MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION'S
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE
HELD ON THE 3RD DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

The Caddo Parish Natural Resources Committee met in legal session on the above date at 1:30 p.m., in the Government Plaza Chambers, with the following members present constituting a quorum: Commissioners Blake, Burrell, Epperson, Lazarus, and G. Young (5). ABSENT: None (0). Commissioner J. Young was also present.

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance were given during the previous committee meeting. There were no Agenda Additions. Mrs. Blake asked Commission Clerk Jeff Everson to read the definition of the Natural Resources Committee. The definition of the Committee reads, "To this committee shall be referred legislation relating to the following subjects: natural resources generally; mineral resources of parish owned lands; all matters relating to parish parks and recreation and parish waterways." The Committee moved on to Public Comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jane Tappe came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

Hello, It's Jane Tappe. That's alright. P.O. Box 764, Blanchard 71009. Okay, we do have three minutes. I will not force y'all to listen to this for three minutes, but it's why we are here [Mrs. Tappe played a clip of a sound recording from her phone]. Okay, I could go on for the entire three minutes. The point is this. We touched on this in the previous meeting a few minutes ago and how the gentlemen and the committees that do the noise studies and things do their jobs and their studies and all that. But after what we just listened to, and I only made y'all listen for like literally one minute, what if this was around your home 24/7, day time, night time, all the time? All the time. And even if the studies that they come back with come and say it's an acceptable level, it meets our requirements to be okay, would that, and that was a low volume, that was a low volume, would that be acceptable around your home 24/7, every day, every night? That's what we're looking at and that's what needs to be stopped, please. Thank you.

Mary May came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Mary May. I live on Winrock Road in Mooringsport, unincorporated rural Caddo Parish. I'm a homeowner who lives near the proposed State Line Road data center project. My family is not connected to a municipal water system. Our private well is our only source of water for drinking, cooking, bathing, and everyday life. I'm not against technology or economic development, but development should not move forward without first understanding how it may affect the people who already live here. For families like mine, water is not just a utility. It's our lifeline. If construction, groundwater demand, contamination, or other unforeseen impact affects my well, I cannot simply switch water providers. I could face the cost of drilling another well, assuming another reliable source is even available. This is not a risk homeowners should be expected to accept without answers. An environmental study is not an obstacle to progress. It is responsible due diligence. It can evaluate water resources, drainage, wetlands, noise, air quality, traffic, construction impacts, and the cumulative effects of the project. If the study finds little risk, the developer, elected officials, and the community all benefit from greater confidence. If it identifies concerns, those concerns can be addressed before damage occurs. I respectfully ask this committee to recommend a comprehensive and independent environmental study before the State Line Road data center advances any further. Once our water is affected, our environment is changes, the consequences may not be reversible. If this project is truly safe, why should anyone be afraid of an environmental study? If it confirms there is little risk, everyone wins. But if it identifies problems, we will be grateful that we ask first and not after. Thank you for your time and consideration in requesting an environmental impact study for the data centers coming to our area.

Matt Alexander came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

My name is Matt Alexander. I live on 178 Carrollton Avenue in Shreveport, Louisiana. Okay, so far, you've had two speakers, both concerned for them and their families. I didn't have anything prepared to say, because I don't know how these meetings work, because like you said, this is the first one you had and it's August. So, basically, you have her, she's subjected to whatever sort of whims of progress that you've decided are acceptable. She's worried about having water. What's the benefit of all this? I mean, what's the real benefit? I don't have a lot to say. Can y'all name the chemicals that are going to go in the water? Do you know how to pronounce those 16-letter words? Do you know what they do to the human body? You had a meeting and you said South Caddo Parish is going dry. Y'all are going to do a million-dollar study to figure out how to get water in Keithville. So, let's give away some more water in the other parts of the Parish. Sounds like a good idea. When this stuff is cooled off in these plants, where's it going to go? You said you're the Natural Resource Committee protecting waterways. Are you doing your job? Are you protecting waterways? Are you protecting people's right to life? Or does she get to be sacrificed so that Jeff Bezos can have another yacht? Does her family get to be sacrificed so that some man in Blanchard can build an RV park for all the local jobs that y'all are creating? Where's all the local jobs? Didn't y'all have a temporary housing regulation? Why do you need temporary housing if the people that live here are going to work there? It's what y'all said. It's what Arceneaux said. These are your words. I'm just telling you what I've heard since December. Doesn't sound good. It sounds like your story changes as much as the permits for these data centers change. Shouldn't have let them have the permit when they applied for it and they didn't meet the criteria. But now they're in there and y'all's authority only really seems to extend itself when

it's convenient for y'all, not when it's inconvenient for them or her or people on Pines Road or people that are praying to god for all this to end. The same god that you think gives you the right to dump chemicals in the water. Y'all need to get yourselves together, man. I'll talk again later.

Peter Siska came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

411 Bellchase Circle, Shreveport, 71115. So, I didn't come here to specifically raise my voice for one or the other issue. Mostly I just like to let you know that from the educational point of view and for research point of view, it is important for us and for me as a professor of biological sciences and environmental sciences to know as much as possible about the environmental impact of the data centers on the citizens, on the nature. We know something from the literature, but most of us, this is a new issue, so most of us do not have long research backgrounds to say a lot of things as science should say and guarantee that what we say is right. So, at this point we just want in Shreveport to accumulate as much information as we can. Maybe we need your help to provide this information to us and help us to make connections with data centers. Commissioner Epperson is very active. I keep in touch with him. So, I get the news, the information what is going on with data centers. From literature we know that there will be some environmental impact. However, it doesn't seem to be as severe as we worry about in terms of the consumption of water. The data centers should be able to clean the water whatever they pollute, but it should not be any chemicals used. It's mostly from the pipes and maybe a rusty material that some pollution will get into it, but it should be cleaned as soon as it comes out of the data centers. And the amount of water they will use is not such huge as we think. For example, when I calculated the Caddo Lake amount of water and annual input and output should be able to handle about 10 data centers, just one lake, just for this example, it's not recommending that the water from Caddo Lake should be used for data centers. It shouldn't be such a devastating impact, but we need to know more, definitely need to know more as possible about the data centers. The second important aspect from educational point of view is that we do not have data science studies at Louisiana State University in Shreveport. People are thinking abut beginning having the data science studies and we need to do something about that at the university. So, our students could have employment in these data centers if they come the Shreveport if they approved here and if they prosper here. So, hopefully there will be balance between the natural environment and the needs of people. So, what I'm looking for is just good balance of knowledge of education of our involvement from the environmental science, and also making sure that the citizens are not suffering, that the environmental impact will be evaluated properly by us studying it and knowing more about it, because we are only also at the beginning of understand of the impact of data science on the environment. There are concerns. We're listening to these concerns. We are studying those concerns. But since Shreveport could be one of the important places where data centers will be located, we certainly need to know more and your help would be also appreciated from that perspective. So, thank you.

Tommy Bison came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

5530 North State Line Road, Mooringsport, Louisiana. My name is Tommy Bison. I live directly, directly, talking about from here to that wall, from this data center. The noise, I'm awoken every morning between 6:00 and 7:00 by tractors backing up, pulling forward. A Flock camera just opposite of my house that records when I turn my door handle from inside the house. The water, the habitat. I've lived out here for 46 years. That's how old I am. My family's been there since 1911. That's 115 years. It's always been trees. There's always been deer, snakes, rabbits, squirrels, frogs, turtles. None of that's there anymore. I've lived there for 46 years. In 44 of those years, might have seen three deer dead on the side of the road. There was a deer management camp over there. They kept the deer up. They kept them over there. They kept them off the road. They grew big deer, big animals. In the last year since they started clearing this mess, I've seen four deer dead on the side of the road. The habitat has no life. I've got ponds on the back of my property that was built in 1937 that have never lost a gallon of water. They've stayed the same height. There's springs and wells back there. They're losing water today, folks. This is 100 yards from the facility over here that they're building. But you know, this is 100 yards from this thing. You know, they're draining our water. They're taking our animals. What's going to happen with these chemicals when my dog gets out there and drinks? I've got video of them wasting thousands of gallons of water that's coming right up out the ground, right down the ditch. I got video of it of them trying to build a bear dam to stop it. And if they drill a well over there, they might have some water. But y'all want to drain our lakes? You want to drain our whole aquifer? This lady's water that she drinks at her house, the water that we drink at my house right across the road, the noise, the lights, the involvement from the police that have no concern for the citizens. None. We are of no concern. Not to you, not to the police, not to Jeff Bezos, not to E. E. Reed, not to Don Haskin, not to Keith Bragg. These are their employees over there. Guys that I've been very, very kind to. Guys that I went and took a loan out, took a loan to try to be able to serve these guys. There's nothing to eat out there. It is a rural area, but there are a lot of folks out there, right across, right there from within a mile of the place, within a hundred yards of the places. My entire family, every member of my family lives on that property and we don't know what's happening. We didn't know what was happening from day one. This is, guys, y'all come on. Think of us. Think of us. Think of yourselves. Think if it was your child living out there across the road from this house. This is probably their first house they ever bought. It's the first time they've ever lived on their own. And somebody just pops up with something that's ruined our property value, it's ruined our way of life, ruining our drinking water, ruining our habitat and our animals and our wildlife and our views. We have backdrops of that area from going back a hundred years. Nice property where we had weddings in the front yard, had birthday parties in our front yard. Now we got to look at tractors and equipment and noise and all for what? Because an AI race. Look, we won. We won. China put a moratorium on building AI buildings, AI data centers. 738's all they could build. How many we got here in the United States? We won, ma'am. We won. Thank you.

Abigail Whittington came before the Commission and gave the following comment:

Abby Whittington, 654 Columbia Street. I just want to say thank you so much to everyone that showed up and made a public comment and I really hope that y'all listen to everybody here. I didn't really have that much planned to say, but also, I do have a petition on me. If y'all want to sign it outside, please do. We have 1,700 signatures on it. I turned it into the mayor's office two weeks ago and we're going to keep getting more signatures. We're going to keep coming to these meetings and we're going to keep putting pressure on you because we do not want data centers in our community. Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

- *Introductory statement and generalized discussion related to addressing public concerns related to the impact of development on natural resources.*

Mrs. Blake gave the following prepared statement:

Since it is true that the developers of the proposed data centers have been 100% compliant with local, state, and federal development laws, and it is also true that the public has lingering questions and concerns that have not yet been assuaged and a desire to be heard and acknowledged, as a community, we can honor the laws in place and honor the public dialogue without making anyone into a villain. Today, I hope to receive input regarding the subject areas that have most frequently been mentioned like environmental impacts, resources in use, impact on cost and availability of water, electricity, as well as impacts related to noise, heat, or pollution. All may be appropriate for this committee. Issues like land use, impacts to neighboring properties may be appropriate for another committee. I like to try to establish and facilitate beneficial conversations to provide peace of mind to citizens without adding chaos to an already tightly regulated development process. Social media and public meetings are great for some purposes, but don't always seem like the best ways to address these types of conversations. And this is something that I think would be an important opportunity here is that if we could some way set up a managed discussion online through a portal through actually the Caddo Parish website where we can have questions and information organized and referenced as we proceed with these specific discussions today. Please keep this goal in mind and share any suggestions following the meeting. Please email me so we can continue to work on that.

Mrs. Blake addressed questions regarding why the Committee had not met earlier in the year. She said data-center development is a significant issue locally, statewide, nationally, and internationally, and that she wanted to gather information from multiple sources before convening the discussion. She said her goal was to obtain current, factual information and help the public understand what matters are within the Parish Commission's authority.

Mrs. Blake then shared information she had received concerning the State Line data-center campuses in Caddo Parish. She said the projects involving STACK Infrastructure and Amazon Web Services represented significant technology and infrastructure investment and that the project proponents had stated they intended to comply with legal and regulatory requirements.

Mrs. Blake said information provided to her indicated that discharge from the State Line project would receive on-site treatment and would be required to comply with applicable water-quality standards. She said each campus would have a permitted stormwater-management system designed so post-development peak discharge rates would not exceed pre-development conditions. She said the developers represented that detention and retention infrastructure would be designed in accordance with applicable requirements.

Mrs. Blake also said information provided by the developers indicated that the State Line project would obtain its water through the Town of Blanchard using project-funded additional capacity and that necessary water and wastewater infrastructure improvements would be funded by the projects rather than existing public-water customers.

Mrs. Blake discussed rainwater harvesting and said information provided to her indicated that harvested rainwater would supplement cooling-water supplies and reduce municipal water demand. She said the harvesting system was not intended primarily as a flood-control measure because cooling-water demand varies seasonally.

Mrs. Blake said she had learned that the developers were using multiple third parties to assist in meeting regulatory requirements involving habitat, wetlands, water, and other matters. She said she intended to continue gathering and sharing information and wanted discussions to proceed on the basis of facts rather than fear.

Mrs. Blake also responded to Dr. Siska's comments regarding university involvement. She said Amazon has educational programming and expressed interest in connecting local educators and researchers with appropriate representatives to discuss data science, environmental research, and educational opportunities.

- *Discuss and make recommendations regarding Resolution 38 of 2026.*

It was **moved by Mr. Epperson**, seconded by Mr. Burrell*, to combine Resolution 38 of 2026 and Resolution 41 of 2026*.

Mr. Epperson said the intent of the resolutions should be to obtain an independent environmental study from an unbiased third party. He said residents and elected officials have received significant information directly from proponents of the data-center projects and that an independent review could address questions involving water use, utilities, infrastructure, flooding, wildlife habitat, and other environmental concerns.

Mr. Epperson said he had independently visited data centers outside the area and obtained information that he intended to share. He discussed the proposed data center at the Resilient Technology Park in Shreveport and noted that the project lies within the City of Shreveport, although Parish Commissioners and City officials represent some of the same constituents in the surrounding area.

Mr. Epperson said he had long worked on flooding issues in the Dawson Road area and was concerned about development, clearing of land, wildlife displacement, and cumulative environmental impacts. He said an independent study could provide information that residents would view as more credible than information supplied solely by the project proponents.

Mr. J. Young said he and several other officials had recently attended an informational “boot camp” hosted by Amazon Web Services and STACK. He said the companies presented information regarding environmental studies, wetlands, wildlife, noise standards, electrical rates, workforce housing, cooling systems, and water use.

Mr. J. Young said the representatives stated that the projects would use air cooling during most of the year and evaporative cooling when temperatures within the facilities required it. He said the representatives also discussed retaining stormwater to avoid increased runoff from impervious surfaces.

Mr. J. Young said he believed retained stormwater could potentially be used to supplement cooling-water needs during dry periods and reduce demand on reservoirs. He said he was disappointed to hear at the presentation that retained stormwater was not expected to be used in that manner, although Mrs. Blake's earlier information appeared to indicate that rainwater harvesting would supplement cooling-water supplies.

Mr. J. Young emphasized that the information he was describing had been supplied by the companies and that he was not independently able to verify it. He expressed concern that officials were encouraged to communicate information presented at the meeting while presentation documents themselves were not distributed for public sharing. He urged the developers to communicate directly with residents and conduct public informational meetings.

Mr. Burrell said data centers and artificial intelligence had been major subjects at recent conferences he attended. He asked Parish Attorney Donna Frazier what local authority the Parish has over data-center development and asked about recently enacted state legislation involving utilities and data centers.

Mrs. Frazier said she was not immediately familiar with the state legislation referenced by Mr. Burrell and would research the matter and provide information. Regarding local authority, Mrs. Frazier explained that zoning requirements may apply in areas subject to zoning ordinances. In areas without zoning, local control is limited, although developments must comply with applicable state building codes, sanitation requirements, and Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality regulations. Mr. Burrell asked whether the Parish could prohibit a data center that otherwise had authority to locate in an area. Mrs. Frazier said it could not.

Mr. G. Young said the meeting provided an opportunity both to hear community concerns and to educate the public regarding the Commission's authority and limitations. He said he personally has concerns about data centers and various other forms of industrial and technological development, but believes such technologies have become part of modern society.

Mr. G. Young discussed the area's population losses and said communities must determine how to benefit economically from technological changes. He said data-center investment could generate employment and revenue that could assist with infrastructure and other community needs. He cited the former General Motors facility as an example of a location where new employment has developed after the loss of a major employer.

Mr. G. Young said public opposition to data centers exists nationally but that the technology supports services people use every day, including cellular phones, banking, streaming, computers, and other digital services. He said his focus is on how the community can obtain economic and employment benefits while addressing legitimate concerns associated with technological development.

Mr. Epperson clarified that he was not opposed to data centers generally but was concerned about location, transparency, and the process used to inform nearby residents. He again discussed the Resilient Technology Park project and said residents in established neighborhoods should receive information before major projects advance.

Mr. Epperson compared the local process with data centers he had visited elsewhere, where he said presentation materials could be photographed and shared. He said developers should hold meetings near the affected neighborhoods and provide information directly to residents rather than relying on elected officials to relay information.

Mr. Epperson again urged the Committee to support an independent environmental study and said the purpose was to provide residents with unbiased information about water, utilities, wildlife, flooding, and other impacts.

Mr. G. Young raised a point of information and asked whether the Committee could act on the resolutions, based on his recollection that the full Commission had previously declined to remand the matter to committee.

Commission Clerk Jeff Everson advised that the minutes of the prior meeting reflected that the resolutions had been remanded to the Natural Resources Committee. Mr. Everson explained that, unlike an item postponed to a date certain while also being referred for a recommendation, these resolutions had been sent to the Committee for it to determine and recommend what should happen next.

Mr. G. Young said he opposed recommending the resolutions. He said the property involved had been acquired and developed under existing rules and permitting requirements and expressed concern about government attempting to impose additional expectations after the fact. He said the Commission should avoid giving the public the impression that it has authority it does not possess and that any new property-development requirements should generally apply prospectively and to similarly situated developments.

Mrs. Blake said she also came to the meeting with the understanding that the Committee would gather information and discuss the matters. She said the Committee should continue to consult Legal Counsel regarding the appropriate way to proceed.

At Mrs. Blake's invitation, Ms. Tappe was permitted an additional three minutes of public comment. Ms. Tappe gave the following comment:

Thank you for allowing me to speak a second time. Jane Tappe, P.O. Box 764, Blanchard 71009. I want to make just two or three statements and to agree, I know that’s unusual, John-Paul Young and Mr. Epperson about a couple of statements they made. I was at the Blanchard town hall meeting where the speakers with all the companies came and their talking heads that had all of their already prepared statements and answers to our questions which may or may not have answered the question because they already had the answer. So, Miss Blake, on a couple of things that you had mentioned that I really have a concern about, and then John-Paul pointed one of those points out. You have people that are working nationwide, responding with their talking point, already printed out answers. And they literally said that only 13% of the year will they reach over 85 degrees. Who lives in Shreveport, Louisiana, in this area? I think we hit 85 degrees way more than that. Now, I know we’re talking about an indoor and an outdoor, but that right there makes you just go, “I don’t believe anything you’re going to say next because we don’t live in an area that is not below 85 degrees only 13% of the year.” So, that right there makes me think what you’re speaking, it’s not about us. It’s not about us. That was one point. Another point, and it was brought up already today briefly, they told us. They told us words out of their mouth. It’s recorded somewhere that says, and I’m not sure if I have the exact process, but they take the water from wherever they take it. They use it, they chemically treat it, they process it, and then they put it back in the lake. That’s what they said. Listen to the recording. Really, what are you going to do to our lake? What are you going to do to our lifestyle? What are you going to do? The water amount and level is not necessarily my concern because sure, we’d like them to take advantage of the rain and all that, but they said the words, they’re going to chemically treat it and put it back in the water. We can’t. We just can’t, alright. And then lastly, third-party people, not Amazon, not SLACK, not any of the people that are already reading their answers to your questions that you hadn’t asked yet. We need answers, y’all. This is going to be something we cannot 10 years from now, my grandchild standing here saying, “My nana told y’all this 20 years ago.” Thank you.

Mrs. Blake then said the Natural Resources Committee does not have jurisdiction over all issues associated with the projects, including some zoning and location concerns. She said she had attended numerous meetings and conferences over the previous months to gather information from sources beyond the local developers.

Mrs. Blake discussed information she had received regarding electrical rates and said SWEPCO had pledged that existing customer rates would not be increased because of data-center

infrastructure investments. She also said the Public Service Commission regulates utility rates and requirements involving the allocation of infrastructure costs.

Mrs. Blake said questions raised regarding cooling temperatures, water treatment, and other technical matters demonstrate the need to continue gathering accurate information. She said she did not believe fear should drive the discussion, but acknowledged that growth creates change and that government should remain informed so it can protect the community where appropriate.

Mrs. Blake said she did not favor using a resolution to ask a company that had already complied with existing laws and regulations to undertake additional requirements after development had begun. She said the Commission should continue monitoring the projects and, if necessary, consider prospective legislation for future developments.

Call for the Question by Mr. Lazarus, seconded by Mr. Burrell. The motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Blake, Lazarus, and G. Young (3). NAYS: Commissioners Burrell and Epperson (2). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

Mr. Burrell asked Mrs. Frazier to confirm that Resolutions Nos. 38 and 41 were requests or expressions of the Commission's position and would not legally compel the companies to take the requested actions. Mrs. Frazier confirmed that understanding.

Mr. Epperson stated that the resolutions are requests rather than ordinances carrying the force of law. He said his proposal was intended to encourage transparency and obtain independent information for constituents.

At this time, Mr. Epperson's motion failed, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioner Epperson (1). NAYS: Commissioners Blake, Burrell, Lazarus, G. Young (4). ABSENT: None (0). ABSTAIN: None (0).

Mrs. Blake addressed comments regarding transparency. She said she had attended the informational meeting for elected officials and media conducted by STACK and Amazon and did not believe information had intentionally been withheld from her. She said she had not been asked to sign confidentiality documents and had received information she requested. She said she had also sought information from sources not connected with the local data-center projects.

Mr. Epperson asked Parish Administrator Erica Bryant to obtain information regarding a community fund associated with one of the data-center proponents. He said he understood that approximately $250,000 had been made available for community projects and asked Mrs. Bryant, to the extent the information is public, to identify the entities that received funding, the principals associated with those entities, and the amounts awarded.

- *Discuss and make recommendations regarding Resolution 41 of 2026.*

There was no further discussion regarding Resolution 41 of 2026.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.



Clayton McGee
Administrative Specialist