

**TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BUSINESS
AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2026 IN BATON ROUGE,
LOUISIANA. PRESENT WERE: CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA, VICE CHAIRMAN
JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN, COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS, COMMISSIONER
MIKE FRANCIS, AND COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL.**

Exhibit	Docket	Description	Page
1		Announcements	1-5
2	T-37797	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Uncle Sam’s Moving Corps, LLC.	86-87
3	T-37833	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. EZ Movers, LLC.	87-88
4	T-37879	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Grade-A Movers LLC.	88-89
5	T-37908	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Hornet Civil Services LLC.	89-90
6	T-37948	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Tiger Totes LLC.	90-91
7	T-37949	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. CollegeBoxes, LLC.	91-92
8	R-37339	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	92-94
9	S-37855	Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, ex parte.	94-98

10	S-37903	Brightspeed of Louisiana, LLC and Brightspeed of South Arkansas, LLC.	99
11	S-37940	Southwest Arkansas Telecommunications and Technology, Inc.	100-101
12	S-37960	Pointe Coupee Electric Membership Corporation and Electric Cooperative, Inc.	101-102
13	S-37962	Concordia Electric Cooperative, Inc. and 1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc.	102-103
14	U-37769	Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative, Inc., ex parte.	103-105
15	U-37775	L & R Utilities, Inc., ex parte.	106-107
16	U-37792	Pierre Part Natural Gas Company, Inc., ex parte.	107-108
17	U-37793	South Coast Gas Company, Inc., ex parte.	108
18	U-37861	Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, ex parte.	108-109
19	U-37862	Parish Water Company, Inc., ex parte.	109-110
20	U-37882	Entergy Louisiana, LLC, ex parte.	6-80

21	U-37887	Atmos Energy Corporation, ex parte.	110-111
22	U-37894	Pointe Coupee Electric Membership Cooperation, ex parte.	111-112
23	U-37912	Louisiana Water Company, Inc., ex parte.	112-126
24	U-37969	Cleco Power LLC, ex parte.	126-127
25	X-38036	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	127-128
26		1) Reports 2) Resolutions 3) Discussions 4) ERSC/OMS business 5) Directives	128-129
27	R-37871	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	131-134
28	T-37136	Cantium, LLC vs. Rosefield Fourchon Operating, LLC.	81-85
29	T-37136	Cantium, LLC vs. Rosefield Fourchon Operating, LLC.	85-86

1 **TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**
2 **BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON AUGUST 12,**
3 **2026 IN BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA. PRESENT WERE: CHAIRMAN**
4 **ERIC SKRMETTA, VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN,**
5 **COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS, COMMISSIONER MIKE**
6 **FRANCIS, AND COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL.**

7 **CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA:** Come to order please. Commissioner Francis
8 is going to lead us in a prayer, followed by Commissioner Coussan, who's going to
9 lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

10 **COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS:** Good morning. Y'all all back, man. Y'all
11 back. Okay. Let's pray.

12 **[COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS LEADS IN PRAYER]**

13 **[COMMISSIONER JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN LEADS IN THE PLEDGE]**

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Good morning, everyone. Any announcements from
15 the Commissioners? Commissioner Lewis.

16 **COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first
17 thing I want to do is acknowledge a dear friend of mine who has sadly left us, State
18 Senator Larry Selders. Larry was not only my state rep, he was also my state
19 senator, and a close friend of mine who tragically -- suddenly, passed away earlier
20 last month. Senator Selders was the epitome of a public servant. A person who I
21 think had no enemies, and found a way to be helpful and joyous. I'll never forget
22 when we had a constituent call our office about three years ago, on an issue that we

LPSC B&E Open Session
August 12, 2026
Baton Rouge, LA

1 had never heard of, and the Commission had never heard of around apartment
2 complexes giving tenants their utility bills. It was in Senator Selders' district. I
3 called him, and right away he agreed to file a piece of legislation for this
4 Commission, and then, ushered it through the legislature. And so his commitment
5 to the people here in Baton Rouge, to the people of Louisiana, and to his friends
6 and family, it is left unknown. And so I could not let this meeting attend without
7 thanking him for his service and the job well done that he did on this earth. Next,
8 Mr. Chairman, the only other announcement I have is that the summer meeting at
9 NARUC in Minneapolis, the consumer and public interest committee, which I vice-
10 chair, along with the water committee, passed a resolution from NARUC that would
11 call on Congress to refund the LIHWAP Program. The LIHWAP Program was an
12 assistance program for water assistance -- for people to pay their water bills that
13 was funded during the COVID, and through the rescue plan. Unfortunately, that
14 has not been renewed. And as we have had multiple conversations here at this
15 Commission around water, wastewater, and the challenges of affordability, that
16 resolution highlights the need to have a federally funded program, such as LIHEAP,
17 that helps on the electric and gas side there. So I would encourage all of our water
18 utilities to take that resolution from NARUC and talk to our congressional
19 delegation to encourage them that they finally pass a LIHWAP program that will
20 bring assistance for those who have -- are struggling with their water bills. And
21 with that, Mr. Chairman, that's all the announcements that I have.

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Thank you. Any other announcements?

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN:** We do have a couple -- we do
2 have a couple of legislators in the audience. I'd like to welcome back Stephanie
3 Hilferty, representative, who also is running for Public Service Commission. So I
4 want to welcome Stephanie. And I think I saw -- do I have Representative Billings?
5 Representative, nice to see you here at our meeting. We always invite our
6 legislators. We love to see y'all here, so you can see and hear what we're doing
7 over here to work together with you to move this state forward in our utilities. Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Anything from --

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Mr. Chairman, I heard through --

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You have to use your microphone, sir.

12 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I've heard through the grapevine that
13 Commissioner Campbell is on the mends?

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah.

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And I want to send him a message. He's in my
16 personal prayers. I hope he's in yours, too. I kind of miss the guy. And its been a
17 good balance with -- between us on each end, but come on back soon,
18 Commissioner Campbell. We miss you.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Well, you took one of my announcements away. So
20 the next one is just a reminder that the October meeting will be held in New Orleans,
21 Louisiana. It is going to be at the State Supreme Court building. That'll be
22 Thursday, October 22, I believe. It has been finalized and confirmed that it will be

1 there. Further information will be announced at the September meeting of our other
2 issues.

3 **SECRETARY BRANDON FREY:** And, one other announcement, too, kind of
4 along those same lines. With Commissioner Campbell, we are going to have the
5 December meeting in Shreveport, location to be determined. But likely the City
6 Council Chambers, which is where we've traditionally held it out there.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

8 **SECRETARY FREY:** And I'll echo what Commissioner Francis said, after my
9 conversations with Foster, I'm surprised he didn't sneak in here. I think efforts were
10 being made. So, Foster, if you're watching -- but I would fully expect him to be
11 here in September.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right. Thank you very much. I'd like to go on --
13 anything else from you before we move to the announcements on the agenda?

14 **MS. KATHRYN BOWMAN:** Yes, sir, I do. I do have one.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** So I do have an announcement related to the energy efficiency
17 working group. The first meeting -- the public meeting will be scheduled for
18 Wednesday, September 23, here in the Natchez Room, beginning at 9:30 A.M. And
19 for those interested in participating, please email me no later than September 2, so
20 that I can have a head count and send a proposed agenda out prior to that meeting.
21 So that's Wednesday, September 23, here in the Natchez Room, and get with me
22 before September 2.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Commissioner Francis.

2 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** One other announcement. I want to welcome

3 some of my hometown crew, the mayor and several of the city council from the

4 great city of Crowley are here. Where you at? Raise your hand. Yeah. Welcome to

5 the meeting. Yeah.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. We'd like to also announce there's been a

7 ruling at the Fifth Circuit, which has struck down the -- as identified as illegal

8 Biden-era energy efficiency standards for stoves and cooktops for the nation. So

9 that will be moving on to the Supreme Court for final decision. So that was

10 something that we worked on with the national gas infrastructure task force for

11 about two years before it was taken up by Louisiana, as well as several other states.

12 So why don't we go through the agenda. I know we're going to move two items to

13 the front, and if there's any other issues.

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir. So the -- technically, three items.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** So, first, is going to be Exhibit 20. And then, after Exhibit 20,

17 we will take up Exhibits 28 and 29.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So 20 is going to be first, 28 --

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** And 29.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- second, and third. Okay. Go ahead and do the in

21 re on 20, and we'll begin.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** So Exhibit Number 20 is Docket Number U-37882. This is
2 Entergy Louisiana's Application for Certification of Generation and Transmission
3 Resources and for Other Relief. It's a discussion and possible vote on Meta's
4 platform Motion for Immediate Review of Interlocutory Ruling. In its application,
5 Entergy sought the Commission's approval to add approximately 5,200 megawatts
6 of generation in addition to battery storage and transmission to serve Evest.
7 According to the application, Evest is locating a large hyperscale data center in
8 Richland Parish, adjacent to the facility approved in Commission Order Number
9 U-37425. On June 29 of this year, intervenors, the Alliance for Affordable Energy,
10 and the Union of Concerned Scientists filed a Motion for Subpoena for the
11 Production of Documents directed towards Meta, which is not a party to the
12 proceeding. The Motion for Subpoena was opposed by Entergy and Commission
13 Staff. After hearing oral argument on July 8 of this year, the Administrative Law
14 Judge issued a ruling on that Motion for Subpoena on July 10, and the subpoena
15 ruling denied in part, and granted in part, the motion. Specifically, the following
16 documents requests were granted for Meta to supply: Analysis, data reports,
17 calculations, and/or evidence, which demonstrate the level of investment and
18 permanent job creation expected to be entailed by the Richland Data Center; and
19 analysis, data reports, calculations, and/or evidence, which substantiate the amount
20 of electricity load the Richland Data Center will need. On July 14, Meta filed a
21 limited appearance in the docket to challenge the subpoena ruling. At issue herein
22 is Meta's Motion of Immediate Review of the Interlocutory Ruling pursuant to

1 Commission Rule 57. After considering the memorandum and arguments of the
2 parties, and in accordance with the procedures set forth in Rule 57, the ALJ declined
3 to reconsider the interlocutory ruling, and referred to the -- for the Commissioners
4 immediate review the subpoena ruling. As this is a request for review of an
5 interlocutory ruling, there is no recommendation from Staff.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** The Chairman moves to defer this matter to
7 September based on the fact that there are two other or three other interlocutory
8 issues. They're all going to be decided at once regarding this particular case. So
9 we're going to take this matter up in September, along with the other issues. But I
10 understand there are people here today who have put cards.

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And, Mr. Chairman -- I'm sorry.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Hang on a second. I'm not finished. That I know we
13 have yellow cards, and if they want to make comments, what I'd like to do is limit
14 the comments to three minutes each. And also, I want to make sure that we don't
15 double cover comments. So if you want to make comments about the deferral to
16 next month, that's fine. But we want to try and keep it on that because that's the
17 issue today. So if you like to -- have you gone through this yet?

18 **MS. BOWMAN:** Do you want to call three, and then have three --

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah, yeah. That's fine. And if you've already
20 identified the folks, and what they're going do. But like I said, you know, be
21 respectful about this. Keep it on the issue about the deferral, and then we'll go from
22 there, and then I'm going to turn this over to Commissioner Lewis.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to stage my
2 objection, and I will object to the pending motion to defer.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure.

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I would like to say, before we get to the public
5 comments, exactly why I am opposing this motion to delay this proceeding. As --
6 according to our rules, Meta has asked for immediate review of their subpoena
7 ruling, and I believe time is of the essence. We have made arguments that this is
8 the time, and so I do have questions when we suggest that the Motion to Quash and
9 the Motion for Immediate Review are considered together. These are separate
10 issues that we should take separately. And if Meta files another Motion for
11 Immediate Review of the quash, we can handle that when they such due file it. Just
12 for procedural records, let's be very clear on how we got to this moment. The
13 Administrative Law Judge, on July 14, ruled that the motion that the NPOs had
14 filed on a subpoena should be stayed until they could make their interlocutory
15 review. On July 14, she also asked them for comments and review. On July 27,
16 Meta responded to the briefs that our Staff and the NPOs filed, and on July 29, there
17 were oral arguments. On July 16, the Administrative Law Judge asked us whether
18 the Motion to Quash and the Motion for Immediate Review should remain distinct
19 for the purposes of the record of appeal. And then that question was responded to
20 all -- this is what the parties in that case said. On July 24, the NPOs responded, and
21 I quote them from their filing on Page 17, the Motion to Quash and the Motion for
22 Immediate Review should remain distinct for the purposes of any record on appeal.

1 While there is some overlap between the motions, Meta does raise some specific
2 contentions in the Motion to Quash that are not included in the Motion for
3 Immediate Review, more are there are issues in the Motion for Immediate Review
4 that do not appear in the Motion to Quash. Subsequently, the Staff of the
5 Commission stated, and I quote them directly, as explained, the Motion to Quash
6 and the Motion for Review serve different procedural functions, and are governed
7 by different standards. The Motion to Quash and the Motion for Review should
8 remain distinct, unless a party, including a specific purpose party, Meta, specifically
9 requests that they be combined for the purposes of appellate review. Meta was
10 asked that exact same question, and Meta, in their briefing said, the two motions
11 remain distinct for the purpose of the record on appeal, because they are two
12 procedurally distinct motions. They said the motion for reconsideration either
13 withdraw or modify the subpoena, but the discussion of legal issues between the
14 two motions overlap, but the Motion to Quash asked the Tribunal to evaluate the
15 subpoena and vacate it, while the Motion for Immediate Review requests the
16 Commission to evaluate the Tribune's decision to issue a subpoena under that
17 ruling, reverse it, or vacate the subpoena. And when we got to the trial, the question
18 was asked to Mr. Adams, who was representing Meta at the trial, whether or not
19 these two distinct motions should be combined? And he said, Your Honor, you
20 asked about the effects of denying the Motion to Quash, what would that have on
21 the Motion for Immediate Review? I think it would have no effect on the Motion
22 for Immediate Review. Those are different things. The motion's basically -- the

1 Motion to Quash is challenging the substantive validity of the subpoena, while the
2 Motion for Immediate Review is addressing irreparable injury in their review. So I
3 think it has no effect on the Motion to Quash if it is denied, and it would have no
4 effect on the Motion for Immediate Review that would stand. The Motion for
5 Immediate Review stand, and the Judge, on last Thursday, ruled that the Motion to
6 Quash was denied. Meta did not file a request for immediate review until 4:38 P.M.
7 yesterday. They had time to ask for immediate review for us to take them up. But
8 based off of the parties in this case, they have made it very clear in their briefs, and
9 in the hearing, that we should see these two motions very separately. And I would
10 say the Commission voted to fast track this process with the Lightning Initiative at
11 Entergy's request. And speed cannot only be used when it values Entergy and Meta.
12 They don't get to dictate our Commission proceedings. We exercised our own rule
13 in 57, and pulled the jurisdiction of this case from the ALJ without a
14 recommendation from the trial. So having made that choice, deferring now means
15 we're also kind of reversing our own procedural decision at another request by
16 Entergy and Meta. I -- as you see, I've read the briefs, I've attended the hearing,
17 I've looked at the party's request, and I am prepared to handle the question at hand.
18 We cannot consider this as a delay tactic, and I -- and I'm fearful that it is. Because
19 if we go back to the prior proceeding, the prior subpoena, and the subpoena was
20 quashed, specifically because of its proximity to the hearing. And the ALJ
21 distinguished the subpoena because it was filed months in advance. However, if we
22 delay, we risk handing Entergy and Meta the same legal arguments to quash the

1 subpoena before the October trial. And so I think it is important that we look at this,
2 and we realize that we should take up the matter as requested, in immediate form.
3 We have found a way, at this Commission, for some odd reason, to find every
4 excuse to not do something when it favors Entergy and Meta, but we find every
5 exception into our rules when it favors Entergy and Meta, and that's why I oppose
6 the motion to defer, and I'm ready to vote on the issue at hand. Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure. Thank you very much.

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Chairman.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Look, I appreciate the applause and everything,
11 we've got to move through this, so try to constrict it, if you can. Okay, so. Like I
12 said, I understand. The -- we're trying to get a little information on -- information
13 from Counsel on this for a second.

14 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Chairman.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir.

16 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I tend to agree with Commissioner Lewis, that
17 we should take this up today. So I've asked Staff to basically review the posture of
18 the matter and tell us the actual motion that would be on the table.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. And, Lauren, can you take and have a private
20 moment with Commissioner Coussan and talk about this -- and see about legal
21 procedure on this?

22 **MS. LAUREN EVANS:** Okay.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So what we discussed?

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yeah.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Or you want to go talk?

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Would you -- so first of all, from our General
6 Counsel standpoint, could you -- Executive Counsel, could you tell us the posture
7 of the matter? And Commissioner Lewis wants us to take it up today. What would
8 we be taking up today should we move forward and not ask for a second to -- move
9 this matter to September?

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** Sure. So what is in front of you today is Meta's request for an
11 interlocutory ruling. On the -- our ALJ's ruling to issue a subpoena to Meta for this
12 specific information I read into the record earlier. So it's you guys review of an
13 ALJ ruling that a subpoena should be issued to Meta in this docket. And that's the
14 only think that is in front of you today.

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** And so our question before the Commission
16 would be whether or not to agree with the -- a ALJ's ruling to issue a subpoena in
17 for a portion of the information that was requested?

18 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct. You would be either agreeing with the ALJ's ruling to
19 issue the subpoena, or disagreeing with the ALJ's ruling to issue a subpoena.

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** And I would like the language to make a motion
21 to disagree with the ALJ's ruling.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** That's the language I'm looking for. Just to air
2 it publicly --

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** -- that's the language that I would like to make
5 very clear -- so that we have a clear understanding of what we're voting on today.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And the second issue that I wanted to ask about is in
7 the next month, since we're going to have this again, on the motion -- is it -- we
8 have something else in September about the Motion to Quash?

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Possibly. At this point, Meta has also filed a request for
10 interlocutory ruling on a separate Judge ruling on a Motion to Quash. She denied
11 Meta's Motion to Quash.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Is that Motion to Quash subject to approval by the
13 Commission at this point?

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Well, not today. It is subject to your approval in September. It is
17 not --

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So it's not ripe yet?

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So that is not subject to a ruling today?

21 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct.

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** It is solely the issuance of the subpoena.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So got it. So if you have a motion that you can
3 provide us --

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah, Ms. Evans got it.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- at this moment to put on the floor.

6 **MS. EVANS:** Lauren Evans on behalf of Staff.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. I'm sorry. Before we --

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Chairman, just for clarity, are we pulling the
9 motion to defer? Because if we're putting a motion on the table, we'd have to just
10 clarify --

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** But that's what --

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Well, it could -- it would be a substitute motion.

13 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Oh okay. That's what I -- I just want to know what
14 motion we're putting on the table.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And we haven't done anything yet. So I'm asking if
16 you have something prepared, Lauren, that you could provide for a motion --

17 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** A substitute motion.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- a substitute motion to oppose and --

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Reject.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- reject the ALJ's order, and quash the subpoena?

21 **MS. EVANS:** Yes, sir. So the motion would be, I move to reverse the Tribunal's
22 ruling --

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** This would come from Commissioner Coussan.

2 **MS. EVANS:** -- and vacate the subpoena, rendering the Motion to Quash moot.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And Chair will second.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** That's my substitute motion that I'd like to put

5 on the floor.

6 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And, Mr. Chairman, for clarity, I will remove --

7 since that's your motion, I will remove my objection to the deferral so that can be

8 the standing motion so it won't have to be a substitute.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** There you go. And so I will withdraw my motion to

10 defer. I will second Commissioner Coussan's motion.

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And I will object to Commissioner Coussan's

12 motion.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** There you go.

14 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Now, we have witnesses.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Now, we have witnesses, and we'll -- it'll be on the

16 Motion to Quash -- motion to overturn the ALJ's ruling. So they can comment.

17 **MS. BOWMAN:** So the comments today will be related to the Judge issuing a

18 subpoena to Meta for specific information. So the comments should be limited

19 solely to whether a subpoena should be issued to Meta in this docket.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Correct.

21 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. I just wanted to make sure everyone has this --

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. So -- and what I'd like for you to do, Kathryn,
2 is, you know, act as referee to restrict the comments and try to keep it on track at
3 least. And, like I said, we want to keep the comments to three minutes. How many
4 witnesses are we going to have on this? Do you -- have you identified?

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** A decent amount. I haven't counted them.

6 **MR. COLBY COOK:** Twenty.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** About 20.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I think we're going to have to try and see if this is
9 going to be repetitive, and we may have to find a number to where we'll have to,
10 you know, stop this.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** So you could instruct -- limit of time of three minutes strictly to
12 whether the subpoena should be issued, and if the comments have been made by a
13 prior public person, to limit those comments.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Well, let's try to do that so we're just not like
15 grinding time for the same stuff over and over again.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We certainly want to have comments, but, I mean,
18 we don't want it to just be an abuse of process. That's all. So go ahead, and I'll let
19 you be the referee on this.

20 **SECRETARY BRANDON FREY:** And while she's doing that, we did get some
21 comments submitted electronically. And, kind of, to your point, some of those --

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We could put those into the record.

1 **SECRETARY FREY:** We will, but some of those are generic. They're not -- I
2 saw one, for example, saying, I live in Rapides Parish and I don't want a data center
3 here. Well, that's not obvious of this matter.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Well, that's not associative to the record.

5 **SECRETARY FREY:** So, yeah. Okay.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. Okay. Well, like I said, Colby, you be the
7 timekeeper, Kathryn, you be the referee, and we'll go ahead and hear the comments.
8 So we'll start stacking them here three and three. And then we'll move through it.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Do you -- would you like three?

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. Put three in the bull pen and three in the chairs.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. So, Ms. Susan Stevens Miller and Ms. Logan Burke for
12 the Alliance for Affordable Energy, and a Ms. -- is it Asti Robins? I'm sorry if I did
13 not pronounce that correctly, Power Coalition for Equity Justice. The three of you
14 can go to the table. And then, a Joseph Rosenzweig, with Louisiana Workers
15 Council; Gabrielle Gemma, Louisiana Workers Council; and Ms. Deborah
16 Pearlman, with the Party for Socialism & Libertarianism and Take Back the Power
17 Campaign. There are three chairs right here if the three would like to come sit up.
18 Yeah. And, just for the record -- well, you signed the card, so never mind. You're
19 good.

20 **MS. SUSAN MILLER:** You ready?

21 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Bring it as close to you as you can, the
22 microphone, and I'll try to -- if you're testifying in the front, please bring the

1 microphone as close to your mouth as you can. Otherwise, you can't hear it online,
2 and we can't hear, because I can't hear.

3 **MS. MILLER:** Thank you. My name is Susan Stevens Miller, and I represent the
4 Alliance --

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You might have to bring it closer.

6 **MS. MILLER:** Even closer? Okay.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** It does have to be pretty adjacent to you.

8 **MS. MILLER:** Okay. My name is Susan Stevens Miller, and I represent the
9 Alliance for Affordable Energy and the Union of Concerned Scientists. We are the
10 parties that filed the Motion for Subpoena and we request you reject the motion that
11 was recently announced. Essentially, it's important to recognize the that this has
12 been a two-step process. The first process was just to see if the subpoena should be
13 issued. It is important to note that the ALJ was very careful. We asked for five
14 categories of information, and only got two. The ALJ very carefully analyzed what
15 was requested and why, and found that only two aspects in economic development
16 and the actual load that Meta will need should be provided. And it's also important
17 to note, that Meta did not participate in this stage of the process, though it could
18 have. When we filed our Motion for Subpoena, we served their resident agent. So
19 they knew this subpoena was there, and could've participated in this part of the
20 process, and did not. It's our contention that they don't even have standing to bring
21 this specific motion because they are not a party, and the rules say parties, and they
22 chose not to participate as a non-party. So it's important, finally, to note why this

1 information is necessary. With regard to economic development, the ALJ relied on
2 the governor's EO-26058, and your Lightning Directive, and determined that this
3 is a special case that economic development is a high priority. It is actually the only
4 public interest that Entergy claims exists in this proceeding is the economic
5 development. So -- and all we asked for was information with regard to that
6 economic development. How many actual jobs? How many permanent jobs? How
7 many remote jobs? That's the information we were looking for, because that's what
8 they claim was in the public interest. The second is the load. The load is what
9 supports their request for seven generating stations. Now, we have argued in our
10 testimony that we shouldn't -- at least should not build -- approve all seven at once.
11 It's difficult for anyone to argue against the generating stations without knowing
12 what Meta's load actually is and how they developed it. Entergy is asking for over
13 \$13 billion of infrastructure just for this part of the data center. And I think at the
14 very least, and as the ALJ noted, it's a two-step process to determine if generating
15 stations should be built, and one of the steps is missing in this case. And then that's
16 the information that will be provided, and then that's the information that's
17 necessary to decide if this application should move forward.

18 **MS. LOGAN BURKE:** Hi there. Logan Burke for the Alliance for Affordable
19 Energy. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. The point that I would like
20 to make is that this Public Service Commission has the jurisdiction to make
21 decisions that no one else in the state does as it relates to the public interest. And,
22 as Susan pointed out, Entergy and, indeed, the governor, and many other elected

1 officials, have insisted that the public interest is met in large part because of the
2 economic development elements of this case. It's incredibly important that the very
3 last people who have an opportunity to say whether this is in the public interest has
4 the information to make that determination. As it relates to the load and how the
5 power is going to be used, this industry is so nascent in the way in which the power
6 is used in these facilities is so -- so different from the ways in which people have -
7 - industries used power for decades, that the industry is really just now trying to
8 figure out exactly how to make sure that the system stays reliable. FERC is looking
9 at this, MISO is looking at this, and the way in which the power is going to be used,
10 and how much is going to be used will also determine how reliable our grid stays,
11 especially in north Louisiana. And so that information is incredibly important to
12 the public interest. Kicking this down the line and waiting for this information only
13 means that other parties in the proceeding, like the Alliance and others, won't be
14 able to fully represent our case, and that this Commission won't have the necessary
15 information to make a good, informed decision. I really appreciate the opportunity.
16 Thank you.

17 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Can I ask you a question? Well, go ahead. I'll
18 asked after you're done. Thank you.

19 **MS. ASTI ROBINS:** Good morning. I'm Asti Davis Robins with the Power of
20 Coalition for Equity and Justice. I just want to echo what these ladies have said, but
21 also say that Louisianans are literally learning these data centers day-by-day, bit-
22 by-bit, article-by-article. They're learning about NDAs and private deals, property

1 sales that they don't know about, as well as insider trading rumors. So this is the
2 chance, the one true chance of transparency that lies within your hands. Along with
3 their own leaders making these decisions blindly for them, we're sitting on the
4 sidelines, waiting to learn of the environmental impacts that this will have, while
5 also watching our brethren in neighboring states endure these impacts. So I feel that
6 Louisianans need to know this information. We stand before you with a plea that
7 the least you can do is vote for transparency today. The Judge has already
8 determined what should be done. And we don't think that you should be
9 overturning what the Judge has decided. Set the precedent that people deserve to
10 know, set the standard that you protect the voters that you -- that seated you, and
11 set the moral paradigm that, even if you support the project's build out, that you
12 congruently support your state, districts, and own people. Thank you.

13 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay. Thank you. Is this -- can I ask, you're a
14 lawyer?

15 **MS. MILLER:** Yes, sir.

16 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Is this -- some of this information accessible to
17 you as confidential, for a lawyer's eye only, type of information?

18 **MS. MILLER:** If they provide it, it would be accessible to me. I'm assuming that
19 all that is provided will be provided on a confidential basis. So only certain people
20 who've signed the NDA and are approved will be able to see it. It will be labeled
21 confidential. But we will be able to use that information in the hearings, which

1 include evidentiary -- include confidential information when you argue in the
2 hearing.

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** So are you arguing -- I'm just asking for your
4 purposes, are you saying that that is still not enough with the -- and because I know
5 the distinction between the two of you is, you're a lawyer and she's not a lawyer.
6 But -- so you have access to the information that would be provided?

7 **MS. MILLER:** If it's provided, I will have access to the information. I think what
8 the --

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** And so is your argument going a step further
10 and saying that you want it even more accessible than even beyond lawyers, or can
11 you clarify that for me?

12 **MS. MILLER:** Yeah. There is another motion that will be before you next month.
13 And it's called Attorneys' Eyes Only Motion. That was our motion to allow Logan
14 and our other client representative to see the information, which, thus far, Entergy
15 has denied that they see it. At this point, our experts can see it, our attorneys can
16 see it. Essentially, they are only 10 people involved in the case who can't see the
17 information, and eight of them work for either the Alliance or the Union of
18 Concerned Scientists. So we think that's unreasonable, but that's actually not before
19 you today. That will be -- presumably be before you in the September hearing. But
20 if that doesn't stand, and if the -- you overrule the ALJ on that issue and find that
21 Logan and the other representatives can't see that information, then the other 50
22 people who are involved in the case, the experts, the attorneys, and people like that

1 will be able to see the Meta information, but the 10 people who've been denied
2 access to the information will not be allowed to see it.

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay. Well, I appreciate that clarification.
4 Thank you.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We'll move on to the next three, please.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Wait, wait, wait. I would like -- I've got
7 something.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** From what I'm hearing -- I'm hearing you need
10 two questions answered. One about economic development and one about how
11 much electricity, yeah. Have you talked to the governor and economic development
12 people, Susan Bourgeois, and asked them these questions? Looks to me, that's
13 where the answer would be on economic development questions.

14 **MS. MILLER:** My understanding is they don't have that specific information
15 either because Meta hasn't provided to them either. They don't have the specific
16 information with regard to, yes, there will be this number of permanent jobs. Yes,
17 there will be this number of part-time jobs versus full-time jobs. Yes, this portion
18 of the jobs will be done remotely, not in Louisiana. The economic development
19 agency does not have that information. But, also, it's important to bear in mind that
20 that information needs to be obtained for this case. It needs to be put into this case
21 as evidence in order to use it to either find that the project is in the public interest,
22 and find that the seven generating stations need to be built. Otherwise, it's not

1 information the Commissioners would be allowed to consider because it has not
2 been put into this proceeding.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Well, economic development is a totally different
4 governmental entity of -- with the governor --

5 **MS. MILLER:** Yes, sir.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** -- the Louisiana legislature, you know, have you
7 asked them these questions?

8 **MS. MILLER:** My understanding is they don't have the information. I have not
9 personally, specifically --

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** The government of Louisiana legislature and
11 economic development, they don't know the answer to these questions?

12 **MS. MILLER:** They don't know the answer to the questions.

13 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And you're here asking us? Okay.

14 **MS. MILLER:** As part of this proceeding --

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Have you asked them? Have you filed some
16 requests with them for this, you know?

17 **MS. MILLER:** No, sir. Because we want this information in this proceeding.
18 That's the only way we can use it to develop our case with regard to whether
19 Entergy's application should be approved. So the fact that -- and I still, I have been
20 told by others that the economic development does not have the information we're
21 asking for. The governor's office does not have the information we're asking for.

1 Meta has refused to provide that information to anybody. Entergy does not have the
2 information we're asking for. So no one has it but Meta, so --

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** That's not -- okay. All right. So one of your
4 colleagues -- witnesses today mentioned the news. There's probably the news here
5 today, and I read the articles, too. I think there doing a stand-up job of reporting the
6 jobs and opportunity that are happening up around state the in northeast Louisiana
7 -- starting in northeast and matriculating all the way down to the river in New
8 Orleans with river traffic increasing. We had a hearing in August 2025, where we
9 had every economic development officer in northeast Louisiana and around the
10 state testifying for the first -- for Meta, for the Laidley deal. And I assume we're
11 going to have the same group that's going to be testifying again. I would invite you
12 to look at that -- the video again to hear the economic development aspect of this
13 deal, because it's going to be even bigger when you talk about the bigger size of
14 the deal, when we talk about expanding this. So, I mean, you can deduce what the
15 economic development will be based upon the testimony from August 2025, and
16 then look at it from now. And you could read the articles written by any number of
17 outlets whether it's The Advocate, whether it's, you know, The Illuminator,
18 whether it's WAFB, whether it's -- you know, any outlet that you want is reporting
19 on the jobs and opportunity right now, from restaurants to manufacturing. So I just
20 think it is a misstatement to say that the only people that have this information is
21 Meta and/or Entergy. This information is readily accessible to the public by
22 watching -- by watching the news and understanding what's happening. I think

1 what you're looking for is more granular data, and that's fine. I just don't
2 necessarily think that's appropriate relative to our role right here.

3 **MS. MILLER:** Well, sir, I respectfully disagree. What's -- what we're looking for
4 is -- what you're talking about is the economic development due to the construction,
5 which we don't argue. There's been a lot of construction and a lot of jobs. What we
6 want to know is, what's the long-term economic development? When it's finished
7 construction, and all those people leave, how many jobs is the data center actually
8 going to create on a permanent basis? Because that is --

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Is 10 years short-term or long-term? I'm just
10 curious. If a construction job lasts 10 years, you consider that short-term?

11 **MS. MILLER:** I consider that short-term.

12 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay. I disagree.

13 **MS. MILLER:** You have to separate in --

14 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** If you give me a restaurant for 10 years, that's
15 humming along for 10 years, I'd take it today, and I'd cruise into retirement. That's
16 not short-term, 10 years to me. That's a big distinction.

17 **MS. MILLER:** Well, that's an amazing restaurant if you can retire after 10 years.
18 But there are two phases, there's a construction phase and there's a permanent
19 operation phase. And what we're looking at with regard to the jobs in the economic
20 development, is the permanent phase, not the construction phase.

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you, we're going to move on to the
22 next --

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Skrmetta, I have a question.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I'm sorry. Go ahead.

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Ms.

4 Miller, when we go back, I'm going back to the actual hearing, the first hearing of

5 the subpoena, and I want to make sure I'm clarifying some things correctly, did

6 Entergy file any briefs of motions in support or opposition to the Motion to

7 Subpoena, to your knowledge?

8 **MS. MILLER:** No, as to my knowledge. And it should've been documented in the

9 case if they had filed. And are you saying Entergy or Meta? I'm sorry.

10 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Entergy.

11 **MS. MILLER:** Entergy, yes. Entergy opposed the initial motion, and as did Staff.

12 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Exact. Okay. And when we go to the ALJ's hearing

13 on Request 1, let's start there with the analyst. She basically states that, this is not

14 a typical utility investment. Would you agree with her justification there?

15 **MS. MILLER:** Yes, I do.

16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And that, she states, and I quote her, this data is

17 relevant to the Commission's public interest determination in this matter, and to the

18 extent that it is responsive data that has not been previously provided, and it should

19 be provided in order to complete the evidentiary record in that matter. Would you

20 agree with her there?

21 **MS. MILLER:** Yes, I would.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Meta subsequently says that this information is
2 highly marketed and sensitive. What is your rationale against their plea in their
3 filing that that is why we should deny the motion, based off of what they say is
4 material, alleged to be trade secret, and confidential of nature?

5 **MS. MILLER:** Information is not denied just because its confidential or trade
6 secret. Protections are put in place to avoid it being released. And we have an NDA
7 in this case, and as we mentioned, my own clients can't see some of the information
8 because of the NDA in this case at this point. So just the fact that it's confidential
9 or trade secret is not in and of itself a reason to deny access to any information. And
10 you don't have it before you because it's in the -- the order on the Motion to Quash.
11 The ALJ also stated that Meta didn't prove how sensitive this information was and
12 that it was trade secrets and just too confidential to give. But that's not even the
13 standard. In fact, those confidential goes through the process.

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. Let's go to the second motion -- the
15 second request that was granted by the ALJ on the energy usage. In the trial, it was
16 asked the question of how Entergy submits that information. Can you refresh my
17 memory on what Entergy's response was to the Judge's question on how --

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Commissioner Lewis, can I ask you a question? Are
19 you going to be basically, going through the entire procedure of the ALJ hearing
20 with this witness as the attorney for them?

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes, sir.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. This is a comment period and not a refresher
2 of the actual hearing --

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** She's a witness at the trial, that's what we ask many
4 people at the table all the time.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You have to understand -- but, this is a comment
6 period. This isn't a refresher.

7 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And it's comments on the motion, and I'm asking
8 her comments about the proceeding, which is the motion.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Well, okay. Well --

10 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** That is what I'm doing.

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I understand. Well, I'm asking you a question, so?

12 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And it's my time, actually. So I would like to
13 continue asking my questions so we can move on.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Nobody's restricted you time, I'm asking you a
15 question.

16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I'm saying, I was asking her a question. You
17 interrupted it.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I interrupted you. I'm the Chairman --

19 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Well, I love that for you.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I have to run the meeting, and, I have to ask you a
21 question. So if you want to restrict the questions about the issue before the
22 Commission about where we are now, that's fine. But what I don't want to do is go

1 through the entire process of the ALJ recommendation. Understanding in which,
2 that the ALJs do not make decisions before the Public Service Commission. The
3 Commissioners make the decisions. The ALJs make recommendations to the
4 Commission, for the Commissioners to make final decisions. So I understand what
5 you're saying, but what I'd like to do is restrict it to this particular issue so we can
6 move the matter forward. Because I understand we have 20 witnesses, and we want
7 to get to all of them. And so I'd ask you to just be restrictive about where we're
8 going with this, and not go through the entire hearing matter, if you can.

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you for that history lesson, but I will
10 respectfully decline you because when you have the opportunity to say whatever
11 you want, the rest of us just sit here and listen. So I'm going to continue as I was,
12 because the motion at the table was on the subpoena --

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Well, that's fine.

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** -- that the ALJ wrote --

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Brace yourself.

16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** -- Meta asked for a review of the ALJ's subpoena.
17 Therefore, I am going to ask questions about why the ALJ is wrong or right. That
18 is what our job is to do. If that's not what you want to do, I'm sorry. But I'm here
19 to do the job that my people elected me to do, and it's not to listen to you. So I will
20 continue with my questions. Ms. Miller, in your briefing, one of the questions that
21 was posed to you, or was suggested to you, that the only reason that the NPOs --
22 you filed this Motion for -- to Subpoena was to delay the proceeding. That it was a

1 motion of delay, and that we have already seen that it'd been declined once in the
2 previous proceeding, and because of timing. And so can you explain to me why you
3 filed this much earlier than you did the last time, versus what we saw in the first
4 proceeding?

5 **MS. MILLER:** Well, exactly, because that timing issue. Our subpoena was denied
6 in the first Meta case because the ALJ said we'd asked for it too late. That discovery
7 had already ended, that it was too close to the hearing, and so she was going to deny
8 our request for the information. So, in this instance, we wanted to -- we still need
9 that information. This is not a delaying tactic. We didn't ask for a stay in the
10 procedural schedule; we didn't ask for any changes in the procedural schedule
11 whatsoever with regard to delays in testimony or anything like that. We still need
12 the information, and we took the ALJ's instructions to heart and filed it much earlier
13 because of the decision that was made in the first proceeding.

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Since that subpoena has been issued, and since the
15 filings of briefs and trials, has Meta asked for a limitation of what you are
16 considering in either Request 1 or Request 2?

17 **MS. MILLER:** No. As a matter of fact, during the hearing -- the hearing on the
18 Motion to Quash, the ALJ -- they said it was burdensome and will be too costly and
19 everything, and the ALJ asked them to provide information on how it could be
20 narrowed, and they absolutely refused. They said, it's just a burden and we won't
21 participate in any discussion process regarding how it can be altered so that it won't
22 be a burden.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And you -- my last point for you, you raised in your
2 brief that you believe Meta did not have standing to file this, one, Motion to Stay
3 and Motion to Quash, and now this subsequently Motion for Immediate Review,
4 because they are not a party to the case. Can you expand on why that's the NPO's
5 position in this case, that Meta's request is not even valid because they did not
6 participate as a formal party to the case?

7 **MS. MILLER:** Yeah. It's not because they didn't participate as formal party with
8 regard to going before the ALJ. Particularly, with regard to the Motion to Quash,
9 because the subpoena went to them, they have a right to ask for a Motion to Quash.
10 The interlocutory rule, Rule 57, specifically says a party can file a Motion for
11 Interlocutory Ruling. It does not say anyone else can. And the rules of statutory
12 construction, which apply to regulations, say they have to be held to their terms.
13 And the term here says, party can ask for an interlocutory ruling, not anyone else.
14 So our argument is not that they couldn't appear before the ALJ to argue against
15 the motion, and to file their Motion to Quash. Our argument is that they could not
16 file for interlocutory ruling before the Commission. And I think it's important to
17 note, in the motion before you, Meta's the one who appealed that. Entergy did not
18 file a Motion for Interlocutory Ruling, and the Staff did not appeal -- file a Motion
19 for Interlocutory Ruling, even though they're the only two parties who participated
20 in that first phase of the case. So Meta didn't even participate in that first phase of
21 the case, yet they're the ones who filed an interlocutory motion as a non-party. They

1 specifically keep saying they are a non-party. And they are the ones who filed the
2 motion even though the first phase of the proceeding, they didn't participate in.

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay. Thank you.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Y'all are excused. And next three, if y'all would
5 come up.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** You got to push. Push your little thing. Push your
7 little --

8 **MS. GAVRIELLA GEMMA:** My what?

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You have to bring it pretty close to you. Otherwise,
10 we won't hear you.

11 **MS. GEMMA:** Okay. How's this?

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** That's good.

13 **MS. GEMMA:** My name is Gavrielle Gemma. I'm a retired worker, living on
14 social security, and I'm speaking for the Louisiana Workers Council. I have a
15 statement to read. But, I want to go off script for a moment based on what
16 Commissioner, pardon me --

17 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Coussan.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Francis, who's on the end here?

19 **MS. GEMMA:** -- gentleman right here said that, well, all this information is public,
20 and you can just go to the newspapers, and you can just find out there what the jobs
21 -- all the jobs that are being created. I want to first remind everybody here --

22 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Coussan. Coussan. Coussan, said that, not --

1 **MS. GEMMA:** I first want to remind everybody here that under the Landry
2 administration, the ITAP, which is the Industrial Taxation Exemption, something,
3 repealed the necessity for tax exemptions to be given on the basis of job creation.
4 And, therefore, the \$3.3 billion tax exemptions for 20 years that are being given to
5 the Meta corporation are not --

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We don't deal with tax issues.

7 **MS. GEMMA:** Well, this was brought up in this hearing.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right.

9 **MS. GEMMA:** So as for the purpose of this squashing the subpoena by saying all
10 this information is public, in effect, it's not public by the industrial development
11 board at all because it's not a requirement.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Just to let you know, we're not doing the quash
13 today. This is the -- the quash will be --

14 **MS. GEMMA:** This is about the subpoena.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. But the quash motion is in September. This is
16 just about the -- it's the first issue.

17 **MS. GEMMA:** Well, my understanding --

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Staff will identify --

19 **MS. GEMMA:** Well, I just want to make that point being as it came up that that -
20 - and, in fact, what was revealed by The Advocate and revealed by The Illuminator
21 in the past, was that promises of job creation that were given for the basis of tax
22 exemption were not fulfilled in any manner at all. And that is why it is very

1 important that on the record that it be stated what permanent jobs, if any, full-time,
2 part-time, will be, and where they will be working from actually must be read into
3 the record of this proceeding. The people of the state of Louisiana have an
4 inalienable rights, meaning they cannot be taken from us, to have clean air and
5 water, and to the conservation of farm, recreational land, and its wildlife, and to the
6 maintenance of life by consistent, uninterrupted, and affordable electricity, which
7 is essential to all aspects of our lives. The protections of those inalienable rights,
8 meaning rights which we cannot be deprived, should be the job of the Public
9 Service Commission. Unfortunately, by virtue of millions of campaign
10 contributions from electric, oil, and gas companies, and their suppliers, and by
11 virtue of political ideology, there places corporations before people and assumes
12 authority, and has no legal, moral, or divine right to exercise this has not been the
13 case. The Public Service Commission majority has bowed at the altar of a
14 guaranteed, whopping 9.7 profit -- billion -- million -- billion-dollar profit on
15 investment for Entergy. The Hyperion project alone would guarantee Entergy \$8
16 billion to profit -- in profit from its investment, where the company sinks all its
17 capital investment into new plants and constant electricity for Metairie, ignoring
18 critical infrastructure needs throughout the entire state, all parishes, including
19 Orleans Parish. The debt incurred from this capital investment will be passed on to
20 residential and small business customers. There is no guarantee by law, just lip
21 service from Governor Landry and pledges from President Trump, that lower bills,
22 consistent service, and rapid restoration of power to the people after a storm will

1 occur. Despite Commissioner Skrmetta's claims of conservatism, that is the policy
2 of corporate profit over people is divinely granted, it is not true. Undoubtedly --
3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Ms. Gemma.
4 **MS. GEMMA:** -- this has personally benefitted him as he ends his PSC term for
5 this year --
6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Your time -- your time is slowly expiring. She's
7 asking you to wrap it up.
8 **MS. GEMMA:** Okay. I'm wrapping up.
9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you.
10 **MS. GEMMA:** The first deputy secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy in this
11 -- for this reason, I would like to ask Commissioner Skrmetta to recuse himself
12 from a vote on the issue on the subpoena, as the Department of Energy's policy is
13 clearly that of drill baby drill, and to move ahead, fast-track data centers, and to fast-
14 track the creation of any and all power and gas -- gas plants, or any plants, nuclear
15 plants, in order to make that happen. And, therefore, is biased on the issue of
16 whether or not anything should be done in terms of transparency, information being
17 given to the public. It is the public, at the last resort, that has the right to say whether
18 or not this is for the good of the public alone, not just a small group of people that
19 sit on this Commission. And the only way that can be done is to give full and total
20 information to the people of this state. If you want to guarantee that the people of
21 the state will not be harmed by this, then put that specifically in writing, not by
22 vague promises and pledges that hold no water. It has been shown --

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I'm sorry, ma'am. Your time is well overdue.

2 **MS. GEMMA:** Okay. I'm on the last sentence. It has been well shown in other
3 states where these data centers have been set up how people have suffered from
4 high costs and pollution of all types from these data centers.

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Ms. --

6 **MS. GEMMA:** And it's our position that this subpoena should not be squashed,
7 and that Commissioner Skrmetta recuse himself from this proceeding.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. All right. Next person. Want
9 to share the microphone over, and which one -- whoever wants to go next?

10 **MS. DEVORAH LEVY-PEARLMAN:** Good morning. My name is Deborah
11 Levy-Pearlman, and I'm a member of the Louisiana Party for Socialism &
12 Liberation, and I'm a volunteer with the Take Back the Power Campaign. In
13 conversations that I've had with community members, I've heard countless people
14 who expressed nothing but outrage over the undemocratic nature of this Meta and
15 Entergy deal. It is absolutely unacceptable that countless public employees,
16 including Governor Landry himself, have signed NDA's, non-disclosure
17 agreements with Meta, to shield them from accountability, and deny people
18 transparency over the data center being built in their own backyard. When they sign
19 NDAs, it shows that they are afraid of the people. They fear how the working people
20 of our state would respond to the truth about this corrupt, back door deal. If this
21 deal is so good for Louisianans, why did they work so hard to keep it out of the
22 public eye? They make decisions over our heads, and we end up paying the price.

1 This is not a democratic process. This is a circle of wealthy elites of big corporations
2 who are making all of the decisions that impact our lives and buying out the
3 politicians. And this remains, regardless of whatever party is in office, or who you
4 vote in. So I want to invite everyone here, if you want to be a part of a real
5 grassroots, people-powered movement to fight back against the data centers killing
6 our communities, against corruption, and demand a real democracy for working
7 people in our state, please join us in our people powered campaign, Take Back the
8 Power. We're running a statewide campaign to bring down: 1) No more data centers
9 on our dime --

10 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay. We're not -- we're not allowing a
11 campaign here -- we're talking about a procedure.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** About a procedure, we're not talking about a
13 campaign.

14 **MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN:** Yes, sir; 2) a cap on utility hikes; 3) Entergy out of
15 Louisiana politics; and 4) democratic control over our utilities.

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure. Well, Thank you very much.

17 **MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN:** So we need people to stand up and be a part of this
18 movement. Thank you very much.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right. Thank you very much. So if we could
20 actually, you know, respect the process, I'd appreciate it. We're not taking about
21 campaigns. We're not talking about other issues. We're talking about -- the issue

1 that we're talking about right now, about the subpoena, so I'd appreciate it. So thank
2 you very much. Yes, sir. You have comments?

3 **MR. JOSEPH ROSENZWEIG:** Yes. My name is Joseph Rosenzweig. I'm a
4 warehouse worker. I'm a teamster. I live in Orleans Parish, and I'm here to oppose
5 the motion for us and to proceed with the ruling of the ALJ to subpoena this
6 information. This is critical information to the public. I want to emphasize that word
7 public. And, in fact, this body is called the Public Service Commission. And yet,
8 the public is seeming to be cut out at every step for -- of the critical information to
9 our lives. The Public Service Commission, which guarantees an \$8 billion profit on
10 -- for Entergy already, and which sees billions of dollars in potential for this
11 Hyperion project, is ignoring the concerns that we have, not least, the issue of the
12 load to the grid. Already, just last month the grid in the northeast was compromised
13 by a surge due to the data centers in Virginia, which consume, at this point, one
14 third of the state's energy. This is going to affect every person that resides in the
15 state of Louisiana. We experienced an outage in Orleans Parish after Hurricane Ida
16 of two weeks, during which time hundreds of seniors in our community perished
17 because of the heat. We've experienced this in the aftermath of hurricanes, whether
18 it's Laura or Katrina, and we need to be guaranteed that the residents of New
19 Orleans, which prop this state up, whose labor is what the entire state of Louisiana
20 runs on, have some guarantee of security. Some guarantee that they're going to be
21 able to cool themselves when a storm hits. Some guarantee that they'll be able to
22 heat themselves when a winter storm happens, as it happened in Texas. And so we

1 are concerned very much for the reliability of the grid, which we have already seen
2 has been compromised in some instances, for example, the case of Virginia. And
3 we need, therefore, to have as much information as we possibly can about this
4 project and the dangers that it poses to the residents of Louisiana.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you very much. I will point out that the
6 Public Service Commission does not regulate the city of New Orleans electric
7 system just for --

8 **MS. GEMMA:** But this grid, it effects our --

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- sorry. I just --

10 **MR. ROSENZWEIG:** We're a part of -- so we're a part of MISO, right? Which
11 extends all the way up to Manitoba and --

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I'm not -- I'm not interacting with you, I'm just
13 making a statement. Also, we have three more people coming up?

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** We have multiple people.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I know but --

16 **MR. ROSENZWEIG:** Our lives are on the line right here.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I understand.

18 **MR. ROSENZWEIG:** I know you got you're appointment approaching, which
19 will be very profitable for you at the Department of Energy --

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Obviously -- obviously, you should agree.

21 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So you should -- you should -- you should go and do
2 your research what people get paid.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** In order to move on and get this done -- so we will call up Jalen
4 Robertson, Raynell Jacobs --

5 **MR. ROSENZWEIG:** I guarantee you that the people are aware of what's going
6 on.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Call six people up, please.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** -- Jude Terrell, those three may go to the table. These three can
9 come sit in these chairs: Travis London, Mary Anne Mushatt, and Jessica Shutts.
10 And I will ask you guys again to limit comments directly to the Motion to Quash
11 subpoena and the information that is asked in that subpoena, and not on the broader
12 topics. I appreciate that. Thank you.

13 **MR. JALEN ROBERTSON:** Y'all can hear me? Chair, y'all can hear me?

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. Go ahead, please. Just say your name first.

15 **MR. ROBERTSON:** Cool, bet.

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And watch the microphone. Make sure you can --
17 they can hear you.

18 **MR. ROBERTSON:** So my name is Jalen Robinson. I'm with the DSA, the
19 Democratic Socialists of America. I hear her talking about jobs, but I don't care if
20 a company is bringing me jobs, and the data plant is bringing me jobs, if it's going
21 to be killing me over 50 years, you know? What's the point of that? If I'm going to
22 be going into work every day smell -- inhaling fumes and drinking water that's

1 killing me, I don't care if I'm making \$30,000 a year. What I do want to know is,
2 how many jobs are they bringing? Like they said, full-time, part-time, remote, in-
3 state. I want to know how much energy they are going to use? I want to know how
4 many parts per measure of pollution are they going to be putting into the state that's
5 going to flow all the way around this country? I want to know how much of the cost
6 is going to be passed down to every single Louisianan? I want to know how many
7 outages are going to happen and, in those outages, how many homes are going to
8 be affected? How many families are going to go without electricity, without heat,
9 without AC, without the ability to charge their phones? And y'all have the ability
10 to ensure that we know that with your decision on this motion. So the question that
11 needs to be asked for you, for yourselves, for your God, or whatever your higher
12 power is, how many zeros can Meta put on that check to where to can forsake your
13 neighbors, your constituents, your wife if you have one, your children if they like
14 you, your grandparents if they're still alive, God help them. You know, like, what
15 -- at what point are you willing to say fuck you to these people? You know --

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Hey, ease up with the language, please.

17 **MR. ROBERTSON:** My bad. Sorry, I guess, not sorry. But, I guess, that's the end.
18 I yield my time.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Next person please.

20 **MR. JUDE TERRELL:** Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Jude Terrell. I'm
21 the president of the Student Alliance for AI Reform at LSU. Our organization fights
22 for AI to be used for the benefit of everyday people. Meta, the company

1 constructing the colossal AI data in north Louisiana, is claiming that it will be a
2 boom for Louisianans. However, myself and many of the people who've joined me
3 in this chamber today have our doubts. We're rightly concerned with the Hyperion
4 Data Center project, one of the largest of its kind in the country, will not generate
5 the 5,000-plus jobs that Meta claims it will, and does not need the seven new gas
6 plants the company wants to build to power it. Seventy-five percent, that is three
7 quarters of Louisiana's electricity, comes from natural gas. When a new gas plant
8 is built, energy demand increases, leading to an almost guaranteed rise in energy
9 costs for Louisianans. We're already paying hand over fist in grocery stores and at
10 the pump; no one needs their electric bill to go up, too. No one in their right mind
11 can support a project that could raise energy costs for their family and not even
12 generate the jobs for their neighbors that Meta says that it will. Members of the
13 Public Service Commission, today you have the power to make what should be an
14 easy decision to uphold the subpoena already issued to Meta. This subpoena simply
15 requests for the corporation to verify their claims about the energy needed and the
16 jobs to be created by the giant data center projects taking place just a few hours
17 north of here. I hope you make the right decision and prove to everyone this body's
18 committed to holding corporations accountable to the people of our state. Thank
19 you for your time.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you. Next person please.

21 **MR. RAYNELL JACOBS:** How's it going? Raynell Jacobs with the Democratic
22 Socialists of America. How's it going, gentlemen? I'm trying to keep the emotion

1 at hand. Of course, no one likes data centers. Let's start off with the jobs. Once
2 again, we've already discussed it, three people at this table so far. When it comes
3 to data centers specifically, the work done there is digital mainly, once everything
4 is sort of established. And as someone in the field, once it goes to a digital aspect,
5 that no longer needs to be a tangible person working there, specifically, remote
6 jobs. Whenever those jobs become remote, they're accessible to not just to U.S.,
7 other states, other bodies, other cities, they're also accessible overseas. For
8 example, not to air out my own company, but recently we just said we don't really
9 need U.S. workers on our IT team, we'll just outsource that to Bangladesh. It was
10 easy, it was done. Big corp, another win for them. We now have so many jobs going
11 to a different country that will never see a U.S. dollar again. What I'm saying is, it
12 can easily be done again with Meta, with this data center, over and over and over
13 again. All that we're going to have in Louisiana is maybe a couple of HVAC
14 vendors that come in and make sure the AC is still running and such. We're losing
15 a lot on the backend of this deal, which I'm sure you guys know. I'm certain you
16 guys know. But, again, it is your decision. I, prefer transparency, before making
17 any -- and I truly mean any deal, but to each their own. It's your choice.

18 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Are you in radio?

19 **MR. JACOBS:** How'd you guess?.

20 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** You've got a great voice.

21 **MR. JACOBS:** Thank you, thank you, thank you.

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Well, thank you very much, and we'd like to -
2 -
3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah.
4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** -- go ahead and switch to the next three folks.
5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah. As you three come up, I'll call three more to come up.
6 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** And they're going to call three more up.
7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Scott Read, Austin -- is it Lawson? And James Hiatt.
8 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** And as you sit down, just share the
9 microphone and identify yourself, and you can begin when you're ready.
10 **MR. TRAVIS LONDON:** Hello. My name is Travis London, I'm from Step Up
11 Louisiana. Looking at TikTok, looking at YouTube, they have many people across
12 the nation that have been complaining about the AIs, data centers. We're hoping
13 that the people that come here, you know, the Meta and so forth, would be more
14 transparent with the public. In North Virginia, people are getting heavily taxed
15 about the power grid and threatened residential rate hikes. You got Phoenix,
16 Arizona, they're over there facing chronic conditions involved with the drought and
17 so forth, they were complaining about the gallons of water. You've got Atlanta,
18 you've got Fayette County, Georgia, they was complaining about the sudden drops
19 in municipal water pressures and unauthorized usage. Right now, Texas have a
20 bunch of lawsuits heading their way about different people complaining about the
21 gallons of water, and now they're having different people telling them about how
22 much water they're going to be consuming. You have -- like I say, they have all

1 these people, landowners, matter of fact, complaining all across the country about
2 the AI centers. What this AI center is also -- these centers also use carbon capture.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Mr. Robertson, I think. We're only on the subpoena,
4 which is related to the information requested, so the water issues, all of that is not
5 really what the Commission is considering today. So if you have comments
6 opposing the issuance of subpoena or supporting the issuance of the subpoena, we
7 will accept those comments.

8 **MR. LONDON:** Like I say, the different projects, like I've been here with Owens
9 and also McCormick, tag me in some of these projects. They're republicans. I've
10 been with democrats, I'm supposed to be going to Ascension Parish for the same
11 type of projects that's probably proposed for Ascension Parish, that will be at 5:30.
12 I'm here for the people. I'm not here about different party strikes and so forth. And
13 I just hope y'all consider different people testimonies, and if I could give y'all
14 different news reports or any different comments across the nation about their
15 power AI, I would love to submit to that to y'all -- to y'all emails. Thank you.

16 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Thank you.

17 **MS. MARY ANNE MUSHATT:** Good morning. My name's Mary Anne Mushatt.
18 I am with the League of Women Voters in Louisiana. In our national -- at our
19 national convention, we also classed a resolution about privatizing utilities and
20 natural resources, which I believe Meta and this data center are doing. By now,
21 you've heard the logical, ethical, and in the long-term, especially if you consider
22 one's legacy and next steps to uphold the rule of law, and your duty to us, your

1 constituents, and citizens of Louisiana and vote to oppose this motion to reject the
2 subpoena. I'm in support of the subpoena and having Meta come clean. We can
3 handle the truth. The question is, can you? What I intend to speak about is to remind
4 you of the bigger picture: Our future in the eyes of our kids and their kids. And
5 they're watching us, and you, for how you vote. How to do your job, and are you
6 going to do your job and protect our fundamental belief in the rule of law over man,
7 or will you abdicate that responsibility and let these companies spread their sweet
8 stories of lies about what they will take from us: fresh water, necessary for life;
9 clean air threatened by gas power plants, clean air is not clean; and false promises
10 of permanent jobs in glorious numbers. Yes, I speak to your self-interest on top of
11 what all has been said. To take a moment to consider where you will stand when
12 history records this moment, because it will, and your grandchildren ask what you
13 did for all of us. Thank you.

14 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Okay. Go ahead.

15 **MS. JESSICA SHUTTS:** Hello, my name is Jessica. I'm a resident here in Baton
16 Rouge, and I'm also a volunteer for the Take Back the Power Initiative. I want to
17 know how Louisianans can be sure that this project won't raise our utility bills if
18 project information isn't even made public. Across the country, we've seen that
19 data centers mean one thing: Higher electricity bills as the costs for these projects
20 get pushed on to the working class. Now, Governor Jeff Landry has attempted to
21 reassure the public that our bills won't go up, but his flimsy executive order raises
22 more questions than answers. How can we trust him if he and members of his

1 administration are signing NDAs? If this project would bring such huge benefits to
2 Louisianans, what is there to hide? Whether he needs to look at what happened to
3 Richland Parish, by the way, to see how the cost of living would skyrocket. The
4 project has already increased the demanding for housing, and rent for trailer park
5 lots, in some areas, have increased by over 500%, and that's already resulted in at
6 least one family becoming homeless. Here in Baton Rouge, people's wallets are
7 already stretched thin for subpar service from Entergy. Just recently, the power
8 went out at my apartment for 16 hours. That means we had to replace all of the food
9 in our fridge, adding on to the cost of living. It means that working class people
10 can't wash their clothes for work the next day. So if Entergy can't even deliver
11 adequate service as it stands right now, what makes us think their grid can support
12 the largest data center in the world? And even if they can support the data center,
13 what's to stop Entergy from raising our rates to maintain their same lack luster
14 standards.

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Subpoena.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Ms. Shutts, we are only on the subpoena. Again, you're
17 kind of going off onto other issues.

18 **MS. SHUTTS:** Sure, I'm almost done. We're not numbers in Entergy or Meta's
19 spreadsheets, we're human beings who deserve a dignified life. Louisianans can't
20 afford Entergy's risky adventures, and we deserve to know what's happening.

21 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right. Thank you very much. Y'all are
22 excused. Next person.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Austin Lawson and James Hiatt, if you're in the room. And then
2 three can come sit in the queue: Kendall Berry, Lee Patterson, and Rebecca Jones.
3 Kendall Berry, Lee Patterson, Rebecca Jones, going once, going twice. Thank you.
4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You can begin whenever you're ready.
5 **MR. AUSTIN LAWSON:** Hi, Commissioners. How are we doing today? My
6 name is Austin Lawson. I am representing the Matt Gromlich for Congress
7 campaign, and I wanted to come up here and speak today in favor of the subpoena.
8 And I'm really glad that the subpoena is the thing that we're here talking about
9 because it's very representative of how these data center talks have been going with
10 the Public Service Commission. And not just the data center talks, anything, right?
11 Data centers, electricity rate increases, dealings they do with these energy
12 companies, it's all symbolic of what the Public Service Commission continues to
13 do over and over again, which is act like it's not their problem or it's not their
14 authority, when you are elected to do this, right? When I came in today, and within
15 a span of five minutes, we heard, oh, you know, the AJS doesn't have authority to
16 do that. Oh, but, oh, five minutes before that, oh, the Public Service Commission,
17 we don't have the authority to do that. I think people are tired of hearing this
18 gaslighting coming from the Commissioners, every one of you, except you,
19 Davante. Thank you for what you do. But I think people are just sick and tired of
20 coming to the Public Service Commission, making their grievances feel heard. And,
21 I mean, we've had multiple Commissioners condescend towards the people coming
22 up to speak, we've had the rules for people speaking tightened, and people have

1 been spoken over multiple times. And I think it really encapsulates the frustration
2 that people have with this Public Service Commission. You know, I was running
3 for that man's seat right there. And when I was going around and talking to
4 everyone at my great district of Seat 5, I was talking to folks and I was like, hey,
5 what do you think about your Public Service Commissioner? They don't even know
6 who he is. The Public Service Commission has this history of operating under the
7 shade of night and behind closed doors, where they want to go and make -- and get
8 in bed with the electricity companies or with any big utility company that's coming
9 here into Louisiana, these data centers, at the expense of their own constituents.
10 Now, I could go over how you guys are selling out your constituents, but other
11 people have already gone over that.

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Can we keep it to the issue about the subpoena,
13 please?

14 **MR. LAWSON:** Well, I believe the subpoena has a greater effect on the
15 transparency issue, generally, right? I think it's a microcosm --

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

17 **MR. LAWSON:** -- for what we're talking about here today. And it's why I'm glad
18 I got to talk about it. You know, the idea that we have to debate if this -- you know,
19 I came from Shreveport, right? That's five hours away. The idea that I would have
20 to drive five hours down to the capital to try and convince people on a Commission
21 to do their damn job. I mean, that's what it is, right? We need to make sure that
22 these investments are what they say they are. And when I have Commissioners up

1 here talking about, oh, you know, we'll push it back even though we have a room
2 full of people here to speak today. You know, you can only comment on it on this
3 very specific way, and then when you do, we're going to over talk you. I think it
4 just sends the wrong message to the people who elect you. And I think you should
5 do a better job representing your district. And honestly, I think your district
6 constituents should pick a different Commissioner. Thank you.

7 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Next person, please. You need to share your
8 microphone. You're next?

9 **MR. JAMES HIATT:** Sure, hi. Good morning. My name is James Hiatt. I'm from
10 Lake Charles. Commissioner Francis, good to see you again. And, you know, I
11 drove over this morning also, and it is such a beautiful state we live in, to drive
12 across that Atchafalaya Basin and watch the sun rise. And that's why we should
13 protect it as much as we can. I've heard a lot here today already about economic
14 development. That economic development should not be voodoo economic
15 development. We should see the work, they should show the work and show the
16 data. If it is so readily available, why is Meta fighting this so hard? You're going
17 to eventually vote on a determination of public interest. How can you possibly make
18 that without the full data, without understanding how many jobs will be? We have
19 seen this already many times, especially in southwest Louisiana, promises of jobs,
20 jobs, jobs, economic prosperity, that does not actually go to the people who live
21 there. In this, they, you know, Meta's one of the richest companies that has ever
22 existed, yet providing energy demand and permanent job creation data is somehow

1 a step too far for them is insane. They're asking the Commission to sign off on
2 seven new gas plants while refusing to release the data that will tell you whether
3 that's actually what's needed. Meta publicly stated that the data -- that the power
4 they need is less than half of what Entergy is proposing to build for them. The
5 Judge's own ruling found that Entergy doesn't even have the underlying data
6 behind Meta's numbers. So the company asking you to approve billions of dollars
7 in new infrastructure can't explain, on record, why it needs that much. How can
8 you make a public interest determination without the facts? A very limited, narrow
9 scope of facts. Job creation, energy demand, and what the impacts will be to the
10 ratepayers of this state. Pledges and promises that are without teeth, have no
11 enforceable action, like the governor has tried, does not provide for the ratepayers.
12 This is very simple. They're asking for the information that lead to the
13 determination of is it going to be 12 jobs? Is it going to be 10,000 jobs? Is it going
14 to cost me and my family, who are Entergy customers, to subsidize what's already
15 been the richest -- one of the richest companies in the world already subsidized with
16 billions of dollars in sales tax exemptions? We should not be subsidizing any more
17 or paying for large companies. I'll leave you with this: These are the two questions
18 Meta is fighting hardest to keep sealed. What are the electricity demand? How
19 many permanent jobs will actually be created? And these are exactly the two
20 questions the Judge already ruled are relevant and in the public interest
21 determination. So we've already given this company so many tax exemptions. You
22 are the regulators charged with protecting the public interest, and I know each and

1 every one of you love this state and do care about your constituents. I think this is
2 an opportunity to pull back the curtain on it and actually be transparent and let us
3 know how this will benefit us and it's not some voodoo economics that will just
4 cause greater harm. Thank you for your time. Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you. Next person, please. Whenever
6 you're ready.

7 **MR. SCOTT READ:** Good morning. My name is Scott Read. I'd like to thank you
8 guys for allowing me to come in this morning. A brief background on how I became
9 involved in this process. In May, I was initially contacted by Entergy to survey
10 property on Ascension, Louisiana. It was going to be impacted by a transmission
11 lines serving this data center. I had no idea what was happening. I didn't -- wasn't
12 familiar with the project. After initial investigation, I determined that the proposed
13 three-quarter mile long transmission line that affected only my property would
14 consume roughly 22 acres. While drilling down on scant details of the project and
15 the energy demands of data centers, I became more widely concerned. I learned an
16 ESA was executed between Entergy and Meta, but was unavailable publicly,
17 protected by a wall of NDAs, and considered a private contract between two private
18 companies. If Entergy is considered a private company for protection of its
19 agreements, then how are they also considered a public company to exercise
20 expropriation powers for transmission lines? Transmission lines for these projects
21 will encumber 240 miles, or roughly 6,700 acres of private Louisiana land,
22 permanently. Some of it using the power of expropriation. Roughly twice the area

1 consumed by Meta's data center, as it currently sits. I understand how we got here.
2 We got here by offering Meta 3.3 billion in tax incentives to create roughly 500
3 jobs. I understand that employment number may be less now and the tax incentives
4 may be greater, but let's take Meta and Louisiana at their initial word. By my math,
5 that's roughly \$6.6 million per job we're paying for those 500 jobs, those permanent
6 jobs. I'm worried about private property subjected to expropriation for a single
7 large load customer and the corporate confiscation it implies. Governor Landry
8 assured the public on May 5 of this year that private property rights are sacrosanct
9 in Louisiana. I hope the Louisiana Public Service Commission shares those same
10 values. I'm worried about the long-term impact to energy rate base after the initial
11 term of the ESA expires in what I understand to be 20 years. It's my understanding
12 that the infrastructure requested for this project has a lifespan of 40 to 50 years, and
13 in some instances, longer. My request to the Commission is that they vote to allow
14 full transparency into jobs created, power requirement calculations, and full details
15 of the ESA with Entergy and Meta, for Entergy and citizens of Louisiana to
16 determine if the current plans on the table are a good idea. What assurances does
17 Louisiana and the Louisiana ratepayer have that any costs surviving past any
18 unforeseen circumstances with Meta, they will not be left on the hook? Without
19 your vote for transparency, we will have none. Thank you.

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Y'all are excused, and
21 if the next three want to come up, and you can call up the next three.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah. The next three in the queue are Lindsay Garcia, Velva
2 Boles, and Jacqueline Brook.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Mr. Chairman.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir.

5 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I've got a question for Secretary Frey.

6 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Go ahead, Secretary.

7 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** We giving out any tax incentives?

8 **SECRETARY FREY:** Not to my knowledge.

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. All right.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right. Sorry. Go ahead whenever you're
11 ready.

12 **MS. KENDALL BERRY:** Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Kendall
13 Berry. I live in Orleans Parish, I'm a member of the Party for Socialism and
14 Liberation and an organizer with the Take Back the Power campaign. We are here
15 to demand full transparency about Meta and Entergy's backdoor dealings, because
16 we have questions. My first question is: Just how much money is Meta putting into
17 this project? And why are they jumping through so many hoops to make themselves
18 an escape route? Meta created a separate legal entity called Beignet Investors the
19 very day you approved Entergy's building of three new power plants last year to
20 absorb their risk, and they're pushing for even more now. Meta has also constructed
21 an agreement with the private credit firm, Blue Owl, allowing them to completely
22 walk away after just four --

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Ms. Berry, can we connect it to the motion, the subpoena itself?

2 Because you're talking about a separate docket that isn't even in front of the

3 Commission today.

4 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Let her speak.

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Well, we are trying to let everyone speak today, and if we let

6 everyone speak everything they needed to say, we would be here until tonight, so

7 we are trying to limit this and let you guys speak. But again, the only thing that is

8 in front of this Commission is --

9 **MS. BERRY:** The subpoena.

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** -- the subpoena.

11 **MS. BERRY:** Okay. Your constituents deserve to know all the details. All the

12 details about where all the money needed to build and maintain these new power

13 plants is going to come from, and if those sources are reliable enough to not just

14 abandon us at the first sign of trouble. Meta has gone to incredible lengths to

15 conceal as much information as possible about this project, going so far as to sign

16 an NDA with our governor, who, in turn, made hundreds -- or over a hundred of

17 his employees sign NDAs with their office as well. We are sick and tired of big

18 tech billionaires making backdoor deals with our politicians. We are tired of having

19 no say in how our electricity grid is used, while our utility bills continue to rise,

20 while we're already struggling to pay for housing costs, groceries, gas. The real

21 reason Meta is so intent on doing business in the shadows like this is because if

22 they were to disclose all of the details of this project, the public would object. They

1 are scared because all across the country, people's power is stopping data center
2 construction in their tracks. The people demand transparency. I hope you will allow
3 this subpoena to go through.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Next. I would like to
5 point out, just before we move on, none of the Commissioners have signed any
6 NDAs. So, next person please.

7 **MS. BERRY:** Oh, good.

8 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Unless Davante.

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Oh, I ain't signed nothing.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** There you go.

11 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** I have not signed an NDA, the Chairman has not
12 signed one, nor has former Chairman.

13 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No, no. And a little notice that the Chairman
14 owns not a single share of stock, at all, of anything. So next person, please.

15 **MS. LINDSAY GARCIA:** Let me see that paperwork.

16 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Ma'am?

17 **MS. GARCIA:** Did you receive any of the motions from Entergy?

18 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Woah, woah, woah, woah, woah, woah, woah,
19 woah [INAUDIBLE].

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You can wait until it's your turn.

21 **MS. GARCIA:** I'll wait my turn. That's all right..

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Please. You need a microphone. You need to
2 slide it over. And just pull it up close to you.

3 **MR. LEE PATTERSON:** All right. Good morning. My name is Lee Patterson.
4 I'm an organizer with the Take Back the Power campaign. I'm also an
5 environmental scientist. I've done work all over this state, and to me, these data
6 centers look like the latest instance of our elected officials sacrificing the health and
7 safety of Louisiana's people and environment for corporate profits. We scarified
8 our coast for oil and gas, we sacrificed our clean air for the petrochemical industry.
9 And what has that done for the people of Louisiana? Our coast is still disintegrating.
10 Taxpayers are constantly on the hook for cleaning up the messes these plants make.
11 We have some of the highest cancer rates in the country. Everybody here is dirt
12 poor and we're dead last in almost every quality of life indicator. I know that Meta
13 has information up on their website about all of their supposed mitigation measures
14 that they're going to do for this data center, but, you know, my question is, we've
15 been fed this -- information like this time and time again by every new plant they
16 want to put in. And why should we expect any different this time? You know,
17 everybody who lives in Louisiana knows how inadequate our environmental
18 regulators are at actually protecting people. If they were good at their job, we
19 wouldn't have the highest cancer rates in the country. So, you know, after all the
20 cloak and dagger stuff that we've seen going into this data center up to this point,
21 what would make me or, you know, what would make the people of Louisiana
22 believe that we are going to be protected against these potential, negative

1 environmental impacts? How do we know that Meta is going to be held any more
2 accountable than Exxon, or CF Industries, or Dow? You know, at very least, I think,
3 at very least we should be able to see the data that Meta has to back up these claims
4 that they're making.

5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Next person, please.

6 **MS. REBECCA JONES:** Hello. My name is Rebecca. I'm a volunteer with Take
7 Back the Power, and I live here in Baton Rouge. I'm curious to know how many
8 jobs are actually forever. We deserve information to be released about the real
9 number of jobs this project will create. Meta claims that this project will create
10 thousands, a thousand new jobs, permanent jobs, but what's the breakdown? Are
11 we supposed to just take that at their word? The forever jobs are thousands until the
12 construction is complete, but then, what, maybe 50, 25? Thousands of jobs doesn't
13 make up for rising energy bills, depleted fresh water resources, toxic pollutants, and
14 all of the risks of communities that data centers are creating in working class
15 communities across the nation. As a lifelong Louisianan, and a parent, the future of
16 our state is important to me. And I take claims about jobs being created very
17 seriously. I want to see real economic development that actually benefits my
18 children's future. Investment in healthcare, coastal restoration, resilient
19 infrastructure, not short-sighted projects that will fill the pockets of billionaires
20 while working people lose in the long run. But we need to see the proof for
21 ourselves. A recent study by the Brookings Institute suggest that naïve estimates
22 about jobs without evidence can be overstated by a factor of three. We need to know

1 what is leading Meta to make this claim about thousands of jobs, and if there's any
2 merit to it. Without information released to the public, we're just crossing our
3 fingers and hoping that a giant corporation that operates in its own interest is telling
4 us the truth. This raises the question: Is Meta's priority the welfare of working-class
5 Louisianans or its own bottom line? I think we know the answer. Thank you.

6 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Next folks.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Jaqueline Book, you are up. And then on queue is Kelly
8 Ward, Trevor Trahan, and a Kenneth -- I cannot read what you have written.

9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** We have another space up front if you want to
10 fill it.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah, there's a Jacqueline Book that I've called, going once.

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** So somebody can come up here.

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah. So you can go up, sir.

14 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** And then in the meantime, you can fill the
15 other three seats.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Kelly Ward and Trevor Trahan. Is that you? Okay. And then
17 there's a Kenneth -- a Kenneth?

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Anybody named Kenneth in the room? Okay.

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** And then the other one is a -- it's another signature that I cannot
20 pronounce. It looks like it's -- is it Lashonda? L-L-A-S -- anybody else who signed
21 a card who hasn't come up here yet, how about that?

22 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. Come on up. Is that it? Is this the --

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir. This will be it.

2 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** This will be the final? Okay. Great.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Well, from public comments, yes, sir.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Right. Public Comments, that's what I meant.

5 Ma'am, if you want to go ahead and begin?

6 **MS. VELVA BOLES:** I certainly will. Thank you so much and thank you for the

7 opportunity. My name is Velva Boles. I'm a physician scientist trained at Tulane.

8 I've worked in all 64 parishes of Louisiana. I am here to say I'd love to see the

9 subpoena to go through. It is so important to include the people body in your

10 decisions. Whatever incentives have been offered, and I've heard many, I hope

11 people are in lead first of that list. It's too important to have the opinion of us before

12 you make a decision on what comes to Louisiana and how it affects our everyday

13 life. As you know as well, or better, than I, Louisiana is at the bottom for healthcare

14 and education and other things. And I would hope that in bringing business to this

15 state, the negotiation is to elevate the income to the state as a whole, and not just

16 have a few benefit, and not just have promises. I would like to think that all of you

17 are scholarly in your negotiation and contracts, if it's on the behalf of the people,

18 would be something proud you can tell us you've done. That there is no need for

19 NDA, and by the way, thank you, it's good to know you've not signed one because

20 we need to know and we should know. And as you being an elected official, you

21 should want us to know. So thank you very much for this opportunity and I look

22 forward for the beneficence of this committee. Thank you.

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you, ma'am. Next -- our next speaker.

2 **MS. GARCIA:** Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Lindsay, or Rubia

3 Garcia. I was the endorsed congressional candidate for the 5th Congressional

4 District, where the data center was going before they cancelled the election, and

5 now I am running in the 6th. And I came here today because I feel like this issue

6 that's sitting right here is actually bigger than just Meta and the subpoena, but you

7 all decided once again, just like in other things, not necessarily for the election, but

8 decided to change the game the day of and along those lines. It's bigger than

9 Entergy. Frankly, all of this is bigger than any particular data center and subpoena,

10 as I said. This is about who this government is belonging to because, let's remember

11 something fundamental, the government does not belong to corporations like Meta,

12 does not belong to Entergy, does not belong to the governor, it belongs to the

13 people, which is what I came here to say. And when government forgets that, the

14 people have a responsibility to come here and remind you. We have been told over

15 and over again about the jobs this project will bring. We have been told about the

16 economic transformation. We have been told about the billions of dollars of

17 investment. Entergy itself has championed the project as a win for Louisiana

18 customers, pointing to the thousands of jobs and billions in investment, and I hope

19 that this jobs line is true. I hope that the people of north Louisiana, all across

20 Louisiana, benefit. But if it's such a tremendous deal for the people of Louisiana,

21 then why has so much of the deal been kept from the people of Louisiana? Why the

22 secrecy? Why the NDAs? Why shouldn't the people who are being asked to live

1 with the consequences be allowed to see the information used to sell them on the
2 benefits? We now know that Governor Jeff Landry personally signed an NDA with
3 Meta's subsidiary, and this wasn't some obscure administrative document. The
4 agreement restricted public disclosure not only of confidential business
5 information, but even the existence of the agreement and the nature of the
6 discussions. At least 54 elected officials have signed NDAs connected to major
7 economic development projects under this administration, and now we're learning,
8 according to the news articles that Mr. Coussan highlighted, we're learning that a
9 sitting member of Congress, Julia Letlow, signed an NDA with Meta and
10 subsequently bought Meta and Nvidia stock with those trades disclosed more than
11 a year later. I'm not standing here today declaring that those trades were illegal,
12 I'm saying that the public has every right to ask the questions of the Public Service
13 Commission. Because when elected officials have access to information that the
14 public doesn't have and then trade securities connected to that information, the
15 appearance of a conflict is not something we should simply shrug off. And
16 yesterday we learned something else. An Entergy executive, its vice president of
17 regulatory and public affairs, wrote or suggested changes to motions that came
18 before this Commission, allegedly including the motion approving the
19 infrastructure for Meta's data center. Mr. Skrmetta, that's what -- Chairman
20 Skrmetta, that's the motion that I was asking about, whether or not Entergy
21 provided any information for some of the motions that have been presented.

22 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Today?

1 **MS. GARCIA:** Yes.

2 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No. You saw we asked Ms. Evans to develop
3 the motion sua sponte.

4 **MS. GARCIA:** Well, I'm just saying, publicly, it's being reported that it has been
5 disclosed to you that there are entities.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** We can't control the public. We can't control --

7 **MS. GARCIA:** Well, then perhaps you shouldn't reference it as a source of
8 material if you're going to turn around and say --

9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You -- well -- I'm sorry, ma'am.

10 **MS. GARCIA:** Suffice it to say, it's my time.

11 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Ma'am, ma'am, ma'am.

12 **MS. GARCIA:** Maybe there is an innocent explanation. Then give us the
13 explanation.

14 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Ma'am, you just saw us, during this meeting,
15 ask Ms. Evans to develop the motion.

16 **MS. GARCIA:** Then explain how the -- sir, I'm going to get back, because it's my
17 time.

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No, go ahead. You have less than a minute.

19 **MS. GARCIA:** Then give us the explanation, that's what transparency is for.
20 Because here's the problem: When you tell the people trust us, we're bringing jobs,
21 while simultaneously keeping the terms of the -- the terms, negotiations,
22 projections, and supporting information behind NDAs and confidentiality walls,

1 you're not asking for trust, you're demanding it from us. And government does not
2 get to demand blind trust from the people it serves. The people of Louisiana are not
3 shareholders in Meta. They don't have a seat in Entergy's boardroom. They do not
4 get confidential briefings, they don't get NDAs, they don't get to negotiate the deal,
5 we get the bill. So the people of Louisiana, especially the people who live in the
6 communities directly affected by these projects, this message is also for you. You
7 are not a nuisance, you are not an obstacle to economic development, you are not
8 something to be managed after the deal has already been made, you are the
9 sovereign. Your government is supposed to work for you. Your elected officials
10 work for you. Your regulators and Commissioners work for you. And corporations
11 that want billions of dollars in public benefits, public infrastructure, tax incentives,
12 and access to our communities should understand something, they don't get to
13 bypass the people. Economic development is not a blank check here in Louisiana.
14 A job is not a bribe for silence. And investment is not a substitute for accountability
15 and prosperity does not require secrecy.

16 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Your time is well over.

17 **MS. GARCIA:** You took some of my time, sir.

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No, no. That's fine. You're good.

19 **MS. GARCIA:** If this project is as good for Louisiana as it champions it to say,
20 then prove it in the day in sunlight. Show us the numbers, show us the contracts,
21 show us the guarantees, show us who pays, show us who benefits. And most
22 importantly, protect the people who are paying the price if something goes wrong

1 because you folks are supposed to be the firewall between corporate power and the
2 people, not the bridge between them. And Commissioners, I want you to remember
3 something else today, your power is temporary. Every one of you sitting up there
4 has a seat, but that seat does not belong to you, it belongs to the people here in this
5 room and across Louisiana. The office and the authority doesn't belong to you, it's
6 loaned to you by the people, and eventually, every one of you who holds public
7 office has to give that power back. The pendulum will swing. I'll skip forward
8 because I want to be fair. I believe in accountability, and it shouldn't be partisan. If
9 its democrat, hold them accountable. Republican, hold them accountable. A
10 corporation does it, hold them accountable. A regulator does it, hold them
11 accountable because that's what public service means. And if any of you sitting in
12 these seats have forgotten whose seats they belong to, I have a simple reminder for
13 you. Once again, they belong to the people, and the people have every right to flip
14 your table, meaning each of your seats, if and when you forget the entire job is to
15 serve us. How many of you are up for reelection?

16 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Your time's expired. Next person.

17 **MS. GARCIA:** Not this time? Just making sure.

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Your time's expired.

19 **MS. GARCIA:** I saw him running for it.. That's why.

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Your time's expired.

21 Next speaker, please.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Thank you, Ms. Garcia. Mr. Trahan.

1 **MR. TREVOR TRAHAN:** Hi. My name is Trevor. I am a nurse here in Louisiana
2 and I've worked in healthcare for approximately 10 years. As a nurse, I have several
3 concerns regarding this project and how it affects public health, and I believe that
4 Louisianans should be included every step of the way, should not be kept in the
5 dark, not only about what widely what this project includes, but how it will affect
6 our public health. Meta and Entergy wish to keep the working-class communities
7 in the dark and those working-class communities are the ones who will pay for this
8 project, yet we don't know exactly what's on the table, we don't know how it affects
9 public health. As Louisianans, we are tired of our state being used a dumping
10 ground. We are tired of our state being used to place projects that no one else wants
11 in their backyard. And these are always placed within marginalized communities.
12 Of these concerns, I will just simply, quickly address three. So draining water
13 resources. Throughout the country, we see communities surrounding these data
14 centers suffer with chronic water pressure issues, leading to water quality concerns,
15 leading to persistent boil advisories. What about people with compromised immune
16 systems who can't handle having water that might or might not be clean? Then we
17 move on to noise pollution. So throughout the United States, communities across
18 the United States that have these AI data centers near them report constant droning
19 noises. This affects both mental and physical health. Lack of quality sleep is directly
20 linked to increased mental health crises, to heart disease, hypertension, and
21 increased risk of stroke. And then we move on to, lastly, greenhouse gases. What
22 emissions will this project cost? There are ten new natural gas plants on the table

1 for this project. Will the government be tracking these emissions? How will we
2 know? Increased air pollutants, of course, we know, medically, caused increased
3 asthmas, COPD exasperations, long-term cancer concerns. And statistically, areas
4 of more air pollution are linked to increased rates of early death. Surrounding
5 farmland could be polluted. This could literally poison food for communities. And
6 why is this relevant? Well, in healthcare, when we get a critical patient, it is our job
7 as healthcare professionals to educate that patient on the risk of treatment and to
8 weigh whether we risk the treatment that can be damaging, and does it outweigh
9 the damage to the patient. Which one's better? Why is that relevant here? Well, this
10 Commission stands to educate the public how this project could affect the public.
11 What are the benefits? Because right now, they're abstract. They are up in the air,
12 they are in NDAs, they are in attorney only, possibly, we don't know that yet, but
13 the public deserves to know. The public deserves to weigh is this truly beneficial,
14 do the benefits outweigh the risks to public health. It is our right to know these
15 things.

16 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Y'all are excused. Next
17 speakers, please.

18 **MR. LUTION REVO:** Black power, all power to the people. My name is Lution
19 Revo, I'm a grad student activist and a social justice and humans right advocate.
20 The first question I have: Is this motion about protecting legitimate trade secrets or
21 is it to prevent the public from seeing information necessary to determine who
22 pays? How can the Commission determine whether this project is prudent if the

1 parties representing ratepayers cannot fully examine evidence? And I also got to
2 say that I'm up here representing the black and brown poor communities, because
3 right now we're seeing one of the biggest data centers being put right on side of the
4 black community in Boise. And it seems like it's always, always on the side of
5 marginalized communities, especially the black communities, so I got to come in
6 here and stand for my people, you heard me. What specific information claim is
7 confidential? Is the confidential information related to Meta's projected electrical
8 load, the electrical service agreement, collateral guarantees, construction costs,
9 financial -- obligations or something else? How can you independently verify -- or
10 Entergy in Meta's claim, too big in their customers savings if the underlining
11 assumptions are confidential? Which parties have access to the complete,
12 underlying calculations and which parties are being asked to accept the savings
13 instant without seeing the underlying data? No answer? If Meta leaves -- all right.
14 If Meta leaves and reduces its load and/or delays construction or it changes, or it
15 changes business model, who absorbs the remaining costs? Do the public pay, do
16 the systems pay? What percentage of the total net plant value is Meta actually say
17 required to secure today? If Meta's load disappears before these plants are fully
18 paid for, who owns the stranded assets and who pays for them? Will Entergy be
19 permitted to put those remaining costs into the general rate bases and recover them
20 from ordinary customers? For each one of the seven proposed gas plants, what is
21 the maximum daily water withdrawal and gallons per day? How many gallons are
22 expected to be consumed rather than returned? Water to water resources for each

1 facility, I'm asking for plant by plant numbers. Commissioners, if the public cannot
2 see the information necessary to independently [INAUDIBLE] evaluate Meta's
3 projected load costs, guarantees, and financial obligations, how can you tell
4 Louisiana ratepayers that this decision is being made on a fully transparent,
5 evidentiary record? It's not. It's not. Before you grant Meta an immediate review,
6 will the Commission identify on the record exactly what injury Meta claims it will
7 suffer and explain why that injury cannot be remedied through the normal, final
8 review process? And if their ruling concerns access to information needed by the
9 public to evaluate ratepayers risk, how does granting immediate review protects the
10 public interest rather than simply protecting one party interest? The LPSC say the
11 April decision already created an unusual, essentially accelerate procedure. That
12 Administrative Hearings Divisions was directed to compile the evidence record
13 with a formal recommendation from the Administrative Law Judge for the
14 Commissioners to consider, but the vote was four to one, which brother there
15 actually opposed it. So can y'all answer any of those questions? And the last
16 question I'll ask is why is it put by the black community? We already got plants.
17 We already got plants, carbon capture plants that we're dealing with, creosote
18 plants that we're dealing with. And history actually shows us that this is what
19 always happens. Y'all put it right next to our community, our people get sick, our
20 people are -- because right now we've seen where our people in other states are
21 developing COPD. Never had it, but now they've got COPD, dealing with asthma
22 and bronchitis problems. My question as a black man, as an African American in

1 this country, dealing with oppression, redlining and modernization, is, are y'all
2 trying to further push us in the ground, further step on our neck, or is this really --
3 I don't even got to ask is it really for the people because it's on the side of our
4 community. Any time it's on the side of our community, we know it's suspect. It's
5 suspect because y'all ain't come ask us, nobody came and talked to us about it, we
6 knew nothing about it, it just clocked up. And in history, that reflects something to
7 me as a black man, my whole race and my people, and our marginalized people.
8 That reflects something, that y'all do not give a damn about us, our kids, our
9 society, our community, or our conditions, or our future. Black power out. Power
10 to the people.

11 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you. Next speaker, please.

12 **MR. KELLEY WARD:** I think you made some excellent points.

13 **MR. REVO:** I got a lot more, I just had to go ahead and let you go.

14 **MR. WARD:** My name's Kelley Ward, I'm from West Feliciana Parish, part of
15 your district. And I appreciate both you and your assistant, Peggy Lathrop, I think.

16 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** She does a great job.

17 **MR. WARD:** She does a great job. She answers our questions, clarifies things for
18 us, and oftentimes will even clarify rumors that might be floating around, so tell
19 her that we appreciate that.

20 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Thank you.

21 **MR. WARD:** Trying to stay germane to the point, we in West Feliciana, as you
22 know, have a data center that is being built right now. We've had a number of public

1 meetings. We have our parish president and others have come and tried to explain
2 everything going on, in with that project, to the extent that they can. Some of the
3 information they cannot comment on and some of the information, especially early
4 on, some of the information, they don't have the answers to because they are not
5 the decision makers. An example: In a meeting yesterday, in our public library,
6 Parish President Kenney Havard, in the presence of Julia Letlow, asked her the
7 question -- asked her the question, can you guarantee that the rates on our -- the
8 electrical rates for our citizens in our parish will not rise? Of course, that wasn't her
9 jurisdiction. It's not the governor's jurisdiction. It's not Kenny Havard's
10 jurisdiction. Whose jurisdiction is it? It's your jurisdiction. And so how do you
11 make decisions, how do you actually get down to the core decision making? You
12 have information. You have clarity of information. You have transparent
13 information. And to the extent that you can, you ought to seek that at all costs. Your
14 Administrative Law Judge has said they need to produce the evidence. We, the
15 citizens, ask you to follow that guideline and follow that and vote to -- for
16 transparency. We need transparency in public service and public forums. These
17 hearings are an example of transparency; people get up and say what they need to
18 say. And we hope that you listen to what people are really interested in doing and
19 interested and attentive to what we need to do. Why is it important to us? Let's be
20 germane about it. If we don't have the information that tells exactly what the cost
21 of energy will be to these plants, we can't make a decision about the efficacy of
22 that -- those decisions. If we don't know all of the factors that go into calculating

1 the energy, then we might get a surprise meeting -- or not a surprise meeting, but a
2 surprise agenda item on this docket that says, well, Entergy needs an increase to do
3 this, that, or the other. Information is powerful. Transparency is powerful. We need
4 transparency with this board and everybody else to the absolute extent. Your
5 Administrative Law Judge says, yes, transparency. Vote for transparency. We are
6 asking you today and each of your members, each of these meetings of this
7 Commission, vote for transparency. Let us know what's going on. We're intelligent
8 people, we can make decisions, we can support decisions. But if you don't give us
9 the information and the information isn't shared with experts, the people that first
10 got up and spoke, how can we process the information and make good decisions?
11 One last thought, iPhone, everybody has one, right? I'm on Facebook and a couple
12 of other. Meta knows everything about me. Meta knows everything about you, if
13 you're on social media. I want to know everything about Meta.

14 **MR. RAVO:** Facts. Facts. Facts.

15 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much. Y'all are excused.

16 **MR. REVO:** I do want to say one thing before I get up. I hope y'all make the right
17 decision, because y'all seen 2020, how we was out there when it was over us and
18 concerning us. Unless you want us back out there, you want people back out there,
19 you better make the right decision, or you're going to see all us back out there.
20 Black power.

21 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Thank you. Appreciate it. That's it? Thank
22 you. All right. We have a motion on the floor --

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Chairman.

2 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** -- by Commissioner Coussan.

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Chairman.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Seconded by the Chairman. We have

5 opposition by Commissioner Lewis. And call the roll.

6 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Chairman, wait.

7 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Yeah?

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I wanted to ask Mr. Marks from Meta about his

9 motion before us.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** That's not a motion from him, it's our motion.

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I know, but he's -- I'm asking can I call a witness to

12 the table to question the motion--

13 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No.

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** -- that's beneath us.

15 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No. We have a motion right now with

16 Commissioner Coussan --

17 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** When have we never allowed to call a witness to the

18 table about their own filing? It is his filing --

19 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** It's not his filing.

20 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** He filed the motion for immediate review.

21 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** That's the -- that's not --

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** So we've taken it up, and I'm asking a question
2 about his motion that he filed.

3 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Procedurally --

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** When have we ever done that? Procedurally, what?

5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** We have procedurally at the point where it is
6 out of order --

7 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** It's never out of order. You do this all the time.

8 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** We have a motion -- we have a motion before
9 --

10 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Chairman, that is disrespectful. I want to ask a
11 question to a witness and I'm asking --

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** There are other words to disrespectful. It is
13 procedurally appropriate --

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** It is not procedurally appropriate.

15 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Kathryn, is --

16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** It is not procedurally appropriate.

17 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** I'm going to ask our Counsel. Is it appropriate
18 right now to go ahead and follow through with the motion as it's on the floor?

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** If there is anyone who wishes to speak, or the Commissioners
20 have questions --

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** We've always done that.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** -- then those questions can be answered.

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Can they refuse? Because Meta's not a party
2 to this [INAUDIBLE].

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** He can come up and talk.

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** I mean, they could refuse to --

5 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Are you on their payroll?

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** -- to answer questions.

7 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** I am not on their payroll.

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** It looks like it.

9 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Liar.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Is that how it's going to be?

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes, it is.

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Guys, I need the public -- I need the audience to not speak
13 unless you're at the mic.

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** You want to disrespect me, I'll disrespect you.

15 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Are you on the payroll of the Democratic
16 Socialists of America.

17 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Oh, go. Go, ha, ha, ha, ha..

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You had a breakfast for them this morning.
19 Who paid for that?

20 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I didn't have a breakfast for anybody.

21 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** It was on your -- it was on your notice.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I had a breakfast for the Power Coalition for Equity
2 and Justice.

3 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Oh, yeah. Well, there you go. Well, you know,
4 for future references, that's --

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Get it right. Get it right. If you want to call me out,
6 you better come with some facts.

7 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Oh, I got facts, so we'll see.

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yeah. Whatever.

9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** We'll see you in the next election cycle, so.

10 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** We'll see you, too.

11 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Oh, I'm out.

12 **MS. CHARLOTTE CRAVINS:** [INAUDIBLE] without being disrespectful. This
13 is ridiculous.

14 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You know, even your Staff is jumping up.
15 There we go. So, look. We're in a position right now to where we have to figure
16 this out. Okay. So let's understand where we are. Either we're going to -- Meta has
17 an opportunity if they want to come up here and be presented, that's fine. The whole
18 issue about this is Meta is not a party to this litigation, okay?

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct.

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** They are not a party to the litigation. That's
21 what the whole issue is here. Okay? They are a non-party, Entergy is the party to
22 this, right?

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct.

2 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** But they filed the motion.

3 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Correct. That -- that is a non-party motion.

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** That we are reviewing [INAUDIBLE]--

5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** The attorney -- the attorney for the Concerned

6 Scientists stated that it is a non-party Motion to Quash that they filed, and they were

7 very clear about that.

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** [INAUDIBLE] for an immediate review.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** We're not on the Motion to Quash.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right.

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** We're on immediate review.

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** I'm just trying to keep the issue straight.

13 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Well, I'll tell you what. We'll solve this right

14 now. Meta, if you want to come up, you can come up, or you can refuse.

15 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I'm referring to, as stated, that was filed into the

16 record, on July 14, 2026, enclosed, find the original copy of the non-party Meta

17 Platform's Motion for Immediate Review and Ruling and Memorandum of Law in

18 Support Therefore of, submitted by Nelson Mullins, law firm by Weston Adams.

19 That's the motion we're talking about.

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** That's the non-party motion is what I said,

21 right? And that's what you just referred to.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** So he filed the Motion for Review, so I'm asking
2 him a question about his motion to review.

3 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** And he can refuse to come up.

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** You didn't give him an opportunity to.

5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** I just did. I said he can come up, or he can not
6 come up. It's his choice.

7 **MR. WESTON ADAMS:** I refuse to come up.

8 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. There we go.

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** We're fine. I'm good.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right.

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** I'm done.

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** There we go. That's fine. Everybody's got a
13 choice, all right? Y'all had a choice, he had a choice. Now, we have a motion on
14 the floor by Commissioner Coussan, and motion seconded by the Chair. And it is
15 opposed by Commissioner Lewis. And we have roll call vote requested by the
16 Chair.

17 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner Lewis?

18 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** No.

19 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Can Skrmetta recuse?

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No.

21 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner Coussan?

22 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Yes, on my motion.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner Francis?

2 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yes.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner Skrmetta?

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Yes. Matter's approved. We will take up the

5 matter on --

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** The matter is not --

7 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Well, the matter is --

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** The matter is not approved, the motion --

9 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** The matter is disposed of.

10 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** The matter is disposed of.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes.

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** They will take up the matter of the Motion to

13 Quash at the September meeting. Okay.

14 **MS. EVANS:** So actually, your motion said that the Motion to Quash is rendered

15 moot --

16 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Oh, it's rendered moot by --

17 **MS. EVANS:** -- because we're not issuing --

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay.

19 **MS. EVANS:** -- you were reversing the decision to issue the subpoena.

20 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. That's fine. All right. That's fine. This

21 is dealt with, then. All right. We'll move on from here. We've got another one

22 coming up on -- this is Cantium, I think?

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir.

2 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** So Exhibit --- I'm sorry.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** This is 20 -- what?

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Twenty-eight.

6 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Twenty-eight?

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** So Exhibit Number 20 is Docket Number T-37136. This is

8 Cantium versus Rosefield, complaint against Rosefield for transportation and

9 terminalling of crude oil as a common carrier without a tariff on file with the

10 Commission at rates that are excessive and request that Rosefield pay reparations,

11 refunds, and damages, and charges above just and reasonable rates. It's a discussion

12 and possible vote -- guys, I need the audience to be quiet so the Court Reporters

13 can get the public. You can leave, but please do it quietly. It's a discussion and

14 possible vote on Rosefield's motion to amend the Order Number T-37136-A to post

15 a bond in lieu of escrow. It also is a possible executive session to discuss litigation

16 strategy. This is at the request of the Chair. At the April 2026 B&E, the Commission

17 directed Staff to coordinate with Rosefield to establish an escrow account for all

18 payments made since October of '23 to Rosefield by Cantium, as well as future

19 payments. The amount to be put into the escrow account is difference between

20 \$0.67 and \$2.50. The action was memorialized in Order Number T-37136-A, which

21 was issued April 24, 2026. Rosefield timely filed a request for rehearing, which

22 was disposed of at the Commission's June B&E. While discussing the

1 establishment of the escrow account, Rosefield indicated that it had not segregated
2 the required revenues from the escrow account and had used some of, and will
3 continue to need, those revenues for capital and operating expenses to maintain its
4 ongoing business operations. Given this, Rosefield sought to furnish a surety bond
5 in lieu of escrow payment in order to comply with Order Number 37136-A.
6 Rosefield filed the instant motion on August 6, seeking Commission's
7 authorization to post a surety bond in lieu of escrow, which is totaling
8 approximately \$13.7 million. Should the Commission allow Rosefield to post a
9 bond in lieu of escrow, Rosefield agrees to post the bond within 10 days of a
10 Commission order authorizing such action. Staff has had numerous conversations
11 with Rosefield regarding the option of a bond, including reviewing and providing
12 edits to the proposed surety agreement, and based upon the information provided
13 and independent research, Staff does not oppose Rosefield's motion. It is Staff's
14 opinion that the bond accomplishes the Commission's goal to provide security for
15 both parties as the amount in question is still pending Commission review.
16 Therefore, Staff recommends that the Commission amend Order T-37136-A to
17 allow for the posting of a surety bond in lieu of escrow as the security for all past
18 payments made between October '23 and February '26 by Harvest or Cantium to
19 Rosefield above \$0.67 per barrel, subject to Rosefield issuing the bond within 10
20 days of a Commission Order allowing the same.

21 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Any motions on this? [NONE HEARD]

22 Hearing none, the matter is disposed of. Go ahead and make a motion for a hearing

1 in September for a rule to show cause on, I believe you have the language on that,
2 Kathryn.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** I do not have --

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** I talked to you earlier about rule to show cause
5 and why the matter should not be dealt with under a contempt rule for failure to
6 follow the Commission's directive under the previous order.

7 **MS. CAMILLE GAUTHIER:** May I speak and provide comments on behalf of
8 Rosefield?

9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** We just dealt -- there was no motion
10 supported, so it's dead.

11 **MS. GAUTHIER:** I'm sorry. Ms. Bowman, may I speak in support --

12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** There was no one -- no one --

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** So if the Commission does not take the action up, then there is
14 no opportunity for public comment.

15 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Okay. So then I just -- I'd like to just note for the record, I
16 would like to speak on behalf of Rosefield in support of our motion. If I'm being
17 denied that opportunity to --

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No one made the motion. You didn't make a
19 motion. The Commissioner has to make the motion. It was no motion and no
20 second.

21 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Okay. Well, then I apologize if I missed -- I would like to
22 motion to -- I would like to make a motion for Rosefield's motion to --

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No, no. I don't think you get to make the
2 motion. It has to come from a Commissioner. It's not Court. It's Commission.
3 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Okay. Well, then I will just note that I would like the
4 opportunity to speak, and if I'm denied the opportunity to speak, I acknowledge --
5 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** It's not -- it's not -- I mean, Staff, you can tell
6 her that it's not public comment if we didn't have a motion on the floor.
7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah. If an agenda item is not taken up, then public comment is
8 not allowed on that item.
9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you.
10 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Noted. Thank you.
11 **MS. BOWMAN:** Thank you.
12 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** All right. So you can put the rule to show cause
13 on the September meeting.
14 **MS. GAUTHIER:** And I'm sorry, just -- I just, to be clear [INAUDIBLE] --
15 **MS. BOWMAN:** Oh, wait, wait, wait. You've got to press the button.
16 **MS. GAUTHIER:** And I just -- to be clear for the record, I will just note
17 Rosefield's objection to our motion not being taken up and the motion --
18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** It was taken up. It was taken up, and it was
19 disposed of by not being dealt with. There's been -- there's no vote on it.
20 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Okay. I just object to it not being taken up and not granted and
21 to the matter --

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** The matter is -- everything you're saying now
2 is not going into record.

3 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Okay. Well, I just want to preserve my objections.

4 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Public -- this is not Court. This is Commission.

5 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Understood.

6 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you.

7 **MS. GAUTHIER:** Thank you. And I just object to this suggestion that this will be
8 considered for some form of contempt --

9 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** You can keep going as much as you want, but
10 this is not Court. This is not the same as litigation in Court. This is the Commission
11 here.

12 **MS. GAUTHIER:** I understand. Thank you.

13 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you. All right. Next item, please.
14 Which will be, I believe, 29. And I think this is rendered the same way, it's rendered
15 moot, isn't it? Or we have to bring it up. Let's bring it up and go ahead and deal
16 with it.

17 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** We're on?

18 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Twenty-nine.

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** So 29 is the same docket, T-37136. It's a discussion and possible
20 vote on Cantium's motion for sanctions at the request of the Chair. It's the same
21 factual background that I just made, and Staff does not make a recommendation.

1 **COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** No motion. This matter is dismissed for failure
2 to have a motion or a second. Next item, please. Go back to the original docket,
3 would be Exhibit Number 2.

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 2 is Docket Number 37797. This is the
5 Commission versus Uncle Sam's Moving Corps. It's a violation of 45:161 through
6 180.1, by engaging in activities related to household good moving prior to
7 complying with the requirements of the Revised Statute 45:164(E) and General
8 Order dated March 16, 2021 for failure to comply with the requirements of General
9 Order dated April 3, '08 as amended. It's a discussion and possible vote on an ALJ
10 rec. Staff investigated Uncle Sam's Moving Company and determined it was
11 advertising moving services without being registered for the Commission, and
12 issued a citation on December 1, with a hearing being published in the
13 Commission's Official Bulletin for a hearing on March 5. The carrier -- Uncle
14 Sam's did not appear. Can we silence cell phones, please? After the hearing, this
15 ALJ issued a recommendation on June 9, 2026, finding that Staff proved that Uncle
16 Sam's is guilty as alleged, and recommends Staff's requested fine and fees. Based
17 on the evidence admitted at the hearing, the ALJ's recommendation that the
18 Commission issue an order finding that Uncle Sam's is guilty of violating Revised
19 Statute 45:164(E)(1) by engaging in activities related to moving household goods
20 intrastate, through online advertising, prior to complying with the requirements of
21 the revised statutes and the general order. They're also guilty of the Commission's
22 2008 General Order by failing to include a common carrier certificate in its online

1 advertising. The company shall pay a \$4,000 fine pursuant to 45:171 for its
2 violations, as well as a \$25 citation fee.

3 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Move to accept Staff recommendation.

4 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

5 **COMMISSIONER COUSSAN:** Second by Commissioner Francis. Any
6 opposition? [NONE HEARD] No opposition. Motion so heard.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 3 is Docket Number T-37833. It's the
8 Commission versus EZ Movers on an alleged violation of Revised Statutes 45:161
9 through 180.1, by engaging in activities related to moving household goods prior
10 to complying with the requirements of Revised Statutes 45:164(E) and Commission
11 General Orders dated March 16, 2021 and General Order April 3, 2008. It's a
12 discussion and possible vote on a recommendation of the ALJ. Staff investigated
13 EZ Movers and determined that they were advertising for intrastate household
14 goods moving services, and not being registered with the Commission. Staff issued
15 a citation to them on January 21 of this year with notice being published in the
16 Official Bulletin for April 2, 2026 hearing. The carrier did not appear. After that
17 hearing and based on Staff's evidence presented therein, the ALJ recommended
18 that the Commission issue an order finding that: EZ Movers is guilty of violating
19 Revised Statute 45:164(E)(1) by engaging in activities related to moving household
20 goods intrastate, through online advertising, prior to complying with the
21 requirements of 45 -- 45:164(E)(1) and the 2021 General Order, as well as violating
22 the 2008 General Order by failing to include its Commission certificate in its online

1 advertising, and that they shall pay a \$1,000 fine pursuant to 45:171, and a \$25
2 citation fee pursuant to 2006 General Order.

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Move to accept Staff recommendation.

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second by Commissioner Lewis. Any
6 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion passes.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 4 is T-37879. This is the Commission versus Grade-A
8 Movers on an alleged violation of Order T-36679, Revised Statutes 45:161 through
9 180.1, by engaging in activities related to moving household goods prior to
10 complying with the requirements of 45:164 (E) and General Order dated March 16,
11 2021 and for failure to comply with the requirements of General Order dated April
12 3, 2008 as amended. It's a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on the
13 affidavit and stipulation. As a result of an investigation by Transportation Staff, a
14 citation was issued to the carrier on March 23, 2026. The owner of the company
15 executed an affidavit and stipulation admitting to the violations and agreed to an
16 imposition of a \$2,000 fine and a \$25.00 citation fee, with 1,000 being suspended
17 conditioned on the general agreements in transportation affidavits and stipulations.
18 Staff recommends that it exercise -- the Commission exercise its original and
19 primary jurisdiction under Rule 57 to consider the affidavit and stipulation; and
20 accept the affidavit and stipulation executed on June 11, 2026 for fines and fees
21 totaling \$1,025.

22 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Move to accept Staff recommendation.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Um, um, um, sorry. I need a Rule 57 first.

2 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Oh. Move to move this to Rule 57.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
5 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. It moves under Rule 57. Motion to
6 accept Staff recommendation.

7 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

8 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second by Commissioner Lewis. Any
9 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion passes.

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 5 is Docket T-37908. It's the Commission
11 versus Hornet Civil Services for alleged violation of 45:161 through 180.1, by
12 operating intrastate without Commission authority to transport non-hazardous
13 oilfield exploration and production waste on three counts occurring on or about
14 January 28 through January 29 of this year. It's a discussion and possible vote on a
15 rule -- pursuant to Rule 57 on affidavit and stipulation executed by the carrier. As
16 a result of an investigation by Staff, the citation was issued to the carrier on April
17 22, 2026 based on these allegations. And in response to the citation, the owner of
18 the company executed an affidavit and stipulation admitting to those violations and
19 agreeing to an imposition of a \$25 citation fee and a \$7,000 fine, with 3,500 of that
20 being suspended contingent on the standard conditions in the transportation
21 affidavit and stipulations. Staff recommends that the Commission first exercise its
22 original and primary jurisdiction under Rule 57, and then second, accept the

1 affidavit and stipulation executed on July 21 of this year for fines and fees totaling
2 \$3,525.

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Motion moved under Rule 57. Seconded by
4 Commissioner Francis. Any objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion to
5 accept the Staff recommendation. Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any
6 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion passes.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 6 is Docket T-37948. This is the Commission
8 versus Tiger Totes on an alleged violation of 45:161 through 180.1, engaging in
9 activities related to moving household goods prior to complying with the
10 requirements of revised statutes and General Orders dated March 16, 2021, as well
11 as April 3, 2008. It's a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on that
12 affidavit and stipulation. As a result of an investigation by Staff, a citation was
13 issued, and the owner of the company executed an affidavit and stipulation
14 admitting to the violations in that citation. The carrier agreed to the imposition of a
15 \$25 citation fee and a \$1,000 fine, with \$500 that are being suspended contingent
16 on the standard conditions and agreements in transportation affidavits and
17 stipulations. Staff recommends that the Commission, first, exercise its original and
18 primary jurisdiction under Rule 57; and second, accept the affidavit and stipulation
19 executed on July 30 for fines and fees totaling \$525.

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Motion to move under Rule 57.

21 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second by Commissioner Francis. Any
2 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. We move to Rule 57. Motion to accept
3 Staff recommendation.

4 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second by Commissioner Francis. Any
6 objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion passes.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 7 is T-37949. It's the Commission versus CollegeBoxes,
8 on an alleged violation of 45:161 through 180.1, by engaging in activities related
9 to moving household goods prior to complying with the requirements of the revised
10 statutes and Commission General Orders of March 16, 2021 and April 3, 2008. It's
11 a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on an affidavit and stipulation.
12 As a result of an investigation by Staff, a citation was issued to the carrier, and the
13 carrier executed an affidavit and stipulation admitting to the violations and agreeing
14 to the imposition of a \$25 citation fee and a \$1,000 fine, with 500 being suspended
15 contingent on the standard conditions in transportation affidavits and stipulations.
16 Staff recommends that the Commission exercise its original and primary
17 jurisdiction under Rule 57, and accept the affidavit and stipulation executed on July
18 15 for fines and fees totaling \$525.

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Motion to move under Rule 57. Seconded by
20 Commissioner Francis. Any objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Move
21 under Rule 57. Motion to accept Staff recommendation. Seconded by

1 Commissioner Lewis. Any objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection. Motion
2 passes.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 8 is Docket R-37339. It's the Commission's
4 proposed amendments to Commission General Orders dated April 21, 1999,
5 November 8, 1999, April 25, 2012, March 16, 2021, and supersede General Order
6 dated May 30, 2008 and October 13, 2023, as well as establish rules for transporters
7 of waste and saltwater to coincide with recent amendments to intrastate motor
8 carrier's insurance requirements. It is a discussion and possible vote on Staff's
9 recommendation on final rules. Staff did these rules to codify all insurance for
10 transportation carriers into one rulemaking. These rules adopt definitions for
11 various classifications of motor carriers and specifically codifies them therein,
12 maintains the historical distinction between common and contract carriers, places
13 all minimum insurance requirements for all classifications into one rule, identifies
14 the specific type of insurances required for each, provides the Commission's filing
15 requirements for insurance purposes, provides a classification for dispatch taxicabs,
16 removes the motor carrier's ability to self-insure, and provides set standards for
17 minimum insurance and violations that can be assessed should a motor carrier not
18 adhere to the Commission's rules. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt
19 Staff's recommendation on final rules filed into the record on August 4 of this year.

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Any comment on this?

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Just one question.

22 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Sure. Go ahead.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. Just a question for Staff.
2 I know we are eliminating the ability for self-insured carriers. And so, I'm just
3 curious on what will that transition period be, and how long will those who are
4 common carriers who self-insure have to come into compliance with this now
5 requirement?
6 **MS. BOWMAN:** Sure. And I'll let Ms. Burl correct me. My appreciation is those
7 that are self-insured currently with us, and there's various [INAUDIBLE]. I think
8 it's --
9 **SECRETARY FREY:** Maybe four or five at the most. Two. Okay. It's less than I
10 thought. Okay.
11 **MS. BOWMAN:** They have to come in every year, and I believe it's June or July,
12 to provide us the information and prove that they in fact are self-insured. So if this
13 rule passes today, we would allow those two carriers the entire rest of 2026 to
14 summer of '27 in order to get insurance. So come into compliance with the new
15 rule.
16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay. Great. Thank you.
17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Let's move on. That was Exhibit 8?
18 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yeah. Exhibit 8.
19 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir.
20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Has it been voted on?
21 **MS. BOWMAN:** No, sir.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** No, we have a motion. I'm making to accept the
2 Staff recommendation.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Second. Seconded by the Chair.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Any objection? [NONE HEARD] No objection.
5 Motion passes.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. I'll take over for Exhibit 9, please.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 9 is Docket Number S-37855. This is DEMCO's
8 request for Letter of Non-Opposition authorizing financing of construction. It's a
9 discussion and possible vote on Staff Report and Recommendation. On February
10 24 of this year, DEMCO filed the instant request pursuant to the Commission's
11 General Order dated March 18, 1994, seeking authorization to enter into a loan
12 agreement with CoBank for \$20 million. The proceeds will be used to pay or a
13 reimburse of project, including construction costs, related professional services,
14 and other project-related costs permitted by those loans. The request was published
15 in the Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Based
16 upon the information received, Staff concurs that the transaction is in the public
17 interest and has no immediate effect on rates or terms of service for DEMCO's
18 members. Staff recommends that the Commission express its non-opposition to the
19 requests subject to standard conditions for issuing non-oppositions for loans.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I have a quick question for Counsel on this from the
21 company.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Get Ms. Kantrow.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And I'll make a motion to accept Staff
2 recommendation, but I do want --

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I'll second.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And a second from Commissioner Coussan. But I
5 got a quick question.

6 **MS. KARA KANTROW:** Hey. Kara Kantrow on behalf of DEMCO. I have with
7 me --

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Why don't you pull it closer to you.

9 **MS. KANTROW:** Yup. No problem. I have with me Mr. Mark Philips, the new
10 CEO, and we'll take this opportunity to introduce him to the Commission. Mark
11 has been with DEMCO for over 25 years. Started as a lineman, and he's taking over
12 for Mr. Randy Pierce, who we were very happy to have, but we're also very excited
13 to have Mark. And then, also with me is Nick, the director of FP&A at DEMCO.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Thanks. This really goes back to a
15 conversation we had in pre-meeting about the issue about this particular loan. And
16 we talked also about the formula rate plan, about how there was going to be, sort
17 of a negligible impact on rates for DEMCO customers. My question to you was,
18 with a \$20 million loan, that over the lifespan is probably going to cost \$40 million,
19 how it's going to not be an additional \$40 million to the cost of the company, and
20 how it's not going to be a rate impact at some point? So if it's not going to be a rate
21 impact now, when is it eventually going to be a rate impact?

22 **MS. KANTROW:** That's a fair question.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Because between the \$200 million cost of the battery
2 that was voted on to pay back NextEra, which is a payback on DEMCO customers,
3 as well as this potentially \$40 million total value cost over the life of the loan, when
4 is this actually going to come into play about really becoming a rate impact?

5 **MS. KANTROW:** Right. And I think that's a good question. The \$20 million, to
6 clarify, for the battery, that wasn't the loan, that's was a PPA that we did with
7 NextEra. This loan interest and the payback is taking -- as you would take -- as you
8 draw money out. I think why we say there's no immediate impact, because the
9 financing itself doesn't have a rate impact. But, yes, you're correct.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You need to pull that microphone closer.

11 **MS. KANTROW:** As we start pulling out -- as we start pulling money out --

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Pull it to you. it doesn't have a cord. There you go.

13 **MS. KANTROW:** As we start pulling money, and drawing money down off the
14 loan, as well as the -- and when interest starts picking up, yes, there's an impact.
15 And we got with Staff in the data responses and responded that it was about
16 probably -- Nick, correct me if I'm wrong, a dollar, or initially very little. But over
17 the course, if you draw the full \$20 million out, a \$1.30, if you don't refinance and
18 over the course of the loan per customer.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So when is that going to come into play?
20 When are y'all going to start drawing on it? Just so I know.

1 **MR. NICHOLAS SMITH:** So we would start drawing on it in 2026 when we start
2 construction, but it wouldn't full hit rates until the 2027 year, because that's when
3 our 2026 formula rate plan test year --

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And that'll be part of the formula rate plan in 2027?

5 **MR. SMITH:** That's correct. I file it in 2027 based off of --

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So in 2027 will be when this dollar plus unit
7 may come into play on your rates?

8 **MS. KANTROW:** When we file our annual reports with the Commission, it will
9 be part of that reporting. So I think that immediate rate impact discusses, like, as of
10 today, tomorrow, no. But when we come in and we file everything with you all for
11 that yearly check up on our rates --

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right.

13 **MS. KANTROW:** -- you'll see it then.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. Because I just want to be realistic about this
15 is, you're saying no rate impact, and you're borrowing \$20 million, which is really
16 going to be \$40 million with interest. It is going to be a rate impact, but it's just
17 nice to talk about what that rate impact will be when it does happen.

18 **MS. KANTROW:** No, I think that's fair.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

20 **MS. KANTROW:** And I think with the interest, it might be 35 -- I mean, was it --

21 **MR. SMITH:** It's about 35 million with interest at the --

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Well, I just did it with, you know, monkey math. I
2 didn't do it with a calculator.

3 **MR. SMITH:** No, no, no, you're good.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. So --

5 **MR. SMITH:** And then that \$1.30 --

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I just ran it in my brain real quick. So before it's
7 over, trust me, it'll be 40 before you blink. But, look, thank you very much. I think
8 that answers all my questions. Commissioner Lewis.

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarity, can you
10 tell me what are the terms of the loan and how many years that we're
11 [INAUDIBLE].

12 **MR. SMITH:** It's a 20-year loan.

13 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Twenty-year loan?

14 **MR. SMITH:** Yes.

15 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay. Thank you.

16 **MR. SMITH:** You're welcome.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I think that's it.

18 **MS. KANTROW:** I appreciate it. Thank you, guys.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We have a motion on the floor, seconded by
20 Commissioner -- by the Chairman, seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any
21 objection? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
22 please.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Next item is Exhibit Number 10, which is Docket Number S-
2 37903. It's Brightspeed of Louisiana and Brightspeed of South Arkansas' request
3 for a Letter of Non-Opposition to the pro forma transfer of certain assets to affiliates
4 of Brightspeed of Louisiana and Brightspeed of South Arkansas. It's a discussion
5 and possible vote on Staff's Report and Recommendation. On April 17, the
6 Brightspeed company sought an order from this Commission authorizing a
7 complete pro forma transfer of certain assets, including customer contracts and
8 related telecommunications network facilities, from Brightspeed Louisiana and
9 Arkansas to their affiliates. The pro forma transfer is part of a new financing
10 initiative by the parties and their affiliates to support the continued deployment of
11 fiber connectivity throughout Louisiana and other states, promoting fiber
12 deployment to rural and underserved areas of Louisiana. It was published in the
13 Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Staff
14 recommends that the Commission express its non-opposition to the request, subject
15 to the conditions contained in Staff's Report and Recommendation, which were
16 filed into the record on July 13, 2026.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
18 seconds?

19 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?

21 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 11 is Docket Number S-37940. It's Southwest
2 Arkansas Telecommunications and Technology doing business as Four States
3 Fiber's petition for partial relinquishment of designation as an ETC in Louisiana.
4 It's a discussion and possible vote on Staff's Report and Recommendation. On May
5 26 of this year, Four States Fiber filed its petition with the Commission, and it was
6 published in the Bulletin with no interventions. Four States Fiber is a wholly-owned
7 subsidiary of Southwest Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation, and is
8 receiving Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I Auction to deploy in Arkansas,
9 Oklahoma, and Louisiana. They were granted this -- the ETC designation in the
10 census blocks that the Commission following the conclusion of the Phase I Auction.
11 Four States has now faced multiple setbacks trying to meet those RDOF obligations
12 in Louisiana, with significant extra costs, such as spending \$4 million just to
13 conduct title searches. This is the reason why Four States Fiber has decided to
14 partially default on its RDOF award in Louisiana and in Arkansas, and terminate
15 its efforts to bring its high-speed broadband and voice services into the areas. Staff
16 recommends that the Commission accept the Staff's Report and Recommendation
17 filed into the record on June 26, 2026, which authorizes the partial relinquishment.
18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
19 seconds?
20 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.
21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
2 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item, please.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 12 is Docket Number S-37960. This is Pointe
4 Coupee Electric Membership Corporation and 1803 Electric Cooperative's joint
5 petition for full membership status of Pointe Coupee Electric Membership into
6 1803 and other relief. It's a discussion and possible vote on the Staff's Report and
7 Recommendation. This petition was filed by the joint applicants on June 15 of this
8 year, and was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with MISO doing
9 an interest party filing, and Entergy filing a petition for intervention. The petition
10 sought Commission Order, finding that it was reasonable and in the public interest
11 for Pointe Coupee to become a full member, allowing it to participate as a wholesale
12 member; as well as finding that the wholesale power contract between the two
13 parties was reasonable; that Pointe Coupee's IRP requirements would be satisfied
14 by becoming a full member; and that the 1803's management of Pointe Coupee
15 Electric's wholesale power agreements would be reasonable and in the public
16 interest. Staff filed its Report and Recommendation into the record on July 28 of
17 this year. And in the opinion of Staff, subject to affirmative obligations of prudent
18 management by 1803, the requested relief is in the best interest of ratepayers and
19 members of the -- of both parties. On July 29, 2026, a joint -- joint applicants filed
20 correspondence into the record indicating that they accepted the Staff Report and
21 Recommendation. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the Staff Report

1 and Recommendation, including the conditions therein filed into the record on July
2 28, 2026.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
4 seconds?

5 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
7 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
8 please.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 13 is Docket Number S-37962. This is
10 Concordia Electric Cooperative and 1803 Electric Cooperative's Joint Petition for
11 Approval of Transmission -- excuse me, of Transfer of Transmission Facility
12 Assets by Concordia Electric Cooperative to 1803. It's a discussion and possible
13 vote on Staff's Report and Recommendation. This petition was filed on June 16 of
14 this year, published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with MISO intervening
15 as -- or, filing as an interested party and Entergy filing for intervention. The petition
16 sought the approval of the transaction between 1803 and Concordia pursuant to the
17 Commission's March 18, 1994 Order, approving the transmission and distribution
18 services contract between the parties; finding that 1803 and Concordia have
19 complied with the Commission's general orders and requirements; declaring all
20 costs associated with the transaction be deemed eligible for rate recovery. And on
21 July 28 of this year, Staff filed its report and recommendation finding that subject
22 to the affirmative obligation of prudent management by 1803, the requested relief

1 is in the best interest of ratepayers and members of both Concordia and 1803,
2 subject to the standard conditions and assets of transfers. Staff recommends that the
3 Commission accepts Staff's Report and Recommendation filed into the record on
4 July 28, 2026, including the conditions contained therein.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
6 seconds?

7 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Let me comment, please.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir.

11 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** We've had some reliability issues in this area.
12 And talking to all the folks that's here, I feel like 1803 could possibly have
13 [INAUDIBLE] reliability [INAUDIBLE]. Add that into the record. Thank you.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir. There are no -- any opposition to it? We
15 have a -- I have a motion and a second. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing
16 none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

17 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 14 is Docket Number U-37769. This is Jefferson
18 Davis Electric Cooperative's petition for determination of its facilities as
19 transmission facilities, and approval to transfer functional control to MISO. It's a
20 discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. On October
21 30, 2025, JDEC filed the instant application, which was published in the
22 Commission's Official Bulletin, and Entergy Louisiana intervened, with MISO

1 filing to be included as an interested party. In its application, JDEC requested that
2 certain [INAUDIBLE] qualify as transmission assets under FERC's Seven-Factor
3 Test; that functional control of those facilities be transferred to MISO; and that the
4 transfer satisfies the Commission's General Order dated March 18, 1994. On June
5 24 of this year, the parties entered into an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed
6 into the record. The major terms of the settlement are that the parties agree for the
7 sole purpose of this application in this proceeding, that the Commission does not
8 object to MISO considering all of the facilities has transmission facilities pursuant
9 to FERC's Seven-Factor Test. JDEC has not requested approval of the O&M
10 agreement attached to its testimony, thus that agreement has not been reviewed for
11 prudence or other concerns, and is not addressed in this stipulation. JDEC does not
12 seek approval of a sale or conveyance of the facilities. And under this stipulation,
13 JDEC will retain ownership of the facilities, while MISO exercises functional
14 control. JDEC shall not transfer the ownership facilities in future -- in the future,
15 except in compliance with the stipulation therein. Staff recommends that the
16 Commission accept the Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed into the record on
17 June 24, 2026.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
19 seconds?

20 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
22 opposition?

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Chair.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir?

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** We have a PowerPoint presentation to show the
4 improvement in the -- Cameron Parish, this new line. And because of the heavy
5 load here today, we decided to put it off 'til next month. But we're really proud of
6 that line and what all the work that's been done. And I'd be glad for people to see
7 the before and after of the -- and don't really like all the shots of the hurricane
8 damage, but that's part of living in Cameron Parish. So stay tuned. Next month
9 we'll show the --

10 **SECRETARY FREY:** And if you'd like to, I mean, we have a link that JDEC
11 provided to us. We can put that up on the website --

12 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** That'll be great.

13 **SECRETARY FREY:** -- as well as a link to it. I think I have the capability of
14 doing that.

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** All right. Okay. All right.

16 **SECRETARY FREY:** I'm looking at IT. Yes? Sure. Yeah. Okay.

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yeah. Yeah. You're good. You're our tech guy.
18 Okay.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Anyway, we've -- we have a motion and a second.
20 And any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next
21 item, please.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 15 is Docket Number U-37775. It's L & R
2 Utilities' application for an adjustment in retail rates for water and wastewater and
3 request for a letter of non-opp to borrow funds for capital improvements. It's a
4 discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. On October 31,
5 2025, L & R filed the instant application, which arose as a result of needed capital
6 improvements such as new water source and current rates being insufficient to
7 cover the operating costs. L & R also requested a Letter of Non-Opposition to
8 borrow up to \$3.7 million for water system improvements and an interest rate not
9 to exceed 2.45% and an amortized period not to exceed 20 years and borrow an
10 additional \$1.1 million for wastewater system improvements at an interest rate not
11 to exceed 9% and an amortization period of not to exceed 15 years. Notice of the
12 request was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions
13 were received. Staff and L & R agreed to a settlement in this proceeding with the
14 major terms as just outlined. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the
15 Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed into the record on July 6, 2026.
16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation.
17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** This is in Foster Campbell's district --
18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes.
19 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** -- and I'm very familiar with it, also.
20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes, sir.
21 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And did you make a motion?
22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I did. Would you like to second it?

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'd like to second.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you very much, sir. The matter has
3 been moved and seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any opposition? [NONE
4 HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 16 is Docket Number U-37792. This is Pierre
6 Part Natural Gas application for extension of a rate stabilization plan. It's a
7 discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. On
8 November 19, 2025, Pierre Part filed the instant request, which was published in
9 the Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions. Commission Order U-
10 35038 authorized the establishment of Pierre Part's RSP with a three-year term, and
11 then a -- with a -- I'm looking for the ROE. Sorry. With a target ROE of 10%, with
12 50 basis points around it. At the completion of discovery and submission of
13 testimony in this docket, Pierre Part and Staff agreed -- reached an agreement and
14 executed an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement, which was filed into the record on
15 June 29, 2026, which allowed the RSP to continue for another year. The Pierre Part
16 would also make a revenue neutral tariff change to increase the monthly service to
17 \$15 and reduce the commodity charge according to the revenue expectations. Staff
18 recommends that the Commission accept the Uncontested Stipulated Settlement
19 filed into the record on June 29 of this year.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
21 seconds?

22 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?
2 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 17 is Docket Number U-37793. It's South
4 Coast's application for extension of a rate stabilization plan. It's a discussion and
5 possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. November 19, 2025, South
6 Coast filed its instant application. It was published in the Commission's Official
7 Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Order Number U-36276 authorized
8 the extension of the South Coast's original RSP for an additional four-year term,
9 with terms ending in 2025. Staff and South Coast entered into a stipulated
10 settlement agreeing to an extension of the RSP, which was filed into the record on
11 June 29, 2026. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Commission accept the
12 Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed into the record on June 29, '26.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any -
14 - any seconds?

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
17 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
18 please.

19 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 18 is DEMCO's formula rate plan annual report
20 filing for the test year ending December 31, 2025. It's a discussion and possible
21 vote on a joint report and draft order. On March 2 of this year, DEMCO filed its
22 annual report filing, which was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin,

1 and no interventions were received. Commission Order Number U-37392
2 established the current FRP rider, which provided a calculated times interest earned
3 bandwidth of 1.4 to 1.6. DEMCO calculated in this filing a calculated TIER of 1.88,
4 which resulted in a revenue decrease of approximately \$2.3 million. Commission
5 Staff conducted a review of the filing and recommended no further adjustments.
6 The parties filed a joint report and draft order into the record on July 1, 2026,
7 acknowledging the resolution of all issues. Therefore, Staff recommends that the
8 Commission accept the joint report and issue the draft order filed into the record on
9 July 1 of this year.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept the Staff recommendation.

11 Any seconds?

12 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?

14 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

15 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 19 is Docket Number U-37862. It's Parish
16 Water Company's formula rate plan for test year ending December 31, 2025. It's a
17 discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order. On March 2 of this
18 year, Parish filed its annual report, which was published in the Commission's Official
19 Bulletin with no interventions. Order Number U-36540 provided the
20 implementation of the formula rate plan with test years ending in -- for 2025. Staff's
21 Report and Recommendation was filed into the record on May 5, 2026. It found
22 that an adjustment in rates was necessary to increase Parish's FRP revenue by

1 approximately \$764,000. On June 10, the company filed formal response indicating
2 it agreed. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report and draft
3 order filed into the record on July 9 of this year.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation.

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I'll second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any
7 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
8 please.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** We have disposed of Exhibit 20, so we are moving to Exhibit 21,
10 which is Docket Number U-37887. This is Atmos' rate stabilization plan annual
11 report for the Louisiana Division for Test Year ending December 31, 2025. It's a
12 discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order. On March 31 of this
13 year, Atmos filed its annual report for test year '25, and it was published in the
14 Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions. In Order Number U-36658,
15 the Commission adopted the terms and conditions for a renewal of the RSC.
16 Specifically, with an overall ROE of 9.8%, with earning bandwidths of 20 basis
17 points. In the 2025 filing, Atmos reported an ROE of 6.54% and the Louisiana
18 Division required an increase of approximately \$38 million prior to the company's
19 amortization of EDIT and amortization of state tax liability. Based upon those
20 adjustments, the overall revenue increase reduced to gross increase of 34 million -
21 - \$34.4 million. Staff conducted a thorough review and found that those adjustments
22 were necessary. On July 20, Atmos filed an addendum to their correspondence

1 indicating a couple of additional changes, which would also reduce Atmos' revenue
2 increase to a total of 33.7. The parties filed a joint report and draft order into the
3 record on July 23, 2026, which acknowledged the resolution of all issues and assets.
4 Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report and issue the draft
5 order filed into the record on July 23, 2026.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
7 seconds?

8 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
10 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
11 please.

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 22 is U-37894. This is Pointe Coupee's formula
13 rate plan annual report filing for test year ending on December 31, 2025. It's a
14 discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order. On April 1, 2026,
15 Pointe Coupee filed this test year annual report, which was published in the
16 Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Order Number
17 U-37341-A established Pointe Coupee's modified debt service coverage ratio
18 bandwidth of 1.75 to 1.95. And in this current filing, Pointe Coupee reported a MDS
19 of 1.81 and as such, the ratio falls within the bandwidth, and therefore, there is no
20 need for adjustments. Commission Staff conducted a review and found no further
21 adjustments needed. The parties filed a joint report and draft order into the record
22 on January -- excuse me, July 6 indicating such. Therefore, Staff recommends that

1 the Commission accept the joint report and issue the draft order filed into the record
2 on July 6 of this year.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any
4 seconds?

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?
7 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, that matter's approved.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 23 is Docket Number U-37912. This is
9 Louisiana Water Company's formula rate plan for test year ending December 31,
10 2025. It's a discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order. On May
11 1 of this year, LAWCO filed its annual report pursuant to the provisions of
12 Commission Order Number U-37760. The filing was published in the
13 Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Staff's report
14 filed into the record on June 30 of this year determined that, with LAWCO's
15 adjustments and several additional adjustments to operating expenses, LAWCO
16 earned a ROE of 7.51% during the 2025's test year, which fell below the 9% lower
17 earnings bandwidth prescribed by the Commission's order. And accordingly, the
18 implementation of a rate increase of approximately \$423,000 was warranted. Staff
19 filed -- the Company agreed with that. Staff recommends that the Commission
20 accept the joint report and draft order filed into the record on July 20, 2026. And
21 we do have one yellow card for this one.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Correct. And we'd like to invite that gentleman to
2 come up. Commissioner Francis would like to invite them to come up.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yeah. The -- my office is downtown Crowley,
4 and we're in the -- in this water district. And I'm proud to have our mayor and some
5 of our city council here. Y'all come up here a minute and let's -- I'm going to show
6 you all off. Where's the council? Come on up, council. And this is -- although I live
7 outside of town, I -- every time I get a drink of water at the office, it's LAWCO
8 water, and you guys are affected by that. Y'all have a seat right quick.

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Ladies may sit.

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Why don't you go ahead and announce yourself,
11 who you are. And let's start with you, Mayor.

12 **MAYOR CHAD MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir. Mayor Chad Monceaux with the city of
13 Crowley.

14 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** All right. Ladies?

15 **MS. SANDRA MARKX:** I'm Sandra Markx, Mayor Pro Temp, Alderwoman
16 Ward 2.

17 **MS. KATIE CHAISSON:** I am Katie Chaisson, and I am Alderwoman for Ward
18 1.

19 **MR. BRAD CORE:** Brad Core, Alderman, Ward 2.

20 **MR. CHUCK ASHBY:** Chuck Ashby, Alderman-At-Large.

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And so the election is this fall for the replacement
2 or re-election, and one of the things that impressed me about your group is -- I
3 understand there's like five that are unopposed?

4 **MS. MARX:** That's right.

5 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And although I think the mayors are opposed, but
7 --

8 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** These four are the ones unopposed.

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. He's the leader, I think. My compliments
10 to you for -- you got a good team there. And --

11 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** We do. We do.

12 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** But I know that the city of Crowley has the waste
13 water system.

14 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** But the drinking water is -- the bottle water, it's
16 LAWCO.

17 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** That's correct.

18 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Most people in town think that y'all regulate all
19 of it. And so, I don't get that many calls in my office.

20 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I get them for you.

21 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** All right. So it's -- anyhow, we thought this was
22 really an interesting situation. A lot of people weren't that happy. We've had some

1 problems with the water in Crowley, and that's why I asked him to come up here
2 today. And I don't know if I could've kept him from coming or not, but you need
3 to have your day in Court, so your people need to know that you're here taking up
4 for their water rights. Even though we regulate it --

5 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** -- you get all the complaints.

7 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

8 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** But, Mayor, tell me what's going on, and have
9 you talked to the water people about the problems?

10 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yeah. So, Commissioners, thank y'all for having us here
11 today. We appreciate the opportunity. As mentioned, I am the mayor of the city of
12 Crowley, and we do not own the water system. Many municipalities of our size do
13 own the water system, but our city only has wastewater. We only own the messiest
14 utility. I guess you would know. And so, you know, we've had -- look, I retired
15 after 20 years of being a firefighter in the city of Crowley. I'm no stranger to
16 working with LAWCO, and we certainly have a great working relationship, and
17 that continues today. But, you know, people will complain about their utility bills
18 often. I'm one of them. I don't want to -- I don't want to pay the high utility bills
19 either.

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** You need to call your Commissioner.

21 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** We -- yeah. Yeah, I'm going to go visit him. But we do
22 have to pay those bills. And so, we see that -- I see those complaints often on social

1 media and, you know, so I start -- I try to explain to people even a small leak in
2 your toilet or a drippy faucet could certainly cause your bill to rise. And this last
3 incident seemed to be quite a bit more than that. And I've got -- we've gotten
4 multiple complaints. And I was able to collect many -- what I did was I called
5 LAWCO, or I sent an email out to the local guy and asked for a meeting, and I
6 asked that some of the managers or the movers and shakers within the company out
7 of Baton Rouge would be there also. And I met with three of them -- individuals,
8 the local in Crowley, and two from what I thought was Baton Rouge, I'm
9 understanding maybe they were from New Iberia now, and questioned these bills.
10 And probably the elderly lady who kind of started the mission of finding out what
11 happened, I have her most current bill here, and she had, since November -- and
12 I'm assuming it's a new service in October, because it just -- the usage history starts
13 in October. And November '25 was 29 units, one unit is 100 gallons. December '25
14 was 24 units, 26, 22, 23, 31, 25, 26 in June '26, and then in July '26, it went to 206
15 units. In August, it's back down to 31 units. Two hundred and six units times 100
16 is what?

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** A lot of water.

18 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** A lot of water. She didn't have a swimming pool in her
19 backyard. She did not, because last month when she got the July bill, our code
20 enforcement, and of course they started calling city hall, and our code enforcement
21 officer went out, helped her, looked at her bill, looked around her house for water
22 leaks, even looked at her meter, which was not turning. Made sure everything was

1 off in the house, and the meter was not turning. Sat there and talked with her a little
2 while, kept looking at the meter, and found that she had no leak, and then August
3 bill went back to normal. So a lot of these bills had been discussed in this situation.
4 And when we met with LAWCO, one of the possibilities were that they estimated
5 bills for two to three months, depending on where you were in the city, because not
6 all customers are read at one time, and so, there's different zones and whatnot. And
7 so, it could've been two to three months for some customers that they estimated the
8 water bill. And this is a result of actually having a meter reader now, and that meter
9 reader going out and reading the meter. That result is -- is said to have been a
10 possible leak within the three months of estimating. Again, I have this bill that
11 obviously there was no leak, and also, I've had people tell that they didn't have a
12 leak. Now, take that at face value. Maybe they're not telling me the truth. But I also
13 just looked at a bill -- because I didn't see all of them. We're still getting them in
14 at city hall. But I just looked at a bill that had 90,000 gallons of water billed, 12 --
15 \$1,300 for the water bill. Now, that total cost includes sewer user fees. So
16 understand that -- not \$1,200 for 90,000 gallons of water, that includes the sewer
17 user fees with that. But 90,000 gallons of water is the real situation. And code
18 enforcement and the LAWCO employee went visit with this lady, and she admitted
19 that she had a leak fixed under her back porch. And I just called my code
20 enforcement guy, and he said, yeah, she admitted that she had a leak fixed, and she
21 said it was a gasket that had to be changed. I don't know how 90,000 gallons of
22 water could leak from the back porch of a residential lot, whether the gasket was

1 gone, or the pipe was disconnected. That's larger than many swimming pools in
2 backyards. Fifty, 60,000 gallons for regular swimming pool, in ground swimming
3 pool, 70,000 gallons, pretty big swimming pool. I can't believe that this resident
4 allowed 90,000 gallons of water to leak, even if it was spread over three months.
5 Not to rub salt in a wound, but I used AI recently, and asked what 90,000 gallons
6 would look like on a residential lot, 75x100, and one of the answers was: If it was
7 able to be contained on that lot, it would be 19.5 inches of water throughout that
8 entire lot. If not, certainly neighbors' yards would have water in it, and it just over
9 -- this is over three months. It just is unbelievable to me that that's possible. Now,
10 to be fair, I didn't like the answers that LAWCO gave me in that meeting. I had not
11 called Commissioner Francis' office yet. I wanted to deal with it with LAWCO.
12 And when I did not get what I thought was honest answers and good help, then I
13 called Commissioner Francis' office, and that's why we're here today. Since then,
14 LAWCO has reached out to me, and a couple of them are here today and spoke
15 with me in the hallway today, also. And I appreciate that. But the questions I have
16 are still at hand. One, how long has LAWCO been estimating bills? You can't tell
17 me 20,000 gallons of water in one month was -- or in three months, were billed to
18 this lady when she did not have a leak, and it was only three months of estimating.
19 I don't believe that. I just -- I cannot believe that. You can't tell me that the 90,000
20 gallons. If it was only three months of estimating, then 90,000 gallons of water
21 leaked out of this lady's --

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** What was the -- excuse me, what was the charge
2 on the 90,000? The one that you ---

3 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I don't know what the just water charge was. The full
4 bill, with sewer user fees. And I understand sewer user fees in the city of Crowley
5 is 24 based, 7.50 for 1,000 -- every 1,000 above 2,000.

6 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Uh-huh.

7 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** So we can figure that out real quick with a calculator.

8 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** It was a couple hundred or a couple thousand?

9 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Oh, no. It was \$1,200 total.

10 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Total over three months?

11 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** It's probably about \$500 or so for water. Because, again,
12 at 7.50 for every 1,000 above 2,000. That sewer user fee starts calculating pretty
13 high.

14 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Think there was a malfunction of the meter?

15 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I don't know. I -- that I don't know. But how long has it
16 been being estimated? How did this happen?

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Well, that's something I want to address.
18 Commissioner Frey, do we allow utilities to estimate --

19 **SECRETARY FREY:** Generally speaking, no, Commissioner. In our water and
20 wastewater regulations, there is language about prohibiting estimating meters,
21 unless they're essentially exigent circumstances. I mean, one example I think of is
22 -- I think we had the 10-year anniversary of the 2016 flood where you had debris

1 in Lafayette area and the Baton Rouge area. Just essentially, you couldn't get to a
2 meter. So there was no way to actually read a meter in that scenario, and waivers
3 were granted. But, no, the general rule is you cannot estimate.

4 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Well, also, I'm very fond of the --

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner, can you bring your mic closer?

6 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'm very fond of the smart meters, the automatic
7 meters. And if you had a situation like that, you'd have an alarm pop up to warn us.
8 I understand that some of the neighboring towns have smart meters already.

9 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Absolutely. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And I'm going to look into that with LAWCO and
11 be talking to you guys --

12 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Sure.

13 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** But there's still some -- some of these situation --
14 issues need to be resolved. If you and LAWCO can't make peace by the time the
15 next meeting, I'll get involved and --

16 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** -- help straighten it out.

18 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** To be fair, LAWCO has issued multiple credits, and they
19 have offered to issue credits to accounts with these excessively high bills. I think
20 there are probably over a 100 or a couple 100 accounts now that they have -- they've
21 shown me outside that they have credited. You know, I can't -- I certainly can't and

1 shouldn't have to go to these customers and say, hey, if you got a high water bill,
2 call LAWCO. And I think they're working on that now.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yeah.

4 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** But our citizens, they deserve an explanation. And they
5 need to know what happened here, and why did it happen, and what are we going
6 to do going forward to prevent it from happening again?

7 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Well, to start with -- you can give them my phone
8 number. Tell them they got the wrong number.

9 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir. I'll do that.

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** This happens with the Louisiana Legislature all
11 the time. And [INAUDIBLE] we're in charge of that.

12 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

13 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** So I'm still in charge --

14 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, sir.

15 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** -- and if they can't get right with you, and let's get
16 some options going, then I think you should ask them -- tell them we need smart
17 meters. That's what I'mma tell them to try to help this.

18 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I asked, you know, obviously I can't demand, I don't
19 own the water company, and I'm not one of those five seats, but I asked for that,
20 and I realized that these smart meters are not cheap. It's going to be a large expense
21 for 5,800 connections or so, and that expense is going to be passed on to the
22 customers, obviously.

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Right.

2 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I mean, that's how business works.

3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** That's who will pay for it. Yeah..

4 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** I mean, you can't spend money in business and not make

5 it back. And I understand that. And maybe it's something that can be phased-in

6 over time. But it seems as though -- so the reason that I was given for the estimation

7 is because they lost their employees. They've quit or whatever it may have been,

8 that read the meters. And so, if this is going to be a continuing issue, we may need

9 to see about a solution to that, you know. And, look, employees are not easy to get.

10 I'm sure I'm preaching to the choir here. Employees are tough to --

11 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Right.

12 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** -- first of all, get, but then keep. So I can understand that.

13 But, you know, our city -- the city of Crowley has a population of 47% poverty.

14 Half of our population is considered poverty. To go from a \$50 bill to a -- like this

15 lady tells me over and over again, she said she'll never forget that number, \$298.99.

16 That's tough on our citizens. That's tough. And so, I'd like a serious solution on

17 how we're going to go forward and prevent that from happening. So, thank you.

18 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Did any other Commissioners have anything to

19 say?

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I'd just like to say that you have our attention. I

21 want to recognize that we appreciate y'all coming, and we'll see to the end that this

22 gets addressed.

1 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Thank y'all. Thank y'all very much.

2 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Thank y'all for coming.

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Really quick. Thank you. This is a question for Staff.

4 Since it is -- since our rule does not allow for estimations without a waiver or

5 coming before the Commission, does our rules also allow for penalties to a utility

6 for violating that rule without notice?

7 **SECRETARY FREY:** There are -- I'd have to go back and look, Commissioner.

8 But the rules --

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** There is.

10 **SECRETARY FREY:** -- of water does have a penalty provision for violations. So

11 we'd have to go through a citation process. But yes, we model the telecom rules,

12 and I know there's violation penalties built therein.

13 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. And, Mr. Mayor, the reason I ask that

14 question is because I want to make sure that while LAWCO has offered credits and

15 refunds, this to me seems like an egregious mistake --

16 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Right.

17 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** -- and something that should be taken seriously. So

18 outside of their voluntary offer of credits, we -- and I hope -- and I think we're all

19 in agreement here that we will look at other ways to answer your question to ensure

20 this doesn't happen. And you got my commitment, along with my colleagues on

21 that to do so. And I'll say, I like you even more because you have that great

22 remarkable right there that I saw you writing on. And so --

1 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Yes, yes.

2 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** -- that tells me you're keeping a lot of good notes.

3 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** It's new, I'm trying to learn it. But, listen, I appreciate

4 that. And, you know, maybe that -- and, you know, I'm not -- obviously I'm not

5 asking for fines imposed, but if they are, if the Commission imposes fines, maybe

6 those fines can be put towards the cost of some of these automated meters.

7 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** We might be able to help with that. I'm going to

8 let y'all try to figure it out amongst yourselves first.

9 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** And I appreciate that. Yes.

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And give everybody my phone number, okay?

11 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** Will do. Thank you. Thank y'all.

12 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Chairman, just a moment of personal

13 privilege. I want to also thank you and your community for electing John Stefanski

14 to your City Court judgeship. He's going to do a great job.

15 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** We're excited about John.

16 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** And I look forward to seeing him in that role

17 and at his investiture. I hope you're all there.

18 **MAYOR MONCEAUX:** John's a great asset in our city. Thank you.

19 **MS. MARX:** He's a hardworking man.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you all very much.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Chairman, in a separate matter, as a
2 personal privilege real quick, 10 seconds. There's one former legislator I left off
3 today --

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure.

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** -- and he's also in the audience, Representative
6 Scott McKnight is here.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** [INAUDIBLE]

8 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I want recognize Scott and embarrass him a little
9 bit --

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** There he is.

11 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay.

12 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** -- and thank him for joining us at the LPSC. He's
13 going to -- he's going to be doing some work around this area. So thank you for
14 joining us, Scott.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Hey, Scott. Well, we have -- we don't have a motion
16 yet, or a second, so, Southwest folks want to handle it, or you want me to make --

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** What's that?

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We don't have a motion or a second yet, with the
19 Southwest folks --

20 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Oh, I'd like to make a motion that we approve
21 LAWCO's proposal.

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Motion by Commissioner Francis. Any seconds?

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I'll second.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any
3 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item,
4 please.

5 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 24 is Docket Number U-37969. This is Cleco's
6 application for implementation of a change in rates and establishment of a new
7 formula rate plan. It's a discussion and possible vote to retain United Professionals
8 Company. On June 23 of this year, Cleco filed the application seeking Commission
9 approval of an implementation of a change in rates to be effective July 1, 2027, as
10 well as establishing a new 2027 formula rate plan. In that notice of that filing, the
11 company also indicated that another application will be filed with the Commission
12 shortly related to a large, new data center customer, and said application will
13 contain ratemaking and deferral requests that will need to be evaluated in light of
14 the Commission's determinations in this proceeding. At the Commission's January
15 2026 B&E, the Commission retained UPC to assist Staff in any dockets opened
16 seeking certification of new generation and/or transmission associated with these
17 new types of customers. Per Cleco's rate application, it will need to be considered
18 alongside its upcoming filing with the Commission's consideration of a new data
19 center customer. As such, and based on UPC's general retention, Staff solicited the
20 company for a proposed bid associated with Cleco Power's instant request. Staff is
21 seeking this solicitation pursuant to the Commission General Order dated
22 November 10, 2014. Based on Staff's solicitation, UPC submitted a proposed

1 budget of 450,000 in fees and 5,000 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of
2 \$455,000. This budget not only includes the analysis of Cleco's request, but it also
3 contemplates a contested hearing, as well as three annual reviews of Cleco's
4 formula rate plan, should the Commission approve its implementation. Staff
5 recommends that the Commission retain UPC for 450,000 in fees and 5,000 in
6 expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of \$455,000.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead. We have a --

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Motion to --

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- motion to accept Staff recommendation. Any
10 seconds?

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And we have a motion and a second to accept the
13 Staff recommendation on -- any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the
14 matter's approved. Move on to, I believe 25.

15 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 25 is Docket Number X-38036. It's the
16 Commission's notice of audit of Magnolia Water Utility Company's billing,
17 customer-service, and acquisition practices, as well as its compliance with other
18 regulatory agencies. It's a discussion and possible vote to retain an outside
19 consultant. Pursuant to the Commission directive at the June B&E, Staff issued
20 RFP 25-06 seeking an outside consultant and received two bids. They're both new
21 qualified bidders as well. It's Eisner Advisory Group for \$135,000 in fees and 2,500
22 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of 137,500, or Silverpoint Consulting

1 for 235,270 in fees and 19,200 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of
2 \$254,470. Staff makes no recommendation as both bidders are qualified.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Move to accept the low bid of Eisner Advisory
4 Group.

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition?
7 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. And the next item, please.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 26 is our undocketed reports, resolutions, and
9 ratifications. We do have three items under this agenda item this month. The first
10 is a report from the Commission's Utilities Division on jurisdictional water
11 utilities' water balances and unaccounted for water.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Who's going to carry that?

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** Mr. Marks.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great.

15 **MR. DONNIE MARKS:** So, yeah. Donnie Marks on behalf of the Staff. We
16 gathered the information from the -- all the water utilities on their water volume,
17 the volume of gallons delivered, the unaccounted-for water, and summarized all of
18 that with comments from the utilities. We have that all summarized.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Can we get a copy of it for each of the
20 Commissioners, please?

21 **MR. MARKS:** We can. We'll get -- I'm sure we'll get that. And we're going to
22 continue to get those every quarter and monitor --

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Perfect. That'd be great.

2 **MR. MARKS:** Yes.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you very much.

4 **MR. MARKS:** You're welcome.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Next item on that -- 26.

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** So the next item is discussion and possible vote to ratify votes
7 cast by Chairman Skrmetta, acting as the Commission's representative on a
8 Regional State Committee of the Southwest Power Pool.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I would like to interject that this took place before -
10 - at -- when I was still serving in that capacity. And then since then, we've had a
11 motion --

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- for Mike to do it. But this was my last vote on
14 anything.

15 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct. Yes, sir.

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

17 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I move to ratify the votes.

18 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'll second.

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** And I will --

21 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Abstain.

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** -- abstain.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** We also have --

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We have to have a vote on it. So --

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Any objections?

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Any objections?

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** There's no objections.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** No objection. It's ratified.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** So there's also discussion and possible vote to ratify interventions

8 of the Commission and RTO-related or other FERC energy regulatory proceedings.

9 Staff recommends that the Commission ratify actions taken in 13 proceedings over

10 the last two months.

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We move to ratify the FERC interventions. Any

12 seconds?

13 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any

15 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 21 --

17 **SECRETARY FREY:** But before she moves off of this, I know it's not

18 announcements, but we failed to make an announcement at the beginning that I

19 notified all of y'all that Tammy has the wrong name tag under her.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. She got changed.

1 **SECRETARY FREY:** She is now our director of our Regulatory Compliance
2 Division. So, with Combined transportation Utilities, and I want to make sure I
3 acknowledge that.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Did you have to take a pay cut? I'm just checking.
5 Okay. All right. So we're moving on to -- let's see, 27?

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 27 is R-37871. This is the Commission's Louisiana
7 Advanced Nuclear Exploration Program. It's a discussion and possible vote on
8 finale rule. It's at the request of the Chair. This docket was initiated by a notice of
9 proceeding filed on March 10 of this year, pursuant to the directive at the February
10 B&E. The notice was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin, and several
11 interventions were filed. Staff -- attached to the notice, Staff provided the proposed
12 LANE program, and sought stakeholder comments. Staff reviewed all comments
13 received and submitted its initial recommendation on July 21 of this year. Staff
14 noted that the intent of the directive was clear, as it specifically limited this
15 rulemaking to establish a mechanism for IOUs and interested rural electric
16 cooperatives to engage with specific nuclear vendors on potential technology. Staff
17 also submitted for a second round of comments, and most feedback was in support
18 of Staff's initial recommendation, with only one minor clarification suggested by
19 1803. After consideration of all the parties' comments, Staff filed its notice of final
20 proposed rules on August 6, 2026, with the final rules attached. The final rules are
21 mandatory for IOUs; however, they are voluntary for the electric cooperatives. Staff

1 recommends that the Commission adopt the final rule filed into the record on
2 August 6, 2026.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Staff -- Chair moves to accept Staff
4 recommendation. Any seconds?

5 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
7 opposition?

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, just briefly.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure.

10 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** While I support, and I believe that we need to do
11 nuclear research and development, I think this is an important time and topic that
12 we should have. However, I do not think this is the appropriate time for us to put
13 that responsibility onto Louisiana ratepayers with the rider. I would've loved for us
14 to find federal dollars, state dollars, having the IOUs contribute to their own
15 shareholder dollars to this research. So while I'm not opposed to the research and
16 the LANE initiative as directed and supported at the Commission, I just cannot
17 support a rider on the residents of Louisiana to fund this research and development.
18 So I'll have to object.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay.

20 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Chairman, I also would like to echo the
21 sentiment, not necessarily the final opinion. But my office has yet to kind of do a
22 little bit deeper dive into this particular surcharge. I'm asking if you would -- could

1 entertain moving this vote to our September meeting, and putting it first on the
2 agenda, and then I'll absolutely have a, you know, an opinion on the matter at that
3 time.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sure. We can move it to September. And I'd like to
5 bring up that this is something we already do in a similar fashion for a natural gas
6 research. So it is -- and we're at a time where we have at least four new nuclear --
7 micronuclear devices that have gone critical before July 4. We have -- I believe
8 four more that are going critical now. It's -- we're at the cusp of finding pathways
9 for new nuclear technology. So we're really on the edge of this, and it puts
10 Louisiana first in being able to develop the -- not just the interrelationship with the
11 use of them, but also in the potential of Louisiana being in the supply chain,
12 workforce development, and manufacturing. So --

13 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I agree with you. I agree with your --

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I said we're going to move it.

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Well, I agree with your sentiment, but I also
16 want to add that, you know, there are other opportunities for seed dollars that may
17 be more apparent in the next couple months where, you know, this option, while I
18 think it's an important step for the state of Louisiana to progress our discussions on
19 nuclear, there may be other funding sources that make this negligible and, you
20 know, that do not impact the ratepayer to the extent that this does. So, with that
21 said, I'll have those discussions, you know, over the next four weeks.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We'll move this to September, and I'd like to talk to
2 you about if you know of anything.
3 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. Yeah.
4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** This is --
5 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'd like to ask Commissioner Coussan. If you
6 don't find that money, you going to vote for this?
7 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I'm a strong maybe.
8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** There you go.
9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. So for the record, Commissioner Skrmetta --
10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Deferred.
11 **MS. BOWMAN:** -- you will withdraw your motion --
12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I withdraw my motion and defer it to September.
13 Next item, please.
14 **MS. BOWMAN:** That is it.
15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Actually, that's it, right? The Chair moves to
16 adjourn. Any seconds?
17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'll second.
18 **MS. BOWMAN:** Commissioner Francis.
19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
20 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, meeting's adjourned.

21

22 **(WHEREUPON THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED)**

23

LPSC B&E Open Session
August 12, 2026
Baton Rouge, LA

1 I certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 135 are true and correct to the best
2 of my knowledge of the Open Session of the Business and Executive Meeting
3 held on August 12, 2026 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

4 *****

5 Rough Draft prepared by:

6 Keyanna Freeman August 21, 2026
7 Key-anna Freeman, Date
8 Court Reporter

9 Kayla Fiorenza August 21, 2026
10 Kayla Fiorenza, Date
11 Court Reporter

12 Alicia Carter-Thomas August 21, 2026
13 Alicia Carter-Thomas, Date
14 Court Reporter

15 *****

16 Proofed by:

17 Alicia Carter-Thomas August 25, 2026
18 Alicia Carter-Thomas, Date
19 Court Reporter

20 Finalized by:

21 Keyanna Freeman August 27, 2026
22 Key-anna Freeman, Date
23 Court Reporter