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CHAIRMAN LAMBERT BOISSIERE: Okay. Well, I’d like to welcome everyone to Jefferson Parish and also my neck of the woods, the New Orleans metro area. We’re in Commissioner Skrmetta’s district but very near mine as well, so it feels like you’re in our home. I want to thank Jefferson Parish to be the host of this particular B&E and to do so graciously. I want to thank Copeland Towers for putting on a great -- a venue. I will say this, because I talked to the staff, masks are optional but preferred, so consider that. This is a senior center -- senior living center, and they made exceptions to some degree for us and this event, but generally masks are not mandatory but -- so if you feel more comfortable with a mask, please be -- please wear it. If you feel less comfortable, then of course it’s optional. Now, before we start and before we really start, the prelude to the beginning of the meeting is, bear with us as we’re in a new venue, and we’ll be working with Staff and our Secretary to manage the meeting. We have, if you’ve noticed, to some degree, a new seating order and that brings me to my first item. I would like to thank all of you and I would like to thank my fellow Commissioners for the reason I’m speaking here today is that they voted for me to be Chair last month. And I
thank you and I also want to -- thank you. And I’d also like to recognize Commissioner Mike Francis, our Vice Chair.

COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS: No applause. No applause.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Please, yeah, come on. And I want to also recognize somebody, Joe Shine. Where’s Joe? All right, Joe. Good to see you. Joe Shine is visiting us today and that’s in your -- in Commissioner Campbell’s office, he came down to help Commissioner Campbell with the meeting and his office as usual. And I’ll let -- and I want to now give the mic to Commissioner Skrmetta, who has an announcement.

COMMISSIONER ERIC SKRMETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First off, without further ado, I’d like y’all to welcome my wife Debbie. Debbie, if you’d stand up? She’s joined us today since she’s oh, so close. Also, I’d like to join Commissioner Boissiere in thanking the -- Al Copeland and his family and the Copeland Towers for hosting us here in this event. Thanks, Mr. Copeland. And I also want to thank in advance Sheriff Joe Lopinto for sharing Captain Andrew Walsdorf, who is going to lead us in the pledge when the chairman calls it. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. All right. And to round it off, I want to thank everyone for voting for me chair and for Mike Francis as vice chair. And to just tell you that for me it’s -- and again, I want to say this before we start the official meeting while we’re still kind of talking on a -- just talking personal level before the record begins at the start of the meeting, that how grateful I am and how many warm congratulations I’ve received over the last month. And I want to share with
my Commissioners how many votes of confidence I’ve received over the last month
that they expect a lot from us and they let me know that. So I’ll do my best here
for you. I’ll make myself available to each and every one of you as I’ve tried to do
my whole time as Commissioner but especially as chair. [INAUDIBLE] this is a
very difficult time and we are all part of this utility regulatory community together
and I expect us all to be all in for the ratepayers, the companies, the stakeholders,
the politicians, and the governmental and all the commercial industrial customers,
that we work together to solve the issues of the utility regulations. Now, with that,
that whole mouthful, I would like to now open the meeting with a prayer -- I’m
sorry. I did forget one thing, Commissioner Greene. Commissioner Greene, go
ahead.

COMMISSIONER CRAIG GREENE: I’d like to welcome new staff that we
have, Ms. Jessica Sanchez. She’s an attorney joining our staff, if you want to wave
to everybody, so. Thank you for [INAUDIBLE].

COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL: We forgot about one of your fellow
workers here, just slipped our mind when we shouldn’t. And I apologize. Jim Ellis
has worked here a long, long time. And he slipped and fell, and he is in better shape
than he was. And so he worked here for 30 years among all of us, and so y’all --
I’m not telling you what to do, but I know that you’ll want to say a prayer for him
and give him a call. He was a nice fellow, a very astute lawyer. He represented
Dixie Rural Electric for a while and worked in a big law firm downtown, and we’ve
just -- we hadn’t done our job. I hadn’t done my job. I’d like to say that we ought
to contact him and send him something and tell the people we hadn’t forgot him.
He’s on his way back, and we’re pulling for him. He had a serious fall. Okay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you, Commissioner. And I hope we include that in our prayers. One last other note, as we begin this meeting and we’re in this local community and we all care about the state of Louisiana, and I want to include this as we begin the prayer, the state of the world is in a very difficult place right now. I don’t know if everybody’s watching the news outside of Louisiana, but believe it or not this small little skirmish called Ukraine and Russia is going to get kind of intense, I think, and it may affect all of our lives to some degree. So pay attention to it, and I think it’s already starting to affect us in the utility regulatory business. It hasn’t been announced that way yet, but I’m paying attention to it and I’m a little worried about and so as we now move to actually open the meeting, I would like to ask Commissioner Greene to lead us in a prayer.

[COMMISSIONER GREENE LEADS IN PRAYER]

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: And we have Captain Andrew Walsdorf of the Jefferson Parish Sheriff’s Office here to lead us in the pledge.

[COMMISSIONER CAPTAIN ANDREW WALSDORF LEADS IN THE PLEDGE]

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Mr. Secretary, do you have any things to start us off?

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY BRANDON FREY: Good morning, Commissioners. We’ve got a couple of items that -- one that’s going to be pulled from the agenda and one deferred. I’ll let Kathryn talk to that. But also, when
Commissioner Campbell was talking about Jim, it reminded me -- and I don't know how many of y'all knew him, but Danny Wilson, who was a long-time lobbyist for BellSouth and then later AT&T, did most of his work at the legislature, but passed away here recently. So y'all remember Danny and his family in your prayers.

**MS. KATHRYN BOWMAN:** Good morning, Commissioners. We have just -- we have 20 agenda items today, and Exhibit 18 is being pulled, that’s Exhibit 18. And then Exhibit 19, under discussions for Charter, that’s being deferred until March.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE:** Hold on a second here. Well, okay, the first hiccup. Give me one second. Forgot my notes.

**SECRETARY FREY:** Also, while the Chairman is getting his notes, we sent out a request to all of you, and I’ve heard back from some of you, but there are a number of conflicts the week of the proposed March date. It’s MISO board week, so I know we’ve got a Commissioner on the MISO board, a Commissioner on the OMS, and a Commissioner on the ERSC, as well as a number of Staff people. So I had sent out some alternative dates, if you’d let us know which of those work, I’ve heard back from a few of you. And also the April B&E that was originally scheduled for Friday in Many was unavailable, the facility, they had it previously booked. So we are moving that to Wednesday of that week. So it will be the same week and I think I’ve gotten sign off from most of y’all on that.

**MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. And then we’re also going to take one item out of order. We’re going to take Exhibit Number 9 up first, which --
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Let’s say that again so everyone could understand and hear what you just said.

MS. BOWMAN: Yeah. We’re going to take Exhibit Number 9 up first. We’re going to take that one out of order.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: We still have an announcement.

MS. BOWMAN: Oh, I’m sorry. One more announcement.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Yeah. Right, right. But let’s -- well, we can move it up, but let’s deal with the announcements and other things as necessary and then move it up as the first item. Commissioner Skrmetta.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yes, sir. I’ve got a couple of announcements. One is the reason that I’ve asked to pull Exhibit 18, which was the motion for notification to the utilities to withdraw from MISO is because we have had a successful interaction with MISO to the advantage of our region, so I’m happy that we were able to work that out and protect the ratepayers of our MISO South region. The second thing is, is Dana Shelton here yet? Or is she still not on her regular schedule, Mike?

MR. MIKE FONTHAM: She’s on her way.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Okay. Well, I want to congratulate Dana. I actually got a contact yesterday to congratulate the Public Service Commission on its comments in FERC Docket RM 22-5 regarding the grid security from both the Secure, the Great Alliance, and from the Center for Security Policy and it’s kind of rare that I get comments coming from the outside world complimenting Staff on their work. So congratulations to Ms. Shelton. So thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: All right. Do we have any other announcements or messages?

MS. BOWMAN: Not from Staff.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Anyone else? Okay. Now if you want to bring it up.

MS. BOWMAN: So we’re moving on to Exhibit Number 9, which is Docket Number U-35991. It’s Entergy Louisiana’s application for recovery and rates of costs related to Hurricanes Laura, Delta, Zeta, and Winter Storm Uri and for related relief. It’s a discussion and possible vote on a uncontested stipulated settlement.

On April 30, 2021, Entergy filed a quantification application to determine the prudence of its restoration efforts after the landfalls of Hurricanes Laura, Delta, and Zeta and Winter Storm Uri. The damage resulting from these storms resulted in ELL incurring significant recovery costs to restore service to customers and to reconstruct the transmission and distribution systems in Entergy’s service area.

Entergy also requested that the Commission certify that the resulting costs are eligible for recovery, direct the manner of recovery of those costs from its customers, approve the re-establishment of storm escrow funding levels of $290 million, and authorize the recovery of carrying costs on the approved storm costs net of the applicable escrow amounts. Notice of the company’s quantification application was published in the Commission’s Official Bulletin with the Alliance for Affordable Energy, the Louisiana Energy Users Group, the Louisiana Utility Restoration Corporation, Marathon Petroleum Company, and Walmart intervening.

On July 30, 2021, Entergy filed its financing application wherein Entergy sought the Commission’s approval and authorization for the LURC to finance the storm
restoration cost authorized for recovery, related carrying costs, storm reserve
replenishment costs, and financing costs to the issuance of system restoration bonds
pursuant to Act Number 55 of the Louisiana Regular Session of 2007 as
supplemented by Act Number 293 of the Louisiana Regular Session of 2021. The
financing application included a proposed financing order that details the financing
arrangement requested by the company. Entergy also filed its ancillary application
on July 30, 2021 wherein Entergy requested that the Commission approve tariffs
for the company to implement ancillary rate adjustments or offsets relating to
elements other than those addressed in the financing application. As a result of
these additional filings, the docket was republished in the Commission’s Official
Bulletin with no additional parties intervening. On August 29, 2021, during the
pendency of this matter, Hurricane Ida made landfall resulting in significant
additional recovery costs to repair Entergy’s electrical facilities with preliminary
estimates of being between 2 and $2.4 billion. On September 30, 2021, Entergy
and the LURC filed a third supplemental joint application requesting that the
Commission establish a $1 billion restricted Hurricane Ida escrow fund and that
these additional funds be funded through the securitization financing already under
consideration for Hurricanes Laura, Delta, and Zeta and Winter Storm Uri as part
of the financing application. The docket was then republished again in the
Commission’s Official Bulletin with no additional parties intervening. Following
discovery, Entergy, Commission Staff, Marathon, LEUG, and Walmart reached a
settlement agreement and executed an uncontested stipulated settlement which was
filed into the record on February 10, 2022. A hearing on the stipulated settlement
was held on February 16, 2022, and the settlement was not opposed by the Alliance nor the LURC. The major terms are as follows: $2,056,849,979 of Entergy’s storm restoration expenditures related to Hurricanes Laura, Delta, and Zeta and Winter Storm Uri are reasonable and prudent and eligible for recovery from Entergy’s customers. Entergy’s carrying costs through February 1, 2022 of 50.6 million are reasonable and eligible for recovery from customers. Additional carrying costs of 3.2 million per month starting February 1, 2022 shall be eligible for recovery from customers until permanent financing occurs. Entergy is allowed to re-establish a storm reserve of $290 million. Entergy shall be allowed to finance $1 billion for a Hurricane Ida specific escrow account. The cost allocation methodology, which is the same as previously adopted by the Commission in Order Number U-32764B, shall be adopted for system restoration costs, storm reserve costs, and Hurricane Ida escrow amounts. And 7) is riders financed storm cost IV and storm costs offset IV are approved. As there are no unresolved issues, Staff recommends that the Commission approve the issuance of a financing order, a quantification order, and an ancillary order consistent with the terms of the uncontested stipulated settlement filed into the record on February 10, 2022. And I have a motion by Vice Chairman Francis. Do you want me to read it?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Can you read that for me, please?

MS. BOWMAN: I will.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Chairman, when you get a moment, I want to make a comment about it just before we move forward.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Absolutely.
MS. BOWMAN: All right. Motion by Vice Chairman Francis. I move that we approve the uncontested settlement submitted by the parties in this case. The propose securitization will allow for a low cost financing at AAA bond rate and save customers approximately $2.5 billion relative to traditional utility financing. There is significant uncertainty and volatility in the current bond markets and it’s important that the Commission act now to protect ratepayers from future potential bond and rate increases. I also understand that the projected bond structure may require a higher payment in the first months and, if the settlement is approved, I direct the company, Staff, and intervenors to work together to agree on a plan to mitigate, if necessary, approximately $6 million a month for June and July 2022 for customers’ bills, with those amounts to be deferred and recovered from customers in a future period without a return on equity. This mitigation period would reduce customer bills for the months where settlement charges approved today would likely be in place before prior finance storm charges for Hurricanes Gustav and Ike are removed from bills. And I ask that any agreed upon plan be presented to the Commission at its March meeting. Therefore, Vice Chairman Francis moves the approval of the stipulated settlement and separately moves the approval of the directive to Staff and Entergy.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Thank you, Ms. Bowman.

MS. BOWMAN: You’re welcome.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Are we done with the reading of the motion?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: In addition to that, I have Commissioner Skrmetta who would like to make an addition --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: If anybody wants to second it first, I’ll wait.

MS. BOWMAN: Is there a second to Vice Chairman Francis’ motion?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Second.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah. I want to bring to the Commission’s attention and also the audience attention that we’ve been entering into discussions with the help of Congressman Troy Carter and with Secretary Fudge of HUD to attempt to access additional block grant money to bring in and help potentially reduce the overall cost of this issue. A requirement of this is that each additional accessing of a grant will require a letter from Governor Edwards to make the request to Secretary Fudge. We’re having a letter prepared for the Commissioners to sign to ask the Governor to make this additional request. Secretary Fudge has indicated that she will welcome the request but says that each request needs to come with an additional letter. And we’ve discussed this matter with Entergy, and that if we are successful in getting additional grant money from HUD that they will apply this and do an offset to potentially reduce this amount even further as we move forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. At this time, we’d like to discuss the item. Will the, of course, the most interested parties come forward? We may need a few more chairs. I think -- Entergy, the attorneys involved, Staff attorneys. We have consultants on this deal as well? Did we have a consultant on this one?
MS. BOWMAN: We do. We have both an accounting consultant and a securitization consultant.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Yeah, we may need to find a few more chairs. Well, let me defer the mic at this time to -- are we all seated? Okay. First of all, I’d like you to introduce yourselves, and then I’ll let Commissioner Campbell start the meeting -- start the discussion.

MR. PHILLIP MAY: I’ll start. I’m Phillip May representing Entergy Louisiana.

MR. MARK KLEEHAMMER: Mark Kleehammer representing Entergy Louisiana.

MR. PAUL ZIMMERING: Paul Zimmering with the Stone Pigman Law Firm, special counsel to the Commission in this matter.

MR. MARK GOODING: Mark Gooding [INAUDIBLE].

MR. BILL BARTA: Good morning, Commissioners. Bill Barta, Henderson Ridge Consulting on behalf of the LPSC Staff.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: First of all, I’m glad to be down here, and I have a dual object -- do you know what dual objects are? I used about to hear about them in school. My -- not presentation, things I want to talk to you affects a couple of different things, and just bear with me a little bit. First of all, I was just talking to Senator -- I mean, not Senator Greene, I was thinking about his daddy --

COMMISSIONER GREENE: At least you don’t call me boy anymore.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Sometimes.
COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And Mr. Lambert, I asked Mr. Greene when he was born, and he was born in what year?


COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And Mr. Lambert, when were you born?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: 1965.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Well, let me -- I got in politics in ’76. Mr. Greene was two and Mr. Lambert was 11. I want to give you a little bit of chronology before I get blamed of being anti New Orleans. Okay. I voted for New Orleans every time I could in the legislature. Some of my best friends from Sidney Barthelemy to Hank Braden and all and I got along with the great Bill Jefferson, it goes through the roof. Believe it or not, in 1976, the hottest issue in Louisiana was whether or not we ought to complete the Superdome, and in north Louisiana, it was very, very unpopular, very unpopular. We all know that would have been a tremendous mistake if we hadn’t done that because it’s been -- it’s one of the greatest assets, if it’s not the greatest asset we got in Louisiana. And every -- every ballgame that’s down here, they talk about the great city of New Orleans. But anyway, it started off costing 50 million or something like that and went, of course, up to a 100 million and all the politicians in north Louisiana were saying are you for it or are you against it, pretty much what it was, you know. So I was for it. And thank God we passed it. And I never will forget we -- I came to New Orleans -- I was teaching school in a classroom at Haughton High School. And if you can visualize this, I ate in the cafeteria every day, and all of a sudden I got elected and I was a big shot, you know what I mean. And I was flying to New Orleans to talk...
with these people. They took me up in the hotel where you look at the crescent city
and all. And I’ve been eating red -- whatever we eat at school every day, all of a
sudden everybody was saying Senator Campbell and blah, blah, blah, you know,
your head swells up and you think you’re really somebody but you’re not anybody
but just Foster Campbell. But anyway, you get up there and they start talking about
social economics. I said what in the hell are they talking about, social economics,
and then I realized how important the Superdome is to this community, and not just
this community, the whole state of Louisiana. Everywhere we go, people talk about
the Superdome and they always want to go to New Orleans, that’s the best place to
go, international city. It’s the best place to go in the country. I have friends, they’re
all out in the panhandle of Texas, and when they come to see me, first thing, they
don’t want to stay in Bossier City, they say when we going to New Orleans. So it’s
a great city. I said that to say this: I’m not against New Orleans. I’m for New
Orleans. I’m for the state of Louisiana. But I want you to think with me, if you
could, just a minute or two, every Commissioner up here represents a million
people. We represent more than congressional districts. I represent 24 parishes. If
you pretty much go from Alexandria, with the exception of a couple, to Arkansas,
and from Texas to the middle of the Mississippi River. It’s a huge area. From one
point to the other point, sometimes it’s over 200 miles. Anyway, we’re talking
about storm damages and things like that. I am having a hard time telling these
people, a million people in north Louisiana, why they have to pay for all this storm
damage when it didn’t occur there, it hasn’t occurred. Just for a simple little
example, I think there was -- on poles, distribution poles, I’m not talking about
transmission poles, I’m talking about just poles. District 1 had 35 percent of the
damage, District 4 had 24 percent, District 3 had 20 percent, District 1 had 17, and
I got about 3 percent damage. So when I go to Monroe or wherever I go and you
make a speech at the Rotary Club or wherever, people remind me -- and I did vote
for Katrina because it was terrible -- when’s that going off our bill, when’s that
going off our bill, and I tell them, you know, best thing is I can tell them is we have
ice storms, they come up here and fix that. Since I’ve been a Commissioner, since
20 years, we’ve had about three ice storms. And a ice storm is a lot of difference
than a huge hurricane. You live in north Louisiana, you know. I mean, in two
weeks we got the lights back on and things are fixed. So proportionally, we pay
very little, but we’re taxed the same that people who have a lot of damage. I
understand that. But anyway, I am in the insurance business. And let me give you
an example. They talk about risk. Mr. Greene would know this, it was his district.
I have a pretty nice house, nothing big. But anyway, I compared my homeowner’s
rate at Elm Grove, Louisiana to Clinton, Louisiana. Same house, same company
now, not the Hartford or the Aetna or All State or State Farm, the same company
that writes my house, I got a quote for them in Jackson. And by the way, Jackson
-- Mr. Greene knows this, is north of I-10 a good bit, 40 miles, 50 miles. So I didn’t
look below I-10 because it’s worse. But my homeowners is $2,000 a year and the
same house in Jackson, Louisiana is $4,000 a year. Now, insurance companies call
that risk. And it costs more for insurance down here than it does in Shreveport.
Why? Because, it’s simple, they have more damage down here and the insurance
company’s not going to write it the same. You’re going to pay more down here
than you do in Shreveport or north Louisiana or Jena or wherever. But that’s the
way we’re doing this now, north Louisiana pays the same thing as south Louisiana.
I got problems with that, and you would, too, if you represented north Louisiana.
You -- I got some questions about that. How does that work? I know you’re going
to tell me that in north Louisiana, you might have way out in the country, you might
have 10 people at eight miles. There’s not many people on the lines. I hear that.
But you -- I asked Mr. May, you real disappointed in north Louisiana, he said that’s
where it cost the most. I said sell it. He don’t want to sell them. So how about
Entergy selling north Louisiana and -- or split it up and have a north Louisiana,
south Louisiana. He ain’t interested in selling it though. They like it because we
provide the numbers. We provide the numbers, but we’re on the low end of the
stick. That’s what I’m saying. But that’s not -- and I have a directive to look into
that and see what we can come up with. But I have some things I want to ask you,
Mr. May, that I’m deeply troubled. You all know or, I’m sure, I’m a proud a
democrat. And I worry about people’s pocketbooks and poor people and that’s our
job up here. We’re all supposed to be on the people’s side. I’m not saying you’re
not. I’m not saying that. But I got some questions about your company that I’m
deeply troubled about. First of all, it is a fact all said and done these people won’t
pay a quarter. We all know that, don’t you? These folks, Entergy, will not pay one
quarter when it’s all said and done. It will be paid for by the ratepayers. Well, let’s
just get that out there on the table, not one quarter will they be responsible for.
Now, they’ll say well, we’re doing this and somebody told me yesterday, well, we
lost a lot of business during that storm because nobody was buying electricity.
Well, Mr. Greene is in the hospital business. They blow the hospital away, he don’t
-- he missed seeing a lot of patients. Well, he don’t get -- refund those patients, he
tells them to come a month from now. You get back in line and I’ll see you, but
they don’t pay him like that. So Entergy hinted to me that they want their money
when they -- the storm came. Well, that’s a lot to ask. I’m not for that. I’m in the
insurance business, and my business blows away, when I put it back, people that
didn’t come in and buy insurance from me, I just hope they come back. That’s
some thinking I don’t quite understand. But here’s what bothers me the most. Mr.
Denault, who is the president of Entergy Corporation in Louisiana, and he ought to
be at some of these meetings. We’re in his backyard. Mr. Denault, he should be
down here sometimes. I know why he don’t want to come because it’s unpleasant,
but it ought to be -- he ought to be sitting right where you are, Phillip because I got
something to ask him today. Dear Mr. Denault, sitting up in your big office up
there, how are you going to explain to my million people up in north Louisiana not
all that you represent, that your salary went from 10 million to 14 million during
these troubled times. How are you going to explain that to them? Well, I know
what he’s going to say. He’ll say that effects -- well, blah, blah, blah. How you
explain, Mr. Denault, that you gave out $1.5 billion worth of dividends during these
troubled times? How do you explain that to people? I mean, seriously. Dividends,
people that buy stock, they ain’t worried about $15 a month. We all got stock up
here. It ain’t going to affect one person in this room, you pay 15 or not, but let me
tell you something, in north Louisiana, which is if not the poorest part of the United
States, some parts, it’s next to it. Only championed by Mississippi, which is a
terrible statistic. Fifteen dollars a month up there is a big deal when the average salary in some of those parishes, annual, is 15,000 a year or so, below poverty, way below poverty. I -- that just troubles me. And then they want to go to Washington and borrow 500 million from the federal government to help out a corporation. You got a corporation that’s making plenty money. Okay. And say it’s all just for the ratepayers of Louisiana. Well, that’s halfway true. It ain’t all true. That’s the best way to get the money. You get everybody feeling sorry for us and we need it because this district was devastated. I understand that. So you say I’m going to go to Washington and I’m going to get all this money, 500 million from the federal government, although I’m a corporation now and I don’t mind paying $1.5 billion worth of dividends to my stockholders and I don’t mind giving Mr. Denault a raise from 10 million to 16 million a year because he needs it, but let me tell you the other side of that money. If I got a company and the poles -- Mr. Greene’s been talking about this. I don’t know if all the poles are good or bad, whatever. But if they had bad poles, they’re fixing to get new poles. And who’s paying for that? The United States government. Maybe you should have been paying for that all along. I don’t know. But you -- you go up there, but that’s not what you saying though. You’re saying is -- and look, I like you guys personally, okay. I think you’re a good fellow, and I really do. I have a lot of respect for you. You got a job representing a huge company. I couldn’t represent them because I’m not on y’all’s side. But anyway, the best way to go borrow money from the government -- and I’m not -- I did it myself before I thought about it. I wrote a letter to all the congressmen, give us 500 million. Well, the best way to do that is say the people
of Louisiana are suffering and we need that. We need that to shore up our system.

Well, when they shore up their system, guess who that helps. Well, it helps their people, but it also helps them a lot, too. You know why? Because if they ever wanted to sell Entergy -- and I’m not saying you’d sell it, but everything’s for sell. Don’t tell me. When the money gets right it’s a sold sucker. It’s gone. You increased all your assets by shoring them up. Well, if you take the 500 million and -- well, anyway, you’ll get a chance to answer. I got some questions. But anyway, I’m just troubled, and I’m not talking about you personally -- by your company’s arrogance. Absolutely arrogance. To know that we’re in troubled times in Louisiana and you give $1.5 billion dividends and Vanguard is your largest -- and I got some Vanguard. You know Vanguard has those funds, you know, you buy into them and they might spread it out. Vanguard’s got -- owns 20 percent of your stock. But Vanguard’s all over America. That guy that buys some Vanguards whatever in Philadelphia, he probably ain’t worried about $13. That guy’s buying some Vanguard in New York or Chicago, he ain’t worried about $13. But that little guy up at Pioneer, Louisiana or Ringgold or Monroe, a lady on a fixed income or a man on a fixed income, they probably worried about it. So I’m saying I don't know who’s running your company and who’s using their head. Is it all about money? Then you can answer -- you can shake your head yes. Then I’d understand it. It’s about money. It’s about stockholders. But I’m worried about your company, worried about ratepayers. Now, what I would like to do in the future -- first of all, I’m not voting for this today because I can’t. I think it’s unequally distributed. That’s just me. But I understand there’s another one coming up. Another billion
dollar deal, 1.5 billion or something like. And if it’s 3 billion and the other one’s is 1.5 billion, that means it will be another $5, so we go to 15. And if we have any other storms, which I hope we don’t, but I was reading the Wall Street Journal the other day. The two most likely states to have storms is Louisiana and Texas and our coasts are the worse for many reasons, but I won’t get into all of that. But anyway, we could have more storms and we keep piling another $5 on and another $5 on, after a while, you’re talking about a little money. What I’d like for this Commission to look at and in that resolution I would ask you to read in just a second about the discrepancy between north and south Louisiana, that can be explained, and I’m ears about it. I want you guys to put up some money. Y’all ain’t putting up anything. Your stockholders are not paying one dime on this. The only -- and they’re making the money. So I’d like to say in the future, not just for you, SWEPCO and Cleco, all the investor-owned companies. Y’all come up here and you want all this money back from fixing storms, but you’re not asking -- you’re not getting your stockholders to put up any money. So why can’t y’all put up half the money? If it’s 3 billion, why can’t your stockholders put up 1.5 billion. We put up 1.5 billion. Instead of being $10 a month, it’s $5 a month. Well, I ask people around, you know what they say? That’s never been done before, you can’t do that. Then I ask one of our guys, they said there’s no rule against that. Yeah, they can do it. They don’t want to do it. So I’m tired of -- and this is not a anti New Orleans deal that I’m voting against this money for storm recovery. I’m for the storm recovery. I think we’re getting the bad end of the stick. I’m thinking ratepayers are paying for it all. And I think these companies that make millions and they can
pay their president 16 million a year up from 10, he can’t pay. You can pay. You can pay, Mark. And all of them. Do you know what the ratio of Mr. Denault -- pay ratio is compared to the average salary? Not the cheapest salary, the average salary in Entergy? The ratio is 106 to 1. He makes $106 compared to $1 for the average -- now, the average guy that works for Entergy makes 70, $80,000 a year. He ain’t up in Claiborne Parish making $18,000 a year. He makes 70, $80,000 a year. That’s how out of whack this thing is. This man’s sitting downtown in a big office, sitting in a big fat chair and not coming to this meeting. He sent these guys to take all the heat. He ought to be right here. His salary is 106 times somebody making 50 or $60,000 a year. I’m not talking about people making 1,500 a month. I’m talking about somebody making 70 or 80. He makes a 106 times more. This is nuts. And we are the Public Service Commission and we’re looking out for people. And I do know that we can’t shut down these companies because it causes a lot of problems. I got it, Paul. I mean, I know what you’re going to tell me. Yeah. I’m all about it. I want them to be healthy. Evidently, they’re pretty healthy though when they can give $1.5 million worth of dividends. They’re not going broke. If they was going broke, they wouldn’t give out the dividends. Now, they’re going to tell me what their stock falls and that will cause the company to look weak, this, that, and the other. There’s always a hundred reasons that you can’t do that. But I would like for the Public Service Commission, Brandon, to look at the possibility forward, not today, because I know it’s too late today. This would cause all kind of hell. I don't know what it would cause. They’d tell you it’s going to -- the world’s going to blow up if we didn’t pass this today. Everything would stop and...
there wouldn’t be a New Orleans. Okay. But that’s not the case. But anyway, down the road when you come back for you another 1.5 billion, you need to come with some money saying we heard you, we want 1.5 billion. We’re willing to eat 750 million and we’ll meet you in the middle. But we’ve never asked them to do that. So I’m asking today, Brandon, check that out and get you some good consultants and I think it would be money well spent to look at it and inside out, outside in, every way. Because I’m sick of the free ride that you all get. I’m sick of it. Not you. Not just your company. And the SWEPCO people out there, too. They going to come to the same thing. I’m not letting SWEPCO off or Cleco. By the way Cleco, you got the highest rates in the state, you’re doing real good, about 13 cents a kilowatt hour. You all need a trophy. So I mean, let’s get this thing fairer. So that’s all I got. And please, I like you, Phillip. You’re always welcome in my office. Mark is always courteous, but you’re working for some people that are greedy. That’s how I’d say it in north Louisiana is greed is driving your company and it should not be greed and it’s our job to reduce the greed and pass it on to the people. That’s all I got to say.

SECRETARY FREY: And Commissioner Campbell, you want me to read your --

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Chair, can I have a minute?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Greene asked for the next, I’ll make sure you’re right after Commissioner Greene. Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yeah, Mr. Zimmering, I have some questions for you. Is my mic on?
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: You have to speak into and then they adjust it.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay. So Mr. Zimmering, can you briefly explain how the Commission came to utilize the process of securitization?

MR. ZIMMERING: Certainly. Securitization --

MS. BOWMAN: Paul -- Z -- Z, can you move the mic closer.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Do you mind repeating your question one more time?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yeah. Mr. Zimmering, can you explain how the process of securitization came to be?

MR. ZIMMERING: Certainly. Securitization basically should be looked at as a mechanism utilized to reduce financing costs in situations like this. Rather than pay utilities weighted average cost of capital, securitization provides the opportunity for the payment to be simply at a AAA rated interest rate. In this particular case, the weighted average cost of capital for Entergy is about 8.49 percent. The best information we have today from the underwriters is that the sale of bonds may take place in a 2.77 percent range. The projected savings are about $2.5 billion nominal, 900 million net present value over the 15 year term of the bonds. In addition, there’s no profit to the utility when you use securitization. There’s no return on equity to securitization. It’s debt only financing. The last part of securitization, why it can be so helpful is, as you all know, and Commissioner Campbell was just referring to, hurricanes in Louisiana are when situations, they’re not if situations. So if you can use securitization to finance storm reserves against the next storm, it makes sense to buy those storm reserves with inexpensive cash rather than cash at the weighted average cost of capital.
COMMISSIONER GREENE: So based on that, can we say no to this, what happens if we say no to it, and is there a different way that could be better than that?

MR. ZIMMERING: Well, the short answer is yes, you could say no to this application, but if the restoration, repair, and rebuilding costs were prudently incurred, under traditional ratemaking, the utility has -- or should have an opportunity to recover those costs. And financing, as I said, with 2.7 percent money rather than 8.5 percent money makes senses. I would add, however, that in the settlement that we put together, there are safeguards that have been in place to protect ratepayers, first, to ensure that only prudently incurred costs are being paid for; second, that those costs were just ELL incurred costs; and third, the monies that Commissioner Skrmetta was talking about, should there be some recovery of costs, for example through community development block grants or if any insurance proceeds should come through for generating units or if there are tax credits that come through, those are going to stick to the ratepayers and not to company. They’re going to be flowed through dollar for dollar with none of that money sticking to ELL.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So and then can you comment on how we go to the 3.2 billion, how much more is out there, and when that’s coming, and also how the savings -- well, just comment on how we got to the 3.2 billion.

MR. ZIMMERING: Okay. I’m going to defer to Bill Barta on the $3.2 billion.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And the other question was: How was that vetted?

MR. ZIMMERING: How was it vetted?
MS. BOWMAN: Yeah. And Bill, if you can speak into the mic.

MR. BARTA: Hey, Commissioner Greene. So there’s a lot of moving parts on how we got to the 3.2 billion, approximately, that’s going to be securitized subject to the Commission’s approval. So the hurricane -- 2020 hurricane restoration costs were about 2.0 billion even. And then there was a Winter Storm Uri event and that was about another 50 million. The carrying costs are projected to be about $52 million. And I’m trying to distill this all down to components. And there was offsets from the prior balance in the storm damage reserve of about 250 million. Finally, we’re asking the Commission to replenish the storm reserve fund, up to $290 million that was exhausted when the first hurricane hit in August 2020, Hurricane Laura. Of course you got to know about the $1 billion request for the Hurricane Ida damage and that’s a preliminary estimate of about 2 billion to 2.5 billion, which Commissioner Campbell was talking about another billion and a half dollar application that’s forthcoming from Entergy. And then there’s the balance of that is about 38 million and that’s issuance cost for the securitized bonds. So that kind of totals up to, you know, almost 3.2 billion.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So are the savings that you mentioned of 2 billion nominal, is that for Entergy customers or is that for all customers?

MR. ZIMMERING: That’s for Entergy customers.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Entergy customers. And do the shareholders benefit from us passing this? And if so, how?

MR. ZIMMERING: I guess the principal benefit to the shareholder is that the shareholder is going to receive cash upfront for the storm costs. But the shareholder
makes no return on equity, no profit, in laymen’s term, on this because it’s debt only financing. All of the dollars that are paid by ratepayers are going to go to pay the principal and the interest on the bonds and there’s going to be no return to the utility. Cash flow, they do well because they get the money up front, but there is no profit to the utility. Stated otherwise, none of the dollars that are being paid for go into rate base.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So can you speak to the urgency of why this needs to be done right now and not in a couple months, but also to the 11th hour change that occurred.

MR. ZIMMERING: Okay. Let me defer to Mr. Gooding, our financial advisor as to the importance of doing this now.

MR. GOODING: Okay. [INAUDIBLE] --

MS. BOWMAN: Wait, Mark. Use the -- yeah.

MR. GOODING: Good morning, everybody. You know, the reason you want to approve this now is you’re in a time of historically low interest rates. Interest rates have been going up steadily for the last six months. In fact, the two year treasury is up 73 basis points since the start of the year. The ten year treasury is up 41 basis points and those are the benchmarks that we spread our bond issuance against. So this has become more expensive already. We’re fearful it will become, you know, further expensive as these rate increases come along. So we have volatile markets and the Fed has already introduced the idea of rate increases this year. People are talking about 50 basis point increase in March, which many people think is already baked into the market with the rates going up in January and February that they’re
expecting that and they’ve already pushed that part of it up. But I would say that
the quicker we can get this done the better off we are because this risk of rising
rates.

MR. ZIMMERING: Twenty-five basis points is worth roughly --

MS. BOWMAN: Z, mic.

MR. ZIMMERING: I’m sorry. I apologize. Twenty-five basis points is worth
approximately 70 to $75 million in ratepayer dollars over the course of this deal.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Could you repeat that? Could you repeat -- pull it a
little closer to you.

MR. ZIMMERING: It’s probably the first time in my life somebody told me I
couldn’t be heard.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: These microphones need you to be close to
them they told us.

MR. ZIMMERING: A 25 basis point increase in interest rates would cost
ratepayers about $70 million, just to emphasize what Mr. Gooding was saying and
why it’s so important -- why Staff has felt it was so important to get this to you.
And I might add I believe the intervenors share that concern, and Commissioner
Campbell referred to it as well to get this to you so quickly because times really are
volatile, particularly with what’s going on in Ukraine now as well.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So I have one last question and maybe Mr.
Campbell can help with this as well, but, you know, we all have homeowners
insurance and whatnot. Can these utilities not get insurance for these storms so that
the burden doesn’t fall so much on the ratepayers or would the ratepayers be paying insurance unnecessarily?

**MR. ZIMMERING:** Since the time that Hurricane Andrew hit Homestead, Florida, insurance for transmission lines and towers and distribution lines and poles has virtually been nonexistent in the south. You simply can’t insure that. There is some portion of the generating units that are able to obtain some insurance, but the vast majority of damage as you all know from these storms is to distribution lines, secondarily to transmission lines, and a distant third is to generating units. You just can’t buy it, it’s not available or at least not that we’re aware of.

**COMMISSIONER GREENE:** Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE:** Commissioner Francis.

**COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** So Mr. Zimmering, you would say that we’re pretty well self-insured on our electricity lines like that, right?

**MR. ZIMMERING:** The utility basically self-insures one of the things that -- one of the advantages that securitization has brought in the past has been 250 or 200 -- start at 253 million and it’s grown to $290 million. The reserves against future storms are there so that the utility immediately can go out and start repairing and they have a source of funds, Number 1. Number 2, just as importantly, utilities for Laura, Delta and Zeta, there was no request for interim storm relief from the utilities because they had a storm damage reserve sitting in place that they could draw on. And so we haven’t seen a request for interim rate relief. The last major one was back for Katrina/Rita.
COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Okay. Mr. Kleehammer, let me ask you this, what are the -- how would you compare the electricity rates of Entergy customers in Louisiana compared to other locations in our country? What’s your rates look like compared to theirs?

MR. KLEEHAMMER: Yeah. It’s been a little bit since I’ve looked at that, but I think the national average is more about 13 cents, $130 per thousand kilowatt hours. This month, prior to this, we are at $110.89 for a thousand kilowatt hours for EGSL and 113.59 for ELL. To Commissioner Campbell’s question from earlier about the difference between north and south Louisiana, this differential is a vestige from having a Legacy Entergy Louisiana, Legacy Gulf States Louisiana that we have not -- we’ve merged the companies functionally. Everything is the same, but we haven’t equalized rates. And so we have two things, the base rates are slightly different and we continue to have a fuel tracker that looks at fuel and kind of puts it back into a 2014 view before we had our business combination.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Are Entergy rates, compared to other states, you say you’re in the top five in the nation, would you say?

MR. KLEEHAMMER: I think for the last 10 years, Louisiana’s rates have been in the bottom five, the lowest.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yes.

MR. KLEEHAMMER: But we do recognize that, you know, customers in Louisiana use a lot of electricity. We have large heating loads and the rates are near the bottom. The overall bill is more in the middle of the pack I think. Especially - - I mean, and you know, that’s electric only because I think you need to look at
everybody’s overall energy usage because you have places in the northeast where
you have significant heating, oil, gas, those bills -- that’s where they pay their big
bills. It’s not necessarily on the electrical part, here it is.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Okay. By the way, I don’t think your company’s
greedy. And Commissioner Campbell and I do share some of the north and central
Louisiana properties. We’ve just went through reapportionment here in Louisiana
along with other parts of the country and Commissioner Campbell and I had to
share some real estate. Just for those of you who do not know, Commissioner
Campbell’s received Catahoula Parish and Sabine Parish that was -- were in my
area in the future, but I was blessed with St. Mary Parish, which is another good
one. It’s in the coastal zone and if there were an argument about would we want to
divide Louisiana on storm damage, I don’t think the St. Mary folks would want to,
so those in Catahoula Parish probably would disagree, so it’s been a tough decision
for both of us. I understand his feelings because he has all of north Louisiana, but
I disagree with him about changing the way we do that billing. And lastly, he’s a
democrat, I’m a republican. I don't know what that means, but okay.

MR. KLEEHAMMER: And Commissioner, if I may comment on a couple things
and Commissioner Campbell, to your questions. You know, one aspect on Mr.
Denault’s salary, I think you’re talking about total compensation, and I’m not trying
to split hairs on there, but the difference between total compensation and salary has
a lot to do with what’s recoverable in rates. Back in 2008, we resolved a -- either,
I can’t recall if it was a 2006 or 2007 test year and we removed compensation --
equity based compensation from rates for high management levels within the
company and that would remove probably roughly 80 percent of the numbers that
you said from any possible recovery, so that -- I just wanted to make that point and
I think Phil wanted to discuss the dividend issue.

**MR. MAY:** So Commissioner Campbell, I appreciate your comments and your
concerns.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I bet you do.

**MR. MAY:** I do. I do appreciate your comments and your concerns for your
customers and constituents. We are also concerned with our customers and
constituents. Over the past two years, Entergy did pay out approximately $1.5
billion in dividends. At that same period, we had to go out and borrow money to
make storm repairs. We spent a total amount of roughly $11 billion in capital with
a significant portion of that related to restoring the storm and so forth. So we are
out borrowing money at a pretty hectic rate to restore service to our customers as
quickly as possible. That payment of dividends is consistent with the level of
dividends that are paid by investor-owned utilities in the US. The payout ratio
that’s paid there is a little less than utility companies through the US. And when
you’re out borrowing money, that dividend payment is what gives those folks who
lend money to us, both in the equity markets and debt markets, confidence that they
will be able to have their money back. So not paying those dividends would be like
stopping payment on loans or your credit cards right at the time you need to borrow
significant amount of money to put your house back together. It’s just a practice
that would lend to us either not having access to capital or paying a higher rate for
it.
COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I want to clarify two things. We talked about
self-insurance. Just on the insurance point, now, when you self-insure, that means
you’re willing to take the risk and you pay. If you’re billing, you’re in medical
school, medical billing up there, if y’all self-insure, you can do it. That’s not the
same. You pay for it yourself. That’s what self-insurance about. You don’t need
insurance because you’ll do it yourself. A lot of people do that. A lot of people
buy a brand new car, they got plenty of money, hey, they don’t want any insurance.
They just take liability insurance to cover it. A lot of people do that. I’m not talking
about you cutting out all the dividends. I got just a little bit of stock and I worry
about dividends, especially when an interest rate at a bank is point one half percent
on the CD. Everybody worries about dividends. I’m not saying cut out your
dividends. I’m saying maybe cut them in half. Cut them in half and send some
down -- and the trouble now, I see where you’re headed and I really -- you’re a
company guy and I’m on the other side. I’m on the people side. That’s what we’re
all supposed to be up here, people’s people, and you have a chance and we don’t
want to break you because you deliver electricity, but what you got to realize, and
it’s hard for company people to realize this because, you know, paying dividends
is good. That’s what people who got money that get dividends and worry about.
But just consider that all these people on your line, most of them don’t have
dividends they’re worried about. Most of them have electric bills they’re worried
about and that’s what -- we’re missing the whole point here. I’m not worried so
much about Entergy’s dividends, and to be honest with you, I bet -- I got some of
those funds. I bet you I got some Entergy stock. I’ll bet you because you buy a
fund, I got mutual funds. I don’t know where they go. They buy thousands of
companies, but it’s people that we’re worried about here. The poorest state in
America besides Mississippi. Louisiana lost population, only four parishes in north
Louisiana gained population, four. And the money went down. Bossier, where I
live, gained 10 percent. That’s the best in Louisiana, maybe besides the across the
lake over there. De Soto a whopping 0.2, Ouachita, three percent, no, 0.5 and
Ruston finally made it up to three. There is no parish in central Louisiana that did
not lose population unless you count Beauregard as central Louisiana. I don’t know
if you count it or not, it’s sort of south. But no parish across central Louisiana
gained population. We’re losing population, we have poverty everywhere and
we’re trying to pop it up and what we’re doing is these bills that people pay means
something and y’all are coming back with another one. You’re not doing it on
purpose, you wish you didn’t have to come here today. I know that because we
wish we didn’t have this storm so, you know, Mr. Greene asked you a good
question. Do y’all have any insurance? Let me give you the other side of that, Mr.
Greene. Hell, they don’t need insurance. Why do they need insurance? How about
that, Paul? They don’t need any insurance. They can’t buy it -- why would he buy
insurance? They going to pay -- we going to pay for it. We’re self-insuring them.
Self-insurance means when you take the risk yourself and you put it back because
you bought a new Lincoln today and you come to see Mr. Campbell, I want to buy
some car insurance. I say, okay -- whoa, whoa, whoa, you don’t understand, Mr.
Campbell, tell me what liability cost. I’m not into all the property damage and all
that. I’m going to handle that myself. A lot of my customers do that all the time,
got plenty of money. So basically, y’all don’t need any insurance. You’re self-insured. We’re self-insuring you.

MR. MAY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Hey look, and I’m just pointing at you, but we’re doing the same thing to SWEPCO and Cleco. I’m telling both of them. Y’all wake up here, man. We can’t be your self-insurer.

MR. MAY: Commissioner Campbell, I appreciate your comments. Thank you. I will say that we have no choice because of the lack of availability --

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I understand. I’m not saying you -- I know you wouldn’t -- look, first of all, the storms were terrible, people lost their lives. There’s people still living in houses without roofs on them. I understand that. I’m all for that, pay them, but they don’t have to eat the whole mule here. You make them eat the whole mule. Hey, eat tail and all, I’m fixing to eat it all.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Before it jumps the fence.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I’m just asking you can we share a little bit of this, that’s all. That’s all.

MR. MAY: Listen, again, I appreciate your comments and I understand your concerns. Really, the storm recovery after a storm is not so much about this storm. It’s about how will we be able to respond to the next storm and it’s not about money, it’s not about greed, it’s about ensuring we have a process that allows us to recover these funds so when we have another storm, which we most assuredly will, hopefully many years from now, we have a means to go out and borrow money and quickly repair the system. And this is a market where investors can decide who
they want to invest in. And if they take a -- if you look at Entergy and you look at its ratios on how it compares to other utility companies, it is clear, in fact, one of our analysts that downgraded us recently said it’s a hurricane stock.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** What -- by the way, what’s the price of your stock this morning; do you know?

**MR. MAY:** I didn’t look at it this morning, but I think it’s about $104 a share.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Okay. What was it last year?

**MR. MAY:** Last year, I don’t know. We peaked a little -- like in February, about two years ago was $135 a share.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Yeah, but it was less and it’s gone up a good bit.

**MR. MAY:** It has.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Okay. That’s the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey says. Two sides to every story, you know that, don’t you, Doctor? How much your dividend?

**MR. MAY:** I don’t know exactly what the dividend, but we pay out about a $750 million of dividends a year.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** No, I know, but if I was lucky enough to go buy some stock today, I have $104 and I went and bought me a share of stock or 10 shares had $1,000. I was real lucky.

**MR. MAY:** Right.

**COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** What dividend are y’all paying today?
MR. MAY: I don’t recall the exact amount but it’s in the 3, 3.5 percent range and consistent with what other investor-owned utilities pay.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: That’s a good dividend. Look, I’m not trying to knock your dividend to nothing. That’s a healthy dividend, 3.5 percent.

MR. MAY: It’s consistent with what the other utilities in this industry pay.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Mr. Advisor, I’m talking to you now Mr. Advisor, you.

MR. BARTA: Me?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. BARTA: He’s actually the financial advisor, unless you want to talk to me.

[INAUDIBLE] --

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Okay. I want to talk to you.

MR. BARTA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: What’s his name? Mr. Barta.

MR. BARTA: You want Mark or me?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Both of you be fine since y’all are --

MR. GOODING: Okay. Well we’ll both sit here by the mic.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: What would you call a 3.5 percent dividend, would that be pretty good?

MR. GOODING: I mean, I would say pretty good, but as Entergy has said, it is consistent with utilities. Utilities tend to pay higher dividends than say tech stocks or something like that because there’s not as much upside on the stock price.
COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yeah, but wouldn’t you -- isn’t it true -- I’m going to ask you a question. Isn’t it true that utilities are the safest place to put your money as a whole? Through the years people not looking for a lot of risks, they go to utility companies and put their money in. That’s true, isn’t it?

MR. GOODING: I believe so, at different times, people do that.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And so they’re paying 3.5 percent on a sure bet, pretty much, true.

MR. GOODING: Well, I guess a sure bet in some ways. Utilities are a safe and secure stock. Some people treat them almost like it’s a bond where they say, okay. The stock price is pretty steady, but I get this dividend and it’s -- it was just the way it works around the country.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I appreciate it. I knew some people and I’m bragging on you now, I knew some people that were sick of getting 0.2 percent on CDs and they were worried about the stock market and they were right. Guess what, I mean, everybody’s took a bath the last week.

MR. GOODING: Right.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: But where did they go to put some money is the utilities because as a whole, that is the safest place you can go is the utility stocks because they give a good dividend, they pay and they -- everybody needs electricity so it’s a safe place to do and I understand. You want to keep it safe because that would interrupt your company providing energy. That’s all.

MR. GOODING: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you, Commissioner Campbell. Next I’d like to ask -- give the mic to Commissioner Skrmetta.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can y’all hear me? Okay. Great. You know, I want to thank Commissioner -- Chairman for not calling me a whippersnapper because I think me and Mike Francis, Commissioner Francis, we escaped it. But I’ll be the sort of in between at 58 year, year ‘58, not age. You know, I’m old enough to remember watching the Superdome get built in high school and going when they opened the doors of it and I remember before that, northwest Louisiana were all Cowboys fans and, you know, but now they’re part of the homogeneous family of Saints’ fans which is kind of nice, so. And it’s sort of the -- sort of same sort of mentality about we’re all a homogeneous family of Louisianans and while we all work together to make systems work. So, you know, when we have these hurricanes, we’re are in a position to where -- and I think I can pretty much guess all the Commissioners think this way -- the first thing we say is we don’t want the utilities to spend money and fix things. Or maybe I’m wrong. When we tell utilities to get off their butt and spend what’s necessary to restore the state. We don’t tell them to hold back. We tell them to get out there and we tell them to spend what’s necessary to restore our economy, to restore power, to restore things. They go borrow the money. Then we have a little storm fund and I say little, what a quarter of a billion dollars, but that runs through quick. And when we have more than a million people in southeastern Louisiana and then you had all of southwestern Louisiana out plus you had the ice storm up north out. We had millions of Louisianans without power. We had an economy without power. We
encourage these companies to spend what is necessary to restore the power that’s necessary to drive commerce in this state. We tell them spend the money. We will audit you, we will figure out what’s necessary to pay you back, you’re not going to make a profit on it, you’re going to get your money back, but we are going to make sure that we run a system because there is a value to the state of Louisiana to have a robust utility system, to have one that doesn’t teeter on paying amounts of returns to investors that’s half the value that other states pay. We have to draw money to this state. We don’t have to reject it and bring it to other states because we’ve got a duty and an obligation to make money come to Louisiana for investment, to come to Louisiana to provide good systems for our citizens and, you know, unfortunately, you know, we’re here and we are in a position where we have to fix things. So the good news is we are in a position to move early on this because of the situation in our country, because of inflation, because of rising interest rates, we are moving quickly on this. You know, we created this journey to the street, meaning Wall Street. This securitization process was created by Louisiana. We go here instead of to the banks. And Mr. Zimmering, what would you say the differential is in interest rates on this versus going to the banks where they used to borrow money under this system?

**MR. ZIMMERING:** To give you the differential --

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Just in percentage of interest rate.

**MR. ZIMMERING:** I’m going to defer to Mark on that, but I can give you the differential between financing these costs with the company’s weighted average cost of capital versus financing it through securitization.
COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: So what’s the percentage of interest that we’re looking at on these bonds that we’re moving forward on?

MR. ZIMMERING: Currently, 2.77 percent.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: So if you go to the bank, it’s going to be at least 8 plus, right? Right. So, you know, 5 percent on this money and you’re the, you know, look, I went to public school before I went to private school, so you tell me what that equals in the amount of interest that we would have to pay on -- what would 5 percent difference mean? Come on, you can do it.

MR. GOODING: It’s 5 percent of the 3.2 billion and that amount’s the same every year, so it’s a sizable number.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: I know. It’s a -- right. It’s going to be close to a billion dollars, right? Right.

MR. GOODING: That’s right.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: So we’re saving a billion dollars by a system we created, okay, to avoid going to banks, going directly to Wall Street, using the full faith and credit of ratepayers of this state and avoiding going to the private insurance industry, if there was one. And, you know, and I appreciate Commissioner Campbell’s knowledge of the insurance industry, but I also know he understands that nobody self-insures a car in Louisiana because you couldn’t get a brake tag, you couldn’t get a driver’s license, you couldn’t do any of those things and it all sounds very good, but we are a state of citizens; we have an obligation to provide uniform services, meaning electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, all the things that we work together on to create services. So, you know, unfortunately,
these things all cost money, and we are unfortunately, subject to damage and, you
know, my issue is, you know, it’s a terrible thing that we have to face. Now, the
one big question I have is, the money that we are recovering, is this money that --
and this is a question for Entergy, this is money you already spent, correct?

**MR. MAY:** That’s correct.

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. So you spent this money to fix this
system so that your customers that are citizens of Louisiana could have power,
correct?

**MR. MAY:** That’s correct.

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** And this is money you spent to fix systems so
the economy of Louisiana could come back and begin work, correct?

**MR. MAY:** That’s also correct.

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Okay. And so you spent this money, and how
many months -- how many days did you spend this amount of money, about what
do you think? I know you have the hurricanes from last year, but Ida, you spent a
billion dollars in what, a month and a half?

**MR. MAY:** Yeah, well, for instance, in 2020, 75 days is what we spent for, you
know --

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA:** Could you move that microphone closer to
you? I’m sorry.

**MR. MAY:** So essentially, 75 days with the 2020 storm season, that was Laura,
Delta, Zeta --
COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: So that’s 2 billion, right. So you know, we’re
talking about you rolling through capital like a freight train to help the citizens of
Louisiana get back and up and running and getting our economy going. So look,
it’s a tough thing to do to pay the butcher’s bill, right, and it’s a tough thing for us
to do as Commissioners to understand that there is a value to the money spent. And
our job is to always make sure that we get the best bang for the buck. It’s not to
diminish profit. It’s not to diminish loss. You’re not getting a profit on this. It’s
not to look at companies and say oh, they have profit. You want to hear about
profit, we have to look at when somebody sells a co-op that the money doesn’t go
to another nonprofit, that money gets divided up amongst its members. It doesn’t
sound very nonprofit to me. So, you know, when we’re looking at, you know, profit
companies, you know, we look at you guys and we say, well, you’ve got
shareholders, right. Your shareholders bring money so you can build power plants
and build transmission and build distribution and that makes us a secure and stable
energy system for our citizens. So, you know, I appreciate the fact that you went
out and brought in tens of thousands of workers from all part of, what forty-
something states and brought them in to fix everything for everybody. I appreciate
you got the power back on in New Orleans, Jefferson, St. Charles, Baton Rouge
and you got it back on in four, five days, in the beginning, very quickly on Ida and
then you rolled it back in over a period of another four or five days, which was, I
think, a tabletop exercise that the national utility systems could look at as a
tremendous engineering feat and I think that what you’ve done is impressive. I
don’t want you to make a penny more than necessary to pay you back. And to
thank you, I want to build the storm fund, that is important for us to be there, and I
want us to be a secure and attractive state for investors to come here so we’ve got
a stable system because Louisiana is a important strategic business facility for the
nation and we help our people earn a living. We help our people find jobs because
people want to invest in our state and everything runs on power. Everything runs
on gas. Everything runs on all the things that this Commission develops, and it
means that having stable systems that aren’t looking at a bankruptcy or failure to
attract revenue is important, so I thank you for laying out the cash. I thank you for
getting it fixed as quick as you did. And, you know, I’m going to support you
getting your money back and I’m sorry that it has to be done this way, but it’s the
cheapest way possible for the public, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. I think everyone’s had an opportunity. Is
there anyone else that has something to say? Commissioner Campbell, and if any
other Commissioners have anything else, let’s wrap it up. Commissioner
Campbell, you’re up next.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I agree with Mr. Skrmetta. I agree with him.
Might be one of our first times.

MS. BOWMAN: Closer to your mic, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I agree with Mr. Skrmetta, y’all hear that? I
agree with him. This is the best way to do it. I voted for it last time. This is sort
of a new process, isn’t it, Paul? We haven’t done this a lot, securitization?

MR. ZIMMERING: Yes, we’ve done -- we’ve done six prior to this one.
COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Well, but I mean, it’s not like it used to be. This is something new, securitization, relatively new.

MR. ZIMMERING: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: That’s right. Well, I guess I voted for every one of them, and I agree that this is the best way to do it. My problems to -- my problem is that my folks are not affected and there’s no way to give them any kind of break, just pay for it all. That’s my problem and -- but I’ve got a new twist, Paul, y’all never tried before. I would ask the companies to put up a little bit too. That’s what’s missing here. This is all the people putting the money up and there’s no rule, I ask you, and I asked Lane and I’ll ask you, Mr. Barta, there’s no rule that says these companies can’t help, they can put up some money too. There’s no rule that prohibits that. So I agree. I like the way you do it, you borrowing money at three percent. I’m all for that. This just affects my district different than it does everybody else. I voted for it in the past. I agree with Mr. Skrmetta, this is the best way to do it. But I got a little new twist y’all never heard about till today. Ask SWEPCO and Cleco and Entergy, put a little of their money in it too. We might would -- actually, we might reduce instead of $10 a month, we might reduce it down to eight or six if they put up a little money. I just got to thinking about it, Mr. -- we talking about reinsurance. Why would they need reinsurance? They don’t need any insurance. We’re going to pay. So anyway, I’m voting no. And I hope next time you come up with one of these things, we can look at it and maybe the companies will put up a little bit and that’d make me feel a lot better, but that’s just me.
SECRETARY FREY: And, Commissioner Campbell, you want me to read what we’ve got?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Read.

SECRETARY FREY: So this will kind of explain what Commissioner Campbell is asking. Given my concerns regarding the recovery utility storm damage costs from those unaffected or only partially affected by storms, I ask Staff to investigate alternative methods to allocate damage recovery costs to geographical classes of customers. Further, I direct Staff to determine whether such alternative forms of damage recovery are being employed in other jurisdictions and whether costs can be passed on or shared by the shareholders of the utility. The investigation should examine historical data on the paths of a storm affecting Louisiana beginning with Katrina and Rita in ’05 and concluding with Hurricane Ida in 2021. It should distinguish various categories of electric utilities storm damage including distribution, transmission, and generation systems.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Basically, all -- I’m asking just to look at it, see if there’s any way to -- the way we’re doing is fair by north Louisiana. If it’s not, I understand that. Show it to me. But I want to see it. Next thing, to look at the possibility of the companies putting up some money. That’s all. If they can’t and I understand. They got good lawyers, I’m not demanding it. I just thought about it and said maybe we ought to look at that. That’s all. Ask the Staff to look at it.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Everyone complete? All right. Well, my turn.

Great. All right. First of all, I want to thank all my Commissioners for such
important comments and words. I want to thank the people sitting before us who have a tough job to do, too. But to get -- keep my Commissioner hat on, as you heard, all five Commissioners weighed in from a different perspective today. Slightly different, but different. Everyone found some part of this that got their attention, that made them want to discuss this very, very important matter for Louisiana. Whenever we come to securitization or paying for storm damage or recovery, it becomes a very difficult day at a place like the Louisiana Public Service Commission and I understand it. I was elected some time ago and the week I opened my office, we got hit with Hurricane Katrina. I didn’t even have a fax machine yet, well, I don’t have a fax machine now, but I didn’t have a max machine, yet. And I didn’t have a phone set up yet before my building was shut down here in New Orleans because of Hurricane Katrina. Couldn’t get to that office and my staff was displaced and we were all out of our homes as well. I bring that up because I understand hurricanes, I understand disasters, and I understand how difficult it is for the utility companies to pay for it. That was probably, and I’m looking at the experts that are set before me today, I think that was the first time that we used securitization as a tool or method to pay for it. So I was glad to say that I was part of the first securitization discussion or to think that I had some input in it, too. I know I was very vocal about it then. The -- but as I listen to my Commissioners, all extremely strong, articulate, and good points but slightly different, but they’re all right in some way. They’re all very right because they’re representing their constituents. We all come from five different districts that represent Louisiana, five different points of views and we make these decisions that
affect all of Louisiana, so it’s important that everyone is considered. I thought the comments were great. I won’t single my Commissioners out but, sure, I trust the Staff that offer this securitization package because I know how hard they work to make Louisiana as reliable in its restoration, repair, and recovery as any state in the union after a disaster. And I know we do so as cheap as possible and I say cheap, but it’s billions of dollars we have to recover, but we do so as reasonable and cheap as possible so that the people have the least amount of burden or one that’s able to be tacked on as possible and I say securitization. What I mean by that is securitization seems to be a better method than what we know as traditional ratemaking. But it’s not easy and it’s not cheap and all of us, whether we’re in south Louisiana, north Louisiana, whether we got hit by Hurricane Laura to the west or Hurricane Ida to the east or an ice storm in the north, all of us are from Louisiana. We have to pay our fair share. But I heard Commissioner Campbell say some very interesting points, and I’m glad there’s a directive for us to examine some of the things that are important to him, not just him, to the fairness of the process is what I heard. He wants to make sure, and I back him on this, that the process has an element of fairness for him to feel satisfied in these securitizations. That doesn’t mean I’m agreeing with him. It doesn’t mean I’m agreeing with the companies. I think it’s important for us to constantly reinvent the process, to constantly examine the fairness of the process. And when these storms hit, we can talk about the company got it or the people got hit, the fact is Louisiana gets hit and whether all the citizens are in it together or the utility companies are in it together, the fact is true that we are all, be it utility company, resident, commercial, industrial,
business people, government, religious, whatever segment you consider yourself part of, we get hit together. And we have to figure out the best way to securitize these damages and recover as quickly and cheaply as possible with a element of fairness that is sensitive to all of us. I don’t like these storms. None of us do, but when they happen, they happen to all of us. So I understand some of the issues with the process. I want to talk about, very briefly, some of the things that were said. I want to say I agree and I’m thankful for the lowest -- some of the lowest rates in the country by utility companies, but I’m really glad to hear Mr. Kleehammer chime that back with a little bit -- just a little bit of putting into perspective, but we don’t have the lowest bills in the country because we use a lot of electricity here. So the rate is an element of the equation; when you tack on usage, that’s how you get your bill. And I want to say one thing to you. I have a lot of constituents, I think a million Foster reminded me of. We have a million constituents and nobody ever called me about a rate, but I get hundreds of calls every month about a bill. They’re unhappy with the utility bills. They don’t ask me what the rate is. They want to know why do they have to pay so much money, and that’s the way we have to look at these things going forward. And the fact of the matter is this is part one of a process. We’re not finished with paying for these storms that have already hit us. We have to come back in a short period of time and consider a securitization plan for the rest of the damage that’s still lingering in Louisiana, the rest of Ida, and then we have to also start to prepare ourselves for next season because as said before, and I hope Philip’s correct, it’ll be many years down the road before we get hit with another one, but we’ll probably have another
one in our future. And I hope you’re right, fingers crossed, down the road, a couple of years. I also want to say that there’s market interests at play. The quickness of getting this done is important to this Commission, the people, the companies, everybody, the bankers because we’re looming with the possibility and the very likelihood or likely possibility of interest rate increases, pardon me, interest rate increases, and that has the potential for taking a securitized amount of money like this, that is borne on the expense of the ratepayers, to go up as interest rates go up. And what we don’t want is to risk interest rates continuing to climb while we take a longer amount of time to complete this deal. In short, that means the more time we take, the more likelihood that the interest rates rising. Therefore, the more expensive this is, if you follow my math -- are we good? Okay. So speed is of the essence that we do these things quickly. To push back on that, what I have and what I’ve heard here is that -- and I heard someone talk about the basis points and the effect. It could be millions and millions of dollars depending on how long we take to get it done and the interest rate that are likely to increase. But I also know that this deal has changed daily over the last few days and sometimes good, sometimes not so good. Usually, not so good for the ratepayers so far. And what that means is, it’s really important that we get this deal done right and correctly. Sometimes maybe at the rate of -- at the risk of one or two points of interest rates if it means we get a better deal out of it for Louisiana. And I don’t know that this fits the proper expression, but ready, fire, aim. I don’t know. Let’s make sure we got the deal right, okay. Now, I’m not willing to put it off, but I’m just saying, you see how complicated this is and we’re getting -- rushing this through as quickly as
possible. I just want to let everybody know I’m saying all this to summarize the
gavity of this issue. It’s not lost on me, we’re talking about billions of dollars that
Louisiana has to pay and we’re trying to determine the method of that and we’re
trying to determine the who and how gets to pay it. We know how this system
works, but if we continue to do things like we did in the past, it would still be a
traditional ratemaking. So I ask that, you know, we continue to re-examine, sharpen
our pencils, and give us the best deal that we can. I’m glad today that we have five
Commissioners that, though were very passionate today, really on best behavior I
thought today.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Because we have a good Chairman running the
meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Good points. Points for Mr. Greene right here. All
right. But I want to say that to say that I think we have a good hard-working
Commission who are very passionate about Louisiana. Nobody here is lost on their
comments or their interests. I want to let you know I talked to all my
Commissioners this month and everybody wants to work hard and they’re doing it,
and I want to talk to the utility companies and say we need you to be a partner with
us. I know the process. Remember, I was, as they say, the baptism of my job as a
Commissioner was by flood in Katrina. I learned this day one when I hit the ground
running and had the biggest securitization up until Ida. And I will combine Katrina,
Rita. I’m not -- I remember all the storms, Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, I know them
by name. We’ve dealt with all of them, and now, we have these upon us right now.
I want to say that I understand the process and I understand what your company is
doing and why they’re doing it. Same with our experts in our legal Staff. I get it.
And I think we have to agree to be partners in the recovery of Louisiana that we are
-- you guys are here to do business, great. We want you here to do business. We
want you to be as healthy as possible, but when the bills come, we want you to be
part of that, too, potentially. Say hey, look we’re partners in this state and I know
you work hard for us, but I understand the recovery system is hard on poor people.
We have low rates, but we’re also one of the poorest states in America, which is
completely reminded -- we’re completely reminded of that again, too. Those things
go hand-in-hand. In short, and I’ll wrap up, that I appreciate the process and I
believe that people can feel confident that whatever decision we make is made with
the confidence, the wisdom of the Commissioners here, but because of the
information that was brought to us by a very, very competent Staff. And I
appreciate the hard work and concern that everybody put forward and I want the
people of Louisiana to know as well as the people here we’ll do all we can to work
hard to get this thing done right. We’ve dealt with storms before, we’ll deal with
this one the right way, and we’ll move on together and be ready for the next one.
Mr. Secretary, is there anything else we need to add?

SECRETARY FREY: I think that covers it.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Well, I want to thank everybody and thank our
Commissioners for this one. Do we have to have a vote on this one?
SECRETARY FREY: We do. We’ve got a motion --
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Could you summarize the motion for me?
SECRETARY FREY: Sure. We’ve got the motion as read by Commissioner Francis -- Vice Chairman Francis, seconded by Commissioner Greene, and Commissioner Campbell has noted he is opposed, so we’ll need a roll call vote.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Let me ask you a question.

SECRETARY FREY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Is Commissioner Campbell’s directive part of the vote?

SECRETARY FREY: No, that’s just added on after.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. I just wanted to know if --

SECRETARY FREY: He wanted me read that in, correct.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you for clarifying that.

SECRETARY FREY: And we’ve got all that information. Sure.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. My first vote as Chairman, I don’t know which way to start. I’ll start on my left with Commissioner Skrmetta.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: No.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Francis.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Chair votes yes. Next item, please.

MR. ZIMMERING: Thank you, Commissioners.
MR. KLEEHAMMER: Thank you.

MS. BOWMAN: Moving back to the front of the agenda is Exhibit Number 2 and it’s Docket T-36206. It’s the Commission versus Samuel Jason Odom, Sr. doing business as Odom Vacuum Services, OV Services.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Hold --

MS. BOWMAN: -- Alleged violation of Revised Statute 45:161 through 180.1 by operating intrastate without LPSC authority to transport saltwater utilized in oil well exploration and production on four counts; it’s allegedly occurring on or about February 1, 2020 through February 10, 2020. This is a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on an affidavit and stipulation executed by the carriers, so we will need two votes. This is a proposed settlement between Odom Vacuum Services and the Commission Staff for violations of the Commission’s rules and regulations relative to the transportation of saltwater waste occurring on or about February 1 through February 10, 2020. As a result of manifest audit conducted by Staff, there was a citation issued to OV Services alleging that the carrier violated the revised statutes by operating intrastate without LPSC authority. In response to the citation, the owner of OV Services signed an affidavit and stipulation admitting to violating the revised statutes. In the affidavit and stipulation, Mr. Odom agreed to a $2,000 fine per count with 1,000 of the fine count being suspended on conditions; that Mr. Odom would obtain a common carrier certificate from the Commission to transport saltwater utilized in oil well exploration and production intrastate and implement changes to the corporate training policy relative to LPSC related statutes, rules, and orders upon employment, and
thereafter on an annual basis; and that failure to comply with any of their
requirements of the affidavit and stipulation would result in the $1,000 suspended
portion of the fine becoming due immediately. Staff recommends that: 1) The
Commission exercise its original and primary jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 57 to
consider the affidavit and stipulation; and 2) Accept the affidavit and stipulation
executed on January 13, 2022 for fines and fees totaling $4,025.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to bring the matter up under Rule 57.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Move -- motion by Commissioner Skrmetta to bring
the matter up under Rule 57.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Second, Commissioner Francis. Any opposition?

[NONE HEARD] All right. Item is under Rule 57. Next.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to approve Staff recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Skrmetta to move -- to
follow Staff recommendation. Seconded by Commissioner Campbell. Any

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Quick question for the Staff on transportation
issues we had talked about moving to -- I’m sorry.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner -- thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Sorry. We had talked about a point base
system being developed. Are y’all getting anywhere on that, Justin?

MS. BOWMAN: There we go.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: There we go.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Are we okay?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: You might have to speak up a little bit.

MR. JUSTIN BELLO: We have begun investigation of authorized citations specifically as to household goods, as you have indicated. We have certain companies that we have found that have several repeat offenses, for lack of a better word. We’re in the process of still collecting that data. Because a lot of it, some of it is on microfilm, believe it or not. So that is part of the investigation in that docket, but we can also expand it to include other types of carriers as well, if you’d like.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: When do you think will get a report back from you on sort of a --

MR. BELLO: Next month.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Ms. Bowman --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Ms. Bowman.

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Let me make a request to you as the secretary out. Let me make a request to you and the people here, can we take a possible break for 15 minutes?

MS. BOWMAN: It’s up to you, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: As well. I like to take a break for 15 minutes, okay.

Everybody be back here at 12:05.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioners, everybody, let’s take your seats.

We’re going to resume the meeting. Anybody seen Commissioner Campbell?

MS. BOWMAN: He’s coming. He’s right there. Commissioner, he’s over there on the side.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: We’re going to start the meeting, okay, Commissioner Campbell. All right. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 3. It’s Docket Number T-36211. It’s the Commission versus Stafford Transport of Louisiana doing business as CEI and it’s an alleged violation of Louisiana Revised Statutes Title 45:1177 and General Order dated November 22, 2011 for failure to properly pay to the state fees for the years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for the inspection, control, and supervision of its business service and rates authorized in Common Carrier Certificate Number 5653-M and contempt of Commission Order Number T-35152. It’s a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on an affidavit and stipulation executed by the carriers and so we will need two votes. This is a proposal settlement between Stafford Transportation of Louisiana doing business as CEI and Commission Staff for CEI’s violation of the Commission’s rules and regulations relative to paying state fees for inspection, control, and supervision of its business services and rates and for being in contempt of Commission Order Number T-35152. As a result of a routine review of the Louisiana Department of Revenue Inspection and Supervision Fee logs, Staff issued a citation to CEI alleging that the carrier had
violated 45:1177 and General Order dated November 22, 2011 for failure to
properly pay ISF for years 2018, ’19, and ’20. Additionally, Staff’s citation alleges
that CEI was in contempt of a prior Commission order, T-35152, wherein the carrier
agreed on June 12, 2019 that it would not violate 45:1177 or General Order dated
November 22, 2011 for a period of three years from the date of execution of the
affidavit. In response to the citation, CEI signed an affidavit and stipulation
admitting to the violations and being in contempt of Commission Order Number T-
35152. In the affidavit and stipulation, CEI agreed to the imposition of a $2,000
fine, with 1,000 of the fine being suspended contingent on certain conditions, such
as CEI not violating 45:1177 or the General Order for three more years from the
date of execution of this affidavit and stipulation; CEI completing the following by
February 1, 2022, which is providing the Commission the previously suspended
fine in Docket T-35152; providing the Commission the executed affidavit and
stipulated fine of $1,025; pay the Louisiana Department of Revenue the
aforementioned inspection and supervision fees for the years ’18 through ’20; and
provide copies of the reports to the Commission and proof of payments; and that
CEI will provide the Commission proof of the inspection and supervision fee
reports for the years of 2021 and proof of payment of those inspection and
supervision fees no later than March 7, 2022. Staff recommends that the
Commission: 1) Exercise its original and primary jurisdiction under Rule 57 to
consider the affidavit and stipulation; and 2) Accept the affidavit and stipulation
executed on January 31, 2022 for fines and fees totaling $1,525.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to take the item up under Item 57.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Second by Commissioner Francis. Any opposition?

[NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ruled. Next.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to accept Staff recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Second by Commissioner Francis to take the item under --

MS. BOWMAN: To accept the rec.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Right. Under recommendation. Thank you so much.


MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 4 is Docket Number R-36131. It’s the Commission’s determination of the Commission jurisdiction over the various methods of providing electricity to electric vehicles, and the infrastructure associated therewith. It’s a discussion and possible vote to hire outside counsel.

Staff issued an RFP seeking the assistance of counsel and received three qualifying bids. The first is from David Williams for 47,200 in fees and 1,400 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $48,600. The second is from Stone Pigman of 69,000 in fees and 2,500 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $71,500. And the third is from Patrick Miller of 128,995 in fees and 5,950 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $134,945. And Staff makes no recommendation as all three bidders are qualified.
COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Chairman --

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to accept bid two under Stone Pigman.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Opposition. Motion to accept the low bid of David Williams of 48,600.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I second that.

MS. BOWMAN: Well --

SECRETARY FREY: So that’d be a substitute motion.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: All right. Substitute motion. All right.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And I’ll second the substitute motion.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Which one is this?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Four.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Number four.


Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 5 is Docket Number R-36226 --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Chairman, before we move into Item 5, I am going to ask that we look at deferring Number 5, 6, 7, and 8. I discussed this with Commissioner Francis and ask that this be deferred for 60 days. These are four interrelated items that may possibly not be necessary. I know Commissioner Francis has comments, I’d like him to go first if you don’t mind.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Hold on. Let’s -- let’s -- can we -- can you please
give a little more information on that, Commissioner Skrmetta?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: You think it might be not necessary?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah, they’re all interrelated items, and I
think discussion about what the issue is first may alleviate the need for reading the
in re and doing the deferral on 5, 6, 7, and 8.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I’ll object to that. I’m okay with a 30 day deferral,
but not a 60 day.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Thirty day is fine, if that’s what
Commissioner Francis wants. You know, we were discussing it so we may just be
30 days.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. So considering -- let me get it correct. It’s --
is it 5, 6, 7, and 8 that you wish --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Exhibits 5, 6, 7, and 8. They’re both the legal
offer and the engineering offer for two things that are pretty much the same and
looking for a deferral of 30 days. And that’s my -- I’m going to make a motion that
we defer those four items for 30 days, but I know Commissioner Francis had
comments, too.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I have some comments as well.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Commissioner -- I’ll hear Commissioner
Francis, then I’ll hear Commissioner Greene.
COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Okay. Well, I’ll second Commissioner Skrmetta.

But I also want to make a point. We talked about 30 days. Mr. Greene and I talked about, you know, going over this over the next 30 days and Commissioner Skrmetta suggested 60. There’s a lot of moving parts and it may take 60 days. Can we -- when we come back in 30 days, if we decide we need another 30 [INAUDIBLE] -

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I think that’s definitely an option.

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY FREY: Sure. By deferring it, it’s automatically going to be on the next agenda. So if it’s up for the next agenda and it’s the will to defer it today, and defer it again next month, we do that. Or if the will is to take it up, it’ll be on the agenda ready to go.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Now this research we’re suggesting to do with the utilities is the -- would also include the co-ops, too, not just the investor owned; is that right?

MS. BOWMAN: That’s right.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And just for the public’s sake and our responsibility as Commissioners, I’d like to have the three investor owned, someone that represents them come forward and let’s get one of the co-ops. I’ve got SLEMCO in my area, one of the larger, it’s Mr. Glenn Tamporello. Is he here, is Glenn Tamporello here? Yes. Come up here and just briefly -- we’re just going to briefly, quickly discuss these directives. And I’d --
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I’m sorry, are we calling people up on a deferral?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Gillam, if you’d come up.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Are you sure we want to do that? I’m just saying.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yeah, if we’re going to defer.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: I mean, I’m okay to defer, but if, you know, Commissioner wants to talk about it, it’s okay. It’s up to him.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I’m going to look at -- you’re okay? You want to do it this way, that’s fine.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yeah, I want to just make a point. In my short time here, when I look at these directives that we’ve been asked by Commissioner Greene to, you know, explore all these grid hardening, or are you putting up the right kind of poles when you have storm damage, and I’d just like to hear from the public utilities who are -- that’s what you do for a living. And do you need us to hire somebody else to tell you how to do your business? That’s basically -- that’s an old -- where I come from, it’s just a simple question. And let me start out with Entergy, you’re the big dog here. Do we need to hire an outsider to tell you how to run your business, to give everybody their money’s worth?

MR. KLEEHAMMER: Commissioner, Mark Kleehammer on behalf of Entergy Louisiana. I’m not sure exactly what the intent is on all of this. You know, we’ve had a lot of practice on restoration and working toward resilience and, you know, that goes from the standards that we’re using on transmission these days, I think we’ve talked about it in recaps to this Commission in Hurricane Laura, the way that
the newer poles have withstood damages during that hurricane and in similar situations with the infrastructure that we’ve put in with our new standards with all the other hurricanes, including Ida. I think we -- Phillip May made a presentation after Ida talking about a lot of the work that we’re doing with stronger poles, you know, what we look in when we go back -- we’re building back differently than what our historic assets are, so whether that’s a, you know, Class 1 pole in areas that are at risk, whether that’s changing, you know, the array that we have on those poles in Grand Isle we built with caissons to sink them because last year the poles were taken down but they weren’t snapped, so we put them in to, you know, help with the ground there. There’s a whole lot that we do in the normal course, you know. In our last formula rate plan, we came to the Commission and we requested a distribution, basically a matching rider to work with our distribution plan. We’ve ramped up our distributions, it’s been pretty significantly over the last few years because there’s only so much you can do, right, at any given time on a customer bill and we’ve gone through a generation portfolio transformation over the last five years. We’ve done a whole lot of transmission, I’d say last year we got authorization from this Commission to enhance our distribution buildout. With that, it came some, you know, some incremental review from y’all’s Staff. Like we have automatic penalties if we don’t make our safety and safety goals within the -- that are the Commission rules. We also have improved requirements that we would have coming forward with that, so I think we had a lot of this discussion in our formula rate planning extension last year on our distribution plan. And then, you know, I guess on resilience, otherwise, we’ve talked about it somewhat in storm
cost recovery. We have a couple of different projects that we’re working on. Commissioner Skrmetta mentioned the delegation and the need for the governor to request a waiver for any offset to our storm costs. That’s one aspect that we’re working with HUD to get CBDG grants, but we also, we filed an application for some resilience projects back in early February, last January -- we had done it last year as well, I’m just trying to think back to what we did. Last year, we asked for grants through building resilient infrastructure community, something like that, BRIC applications with FEMA. We asked for a couple of projects for about $30 million, that was in 2020. We were not granted any of them. We came back this year and asked for nine projects for $450 million. Commissioner Campbell, I think that’s what you and I have discussed a couple of times, and if those were to move forward, that would be areas where we could enhance the resiliency in the Houma area, that’s one of the big transmission ones. We’ve got multiple requests for flood mitigation and resiliency around our transmission substations, and we have some requests on shoring up feeders, you know, all outside of kind of the normal course of work. And then I would just say finally, you know, enterprise wide at Entergy, we’re looking at grid resilience, it’s, clearly after being hit by two hurricanes, a question that people say, it’s not necessarily if, it’s when, and so we’re looking at how we can find and make a business case for enhanced resilience in a way that is customer centric and manages customer bills. So we’ve got a lot going on within the company, that’s the way I look at it.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: One of my questions would be, we’re talking about grid resiliency with all the -- all those who have transmission here in
Louisiana. Aren’t you working hand in hand with MISO or RSPP on this, so it’s not just your company that’s recognizing and looking at grid resiliency; is that right?

MR. KLEEHAMMER: Yeah, I agree. I agree.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Now, I know the co-ops basically have no transmission or very little, but that speaks to, you know, other situations like we’re talking about infrastructure, you know, your infrastructure, that would be the smaller lines, or transmission stations. I know, Mr. Tamporello, you worked from the ground to the crown in the oil, like they say in the oil field, you probably know how to play them poles, but --

MR. GLENN TAMPORELLO: I don’t know about that.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Do you need us to hire somebody to tell you how to run your co-op, SLEMCO?

MR. TAMPORELLO: Again, we have a --

MS. BOWMAN: Glenn --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: If you’ll move closer to the microphone.

MS. BOWMAN: Yeah, and introduce yourself first, please.

MR. TAMPORELLO: Glenn Tamporello, SLEMCO, CEO. We have a continual program of checking poles, and as the gentlemen said, changing our specs as times go. In other words, through storms, different things like that, we’ll adjust to different size poles. For example, one of us, and I know Entergy does a lot, too, steel, in some cases are better, so we’re constantly reviewing it. In addition to that, we’re an RUS borrower. RUS has specifications already predesignated that they
are willing to finance, so we also have those specs that are going and as you said
earlier, there’s not a site that we don’t look at when we rebuild a line or whatever.
And we also have an ongoing program for pole checking, be it -- we have a little
bit of transmission, but none that’s in MISO so we are not a transmission
organization, so it’s all distribution in our case. We have somewhere around
140,000 poles. In general, we cover them all, at least in 10 years. And then we
modify whatever needs to be done at that time, and so yes, we have a continual
review. We do have in house engineering and out of house engineering. We spend
somewhere around 25 million a year in new construction of distribution only.
Again, we’re not as big as Entergy, obviously, on there, but we have an ongoing
program, yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: All right. Well, let’s -- I’ll be talking to you guys
over the next 30 days, reviewing this. And I would just like to ask all these vendors
who’ve applied to possibly give us these services to help you guys run your
business, I need to hear from you to help me understand why we need to spend
ratepayer monies to police what I think is already a good system. So that’s it, thank
you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Well, hold on gentlemen, hold on. Commissioner
Skrmetta has a comment.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Just one comment real quick. You know, my
concerns about this are, and, you know, I know the investor-owned utilities engage
with the NERC, they engage possibly on these particular issues that are directed,
and I think -- my concerns are, what we’re looking at, even if we just go with the
low bids across these four issues, we’re looking at close to, you know, close to a
million dollars in added costs on ratepayer bills that are, I personally think, are
largely unnecessary because I think the companies are in a best position to take the
issues and requests from the Commission, analyze it to their, you know, interpretation of what we bring, and come back and talk to the Commission about
what is freely discussable versus what is not freely discussable. We understand that
there are certain issues that you keep private and for the benefit of protection of the
system. You know, my thing about this is, and I think that it’s very reasonable that
we have done this in the past, where we direct utilities to do things. We don’t have
to issue RFPs to hire people to do things that we can just tell you to do and you can
come back with a report to us, whether a confidential report or a public report. So,
you know, I want you to, you know, after you meet with Commissioner Francis, I’d
like the investor-owned utilities and the co-ops to, if they’ve got time, to come meet
with me to talk about the same thing. I’d appreciate them taking the time to visit
and discuss the potential about this because I do think in economic times like this,
what I’d like to do is work on bringing ratepayers’ bills down and not just, you
know, ticking them up. So -- and if we can manage that with you doing what you
know best for your companies, that would make me feel a little bit better about
what we do for the ratepayers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yes, thank you, gentlemen, for all you do do.
According to the Energy Information Administration, and I know we’re deferring,
so I won’t get too much into it. I just want to give y’all -- I’ve opened a resiliency
docket and I want to share with you why, and y’all are very much a part of how we can make that better. But according to that report, that’s the same report that tells us that we have the lowest rates, so this is who we trust. We’re ranked 50th in resiliency. If you subtract out the hurricanes, we’re ranked 47th. So to say that we don’t need to look at this is to say that we’re okay with being 50th, and I’m not. I don’t think, to my knowledge, that Louisiana has a coherent resiliency plan, which by the way, is what’s required in order to attract the new federal dollars from the infrastructure bill. So I think we need -- and I think knowledge is knowing the answers and wisdom is knowing where to find them, and I don’t know all these answers so I want to ask smart people who do. And as a matter of percentage, you know, we’re about to approve 4.5 billion in rebuild costs, so how much are we willing to spend in resiliency planning so we don’t have to spend 4.5 billion next time. That’s the heartbeat of how I’m approaching this. And so I think -- I hope that over the next 30 days y’all as well as those bidding in can have robust discussions with these Commissioners and we can get to the most refined answer so that we can perhaps rise from 50th and it might cost a million or two dollars, but hopefully won’t have to pay 4.5 billion in the next coming year. So I’m okay with a deferral, but I look forward to a robust conversation and moving Louisiana up from 50th.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Commissioner Boissiere, Mr. Chairman, one last comment.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Sure, Commissioner Skrmetta, but I want to --
anybody else have any comments, let’s get them ready because we want the
meeting to flow.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah. I think what Commissioner Greene
actually said is pretty good because we could actually kind of move past this and
open a docket on resiliency and have the companies report back on what we need
to do about resiliency because I think we could take a large step past, you know,
mincing thorough the sort of interpretative element of what resiliency is from
people outside the systems, looking towards what resiliency is from inside the
systems, looking at incorporating issues through the NERC and other aspects about
that because I think that’s actually ultimately where we might end up, and Brandon,
you may want to look at the potential of that down the road for us. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: One more comment. The way this is split out is
five and six are looking at do these companies do what they told us they were going
to do with the money that we set aside for them to do it. We don’t know, we don’t
physically check it, we regulate, we don’t enforce, so we want to look under the
hood as to why we’re 47th or 50th. And seven and eight are really how do we -- in
the ready, aim, fire, this is how do we get ready. What’s the better ready? I think
about LSU football. If we go four and seven, we’ll pay $17 million for a coach to
leave and pay 100 million for another one to come in without knowing the results
yet. And I think that with us being 47th or 50th is worse than us having a losing
football team, and I played for Curley Hallman who was pretty bad. I also think,
you know, I heard a great quote recently, having some of the answers -- having some of the questions is better than having all of the answers. I think we should ask questions until we get to the most refined answer. I mean, we’re living right now as failing to plan is planning to fail. And so I think this is the heartbeat of why we are here, and if nothing else, it’ll bring about a robust discussion, so I look forward to the next meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. I’m going to do this one more time. Anyone else have any comments? Thank you. Listen. This is the longest thing -- item we’ve ever had that got deferred. Good thing we passed it to next month or we’d be here all day. I thought the tough one was over already. I want to thank you. Are we -- do we need a vote to defer?

MS. BOWMAN: As long as there’s no opposition.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Say it out loud, which ones are we deferring again, Brandon?

MS. BOWMAN: We’re Deferring Exhibits 5, 6, 7, and 8.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: So 5, 6, 7, and 8 are deferred for 30 days or the next B&E?

SECRETARY FREY: Next B&E.

MS. BOWMAN: Next B&E.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Next B&E. Thank you for coming, thank you for handling our questions. Let’s go to the next one, Number 9 -- Number 10.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 10 is Docket --
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Look, in the nature of this meeting -- for the nature of this meeting, I’d like to get it -- keep it moving along, so I’m going to ask my Commissioners to keep their comments poignant and to the point of the issue of the meeting. That was a deferred item, guys. We’re going to have the discussion again in 30 days. So let’s move on and everyone be prepared for each item coming up. Thank you.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 10 is docket Number U-36133. This is Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, NextEra Energy Marketing, LLC, and Amite Solar, LLC’s joint application for approval of power supply agreements. This is a discussion and possible vote to hire outside counsel. Staff issued an RFP and received two qualifying bids. This first is from Patrick Miller of 78,995 in fees and 4,950 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $83,945. And the second was from Stone Pigman of 117,000 in fees and 5,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $122,000. And Staff makes no formal recommendation as both are qualified.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Motion to accept low bid.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Motion to -- second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Movement by Commissioner Greene to accept low bid. Second by Commissioner Skrmetta. Hold on, wait a minute.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: It’s Number 10.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: It’s Number 10. All right. And the low bid, I wanted to say, is that of Pat --

MS. BOWMAN: Patrick Miller.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Patrick Miller.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. I do have a substitute motion, Mr. Francis.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I’d like to choose number two, Stone Pigman, for this job.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Do I hear a second?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yeah, I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Great. Second Commissioner Fran -- Campbell, sorry. So it’s moved by Commissioner Francis, second by Commissioner Campbell for Stone Pigman.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I object.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Any objection?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I object.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Roll call vote. So I’ll start at the end, I know where everybody’s going now. Commissioner Skrmetta. This is for the substitute motion of Stone Pigman.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: No.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: No.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Francis.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Well, yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioner Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: And Chair votes yes. Next item.
MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 11 is Docket Number U-36135. This is Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative and NextEra Energy Marketing’s joint application for approval of power supply agreements. This is a discussion and possible vote to hire outside counsel and we received two qualifying bids for this one. The first was Patrick Miller for 68,995 in fees and 4,750 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $73,745. And the second was for Stone Pigman of 117,000 in fees and 5,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $122,000. And Staff makes no formal recommendation as both bidders are qualified.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to accept the low bid of Patrick Miller of 73,745.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Second.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second.


MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 12 is Docket Number U-36173. It’s South Coast Gas Company’s rate stabilization plan filing for the year ended June 30, 2021. It’s a discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order. South Coast filed its 2021 RSP Filing on October 15, 2022 for the Commission’s review pursuant to the provisions of Order Number U-35052. Notice of South Coast’s RSP Filing was published in the Commission’s Bulletin with no interventions. Pursuant to Order Number U-35052, South Coast’s Rate Stabilization Plan allows the company to earn a midpoint return on equity and requires a resetting of rates in
the event that the test period earnings fall outside of the prescribed deadband. The prescribed deadband for South Coast is fifty basis points above and below the allowed ROE. In South Coast’s RSP Filing, the company reported a ROE deficit, which would have required a rate increase and resulted in an upward adjustment in the revenue requirement of $283,972.65. Staff conducted a review of the company’s RSP Filing and determined that the company’s earned ROE for the test year was, in fact, deficit, and below the established bandwidth. As such, Staff found that South Coast was authorized, in accordance with the provisions of its RSP, to adjust its rates to generate a revenue increase. Staff filed its report and recommendation into the record indicating this on January 14, 2022. And upon review, South Coast indicated the company accepted the Staff’s report and recommendation and filed notice to this effect into the record. Upon agreement of all the parties, both Staff and South Coast filed a joint report and draft order into the record on February 8, 2022, acknowledging the resolution of all issues. As such, Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report and draft order filed into the record on February 8, 2022, finding that South Coast is authorized to increase its rates to generate a revenue increase of $283,972.65 based on the deficit earned ROE 2021 Test Year, subject to conditions contained therein.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Question.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Do we need a motion to begin? Or let me just do this, Commissioner Skrmetta has a question.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Who is Staff -- who’s representing South Coast?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Okay. All right. That’s my answer. Never mind. That’s what I was just double checking, so.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Move --

MS. BOWMAN: Was there a motion? I’m sorry.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: No, we’re doing it now.

MS. BOWMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I made a motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Motion by Commissioner Greene to accept. Chair seconds. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 13 is Docket Number U-36180. This is Pierre Part Natural Gas Company’s rate stabilization plan filing for the year ended June 30, 2021. It’s also a discussion and possible vote on a joint report and draft order.

Pierre Part filed its 2021 RSP Filing on October 15, 2021, for the Commission’s review pursuant to the provisions of Order Number U-35038. Notice of the filing was published in the Commission’s Official Bulletin, with no interventions or protests. Pursuant to Order Number U-35038, Pierre Part’s rate stabilization plan allows the company to earn a midpoint return on equity and requires a resetting of rates in the event that the test period earnings fall outside the prescribed deadband.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: May I ask who’s representing Pierre Part? Oh, lookie here.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: That’s the answer.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to accept.

MS. BOWMAN: I haven’t read the recommendation yet.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Oh, I thought you --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: There you go.

MS. BOWMAN: I could read it real quick.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Could you please read the recommendation for us.

MS. BOWMAN: As there are no unresolved issues, the Staff requests that the Commission accept the joint report and draft order filed into the record on February 8, 2022, finding that Pierre Part is authorized to increase its rates to generate a revenue increase of $7,267.81 based on the deficient earned ROE of 2021 test year, subject to conditions contained therein.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you.

MS. BOWMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Now I motion to accept what she said.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: All right. Moved by Commissioner Greene to accept Staff recommendation, and seconded by Commissioner Campbell. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 14 is Docket Number U-36222. This is Entergy’s prudence review of the management of the construction of the Lake Charles Power Station. It’s a discussion and possible vote to retain Henderson Ridge Consulting. On December 9, 2021, Entergy Louisiana filed its application
seeking the Commission’s review of the management of construction of the Lake Charles Power Station, which began commercial operation in March of 2020. Henderson Ridge was retained to assist the Commission in its review, certification, and monitoring of the Lake Charles Power Station in Docket Number U-34283. Given Henderson Ridge’s knowledge and experience with the construction of the Lake Charles Power Station, including monitoring during construction, Staff solicited Henderson Ridge to assist in Docket Number U-36222. Staff is of the opinion that Henderson Ridge’s assistance in Docket 34283 is substantially related by common factual and legal components of the upcoming docket, and therefore no formal RFP is required. In response to Staff’s solicitation, Henderson Ridge proposes to complete all work required for 144,800 in fees and 3,600 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of $148,400. And Staff recommends that the Commission retain Henderson Ridge Consulting.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Motion to accept Staff recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Motion by Commissioner Greene to accept Staff recommendation. Chair seconds. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 15, which is Docket Number U-36254. This is DEMCO’s application for interim and final emergency rate relief pursuant to the extraordinary cost provision of its Formula Rate Plan and request for order of the Commission directing DEMCO recognize paycheck protection plan loan forgiveness in 2022. This is a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule
57 on interim emergency rate relief, at the request of Commissioner Greene, and I have a motion on his behalf.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yes, can you please read that in?

MS. BOWMAN: Well, first we take up under Rule 57.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I motion to take the item up under Item 57.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Greene to --

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Greene to accept the item and second by Commissioner Francis.

MS. BOWMAN: And then Commissioner Greene’s motion is: Considering DEMCO’s application filed January 18, 2022 requesting interim and final emergency rate relief to address the extraordinary costs it has occurred as a result of recent storms and cost increases associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that notice of the application was published in the Commission’s Bulletin for a 15 day intervention period and in the requisite official journals and no party has intervened, I move that the Commission grant DEMCO’s request for an interim rate increase in the amount of 6.24 mils per kilowatt hour, subject to the following conditions: That 1) DEMCO file into the record of the proceeding the revised tariff reflecting the interim rates and compliance with the Commission’s electric tariff filing rules within five business days; that 2) DEMCO shall submit to the Executive Secretary and file into the record of this proceeding a protective bond or security in the amount of $11,500,000 to ensure refund on the interim rates, if necessary; and 3) That the interim rate shall be effective upon the first billing cycle after the
Commission’s receipt and acceptance of Items 1 and 2, and shall remain in effect pending the issuance of a final Commission order on the merits of DEMCO’s application filed January 18, 2022, or December 31, 2022, whichever is sooner.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: That’s my motion to accept, so.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: So that’s -- it’s already been moved or do we have to --

MS. BOWMAN: So we just need a second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: This is the motion.

MS. BOWMAN: This is the motion.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: We already read in the motion and a second.

MS. BOWMAN: Well, we need a second.


COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah, a couple of questions. Is Resolved here?

MS. MELISSA FREY: No, Commissioner Skrmetta, Resolved is not in attendance today.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah, you know, this is how I show you I’m almost as old as two members of the Commission by saying that Resolved does the best Claude Rains imitation by being the invisible man, because I’ve never heard from them, I’ve never talked to them. This is one of those ones where, you know,
if you don’t call the office and talk to me about the case, and I want you to know, in my book, I got one page.

MS. FREY: There is no Staff recommendation on this.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Yeah, I know, but I got one page that’s just nothing on it. And I’ve had, you know, their governmental consultant send me information on it, you know, and it’s kind of like -- my problem is is when the Commission hires a consultant, I expect them to contact each Commissioner and go over the case with them, you know. And I told you what I was going to do when they don’t, okay. Now, it’s not you. I’m not mad at you, Melissa.

MS. FREY: No, I will take the heat on this one.

MS. BOWMAN: Melissa --

MS. FREY: Yeah, I’m sorry.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: What I’m saying is --

MS. FREY: I will take the heat on this one.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: No, you don’t -- no, Melissa, just --

MS. FREY: Well, he asked me if he needed to be here --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: It’s the other Frey I’m going to go to. Okay. So this is -- this is Brandon needs to make sure that the consultants follow through and contact the Commissioners, okay. Because I’m going to tell you, and it’s not like this is a surprise, if they don’t call me, I’m going to abstain, okay. And that’s where I am on this. Because I still have never spoken to anybody from Resolved. We keep hiring them, and those days are over until they start calling the Commissioners. Okay. So anyway, I’m done.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Did everybody hear that? Everybody know what to do? Good. Now back to the motion. I’m going to read it again. Moved by Commissioner Greene, Chair second. Any opposition on this issued? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Now we are on which one, Number 16?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: I abstained in the vote.

MS. BOWMAN: Abstain [INAUDIBLE].

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Oh, I’m sorry. Let the record reflect --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: I wanted to just make sure my -- I’m recorded as an abstention.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Let the record reflect that Commissioner Skrmetta has abstained on that vote. Understandable. Now, next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 16 is Docket Number X-35741. It’s Concordia Electric Cooperative, Pointe Coupee Electric Membership Corporation, and Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation’s request for proposals for power purchase contracts and/or generating capacity pursuant to the Commission’s Market Based Mechanism Order. It’s a discussion and possible vote to hire outside counsel. We received two qualifying bids. The first is from Patrick Miller of $205,995 in fees and $7,495 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $213,490. And then Stone Pigman was the second bid for 269,000 in fees and 5,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $274,000. And Staff makes no recommendation as both bidders are qualified.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Chairman, I move to accept the low bid of Patrick Miller of $213,490.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Chair moved -- I mean, I’m sorry. Commissioner Skrmetta moved for Patrick Miller.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I object. I got a substitute.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Right now I don’t think there’s a second. But I did hear a substitute. Commissioner Francis -- I mean Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: I would like to make a comment. You know, we go a long way to make big arguments to get more people bidding and I don’t want this to be lost on anybody in the room or anybody who’s watching on television, so we make big noise about getting more people arguing about getting more people bidding, and then we don’t accept low bids, and then it becomes a lot of hooey. So that’s my comment.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Let me -- I’m going to answer that a little bit. I appreciate that. Nobody more than myself would like more bidders and more participation in this, but we have the proper and we have the authority to evaluate each and every item individually and as much as that’s true, some people, some Commissioners believe that other people are qualified as well, and not to get into it, I think there’s room for everybody here. And I don’t know if any of these contractors have won other bids or not, just keep bidding. It’s a fair process.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: The next time that we get into the discussion about getting more people to bid, you’ll wonder why they don’t.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Well, that’s okay. So what do we have? We have a motion --
MS. BOWMAN: We have a motion by Commissioner Skrmetta to accept the low
bid of Patrick Miller.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. And we have a substitute by Commissioner
Campbell.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: No second.

MS. BOWMAN: Well, if there’s no second then the motion fails.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: My motions fails. Right.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I got it. Any other motion? Commissioner
Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I have a substitute motion.

MS. BOWMAN: Can you please use your mic?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Wait, I thought you said you didn’t have a
second.

SECRETARY FREY: Yeah. Right.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: So you do have a second?

SECRETARY FREY: No.

MS. BOWMAN: No, there is no second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Just read your -- read your motion.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Oh, you want a motion now?

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Okay. I make a motion that we hire Stone
Pigman. It’s $65,000 more -- $64,000 more. Let me -- the other gentlemen has got
some work today, it’s not like we shut him out. Patrick Miller, he’s got some work today, hadn’t he? And this is my area, Concordia. So I just make a motion --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: When it’s my area, I’ll remember that.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: All right. Do we have a second? Commissioner Francis? Do you make a second or no?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Okay. I’ll second that.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: All right. So we have a motion by Commissioner Campbell for Stone Pigman and a second by Commissioner Francis. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 17 is Docket Number X-36125. It’s the Commission’s audit of fuel adjustment clause filings for Southwestern Electric Power Company for the period of January 2019 through December of 2020. It’s a discussion and possible vote to hire an outside consultant. Staff issued an RFP seeking the assistance of outside consultant and received five qualifying bids. The first was from Resolved Energy Consulting of 27,000 in fees and 900 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of 27,900. The second was from United Professionals Company of 55,000 in fees and 2,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $57,000. Third was from Exeter and Associates of 62,000 in fees and 2,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $64,000. The fourth was Vantage Energy Consulting of 70,400 in fees and 2,600 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $73,000. And the fifth was London Economics of 91,450 in fees and 2,356 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $93,806. And Staff makes no recommendation as all bidders are qualified.
COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Mr. Chairman, normally I would go with the low bid, but since they don’t call Commissioners, I’m going to skip them and move to the lowest bid and bid United Professionals for a total of $57,000.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Which one is it?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: We’re on Item Number 17.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: No, who is it?

MS. BOWMAN: It’s a motion to accept UPC.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I’ll read it for everyone to hear. Commissioner Skrmetta moved that we hire United Professionals. Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I’ll second.


Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 18 is pulled. We’ll move on to Exhibit 19, which is reports, resolutions, discussions. The discussion part related to Charter Communications is deferred until next month, and we have two ratifications under ERSC, OMS, and SPP. The first is a discussion and possible vote to ratify the LPSC interventions in RTO or ERSC related FERC proceedings. This matter is on the agenda pursuant to the scope of work approved in connection with the retention of Stone Pigman and United Professionals Company at the February 24, 2021 B&E for MISO, SPP, and ERSC participation. Due to the short deadlines allowed for these interventions, if advanced Commission approval is not possible, the Executive Secretary on recommendation or on his own determination may
authorize initial interventions, comments, or protests, subject to following ratification at a B&E. Interventions were filed on LPSC’s behalf in FERC Docket Numbers ER22-914 and RM22-5, as well as ER22-995. Comments will be filed in that, which is MISO’s LRTP cost allocation filing, and Staff recommends that the Commission ratify and/or authorize these interventions.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to ratify.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Motion by Commissioner Skrmetta to ratify. Chair seconds. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD]

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Any abstentions required?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Wait a minute. Do I need to abstain on this one?

MS. BOWMAN: No.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. All right.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Francis abstains.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I wanted to ask, can one of our utilities actually pull out of MISO without our approving it?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: You know what, that’s an excellent question.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Oh, good.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Secretary, Commissioner Francis, I’ll reiterate it for you.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: That’s a real redneck question, I’m sorry. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Can a utility company leave MISO on its own or without Commission approval or what is the process?
SECRETARY FREY: I’m going to look at our experts. I don’t think they can. Walter?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: He says they can?

MS. BOWMAN: They cannot.

SECRETARY FREY: They cannot. I confirmed with Mr. Darce, he gave me the thumbs down, they cannot.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Or is Walter here, Walter Ferguson? You can tell us. Can they leave without us?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: So they can’t leave without our permission?

MS. BOWMAN: Correct, they cannot.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Why do we even need this in our --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Because they can’t leave without our permission and we can’t leave without your permission and you can’t leave without their permission, so it’s a nice weirdo triangle, right?

MS. BOWMAN: What’s your question, Commissioner Francis?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: That’s a rhombus, by the way.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I think it’s a rhetorical question right now. All right. What -- do we have an item before us right now, Staff?

MS. BOWMAN: We have a ratification of a vote on SPP.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yeah, we’re still talking about this.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to ratify.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Wait, wait, wait. One person at a time right now.

Let me ask a question to Ms. Bowman. We are still on which item?
MS. BOWMAN: So we’re on Exhibit Number 19.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Got it, 19.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: 19.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: All right. And which part of Exhibit 19, which number?

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Francis, Exhibit 18 was pulled. Is that what you’re looking at?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yeah.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 18 was pulled.

SECRETARY FREY: We pulled, we’re going with that.

MS. BOWMAN: We pulled it from the agenda, we’re --

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: [INAUDIBLE]

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: We were successful with MISO.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: [INAUDIBLE]. No wonder they pulled it. Who put it on there to start with, you know? Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: We won that one.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Y’all see, huh? Okay. Now we’re on 19.

MS. BOWMAN: We are on 19. We have an additional ratification, it’s a discussion and possible vote to ratify votes taken by Vice Chairman Francis acting as the Commission’s representative on the Regional State Committee of the Southwest Power Pool. So this agenda -- this is on the agenda for ratification of two votes take on January 24, 2022 by Vice Chairman Francis. Staff followed the protocols set forth in Special Order 17-2019 to consult with the Executive Secretary
and the Chairman for the vote, and to make a recommendation to Vice Chairman Francis prior to the vote. The protocols also require that the vote be ratified at a following Business and Executive Session. The following -- the voting items were as follows. The RSC sought a vote on SPP’s proposed exception to its highway/byway cost allocation regime. The wind rich zones have complained that they are disproportionately allocating costs of byway projects to facilitate the exports of wind energy to other zones. And in response, SPP proposes a waiver process by which particular byway projects can be granted an exception to the highway/byway cost allocation regime to allocate byway projects 100 percent to the entire SPP footprint.

**COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA**: Move to ratify.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE**: Well, before --

**MS. BOWMAN**: There’s one more.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE**: I want to ask a question. On this ratification, does anyone have to abstain from voting?

**MS. BOWMAN**: Commissioner Francis.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE**: I just want to be clear.

**COMMISSIONER FRANCIS**: Yeah, I abstain from this vote.

**CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE**: Okay. So moving by Commissioner Skrmetta. Second by the Chair. Commissioner Francis is abstaining. Commissioner Campbell, any opposition? [NONE HEARD] None. Item so ordered. Move on to the next portion.

**MS. BOWMAN**: And there’s one more vote that needs to be ratified.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Gotcha.

MS. BOWMAN: From Vice Chairman Francis.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Sure, go ahead.

MS. BOWMAN: RSC sought a vote on whether to approve tariff language implementing the previously approved White Paper on Storage as transmission asset only. The proposed language incorporates SATOAs and provides the cost allocation for them to be based on the voltage level of the transmission issue that is resolved by SATOAs, which is consistent with the White Paper, and on Staff’s recommendation, Vice Chairman Francis voted yes to the tariff amendment incorporating the cost allocation for storage resources. And Staff recommends that the Commission ratify Vice Chairman Francis’ vote taken on January 24, 2022 as the LPSC’s representative.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And I’ll abstain from this vote again.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moving by Chair. Any second?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Second by Commissioner Skrmetta. Commissioner Campbell, any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, our thing’s ratified. I didn’t make a point of it enough early on. I know we have a directive session now, is that where we’re headed?

MS. BOWMAN: We do not have any directives, so we can move on to Exhibit 20.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: But I want to make a comment. I’m going to use this moment to make a brief comment, that’s why I chose it right now. And this is
completely off the cuff, and it’s very spontaneous. And it is not a directive, per se, but it may be worthy of a directive going forward. I’ve been getting news feeds from yesterday and even today that we should pay attention, once again, to the Ukraine and the international issues that are going on. There are a number of things that may affect things from markets to energy prices to even cyber hacks and prime targets are utility companies, and from water companies. If you’ll remember the attack about a year or two ago on a pipeline, it may be the kind of thing we can look forward to, potentially. So I’m using this time to raise everyone’s attention, especially that of Staff and the utility companies, and everyone who’s listening, just to pay attention, that these are some of the targets that are possibly out there, considering these international difficult times that we’re in right now, and that we should -- and I’ve been meeting with our Staff, Secretary Brandon Frey, to discuss our safety and security, and I’ve been meeting and I’ll be calling on all of the utility companies to give me an update of your cyber security plan. And if there’s anything we have in the rulemaking here at the Commission and if there’s anything on the private sector that you’re doing to protect yourselves, we need to have that confidence, and I will be in touch and you need to let us know. Commissioner -- and I’m done with my comments, if they’re clear, but I’m now opening it up for Commissioner Campbell to make a comment.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Look, I didn’t mean all I said at the first of the meeting. It’s raining like hell in north Louisiana and its 40 degrees. If we have ice, y’all come up there and help us out here. I have -- I didn’t mean any of that. All right.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Thank you, Foster. All right. Ms. Bowman, Number 20, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 20 is Docket Number U-35806. This is Cleco Power’s request for recovery of lost revenues related to LPSC Special Order Numbers 22-2020, 28-2020, and 43-2020, and request for accounting order. It’s a discussion and possible vote on uncontested proposed partial stipulated settlement pursuant to Rule 57, and this is at the request of Vice Chairman Francis. On December 7, 2020, Cleco filed its application requesting Commission authorization to recover certain lost revenues associated with the Commission’s special orders and the application was published in the Commission’s Official Bulletin with no inter -- excuse me, with timely interventions filed by Packaging Corporation of America, Cabot Corporation, and the Alliance for Affordable Energy. Cleco’s application further requested that the Commission issue an accounting order authorizing Cleco to utilize the methodology established by the FERC that modified FERC’s existing allowance for funds used during construction rate calculation on a temporary basis. The FERC granted a waiver to utilities allowing the utility to compute the AFUDC rate using the utility’s simple average of short-term debt balances as of 2019 instead of the current short-term debt balances as a means to maintain liquidity during the COVID-19 pandemic. Cleco requested Commission authorization to file the same exclusion for the duration of the company’s capital structure and cost rate of debt for ratemaking purposes. On February 15, 2022, the parties executed an uncontested proposed partial stipulated settlement pursuant to Rule 6 of the Commission’s rules, wherein the parties have
negotiated and agreed upon the terms and provisions of Cleco Power’s request for an accounting order. All parties either executed the partial stipulation or there is no opposition to the partial settlement. If the partial settlement is approved, it will resolve Cleco’s request for an accounting order, subject to terms and conditions, as well as reservations of rights by Staff, the intervenors, and Cleco Power. All other issues raised by Cleco in this application are pending and the Commission’s approval of an accounting order will not authorize an increase or change in existing rates. Staff recommends that: 1) The Commission exercise its original and primary jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 57; 2) That the Commission accept the uncontested proposed partial stipulated settlement filed into the record on February 15, 2022 approving Cleco’s request for an accounting order; and 3) That the order issued in this proceeding be effective immediately.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I’ll --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: [INAUDIBLE].

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Okay. Two votes, Commissioner -- okay.

Commissioner Francis.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Rule 57, please.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Moved by Commissioner Francis to take the item up under Rule 57. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Second.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Motion to accept the recommendation of Staff.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Motion to accept by Commissioner Francis. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Second by Commissioner Skrmetta. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Great, hearing none, so ordered. And that --

MS. BOWMAN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: -- that concludes our meeting.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to adjourn.

MS. BOWMAN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Wait a minute. I do want to make one small comment. Commissioner Greene did leave a little bit early, he had a patient --

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Did his Staff have a patient?

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: [INAUDIBLE]. So Commissioner Greene asked me to convey that to you, that he did leave [INAUDIBLE] and that he felt comfortable at the end of the meeting that the items that he was departing would be handled properly, and they were. I just wanted to make that comment. Thank you all for coming --

MS. BOWMAN: We need a motion and a second.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: I know.

MS. BOWMAN: Okay. Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: Here, come get -- you want this? All right, so.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Move to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN BOISSIERE: So thank you all for coming to this part of the state.

Move to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER SKRMETTA: Second.
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