

Memo

To: Larry Henson, LED; Mike Webb, LED; Daniel Michel, LED

From: Ron Crum, Cell: 225-313-7779

Date: September 21, 2018

Re: **Certified Site Program: Review of the Harvey Site – West Feliciana Parish**

Larry/Mike/Daniel:

We have completed our review of the application for the Harvey Site in West Feliciana Parish submitted by the Baton Rouge Area Chamber.

They did an outstanding job of completing the application and preparing quality exhibits. They took the effort seriously and the results demonstrate that. The binder was a pleasure to review. It was super “clean” with no major errors and very few typos.

We did NOT find any significant issues with the site for LED’s review and consideration prior to approval as a certified site. There are a few items for LED to consider before making the decision to certify:

1. The site has three somewhat small and fairly insignificant cultural resource sites that cannot be disturbed by future construction activities including a cemetery that has signs of recent usage. These sites are located such that they will not likely impede future development.

Note: The Phase 1 ESA indicated there are no cemeteries on site; I have requested a revised report herein but do not feel it will impact my overall assessment of the site.

2. Unlike most of Louisiana, this site has a significant amount of elevation change and will require a significant amount of cut/fill for most projects. The land is, in general, high ground, not subject to flooding, so any soils needed to fill in valleys can likely come from on-site sources.

Note: This area of the state likely has some of the best soils we have to offer, meaning higher soil bearing capacities.

3. The site does not have access to a municipal sewer system but a reasonable plan was included.
4. The site does not have natural gas distribution lines near it but it does have large gas transmission lines on-site.
5. Further, the site has 5 pipelines crossing the site but these will not impact the site utility for most projects.

6. Lastly, the site has access to rail but it will require one at-grade rail crossing over LA Hwy 964 (requiring the closure of one rail crossing elsewhere within the state.) So, getting rail to this site is possible, but difficult.

As you know, LED tasks us with conducting an engineering review. However, as always, we strive to review every detail of the document to make sure it fully meets all of LED's stated requirements, whether those are engineering requirements, documentation requirements or formatting requirements.

Notes:

1. We did not visit the site as visiting the site is outside of the scope of work. While we reviewed the entire submittal, the primary focus of the review were those portions of the submittal related to the infrastructure aspects of the application.

We recommend that someone from our company or someone from LED visit the site and drive the property lines, any on-site dirt roads, and walk a few of the acres.

2. We did not review the titles, deeds, easements, zoning documents, etc. for restrictions or other encumbrances that might make this sight unsuitable for certain tenants. We are not attorneys and do not have the ability to review these legal documents that might render this site unsuitable for future development. The entirety of the review/scan of these documents was to confirm their presence in the submission.
3. We accepted the data presented at face-value. It is beyond the scope of this review to confirm each and every piece of submitted data. If the submitted data indicates there is a 6" water line adjacent to the site, we accepted that as fact. We did look at the data to see if it looked reasonable but we did not contact anyone to confirm it.

Comments specific to the submittal documents:

We found no glaring errors. The notes below are more "picky" in nature than substantive. But, as the entire LED Site Certification team has agreed, it is critical that we deliver a quality document to prospective buyers, a document that will help sell the site and present it in its best possible light. *With that concern in mind, we even pointed out spelling errors; not in an effort to be picky but rather to present buyers with a quality document as error-free as possible.*

- Page 25, Question 8. In the response to North, please put the word "nuclear" in the River Bend name as this would be important for site selectors to know. Also indicate the presence of LA Hwy 10 and US Hwy 61.

In the response to South, please add the words, "Containerboard Plant," to the Hood Industries name to let prospective buyers know the nature of the plant.

- Page 27, Question 3. Exhibit H indicates the Gulf States ROW is only 245' wide. Please check and correct one or both documents.

Exhibit H indicates the Texas Eastern ROW is 75' wide. Please check and correct one or both documents.

Exhibit H indicates that ROW's 2 and 3 overlap, not 1 and 2. Please check and correct one or both documents.

- Page 29, Question 4. We could not identify the Starhill Fire Station on a map but did identify the general area and the distance appears to be closer to 3.5 miles than 9.52 miles. Please find the exact location and the correct distance.
- Page 36, Question 2. Please include title of the contact, per the directions.
- Page 40, Question 7. Per the question, please name the owner/operator of the intermodal yard.
- Page 44, Question 5. The response indicates no wetlands were found on the site. Please correct to indicate that the site does have wetlands.
- Exhibit H, ROW Exhibit. Please name the owners of the ROWs shown on the map within the legend. For example, "175' Right of Way" would become "175' Transcontinental Gas Right of Way."
- Exhibit M, Electrical Infrastructure. Please clearly label "River Bend" as "River Bend Nuclear Power Plant." As this is an electrical infrastructure map, please make the label more bold than it is currently.

If it is easy to do, it is important to show the NRG Power Plant on Hwy 981 across the Mississippi River on the map, due east of the site. (The driveways to the plant are on the map but the plant itself is just off the left side of the map.) It is also called "Big Cajun II Power Plant."

Note: The plant is being acquired by CLECO but I do not believe the transaction has closed yet, so just label it as one of the two names above.

- Exhibit T, Rail Infrastructure. The rail map and accompanying and cost estimate discuss the need for a \$4.3 million rail spur to the site. Is this the cost to bring rail to the property boundary? We are concerned about the \$2.5 million cost for the drainage channel shown on the cost estimate. If the drainage channel is "on site", then that is a cost that should not likely be included here as it will potentially put the site at a disadvantage when site selectors are comparing this site to others. If the drainage channel is off-site, then leave these costs in the estimate.
- Exhibit Z, Geotechnical. The instructions require that the report clearly state the load bearing capacity of a 14" concrete piling or similar deep foundation supports. While the report does have a graph, which we like, the typical site selector is a non-engineer and is looking for a "number," not a graph that he/she will have a hard time interpreting. Please add a table giving various piling capacities to the main body of the report.
- Exhibit BB, Oblique Aerial. Please put "containerboard" in the name of the Hood facility instead of just "Container." It is important that they know the nature of this plant.

Please label Big Cajun/NRG Power Plant in the distance.

Please label River Bend Nuclear Power Plant.

- Exhibit DD, Phase 1 ESA. Please have CK revise this report, as appropriate, throughout the report to reflect the presence of a cemetery on the site. This was a "significant miss" on their part, their maps even show it there.

- Exhibit JJ, Buildable Area. The Buildable Area exhibit is mislabeled as the “Lake Charles Regional Airport.” Everything else appears correct, although we did not check them.

Summary

GREAT JOB! Thanks for the superlative effort. It is GREATLY appreciated.

And thanks for taking the time to get this site added to Louisiana’s Site Certification program. It will be a valued addition to the program.