



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-1360

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, kay.hartman@palmsnc.la

Mon, Apr 6, 2026 at 3:09 AM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Palms

Name: Kay Hartman

Email: kay.hartman@palmsnc.la

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(7) Nay(1) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 04/01/2026

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 04/06/2026

Update to a Previous Input: Yes

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-1360

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: The Palms Neighborhood Council opposes CF25-1360. LADWP's proposal to convert Scattergood into a "hydrogen-ready" thermal power plant that continues to temporarily burn methane gas, or methane gas mixed with hydrogen, is informed by the Los Angeles 100% Renewable Energy Study (LA100) in 2021 and update in 2025, which both conclude that in-basin combustion generation is necessary for LADWP to maintain resilience during extreme weather events such as wildfires. We believe this conclusion is false.

CIS Oppose CF25-1360

Community Impact Statement From Palms Neighborhood Council

Council File: 25-1360

Subject: Scattergood “Green” Hydrogen

Position: Oppose

The Palms Neighborhood Council opposes CF25-1360. LADWP’s proposal to convert Scattergood into a “hydrogen-ready” thermal power plant that continues to temporarily burn methane gas, or methane gas mixed with hydrogen, is informed by the Los Angeles 100% Renewable Energy Study (LA100) in 2021 and update in 2025, which both conclude that in-basin combustion generation is necessary for LADWP to maintain resilience during extreme weather events such as wildfires. We believe this conclusion is false.

The 2025 update to the LA100 study states that a 330 MW, 10-hour battery storage facility would be sufficient to replace Scattergood’s baseload electrical output, and that such a facility would only require 21.1 acres of land inside the basin. However, the update vaguely concludes that battery storage is not a viable alternative due to “significant uncertainty” that exists regarding LADWP’s ability to procure this new land before 2030, without going into any substantive detail.

From 2021-2025, California installed 15,181 MW of battery power capacity, with most facilities interconnecting with the grid only a few years after the permitting process initially began. Meanwhile, as the battery storage industry is booming, California’s “green” hydrogen industry remains in a state of inertia, and the Trump Administration’s decision to withdraw \$1.2 billion in federal funding from the proposed California ARCHES H2 hub (leading to the closure of the project) has caused further setbacks.

Almost three years after City Council voted to approve the Scattergood project, it is still unknown where the hydrogen for the plant will be coming from, by what means of transport, how it will be generated, and at what price. LADWP can replace Scattergood’s baseload capacity with increased battery storage and transmission capacity on a shorter timeline and at a lower cost than it can with hydrogen. LADWP’s EIR inadequately evaluates these other potential transition scenarios. The Board’s certification of this flawed EIR is unacceptable and warrants the City’s intervention.

The Scattergood Modernization Project would prolong LADWP’s reliance on methane gas, increase rates for LADWP customers, and waste billions of dollars on what is soon to be a stranded asset. City Council must appeal the LADWP Board’s decision now in order to prevent the Department from making this critical mistake that will derail southern California’s decarbonization progress for decades to come.