TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON OCTOBER 22, 2026 IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA. PRESENT WERE: CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA, VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN, COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS, COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS, AND COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL.

Exhibit	Docket	Description	Page
1		Announcements	1-7
2	T-37136	Cantium, LLC vs. Rosefield Fourchon Operating, LLC.	7-17
3	T-38039	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Next Nest, LLC.	17-18
4	R-36241	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	18-29
5	R-37871	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	29-37
6	R-37943	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.	37-48
7	S-37686	Southwestern Electric Power Company, ex parte.	49-57

8	**S-37945**	**Washington-St. Tammany Electric Cooperative, Inc., ex parte.**	**57-59**
9	**U-29203** **U-30981** **U-32764** **U-35991** **U-36350**	**Entergy Gulf States, Inc. and Entergy Louisiana, Inc.** **Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, L.L.C. and Entergy Louisiana, LLC** **Entergy Louisiana, LLC and Entergy Gulf States, Louisiana, LLC** **Entergy Louisiana, LLC, ex parte.** **Entergy Louisiana, LLC, ex parte.**	**59-66**
10	**U-35523**	**Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.**	**66-67**
11	**U-37603**	**Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.**	**67-69**
12	**U-37812**	**Entergy Louisiana, LLC, ex parte.**	**69-86**
13	**U-37838**	**Claiborne Electric Cooperative, Inc., ex parte.**	**86-87**
14	**U-37843**	**Magnolia Water Utility Operating Company, LLC, ex parte.**	**Deferred**
15	**U-37904**	**Parish Water Company, Inc., ex parte.**	**87-88**

16	**U-37929**	**South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association, ex parte.**	**88-91**
17	**U-38093**	**1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc., ex parte.**	**91-92**
18	**X-38068**	**Dixie Electric Membership Cooperation and Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation**	**92-11**
19		**1) Reports** **2) Resolutions** **3) Discussions** **4) ERSC/OMS business** **5) Directives**	**112-115**
20	**R-38096**	**Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.**	**115-117**
21	**U-37394**	**South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association, ex parte.**	**118-124**

TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON OCTOBER 22, 2026 IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA. PRESENT WERE: CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA, VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN, COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS, COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS, AND COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL

CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA: Good morning. I want to call the meeting to order of the Public Service Commission. We're thankful to be here in New Orleans at, I think -- guests of the Louisiana Supreme Court. And thank Justice Burris for allowing us to use the chambers today. It was very kind of him. I was supposed to -- I'm checking to see or -- I invited Councilman Liljeberg and Chief -- is Councilman Liljeberg here, or Chief Conley? Okay. Well, they're not here. If they show up later, and they want to make some remarks as local officials. They're other -- we've moved our comment period for general public comment. I know we have some folks here -- some elected officials from Southwest Louisiana, Crowley, etcetera, and that'll come during the comment period. That's when we do announcements -- not announcements, reports etcetera. And I think -- I forget what the number that is but what number is that, Kathryn?

SECRETARY BRANDON FREY: Nineteen.

MS. KATHRYN BOWMAN: Nineteen.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Nineteen?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. When we get to agenda item 19, we'll pull up comments from the elected officials from Crowley, and the area around Crowley.

COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL: Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: When you get a chance, I want to speak.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. We're going to make some announcements in a second. We'll go ahead and begin with announcements from the Commissioners. Commissioner Campbell, you can go first.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Commissioner Skrmetta, I want to say thank you for having us back in New Orleans. I might remind -- and I'm sure you know when I was in the Senate I -- not in the Senate, but the first day on the Public Service Commission, I passed a rule to let you go around the state. I think that's one of the best things we've ever done. We've -- when I first got elected you met up -- in a building up in Baton Rouge once a month. Didn't go around the state. People didn't hear much of the Public Service Commission as much as they do now but we have a lot more people listen to the Public Service Commission because we simply -- communication. I also wanted to tell you, the biggest debate I ever got into was whether or not we move this building to Baton Rouge. This was a big, big debate. We had the votes to do it, but the chief justice didn't want it because he liked eating at some restaurants down here. But anyway, this is the only building that you'll ever go to that has -- we spent 40 million on and only have 8 parking places. Eight. I thought it was ridiculous. We had a big, big lot up in Baton Rouge, right next to the Court of Appeals, where everybody could have gone and park -- plenty parking.

But we built this building for 40 million, spent 40 million, and you got 8 parking places. And guess who they was for? Eight judges. So anyway, I'm glad to be here in New Orleans. It's pretty. It a beautiful building. It's $40 million worth, y'all enjoy.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Any other announcements from any other Commissioners? Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank everyone who participated in Senator Barrow's Senate Resolution 148 Utility Assistance Coordination Task Force. So I want to thank all of the utilities who showed up on Senator Barrow's behalf. She was very pleased with the work that we are doing and continuing. If you have not checked your email, Charlotte, in my office, has sent a email to your designee for scheduling the next meeting. We are looking mid-November. So please make sure that your designee to the Commission -- to the task force, excuse me, has done so and we will get that meeting scheduled hopefully before the next B&E. Also, I -- Mr. Chairman, I wanted to congratulate Entergy Louisiana and 1803 for receiving the DOE SPARK grants. These are grants to help with advanced transmission technology. It was a very competitive process. I'm very pleased to see two Louisiana utilities receive federal dollars to help us with our transmission system, advance transmission technologies, grid enhancing technologies. So it's always great when federal dollars come back to Louisiana. So I want to personally thank 1803 and Entergy for their applications and look forward to seeing that the work you do with these grant dollars. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Commissioner Francis, or, Commissioner Coussan, any comments or announcements?

VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN: I just wanted to thank Commissioner Campbell for his comments and just keep being you man. Like, that's what I'm saying. Just keep being you, swinging to the end.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Let me -- I got some more swinging to do.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Let's do it after the prayer.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'd like to say something. You know, two or three years ago, we talked about rates being 10 cents. You remember that? You probably don't, but we talked about 10 cents, and it got to be 12 cents, and I'm going to talk about my own company here. SWEPCO, damn near 16 cents a kilowatt, 15.8 cents per kilowatt hour. That's too high. Y'all know that's too high. People can't pay those rates. And the high this month is -- you ought to give them a trophy, Pointe Coupee, is 16.5 cents per kilowatt hour. It's outrageous. And what's happening is people can't pay these bills. Y'all know that and we continue to just let them go up, up, up. I remember when I first got here, there were eight. The people said, oh Lord, eight. Then it got to be nine. Then it got to be 10. Now, I see it's a little bit from being 17 cents per kilowatt hour. So, I guess, we -- I'm not -- look, I won't be here but two more meetings. A lot of you will probably be glad, but anyway, two more meetings. This is too high. We ought to be doing everything we can to keep it a little bit lower.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS: No, no.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Anything from y'all?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: No.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, before we begin, I just want to make one final note. This is the last meeting that I'll host in my district. It's been an honor to have it in District 1. And I couldn't ask for better weather and a better opportunity to host it in -- in the city where I was born. You know, this building, I've had a lot of memories with this building, when it was abandoned when it was a federal courthouse. I actually was an extra in a movie here when it was literally a shell, when the wildlife and fisheries building had a thing. I actually hung out with Kathleen Turner in the hallway all night long once. And I guess that's something you can view as a claim to fame other than we were just waiting for the next shot. So there you go. But what a fantastic place to be. What a fantastic opportunity to host this Commission in such a lovely sitting. So thank y'all for coming here and making an effort to come to New Orleans today. We'll go ahead and move on with item -- Exhibit Number 2.

MS. BOWMAN: Well, can --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: We didn't do the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Oh, sorry. The prayer and the pledge, I'm sorry. Thank you for reminding me. I would ask the prayer from Commissioner Francis, please?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: All right.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And I will lead in the pledge.

[COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS LEADS IN PRAYER]

[CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA LEADS IN THE PLEDGE]

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Just a second reminder to silence your phones, please. Okay. And go ahead with Exhibit 2.

MS. BOWMAN: And, Commissioner, I have two quick announcements.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. BOWMAN: The first is Exhibit Number 14 is being deferred today.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay.

MS. BOWMAN: So that's Exhibit 14 for everyone. And then a quick announcement is on November 5, at 10:30 in the morning, at the Galvez Building, in the Natchez Room, where we normally have our B&Es, we will have the first public energy efficiency working group. So it's all -- it's on the website as well as the agenda, but just wanted to make that announcement here today as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. And are we doing any other deferrals, like on 21, or we still have 21 active?

MS. BOWMAN: I haven't heard --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: This is the rehearing. I'm respectfully requesting, Mr. Chairman, that we defer that one until our next meeting.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: That's deferred.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: But that would not preclude us having the testimony that we've also asked for separately today.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. That's fine. We can have comment on that?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: During -- when we do --

MS. BOWMAN: There's two agenda items.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right. We can do comment and we can also defer 21?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. All right. Now, since I'm all scatter brained because I forgot to eat breakfast, let's go ahead and move onto Exhibit 2.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 2 is Docket Number T-37136. This is Cantium versus Rosefield. It's a complaint against Rosefield for transportation and terminalling of crude oil as a common carrier without a tariff on file with the Commission at rates that are excessive and request that Rosefield pay reparations, refunds, and damages for charges above just and reasonable rates. This is the discussion and possible vote on the final recommendation of the remand of -- to the Administrative Law Judge. The matter was initiated with a complaint from Cantium in March of 2024. And after filing of exceptions in hearing -- and hearing on those exceptions, the ALJ issued a ruling concluding that Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of Cantium's complaint. The Commission memorialized that in Order Number T-37136, issued on June 4, 2025. Rosefield then appealed that order to the 19th JDC. Act 458 of the 2025 Regular Legislative Session amended certain statutes regarding the Commission's jurisdiction over common carrier pipelines. At a hearing on December 9, 2025, the 19th JDC remanded the

matter to the Commission. The Commission set briefing deadlines for the parties to file briefs directly to the Commission regarding the issues on remand and that matter was placed on the March 2026 B&E. After discussion and argument, the Commission voted not to amend its findings. At the Commission's April B&E, the Commission voted to remand the matter to the ALJ to conduct a narrow-expedited hearing regarding the applicability of the 2025 amended statutes. Throughout the proceeding, Rosefield has taken the position that it is not a common carrier pipeline subject to the Commission's jurisdiction while Cantium and Commission Staff have taken the position that Rosefield is a common carrier pipeline subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Pursuant to the procedural schedule established for the remand hearing, Rosefield filed testimony with exhibits of two witnesses. Staff and Cantium did not file testimony. After the filing and disposition of various evidentiary motions and pre-hearing statements and briefs, the remand hearing was held in July 7 of this year. At which, Rosefield, Cantium, and Commission Staff appeared -- participated. Rosefield presented the testimony of Ms. Legge and Mr. Capsimalis, documenting evidence and argument in support of its position. Cantium presented documentary evidence and arguments in support. Following post-hearing briefing, by the parties pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the ALJ issued a proposed recommendation on the remand on September 2 of this year. That recommendation concluded that the Commission's finding of Rosefield as common carrier was not altered based on the applicability of Louisiana Revised Statutes amended during the 2025 Legislative Session. Rosefield filed exceptions to the proposed recommendation on September 18,

arguing that the ALJ's applicability of the amended statutes would lead to absurd consequences and Staff and Cantium filed replies on October 2 disputing Rosefield's interpretation, and supporting the ALJ's application of the amended statutes finding that the ALJ's application was correct. On October 7 of this year, after consideration of the exception filings by the parties, the ALJ issued its final recommendation on remand of the Administrative Law Judge in the form of a Draft Order. The ALJ recommends that the Commission adopt the final recommendation of the ALJ, issued in the form of a Draft Order filed into the record on October 7 of this year, which concludes that the Commission's finding of Rosefield as a common carrier is not altered based on the applicability of the Louisiana Revised Statutes --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Please silence phones. Keep going.

MS. BOWMAN: -- amended during the 2025 Legislative Session, specifically, Act 458, and we do have yellow cards for two parties to speak.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Go ahead and put a motion on the floor to affirm the ALJ's recommendation. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Okay. Then we'll hear the commentary before we'll go to a vote.

MS. BOWMAN: So we have two representatives of Rosefield, it's Mr. Seth Lawrence and Ms. Jamie Watts.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Any other commentary?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir. Representatives from Cantium as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Well go first. All right.

SECRETARY FREY: And just for these items, there are two seats.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right.

SECRETARY FREY: So I can get up if you need me to. But otherwise, let's try to limit it to two people at a time.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Jamie, do you only need two chairs?

MS. JAMIE WATTS: That's correct, Chair.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. All right. Go ahead and proceed.

MS. WATTS: Thank you, Chairman and Commissioners. Jamie Watts of the Long Law Firm, with my partner Seth Lawrence on behalf of Rosefield Fourchon Operating. And Mr. Lawrence will address this morning's comments.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: You can go ahead.

MR. SETH LAWRENCE: Good morning, Commissioners. And what we want to do today is, we would ask that the Commission overrule the final recommendation because the ALJ's recommendation looked at this issue on the new law through the lens of the old law, and did not properly give weight to what the amendments intended and what they -- how they read. And that this ruling is going to set a precedent that is going to potentially impact the many other similarly situated terminal facilities in the state. And it's going to go back a little bit on when we -- this complaint was first filed. Cantium filed a complaint in May 2024. The statute at that time -- losing a Revised Statute 45:251, was a century old, had very broad language, and it was a focus on whether there was petroleum being transported through a line of pipe from once place in the state into the other. Well, the

legislature amended the statute this past year. It included very specific exclusions from what is defined as a pipeline, which then goes on as a common carrier, which is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission. The question that really comes into focus after the amendments is not whether Rosefield was moving petroleum for compensation in the literal sense, but it's whether its assets in the facility, the terminal facility, met the definition of the excluded items that was excluded from the broad definition of pipeline which was, pipes -- used for terminalling services, intraterminal transfer lines, metering facilities, tanks, and truck unloading facilities. The amendment was very clear that they wanted to carve out terminal facilities from a very broad definition. And it is interesting that prior to this amended law, it really was -- everyone referred to this facility as a terminal facility. Cantium's complaint referred to it as a terminal facility, and so did Chevron, and of course, Rosefield maintains it isn't a terminal facility. And at the ALJ hearing, the only evidence that was offered about what terminal services are -- terminal facility and what actually goes on at the Fourchon terminal, was the testimony of Rosefield. Rosefield's CEO and then a expert. There was -- and so what happened and what, kind of, the evidence showed was that Rosefield operates a terminal facility and Port Fourchon receives petroleum from customers, places it in storage tanks for a period of time, and then will release it through a short intraterminal transfer line into a larger downstream system. This is a very common example of what terminal facilities do. There's going to be some movement in petroleum throughout the facility. And particularly, all this occurs on land that Rosefield has property rights in. There's a talk about it goes underneath a canal, but it goes into a canal that

Rosefield has a lease interest in. So this recommendation has the potential to go beyond just this private dispute between Rosefield and Cantium, and to call into question other facilities that have not previously been regulated by the LPSC, and that also have statutory exclusions that are very new in the law. So as, kind of, part of what the ALJ, I think, just missed is there was a lot of focus on this transportation piece and it being, kind of, under the old lens. But the new law was very specific. And the evidence could not -- there's no evidence controverting what Rosefield put on, that this was the definition of a terminal facility. It all occurred on its facility and the conclusion has to be that this would meet a terminal facility. However, the ALJ's recommendation, I think, had a lot of vestiges of the old law. So that's why the Rosefield respectfully, request that the Commission overrule the that. Because, I mean, the -- if the terminal facilities, and the Commissioners can look at the amended statute itself, very specifically are trying to carve out of what is the definition of pipeline? Because it is a very different and unique service that is not part of, you know, long haul transportation of petroleum which would be subject to either this Commission or the federal, FERC, depending on if it's inter or intrastate. So -- and not to belabor the point, but Rosefield respectfully requests that the Commission overrule and set a precedent that is very clearly carved out from the amended statute and that these terminal facilities are not to be subject to LPC regulation. Because they have a different function than what we would think about as a pipeline -- along all pipeline. These are very short lines, low pressure lines, and they are all within a facility that Rosefield has property rights in. There is the ALJ -- there was a lot of discussion about whether it was solely within a facility, solely

for terminalling services, and then she actually took the solely within a facility and solely for terminalling services and extrapolated it out through those other exceptions. That's not how the law was written and if you do that you actually run into redundancies because there's other definitions about what's terminalling services and what is not. And specifically, there was testimony that the primary line that the ALJ mentioned that was not within the facility LAL 1490, that that line was is -- an intraterminal transfer line. It's known by -- in the industry. And, of course, you know, under the rules of statutory construction, you look at it if there's ambiguity, you kind of look at the technical terms, got to give them technical definitions. And there was technical definitions given at this hearing and they were not -- the ALJ chose to ignore those, and I think, you know, that was a legal error. And so Rosefield respectfully requests that this Commission overrule the ALJ's final recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Thank you very much. And we'll hear now from -- oh, sorry. We actually have some other folks who want to talk to them directly now or you want --

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Yes, yes. Well, if it --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Whenever --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: No, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to pick up where you left off because that's where I -- the way I read the statute, it talks about solely

terminalling facilities. So is it your testimony that Rosefield counts itself as a sole -- solely terminal facility?

MR. LAWRENCE: The Rosefield Fourchon terminal, yes, Chairman -- Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: So you're saying that that is what you are?

MR. LAWRENCE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. No problem. Thank you very much. We'll go on and we have other commentary?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir. There're two representatives from Cantium, Matt Simone and Kelly Perrier.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. They can come on up. Do y'all need other chairs, or two is okay?

SECRETARY FREY: No just that. Keeping the other one in the back.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay.

MR. SIMONE: We're actually keeping Ms. Perrier, she waives --

MS. BOWMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. SIMONE: -- that her card as well. And, Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I appreciate it and I'll be incredibly brief on this. I know there's a lot of documents that have been presented in the past few years. I want to make very clear, we're talking about the intent of the statute, the intent of legislature. The statute was 100 years old, never challenged. The reason there was an amendment to that statute was because Rosefield would like to overrule your

prior decision. That's why the statute was amended. The original bill, which Rosefield favored, was a cut and dry, pretty much said Rosefield is a terminal not under LPSC jurisdiction. It was amended. A test came out. And we can talk all day about statutory interpretation, and how picky you can get, and look into grammatical rules. I would say just look at the statute. That's what the ALJ did. She looked at the statute, read its plain meaning. And in it a two-part test to it. To fit within the exception of not being a pipeline, you need to pass two tests: 1) Be operating solely within a terminal facility; and 2) Be solely engaging in terminal activities. The ALJ looked at that. She found: 1) That the pipeline, it leaves Rosefield's facility outside of its fence line. It then goes under a canal. It then goes through some marsh. Just general concepts of common sense say that marshland is not a terminal facility. A canal is not a terminal facility. And again, we can look at the documents and evidence that were presented by Rosefield in which it shows that the sublease that they own is only within the fence line, on the small area where you can see it on a map. It does not go -- they have no rights to the canal. They have no rights to the marsh land. Their sub-lessor does, but Rosefield as a sub-lessee, has no rights past their fence line. Therefore, common sense says the pipeline that leaves the pipeline is under the marsh and canal is going outside, as well as just legal principles, that they don't have any rights to be operating outside of that fence line. That's part one of the test, the location. The second part is the use. We've been in front of this Commission now several times. You all have heard us all speak about this. You have ruled previously that Rosefield is engaged in transportation. At least in some sort, they are engaged in transportation. Factually, they are not

solely engaged in terminalling services. The ALJ found that again because the testimony of Mr. Capsimalis, Rosefield's CEO, he essentially testified again. We transport product. And there is no limitation of statute talking about how if you're a long-haul pipeline, or a short pipeline, the statute doesn't say, if I'm going 100 feet are from here to the west coast. You're a pipeline, if you're moving hydrocarbons from one spot in Louisiana to another through a line made of pipe, and that's what they're doing here. Commissioners, this statute I believe was passed because the terminal industry was somewhat scared that it could apply to them. You all stated that we are not trying to regulate terminals. And I think that's still y'all's position. This Commission is not regulating terminals or seeking to regulate terminals. However, legislature said, let's make a statute to make it clear. That statute now says, pipelines that are inside terminals, and used for terminals, those are not pipelines under LPSC jurisdiction. That comports with your statements. However, if you go outside of the terminal, you were then a pipeline under LPSC jurisdiction. It's common sense and clear. Rosefield would like to tell you that that statute if you take apart one phrase, just read one phrase, then they should be accepted. However, again, I'd say read the entire statute. The statute has that two-part test, and it says including A, B, C, D facilities. Those are just an exhaustive list of what may be into the exception. But you still must pass that first test. I'll close on the public policy piece that was raised by Rosefield. They say there's a worry that all the terminals will be scared of your ruling on this. There's not one example to show when that will be the case. Instead the public policy argument it still rings true today, says that if a producer put its crude or their hydrocarbons through a

pipeline, some bad actor could buy a piece of that pipeline and then all of a sudden say, I have a tank on this. I put that oil through a tank for a day or two and I'm no longer under LPSC jurisdiction. Therefore, I can set whatever rate I want. It could be $2 a barrel. It could be $450 a barrel. It could be $10 a barrel, because the LPSC can't tell me anything. I'm held captive by that pipeline who wants to say they're a terminal. That still stays true today. And, Commissioners, I have no other comments. I was longer than I expected to be so I apologize.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: That's okay. Any questions from the Commission? [NONE HEARD] No questions for you. We have a motion on the floor from the Chairman, seconded by Commissioner Coussan to affirm he ALJ recommendation. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the ALJ recommendation is affirmed. Thank you very much. Move on to the next item please.

MR. SIMONE: Thank you, Commissioners.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 3, which is T-38039. This is the Commission versus Next Nest on an alleged violation of the Revised Statutes by engaging in activities related to moving household goods prior to complying with the requirements of Revised Statutes 45:164(E) and the Commission's General Orders dated March 16, 2021 and failure to comply with the requirements of General Order dated April 3, 2008 as amended. It's a discussion and possible vote pursuant to Rule 57 on an affidavit and stipulation executed by the carrier, so this will need two votes. As a result of an investigation by the Transportation Staff, a citation was issued to Next Nest on July 10, 2026 based on aforementioned allegations and violations. In response to that citation, the owner of the company

executed an affidavit and stipulation admitting to the violations in the citation and agreed to the imposition of a $25 citation fee, and a $1,000 fine with 500 being suspended contingent on conditions of executing the affidavit by a date certain, ceasing engaging in activities related to moving household goods until he received common carrier certificate from the Commission, removing references of moving services, and change language to read labor only on the company's website. Staff recommends that the Commission exercise its original and primary jurisdiction under Rule 57 to consider the affidavit and stipulation and accept that affidavit and stipulation executed on September 25 of this year for fines and fees totaling $525.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. First, Chair moves to bring the matter up under Rule 57. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Second by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is brought up. Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Second by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 4 is Docket Number R-36241. This is the Commission's rulemaking to revise the Commission's Rule of Practice and Procedure. It's a discussion and possible vote on Staff's recommendation on a final proposed rule for Part 2 related to parties. This rulemaking was initiated in January 2022, and Staff has been working to review and substantially revise the rules to not

only clarify specific components, but also ensure the rules are up to date. At the Commission's April meeting of this year, the Commission directed Staff to implement an interim Rule 10(A) for mandatory disclosure of foreign and outside funding sources by intervenors in Commission proceedings. Staff is still working on a complete revision of the rules, but given the Commission's directive at the April B&E, Staff worked separately on Part 2 of the rules related to parties to a Commission's proceeding, including proposing rules consistent with the Commission's directive at the April B&E. The Commission's directive was based on a finding that participation in Commission proceedings by entities whose funding is directed, controlled, or substantively influenced by a foreign country of concern, or by an entity acting on behalf of such foreign country can undermine the integrity of Commission proceedings affecting Louisiana ratepayers, energy infrastructure, and the public interest. The Commission's findings were drawn from the Pelican Institute for Public Policies March 2026 report, barriers to Louisiana energy dominance which documented organizations having received over $100 million in out-of-state funding since 2020, including millions from the US Energy Foundation and Energy Foundation - China. Concerning to the Commission was the report that those -- the Energy Foundation - China, has faced intense scrutiny over allegations of Chinese communist party connections and improper foreign influences including funneling money to U.S. based organizations to advance Chinese energy policies. Staff filed several notices of proposed rules throughout this proceeding with several intervenors providing comments. Staff filed its third set of proposed rules on September 9, 2026 titled Staff's Final Proposed Rules for

Part 2 - Parties, providing notice to all intervenors that his was the final review of the rules and requested final comments. The September 9, 2026 proposed rules made substantial changes based on comments previously received including limiting the disclosure requirements to foreign adversaries, as well as providing for secondary tertiary funding on the same. Comments were received by 10 intervenors. Generally, ALEC, Entergy, Alliance for Affordable Energy, LEUG, SERA, all indicated they had no major concerns. However, each had comments suggesting slight modifications. Sierra Club and the Pelican Institute indicated substantial revisions were still necessary. Based on the Commission's directive, Staff's independent research, and comments and input received from all intervenors, Staff filed the proposed final rules on October 7, 2026. Those rules focused not only on clarification of longstanding Commission policies, but also furthers the Commission's goal of transparency in Commission proceedings, transparency of the underlying goals and policies in the Commission's proceedings, assist the Commission in understanding the various interests and/or bias of all parties, providing information in a proceeding both for proponents and opponents. The final proposed rules provide the terms of which all parties may participate as intervenors in the Commission's proceedings and treat all parties equally. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the final proposed rules filed into the record on October 7 of this year, and we have two requests for comment.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. We'll put a motion on the floor first. Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. And we'll go ahead and hear the comment.

MS. BOWMAN: A Mr. Ahmed Jaber and Mr. Daniel -- is it Erspamer? I'm sorry. I probably did not say that correctly.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I'm surprised you don't know his name by heart.

MR. AHMED JABER: How does this work? Do I give my address, or do I just start, or? Okay. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Ahmed. I'm with the Party for Socialism and Liberation and the Take Back the Power Campaign to kick Entergy out of Louisiana politics. Counselor Skrmetta, you seem a little concerned that foreign powers might be interfering with Louisiana's energy -- energy policy. This whole thing kind of reminds me of the meeting that you guys had back in August. You got really defensive about being on Meta's payroll and grilled Commissioners Lewis on whether he was quote, a future communist. I'm looking at this new rule that you're proposing to investigate if any non-profit that challenges utility companies are on the payroll of some spooky Oriental country. And it makes me wonder, have you always shouted commie whenever someone disagrees with you or is this a new thing? Commissioner Skrmetta, please spare us the General McCarthy cosplay because you don't have to look all the way to China to find somebody interfering with our government. Investigative journalists found that Entergy executives ghost wrote a motion submitted on your behalf, and that about half of your campaign contributions came from utility and fossil fuel interests, or should we believe that Floodlight and WWNO are international spies as well? To hear you, Commissioner Skrmetta, raise such a stink about interference of all

people, all I have to say is, have you no sense of decency, sir? Corporations like Entergy do not have to infiltrate our government. Why bother? They're already allowed to ghost write favorable policy, outspend any grassroots campaign, and then stick the cost on our bills as a surcharge. That is the elephant in the room here and no amount of red scare finger pointing is going to hide it. The Public Service Commission's decisions, the only thing that matters ultimately, serve to benefit Entergy the very corporation they are supposed to be regulating at the expense of Louisiana's working families that they are supposed to be protecting. So why are the players flagging the referees here? Whose side are you on? As long as Entergy can buy its own regulators and write its own rules, we will always have to fight barriers to participation like these new financial disclosure requirements, and as long as for-profit monopolies like Entergy control essential services, there will always be an Eric Skrmetta sitting at that desk. The solution is to take electricity out of private hands altogether, and let the people who depend on the grid decide what we do with it. And the best part, you don't even need foreign funding to come help with that idea. Zero dollars and cup of common sense.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Wait. Say, we have some questions for you from other Commissioners.

MR. JABER: Who?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Good morning.

MR. JABER: Hi.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Who are you with again?

MR. JABER: The Party for Socialism and Liberation and the Take Back the Power Campaign to demand Entergy get out of Louisiana politics.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: And does your sign say, drill baby drill, or are my contacts bad?

MR. JABER: What?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: That was -- I'm sorry. That was a different sign. Thank you.

MR. JABER: That's it?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: That's it. That's all I've got.

MR. JABER: Oh.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I've got a question, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I have a question from Commissioner Francis.

MR. JABER: Yes. Who?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I can't read the -- would you read your sign for me? So I -- I can't see it from here.

MR. JABER: Oh, this is just -- I was using -- so I'd be able to write on the comment card. It just says, no data centers on our dime. The reason being that Entergy is going to be building 10 power plants to power the Hyperion Data Center in Richland, and the expected amount that everyone in Louisiana's bills are going to go up is $40 a month. I really don't want to pay $40 a month. I don't think most people can afford that. There's already an affordability crisis.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I've got something to say.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: So you want to change things in Louisiana -- in America to socialism, from capitalism to socialism?

MR. JABER: So can you repeat the question?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Do you want to change Louisiana to socialism?

MR. JABER: Do I want to change Louisiana to socialism is your question?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yeah.

MR. JABER: So I would love to see a system where people are in control of our essential utilities. People have political power to actually represent their interests versus, you said capitalism is the alternative. Capitalism, as in the thing that is putting data centers all over the state. As in the thing that we've been having to fight tooth and nail to maintain the temporary ban on data centers in all of New Orleans. That thing that every politician keeps trying to overturn. This gigantic buildout that only serves to make rich people richer, while it pollutes our air, evaporates our water, taking it out of the water table completely. Do I want to replace that with a better system? What's your name? Mike -- Commissioner Francis, correct. Yes. I do want to replace that with another system.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. JABER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner Campbell has a question.

MR. JABER: Oh, hi.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How you doing?

MR. JABER: Good. How are you?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I commend you. You're a good speaker. I enjoy hearing you talk. I represent that part of the country up there that -- putting a data center up in Richland Parish. I've been in politics 50 years. On January 1, it'll be 51 years. Fifty of those 50 years, I've been trying to do something for those people out there in northeast Louisiana. They have been the poster child for poverty. The people, the children, and etcetera. All the bad stuff happens. So we finally got a chance to get some -- a little help up there and I'm supporting it. But I understand what you're talking about, but you need to understand what we're looking at too.

MR. JABER: May I respond to that?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Excuse me. Let me get through.

MR. JABER: Sorry. I thought you were done.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: That's okay. I got a chance to do something about it. I made a decision to do it. A lot of people up there are going to have jobs for the first time, good paying jobs. And I know there's -- I never seen a decision in 50 years where everything is on one side. There're always two sides. I told you I would listen to both sides and make a decision. I made a decision for the data center. I'm not ashamed of it. I also made a decision a long time ago to try to help north Louisiana everywhere I could, especially northeast Louisiana. And I hope to God this does the trick. I understand where you're coming from, excuse me. You're entitled to your opinion. But we got a decision to make sometimes, you have thousands of people that need jobs, better paying jobs. And I made that decision. And I'm not pulling back from it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. JABER: I would say -- may I respond?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. JABER: Okay. So I think in that regard, we're both on the same side. We would love to see a better life for all working families throughout the state, north Louisiana, New Orleans, no matter where. There are also, you're correct, there are two sides about this. But I do think that those two sides are Meta and Entergy, and the working people of this state. I went to Richland twice so far. I've talked to people. So far, I've found one person who the trailer park down the street from her, the rent's went up by some crazy amount. Nobody could afford it. They gave them 12 days to vacate, and then flattened the whole thing. Right now, all of the development around there centered around the construction build. Even the teacher bonuses, the $50,000 teacher bonuses that everyone was so -- like, Meta was so proud of, that is not anything having to do with Meta. That is like an old 1950s-ish law -- like local law where teachers get 1% of sales tax. That is not taking care of people. That is temporary. That is not going to do it. I've also spoken -- everybody that I've spoken to is really not liking the noise, the traffic problems. I actually, the day before, the last time we went to Richland, traffic was completely backed up because a truck delivering supplies got stuck on the railroad crossing because it was just at too steep of an angle. There're no preparations being made for this area to adapt to that amount of development. It seems like -- it seems like the MO here is just to not invest anything and reap all the -- all the extraction profits. Also, I did speak to one person who said that they were working for the data center as a janitor. But even they -- and that's good for him. I'll bet it probably pays more than like,

most other janitor spots. So very good for him. But he also told me that's only 40 people. I don't think that 100, what is it, $50 billion for this project, and it gives 40 janitor jobs. I heard something like 1,000 other jobs. Are the certifications for those jobs available locally or does Meta plan to import people from New York and California? I doubt that, you know, data center engineering jobs are offered at the Richland Parish Community College.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Well, you do a lot of talking. Some of it's not backed up but I hear you talking.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. Well, thank you. And as -- when you, you know, keep this thought in your mind that we don't have to build data centers. We get to build data centers. It's a blessing on our state. So I want you to know that. Anyway, thank you very much for your commentary.

MR. JABER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Next speaker, please.

MR. DANIEL ERSPAMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I'm Daniel Erspamer, CEO of the Pelican Institute for Public Policy. As many of you may know, the Pelican Institute is Louisiana's free market think tank. Our vision for the state is that every Louisianan has the opportunity to flourish, to pursue the American dream, and our mission is to remove the barrier -- those barriers to flourishing an opportunity. Obviously, the work that you do as Commissioners is critically important in that mission. Entergy and all of the areas you regulate have a very direct impact on the lives on Louisianans. I really also appreciate the stated objectives of Commission in reading in this docket and others that the objective is

to unleash Louisiana energy dominance. We share that objective with you and applaud you for your leadership in getting us to that point. Very briefly, comments on this docket. Obviously, you heard our name mentioned in some of the description to it. And I just want to express gratitude particularly to the hard-working Staff and other intervenors who -- who helped to take this rule and get it to what I think is a strong place. A narrowly tailored rule that doesn't violate rights of privacy and free association for Americans who want to support causes they believe in without fear of retribution and intimidation. But at the same time, protecting Louisiana, and protecting and providing transparency when foreign adversaries are engaging in the process. So that was the stated goal at the beginning of this. I think throughout the process of revisions -- really grateful for the open ear of Staff and the Commission when we and others had feedback on how to make it stronger and more narrowly tailored. So I'm just here to say thank you, express our support for the rule, and look forward to working with you and the Commission on a number of other important topics into the future. Thank you for a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, thank you and thank the Pelican Institute for bringing this matter to our attention.

MR. ERSPAMER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So thank you very much. We have a -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Hey, my friend. Good to see you.

MR. ERSPAMER: Hello.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: I just wanted to make sure, because I was reading through some of your comments --

MR. ERSPAMER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: -- do you believe that the now final rule does solve your particular comment on the dormant commerce clause, are you good with that now?

MR. ERSPAMER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. So we have a motion on the floor, a second. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, matter's approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 5 is Docket Number R-37871. This is the is Commission's Louisiana Advanced Nuclear Exploration Program. It's a discussion and possible vote on a final rule. This was Exhibit 3 last month. The docket was initiated by a Notice of Proceeding filed on March 10 of this year, pursuant to a directive at the February B&E. Staff was directed to develop the Louisiana Advanced Nuclear Exploration Program, which would establish a mechanism to require the IOUs to engage with qualified advanced nuclear technology vendors for potential integration of small modular reactors, microreactors, and other advanced nuclear technologies into the state's electric generation fleet. The notice was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with six parties intervening. Attached to the Staff's notice, Staff provided the proposed program and sought comments from -- about the program. Staff reviewed all feedback and filed its

recommended of proposed -- proposed rule. In that initial recommendation, Staff noted that the intent was clear and it specifically limited the rulemaking to establish a mechanism for the electric utilities to engage with specific nuclear vendors on potential technologies. Staff did incorporate suggestions provided by stakeholders and requested one more round of comments. At the consideration of all parties' comments, in both the first round and a second round, Staff filed its final rule on August 6 of this year. The final rule is summarized as: Requiring the electric utilities who participate in the program to partner with qualified nuclear vendors and designers to fund feasibility studies, site assessments, economic analysis, and preliminary licensing and permitting preparations. A $20 surcharge/rider will be applied to all metered customers on the participating utilities for a 5-year period. Annual reports will be filed providing details of the program and at the end of the 5-year term, the Commission will conduct a review to determine whether the program should continue to be modified or terminated. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the final rule filed into the record on August 6, 2026.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. I'm going to move to adopt the Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: The motion?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: This motion has been adopted in the Staff recommendation?

MS. BOWMAN: No. But I can -- would you like me to read that into the record?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes. Please do that into the record.

MS. BOWMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So we clarify it.

MS. BOWMAN: So the Chair's motion is we -- that we move to accept the final proposed rule filed into the record on August 6 with three modifications which is intended to avoid per meter charges or rate increases for customers as a result of the rule. The first modification is to replace the entirety of Section 201, and replace it with the following: Each participating utility is authorized to spend up to $2 million over three years on approved program activities. Any such expenditures are subject to review for prudence in accordance with applicable law. Prudently incurred expenditures on approved program activities are deemed eligible for recovery through base rates, so long as those expenditures do not result in a rate increase for customers. The second modification is to delete Section 101(A)1, and Section 501(B), as they are not -- as they are now unnecessary with the changes made to Section 201. The third modification is to change the term of the program in Section 501, from five years to three years. And the fourth modification is to change Section 101(A) from enable to require, as the intent of the program in the rule was to require the IOUs to participate and allow interested electric cooperatives to participate.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. That's the motion. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Seconded by Coussan.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I still have a question for Staff real quick.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And question from Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question for Staff. Can you explain to me the funding mechanism? I've gotten a lot of calls from constituents, and as I read the language, I know we're moving away from the per meter charge, but this is still within the formula rate plan, the rates that are collected. But I'm battling with spending up to 2 million. So are the utilities -- IOUs required to spend 2 million, or they're just required to spend some portions as long as it doesn't go over their bandwidth within 2 million?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I think that's it. I think they can spend up to.

MS. LAUREN EVANS: Lauren Evans on behalf of Staff. Commissioner, they're allowed to spend up to that amount, but they are not required to spend that amount.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Correct. Correct.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: But they are required to spend some amount?

MS. EVANS: They are required to participate in the program which would cost something. So, yes. They are required to spend something but that -- that amount is not -- cannot cause a rate increase for customers.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Correct.

MS. EVANS: And so it has to be within the bandwidth of the FRP.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BOWMAN: And --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So go ahead. We have a --

MS. BOWMAN: I'm sorry. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So we can't have a vote yet because we've got a card?

MS. BOWMAN: We do have a public comment from --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Go ahead.

MS. BOWMAN: -- Kendall Berry.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. And before she -- before you start speaking, I want to clarify something. It was some concerns that there was a issue going on in Arkansas about nuclear funding. That's funding for a Westinghouse 1100-megawatt unit, which is about CWIP cost while in progress. That's something that Louisiana has been avoiding since we've built the last large nuclear systems. That's for during the actual construction of facilities, and we still haven't resolved CWIP issues in the state of Louisiana. So that's a totally different issue than this.

SECRETARY FREY: Yeah. And we've got on that point, we have those quote, new nuclear --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right.

SECRETARY FREY: -- rules that we worked on back in the '08 timeframe, I think. And we talked about looking at that maybe there in the future.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Because you're talking about that being in the billions.

SECRETARY FREY: Correct. Correct.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So this is something which is a research element --

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: -- because we're talking about, while there's six new units that have been designed from six different companies, there's an upwards of 25 units from different companies that are going to be coming out in the next year and a half that need to be researched for which ones are going to provide the best value to the consumers. So okay. All right. Continue.

MS. BOWMAN: And, Ms. Berry, before you start, I know you've spoken before in front of us, so you're familiar with our rules, but please keep your comments to the actual agenda item.

MS. KENDALL BERRY: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: Thank you.

MS. BERRY: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Kendall Berry. I'm an organizer with the Take Back the Power Campaign. And I'm here to ask for you all to put a cap on utility hikes of all kinds. Regular people's energy bills are already insanely too high, and considering passing any cost onto customers who've already been robbed by the parasite that is Entergy is heinous. Why should families cover corporate expenses when they're already struggling to pay their Entergy bills? Nobody I've talked to asked for or wants this silicon bayou that our government -- governor is forcing on us. And considering he's had to do it behind NDAs with mega corporations owned by billionaires, excuse me for being skeptical. I hear people's outrageous Entergy bills every day. Just the other day, a friend of mine, a native New Orleanian, had been living out of state and he just moved back about a month ago. His first Entergy bill was over $2,000. Two-thousand dollars for one

month. Thankfully, he had sense to fight back and get on the phone with Entergy, and after days of arguing, was able to partially remedy this impossibly large bill. But this is unacceptable. Do we want people to live here or not? I grew up learning that monopolies were bad but now my government agencies specifically tasked with protecting ratepayers from utility companies, lets Entergy write legislation for them. The people want a cap on utility hikes. The people need relief now. Prices of everything are skyrocketing and the last thing we need is to go on a risky gamble for a big tech company and let them swindle their way into moving their costs onto regular customers.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner Campbell has a question for you.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How you doing this morning?

MS. BERRY: I'm doing pretty good. How are you?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: You sound like you're excited. Hey, Miss, let me ask you something.

MS. BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I saw many of speech at the [INAUDIBLE] about high utility bills. So I'm on your side about the rates. What do you think the rates -- this lady that paid -- gentleman paid $2,000 is what you said his first bill? What did he get it down to?

MS. BERRY: I didn't -- I didn't ask.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: That'd be real important. Did he get it down to 1,900 or did he get down to 400? That would be real important.

MS. BERRY: But he had to call and be on the phone for days? Like, some people don't have that time.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I got you but I'm on your side. I'd like to get it down but it does make a big difference if it was $2,000 and we got it down to 400 under the --

MS. BERRY: What about other people whose rates are over $1,000 and aren't able to get it down?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Look, you're preaching --

MS. BERRY: Because I have other stories.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I got you. You're in the choir preaching to me. Okay. I'll give you a little tip. Don't take this personal. Try not to. Talk a little lower. It does a lot better. Speak a little lower. You act like you're screaming, you know? It will probably help you a little bit. I wanted to give you that information because I've done the same thing you have, and it doesn't always pay dividends. That's just a tip from coach.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Thank you very much. We've got a motion on the floor. Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I will oppose, so I'll --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Ask for roll call vote.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Francis.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Coussan.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: No.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: And the Chair.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes. The motion is -- the item is approved. Move on to the next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 6 is Docket Number R-37943. This is the Commission's possible modifications to General Order dated October 12, 2007 related to franchise fees. It's a discussion and possible vote on Staff's final proposed rule and recommendation. This docket was initiated by the Commission's directive at its May 13, 2006 B&E, which directed Staff to review and possibly modify the Commission's General Order dated October 12, 2007 related to franchise fees, with a focus of including all franchise fees in a line-item on utilities bills. Notice of this proceeding was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with seven parties intervening. Based on the Commission's directive, a discussion had at the May B&E, Staff started its review with the Commission's General Orders dated October 18, 1988 and October 31, 2006 regarding the Commission's historic treatment of franchise fees and requiring those fees to be a separate line item on customers bills. Staff issued a proposed rule on September 4, which largely tracked the Commission's 1988 and 2006 General Orders and sought comments thereon. Generally, all comments received were receptive to Staff's proposed rules to the line item of the franchise fee payments with minor suggestions -- minor

modifications. Staff file notice of the final proposed rule on October 5 largely agreeing with all of the requested modifications and clarifications provided in the comments. And in the final proposed rule, Staff maintains that franchise fees are not part of a utility's cost-of-service, as they do not meet the general definition of operating expenses, and are not related to, and arguably are not necessary for regulated operations and as such recommended the Commission require all jurisdictional utilities to line item franchise fee payments and allocate those payments to those customers within those political subdivisions. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the final proposed rule filed into the record on October 5, 2026. And I believe I have a motion by Commissioner Coussan?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I make a motion to adopt Staff's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Actually, your individual --

MS. BOWMAN: I think you have an amended --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: -- your expanded motion, I think, you know, a special motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Can you read it?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I'll have her to come --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Go ahead.

MS. BOWMAN: Commissioner Coussan's motion is to amend the second paragraph of Section 601 of the final proposed rules to read as follows: Notwithstanding the foregoing, any jurisdictional utility with a rate proceeding

pending before or prescribed by the Commission as of the effective date of this order shall comply with the requirements of this order upon the effective date of new rates resulting from such proceedings. And any jurisdictional utility that is a party to an existing contract for franchise payments with a political subdivision that is currently billed in compliance with the Commission's 2007 order. It shall comply with the requirements of this as well -- as and when contracts contract amendments can be negotiated with said political subdivisions, but in no event later than the renewal of the existing contracts for franchise payments which may only be executed in compliance with this order, and as the same may be amended from time to time.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. I'm going to second the motion. We're going to bring up, is it SLEMCO?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I'd like to bring up someone from SLEMCO if you don't mind.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: And this overall issue is something, Mr. Chairman, that has been near and dear to your heart, I believe. It's technical, but it's important.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: SLEMCO is not the amendment and the motion particularly effects SLEMCO and some of their ongoing contracts, but in no way does it seek to undermine the overall intent of the original rule.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And this will also allow for the line iteming --

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: -- on all bills identifying each parish that engages in a franchise fee on utilities as I -- identifying that parish as a parish tax.

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Great. Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: And we're just -- I'm asking you just to speak on the amended version --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: -- so that we know that it -- overall impact doesn't impact the overall intent of the rule.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right.

MR. GLENN EDWARDS: Correct. Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity. Glenn Edwards on behalf of SLEMCO, and I'm accompanied this morning by my partner, Chris Piasecki. And I will address just the amendment. The -- SLEMCO indicated in its comments filed in connection with this rule that philosophically, we had no problem with a rule that requires a line-item of franchise fees to be included on the bills and that the actual ratepayers who live within municipal jurisdictions that charge the franchise fees bear the cost of those fees. The concern that we expressed in our comments, and the concerns that we discussed with you, Commissioner Coussan, other Commissioners afterwards, is that we have existing franchise agreements with 23 municipalities within our service area. Three of them are franchise agreements which pre-existed Commission jurisdiction over the cooperative so they're specifically excluded from the effects of this order. So

we're not talking about those today, but we're talking about the 20 that are affected by this order. We -- those franchise agreements are 10-year agreements. So we've actually since the 2007 order, undergone an initial 10-year contract and a renewed contract for 10 additional years. Both the initial contracts and the renewed contracts call for the payment of a 5% franchise fee by SLEMCO, and the contracts also provide that SLEMCO will bill and collect the franchise fees in accordance with the Commission order of 2007. The Commission order of 2007, it was not permissive in its language. It was mandatory. It was mandatory that we line-item 50% of the franchise fee to the customers of the municipalities, and it was mandatory that we include 50% of the franchise fee in our base rates for customers system wide. That's what we have done. We have gone through two rate proceedings since the 2007 order. Both of which included this 50% of the franchise fees in our rate cases which were approved by the Commission. So the concern that we have, and that we brought to your attention was that if we go to the municipalities, and we say we are going to change the way we collect this fee, and we're going to collect all of it from your city residents rather than 50% as required by the previous Commission order that the municipalities and the governing bodies of the municipalities are faced with having to accept the change for their citizens that they did not contemplate at the time they approved the franchise agreements. They approved the franchise agreements believing that their customers would be billed -- that their customers would be billed in accordance with the October 7 order. They relied on that and we don't want to create -- we don't want to create a situation where we've got municipalities trying to terminate franchise agreements

or becoming frustrated with SLEMCO and not renewing franchise agreements. So we have requested, look, let us go to the municipalities if we can renegotiate agreements, fine. If we can't, we have guaranteed the Commission that the new agreements, when the agreements renew, they will absolutely comply with the new order going forward. So our initial comment in this docket was to make this order prospective as to new contracts as opposed to retroactive, and so that's where we are. I can get into the dollars and cents, you know, the rate impact, or the changes that municipal residents are going to see if you like, but philosophically.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: So as your contracts expire or renewed, you're going to renegotiate, and there will be transparency with the public body insofar as what will be charged to the ratepayer based upon the actions of the local governing body?

MR. EDWARDS: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Reason being --

MR. EDWARDS: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Go ahead.

MR. EDWARDS: So as the contracts renew, if the local governing body says we want a 5% franchise fee, 5% franchise fee is going to be included on the bill, as a line-item, and charged only to the citizens of the municipality, and we have no problem with that.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Thank you, Mr. Edwards. I don't have any more questions.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner Campbell.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Mr. Edwards, you mentioned three co-ops that wasn't under the Commission.

MR. EDWARDS: No, no. Three contracts.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Contract.

MR. EDWARDS: We have 23 franchise agreements, Commissioner Campbell. The order itself says that this order does not apply to any contracts which were entered into with municipalities prior to the time that the utility was under the jurisdiction of the Commission. That language is a carry over from the previous orders. We have three franchise agreements which affect very few people that are -- that had 60-year terms and were entered into in the early 1970's. Okay. So at a time when we were not subject to Commission jurisdiction. However, when those contracts terminate, they will be -- if they are extended, they will be brought in under the current Commission rule as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. Thank you, Glenn, also for meeting with me on this. What is the timeframe between the existing 20 contracts? What are we looking at in terms of being able to bring those into compliance if it -- with this order?

MS. EDWARDS: So we provided -- we provided that information just over or right at half of those contracts will be renewed by 2028. Okay. The balance of them will be renewed in 2029, 2031, and 2035. I can tell you that the ones that are later out, affects very smaller numbers of people but the bulk -- the bulk of these dollars and the bulk of these people will be taken care of through the 2028 renewals.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. And as we talked about, you know, in my -- this has been a hot topic in my district and I told them I would mention it. The parish-president of Ascension Parish has -- we've talked. It is in support and he's okay now with this, also amendment. It has been a challenge, particularly in East Baton Rouge Parish, where the franchise fee on Entergy was raised and instead of going to infrastructure, it went into members of the Metro Council's budgets to pay for a parade and a go kart. So I've gotten a lot of calls from my constituents about this. And so I'm thankful for being able to work that solution out with you. And I just wanted to mention the support of the local governments that I represent that have -- that have voiced their support of this rule with the amendment as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. I would like to bring up a broader understanding of this issue for the public which is that this is a tax issue. Because there are many parishes in this state which have floated tax referendums and have not gotten any success. And, in some cases, five six times, movements to raise property taxes, movements to raise sales taxes, and parish governments seeking to find other ways to raise revenue. And raising them through -- sometimes through municipality franchise fees. But, in some cases, some parishes are looking for parish wide franchise fees on all or some utility services. That to me is a issue where it needs to be identified as a parish tax on the bill, and not something coming from the Public Service Commission, and that is the purpose of this. So I wanted to make sure that that is the clarification of what this is about. So we have a motion. We have a second?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I'd like to say something.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Mr. Edwards, where did -- where did this word franchise fee, the idea, where did that come from and when was -- when was that applied to the people?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, franchise fees from municipalities are provided by the state legislature. It is a matter of state law. Okay. That authorizes a governmental jurisdictions to charge franchise fees for those utilities that would operate within their jurisdiction. And, in fact, the -- so its been around for a long time, and franchise fees have been around for a long time. As I indicated earlier, we do still have three contracts that were executed back in the early 70s.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Did the Public Service Commission have anything to do with instigating franchise fees to people?

MR. EDWARDS: You know, honestly, historically, no.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Mr. Secretary, you know this?

SECRETARY FREY: No. I would say no. And I'm basing that, I'm going back historically. I worked on the '08 rules. I had two lawyers working on it and they both left in the middle of it. I don't know if it was a docket that made them leave, but no, it does go back. There's been statutory authority for municipalities in Title 33, and then for parochial governments and whatever the corollary statute is, I know, Commissioner Skrmetta, Commissioner Lewis, you brought this up. They have been reluctant to use that but the concept of a franchise fee and the language

thereof, has been a statutory language for 50 plus years, way predates the Constitution. What the statute has been clear about though, and where the Commission comes in is the maximum that ratepayers can be allowed to pay, and that's 5%. But it is -- it's a fee. It's a -- like, we had a lot of discussion back then, but I agree, it's a tax. So you can call it a fee, but it is what it is.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: They ought to call it a tax, a franchise fee tax. And -- but we use it -- it's tied to a multiple [INAUDIBLE] electricity bill; is that right?

SECRETARY FREY: That's correct. It is based on gross receipts.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: So it shows upon your electricity bill. It looks like it's a process that he Public Service Commission has put in place which is not true.

SECRETARY FREY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: If you would, let me ask you this, Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: As a SLEMCO customer -- I'm a SLEMCO customer. If a -- if we eliminate a tax franchise fee, would my electricity bill go down?

MR. EDWARDS: The --

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And these high bills tax? Would my -- just a yes or no --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: It would go down 5%.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: -- if you eliminated the franchise tax is eliminated --

MR. EDWARDS: If franchise fees charged by municipalities were eliminated, absolutely. Every -- nobody would pay it anymore.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: My SLEMCO bill would go down?

MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And, Commissioner Campbell's SWEPCO bill would go down if we eliminate it?

MR. EDWARDS: I cannot --

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: All right. Okay.

MR. EDWARDS: I cannot speak for whether other utilities pay franchise fees. I could tell you your SLEMCO bill would go down.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And my concerns to add to Commissioner Francis is there are movements now to put it not just on electricity bills but gas bills, on water bills, on sewer bills, on public services across the board in an effort to raise taxes on the public. And basically, do so in a way that makes it look like the Public Service Commission did so which is not true, which is why we're having it put as a line item on these bills in this parish tax.

MR. EDWARDS: And we currently do carry on our bills as a line-item for municipal residents, 50% of it. So there is a portion of your bill that says franchise fee city of so and so that is on our bills currently --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well --

MR. EDWARDS: -- which is what was required by the '07 order is what we do.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, we want to make clarification on this because there are, I think, we are seeing because of a -- and rightfully so, resistance of the public to increase taxes in general, that there are movement of some parishes to do so to find alternative ways to raise revenue instead of cutting, expanding, increase spending. So it's a problem and it needs to be recognized and the electric can take care of it however hey want to take care of it, so.

MR. EDWARDS: I don't disagree with you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, all right. So we do have a motion. We have a second? Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved.

SECRETARY FREY: And before Mr. Edwards leaves --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah.

SECRETARY FREY: -- personal privilege. The last time he and I sat together at this table, we were on that side. And we got a 7-0 decision from the guys and the ladies that were sitting up here. So just -- he also stole all of my reply time.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Oh, he's -- you're talking Supremes.

SECRETARY FREY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: There you go.

SECRETARY FREY: It was a good decision by Justice Genovese, we cite it all the time.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. Well, thank you very much. Appreciate you being here. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 7 is --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Is it seven?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir -- is Exhibit Number S-37686. This is SWEPCO's request for approval of three new proposed rate schedules regarding curtailable stand-by power and electric vehicle charging services, and modifications to an existing rate schedule regarding economic development in accordance with General Order dated July 1, 2019. It's a discussion and possible vote --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Got it. Go ahead. Go ahead. I heard you.

MS. BOWMAN: -- on Staff's Report and Recommendation. On July 23, 2025 SWEPCO filed the instant request, which was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions. In the request, SWEPCO requested Commission approval of three new tariffs and a modification to an existing tariff. On September 11 of this year, Staff filed its report and recommendation into the record, and in that report, Staff detailed its review at SWEPCO's request as well as supporting documentation. Staff did recommend modifications to the Rate Schedule 71, which should be changed to indicate instead of customer's own generation, read to customer's interconnected generation that is interconnected to the company's system and are qualified facilities within the meaning of PURPA. Staff also recommended Rate Schedule 72 -- a recommended approval of Rate Schedule 72, because recent outage reports that were produced by regulated utilities in from of the Commission where the company highlighted decision making guidelines for when the company is forced to determine when to shut off a customer's power due to system load requirements. Rate Schedule 73, Staff determined SWEPCO had an existing on this matter. Therefore, Staff recommended the Commission not approve that schedule in this docket but to

coordinate with Staff to resolve the approval of that rate schedule and the other currently pending docket. And then, in Rate Schedule 36, Staff believes the proposed changes lower the barrier for injury into the optional tariff, and can produce additional takers for SWEPCO's customers rate base. So Staff recommends that the Commission accept the Staff Report and Recommendation filed into the record on September 11, 2026, including the updated Rate Schedule 72, which was filed into the record on October 9 of this year.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. We have any motions? Commissioner Campbell, do you want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I would like to get Mr. Gilliam up here.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. You want to do that first, or you want make a motion first?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: No, I'll make -- get him up here first.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay, Mr. Gilliam, SWEPCO. I have a quick question for you on unrelated business. The yellow cards, are they a statement of taking an oath to tell the truth?

SECRETARY FREY: Yeah.

MS. BOWMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Is it swearing an oath?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. I'd like to review all the cards at the end.

MS. BOWMAN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Mr. Gilliam coming?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah. I've called him up, he just don't listen.

MR. BOBBY GILLIAM: Good morning, Commissioners.

MR. WESLEY HUNT: I'm Wesley Hunt. I'm director of regulatory services for Southwestern Electric Power Company and I'm pleased to be in such a beautiful venue.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: $40 million.

MR. HUNT: It's beautiful though. And with me of course, as you all know, with me is Mr. Bobby Gilliam representing Southwestern Electric Power Company and we're happy to answer any questions you have about these three tariffs which we believe provide really good options for additional services to our customers.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: What -- can you briefly explain them -- what you're doing here?

MR. HUNT: Yes. So there's -- in this particular docket we proposed four tariffs, of course, one has been moved over to Docket U-36963, and that's the commercial pilot charging tariff. We have a lot of customers excited about that. Some larger customers who are interested in installing public commercial charging stations and we hope to present that to you soon for approval. It's under review by Staff and other parties right now. But before you today is the three tariffs that remain in this particular docket and that's the Rate Schedule 71. It's a supplemental backup, maintenance, and has available power. This is a tariff we presented because we want to ensure that our existing customer base is not subsidizing larger customers who build interconnected generation facilities. We were very, very grateful and appreciative of Staff's additions to this tariff which we believe even strengthens

and reduces the risk associated with subsidization. Rate Schedule 72 is our curtailable service tariff. Again, this is a tool SWEPCO can use in peak demand situations to avoid higher peaks, make sure we're maintaining the reliability of our system. That's applicable to customers who have at least 300 kW of curtailable load. And again, this is a tool that we can use to help all of our customers. And then finally, Commissioner, is Rate Schedule 36 as it was introduced. We've lowered the barrier to entry on this down to 300 kW facilities of -- or 300 kW of incremental load or new load. There's associated job threshold requirements, and the company comes in and creates a level of jobs. They will get a credit to their rates. So that's an economic development pilot program. And we've lowered the barrier entry consistent with what we have in our other jurisdictions, Arkansas and Texas.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner Campbell.

MR. GILLIAM: And I'll add, Commissioner, we have lots of input from Staff. We worked closely with Staff and they provided comments and consider all the issues. And there was at least -- there was customers that we received comments from and talked to as well -- as well as through one of their lawyers. So it was well met.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'll make a motion that I'll accept Staff Reports and Recommendations.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And I'll second it. We have a question from Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Wesley and Bobby. I have a quick question on Rate Schedule 71. The supplemental backup

maintenance and available stand by power. Who is the typical light and power customer? I'm curious, is this business, municipalities, or is this also open to residential?

MR. HUNT: This would be related primarily to a larger customer.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: A larger customer.

MR. HUNT: A large lighting and power customer who was building their own interconnected generation to our system. It requires a five-year contract to receive this backup power. It requires those customers to provide a CIAC for any distribution, generation, transmission needed to provide that backup power. And that was an addition by Staff that we thought was a great addition to ensure again there's no subsidization between retail customers and this large customer who's deciding to interconnect his own generation, or her own generation to our system.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. And while I have you on your curtailable services rider, since the previous tariff was cancelled for low participation, I'm very -- I'm just kind of curious on how you plan to increase participation under this new tariff that you've developed?

MR. HUNT: Well, primarily, I mean the initial step was just the applicability. We've lowered that threshold to 300 kW. So, obviously, this would allow some -- there's still large customers, but this would allow some relatively smaller customers to participate in the program. And again, we just hope that that incentivizes more folks to consider this program which, frankly, is a benefit to the entire state ensure that during these peaking demands situations, customers are willing to off load some of their load.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Is there -- I'm just curious, also, what would -- could count as a critical mass of your customer load reduction under this program that would help the demands? Like, what is a level of reduction if this program was highly successful that would -- that you think would come off your load?

MR. HUNT: That's a great question. Currently, we need every megawatt we can get at SWEPCO. I think that's the case for a lot of utilities who are seeing load growth and new loads in their areas, including large loads. And so I would say anything would help. But, certainly, just even having a handful of customers that provided several megawatts of curtailable load, I think would be helpful. Because again, we need every megawatt we can get and if this helps offset our peak demand, that reduces the capacity we need through purchase power agreements or other forms of generation.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. By the way, I know it must be tough to stretch one leg from Little Rock to Shreveport, but we're glad to have you in Shreveport as much as possible. So thank you for joining up in Louisiana. Thank you.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Chairman. I enjoyed my time on the Arkansas Commission, a lot of good folks there, but I'm grateful to be in Louisiana now.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Were you up there when I gave them that speech about spending lavish --

MR. HUNT: We're working -- yeah. Southwest Power Pool also has a nice facility.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Do you know the hell we go through to be down here today, and we got a $40 million building, and you got a $40 million

building up there in Arkansas? And they all charge -- you know, the common thing about this? It's all charged to the people. Louisiana people pay for $40 million on this. And we pay -- by the way, we're paying to help you pay for that up in Arkansas.

MR. HUNT: We're also fighting every week, as are members of your Staff to ensure that Southwest Power Pool does not change its current cost allocation structure to require our transmission customers to pay more.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Tell the fellow, whoever runs the deal, it's sort of improper to have a Mercedes, a big most expensive Mercedes plugged up to an electric facility, a Jaguar excuse me.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Jaguar.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And when you come up there, that's all -- makes about appearance.

MR. HUNT: There's a RSC meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas with Southwest Power Pool November 15, and I will deliver that message personally.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Do that.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I would like to make comment about one thing that's been brought to the attention of the Commission through NARUC, which is about the upcoming issues associative with permitting reform and with LEPA. And it's the issue of expanding jurisdiction under the federal legislation associative with current citing issues, and it actually reducing state's authority even more over transmission rules and giving more authority to the FERC. Reducing practically, no authority to the states. And this is a problem. And this is a problem that's

granting more authority to the RTOs effectively as, you know, stepchildren of the FERC, since they were all created by the FERC, that this is a real problem that the Commission really should be focused on. I've asked the Commission to review the upcoming federal legislation. Whether the Staff feels that the appropriate action is to, at least at a minimum, a resolution at the November meeting opposing this action. It's the old camel's nose under the tent issue of the original reduction and citing for state authority over transmission. But effectively, there's a lot of concern over transmission in the state. This -- the Commission really doesn't have a whole lot of authority on it now anymore. But it would absolutely have zero authority over that. If this continues on until this vote, which I think is going to take place in Congress -- I think it's going to be sometime in mid to late November. And so, I think this should be largely of concern to the states and their utilities, and their memberships in the RTO. If the states are going to have no authority, their membership in the RTO should be questionable, so I think there's a real problem associated with that, so I think there needs to be a real sit down with the Commission's Brain Trust and how you look at that for the future. So anyway, just to note. There's been a motion --

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: One quick question I missed, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will say only -- I'm sorry I missed this question and I wanted to ask. On the Experimental Economic Development Rider, you mentioned that you will be tracking the employment or

the job creations as part of a threshold, are you doing that LA works, LAD? How will you track that information to see whether or not that they qualify for this rider?

MR. HUNT: So for this particular rider, there's various thresholds depending on the percentage credit that they get to their rate. And they're required actually, Commissioner, to submit an affidavit that those jobs, those permanent jobs, have been created through the addition of the new or incremental load. So there's a -- in the tariff there's different levels of job creation tied to the different levels of credit you get, but it does require an affidavit from those business swearing that those permanent jobs have been created.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Great, and how long did you put this rider in effect? Or is it just now a consistent rider?

MR. HUNT: This rider, a version of it has been in place, but this particular rider kind of lowers the barrier of entry, changes some of those thresholds related to jobs, and we think -- we provided some more appropriate incentives to businesses to create these jobs for our state.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay great. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: There's a motion by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by the Chair, any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, matters approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 8, which is Docket Number S-37945. This is Washington-St. Tammany Electric Cooperative's request for a letter of non-op to secure a loan for WST's construction work plan, including mortgaging assets related thereto. It's a discussion and possible vote on Staff's report and

recommendation. On June 1 of this year, WST filed this request, pursuant to the Commission's general order dated March 18, 1994, which sought the Commission's authorization for WST to enter into a loan agreement in the form of a conventional mortgage for a proposed construction work plan through the years 2025 through 2028. WST asserts that the proceeds from the loan will prevent from WST to implement necessary system improvements that are designed to improve reliability, maintain adequate voltage levels, address aging infrastructure, support projected growth, and maintain safe and reliable electric service throughout the cooperative's service territory. The request was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions received. The workplan consists of four years, with set amounts being spent each year. The construction workplan outlines work that is needed to support the projected peak demand, increase reliability, and lower system energy losses, and help reduce power costs to customers moving forward. On September 11 of this year, Staff filed its report and recommendation into the record, finding that the terms of the transaction are in the best interest of the public and recommended that the Commission expresses non-opposition to WST's request, subject to standard conditions of the Commission approving a loan. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the Staff report and recommendation filed into the record on September 11, 2026.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Move to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 9 is dockets number U-29203, U-30981, U-32764, U-35991, and U-36350. This is Entergy Gulf States and/or Entergy Louisiana's applications for permanent and interim recovery rates of cost related to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, Hurricane Isaac, Hurricanes Laura, Delta, Zeta, Winter Storm Yuri, and for Hurricane Ida. It is a discussion and possible vote to accept and approve the annual report of the Louisiana Utilities Restoration Corporation to the Commission for the fiscal year of 2026, including the annual operating budget for fiscal year 2027, in interim and annual compiled financial statements for fiscal year 2026. As required by the relevant orders, as well as the restoration law, now codified by revised statutes 45:1311 through 1343. The board of directors of LURC submitted its fiscal year 2026 annual report of September 25, 2026. Staff recommends acceptance and approval of this fiscal year 2026 annual report of the LURC to the Commission, including the annual operating budget for the fiscal year, ending June 30th, of '27. And the interim and compiled annual financial statements for the fiscal year of June 30, 2026. And we do have two yellow cards on this one.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. I'll put a motion on the floor to get it started and move to accept the Staff recommendation to accept the LURC report. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Lewis, and let's hear the cards.

MS. BOWMAN: It is Assata -- is it Nkosi? And then Kieran Spencer.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Either of those people here? Okay, we'll take the other one. Jamie? There's going to be a question for you if you want to come up.

SECRETARY FREY: Yeah, and I can probably answer it too, if she doesn't want but, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah. It's more fun to make her come up. You can begin whenever you'd like.

MS. KIERAN SPENCER: Good afternoon, my name is Kieran and I'm an organizer with the Party for Socialism and Liberation as well as the Take Back the Power Campaign. And I'm here to demand that the people of Louisiana receive democratic control over our utilities. Energy should be a democratic right for all Louisianans, not a commodity to be sold for profit. Access to electricity can mean life or death for working class people around the state.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Can I ask you a question? How is this associative with the LURC reports for the Louisiana Utility Restoration Corporation? Cause we're trying to keep it associative with the actual agenda item. And I appreciate what you want to do, which is what other people have done before you with your group, but we want to try to keep it on topic for the agenda item if we can.

MS. SPENCER: Can I continue?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah.

MS. SPENCER: Louisiana has the means to both make electricity widely available and reliable, but the state allows a corporate monopoly to own our grid. Wealthy CEO's and venture capital funds like Blackrock and Vanguard, they own tens of millions of shares in Entergy, only look out for their bottom line, and not the common good of Louisianans. The result of this is increasingly unaffordable rates and an energy grid that is not reliable or accountable whatsoever to working people's needs. Louisiana Public Service Commission is supposed to be our watchdog for companies like Entergy, but in practice the watchdog has been captured. Over the past decade, Entergy, its executives, and its political action committee have donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the very commissioners who regulate them. Across all Louisiana, Commissioners, nearly 43% of campaign contributions, about $3.5 million, came from utilities, energy businesses, and their lobbyists. This is functional political bribery and it should be an unacceptable norm for our state. When it comes to reliability, Louisiana ranks near the bottom. Our reliability metric ranks 47th in the nation. After Hurricanes Laura, Delta, Zeta, and Ida, Entergy secured approval to charge customers $1.5 billion over 15 years, on top of a $3.2 billion fee approved the year prior. So the shareholders are protected and the ratepayers absorb the risk. So Louisianans have had enough of corporate corruption damaging our quality of life and interfering with our political and accountability processes. Which is why we are building a movement to demand democratic control and public ownership over our utilities now.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Have you reviewed the reports of the LURC?

MS. SPENCER: Sorry?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Have you reviewed the reports of the LURC?

MS. SPENCER: No. Not recently.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay so, this presentation of the LURC and their presentation of their report, and their annual review, which is the subject of this presentation that they're making, you haven't reviewed it? Okay. Thank you.

MS. SPENCER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Jamie? You have a question from Commissioner Lewis. Not you, Jamie

SECRETARY FREY: He's got a busted mic.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: It's me. Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I think if you don't -- I think if we leave him alone, I think we're going to be fine.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: I think I broke it. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Jamie -- and Brandon, this may also be for you. So as I'm going over the LURC report -- Hurricane Isaac matured this year in August, that's correct?

MS. JAMIE WATTS: That's correct

SECRETARY FREY: Right.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And so we -- who are -- which tranches remain, been collected, or securitized right now?

SECRETARY FREY: It would be the Laura, Delta, Zeta, Yuri, and Ida. So as well as E&Os, which we're voting on here, but obviously we didn't approve that. That's the city council doing a similar job that we did here. So that's -- for Entergy Louisiana, it would be Laura, Delta, Zeta, Yuri, Ida. And then for E&O, I believe it is Ida and Yuri.

MS. WATTS: It's a storm restoration.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Would you like as part of the reports, put the expiration dates of the tranches along with this?

SECRETARY FREY: Sure. And I know we've got --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: We use to line item them. And then all of a sudden, they got put into a pool. We used to have them line item so the public could see the actual expiration dates of the particular storm. But I know one year we had nine events, so it was like a massive one year.

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: But I think if we just make sure to tag the expiration date of the bonds so we can just kind of keep track of them.

MS. WATTS: Yes sir.

SECRETARY FREY: And, you know, also, too, just to be clear, when Commissioner Lewis, you asked about Isaac maturing. There are still tax dollars flowing back as credits going all the way back to Katrina-Reed even though that one matured what, Jaime, five years ago at least?

MS. WATTS: In 2018.

SECRETARY FREY: So, eight years ago now. Time flies. You'll see those on your bill as well. I think those still might be individually line item, I'll have to pull my bill on the flowbacks. And that probably ties back to those original orders and that was the language the Commission voted on back then.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right.

MS. WATTS: And that layer of savings is expected, with respect to Katrina-Rita, is expected to continue to flowback to the 2030 timeframe and then Gustav-Ike after that, and Isaac after that, and then ultimately the current storms.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Do we have any dollar estimates on the tax recovery on those?

SECRETARY FREY: I know we're -- I know its north of a billion, I'm sure.

MS. WATTS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: The reason I'm asking is for the public to understand, since we're honoring this, that that's, a billion dollars coming back to their benefit as credits against these costs that were associative with of the actual storm.

SECRETARY FREY: Yes. The securitization has provided tremendous savings as an alternative to traditional rate recovery.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I would also like to point out that Louisiana invented this program, you know?

MS. WATTS: One of the early adopters.

SECRETARY FREY: We made it the best.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, let's put it this way, we certainly, you know -- and big shout out to David Gary who was element of the original, sort of, developer of this program with going to the street in New York about developing this. Other states are doing it now, but Louisiana led the way on this. And its taken this away from bank rate to bond rate, which is massive savings for the consumers.

SECRETARY FREY: Well its actually to materialize where -- and I think we've only used it a couple instances before storm restoration, but this is used heavily in other jurisdictions just for large scale investments. I think you see it more on the pipeline side, where you've got tremendous investment that would have a rate shot.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Especially states that don't do a lot of pipeline work.

SECRETARY FREY: Right. I think Oklahoma uses securitization for sure.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Oklahoma, right.

SECRETARY FREY: But it's -- to your point, Texas, Florida, all the gulf coast states have used it. I think some of the Northeast states have used it as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Some of the Northeast, after Sandy, they did it.

SECRETARY FREY: Yes. Yes, so.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right. Well, and I think that we're going to find that there's going to be opportunities for, you know, when we are looking at the aging out of the current fleet across all the investor and utilities -- that as we move into -- probably 10, 15 years down the road. We might have to look at securitization as some of the replacement elements of that, to try to access cheaper money down the road. But, that's going to be down the road somewhere, but I think it's a good thing to keep as a concept to access, bond rate versus any other financing mechanism.

MR. BRANDON: Yes, sir. Agree.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: The only other question I had reviewing the reports since there were -- seems to be no substantial changes, I know there was a correction by Entergy Louisiana on an over collection of Laura, Delta, Zeta, and Yuri. Do you know what that reduction in surcharge would be?

MS. WATTS: So this surcharge is trued up every six months for each transaction, and so -- and the surcharge looks at usage and other factors. And Henderson Ridge Consulting evaluates Entergy's semi-annual true up filings, and so, whether there's any over-under collection, those are resolved twice a year in the semi-annual true up mechanisms.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So we have a motion, and we have a second. Any opposition to accepting the report of Staff recommendation? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, matter's approved. Thank you. Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 6 [sic] is Docket Number U-35523. This is the Commission's audit of fuel adjustment clause filings for Entergy Louisiana for the period of January 2016 through December 2019. It's a discussion and possible vote on a joint report.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Exhibit 10?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sorry, I thought you said six.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: You said six.

MS. BOWMAN: Did I say six?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: Ten.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Six, ten, ten, six, cool, got it.

MS. BOWMAN: So, this docket was initiated by Staff consisting with the Commission's general order dating November 6, 1997. The purpose of the FAC audit is to determine whether the fuel costs were appropriate and eligible for recovery through the FAC consisting with the Commission's general order and the costs were probably included. Whether those costs were prudently incurred and they produced just and reasonable rates. Staff filed its audit report on September 28, 2021, finding that Entergy complied with the FAC General Order, specifying includable and excludable costs. And in that report, Staff recommended that future audits Entergy provided a reconciliation analysis of the FAC cost and the invoices related therein. Entergy had no issues, and as there are no unresolved issues, Staff and Entergy filed a joint report into the record on October 9, 2026, seeking Commission acceptance thereof. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report filed into the record on October 9, 2026.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Move to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

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

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 11 is U-37603. This is the Commission's audit of purchase gas adjustment filings for the natural gas division of Entergy Louisiana,

for the period of January ’23 through June 30, 2025. It is discussion of possible vote on a joint report and draft order. This joint report draft order is submitted to advise the Commission of resolution of all issues of Entergy’s purchased gas audit from the years indicated. This is the final PGA filing for Entergy, as the sale of Entergy’s natural gas business was completed to Delta in 2025. Staff issued notice of its audit report on June 4, 2025, which was docketed as the docket herein and published in the Commission’s Official Bulletin. Staff filed its audit report on March 11 of this year and noticed the same in the Commission’s bulletin with no interventions being received. Staff reviewed Entergy’s monthly PGA filings for adherance consisting with the requirements set forth in the 1999 General Order. And the purpose of the audit was determined whether the costs passed through the PGA of Entergy was reasonable and prudent, eligible for recovery, in compliance with the Commission’s order, and was necessary for the provision of natural gas services. Staff concluded that with minimal exceptions the cost included in Entergy’s PGA filings were reasonable, prudent, necessary, and compliant with the Commission’s orders and eligible for recovery. Entergy and Staff submitted a joint report and draft order indicating no unresolved issues on October 5 and Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report and issue the draft order filed into the record on October 5, 2026.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Move to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 12, and this is docket number U-37812. This is Entergy's application for certification of the Babel-Webre 500 kV transmission project, in accordance with the General Order dated September 10, 2024. It's a discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. December 23 of last year, Entergy filed the incident application and timely interventions were received by SREA, the Alliance, LEUG, and on January 28 of this year, the Union of Concerned Scientists filed a petition to intervene out of time, and no objections were filed. In the application, Entergy requested the Commission certify for the public convenience and necessity would be served by the completion and siting of the Babel-Webre 500 kV project consistent with the Commission's 2024 Siting Order. The project would consist of approximately 147 miles of new 500 kV line in Louisiana, reconstruction of the Webre switching station in Louisiana, and coordinating with Entergy Texas for the construction of approximately four miles of 500 kV transmission line in Texas, and the construction of a Babel switching station in Texas. After reviewing the application, Staff filed supporting testimony -- Staff filed testimony into the record which recommended that the Commission can reasonably determine that the certification of the Babel-Weber project is in the public interest, and will serve the public convenience and necessity. The project is classified by MISO as a baseline reliability project, meaning it is required to meet NERC standards governing reliability and local

planning criteria. In addition, the project addresses recurring operational and reliability concerns, particularly in the load pockets and provides increased import capability in East-West transfer capability, providing economic and production costs benefits and is needed to serve low growth and improve reliability during extreme events. On September 15 of this year, the parties entered into an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement and Staff recommends that the Commission accept that uncontested stipulated settlement that was filed into the record onto September 15 of this year. And we have one yellow card.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay, well I'll put a motion on the floor so we can get it moving. Chair moves to accept Staff recommendation. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Go ahead and hear the comment.

MS. BOWMAN: It's Ms. -- Is it Levy-Pearlman?

MS. DEVORAH LEVY-PEARLMAN: Good morning, my name is Devorah Levy-Pearlman and I'm a volunteer with the Take Back the Power Campaign and with the Party for Socialism and Liberation. I have a comment to give, but first of all before I give my comment -- I'm sorry is there a problem?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: It's very, very loud.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Very loud? Okay.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: If you could sit back -- sit back a little bit further from the mic.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Okay. I will sit back a little bit. No problem. Well before I get to my comment, I --

MS. BOWMAN: Just keep -- they'll adjust it.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: They'll adjust -- there they go.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Testing. Testing. Okay. Well before I begin my comment, I had a question. Commissioner Campbell, do you consider yourself a public servant?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: What did you --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Do you consider yourself a public servant?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: She wants to know if you have a job.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Do you consider yourself a public servant? Do you feel that it's appropriate for a public servant to belittle and disrespect their constituents when they are speaking in a public comment?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I don't think I did that.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I'm going to cut this off if this is going to be anything other than a comment.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I don't think I did that.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: I would like to leave my comment that is germane to this agenda item, however I found it extremely disrespectful --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yep. Okay. Well, okay. Please move on.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: -- the way that you spoke to the previous commenter. So I oppose the construction of this new transmission line because it's being built

to build more data centers that nobody in Louisiana wants and to put more money into Entergy's shareholder's pockets. The Take Back the Power campaign demands no more data centers on our dime. Entergy comes in and they decide they're going to do whatever they want with Louisiana, with our beautiful state. Governor Landry has touted Louisiana as open for business, but what kind of business? Who benefits for it -- who benefits from it? And who has to pay for it? Entergy is particularly betting big on Meta's Hyperion data center in Richland Parish. They are offering to build ten new power plants for Meta, while our power grid here in New Orleans and all over the state fails time and time again. Entergy says that this deal will save us money and strengthen the grid, but an independent report put out that it estimated to raise our utility bills by an average of $40 a month. That's more a month for everyday rate payers who are already being squeezed. This is obscene when we as working people are already struggling to make ends meet. These data centers are a disaster for our climate, our water source, our energy grid, and our communities. Polls show nationwide that 75% of people oppose data centers and whenever they try and go and put them in the community, we see people resisting, we see working people fighting back to shut them down. We reject this expansion of infrastructure because it's not an infrastructure to make our lives better, it's an infrastructure for the tech billionaires. So we say loud and clear, no more data centers on our dime. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I have a question for you myself. We were talking about New Orleans, which the Commission doesn't regulate. But, you're talking about continuity of power in New Orleans. And are you aware when Entergy New

Orleans removed the old power plants systems, do you know how many megawatts they removed?

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: How many megawatts?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: It was about 8 -- it was 700 or 800 were removed out of New Orleans East. And do you know what, people who were associated with your community fought against the restoration against that amount of power into the city. And you know what they replaced it with? 127 -- 120 megawatts of power. And so, relying on the deliverability of power to the city -- cause it went from that much power to that little power. They relied on the deliverability of power into the city by transmission, and new transmission. That's why they're building transmission, to satisfy the goals of places like New Orleans; that need more power because they got rid of generators and they need to import power. So they need more transmission. So I just want to make sure you understand, electricity comes out of power plants, it doesn't come out of the air. And they need to transmit it, if they can't generate it locally, they got to build transmission to move it here. So I think it's an important thing to just keep in mind, when we are trying to replace powerplants, you should match it megawatt for megawatt instead of fighting to reduce it to something that's barely big enough to do a black start when we did have that one hurricane that we had to do. So -- but that's the reason they're building transmission lines. And if you think it's about one thing, it's about the greater good, it's not just one thing. In fact, we're going to be talking about building more transmission lines, it's not just about data centers, we're going to have to build power -- transmission lines for SpaceX. But that SpaceX transmission line, it's

going to be about the development about the entire new metropolis, that's probably going to from Mamou, Louisiana to Pecan Island and from Iowa to Henderson and it's going to be bigger than the city of New Orleans. But all of that's going to be growth about deliverability of electricity to the public and not just an identified boogeyman, and so you just have to understand that, that transmission has to move power unless we're building powerplants. So it's a balancing of interest between building powerplants or building transmission to move power to the need. So I just wanted to make sure you understood how that works.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Oh, I understand how it works. Can you explain to me why is it that the Hyperion data center is using seven times the amount of power as New Orleans?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah, because it's using more power than the city of New Orleans uses.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: So one hub of computers, that's okay for it to use seven times the amount of energy as an entire city of 300,000 people?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Alright. Very interesting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well it's a difference between have-to and got -- get-to, right? We're lucky that people want to come to our state and develop industry in our state. We are absolutely blessed with the opportunities that are presented to our state. You are, you know, you look like you're in your 20s, you know, you don't understand the struggles --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Oh. I don't understand?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: No, no, no, no.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Okay. I see.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: No, you don't understand the economic struggles this state has gone through for the last --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Okay, because we're not very intelligent, so we wouldn't understand what the Commission understands. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: No, no, no, no, no. I think you're misinterpreting. What I'm saying is, you didn't experience the economic struggles because you weren't alive then. We are --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: We're experiencing economic struggles every single day.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: We are not wanting our rates to go up $40 a month. We understand economic struggles.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well -- the $10 trillion that was spent on renewables has doubled the rate structure over the last 18 years. So if you want to know why rates have doubled, it is because we've built in renewables that have to be supported by traditional power because the sun doesn't shine all the time, the wind doesn't blow all the time, and it has to be supported by backup energy. So we've doubled rate structure by doubling infrastructure. So that's the issue, okay. But I want you to know that we're going to be building more transmission, and it's not just for one beneficiary, it's for the greater good of the state. And that's an important thing.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: The greater good of the energy super PACs that payout this Commission?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well -- we're going to have real talks about that, because that's not really what happens. I think that's --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Because what about that $3.5 million in Entergy donations to those campaigns?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: You know, you can make up any number you want.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Oh, they're not made up numbers. I'm also aware of the $1.2 billion paid out to shareholders after Hurricane Ida, paid out to Entergy shareholders. They're owned by big Wallstreet investment, Blackguard -- Blackrock, and Vanguard.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well, I'm aware of $40 billion that's funding all this opposition from another country. So --

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: What other country?!

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: The Chinese. And it's our little enemies, it's Mr. Singh, it's all these other folks.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: That's very interesting because we're all volunteers and we don't take money from millionaires and billionaires. Unlike this Commission that takes money from tech billionaires.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Well -- well we -- well we've heard people standing outside the building saying why are we here and what are we supposed to talk about? So, you know, we understand what y'all are doing.

MS. LEVY-PEARLMAN: Well you can make all the excuses and try to distract us as much as you would like, but the people have a very clear sense of what's happening. Seventy five percent of people, in this whole country, oppose data centers because we understand the environmental impacts, we understand the impacts on energy affordability, and we don't want them here in Louisiana, in our backyard. And that's not going to change. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay well -- you better -- thank you very much. Anyway, Mr. Hand, we have some questions.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And I think Lane can come up too.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Lane, I think there's a question for you too. Larry, before we move to Commissioner Lewis, I have a have question for you. Which is -- while we're talking about this Texas line, I do want to talk a little bit about the SpaceX potential line that's going to have to be built to serve the issues associative. We're talking about a 200-kV line and I think that the Commission is going to have to look at, for the benefit of Southwest Louisiana, a 500-kV line. Because I think -- because of -- not so much SpaceX, but about the potential overall regional development that is going to benefit all of that area of west -- you know, central and southwestern Louisiana. And the potential growth over the next five, 10, 15, 20 years, that the Commission should be looking at having you make determinations about what real power generation and transmission is going to be necessary to serve that area. So I wanted to make sure that you get some direction from the Commission now to make sure that as you're look at taking care of the

needs of a industrial developer like SpaceX. We're also looking at the population needs of what is going to be deliverable in that region.

MR. LARRY HAND: Yes. Good morning Commissioners, Larry Hand on behalf of Entergy Louisiana. To be clear, Entergy Louisiana is not intending or proposing to serve SpaceX. That is not our service area, I believe it falls within Slemco's service area. But what we are doing is cooperating with both Slemco and JDEC to figure out transmission solutions.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Pardon my statement, but if y'all could get together as a team for the benefit of the public and work out a plan to associate for the proper development of the necessary transmission for the future, and not just for the moment.

MR. HAND: One hundred percent, that is what we're doing. And I want to just remind folks, the high voltage transmission system, this Babel-Webre line is a 150-mile, 500-kV line starting in Texas, going, you know, west -- I'm sorry East, toward Baton Rouge. It will be the first 500-kV in central Louisiana. So none today --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: To go to ancient history, does this is sort of relieve what was -- used to be referred to as the Acadiana load pocket issues?

MR. HAND: It certainly unlocks a lot of that congestion. That's one of the big benefits is congestion relief. But it does help with the -- what we call the WOTAB load pocket issues. Also, significant resilient for liability benefits because we all remember -- Commissioner Francis remembers well after Hurricane Laura, the damage sustained to the 500 system -- the existing 500 kV system that runs a little bit north of I-10 was significantly damaged, and we had to get the grid back up

relying on lower voltage systems with cooperation from Cleco and others. This line will be much further north. Rapides, Vernon Parish, in that area. Much further north. So it's further removed from the higher winds, will be built to higher wind standards as well. So it provides that resilience and reliability effect as well. But the primary driver is to ensure reliability on the entire system, the bulk system, with regard to load growth we are seeing primarily in southeast Louisiana. Hyundai is one of the big drivers for this. There are other loads in that area that without this transmission line, it will create reliability issues statewide, and violate NERC, the North American Reliability Corporation's standards. I believe it's TPL001-5. So it's a reliability driven project, but also unlocks significant load serving capability in southeast Louisiana. So happy to answer any other questions.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Hand for coming up and answering some of my questions. You know, transmission has been something that I've preached about a lot in my four years here on the Commission. And you know I'm a -- been very hard on Entergy about transmission planning. And so, in respect to the comments, and especially where I'm going with this, I want to be very clear. This transmission line was not proposed for Meta, is not part of that application, and is talking about our overall grid system; am I correct in that?

MR. HAND: That is correct. It was submitted into MISO -- the MTEP 25 process as a reliability project. It went through that stakeholder evaluation process and was recommended and approved by the MISO board. I do want to -- just to be clear, because the grid across the state will be interconnected, Meta is not the Laidley data

center that was approved previously or the power arrangement were approved, is not the driver for this. But as we continue to add more loads across the state, whether it's the northeast Louisiana or the south, this line supports all of it. And so in the sense that the Laidley facility in Richland Parish is part of the bulk system -- attached to the bulk system, it contributes just like Hyundai or a Walmart. Everyone contributes to this need. So it's not for -- it wasn't triggered by Laidley or Meta, but they do contribute to the reliability needs, and importantly, the Laidley ESA, Meta will pay. You know, because they're paying the formula rate plan, they will pay their fair share of this line, even though they didn't trigger it to be needed for a reliability purposes.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Hand. I know Commissioner Skrmetta started to hint on it, but part of this Babel-Webre 500 kV line is going into what we would call the Amite South load pocket to relieve the congestion that we are seeing from generation and also transmission. So I -- briefly, if you could just explain -- or Lane, maybe this is better suited for you, exactly what is that load pocket and what would the capability of this transmission project do.

MR. SISUNG: Sure. So the Amite South load pocket -- let's start with what a load pocket is. A load pocket means that there is more load than generation available to serve that load in a confined area. Amite South is such a confined area load pocket, primarily, because of its geography and the fact that the -- you have the river and you have The Gulf below, and so you don't have a lot of access to generation coming from north, south, east, and west. And there's a lot of geographic constraints on how you can get -- how you can transmit energy into that area. Amite South has

within it even other load pockets more refined like the down south of gypsy, DSG, you know, where the city of New Orleans resides in it. So there's a lot of hurdles and a lot of trouble getting -- reliable power into the system, so transmission becomes a very important part of how we serve these -- reliably serve these load pockets. This line will -- it's creating a east-west backbone, it will allow a lot more power to flow into that load pocket in times of stress, and that's why the NERC reliability standard is being corrected with this line.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. And looking through the testimony and looking through the record, it was stated -- and Larry, this could be for you or Lane, that the load shed that we had through -- under MISO on May 25, that if this line was constructed and in operation, we would've been able to flow generation maybe from Mississippi or from other places, and would've prevented that blackout that many residents particular here in the city of New Orleans faced that day.

MR. SISUNG: Sure. The redundancy of extra high voltage lines is what would contribute to that. There is a -- currently a 345-kV line that runs a little east-west.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Uh-huh.

MR. SISUNG: It had been damaged with a tornado. I believe it was severe weather. And it was not in service. So when that event occurred, there was no other way to get power in from the east to the west. By building this redundant 500 kV line, it would -- it absolutely adds to the reliability, and can help prevent events like that.

MR. HAND: I agree with that, Commissioner. And I wanted to -- this dialogue, we've touched on the three primary drivers and benefits, this line. There are two others I wanted to mention. I think it's germane to a lot of the comments we've

heard today. The first is, this line eliminates congestion on the transmission system, and congestion -- what that means is, cheap power is not able to flow because of transmission congestion. So when you relieve that congestion, it unlocks the ability for a cheaper energy, whether it's renewable, gas driven, whatever, to dispatch and be delivered to customers. MISO's estimate of the adjusted production cost savings that the congestion this will eliminate range from Endzone 9, I believe $290 million over a 20-year period, up to 350 million. So that congestion relief will show up in the form of lower fuel costs for customers over the 20-year period relative to what they would've been without the line. So that's a key benefit. The other benefit is in the WOTAB load pocket, which means we have, as Lane said, I believe he said, we have more load in the WOTAB pocket than we have generation, and we rely on transmission to import. This line will relieve congestion for new generators, whether it's renewable, gas driven, whatever, up to 2,000 megawatts of generation will be able to be located in and around the WOTAB load pocket, because this line is there. So if you're looking to advance the state's energy future with gas generation, renewables, whatever, this is a pathway to allow that to be connected to the grid efficiently without congestion. One of the biggest obstacles to adding new generation is the cost of transmission upgrades. And so this will be available for, you know, all utilities, all independent power producers who want to site generation here to attach to this open access line.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: All right. And I know to help, especially in interconnections. The last point that I want to go over, when do you expect construction to begin and in-service to be of this 500-kV line?

MR. HAND: So construction is slated to begin in 2027, assuming the Commission approves the matter to go forward. So sometime in 2027 we'll begin construction. Expected commercial operations is targeted for August 2029. That was driven by, you know, some large loads that are coming on in that timeframe that drives that date. So roughly a two year-ish construction period for this project.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And what would the estimated residential bill impact be?

MR. HAND: The first month? And I want to -- I don't mean to be -- flippant, but I want to make sure we present the proper picture.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Yeah, yeah. Please. Please do.

MR. HAND: So when we present a first month bill impact, which I'll get to your question, that is the first month. Every month that passes, every year the asset depreciates in accordance with the depreciation schedules, which means the cost goes down, you know, every month, every year. So the first year is the worst year, right? Because the full cost is there, that bill estimate for a 1,000-kWh residential customer is $3.74. Just for -- to illustrate my earlier point, if you were to take a snapshot and look forward to year 15, that 3.74 would be 2.82 on a bill. Just to demonstrate the effect of depreciation over time. That's the raw cost -- the gross cost on the customer bill, that doesn't reflect -- the 3.74 does not reflect other benefits and offsets customers will receive that this line enables. And I want to just talk through high levels, some of those. These are not very precise numbers. But when you think about the line being added to serve new industrial growth, we have to consider when those industrials come online, how much will they be contributing

to the cost of this line, right? The 3.74 represents the current customer base today. It doesn't reflect, you know, growth in the future, it doesn't reflect Meta's contributions to transmission lines, or Hyundai, CF Industries, whoever. So this does not include any Meta sales. We just didn't include it here just to be conservative. But if you look at the new industrial sales, we expect in 2029 when this goes into rates, that's probably a, you know, drops the bill impact down to $3.37. It's a 10 to 15% reduction from the gross cost. You can also factor in -- as I said earlier, this is a FERC open access line, so anyone can use it. Other utilities, co-ops use our transmission system, it's open access. When they do so, they do pay a charge to use it. And so when they pay that charge, that is a credit. We credit that back for our rates for our customers. So that OATT revenue -- again, this will change over time as our load or other users' load grows, that, too, could be a 10 to 15% reduction, which would drop it down to $2.87. If you were to factor in the congestion relief, that $300 million, that drops it further. So 3.74 is the first month charge, but it doesn't truly reflect all of the other benefits that will show up on a customer's bill.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And to be very clear, the rate impact -- or the customer charge does not go into effect until the line is in operation.

MR. HAND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: So we're looking at September 2029; am I correct?

MR. HAND: If it is in service. So if we -- if the line were complete in August, it would go into rates the first billing cycle of the following month. So September would be correct.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Great. Thank you. And as you know, I've always been a proponent of transmission expansion. I want to be very clear, transmission has been desperately needed in the United States. Part of our challenge of our energy affordability has been the lack of transmission being able to import power. But you know the devil's always in the details. And so I reviewed this application thoroughly, and this truly is a project that is in the public's interest of Louisiana. I just want to state that for the public that there is multiple conversations happening, and I think there is a valid conversation around large loads and data centers, and we will, of course, have those discussions when those dockets come up before the Commission, and those transmission costs. But there's also a real need for transmission. Commissioner Skrmetta -- Chairman hinted on that about what we've seen federally with the bipartisan permitting bill that's looking at transmission and how we can permit and site transmission better. And so I want to make very clear that we have two different conversations that are very much similar, but very different, and this project, as evaluating it, is truly needed for Louisiana to ensure that the lights stay on, and that we have opportunities to import cheaper power. I want to be very clear on that. May 25 load shed when New Orleans was black, we had cheap power in Mississippi that we could've imported into Louisiana at a cheaper cost than what we already had, and kept the lights on, but we did not have the transmission capacity. Transmission capacity would've allowed that. And so I thank you, Mr. Hand, and Mr. Sisung for meeting with me and my Staff. And I just wanted to put that onto the record. I look forward to

reviewing the semiannual reports to ensure that we're on track, and that the benefits that we say are actually materializing. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Anybody else have questions for Mr. Hand or Mr. Sisung before they go?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir, Commissioner Francis?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I just want to compliment Entergy and this -- the idea of this line. It's through the heart of my district. And it's something for reliability that's been badly needed. It's going to open the door for possibly other corporations coming in, because now they know they have cheap, reliable power through central Louisiana. And I think it's a great suggestion. And I know MISO and all the other planners have strongly supported this, so thank you. [INAUDIBLE]

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Thank you very much. You're excused. The matter has a motion on the table and a second. Is there any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit Number 13, which is Docket U-37838. This is Claiborne's request for approval of a one-year renewal of its formula rate plan. It's a discussion -- excuse me. It's a discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. On January 20 of this year, Claiborne filed a request for extension and modification of its formula rate plan. The request would extend Claiborne's FRP for an additional one year, with test year ending December 31, 2026. Claiborne did not request any additional modifications to its terms. The

application was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin, and no interventions were received. Staff filed its recommendation on June 30 of this year, and subsequently, Claiborne and Staff executed an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement, which was filed into the record on September 3, 2026. The terms of that settlement are that: Claiborne establish -- can -- is authorized to establish a one-year extension of a single test year, and that no later than the expiration of this extended term, Claiborne shall file with the Commission a full base rate case with a 2025 test year. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed into the record on September 3 of this year.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I make a motion that we accept [INAUDIBLE].

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Motion by Commissioner Campbell to accept Staff recommendation. Second by the Chair. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 14 is deferred, so we will move to Exhibit 15, which is Docket Number U-37904. This is Parish Water Company's request for an extension and modification of its formula rate plan. It's a discussion and possible vote on an Uncontested Stipulated Settlement. On April 17 of this year, Parish filed the instant application, which was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions. Parish proposed an extension of the current formula rate plan effective with the company's December 31, 2025 test year, and the proposed extension would remain -- would maintain their current midpoint of 9.5 with an earnings bandwidth calculated on a lower limit of 9 and an upper limit of 10%.

Parish was also requesting substantive and non-substantive modifications to their formula rate plan, including adjustments to their filing dates. On August 28 of this year, Staff filed its Report and Recommendation, and on September 9, Parish filed correspondence accepting that Report and Recommendation. An Uncontested Stipulated Settlement was filed into the record on September 17, 2026. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the Uncontested Stipulated Settlement filed into the record on September 17, 2026.

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

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

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

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 16 is Docket Number U-37929. This is SLECA's formula rate plan and annual report filing for test year ending December 31, 2025. It's a discussion and possible vote on joint report and draft order. On May 14 of this year, SLECA filed its instant request, which was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin with no interventions. Commission issued Orders Number U-36339-A and U-36339-B, establishing SLECA's current formula rate plan. The cooperative's formula rate plan provides for a TIER bandwidth with a lower endpoint of 1.40, an upper endpoint of 1.60, with a midpoint of 1.5. And under this formula rate plan, if a test year's TIER is outside the band, SLECA's revenue rider is increased or decreased, respectively, by the amount necessary to get to the TIER midpoint of 1.5. In its 2025 Filing, SLECA reported a -- a calculated

a TIER of 1.07, which falls below the lower bandwidth set forth in Commission Order U-3633-A -- 339-A. And as such, requires adjusted to reflect a revenue increase of approximately $578,000. Commission Staff conducted a review of this filing and found that SLECA's adjustments were warranted. Therefore, Staff recommended no further adjustments, and filed its recommendation on August 7 of this year. The parties filed a joint report and draft order into the record on September 30, 2026, which acknowledged the resolution of all issues. Staff recommends that the Commission accept the joint report and issue the draft order filed into the record on September 30 of this year.

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

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Campbell. We have questions for Ms. Kantrow from Commissioner Lewis.

MS. KANTROW: Good morning. Kara Kantrow on behalf of SLECA. And I have with me Justin Proctor with C.H. Guernsey.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Great. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Kantrow. First, I want to thank you for meeting with my Staff and answering all of our questions about this joint report and walking through the financials, because we did have some questions. Before I ask my question, I do want to highlight something that I thought was beneficial to you that really jumped out to me on your balance sheet, which is that your purchased power has gone down significantly since you joined 1803. And so I think that's a -- worth celebrating and worth noting as we review this. So even

with this adjustment, can you tell me where your -- what the residential bill impact would be?

MS. KANTROW: Sure. For 1,000 kilowatts, kind of going with what the PSC's structure there is $1.10, but our average member uses about 1,200, so that would come up to about $1.34.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And do you know where -- where does that put you in ranks of --

MS. KANTROW: SLECA's very excited and has been -- has worked very hard on keeping the lowest rates in the state. And so we're hopeful that next month when these are implemented, we will continue to be the lowest.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And you plan to do a full rate case relatively soon, or have you filed one already?

MS. KANTROW: Yes, Commissioner. And part of the filing -- we have a current filing in front of you all for an extension -- a one-year extension very similar to some of the other co-ops and what we've been doing to give us a little bit more time to put that rate case together. But that is forthcoming, you know, year and a half.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Great. I really look forward to your rate case. I think there's some ways that we can get a regulatory rate framework for you with your new realities that are facing. So I look forward to working with you both on that. And I just want to thank you again for your engagement and your -- and you've got my support on this matter.

MS. KANTROW: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Thank you, Chairman Lewis. Are there any other questions? Is there a motion pending? Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: [INAUDIBLE]

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Okay. Are there any other objections? [NONE HEARD] Hearing no objections, motion --

MS. BOWMAN: I'm sorry. Let's do one housekeeping, because the Chair made the motion, but since he stepped out of the room, can we --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Vice Chairman makes the motion.

MS. BOWMAN: Thank you. And then --

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'll second.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Yup. Seconded by Chairman Campbell -- by Commissioner Campbell. And hearing no objections, the motion passed.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit Number 17 is Docket Number U-38093. This is 1803 Electric Cooperative's application for approval of a Winter Capacity Purchase Agreement, including cost recovery. It's a discussion and possible vote to retain United Professionals Company for an under 50,000 solicitation. 1803 filed the instant application seeking certification of an unsolicited offer for winter capacity over a three-year period with a locked in price. Per 1803, time is of the essence for approval of this upcoming request in order for 1803 to address a projected winter capacity shortfall. Based upon the need for an expedited review, as well as Staff's understanding of 1803's request, Staff solicited UPC for an under 50,000 proposal given UPC's current assistance on 1803's open RFP, as well as the last three years of 1803's FRP. UPC's knowledge of the RFP results can be used to review and

provide analysis of the unsolicited offer to confirm how attractive it is to a market-based testing. Upon -- based upon UPC's current scope, Staff's opinion that no formal RFP was required and solicited them pursuant to the Commission's General Order dated November 10, 2014. Based on Staff's solicitation, UPC submitted a proposed budget with discounted hourly rates, and Staff recommends that the Commission retain UPC for 35,000 in fees and 1,000 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed $36,000.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I make a motion to approve the Staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Seconded by Commissioner Campbell. Are there any objections? [NONE HEARD] Hearing no objections, motion passes.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Next item, please.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 18 is Docket Number X-38068. This is Dixie Electric Membership Corporation and Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation's request for proposals for long-term power purchase contracts, generating capacity, and/or generating resources pursuant to the Commission's General Order dated October 14, 2024. It's a discussion and possible vote to retain outside consultant. DEMCO and SLEMCO jointly provided notice to the Commission of their intention to conduct this RFP, and based upon that notice, Staff issued an RFP seeking outside consultant and received three bids. The first is Drexel Hamilton of 75,000 in fees and 5,000 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $80,000. The second is United Professionals Company of 89,000 in fees,

1,500 in expenses, for a total budget not exceed of 90,500. And the third was London Economics of $88,512 in fees and $2,178 in expenses for a total budget not to exceed of $90,960. Staff makes no recommendation as all three bidders are qualified.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Any motions?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: I make a motion to accept the bid of United Professionals Company.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: Second. I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Francis. I made a -- motion made by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. Next item.

MS. BOWMAN: Next item is Exhibit 19, which is our reports, resolutions, discussions, and public comment. We do have discussion on here as an update from SLECA on its plans to provide electric service to its lake line members.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Do you want to go ahead and do the other elements first on --

MS. BOWMAN: We can. And then we also have one public comment from Chad Monceaux --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure.

MS. BOWMAN: -- from the city of Crowley.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure.

MS. BOWMAN: So we can take that up, and then take up the ratifications.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Either one.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Let's do Monceaux --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Six one half, [INAUDIBLE] another. Let's take --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Let's take Monceaux first, so [INAUDIBLE]

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Let's go ahead and take the folks who drove over first from Crowley.

MS. BOWMAN: Yeah. So it's Mr. Chad Monceaux. Are you still [INAUDIBLE].

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Mr. Monceaux [INAUDIBLE].

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Mr. Monceaux is, I believe, a representative from the city of Crowley.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Actually, the mayor; aren't you?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: He's the mayor.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yup. Absolutely.

MR. CHAD MONCEAUX: I do have a packet for each one of you, so.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: We'll get the Staff to hand it off to us.

MR. MONCEAUX: In your packet, you will have all the information that I'm going to be talking about here. So, good morning, Commissioners. And my name is Chad Monceaux. I am the mayor of the city of Crowley. I would like to -- before I go any further, I want to recognize our three members of this Crowley city council that have traveled to New Orleans with me today. I'd ask them to please stand. We have Brad Core, Sandra Marks, and Chuck Ashby here with us. Their presence here demonstrates just how seriously we take the concerns of our citizens. They're not

here to speak, but they are here to stand with the people of Crowley as we ask -- we seek answers and accountability. I'm here today, once again, because our citizens continue to experience unusually high water bills, unexplained increases in reported consumption, and tremendous frustration with Louisiana Water Company. Let me begin by making something very clear. I'm not here representing myself, I am here representing the people of Crowley. I'm representing elderly residents on fixed incomes, working families struggling to make ends meet, and homeowners who cannot understand the amount of water they're being charged for. These citizens depend on water services as a basic necessity. They cannot simply choose another water company when they are dissatisfied with LAWCO. They depend on this Commission to ensure that the utility providing -- the utility providing that service operates fairly, accurately, and in compliance with its regulatory obligations. Commissioners, I have brought these concerns before you previously, yet, the complaints continue. I want to be respectful of this Commission, but I also want to be direct. I'm disappointed that we are still discussing these same concerns without having the independent documented answers our citizens deserve. I did not travel to New Orleans today simply to repeat complaints. I came here to demand a meaningful investigation, accountability, and answers supported by evidence. The citizens of Crowley have spoken. In preparation for this meeting, the city of Crowley made a citizen petition available electronically and through paper forms at city hall. We received 376 petition submissions; 365 electronically and 11 on paper. Of the electronic submissions, 288 respondents reported personally experiencing a LAWCO billing or service problem, and 283 provided written

descriptions of their experiences. You have that in your packets. These figures represent submitted responses, not a final count of unique individuals. I'm providing these records because I want this Commission to understand that these concerns extend throughout our community. I recognize that a complaint does not automatically establish that LAWCO made an error, but when hundreds of citizens take the time to document their concerns and ask for regulatory action, these -- those concerns deserve serious attention. Our citizens are not asking this Commission to assume LAWCO has done something wrong. They are asking you investigate and determine the facts. I have personally investigated these complaints. I want you to understand how seriously I've taken these concerns. I have personally visited dozens of homes throughout Crowley. I've sat down with residents, reviewed their water bills, discussed their usage, and physically inspected their meters for indications of leaks. I have not simply received complaints over the telephone and passed them along. I've gone into our neighborhoods and attempted to determine what is happening. And I want to be transparent about what I found. At a couple of those properties, there were indications of leaks. I'm not suggesting that every unusually high bill is the result of a billing error. Increasing -- interestingly, those properties with leaks generally had bills in the $200 range. Meanwhile, I have visited properties where customers received bills exceeding $500 or more, and I found no indication of an active leak during my inspection. In fact, the majority of properties I personally inspected showed no indication of an active leak at the time of my visit. I recognize that this does not conclusively rule out an intermittent or previously occurring leak, but when a customer receives a bill

reflecting extraordinary consumption and there is no apparent explanation for that consumption, the utility should be able to substantiate its charges. Let me give you a specific example. I recently visited a rental property after the owner questioned an extraordinarily high water bill. According to the owner, the tenant moved out on March 1, 2026. That example is also in your packets. And the property has remained unoccupied. The billing history showed relatively little consumption, sometimes even zero over a few months. For several months, followed by dramatic increases in August and September. The September bill included more than $850 in current water and sewer charges. I personally went to their property to inspect the meter and check for indications of a leak. When I opened the meter box, I found the meter covered with dirt and debris. I personally took the photograph that I am providing to this Commission. I'm not claiming that photograph proves LAWCO failed to read the meter. I understand there are different methods of obtaining readings. But I am asking some very reasonable questions. Was that meter actually read? Was the account estimated during the preceding months? Was the extraordinarily -- was the extraordinary increase in consumption flagged for review? And what records does LAWCO have to substantiate the reported consumption? These questions deserve answers supported by documentation. One of my greatest concerns is the possibility that some LAWCO accounts are being estimated for multiple billing cycles. I want to be precise about what I'm saying. I do not have LAWCO’s internal meter reading records. I cannot tell you how many accounts have been estimated, or how long those estimates have -- may have continued. That is exactly why I am requesting an investigation. I want to know how many accounts in Crowley received estimated

bills during the past two years. How many were estimated for multiple consecutive months? Why were those readings estimated? And how many customers subsequently received unusually high bills when an actual [INAUDIBLE] was obtained. I'm requesting that the Commission obtain LAWCO's original reading histories, actual versus estimated indicators, billing adjustments, and supporting documentation covering at least January '25 through the present. I also want the Commission to examine how LAWCO calculates catchup bills. If an account has been estimated for several months, and an actual reading later identifies additional consumption, how is that consumption allocated? Or the applicable rates, minimum charges, and any usage calculated correctly? Are could accumulated consumption be charged in a manner -- in a manner that results in higher bills than what otherwise apply? This is particularly important in Crowley because our sewer user fee charged in January -- changed in January '26. LAWCO bills and collects sewer charges on behalf of the city of Crowley. I want to know whether any catchup adjustments involving periods before and after that change were calculated accordingly to the applicable ordinances and billing rules. An accurate meter reading does not automatically mean the resulting bill was calculated accurately. If customers were overcharged, I expect those errors to be corrected and appropriate credits or refunds to be considered. Another issue -- another serious concern is how LAWCO handles unusually high reported consumption. I have reviewed bills reflecting usage far outside of customers' normal pattern, including an extraordinary bill that was subsequently described as a clerical error. Twelve thousand dollars got into the mail to this person's home. Mistakes happen. I understand that. But I also expect a

regulated utility to have effective procedures for identifying abnormal consumption before bills are issued. When a customer's reported usage suddenly increases several times over, what happens? Is the reading flagged? Is it verified? Does anyone investigate before the bill is mailed? Our citizens should not have to serve as LAWCO's final billing quality control department. I want the Commission to examine LAWCO's abnormal consumption review procedures, and determine whether they are actually being followed, not simply what the company says its procedures are. I want the records showing what was flagged, what was reviewed, and what action was taken. This Commission has acted before. Commissioners, what I'm requesting is not unprecedented. This Commission previously investigated meter reading and billing concerns involving Greater Ouachita Water Company, including missed readings and subsequent catchup bills. That matter resulted in regulatory scrutiny, corrective billing measures, and substantial customer credits. The Commission has also initiated an audit involving Magnolia Water Utility concerning billing practices, customer service, and regulatory compliance. These proceedings demonstrate that this Commission has mechanisms available to investigate utility operations, and require corrective action when warned -- warranted. So I have a straightforward question. If this Commission has investigated similar concerns involving other Louisiana water utilities, why should the citizens of Crowley expect anything less? I'm asking for the same serious regulatory scrutiny with the findings and any remedies determined by the evidence. Commissioners, I have submitted 10 specific requests of Commission action, but today I want to make my expectations unmistakenly clear. First, I want formal

investigation -- independent investigation. I want the Commission to obtain and examine LAWCO's meter reading records, estimated billing histories, abnormal consumption reports, customer complaints, billing adjustments, and catchup billing calculations. Second, I want the documents that substantiate the answers. If LAWCO says a meter was read, produce the supporting record. If LAWCO says a bill calculated -- was calculated correctly, show the calculation. If LAWCO says an unusual reading was reviewed, produce the documentation of that review. And if LAWCO says an account was estimated for a legitimate reason, identify that reason and provide the supporting evidence. I do not want conclusions based solely on LAWCO's assurances. I want findings supported independently -- independently examined -- by independently examined records. Excuse me. I also want the city of Crowley to receive copies of the supporting documents that can lawfully be disclosed. I understand that some information may be confidential and require redaction. But where records cannot be released, I want the Commission to identify the legal basis for withholding them and explain how the information was independently verified. Third, I expect to be kept informed. I do not want to leave New Orleans today and spend the next several months wondering whether anything is happening. I'm requesting a designated Louisiana Public Service Commission Staff contact for the city of Crowley, a written investigation plan, and regular written progress reports. I'm asking for updates at least every 30 days while the investigation remains active, or another specific schedule established by the Commission. Those reports should identify what records have been requested, what has been received, and what work remains outstanding. Finally, I want a written

report of the findings and any corrective action. I want to know whether deficiencies or violations were identified. How many customers may have been affected? And what remedies are warranted? I want a written response addressing each of the 10 requests I have submitted, and I want to be able to return to the people of Crowley and tell them what this Commission has done, what the investigation revealed, and what actions will follow. In closing, our citizens deserve action. Commissioners, I understand that utility regulation involves procedures, legal requirements, and due process. I'm not asking you to disregard any of those responsibilities, but I am asking you to use the authority available by this Commission to address the continuing concerns of the people I represent. The average citizen cannot compel LAWCO to produce its internal records. They cannot independently audit the company's billing system. They cannot determine how many accounts have been estimated, or whether billing procedures are being followed. That is why regulatory oversight exists. I have personally visited dozens of homes, reviewed bills, inspected meters, listened to residents, and brought their concerns before you. I have done what I can with the information available to me, but I am the mayor of Crowley, I am not LAWCO's meter reading supervisor, billing auditor, or regulatory investigator. Now I'm asking this Commission to do what only a regulatory investigation can do: obtain the records, independently examine them, and establish the facts. I'm not asking you to assume LAWCO is guilty or of wrongdoing. I'm asking you to determine whether its billing practices are accurate, fair, and compliant. And after months of continued complaints, I'm no longer satisfied with general assurances or promises that someone will look into

this matter. Before I leave today, I want to know who will be responsible for addressing these concerns, when the necessary records will be requested, and when the city of Crowley can expect its first written update. I intend to continue following this matter until the people I represent receive meaningful, documented answers. I did not come here asking for special treatment for Crowley. I came here demanding accountability, transparency, and a thorough investigation. The citizens of Crowley deserve more than promises. They deserve answers, they deserve evidence, and they deserve action. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Let me begin by telling you thank you for this. I've consulted with Commissioner Francis who is -- Crowley is in his district. I'm going to make a directive to Staff and a directive to open -- telling them to open an investigation to assign legal counsel as necessary in this matter to cause a forensic audit of the last five years of data and of the company associative with these issues, to attach an engineer to evaluate the system in place, to require the cost of all of these investigations be borne by the company and not by the customers of the company, and to report back to the Commission by the December B&E of this year, and every month thereafter as necessary until the matter is resolved, and to -- as part of this investigation, to include all requests made by the mayor in his presentation to the Commission today. I think that should give you something to take back to the people of Crowley that'll satisfy the issue. But in the meantime, we do want to talk to counsel for the company to come up and -- but before she does, I'm going to let the Commissioners talk to you. But I don’t think there's going to be any objection, but if there is objection to the directive, let's make

it now.

MR. MONCEAUX: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: But if there's not, it moves forward. But in the meantime, if any Commissioners have any questions for you, I'm glad for them to do it now.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: I might remind the group that my district office is in Crowley, and we use LAWCO water. We're a customer of LAWCO there also. And we're going to get on top of this. I promise you that. It means a lot to me that this is my hometown. I thank y'all for coming. It's a lot of trouble. And I do want to point out your -- three of your Commissioners that came here. Paul ran unopposed in this re-election --

MR. MONCEAUX: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: -- it's a good sign of your unity and what you're doing in Crowley. And I wish you well on your election -- re-election as mayor.

MR. MONCEAUX: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRANCIS: And like the Chairman said, we're going to take this in -- we're going to take care of it.

MR. MONCEAUX: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yes, sir.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to thank you for your thorough presentation. I think your -- the basis and your request is very clear, and it leaves no doubt that action is warranted, which we're taking now. And again, I want to make sure that you know and that you can communicate that

what is being done today does have teeth and it's not merely for window dressing.

MR. MONCEAUX: Correct.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: So I appreciate your commitment to your constituents, and we look forward to hearing the results of this audit.

MR. MONCEAUX: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And this directive is a living directive. And if we need to modify it to expand anything, the Commission Staff has full authority to modify it as necessary.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Well, first, thank you, Mr. Chairman for that, because I was going to ask a question to Staff. I know we had a discussion the last time since the General Order doesn't allow for -- I'm losing track of the word I want to talk about. Brandon, help me out.

SECRETARY FREY: Which General Order, and I'll help you out.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: On metering. I normally know where I'm going here. I'm kind of a little lost in my own head there.

SECRETARY FREY: So, but the water -- wastewater rules and regulations.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Yes, yes.

SECRETARY FREY: There is a -- there's a prohibition therein about estimating meters.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. That's the word I was --

SECRETARY FREY: I think that's what you're looking for. There you go.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Estimating.

SECRETARY FREY: Oh, yeah. Okay.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: And I couldn't find it. And I know we had a conversation about that. And, Mr. Chairman, if -- I believe that would be acceptable to you that in that investigative docket, any penalties for violating --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: -- that rule be considered as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Absolutely.

SECRETARY FREY: And that would be part of the ultimate proposal or report that we get out.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Great.

SECRETARY FREY: We would consider that as well.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you. And I just want to thank you as well.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: As part of this -- as part of this forensic audit, the Staff will recommend any penalties necessary to adjust and take corrective action. And if there's penalties that need to be taken against the company, they should be suggested by the Staff. Okay.

SECRETARY FREY: Got it.

MR. MONCEAUX: I urge you all to look in that packet. All of those signatures, if you will, on the petition, you have names and addresses and phone numbers of people who may or may not want to speak to you. They have even -- there was even an option if they accepted any communication from the Public Service Commission or not. So all of that is on that document. And there's even comments from customers also, so.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Well, we will. And you can go back and you can tell them with clarity that we've made the decision to move forward.

MR. MONCEAUX: Thank y'all. Thank y'all, again.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Absolutely. Ms. Kantrow, I think the Commissioners want to talk to you for a minute.

MS. KANTROW: [INAUDIBLE]

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And, yeah. Watch out for the microphone. Okay.

MS. KANTROW: Yup. Thank you for the time and thanks the mayor for his comments. Kara Kantrow on behalf of LAWCO.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I think it's -- I don't -- not looking for a presentation as much as I wanted to see if the Commissioners had any questions for you. So any questions for Ms. Kantrow from anyone? Go ahead, Commissioner Campbell. Might want to move your microphone a little closer.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: It seems like you're in a world of trouble over there.

MS. KANTROW: I appreciate that comment. And I'll let Mr. Simmons, CFO of LAWCO, go further through it. There was a momentary time in which estimation of bills had to occur due to us losing our meter readers. We filed notice with the Commission of that on August 7. We've been meeting with Commissioner Francis, and I know Mr. Simmons has met with the mayor multiple times to address any issues that that may have caused. But some of the other issues that the mayor raised, Mr. Simmons is probably best to respond.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Commissioners. I really appreciate the opportunity

to come here and address these concerns made by the mayor. I actually really do appreciate what he's done, and we share his goal of ensuring that all of our customers receive accurate bills, and if -- and any other concerns that they have are addressed, just like we have over the last 42 years that we've been operating in Crowley. The -- one of the things that Ms. Kantrow said is that we did file and we did alert the Commission that we had a extreme staffing shortage with our meter reader, and we had to read them -- estimate meters for the month of April. But we started -- or month of May. We started in June, and we've been reading them ever since. One of the things I think that the mayor says that may be -- that is very misleading I think is that we are very diligent in the way we read meters. To give you an idea of how that works essentially is, every meter reader goes out with a handheld that has software on it, and that software has a route, and they look at that route, and they look at the next meter, and they read that meter. And the only thing that those meter readers are -- have access to are the meter serial numbers. They don't know how much was used last month, they don't know what the reading was last month. They actually have to open the meter lids, look at the registers, and read the meters. And since -- for the last three months, and I think that he's asserted several times that we have not been reading meters. I have here, and this can be furnished to the Commission at any time, these are the last three months, there's 300-meter readings -- there's 300 pages of meter readings with the prior readings, the current readings, the consumption, the meter numbers, the account numbers. These are things that are stored in our billing system, and they're auditable, and I think as all these Commissioners up here now know, we're very open and -- to any

-- every year we have an annual review where the -- we get multiple sets of data requests, and we supply the Commission with anything that they need. And we're totally open to cooperate in any way that we possibly can.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Have you had problems like this in Crowley in the past?

MR. SIMMONS: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Never had them?

MR. SIMMONS: No, sir. One of the things, too, I'll say is that Crowley is one city in Louisiana Water Company. We operate -- we have about 5,900 customers in Crowley, and LAWCO in total has 33,500 customers in New Iberia. Crowley, Eunice, DeQuincy, Lecompte, Mansura, and there are -- and the systems and the policies that are used, and the billing system and everything, is exactly the same for all 33,000 of these customers.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How many complaints you have out of the whole system?

MR. SIMMONS: How many complaints we have?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: In the whole system of 33,000.

MR. SIMMONS: Out of the 33,000? We have -- so one of the things we did, and I'll tell you this, one of the things that we did was when the mayor came to us and said that there's an unusually large number of high usage bills. What I did was, I went into the system and I did a deep dive on the data analysis to look and go month to month from January 2025 all the way to August 2026, and I used a factor of if anybody's bill doubled from the previous month, I included that, and I said what

percentage of the total bills doubled from the previous month? And when you look at all the towns, including Crowley, the number ranges between .9 and 1.2 every month for the past year and a half. And so it's consistent that those numbers -- and you can see it in all of our system. Our total system, not including LAWCO, is almost 270,000 customers that we send bills to. And that 1% number is 99% of the time are going to be leaks in the customer's house. And I know a lot of customers go, I had no signs of a leak. Well, you don't have to have a sign of a leak. You can have leaking toilets that can double and triple bills, easily. We see it in all of our field operations when we go out to customers. So anytime -- the process that takes place is anytime when a meter reader goes out and they enter the read, if it's outside of a certain variance, because they don't know what the prior read was, so they have to just enter what they read on the meter. If it's anywhere outside of that, they have to enter it again with the serial number, and then what that does, that comes back into our system, and that sends a water service man out into the field, and they re-read the meter again to make sure it was read properly. If there was a mistake in the reading, they fix it and they have audit processes where they try to fix it before the bill goes out. Sometimes they don't make it. Sometimes the bill does go out. We're not perfect. But it does happen and the customer typically will call us, we'll send somebody out, we'll -- if the bill was a mistake, we'll tell the customer what we're going to fix, and if the bill -- if the reading was not a mistake, if the actual water went through the meter but the bill was significantly higher, then we work with the customer and we tell them what the possibilities can be for them having a higher bill than normal. So --

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How many people did you have in Crowley? Now would you say 7,000?

MR. SIMMONS: We have about 5 -- about almost 6,000.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: 6,000?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How -- what percentages are complaints there? Do you know?

MR. SIMMONS: We have high bill -- our high bill complaints are about 1% a month, every month. Month in and month out.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: In Crowley?

MR. SIMMONS: In Crowley. Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: What are all these people signing this petition for?

MR. SIMMONS: Why'd they sign it?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, because the mayor went on Facebook and asked people to sign this and send him any large bill that they get. In other towns where it happens, the individual customer just calls the company, and we take care of it.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: All right. Mr. Chair -- Mr. Chairman, let's go ahead and wrap up your comments. If there's any other questions.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: We're going to let the process take over this, and we're going to let the Staff begin its --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Mr. Mayor, out of respect, we're not going to

have a debate. We're going to move forward with the request for the directive, and then we'll work through like that. Okay?

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay.

MS. KANTROW: Appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. Y'all are excused. Thank you. On the next item, which -- is the next item for the -- actually, we still have to go through the other [INAUDIBLE]. We have any more comments?

MS. BOWMAN: No, sir. Well, we do have one, but it's tied to a separate matter. It's tied to SLECA.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. But since it's discussion or public comments, do we -- is the public is tied to SLECA?

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: It is --

SECRETARY FREY: Well, the docketed number is, but it's my appreciation that we're going to go into Executive Session before that --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Oh, we're going to go into Executive Session before that. Okay.

SECRETARY FREY: -- and then come back and take those.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So we can come back and take care of that one a little bit later, then.

SECRETARY FREY: Yeah. Right after Executive Session. We --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: So we'll go ahead and continue on with the rest of Exhibit 19.

SECRETARY FREY: And we have like one other item after that before --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right. And then we'll do the other part.

SECRETARY FREY: And just remember, we'll just be able to go into that room.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right. [INAUDIBLE]

SECRETARY FREY: We don't have to clear -- yeah. We don't have to clear the audience.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Nope. Everybody else can stay seated here during Executive Session.

MS. BOWMAN: So also under Exhibit Number19 is discussion and possible vote to ratify interventions of the Commission in RTO-related or other FERC proceedings. Pursuant to the scope of work approved in connection with the retention of Fishman Haygood and United Professionals Company for a MISO, SPP and ERSC participation. And due to the short deadlines allowed for these interventions, if advance Commission approval is not possible, initial interventions, comments or protests, subject to ratification at a following B&E may be filed on the Commission's behalf. Interventions were filed on the behalf of the Commission for the purposes of monitoring issues related to MISO. And

Staff recommends that the Commission ratify the actions taken in FERC Docket Numbers ER26-3552, ER26-3557, ER26-3558, ER26-3650, ER26-3677, and ER26-3756.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Move to ratify. Commissioner Francis will -- I'm sorry?

MS. BOWMAN: Move to ratify RTO interventions.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Right. Move to ratify all of the interventions.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: And the RTO-related at the Federal Energy Regulatory proceeding. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second.

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

MS. BOWMAN: Also, under Exhibit 19 is a discussion and possible vote possible vote to ratify votes cast by Commissioner Francis acting as the Commission's representative on the Board of Directors of the Organization of MISO States. The protocols require that votes cast be ratified by the Commission at a future B&E. At its September 10, 2026 board meeting, OMS approved a position on the Auction Revenue Rights and Financial Transmission Rights enhancements, which supported a proposal to allocate ARR entitlements seasonally and increase transmission outage reporting. On Staff's recommendation, the Commission voted in favor of this. The OMS also conducted an email vote on September 11 for filings in FERC Docket 26-3552, which is a MISO application related to its Zero Injection Generator Interconnection Agreement. The OMS comments conditionally support that framework as a potential tool for addressing the need for quicker interconnection of large loads, and based on Staff's recommendation, the Commission voted in favor of the OMS comments. OMS conducted an email vote on September 18, 2026 with comments for filing in FERC Docket 26-3650, which is a MISO application related to compliance with FERC show cause directive

related to interconnection reliability and data transparency issues. OMS generally supported those MISO comments, and based on Staff's recommendation, the Commission voted in favor. The OMS conducted a vote at its October 5, 2026 special board meeting on comments to be filed in FERC Docket 26-3813, which is a MISO proceeding designed to speed up normal generator interconnection queue processes, including its 2022 process, by providing one-time, unconditional opportunity to withdraw the queue penalty-free. Based on Staff's recommendation, the Commission voted in favor of the OMS comments. Staff recommends that the Commission ratify Commissioner Francis's votes cast on September 10, 11, 18 and October 5 of this year as the Commission's representative on the OMS Board of Directors.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Chair votes to ratify the votes of Commissioner Francis with -- Commissioner Francis will abstain from the vote. Any seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the votes are approved.

MS. BOWMAN: And so we will take up Exhibit 20 next, and then go back to the update from SLECA under Exhibit 19.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Or go into Executive Session first?

MS. BOWMAN: Yes. Sorry. Go into Executive Session first.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. That's fine.

MS. BOWMAN: Exhibit 20 is Docket Number R-38096. This is the Commission's possible amendments to Commission General Order dated December 20, 2024 and

Special Order 46-2005 (Corrected) solely to consider increasing the cap on the current fuel charges schedules for nonconsensual towing companies and motor carriers. It's a discussion and possible vote on Staff's proposed recommendation, and this is at the request of the Chair. The proposed -- the purpose of the rulemaking is to consider the amendments to the orders mentioned to address the rising cost of fuel prices and the current fuel surcharge index currently capped at 16% when the price of diesel fuel goes above $5. Based on the request by the Towing and Recovery Professionals of Louisiana, Staff reviewed not only the Commission's orders related to the cost of fuel, but also the U.S. Energy Information Administrator's report regarding the current retail price of on-highway diesel fuel for the Gulf Coast region. Staff confirmed TRPL's concern, that the retail price of fuel is increasing. Notice of this rulemaking was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin, seeking comments on the proposed rules, including specific redline proposals, and no interventions, nor comments were received. Staff's recommended -- recommendation is to just continue increasing the fuel surcharge to correlate to prices of fuel above the 5%. It maintains the same methodology. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt Staff's proposed recommendation filed into the record on October 16, 2026.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Move to accept Staff recommendation by the Chair. Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Second. And I have one question for Staff.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. And he has a question for --

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Probably Ms. Burl or Ms. Bowman. I just want to make sure I'm understanding correctly. So the nonconsensual towers must abide by the new rates as described in the index, but the other transporters, home goods, waste, and passengers, those will be if -- those rates will be set by -- if they put them in their tariffs. Am I understanding the difference of how they would operate?

MS. TAMMY BURL: Tammy Burl with Staff. Yes, sir. A motor carrier other than towing companies has the ability to adopt the Commission's fuel surcharge table. Other motor carriers have their own fuel surcharge. They have not -- we have not had -- have any applications from them requesting to change theirs. So this really just carries on just like it did for the towing and recovery professionals. We carried this one as well. Because I have been getting phone calls from household good movers, waste carriers, more specifically, asking if the Commission had any intention to try to expand this fuel surcharge that was currently in 46-2005 (Corrected).

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: So those would just have to do an application with you and not have to basically do a new tariff or rate structure?

MS. BURL: And in this -- if they have their own, this recommendation was that a carrier could request to adopt --

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Gotcha.

MS. BURL: -- the Commission's -- what the Commission's recommending here today.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. Thank you. That helps me understand the difference. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. All right. We have a motion by Chair, seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter's approved. We now -- do we have an in re for Executive Session, or do we just move to go into Executive Session?

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'll make a motion [INAUDIBLE].

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I'm just checking with Kathryn.

MS. BOWMAN: Yeah. We can read the -- so we need a combination of the two in res. The first would be an update from SLECA on its plans to provide electric service to its lake line members, and then the second is Docket Number U-37394, which is SLECA's petition for approval of abandonment of electric facilities located in Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes pursuant to the Commission General Order dated July 9, 2008. And this is a possible Executive Session to discuss litigation strategy pursuant to Revised Statute 42:17.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. And that is -- equates to the motion to go into Executive Session?

SECRETARY FREY: Yes.

MS. BOWMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Moved by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by the Chair. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, Commission moves into Executive Session.

[OFF THE RECORD]

[BACK ON THE RECORD]

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Chair moves to come out of Executive Session. Any

seconds?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, we are now in active session. Ms. Bowman, tell us where we are.

MS. BOWMAN: So we are going back to Exhibit Number 19, which is the update from SLECA on its plans to provide electric service to its lake line members. So I guess we'll call up Ms. Kantrow to the table.

SECRETARY FREY: And then we also have a --

MS. BOWMAN: And we do have a yellow card.

SECRETARY FREY: -- we do have a yellow card as well after they finish.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. No problem.

MS. KANTROW: Morning, Commissioners. Kara Kantrow and Kyle Marionneaux on behalf of SLECA. My appreciation of a status update here. And so for next steps, SLECA's weighing all of its legal and regulatory options in light of the Commission's actions. We recognize the difficult circumstances facing some of the affected camp owners, but the board also must consider the financial impact on the cooperative's broader membership. Ultimately, SLECA believes its decisions were made in the best interest of the membership as a whole, and in line with the greater good of the cooperative, and we remain willing to work with the Commission towards any type of practical solution, while also exercising all of our rights and legal options.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Kara, thank you for joining us this afternoon

again on this issue. My question is: you or the board is continuing to have public meetings on a regular basis, correct?

MS. KANTROW: You mean board meetings?

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Board meetings.

MS. KANTROW: Well, yeah. We have them every month.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Every month. Okay. And when was your last board meeting?

MS. KANTROW: Couple weeks ago.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: It's public?

MS. KANTROW: If a member would like to attend, which we were told some members would like to attend, they give us their name, they're given five minutes, and they did not show up.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay. Commissioner Lewis.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: How -- just for curiosity, I mean, because we had some of those complaints during the original hearing. How are members notified when the board meets, what time, and place? Is that through -- what communications does the board have to give people that opportunity?

MS. KANTROW: I don't know the answer. I'd have to get back with you on that.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Okay. I think --

MS. KANTROW: [INAUDIBLE] advertise that.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: I think that's very important. I mean, because if we're going to say that members -- if the board's going to meet every month, as

you said, and members are going to be eligible in this conversation, we've had very active people. I think SLECA deserves to at least contact the members or advise the members when board meetings are, what time, and their process to be involved. Because, I mean, I think that was one of the complaints we heard is that when the board made the decision, it was not really publicized. So I would advise SLECA to please ensure that that is part of those ongoing board decisions with this pending matter.

MS. KANTROW: I hear you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. Thank you. Y'all are excused. We have some yellow card?

MS. BOWMAN: We have one yellow card from Ms. Boudreaux who would like to speak.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Sure. Absolutely. Just state your name and go ahead.

MS. SARA BOUDREAUX: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Sara Boudreaux. I am an intervenor and active participant in this docket. I'm going to first address the board meetings. I searched high and low to find out when these board meeting was -- when the next board meeting was. I had friends and family and other members contact SLECA. I'll get back to you, I'll call you back, I don't know when they are. And we waited, and waited, and waited. They're not on a website, they're not on any social -- any of their social medias, they're not out in public for me to go and participate, because I have tried. Before addressing

SLECA's motion for rehearing that was postponed, I'm going to address something that comes up at nearly every meeting, the financial impact on ratepayers. I understand the concern about affordability, but I respectfully ask this Commission to require SLECA to demonstrate that it has pursued every reasonable opportunity to minimize those costs. FEMA may cover 90% of the eligible restoration cost. What efforts are being made to preserve that funding? What additional grants have been pursued? And have available appeals or other funding remedies been exhausted? I respectfully ask the Commission to require documentation of those efforts, not simply assurances. Could the final impact on ratepayers be zero? Possibly. Am I saying they will be? No. But every reasonable funding opportunity has to be pursued. We should not be treated -- we should not be treated -- we should not treat projected rate increases as unavoidable. Sorry. I'm shaking. While this matter continues to be delayed, our communities remain without power. Spending 25 months during this proceeding, and more than 5 years --

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Ms. Boudreaux, you got all the time in the world. Just take a breath. You always do great. Just don't worry about it.

MS. BOUDREAUX: Thank you. While this matter continues to be delayed, our communities remain without power. Spending 25 months during this proceeding, and more than 5 years without service. I respectfully ask that when the motion for rehearing is reconsidered, the Commission remember that SLECA was already afforded a second evidentiary hearing to address the deficiencies in its case. I was able to quickly compile 51 pages and 78 findings of those deficiencies. They were evaluated by the ALJ, they were evaluated by Staff, and they were evaluated by

me. SLECA was not denied the opportunity to present its case. If a financial settlement or alternatives like solar, microgrids, hybrid systems are being considered, I respectfully ask that affected property owners and intervenors have an opportunity to review and respond to any proposal before decisions are made. The alternative should also be evaluated and not automatically be treated as satisfying SLECA's obligation to serve. I also want to remind the Commission that the natural gas abandonment cases previously cited and noted in the record, cited uncontested proceedings, and in several cases, affected customers accepted the financial arrangements. This case is different from any of those dockets. I have contested abandonment. I have not agreed to surrender electric service for financial compensation. Hurricane Ida caused some damage. SLECA made the decisions that followed. Those decisions deserve accountability. Thank you for an opportunity to speak to you this morning -- afternoon.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: I know, right? Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments.

MS. BOUDREAUX: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Thank you, Ms. Boudreaux. I want to, once again, thank you for being a very active participant. And just in a personal capacity, seeing citizens be involved in dockets across the board, I think is extremely helpful to our process and to us. And I will request SLECA give me the information of every board meeting so I'll make sure that you have that, because I -- I'll look into.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Yeah. I'm a little concerned about the fact about this sort of actions of the board sort of mimic the original actions of the board in, you

know, this sort of star chamber kind of activity. And I think that the Commission -- the original action of the board was that they made a decision, then notified the membership what they were going to do without notifying the membership of what they were contemplating they were going to do in the first place. And so now they can't even find out when their meetings are being held where they can attend their board -- the membership can attend the board meetings and express their issues. Something tells me that the, you know, overall rules of operation of that -- the co-op itself are probably being violated. And so I think that that probably is a civil issue versus a Commission issue. So I would go and start digging into the original formation documents. So, anyway --

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Go ahead.

VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN: Just relative -- Ms. Boudreaux, relative to your request to kind of stay plugged in. You know, from a standpoint of our public meetings, like, that's why we want to try to talk about things here that we can that are not in anticipation of litigation where we might have to go into our Executive Session. But to the extent that there are any proposals that will be made public, and you would have a chance to respond, you would have a chance to -- as an intervenor, clearly, that's what the intervention process is about. So even though, you know, we're trying to comply with your request is what I'm telling you, relative to staying involved. But I think your action as an intervenor and your participation in the process, that's what we're trying to accomplish. Your request to stay involved, and we are doing so from the Staff standpoint through your representation as an

intervenor.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: All right. Well, winter is coming. All right. Anybody else?

MS. BOWMAN: That's it.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: That is the end of the agenda. I entertain a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER LEWIS: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA: Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Lewis, Chair seconds. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD]. Thank you all for coming to New Orleans.

(WHEREUPON THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED)

I certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 125 are true and correct to the best of my knowledge of the Open Session of the Business and Executive Meeting held on October 22, 2026 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

****

Rough Draft prepared by:



November 17, 2026

Key-Anna Freeman, **Date**
Court Reporter



November 17, 2026

Alicia Carter-Thomas, **Date**
Court Reporter



November 17, 2026

Noah Rovira, **Date**
Court Reporter

****

Proofed by:



November 18, 2026

Alicia Carter-Thomas, **Date**
Court Reporter

Finalized by:



November 20, 2026

Key-Anna Freeman, **Date**
Court Reporter