



Reject the Scattergood EIR and Grant the Appeal

1 message

Michael Chaskes <chaskes1@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 8, 2026 at 8:12 AM

To: councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org, lyric.kelkar@lacity.org, Councilmember.Nazarian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, keith.banks@lacity.org, contactCD4@lacity.org, mashael.majid@lacity.org, councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org, Andrew.deblock@lacity.org, councilmember.padilla@lacity.org, lamont.cobb@lacity.org, councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org, marie.rumsey@lacity.org, sean.starkey@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, cd10@lacity.org, andrew.westall@lacity.org, councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org, Sachin Medhekar <sachin.medhekar@lacity.org>, councilmember.jurado@lacity.org, steve.diaz@lacity.org, councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org, Pamela.Thornton@lacity.org, anissa.raja@lacity.org, councilmember.Lee@lacity.org, Traci Park <councilmember.park@lacity.org>
Cc: clerk.cps@lacity.org

City Clerk: Please attach the following letter as written public comment to Council File 25-1360

Dear Councilmembers,

I am writing to urge the LA City Council to reject LADWP's Scattergood EIR and grant the appeal. The EIR does not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This project is dangerous, expensive, polluting, and communities don't want it.

The money being spent on this risky project, which prolongs reliance on fossil fuels, should instead be invested in truly clean, non-combustion technologies that will help LA meet its 2035 clean energy goals. LADWP adopted a very narrow project description that unfairly favors combustion generation, even though the same goals could be met through non-combustion alternatives.

The EIR also fails to properly evaluate the project against the reality that Scattergood's existing once-through cooling units must legally close by 2029. Rather than analyzing a future where these polluting units are retired, the EIR relies on an outdated baseline that makes the project appear less harmful than it actually is.

Additionally, the EIR does not incorporate impacts from hydrogen production and transportation. Recent analysis shows hydrogen production for plants including Scattergood could account for 1% of statewide water demand by 2045. Failing to analyze impacts from production to end use, including water and energy use and the infrastructure required to transport hydrogen, makes the EIR incomplete.

Los Angeles is already in extreme nonattainment for pollutants like ozone. NOx emissions from hydrogen combustion contribute to ozone and smog, worsening air quality and disproportionately harming frontline communities near the plant.

Thank you for your time. I hope you will listen to the community and reject this EIR, prioritizing environmental justice, climate, and public health by pursuing cleaner alternatives.

Michael Chaskes
Los Angeles, 90064