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MR. WINDHAM:

   Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call to order the meeting for the December 14th Board of Commerce and Industry. It is 9:02.

   Just a few opening comments. I'd like to welcome everyone to the meeting and say Happy Holidays to all of you.

   For the new visitors who are here and the overflow room, I just want to give you an overview of who we are because you may have never been to one of these meetings -- who we are, what we do, you may have never been to these meetings.

   We are the Board of Commerce and Industry. We're made up of 24 members from communities and entities across the state. Part of our charge is to determine an applicant's compliance with the laws and rules for a variety of programs. I believe we hear four different programs, maybe five different programs at this meeting, the economic development incentive programs. From there we make recommendation, and in the case of the ITEP especially, to the Governor on whether or not a contract should be entered into between the state and the applicant company.

   Once that determination is made, we, by staff -- via staff, forward the approved Industrial Tax
Exemption applications to the specific local bodies for their consideration of approval or disapproval.

We administer in a uniform manner. We ensure that the required documentation which establishes accountability is present and certified through the approval of the documents that these entities represent a positive and community -- a positive state and community economic impact for those communities that so choose to adopt them.

The step this Board is charged with is to determine if an application qualifies for a program as provided for by the Constitution, the laws, the rules and Executive Orders that govern the respective programs. If applicants meet these qualifications, it's the responsibility of the Board to forward the application to the local authorities.

So as you step forward with thoughts or comments, that you exercise your rights as a citizen of Louisiana as well as the United States of America, we're not here to debate the policies, though. So keep that in mind. Stay on point. Each one of the respondents or speakers will be given two to three minutes of free speech, but understand there's no need to repeat what has previously been said. If you can keep it concise and to the point and not repeat -- I have a gavel. If
you can keep it concise and to the point and not repeat what has been previously expressed.

This Board is here to administer the Economic Development programs as provided by law. They've been through the legal due process to adhere to the rules to govern the programs. Your voice of concern should speak to whether a company is or not in compliance with the laws or C&I Board rules.

So those are just my opening comments.

With that, we'll move to rollcall, Ms. Simmons.

MS. SIMMONS:

Dr. Shawn Wilson.

DR. S. WILSON:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Designee Don Briggs.

MR. BRIGGS:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Representative Phillip Devillier.

MR. DEVILLIER:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Tanita Baker.

MS. BAKER:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Mayor Glenn Brasseaux.

MAYOR BRASSEAUX:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Representative Paul Hollis.

MR. HOLLIS:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Yvette Cola.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:

Major Coleman.

MAJOR COLEMAN:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Ricky Fabra.

MR. FABRA:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Manuel Fajardo.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:

Jerald Jones.
MR. JONES:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:
Heather Malone.

MS. MALONE:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:
Senator Francis Thomas.

MR. THOMPSON:
Here. Thompson.

MS. SIMMONS:
I'm sorry. Thomson.

MR. THOMPSON:
That's all right. If Mr. Chairman can repeat what I didn't hear when I came in four seconds late.

MS. SIMMONS:
Charles Miller.

MR. MILLER:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:
Jan Moller.

MR. MOLLER:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:
Senator Norby Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:

Very good. Yes, I am here. This is only her second meeting, y'all, so she's getting it.

MS. SIMMONS:

Secretary Don Pierson.

SECRETARY PIERSON:

Present.

MS. SIMMONS:

Scott Richard.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:

Darrell Saizan.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:

Daniel Shexnaydre.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:

Ronnie Slone.

MR. SLONE:

Here.

MS. SIMMONS:

Bobby Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Here.
MS. SIMMONS:
Steve Windham.

MR. WINDHAM:
Here.

MS. SIMMONS:
And Dr. Wilson.

(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS:
We have a quorum.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Simmons.
I'm sure everyone has had a chance to
read the minutes from the last meeting. Is there a
motion to approve?

Made by Dr. Wilson; seconded by
Mr. Slone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.

Ms. Samantha Booker will be presenting
the Quality Jobs Program.
This is your first presentation; right?

MS. BOOKER:
It is.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Everyone be nice.

MS. BOOKER:
Good morning. I have one new QJ application: Application Number 20161808, Juniper Specialty Products, LLC in Calcasieu Parish.

And that concludes the Quality Jobs applications.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. And to note on here, there is $140-million worth of investment, 13 new permanent jobs, 250 construction jobs.

Are there any questions from the Board members concerning the application for Juniper Specialty Products?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Senator Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:
I would ask that as you go through these, I'd like to know -- we're not debating, as the acting Chairman said, we're not debating what the issues
are specifically, but I'd like to know -- it's been a lot of conversation about the largest tax rebates are forgiveness. I'd like to know all of the details as you go through, specifically on how much it cost and how much there are left for parishes or cities or communities to benefit from.

Now, I know this one is not as specific, but as you go through them, I'm just telling those so I won't have to ask that question 10 times.

MS. BOOKER:
Okay.

MR. THOMPSON:
Thank you.

MS. BOOKER:
Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON:
And I'm sure Commerce & Industry officials will make comments on it.

MS. BOOKER:
Okay.

MR. THOMPSON:
Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Senator.

Are there any comments from the audience
or guests?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. The motion has been made by President Miller to approve. Is there a second?

Seconded by Major Coleman.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. BOOKER:

I have three Quality Jobs Renewals:


And that concludes the Quality Jobs Renewals.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Booker.

Are there any comments from the public concerning the renewals for the Quality Jobs Program?
MR. WINDHAM:

Questions or comments from any of the Board members?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion to approve made by Mr. Slone; seconded by Mayor Brasseaux.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. BOOKER:

I have two special requests. First request to add an affiliate or LLC members to Schedule 1 of the following contract: Contract 2015049, TCI Packaging, LLC requests to add TCI Plastics, LLC, Alvar Properties 1, LLC, France Road Parkway Properties, LLC, Transportation Consultants, Inc. in Orleans Parish.

I also have one transfer of ownership:

Contract ID 20130822, from Boise Packaging Newsprint, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Packaging Corporation
of America to Packaging Corporation of America in
Beauregard Parish.

And that concludes the specials.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Booker.
Are there any comments from the audience
concerning the change of affiliate or full transfer of
ownership?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there any questions from the Board?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion to approve made by Dr. Wilson;
seconded by Senator Thompson.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Thank you, Ms. Booker. Good job.
Next we have Restoration Tax Abatement
Program presented by Ms. Becky Lambert.
MS. LAMBERT:

Good morning. Restoration Tax Abatement program has one new application to present for Project ID 20161678, 2700 Bohn Motor, LLC in Orleans Parish for an investment of $9,480,000, 45 new permanent jobs and 30 construction jobs.

This concludes the application.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Are there any questions from the public concerning Restoration Tax Abatement Program application?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Questions from the Board?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to approve?

Made by Major Coleman; seconded by Jan Moller.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.

MS. LAMBERT:
Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Next we have the Enterprise Zone Program presented by Joyce Metoyer.

MS. METOYER:
Good morning. I have five new applications: 20160039, Benny's Car Wash, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20141316, Peter and Paul MT, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20180100, Randolph McCormick Realty, Incorporated, St. Landry Parish; 20160703, SB Nola Subtenant, LLC, Orleans Parish; and 20150153, Willa Jean, LLC, Orleans Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
And can you run through the totals real quick on those?

MS. METOYER:
The investment?

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, the investment and the tax break.

MS. METOYER:
Okay. For Benny's Car Wash, the investment --

MR. WINDHAM:
Just in total.

MS. METOYER:

Oh, the total. I'm sorry.

The total investment is $58,383,398 for total investment, and the total ITC, Investment Tax Credit, is $875,735.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.

MR. THOMPSON:

The number of permanent jobs?

MS. METOYER:

Yes, sir, these are all permanent jobs.

MR. THOMPSON:

What's the estimated number of permanent jobs? One-hundred something.

MS. METOYER:

161 new jobs.

MR. THOMPSON:

Yes. And the total is 58-million investment; right?

MS. METOYER:

Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON:

Okay. Thank you.
You're welcome.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Any comments from the public concerning the Enterprise Zone Program applications, the new ones?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Questions or comments from the Board?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

I'll entertain a motion to approve.

Made by Major Coleman; seconded by Ms. Malone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

Contract terminations.

MS. METOYER:

Okay. 20150026, AJ Pontchartrain Employer, LLC, Orleans parish. The existing contract is May 1 of '15 to April 30 of 2020. The requested term
date is May 15 of 2018. The program requirements were met and no additional jobs were anticipated; the next one is 20140988, Isidore Newman School in Orleans Parish. The existing contract period is July 15 of 2014 to July 14 of 2019. The requested termination date is March 15 of 2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20120015, Twin Brothers Marine, LLC, St. Mary Parish. The existing contract period March 27 of 2012 to March 26 of 2017. The requested term date is September 26th of 2014. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20140151, International Paper, Washington Parish. The existing contract period is February 1 of 2014 to January 31 of 2019. The requested term date is July 31 of 2016, and the program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20120850, Associated Terminal of St. Bernard, LLC, St. Bernard Parish. The existing contract period is November 1, 2013 to October 31 of 2018. The requested term date is April 30 of 2016. The reason for termination -- I'm sorry. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20141196, 500 Laurel Development, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish. The existing contract period is June 15 of 2015 to June 14 of 2020. The requested term date is March 31 of
2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20130935, Corporate 737 Hotels, LLC, Terrebonne Parish. The existing contract period is June 17 of 2013 to June 16 of 2018. The requested term date is June 16 of 2016. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20140182, B&G Food Enterprises, LLC, Lafourche Parish, February 10 of 2014 to February 9 of 2019. The requested term date is August 9 of 2016, and the program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20140456, Enlink Midstream Operating, LP, Acadia Parish, October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2019 is the existing contract period. The requested termination date is March 31, 2017. The program requirements have been met and no additional jobs are anticipated; 20131410, Super Hospitality Master Tenant, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish. The existing contract is January 1, 2014 to 12/31/2018. The requested term dates is December 31, 2016. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20120870, Exxon Mobil Corp., East Baton Rouge Parish. The existing project period is May 1 of 2013 to April 30 of 2018. The requested term date is 10/31 of 2015. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; and 20110959,
Chalmette Refining, LLC, St. Bernard Parish, and the contract period is May 1 of '13 to April 30 of 2018. The requested term date is October 31 of 2015, and the program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.
Are there any comments from the public concerning any of the cancelations?

MS. METOYER:
Terminations.

MR. WINDHAM:
Terminations. I'm sorry. Terminations.
Any questions from the Board?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion has been made by Senator Thompson to accept the terminations; seconded by Fajardo.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
All right. Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.

Next we have the Industrial Tax Exemption Program presented by Ms. Cheng.

MS. CHENG:


MR. WINDHAM:

The tax relief from the first year of exemption?

MS. CHENG:

The estimated tax relief is $853,904.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Are there any questions or any comments from the public concerning these applications?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Any questions or comments from the
Board?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to approve?

Made by Major Coleman; seconded by Ms. Cola.

MS. BAKER:

Baker.

MR. WINDHAM:

I'm sorry. Ms. Baker.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

I have three post-Executive Order 2017 Rule application, but Syrah Technologies, LLC in Concordia Parish has asked to defer to the February 2019 meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to accept the request for deferral?
Made by Jerry Jones; seconded by Mr. Slone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
These two applications.

MS. CHENG:
These two applications have received their local endorsements prior to coming to the Board:
20161566, Driftwood, LNG in Calcasieu Parish, and 20160187, HR NU Blu Energy, LLC in West Baton Rouge Parish for a total investment of $15,946,603,365 with 380 new jobs and 6,530 construction jobs. The estimated first year of tax relief is $284,409,410.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from the public concerning these two applications?
Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. BAGERT:
I have some material to hand out.
MR. WINDHAM:

You can give it to staff I believe. Our staff.

MR. BAGERT:

I'm Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana, and two residents from Calcasieu Parish will hopefully be joining me after they pass out these packets.

This is or appears to be the largest public subsidy by local governments in the history of the country. There are two sides to that. That also means it's a gigantic project with enormous positive potential. It's, if not the largest, close to the largest capital investment in the history of the country as well, and Southwest Louisiana is strategically positioned to benefit in an extraordinary way from the changes in the liquid natural gas exporting market.

It also means that it is a really big decision, and it ought to happen in an appropriate way. Some things that have happened are not appropriate, and we'd like to describe why there's concern in Calcasieu Parish and request a deferral until the next meeting.

No one we've talked to was against this project. Most people we've talked to aren't against an exemption for this project. They do want to be informed
about it before the decisions of their elected officials are made.

There's three documents that you have in that packet. The first has got a little picture on it, and describes, well, four different points. In February of 2017, this Board adopted a provision that is -- became LA Administrative Code 503(D)(2)(b)(i); okay, and the text of it is right there. It says, "The business" -- that is the applicant business seeking an Industrial Tax Exemption -- "shall copy LED on its written request to the parish governing authority, the school board and municipality for the required resolutions and its written request to the sheriff for the required letter."

The intent here was under the old rules, when the process starting by companies going to their local taxing bodies and then would come to the Board of Commerce & Industry, that citizens would know that's happening, because if the only people who know it was happening were industry and elected officials, then there wasn't a meaningful public process to deliberate around it. And in order to address that concern, this Board adopted the provisions which started being known as the "ITEP Sunshine Provision."

It goes on, "LED" -- after being CC'd --
"shall post a copy -- or post a copy of the business' written request to the parish governing authority, school board and municipality for the required resolutions and the business' written request to the sheriff for the required letter on its website no later than three business days after the receipt of the request."

Now, there was, subsequent to this, an interpretation by Mr. House that this is not what it appears to be, that it wasn't your intent to actually have the public know what's going on, that this only became relevant if there was a written request to start 120-day period.

On the backside of this page is the transcript of the deliberation that happened on February 21st, 2017, and it says what many of you know to be the case, that the intent of this is what it looks like it was, to make sure that people know an important decision is going on before that decision is made. This was not adhered to in this case. There was no posting of the application. There was no notice provided that the deliberation process had started.

Next, the local taxing bodies -- and this is on them, not on me -- have set up a committee of a formal representative of the taxing bodies that meets
in violation of public meeting laws. It is -- doesn't provide public notice, it bars public input, and it is convened by an industry representative. It was that body that developed the recommendation of 100-percent exemption, and nobody even knew a 100-percent exemption is still a possibility because the rules had changed it to cap at 80 percent.

Now, you and I know that there is a provision of a period of time that allows 100 percent, and it folds into that exception, but there was no way to know that this was even going on, much less that it fell into that exception; right? So everybody thought 80 percent, we can live with that.

This committee meets in secret, then makes a recommendation, and with 24-hours notice, Driftwood LNG Industrial Tax Exemption goes on an agenda for a school board and police jury. Police jury dealt with it in 45 seconds. The school board had almost no discussion about it. There was no provision of the cost. As far as we know, the school board members never even saw the analysis. On the same day that Exxon -- Amazon approved HQ2 and New Yorkers flew into a rage because it was 112,000 jobs, this project got approved by the school board, and it's $8-million per job (sic).

The Calcasieu -- it is true. It's
$2.4-billion and 350 jobs.

The Calcasieu school board president, in his personal capacity, because there has not been time to hold a meeting, has written to you asking for you to defer it and has said that the information provided was minimal and it left out pertinent information. It failed to include critical details. And what he ends with is by saying, "By having a more public process, a more open process, it will end with greater support for Tellurian, Driftwood LNG."

We think that's the case. We think people back this project, but to approve the largest exemption in state history, maybe in the country's history, on this basis with a violation of your own rules around Sunshine, with a violation locally around public meeting law and without anybody knowing what's going on is unnecessary and is going to leave a long legacy of distrust around this.

More than 1,000 residents have signed a petition --

MR. WINDHAM:

Are you drawing to a close, Mr. Bagert?

MR. BAGERT:

Yes, sir.

-- expressing concern about this in a
72-hour period, and a few of those who are here today would like to talk.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Senator Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:

Just a couple questions for Mr. Bagert.

You and I have had discussions about the exemptions for many years, and I think y'all have done good, Together Louisiana. Not always to what I thought, but basically taking another look at exemptions and how communities are left, or some of them, many years back, never got anything, just got the exemption. But I made it clear to you on one in Lake Providence, Louisiana, and to the chairman of Commerce & Industry and others, I noticed most of these names that are mentioned are below I20. Matter of fact, below I10. You don't -- I did hear Concordia mentioned once, but we have very little of that. But you and I argued a point about a facility that was built and back to across the levee up in East Carroll Parish, and we had a disagreement, but I wanted to remind you of this. Locals wanted it, and I told you that. And I said a lot of things I would change, but that's not my job. Probably a lot of the things they
would change if they were a state senator, but that's not their job.

And I reminded you, if we did not get an exemption on this plant, it wouldn't be here in two years. And if we didn't, that land is worth zero. Now, you can talk about how much it's valued at and what it's -- but it's worth zero without the economic development portion in it.

So my question to you today is, the locals did go through the process. The meeting might not have been as long as you would like it or I would like it. They didn't maybe go in through all of the details that you thought, but you're not on that board, nor I or probably anyone else on the Louisiana group. What procedure did you find that was the most incriminating part of it?

MR. BAGERT:

Well, I remember the Lake Providence discussion well, and two days before that meeting, I was on a conference with Sister Bernie Barrett, who is a -- I don't know if she loves Lake Providence as much as you do, but she loves it a lot.

MR. THOMPSON:

Not as much, but pretty close.

MR. BAGERT:
That's right. A close second.

And she asked whether there was anything on there that dealt with Lake Providence, and I said no. And then that, if I remember, was in a separate part of the agenda because it was dealing with a company that had closed, and that's an unusual category for providing an exemption.

MR. THOMPSON:

Right.

MR. BAGERT:

And you went after me because what do I know about Lake Providence, and I said that you scare me, but not as much as Sister Bernie. And I couldn't not convey the questions and concerns, not opposition in that instance.

But I tell you, she just raised $50,000 to do community improvement in Lake Providence, so she's going to want to work with you.

The two things that we think provided a significant and actionable basis for not providing adequate or legal public notice are these: First, this Board has adopted a procedure for the rules in application for this request that say the applicant company starts the process by writing a letter to the local entities and needs to CC LED, and within three
days, LED needs to put it on its website.

I'm fully aware and you'll hear LED staff attorneys say that doesn't say what it appears to say. He'll say that that only comes into effect if the companies are requesting 120-day period. I would ask you to recall your own memory and the testimony on here and what the Governor has said publicly about the intent of that. Some of these things don't get resolved unless there's a lawsuit. We don't have a bunch of lawyers. We've just got a bunch of citizens. But that's the first, so that no public residents, no members of the public had any way, even if they were inclined, had any way to know that this deliberation was happening.

Second, at the local level, a process whereby official representatives of public bodies met without public notice with industry representatives in a meeting that barred the public, developed a recommendation that was then acted on. That violates public meeting law, and inside of this process, you can't fix that by having a subsequent meeting that doesn't violate it. If the school board members had gone to Bermuda and all deliberated and come up to a conclusion and then they had a second meeting that was public, it wouldn't fix the fact that deliberation and recommendation happened in a way that's nonpublic.
There was a misunderstanding at the local entities' level that if it wasn't an elected official, if it was just staff, then public meeting law didn't apply. It does apply. There have been 21 decisions by the Attorney General's office that show that any official representative of the public body representing the public body, public meeting laws apply. That was violated. So the result is, in the largest public subsidy in American history, there was no responsibility of citizens having any of the information about the project before the decision was made. That's wrong. That's illegal. And all they're asking for is 60 days to have those hearings. And then so be it. And then if it's approved just the way it is now, they can take it up with their school board member, they can take it up with the police jury member. They may disagree, but they won't have a claim to feel that their rights were violated to know what was happening.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON:
Okay. Let me make a comment, if I might, to that. I understand that, and I had forgotten how well versed you were and how much you enjoy talking about this issue, but that's a good thing.
But to answer my question specifically, the public bodies met and voted in a positive way; is that correct?

MR. BAGERT:

After --

MR. THOMPSON:

Yes or no?

MR. BAGERT:

Yes, after having a meeting that violated public meeting law and the school board president had -- again, yes.

MR. THOMPSON:

But that's not this body's or this group's problem. We take it as it comes and that those public bodies did vote in favor of it; isn't that correct?

MR. BAGERT:

Your mission under Constitution is to make decisions that are in the best interest of the state.

MR. THOMPSON:

Well, let us decide that. You just answer the questions about public bodies voting for it.

MR. BAGERT:

It is within the purview of this Board's
mandate to determine whether a public process
violated -- being your own public process, though, and
so we do think that's a consideration.

MR. THOMPSON:

Yeah. But they did vote for it; isn't that correct? That's the question I ask.

MR. BAGERT:

They did.

MR. THOMPSON:

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES:

Mr. Bagert, there's information in your handout that I don't find that is in your -- it may be. I tried to read through it very quickly as I've just now gotten it.

When was the meeting of the parish held?

Not the committee meeting that you're referring to, but the meeting itself where this was passed, what date was that?

MR. BAGERT:

November the 13th for the school board, and then I'm not recalling the police jury. Maybe it was the -- do y'all know? Sometime in November.
MR. JONES:
So it was several weeks ago?

MR. BAGERT:
Yes, sir.

MR. JONES:
And you knew at that time that, at least your allegations, that they violated open meetings?

MR. BAGERT:
I don't think anybody knew at that time. Nobody knew any of the details or even that something significant had happened at that time because there still was, after the meeting, all it said was the Driftwood LNG exemption had been approved.

MR. JONES:
Okay. I'm trying to understand. I understand your allegations to be two-fold. Number one, that a clandestine meeting of government officials that you believe violates the open meetings law, that's one.

MR. BAGERT:
That's right.

MR. JONES:
And Number 2, I thought there was something about the school board -- the parish meeting itself had violated open meetings. Is that true?

MR. BAGERT:
That's less clear in that they did give a notice that Driftwood LNG was on there. They didn't provide information around it. I'm not sure whether that violates public meetings law. That's the kind of judgment call the court sometimes makes.

But after they acted, there was still no understanding and awareness that an exemption of this size has been approved because no information was shared publically that that meeting --

MR. JONES:

Okay. It was passed at a duly-called meeting giving 24-hours notice of everything that was on the agenda; is that correct?

MR. BAGERT:

That's our understanding.

MR. JONES:

Okay. Now, the earlier meeting that you're referring to, when did you learn of that early meeting?

MR. BAGERT:

In late December -- personally, in late November.

MR. JONES:

Okay. Late November, so it's been at least a couple of weeks. You realize that if there is
an open -- if you believe there's an open meetings
violation, there's a way to resolve that by filing a
lawsuit?

MR. BAGERT:

A lot of the details that we found out
about that meeting are from an attorney who appears to
be preparing a lawsuit on just those grounds.

MR. JONES:

But it's not been filed?

This is my difficulty is that Number 1, frankly, I've been doing municipal law for 30 years, and
I frankly disagree with your assessment of what the open
meetings law says with this issue. I strongly disagree
with you. So when you come to us and represent, you're
not under oath, you're coming in and making
representations to this Board about something that's
happened that we have no way of verifying, we have no
way of determining whether it's true or not. You're
asking us to accept your word and put a stop to
something that local officials, as far as we are
concerned, has acted on, that you're wanting us to stop
it based on your representations of, A, what you believe
happened, but we don't know for sure, of what you
believe the law to be, that I disagree with personally.
I can't speak for anybody else on the Board.
I might suggest to you, Mr. Bagert, that
the right way to handle this, if you come to me and
says, "We have filed suit because we believe that there
is a violation," I would be much more inclined to listen
to your argument, because at that point, somebody has
filed something under oath before a court of law that A,
B, C and D has happened.

MR. BAGERT:

Well --

MR. JONES:

I can't speak for the rest of the Board, but that's my problem with what you're bringing to us here. There was plenty of time to file a lawsuit based on what you've learned. There's -- if there was a citizen that felt that strongly about it, believe me, I have fought open meetings lawsuits, and always there's a lawyer who's willing to file them if somebody feels strongly enough to get it done.

So that's my struggle with what you're bringing to me today. You want me to accept what you're telling me. I hesitate on that given the fact that there were lawful actions that, at least on its face, from public bodies.

MR. BAGERT:

Look, two things: One is not everybody
can afford an attorney. The second --

MR. JONES:

Excuse me, Mr. Bagert. Let me stop before everybody starts clapping. When I see how much money Together Louisiana is spending in this state, there's plenty of money for Together Louisiana to hire a lawyer, I guarantee you.

MR. BAGERT:

How much do you think Together Louisiana is spending in this state?

MR. JONES:

When I see the ads, somebody's paying for that. Somebody's paying for those ads in the newspapers; somebody's paying for the website; somebody's paying for the mailouts that go out. So I don't know.

MR. BAGERT:

You'd be amazed.

MR. JONES:

Apparently I would be because I know how much ads in the newspapers cost.

MR. BAGERT:

We didn't take any ads in the newspaper.

This was an article.

The second is there's something broader
at stake than narrow legality, and it's the principle
and the concept that when an important decision is made,
citizens ought to have the opportunity to have access to
the information that's relevant to that decision. And
even outside of the narrow legality, the questions of
narrow legality that we have raised attempting in our
most honest way to represent our understanding of what
happened, and at the request of 1,000 residents of
Calcasieu Parish, that's one question.

The other is, if there's no way that
people can know something is happening, then they ought
to be given the opportunity to have a hearing, and
that's what they're asking for. So I don't think it's
just a matter of what's legal. It's a matter of what's
appropriate and what's good for the people in Calcasieu
and the state.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Bagert.
Mr. Moller.

MR. MOLLER:
Is Mr. House available to come up?
Because I'm -- you know, as you stated, Mr. Chairman,
we're here to see -- you know, not to vote necessarily
on our opinion of tax exemptions, but to see if whether
these applicants followed the rules and the laws that
we've set up. And I'm curious, Mr. House, on your interpretation of this Sunshine provision that we adopted, and I believe I either made the motion or seconded the motion, and I certainly remember what my intent was at the time, but I'm curious how you interpret it because what I have before me, it says, "LED shall post a copy of the business's written request on its website no later than three business days after receipt of the request." Was that followed? Did LED do that, do you know? And what is your understanding of the intent?

    MR. HOUSE:

    That statute -- I'm sorry. That rule, which is available to companies under its plain language, which is available to companies who have not been able to secure a hearing before a local group, before a local entity, and it provides for a 120-day period in which a local entity has to act. And this is under the 2017 approval process.

    MR. MOLLER:

    Does this fall under the 2017 process?

    MR. HOUSE:

    Yes, it does, and -- but, Mr. Moller, as you know, at that particular meeting, we were discussing this 120-day process, and this particular -- I've never
heard it called the "Sunshine Act." It wasn't called that at the meeting. I remember Mr. Jones making a number of comments at the point -- at that point in time, and I also made a point in time that this referred -- made a comment at this point in time that this referred to the 120-day provision.

This particular rule has been followed twice or has been invoked twice, once by a company in Orleans Parish and another time by a company in Caddo Parish, and in both instances, they had not secured or been able to secure a hearing on their request for an exemption under the 2017 rules, and the companies have to have that request for an exemption.

MR. MOLLER:
So they came to you after they couldn't secure that hearing?

MR. HOUSE:
They filed their notice under this particular provision because that's what it was designed for, and then when they filed that request or that notice, that notice was published in accordance with what you call the "Sunshine Act."

There have been now, since under the 2017 rules, there have been a large number of contracts -- I'd have to go back and count them -- where
nobody followed that notice provision because that notice provision wasn't applicable. The companies were able to go before local governing bodies, secure the notice from the local governing bodies and get heard, have hearings. And then those local governing bodies provided us with Exhibit B, as is the case here.

So this particular applicant followed the same process that probably 50 to 100 other applicants have followed in getting their contract approved. There was no objection at that time, no invocation of some type of "Sunshine Act."

So that's my answer to your question.

MR. MOLLER:

Okay.

MR. HOUSE:

And let me just add one other thing while I'm here and it's fresh on everybody's mind regarding the statement about Together Louisiana and money. Last year in Ascension Parish there was a controversy about whether or not the city council or parish council gave appropriate notice. Together Louisiana filed a lawsuit against Ascension Parish and there was a hearing. My recollection, I believe it was ultimately settled by the parties, but, Mr. Jones, I just wanted to make sure everyone knew that because that
wasn't the answer you just got.

MR. MOLLER:

Okay. I guess my second question, I don't know if it's for you or Mr. Bagert, but if the question here is whether to grant a -- to defer this until February, if this is deferred, what's the recourse, like what could potentially be different in February than today?

MR. HOUSE:

Well, I think as a matter of how this board conducts itself, Number 1, I don't know that there's any pending motion before the Board right now to defer anything.

MR. MOLLER:

No, but that's the request.

MR. WINDHAM:

There is no motion.

MR. HOUSE:

There is no motion before the Board, Mr. Moller, so in terms of a hypothetical motion or a hypothetical consideration of this, the advice -- and you guys are the Board members. I'm just giving you some advice here -- is that you -- in the 2017 rules, you set up a way to operate. You set that up with the 2018 rules. I do believe that you have Exhibit Bs, and
Tam Bourgeois, Executive Counsel of LED, can give you the history of Exhibit Bs and the Board meetings and the information that we have regarding the procedures that went forth at the local level. And you can give as much weight as you want to or don't want to with respect to that, but I believe that, you know, that's a matter of your judgment, but I would ask you to take that into consideration and that if -- you know, and take into consideration the entirety of what you're considering here in terms of the exemption and make the best decision that you can.

But the idea that, Number 1, there hasn't been public notice or public bodies haven't met is dispelled by the documentation. I believe it's in your packet. But, again, that's up for you to decide. I mean, if you read these Exhibit Bs and these resolutions from these bodies and you don't want to believe them, then maybe you don't want to believe that 9/11 happened, I don't know, but that's up to you. You're a Board member. So take into account those things that you have before you and what they are, and take into account -- I do believe notice is very important. I do believe that what happens is important. But take a look at what you have in your file and make your determination. I think this Board can interpret
its own rules.

MR. MOLLER:

Well, for the record, I do believe that 9/11 happened, but I also believe there are 1,000 citizens of Calcasieu Parish who don't believe that they've had adequate input into this process.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Moller.

Senator Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:

Thank you. I don't know if Mr. Bagert wants to come back up or what. I don't necessarily know if I have any questions or comments for the gentleman. There's a lot of numbers being tossed around, and I just want to make sure that I give adequate representation to some of the other factors. Some of the issues that this Board has to analyze is return on investment. This is the Board of Commerce & Industry. What is the value of the investment that is before us? It's a $15-billion investment of which the opponents are talking about, that $2-billion exemption. There's 350 jobs associated with this project; okay, that are permanent. Ain't going no where. It's going to be there in, as we say down in the bayou, "temps toute de la terre" (sic), as
long as there it shall last. All right. They there. All right. And there's another 6,400 construction jobs associated with that for a total salary of over $31-million. The average construction job salary is going to be somewhere around $83,000. They going to be building that plant for a long time. Those jobs in that community; okay, the average salary on those jobs, 350 of them, $95,000 a year. $95,000 a year. That's strong, y'all. That's a heck of a deal.

I don't serve on the Calcasieu Parish School Board. I don't know -- you know, I do know that it's one of largest school boards in the state. I think there's something along the lines like 11 or 15 members on it, where the average school board in the State of Louisiana is nine. For those of you who do not know, I am also the Chairman of the Senate Natural Resources Committee, so this is an area that I have particular involvement with. The Driftwood LNG project, the Tellurian Group, have been advancing this project for literally years. There has been so much community outreach about this project, you can't -- and I don't mean this in any way, shape or form to anyone here or on this list as disrespectfully. Okay. I respect citizen participation. I mean, I voted for every Sunshine law since I've been in office. I am for it. My father was
a teacher. I get the impact that some of these exemptions, how they hit school boards and local governments and whatnot. However; all right, there's over 200,000 people in Calcasieu Parish and growing. It is literally the fastest growing market in the State of Louisiana in the Southern region and one of fastest growing in the country. What's going on there is world renowned. Okay?

And, again, I'm going to say this with -- I mean no disrespect. It's really hard to live where y'all live and not know about this project. Everyone is talking about it, and have been. The Chamber of Commerce laud this project. The Southwest Economic Development Alliance lauds this project. Not to mention, the same people who brought you Cheniere Energy, that amazing transformational project that is being lauded worldwide as the first LNG export facility, they got bought out, and you know what they did? They started a new company called Tellurian. Okay? And are doing -- they're trying to replicate the successes that they had with Cheniere Energy. And all of y'all that are working in Calcasieu and the Cameron area, all of that area, that know what kind of economic boom it has been, the construction that's going on, the retail investment, the improvements to schools, salary
increases across the board, that was because of Cheniere Energy. And then you've got Tellurian coming right behind it, and then you have another one.

I know a lot of you around here aren't familiar with the FERC process. That's the permitting process federally that these people have to go through. It's minimum nine, 15 months. And they're still going through it. They're not even approved yet. So there's ample information out there for anyone, including all of the members of the school board, all of the members of the parish government, the sheriffs, the respective council person; okay, certainly the legislative delegation, the state economic development authority, and again the Southwest Economic Alliance. It's not like information on there isn't out there. But I understand what y'all are saying about whether or not the benefit is there and should citizens have been informed. We appreciate that. However, that's not our job. Okay?

I totally agree with what my colleague said about disputing Mr. Bagert's question about whether or not that was even operating in an illegal way about the public meeting law, I don't know if I agree with that at all. And then I totally think that probably a lawsuit should be filed if that is the due course, but
that isn't our job.

So I don't know if Mr. Bagert wants to say anything or -- and, look, I respect the heck out of him. And he comes before -- I know a lot of you, this is your first meeting, but he comes in every meeting and defends the citizens of our state, and that's a good thing.

MR. BAGERT:

Only to clarify that you refer to me and the others here as opponents of this project.

MR. CHABERT:

I don't know if I said opponents, and I may have. I don't want it to be --

MR. BAGERT:

And really as matter of clarification, the request is for a deferral till the next meeting so that they can have a process that feels like they had the basic information and were able to discuss it and don't have a sort of -- you know, there's a lot of people that have come to feel like our politics are rigged. There's a lot of people in Calcasieu who feels like this was rigged, and 60 days would address that and then we're all right back on track.

They knew Driftwood existed. They didn't know about the exemption, the size, the scale of
it, and they just want to be able to have a public
process with their public officials and then take it up
in two months. There's not opposition from Together
Louisiana or, as far as we know, the 1,000 people on
that petition to the project. It's asking for a
deferral to have a public process.

MR. CHABERT:

Understood and respected.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator Chabert.

Dr. Wilson.

DR. S. WILSON:

I was just going to point out for my
peer, Senator Chabert, Mr. House asked us to go back and
look at the Exhibit, and I just wanted to share with the
public what we look at here is a resolution that was
unanimous by the school board. So I have to trust the
local elected officials that the citizens have voted
for, and I would echo the Senator's comments. I don't
know, going through several processes, whether it's
environmental process or others, where we delay and
expect a different alternative, and I think those delays
can be very complicated and very impactful, particularly
when you're talking about $15-billion of investment.
And I met just this week with other entities in the same business looking to get their final investment decision sooner than later, and I think those delays only complicate that process as well as others.

So for the public to know, all of the exhibit and supports we see are from a unanimous school board, as well as support from the sheriff and others that are in this package, and that's what we have to base our decisions on. So my opinion at this point is I don't see the value in the delay and would welcome to hear other comments from the citizens that would like to speak.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Dr. Wilson.

I believe we have two others that want to speak to this item. Again, if the audience can keep applause down, that would be good, and if you can keep -- and not repeat what's been said before, that would be really good.

MS. GRAVES:

Absolutely. My name is Georgina Graves, I'm --

MR. WINDHAM:

Ms. Graves, can you pull the mic a little closer?
MS. GRAVES:

I have a sweet voice. I'm sorry.

My name is Georgina Graves. I'm from Sulphur, Louisiana. I pride myself on being very active in our community.

Unfortunately, I was unaware of the motion to pass the LNG tax exemption, and nobody is against it. What we are against is the exclusion of the public word. And everybody wants to have this. We are definitely, like you said earlier, a booming town. We have advancements happening left and right, but on several of the things, we had Calcasieu Parish School Board, on their agenda posted online, did have a motion to talk about LNG, but with this motion, no documents were provided for the public to see, nor online or at the meeting itself, and they were denied public comment.

Now, I know this is a problem that should be taken up with ur school board, and believe me, that we have. But what I'm trying to implore upon you is not that we are against this, but is by not delaying this, you are setting a standard that you could fasttrack and ignore your constituents, have a separate -- they set aside a separate tax authority to thwart the engagement of the public and then made, you know, sidebar conclusions without engaging us, which is
wrong. And if we're just going to come back to the same conclusion that Driftwood gets accepted in 60 days, then so be it, but you're going to force the conversation with the constituents, which is ideally and altruistically how it's supposed to be; right? That's all we're asking, because you're going to help set the standard that stuff like this will not rest, that it is unacceptable of any elected official, because I would hope that each of you would hear the concerns of anyone that came to you, and that's not what's happening here. 

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Ma'am, I believe we have one more.

Sorry Senator.

Mr. Briggs.

MR. BRIGGS:

This project is absolutely enormous. It is a blessing for our state and for those in Calcasieu and that part of the state that we have such a project. And the last thing we want to ever do is have that project be moved across the river, the other side of the State of Louisiana.

Now, you know, I agree with -- I believe we voted on it. I have family in that area, and there
are so many special projects going on in Calcasieu Parish and that part of the state, and the state is reaping the benefits from it. So is that whole area. And even when this one was being developed and voted on and things like that, that I even talked to some of my family there, but there's so many wonderful projects already, and this is one of those very special ones as jobs that keep on giving, revenue that keeps on giving. It doesn't get any better than that. We're fortunate to have it.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Briggs.

Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES:

I think it's real important for all of the citizens to know, not just of Calcasieu Parish, but everywhere, is a group of people came to this Board, including the Governor, and said, "We want the locals to have a voice," and we went through a great deal of process to ensure that locals have a voice. We put rules in place to make sure locals have a voice. However, we cannot become the policemen to make sure that the locals are doing it right. We have to, at some level, let locals be locals. You've asked for the right to go to them and make your arguments, and if your
locals, if you feel like your locals aren't doing it right, and, as you said, ma'am, you need to bring it up with them.

MS. GRAVES:

We have.

MR. JONES:

But we -- I understand. Just one second and you'll speak as long as Mr. Windham lets you.

But the difficulty you're putting -- by asking what you're asking, the difficulty you're putting on this Board is that then, in the future, every time someone doesn't like what the locals have chosen, they can come to this Board and say, "Wait a minute. They didn't dot this 'i'. They didn't cross that 't.' Y'all need to defer and let us have another shot at the locals." And I Frankly don't want this Board to be put in that situation.

If when the board sends us their certified copies of their decisions, that needs to be what we rely on. And if you as citizens don't like the way your boards handle it, I think that's where your recourse is. Not this Board.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Jones.
Ma'am.

MS. AMES:

I've been waiting to speak, because I just want to make it short, sweet --

MR. WINDHAM:

Please state your name.

MS. AMES:

My name is Heather Ames. I am a journey wireman from Lake Charles, Louisiana in Calcasieu Parish, which means that I am a construction worker. There's a large possibility that I will work on this project, and I do not make $95,00 a year.

But I'm not debating on -- I want you to understand that these projects are my bread and butter. This is how I make my money. I know exactly what it means.

Now, the only debates that I have is they already bought the land. They're not moving, you know. And $2-million, this is a national conversation. Okay? We're not asking to have permission to come up here and just cry whenever things don't go our way.

It's obvious to me, it should be obvious to everyone else, that there was some gray areas, some miscommunications about the law, about the "Sunshine" rules, and these were recently implemented, and this
also applies to our local officials. I'm asking for a 90-day extension for us to get the legalities of this to find out what exactly needs to happen. Honestly, I hope that it passes. I hope to get it, but I'm still here because what I'm afraid is that if we don't trust our local officials, at what point are citizens going to show up and vote zero, zero, zero and deny tax exemptions because they feel that there's something fraudulent going on. That would hurt me financially. That would hurt my area. That would hurt everything about it.

I'm asking for 90 days that we have this clarified, that we get our local officials on board so that we don't ever have to worry about this again, that we have input and we're properly represented.

I'm an electrician. Y'all, y'all know the laws; y'all know the rules. I'm not an accountant, and whenever they have a meeting that discusses the analysis of these dollars, I trust that somebody who professionally handles numbers is going to say, "This means this. This means this," just like you're doing today with the law, your perception of what you believe and what you stand it. I should have privy to those numbers and to that meeting, and the fact that we were not allowed that information and had to read in the
paper that $2-billion was gone, people are very upset. And I want 90 days to just funnel this down, stop it, end it, and that here on out, that we make the best decisions for Calcasieu Parish and the residents feel like we're making the best decisions for Calcasieu Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, ma'am. Representative Devillier.

MR. DEVILLIER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Ms. Heather, where do you come up with $2-billion?

MS. AMES:
The tax exemptions, the incentives, it was over $2-billion and forgone revenue.

MR. DEVILLIER:
Okay. I'm looking at 283-million.

MS. AMES:
Okay. Well, maybe if I had the documentation that they decided in that private meeting, I might know a little bit better and have the numbers to give you, sir.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Devillier, that's the
first year.

MR. DEVILLIER:

Okay. That's what I'm just trying to figure out where you --

MS. AMES:

Me too. Me too, babe. Ninety days, we'll get it figured out.

MR. DEVILLIER:

Thank you, Ms. Heather. Are you for this project?

MS. AMES:

I'm absolutely for this project because, like I said, I will be working on it one way or another at some point, yes.

MR. DEVILLIER:

So you're for it?

MS. AMES:

Yes. We all are.

MR. DEVILLIER:

Thank you. I don't have any other questions.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

All right. Is there any further discussion on either of the two items that are before us
for approval?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion?

Mr. Miller has made the motion to approve; second by Mr. Slone.

All in favor -- substitute by Mr. Moller.

Please state your substitute.

MR. MOLLER:

I would make a substitute motion to defer this until the February meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. There's an objection to that made by Representative Devillier.

Is there a second on the substitute motion?

Second on the substitute? On the substitute?

MR. MILLER:

No, I do not.

MR. WINDHAM:

No.

Is there a second on the substitute motion?
MS. BAKER:

I'll second it.

MR. WINDHAM:

Ms. Baker seconds the motion.

We'll have a vote.

Is there any discussion on the substitute motion by the Board members?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

There's a substitute motion to defer until the February meeting. It's been made by Mr. Moller; seconded by Ms. Baker.

MR. CHABERT:

Point of clarification.

MR. WINDHAM:

Question by Senator Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:

What happens should Mr. Moller's substitute motion pass? What are the ramifications of that? I think it would be important for the Board to understand the ramifications of should this happen, should his substitute motion be approved. Can someone from staff --

MR. WINDHAM:

I will have staff to tell you
specifically.

MS. BOURGOIS:

I mean, as far as the Board is concerned, it's simply deferred until February and we just see what happens between now and February when it comes back to the Board at that point. We can't anticipate what might happen at a local level between now and then.

MR. CHABERT:

Right. And I'm realizing that -- I don't know if you've heard from anybody from Tellurian on this or Driftwood, so if -- they are present, and we're about to take votes and we hadn't even heard from.

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a representative from Driftwood with us?

Please step forward, identify yourself and answer any questions that may be posed.

MR. FRENCH:

My name is Jason French, Vice President of Government and Public Affairs for Tellurian, developer of the Driftwood LNG project. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board for inviting me to the table.

Deferral, as the motion that's before
you, would be very problematic. I'm not an attorney; I don't claim to be one, and I don't believe this is the venue to necessarily be litigating the issues that Mr. Bagert has raised, but there are a couple things I can tell you. I have been involved with this project since the beginning. As to Senator Chabert's point, we've done extensive outreach to the local community and local elected officials and body that consider this resolution that you have before you, the resolutions that were, I will point out, again, voted on unanimously.

I won't spend time going into the legal situation, but what I will tell you is that uncertainty, to your question, Senator Chabert, the deferral would create significant uncertainty for us. It would send a message to the industry that this process, the Industrial Tax Exemption process, which is an important part of the partnership, the public/private partnership, that's causing this transformative change in Southwest Louisiana and really across Louisiana. It would create uncertainty in that process, because I can tell you that we followed the process. We submitted the required data.

And I would like to just, if you give me a moment, I would like to credit Mr. Bagert and his
organization. I think the scrutiny that they've brought to the ITEP program and many of the changes that have come about because of the discussion around the ITEP program have been positive ones. And one of most positive changes that were brought about was the local input. These are local tax dollars. So I do commend them and the work that they've done to help bring about that change.

We respect the local process. We went through the local process. After two years of discussions and after public notice in every one of the meetings where a vote was taken on this project unanimously, the elected officials supported us.

To now defer when we have followed that process, I think textbook to what the Governor envisioned when the changes to ITEP were made and what this Board envisioned, would send a message of uncertainty to us as a company, to the industry, to our customers and partners who are looking as we near final investment decision and make a final decision to actually locate this project in Louisiana. It would create a climate of uncertainty that I don't think this Board wants to send into the industry, to our company, and I think it sends a message to the local officials that their opinions aren't being respected as this
process intended through the ITEP changes.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. French.

Are there any questions for Mr. French?

MR. CHABERT:

Mr. French, when you went through the process, how many other entities that have to, by law, engage and sign off on this project have y'all had discussions with?

MR. FRENCH:

So in our situation, we're an unincorporated area of Calcasieu Parish just south of Carlyss, so it'd be the police jury, the school board and sheriff's office.

MR. CHABERT:

And did the sheriffs approve this, the sheriff's office?

MR. FRENCH:

Yes.

MR. CHABERT:

And you said the parish council?

MR. FRENCH:

The police jury.

MR. CHABERT:

I still forget that some parishes around
the state are on the jury system, which is -- where the
two parishes that I represent, Terrebonne and Lafourche,
we have a consolidated government, and it's a
district-type of government where you like to think that
everybody kind of tries to hold hands and do things for
the betterment of the parish, whereas a police jury
system is very district specific. Your representatives
and the police jury are very focused, not necessarily on
the whole so much as some of the individual parts. So
it's -- I would say it's even more difficult to pass
something through a police jury as opposed to a
consolidated government parish council.

And they voted unanimously; right?

MR. FRENCH:

Right.

MR. CHABERT:

And then the school board voted
unanimously?

MR. FRENCH:

Yes.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator Chabert.

Mr. Slone.

MR. SLONE:

I was just going to ask, the
requirements have been met based upon what we're supposed to do, so, you know, for us to consider deferring would be going against the process that's already been in place. I've looked at the Exhibit B's, and everything's been met, the requirements have been met, so I don't think we should be trying to defer this. The fight is a local fight.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Slone.

Mr. Moller.

MR. MOLLER:

I just want to be clear, I'm not opposed to this project at all. My concern is -- nor do I want to substitute my judgment for the locals, but the president of the school board sent us a letter saying he didn't think that they were furnished with enough information before they made their decision, and so my concern is, you know, if we had just a little bit more time. Like you said, this project has been in the works for several years and there's been a lot of input. Explain specifically what does an extra 90 days do you? You mentioned uncertainty.

MR. FRENCH:

So our project is in a sensitive time in that we are coming up on our final FERC process to get
our permits from FERC to allow us to move forward to
site build and operate this facility. That is a key
part. Someone on the Board referenced earlier the
process that we go through in permitting this. That's
extensive; that's coming.

We are talking. We are certainly
commercializing this project. You see announcements
about the LNG projects in the newspaper and across the
news. We are commercializing our project and talking to
customers and investing partners in our project. This
would change and create some significant uncertainty for
those partners as we're moving forward, and we need to
get the final investment decision to make this
investment in Louisiana.

You know, the Amazon headquarters thing
has been mentioned, but the fact is, this is -- we do
not have a final decision here. Is it competing with
two cities against one another? Not necessarily, but it
is Louisiana competing against itself. Right now we
have made a preliminary decision to site in Louisiana.
We need to make a final investment decision, and the
Industrial Tax Exemption is a key part of that calculus
and we're moving very closely to that final investment
decision.

MR. MOLLER:
But you've already bought the land; correct?

MR. FRENCH:

We have acquired the land, but acquiring the land is a minuscule amount of a 15.9-billion project.

MR. MOLLER:

I understand that.

MR. WINDHAM:

A little order, please.

Mr. Moller, anything else?

MR. MOLLER:

No. I guess my only concern is I think if we just -- if we push this back 90 days and allowed for that input, it would set -- you know, we talked about setting a precedent, and I want to set a positive precedent that when these types of projects of this kind, of size and scope are approved -- and I don't think anybody opposes it. I haven't heard a single person say they oppose this -- that the public process, especially at the local level, is done in as open and transparent level and way as possible. So, again, I'm not trying to kill this project in any way. I'm just hoping we can...

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.

Ms. Tam. Ms. Bourgeois.

MS. BOURGEOIS:

Tam Bourgeois from LED.

Just as a couple points of information for the Board. Number 1, just to address one of the allegations, based upon our information, the committee that looks at the applications before they're presented to the local public bodies are not made up of local officials. They're made up on local economic development staff. So I just wanted to make that point.

And, also, this is not the first Calcasieu Parish project to come through the Board under the 2017 rules. They have done -- you know, Calcasieu has been very responsible, we have found, in how they carried out their duty with regard to the new rules, and so this is not the first time that a Calcasieu application has been presented to you and they weren't changed in the past. So just wanted to make those points.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

All right. There's a substitute motion on the floor. I'm sorry. Senator.

MR. THOMPSON:
I wanted to compliment Together Louisiana on making us take a real close look on all of these statewide. But my concern is, as it was earlier today, if the locals have done it, and even if you get a letter from the school board saying, "Well, we'd like some additional information," I know many times that this body, over 40-something years of service, I'd like to go back and have another shot at the apple or do something differently, but I think it's our responsibility to not cause maybe dissension -- more dissension in the community, but follow the rules.

If locals are for it, I hate to make a substitute motion to or support one that would put it off if we see no great changes. If somebody can tell me other than, "I'd like to defeat it," but they've already had that discussion.

And if they've done something illegal, if they've done something out of line, I'm sure that somebody's going to file suit or do something, but I think it's our responsibility to make these companies or corporations work for the locals. And but I wanted to make that clear, and if you have anything that you disagree that's the LED or the other speakers, I'd like to hear it right now, that's different from what we've talked about.
MR. FRENCH:

I appreciate all of your comments. The only thing I would clarify is that while there is a letter that's been put before you today, that was from an individual citizen who happens to serve on the school board. That was not the school board itself. The school board met 60 hours ago and had the opportunity to reconsider the resolution -- there was significant pressure to do so -- and chose not to. So I think -- I don't want anyone on this Board to feel that the school board has suddenly turned against this project.

MR. THOMPSON:

I got you. And that sounded like that was the school board, but I'm glad you clarified that. Is there anymore clarification that we need to know about from LED?

MS. BOURGEOIS:

No, sir. We've presented you with what we think you need to consider this application.

MR. THOMPSON:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:
Thank you. That was my question, Senator Thompson hit it, was the letter I had before me explicitly says, "Acting in my personal capacity as a resident."

My question is -- "and not as the parish president" -- I mean, excuse me -- "the school board president."

My question is, did the gentleman, this member, vote for this prior?

MR. FRENCH:
He did.

MR. CHABERT:
So he previously voted for it, and then is sending a letter for -- that's -- no further questions.

MR. WINDHAM:
Dr. Wilson.

DR. S. WILSON:
I was just going to make the same statement, that I think the school board member, if he voted unanimously, we have to accept his official vote in that capacity as a public official, and so I know the gentleman -- and, again, the letter is not signed, and so I just have to take it on face value. I don't disagree with the opinions that folks have expressed as
to their concerns, but it's not our place to fix that. And I think delaying will just leave us in an open window with no obligation to act on any other party because they've already acted, and so it just puts us in a holding pattern and I think it does more damage than good.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Dr. Wilson.

With that, we have a substitute motion on the floor; it's been seconded. It's been objected to, so we will have a rollcall. The motion is to defer -- Mr. Moller, you want to state your motion again?

MR. MOLLER:

Is to defer to the February meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

Which is 60 days-ish.

MR. MOLLER:

Sixty, yeah, February 27th.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right it's been objected to, so now we need a rollcall vote. Ms. Simmons.

MR. CHABERT:

Which way, what happens?

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry. If you vote for the motion, this application will be deferred until February. If you vote against the motion, we will proceed with the original motion to approve both of these applications, Driftwood LNG and HR Nu Blu Energy, LLC.

Ms. Simmons.

MS. SIMMONS:

Dr. Wilson.

MR. WINDHAM:

Wait. I've got to turn it on.

MS. SIMMONS:

Okay. Dr. Wilson.

DR. S. WILSON:

I'm usually at end of the rollcall, but my vote is not to defer. No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Don Briggs.

MR. BRIGGS:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Representative Devillier.

MR. DEVILLIER:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Ms. Baker.
MS. BAKER:
  Yes.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Mayor Glenn Brasseaux.

MAYOR BRASSEAUX:
  No.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Representative Paul Hollis.

MR. HOLLIS:
  No.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Major Coleman.

MAJOR COLEMAN:
  No.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Rickey Fabra.

MR. FABRA:
  No.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Manuel Fajardo.

MR. FAJARDO:
  No.

MS. SIMMONS:
  Jerald Jones.

(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS:

Heather Malone.

MS. MALONE:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Senator Francis Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Jan Moller.

MR. MOLLER:

Yes.

MS. SIMMONS:

Senator Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:

Secretary Don Pierson.

SECRETARY PIERSON:

No.

MS. SIMMONS:
Ronnie Slone.

MR. SLONE:
No.

MS. SIMMONS:
Bobby Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS:
No.

MS. SIMMONS:
Steve Windham.

MR. WINDHAM:
No.

MS. SIMMONS:
We have two yes and 17 no.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So the motion to defer fails.

Now we have a motion on the floor to approve the two, and I believe it was made by Mr. Robbie Miller and seconded by Dr. Wilson.

Any further discussion on the motion to approve these two applications?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Thank you, Ms. Cheng.
MS. CHENG:
We need to approve HR Nu Blu Energy as well.
MR. WINDHAM:
The motion was to approve both of them.
MS. CHENG:
Oh, for both. Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
To approve both of them.
All right. Please proceed.
MS. CHENG:
We have 14 post-Executive Order 2018 rule applications: 20180149, Diversified Foods & Seasonings is requesting to defer until February. Diversified Foods is requesting to defer till February.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Is there a motion to allow for the deferral of Diversified Foods?
Made by Mr. Slone; second by Ms. Malone.
Any discussion?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:
There was also a request by Exxon Mobil Corp to withdraw two of their applications: 20161912 and 20161913. So those are being withdrawn from the agenda.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve the withdrawal?

Made by Major Coleman; seconded by Dr. Wilson.

Any discussion on the withdrawal?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:
Okay. We have 20170552, Bancroft Bag, Incorporated in Ouachita Parish; 20170154 Chalmette Refining, LLC in St. Bernard Parish; 20161911 Exxon Mobil Corporation in East Baton Rouge Parish; 20161914 Exxon Mobil Corporation in East Baton Rouge Parish; and 20161915 Exxon Mobil Corporation in West Baton Rouge Parish; 20180413, Graham Packing Company, LP in East Baton Rouge Parish; 20170155, PBF Logistics, LP in St. Bernard Parish; 20170377, Pala Interstate LLC in Livingston Parish; 20161917 Peppers Unlimited of Louisiana, Inc. in St. Martin Parish; 20180378, Shell Chemical LP in Ascension Parish; and 20170378, Stevendale Road, LLC in Livingston Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Ms. Cheng.

All right. We have a number of cards related to the Exxon Mobile applications. So with that, I'm going to invite -- some of them don't indicate whether or not they're for or against, so I am going to
invite the ones that say against first. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to call out the person, and then I'm going to call out the person to be on deck as a baseball term.

So, first, we have Kirk Green that would like to discuss the Exxon project, and on deck we will have Donald Victorian. So these individuals could come forward, identify themselves and tell us your thoughts.

Please step forward.

MR. GREEN:

Kirk Green.

MR. WINDHAM:

Two to three minutes, please. Keep it concise. Don't repeat what was said before, not that anything has been said in your case.

MR. GREEN:

Yes, sir. Thank you to the Board. My name is Kirk Green. First of all, I'm a parent of an EBR student. My daughter attends Baton Rouge Magnet High School. I'm a teacher, a history teacher in the EBR school system. I'm also a homeowner and a taxpayer for East Baton Rouge.

First, I'd like to bring a little bit of history into the context. If we remember, we did have a prior system of government called the Articles of
Confederation. Under the Articles of Confederation, there was a complete failure of the government, thanks to things like Shay's Rebellion. Shay's Rebellion was an upheaval of the farmers when the tax burden was shifted completely upon them, so much so that they were able to take away their farms, and that lead to the downfall of the Articles of Confederation and the constitution that we have.

In the light of that, Benjamin Franklin wrote to Robert Morris, "The failure of our people in paying taxes is highly blameable. The unwillingness to pay them is still more so. I see in some resolutions of town meetings, a petition against giving congress power to take, as they call it, the people's money out of their pockets. They seem to mistake the point. All property seems to be taxable for public good. He that does not like civil society on these terms, let him retire and live among the savages. He can have no right to the benefits of society who will not pay the support of it."

So that we are clear on some of the numbers, the quarterly profit for Exxon in the first quarter, 4.7-billion; second quarter, 4-billion; third quarter, 6.2-billion -- excuse me -- .24-billion. That is just profit enriching shareholders and board members.
The CEO of this board -- excuse me -- of the company is making $14-million. The deficit for our EBR schools is $16-million. That's the money we need to teach our children. Now, he gets one year as much as we have as a deficit for our entire year. We're talking a lot of money. I don't make near that.

Now, your vote today is going to tell us whether Louisiana will put children first or company profits first. Our children's right to a good education and the promised social mobility of the American dream is important and at stake in some of the these decisions you are making.

We have, as Dr. King said, a promissory note. It is for all of us. It is not for the benefit of the few, for the rich, for the white, for the black, for the Republican, for the Democrat.

MR. WINDHAM:

You have one minute left.

MR. GREEN:

Thank you, sir.

So Benjamin Franklin and our Founding Fathers gave us a government of the people, by the people and for the people, not for the shareholders by the corporations and for profit. We simply ask that equitable support of a society that benefits so heavily
from this society.

    Thank you, sir.

MR. WINDHAM:

    Thank you.

    Donald Victorian.

MR. VICTORIAN:

    Thank you. My name is Donald Victorian, and I live at 8545 Hooper Road here in Baton Rouge. I'm a retired petroleum chemist with 35 years of experience. These exemptions are inappropriate because tax exemptions don't seem to be, in my opinion, the proper incentive for a company to locate or not locate -- not locate in a particular area.

    My wife worked as an educator in East Baton Rouge schools in excess of 11 years. She worked in the alternative school system. Her disappointment in the proper funding of necessary resources of those schools helped to influence her decision to move to Wallis, Texas school system.

    It's my belief that the approval of these tax exemptions will continue to drive qualified educators away from East Baton Rouge Parish in search of better opportunities.

    Therefore, the proper funding of East Baton Rouge schools is more important than the proper
development and -- I'm sorry -- proper embellishment of corporate profits.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Dr. Tia Mills. Please step forward.

It's not indicated for or against.

And on deck we have Kathryn Grigsby.

Please step forward and identify yourselves.

DR. MILLS:

Good morning. My name is Tia Mills. I am President of the East Baton Rouge Parish Association of Educators, and I'm also a public school teacher in East Baton Rouge Parish School System. This has been an issue that I have been fighting for quite some time, and the only thing that I can look at when I've been in the process of moving through this entire journey is the fact that the students that I serve deserve so much better than what they have.

I'm not in favor of giving away dollars that could be used to best serve our students. I'm currently at a school that is an alternative system for elementary-aged children, and the school that I'm at, the building that I currently work in, it's been on the condemned list for years. I've never, since I've served
in the school system, obtained a salary increase. I've been working for the school system for almost 10 years.

There are a number of things that my students don't get compared to other schools. The entire district as a whole, we have limited resources. We don't have a lot of technology in our building, and to think that this is what I have -- I have to go above and beyond. So many of our employees give out of their own pockets in order to make sure that our children obtain an education that's conducive to really learning, because right now --

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

DR. MILLS:

-- right now, they're not.

I've been fighting this fight along with many others. We've taken it to the court system. We need business and industry to pay their fair share to our children. This is who it is ultimately about. Yes, business and industry, they're doing very well, but what about them? Forget about the fact that employees may not be getting their due diligence, but what about the children? They can't fight for themselves. So it is up for us -- it's up to us to do so. It is up to us to do that, and that's what we're doing because there are
policies that are put in place on their behalf every
day, and they can do absolutely nothing about it.

I could go on and on about how I'm a
taxpayer and how I have homeownership right here in this
city. Yes, I do pay property taxes, and if I'm willing
to put the investment of the children into play knowing
that it's a good one, businesses and industry need to
see it as the same thing too.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Mills.

Next we have Ms. Kathryn Grigsby, and
Dianne Hanley is on deck.

MS. GRIGSBY:

Good morning.

MR. WINDHAM:

Please identify yourself.

MS. GRIGSBY:

I am. My name is Kathryn Grigsby. I'm
a lifetime resident of East Baton Rouge Parish, and I
began my personal professional career as a teacher in
East Baton Rouge Parish School System. I come from a
family of educators. My grandparents, my mother. My
mom actually was eight hours of short of a Ph.D. And
once we needed, when I was in high school, a plumber,
and she figured out that if she were being paid what the
plumber was being paid for the hours that she spent
teaching children, in the classroom only, not at home,
she would have been making $60,000 a year. And I'd
venture to say there's not very many teachers — and
that was over 30 years ago.

At any rate, what I want you-all to
think about and consider is that these dollars, you
teach, you educate, you touch the future. All of these
business and industries are complaining about not having
educated workforce, and if you want an educated
workforce, you've got to pay for that. You can't just
say "Oh, let's reward these people." This system came
into being 80 years ago, and little has changed. And we
reward the wealthy to continue a good ol' boy's club,
and we can't afford that. When you have a state that is
willfully ignorant and benign neglect, when you allow
things like this to continue, you've got to think about
our future, and these companies want educated people.
They want people who can read; they want people who can
do math. And we need this money in East Baton Rouge
Parish in our school system. You would be appalled at
the schools' —

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. GRIGSBY:
-- condition, if you want to walk through them, and see where there's ceiling tiles falling off.

We used to have a fine education system in East Baton Rouge Parish. You have an opportunity today to ensure that that process begins again. And it's not just East Baton Rouge Parish. It's our entire state. Millions and billions of dollars are flying out the door.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Grigsby.

Ms. Hanley, step forward and identify yourself.

MS. HANLEY:

I am Dianne Hanley. I live here in East Baton Rouge Parish.

The Exxon exemptions are inappropriate because they do not meet the standards that they should be in the best interest of this state. The rules have been tweaked and tweaked, and I followed it for over two years. I watched how the rules have been tweaked and tweaked to be so vague and broad that the applications that are before you follow a new interpretation that I do not believe are true to the intent of full-time
equivalent jobs. There aren't enough full-term
equivalent jobs created to warrant the amount of money
being foregone, given away, especially from schools.

   This is important to me because all my
children are teachers. They live here, two of them.
They work in a different parish because of the salaries.
One of them has moved away. That's why it's important
to me. We need better salaries to attract and keep good
teachers.

   If you approve this exemption, that will
not bring my children here to work. You are taking,
one, money away from teachers and giving it to Exxon.
Exxon does not need it to stay here, but my children
need it to stay here. I'm asking you not to do that
because it is against -- not to do that, not to give the
exemption because it is against the interest of my
children and the interest of this state.

   Finally, Exxon is saying that they need
an incentive to do something that they did a year and a
half ago. That is not an incentive. They finished the
construction project 18 months ago. We're not saying we
blame them for doing that. You gave them permission.
Eight-two years of this program gives them permission to
go do something and then come say, "We need money to do
it." But nobody on this Board and nobody in their right
mind would take seriously that is an incentive to give
me money for something I have been able to do on my own
without you.

    Thank you very much.

MR. WINDHAM:

    Thank you, Ms. Hanley.

    In the interest of other applicants
other than the Exxons, we have been requested to
consider those that don't have public comment, so those
include -- Ms. Cheng, if you'll read off the just the
names real quick.

MS. CHENG:

    Excluding Exxon?

MR. WINDHAM:

    Excluding Exxon.

MS. CHENG:

    And I just want to note, these all go to
the locals after y'all give preliminary approval.

MR. WINDHAM:

    All right.

MS. CHENG:

    2017 --

MR. WINDHAM:

    You don't have to read the number, just
the names.
MS. CHENG:

Bancroft Bag, Inc., Calumet Refining, LLC, Graham Packaging Company, LP, PBF Logistics, LP, Pala Interstate, LLP, Peppers Unlimited of Louisiana, Inc., Shell Chemical LP and Stevendale Road, LLC.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Are there any comments from the public concerning any of those applications? Yes, please step forward, identify yourself. Only those, not Exxon.

MS. PRANJIC:

Well, first of all, I'm going to kind of address generally all of the applications.

MR. WINDHAM:

Identify yourself.

MS. PRANJIC:

And my name is Jessica Pranjic. I'm the Manager of Communications and Workforce Development with the Greater Baton Rouge Industry Alliance, and on behalf of our 60-plus industrial member facilities in the greater Baton Rouge area, we would just like to urge the Commerce and Industry Board to approve all of the ITEP applications on the agenda today, of course, assuming that they meet your criteria. And we believe that should the Commerce and Industry Board not approve these
exemptions, it is going to send a strong signal to those interested in investing in Louisiana that the laws written as they are cannot be counted on and the instability caused would make instant news that would travel literally around the globe with the signal that Louisiana is too unpredictable for business.

In our role at GBRIA, we work closely with hundreds of contracting companies within our region helping them navigate and understand the safety and skilled requirements needed to construct, operate and maintain these technologically sophisticated plants. We also interact with high schools, trade schools and universities so that they understand the specific skills needed to prepare the industrial workforce, and we interact with many nonprofits who seek donations and grants helping to make the necessary connections in order to find funding for their causes.

All of these groups employ people and benefit from the industrial manufacturers being located in this region, especially Exxon Mobil, which is the largest of these. Exxon Mobil has been a steadfast supporter of many activities and organizations that provide a positive affect on our community, not only monetarily, but also in a way that lifts the spirit of the people here.
From the products people buy in grocery stores to the volunteers helping kids and teachers at schools or building homes for the needy and to the many business owners who sell product to industry, the positive effects we see are unmistakable. Industry already pays for two-thirds of all of the property taxes paid in the Capital Region and at a higher percentage in other parts of the state.

In addition, business and industry pays for half of all property taxes paid in the state. To say that industry should pay more property taxes is like saying that homeowners should give up their Homestead Exemption. Our state's laws are set; the personal property and ITEP rules are set, so it's time for us to approve these application and just let the system work and let the results continue to build in our communities.

So thank you for your time.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Are there any questions by any of the Board members?

Senator Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:

You wasn't suggesting -- you were going
pretty fast there. You're not suggesting we do away
with Homestead Exemption because --

MS. PRANJIC:

No.

MR. THOMPSON:

Ma'am?

MS. PRANJIC:

I'm not.

MR. THOMPSON:

Okay. Because it would change my
opinion of Exxon and everybody else. You get my drift?

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator.

All right. Are there any further
comments from the public concerning the ones that are
not Exxon that were previously mentioned?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to approve, other than
Exxon?

Made by Mr. Moller; seconded by
Mr. Slone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

All right. We are going to go back to Exxon.

Next we have Mr. Edgar Cage, and on deck Angela Reams-Brown.

Again, just to remind everyone, if it's already been said -- I know, Mr. Cage has used the "ditto" statement before. In the interest of time --

MR. CAGE:

I will try to appropriate this time.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

MR. CAGE:

My name is Edgar Cage. I'm with Together Baton Rouge and Together Louisiana. I've been a frequent visitor to this Board of Commerce and Industry, to this Capital and to this room. I just want to tell you about the four exemptions that you have before you from Exxon Mobil.

For over 83 years we have been giving away millions of dollars to multibillion-dollar
international companies by approving ad valorem tax exemptions. The rich have gotten richer, when, unfortunately, the poor have gotten poorer, and remain the same. When I look around my community, I see bad roads, failing schools, underpaid policemen and access issues to healthy food and health care. These are just some of the critical issues that need to be addressed.

Recently, in the last election, I supported two tax measures to begin to address road issues and mental health availability. We have been rubber-stamping these ITEP exemptions without criteria and standards. If we had meaningful, fair and balanced criteria and standards, the tax measures that I just voted on may not have even been necessary. We could have had enough and sufficient funds to do what needs to be done in our community.

And I would like to commend our East Baton Rouge Metro Council and other taxing entities across the state that have established those fair and balanced criteria and standards and are not just rubber-stamping.

These exemptions that you are considering today will not affect the decision on whether the projects will come. They are here and operating, and they did not need your approval or our
approval for the exemption. Because they did not need
them and the projects are complete, we should not give
it to them. Let's start today not to stop
rubber-stamping these exemptions and serve all citizens,
not just big business. Please deny these exemptions.

    Thank you.

    MR. WINDHAM:

    Thank you, Mr. Cage.

    Ms. Angela Reams-Brown, and on deck we
have Robin Moulder.

    Please identify yourself.

    MS. BROWN:

    Good morning. I'm Angela Reams-Brown.
I'm a retired educator from the East Baton Rouge Parish
School System with 33 and a half years. I'm the proud
mother of a son that just turned 35 this week, and he's
a graduate of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System,
but currently resides in the State of Texas. And I'm
the President of the East Baton Rouge Federation of
Teachers.

    As I sat here and listened my
colleagues, I decided to approach my message from a
different point of view, that of a storyteller and a
teacher. All of the facts have been laid out about the
consequences of your actions and how your decision today
will affect the citizens of this great State of Louisiana. I would like to appear to a different part of your body, your heart.

Often while watching TV we'll see commercials that either warm our hearts or make us cry. It all depends on what we see and what we hear. I'm asking each of you to take a minute to visualize a classroom, a classroom with a teacher who is fatigued from working an extra job to make ends meet the night before. Envision the classroom lacking the most innovative technology that will assist our students in learning. Imagine the parent who is unable to assist her child with their homework and can't afford to hire a tutor, but could and would benefit from an after school extended day program. Envision the citizens of this great state paying additional taxes to support their local schools, even after their children have graduated and moved away from the State of Louisiana. Envision the teachers who do become nationally board certified and earn advanced degrees moving away from their neighboring schools to a state so that they can afford to care for their children and their families.

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. BROWN:
Now imagine that teacher is you. Imagine that parent is you. Imagine that student is your child, and imagine the taxpaying citizen as yourself. Make a decision today that will warm your heart and not make it cry. Vote no on these applications, because these applications will not create any additional jobs and they have already been completed.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and Merry Christmas.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Reams. You too.

Mr. Moulder, and on deck we have Alexandra Clark.

MR. MOULDER:

My name is Robin Moulder. I am a homeowner in East Baton Rouge Parish. These exemptions and those this Board has passed in the past have and will require homeowners and all other classes of business, commercial, office space, apartment, residential, all other kinds of businesses, to pay more property tax so that we can all have the same level of government services we have today, that's sheriff, schools and the metro.

We all pay more so that we can exempt
Exxon from paying its share of the property tax. Why?

Why are we doing that? Why are we giving Exxon and
other large industrial firms an exemption to the taxes
we all pay, you pay? We hope they'll provide more jobs.
We don't require proof. We don't have any idea what
they really did. We are just taking it on faith that
they are going to have more jobs because we gave them
their exemption to our taxes.

An ex-Metro Council member at the Baton
Rouge Metro Council -- I'm going to paraphrase him. I'm
sure I'm not quoting him exactly -- said that that is
like shooting of case of shotgun shells straight up in
the air and calling it duck hunting. In this particular
case, two years after they did the work, the flock of
ducks is already on the other side of the hill before
they started shooting. You're wasting ammunition, my
tax money.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Moulder.
Alexandra Clark, please step forward,
identify yourself. On deck we have Valencia Johnson, I
believe. Valencia.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Valencia had to go.

MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, okay. Thank you.

On deck then we have Joyce Williams.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

She did too.

MR. WINDHAM:

She had to leave.

All right. Gretchen Lampe.

MS. LAMPE:

That's me.

MR. WINDHAM:

You're on deck, Ms. Lampe.

MS. CLARK:

Good morning. My name is Alexandra Clark, and I'm a school psychologist in the EBR School System.

As a school psychologist, my main job responsibility is to evaluate students for special education eligibility. During the 2010–2011 school year, my first year with EBR, my had close to 20 psychologists. Now we are down to just 11, and two are set to retire this school year. That's currently 11 school psychologists for 80-something schools once you include the private and charter schools that we have to serve.

Due to our lack of funds, when a
psychologist leaves or retires, they are not replaced, just as with many other positions in the school system. When one leaves, they just double our workload, which adds more stress on us, and, yet, our pay remains the same. Lack of funds also means less teachers employed, which makes it harder to get the paperwork I need as part of the special education evaluation. And may I add that all of that information is mandated by the federal government, so I have to have it from the teachers as part of the reports. Due to understaffing, teachers don't have planning periods or free time to complete the required paperwork.

The funding issue is so bad that my department, Pupil Appraisal, is rationing out paper to us knowing that our job is paper based. Sometimes we can do a report on a student that's over 30 pages long. So just imagine each of us probably evaluates at least 50 kids a year. There's like 60 to 70 of us altogether, so that's a lot of reports and that's a lot of paper, and they're rationing paper out to us for a paper-based job. That's how bad it is. That's how much money we need. Without paper, I can't print the reports that are required to give a student the services they qualify for, which is both unethical and illegal.

Keep in mind that Louisiana is Number 1
to Number 2 in most resources. We are the richest state, but, yet, we have the poorest schools, the poorest school systems. We're at the bottom of the barrel with reading, math, quality of life and everything else, but we have all of these resources at our disposal, but we don't access it because you keep giving this money away.

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. CLARK:

Basically approving exemptions leads to no money for the school system, which leads to not enough supplies or employees, and our children's education and future will suffer. These children are supposed to be our future and our future lawyers, doctors, engineers and future process operators in the plant. If you don't stop these exemptions, we will all soon regret it.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Lampe, and I believe on deck we have Jean Coco.

Please identify yourself.

MS. LAMPE:

Hi. I'm Gretchen Lampe. I'm employed
by the Louisiana Association of Educators. I represent
the education employees in EBR.

Just an aside comment before I make my
regular ones, the person who spoke before about how much
property tax the corporations of Louisiana are paying,
that they pay over half of the property taxes. If
you—all happen to have the chance to look at the ITEP
video that was done by Together Baton Rouge about why
Louisiana remains in poverty, it may be because our
corporations property and the reason they're paying half
the property taxes is when your property is worth
$3.1-billion, that's a whole lot more than that person
who's getting a Homestead Exemption for their $115,000
home. Not only that, between 67 percent to 95 percent
of that property is exempted at this point, and they are
not paying taxes on it.

You've heard of the phrase that it will
be a great day when schools are funded and the Air Force
has to have a bake sale to buy airplanes. The employees
that I work with every day are trying to make sure that
students have a great public school education. Our
economic development job is to prepare students for
future jobs that we are creating today and don't know
what they're going to look like. It takes resources to
have great public schools.
In the last 10 years, EBR, just like every other school system in Louisiana, has had one, only one, dime of increase in per-pupil funding from the Minimum Foundation Program. Now, that's on the legislature for doing that, but you have approved 47 tax exemptions, which means that local revenue that we need to educate these students for future jobs is not coming in. Because of the starvation of our school systems, and that's every school system in this state that's being starved, we're facing a $23-million deficit in EBR this year.

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. LAMPE:

You're now preparing to grant a tax incentive for projects that were completed in the past and were actually we're acquiring capital equipment, which is the cost of doing business if you own a company.

I'll be now looking for a day when I don't have to come and beg you to deny tax exemptions that we believe don't meet the ITEP requirements.

Thank you so very much for giving me an opportunity to speak to you today, and you—all have a real good holiday.
MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Lampe.

Jean Coco. And then I believe that is all of my opposition cards, and then we'll have the in support of.

MS. COCO:

Good morning. My name is Jean Coco. I'm representing the League of Women Voters of Baton Rouge. I also teach writing at LSU. I'm from a family that has lived in this state for six generations, and I'm also a product of public schools, K through college. So I thank you for letting me speak today. I appreciate it.

So I have a little story to tell. I left Louisiana in 1999 with my spouse, a native of Wisconsin, for academics. So we had a good job offer in Rochester, New York. So my daughter was a kindergartner at Buchanan Elementary, where I was very active in the PTA. She happened to be in a gifted program, and I felt terribly guilty about the fact that my gifted child -- all of the kids there were gifted -- was in class with only six students, whereas next door, the regular students, had classrooms of 30. Actually, those were the kids that needed more help, more one-on-one attention, a lower teacher-student ratio,
student-teacher ratio. So off we went to New York, where I have to say my kids, for 10 years, had an amazing education because class sizes were capped at 20. The property taxes I paid year to year were the property taxes I paid in a month in New York, where teachers had master degrees after five years and were paid very well. And I had a kid with some learning issues, and she was serviced just extraordinarily well. Then we moved to North Carolina, where we also had a fine education.

So then we came back to Louisiana about 18 years later because we kind of wanted to come back and do something good for our state. My husband got a job at LSU. He's Dean of Library at LSU, and I'm still teaching there.

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. COCO:

And I was shocked to see all of the volunteers we have in the state for Teach for America, City Year, AmeriCorps, that come from states that educate these kid well, and then they come in here and do charity work for us because we're really not paying our way because we give so many tax breaks to big companies that aren't going to go anywhere else because we have the Mississippi and the Gulf and they've already
got stuff going on here. So it really makes me sad that nothing's really changed here, and I watch poor kids get poor education and have no alternatives.

I registered people to vote at the CATS bus station and watched people wait two hours for a bus to get to a job interview. It's embarrassing. When are we going to step up and not be 48, 49, 50 in education? We have a multimillion, billion dollar company all over this river, all over this state taking our resources.

And then, yes, of course you would go to Texas to teach or to New York where a teacher would make $90,000 a year.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Start wrapping it up, please.

MS. COCO:

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

All right. Is there anyone else on the opposition side that has not filled out a card that would like to address the Board?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Not seeing anyone, we will
go with the ones in support of the projects. I guess we'll start off with Stephanie Cargile, and on deck we'll have Chris Barker.

Please step forward and identify yourself. And, again, limit your comments to two to three minutes, three minutes, and don't repeat what has been said previously if possible.

MS. CARGILE:

Hi. This is Stephanie Cargile with Exxon Mobil in Baton Rouge, and I am also a Baton Rouge native, like many of the speakers that you've heard today.

I think the first thing I want to say, because my job is the Public Affairs Manager here in Baton Rouge, is that we love teachers, and the majority of the community investments that we make in the Baton Rouge area is to education to support our teachers. In fact, last night we were honored at the school board for being the largest corporate donor of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System, and that's a commitment we take seriously, to support education in the community, and we'll continue to do so. So that is reality. It's not something we have to imagine. It's happening right now, and it will continue to happen.

In particular, the three applications
before you, two are in East Baton Rouge Parish and one is for our facility in Port Allen, and we have our plant management here that can give you more information about those specific projects that were involved. We can provide you with the details of the investment that was made.

As it's been pointed out by some of the speakers, the investment was made in 2017. However, in an industry like ours, we don't just build a unit in one year and say that we're done. A lot of the investment on these three sites that we chose as a company to go forward with were to pave the way for future investment, and our plant manager is here can speak to you about that. So they were strategic; they were competitive.

I want to also point out that our company, we cannot take it for granted that they're going to continue to invest in Baton Rouge. That is misinformation. We're a global company. As you guys have heard, we're investing right now $20-billion in the Gulf Coast, so that's a great opportunity for Louisiana. It's also a great opportunity for Texas. And that investment --

MR. WINDHAM:

Two minutes.

MS. CARGILE:
-- it's competitive. So we have to use programs like ITEP to bring that investment here.

    The most important thing I ask of you today is to be predictable for us. If you choose one company to single out, our company has followed the rules, and like the folks that are here today, they're choosing one company to target. There have been many applications that you guys have approved with no comments, no questions that had 2017 investments, and these folks have not singled out. And we just ask for predictability and for fairness going forward.

    MR. WINDHAM:
    Thank you, Ms. Cargile.
    Senator Chabert may have a question.

    MR. CHABERT:
    Yes. Ms. Cargile, you're a representative of Exxon, how much did y'all pay in property taxes last year?

    MS. CARGILE:
    We're the largest property taxpayer in East Baton Rouge.

    MR. CHABERT:
    You're the largest property taxpayer in East Baton Rouge Parish.

    MS. CARGILE:
And the state.

MR. CHABERT:
And the state.

MS. CARGILE:
We pay around 32 to 33-million annually.

MR. CHABERT:
I just wanted to -- it's important to
get all of the information out there. Numbers are
numbers; math is math; one plus one equals two. Period.
If they're the largest taxpayer in the state, they're
the largest taxpayer in the state.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS:
How often do they get exemptions? That cancels it out.

MR. WINDHAM:
Ma'am.

MR. CHABERT:
All right. I think it's very important,
and I don't want y'all to get all riled out about that.
All right. Just listen. It's a holistic -- you have to
look at things from a holistic view. Okay? You can
choose not to, but you have to. All right?
The State of Louisiana generates the
majority of its tax revenue on two things, and I think
it's wrong and I think we need to change it. So as much
passion as we have for this, we need to really work on a constitutional convention. That's my plug to y'all. Because that's where a lot of the problems in our state lie. And I'm telling -- look, Ms. Cargile probably doesn't want that, and a lot of businesses out there don't want that, but we have an inherently broken tax system that begins there. All right?

So I would encourage you-all to channel this energy and work with your legislators and your local governments and civic organizations to really work on a broken constitution, particularly in the area of our tax code. We do have the lowest property tax in the state. We have the lowest gas tax in the state. The result of that, you have to wind up having one of the highest sales taxes in the state.

We have, you know, the -- 75 percent of our revenue in comes from sales and income, and that hits every working person in the State of Louisiana, me, you, her, him, them, everybody. And we need to fundamentally change that. So quite often we pick a target like the largest corporation in the world and say, "You're the bad guy." So I think we really need to just take a more holistic view of all of this and not disincentivize it and discourage corporate investment into Baton Rouge. You know, they face infrastructural
challenges in our state on a daily basis because we don't have any money as legislators to appropriate it properly because we don't collect enough because we have the lowest gas tax in the doggone country.

Phillip Devillier hates it when I say that.

DR. S. WILSON:

Secretary Wilson likes when you say that.

MR. CHABERT:

But it's true.

Traffic in East Baton Rouge backs up every day. Why? Because we don't have money to pour another bridge? Why? Because we don't collect enough infrastructure tax to improve it. Exxon hates that, so...

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator Chabert.

MR. CHABERT:

So we all need to work on this together.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER:

Yes, ma'am. I have -- actually I have a
lot of thoughts, but I just want to ask you a few questions.

You mentioned that this project has been -- several people have mentioned that this project has been finished. When was the decision or approximately when was the decision made by Exxon to actually invest that money in East Baton Rouge Parish?

MS. CARGILE:

That's a great question.

So for these projects, the decision was made way back in 2014 or 2015.

MR. MILLER:

That's what I figured.

MS. CARGILE:

So they were made under the old ITEP rules. In fact, the advanced application was filed back in 2016. We waited until the new rules were promulgated. And there was a lot of discussion earlier on another agenda item about communicating with the public, and that's one thing that our company believes very strongly in. We went and even talked to neighbors, elected officials and the mayor's office about these applications, and they asked us to wait until the new rules were promulgated to move forward.

MR. MILLER:
I just want to make sure that everyone understood, Exxon doesn't make -- like most people, don't make decisions to invest in '16 to build in '16. It's usually way before that.

Secondly, during that timeframe, from '14 through today, how many projects has Exxon, roughly, and within your group, how many projects has Exxon decided to do elsewhere?

MS. CARGILE:

So I think anyone can look at the media and see the investment that has been made recently in the state next to ours, in Texas. There is, like I said, it is about $20-billion worth of investment at our hands and an opportunity. I don't have an exact number of that 20-billion how much is going to Texas, but there's a lot, but the good news is we want to bring more of it here.

We have a project right now that is under gate review today, and we are hoping to get that project. You guys actually approved the ITEP for the eventually nearly a billion-dollar polypropylene project here. So we want to get some of that investment. If we can, we can grow the amount of property taxes that we pay for the long-term.

MR. MILLER:
Right.

MS. CARGILE:

Our assets at the refinery, for example, stay on the tax rolls for 30 years. Even when those assets go out of service, they are still -- we're still paying taxes on them.

MR. MILLER:

Okay. So if I'm not mistaken, there was a $10-billion project that Exxon took to Texas we barely got to look at because we were in the middle of our rules evaluation. I think it was 1,200 jobs that went to Texas, and no matter what Exxon says, I have to believe that our uncertainty had something to do with that.

Just for -- this isn't necessarily about Exxon. If anybody thinks that the markets trends, market forces, including ITEP, don't have an impact or they're not -- and the river's there. If you go down -- anybody here drives down Gulf States Road in Baton Rouge, when I was a kid, because I grew up right off of Foster Road where that gentleman lives, and my dad worked at the end of Gulf States Road, there are plants all of way down that road. Today they're not there. Some of them are not there. And nothing's come back in its place. So things can make them leave.
I don't believe Exxon would pick up tomorrow and be gone, but in 15 years, instead of being 6,500, 7,000 employees, there could be 3,000. If you think it's hard to get tax money out of people who are growing and green and doing great, then try and get something from someone that's leaving.

And I have much more to say, but that's all I'll leave with today. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Miller.

MR. MOLLER:

I just have some questions specific to the one on -- the refinery and the job creation totals. Would you be the appropriate person to ask or is there anybody else?

MS. CARGILE:

I'd like for Gloria Moncada, our refinery manager, to come up here if that's okay.

MR. MOLLER:

Okay.

MS. CARGILE:

I can help answer them, but she's...

MR. WINDHAM:

Please identify yourself.
MS. MONCADA:

Gloria Moncada, Exxon Baton Rouge Refinery Manager.

MR. WINDHAM:

Congratulations.

MS. MONCADA:

Thank you.

MR. MOLLER:

I'm just trying to understand job creation, because this says the refinery component would create 18 new permanent jobs.

MS. MONCADA:

Correct.

MR. MOLLER:

I'm looking at the Advanced Notification filed on the refinery in late 2016. That said there were 1,283 existing jobs at the refinery, and then another Advanced that was filed a year later, at the end of the 2017, that said there were 1,272 jobs, so a net loss of 11 jobs. But then in your application, it said there were 1,357 existing jobs and that 18 new ones would be added. Could you just kind of clarify those three numbers for me so I understand?

MS. MONCADA:

Yeah, absolutely. I know how it can be
confusing. It has to do with the timeframe that you're looking at. So we hire throughout the year. In fact, you know, we'll have years where we hire over 100 people, but during the year, we'll have retirements, you've got people that move on to different assignments, and so depending on when you take that snapshot, you could see movement in the head count.

What you need to look at is positions in the refinery; right, because you'll sometimes have a position, but it's unfilled while you've got a retirement waiting on that next new hire to get trained up and put in the job. So when we count positions, we know that we're increasing positions.

MR. MOLLER:

So 1,357, the number that's in this application, that is the number of positions at your company at what point in time?

MS. MONCADA:

I don't know that I can --

MR. MOLLER:

That's not the actual number of warm bodies working at the refinery?

MS. MONCADA:

The 1,357 is the number of bodies that -- that application has the number of bodies that
were at the site at the time that number was drawn.

MR. MOLLER:

On 3 -- on March 30th of 2018?

MS. MONCADA:

I believe so.

MS. CARGILE:

I believe so, yeah. I think so.

And, Jan, one other thing that you might want to notice is when the advances were filed -- and this is something we've shared with a lot of folks -- you had a different set of rules; right? So the assets related to the jobs at that time were different than when we readjusted because several of our assets did not apply under the new rules; right?

MR. MOLLER:

Right.

MS. CARGILE:

So we had to remove regulatory, environmental regulatory, anything that was in there that did not apply. So that changed the whole face of your application as well. So your final application was moved to adjust the new capital that applied under the new rules and the new jobs with that capital.

MR. MOLLER:

Okay. And LED is satisfied that these
18 jobs are actual 18 new jobs? I'm just -- you understand my confusion, because it looked like the number of jobs decreased year to year during the year where it was supposed to add 18.

MS. MONCADA:

Absolutely. Right.

MS. CHENG:

There are compliance documents that need to be filed with LED once there is an active contract on this application, and the compliance documents are filed every year, so...

MS. MONCADA:

And we use whatever basis, you know, whether if we start out by applying with positions, we'll end with positions. If we start out applying by just pure head count, we use that same basis so that we don't create confusion in approving of the number.

MR. MOLLER:

So they file the compliance documents after we approve this?

MS. CHENG:

Correct.

MR. MOLLER:

And if there's some problem with the compliance, I mean, if you look at this and say, "Well,
it doesn't look like you actually created the 18 jobs," what happens then?

MS. CHENG:

If compliance isn't met, it comes back to the Board and it goes back to the locals.

MR. MOLLER:

Okay.

MS. CARGILE:

And let me also add to that that you only see two EBR applications and one West Baton Rouge; right? And we haven't asked why, but the answer is that all of our plant managers look at the CEA that LED asks us to sign, and they wanted to make sure that we were able to maintain those job growth numbers for each contract over the 10-year period of the abatement. So that was done with very diligent review by each plant manager as well as our HR team because they didn't want to sign that --

MS. MONCADA:

In fact, two of the applications, the reason they were not sure about maintaining is because we're sending employees to Texas for projects that are being built there with Exxon Mobil because it's more attractive.

MR. MOLLER:
Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. I have on deck Mr. Slone first and then Secretary Pierson.

Mr. Slone.

MR. SLONE:

Sure. Thank you for sharing that information about the jobs because they can be a little bit confusing.

I guess my questions would be simply can you talk a little bit about the direct value to Baton Rouge and the communities that you guys have put some work into? Because I know there's some things going on in North Baton Rouge that are near and dear to my heart as a young man that grew up in North Baton Rouge and had relatives at Exxon Mobil, and from what I can hear is there's a corporate citizenship piece that maybe sometimes get overlooked in some of these conversations. So can you share a little bit about that?

MS. CARGILE:

Absolutely. That's what I like to talk about the most.

So we give about 5-million back to the Baton Rouge community alone every year. There's a little bit more added to that because we were actually
able to attract $13-million that went to the National Math and Science Initiative. And that, by the way, goes to schools in our surrounding school districts. A lot of it in EBR where each school gets direct funding and the teachers in those schools that teach AP classes actually get stipends. So it's a great way to directly support the schools and teachers involved in the National Math and Science Initiative. So we are hoping that we can continue to bring that NMSI funding back to Louisiana and back to EBR schools.

Some of the really cool projects that I think you're referring to that we're doing in North Baton Rouge, we're working right now to help the community there start a small business resource center, and we're hoping to get that up and running in early 2019. That's a cool partnership between Southern University, the Chamber, LED. We brought in a whole lot of partners, and even gotten other companies in the area, like Coca-Cola and some of the banks in North Baton Rouge to rally around with us. That will be a business investment because the business is actually giving us an office building to operate from. We will also have the Baton Rouge North Economic Development District housed there. So that's a great way to foster growth in small businesses in the North Baton Rouge
We're secondly expanding our North Baton Rouge Industrial Training Initiative. That actually tripled. There was a news release that went out yesterday. And like you said, it didn't get picked up yet by the media. Sometimes it's hard to get the story out. But that program accepted 200 people in North Baton Rouge to go through a free fasttrack training where they'll get jobs in our industry. And Gloria Moncada right here made the commitment to actually direct hire the students in the millwright program. So that's a new tract directly that will be hired by the refinery.

So that's just an example of two of the programs that we're doing in North Baton Rouge.

MR. SLONE:
Do you have any idea of how much money does Exxon Mobil contribute to the United Way?

MS. CARGILE:
We're the largest corporate distributor to the United Way, so we make up about 14 percent of their budget, and it's about 1.5-million each year.

MR. SLONE:
But when they distribute that money, it doesn't say "Exxon Mobil" on it, does it?
MS. CARGILE:
No, it does not.

MR. SLONE:
It just says "United Way"?

MS. CARGILE:
That's right.

MR. SLONE:
Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Slone.
Secretary Pierson.
Please let's keep the order.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Just a point of clarification and maybe
one other point I'd like to illuminate, but certainly
Advanced Notifications are estimates and they should
already be treated that way. They are the best
available information when the project is envisioned,
and that's why when the application comes forward, you
have more certainty, and certainly the Governor's
edition of the NXA, which is basically a contract of
what the company will provide and where and for how
long. Those details are available. They're available
for the examination in front of these school boards and
parish and sheriff activities. So the idea that the
Advanced may not have agreed with the final document in the application is not surprising at all.

Just want to kind of -- one of features of the Industrial Tax Exemption Program is it also recognizes the permanent jobs that are created as part of the project. That may or may not be a full-time Exxon employee, but represent a significant employment in the region. So while we see maybe 1,270, 80 jobs that are Exxon at the refinery, what figure do you think of when you think of your total employment there?

MS. MONCADA:

The number of people that cross through our gate every day at the refinery alone is over 3,000 people. For all of the Exxon Mobil facilities in Baton Rouge, it's about 5,000 people.

SECRETARY PIERSON:

Thank you. I think it just calls attention to a discrepancy of seven or 10 that will be accounted for, that we do know the exact location where these projects will be executed, we do have access to payroll and we will hold Exxon accountable to the requirements of the program, but I would hope that all of us would look beyond just the people that pass through the gate, more than 5,000 daily, and understand the implications that these manufacturing tax exemptions
are only offered to manufacturers. Why? Because they're a tremendous multiplier. There's many thousands of other jobs that are generated by this project and by that employment that ripple through the economy, and all of that needs to be looked at. And, you know, certainly from our perspective, we want to build a vibrant economy in Louisiana, we want good education. How will we get there? We grow the pie. And so I'm hopeful that the Board will support today, and I'm certainly speaking on behalf of these projects that Exxon has proposed for the 10-year tax exemption.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Senator Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:

Mr. Secretary, those were great remarks and comments. I had wanted to say that I have a lot of support back home for changes in the laws that we have and the procedures that we have, but I wanted to let you know that it's a little bit too little too late. As you said, you couldn't get it in the paper about what you were doing and how you're doing, but I just, as a warning or as an information deliver, there's a lot of legislators that want to change the direction we're going. And the way we're going to build Louisiana is
like what Commissioner Pierson said, if we don't get these corporations in and people that are in it now to do a good job for the future, we won't have the public being supporting you like you're being supported today.

Nothing's more important than education.

When I hear those teachers, former teachers, talking about the importance of education, nothing is more important than that. And corporations like Exxon have recognized that, but they're going to have to do a real good selling job for the next generation of those ITEP groups that come in. Hope they're in my area. Hope we can work as partners in that type of operation, but if we hadn't had Governor John Bel Edwards in the mix, we probably wouldn't have this opportunity to do what we're doing today.

But I just want people to realize that here today, the public is supporting Exxon and others. We've seen that all through the process today, but that may not be the case in another five or six months. And Don Pierson made that point very clear. We've got to make sure that you-all do the right thing all of the time, and I want to encourage that. I don't know who's here with Exxon Mobil today, but one of the largest corporations in the world making more profit than any, they need to set good examples here in Louisiana.
MS. CARGILE:
Absolutely.

MR. THOMPSON:
As they've done in the past.

MS. CARGILE:
We agree.

MR. THOMPSON:
But rather than taking baby steps, we ought to make some leaps. We shouldn't be here today talking about that. If we'd have done right at the beginning, we probably wouldn't be refighting this battle and every step of the way. You understand that?

MS. CARGILE:
Right. I think, you know -- and just to reply to that, I think, you know, in general, our company agrees with the policy changes that have been made. We like the fact that locals are involved. It's given us an opportunity to talk to a lot of stakeholders about our investment, about our projects, things that we maybe would have never had those types of conversations. So we embrace the changes that have been made.

The thing that I think our company asks the most is just for predictability. Tell us what the policy is, and we will follow it, we will abide by it, and we will use it to try to get projects here so that
we can become an even stronger corporate citizen, an
even stronger contributor to the economy.

MR. THOMPSON:

Thank you for those comments, because
that's what we want, but if I was at Exxon Mobil, I
would have every university in research and development
in this area, not just -- and I would not come to the
table and say, "I couldn't get my points across in the
newspaper." If you can't get your points across in the
newspaper, somebody's not doing their business.

MS. CARGILE:

It was just that one story.

MR. THOMPSON:

Right, but we ought to be leading, not
following or not saying, "Whatever y'all require of us
to do, we're going to do our best to do it." You ought
to be making examples. And I bet if I did a little
research, I could find that you're doing much more in
some other states that are not doing as much for you as
the people of Louisiana are.

MS. CARGILE:

I actually do have to just disagree with
that. Our community --

MR. THOMPSON:

Well, prove it to me.
MS. CARGILE:

I would love to sit down with you and show you what we're doing in the Baton Rouge Community. That is the leader amongst all of our downstream sites.

MS. MONCADA:

Absolutely.

MS. CARGILE:

And Gloria will agree with that. As far as bringing private sector funding and resources to public issues, like giving capacity to small businesses, like giving folks jobs in North Baton Rouge.

MR. THOMPSON:

Right.

MS. CARGILE:

So that was -- North Baton Rouge Industrial Training Initiative was, one of our refinery managers started that because they wanted our near neighbors to have more jobs in our industry. So that is a program that has not been replicated at any of our sites across the US, and we want to lead.

MR. THOMPSON:

Right. Last comment, I appreciate that, but I would just suggest make some leaps and just -- you don't have to do it just right here where you get the vote. You need to do it statewide and make sure that
all of these entities next time are right there in support of what you're doing because this -- the resources that we have in Louisiana, gas, oil, you wouldn't be here without that, and processing and so forth, but that's owned by all of the citizens of the State of Louisiana. You know that.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Senator.

All right. Next on we have -- Ms. Moncada, do you have anything to add?

MS. MONCADA:

The only thing I want to clear up is a fallacy that was I think referred to earlier that Exxon Mobil is here to stay and that the ITEP doesn't make any difference. I'm, in fact, in a position of knowledge to know that it makes absolutely a difference at Exxon Mobil. When asked earlier about projects that have not come here, I've been involved in watching corporately decisions being made to send billion-dollar-plus projects to our Beaumont refinery. And, in fact, we're competing right now, very hard, for a project in Baton Rouge that's being considered versus our Baytown, Texas refinery.

I'll just end with saying the $6-million abatement that we're talking about here, these projects
came with that incentive. It attracted those projects to Baton Rouge versus our other refineries, 19, around the world, and they're going to generate $23-million of property and sales tax benefit over the next 20 years. $6-million of abatement providing $23-million. If the projects hadn't come, that 23-million would be a zero, so...

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Moncada. And you tell those people at corporate that we want those projects.

MS. MONCADA:

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

I know this Board does.

All right. Next we have Mr. Chris Parker. I think Mr. On deck we have Scott Gleason.

Again, if you can keep your comment to two to three minutes, unless there are questions by the Board members.

MR. PARKER:

Yes, sir. Chris Parker, Exxon Mobil.

Most of the comments I was going to make were discussed between the Board and Stephanie and Ms. Gloria, but I did just want to add and clear up something that was stated earlier. It was said that the
projects were completed 18 months ago, but in reality
they were completed December of 2017. So that's 12
months by my calculations. So just wanted to clear that
up.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Thank you.

Mr. Gleason.

Please, if you have comments you'd like
to talk amongst yourself, please step out to the
hallway.

Mr. Gleason.

MR. GLEASON:

Good morning. I'm Scott Gleason. I am
the Plant Manager at the lubricants plant in Port Allen,
Louisiana.

In the interest of not repeating
anything, I'll just talk in terms of from a lubricants
perspective. We do compete, not only with the other
plants here in the United States, but across the globe
for these investments. Recently we celebrated two years
of our new aviation facility, which we are very, very
proud of. And the predictability of the investment that
we make drives a lot of these decisions. So we have a
lot of things in the future that we're competing not
only with our neighboring states in Texas, but
throughout the US and throughout the globe for this business. So I'd ask that you continue to give us that predictability so that we can make the appropriate investment.

I am not from Louisiana, but this is my second time I've returned a citizen. I'm very, very happy to be here. I want to continue to support our great state, and thank you very much.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Gleason.

We have Brad Allen, and on deck, Sam Williams.

MR. ALLEN:

Good morning. My name is Brad Allen. I'm the Operations Manager at Exxon Mobil's Baton Rouge Polyolefins plant. So that is the plant where we've had a lot of discussions at past meetings about the polypropylene expansion project.

Again, not to repeat anything. Just wanted to mention, you know, one of our lined items on this ITEP approval is for some projects in our polyethylene facility. So we produce both of those products at our plant here. Those projects are really designed to increase our reliability, our safety performance in order to set ourselves up for that next
tranche of that $20-billion corporate investment that we're looking at. So we are very successful over the years of improving our plant to get that money for this polypropylene plant. We're doing the same thing right now for polyethylene. So that's another expansion zone we're looking at, and that's what these projects are really designed to do. They're to make ourselves look better in our corporation's eyes so that we're able to successfully compete for those bigger expansions and projects in the future.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Allen.

Sam Williams, and on deck we have Clay Fuller.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Good morning. My name is Sam Williams. I am the Product Quality Assurance Manager at Port Allen lubricants plant on the west side.

I'm just here to say that I appreciate allowing me to come on today to speak and to ask you-all to do what you are here to do. But I'm excited about the opportunity that I have at Exxon Mobil with these projects coming along and to make us more robust to get more projects at our facilities and also allow us an
opportunity to send some of our employees over to the other schools to be able to be mentors with Junior Achievement and things of that nature. And if it were not for these projects, then we could not free these young people up to go and inspire other people in our public education schools.

I am a graduate, a lifelong resident of East Baton Rouge Parish. I went to schools in East Baton Rouge Parish. I actually volunteered my time, energy and effort, also my wife, in the schools. So we spend a lot of time in the schools. So, therefore, I just ask you-all to assist us to help young people to go and inspire other young people in the education areas.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Clay Fuller.

MS. CHENG:

Clay Fuller doesn't want to speak.

MR. WINDHAM:

Oh, I'm sorry.

All right. Tyler Gray, I think, and on deck, Adam Knapp.

MR. GRAY:

Good morning. I think it's still the
morning. My name is Tyler Gray. I am currently the General Counsel for the Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, but I will, in my capacity here, I'll also be President of the organization starting next year.

You know, a lot has been covered today, some different issues. What I want to do is just kind of make one general comment. So Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association has several members representing the oil and gas industry here in the State of Louisiana. Those memberships include Exxon, Shell, PBF, Chalmette Refining, Enlink, Tellurian and several other companies.

Now, the other companies have already been approved; right? The rules have been followed, and they've been allowed to move forward. At this point, we're looking at one application, and from what I've heard today from Secretary Pierson, whose trust I put in evaluating the rules that we set forth, it comes out in favor of the application. So, therefore, as a representative of all of industry, I do want to focus on the fact that we are granting exemptions when organizations are following the rules. Therefore, when we have situations where we look at policy beyond the scope of this Board, something like education, which the Governor has already come out and said is an issue and
we will address going forward. And as a representative of industry, I can tell you that workforce development is just as important as investment.

We have those conversations at the appropriate time. Today we look at the rules, we review the exemptions, we grant the exemption. If they don't comply, we send them back to the place that they go. LED has spoken. We've heard from the applicant. And so at that point, I ask you to look at it from that perspective to make sure that we stay focused, we review the application, what's put in front of us and we move forward.

With that, I appreciate the opportunity to make comments. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.

Mr. Knapp.

MR. KNAPP:

Thank you for the opportunity be with you today. My name is Adam Knapp. I'm the President and CEO of the Baton Rouge Area Chamber. Our organization leads the economic development in the nine-parish Capitol Region and we serve as the economic development partner for East Baton Rouge Parish on economic development projects that concern the parish.
On a personal note, I'll also add, for the prior comments, that my children are students in the East Baton Rouge Parish School System, all three of them, and my wife and I are both participants in the PTA and active in our community. Our parish -- our own property taxes and sales taxes, of course, go to support our parish services, and we are personally involved and active in the education system. And I would say we are proud of the services provided by East Baton Rouge Parish public schools, and that's the reason why my family chooses to do that for our children. It's something that we believe is an important part of our life. Both of us were products of public education. Me in Lake Charles and her in Virginia, but we both continue to be very active. I will say it is a good public school system and it's one that's working very hard every day because of many of the people in the room doing everything they can to get better as well.

Our parish is stronger, not weaker, for having an incredible base of manufacturing, which is, today, driving our economy. Yesterday, the Baton Rouge Area of Chamber released it's 2019 forecast for the regional economy, and we enjoy economic growth. Much was said earlier about the boom that's happening in Lake Charles. I would say that we've been on a pretty good
streak ourselves, although we do envy a little bit some of the numbers that we see in Lake Charles. We've been on a good streak ourselves.

We also reported yesterday that area household incomes in the Capital Region reached a record high this past year, largely driven by an incredible surge we've seen in manufacturing activity over the last five or six years, and that is driving household income at a rate faster than Louisiana, faster than our peer cities across the country in the last 10 years --

MR. WINDHAM:
Two minutes.

MR. KNAPP:
-- and we're excited to see that contributing to a benefit that is spreading across our community.

Economic development is, of course, a complicated business, and our tax code is less attractive in many cases than other states, so the incentive tools that you provide through things like the ITE provide targeted strategies for how companies make corporate investment decisions, as you've heard, and it has benefited our community, not taking away from it, to have a very strong manufacturing base.

Industry, as you've heard, is paying
two-thirds of the parish property taxes in our community, and they're going to continue to be the fuel in the tank of education funding because of ITEP, because of ITEP is helping to attract manufacturing, and we should do everything we can to continue to push forward.

We stand in support of the Exxon Mobil applications today. We are pleased to continue to compete for economic development projects with Exxon. We continue to appreciate the support that this organization board has provided.

I would note that the last application you approved for the project, that polyolefin project that was spoken of, was approved at the local level unanimously by the school board, by the Metro Council and signed off on by the sheriff. There is an enormous community support for Exxon Mobil and for manufacturing.

We appreciate your time in volunteering.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Knapp.

That is all of the cards that I have.

Again, is there anyone that would like to make a comment?

(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I always like to give everyone an 
opportunity to speak.
All right. With that, all we have on 
this one is three Exxons for consideration; correct, Ms. 
Cheng? Three?

MS. CHENG:
Correct. 20161911, 20161914 and 
20161915.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. With those, I believe 
Mr. Slone has made the motion to approve. It has been 
seconded by Ms. Heather Malone.
Any further discussion or questions by 
any of the Board members?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Next on the agenda, we have 14
post-Executive Order --

MS. CHENG:
We just did that.

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry.

MS. CHENG:
That's okay. We have 111 --

MR. WINDHAM:
We have 111 renewal applications, and in light of the video that was put out, I'd like for you to read each one of those individually.

MS. CHENG:
Okay.

MR. WINDHAM:
So it is not perceived that we just rubber stamp these. Unless there's an objection by any of the Board members.

MS. CHENG:
20140276, American Advanced Technologies, LLC in Terrebonne Parish; 20121084, BASF Corporation in Concordia Parish; 20140332, Bancroft Bag, Inc. In Ouachita Parish; 20121271, Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. in Lafayette Parish; 20140295, Bercen --

MR. WINDHAM:
I will entertain a motion to approve
these in globo.

Made by Mr. Slone; seconded by Mr. Jan Moller.

Is there any discussion from the public concerning in globo passing of these renewals?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Any comments or discussion from the Board members?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Do we have a quorum?

MR. CHABERT:

There are several members that are in need of a pause, but they're coming out.

MS. CHENG:

I can keep reading until then if you want.

MR. WINDHAM:

I'm sorry. There is a video screen in the break room with audio. We have 13 now or 14.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."
MR. WINDHAM:

The renewals are approved.
We have one late renewal request.

MS. CHENG:


MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a representative here from PBF Holding Company?

Please step forward. Can you tell us why you were late?

MR. KORT:

First off, my name is Greg Kort. I'm with Ryan, LLC. Thank you for the chance to speak to you on this issue.

Reason for us being late on this is PBF had a transition in consulting in terms of who was handling their property taxes in Louisiana. Prior consultant contract ended at the end of the year and ours picked up at the beginning of the year and we had basically a learning process of getting an understanding of what PBF all had. And we kind of missed the boat on
this, so we apologize. And that's the reason for the late application.

MR. WINDHAM:
So this due date was December 31st, 2017. The renewal request date was 2018, 8/14 of 2018. It's been our practice to reduce this by one year, and I would entertain a motion for the same.

Made by Ms. Malone; seconded by Mr. Briggs.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have a quorum now?
Yes, we have a quorum.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Thank you, sir.

MS. CHENG:
We have 74 changes of company name only contract amendments.
MR. WINDHAM:

Motion has been made to approve the 74 in globo as they apply to two entities, Columbian Chemicals Company will be changed to Birla.

MS. CHENG:

Birla Carbon U.S.A., Inc. in St. Mary Parish and Graphic Packaging International, Inc. will be changed to Graphic Packaging International, LLC in Ouachita Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:

That’s for all of the listed contracts as identified by number.

Motion has been made by Dr. Wilson to approve in globo; seconded by Ms. Malone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

We have one change in physical location contract amendment requests.

MR. WINDHAM:
Comments, please step outside.

MS. CHENG:

Denbury Onshore, LLC, Contract 20150267 was previously located at 481 Highway 609, Delhi, Louisiana 71235 in Richland Parish, and their new location is 463 Highway 609, Delhi, Louisiana in Richland Parish.

I believe they didn't move. It's a change in address by the post office.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Are there any questions concerning this, even though.

Motion has been made by Dr. Wilson to approve; seconded by Major Coleman.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye" -- oh, I'm sorry. Dr. Wilson has a question in addition.

DR. S. WILSON:

Just to comment for a Senator Francis, we've had three projects that were all North Louisiana, and he was commenting the entire day of nothing being in North Louisiana.

MR. THOMPSON:

I made the motion.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Thank you, Dr. Wilson.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

We have one transfer of tax exemption contract: Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc., D/B/A, Great States Galvanizing, Contract 20161014 is being transferred to South Atlantic, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. For the transfer of exemption contract, any comments from the public?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion from the Board?

Made by Mr. Briggs; seconded by Mayor Brasseaux.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

We actually have four -- that's incorrect on the front cover page. We have four partial transfers -- or, no. I'm sorry. They're being transferred to multiple companies. That's why. I misspoke. Sorry.

Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc., D/B/A, Great States Galvanizing, Contract 20100919, they're retaining $741,106. South Atlantic, LLC is receiving $3,416,185 in assets and Natchez Management, LLC is receiving $5,281,298 in assets from that contract.

Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc., D/B/A, Great States Galvanizing, Contract 20190919–A is retaining $431,866 in assets in East Baton Rouge Parish and is transferring $25,571 to South Atlantic, LLC and Natchez Management, $31,101 to Natchez Management, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish.

Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc., D/B/A, Great States Galvanizing, Contract 20140711 is retaining $71,273 in East Baton Rouge Parish, transferring $51,948 in assets to South Atlantic, LLC and $68,237 in assets to Natchez Management, LLC both in East Baton Rouge.
Parish.

Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc., D/B/A, Great States Galvanizing, Contract 20150736 is retaining $8,046, transferring $92,553 to South Atlantic, LLC and $78,091 to Natchez Management, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Cheng.

On the partial transfer of exemption contracts, any comments from the Board members?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

From the public?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Questions or comment from the Board members?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to approve?

Made by Senator Francis Thompson;

seconded by Mr. Briggs.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

Ms. Cheng.

MS. CHENG:

I have 11 contract cancelation requests:

Deltech Corporation, Contracts 20090579, 20100090, 20110315, 20120527, 20130550, 20140481, 20141333, 20150504 and 20160965, company requests cancelation, and they're located in East Baton Rouge Parish.

Dredging Supply Company, Inc., Contract 20110831 in St. John the Baptist Parish, company requests cancelation.

And Groth Equipment Corporation, D/B/A, Groquip, Contract 20100619 in Ascension Parish, both companies request cancelation.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. All of these have been requested cancelation by the companies themselves.

Are there any comments from the public concerning the cancelation request of the companies?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion?
The motion has been made by Senator Thompson; seconded by Representative Devillier.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

I six special requests from Bradken in Tangipahoa Parish. They request non-cancelation of their -- they are actually idled currently, but they're requesting to continue their ITEP contracts in the hopes of attracting a buyer. They're working with locals to get a letter of support, but these are Contracts 20100584, 20110612, 20120506, 20140515, 20150507, and 20161009.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Thank you.

Secretary Pierson.

SECRETARY PIERSON:

Just some additional information. The Parish Resident, Robbie Miller, would likely have to recuse himself from this vote. He has not been able to
stay here at the meeting and has had to depart. His request was to the Board that this be deferred to the February meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion has been made by Mr. Slone to defer the cancelations until the February meeting for these ones related to Bradken. There's a second by Secretary Pierson.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

MS. CHENG:

That concludes the Industrial Tax Exemption portion of the agenda.

MR. WINDHAM:

We have an appeal, I believe.

MS. CHENG:

ITEP appeals are under Other Business. We do have one ITEP denial appeal, LED requests -- received a request from Reliable EDM appealing the decision to deny their request for late renewal of tax
exemption contract by the Board of Commerce and Industry at the October 31st, 2018 meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a representative from Reliable EDM with us?

Please step forward and identify yourself, make your appeal.

Mr. SOMMER:

Yes. I'm John Sommer with Reliable EDM, and we're obviously not on par with these companies. I had no idea this is this formal. I was actually out of town and I was at a meeting and I didn't realize that it was this formal. I apologize. I was not able to make it to the meeting on the 31st. I was in Denver.

So I'm asking is there any way that we could continue this contract that we had?

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. The process is, I believe we have to have a motion to --

MS. CHENG:

Approve the appeal.

MR. WINDHAM:

-- approve the appeal, and then we'll vote on --

MS. CHENG:
Reconsider.

MR. WINDHAM:

-- the consequences, reconsideration.

So is there a motion to approve the request for appeal?

Made by Mr. Briggs.

Is there a second?

Made by Mr. Manny Fajardo. I'll get it right one day.

Is there any discussion by any of the Board members to approve the request for the appeal?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.

All right. So on here, you were due to be in on December 31st of 2017. You were late by eight months. The practice has been to reduce your exemption by one year for that.

MR. SOMMER:
Okay.

MR. WINDHAM:

So is there a motion to do just that, reduce it to a four-year contract?

Motion has been made by Major Coleman; seconded by Ms. Baker.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

Mr. Slone.

MR. SLONE:

Okay. I was just curious, is this the one from our meeting where there was no representative present and we thought that maybe based on the magnitude of what's going on that someone should have been here? I'm just curious if this was the same one. I'd have to go back to my last meeting notes.

MR. WINDHAM:

I don't believe so. This was one where there was no representative. The one that I -- I have a different question about, but I don't think so because this investment was $298,000.

MR. SLONE:

Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
The exemption is $2,700 a year.

MR. SLONE:
Okay.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Any further questions?

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Secretary Pierson.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
I'll make my remarks very quickly as the hour grows late, and I know that --

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry. I thought you had a comment.

Hold on.

All right. So all in favor, indicate with an "aye" to reduce it by one year, so it's a four-year renewal contract. All in favor, indicate with an "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."

(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carried. Thank you.
All right. So what happened to Cocentric? Did the gentleman not make it?

MS. CHENG:
No. His renewal was timely.

MR. WINDHAM:
It was just an oversight?

MS. CHENG:
Yeah.

MR. WINDHAM:
That was the gentleman that I told that he did not have to come back?

MS. CHENG:
That's correct.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I just want to make sure that we all know that I was trying to be nice.

All right. Secretary -- that's all the exemptions, special requests and everything?

MS. CHENG:
Yes.

MR. WINDHAM:
Secretary Pierson, comments to the Board and to the public.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Again, I'd like to thank all of the
Board members for their participation in this important process today. We had a lot of very good discussion. We think that it's very appropriate for the public to have input with the elected officials to make the decisions at the local level, which is what this Board now provides through the new rules established through the leadership of Governor John Bel Edwards. We have accountability, we have a local voice in the process and what we're seeing here is simply that action taking place. And with that, we've also seen unanimous support for proposed expanding industries in our state, and hopefully this message resonates and allows us to continue to recruit new jobs, new investment in our state, grow the pie and completely agree with the support for education, and we know that's a priority to the Governor as well.

I get concerned about some of the figures that I read in the paper when there are estimates about what a tax exemption might be, when those are exaggerated and divided by numbers and come up with a sort of a meaningless quote that alarms many people, citizens, business organizations and corporations, appropriately alarms them. But just as we talked about 1,280 jobs for Exxon and their project with a realization that actually there's a number of
contractors that augment that to a number that exceeds 3,000, and those are the jobs inside the fence that are multiplied significantly through the ripple effect in the economy.

Again, it's important, as we do our work, to educate and to make sure there's an understanding out there in the greater community, that we're not doing this for every business. We are doing this for manufacturers that will be held accountable for what they're offering to our state and growing the pie, and that certainly is how we improve many things, education included, health care, roads, bridges, et cetera.

With that, I want to thank the LED staff who put a lot of muscle into making sure that we were well prepared today to answer your questions, to answer the questions of the public and for their dedication. We've had a great year. We will print our annual report and have that available to you in the first quarter of '19, but we continue to set a standard of excellence at Louisiana Economic Development, where we are now the only state organization in economic development that is certified by the International Economic Development Council where we once again receive the Number 1 Workforce Training Program in America designation from

So we're doing your work, and certainly the support that we get from this Board with the scrutiny, the requirement for accountability and following a process, treating all of our clients in a uniform manner is greatly appreciated and makes a very significant statement towards establishing stability, which is the number one requirement for business to make investments in our state.

So thank you for your efforts and support in that regard.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Secretary Pierson.

I have just a couple of announcements that I have to make before we adjourn. Most importantly, your annual ethics for Board members is due December 31st. If you have not taken the online class, you will be getting -- you'll probably be getting an e-mail anyway to sign up for the online ethics training so that we all are in compliance with that.

Board meeting dates for next year will be forthcoming, I believe, or do we have them? Oh, we
passed them out. Okay. I didn't get that. Maybe I did.

And then most importantly, elections of officers will be at the February Board meeting. So any of you that would like to step into this chair, please raise your hand now.

SECRETARY PIERSON:

We have had some interest from Mr. Jerry Jones, but we can handle this nominations process at our next meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:

Okay. There's going to be a nominations.

Senator Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON:

I'm not a regular member of this Board, sadly to say, but it's well run. I appreciate the effort that you-all put forward, and certainly our chairman, he was very well prepared. I would like to have him run most of my meetings for me. I'd just tell him what to do, Don. But thank you for your knowledge and your background. You know, I've watched you through Governor -- before you retired. And thank you, Don Pierson, on the job you do. Appreciate all of you's hard work and dedication, and legislators that agree to
serve on here. That's really good. Very important group.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. With that, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Made by Mr. Hollis; seconded by Mr. Slone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:

Adjourned.
(Meeting concludes at 12:08 p.m.)
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<td></td>
<td>87:7</td>
<td>93:6</td>
<td>96:23</td>
<td>101:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102:3,25</td>
<td>104:4,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109:23</td>
<td>110:24</td>
<td>111:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114:12</td>
<td>116:4</td>
<td>121:6,19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122:23</td>
<td>123:8</td>
<td>134:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135:4,15,17,18,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136:9</td>
<td>143:21</td>
<td>145:6,17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146:5,20</td>
<td>147:21</td>
<td>149:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>told</td>
<td>30:23</td>
<td>167:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomorrow</td>
<td>123:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools</td>
<td>148:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tossed</td>
<td>48:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17:1,3,4,5,19</td>
<td>22:12</td>
<td>24:16</td>
<td>49:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totally</td>
<td>51:20,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>123:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>touch</td>
<td>92:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toute</td>
<td>48:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town</td>
<td>55:10</td>
<td>86:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track</td>
<td>52:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tract</td>
<td>131:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade</td>
<td>97:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>119:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained</td>
<td>125:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>131:3,8</td>
<td>138:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranche</td>
<td>143:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcript</td>
<td>27:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer</td>
<td>13:23</td>
<td>14:7</td>
<td>157:9,15</td>
<td>159:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transferred</td>
<td>157:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranferring</td>
<td>158:18,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfers</td>
<td>158:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformational</td>
<td>50:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformative</td>
<td>66:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition</td>
<td>153:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparent</td>
<td>72:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>13:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td>97:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treated</td>
<td>132:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tremendous</td>
<td>134:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trends</td>
<td>122:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tripled</td>
<td>131:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>53:18</td>
<td>60:5,19</td>
<td>145:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn</td>
<td>78:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turned</td>
<td>75:11</td>
<td>102:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor</td>
<td>103:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>103:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>