# LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
## ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION

**DOCKET NUMBER U-37882**

**ENTERGY LOUISIANA, LLC, EX PARTE**

***In re: Application for certification of generation and transmission resources and for other relief.***

## RULING ON MOTION FOR SUBPOENA FOR THE PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

On June 29, 2026, the Alliance for Affordable Energy and the Union of Concerned Scientists ("NPOs"), filed with the Louisiana Public Service Commission ("LPSC" or "Commission") a Motion for Subpoena for the Production of Documents ("Motion") directed to Meta Platforms, Inc. ("Meta"), compelling the production of documents and other evidence on or before July 10, 2026. Entergy Louisiana, LLC ("ELL"), immediately provided notice that it opposes the Motion. Thereafter, a procedural schedule was set to allow parties to present their arguments on the Motion.

On July 2, 2026, ELL filed its Opposition to Alliance for Affordable Energy and Union of Concerned Scientists' Motion for Subpoena for the Production of Documents ("Opposition"). Also, on July 2, 2026, the Staff of the Louisiana Public Service Commission ("Staff") submitted Comments on the Motion, refraining from taking a position until the July 7, 2026 deadline provided by the Notice of Opportunity to File Response to Subpoena for the Production of Documents and Notice of Oral Argument. On July 7, 2026, NPOs filed the Reply of the Alliance for Affordable Energy and Union of Concerned Scientists to Comments of the Louisiana Public Service Commission Staff and Opposition of Entergy Louisiana, LLC to the Motion for Subpoena for the Production of Documents ("NPO Reply Brief") and Commission Staff filed the Reply

Comments of the Louisiana Public Service Commission Staff on the NPO Motion for Subpoena for Production of Documents ("Staff Reply Brief"). Oral argument was convened before the undersigned administrative law judge on July 8, 2026.

**HAVING CONSIDERED** the Motion and all arguments in support and opposition thereto;

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion is **denied in part** and **granted in part.**

## Background

This proceeding was initiated upon ELL's filing of the Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Certification of Generation and Transmission Resources and for other Relief Pursuant to the Commission's *Lightning Initiative* ("Application"). In the Application, ELL seeks the Commission's approval of 5,278 megawatts ("MW") of generation, in addition to battery storage and a transmission line, to serve Evest LLC, a customer locating a large hyperscale data center in Richland Parish, Louisiana, adjacent to the facility previously approved in Commission Order No. U-37425 ("Customer").[1] Similar to the previous certification proceeding, ELL points to significant economic investment as justification for an exemption from the Commission's market-based mechanisms ("MBM") General Order. The NPOs intervened in the proceeding, along with the Louisiana Energy Users Group, Southern Renewable Energy Association, Sierra Club, the Association of Louisiana Electric Cooperatives, Inc., 1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc., Walmart Inc., and Gulf States Renewable Energy Industries Association.

[1] See Order No. U-37425 - Entergy Louisiana, LLC, ex parte. In re: *Application for approval of generation and transmission resources in connection with service to a single customer for a project in North Louisiana*. In Order No. U-37425 the Commission accepted the settlement entered into by Entergy Louisiana, LPSC Staff, Sierra Club, Walmart, and Southern Renewable Energy Association, approving the generation and transmission resources proposed in connection with service to a customer project in North Louisiana, subject to certain conditions.

In its Application, ELL claims that it worked extensively to arrive at an agreeable Electric Service Agreement ("ESA") that: "protects ELL's other customers from undue rate impacts, delivers unprecedented benefits for other customers, and provides never before seen protections from ELL's other customers."[2] As part of their negotiations, ELL and the Customer agreed upon a Contribution in Aid of Construction Agreement ("CIAC Agreement") wherein the Customer agrees to make significant contributions toward construction costs. ELL quantifies the savings and other benefits at $2.67 billion during the 20-year term of the ESA.

In Paragraph IV of its Application, ELL discusses the specific investments to be funded by the Customer. These include 2,500 MW of renewable resources, $120 million to Entergy's "The Power to Care" program, $140 million associated with energy-efficiency and/or weatherization programs for low-income residential customers, and a commitment to work in good faith with ELL to identify low-carbon generation technologies and advanced nuclear investments.

ELL submitted the testimony of fifteen witnesses in support of its Application. The Motion focuses mainly on five of those witnesses (Beauchamp, May, Ingram, Owens, and Jones), citing testimony from the aforementioned witnesses concerning the economic benefits of the project, the anticipated electric load of the data center, the sustainability agreement, and the parental guaranty.

The following documents are specified in the Motion and attached Subpoena for Production of Documents to Meta, a non-party to the proceeding:

1. *Analyses data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which demonstrate the level of investment and permanent job creation expected to be entailed by the Richland Data Center.*

2. *Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which substantiate the amount of electricity load the Richland Data Center will need.*

---

[2] Application, at p. 6.

3. *Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence providing the Richland Data Center's load factor and expected load variability over time; including daily, weekly and monthly load variability.*

4. *A copy or records of any communications between Meta and ELL discussing the Sustainability Agreement as a relevant factor for the Customer in deciding to move forward with building a data center in Louisiana.*

5. *Information on the location, amount, and nature of assets held by Meta Platforms, Inc., sufficient to fulfill its obligations under the Guaranty; and information on other guaranties Meta has made to other electric utilities.*

## Applicable Law

The Commission exercises jurisdiction in this proceeding pursuant to Article IV, Section 21 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, which provides in pertinent part:

> The commission shall regulate all common carriers and public utilities and have such other regulatory authority as provided by law. It shall adopt and enforce reasonable rules, regulations, and procedures necessary for the discharge of its duties, and perform other duties as provided by law.

Pursuant to the above authority, the Commission enacted Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Louisiana Public Service Commission ("Commission Rules") to assist the Commission in protecting the public interest through procedures that are "simple, orderly, and efficient."[3] The Commission's administrative law judges ("ALJs") are delegated the authority to issue and enforce subpoenas for the production of documents and other evidence at depositions and hearings, and otherwise compel or limit discovery pursuant to Commission Rules 55(c)(d)(h) and Rule 63. When exercising this discretion, Commission ALJs examine Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure articles 1420, *et seq.*, within the context of Commission Rule 32, which provides for a liberal approach to the inclusion of evidence in Commission proceedings, wherein "all needful and proper evidence

[3] Rule 1: Object of Rules.

shall be conveniently, inexpensively and speedily heard while preserving the substantive rights of the parties to the proceeding."

Concerning the Motion herein, Commission Rule 40(B) specifically provides for the issuance of subpoenas to compel the production of books, papers, accounts or documents, as long as they are relevant and necessary and the production will not result in unnecessary harassment, imposition, or undue inconvenience or expense to the party compelled to respond. Likewise, Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Articles 1354 and 1463(B) provide for the use of a subpoena duces tecum to a non-party as long as a reasonably accurate description of the documents and reasonable notice are provided. Commission Rule 40 prohibits subpoenas for material of a trade secret or confidential nature if the interests of the parties and the public cannot be protected through a protective order or other means.

Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article 1422 allows parties to obtain information that "appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence" as long as it is relevant to the subject matter of the proceeding and not privileged. Louisiana Code of Evidence Article 401 defines relevant evidence as any evidence that has any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of an action more probable or less probable that it would be without the evidence.

## Party Positions

### *NPOs*

The NPOs argue that ELL makes claims that it cannot substantiate and for which it has identified Meta as the source of the information. The NPOs argue that this information is necessary and relevant to a Commission determination of whether approval of ELL's Application is in the public interest. The NPOs argue that ELL's reliance on agreements with Meta as the justification for a Commission finding that Project Evest is in the public interest and its reliance on those agreements as evidence of the steps taken by ELL to ensure that existing customers will not be unduly burdened by the project supports NPOs' position that the information sought from Meta is necessary and relevant. The NPOs also rely on the Louisiana Rules of Evidence and argue that without Meta sponsoring its own declarations, ELL's assertions are inadmissible hearsay. Further, while the NPOs admit that this Motion is similar to one made in Docket No. U-37425, in which the requested subpoena was quashed for being untimely, this request was lodged over one month before the discovery deadline.

In the NPO Reply Brief, they argue first that both ELL and Commission Staff lack standing to object to a subpoena directed to Meta; that they cannot and did not plausibly assert any privilege or proprietary interest in the subpoenaed documents. The NPOs cite *Arnauld v. Scottsdale Ins. Co.*, 182 So. 2d 97, for the proposition that only the recipient of a subpoena has standing to move to quash it. Second, the NPO Reply Brief asserts that ELL misstates the standards applicable to the issuance of a subpoena by confusing the sufficiency of the evidence it has provided and the additional information that may lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The NPOs argue that ELL is asking the Commission to weigh only its inadmissible hearsay evidence, and that no further information is necessary, including where the record is devoid of information such as Meta's other guaranties or intended job creation. The NPOs argue that the Commission should consider Executive Order JML 26-058 (Louisiana Ratepayer and Community Protection Initiative Criteria for LED Certifications for Data Center and Large-Load Investment) ("EO 26-058") wherein Governor Landry expresses the state policy to ensure that transformational investment benefits Louisiana citizens and communities, and is not realized at their expense. And third, the NPO Reply Brief asserts that the Commission Staff is attempting to add an exception to Rule 40 where one does not exist when asserting that the Tribunal should create an exception to the Commission's subpoena rules for a non-party utility customer who is the subject of a pending application.

At the oral argument, the NPOs "strenuously" objected to the Commission Staff's July 7 Reply, stating that the briefing schedule on the Motion clearly stated that opposition was meant to be filed by July 2, and the Staff's delay in filing was prejudicial to the NPOs. The NPOs also reiterated their argument that neither ELL nor Commission Staff had standing to object to the issuance of the subpoena. The NPOs cite Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article 1354 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 45 for the proposition that only the recipient of a subpoena can object to it. The NPOs take issue with the Staff's strict interpretation in Rule 40 and point to EO 26-058 as an obligation to shine a light on the project. Further, the NPOs argue that they are merely asking basic questions.

The NPOs addressed each of the Staff's arguments with regard to the enumerated subpoena requests by stating that the information provided to Commission Staff regarding economic investments and job creation consist solely of press releases and public disclosures. For load data, the Commission Staff's reliance on the ESA is misplaced. For the financial data that Staff argues is sufficient because it is in the public record, the NPOs argue that the publicly available financial data is not sufficient as it is not segregated for the Customer.

And finally, the NPOs requested that their subsequently filed verification inadvertently omitted from the Motion be deemed sufficient.

***ELL***

ELL argues that aside from failing to meet the requirements of Commission Rule 40, the granting of the Motion would send negative signals to prospective business interests in Louisiana. ELL also asserts that the NPOs' claims are misleading and superficial and intended to confuse and distract from the actual issues in this matter. ELL contends that Commission rules on the issuance of a subpoena from an intervenor to non-party should bar the NPOs from embroiling Meta in litigation.

ELL argues that the Motion fails to satisfy the strict requirements of Commission Rule 40 in several ways. First, ELL asserts that because NPOs have not verified their Motion, the request is facially and fatally flawed, requiring denial. Second, ELL asserts that the requests are overbroad and do not satisfy Commission Rule 40's requirement that requests for subpoena specify "as nearly as possible" the information and documents desired. ELL argues that the language providing the information sought would potentially result in large amounts of documents, and seeks more information and documents than could possibly be needed for resolution of any issue in this matter. Third, ELL argues that the Motion fails to show that the information is necessary. ELL contends that contrary to NPOs' claim, it has provided specific factual support for its assertions related to intended investment, load needed for the project, Evest, LLC's sustainability goals, and Meta's ability to fulfill the Guaranty.

ELL also argues that the NPOs' hearsay argument ignores the plain language of Commission Rule 32 and precedent from the Louisiana Supreme Court. ELL argues that the language of Commission Rule 32 expressly contemplates that evidence beyond that which is admissible under the rules of evidence can be admissible in proceedings before the Commission. ELL further argues that based on Commission Rule 32 and case law precedent, the evidence offered by ELL is competent evidence that can be admitted for consideration by the Commission.

ELL states that it is worth noting that the Commission has historically made public interest determinations on new-build or acquired capacity without needing to issue subpoenas to utility customers. ELL also argues that the information sought in NPOs' Motion is beyond what is required by the Commission in the 1983 General Order. Lastly, ELL argues that, other than the timeliness issue, the same reasons provided in the ruling quashing the subpoena in Docket No. U-37425 apply here. At the oral argument, ELL reiterated its position that in order for a subpoena duces tecum to be issued to a non-party pursuant to Commission Rule 40 it must be shown to be necessary and the NPOs have failed to make such a showing. ELL argued that the NPOs are attempting to shift the burden when they have not made a prima-facie showing.

***Commission Staff***

In its initial comments, the Commission Staff emphasizes that while the Commission has the authority to issue the requested subpoena, it should exercise caution in doing so. Further, the Commission Staff declined to take a position on the merits of the subpoena, but advised that it would file an additional brief on or before the reply deadline after reviewing any opposition filed by any other party. After reviewing ELL's Opposition, Commission Staff advised against the issuance of the subpoena, stating that the NPOs failed to meet the requirements of Commission Rule 40 for each of the five categories of document requests.

Specifically, with regard to Request No. 1, the Commission Staff finds the request to be facially deficient because it includes a request regarding economic investment that was not previously sought through written discovery to ELL. Staff further argues that information regarding economic investment is not necessary to resolve the issues before the Commission, because the Commission is not required to consider economic development in its public interest determination. The Commission Staff nevertheless goes on to implore ELL to produce any such data that it has as soon as possible.

With regard to Request No. 2, Commission Staff agrees that information about the electric load required is important; however, it does not agree with the NPOs that ELL provided insufficient information in this regard. With regard to Request No. 3, Commission Staff says this information was already provided by ELL. When confronted at oral argument with the NPOs' argument that the load factor data did not address everything sought in the request, Commission Staff Counsel stated that maybe that request could be more narrowly tailored, but it was not and therefore should be denied.

With regard to Request No. 4, Commission Staff says ELL would have possession of the same communications that Meta would have, but the same request was not made to ELL. And while information regarding the sustainability agreement is relevant, the NPOs didn't ask about specific provisions but rather information discussing the agreement as a deciding factor which is not necessary to the decision. Further, Commission Staff agrees with ELL that the Sustainability Agreement itself proves the commitment. Commission Staff points out that ELL also provides citation to a 73-page report that is publicly available.

With regard to Request No. 5, Commission Staff argues that while the financial viability of Meta is a relevant and important issue, the requested subpoena is unnecessary. Rather, Commission Staff avers that the requested subpoena will more likely harass and inconvenience the Customer than lead to usable and probative data in this proceeding. Further, according to Commission Staff, information regarding Meta's financial metrics are already in the public domain in filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), and in Meta's credit ratings assigned by credit rating agencies. Commission Staff argues that the NPOs fail to explain how they will use the information in a more reliable or accurate way than has been done by the rating agencies and in the pre-filed testimonies of ELL witnesses Kidd and Hinkson. In addition, Commission Staff argues, the ESA has protection mechanisms to ensure that any financial concerns are met with requirements for additional collateral.

At the oral argument, the Commission Staff advised against the issuance of the subpoena in order to protect the integrity of the process, arguing that the Commission Staff has standing to weigh in on the threshold determination of whether the Commission Rule 40 standards have been met, and that the NPOs failed to provide sufficient justification for the information sought in the subpoena. Commission Staff was also not persuaded by the NPOs' arguments that some of the information in the record is incomplete and would be served by the issuance of the subpoena. Like ELL, Commission Staff acknowledged that the NPOs cured the defect in the original filing insofar as the verification was filed; however, Commission Staff continued to oppose the issuance of the subpoena on the merits of the requests.

## Discussion

ELL's Application was filed pursuant to the Commission's Lightning Initiative approved at the December 17, 2025 Business and Executive Session. The Minute Entry provides as follows:

> ***LPSC Lightning Amendment to the General Order***
>
> *To support the Governor's initiative and ensure utilities can meet the power needs of new and expanding load, I request that the Louisiana Public Service Commission adopt the following regulatory pathway:*
>
> *1. The requirements of General Order 10-14-2024 (R-34247) are considered waived for a proposed capacity addition where the following factors are demonstrated and proven in the certification proceeding:*
>
> *a. A signed electric service agreement ("ESA") with a new or expanding load with a requested initial in-service date within five years of the certification application;*
>
> *b. Without the proposed capacity, the utility is projected to be short of the energy or capacity needed to meet the customer's electric requirements on the requested in- service dates;*
>
> *c. A letter from the Secretary of Louisiana Economic Development confirming the customer's interest and the importance of power availability within the five-year initial in-service date;*

*d. The ESA has a term of at least 15 years, with an option to renew; and*

*e. The ESA ensures a level of fixed revenue over the term of the ESA that will cover at least one-half of the fixed revenue requirement associated with the requested capacity during the term of the customer ESA.*

*2. Further, for any certification proceeding that is filed consistent with the requirements of this directive, I direct Staff to take reasonable steps to ensure that those applications are reviewed and processed on a timely basis, including retention of counsel and consultants as necessary, and handling any matters that arise with interventions, with the objective of the Commission being able to vote within 8 months of an application. Any utility seeking to take advantage of this regulatory pathway shall communicate with the Executive Counsel at least 60 days prior to any filing made at the Commission.*

*3. Nothing herein shall be construed to relinquish the Commission's authority over the proposed capacity additions, including, but not limited to the determination of whether the capacity addition serves the public interest and the prudence of the utility's management of the procurement, construction, or contract administration associated with such capacity additions. Further, nothing herein shall be construed as restricting or limiting any party's participation in a certification proceeding that is filed pursuant to this directive.*

At a status conference held on April 29, 2026, a procedural schedule was established in accordance with the Lightning Initiative and Commission Order No. U-37882,[4] whereby a hearing will commence on October 7, 2026, and a complete evidentiary record will be compiled for *de novo* consideration by the Commissioners at its December Business and Executive Session.

The Lightning Initiative and Commission Order No. U-37882 require a careful weighing of the interests of the NPOs, as intervenors in the proceeding, and Meta, parent and guarantor of the Customer, as a non-party to this proceeding, but an active participant in Project Evest. ELL and Commission Staff emphasized Meta's status as a non-party in their argument on the Motion, concerned that a precedent could be set where not only will parties attempt to obtain utility

[4] Order No. U-37882 was issued in this proceeding and directs the ALJ to serve as a hearing examiner without the issuance of a formal recommendation.

customer information but will discourage business investments in the State. While this may be a valid concern, the Commission considers each case on its own merits and in this instance, Meta has created the need for the additional resources at issue, which are larger in scale than any previous request before this Commission. The Commission has an interest in ensuring that Project Evest is in the public interest and that ratepayers are protected, without concern that it may create a window for parties to harass ordinary utility customers with requests for information that are unnecessary.

As a preliminary matter, this ruling will address the NPOs' challenge to the standing of ELL and Commission Staff to oppose the issuance of the subpoena. Initially, it should be noted that the state court case cited by the NPOs did not reach the issue of whether there was standing to move to quash the subpoenas at issue.[5] Even if we were to find *Arnauld* or any of the federal cases cited in the Motion applicable, however, this ruling is not on a motion to quash, but rather, a motion to issue a subpoena in the first instance. This Tribunal requested comments and opposition from the parties, and ELL and Commission Staff responded to that request. Therefore, we find this argument without merit.

Both ELL and Commission Staff argue that the requested subpoena fails to meet the requirements of Commission Rule 40(B). Commission Rule 40(B) requires that the requested subpoena seek "relevant material and necessary and that the production of such books, papers, accounts or documents will not result in unnecessary harassment, imposition, or undue

---

[5] In *Arnauld*, the plaintiff in a motor vehicle accident case sought to subpoena a broad swatch of financial and employment records of the defendant, after a defense verdict, on a motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict, to show juror misconduct. The trial judge in that matter determined that there was no juror misconduct, that the evidence in the record, consisting of affidavits and communications evidencing that there was no relationship between the defendant and the juror was sufficient, and that it would be unnecessary to obtain such information "to prove what had already been proven". *Arnauld* at 105.

inconvenience or expense to the party to be required to produce the same". After considering all of the arguments of the parties, we find that the requested subpoena meets Rule 40(B) and in some respects, and fails in others. It is important to note, however, that this ruling is, as the Commission Staff characterized it, a threshold determination in whether to issue a subpoena. It does not consider all of the arguments of Meta, as they are not a party, have not made an appearance in this case, and have not been served with the subpoena. As such, they maintain any objection that they may have as to any burden that these requests may impose, consistent with Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, and will bear the burden of proof on a motion to quash or motion for protective order, should they object to providing the requested information, as modified by this ruling.

Request No. 1

> *Analyses data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which demonstrate the level of investment and permanent job creation expected to be entailed by the Richland Data Center.*

With regard to Request No. 1, the Motion is **granted.** While it is generally true that the Commission often performs only a limited review of societal economic benefits associated with utility investments, Project Evest is not a typical utility investment. Special procedures have been specifically implemented for this and similar projects due to the economic benefits and job creation they bring to Louisiana, as is evidenced by EO 26-058 and the Commission's Lightning Initiative. Neither ELL nor Commission Staff have offered any convincing argument as to why this information will be burdensome for Meta to produce. ELL makes a cursory allegation that the request is overly broad and would potentially require "large volumes of documents", but if this is true, it begs the question why these documents should not be provided. This data is relevant to the Commission's public interest determination in this matter, and to the extent that there is responsive data that has not previously been provided, it should be provided in order to complete the evidentiary record in this matter.

Request No. 2

*Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which substantiate the amount of electricity load the Richland Data Center will need.*

With regard to Request No. 2, the Motion is **granted.** ELL and Commission Staff argue that the ESA guarantees are sufficient evidence of Project Evest's electric load. And while they may have an argument for why the Commission should find that to be the case, a full evidentiary record requires substantiation of the data upon which ELL has relied, and allowing the Commission to make a determination based on all needful and proper evidence, taking the parties' arguments regarding the sufficiency of the evidence into consideration at the appropriate time. For a project of this magnitude, the Tribunal would be remiss to advise the Commission to skip over the first step in its two-fold analysis when considering the addition of electric resources. That is, the Commission considers first whether there is a need for the additional resources. If there is a need, the Commission then determines whether the process used to meet that need is reasonable and in the public interest.[6]

Further, NPOs are entitled to present their own case and are entitled to obtain information reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in accordance with Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure article 1422 and the Commission's Lightning Initiative. The need for capacity is a specific requirement of paragraph 1(b) of the Commission's Lightning Initiative, as stated above, as well as a preliminary consideration in Commission proceedings requesting

---

[6] See Commission Order No. U-35927, citing Entergy Louisiana, LLC, Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, L.L.C. & Entergy Louisiana Power, LLC, No. U-33770, 2016 WL 7337362, at *13 (Dec. 14, 2016).

approval of electric resources. Therefore, the request for any document substantiating the amount of the electricity load underlying the Application is relevant and necessary to a full evidentiary record.

Request No. 3

*Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence providing the Richland Data Center's load factor and expected load variability over time; including daily, weekly and monthly load variability.*

This request and the information thus far provided was argued at length during the oral argument. After hearing the arguments of Counsel and reviewing the discovery responses attached to ELL's Opposition, The Tribunal finds that sufficient data has been provided with respect to this request, and to the extent that additional assumptions are sought by the NPOs, they have the ability to manipulate the data and reach their own conclusions. Therefore, this request is **denied.**

Request No. 4

*A copy or records of any communications between Meta and ELL discussing the Sustainability Agreement as a relevant factor for the Customer in deciding to move forward with building a data center in Louisiana.*

Having considered the arguments of the parties and finding no probative value in this request, this request is **denied.**

Request No. 5

*Information on the location, amount, and nature of assets held by Meta Platforms, Inc., sufficient to fulfill its obligations under the Guaranty; and information on other guaranties Meta has made to other electric utilities.*

This Tribunal agrees with arguments of the Commission Staff and ELL that it is reasonable to rely on Meta's public disclosures before the SEC and credit rating agencies and therefore, this request is unnecessary and is therefore, **denied.**

## Conclusion

The Motion is granted with respect to Requests 1 and 2, above, and denied with respect to requests 3-5. A Subpoena will be issued in accordance with the ruling and will have a return date of July 20, 2026.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 10th day of July, 2026.

Melanie Verzwyvelt
Chief Administrative Law Judge

cc: Official Service List

***Louisiana Public Service Commission***
***Administrative Hearings Division***
***11th Floor, Galvez Building***
***602 North Fifth Street***
***Post Office Box 91154***
***Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-9154***
***Telephone (225) 219-9417***

# LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
## ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION

**DOCKET NUMBER U-37882**

**ENTERGY LOUISIANA, LLC, EX PARTE**

***In re: Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Certification of Generation and Transmission Resources and for Other Relief Pursuant to the Commission's Lightning Initiative***

## SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

To: Meta Platforms, Inc.,
through its agent for service of process:
Corporation Service Company
450 Laurel Street, 8th Floor
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801

**GREETINGS:**

**YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED TO PRODUCE,** as requested by Susan Stevens Miller, attorney for the Alliance for Affordable Energy and the Union of Concerned Scientists, at the place set forth below, on or before

**Monday, July 20, 2026**

The following documents and evidence:

1. Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which demonstrate the level of investment and permanent job creation expected to be entailed by the Richland Data Center.

2. Analyses, data, reports, calculations, and/or evidence which substantiate the amount of electricity load the Richland Data Center will need.

**Place:** Susan Stevens Miller, 1250 Eye Street NW, Floor 4, Washington, DC 20005 (no appearance is necessary)

**AND HEREIN YOU ARE NOT TO FAIL UNDER PENALTY OF LAW.**

**BY ORDER OF**
**THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**
**ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION**

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 10th day of July, 2026.

Melanie Verzwyvelt
Chief Administrative Law Judge

cc: via certified mail (Certified Mail Number: 7003 3110 0002 3795 0423)
and Regular Mail to Addressee
Via Email to Official Service List

***Louisiana Public Service Commission***
***Administrative Hearings Division***
***11th Floor, Galvez Building***
***602 North Fifth Street***
***Post Office Box 91154***
***Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-9154***
***Telephone (225) 219-9417***

# Service List for U-37882
# as of 7/10/2026

## Commissioner(s)

Jean-Paul P. Coussan

Mike Francis

Davante Lewis

Foster L. Campbell

Eric Skrmetta

## LPSC Staff Counsel

Lauren Evans, Deputy General Counsel

## LPSC Staff

Donnie Marks, LPSC Utilities Division

Robin Pendergrass, LPSC Auditing Division

## LPSC Consultant

R. Lane Sisung
United Professionals Company
3850 North Causeway Blvd., Suite 1930
Metairie, LA 70002
Email: lane@sisung.com
Fax: (504)544-7701; Phone: (504)544-7724

Julie Viviano
United Professionals Company
3850 North Causeway Blvd., Suite 1930
Metairie, LA 70002
Email: julie@sisung.com
Fax: (504)544-7701; Phone: (504)544-7711

Jake Chapman
United Professionals Company
3850 North Causeway Blvd., Suite 1930
Metairie, LA 70002
Email: jake@sisung.com
Fax: (504)544-7730; Phone: (504)544-7701

Jonathan Bourg
United Professionals Company
3850 North Causeway Blvd., Suite 1930
Metairie, LA 70002
Email: jbourg@sisung.com
Fax: (504)544-7702; Phone: (504)544-7728

## LPSC Special Counsel

Dana Shelton
FishmanHaygood LLP
201 St. Charles Avenue, 46th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70170
Email: dshelton@fishmanhaygood.com
Fax: ; Phone: (504)556-5252

Noel Darce
FishmanHaygood LLP
201 St. Charles Avenue, 46th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70170
Email: ndarce@fishmanhaygood.com
Fax: ; Phone: (504)556-5252

Justin A. Swaim
FishmanHaygood LLP
201 St. Charles Avenue, 46th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70170
Email: jswaim@fishmanhaygood.com
Fax: ; Phone: (504)556-5252

**Applicant :** **Entergy Louisiana, LLC**

Lawrence J. Hand Jr.
Entergy Louisiana, LLC
4809 Jefferson Highway
Mail Unit L-JEF-357
Jefferson, LA 70121
Email: lhand@entergy.com
Fax: (504)840-2681; Phone: (504)840-2528

Ryan D. Jones
Entergy Services, LLC
4809 Jefferson Highway
Main Unit L-JEF-357
Jefferson, LA 70121
Email: rjone25@entergy.com
Fax: (504)840-2681; Phone: (504)840-2615

D. Skylar Rosenbloom
Entergy Services, LLC
639 Loyola Avenue
Mail Unit L-ENT-26E
New Orleans, LA 70113
Email: drosenb@entergy.com
Fax: (504)579-5579; Phone: (504)576-2603

Matthew T. Brown
Entergy Services, LLC
639 Loyola Avenue
Mail Unit L-ENT-26E
New Orleans, LA 70113
Email: mbrow12@entergy.com
Fax: (504)576-5579; Phone: (504)576-4645

Michael R. Dodson
Entergy Services, LLC
639 Loyola Avenue
Mail Unit L-ENT-26E
New Orleans, LA 70113
Email: mdodso1@entergy.com
Fax: ; Phone: (504)576-5508

**Intervenor :** **Louisiana Energy Users Group**

Randy Young
Kean Miller, LLP
400 Convention Street, Suite 700 (70802)
Post Office Box 3513
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3513
Email: Randy.Young@keanmiller.com
Fax: (225)388-9133; Phone: (225)387-0999

Carrie R. Tournillon
Kean Miller, LLP
400 Convention Street, Suite 700 (70802)
Post Office Box 3513
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3513
Email: carrie.tournillon@keanmiller.com
Fax: (504)585-3051; Phone: (504)585-3056

Gordon D. Polozola
Kean Miller, LLP
400 Convention Street, Suite 700 (70802)
Post Office Box 3513
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3513
Email: gordon.polozola@keanmiller.com
Fax: (225)388-9133; Phone: (225)387-0999

**Intervenor :** **Alliance for Affordable Energy**

Alaina DiLaura
Alliance for Affordable Energy
4505 S. Claiborne Ave.
New Orleans, LA 70125
Email: alaina@all4energy.org
Fax: ; Phone: (504)208-9761

Logan Atkinson Burke
Alliance for Affordable Energy
4505 S. Claiborne Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70125
Email: Logan@all4energy.org
Fax: (504)313-3478; Phone: (504)208-9761

Sophie Zaken
Alliance for Affordable Energy
4505 S. Claiborne Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70125
Email: regulatory@all4energy.org
Fax: (504)313-3478; Phone: (504)208-9761

**Intervenor :** **Southern Renewable Energy Association**

Simon Mahan
Southern Renewable Energy Association (SREA)
11610 Pleasant Ridge Road, Suite 103 #176
Little Rock, AR 72223
Email: simon@southernwind.org
Fax: ; Phone: (337)303-3723

Whit Cox
Southern Renewable Energy Association (SREA)
11610 Pleasant Ridge Road, Suite 103 #176
Little Rock, AR 72223
Email: whit@southernrenewable.org
Fax: ; Phone: (501)701-0874

Harry J Vorhoff
Plauche & Carr LLP
450 Laurel Street, Ste. 1850
Baton Rouge, LA 70801
Email: Harry@plauchecarr.com
Fax: ; Phone: (225)256-4028

Megan K. Terrell
Plauche & Carr LLP
450 Laurel Street, Ste. 1850
Baton Rouge, LA 70801
Email: Megan@plauchecarr.com
Fax: ; Phone: (225)256-4028

**Intervenor :** **Union of Concerned Scientists**

Paul Arbaje
Union of Concerned Scientists
200 East Randolph Street
Suite 5151
Chicago, IL 60601
Email: parbaje@ucs.org
Fax: ; Phone: (617)716-6314

Sam Gomberg
Union of Concerned Scientists
1825 K St. NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
Email: sgomberg@ucs.org
Fax: ; Phone: (202)331-6953

Jeff Deyette
Union of Concerned Scientists
2 Brattle Square
Cambridge, MA 02138
Email: jdeyette@ucs.org
Fax: ; Phone: (617)301-8012

**Intervenor :** **Sierra Club**

Joshua Smith
Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612-3011
Email: joshua.smith@sierraclub.org
Fax: (510)208-3140; Phone: (415)977-5560

Kristin Henry
Sierra Club
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
Email: kristin.henry@sierraclub.org
Fax: (415)977-5793; Phone: (415)977-5560

Tony Mendoza
Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Weber Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
Email: tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org
Fax: ; Phone: (415)977-5589

Ashley Soliman
Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612-3011
Email: ashley.soliman@sierraclub.org
Fax: ; Phone: (415)977-5660

Soliana Samson
Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
Email: soliana.samson@sierraclub.org
Fax: ; Phone: (805)253-3479

**Intervenor :** **Assocation of Louisiana Electric Cooperatives, Inc. (ALEC)**

Kyle C. Marionneaux
Marionneaux Kantrow, LLC
10202 Jefferson Highway, Building C
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: kyle@mklawla.com
Fax: (225)757-1709; Phone: (225)769-7473

Kara B. Kantrow
Marionneaux Kantrow, LLC
10202 Jefferson Highway, Building C
Baton Rouge, LA 70809-3183
Email: kara@mklawla.com
Fax: (225)757-1709; Phone: (225)769-7473

H. Barlow Holley
Marionneaux Kantrow, LLC
10202 Jefferson Highway, Building C
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: barlow@mklawla.com
Fax: (225)757-1709; Phone: (225)769-7473

**Intervenor :** **1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc.**

Kyle C. Marionneaux
Marionneaux Kantrow, LLC
10202 Jefferson Highway, Building C
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: kyle@mklawla.com
Fax: (225)757-1709; Phone: (225)769-7473

Brian W. Hobbs
1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc.
4601 Bluebonnet Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: brian.hobbs@1803electric.coop
Fax: ; Phone: (405)831-5615

Ron Repsher
1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc.
4601 Bluebonnet Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: ron.repsher@1803electric.coop
Fax: ; Phone: (405)831-5615

John N. Grinton
1803 Electric Cooperative, Inc.
4601 Bluebonnet Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Email: john.grinton@1803electric.coop
Fax: ; Phone: (225)457-1803

**Intervenor :** **Walmart Inc.**

Carrie H. Grundmann
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103
Email: cgrundmann@spilmanlaw.com
Fax: (336)725-4476; Phone: (540)353-2744

Steve W. Chriss
Walmart Inc.
2608 SE J Street, Mail Stop: 5530
Bentonville, AR 72716
Email: stephen.chriss@walmart.com
Fax: ; Phone: (479)204-1594

Derrick P. Williamson
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Blvd, Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
Email: dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com
Fax: (717)795-2743; Phone: (717)795-2741

**Intervenor :** **Alliance for Affordable Energy and Union of Concerned Scientists**

Susan Stevens Miller
Earthjustice
1001 G Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20001
Email: smiller@earthjustice.org
Fax: (202)667-2356; Phone: (202)797-5246

Sameer Doshi
Earthjustice
311 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60606
Email: sdoshi@earthjustice.org
Fax: ; Phone: (312)800-8332

**Intervenor :** **Gulf States Renewable Energy Industry Association**

Monika Gerhart
400 Poydras Street, Suite 900
New Orleans, LA 70130
Email: mgerhart@gsreia.org

Stephen Wright
400 Poydras St, Suite 900
New Orleans, LA 70130
Email: swright@gsreia.org
Fax: ; Phone: (504)383-8936