggested that older buildings should be retrofitted. Participants also proposed that LADWP provide/expand energy audits to demonstrate to customers what changes or improvements could be made in homes or businesses to use less energy.

Eliminate Coal from LADWP's Energy Portfolio

Many participants expressed concern over the continued use of coal, recommended its removal from LADWP's energy portfolio, and suggested that it be replaced with renewable energy sources as much as possible. These participants noted that the elimination of coal would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality, and some said that replacing coal with natural gas would not be a significant improvement. Other participants believed that the secondary costs of coal were not totally being accounted for, and that impacts to the environment and public health have a cost not always reflected in energy prices.

In addition, there was some discussion of the need to insulate the energy portfolio from anticipated cost increases of coal, such as compliance with new regulatory requirements including a cap and trade program. It was recommended by some attendees that this insulation should be created by the development of renewable sources because the cost of natural gas is also predicted to increase. Furthermore, some participants recognized that the proactive development of renewable sources could stabilize cost increases, and avoid potential market-driven/investor-influenced cost spikes.

Finally, some attendees said developing more renewable sources now will allow LADWP to hedge against future uncertain energy market fluctuations and experience lower renewable development prices from early market entry. Other suggestions included increasing the renewable sources in the near-term portfolio while high-yield development sites are still available.

Expand Local Solar Generation

There was widespread support for LADWP to expand solar power generation in-basin. However, out-of-basin solar generation was also viewed favorably. Many participants noted that in-basin solar has environmental benefits because of the decreased need for transmission facilities. In addition, some participants felt that distributed, in-basin generation would improve reliability, especially on summer days when both energy demand and solar radiation are typically high. In-basin solar had an additional perceived benefit of creating local jobs and improving the local economy.

Participants suggested that LADWP offer additional incentives to promote small-scale, in-basin photovoltaic systems, which could include subsidized loans to offset construction costs and/or feed-in tariff programs. Some attendees suggested that LADWP advance initiatives to install solar panels on roofs throughout Los Angeles, including on public buildings and parking lots.

Some participants expressed frustration over the current billing system related to individual solar systems, and an owner's inability to sell energy back to LADWP for cash. It was suggested that LADWP consider reevaluating this program and the way in which credits are applied.

Avoid Adverse Impacts to Vulnerable Communities

A number of participants expressed concern over the possibility that some communities in the region may experience unequal impacts from implementing particular components of the IRP. Low-income households, seniors, disabled persons, and others on a fixed income were identified as populations that may be impacted financially by potential costs associated with repowering. There was support for LADWP continuing to provide some protection against overly burdensome costs of electricity to customers who are economically disadvantaged.

Many participants believed that costs could also be minimized through incentive programs that encourage energy efficiency. Additionally, some participants voiced opinions that communities with a disadvantaged socioeconomic status have historically received more than their fair share of major infrastructure and suggested that equal distribution of facilities throughout the city should be prioritized.

There was also concern on how facilities would impact communities outside of Los Angeles. Some participants questioned if it is ethical to allow out-of-basin communities to bear the

environmental impacts of providing power to Los Angeles and expressed a desire to see out-of-basin generation minimized. However, most understood the benefits of out-of-basin generation, such as greater resource diversity and reliability, and recognized continued collaborative relationships with other out-of-basin utilities.

Clarify Costs of IRP Implementation and *Potential Impacts* to Ratepayers

Nearly all participants felt there was a need to clarify costs of IRP implementation and the potential impacts to ratepayers. Many participants thought that clarifying the different costs associated with generation, transmission, and distribution would provide a more accurate assessment of the overall costs associated with the IRP. Others considered it important to clarify labor and administrative costs of LADWP operations and their relation to the IRP. There was also discussion of the need to demonstrate the relationship between the costs associated with the IRP and LADWP's Strategic Plan.

The relative costs of different energy sources were also of interest to attendees. Many participants were concerned with the externalities associated with the IRP, including the secondary costs of the different case options. Secondary costs of interest to participants include the environmental and public health impacts, which were perceived by many to be costs incurred by the community but not reflected in energy rates. In contrast, other participants suggested that implementing the IRP would create local jobs and provide an economic benefit.

Some participants were adamantly opposed to potential future increases in their energy bills, while others supported an increase with caveats such as the need for improved transparency and accountability, or that additional revenues would be used exclusively for providing more renewable energy and/or getting off coal early. Participants who supported a potential increase often argued that an increase could be offset by reduced energy consumption, which could ultimately lower bills. There was also a desire to avoid any adverse impacts that a potential increase would have on low-income communities and individuals with a fixed income. Many people expressed concern that increasing energy costs would be detrimental to businesses in Los Angeles, especially during the current economic climate.

Reduce Environmental Impacts

Environmental protection was a priority for many participants. Some participants expressed a general concern for the environment, while other participants were interested in specific impacts to wildlife and landscapes, water quality, and aesthetics, as well as the storage of nuclear waste. Many attendees indicated that their concern for the environment extended

beyond air quality and global warming/climate change issues.

The environmental impacts of construction, maintenance, and operation of generation, transmission, and/or distribution facilities were all among the activities that participants were concerned about. It was noted that environmental impacts could be reduced by maximizing existing infrastructure and locating new facilities on already disturbed sites, such as rooftops and brownfields, where possible.

Provide Proactive Leadership and Transparency

Participants saw an opportunity for LADWP to take proactive steps to educate the public about existing LADWP programs and incentives, ways to improve energy efficiency and conservation, and the power system in general. Some participants advocated LADWP to make information easily accessible and clearly identify the decision-making process.

Some participants felt that LADWP needed to lead-by-example with their operations and facilities, invest in research and development, and demonstrate the viability of new technologies. Participants supported LADWP continuing outreach to the public by partnering with existing local groups, schools, and other institutions to disseminate important information, especially related to energy efficiency and conservation. Suggestions were also expressed that clear and accessible information about LADWP's power system be made readily available to the public.

Organizational transparency and accountability were important to participants. Participants emphasized that the planning and facility development process continue to involve the public. There was also support for an independent ratepayer advocate to provide transparency and accountability in LADWP's finances and promote the interest of ratepayers in decisions. Some participants felt that billing statements should explicitly separate water and power costs and provide clear information and education on how bills are calculated. There were also suggestions that a program be established to monitor progress in achieving goals outlined in the IRP.

Exhibits

A – Project Fact Sheet

B – Workshop Agenda

C – Discussion Group Notes

D – Comment Cards

E – Online Survey

To view these exhibits, please visit www.lapowerplan.org.