



Entergy Services, Inc.  
639 Loyola Avenue  
P. O. Box 61000  
New Orleans, LA 70161-1000  
Tel 504 576 2984  
Fax 504 576 5579  
hbarton@entergy.com

Harry M. Barton  
Senior Counsel  
Legal Department -- Regulatory

August 31, 2018

**By Hand Delivery**

Ms. Lora W. Johnson, CMC, LMMC  
Clerk of Council  
Council of the City of New Orleans  
Room 1E09, City Hall  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

**Re: In Re: 2018 Triennial Integrated Resource Plan of Entergy New Orleans, LLC**  
**Docket No. UD-17-03**

Dear Ms. Johnson:

Entergy New Orleans, LLC ("ENO" or the "Company") respectfully submits the Public Version of its September 14, 2018 Technical Meeting Materials in the above referenced Docket. Please file an original and two copies into the record in the above referenced matter, and return a date-stamped copy to our courier.

The confidential information provided on CD included with the Technical Meeting Materials are considered Highly Sensitive Protected Materials ("HSPM") and will be provided to the appropriate reviewing representatives pursuant to the provisions of the Official Protective Order adopted in Council Resolution R-07-432 relative to the disclosure of HSPM. As such, these confidential materials are being sent to the appropriate parties via UPS overnight delivery.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, I may be reached at (504) 576-2984. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

Harry M. Barton

HMB/bkd  
Enclosures  
cc: Official Service List (via email)

AUG 31 47

RECEIVED  
AUG 31 2018

BY: 



***ENO 2018 IRP  
Technical Meeting #2***



**September 14, 2018**

## Technical Meeting #1—Follow Ups

- **Proposed Planning Scenarios**
  - Add narrative descriptions
  - Consider impact of 50/50 renewables-to-gas buildout on LMPs
  - Consider CO<sub>2</sub> pricing adjustments to create better range of macro market futures
- **Proposed Planning Strategies**
  - Propose ideas for Strategy 3 for group discussion
- **IRP Modeling**
  - Further discussion of portfolio development process
- **Inputs Workbook**
  - Produce workbook with relevant IRP modeling inputs
  - Transition from BP18U to BP19

# Goals and Agenda of Technical Meeting #2

## Goals

- As described in the Initiating Resolution (R-17-430), the main purpose of this meeting is for ENO, the Advisors, and Intervenors to attempt to reach consensus on the Scenarios and Strategies that were initially discussed in Technical Meeting #1 (and which have been refined as described in this presentation), or
- To discuss the Planning Scenario and/or Strategies that have been prepared by the Intervenors and provided to the parties in advance of this Technical Meeting


## Agenda

1. Analytical Framework and Portfolio Development
2. ENO Capacity Need and Supply Alternatives
3. IRP Inputs and Assumptions
4. Timeline and Next Steps

# Section 1

## Analytical Framework and Portfolio Development

# Analytic Process to Create and Value Portfolios



# Development of ENO Proposed Planning Scenarios – Update

## *MISO Market Outside of New Orleans*

- Aurora market model testing has shown negative Locational Marginal Prices (LMPs), over an extended period of time as a result of the 50/50 renewables-to-gas market additions originally proposed for the MISO market
  - These negative LMPs could result in the suppression of renewable resource additions in portfolios designed for ENO
  - Because it is not realistic to expect the MISO market to experience negative LMPs over an extended period of time, it was necessary to reconsider this assumption
- Based on this testing, two of the three Scenarios proposed at Technical Meeting #1 were modified as shown on following slide:
  - To mitigate the impact that negative LMPs would have on the results and to encourage a range of market prices, ENO:
    - Adjusted the second Scenario to reflect a 25%/75% renewables-to-gas mix for MISO Market additions, and adjusted the CO<sub>2</sub> pricing assumption
    - Adjusted the third Scenario to incorporate battery deployment to address the possibility of negative LMPs due to the 50/50 renewables-to-gas addition assumption
- This helps ensure that the market model doesn't preclude any resource type because of negative LMPs



# ENO Proposed Planning Scenarios – Assumptions

	Scenario 1 (Moderate Change)	Scenario 2 (Customer Driven)	Scenario 3 (Policy Driven)
Peak Load & Energy Growth	Medium	Low	High
Natural Gas Prices	Medium	Low	High
Market Coal & Legacy Gas Deactivations	60 years	55 years <i>(Modified from 50 years)</i>	50 years <i>(Modified from 55 years)</i>
Magnitude of Coal & Legacy Gas Deactivations <sup>2</sup>	12% by 2028 54% by 2038	31% by 2028 88% by 2038	54% by 2028 91% by 2038
MISO Market Additions Renewables / Gas Mix	34% / 66%	25% / 75% <i>(Modified from 50%/50%)</i>	50% / 50%
CO <sub>2</sub> Price Forecast	Medium	Low <i>(Modified from High)</i>	High <i>(Modified from Medium)</i>

1. Highlighted cells indicate a change since Technical Meeting #1
2. "Magnitude of Coal & Legacy Gas Deactivation" driven by "Market Coal and Legacy Gas deactivation" assumptions (e.g. 55 Years; 31%/88%) and were likewise swapped between Scenarios 2 and 3. Percentages based on BP18U; to be adjusted for BP19



## Proposed Scenario Purpose and Drivers


IRP analytics rely on macro market Scenarios designed to allow for the assessment of the total production cost and risk of resource portfolios across a reasonable range of possible future outcomes. The three proposed Scenarios for the ENO 2018 IRP are:

Scenarios	Key Drivers
<i>Scenario 1 (Moderate Change Over Time)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat/declining usage per customer (UPC) in residential and commercial sectors due to increases in energy efficiency and other customer adopted measures</li> <li>• UPC declines partially offset by industrial growth and growth in residential and commercial customer counts</li> <li>• Renewables and gas replace retiring capacity to promote fuel diversity in long-term resource planning</li> </ul>
<i>Scenario 2 (Customer Driven Change)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low peak load growth and natural gas prices tied to slumping demand</li> <li>• Growth rate of residential and commercial demand and energy usage decreased due to strong customer preferences for EE and DERs</li> <li>• Capacity additions in the MISO market are weighted towards gas-fired generation due to low gas and CO<sub>2</sub> prices</li> </ul>
<i>Scenario 3 (Policy Driven Change)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth rate of residential and commercial customer demand and energy usage increased through economic development and moderated energy efficiency gains</li> <li>• Political and economic pressure on coal and legacy gas plants accelerates retirements</li> <li>• High CO<sub>2</sub> pricing along with economic factors drive the replacement of retiring capacity with portfolio of equal amounts of renewables complemented with battery storage and gas-fired technology to replace retiring capacity</li> </ul>

# ENO Proposed Planning Strategies– Update

## Proposed Strategy 3: Solar, Storage, and DSM Alternative

- **Policy-driven strategy under which capacity needs are met through a diverse array of solar, battery storage, and DSM**
  - **Solar:** Added to meet energy needs throughout planning horizon
  - **Energy storage:** Will be explored to help meet peak load requirements
  - **Demand Response and Energy Efficiency Assumption:** To be discussed



# ENO Proposed Planning Strategies--Assumptions

	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Objective	Least Cost Planning	0.2/2% DSM Goal	Solar, Storage & DSM Alternatives
Capacity Portfolio Criteria and Constraints	Meet 12% Long-term Planning Reserve Margin (PRM) target using least-cost resource portfolio	Include a portfolio of DSM programs that meet the Council's stated 2% goal	Meet peak load need + 12% PRM target using DSM, solar, and battery resources
Description	Assess demand- and supply-side alternatives to meet projected capacity needs with a focus on total relevant supply costs	Assess portfolio of DSM programs that meet Council's stated 0.2/2% goal along with consideration of additional supply-side alternatives	Assess demand- and supply-side alternatives to meet projected capacity needs with a focus on adding solar and batteries
DSM Input Case	Navigant Base	Navigant 2%	To be discussed

# Optimized Portfolio Design

- **Two ways to develop portfolios within the constraints of the strategies:**

## (1) Aurora Capacity Expansion Algorithm Portfolios

- Used to identify **least cost portfolios** across a range of scenarios to meet the goal of a least cost planning strategy. A portfolio could be developed for each, or a subset of, the Scenarios.

## (2) Customized Portfolios

- Used to create **policy-driven portfolios** where desired outcomes (i.e., selection of particular renewable resources, adoption of aggressive DSM programs) consistent with policy requirements and planning principles would be ensured.


- **Production Cost Modeling**

- All portfolios are later tested against all Scenarios in the Aurora Production Cost model in order to calculate the variable supply costs for each portfolio/scenario combination.

# Assessment of Each Portfolio Design Approach


	Benefits	Challenges
<b>Capacity Expansion Approach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capable of finding least cost portfolios given inputs and constraints</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> party model-based portfolio development</li> <li>• Considers multiple market and cost inputs</li> <li>• Simultaneously considers multiple competing constraints</li> <li>• Captures intermittent resource attributes</li> <li>• Consistent application of algorithm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependent on and sensitive to changes to inputs in ways that can be unpredictable</li> <li>• May not account for qualitative benefits and considerations</li> <li>• May not account for all stakeholder preferences</li> <li>• Application of constraints without judgment can result in less appropriate resource selection</li> <li>• Lack of transparency for validation and explanation of results</li> </ul>
<b>Customized Portfolio Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures stakeholder preferences are met</li> <li>• Enables greater focus on other aspects of the IRP (e.g. sensitivities, stakeholder engagement and feedback)</li> <li>• Allows evaluation of alternatives and portfolios</li> <li>• Transparency</li> <li>• Can utilize non-Aurora software</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependent on input from stakeholders and agreement on assumptions</li> <li>• Unlimited possible combinations</li> <li>• May not meet all objectives (e.g. traditional “least-cost” portfolio)</li> </ul>

# Optimized Portfolio Design




# Optimized Portfolio Design

## Capacity Expansion Approach



## Customized Portfolio Approach



**NOTE: All 7 of these portfolios would be tested across the 4 Scenarios in the Production Cost Model, generating 28 Total Relevant Supply Cost Results**




## Section 2

# ENO Capacity Need and Supply Alternatives

# ENO's Long-Term Capacity Need

ENO's existing and planned capacity portfolio over the 20 year planning period



**Assumptions:**

- Requirements based on non-coincident peak and a 12% reserve margin
- ENO Solar additions modeled with 50% effective capacity (100 MW nameplate)

## DSM and Supply Side Resources

- DSM programs will be evaluated based on the characteristics and attributes provided in the potential studies.
  - Demand Response programs described by an average annual load reduction and annual program costs will be evaluated through spreadsheet models outside of the Aurora model based on capacity value net of fixed program costs.
  - Energy Efficiency programs described by an hourly load reduction profile and annual program costs.
- Programs determined to be economic (i.e. positive net benefits) will be selected in the first year.
  - ENO's capacity position (surplus/deficit) will be adjusted to reflect the capacity contribution of selected Demand Response programs.
- Programs not considered economic in year one will be evaluated by AURORA alongside supply side resources in future years (future program inputs to be provided following initial run).
  - DSM programs with hourly load reduction profiles will be evaluated alongside supply side resources in the portfolio design in order to identify the most economic combination of DSM programs and supply side resources.

## Supply-Side Technology Resources

- The supply-side technology assessment analyzes potential supply-side generation solutions that could help ENO serve customers' needs reliably and at the most reasonable cost, including renewables, energy storage, and natural gas technologies.
- ENO's technology assessment for the 2018 IRP explores in detail the challenges, opportunities, and costs of generation alternatives to be considered when designing resource portfolios to meet the capacity needs of customers.
  - Renewable energy resources, especially solar, have emerged as viable economic alternatives.
  - Trend to smaller, more modular resources (such as battery storage) provides opportunity to reduce risk and manage peak demand.
  - Deployment of intermittent generation has increased the need for flexible, diverse supply alternatives. New smaller scale supply alternatives will better address locational, site specific reliability requirements while continuing to support overall grid reliability.


# Renewable Resource Assumptions (Solar PV & Wind)

Levelized Real Cost of Electricity (2019\$/MWh-AC) <sup>1</sup>

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038
<b>Solar Tracking <sup>2</sup></b>	\$53.39	\$49.64	\$46.71	\$44.35	\$43.86	\$43.79	\$42.28	\$40.51	\$39.10	\$37.82
<b>Onshore Wind <sup>3</sup></b>	\$44.82	\$46.12	\$48.65	\$48.19	\$48.14	\$47.32	\$44.35	\$42.21	\$41.47	\$41.46

## Other Modeling Assumptions

	Solar	Wind
<b>Fixed O&amp;M (2017\$/kW-yr-AC)</b>	\$16	\$36.01
<b>Useful Life (yr)</b>	30	25
<b>MACRS Depreciation (yr)</b>	5	5
<b>Capacity Factor</b>	26%	36%
<b>DC:AC</b>	1.35	N/A
<b>Hourly Profile Modeling Software</b>	PlantPredict	NREL SAM



1. Year 1 levelized real cost for a project beginning in the given year
2. ITC normalized over useful life and steps down to 10% by 2023
3. PTC steps down to 40% by 2020 and expires thereafter

Source: The capital cost assumptions for Wind and Solar are based on a confidential IHS Markit forecast.

# Grid-Scale Battery Storage Alternatives

As battery storage technology continues to improve it is important to assess the costs and benefits associated with its deployment to meet long-term needs in the proper context.

Battery storage includes a range of unique attributes that should be considered, such as:

- The ability to store energy for later commitment and dispatch (energy and capacity value)
- Ability to discharge in milliseconds and fast ramping capability (ancillary services)
- Potential deferral of transmission and distribution upgrades
- Rapid construction (on the order of months)
- Modular deployment provides potential scalability
- Portability and capability to be redeployed in different areas
- Small footprint (typically less than an acre), allowing for flexible siting
- Low round-trip losses compared to other storage technologies (such as compressed air)

These attributes should be considered in the appropriate context, not all of which is well understood at this time, including but not limited to:

- Batteries are not a source of electric generation
- Useful life can be much shorter than other grid-scale investments (replacement cost)
- Market rules not yet established to govern participation in wholesale markets
- Discharge less electricity than required to charge due to losses
- Cost of environmentally sound disposal

# Battery Storage Assumptions


Levelized Real Fixed Cost (2019\$/kW-yr) <sup>1</sup>

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038
<b>Battery Storage</b>	\$177	\$163	\$155	\$146	\$143	\$132	\$122	\$113	\$105	\$96

## Other Modeling Assumptions

	Battery Storage
<b>Energy Capacity : Power <sup>2</sup></b>	4:1
<b>Fixed O&amp;M (2017\$/kW-yr)</b>	\$9.00
<b>Useful Life (yr) <sup>3</sup></b>	10
<b>MACRS Depreciation (yr)</b>	7
<b>AC-AC efficiency</b>	90%
<b>Hourly Profile Modeling Software</b>	Aurora

Levelized Real Fixed Cost (2019\$/kW-yr) <sup>1</sup>



1. Year 1 levelized real cost for a project beginning in the given year
2. Current MISO Tariff requirement for capacity credit
3. Assumes daily cycling, no module replacement cost, full depth of discharge

Source: The capital cost assumptions for Battery Storage is based on a confidential IHS Markit forecast.



## Gas resource assumptions

Technology		Summer Capacity [MW]	Capital Cost [2017\$/kW]	Fixed O&M [2017\$/kW-yr]	Variable O&M [2017 \$/MWh]	Heat Rate* [Btu/kWh]	Expected Capacity Factor [%]
<b>Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT)</b>	1x1 501JAC	605	\$1,244	\$16.70	\$3.14	6,300	80%
<b>Simple Cycle Combustion Turbine (CT)</b>	501JAC	346	\$809	\$2.37	\$13.35	9,400	10%
<b>Aeroderivative Combustion Turbine (Aero CT)</b>	LMS100PA	102	\$1,543	\$5.86	\$2.90	9,400	20%
<b>Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engine (RICE)</b>	7x Wartsila 18V50SG	128	\$1,545	\$31.94	\$7.30	8,400	30%

\*Heat Rate based on full load without duct firing

## Section 3

# Inputs and Assumptions


# 2018 IRP Inputs and Assumptions

Input/Assumption	MISO Market Modeling	Portfolio Development	Total Relevant Supply Costs
Scenarios & Strategies	✓	✓	✓
Gas Price Forecast*	✓	✓	✓
CO <sub>2</sub> Price Forecast*	✓	✓	✓
Capacity Value*		✓	✓
Supply-Side Resource Alternative Costs*		✓	✓
Load Forecast*	✓	✓	
ENO's Long-Term Capacity Need*		✓	✓
DSM Potential Study Results		✓	✓

\*Updated to Business Plan 19 Inputs since Technical Meeting #1

# Gas Price Forecast


Nominal \$/MMBtu



Case	2019	2026	2031	2038
Low	\$2.52	\$2.86	\$3.32	\$3.83
Reference	\$2.79	\$4.15	\$5.09	\$6.41
High	\$3.09	\$5.64	\$6.89	\$8.80


# Coal Price Forecast

Nominal \$/MMBtu




# CO<sub>2</sub> Price Forecast

Nominal \$/Short Ton



# Capacity Value Forecast





28

WE POWER LIFE<sup>SM</sup>



# Peak Load & Energy Forecast

3 demand forecasts were created for the ENO IRP: a low, reference, and high



10 Year CAGR (%)	2019 – 2028	2029 – 2038
Low	-0.28%	0.26%
Reference	0.08%	0.41%
High	0.20%	0.42%

Peak Load (MW)	2019	2024	2029	2033	2038
Low	1,158	1,130	1,114	1,127	1,130
Reference	1,175	1,171	1,162	1,179	1,191
High	1,181	1,182	1,177	1,196	1,207

## Section 4

### Timeline and Next Steps

# Current Timeline

Description	Target Date	Status
<i>Public Meeting #1- Process Overview</i>	September 2017	✓
<i>Technical Meeting #1 Material Due</i>	January 2018	✓
<i>Technical Meeting #1</i>	January 2018	✓
<i>Technical Meeting #2 Material Due</i>	August 2018	✓
<i>Technical Meeting #2</i>	September 2018	✓
<i>Technical Meeting #3 Material Due</i>	November 2018	-
<i>Technical Meeting #3</i>	November 2018	-
<b>IRP Inputs Finalized</b>	<b>December 2018</b>	-
<b>Optimized Portfolio Results Due</b>	<b>April 2019</b>	-
<i>Technical Meeting #4 Material Due</i>	April 2019	-
<i>Technical Meeting #4</i>	April 2019	-
<i>File IRP Report</i>	July 2019	-
<i>Public Meeting #2 Material Due</i>	July 2019	-
<i>Public Meeting #2 - Present IRP Results</i>	August 2019	-
<i>Public Meeting #3 Material Due</i>	August 2019	-
<i>Technical Meeting #5 Material Due</i>	August 2019	-
<i>Public Meeting #3 - Public Response</i>	September 2019	-
<i>Technical Meeting #5</i>	September 2019	-
<i>Intervenors and Advisors Questions &amp; Comments Due</i>	September 2019	-
<i>ENO Response to Questions and Comments Due</i>	October 2019	-
<i>Advisors File Report</i>	December 2019	-

# Appendix

# Technical Meeting Purpose

Technical Meeting	Purpose
<p>Technical Meeting 1 (January 22<sup>nd</sup>)</p>	<p>The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss Planning Scenarios and Strategies. ENO should be prepared to present its Reference (and two alternative) Planning Scenarios, the Least Cost Planning Strategy, and the Utility’s proposed Reference Planning Strategy.</p>
<p>Technical Meeting 2 (September 14<sup>th</sup>)</p>	<p>The purpose of this meeting is to either confirm the consensus Scenario and Strategy or to confirm that ENO is prepared to include the Stakeholder Scenario and Strategy pursuant to the discussions of Technical Meeting 1.</p>
<p>Technical Meeting 3 (November 19<sup>th</sup> – November 30<sup>th</sup>)</p>	<p>Purpose is to finalize the Planning Scenarios and Strategies by all parties and lock down of all IRP inputs. The results of the DSM Potential Studies will be provided in the input format required for modeling in the IRP. This meeting will also contain the initial discussion of scorecard metrics.</p>
<p>Technical Meeting 4 (April 22<sup>nd</sup> – May 3<sup>rd</sup>)</p>	<p>The purpose of this meeting is to review the Optimized Resource Portfolios, finalize the Scorecard Metrics, and conduct an initial discussion regarding Energy Smart Program budgets and savings goals. For this meeting, ENO should prepare initial proposed Energy Smart Program budgets, and savings goals for discussion.</p>
<p>Technical Meeting 5 (August 28<sup>th</sup> – September 11<sup>th</sup>)</p>	<p>The purpose of this meeting is to discuss Energy Smart implementation for Program Years 10-12.</p>

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**Docket No. UD-17-03**

I hereby certify that I have served the required number of copies of the foregoing report upon all other known parties of this proceeding, by the following: electronic mail, facsimile, overnight mail, hand delivery, and/or United States Postal Service, postage prepaid.

Lora W. Johnson, CMC, LMMC  
Clerk of Council  
Council of the City of New Orleans  
City Hall, Room 1E09  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Erin Spears, Chief of Staff  
Bobbie Mason  
Connolly Reed  
Council Utilities Regulatory Office  
City of New Orleans  
City Hall, Room 6E07  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

David Gavlinski  
Council Chief of Staff  
New Orleans City Council  
City Hall, Room 1E06  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Sunni LeBeouf  
City Attorney Office  
City Hall, Room 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Norman White  
Department of Finance  
City Hall, Room 3E06  
1300 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Hon. Jeffery S. Gulin  
3203 Bridle Ridge Lane  
Lutherville, GA 21093

Clinton A. Vince, Esq.  
Presley R. Reed, Jr., Esq.  
Emma F. Hand, Esq.  
Herminia Gomez  
Dentons US LLP  
1900 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Basile J. Uddo, Esq.  
J.A. "Jay" Beatmann, Jr.  
c/o Dentons US LLP  
The Poydras Center  
650 Poydras Street, Suite 2850  
New Orleans, LA 70130-6132

Walter J. Wilkerson, Esq.  
Kelley Bazile  
Wilkerson and Associates, PLC  
The Poydras Center, Suite 1913  
650 Poydras Street  
New Orleans, LA 70130

Philip J. Movish  
Victor M. Prep  
Joseph W. Rogers  
Cortney Crouch  
Legend Consulting Group  
8055 East Tufts Avenue  
Suite 1250  
Denver, CO 80237-2835

Errol Smith, CPA  
Bruno and Tervalon  
4298 Elysian Fields Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70122

Gary E. Huntley  
Entergy New Orleans, LLC  
Mail Unit L-MAG-505B  
1600 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Timothy S. Cragin, Esq.  
Harry M. Barton, Esq.  
Brian L. Guillot, Esq.  
Alyssa Maurice-Anderson, Esq.  
Karen Freese, Esq.  
Entergy Services, Inc.  
Mail Unit L-ENT-26E  
639 Loyola Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70113

Polly S. Rosemond  
Seth Cureington  
Derek Mills  
Keith Wood  
Entergy New Orleans, LLC  
Mail Unit L-MAG-505B  
1600 Perdido Street  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Joseph J. Romano, III  
Suzanne Fontan  
Therese Perrault  
Entergy Services, Inc.  
Mail Unit L-ENT-4C  
639 Loyola Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70113

Renate Heurich  
350 Louisiana  
1407 Napoleon Avenue,  
Suite #C  
New Orleans, LA 70115

Andy Kowalczyk  
1115 Congress St.  
New Orleans, LA 70117

Benjamin Quimby  
1621 S. Rampart St.  
New Orleans, LA 70113

Logan Atkinson Burke  
Forest Bradley-Wright  
Sophie Zaken  
Alliance for Affordable Energy  
4505 S. Claiborne Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70115

Ernest L. Edwards Jr.  
Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.  
300 Lake Marina Ave.  
Unit 5BE  
New Orleans, LA 70124

Mark Zimmerman  
Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.  
720 I Hamilton Boulevard  
Allentown, PA 18195

Maurice Brubaker  
Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.  
16690 Swingly Ridge Road  
Suite 140  
Chesterfield, MO 63017



Marcel Wisznia  
Daniel Weiner  
Wisznia Company Inc.  
800 Common Street  
Suite 200  
New Orleans, LA 70112

Luke F. Piontek,  
Judith Sulzer  
J. Kenton Parsons  
Christian J. Rgodes  
Shelly Ann McGlathery  
Roedel, Parsons, Koch, Blache, Balhoff &  
McCollister  
8440 Jefferson Highway,  
Suite 301  
Baton Rouge, LA 70809

Andreas Hoffman  
Green Light New Orleans  
8203 Jeannette Street  
New Orleans, LA 70118

Jason Richards  
Angela Morton  
Joel Pominville  
American Institute of Architects  
1000 St. Charles Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70130

Monique Harden  
Deep South Center for Environmental  
Justice  
3157 Gentilly Boulevard  
Suite 145  
New Orleans, LA 70122

Amber Beezley  
Monica Gonzalez  
Casius Pealer  
U.S. Green Building Council, LA Chapter  
P.O. Box 82572  
Baton Rouge, LA 70884

Corey G. Dowden  
Lower Nine House of Music  
1025 Charbonnet St.  
New Orleans, LA 70117

Nathan Lott  
Brady Skaggs  
Miriam Belblidia  
The Water Collaborative of Greater New  
Orleans  
4906 Canal Street  
New Orleans, LA 70119

Jeffery D. Cantin  
Gulf States Renewable Energy Industries  
Association  
400 Poydras St.  
Suite 900  
New Orleans, LA 70130


Andreanecia Morris  
Trayshawn Webb  
Greater New Orleans Housing Alliance  
4640 S. Carrollton Avenue  
Suite 160  
New Orleans, LA 70119

Elizabeth Galante  
Ben Norwood  
PosiGen  
819 Central Avenue  
Suite 201  
Jefferson, LA 70121

Katherine Hamilton  
Advanced Energy Management Alliance  
1200 18<sup>th</sup> St. NW  
Suite 700  
Washington DC 20036

Cliff McDonald  
Jeff Loiter  
Optimal Energy  
10600 Route 116  
Suite 3  
Hinesburg, VT 05461

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2018.



Harry M. Barton