

TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON APRIL 15, 2026 IN ALEXANDRIA, 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 - 11 16 -17
2	T-37136	Cantium, LLC Vs. Rosefield Fourchon Operating, LLC	12 - 16
3	T-37772	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. All My Sons Moving & Storage of Baton Rouge, LLC	17 - 18
4	T-37747	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. 2Easy2Move Moving Services LLC	18 - 20
5	T-37748	Louisiana Public Service Commission vs. Nola Moving, LLC	20 - 25
6	I-37858 I-37860 I-37864 I-TBD	Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative, Inc. Dixie Electric Membership Corporation Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation 1803 Electric Cooperative	26

7	S-37826	American Broadband Holding Company and CSM Intermediate II, LLC	27
8	U-36697	Entergy Louisiana, LLC	28 - 29
9	U-37343	Dixie Electric Membership Corporation	Deferred
10	U-37425	Entergy Louisiana, LLC	29 - 30
11	U-37794	Southwestern Electric Power Company	30 - 37
12	U-37760	Louisiana Water Company, Inc.	37 - 38
13	U-37882	Entergy Louisiana, LLC In re: Discussion and possible vote to retain Fishman Haygood.	38 - 39
14	U-37882	Entergy Louisiana, LLC In re: Discussion and possible vote on Motion for Procedural Directive pursuant to Rule 57.	39 - 51
15	Undocketed	Entergy Louisiana, LLC's request for approval of an agreement with Commission Staff regarding the monetization of 2025 nuclear production tax credits.	51 - 52
16		1) Reports 2) Resolutions 3) Discussions 4) ERSC/OMS business 5) Directives	11 - 12 63 - 64

17	S-37783	Atmos Energy Corporation	52 - 53
18	Undocketed	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte	53 - 56
19	Undocketed	Directive to Staff to implement Interim Rule 10a for mandatory disclosure of foreign and outside funding sources by intervenors in Commission proceedings.	56 - 62

1 **TRANSCRIPT OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**
2 **BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE OPEN SESSION HELD ON APRIL 15, 2026**
3 **IN ALEXANDRIA, LOUISIANA. PRESENT WERE: CHAIRMAN ERIC**
4 **SKRMETTA, VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN,**
5 **COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS, COMMISSIONER MIKE**
6 **FRANCIS, AND COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL.**

7 **VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN:** Good morning and welcome to
8 Louisiana Public Service Commission monthly meeting. Today is Wednesday,
9 April 15, Tax Day. Hope everybody got their extensions filed. We're going to start
10 with a prayer led by one of Louisiana's leaders, the Speaker Pro Tem of the
11 Louisiana House of Representatives, Representative Mike Johnson. He represents
12 Pineville. He is a servant leader and continues to file and advocate for his
13 community and his state every day. And we look forward to hearing from him
14 about the history -- a little bit about the district, but we're going to start with a
15 prayer.

16 **[SPEAKER MIKE JOHNSON LEADS IN PRAYER]**

17 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Do the Pledge of Allegiance.

18 **[VICE CHAIRMAN JEAN-PAUL COUSSAN LEADS IN THE PLEDGE]**

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Mr. Speaker Pro Tem, would you mind
20 welcoming our audience?

21 **SPEAKER MIKE JOHNSON:** I would be delighted. Welcome to central
22 Louisiana. It is great to see you here. We are proud of our community. Certainly,
23 we hope you had an opportunity to enjoy the Hotel Bentley. You're going to hear

1 a little bit about the history of this historic place in a little while. But I just want to
2 say thank you for being here. Central Louisiana is on the edge, on the ledge, of
3 great things ahead. And what you do here today, and what you continue to do, will
4 have a lot do with the future. I'm excited about the direction of our state. The
5 governor -- it's almost if you asked him, Governor, would you like the salt and
6 pepper? His answer will be: Did you know we have \$100 billion right now of
7 growth going on in the state? That is what he is laser focused on and that is what
8 our Legislature is focused on. This is a historic hotel. We're in historic times. And
9 it's historic times in a good way because I think Louisiana is poised to lead the
10 nation. And right in the middle of all of that is a thing that this Public Service
11 Commission will be so instrumental in. And we just -- so happy that you're here.
12 Hope you will take the time if you're not from this area to enjoy our little
13 community and to come back. Hotel Bentley is so important to the history of this
14 area and so much a part of the fabric of this community even 150 years later -- 140
15 years later. So I hope you'll take time to get to visit. I appreciate the opportunity
16 to visit with you, to visit with some of you individually, and look forward to
17 working with you. If I can ever be of any assistance to you in Baton Rouge, I hope
18 you'll reach out to me. I really tried to take one of your Commissioners back with
19 me. He is very much instrumental when I first got into the Legislature. We hated
20 to lose him, but we hear good things about what he's doing. Again, thank you for
21 being here. Welcome to central Louisiana. Welcome to Alexandria. And I hope
22 you have a great stay and a productive day. Am I supposed to call up Mike, too?

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** We're not taking any questions from the
2 audience, Mike, so.

3 **SPEAKER JOHNSON:** Thank you for that.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Send our best regards to the Legislature and
5 drive safely.

6 **SPEAKER JOHNSON:** Thank you.

7 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Next up, I'd like to bring up a Rapides Parish
8 business leader, Mike Shelton, to introduce our next speaker.

9 **MR. MIKE SHELTON:** Thank you. Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you,
10 Commissioner Francis for bringing this meeting to Alexandria. I think it's been 22
11 or 24 years since the Commission's been here. Thank you to the Staff of the Public
12 Service Commission and all the Commissioners. And I think we have one -- two
13 former Commissioners. Y'all all know Jay Blossman, but I think Charlie DeWitt's
14 in the crowd. Is he still -- there he is. He was a former Commissioner, but also
15 two-time Speaker of the House, and he's our guy. He's done more probably for
16 central Louisiana than any other politician in the history of Rapides Parish. So
17 thank you, Mr. Charlie. And I'd like to introduce -- Commissioner Francis was
18 talking to me about the history of this hotel and what it meant to central Louisiana.
19 As some of you know, he's from Jena, which is right up the street, and he played
20 football for the Jena Giants. And remember if you were here last night, coming to
21 Alexandria was like the big city. He said it was like coming to New York City.
22 And all of us that grew up here, this was a great place and you will hear more about
23 it, but it's the cornerstone for central Louisiana. So I said I have a friend who is a

1 historian for central Louisiana, knows more about the history of central Louisiana,
2 but particularly this property, and I'd like to have him come up and speak about it.
3 But he won't tell you this so I will, his family actually owned this hotel at one time.
4 And it was closed for many years, and they are the family that's responsible for
5 bringing it back. So I'd like to introduce Mike Tudor.

6 **MR. MIKE TUDOR:** Thank you, Mike. If it's okay, I'd like to sit. I have remarks
7 that I've made sure don't go longer than five minutes and address the Commission
8 if that's okay.

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yes, sir.

10 **MR. TUDOR:** I apologize to my audience for -- I'll hold it -- for putting my back
11 to them, but I'd rather address you folks. And let me say first about Mike Shelton,
12 wonderful guy, was very enjoyable representing him when he owned Popeyes, and
13 he has his own stories. And sometime y'all need to get him to tell you about us
14 accompanying Commissioner Strain to Havana, Cuba in 2015 and running into one
15 of Fidel's sons and our conversation. And Mike and I knew then that when Cuba
16 was fixed, it was going to be all about the money. Isn't it always? But thank you,
17 Mike. I also wanted to acknowledge that I've met three of the Commissioners.
18 Commissioner Coussan and I happened to work together as attorneys when I was
19 trying to cure a piece of property that had been out of commerce for decades. And
20 it was a lot of fun getting to know you. And you had a different nickname then, but
21 that's another story. And Commissioner Campbell spoke with the Alexandria
22 Rotary Club a number of times. And as a Francis Grevemberg, Charlton Lyons,
23 Dave Treen republican, which will tell you how old I am, I've always respected

1 and enjoyed hearing your very articulate enunciation of your political philosophy.
2 Always respected it. And then I discovered Commissioner Francis and I were in
3 high school together. I was a Pineville Rebel and he was a Jena Giant. And I was
4 relating that I was on the basketball team and the only brawl we ever got into was
5 my last game as a senior at Jena and it was a doozy. And I said, oh my goodness,
6 I hope we didn't exchange blows. And he said, no, I just played football. But that
7 was fun to have that memory, Commissioner. Okay. Let me get into the history of
8 this property. The Hotel Bentley opened in 1908. Built by Joseph A. Bentley, a
9 wealthy lumber businessman. The backstory is that in the era of 1880 to 1910,
10 there was a period of rapid national economic growth. The giant inventory of
11 southern virgin forest offered the building materials for this growth. Post-Civil War
12 capital was scarce in the south, so wealthy northern entrepreneurs such as Joe
13 Bentley came south, acquired land and timber rights, and built sawmills. So did
14 the northern émigré Martin and Kellogg families who remained and contributed to
15 this community through present times. Okay. This is the backstory. Since Joe
16 Bentley was a bachelor all of his life, an expensive country or urban home was out
17 of the question. Instead, Bentley constructed this hotel, which would also contain
18 his personal residence as a multi-room suite overlooking the river. No way
19 Alexandria with a 1910 population of 8,000 and a Rapides population of 41,000
20 would have predicted at onset a commercially sustainable hotel enterprise. But this
21 building was his home, too. The architect chose the bow arch style, which you just
22 look up and you see it. That's the style. Highly popular in the U.S. during this
23 period. If you would walk into the lobby of the Capital Hotel in Little Rock today,

1 you are going to muse: This looks familiar. Same architect as this Hotel Bentley.
2 Walk into the lobby of the still operating Jefferson Hotel in downtown Richmond,
3 ditto. Same architect. The hotel was successful despite its immediate population
4 base because it was without rival and served all of central Louisiana from Vidalia
5 to Leesville, an economic and geographic fact often overlooked by outsiders who
6 often judge us by city limit populations. And at the time of its opening, Alexandria
7 was a hub of five different railroad lines, which produced travelers and guests for
8 this hotel. And since its 1908 opening, this hotel has been a visual and icon of this
9 city and region. Parenthetically, an anecdote, when the hotel reopened in 1985 after
10 one of its interregnums of being closed, my grandmother related how her father and
11 she caught the Texas and Pacific Railroad from Garland up to Alexandria for the
12 grand opening. And she showed me outside, on the exact spot of the present
13 balcony, where she stood and watched the ceremony below in 1908. In 1935, the
14 successor owner to Joe Bentley, J.W. Beasley, authorized and financed the eight-
15 story connected art deco tower. This boosted the hotel capacity to 300 rooms. The
16 general contractor was Tudor and Radcliffe. Each of those families operating,
17 independently, their own construction companies three generations later, here
18 today. In the midst of the depression, this project contributed our own local WPA-
19 like construction boost. Mr. Beasley was seen as almost something as a hero and
20 personification of continuing faith in the future of our community. There's an
21 historic marker on the DeSoto Street below which describes the 1941 Louisiana
22 military maneuvers. These maneuvers were some of the largest war games ever
23 held in the United States. Because Alexandria was the center of these exercises,

1 many high-ranking officers such as Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and Clark stayed
2 at the Hotel Bentley and/or ate and drank here. These guys would, today, easily
3 recognize The Mirror Room, and the lobby, and the dining room as unchanged.
4 Now, MacArthur never made it here as he was then generalissimo for the
5 Philippines. Of course, at that time, none of these officers had the fame which
6 World War II brought to each. But to this day, local families have stories of
7 interacting with these famous military leaders, plus their families who accompanied
8 them here in many instances. There's a beautiful home on City Park Avenue on
9 the National Registry built in 1938. The owners gave me the permission, the Milton
10 Rhea Home, whose back porch there are pictures of Bradley, Patton, and
11 Eisenhower smoking, and drinking, and socializing. Most of us are familiar and
12 heard it firsthand of a local young man, Lee Stagg, dating George Patton's daughter
13 here. And, actually, some favorable comments made by the Patton family about
14 people they met here and our hospitality. Knowing that is why I have always
15 resented the remark Patton makes in his opening soliloquy in the movie by the same
16 name, and I'm sure some of you remember what he said about shoveling something
17 in Louisiana. Equally important to our local history were the surrounding camps
18 of Polk, Livingston, Claiborne, and Beauregard, which hundreds of thousands of
19 soldiers were trained for World War II. And it might be mentioned they were
20 [INAUDIBLE] during World War I here when thousands took training at Camp
21 Beauregard in Pineville, now the state National Guard headquarters in fact, if not
22 in name. The patriotic past of our community even extends to the Civil War when
23 Alexandria was known as a union town thanks to the personal lobbying of then

1 highly popular -- then, I would say, highly popular LSU President W.T. Sherman,
2 which school was located in Pineville until 1869. Post-World War II, this historic
3 property has had its times of struggle and even closings. The advent of driving to
4 the front of your room Holiday Inn-like chains of the 1950s challenged almost all
5 historic downtown hotels. And, obviously, Alexandria did not enjoy the growth of
6 Little Rock and Richmond. But today, thanks to the local entrepreneur Mike
7 Jenkins and his excellent staff, this bows arch, architectural jewel remains our
8 community icon. Parenthetically, the Bentley's only rogue past owner, whose
9 name I shall not mention, had himself painted on a horse, in Roman, Caesar attire,
10 on the lobby rotunda ceiling, which you can still see now, supposedly as Augustus
11 or Tiberius. But given the history, somehow when I look up, I always see Nero or
12 Caligula. The Bentley's only rival in state hotel longevity is the Hotel Monteleone
13 in New Orleans. And like the Hotel Peter and Paul in Marigny and other such
14 examples, Jenkins has created Hotel Bentley as an event destination venue. With
15 the wealth now concentrated at the top in this country, unique properties such as
16 this are sought after by the uber-rich for weddings and other celebrations. And
17 renting a whole property like Hotel Bentley is part of the new marketing strategy.
18 So, gentlemen, as you contemplate our state's important business today, be aware
19 of 118 years of similar serious convocations within these walls. Perhaps channeling
20 a little bit of Ike's great wisdom would serve you well. Thank you for this
21 opportunity.

22 **COMMISSIONER MIKE FRANCIS:** Kathryn, we under announcements now?

23 **MS. KATHRYN BOWMAN:** Yes, sir.

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** All right. I'd like to recognize a good friend. He
2 came from -- drove here all the way from Ball, Louisiana. The mayor of Ball, the
3 mayor of the town that has the Moon Pie Festival, Gail Wilking. Gail, would you
4 stand up? Give everybody a hand. And when I hear the word moon pie, that's the
5 nickname that Foster Campbell gave to Moon Griffon. So I just -- that's another
6 moon pie there.

7 **COMMISSIONER FOSTER CAMPBELL:** That's a real good name for Moon
8 Griffon.

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** And I'd like to also, in all seriousness, change of
10 tone, this is the area of our past friend William Earl Hilton, and his passing. And
11 he just -- he was a great friend to so many of us. I know Shane may be here, there,
12 somewhere, but he was a great guy and we all miss him. And there's Shane. Thank
13 you. Thank you for sharing your daddy with us for all these years. Thank you.
14 That's all I have.

15 **CHAIRMAN ERIC SKRMETTA:** Any other Commissioners have anything?
16 Go ahead.

17 **COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just two
18 announcements. I want to thank the American Association of Blacks in Energy,
19 AABE as it's known, for hosting its 49th annual conference this week in New
20 Orleans. AABE was started in 1977 when individuals who worked at energy
21 companies decided they needed a seat at the table to ensure that we were looking
22 at promoting and pursuing opportunities for generation expansion, technology
23 advancement. And so this week, we were proud to have AABE here in New

1 Orleans. I want to thank Entergy for being one of the lead sponsors and having so
2 many of their staff participate in this conference this year, as well as Atmos Energy
3 who had a very large presence. I know a majority of them are still playing golf
4 right now at the annual golf tournament, but I'm here to do the people's business.
5 So I just wanted to send a shout out to AABE and thank them for choosing New
6 Orleans as the host for their 49th annual conference this week. And the second
7 announcement that I wanted to do is thank NARUC's president, Ann Rendahl.
8 Recently, President Rendahl appointed me as the co-vice chair of the consumer and
9 public interest committee. I am deeply honored to serve our association in that role.
10 I look forward to working with our new chairman, Commissioner Zenon
11 Christodoulou, and my fellow co-vice chair, Commissioner Kristy Nieto of
12 Wisconsin. And I look forward to showcasing what Louisiana does to protect
13 consumers with our friends and comrades across the nation and NARUC. That's
14 all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Thank you. Commissioner Campbell, you
16 have anything?

17 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I'm glad to be here today. I have two special
18 friends. My wife's uncle was Camille Gravel, who was a renowned lawyer in
19 Louisiana, lived here in Alexandria. And my cousin was Ned Randolph, who was
20 a previous mayor of Alexandria. So I -- every time I come here, I think about those
21 two people who were very proud of Louisiana, very proud of Alexandria. And it's
22 -- glad to be here in their presence. Thank you.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Well, thank you very much. Look, we're
2 going to go ahead and jostle the agenda a little bit. We're moving one item up to
3 the beginning. Kathryn, you want to explain that or at least list what that is for the
4 agenda and redo the in re? And Commissioner Coussan has a directive. Is it a
5 motion or a directive?

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** It's a directive.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Directive. Go ahead.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes. So we're going to move Exhibit 16 --

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You might have to speak closer to the microphone,
10 I think.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** So we're going to have to -- we're going to move Exhibit 16 up.
12 So we're going to keep the Executive Session to the end of the session, but we're
13 going to move up the directive from Commissioner Coussan. Which,
14 Commissioner, would you like me to go ahead and read it?

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yeah. Would you, please? Thank you.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** So it's the directive to Staff to open a rulemaking to evaluate
17 private use electrical networks at the request of the Vice Chairman. Louisiana State
18 Senate task force created Senate Resolution 195 and has been studying inter alia
19 policies regarding energy self-generation, industrial micro grids, and expedited
20 permitting in the state of Louisiana. Discussion at the task force also included
21 potential statutory changes to ensure that Louisiana has the electrical generation
22 needed to attract new large loads to Louisiana, and more recently, how micro grids
23 could serve these large loads. Incidentally, Senate Bill 490 has now been

1 introduced into this 2026 Regular Session proposing private use electrical networks
2 to enable construction of generation to support large industrial and digital
3 infrastructure projects. The Commission is actively participating in that task force
4 -- in those task force meetings and has provided pertinent information garnered
5 from relevant prior Commission rulemaking proceedings including its position
6 memorialized in Docket Number R-35462, as certain situations created by some
7 utility customers could create stranded costs and the potential for increased costs to
8 all other customers. Nevertheless, private use electrical networks was not directly
9 addressed in Docket Number R-35462 and should be given due consideration. As
10 the agency with the constitutional mandate to regulate electric public utilities, I
11 direct Staff to open a docket to evaluate private use electrical networks to enable
12 generation to serve new large load looking to locate in Louisiana. I further direct
13 Staff to work with the already retained counsel and consultant in Docket R-35462
14 under their remaining budgets therein. And that is the directive.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Any opposition to the directive? [NONE HEARD]
16 Hearing none, it moves forward. Please notify Executive Secretary Frey, please.
17 And we'll go ahead and move forward with the regular docket.

18 **MS. BOWMAN:** So then moving to Exhibit Number 2, which is Docket Number
19 T-37136. This is Cantium v. Rosefield Fourchon Operating complaint against
20 Rosefield for transportation and terminalling of crude oil as a common carrier
21 without a tariff on file with the Commission at rates that are excessive, and request
22 that Rosefield pay reparations, refunds, and damages for charges above just and
23 reasonable rates. It's a discussion and possible vote to rehear the Commission's

1 jurisdictional determination of Rosefield pursuant to the 19th Judicial District
2 Court's remand, and this was Exhibit 2 last month. Last month, the Commission
3 provided notice that the Commission would consider whether Rosefield's services
4 were jurisdictional based upon the remand from the 19th Judicial District Court.
5 That notice was triggered by the briefing schedule set at the Commission's
6 December 2025 B&E and provided for in the notice of transcript availability filed
7 on January 8, 2026. The Commission thought it was clear that the opportunity for
8 all parties to present their respective cases was set forth in that briefing schedule.
9 In fact, the Commission directed the parties to file briefs on the issues raised by the
10 19th JDC. As was evidenced at the March B&E, Rosefield interpreted the
11 Commission's briefing schedule differently and anticipated a hearing during the
12 B&E. In order to provide the other parties the opportunity to respond to Rosefield's
13 additional evidence, as well as adhering to the Commission's standard procedure
14 for the admission of testimony and evidence, the Commission remands this
15 proceeding back to the Administrative Law Judge to conduct an expedited narrow
16 hearing, limited to whether the Commission's finding of Rosefield as a common
17 carrier be altered based upon the applicability of Louisiana Revised Statutes
18 amended during the 2025 Legislative Session, specifically Act 458. In conducting
19 such hearing, Rosefield will have the opportunity to present the anticipated
20 testimony from the March B&E with an opportunity for Cantium and Staff to cross-
21 examine Rosefield's witness and put on their own witnesses regarding this
22 information. To be clear, the only testimony and evidence that is to be presented
23 by Rosefield during this hearing is that which was already presented at the March

1 B&E and any necessary rebuttal. As part of this remand, the Commission directs
2 the Administrative Hearings Division to notice a status conference within 15 days
3 from today to determine appropriate hearing schedule, including any pre-filing
4 deadlines as determined appropriate by the Judge with a recommendation back to
5 this Commission no later than the October 2026 B&E. The ALJ's recommendation
6 should not only consider any live testimony presented at the hearing, but should
7 also consider the facts already established in the record, as well as all parties' briefs
8 filed pursuant to the Commission's briefing schedule. It is Commission's position
9 that the additional briefing is unnecessary. However, in the course of the
10 proceedings, should the ALJ determine additional briefing is necessary, it is within
11 the ALJ's discretion to do order. Further, this remand does not alter the
12 Commission's action at the March B&E directing Rosefield to work with Staff to
13 establish an escrow account for all payments made since October of 2023, as Order
14 Number T-37136 was not vacated by the 19th JDC and the 19th JDC's stay has been
15 lifted. This Commission has jurisdiction over Rosefield unless or until such order
16 is altered, modified, or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction. We do have
17 three yellow cards on this item.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We'll go ahead and put a motion on the floor while
19 we're bringing up the people who want to speak for the cards. Move to remand this
20 matter to the ALJ for the purposes established in the reading by the Executive
21 Counsel for the collection of testimony under the constrictions.

22 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I'll second.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Campbell. And people
2 who -- you want to call the cards up?

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yeah. So we have three chairs, so if y'all all want to come up.
4 It's Jamie Watts, Kelly Perrier, and Matthew Simone.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Can everybody in the back hear? Okay.
6 Good. Before y'all start, you understand the process of what we done, and so we're
7 going to move the bulk of this to the ALJ for that hearing. So I'd like to, you know,
8 limit this to the necessary -- whatever's necessary now and don't want to cross that
9 bridge two or three times, so thank you.

10 **MS. JAMIE WATTS:** Yes, Chairman. Thank you. Jamie Watts on behalf of
11 Rosefield Fourchon Operating, and very briefly wanted to state Rosefield's position
12 on the Commission's proposed action today. Conceptually, Rosefield does not
13 oppose a rehearing to remand the jurisdictional determination to the Administrative
14 Law Judge as long as that process is equitable to all parties, is not unreasonably
15 restricted in terms of the parties' ability to offer and respond to witness testimony,
16 evidence, argument, and briefing, and does not alter the existing record by
17 removing anything previously admitted or proffered. Rosefield continues to
18 oppose the Commission's requirement for escrow of retroactive and perspective
19 payments to Rosefield by Cantium and/or Harvest in excess of 67 cents per barrel.
20 Rosefield believes that requirement is unauthorized. It is premised upon the
21 LPSC's threshold jurisdictional determination that Rosefield is a common carrier
22 pipeline and that jurisdictional determination is what is to be decided in the

1 proposed remand to the ALJ. And for these reasons, Rosefield reserves all rights
2 to make any objections as this docket continues. Thank you.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Cantium folks?

4 **MR. MATTHEW SIMONE:** Matthew Simone on behalf of Cantium, LLC. One
5 comment we'll make is that we reserve the right to object any evidence that would
6 not be allowed in a remand under Louisiana law. That's all.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Great. We've had a motion on the floor and
8 a second. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is
9 remanded and approved. Move to the next item.

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** One additional housekeeping item.

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead. You need to speak into the microphone.
12 I'm not picking it up myself.

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** One additional housekeeping item. An announcement from
14 Staff that Ms. Evans has.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead.

16 **MS. LAUREN EVANS:** Lauren Evans --

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Tap on it. There you go.

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

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** There we go.

20 **MS. EVANS:** Consistent with the March 18, 2026 B&E, wherein Staff was
21 directed to hold a technical conference on the non-binding guidelines related to
22 large load customers, Staff will hold the technical conference on Thursday, May 7
23 at 9 A.M., in the Natchez Room. Since this technical conference is not being

1 noticed in a docketed proceeding, notice of the technical conference will be posted
2 on the Commission's website under news and information.

3 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you.

4 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** What was that date again? I'm sorry I missed
5 that.

6 **MS. EVANS:** May 7 at 9:00 in the morning.

7 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** That's in the main meeting room? Okay.

8 **MS. EVANS:** Correct.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Next item.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** Moving -- there we go.

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

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** Moving to Exhibit Number 3, this is Docket Number T-37772.

14 This is the Commission versus All My Sons Moving & Storage of Baton Rouge

15 regarding an alleged violation of the revised statutes and General Order dated July

16 1, 1921 as amended by exceeding rates as outlined in the company's tariff dated

17 October 11, 2017 while operating under Common Carrier Certificate Number

18 7508-A allegedly having occurred on or about June 27, 2025. It's a discussion and

19 possible vote on a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge. Staff

20 investigated All My Sons Moving & Storage of Baton Rouge following a customer

21 complaint and determined that All My Sons had exceeded its tariffed rates for the

22 move. Staff issued a citation with notice of the citation published in the

23 Commission's Official Bulletin and All My Sons did not appear when the matter

1 was called for hearing. Staff argued that All My Sons violated the revised statutes
2 in the Commission's General Order and sought an order finding All My Sons guilty
3 as alleged, fining the company \$1,000, and assessing a \$25 citation fee. The
4 recommendation of the ALJ was issued on March 26, 2026. Based on the evidence
5 admitted at the hearing in this matter the ALJ recommends that the Commission
6 issue an order finding All My Sons guilty of violating the Louisiana Revised Statute
7 45:168(B)(1) and the 1921 General Order by exceeding the rates and its effective
8 tariff on file with the Commission dated October 11, 2017. All My Sons shall pay
9 a \$1,000 fine pursuant to the revised statutes for said violations, and All My Sons
10 shall pay a \$25 citation fee pursuant to the 2006 General Order with all fines and
11 fees due within 30 days of an order's issuance date.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Move to accept Staff recommendation by Skrmetta.
13 Any seconds?

14 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Coussan. Any
16 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item please.

17 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 4 is Docket Number T-37747. This is the
18 Commission versus 2Easy2Move Moving Services regarding an alleged violation
19 of revised statutes by engaging in activities relating to moving household goods
20 prior to complying with the requirements of Louisiana Revised Statute 45:164(E)
21 and General Orders dated March 16, 2021 and April 3, 2008 as amended. It's a
22 discussion and possible vote on a recommendation of the Administrative Law
23 Judge. Staff investigated the company and determined that it was advertising for

1 intrastate household good moving services while not registered with the
2 Commission. Staff issued its citation in 2025 with notice being published in the
3 Commission's Official Bulletin. The company did not appear when the hearing
4 was called. Staff argued that 2Easy's advertising for household good moving
5 services violates the revised statutes and the general orders by holding itself out as
6 a household good mover without being registered with the Commission and further
7 violates the Commission's general orders by failing to include a LPSC certificate
8 number in its advertising. Staff sought an order finding that the company be found
9 guilty, be fined \$1,000, be ordered to pay a \$25 citation fee, and all payments due
10 within 60 days. The ALJ's recommendation was issued on March 9, 2026, and
11 based on the evidence admitted at the hearing, the ALJ recommends that the
12 Commission issue an order finding 2Easy2Move Moving Services as guilty of
13 violating Revised Statute 45:164(E)(1), by engaging in activities related to
14 household good moving, advertising online prior to complying with the
15 requirements of the revised statutes and the Commission's general order, is guilty
16 of violating the Commission's general order by failing to include its certificate
17 number in the online advertising. And based on these violations, Staff shall --
18 excuse me. Based on these violations, shall pay a \$1,000 fine pursuant to revised
19 statutes and the general order, and a \$25 citation fee, and that all of this shall be
20 paid within 30 days of issuance of the order.

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

23 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

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

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 5 is Docket Number T-37748. This is the
4 Commission versus Nola Moving on an alleged violation of Order Number T-
5 37118 and Revised Statutes 45:161 and 180.1 by engaging in activities related to
6 household -- moving household goods prior to complying with the requirements of
7 45:164(E) and General Order dated March 16, 2001, and for failure to comply with
8 the requirements of General Order dated April 3, 2008 as amended. It's a
9 discussion and possible vote on a recommendation of the Administrative Law
10 Judge. Staff investigated Nola Moving following a complaint from a registered
11 carrier and determined that the company was continuing to advertise for intrastate
12 household good movings after being found guilty of advertising without
13 Commission authority in Order Number T-37118, and Nola had not paid the fines
14 and fees required from that order. Staff issued a citation to the company with notice
15 of the citation being published in the Official Bulletin, and Nola did not appear at
16 the hearing when the matter was called. Staff argued that the company failed to
17 pay the fine and citation fee required by Order Number T-37118, was a violation
18 of that order, and arguing further that Nola's continued advertising violates the
19 revised statutes and Commission's general order by holding itself out as a
20 household goods mover without being registered with the Commission and
21 violating the Commission's general order. Staff sought that the company be found
22 guilty as alleged, and that the Commission enforce the payment of the fines and
23 fees ordered in Order Number T-37118. The recommendation of the

1 Administrative Law Judge was issued on March 16, 2026. And based on the
2 evidence admitted at the hearing in this matter, the ALJ recommends that the
3 Commission issue an order finding Nola Moving is guilty of violating Order T-
4 37118 for failing to pay the \$1,000 fine and \$25 citation fee ordered therein; that
5 the company violated the revised statutes by engaging in activities related to
6 household goods intrastate through online advertising prior to complying with the
7 requirements of revised statutes and the Commission's general order; that they're
8 guilty of the Commission's general order by failing to include a Commission
9 certificate number in its advertising; and as such, shall pay a \$2,000 fine pursuant
10 to revised statutes for the violation of the said revised statutes and the general order,
11 as well as pay a \$25 citation fee; and that these fines and fees shall be paid within
12 30 days of issuance of the order.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We have a question from Commissioner Coussan.

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

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Well, first, I'd like to make a motion to accept
16 the Staff recommendation.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Seconded by the Chair. You have any
18 questions?

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** So it's a general question for Ms. Burl. I
20 believe you are -- could you please state what your role is relative to these
21 investigations?

22 **MS. TAMMY BURL:** Yes, Commissioner. Tammy Burl on behalf of
23 Commission Staff. I am the Transportation Administrator and run the

1 Transportation Division and oversees all aspects of transportation, including
2 unregulated --

3 **MS. EVANS:** Tammy, you're not getting picked up.

4 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Seems like you're very busy.

5 **MS. BURL:** I have been.

6 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I've been getting a bunch of calls from
7 constituents -- tap your mic. I think she's on now.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You might need to just bring it closer to you. I think
9 that these work a lot closer.

10 **MS. BURL:** Gotcha. Is that better?

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Better. Way better.

12 **MS. BURL:** Okay.

13 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** So I've been getting calls from constituents who
14 are in the same industry as many of these entities who are subject to these
15 enforcement proceedings. I take some of them with a grain of salt because they're
16 competitors. However, in some cases, my constituents are pointing out that we
17 have repeat violations, and in particular, Exhibit Number 5 is an example of that.
18 What is the ultimate penalty? What is the worst penalty that we could enforce on
19 a repeat offender under our current rules and statutes?

20 **MS. BURL:** Our statute allows us to fine a carrier of up to 10,000 per offense. So
21 it's up to \$10,000 per offense.

22 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** And if they don't pay the fine, what is the teeth
23 after that?

1 **MS. BURL:** I have been working with counsel, and I will let Kathryn Bowman
2 answer that question.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes. So, Commissioners, we can take our judgment and go to
4 district court to enforce that order, essentially. We have a --

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** So can render it into a damage -- a money
6 judgment?

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Correct. Yes. We could go after them to do that. We just -- we
8 have not done that, but we can certainly look into that and start doing it.

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Have we had instances where these entities are
10 essentially starting new LLCs and avoiding the consequences of their prior names?
11 Is that something that we're seeing in the industry as well?

12 **MS. BURL:** I have seen them attempt to do so. If an owner of a company tries to
13 come back in in a different name, before I will grant the new authority, I will require
14 them to resolve any issues in their previous company's name.

15 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Before it's authorized in --

16 **MS. BURL:** Before authorizing a new company to come in. And that's across the
17 board of all common carriers that we regulate.

18 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Okay. And you said that you're actually --
19 you've experienced this issue?

20 **MS. BURL:** I have on a few instances. I do have one right now that has a pending
21 application, they've come in in a new name, and they're having to resolve any issues
22 they had under their previous name before I would grant a new authority.

1 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Well, I support you in your efforts, and if we
2 need to do anything relative to our rules to maintain that enforcement authority and
3 to ensure that they're compliant, please let us know and we'll look into it for you.

4 **MS. BURL:** I'll do that, Commissioner.

5 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Thank you.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I just want to add one other thing. We've discussed
7 I think this in the past. The Commission also has the authority to revoke their
8 permit, correct? At some point?

9 **MS. BURL:** That's correct, Commissioner. We do. And we do revoke permits if
10 they don't maintain their insurance, they fail to make annual filings, quarterly
11 filings. We have revoked authority for that. We could revoke authority for
12 violating anything in the statute or Commission orders.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Right. And if they fail to make payment on any
14 fines, we could also revoke permits on that basis as well?

15 **MS. BURL:** Yes, sir. That's my understanding.

16 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. And if they -- permits revoked under one
17 LLC, they couldn't start another one until they satisfied all the issues that were of
18 concern to you?

19 **MS. BURL:** That is correct.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, Commissioner Lewis.

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Burl, just a quick
22 question, and we've talked about this. One of the challenges I've had in my district
23 are those who are unauthorized operating. So has there been any conversations or

1 things we need to do with the Secretary of State so as companies are filing their
2 LLCs, they are advised that they should and must be registered with the Public
3 Service Commission? Because I've had some of the same challenges in my district
4 I think as Commissioner Coussan, but on the opposite where they are pointing out
5 operators who don't have a PSC permit in it.

6 **MS. BURL:** I could most definitely reach out to the Secretary of State's office and
7 see if there's anything that they provide to certain types of company, because they
8 do have to identify themselves as to the nature of their business when they register
9 with Secretary of State. I most definitely can look and see if there's something that
10 I can give to them that would trigger them referring them over to the Public Service
11 Commission. I can look into that.

12 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Great. And I look forward to working and helping
13 with that, because that's been a challenge. Not particularly on moving, but on some
14 of the other transportation services that are regulated by us where individuals are
15 creating new businesses, great entrepreneurial, and then now finding themselves
16 before us even though they did not know they had to be registered because they
17 were operating a business in their mind. So not only for the bad actors, but for
18 those who don't know that they should be regulated by the Public Service
19 Commission. So I look forward to working with you on that.

20 **MS. BURL:** Yes, sir.

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Well, we have a motion and a second. Any
22 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, Staff -- that matter is approved.
23 Move onto -- I think it's Exhibit --

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Six.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Six? There we go.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir. Exhibit Number 6 is Docket Numbers I-37858, I-
4 37860, I-37864, and a to be determined docket. These are Jefferson Davis Electric
5 Cooperative, Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, Southwest Louisiana
6 Electric Membership Corporation, and 1803 Electric Cooperative's request to
7 initiate 2025 integrated resource planning process pursuant to the Commission's
8 General Order dated August 28, 2024. It's a discussion and possible vote to hire
9 an outside consultant. Staff issued an RFP to handle all of -- all four of these
10 dockets. One, we received four bids. The first is United Professionals Company
11 of 185,000 in fees and 4,000 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of
12 \$189,000. The second is Christensen Associates Energy Consulting of 189,550 in
13 fees and 4,000 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of \$193,550. Third is
14 J. Kennedy & Associates of 189,000 in fees and 6,000 in expenses, for a total
15 budget not to exceed of \$195,000. And the fourth is London Economics of 198,080
16 in fees and \$7,712 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of \$205,792. Staff
17 makes no recommendation as all four bidders are qualified.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Chair moves to accept the low bid, which is United
19 Professionals for the amount stated, which is a total budget of \$189,000. Any
20 seconds?

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

22 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any
23 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Next item, please.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 7 is Docket Number S-37826. It's American
2 Broadband Holding Company and CS Intermediate II's Section 301(M), notice of
3 transfer of control of Cameron Communications, Cameron Telephone Company,
4 Elizabeth Telephone Company, and LBH to CSM Intermediate. It's a discussion
5 and possible vote on a Staff report and recommendation. On January 12 of this
6 year, American Broadband Holding Company and CSM Intermediate jointly filed
7 this request seeking an order of approval or non-opposition from the Commission
8 to transfer ownership of certain -- ownership and control of certain American
9 broadband indirect, wholly owned subsidiaries. The effect of the proposed
10 transaction is the regulated Louisiana subsidiaries will ultimately be owned and
11 controlled by CSM Intermediate. The request was published in the Commission's
12 Official Bulletin and no interventions were received. Based on Staff's review of
13 the request submitted in connection with the proposed transaction, Staff
14 recommends that the Commission issue an order expressing its approval or non-
15 opposition to the change of ownership and control of Cameron Communications,
16 Cameron Telephone Company, Elizabeth Telephone Company, and LBH, subject
17 to the conditions contained in Staff's rec filed on March 19, 2026.

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

20 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner -- I think that was
22 Commissioner Francis. There we go. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing
23 none, so ordered. Next item, please.

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 8 is Docket Number U-36697. This is Entergy
2 Louisiana's application for approval of an alternative market-based mechanism
3 process seeking to secure up to 3,000 megawatts of solar resources, including
4 certification of those resources, expansion of the Geaux Green Option Rider, and
5 approval of a new renewable tariff. It's a discussion and possible vote on Entergy's
6 certification filing for the Cypress Harvest Solar Facility. At the Commission's
7 May 2024 Business and Executive Session, the Commission considered an
8 uncontested stipulated settlement which was approved and memorialized in Order
9 Number U-36697. As part of that order, the Commission approved terms which
10 governed the implementation of an alternative, streamlined procurement process to
11 secure up to 3,000 megawatts of additional solar resources and certification of those
12 resources. Consistent with this process, February 9 of this year, Entergy filed the
13 instant certification filing requesting the Commission approve and certify a 200-
14 megawatt solar facility in Iberville Parish. ELL provided how the facility complies
15 with the breakeven parameters and viability parameters established in the order,
16 and the filing further explained how Entergy anticipated allotting the requested
17 program between the Commission approved optional green tariff riders. Pursuant
18 to the procedure established in the order, all intervenors had an opportunity to file
19 protest and none did. On March 23 of this year, Staff filed the affidavit of Mr.
20 Sisung pursuant to the review procedure established by the order, and based on that
21 review, Staff confirmed that Entergy has met both the breakeven parameters and
22 the viability parameters established in the order. Staff recommends that the

1 Commission accept Entergy's certification filing for Cypress Harvest Solar Facility
2 filed on February 9, 2026, and that the order is effective immediately.

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

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commission Lewis. Any opposition?

7 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, it's approved. Next item, please.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** So Exhibit 9 is deferred, so we will go onto Exhibit Number 10,
9 which is Docket Number U-37425. It's Entergy's application for approval of
10 generation and transmission resources in connection with service to a single
11 customer for a project in north Louisiana. It's a discussion and possible vote on a
12 scope expansion for United Professionals Company. At the Commission's August
13 2025 B&E, the Commission approved a settlement between Staff and Entergy
14 regarding the approval of generation and transmission resources in connection with
15 providing services to Meta, Laidley. The Commission's approval was
16 memorialized in Order Number U-37425, and part of that approval contemplated
17 additional capacity, specifically a need for additional capacity during the ramp-up
18 period. Since Order Number U-37425 was issued, Entergy has filed an application
19 for approvals related to various purchase agreements. Part of that application
20 indicated that the agreements would satisfy part of Entergy's obligation under
21 Order U-34725, and address the needed capacity for the ramp-up period. Given
22 UPC's knowledge and experience in not only the Commission's '83 certification
23 order, but the requirements of the Order U-37425, Staff sought a budget expansion

1 for UPC to assist with these filings. UPC submitted its proposed budget with
2 discounted hourly rates. Staff recommends that the Commission increase UPC's
3 budget due to a scope expansion for an additional 70,000 in fees and 2,000 in
4 expenses for a total budget not to exceed of 72,000.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Move to accept the expanded the budget
6 recommendation of UPC by the Chair. Any seconds?

7 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

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

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** The next item is Exhibit Number 11, which is Docket Number
12 U-37794. This is SWEPCO's application for authorization of a system
13 improvement plan, including related rate recovery. It's a possible vote on interim
14 rate increase pursuant to Rule 57 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and
15 Procedure at the request of Commissioner Campbell, and this will need two votes.
16 On November 24 of last year, SWEPCO filed the instant application, which was
17 published, and the Alliance for Affordable Energy intervened. On March 10 of this
18 year, SWEPCO filed supplemental testimony to support SWEPCO's request that
19 the Commission exercise its original and primary jurisdiction under Rule 57 to
20 grant interim relief to extend its incremental vegetation management spending at
21 the previously approved rate of 1.5 million per month for an annual total of \$18
22 million. The recovery will be through SWEPCO's fuel adjustment clause from
23 June 1, 2026, through SWEPCO's requested system improvement plan in this

1 docket. SWEPCO asserts that there is no overlap between the collection of the
2 extended incremental spend and the collection of SIP costs. While Staff makes no
3 formal recommendation regarding the interim rate increase request, Staff does note
4 that, pursuant to the applicable law, any interim increase should be subject to refund
5 and the applicable bonding requirements. If SWEPCO's request is approved, Staff
6 would recommend that SWEPCO file proof of the applicable bond requirements
7 with the Commission, be required to file an updated tariff within 30 days, and that
8 SWEPCO cannot begin charging the interim rate until proof of the applicable bond
9 requirements and updated tariff have been provided to and approved by Staff.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Mr. Gilliam and anybody from SWEPCO who
11 wants to come up, Commissioner Campbell has some questions. Do you want to
12 put a motion on the floor, Commissioner?

13 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Yeah.

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** Well, we need to first do a Rule 57 motion.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** I can't hear you, dear.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** We need to do a Rule 57 motion.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Move to bring the matter up under Rule 57
18 by the Chair. Any seconds?

19 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
21 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved for -- under
22 Rule 57. Commissioner Campbell, you want to make the motion? Commissioner
23 Campbell, you want to make --

1 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I want these people to talk.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. He wants to talk first. Commissioner

3 Campbell has some questions for you.

4 **MR. BRETT MATTISON:** Okay.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You might have to bring that thing closer to him.

6 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Tell us exactly what you're doing here.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** He wants to know what you're doing.

8 **MR. MATTISON:** What we're doing, Commissioner, is currently we have an

9 incremental \$18 million of vegetation spend that we've been doing for a while, and

10 it will end May 31, this year. And we want to simply extend that \$18 million that

11 we're currently utilizing. And we've also filed for a system improvement plan.

12 Once that plan is approved, the \$18 million will drop off, and we'll be into a system

13 improvement plan.

14 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** You're worried if we don't do this today,

15 there's a possibility about losing some markets; is that correct?

16 **MR. MATTISON:** That's exactly right. We currently have contractors that are

17 doing this work for us on property, and they know that that deadline is at the end

18 of May, and so they're starting to look for other places to go do work. And because

19 of the positiveness of this program, you know, we recently had Winter Storm Fern

20 -- and tomorrow, I'll be at SWEPCO 37 years, and this is the most positive response

21 I've ever seen. When you look at the circuits that we've been able to work on with

22 the \$18 million incremental, we had four outages on the circuits that we touched,

23 and we had 25 outages on those we've not yet gotten to. It's the best response I've

1 ever heard and the best customer sentiment and the quickest recovery we've been
2 able to do as a result of it.

3 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Mr. Gilliam, you have anything to add?

4 **MR. BOBBY GILLIAM:** No. Other than we'll be collecting \$1.5 million a
5 month, and then when the SIP is approved by the Commission, that --

6 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** It's not -- so it's really not an increase, it's
7 what they -- it's what we've been charging all along; is that correct?

8 **MR. GILLIAM:** Correct.

9 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** So I will like to make a motion that we
10 approve this item.

11 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Motioned by Commissioner Campbell., seconded
13 by Commissioner Coussan. Any opposition?

14 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes, sir. [INAUDIBLE] --

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead, Commissioner Lewis.

16 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. Thank you, SWEPCO, for coming and
17 reaching out to my office. As you know, I'm pretty strict on interim rates and I
18 have a very hard criteria on interim rates. So I just had a few questions about this,
19 as we evaluate the SIP -- your SIP program. So can you explain to me how you --
20 the Commission will be able to verify that there is no overlap between intermediate
21 recovery and your future SIP cost recovery so that we're not having any double
22 recovery throughout the process?

1 **MR. MATTISON:** Sure. What I would say, Commissioner, is as soon as that SIP
2 is approved, the \$18 million incremental that we're charging now, which is \$2.91
3 a 1,000 kWh, will drop off and go away. And we'll be able to verify that through
4 our reporting to the Commission Staff.

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay. Great. Thank you. I had a question. Since
6 we haven't fully reviewed the first interim 18 million, what metrics are you utilizing
7 to evaluate the success of the program since our Staff hasn't had the ability to do
8 that just yet?

9 **MR. MATTISON:** What we've done, we've been able to look at those circuits
10 that have actually been touched by the \$18 million incremental and recorded SAIDI
11 improvements on those circuits so there's a fact base that the improvement is there
12 because of that incremental on those circuits that we've been able to do the work
13 on.

14 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Let me -- go ahead.

15 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes, sir. Thank you. And so can you -- the potential
16 customer impact of this interim recovery is not evaluated any differently than the
17 monthly bill estimates that you just stated, Mr. Gilliam, right? That there's no bill
18 impact, that it would be a continuance?

19 **MR. MATTISON:** That's correct.

20 **MR. GILLIAM:** No, that's correct. No bill impact.

21 **MR. MATTISON:** No change.

22 **MR. GILLIAM:** It will stay the same.

23 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** It will stay the same.

1 **MR. GILLIAM:** It will. Yes.

2 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** And that was about \$2.12 you said?

3 **MR. GILLIAM:** Two dollars --

4 **MR. MATTISON:** Two ninety-one.

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Two ninety-one?

6 **MR. GILLIAM:** Yes.

7 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** That goes off.

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Two ninety-one. And so I just -- the last question I

9 kind of have is how will you really track the effectiveness of this continuation

10 spending with what you're also asking in the SIP to showcase that their needs to be

11 this kind of continuation of vegetation management spending, or then also an

12 increase, as you're asking within your filing in the SIP program?

13 **MR. MATTISON:** Right. We use a third-party to determine the SIP and

14 calculated the cost that it would be, and did a cost benefit ratio on all of the circuits

15 that needed to be touched by a SIP -- a system improvement plan. And anything

16 with a cost-benefit ratio of one or above, we identified those circuits. That's where

17 we'll do the work, and then we'll have extensive reporting requirements to prove

18 that out to the Commission as we go forward.

19 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. And are you planning -- as you know,

20 we've approved the pilot vegetation management program that would be very

21 separate from this, but I'm curious, are you also planning to file a plan under that

22 pilot program that has been approved by the Commission?

23 **MR. MATTISON:** No, we're not going to do both.

1 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** So you're not going to do both. So you're just going
2 to continue this interim rate, and then as for what's in your SIP program -- or in
3 your SIP application that's pending, but not file a new application under the pilot
4 program that we approved last month?

5 **MR. MATTISON:** Yes, sir. That correct.

6 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay. Great. Thank you for answering my
7 questions. As I stated, you know, I'm pretty strong on interim rates, and I would
8 prefer we waited until the evaluation of the first 18 million was done, but I do
9 appreciate you answering my questions, and also your dedication to vegetation
10 management.

11 **MR. MATTISON:** Thank you.

12 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Let me say something.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Is there any opposition to the motion?

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

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So we're going to have to have a roll call
16 vote.

17 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Wait a minute. I would like to say something.

18 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Sorry. Commissioner Campbell has
19 something to say.

20 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I represent this area up there, and I can tell
21 you there's been a big difference in our service since we've been doing this tree
22 trimming program and whatever we're doing with the extra money. It's been a
23 huge difference. I hadn't had the telephone calls, so I'm for this. I think it's a good

1 idea. And I think the people -- and like you said, the people are used to paying
2 2.91, and now they're going to go up to 3.05 or something like that. It's miniscule,
3 but it's a good deal for the people that I represent.

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** So for roll call vote, Commissioner Campbell, how do you vote
5 on --

6 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Yes.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes. Commissioner Lewis?

8 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** No.

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

10 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yes.

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

12 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yes.

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

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes. Matter's approved. Next item, please.

15 **MS. BOWMAN:** The next exhibit is Number 12, which is Docket Number U-
16 37760. This is Louisiana Water Company's request for an extension and
17 modification of a formula rate plan. It's a discussion and possible vote on an
18 uncontested stipulated settlement. On October 21, 2025, LAWCO filed the instant
19 application seeking approval of a renewal and modification to its formula rate plan.
20 Notice was published in the Commission's Official Bulletin and no interventions
21 were received. LAWCO proposes an extension of its current FRP for an additional
22 three-year term, maintaining the current midpoint rate of return on equity, with an
23 earnings bandwidth based on a calculated ROE of 9 to 10%. LAWCO does request

1 substantive and non-substantive modifications to the FRP including adjustments to
2 the review and the effective dates. The party reached an uncontested stipulated
3 settlement which was filed into the record on March 13 of this year, which
4 authorizes a renewal of LAWCO's formula rate plan for an additional three-year
5 term, with modifications to the extraordinary cost revenue changes, additional base
6 rate adjustment, special rate filings, and procedural deadlines. Staff recommends
7 that the Commission accept the uncontested stipulated settlement filed into the
8 record on March 13, 2026.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right. This is Commissioner Francis --

10 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'll make a motion that we accept the Staff
11 recommendation.

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Chair. Any opposition? [NONE
13 HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved. Next item, please.

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** Next item is Exhibit Number 13, which is Docket Number U-
15 37882. This is Entergy's application for a certification of generation and
16 transmission resources and for other related relief. It's a discussion and possible
17 vote to retain Fishman Haygood. Entergy provided notice of the instant application
18 pursuant to the Commission's Lightning Initiative indicating the company is going
19 seek certification of additional resources as well as cost recovery under its existing
20 formula rate plan. Staff solicited Fishman Haygood given their experience with not
21 only Entergy's FRP, but also their assistance in the Commission's approval of the
22 only other certification that could have been utilized -- that could have utilized the
23 Commission's Lightning Initiative had it been adopted at the time. Based on Staff's

1 solicitation, Fishman Haygood submitted a proposed budget with discounted hourly
2 rates. Staff recommends the Commission retain Fishman Haygood for 970,000 in
3 fees and 28,000 in expenses, for a total budget not to exceed of \$998,000.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right.

5 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** [INAUDIBLE] a motion to retain.

6 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We have a motion from Commission Lewis to
7 retain. Any seconds?

8 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

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

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 14 is Docket Number U-37882. This is
13 application for certification of generation and transmission resources and for other
14 related relief. It's a discussion and possible vote possible on a motion for
15 procedural directive pursuant to Rule 57. So this will need two votes. March of
16 this year, Entergy filed the instant application seeking resources needed to serve a
17 substantial new load proposed for Evest, a customer seeking to locate a large
18 hyperscale data center in Richland Parish. The application was filed pursuant to
19 the Commission's Lightning Directive adopted at the December B&E, which
20 provided for certain waivers of the Commission's Market-Based Mechanism Order
21 for a proposed capacity addition where certain factors are demonstrated. The
22 Lightning Directive also directed Staff to take reasonable steps to ensure that any
23 application filed under the directive was in front of the Commission, being able to

1 be voted on within eight months. In the application, Entergy requested timely
2 treatment in order to meet the in-service date specified by the customer and
3 requested the Commission direct the Administrative Hearings Division adopt a
4 procedural schedule and procedures necessary to facilitate a decision consistent
5 with the Lightning Directive. Consistent with this request for timely treatment, the
6 company filed the instant motion into the record on April 2, wherein Entergy
7 requested the Commission take this matter up under Rule 57 of the Commission's
8 rules. And in the motion, Entergy claims that it met the five factors contained in
9 the Lightning Directive and requested that the Commission direct the
10 Administrative Hearings Division to serve as a hearing examiner and compile a
11 record on this proceeding without a recommendation -- without a recommendation
12 for the Commission's consideration at the November 18, 2026 Business and
13 Executive Session. Staff does not make a formal recommendation. However,
14 should the Commission take this matter up under Rule 57 and grant the company's
15 motion, Staff does recommend that the Commission consider the company's
16 application at the December B&E to ensure that the Commission has the entire
17 eight months to make its determination consistent with the intent of the Lightning
18 Directive. We do have a yellow card, but Commissioner Campbell, would you like
19 me to read your motion in the record?

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Commissioner Campbell, you have a motion to be
21 read in the record, sir?

22 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Would you read it?

1 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir. So this is a motion by Commission Campbell. Entergy
2 filed its request for certification of generation and transmission in this docket on
3 March 26 pursuant to the Commission's Lightning Directive. In its filing, Entergy
4 requested the Commission's establish a procedural schedule that would allow for a
5 vote at the November 2026 B&E Session. The Lightning Directive contemplates
6 Commission consideration approximately eight months after the filing of the
7 application in consideration that the November meeting will be just shy of the eight
8 months. To better align with the eight months provided in the Lightning Directive
9 and given that Entergy must still demonstrate its eligibility under the directive as
10 part of the proceeding, I make the following motion. I move that the Commission
11 direct the Administrative Hearings Division to establish a procedural schedule in
12 the Docket U-37882 that provides for Commission consideration of the requested
13 relief at the December 16, 2026 Business and Executive Session. I further move
14 that the Administrative Hearings Division serve as a hearing examiner and compile
15 complete evidentiary record for the Commission's de novo consideration without
16 the issuance of a formal recommendation for the presiding Administrative Law
17 Judge. And before we get a second on that motion, I was out of order. We need a
18 Rule 57 motion first.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Move to bring the matter up under Rule 57. Any
20 seconds?

21 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
2 opposition to the Rule 57? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is brought
3 up under Rule 57 for consideration.

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** And we have Commissioner Campbell's motion that I just read.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** We have Commissioner's Campbell's motion and
6 we have a second from Commissioner Coussan, I believe. Correct?

7 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Oh, that was Francis.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Commissioner Francis seconded.

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. And before we concluded, we do have one yellow from
10 Ms. Alaina DiLaura from the Alliance, if she'd like to come up.

11 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** That's fine. Please come up and they can make their
12 comments.

13 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** This on the motion?

14 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. They're -- this is on your motion, but she has
15 a yellow card.

16 **MS. ALAINA DILaura:** Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Alaina
17 DiLaura, and I'm with the Alliance for Affordable Energy. I'm here to request that
18 the Commission deny Entergy's premature request to rush forward this application
19 in November or December, and remove the ALJ review and recommendation from
20 the procedural process. The 1,200-page application alone requires significant time
21 to review and analyze. Entergy's asking the Commission to say upfront that there
22 won't be any scrutiny or independent consideration on the record of the most
23 transformational proposal that the Commission has ever seen. At this scale, the

1 questions before this Commission aren't just about the risks after 20 years and what
2 happens then. This risk is now amplified because of the sheer amount of investment
3 that is requested for recovery. Those questions deserve independent review to
4 determine whether the public interest is met. One of the questions that Entergy is
5 asking the Commission in their application is to confirm that they have met the
6 qualifications of the Lightning Initiative. But, perversely, they're asking upfront
7 today to skip that scrutiny and independent review of that very question in the
8 application. The scale of this application is so enormous, it raises the question
9 much larger than are these investments even prudent? Transformation like this begs
10 us to ask questions related to grid planning, resource planning, and ratemaking. For
11 example, what will be the impact of this transformation on Entergy's current
12 generation fleet, and actually on all of Louisiana, and on the transmission grid in
13 such a short period of time? What is the ratemaking impact of the revenues
14 expected from Meta and how that changes the calculus of ratemaking for all other
15 customers? With time for a full analysis, the Commission may discover that the
16 benefits should be higher than what Entergy has actually promised. What are the
17 possible effects of more fully trusting that the cost of natural gas will remain stable?
18 If we've learned anything this year, it's that the volatility of the gas impacts folks
19 are experiencing already, and we're only at 75% gas now. The Commission should
20 be considering what seven more plants will do to that exposure to market prices
21 and if there's anything that can be done to mitigate those effects to all of the
22 customers. We urge the Commission to deny Entergy's request today to
23 prematurely confirm that they've met the requirements of the Lightning Initiative

1 and to speed up this process. We recommend the Commission consider the value
2 of an independent Administrative Law Judge review, which would provide a
3 stronger record for a final decision. We support transparency, and transparency and
4 scrutiny is especially crucial here. Thank you, Commissioners.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you.

6 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I make a -- go ahead.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** You want to come up? You're excused. Thank you
8 very much.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes?

11 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** I just -- can I make a brief comment?

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. Go ahead.

13 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Only in government is eight months rushed to
14 make a decision. And I would note that as we sit here, Louisiana is in their
15 legislative session, which yearly ranges from 60 to 90 days. And they make
16 decisions in less than 90 days on issues affecting each one of us every day of our
17 lives, from energy to insurance, to crime and punishment. And that seems to be
18 enough time to make good policy in the state of Louisiana. And I think that the
19 consideration that we're going to give this issue over the next eight months will be
20 enough that we're going to answer many of the questions that were just posed. And
21 I challenge our Staff and our experts to work as diligently and efficiently as possible
22 to get those answers and that's our charge as well.

23 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you.

1 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** And I'd like to say something, too.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Go ahead, Commissioner.

3 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** When I was in the Senate, I often asked a lot

4 of people, some days we passed 50 bills in one day. Fifty. And you sort of wonder

5 how they got through them, but we got through it and Louisiana is still a state. So

6 I agree with Mr. Coussan.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Mr. Hand --

8 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Thank you very much.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** That's the Senate mafia. So there you go. Mr.

10 Hand, you sure you want to do this?

11 **MR. LARRY HAND:** Very [INAUDIBLE].

12 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Go ahead.

13 **MR. HAND:** I want to be -- first off, Larry Hand on behalf of Entergy Louisiana.

14 Thank you, Commissioners, for the discussion and the support. I want to be really

15 clear for the folks who are listening to this, what is before the Commission today, I

16 don't agree with the characterization that what the Commission is voting for in this

17 motion is approving that we have -- Entergy has in fact met all of the requirements

18 of the Lightning Directive. All that is being put before you is to proceed on the

19 schedule, have the full discussion, the full record. We still need to prove to you --

20 and the parties can do discovery, they can take positions. We still need to prove to

21 you that we meet each and every one of the requirements of the Lightning Directive

22 in order to be entitled to the exemption from the market based mechanism process.

23 And we are up for that task. It is -- I assure you, it is in the 1,200 pages of testimony

1 that's referred to and the exhibits. But that's why we're going to have the full
2 process to lay that out and I'll just -- I'll leave it there. I'm not going to argue the
3 merits of the case. That's why we have the proceeding and I will say -- I will
4 acknowledge this is a significant undertaking of the Commission. It's a significant
5 undertaking of the parties. It's a lot of work. But Louisiana is up for the hard work
6 and I think we're up for the benefits that will come with it. So thank you for your
7 support.

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

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Mr. Hand, really quickly. First, I want to thank you
10 for meeting with me and discussing this issue. And before I come to you, I just
11 want to -- to a point you that you made, I want to clarify with Staff that under the
12 preliminary relief, we are not in this vote certifying that Lightning requirements,
13 the five requirements, have been met. Entergy was just using that as an example or
14 putting in evidence of why they believe they will meet those requirements. Thus,
15 this motion should be accepted. Is that a reasonable understanding of what we're
16 doing today?

17 **MS. EVANS:** That is -- that is correct.

18 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Great. Suffice.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Sorry. There was a stutter in the tape. So there you
20 go.

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you, Staff. Mr. Hand, just a few things and
22 we discussed this briefly as you know this has been of great interest of the public,
23 particularly as you know in the proceeding the intervention period ended on

1 Monday afternoon. We do know who those intervenors were. So can we just
2 explain what consideration did we take into thinking about the comments they may
3 make or the ideas they may have, depending on if we go to a contested trial, whether
4 there's a settlement or a stipulated settlement? Was that considered in asking for
5 this motion?

6 **MR. HAND:** I think it was, Commissioner. From the outset, we wanted to be very
7 transparent about what our requests were so the application we filed on March 25,
8 published in the March 27 Bulletin, that -- the prayer for relief in that application
9 specified we were seeking to proceed under the Lightning Directive. In fact, we
10 requested consideration at the November B&E that the motions changed that to
11 December, which we are, you know -- we're fine with that. So we tried to be very
12 transparent. But beyond that, we actually filed a separate motion in the docket
13 seeking this relief. So we tried to be very transparent, but I agree we will have a
14 full process. I would liken, you know, what we filed in the record to show that we
15 are -- we should be allowed to proceed under the Lightning Directive timing. That's
16 all we're talking about is the timing. The merits will have to prove themselves out.
17 I believe -- it's not legally equivalent, but I believe we have laid a prima facia
18 showing in the record that we can meet the requirements. But we still need to prove
19 that. The other parties will have discovery rights and the opportunity to file their
20 own positions on that before the Commission makes the ultimate determination.

21 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** No. And thank you. And one of the -- I do really
22 appreciate the transparency that Entergy did with this motion, unlike the last one
23 where there was some concerns that it came later in the proceeding, that we are

1 having this discussion upfront as we are starting the discovery and pre-hearing
2 briefs process. I will note there were some questions when you and I discussed
3 these where it's not that I'm opposed to us relieving and having an evidentiary
4 hearing, only it's the fact that there's some questions that would judge whether I
5 would approve that. For instance, if this was a contested case between our Staff
6 and Entergy, and we didn't get into a settlement, or if there was contested hearings
7 from the intervenors, that would subject me to say, okay, I believe an evidentiary
8 hearing is good. Or if I see a very contested and multi-briefed positions from
9 various parties, then I would then like an ALJ to give that recommendation. So
10 while I think I will oppose this today, it's not off of the request. It's more off of
11 that the questions that I would have to make that determination of whether or not
12 an evidentiary hearing unfortunately just can't be answered at this point in time in
13 the proceeding, but could be answered later on as we do discovery, as we heard pre-
14 hearing briefs, and as we started the process of a trial. Because as you know, in the
15 last deal when we got to the proceeding of the hearing, we had a settlement on the
16 table, which gave you some comfort of not having an ALJ recommendation since
17 we had almost all the parties there and the other parties were able to brief that matter
18 and then give that information to us. I'm just a little concerned about pre-jumping
19 of that, even though I do respect in giving us the heads up that you would like that
20 evidentiary hearing, but those are the questions that I have that unfortunately just
21 can't be answered in today's motion that subsequently could be answered at a future
22 date.

1 **MR. HAND:** Thank you, Commissioner. And we do look forward to working
2 with all the parties, Commissioners, to answer the questions and provide the
3 evidence and the record you need by December. So thank you.

4 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Great. Well, first thing, I'd just like to add in my
6 two cents' worth on this that I think it's important to recognize that some folks are
7 putting the cart before the horse on this. That it's important to recognize that the
8 Commission is not approving anything. That the game is just starting. We are
9 looking into the analysis. But the important thing to look at is when we did the
10 Meta project in the beginning, it took approximately nine months, and there were
11 lessons learned on how to do the analysis. And when we moved towards the
12 Lightning Initiative, we figured out that there are ways to shorten that timeframe.
13 We learned the process of how we can speed up the analysis. So shortening it by
14 one month is not an extreme reach. So I believe that between the consultants we
15 have and the Staff we have and the prior experience we have on the process that
16 we've done on the regulatory aspects of this, that we can easily move this matter
17 through within eight months and I think that the public will be easily protected on
18 this. I think there is tremendous value to the public on the initial Meta project and
19 I think that those values will continue through the extension of this project. On a
20 second note, and it's been suggested by Commissioner Coussan, I think it's a valid
21 suggestion, if the Staff and the consultants see any need between now and the end
22 of May to -- end of June to evaluate of adding a one day technical conference on this
23 issue during the month of July to increase the timeframe necessary to move this

1 matter forward and get it complete within the effective eight month period, that the
2 Commission will make itself available on a special one-day meeting in July as
3 necessary if that can be worked out. But I do think that the fact that the Commission
4 itself does not need an official meeting in July, doesn't mean that the consultants
5 and the Staff and etcetera will not be available to continue the work product analysis
6 necessary to complete this task. So I think the public can take great satisfaction
7 understanding that nothing has been approved, everything is beginning the analysis,
8 and that the analysis will be taken with the same great consideration and study that
9 the first Meta project was. And I think we got a lot of value for the public in that
10 one and we intend to get a lot of value for the public in the next one. So thank you
11 very much. Matter has been moved and seconded. Any opposition?

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

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Roll call vote, please.

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** So there's a motion on the floor by Commissioner Campbell,
15 seconded by Commissioner Francis, opposition by Commissioner Lewis.
16 Commissioner Campbell, how do you vote?

17 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** [NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE]

18 **MS. BOWMAN:** On the record, he said yes.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Roll call vote, Commissioner.

20 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I told her.

21 **MS. BOWMAN:** He told me. Commissioner Lewis?

22 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** No.

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

1 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yes.

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

3 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yes.

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

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes. Matter is approved. Thank you very much.

6 Move on to the next item, please.

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 15 is undocketed. This is --

8 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Madam Secretary, I was a yes, right?

9 **MS. BOWMAN:** That was a yes. Yes, sir.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** That was a yes.

11 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Good.

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Entergy Louisiana's request for approval of an agreement with

13 the Commission Staff regarding the monetization of the 2025 nuclear production

14 tax credits. It's a discussion and possible vote on the agreement between Entergy

15 and Staff. Entergy initiated these discussions regarding the proposal to obtain and

16 realize the benefits of federal production tax credits associated with Entergy's

17 nuclear energy production in 2025. Based on those discussions, Staff and Entergy

18 have entered into agreement regarding the monetization of those credits, whereby

19 the realized benefits would go to Entergy's customers. Entergy proposed to Staff,

20 and after discussion, Staff ultimately agreed that Entergy selling the 2025

21 production tax credits would benefit customers. Staff agreed given that the full

22 value of these realized tax credits, net the transaction and administrative costs,

23 would go to customers. Customers will also be responsible for indemnities and

1 interest if the production tax credits ultimately accepted by the IRS are less than
2 those conveyed to the buyers. However, based on the data reviewed by Staff, the
3 potential benefits realized from the sale outweigh the potential risks. Staff
4 recommends that the Commission approve the agreement executed between
5 Entergy and Staff regarding the monetization of the 2025 nuclear production tax
6 credits.

7 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Do we have a -- this is a Staff recommendation and
8 Chair votes to approve it.

9 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Second.

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

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** So I would suggest skipping Exhibit 16, since it has the
14 Executive Session, and we'll go to Exhibit 17.

15 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Let's do that. Let's do that.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 17 is Docket Number S-37783. This is Atmos Energy
17 Corporation's request for Commission approval to abandon a portion of its natural
18 gas facilities in DeSoto Parish pursuant to General Order dated July 9, 2008. It's a
19 discussion and possible vote on a Staff report and recommendation. This is at the
20 request of Commissioner Campbell. On November 10, 2025, Atmos filed the
21 instant application which was published in the Commission's Bulletin and no
22 interventions were received. Atmos' petition proposes to abandon natural gas
23 distribution facilities and associated natural gas services for two affected customers

1 in DeSoto Parish. The facilities consist of approximately 6,000 feet of main that
2 originate from EnLink's Holly Pipeline system and extends parallel to Rogers
3 Road. As indicated by Atmos, the abandonment of the facilities is necessary due
4 to EnLink's expected abandonment of a portion of that system. EnLink's system
5 is currently the only source of supply for the Roger Road facilities. Atmos' petition
6 further indicates that the two affected customers have consented to the
7 abandonment, and that the customers will be converted from natural gas to propane
8 at the sole cost of Atmos. Staff reviewed Atmos' petition and found that Atmos
9 has met all the requirements of the Commission's Abandonment General Order,
10 and have gone above and beyond, ensuring the affected customers are able to
11 convert to an alternative fuel source at no cost to the customers. Accordingly, Staff
12 filed its recommendation on March 27, recommending that the Commission grant
13 the request, authorizing Atmos to abandon the Rogers Road facilities and that the -
14 - Atmos files proof of services rendered effective to the customers within the docket
15 of 30 days completion. Staff recommends that the Commission accept Staff's
16 report and recommendation filed into the record of this matter on March 27, 2026.

17 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** I'll make a motion that we approve Staff
18 recommendation.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded. Motion by Commissioner Campbell,
20 seconded by the Chair. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the
21 matter is approved.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit 18 is undocketed. This is the Commission's receivership
23 of Hillcrest Builders and Construction, Inc. It's a discussion and possible vote to

1 move forward with a receivership proceeding at the request of Commissioner
2 Campbell. During the 2025 Legislative Session, Act 257 was passed providing the
3 Commission a mechanism by which to place troubled water or wastewater systems
4 into receivership. That act promulgated as Louisiana Revised Statute 45:1206 and
5 states that the Commission may move forward with seeking the receivership of a
6 regulated water or wastewater utility if the utility has conducted certain activities,
7 including failure or refusal to comply with enforceable orders, judgements, or
8 actions issued by the Louisiana Department of Health or the Louisiana Department
9 of Environmental Quality. Based upon information received from both the
10 Department of Health and the Department of Environmental Quality, the owner of
11 Hillcrest Builders and Construction, Mr. John Rusty Miller, is in violation of
12 enforceable orders for both agencies. Hillcrest Builders and Constructions is a
13 regulated wastewater company operating two systems in Caddo Parish. Staff has
14 been working with both LDH and DEQ for over a year regarding the non-
15 compliance of Hillcrest, not only to those agencies' regulations, but also to the
16 Commission's rules and regulations. Further, Staff has attempted to work with the
17 owner of Hillcrest Builders to find an amicable solution to its non-opposition --
18 excuse me, to its non-compliance to no avail. Based upon the open compliance
19 orders from DEQ and LDH, the company's continued violation of Commission
20 General Orders dated July 1, 1921 and November 22, 2011, and the company's
21 inability to rectify the non-compliance with three state agencies, justifiable action
22 exists pursuant to Louisiana Revised Statute 45:1206 to seek a receivership of
23 Hillcrest Builders Construction, and Staff recommends that the Commission

1 authorize Commission Staff to move forward with a receivership proceeding
2 against Hillcrest Builders and Construction and its owner, Mr. John Rusty Miller,
3 for its two regulated systems, Miller's Crossing and East Cove.

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Commissioner Campbell?

5 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** This is -- this guy's given us more trouble in
6 north Louisiana than anybody else. We've been trying to work with him. So there's
7 only one way to improve this problem I think. If you look at, in your book, 13
8 violations that he's had here. And if you had 14, he would have 14, but he has 13.
9 So I would make a motion that we put him under receivership.

10 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. Seconded. Motion by Commissioner
11 Campbell, seconded by the Chair. But before taking the vote approving it, I want
12 to make a comment that the Commission itself, up until now, did not have authority
13 to move into receiverships and the Legislature was -- you know, recognized the
14 viability of the Commission to act in its own behalf. We used to have to look at
15 working with other agencies to have their authority under receiverships to work
16 with them to do this. Now the Commission itself has the authority to go into civil
17 court under our Counsel to bring civil matter forward to have receivers appointed
18 for failing systems to get receivers to put into place. These receivers will go in,
19 they will expend the capital necessary to make the improvements that will get
20 everything going properly, and then they will return those systems to the owners
21 with a fixed system with working out the financials on that. So it's a big step
22 forward for not only Commission authority, but it's a big step forward for the public
23 in moving things on a faster pace of government. So there you go. So the matter's

1 been moved by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by the Chair. Any opposition?
2 [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, the matter is approved. Next item, please.

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Exhibit Number 19 is undocketed. It's a directive to Staff to
4 implement Interim Rule 10a for mandatory disclosure of foreign and outside
5 funding sources by intervenors in Commission proceedings. And this is at the
6 request of the Chair. Staff is directed to prepare for consideration at the earliest
7 practical B&E, but no later than June, a proposed Interim Rule 10a or other
8 appropriate placement in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure that
9 would require all intervenors in every docket, proceeding, or matter before the
10 Commission to publicly disclose and certify all sources of funding for their
11 organization that originate, directly or indirectly, from individuals or entities
12 located outside of Louisiana, including, without limitation, the following foreign
13 nations: The People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of
14 Korea, the Russian Federation, and the Islamic Republic of Iran, or any of the
15 entities, agents, or intermediaries controlled by those governments. The proposed
16 rule shall apply to both existing and future intervenors, and shall include at a
17 minimum: A requirement for a sworn affidavit or certification filed with every
18 intervention pleading and updated annually or upon change; a statement of the
19 percentage of annual funding for individuals or entities located or domiciled outside
20 the state of Louisiana; full disclosure of any grants, donations, contracts, or other
21 financial support received, directly or indirectly, from the listed foreign nations or
22 their state-linked entities during the preceding five years; identification of the
23 ultimate sources of funding, including any pass-through foundations, non-profits,

1 or intermediaries; public filing of the disclosure in the docket, subject to any
2 narrowly tailored protections for truly proprietary non-funding information; a clear
3 statement that failure to comply may result in denial or revocations of intervenor
4 status, sanctions, or other remedies as determined by the Commission; and effective
5 date no later than 60 days after adoption of any proposed rule. Staff shall model
6 this proposed disclosure requirement rule on analogous transparency provisions in
7 Louisiana law, while tailoring the Commission's rules to the administrative context
8 of Commission proceedings. Further, any proposed rule should emphasize that this
9 is a transparency measure to protect the integrity of the Commission's regulatory
10 process, Louisiana ratepayers, and the public interest, and is not to bar participation.
11 In proposing an interim rule pursuant to this directive, Staff shall also include any
12 such proposed rule within Staff's proposed revisions to the Commission's Rules of
13 Practice and Procedure currently being reviewed in Docket Number 36241 in order
14 to allow stakeholder comment. This directive is issued in furtherance of the
15 Commission's mission and the broader goal of achieving Louisiana energy
16 dominance. And we do have one yellow card for Mr. Jackson Voss.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. First off, it's a directive.

18 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes.

19 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So any opposition to the directive?

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

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So we'll have a vote on the directive, but in
22 the meantime, let's hear the yellow card.

1 **MR. JACKSON VOSS:** Good morning, Commissioners. I will be brief. My
2 name is Jackson Voss. I am the senior government affairs advisor for the Alliance
3 for Affordable Energy. We just wanted to say, first, we are in full support of
4 transparency. The Alliance thinks it's incredibly important over our 41 years of
5 advocating for the Commission and the New Orleans City Council, we've been
6 huge proponents of ensuring that the process is as transparent as possible, that
7 people know who is involved in the process, let stakeholders have an opportunity
8 to participate openly and publicly and transparently. I think that, in that spirit, we
9 do not have necessarily substantive problems with this rulemaking. We would
10 appreciate of course the opportunity for stakeholder engagement and input to be
11 provided and think that could be helpful in this case. We would want to elevate for
12 the Commissioners as they consider this and as the Staff considers the rulemaking
13 that there might be some constitutional issues to take into consideration, especially
14 the precedent held in -- I believe it's *Americans for Prosperity v. Bronto*. This is
15 the case from California where *Americans for Prosperity* was seeking to protect the
16 identities and protect the privacy of its donors from the state of California. So
17 something for the Commission to take into consideration. Obviously, a narrowly
18 tailored transparency process is permissible under that standard. But in general, I
19 think the Alliance shares the spirit of this directive. We think that transparency is
20 incredibly important and we're glad to see the Commission take that into
21 consideration here and we think, again, that all these processes should be more
22 transparent.

23 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Thank you.

1 **MR. VOSS:** Thank you.

2 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right. Commissioner Lewis?

3 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Yes. Quick question for Staff, procedurally. Will
4 this be -- this is not a docketed proceeding, so would it go into the Bulletin and then
5 be open for intervention, or would this just -- as I read it, would just be Staff
6 constructing an interim rule? Or am I wrong on that?

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** No, sir. So we do have an open docket that is to revise our Rules
8 of Practice and Procedure.

9 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Okay.

10 **MS. BOWMAN:** So what we're proposing, and we've done this in the past, is we
11 issue a special order that provides an interim rule while the full rulemaking is going
12 on. And we did this back in 2021 related to our Rule 7. And we right now have an
13 Interim Rule 7 in place because during COVID we were having trouble doing
14 transportation citations through the regular USPS. And so per our rules, we had to
15 serve that way. So the Commission adopted an Interim Rule 7 to allow for FedEx
16 or UPS or some other type of method where we could prove certified, you know,
17 mail versus just the traditional. So we have done this in the past where we approve
18 an interim rule while we work through the stakeholder process through an actual
19 docketed proceeding which is ongoing right now.

20 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Got you. So that makes a lot of sense for me. If
21 there is a person who now has an interest in this portion but were not a previous
22 intervenor under that docketed proceeding, how would they be able to or will they
23 be able to participate, given that this was not contemplated when that rulemaking

1 was opened, even though it was brought of our overall general rules and practices
2 of procedure?

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Absolutely, they can still intervene. For our rulemakings, we
4 rule on requests to intervene technically out of time or late all of the time. The
5 general standard for that is just whoever is intervening takes the docket as it is on
6 the date that they are allowed to intervene. In other words, they, you know, can't
7 go back and try to fight something that was already decided in that docket. But,
8 absolutely, if somebody wants to intervene tomorrow in this docket, they certainly
9 can do that.

10 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. And so when we get to a final
11 recommendation of that docketed proceeding, would that then take it out as an
12 interim rule and it'll be part of the proceeding or -- I guess I'm trying to understand
13 the timeline here from the interim rule to when it would be subject to just part of
14 our general rules and practices of procedure.

15 **MS. BOWMAN:** Sure. So the interim rule, if approved today, would go into effect
16 -- well, we would start the process in order for a May or June vote for the actual
17 interim rule so we can put that rule together for you guys. After that, that would
18 become in effect. Once the Rules of Practice and Procedure had been completely
19 revised and Staff puts out a final rule for you guys to consider, if those are approved,
20 then the final revised Rules of Practice and Procedure would then take the place of
21 the interim rule.

22 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Thank you. Thank you for that procedural
23 clarification and I would say that I'm completely in support of transparency. I

1 believe this is important. I would prefer that this be its independent docket with
2 full stakeholder engagement, full consideration, multiple entities. How we handle
3 this from certain intervenors versus utilities, which I think will bring a real question
4 how they comply with this interim rule since they are also intervenors. And so
5 while I respect and think we should handle transparency, I think there's a better
6 avenue than an interim rule. I don't believe there's a pressing issue at this moment
7 to do so, but that we should continue the conversations in a more deliberative
8 process. So that is why I will be objecting to this directive today.

9 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. So require a roll call vote to approve the
10 directive.

11 **MS. BOWMAN:** So, Commissioner Campbell, how do you vote on
12 Commissioner Skrmetta's directive?

13 **COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL:** Yes.

14 **MS. BOWMAN:** Thank you. And Commissioner Lewis?

15 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** No.

16 **MS. BOWMAN:** And Commissioner Francis?

17 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Yes.

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

19 **VICE CHAIRMAN COUSSAN:** Yes.

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

21 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yes. Directive's approved and moves forward.

22 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** [INAUDIBLE] have two cents over here on this
23 end? Do I have two cents?

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Yeah. Go ahead, sir.

2 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. I want to commend Commissioner
3 Skrmetta on this act and I think it's way overdue. And I'd like to ask the Staff --

4 **MS. BOWMAN:** Your mic, can you pull it a little bit closer?

5 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. Can you hear? All right. Can you hear
6 me okay?

7 **MS. BOWMAN:** Okay. Yes, sir.

8 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Might want to lift over a little closer. There you go.

9 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** I'd like to commend Commissioner Skrmetta on
10 this act and I think it's way overdue. And I was just wondering when it would be
11 ruled here that we'd be under -- how long do you think it would take for this to be
12 a --

13 **MS. BOWMAN:** So I don't think it will take us long to put the rule together,
14 especially because Commissioner Skrmetta would like us to follow already --
15 revised statutes law in place. So I asked Commissioner Skrmetta to just give us
16 until June to put something back to you guys. I will try to get it back in May, but
17 June at the absolute latest.

18 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Okay. Well I know we've talked about the
19 lightning speed and I don't believe eight months in Wall Street is lightning. But
20 I'd like to put the lightning speed to do this one. I think it's something we need to
21 get done. Thank you.

22 **MS. BOWMAN:** Yes, sir. Okay. So we're back at Exhibit 16.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So in Exhibit 16, I know we have a Executive
2 Session, we have an approval on a FERC matter, and that would be it, correct?

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

4 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So let's do the FERC approval and then we'll move
5 into Executive Session issues.

6 **MS. BOWMAN:** So under the FERC approval, it's a discussion and possible vote
7 to ratify interventions of the Commission in RTO-related or other FERC
8 proceedings. It's on the agenda for ratification pursuant to the scope of work
9 approved in connection with the MISO, SPP, and ERSC participation. And due to
10 those short deadlines allowed for interventions, if advanced approval is not
11 possible, the Executive Secretary can authorize the initial interventions, comments,
12 or protests, subject to ratification. Interventions were filed on the Commission's
13 behalf for the purposes of monitoring issues related MISO and SPP proceedings in
14 five dockets. And Staff recommends that the Commission ratify the actions taken
15 in FERC Docket Numbers ER26-1564, ER26-1482, ER26-1538, EL26-49, and
16 ER26-1731.

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Move to ratify the intervention into this particular
18 FERC docket.

19 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis, moved by the
21 Chair. Any opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, so ordered. Regarding
22 the Executive Session, I think because of the complexity with the microphones in

1 here, we can move off into another area and, Staff Counsel, you can take us
2 wherever you want to take us. Did you already make plans?

3 **MS. BOWMAN:** Well, actually there is a downstairs, so we can just walk down
4 there and have a -- no?

5 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Okay. I'm not going to be a smart aleck, but yeah.
6 Okay. I was going to -- I'm holding back, Lauren. Okay. Okay. Move to go into
7 -- do the in re and we'll move into another area, but read the in re.

8 **MS. BOWMAN:** It's a possible Executive Session to discuss litigation strategy
9 pursuant to Louisiana Revised Statute 42:17. And I'll take a second to
10 Commissioner --

11 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

12 **MS. BOWMAN:** Thank you.

13 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** So we have moved, we approved, we are going into
14 Executive Session. We are out.

15 **[OFF THE RECORD]**

16 **[BACK ON THE RECORD]**

17 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** All right. The Chair moves to come out of
18 Executive Session. Any seconds?

19 **COMMISSIONER LEWIS:** Second.

20 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Lewis. Any
21 opposition? **[NONE HEARD]** Hearing none, so ordered. Chair moves to adjourn.

22 Any seconds?

23 **COMMISSIONER FRANCIS:** Second.

1 **CHAIRMAN SKRMETTA:** Seconded by Commissioner Francis. Any
2 opposition? [NONE HEARD] Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned. Thank
3 you, Alexandria.

4

5 **(WHEREUPON THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED)**


6


1 I certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 65 are true and correct to the best
2 of my knowledge of the Open Session of the Business and Executive Meeting
3 held on April 15, 2026 in Alexandria, Louisiana.

4 *****

5 **Rough Draft prepared by:**

6  April 20, 2026
7 Clarisa Findley, Date
8 Court Reporter


9  April 20, 2026
10 Key-anna Freeman, Date
11 Court Reporter

12  April 20, 2026
13 Alicia Carter-Thomas, Date
14 Court Reporter

15 *****

16 **Proofed by:**

17 **Court Reporter**

18  April 21, 2026
19 Alicia Carter-Thomas, Date
20 Court Reporter

21 **Finalized by:**

22  April 21, 2026
23 Clarisa Findley, Date
24 Court Reporter
25