**Context and Background:**

James R. Dauphinais presents cross-answering testimony for the Louisiana Public Service Commission (LPSC) concerning Entergy Louisiana, LLC's (ELL) proposed projects for serving a specific customer, Laidley, in North Louisiana. Dauphinais represents the Louisiana Energy Users Group (LEUG), addressing several key issues identified by LPSC Staff witness R. Lane Sisung.

**Key Issues and Responses:**

**1. Additional Generation Capacity for Laidley Contract Demand Increase:**

* Dauphinais addresses the planned increase in Laidley’s contract demand. He emphasizes the need for ELL to explicitly account for the additional generation capacity required due to this increase.
* He criticizes Sisung's suggestion that ELL address the issue in future proposals, noting it creates procedural issues.
* Dauphinais recommends immediately incorporating these additional generation costs into the minimum charge under Laidley's Electric Service Agreement (ESA) to protect other ratepayers from associated risks (pp. 3-4).

**2. Transmission Projects (Mt. Olive to Sarepta, Sterlington Substation Upgrades, Babel to Webre):**

* Dauphinais affirms that the proposed Mt. Olive to Sarepta 500 kV transmission line and Sterlington 500 kV substation upgrades are directly tied to Laidley's load addition and would not be pursued otherwise.
* He challenges Sisung's lack of action regarding the over $500 million transmission costs, arguing that ratepayers are unfairly burdened.
* Dauphinais disagrees with ELL's and Sisung's positions that Babel to Webre would be required regardless of Laidley's load, highlighting no supporting evidence. He insists future certification proceedings explicitly assess whether Laidley should bear the project's cost.
* Discovery information revealed MISO's evaluations included Laidley's load, reinforcing his position that the proposed transmission projects are needed due to Laidley's specific demands (pp. 5-11).

**3. ESA Minimum Charge "True-Up":**

* Dauphinais asserts the ESA’s minimum charge calculation must comprehensively account for all incremental fixed costs related to Laidley’s load, including transmission projects, supplemental generation capacity, and pipeline costs associated with proposed generation assets.
* He highlights deficiencies in Sisung’s narrower recommendation for the "true-up," emphasizing the importance of protecting ratepayers from additional costs not captured by ELL’s initial proposals (pp. 12-13).

**4. Potential Net Cost or Benefit from ELL’s Proposal:**

* Dauphinais disputes Sisung’s projections of net benefits from ELL’s proposal. He emphasizes that if only the minimum charge is paid, the risk of the Laidley load not fully materializing significantly outweighs potential benefits.
* He reiterates the necessity of comprehensive minimum charges that fully encapsulate all incremental fixed costs and protect ratepayers from bearing the residual risks (pp. 13-15).

**5. Revenue Deferral / Revenue Sharing Proposal:**

* Dauphinais critiques Sisung’s proposed complex revenue deferral and sharing mechanism, advocating instead for simpler, more direct adjustments to the ESA minimum charge to cover incremental fixed costs. He argues this approach provides clearer protections to ratepayers (pp. 15-16).

**6. Corporate Sustainability Rider (CSR) and Renewable Generation Issues:**

* Dauphinais supports Sisung’s rejection of ELL’s initial process for acquiring 1,500 MW of renewable resources, noting ambiguities and procedural issues.
* He emphasizes the need for sufficient procedural time to evaluate any new proposals ELL may submit in rebuttal (p. 17).

**Exhibits and Additional Information:**

* Exhibit JRD-9 includes ELL’s responses to data requests, particularly regarding the Babel-Webre transmission project and the inclusion of Laidley's load in MISO’s evaluations (pp. 21-25).

**Conclusion:**

Dauphinais emphasizes the need for thorough consideration and protection against potential risks associated with ELL's proposed projects, advocating specific measures to safeguard other ratepayers from bearing unnecessary financial burdens related to the Laidley load and associated infrastructure developments.