

Communication from Public

Name: Carter Moon

Date Submitted: 02/01/2023 05:31 PM

Council File No: 23-0039

Comments for Public Posting: I am a resident of the Sawtelle neighborhood and I support this motion to move our city to 100% renewable energy without relying on hydrogen. Investing \$800 million in a project that will increase NOx emissions is dangerous and short-sighted in a time when that money desperately needs to be spent on electrification upgrades and solar storage, the solutions we know actually address climate change.

Communication from Public

Name: Catherine M Ronan

Date Submitted: 02/01/2023 07:13 PM

Council File No: 23-0039

Comments for Public Posting: I support the motion to ask LADWP to explore alternatives to burning hydrogen at the Scattergood generating plant. LADWP is eager to have the City Council greenlight a project to build a power plant at Scattergood which will burn a mixture of gas and hydrogen, and eventually, in theory, just hydrogen. We need to put the brakes on this project because there are too many unanswered questions. The LA 100 report itself said that burning hydrogen in power plants needs more research and development than was within the ability of a single municipal utility to carry out. We do know that green hydrogen production is energy and water intensive, that it is very flammable, that it is prone to leaking, and that, when burned, it produces nitrous oxide which contributes to our bad air quality and causes health issues. What we don't know is whether it is even feasible to run a power plant on 100% green hydrogen. A report I came across recently evaluated a test project in New York that was able to mix 35% hydrogen with gas but that only reduced carbon dioxide emissions by 14%. And Nox emissions increased. That hardly seems like a result worth pursuing.

<https://www.epri.com/research/products/000000003002025166>

We also don't know how green hydrogen fuel for Scattergood would be produced, transported and stored. When I asked about this at an LADWP outreach meeting, The answers I heard were "it's a problem" and "there is no market for green hydrogen" and "it's expensive." Would you buy a new car without knowing where you would get fuel for it or how much it would cost? No, of course not. SoCal Gas is eager to get into the business of producing hydrogen as they see it as a way to keep their natural gas/methane industry alive. Mix a bit of hydrogen with methane and call it a clean fuel. This is greenwashing at its worst. Mostly likely the hydrogen would be produced far from Scattergood and then piped in and stored. That means new infrastructure to move and store a highly flammable gas just when we are committed to weaning ourselves off natural gas (methane) in our power plants and our homes. Why would the City approve a project which will extend the life of methane and require new infrastructure? And it would be the ratepayers paying for this infrastructure. An excellent article discussing the best uses for hydrogen was published by the Rocky Mountain Institute. Their take is that

using hydrogen as fuel in power plants is not a good idea and that blending hydrogen with natural gas does little to reduce emissions . <https://rmi.org/we-need-hydrogen-but-not-for-everything/>
Repowering Scattergood with hydrogen presents increased health and safety risks. It's very expensive, and it's not even proven to work. Let's put a hold on this project. We need clean electricity to reliably power the city. Hydrogen is not the answer. There are other alternatives to be explored.