



March 31, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Aisha Collier
Clerk of Council
City Hall - Room 1E09
1300 Perdido Street
New Orleans, LA 70112

**Re: Comments of Together New Orleans Regarding ENO Proposed
BESS Phase 3 Implementation Plan (CNO Docket No. UD-24-02)**

Dear Ms. Collier:

Together New Orleans respectfully submits the attached filing in the above-referenced docket.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions related to this filing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B Bagert', is positioned above the typed name.

Broderick Bagert
Together New Orleans
2721 S. Broad Street
New Orleans, LA 70125
(225)803-5876
broderick@togetherla.org

cc: Official Service List UD-24-02 (via electronic mail)

**BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
DOCKET NO. UD-24-02**

**COMMENTS OF TOGETHER NEW ORLEANS REGARDING APPROVAL OF
A BESS PHASE 3 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Introduction: The Phase 3 implementation plan should close the battery affordability gap

A program customers cannot afford will not deploy systems.

That premise should guide Council’s approach to approving an implementation plan of the Distributed Energy Resources program. Resolution R-25-669 found that customer upfront incentives are necessary, approved a budget of \$28 million for customer upfront incentives over a three-year term, required quantified deployment targets and annual participation benchmarks and made clear that incentive levels may be evaluated and adjusted based on program results. (Resolution R-25-669 at 7-9, 11-15.)

Consistent with that framework, these comments evaluate the proposed implementation plan of Entergy New Orleans (ENO) and recommend revisions to that plan to make the program affordable to customers and therefore capable of delivering deployment.

Section I addresses the funding structure the Council already approved and the extent to which ENO’s proposed implementation plan departs from it.

Section II presents TNO’s Customer Feasibility Analysis and quantifies the battery funding gap under ENO’s proposal for LMI residential, non-LMI residential and commercial participants.

Section III addresses the disparity between ongoing BESS incentive payments to residential and commercial customers, as well as the structure and impact of the associated annual caps on those payments.

Section IV sets out the incentive levels that, according to TNO’s analysis, would make battery adoption financially viable for New Orleans customers.

Section V sets out the specific elements TNO recommends the Council include in an approved implementation plan.

I. The implementation plan should be revised to restore the Council’s \$28 million in upfront incentives.

The Council directed ENO to file an implementation plan for a DER Program that includes \$28 million in customer upfront incentives over a three-year term, with 50 percent allocated to residential customers and 50 percent to commercial customers and with 40 percent of residential upfront incentives reserved for LMI participants, subject to review based on program performance. (Resolution R-25-669 at 7–8, 12.)

ENO’s implementation plan does not implement that structure. ENO proposes approximately \$15.2 million in upfront incentives over the first three years, a reduction of approximately \$12.8 million from the amount the Council directed. ENO budgets \$9,748,000 for ongoing participation incentives over ten years and \$5,047,840 for administration and other non-incentive costs, for a total Phase 3 budget of \$29,991,440, of which only about half the amount directed by Council is devoted to upfront installation support. (ENO Implementation Plan at 6-9.)

A plan that reduces installation support by that amount will substantially reduce deployment. The implementation plan approved in this docket should therefore restore the full \$28 million of upfront incentive funding the Council directed.

II. Under ENO’s implementation plan, batteries will not be affordable to New Orleans customers.

TNO conducted a Customer Feasibility Analysis, included as an Appendix to these comments, to evaluate the central adoption question: after applying the battery investment tax credit and the program’s upfront incentive, how much battery cost remains at installation, and how many years of annual BESS payments are required to recover that amount.

That remaining cost is the decisive factor for customer adoption. If it is too large, customers will not proceed and systems will not be installed.

The TNO analysis evaluates affordability across the program’s three participant classes: LMI residential, non-LMI residential and commercial. For each, it calculates the remaining battery funding gap and the years required to recover that gap. It assumes a 13.5 kWh / 6.75 kW battery module, a 40 percent battery ITC with a 90 percent monetization factor and a declining incremental cost curve reflecting lower marginal cost as additional batteries are added. The analysis isolates battery economics to determine whether the proposed incentives bring deployment within reach.

Table 1. Battery gap under ENO’s proposed implementation plan

Customer type	# batteries (per site avg)	ENO upfront incentive level (per kWh BESS)	Battery project cost (per site avg)	ENO upfront incentive (per site avg)	ENO upfront incentive as % of project cost (per site avg)	Funding gap (per site avg)	ENO ongoing incentive (per site avg)	Years to breakeven
LMI residential	1.1	\$480	\$19,906	\$7,128	36%	\$5,612	\$600	15.5 years
Non-LMI residential	1.2	\$400	\$21,312	\$6,480	30%	\$7,160	\$600	25.7 years
Commercial	4.3	\$400	\$118,397	\$22,977	19%	\$52,797	\$1,800	30+ years

These results are not consistent with customer adoption. Each customer class faces a material upfront battery gap and a recovery period that extends beyond a workable investment horizon. On a total installed project cost basis, ENO’s upfront incentive covers only about 36 percent of the cost of the average LMI residential project, 30 percent of the cost of the average non-LMI residential project and 19 percent of the cost of the average commercial project. For commercial participants, the barrier is greater still because ENO assigns interconnection study and upgrade costs to the applicant rather than the program budget. (ENO Implementation Plan at 11–12.)

Addressing this affordability gap requires two changes: (1) correcting disparities in ongoing BESS payments and removing constraints imposed by annual caps and (2) revising upfront incentive levels to bring the remaining battery cost within a range that customers can afford at installation.

III. Compensation for identical dispatched battery service should not vary by customer class absent a record-based justification.

The differential rate of ongoing payments between residential and commercial customers in ENO’s plan should not be approved as filed. Under the Resolution and ENO’s implementation plan, residential batteries are compensated at \$125 per average kW delivered across events and capped at \$600 per site per year. Commercial batteries, providing the same service, are compensated at \$250 per average kW delivered across events — twice the residential rate — and capped at \$1,800 per site per year. (Resolution R-25-669 at 9; ENO Implementation Plan at 5–8.)

EnergyHub’s attachment indicates that both residential and commercial participants are compensated based on the same performance metric — average kW discharged across demand response events — and participate through the same DERMS dispatch framework. (Attachment 1 to ENO Implementation Plan at 2–3.) Despite this, ENO compensates identical dispatched battery service at materially different rates across customer classes:

Table 2. Current ongoing-payment structure

Customer class	Ongoing payment	Annual cap	Upfront cap
Residential	\$125 / avg. kW-year	\$600	\$10,000
Commercial	\$250 / avg. kW-year	\$1,800	\$100,000

The record does not support compensating that service at different rates by customer class. There is no finding that residential battery capacity provides lower system value, is subject to a different performance obligation or imposes different program costs. Absent such a basis, a class-based differential in compensation for the same service is arbitrary and unduly discriminatory and should not be approved.

Resolution R-25-669 expressly contemplates adjustment of these initial values based on program results. (Resolution R-25-669 at 9–10.) The present record provides a sufficient basis for that adjustment.

The annual caps independently distort compensation and suppress efficient deployment. A residential and a commercial customer with identical two-battery systems would not be compensated remotely the same way: the commercial customer would receive \$18,000 over ten years, while the residential customer would receive \$6,000 for the same dispatched service.

Within the commercial program, annual caps create equally stark and unstrategic compensation distortions. Two businesses — one with three batteries and another with ten batteries — would each receive identical compensation of \$1,800 per year, or \$18,000 over ten years, despite one providing more than three times the capacity and therefore materially greater system value.

These caps work directly against economies of scale by capping compensation as marginal costs decline with additional batteries. They strip compensation from incremental capacity on the most efficient projects, where per-unit costs are lowest and aggregate system value is highest. This outcome is inconsistent with efficient program design.

The approved plan should therefore adopt a uniform ongoing payment of \$250 per average kW-year across customer classes, set the residential annual cap to \$1,200 and remove the commercial annual cap that currently suppresses efficient larger installations.

IV. Recommended upfront incentive levels

The Customer Feasibility Analysis is designed to identify the upfront battery incentive levels required to produce payback periods that can reasonably support customer participation, assuming the nondiscriminatory ongoing payment structure described above. For purposes of this analysis, payback is measured as the number of years of ongoing BESS payments required to recover the remaining battery funding gap after application of the battery investment tax credit and the upfront incentive.

The analysis assumes a 40 percent battery ITC with a 90 percent monetization factor and applies a 6.86% discount rate to calculate years to breakeven. It isolates battery economics only. Solar costs are not included in the calculations presented here, although they are modeled in the full Customer Feasibility Analysis included in the Appendix.

The recommended upfront incentive levels reflected in Table 3 make battery adoption financially workable for each participant class.

Table 3. Recommended upfront incentive levels and resulting payback periods

Customer type	# batteries (per site avg)	Upfront incentive level (per kWh BESS)	Battery project cost (per site avg)	Upfront incentive (per site avg)	Upfront incentive as % of project cost (per site avg)	Funding gap (per site avg)	Ongoing incentive (per site avg)	Years to breakeven	Caps per site
LMI residential	1.1	\$822	\$19,906	\$12,214	61%	\$526	\$1,200	0.5 years	\$20K upfront cap; \$1.2K annual cap
Non-LMI residential	1.2	\$527	\$21,312	\$8,535	40%	\$5,104	\$1,200	5.2 years	\$20K upfront cap; \$1.2K annual cap
Commercial resilience facilities	4.3	\$822	\$118,397	\$47,226	40%	\$28,548	\$7,180	4.8 years	\$100K upfront cap; no annual cap
Commercial, non-resilience	4.3	\$527	\$118,397	\$30,262	26%	\$45,512	\$7,180	8.6 years	\$100K upfront cap; no annual cap

For LMI residential customers, TNO recommends an upfront incentive of \$822 per kWh. For the average project modeled here, that provides \$12,214 in upfront support, equal to 61 percent of the total battery project cost (compared to ENO’s \$7,128, which is estimated to cover only 36 percent for LMI projects). The recommended level reduces the remaining battery funding gap from \$5,612 to \$526 and reduces the years to breakeven from 15.5 years to 0.5 years.

For non-LMI residential customers, TNO recommends an upfront incentive of \$527 per kWh. For the average project modeled here, that provides \$8,535 in upfront support, equal to 40 percent of battery project cost (compared to ENO’s \$6,480, which covers 30 percent). The recommended level reduces the remaining battery funding gap from \$7,160 to \$5,104 and reduces the years to breakeven from 25.7 years to 5.2 years.

For purposes of the approved plan, a Commercial Resilience Facility should be defined as a commercial or institutional site that provides essential public-serving or life-safety functions during outages, including clinics, health centers, pharmacies, shelters, cooling centers, food distribution sites, schools used as community hubs, community centers and comparable facilities. Qualification for this category should be determined by the Program Administrator, subject to approval by the Council.

For commercial resilience facilities, TNO recommends an upfront incentive of \$822 per kWh. For the average project modeled here, that provides \$47,226 in upfront support, equal to 40

percent of battery project cost (compared to ENO's \$22,977, which covers 19 percent). The recommended level reduces the remaining battery funding gap from \$52,797 to \$28,548 and reduces the years to breakeven from more than 30 years to 4.8 years.

For other commercial sites, TNO recommends an upfront incentive of \$527 per kWh. For the average project modeled here, that provides \$30,262 in upfront support, equal to 26 percent of battery project cost (compared to ENO's \$22,977, which covers 19 percent). The recommended level reduces the remaining battery funding gap from \$52,797 to \$45,512 and reduces the years to breakeven from more than 30 years to 8.6 years.

TNO recommends raising the residential upfront incentive cap from \$10,000 to \$20,000, with the average incentive project to be between \$8,000 and \$12,000 per site. TNO recommends keeping the commercial upfront incentive cap at \$100,000 and removing the annual performance-payment cap for the reasons stated above.

The Council has already seen the consequences of misaligned program economics in the community solar docket. There, the initial credit rate was set too low to support development, and the program produced no projects for years. After the credit rate was corrected, market response followed promptly. The Council should avoid repeating that error here.

V. Summary of program recommendations.

The approved Implementation Plan for the Distributed Energy Resources program should:

1. Restore the full \$28 million of upfront customer incentive funding over the initial three-year term, consistent with Ordering Paragraph 3 of Resolution R-25-669.
2. Maintain the Council-directed residential/commercial allocation structure and the residential LMI set-aside, subject to review based on actual deployment results, with 80 percent of Area Median Income as the LMI eligibility standard.
3. Set a uniform ongoing payment of \$250 per average kW-year across customer classes; set the residential annual payment cap at \$1,200; remove the commercial annual payment cap; and set the residential upfront incentive cap at \$20,000.
4. Establish upfront battery incentive levels at:
 - **\$527 per kWh for non-LMI residential customers**
 - **\$822 per kWh for LMI residential customers**
 - **\$527 per kWh for non-resilience commercial customers**
 - **\$822 per kWh for commercial resilience facilities.**
5. Define Commercial Resilience Facilities as commercial or institutional sites that provide essential public-serving or life-safety functions during outages, including clinics, health centers, pharmacies, shelters, cooling centers, food distribution sites, schools used as community hubs, community centers and comparable facilities, with qualification determined by the Program Administrator subject to Council approval.

6. Ensure that commercial interconnection study and upgrade requirements do not defeat deployment at qualifying resilience facilities, given ENO's proposal to assign those costs to commercial applicants. (ENO Implementation Plan at 11-12.)
7. Implement the annual participation benchmarks, quantified deployment targets and quarterly and annual reporting the Council already required, and conduct biannual review of incentive levels and customer-segment allocations so they can be recalibrated if actual uptake diverges from targets. (Resolution R-25-669 at 11-15.)
8. Preserve the Council-directed third-party incentive administrator structure and Council oversight of program implementation. (Resolution R-25-669 at 7, 12-15.)

Conclusion

The Council has already established the framework for this program: a DER Program designed to drive meaningful deployment, supported by \$28 million in upfront incentives and structured to deliver measurable benefits to customers and the grid.

With targeted revisions, ENO's implementation plan can fulfill that directive. Strengthening upfront incentives to close the remaining affordability gap, aligning compensation with actual system value, and removing unnecessary constraints on participation will position the program to achieve broad adoption across residential and commercial customers.

A program that is accessible and properly aligned with customer economics will deploy at scale and deliver the resilience and system benefits the Council intended. The Council should approve the plan with these modifications so the DER Program can move forward on a strong and effective footing.

Respectfully submitted,

TOGETHER NEW ORLEANS

2721 S. Broad Street

New Orleans, Louisiana 70125

By: /s/ Broderick Bagert

Broderick Bagert

Together New Orleans

UD-24-02 DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCED - CUSTOMER FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

APPENDIX

	ENO	Council / Recommended
Funds for upfront incentives:	\$15,200,000	\$28,000,000

Metric	Units / Notes	Residential LMI			Residential non-LMI			Commercial - Resilience facilities			Commercial - Regular		
		Scenario 1: ENO	Scenario 2: Fully-funded	Scenario 3: Recommended	Scenario 1: ENO	Scenario 2: Fully-funded	Scenario 3: Recommended	Scenario 1: ENO	Scenario 2: Fully-funded	Scenario 3: Recommended	Scenario 1: ENO	Scenario 2: Fully-funded	Scenario 3: Recommended
How long for customer to break even?	Years	15.5	0.0	0.5	25.7	0.0	5.2	30+	0.0	4.8	30+	0.0	8.6
Incentive Values													
Upfront incentive (\$/kWh BESS)	\$	\$480	\$858	\$822	\$400	\$842	\$527	\$400	\$1,319	\$822	\$400	\$1,319	\$527
Upfront cap per site (\$)	\$	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Ongoing payment rate (\$/avg kW/yr)	\$	\$125	\$250	\$250	\$125	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250
Ongoing cap per site (\$/yr)	\$	\$600	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$600	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,800	N/A	N/A	\$1,800	N/A	N/A
% of sites with only 1 battery	%	90%	90%	90%	80%	80%	80%						

BESS (battery) feasibility, per site													
BESS funding gap, per site	\$ / site	\$5,612	-	\$526	\$7,160	-	\$5,104	\$52,797	-	\$28,548	\$52,797	-	\$45,512
Upfront incentive as % of total project cost		36%	64%	61%	30%	64%	40%	19%	64%	40%	19%	64%	26%
BESS ongoing incentive, per site per year	\$ / site / yr	\$600	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$600	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,800	\$7,180	\$7,180	\$1,800	\$7,180	\$7,180
Years for participant to recover funding gap	years	15.5	0.0	0.5	25.7	0.0	5.2	30+	0.0	4.8	30+	0.0	8.6

Per site details													
# batteries, per site	#	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
BESS energy, per site	kWh	14.9	14.9	14.9	16.2	16.2	16.2	57.4	57.4	57.4	57.4	57.4	57.4
BESS capacity, per site	KW	7.4	7.4	7.4	8.1	8.1	8.1	28.7	28.7	28.7	28.7	28.7	28.7
BESS upfront incentive, per site	\$ / site	\$7,128	\$12,740	\$12,214	\$6,480	\$13,640	\$8,535	\$22,977	\$75,774	\$47,226	\$22,977	\$75,774	\$30,262
BESS ITC, per site	\$ / site	\$7,166	\$7,166	\$7,166	\$7,672	\$7,672	\$7,672	\$42,623	\$42,623	\$42,623	\$42,623	\$42,623	\$42,623
BESS, identified funding per site	\$ / site	\$14,294	\$19,906	\$19,380	\$14,152	\$21,312	\$16,208	\$65,600	\$118,397	\$89,849	\$65,600	\$118,397	\$72,885
BESS cost, per site	\$ / site	\$19,906	\$19,906	\$19,906	\$21,312	\$21,312	\$21,312	\$118,397	\$118,397	\$118,397	\$118,397	\$118,397	\$118,397

Solar feasibility, per site													
New solar capacity, per site	KW	11.9	11.9	11.9	13.0	13.0	11.9	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	11.9
Solar cost, per site	\$	\$16,335	\$16,335	\$16,335	\$17,820	\$17,820	\$16,335	\$77,038	\$77,038	\$77,038	\$77,038	\$77,038	\$31,038
New solar generation, per site per year	kWh	16,632	16,632	16,632	18,144	18,144	16,632	64,336	64,336	64,336	64,336	64,336	16,632
Solar savings, Net-present value		\$16,557	\$16,557	\$16,557	\$18,062	\$18,062	\$16,557	\$64,045	\$64,045	\$64,045	\$64,045	\$64,045	\$16,557
Solar gap, per site		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$12,993	\$12,993	\$12,993	\$12,993	\$12,993	\$14,481
Total Cost per site, battery and solar		\$36,241	\$36,241	\$36,241	\$39,132	\$39,132	\$37,647	\$195,434	\$195,434	\$195,434	\$195,434	\$195,434	\$149,435
Total Sources per site, battery and solar		\$30,851	\$36,463	\$35,937	\$32,214	\$39,374	\$32,765	\$129,645	\$182,442	\$153,894	\$129,645	\$182,442	\$89,441
Total funding gap, per site		\$5,390	-	\$304	\$6,918	-	\$4,882	\$65,789	\$12,993	\$41,541	\$65,789	\$12,993	\$59,993

Aggregate totals													
% of total		20%	20%	20%	30%	30%	30%	20%	20%	20%	30%	30%	30%
Funding in category		\$3,040,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000	\$4,560,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000	\$3,040,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000	\$4,560,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000
# sites in category	#	426	440	458	704	616	984	132	74	119	198	111	278
Installed BESS kWh, per category	kWh	6,333	6,528	6,809	11,400	9,977	15,943	7,600	4,245	6,811	11,400	6,368	15,945
Total delivered BESS kW	kW	3,167	3,264	3,404	5,700	4,988	7,971	3,800	2,123	3,406	5,700	3,184	7,972
Total BESS project cost	\$	\$8,489,652	\$8,750,000	\$9,126,696	\$14,997,333	\$13,125,000	\$20,973,785	\$15,664,593	\$8,750,000	\$14,039,362	\$23,496,890	\$13,125,000	\$32,864,182
Total BESS upfront incentives	\$	\$3,040,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000	\$4,560,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000	\$3,040,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000	\$4,560,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000
Total BESS ITC	\$	\$3,056,275	\$3,150,000	\$3,285,610	\$5,399,040	\$4,725,000	\$7,550,563	\$5,639,254	\$3,150,000	\$5,054,170	\$8,458,880	\$4,725,000	\$11,831,106
Total BESS funding gap	\$	\$2,393,377	-	\$241,085	\$5,038,293	-	\$5,023,223	\$6,985,340	-	\$3,385,192	\$10,478,010	-	\$12,633,076
Total annual ongoing payments per year	\$ / yr	\$255,892	\$527,479	\$550,188	\$422,222	\$739,020	\$1,180,956	\$238,151	\$530,655	\$851,436	\$357,227	\$795,983	\$1,993,092

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

DOCKET NO. UD-24-02

**COMMENTS OF TOGETHER NEW ORLEANS REGARDING APPROVAL OF A BESS
PHASE 3 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN THAT WILL DEPLOY BATTERY SYSTEMS**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 31, 2026, I served the foregoing Comments of Together New Orleans Regarding Approval of a BESS Phase 3 Implementation Plan That Will Deploy Battery Systems upon all persons listed on the Official Service List for Docket No. UD-24-02 dated March 26, 2026 by electronic mail.

/s/ Broderick Bagert
Broderick Bagert
Together New Orleans

March 26, 2026

ENHANCED DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCE PROGRAMS

DOCKET NO. UD-24-02

Aisha Collier, clerkofcouncil@nola.gov

Clerk of Council

City Hall - Room 1E09

1300 Perdido Street

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 658-1085

Fax: (504) 658-1140

Service of Discovery not required

Erin Spears, espears@nola.gov

Chief of Staff, Council Utilities Regulatory Office

Bobbie Mason, bfmason1@nola.gov

Christopher Roberts, cwroberts@nola.gov

Byron Minor, Byron.minor@nola.gov

Candace Carmouche, Candace.Carmouche@nola.gov

Jared Reese, jared.reese@nola.gov

Tyrienne Varnado, tyrienne.varnado@nola.gov

City Hall - Room 6E07

1300 Perdido Street

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 658-1110

Fax: (504) 658-1117

Krystal D. Hendon, CM Morrell Chief-of-Staff, Krystal.hendon@nola.gov

1300 Perdido St. Rm. 2W50

New Orleans, LA. 70112

Sherae M. Hunter, CM McCarron Chief-of-Staff, smhunter@nola.gov

Razan Badr, Community Engagement Director, Razan.Badr@nola.gov

LeeAnn Moss, Policy Director, LeeAnn.Moss@nola.gov

City Hall, Room 2W80

1300 Perdido Street

New Orleans, LA 70112

Courtney Fleming, CM Willard Chief-of-Staff, Courtney.Fleming@nola.gov

Erin Hansen, Policy Director, Erin.Hansen@nola.gov

1300 Perdido St. Rm. 2W40

New Orleans, LA. 70112

Dominique Lang Jackson, CM Harris Director of Governmental & Legislative Affairs,

Dominique.Jackson@nola.gov

Matthew C. Schoenberger, Director of Community Engagement,

Matthew.Schoenberger@nola.gov

1300 Perdido St. Rm. 2W10

New Orleans, LA. 70112

Sandra G. Thomas, CM Green Chief-of-Staff, Sandra.Thomas@nola.gov

1300 Perdido St. Rm. 2W20

New Orleans, LA. 70112

Justyn Hawkins, 504-658-1108 jahawkins@nola.gov

Chief of Staff

City Hall - Room 1E06

1300 Perdido Street

New Orleans, LA 70112

Charline K. Gipson, Charline.Gipson@nola.gov

Law Department

City Hall - 5th Floor

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 658-9800

Fax: (504) 658-9869

Service of Discovery not required

Tanya L. Irvin, tirvin@nola.gov

Chief Deputy City Attorney

Law Department

City Hall - 5th Floor

New Orleans, LA 70112

Tel: (504) 658-9800

Fax: (504) 658-9869

Norman White, Norman.White@nola.gov
Department of Finance
City Hall - Room 3E06
1300 Perdido Street
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: (504) 658-1502
Fax: (504) 658-1705

Meagan Williams, memwilliams@nola.gov
Office of Resilience & Sustainability
1300 Perdido Street, Suite 8E08
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: 504-658-8420
Cell: 504-729-9615

Anna Nguyen, anna.nguyen@nola.gov
External Affairs Administrator
Office of Resilience & Sustainability
1300 Perdido Street, Suite 8E08
New Orleans, LA 70112
Tel: 504-658-4956
Cell: 504-905-2049

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER

Hon. Calvin Johnson, (504) 439-2514
fourwakes@gmail.com

CITY COUNCIL CONSULTANTS and SUPPORT STAFF

Clinton A. Vince, clinton.vince@dentons.com

Presley Reed, presley.reedjr@dentons.com

Emma F. Hand, emma.hand@dentons.com

Dee McGill, dee.mcgill@dentons.com

Denton Law Firm,

1900 K Street NW

Washington, DC 20006

Tel: (202) 408-6400

Fax: (202) 408-6399

Basile J. Uddo (504) 583-8604 cell, buddo@earthlink.net

J. A. "Jay Beatmann, Jr. (504) 256-6142 cell, (504) 524-5446 office direct,

jay.beatmann@dentons.com

c/o DENTONS US LLP

650 Poydras Street

Suite 2850

New Orleans, LA 70130

Joseph W. Rogers, jrogers@legendcgl.com

Victor M. Prep, vprep@legendcgl.com

Byron S. Watson, bwatson@legendcgl.com

Legend Consulting Group

6041 South Syracuse Way, Suite 105

Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Tel: (303) 843-0351

Fax: (303) 843-0529

ENERGY NEW ORLEANS, LLC

Leroy Nix, lnix@entergy.com

Entergy New Orleans, LLC

Vice-President, Regulatory and Public Affairs

Deanna Rodriguez, drodri2@entergy.com

Entergy New Orleans, LLC

President and Chief Executive Officer

Entergy New Orleans, LLC

Mail Unit L-MAG-505B

1600 Perdido Street

New Orleans, LA 70112

Polly Rosemond, prosemo@entergy.com

Kevin T. Boleware, (504) 670-3673, kbolewa@entergy.com

D'Angela Savoie, dsavoil@entergy.com

Keith Wood, (504) 670-3633, kwood@entergy.com

Derek Mills, (504) 670-3527, dmills3@entergy.com

Ross Thevenot, (504) 670-3556, rtheven@entergy.com

1600 Perdido Street, L-MAG 505B

New Orleans, LA 70112

Vincent Avocato, (281) 297-3508, vavocat@entergy.com

Entergy New Orleans, LLC

2107 Research Forest Drive, T-LFN-4

The Woodlands, TX 77380

Courtney Nicholson, cnicho2@entergy.com

Heather Silbernagel, (504) 576-2806, hsilber@entergy.com

Lacresha D. Wilkerson, (504) 576-6571, lwilke1@entergy.com

Ed Wicker, (504) 576-3101, ewicker@entergy.com

Linda Prisuta, (504) 576-4137, lprisut@entergy.com

Entergy Services, LLC

Mail Unit L-ENT-26E

639 Loyola Avenue

New Orleans, LA 70113

Fax: 504-576-5579

Joe Romano, III (504) 576-4764, jroman1@entergy.com

Tim Rapier, (504) 576-4740, trapier@entergy.com

Jessica Coolidge, (504) 576-5407, jcoolid@entergy.com

Greg Crisler, (504) 670-3538, gcrisle@entergy.com

Kimberely Caron, kcaron@entergy.com

INTERVENORS

Alliance For Affordable Energy

Logan A. Burke, logan@all4energy.org
Jesse S. George, jesse@all4energy.org
Sophie Zaken, regulatory@all4energy.org
4505 S. Claiborne Ave.
Tel: (504) 208-9761

TOGETHER NEW ORLEANS

Broderick Bagert, (225) 803-5876, broderick@togetherla.org
Abel Thompson, (225) 978-1667, abel@togethernola.org
Nathalie Jordi, (504) 715-1742, nathalie@togetherla.org

LOUISIANA GREEN CORPS

Ryan Mattingly, ryan@lagreencorps.org
26455 Toulouse Street
New Orleans, LA 70119

FINANCE NEW ORELANS

Annie Clark, Aclark@financeauthority.org

PILA ENERGY INC.

Cole Ashman, 504-952-5026, cole@pilaenergy.com
1362 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA, 94117

SOLAR UNITED NEIGHBORS

Shannon Anderson, (307) 288-4525, sanderson@solarunitedneighbors.org

1350 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite
412 Washington, DC 20036

GREATER NEW ORLEANS INTERFAITH CLIMATE COALITION

Pastor Gregory Manning, (913) 940-5713, gmanning1973@yahoo.com

Jonathan Leo, jonathan.s.leo@gmail.com

Peter Digre, (310) 346-4361, peterdigre@gmail.com

Broadmoor Community Church

2021 S. Dupre St.

New Orleans, LA 70125

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS LOCAL UNION

130

Calvin Lawrence, (504) 644-1192, calvin@ibewlu130.com

Rodney Wallis, (504) 913-4728, rodney@ibewlu130.com

3200 RidgelakeDr., Suite 300

Metairie, LA 70002

SOUTH LOUISIANA CHAPTER, INC. – NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION

Shawn Martinez, (504) 352-6417, SMartinez@solaNECA.org

501 Commerce Point,

New Orleans, LA 7012

PRORATE ENERGY INC.

Myron Katz, (504)-343-1243, myron.bernard.katz@gmail.com

302 Walnut St

New Orleans, La 70118

SOUTHERN RENEWABLE ENERGY ASSOCIATION

Simon Mahan, (337) 303-3723, simon@southernwind.org

Whit Cox, (501) 701-0874, whit@southernrenewable.org

11610 Pleasant Ridge Road, Suite 103 #176

Little Rock, AR 72223

ENPHASE ENERGY INC.

Marc Monbouquette, (415) 488-6035, mmonbouquette@enphaseenergy.com
Steve Lasher, (617) 519-6631, slasher@enphaseenergy.com
47281 Bayside Pkwy
Fremont, CA 94538

504 HEALTHNET, INC

Curin Wallis, (978)-505-3059, cwallis@504healthnet.org
1030 Lesseps St,
New Orleans LA 70122

RESILIENCE NEW ORLEANS

Casey DeMoss, (504) 982-0468, casey@resiliencenola.org
4659 Clara St.,
New Orleans, LA 70115

EFFORTS OF GRACE, INC/ASHE CULTURAL ARTS CENTER

Asali DeVan Ecclesiastes, (504) 813-1586, adecclesiastes@ashenola.org
2236 D'Abadie Street
New Orleans, 70119

Patricia Smith, (504) 515-3899, patricias@ashenola.org
6101 Ransom Street
New Orleans, 70126

VOLTUS INC.

Kimaya Abreu, (609) 994-7686, kabreu@voltus.co
2443 Fillmore St.
San Francisco, CA 94115
Harry Alper, (617)-974-1116, halper@voltus.co

1114 Crete St.
New Orleans, LA 70119

ENERGYHUB, INC

Gabriela Olmedo, (949) 518-5695, gabriela.olmedo@energyhub.net
41 Flatbush Avenue Suite 400A
Brooklyn, NY 11217

GROUNDWORK NEW ORLEANS

Todd Reynolds, (504) 256-1336, todd@groundworknola.org

GULF STATES RENEWABLE ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Monika Gerhart, (504) 258-9294, mgerhart@gsreia.org
Executive Director

Jeffrey Cantin, jcantin@gsreia.org
Chairman of the Board

Christopher Pourciau, cmpourciau@gmail.com
Energy Fellow

RECURVE ANALYTICS, INC

Ted Thomas, ted.thomas@energizestrategies.com
Energize Strategies
1910 Navarre School Road
Navarre FL, 32566

Cailee Mangan, cailee@recurve.com

CITIZENS CLIMATE LOBBY NEW ORLEANS

Keely Lewis, (504) 372-7599, utopiantemple@gmail.com

Chapter Leader

701 Loyola Avenue # 58542

New Orleans, LA 70113