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MR. WINDHAM:
Good morning, everyone. I
would like to welcome everyone to
the Board and Commerce and
Industry meeting on October 28th.
Thank $y^{\prime}$ all for coming and call
this meeting to order. Melissa,
do roll call, please.
MS . SORRELL:
Robert Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Robert Barham for Lieutenant
Governor Nungesser.
MR. BARHAM:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Representative Broadwater for
Representative Abramson.
MR. BROADWATER:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Millie Atkins.
MS . ATKINS:

Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Mayor Brasseaux.
MR. BRASSEAUX :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Representative Carmody.
MR. CARMODY:
Present.
MS . SORRELL:
Yvette Cola.
MS COLA:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Major Coleman.
MR. COLEMAN :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Rickey Fabra. Manny Fajardo.
Jerry Jones. Heather Malone.
MS . MALONE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Ben Hudson for Senator
Martiny.

MR. HUDSON :
Here.
MS . SORRELI:
Robbie Miller.
MR. MILLER :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Jan Moller.
MR. MOLLER :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Senator Chabert. Ann Miller
for Secretary Pierson.
MS . MILLER .
Here.
MS SORRELL:
Scott Richard.
MR. RICHARD :
Here.
MS . SORRELI:
Danny Shexnaydre. Ronnie
Slone. Bobby Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:

Steve Windham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Dr. Wilson. We have a quorum.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Melissa. With that, I can assume everyone has had a chance to recommence from the last meeting. I would like to entertain a motion. Motion by President Miller. Seconded by Mr. Williams. Any discussion? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed? Passed.
Within these minutes I would like to cover one question that was asked at the previous Board meeting. I think everyone has the information. Mr. Adley had
requested information on the Cleco's exemptions. And are there any questions on that? Mr . Adley?

MR. ADLEY:
No. They provided us the list and $I$ assume it's around 200, it looks like.

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes. It goes back to, I believe, 2002, so a lot of them are expired and not in effect right now.

So with that, I think that was the only question from the previous meeting. We'll move on.

MR. ADLEY:
I might add the other piece of information that was provided us was -- the question was did Cleco pay any property tax since electricity had been considered to be manufacturer, and the correct answer to that, as I understand, is $\$ 34$ million a year
the staff has provided.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. We will move on to the Quality Jobs Program. Mr.

Burton.
MR. BURTON :
Good morning. I have three new applications for the Board today.

20141243, Cajun Ready Mix Concrete, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish.

20141138, CGI Federal Inc. in Lafayette Parish.

20141058, NFR BioEnergy CT, LLC in Iberville Parish.

This concludes the new
applications for Quality Jobs.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?
MR. ADLEY:
You just clearly verified everything that -- you clarified that they met all of the obligations in the Quality Jobs?

MR. BURTON :
They have shown the number of requirements for the program for participation.

MR. ADLEY:
I move that you adopt all three.

MR. BURTON :
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
There's a motion to adopt the three applications for the Quality Jobs Program. Mr. Adley, and seconded by Mayor Brasseaux.
Any questions, comments, observation from the Board? All
in favor identify with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS :
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed? Motion passes. Next item up will be the Renewals.

MR. BURTON:
I have eight renewals for the

Board today.
20110680, Almatis Burnside
Inc. in Ascension Parish.
20120020, American Queen
Steamboat Operating Company, LLC
in Orleans Parish.
20110132, Cornerstone
Chemical Company in Jefferson
Parish.
20111070, Louisiana Spirits,
LLC in Jefferson Davis Parish.
20111077, the Pangburn Group,
Inc. in Pointe Coupee Parish.
20110996, the Schumacher
Group of Louisiana Inc. and TSG
Resources, Inc. in Lafayette
Parish.
20110920, Valero Services
Inc. \& Valero Refining New
Orleans, LLC in St. Charles
Parish.
And 20101033, Westlake Vinyls
Company, LP in Ascension Parish.
This concludes the Renewals.
MR. WINDHAM:

Any comments from the public relating to these renewals?

There's a motion to approve these
renewals from the Board member.
Moved by Millie Atkins. Seconded by Ms. Cola.

Any questions from the Board members? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed? Motion carries.
MR. BURTON :
The next item we're going to
have the Specials for Quality
Jobs. We have a request for a
change in name only of the
following contract: 20110680,
Almatis Burnside, Inc. changing
from Almatis Burnside Inc. to
Almatis Burnside, LLC in
Ascension Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?

Motion from the Board members.
Mr. Coleman. Seconded by Ms.
Heather Malone. All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON :
Next item is a Request for a
Change in Location only for the
following contract: 20140900,
ControlWorx, LLC changing from
10020 Mammoth Avenue, Baton
Rouge, Louisiana 70814 to 37056
Cornerview Road in Geismar,
70734. Changing from East Baton

Rouge to Ascension Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?
Is there a motion on the -- by
Board members? Motion to
approve. Seconded by Mr.
Williams. All in favor indicate

```
with an aye.
```

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any opposed with a nay.
Motion carries. Next.
MR. BURTON :
Next item is the Request for
a Change in Ownership only of the
following contracts: 20131069
from Leevac Shipbuilders, LLC to
Gulf Island Shipyards, LLC in
Terrebonne Parish. The reason
for this, the company stated that
the change in ownership is due to
the fact that Gulf Island
Shipyards, LLC purchased LEEVAC
Shipbuilders, LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:
Question by Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Just to be clear, the length
of the contract is from the original time, it doesn't start over with the new owner; is that
correct?
MR. BURTON:
Correct. It's still the same
length of contract. They are
change in ownership. Nothing
with that is going to change the
benefits or anything in the
program.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions? Any
comments from the public? Got a
motion by the Board. Mr. Miller.
Seconded by Mayor Brasseaux. All
in favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
Oppose with a nay. Motion carries.

MR. BURTON :
Last item under Quality Jobs
is going to be a request -- two
requests to terminate the contracts below. Contract No. 062272 Corval Constructors, Inc.

## BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY MEETING

and Corval Group Inc. The company
requested an early termination
because they no longer have
employees in the state. The
contract requirement has been
illustrated. That is in East
Baton Rouge Parish. The second
one is 20130825, Enerflex Energy
Systems, Inc. The company
requested an early termination
because they have moved and are
no longer located in a census
tract block group below the state median per capita income. The contract compliance has been
illustrated. That is in
Lafayette Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public regarding these terminations? Do we have a motion by the Board?

Mr. Coleman makes a motion to
approve the termination.
Seconded by Ms. Millie Atkins.
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
Motion carries.
Next we have -- thank you,
Mr. Burton.
Next we have Ms. Becky
Lambert presenting the
Restoration Tax Abatement
Program. Four new applications and two renewals.

MS . LAMBERT :
Good morning. I want to make
a slight correction to the
agenda. There are actually five new applications. It's the same investment dollars and jobs.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right.
MS . LAMBERT :
I will repeat it. There are five new applications instead of what is shown as four on the
agenda summary sheet.
MR. ADLEY:
What I'm trying to find out
is was it posted on the website
that there were these five or the
typo error of four?
MS . LAMBERT :
It's a typo error because within the agenda they have five applications on the summary sheet.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay.
MS . LAMBERT :
Please correct the record.
The first application is
20152025, 210 Laurel Street, LIC
in East Baton Rouge Parish.
20151958, Durrett
Investments, LLC, Lincoln Parish.
20151972, Gibraltar
Management Company in East Baton
Rouge Parish.
20150171, Susan M. Mizell and
Ronald J. Mizell, Orleans Parish.

And 20161399, Vantage Health
Plan, Inc. and Affinity Health
Group, LLC, Ouachita Parish.
This concludes the new
applications.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. All of these entities comply with the program rules, right?

MS . LAMBERT :
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
I assume that local
governments have some restoration that they have to go through the process within the program?

MS . LAMBERT :
Yes. They do. And every one of these applications that is going through the local process once $I$ send them a complete application and they've met all state requirements and then they go through their local governing authority approval process. This
does not come to the Board until
a resolution comes from the local governing authority approving and supporting this project.

MR. ADLEY:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?
Any other comments from the Board members? Is there a motion to approve?

MR. ADLEY:
Move to approve all five.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes. Is there a second? Motion made by Mr. Adley. Seconded by Mr. Coleman. Any questions from the Board members? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.

MS . LAMBERT:
We have two renewal
applications. First one is 050773, MWIII Hospitality, LLC in

East Baton Rouge Parish.
The second one is 20090849,
RICO 6, LLC, Terrebonne Parish.
That concludes the renewal
applications.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public concerning Restoration Tax

Abatement Renewals? Any comments or questions from the Board members? Is there a motion to approve the renewals for the RTA project? Major Coleman. Seconded by Ms. Atkins. Any questions?
All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All oppose with a nay.
Motion carries. Thank you, Ms.

Lambert.
MS . LAMBERT :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Next on the agenda we have
Enterprise Zone Program presented
by Ms. Joyce Metoyer. We have 17
new applications. Two referred
from last time. One name change,
and 11 contract terminations.
Please proceed.
MS . METOYER:
20130018, Bollinger Fourchon,
LLC, Lafourche Parish.
20140107, Doctors Dental,
LLC, Jefferson Parish.
20141335, Garden View at
Jones Creek, LLC, EBR Parish.
20131270, Halliburton Energy
Services, Inc., Iberia Parish.
20131100, Harlon's LA Fish --
Harlon's Louisiana Fish, LLC,
Jefferson Parish.
20130915, Hernandez
Consulting, LLC, Orleans Parish.

20141402, Ivan Smith
Furniture, LLC, Caddo Parish.
20141028, Louisiana Creole
Hospitality 1, LLC, Calcasieu
Parish.
20131119, Mid South Extrusion
Incorporated, Ouachita Parish.
201204450, Price Leblanc, EBR
Parish.
20130808, Rapides Health Care System, LLC, Rapides Parish.

20141309, Triumph Investment Group, LLC, Livingston Parish.

20131126, Venyu Solutions,
LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish.
20141009, Walmart Louisiana,
LLC Neighborhood Walmart,
Calcasieu Parish.
20141115, WalMart Louisiana,
LLC. That's another Neighborhood Walmart in Orleans Parish.

And the two referred from the
last Board meeting are 20150273, Parc Lafayette, LLC, Lafayette Parish.

And 20131359, USA Travel
Plaza, LLC, in Ouachita Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer. And all of these meet the program requirements.

MS . METOYER:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Create the jobs as required by the program?

MS . METOYER:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public regarding any of these applications? Any comments from the Board regarding Enterprise Zone Applications? Is there a motion to accept the Enterprise Zone applications? Made by Mr. Secretary Barham. Is there a second?

MR. ADLEY:
Second.

MR. WINDHAM:
Made by Mr. Adley. All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
Please proceed.
MS . METOYER:
The terminations are
20121110, 235 14th Street --
MR. WINDHAM:
I think you skipped some. Did
you skip the name change?
MS . METOYER :
Oh, I'm sorry. I have that
on my last page. Let me go
there. Excuse me. It's a name
change only. It's 20141011, NVHG
Q\&C Hotel Operator, LLC is the
current name, and the new name is
KBS SOR II Q\&C Property, LLC.
This is Orleans Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:

Any comments from the public on the name change? Any comments
from the Board members regarding
the name change? Is there a
motion by a Board member to
accept the name change? Motion
by Ms. Atkins. Seconded by Ms.
Villa. All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
Motion carries. Next we have the terminations.

MS . METOYER:
2012110, 235 14th Street,
LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish.
Requested term date is 3-20-2015.
The hiring requirements have been
met. No additional jobs are
anticipated.
20100972, Chevron USA, Inc.,
Plaquemines Parish. Requested
term date 12-31-2014. The hiring

requirements have been met. No
additional jobs are anticipated.
20101082, St. Margaret's
Daughter's Home, Orleans Parish.
Term date 12-31-2015. Hiring
requirements met. No additional
jobs anticipated.
20100702, Rain CII Carbon,
LLC. Calcasieu Parish. Term
date, 12-31-2014. The hiring
requirements have been met.
20101208, Epic Boats, LLC.
Caddo Parish. Requested term
date 12-31-2014. Hiring
requirements have been met. No
additional jobs anticipated.
20110034, Shriji West Monroe
Incorporated. Ouachita Parish.
Requested term date 12-31-2014.
Hiring requirements have been
met. No additional jobs
anticipated.
20110715, HRI Lodging
Incorporated, Orleans Parish.
Requested term date, 12-31-2014.

The requirements have been met.
No additional jobs anticipated. 20110854, Cajun Land Hotel,

St. Mary Parish. Requested term
date, 12-31-2014. Hiring
requirements have been met. No
additional jobs are anticipated.
20111013, Williams WPC-1,
LLC, Ascension Parish. The
requested term date, 5-31-2015,
the requirements have been met
and no additional jobs are
anticipated.
20120806, Union Pacific
Railroad Company, Calcasieu
Parish. Requested term date,
12-31-2014. The hiring
requirements have been met. No additional jobs are anticipated.

And the final termination is 20120879, Hard Rock Cafe

International Incorporated.
Orleans Parish. The requested
term date, 12-31-2014, and the
hiring requirements have been
met. No additional jobs anticipated.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer. Any
comments from the public
regarding termination of
Enterprise Zone contracts? No
questions. Any questions from
the Board members regarding these
terminations? Is there a motion
that they be terminated? Made by
Ms. Malone. Seconded by Ms.
Cola. All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Thank you, Ms.
Metoyer.
MS . METOYER:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Next we move on to Industrial
Tax Exemption Program. We have a
number of them on here. There is
going to be a little deviation
from exactly how they are
presented on here in order to
address questions and concerns
and groupings. Mr. Adley has
asked that they be grouped
together and presented in groups.
I believe you have the groupings,
Ms. Ms. Kristin.
MR. ADLEY:
As we go to each group, as we
met with the staff from LED,
rather than going through 200 of
these individually and voting
individually as we've done in the
past, taking this out 6 or 7
hours, Mr. Barham, I tried to find a way to consolidate this to some degree so we can speed up the process. I think you will
see most of the consolidation
when we get to the group of 100
plus. Prior to that, if we
simply group these by companies
in certain categories, like if they created jobs let's put them in a group. If their explanation was not really clear of what they did, it looks like it was clearly maintenance, put them in a group.

And then the larger companies that have three, four, ten of them, put them in a group to themselves, and if we do that I think we'll find that we'll promptly speed up the process, still get to the questions, but we won't have to take each and every one of them individually.

Now, the reason $I$ asked for that from the staff was that most of you know the Governor amended his Executive Order that we've been trying to comply with a few weeks ago to basically say that those industrial tax exemptions that have been applied for in the past, prior to June 24th, and their renewals that to be sure
that Louisiana kept its word, not
necessarily what contracts were
sitting there, but because there
was confusion over exactly what
you can require in a contract,
but to insure that Louisiana kept
its word, and, so, he has asked
us, at least asked me as his
representative to be sure and
vote for those things where they
complied with whatever was in
their contract whatever their
agreement was with LED prior to
June $24 t h . ~ A n y t h i n g ~ t h a t ~ c o m e s ~$
in after June $24 t h$ is a totally
different issue. So he had
amended his Executive order to
grandfather that in and to say
for those new ones that come in
after June $24 t h$ that he would no
longer support one hundred
percent tax abatement for a full
ten-year period. That he would
first five years with local
fort up to 100 percent for the
fore
first five years with local
government deciding how much of that one hundred percent they want to give and up to 80 percent
for the next three years the
local government decided what they wanted to give. The first group of Industrial Tax

Exemptions that we have, as I understand it, these were MCA's that came in prior to June the 24th. Under his Executive Order they all have to create jobs or retain jobs for him to consider, and so with that in mind $I$ would ask, Mr. Chairman, in his first group if we would just divide it up into three companies, take Motiva and all three of its applications together and render all three of theirs together and Textron in their application by itself.

MR. WINDHAM:
I think that would be appropriate, Mr. Adley. Pointing
out on the agenda it says there are nine.

MS . CHENG:
Actually, seven.
MR. WINDHAM:
Actually there are seven in the programing. Any objections of doing it that way by any of the Board members? All right. With that, we'll proceed.

MS . CHENG:
We have seven new
applications that were deferred from the September 12, 2016 --

MR. ADLEY:
Can you speak up just a little bit for me. I got them turned up as high as I can get them.

MS . CHENG:
So we have seven new applications that were deferred from the September 12 th meeting of the Board.

We have 20161366, 20161367,
20161371. Motiva Enterprises, LLC.

MR. ADLEY:
As I understand it, Motiva,
when they met with us previously,
there were no jobs associated with it, and they could not
determine what they were. Since
that meeting they have now come
back to you and stated there will
be 23 --
MS . CHENG:
No. The application is still
stating there are zero jobs
directly related to these three
projects but they did include additional information saying that 23 jobs were added at the plant as a whole.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. I'm going to go back. I saw the zero on the application. I also saw the 23 -- said the increase in 23 permanent jobs are between the
second and third months of the
4th quarter. Now, are those jobs
related to this ITEP or not?
MS . CHENG :
Not to those three specific projects but they were at that same site.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. Mr. House, this is where you are going to have to make it clear. You tried to make it clear to us once before. You
helped draft and craft the
Executive Order. As I understand
it, they have to have jobs or
retaining -- retention of jobs
for the Governor at least to be willing to sign these exemptions.

MR. HOUSE :
The retention of new jobs at
the site that are --
MR. ADLEY:
Yeah. In the case of this
one, this ITEP from Motiva does
not create any new jobs but they
are stating that at some point it created new jobs. So how does that fit, in your opinion, the Executive Order.

MR. HOUSE :
In my opinion, under the
Executive Order, if there is no
linkage between this MCI and the new jobs then it's -- this application would be considered to have expired on June 24 th .

MR. ADLEY:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there someone from Motiva
here to discuss the situation?
Please step forward and state your name and identify yourself.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman, Board members, my name is Joe Baker. I'm with Shell Oil Company. I'm a property tax advisor for Shell, and with me is Mandy Antenono (ph) who appeared before this

Board, I think last time they met over this same issue. I'm going to yield to Mandy in just a moment, but $I$ would like to just give my own opinion on this issue about the jobs and job site.

What my understanding was is that that the -- that the question was around these jobs is whether or
not they -- we were retaining
jobs at the plant. These
miscellaneous capital additions prior to June 24th, in our opinion, was just that, yes, we were retaining jobs. Those jobs that may not be absolutely directly tied to miscellaneous capital additions, maybe not, but I didn't think that was the question at the time. I thought the question at the time was what about these new jobs that we were adding, and so those jobs were added during that period of time as part of the overall plant

## operation.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Ms. Antono (ph).
MS. ANTONO (PH):
Yes. Good morning. Similar to what Joe Baker said, I'm also with Shell Oil. Motiva joint venture with Shell. Per the question last time, the Board wanted to know if there was new jobs, additional information was requested by the LED prior to June 24th. It was provided prior to June 24 th. We did say based on the pseudo report, which is a requirement from the State of Louisiana, we showed that we have a net increase. We went back to HR to verify what they increases were and they're directly at this plant. So all of them. I can explain where they are located in the plant. There may be parts of location that are in the project but they are not directly to the
project on the ITEP itself. So going back to what Joe has said,
you know, this -- my understanding when we filed this application, we have to retain or produce the job. We try to provide as much information as we can that we know at the plant site what was going on. So I'm sort of putting up a case against the Board to take into
consideration that even though
these are not direct jobs but
these projects are done at the
site in order for the operations
of the production to continue and
therefore being able to retain
and maintain and create new jobs
as you can see in the pseudo
reports.
MR. WINDHAM:
Do any of the Board members have questions for Mr. Baker or Ms. Antono (ph).

MR. ADLEY:

I guess my only question is
is that when I look at your
description it simply says under
this one with Harper 1, Harper 2,
what is that?
MS . CHENG:
That's Miranda.
MR. ADLEY:
That's Miranda. So if this says addition, tell me if you had not done this would 23 jobs been gone.

MS. ANTONO (ph):
I can't speak to the 23 jobs because they are indirect to these projects, but if some of these projects are not done then the things that you will see is inefficiency of the project; the plant will shut down. I wouldn't say shut down, the whole plant, but the units will shut down, and so there are risks if some units are not run $I$ would venture to guess some of the jobs will be
postponed at that point, so that would be my only --

MR. ADLEY:
For what it's worth, what
makes this one so different this was an MCA miscellaneous, this is
one of those where you didn't
notify anybody, you didn't send
anything in advance to the
department, just went out there
on your own and did it. Those
things were basically going away
outside of pure retention of jobs
in the future. That's what has
created this problem is companies
basically going out doing
whatever they thought they wanted
to do, whether they thought it
was maintenance, upgrades or
whatever, and the Governor was very explicit because of that
because this was not an advance notice. This is something you
just chose to do on your own that he would not sign anything that
did not create new jobs or retain jobs, and based on what you told me, albeit $I$ think it certainly helped your facility, I can't see in my mind where you would literally have to lose these jobs if you had not done this, so at least for his vote on this Board I'm going to vote no to not to accept it because it clearly violates what he has laid out in his Executive Order.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Moller, I believe you had a question.

MR. MOLLER:
Well, I waive. I was going to say it doesn't comply with the Executive Order, so I don't -you know, I agree with Senator Adley.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Broadwater.
MR. BROADWATER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The

23 jobs you are talking about what pseudo report, when they were created.

MS . ANTONO:
The pseudo report was created at the end of last year. It was the net increase between, $I$ believe, the third and fourth quarter of 2015.

MR. BROADWATER:
It was the 4 th quarter pseudo
report showing 23 jobs over what was showing -- showing in the
third quarter.
MS . ANTONO:
That is correct.
MR. BROADWATER:
What was the difference between the third quarter and the second quarter.

MS. ANTONO:
I don't have that
information, but $I$ can get that
for you.
MR. BROADWATER:
Do you know what the
difference was between the fourth
quarter and the first quarter of
this year?

MS . ANTONO:
I do not, sir.
MR. BROADWATER:
Okay. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions by the
Board members? Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD :
Good morning. Just a quick
question. Has Motiva had any
conversations or dialog with the
local government entities in St.
James Parish regarding this
application?
MS. ANTONO:
Not from this particular application, but we have started to -- on other advances that we have.

MR. RICHARD:
Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions by any of the Board members?

MR. ADLEY:
On behalf of the Governor I move to reject what the Board can do what it sees fit, but I have a feeling that once it gets to his desk, based on his Executive Order, this is clearly not in compliance what he has asked me to do to represent him.

MR. RICHARD:
Second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion made by Mr. Adley to reject the approval of the three Motiva applications. Seconded by Mr. Richard. Is there any discussion from the public? Further discussion? Any comments from any of the Board members? I am sorry. I have someone. Please come forward and identify yourself.

MS. HANDLEY:
My name is Diane Handley and
I wanted to step forward and say
thank you to Senator Adley for
your position on this. I was
going to speak saying exactly
what you said, and just wanted to
reiterate that I'm here and
appreciative of the direction
that this is taking. It is our
complete understanding what you
share as well. So thank you for
that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions of Ms. Handley?
Thank you, Ms. Handley.
All right. All in favor of
rejecting the three applications indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed to rejecting them
indicate with a nay. No
objections to the rejection.

Motion carries.
Next is Noranda Alumina.
MS . CHENG:
We have 20161098, 20161104
and 20161102, Noranda Alumina,
LLC.
MR. ADLEY:
And this, too, is an MCA as I understand it now. This is --

MS . CHENG:
That's correct.
MR. ADLEY:
This is one of those that did not put in an advance notice.

MS . CHENG :
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there someone here from Noranda. I believe that's how you say it. Noranda. Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. BARRETT :
I am Todd Barrett. I'm the VP of finance of Noranda Alumina,
and accompanying me is state rep
to speak on behalf of Noranda.
We did not file an advanced
notice for this miscellaneous capital addition, but we have been working with LED over two years with this project. This
project was a retention project for the plant and saved over 400 jobs. That counsel today with a presentation that we can go through and you can flip through yourselves that explains the nature of our business, the pressures we're getting from China, and the decision we had to make on an unloading system via our main volunteer group on the plant. We had no other options but this project. If we would have -- the alternative was a \$65 or $\$ 70$ million project, and that's just not in our budget, our cash flow budget.

MR. ADLEY:

Just spend some time, if you will, the issue is the retention of the jobs.

MR. BARRETT :
Correct.
MR. ADLEY:
Whatever you can do to
explain why it was absolutely
necessary to retain the jobs.
MR. BARRETT :
If we can't get our main raw material in the process, we don't have a process. This is our main unloading system to bring the raw material into our process.

MR. ADLEY:
That's what you told me if the plant was shut down.

MR. BARRETT :
The plant would have absolutely shut down if we would not have done this project, and we really had no other
alternative but this type of project. Also in your packet is
a letter from the parish
President in support of these
ITEP --
MR. ADLEY:
You have reached out to your
heavyweights this time to bring your representative with you.

MR. BARRETT :
And we reached out to our
local rep.
MR. ADLEY:
You know you can't buy him
lunch when you leave here, you do know that.

MR. BARRETT :
I do know that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Representative, do you
care to address the committee?
MR. SCHEXNAYDRE:
Yes. Thank $y^{\prime}$ all for meeting with us.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MR. SCHEXNAYDRE:

Clay Schexnaydre, State Rep,
District 81. This plant has been
in operation for a while and has
been in good standing with the
parish and with us. For them to
shut down and lose roughly 400
and something jobs is just
unheard of right now.
MR. ADLEY:
And it's your belief that if
this project didn't go through
that plant would have shut down.
MR. SCHEXNAYDRE :
I do.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any --
MR. ADLEY:
LED, if you -- I mean, you
said he he has been working with
for two years. Do you agree with

## that?

MS . CHENG:
Project manager, I believe
Charlie Romaine.
MR. WINDHAM:

Is Mr. Romaine here? Is
there someone from LED that can
speak to this project? I believe
Mandi spoke last time and
testified that the LED had been working with him for the past couple of years.

MR. BURTON :
Charlie is upstairs right now on a conference call. We didn't think we would be going through this quickly today.

MS . MITCHELL :
Mandi Mitchell. Assistant
Secretary. I apologize for my
tardiness. Secretary Pierson and
I were over at joint budget working on an agenda item there.

Charlie Romaine, our project manager, is most familiar with Noranda Alumina. I can speak only to my involvement, which has been earlier this year having been directly involved with this company in reaching out to
members of our congressional
delegation to try and get their
support and make them aware of
the impact of international
factors causing issues for the
company, particularly Chinese
dumping of Alumina. I can speak
only to that.
MR. ADLEY:
The issue is that -- the department believes, as we have been told by the owner and by
their representative that their facility would have had to shut
down if this had not been done and the loss of 400 jobs. I certainly believe what they are saying. It would be helpful if someone from LED would just simply confirm that you have been working with them for two years and that's a true statement.

MS . MITCHELL:
That we have been working

```
with them, yes, through their
```

project manager, Charlie Romaine.
MR. ADLEY:
Would they have shut down,
that's the question.
MS. MITCHELI:
I can't personally affirm that statement, and so we will try and get the project manager here to makes that representation to you.

MR. ADLEY:
I want to ask that we can
move forward that there's --
because the Executive Order clearly defines the retention of jobs. This is an issue of retention of jobs that we approve this application subject to confirmation from LED, whether it's at this meeting when the fellow gets off the phone or whenever he does it, subject to their confirmation that the plant would have literally shut down without this particular project.

MR. BROADWATER:
Can I ask for clarification
from this side, Mr. Chairman?
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes.
MR. BROADWATER:
Because the issue is
retention of jobs, if your motion
is approval subject to
confirmation that the plant will
shut down without it, I'm not
sure that's what the Executive
Order says. If it is retention
of jobs and they are saving
reduced production by half, then
I think they still need the
criterion, so $I$ would ask that
you consider amending your
motion.
MR. ADLEY:
You know, I get that. The point is we're sitting here now voting to approve or not approve.

Clearly the Governor said if it
is for the retention of jobs and

200 jobs, I personally would
still be in favor of approving it
at that point because we are
retaining 200 jobs. I don't
think the criteria is shut down
or stay in business.
MR. ADLEY:
I don't have an objection to that. We move for approval upon LED confirming for us that it's
truly the retention of jobs associated with this project.

MR. BROADWATER:
I agree with that. That's a proper motion. I second it.

MR. WINDHAM:
We have a motion by --
MR. ADLEY:
I never had a house member correct me, but $I$ want to thank you for that.

MR. BROADWATER:
You are welcome.
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe there is a question by Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD:
Yes, sir. Thank you. I see
a letter of support from the
Parish President. Have you
engaged the School Board or the
sheriff and other local
government entities in this
process?
MR. BARRETT :
Other than LED and the Parish
President we haven't reached out
directly to the School Board or
the sheriff. We do have $\$ 1.3$
million a year in property taxes in the parish. We pay about $\$ 100$ to $\$ 120,000$ a month to the parish in sales and use tax, so we are putting pretty significant money back into the communities through taxes.

MR. RICHARD :
Since you offered those numbers, $I$ wasn't going to ask, but since you offered those numbers, are there any concerns
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with taxes being owed to the
School Board at this time.
MR. BARRETT :
We did file Chapter 11
bankruptcy in February and we
actually are being purchased
today out of bankruptcy. Those
taxes will be paid and made
current by the estate through the
bankruptcy process as taxes are a protected party through the bankruptcy process. They are the first money out.

MR. RICHARD :
So there are some taxes that are owed at this point in time?

MR. BARRETT :
Yes. By the old estate, yes.
MR. RICHARD:
I would ask the makers of the motion that you would go along or accept a friendly amendment that the company also reaches out to the School Board and the sheriff and provides confirmation that
they had dialog with those local
government entities along with
the motion to approve if that
would be okay to the makers of
the motion.
MR. ADLEY:
I would withdraw the motion
and recommend that we approve
these three projects upon
confirmation from LED that they
work for the retention of jobs
and upon receipt of some
communication from local
government that you have communicated with them what you are doing.

MR. WINDHAM:
And do you amend your second?
MR. BROADWATER:
Yes. That's fine.
MR. WINDHAM:
Amended motion by Mr. Adley. Amended second by Representative Broadwater. Any further
comments, Mr. Richard?

MR. RICHARD:
Thank you, very much.
MR. COLEMAN :
The company before these,
before this company, um, they sat there and they told us that they retain 23 jobs and the vote just went no, so now we seem like we are not being fair. It seem like we tell these people, okay, you go back and come back and show us and they said that, well, we
can't really time -- I guess they
didn't have time but they did
retain some jobs, so we should go
and let them come back to us and
say hey, if you can prove to us
that you retain the 23 jobs that
you said you did then we will
consider approving their
application, but seem like they said, okay, we didn't believe them, but, okay, we are going to
believe $y^{\prime}$ all. That's what I'm
feeling that, so --

MR. ADLEY:
I get you, but I listen to
what the other company said. The
other company said that they
didn't talk about retention.
They just simply said that
sometime last year they added 23
jobs and then they did this
project. It's certainly
beneficial to them, $I$ assume,
they do the project, but their
presentation, in my view, was
substantially different than the
one $I$ heard from this group.
This group has legitimately said,
clearly said the plant itself
would shut down without the
project. That's a huge
difference between someone saying
look, I went and did some work
out there and the year before I
added some jobs, so y'all can
approve my work. That's what I
heard from the other company.
That's my view.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Coleman.
MR. COLEMAN :
I heard that, but if we are
in the business of retaining
jobs, I think we should retain 23
just as well we do 400. I don't
know how many they said, 450, the
whole plant will shut down, but
I'm in the business of saving
jobs, so if we can save 23 for
the state, I would love to do
that as well. If they can prove
to me that the investments they
made retain three jobs then $I$
will be ready to approve the
application.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER :
Can we get Mr. House up here to talk about what the Executive Order really says with respect to MCAs and whether this complies with that because my
understanding of section 2 of the
Executive Order is that, you
know, for all pending MCA's that were pending before June 24 th , the effective -- the Executive Order is effective immediately unless they provide for new jobs. It doesn't speak to retained jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
I think you are making a
legitimate point. I just happen
to have a copy of it in front of me. You are not going to like to hear it, but I'm going to be withdrawing my motion based upon that.

The retention of new jobs dealt with MCA's and the Executive Order into the future that we would allow an MCA for the retention of jobs into the future. The Executive Order says for all pending contractual
applications for which no advance
notification is required under
the rules of the Board Commerce
and Industry except for such
contracts that provide for new
jobs at the completed
manufacturing plants or
establishment, this order is
effective immediately. So it's
not -- I was in error. I was
wrong and you can corrected me rightfully so.

At least from the Governor's perspective unless it's creating new jobs and was an MCA then it would be his position not to sign it, and so for that reason I don't have to touch the motion $I$ made with the first one but $I$ would withdraw what I made on this one.

MR. BURTON :
And I can respond to that for a second, and maybe $I$ missed with what you read but new jobs at the plant doesn't say anything about
permanent jobs in that language the way you've read it. I may have misheard. There were over 100 contractor jobs created over the six months of this project at the plant. There is $\$ 12$ million spent on this unloading facility so there were new jobs created. Were they permanent forever, no, but it saved 400 jobs at the plant, 400 plus jobs that are living wage jobs. Our hourly workers make about \$28 an hour before fringes, and we did create about 100 temporary jobs that, you know, were well funded through this project.

MR. MOLLER :
If this created construction jobs why isn't that listed in the summary page.

MR. BURTON :
I don't know why it's not listed in the summary page. It's listed in the presentation and $I$
have provided that info. And if
I could ask the council to listen
to Charlie Romaine, too, it
proves that we have been working with them for over two years on this project. Advanced notice was not required when we were working on this project. If it was we obviously would have done it, but we worked arm in arm with LED to get this project through the process.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Romaine, please identify yourself.

MR. ROMAINE:
Yes, Charlie Romaine. I am an
assistant director with the business retention at LED. I was with this project from the very beginning. Excuse me, I am a little out of breath. I was running here.

The project was project manager, which we met with them
and discussed the project in
detail and capital that they
would have to put in. At the
time they didn't file the
advanced notification because
under the existing or the
previous rules it wasn't
necessary and that's one of the
reason why they did the capital
additions, but in this project in
and of itself it was a total
upgrade of a conveyor system for
loading and unloading barges, so
they fought with that and we've
been dealing with them for two
years I would say, and,
obviously, you know what the
situation is with the company.
They've been through a Chapter 11
bankruptcy trying to come out of
it now hopefully with a new
acquisition that could go one or
two ways depending on what the
purchaser wants to do, so based off of that $I$ think at this point
in time it's very critical that we make sure that the companies that are already here and
experiencing tough times have that opportunity with the new owner to see what can be done.

MR. MILLER :
May I ask a question.
MR. WINDHAM:
Sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER :
Just kind of switch gears a
little bit. What was the -- you
talked about the School Board --
I mean, property tax and the other local property tax. What is that total that is going to be paid?

MR. BARRETT :
So what will be paid as the estate winds down will be the 1.3 million that is due for the year 2015. We are completely current on sales and use tax as we speak.

We make a payment on the 20th of
every month, so the next payment
will be November 20th for the
October period. We also are
accruing property taxes for this
year at about the same rate as
last year.
MR. MILLER:
So your total property tax --
local -- what your total property
tax, not local, your total
property tax is 1.3 million for
this facility.
MR. BARRETT :
Correct. And a small portion
goes to St. Johns, the majority
of it goes to St. James.
MR. MILLER:
Okay. The conveyor system that you put in, where is the manufacturer of that system located, is that a Louisiana company by chance.

MR. BARRETT :
We used Kostmayer to
construct part of it. We used

Boh Bros. Kostmayer and Boh Bros are both located in Louisiana.

We used other local suppliers
like EIU Industrial or Electronic
Industrial United, I think is
their name.
MR. MILLER:
Are any of them manufactured
in Louisiana.
MR. BARRETT :
I don't know where the actual
steel or whatnot, but they are
definitely constructed in
Louisiana and then barged down at
the river.
MR. MILLER :
Thank you.
MR. ADLEY:
I'm going to say this and get
out of there for my Governor
before I get myself in trouble.
But I have to believe that if the
Governor felt that the retention
was an issue going forward and
that when he said the creation of
new jobs and he didn't define
that whether or not they were
there at the plant or the
construction jobs, to me it
really makes no sense that you
would not move forward with this
application. Now, $I$ understand
that there is some more testimony
and I would like forward to
hearing that unless someone can
give a counterargument that
common sense appears directly in
that direction.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Adley.
Representative Broadwater have
any comments.
MR. BROADWATER:
Yes. Mr. Romaine, you said
you have been working on this
project for two years, correct?
MR. ROMAINE:
Correct.
MR. BROADWATER:
And your responsibility is
business retention and expansion?
MR. ROMAINE:
Correct.
MR. BROADWATER:
Did LED provide any guidance
to the company in terms of
recommendations of how they could remain in existence and did you provide any recommendations to them as to whether they ought to just participate in this program to assist in their retention?

MR. ROMAINE :
As part of our process when
we meet with the company, we
value the company pretty much all
of the incentives that the
company qualifies for. If we are
in a meeting with them we are going to, of course, bring that to their attention as part of our duties to make sure they are aware of it, so, yes, we -whether it's Quality Jobs Enterprise Zone or the Industrial

Tax Exemption, we inform them of it.

MR. BROADWATER:
And I appreciate that, and I appreciate Mr. Adley's comments as well. I do not -- I think the other thing that is important here is -- and it's been
evidenced by the Governor -- is
that he is concerned about
keeping word, and if the State of
Louisiana went out and worked
with this company in an effort to
try to retain those jobs and
said, go down this process, do
the expansion and there is this
opportunity for you to do that, I
think that's part of keeping that word as well, and so I'm going to make a motion that we approve, based upon the testimony that's been provided.

MR. WINDHAM:
So you withdraw your second?
MR. BROADWATER:

No. I withdrew the motion.
MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, you withdrew your motion.
MR. ADLEY:
I did.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Just some clarity. In the
documents that we're provided as
Board members the ad valorem tax
relief for the Noranda in this
agenda item amounts to about
\$820,000. That is over ten
years, as $I$ understand things.
MR. ROMAINE:
Correct.
MR. RICHARD:
So basic math, that's about \$80,000 in abated taxes each year based on the information that we're provided, so you're testifying today that if this ad valorem tax relief is not granted through this ITEP application
that about $\$ 80,000$ a year that
that would cause Noranda to shut down and lose jobs?

MR. BARRETT :
No. That's not what I'm testifying. What I'm testifying today is that we did the project to save the jobs, the project is in place. We're not going to close down now because if we don't get this tax exemption, but we did the project based on the rules of the tax exemption program, so we do pay our taxes, $\$ 80,000$ a year is a big sum for us. We don't make that much or cash on a yearly basis. When we close down at this point, if we don't get this abatement, no.

Would we have closed down if we didn't do this project, yes.

MR. RICHARD:
I appreciate you clarifying and it's one of the areas we're working through, as I understand
things, with the information
we're provided. The tax relief
is projected over ten years, and,
I mean, that's what we have to go
by, and I think we are going to
try to fix that moving forward
but, thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion and seconded by
Representative Carmody. Are
there any other comments from the
public. Please step forward and
identify yourself. Do you
gentlemen have anything that you would like to add before you --

MR. BARRETT :
Thank you for your time.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much. Please

## identify yourself.

MS . WASMANN:
Good morning. Kathy Wasmann,
Louisiana Environmental Action
Network.
The subject that has really
not come very often before this
Board is environmental issues.
Noranda is a facility that is currently having problems with mercury emissions, and I thought at one point that the Department of Economic Development did look at environmental compliance of where they issued some of these tax measures, so we might want to put that into the consideration when we look at these tax issues also. So they are currently --
Louisiana Environmental Action
Network has filed a suit on mercury emissions for this
company or an intention to file
suit on its mercury emissions. I
do appreciate that, you know,
it's a struggling company. In January there was another reason given why this company would not exist and certainly no area wants to lose 444 jobs, that's very

```
important in Louisiana, but you
```

have to have good actors and you have to have people who support the local communities, and you also have to factor in the cost of pollution. If you have fishing advisories on Belle River or other areas because of mercury pollution then you have to look at that cost, too. Environmental costs are real actual costs, so as you evaluate these -- all of these exemptions from local property tax because it is the locals who are going to have to pick up whatever you grant here, please also consider environmental impacts and the real actual costs of environmental impacts. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Wasmann. Are there any questions by the Board members? Mr. Adley.

MR. ADLEY:
Yes. The Governor has made
it very clear he will not support any ITEP or any required or mandated environmental upgrades, period. I don't think from what I read from this this is an environmental upgrade.

MS . WASMANN:
No, sir, but as you evaluate the companies as they come before you and ask that you also look at their environmental record. What they have done in the community, what have they done as far as their environmental impact on the community because the actual real cost to human health in the environment has never been put into the arena of evaluating the cost when you look at a cost benefit analysis, so we would like to put that out there because there is a cost for people not being able to fish. There is a health cost of people ingesting mercury. There is a
health cost of people ingesting
led, and there is a real cost and
a real cost to healthcare and to the people and to the community. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Wasmann. Are there any other questions from any of the Board members of Ms. Wasmann?

I believe someone else would
like to speak from the public.
Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. HANDLEY:
My name is Dianne Handley
with Together Louisiana. I
forgot to say that last time. I believe that the beginning conversation was the right way to go. I was looking at section 2 at the same time that you were reading it as well and my understanding is exactly as you
stated before that it has to do
with new jobs. When the question
came up about well, there were
some jobs, temporary jobs, don't
those count, it doesn't say
whether it's permanent or not, my
understanding of the application
is new permanent jobs is listed
as zero, construction jobs were
listed as zero and now all of a
sudden we're talking about some
other new jobs that were -- came
and went. I think it's
critically important that we do
not degrade this job requirement
by saying that we will now look
at some other possibilities of
what jobs might or might not have
been. we know what we are
talking about, new permanent
jobs, and the application was
clear on how you state that.
They put zero for new permanent
jobs, zero for construction jobs
and to come up today and say
there were some that came
well
well, there were some that came
and went $I$ think really degrades
the job requirements to a point of meaninglessness. We can all say we had jobs that came in and out, so I wish you would go back to Senator Adley's very first
statement and do apply it as
section 2 does speak for all
pending contractual applications
for which no advanced
notification is required under
the rules of the Board of
Commerce and Industry except for
such contracts that provide for
new jobs at the completed
manufacturing plants or
establishments, this order is
effective immediately, so thank
you so much for this.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions of Ms. Handley?
MR. ADLEY:
I did just read the
application again looking at the contract jobs, they are listed at
zero, and you testified 100.
Something's wrong.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Handley. Mr.
Barrett, would you like to respond.

MR. BARRETT :
Yes. First I would like to respond to the jobs. When we filed I sent a letter with the application that did state that there were numerous temporary jobs around 100. I don't know why it's not on the summary sheet. It's not correct from the beginning. We always talked about temporary jobs being added over the portion of the project.

Charlie can talk about that. We
did not add any permanent new
jobs. We did not lose any
permanent new jobs because of
this project. It was to keep the plant open.

I would also like to respond
to the environmental discussion
that was brought. We are a good citizen. LDEQ is at our site often. They have a mobile testing lab around our plant all of the time. We have not failed any tests. We have permits with the state. There's normal
industrial issues with our plant.
Nothing has been tied directly to
our plant for elevated mercury
levels, and the lawsuit that has
been potentially filed or noticed
from our standpoint has no
substance at all. So we get
tested all of the time. We are
very active members with LDEQ.
They come on site do tests. MSHA
comes on site often and make sure our workers are safe and work in
a good environment. And we have a very good relationship with them. I just want to put it out there and respond because we are good actors in the community.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Barrett. Are
there any additional questions by
the Board? There is a motion on
the table by Representative
Broadwater. I believe it was
seconded by Representative
Carmody. Any additional
questions? Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Just some clarity before we
vote on this motion. The
Executive Order, whether the
first one or the second one, both
apply to this particular
situation and the applications do
not meet the requirements of the
Executive Orders. Is that clear
from LED?
MR. ADLEY:
I think that you add -- his
definition of new jobs were construction jobs. The other
side would say it's permanent jobs. I clearly think the

Governor meant permanent jobs.
I'm sure that's what he meant.
Common sense does tell me that
the Governor said going forward
on any of these if you could
prove pending retention. For me
I'm not going to -- Mr.
Broadwater put out another motion
and let the Board determine what
you think is right. I'm going to
follow the Executive Order,
that's what I'm going to do.
MR. ROMAINE :
Could I add something?
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Mr. Romaine.
MR. ROMAINE:
Just to kind of second what he said. I'm not sure about the construction jobs, but I have seen the equipment and the new gantry systems, so someone built it. Obviously there were some construction jobs there. And on the second note, if $I$ could just
talk. You know, for two years I have been working with this project and in two years two aluminum refineries have closed in the United States. I know Alumina refinery, which these guys have manufactured closed in the United States. This virtually these may be the last one in the United States. China is dumping and causing a lot of that, so when we think about the impact of the jobs and the new jobs when you are in an industry where all across the country they are closing and these guys are trying to stay open, I think it's something that we need to take into consideration. Thank you.

MR. ADLEY:
Appears to me that if -- even I said no, voted no and the Board approved that that it would then be sent over to the Governor and you would have that opportunity
to make that argument yourself.
By representing him and what he has said, I feel compelled to make the no vote. The Board deems it appropriate, in my view, to send it over to have him have this discussion. I think that's within your power to do that.

MR. BROADWATER:
Mr. Chairman, if I may. I appreciate Mr. Adley saying that. I think the other thing that I know about the Governor, as I said earlier, that he's already demonstrated is that he wants to
also insure that there is some certainty for these businesses that are out there, and if we started down a path with them that we need to honor our word and keep our commitments. Having known him inside and outside of government, $I$ know how important that is to him. I personally would like to give him the

testified earlier that they have
not had substantive dialog with
the School Board or the sheriff in regards to these applications.

MR. BROADWATER:
Mr. Chairman, that's a fair
request and that's not asking too
much of that company. I will
withdraw my motion and restate it
requesting or moving that we
approve the application subject
to proof from those local
governmental entities as defined
in the Executive Order that there
has been communication from the company with them, and that will
be my motion.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Representative
Broadwater. Representative
Carmody with his second. Is
there any additional comment?
MS . CHENG:
I did want to add that we did
have a letter from Noranda that

```
did say something about 50
```

contractor jobs. My mistake that it's not on the actual
application.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Cheng. All right. Any additional comments
from the public, please step
forward. Identify yourself.
MR. BAGGER :
Good morning. I'm Broderick
Bagger with Together Louisiana.
There are two potential criteria
for evaluating whether something creates jobs or not. One is whether the underlying investment creates or retains jobs, and the other is whether the tax benefit incentive creates and retains jobs. A lot of this discussion is presumed that we are talking about whether the underlying investment creates or retains jobs. Virtually every company in the United States of America or anywhere in the global capital
system has to make investments to stay in business so they could claim plausibly that these investments are necessary to staying in business. The question for public policy ought to be the public component of it. Does the tax subsidy change behavior in a way that has some element of the common good. Would the company be doing the same thing without that tax subsidy or does it result in some kind of different behavior, some kind of different pattern of jobs or investment other than what would have happened otherwise. They just testified that there would be no difference with or without subsidy. They said it's the underlying investment was essential and $I$ don't doubt for $a$ minute, but that's not unusual to have to make investments to keep a company open. The question for
this body seem to us, not just now but throughout is, does the subsidy create some difference in
behavior. We heard it doesn't so
it doesn't seem to have any
plausible justification in that the act of granting or not granting the subsidy won't effect any jobs because it won't effect the decisionmaking process now going forward with this company. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Bagger. I am sorry. Any questions by the Board members of Mr. Bagger? No. I guess we'll -- we'll need to take a roll call on this vote. Any further comments by any of the Board members? Ms. Melissa, if you will please.

MS . SORRELL:
Robert Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
No.

MR. BARHAM:
Robert Barham.
MR. BARHAM :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL :
Representative Broadwater.
MR. BROADWATER:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Millie Atkins.
MS. ATKINS:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Mayor Brasseaux.
MR. BRASSEAUX :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL :
Representative Carmody.
MR. CARMODY:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Yvette Cola.
MS . COLA:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:

Major Coleman.
MR. COLEMAN :
No.
MS . SORRELL:
Heather Malone.
MS . MALONE :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL :
Ben Hudson.
MR. HUDSON :
No.
MS . SORRELL:
Robbie Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Jan Moller.
MR. MOLLER :
No.
MS . SORRELL:
Secretary Pierson.
MR. PIERSON:
Yes.
MS . SORRELI:
Scott Richard.

MR. RICHARD:
No, ma'am.
MS . SORRELL:
Bobby Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS :
No.
MR. SORRELL:
Steve Windham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes.
MS. SORRELL:
Ten yes's. Six no's.
MR. WINDHAM:
With that, the motion
carries.
Next item on the agenda is --
MS . CHENG :
Sorry.
MR. WINDHAM:
I am sorry. Textron Marine \&
Land System. Ms. Cheng.
MS. CHENG:
20161269, Textron Marine \&
Land Systems.
MR. WINDHAM:

Mr. Adley, I believe you have
some questions about Textron
Marine \& Land Systems.
MR. ADLEY:
Well, I did. Give the staff
an opportunity to, I guess,
explain it to everyone. When I
looked at Textron, if you will
look at it, the investment is 3.3
million. It shows the creation
of 94 jobs. That's a good thing.
It shows a payroll of
\$55,527, 000 .
MS . CHENG:
That's a ten year payroll
that was calculated.
MR. ADLEY:
I am sorry.
MS . CHENG:
That was for over ten years.
MR. ADLEY:
So it's not an average of
$\$ 590,000$ per year per job, it's an average of $\$ 59,000$ a year per job.

MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Correct?
MS . CHENG :
Yes. That's correct.
MR. ADLEY:
And they have created 94
jobs.
MS . CHENG:
I have the company to speak
about that, actually. I believe
there's a correction.
MR. WINDHAM:
Somebody from Textron please
step forward to discuss this
application. Identify yourself, please.

MR. LUSK:
Hello. My name is John Lusk.
I'm the capital accountant at
Textron, and when I looked more
closely at the application, I
realize there was a mistake, and
actually there was 165 jobs
added. The form was filled out
incorrectly. We went from 94
jobs in January 2015 to 259 in
December of 2015 at the
conclusion of the project, and as
of today we have 412 jobs that's
at the plant.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Lusk. MR. ADLEY:

The only question, I'm
certainly, for your application,
I will tell you it created the
jobs. That's what we're
interested in. Just for the
Board's point when we move
forward on these next set of
applications, $I$ want to ask if you look very carefully when you look at the project description, you really don't tell us anything. I really don't know if that's for additions or it's new or if it's maintenance. I don't have a clue what that is when it
just says 2015 miscellaneous
capital additions.
MR. LUSK:
Well, $I$ sent in -- Kristin
asked for more information. I
sent in a report of details about
each and every single project. I
don't know if you have that, but
primarily what this project
was --
MR. ADLEY:
Was any of that just pure maintenance upgrade what you had?

MR. LUSK:
No. We were converting a
facility that was primarily a warehouse into a construction facility for armored security vehicles, so these were all renovations and additions to the facility in order for us to be able to produce these vehicles.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much for your investment and the jobs that you
did create, which the state really appreciates that. I know
that the Governor does as well.
Are there any other questions
from the Board of Mr. Lusk?
MR. ADLEY:
I move for approval.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion my Mr. Adley.
Seconded by Mr. Miller, President Miller. Are there any comments
from the public regarding the
Textron Marine and Land Systems applications? Any other comments from the Board? No comments.

All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
Hearing no nays, motion carries.
Passes.
We have nine new
applications.

MS . CHENG:
We have nine new
applications. These did all have advances filed prior to the Executive Order on June 24 th of 2016.

Before we start, I want to say that 20151141, Venture Global Calcasieu Pass, LLC; 20161532, Venture Global Plaquemines LNG,

LLC; and 20150886, Westlake
Chemical OpCo, LP all requested
to defer their applications until
December.
MR. WINDHAM:
The last three deferred?
MS. CHENG:
Yes. The last three
deferred.
MR. WINDHAM:
We need to make a motion.
Motion. Seconded by Mr. Coleman
to defer the last three
applications on this list.
MR. ADLEY:

So what we're left with,
then, is six --
MR. WINDHAM:
Let me finish the motion. All
in favor indicate with an aye
that these three be deferred.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
Motion carries. Now we will
cover the preceding six.
MR. ADLEY:
I want to suggest to you to
try to get these in a block so we
can try to move on because we start to break these down. That
the remaining six, it appears that three of them clearly or
three were for expansions or additions, and I would like to move for approval for those, and that would be looking at the last two numbers or three -- 277, the first one. The second one, 029;
and then dropped to the 4 th one at 59C. Those were all new
additions, construction, and I would ask for approval -- move
for approving for those three.
And then what $I$ am going to do if you approve that is then take the next three that would fall in the category of generally
maintenance. That appears that we don't clearly know what it is and ask for approval of them.
There is a reason for that and I will explain it when we get to that if $I$ can.

MR. WINDHAM:
Let me make sure $I$ understand
this. The motion is to approve
iFAB Industrial, Sabine Pass
Liquefaction. Those two.
MS. CHENG:
And Marathon Petroleum
Company, LP.
MR. ADLEY:
IFAB, Marathon and Sabine

Pass. Those three were
expansions and construction or
additions.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to that
motion?
MS . ATKINS:
Seconded by Ms. Atkins. Is
there any discussion from the
public regarding those three
applications? Is there
discussion from the Board
regarding those three
applications?
MS . CHENG:
Would you like me to read the numbers of those application into the --

MR. WINDHAM:
I think we see the names better than the numbers, but you can. For the record, I guess it's appropriate.

MS . CHENG:
20141277, iFAB Industrial,

LLC. 20152029, Marathon
Petroleum Company, LP. And
20110659C, Sabine Pass
Liquefaction, LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Yes, sir. And I appreciate
Mr. Adley wanting to move forward
by grouping them. Had
conversations with the local
government school boards,
especially in the districts that
show no new permanent jobs and
that would be the application
dealing with Marathon, Motiva,
Shell and Westlake Chemical, but
I understand that Westlake
Chemical has been deferred, so I have had conversations with the leaders of those school systems and they have had no dialog with any of these three companies in regards to these applications, and $I$ just think that we're at a
point in our state where --
MR. ADLEY:
Those are not the three I'm doing right now. We are going to do your three next.

MR. RICHARD:
Okay. Well, I think we need some clarity because they are grouping Marathon in, and Marathon shows no new permanent jobs in St. John, so do we need to clarify?

MR. ADLEY:
I see. You are correct. I have iFAB, Marathon and Sabine Pass.

MR. RICHARD :
But Marathon shows no new jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
That's correct.
MR. RICHARD:
Do we want to remove Marathon
from your grouping and focus on
iFAB and Sabine Pass?

MR. ADLEY:
No, I don't. I am going to
tell you why I don't. Here is our dilemma. Under what the Governor
has proposed and under what you
hopefully will adopt when this meeting is over with, a new set of rules is going to solve a whole lot of these problems that we're having here today. The reason $I$ am trying to separate them out is that under the new rules when you get to expansions, construction and addition that's clearly acceptable with jobs.

Today is acceptable period. When
you get to these areas that I
call maintenance because they
don't tell us what they do those
are not going to be acceptable under the new rules, and so I'm
trying to give the Board a feel
for how many of these things may
actually go away in the future
and that's why $I$ was dividing
them out. Just because I divide
them out doesn't mean we can't vote against them or discuss them, but if you like, $I$ would be more than glad to, you know, take Marathon, take them all out, withdraw a motion and you can go vote for them one by one, but when we get to 140 , 114, I don't think you are going to want to do that, but that's all I was trying to do.

MR. RICHARD:
And I appreciate that, Mr.
Adley. My point of commentary on these items was going to focus on the fact that applications that have no new jobs indicated Marathon, Motiva and Shell now that we not disapprove them but that we defer until our next meeting and request that they have evidence of conversations with this School Board, the sheriff and the parish government
moving forward, and I don't know if that's what the will of the Board is.

MR. ADLEY:
You and I are on the same
line and want to do the same
thing at the end of the day, but
the Governor has made it very
clear what it is that amended
Executive Order that everything
filed by 6-24 that it would
comply with the current rules and
whatever current agreements they had albeit we may not like what those agreements were, to insure that Louisiana has kept its word, that you find himself -- I can
tell you $I$ sat in a lot of meetings with him on this issue and it's very difficult for him that he had competing interest and keeping Louisiana's word became critical, so there were no requirements when they did these for jobs. I hated it's at zero.

That's not going to be the case in the future. It's not. But because they were filed before 6-24 I simply tried to group them into two categories so you can see the difference between construction and additions and people who were just generally spending money with no real description of what it's for because that's probably going to go away in the future also. For that reason, I'm going to ask you to please consider that because these were filed by -prior to 6-24, and Louisiana rightfully or wrongfully gave its word this is where they were going to move forward unless they violated the existing agreement that they had with Louisiana, it is his position that we move forward on that.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Adley. There
is a motion on the floor that we group these three together. Is
there a second? Mr. Broadwater
seconds the motion. Any
additional discussion?
MR. RICHARD :
Would you accept a friendly amendment to your motion that they bring evidence to the Board even though it's after the fact that they've had these conversations with local
government?
MR. PIERSON:
Can you please define what
the conversation with local
governance would indicate. I
mean, is there an agreement with
local government or a
conversation that says we are
doing a plant expansion in your
jurisdiction or --
MR. RICHARD:
Secretary Pierson, I just
think we are at a point in

Louisiana where we can't -- we can no longer approve giving away local taxes without even having a conversation with the leaders of local government.

MR. PIERSON:
And that is absolutely going to happen on everything going
forward. There is a very
important demarcation line we crossed, but they are in full compliance with everything that we asked them to do at that time. If we are going to task an additional element, we can certainly make that, but it doesn't have a definition of what we've been trying to achieve. We know very clearly what that looks like post 6-24.

MR. RICHARD:
And I'm totally and
completely cognizant and aware of the Executive Orders and the requirements. The point of my
dialog today is to reemphasize
that common sense should tell
stakeholders, whether they be
government or industry, that if we're asking to give away local
taxes at the state level that
there at least be some
conversation with those entities at the local level, whether that be formal as required by the

Executive Orders or informal, and
that's what the leaders of those
school systems have had dialog
with me in regards to this matter
that, you know, we haven't even
spoken to them about this, you
know
MR. PIERSON:
I think we're on the same
page.
MR. RICHARD :
I withdraw my friendly
amendment request and we can move
forward. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:

Any additional questions or
comments from the Board? The
motion is to group these three
together. It's been seconded. No
additional comments. All in
favor indicate with an aye.
PARTIAL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.
MR. RICHARD :
Nay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, I am sorry. Mr. Richard
voted nay. Motion carries. With
that we'll move forward with the
grouping of the three.
MR. ADLEY:
I would recommend, Mr.
Chairman, that we now take Motiva 20140815, 201415, 17, 77, yeah, 77, and 20141578, Shell, that you take those three together, and the reason for that is if you look at their description of
their projects it is very
difficult to tell whether or not
some kind of maintenance or
additions we really don't know.
Under current rules maintenance was allowed. And the reason I wanted to separate these and when we get to that large list you are probably going to find 40 or 50 of these that we will be able to group together there's perfectly legal under the current rules that may very well not fit under the new rules that we adopt, and the only reason $I$ separated them out was to make that clear so that everyone understands going forward these applications are getting approved here today filed prior to 6-24. Going forward, unless there is some different description, they are not going to be before this Board anymore is my guess with the adoption under the new rules, so I ask
that you move favorably on those
three.
MR. WINDHAM:
So the motion is to move
favorably on the three numbers
that Ms. Cheng will read.
MS . CHENG:
20140815, Motiva Enterprises,
LLC.
20141577, Shell Chemical
Company LP.
And 20141578, Shell Chemical
Company, LP.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second? Seconded
by Mr. Coleman. Are there any
comments from the public? Are
there any comments or questions
by any of the Board members
regarding these. All in favor
indicate with an aye.
PARTIAL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay.

MR. RICHARD:
Nay.
MR. WINDHAM:
I am sorry. Mr. Richard voted no. Motion carries.

Next will be the other three, which I believe you will read out by number again? I am sorry, I believe the motion before was to group them together. The first three are approved. I stand corrected. All right. Next grouping will be.

MS . CHENG :
Next we have 14 renewals that were deferred on September 12th at the September 12 th meeting.

MR. ADLEY:
I would move, Mr. Chairman, that we approve all of these applications except for those pending for Baker Hughes and Kennedy Rice Dryers, to take those two separately.

MR. RICHARD:

Second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion made by Mr. Adley to
approve all of them except for the three Baker Hughes'.

MR. ADLEY:
There's four.
MR. WINDHAM:
Four Baker Hughes' and the Kennedy Rice Dryers. I believe the second was made by --

MR. BROADWATER:
Hold on. There's five Baker
Hughes'. There's Kenney Rice
Mill, Kennedy Rice Dryers. I
just want to make sure $I$ know what we're voting on.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. I realize that the advanced notifications follow the original application versus the no advanced notification MCA's. You are absolutely correct. So, Mr. Adley, with that --

MR. ADLEY:

That's fine.
MR. WINDHAM:
So the motion is amended.
Seconded by Mr. Richard.
MS . CHENG:
Without Baker Hughes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Without Baker and without
Kennedy.
MS . CHENG:
Okay. 20100924, CAP
Technologies, LLC.
20110805, K\&W Patten's
Mineral Express, LLC.
20120744, Advanced Graphic
Engraving, LLC.
20120394, Benoit Premium Threading, LLC.

20120743, Catalyst Recovery
of Louisiana, LLC.
20120297, Imperial-Savannah,
LP.
And 20111078, Textron Marine
\& Land Systems.
MR. WINDHAM:

So the motion is to approve
those. It's been properly
seconded. Are there any comments
from the public? Yes. Mr.
Bagger, please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. BAGGER :
Could I give these documents around?

MR. WINDHAM:
Please or have our people so you can begin.

MR. BAGGER :
This is in a similar vain to Senator Adley's taking a look going forward at what the new criteria would be. The first page is the ones that's already been approved, the new
applications, but page 2 through 8 are the renewals and it looks at the jobs performance based on the data provided by the company for each of the renewals, so that we can see, well, if we provide a
subsidy of one term, what has
been the jobs outcome during that
period of time. The -- I would
like to -- when people get --
make a couple of observations.
That looks at the number of current existing jobs -- not the whole company but the specific site that they had when they originally applied five years ago. It looks at the number of current existing jobs they had now and subtracts one from the other. There is an additional number the staff has in the Board packet and the summary pages that
is the full time jobs in the first year of the application.
We put both of them in there because it actually -- sometimes it helps companies, sometimes it doesn't, but that's actually at the end of year one, and then
there is a column in purple which
looks at the net effect of jobs
and then the public subsidy per
job based on the ten year
evaluation.
The final column is the
number of jobs the original
application claimed knowing that
that didn't really mean a whole
lot, but hopefully this will help
to provide some criteria by which
to assess the week from the
chaff. Which ones seems to be
providing jobs, which ones do
not. Which, you know, we know
what this is going to look like
today, but going forward, they
start to be some abilities to be
discretionary about when these
incentives seem to be doing what
they are intended to do. So I
would be happy to take questions on this, but we provide that not
to oppose these but to provide
information on them.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Bagger. I have
a question by Secretary Pierson.
MR. PIERSON:
Thank you for your thoughtful
analysis and providing the
information for our
consideration. My question to
you is the term of your analysis,
I believe, is ten years; is that
correct?
MR. BAGGER:
In what respect?
MR. PIERSON:
You provided some numbers here talking about ad valorem benefit, etc. Is that for a ten-year?

MR. BAGGER :
Yes. The ten year term provided for by the -- so, it's got the ad valorem tax, which is right from the summary sheet, and that's, I believe, the ten year term, and then the public subsidy per job created is also for a ten year term.

MR. PIERSON:
So the part of -- it's
difficult for me to follow and comprehend is that we have a 20 , 30 or 40 year investment and your analysis covers a ten year term only, so it would appear to me that the value to the public would extend far beyond what your brief tenure term portion of this analysis.

MR. BAGGER :
Are you talking about the public subsidy per job?

MR. PIERSON:
No. I am talking about a
company that makes an investment
and a parish that foregoes its
revenue for a ten year term but
that that investment, just like
that Exxon refinery down the road
here that may be there 40 or 50 year, so that part of the value that comes back to the public seems to be missing from your

## analysis.

MR. BAGGER:
The only part that is
relevant to a ten year term is
the public subsidy per job
created. The rest of them are
just how many jobs have been
created, and that number of jobs
that have been created is from day one to current and it's looking at the previous five years. That number on the public subsidy is not meant to say the high number is bad and the low number is good, but that the higher number is worse than a lower number. You can -- there are certainly longer term benefits, but a million dollars
over ten years per job is
different from a $\$ 100,000$ and $\$ 50,000$. You can see how many bang for the public buck you get just as well by taking a constant standard, which we took at ten
years because that's the standard that's provided by your office in public data, the ten year basis.

MR. PIERSON:
Thank you.
MR. BROADWATER:
Mr. Chairman.
MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Broadwater.
MR. BROADWATER:
In what column do you factor
in the impact to the public of sales tax dollars spent in the community? Is that on your chart?

MR. BAGGER :
As far as I'm aware, that's not something that the LED tracks. It would be --

MR. BROADWATER:
Yeah. I am just trying to figure out in terms of -- you are describing something that you describe it, public subsidy the cost for each job created or
lost, I'm just trying to understand whether or not we are evaluating the full impact to the public. If we are not factoring in sales tax generated within a community, if we are not factoring in increase in personal income tax collected on the jobs created, and to the secretary's point, if we aren't looking beyond that in terms of what the ultimate game is in year 11
through 100, then an evaluation of public subsidy per actual job created, that column ought to be
struck because you didn't
consider all of what the value
was if you didn't factor in sales
tax, personal income tax, the
houses that are bought when the new employees come there. And I recognize your point that some have decreased. I guess the other thing that $I$ would point out is that what can't be
reflected on this chart is --
I'll give it an example. On the very first one, Baker Hughes one, from 214 the time of the original
application to 105, if they had not had some assistance through
economic developments, whether that would have gone from 214 to zero and that cant be reflected on here as well. Certainly we want to see all of these in growth, but you are also dealing with the time as well when we hit 2009 hit an economic downturn and there are external factors that are very different that occurred here in the time period.

So I do agree with the
secretary. I appreciate your
analysis. I would just ask that you also maybe consider some
additional factors when you present it in the future.

MR. BAGGER :
It has been our earnest and
consistent plea that the kind of analysis that you are describing be conducted by the LED and be insisted upon by this Board and that doesn't happen as we understand it. That would also mean disaggregating those
investments that would have
happened any way from those that are encouraged by the incentive,
and you would only challenge
benefit provided by the
incentive, the investments that would not have happened without that instant.

MR. BROADWATER:
Isn't that what's happening now?

MR. BAGGER:
Not necessarily. These are blanket across the board.

MR. BROADWATER:
Going forward in establishing -- right.

MR. BAGGER :

Potentially it is going to be
developing tools of analysis,
though, that are, you know, we
can only use the data that $y$ 'all
or that the LED is providing
disaggregating outcomes based on
ones that would have happened
anyway, that will depend on the quality of the return on
investment analysis. That is one
of the things. There are also
opportunity calls of tax dollars
in jobs and other benefits that would have gone to the public
sector. So if you take Baker
Hughes, that $\$ 3.4$ million over
ten years, give or take with
depreciation also would have had jobs impact, and those are
exactly the kind of things on one level we're doing this to say we are not professional analysts of this. This is simply addition and subtraction. There are much
more sophisticated analyses that
have not been conducted in the past that would seem to give a more solid base on which to make
those decisions, but the assumption that just because you gave something as money there must have been this public benefit that takes into account the entirety of their investments doesn't really meet the threshold of what is being provided for by that investment and what is happening anyway because people are doing business.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Bagger. Mr. Adley, you have a discussion?

MR. ADLEY:
Now, this discussion has been an extremely good discussion. Mr. Broadwater, Mr. Pierson, this is the very discussion that went on with the Governor's office
looking backwards. Looking
backwards we had no guidelines
whether to require jobs, not
require jobs. One of the
considerations that he considered
was is looking at those going
backwards and those that promised jobs but actually came back with
less the possibility of rejecting
them, but you couldn't do that
because you had another group
that promised zero and then we
would approve them to go forward.
For fear of being arbitrary and
capricious, he made the decision
that regardless of what the
report looked like for those
things backwards in time because
Louisiana had given its word
that's what we would do, but what
makes this so very interesting
conversation you will find at the end of this meeting when we do
these rule changes, Mr .
Broadwater there will be a
requirement now in the rules for
an ROI, and return of investment
that will be submitted by the
department for everyone to see,
so we will have a way in the
future to track going forward --
your information is very helpful,
but we could not use it, we
didn't believe in those that were
behind us that are coming up now
for renewal because there were no
explicit guidelines tying to jobs
or not. That's -- and the only
reason $I$ separated this two
groups for you is that the next
group and Baker were going to
find they created a lot of jobs
and find out more about that, and
they have the rice drying issue,
but it's a good discussion, and
I'm telling you, if we can just
get through this meeting and get
through all of this that is
coming at us, these renewals is
going to last through 2021 from what they tell me.

Once we get to the adoption
of the rules for everything going
forward there will be a
substantial change that will take
into consideration all of the
things that $I$ think you are
talking about.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Adley. Mr.
Moore? All right.
Any other comments from the
public? Any other comments from
the Board on the motion on
approving the --
MR. ADLEY:
Everything but Kennedy and
Baker.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seven applications. All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All oppose with a nay?
Motion carries. Mr. Richard, I
was waiting for you. All right.

The next one we will go forward.
MR. ADLEY:
I'm going to move in a moment
for approval the five for Baker,
but the question that $I$ had was
is that in Baker's case they show
the creation of 138 jobs, which
was a good thing for an
expansion. My only question were
all five of these related to that expansion or were they outside of the expansion. That is what $I$ needed to know.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there someone here from
Baker Hughes? If so, please step
forward and identify yourself.
MR. BROADER:
Good morning. Jessie
Broader. We represent Baker
Hughes.
MS . FORD:
Jennifer Ford. Property tax manager for Baker Hughes.

MR. ADLEY:

The first application shows
an expansion for the
manufacturing of oil field tools.
I get that. I'm trying to find
out the other four that are
listed down that had no advanced
notice. Were they all related to
the first one, the expansion for
the manufacturing of oil field
tools.
MR. BROADER:
The one for Bossier,
20120722, that the same site in
Bossier that is related. The
other three are at different sites.

MR. ADLEY:
Can you tell me -- well, there is actually four more. Can you just tell me what -- you have one, St. Martin, Terrebonne. St. Martin, Terrebonne and Bossier, so I assume the one for Bossier is the same manufacturing of oil tools. Tell me what the
manufacturing is in Terrebonne
and St. Martin.
MR. BROADER:
Just to clarify, the
manufacturing that is going on in
Bossier is the mud manufacturing
facility that is only related.
The investment that's being
claimed is only related to the manufacturing operations at that site. The total investment was well over $\$ 23$ million.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. Let me ask you a question. When you were here last time, you made that statement relative to the mixing, blending of mud, but your application says part of your manufacturing is oil field tools. So I'm trying to find out. I mean, I love the idea of 138 jobs, I just love it, but is it oil field tools or is it the blending of chemicals for mud. That is what $I$ need to
know.
MR. BROADER:
The site in Terrebonne is
manufacturing of oil field tools.
MR. ADLEY:
So the one that says in
Bossier for the manufacturing of oil field tools is not correct?

MR. BROADER:
That is correct. That is a correct statement.

MR. ADLEY:
I guess, staff, what I'm
trying to find out is when we
look at these things we believe everything that we see in here is true and correct, and obviously no one from LED, $I$ guess, goes out there to find out if he is mixing up chemicals for mud or if he is manufacturing oil field tools. How do we deal with that? I mean, clearly the application says something other than what you say you are doing.

MR. BROADER:
This was something that was
completed by the company
themselves and $I$ can only guess as to why it was completed that way, but $I$ will say that there was a site visit by LED at the facility in Bossier, I believe Mr. Favaloro did that site visit and view the operations at the site.

MR. ADLEY:
Let me ask LED not to delay this one. How do you determine that the mixing of chemicals for mud for fracking is manufacturing. What brought you
to that conclusion?
MR. WINDHAM:
Please step forward and
identify yourself.
MR. FAVALORO:
My name is Frank Favaloro
with LED business incentives. We do site inspections for
industrial tax exemption to make sure that the sites we visit are putting in the components based on industrial tax exemption contract. I think I have done that, what's that, three years ago .

MR. ADLEY:
Did you review what they were manufacturing to say that they are a manufacturer.

MR. FAVALORO:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
And when you finished you came to the conclusion that the mixing of these chemicals they put together for mud to go in truck for fracking was manufacturing.

MR. FAVALORO:
As I recall, yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Thank you very much. I'm going to move to approve all of

Baker Hughes applications knowing that they were prior to, I guess, the 6-24 deadline, but to say to the Board that someone ought to probably take a second look at to
insure that what we are calling manufacturing in all cases is manufacturing. I move for
approval of those and then ask that we take the last one after that.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Cheng, can you read those numbers.

MS . CHENG:
20100679, Baker Hughes
Oilfield Operations, Inc.
20120719, Baker Hughes
Oilfield Operations.
20120723, Baker Hughes Oilfield Operations, Inc., dba Completions \& Fishing.

20120724, Baker Hughes Oilfield Operations, Inc., dba Completion \& Fishing.

And 20120722, Baker Hughes
Oilfield Operations, Inc.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to the
motion? Seconded by Mr. Carmody.
Representative Carmody. Any
discussion from the public? Any
questions, comments, observations
by the Board members? Yes, Mr.
Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Just for the point of
clarity, on the agenda, the ad
valorem tax relief for these 14
renewals that's indicative of
five years or ten years?
MS . CHENG :
That's ten years.
MR. RICHARD:
Even though it's a renewal
for five years?
MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir. That's how our
system generates it because it
hasn't been updated to reflect
the changes from the Executive Order.

MR. RICHARD :
So moving forward with as we discussed earlier, the new agendas will also reflect the more accurate yearly projection possibly, the annual -- the amount of ad valorem tax relief will be broken down in as a more detailed manner.

MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. RICHARD :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional comments from the Board? All in favor indicate with aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion Carries.
MR. ADLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I move
favorable on Kennedy Rice Dryers
as it was part of that group that
was committed in the past. I
just want someone from LED to
explain the reasoning behind a
rice dryer being manufacturing.
MR. WINDHAM:
Could someone from LED come
and talk about rice drying as a manufacturing process.

MS . CHENG :
They indicated a 311.
MR. WINDHAM:
Someone from Kennedy here?
Please step forward. Describe
the process.
MR. OLDHAM:
Good morning. My name is
Marley Oldham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Say that again.
MR. OLDHAM:
Marley Oldham, O-I-D-H-A-M.
Oldham. I am Vice President and
general manager of Kennedy Rice Dryers and Kennedy Rice Mill.

MR. BOLTON :
I'm Wes Bolton, the inhouse
CPA for Kennedy Rice Dryers and
Kennedy Rice Mill.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please describe the process and why it's manufacturing.

MR. OLDHAM:
A large majority of rice that
we bring in comes in from the
field. It's high moisture. Has to be cleaned. So what we do is we dry it, we clean it. We make it a processible product for the rice mill. So we're changing what the state is when we get it what state it's in and making it where it can be used in a rice mill and thus step forward to complete.

MR. WINDHAM:
Does anyone have any

```
questions?
```

MR. ADLEY:
It's not what I think most of us view as typical manufacturing no differently than making a cup of coffee. The change of structure or cement truck, but I appreciate. I move favorable.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second on the
motion? Motion made by Mr. Adley.
Seconded by Representative
Carmody. Yes. Please. Secretary Allen.

MR. ALLEN :
I will comment to Mr. Richard that the proximity to markets is
a huge issue in agriculture production, and the fact that Kennedy Mill in Morehouse Parish is there means that it has dramatically changed the value of the land in close parishes to

Kennedy Mill and the rice dryers.
I know that because I have land
that they have reassessed this
year and the taxes are going up,
so I can assure you that if the sheriff or the School Board were here they would testify that this is one of the most valuable operations in that rural part of north Louisiana, and just the -I wish we all knew more about every single product -- every single company that comes for these exemptions before us. It would be valuable to all of us to know. From personal knowledge I know about the quality of this company and the impact they are having in the agricultural community in north Louisiana. MR. WINDHAM: Thank you, Secretary Barham.

I know that from my experiences with LED, Board members are all welcome on site visits. I know the companies would welcome the Board member from their area and may live in that area to go along
on a site visit with them so that they can see what happens and how it happens. I found it
fascinating over my 30 years of doing government the different processes and industries that we have in the state. We truly have
a gem out there with these industries.

Did we pass a motion? No. Motion and second. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD :
I certainly appreciate Mr.
Barham's comments. I'm not sure why he directed them at me, but we certainly know that all
government entities rely on property taxes that our business partners work hand in hand with us, and I think that's the goal of this whole process, and with that being said, I would like to thank you guys for coming down
all of the way from Morehouse
Parish today. We were hoping to
see every business represented in meeting room today.

MR. OLDHAM:
We're glad to be here, and
thank you for your consideration.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much. With
that, is there any further
discussion from the public?
MS . CHENG:
I do also want to mention
that they have the next code that begins with a 31 , which means the workforce commission has
designated them as a
manufacturer.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Do we need to
read their numbers out?
MS . CHENG :
Sure.
MR. ADLEY:
I wanted you down here to see if you talked like Mr. Barham.

MR. OLDHAM:

We have a striking
resemblance.
MR. BARHAM :
He is another fellow that
doesn't have an accent.
MS . CHENG:
20110818, Kennedy Rice Mill,
LLC dba Kennedy Rice Mill.
And 20120536, Kennedy Rice
Dryers, LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Ms. Cheng

All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Thank you.
MS . CHENG:
101 renewals that are being presented today.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. I believe Mr.

Adley would like to group them in
some distinct areas maybe to
speed this along.
MR. ADLEY:
Did we prepare a list from my meeting yesterday from the grouping?

MS . CHENG :
We did. I have one of these that the company would like to defer. That would be 20081170,

Air Liquide Large Industries U.S.
LP. The very first one.
MR. ADLEY:
I am sorry. I was not
listening.
MS . CHENG:
20081170, Air Liquide Large Industries U.S., LP.

MR. WINDHAM:
So, with that, Mr. Adley, if you can describe what you are grouping together and why you are grouping together.

MR. ADLEY:

I am not for sure I'm
following. Staff, whoever put
together this list can you step
up here with me and let's make
sure that we've got them
together.
We tried to group them by
large companies that had multiple
applications so that we can take each one of them separately, and
then I think we tried to group
them by those things that in
their description appeared to be
either maintenance or we didn't
know for sure.
MS . CHENG :
So all of the ones that you
believe are maintenance or we are
not sure about are the last ones
on the list starting with Afco
Industries, Inc.
MR. ADLEY:
Starting with which one?
MS . CHENG:
It's on the third page.

MR. ADLEY:
Starting with Afco.
MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Let me move for approval of that list first beginning with

Afco Industries members on the third page of that handout all of the way, $I$ assume, to the bottom.

MS . CHENG:
Those are the maintenance ones.

MR. ADLEY:
The reason -- are those the ones that you had listed, sir, as maintenance that we discussed yesterday?

MR. FAVALORO:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
That doesn't mean they are maintenance, it means that when we read from their application there was no way to know for sure
if it was maintenance or
additions or exactly what it was.
Under the current rules,
maintenance was allowed so it
didn't make really any difference
whether they were very clear or not, but before the rules allowed it, $I$ broke all of them down just for you to be able to see maintenance will not be allowed in the future with the new rules.

There is a very good possibility that this minute applications
that you are looking at today may never be here again if we adopt those new rules. Now, some of these in here may be some
expansion but we don't know that.
I do know that they complied with the current rules and current law and that's why I wanted them separated out, but I want you to see of that 100 plus over half of them come to us with an explanation that you don't
have a clue really what they are, and very well could be maintenance, and if that is the case with the adoption of the new rules going forward, that entire group would be probably removed from this agenda. That's why I wanted you to see it in that fashion.

So with that said, that group beginning with Afco, down, I would ask for a favorable approval of that group.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to the
motion? Seconded by
Representative Broadwater. A couple of questions, I believe, about the process first. Mr.

## Miller.

MR. MILLER:
I just need to abstain on the vote for 20120352. Elmer Candy Company located in the great

```
Parish of Tangipahoa.
```

MR. WINDHAM:
So that's from Afco forward.
Do we want to do this in-globo?
Are you making a motion to move that in-globo?

MR. ADLEY:
From Afco down to take that group in-globo and move for approval.

MR. WINDHAM:
Second by Representative
Broadwater. Any objection? Any comments from the public
regarding the renewals? Those
renewals? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
Now I would ask if we could
take those large companies and group them together so that we
can begin to deal with them and
Dow Chemical being the first, in
your group on the first page of your list. I will come back to the individual if $I$ can. Can
someone roughly explain to us
what Dow Chemical has done.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative
from Dow Chemical? Please step forward and identify yourself.

Ms. Cheng, can you read the numbers?

MS . CHENG:
Yes. It's 20091059, 062293A,
20110028, 2010, 1004, 20080938B,
and 20100819, and they are all
Dow Chemical Company.
MR. ADLEY:
Just to be helpful for the
record, this list that we all
have, that is what we are talking
about now, those that deal with
Dow Chemical. Ma'am, my only
question to you is I noticed in
all of these were there any jobs created? I kept just saying zero to zero to zero, and that being the case, why is this not just -was it maintenance? Was it expansion? What was it?

MR. WINDHAM:
Ma'am, please identify
yourself, please.
MS. DAIGLE:
My name is Roma Daigle. I'm
a tax manager for Dow Chemical.
In reference to the projects that are on the list, it may have had zero on it, but if you see the renewals of each one of these, it shows you the actual facility
increase. We did have a segment of a business that was sold, but that those employees went to the new business, and in the paperwork it shows you that those employees still exist and that we did have increases to the facility for each one of these
projects.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional questions for

```
Ms. Daigle?
```

MR. ADLEY:
No. I am not understanding.
Staff, why the zero?
MS . CHENG:
The jobs created at the
initial application, and then when you go to the renewal data summary, that would show the jobs that were lost because of part of the business that was sold, and that's going to be on the second part of it in the summary.

MR. ADLEY:
Be helpful. I think in the future on our summary sheet on the front that we --

MS . CHENG:
We don't want the information
from the initial application.
MR. ADLEY:
If there is some job
creation, we need to see it, and
I'm not so sure I see any even written in the second page.

MS. DAIGLE :
We went from 1388 and then when we -- the 189 went to the new company, so if you net that out, and then we went to 2 -- 12
-- 49 was an increase, so I think 42 -- let's see. 22 new jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
Why would not be listed on the first page? I mean, if they created new jobs, $I$ just -- what happens is $I$ get phone calls, and I'm not sure everybody else does, we print the agenda of the website, they see this on the sheet, and all they see is no jobs.

MS . CHENG:
This is information from the application that was filed five years ago.

MR. ADLEY:

And there were no jobs
promised five years ago?
MS . CHENG:
That's what this application
says.
MR. ADLEY:
And they were not required
to?
MS . CHENG:
Correct.
MR. ADLEY:
Mr. Chairman, I move for
approval of -- at the appropriate
time for those by Dow Chemical.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second on the
approval for Dow Chemical?
Seconded -- motion made by Mr.
Adley. Seconded by
Representative Broadwater. Any
additional comments from the
public? Any questions from the
Board members? All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:

Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Thank you. Next
one I believe we do will be
Exxon.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes. Exxon. The only
question that $I$ had on Exxon they
showed zero jobs also.
MR. WINDHAM:
Someone from Exxon here?
MR. ADLEY:
The summary says startup new, and then it says, plan additions.

I guess that's from 2011. It's
the same explanation?
MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
That shows zero because it
wasn't --
MS . CHENG:
It wasn't our requirement to
report any new jobs even if they
had new jobs, so it was probably not included on the application at the time.

MR. ADLEY:
So the renewal of the
application does not create any jobs?

MS . CHENG:
That's not -- that's not a requirement on the --

MR. WINDHAM:
Ma'am, please identify yourself.

MS . CARGILE:
I am Stephanie Cargile. I am the public affairs manager with ExxonMobil.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley, do you have some questions for Ms. Cargile?

MR. ADLEY:
No. I think the staff's got
it. No requirements for jobs, and so we just doing the renewal because that is what Louisiana
said that it would do. Bear in
mind for everyone here to
understand the new rules once
adopted will not give any
renewals outside of three years
with a capital of 80 percent, and
there will certainly be job
requirements. I move for
adoption of Exxon.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion by Mr. Adley.
Seconded by Representative
Carmody. Any additional comments
from the public? Please step
forward and identify yourself.
Thank you, Ms. Cargile.
MS. CARGILE:
Thank you.
MS . WASSAM:
Good morning. Kathy Wassam
again. I'm speaking as a
resident of East Baton Rouge
Parish. Someone who just voted
and we had two taxes on our
election ballot and we will have
another taxes on our December
ballot. Exxon has been here
since 1909, Secretary Pierson,
and $I$ just wonder how long we are
still going to keep supporting
this large multination interest
as we go and ask citizens to
continue to vote for taxes for
our council on aging, taxes for
schools, taxes for our libraries,
taxes for our parks, and all to
renewals, so I think -- I think I
looked at it and I think it's
over $\$ 20$ million, $\$ 21$ million in
industrial tax exemptions that
can certainly be used by East
Baton Rouge Parish especially
when we -- I understand we will
be looking at our green light
program which is furnished it for
-- to help our roads and our
traffic congestion in East Baton
Rouge Parish.
I understand from the
Executive Order that these will
be approved, but our School
Board, our sheriff's, our parish
in general could certainly use
this income to help support the parish instead of going back
continually, continually to
citizens and asking them for more tax money. Thank you. MR. WINDHAM: Thank you, Ms. Wassam. Please step forward and identify yourself and address the Board.

MS . CARGILE:
It's Stephanie Cargile again.
Like Kathy said, I do agree that
we need to support our schools,
and that's something that
ExxonMobil as a company has hold
very dear over most of the
centuries that we've been located
here. Recently this year I just
wanted to share we announced 17
schools in the general area in
Louisiana we'll be part of the
\$13 million grant from the
company to further their stem education. Just this week we announced $\$ 100,000$ is going to be the East Baton Rouge school system, but more importantly I just wanted to put these renewals in perspective for you, so when you look at actual ad valorem tax relief for our Baton Rouge
facilities, these renewals represent about $\$ 1.3$ million a year. Now, each of those years our company in the greater Baton

Rouge area, all five of these facilities that are up for renewals, they are paying about \$36 million in property tax. So in East Baton Rouge Parish right now, we represent about eight percent of the city's property tax, we are the largest property taxpayer and in West Baton Rouge I think we are the second largest taxpayer in the parish, so this

```
investment I think we're
```

continuing to invest in our Baton
Rouge facility, so for the long
term we can continue to build the
tax base and give back to the
community.
MR. ADLEY:
Just by any chance, does
Exxon pay inventory taxes?
MR. JEFF:
Hi. This is Jeff Coxski.
Government relations. Yes, we do.

MR. ADLEY:
Do you get a credit for that?
MR. JEFF:
I believe we do, but I am
told that our -- we pay more in
-- I am sorry, we pay more in
corporate income and franchise
taxes than we do in credits.
MR. ADLEY:
My question is what I'm trying to get from the staff is that I thought the legislature in the last session, and those of
you that voted on that you might chime in here. I'm trying to
draw from memory, but I thought
it said that if you got the
inventory credit and you got the
industrial credit you can only
take one or the other. Am I
wrong about that?
MR. BROADWATER:
Senator Ward's bill.
MR. JEFF:
It was until 10 and it was
amended so that the business --
the business community was okay
with it. I don't think it was --
the way it passed the house --
well, finally passed was a way it
was introduced in the senate.
I'm at a deficit.
MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Mandi.
MS . MITCHELL:
Yes. Very briefly. What the
legislation ended up is that if a company has an active exemption
contract the company can no
longer receive the refundable
portion of the inventory tax credit, so it started out as what
you mentioned is a company can only get one or the other, but through the legislative process and through various amendments, the way that it came out was that
a company that has an active
industrial tax exemption can no
longer receive the refundable
portion of the inventory tax.
MR. ADLEY:
The question is do you
receive the refundable portion or
not.
MR. JEFF:
As I understand it is the
short answer is I'm not sure.
I'm telling you the aggregate
that we pay in excess our
corporate income and franchise
taxes --
MR. ADLEY:
that based on what $I$ just heard and based on what the legislature did there would be no refundable credit to you because you are taking the ITEP. That's a correct statement.

MR. JEFF:
Yes, sir. I mean, to your point one of the reasons we did want to come up here was to explain the integrated nature of our operations that we do have several different operations in the state, in the metro Baton Rouge area, so when you ask specific questions about who is paying inventory taxes, who is getting inventory tax credit, I can't give you the simplest of answers at this moment.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional questions?
Any questions? Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:

Good morning. Thank y'all
for being here. Certainly I want
to acknowledge the support and
the partnership with the local
school systems in this EBR metro
area.
In regards to the
applications, have you had
conversations with parish
government officials informally
or formally about these requests.
MS . MITCHELL:
We have talked to our East
Baton Rouge Parish quite often.
We meet with their finance
director on a regular basis. We
have not talked about these
specific ITEP application
renewals that we are talking
about today, but we have talked
about a lot of the projects in
the capital investment that are
included in these renewals.
MR. RICHARD :
Thank you. Thank you.

MR. JEFF:
There was a bit of
uncertainty how these were being to be treated, so that's --

MR. RICHARD :
I am not referring to the
Executive Order whatsoever. Just
have you had a conversation with
your parish President, your
School Board superintendent,
CFO's your sheriff about these applications whereby therefore going their local taxes that support basic services to invest with you as a business partner in

East Baton Rouge and west Baton
Rouge.
MS MITCHELL:
Our conversations with the school Board and with the city continue to be very robust and even with our law enforcement, and we will be talking to them more about the actual
applications that come up for
sure.
MR. RICHARD :
Good. Thank you. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER :
When Exxon has multiple
locations throughout the country
when you are -- Exxon's
evaluating where to add a new
process or upgrade a process, are
these incentives taken into
consideration and is that part of
the determining factor if you expand Baton Rouge or are you expanding in Texas.

MS . MITCHELL:
Absolutely. It's always been an important factor in the decisions that we've made, and one example that $I$ can share is if you guys saw yesterday they announced our aviation lubricants site in Port Allen started up and that was a huge project where

Louisiana was in competition
actually with New Jersey, and when we went back to the company to look at the different
locations, ITEP was one of the considerations for that project, so it did figure into the
business environment and the tax reliefs that was going to be available for the project.

MR. JEFF:
I think we had 15 refineries
that we compete against
internally and three dozen
chemical plants we compete with
internally, and just since our earnings came out today, I think it's important to note that as
you take a look at our
ExxonMobil's U.S. operations they
represented about a little over
six percent of the company's
earnings. I think the reference
was that we were a global, a
global company, and if you took a
look at the numbers, 93 percent of our earnings came from outside of the United States, so I think, you know, putting a little bit of context about who we are and what we are and what we're up against when we're competing internally and against our competitors for capital expenditure, operating expenditure, our payroll here is over half a billion -- nearly
half a billion dollars a year, just our payroll, and also while

I'm up here I do want to
reference conversations we've had
that you have been focusing on
head counts, jobs, so we've had discussions with some about you need -- we would appreciate it if you would consider also the changing nature of our operations. We have our -- I put it in three: ExxonMobil employee -- we have ExxonMobil employees and we also have --
(Microphone not working).
MR. ADLEY:
If you paid your taxes, we could have lit you up.

MR. JEFF:
We appreciate the
consideration during the rules committee to take a broader look
at the full -- the full context of what we bring as far as ExxonMobil jobs, permanent contractors as well as the construction workers that are working on the projects, so there's three numbers there. Stephanie, our total numbers is about.

MS MITCHELL :
It's a little bit over six thousand total folks, and what Jeff is referring to is contractors. Those are permanent contractors, so those are onsite contractors that have permanent jobs.

MR. CARMODY:
Could you repeat those three
things for Senator Adley.
MR. JEFF:
So what we are looking at are
head counts. We are real focused on jobs and retention of jobs.

Sometimes, and I can't even say it's about us, but you might see the company employee head count go down, but at the same time there's nothing in the data that
I see necessarily that reflects permanent contractor jobs and then on top of that you have the specific projects. There are construction jobs related to the project in the capital investment here, so the term "temporary" gets thrown around, so that is why we are trying to let people know that permanent contractor employees that you see at our facilities, those are real jobs.

They are not temporary. The
skill press people that were
training in our community
colleges they would be very
surprised to know that somebody
is thinking that those are only
temporary.
So I think just to broaden
this and the document you have in
front of you is more robust 360
view of our economic impact in
the community and we wanted to --
sometimes we get so narrowed down on some of these things that we can't -- we are so focused on the trees you don't see the forest.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Copski.
MR. CARMODY:
I think you make a good point
and I think it's something that we need to be looking at as a state, and that is individual
industry and businesses the
nature of how they do what they
do in order to turn a profit
changes with technology, and if
the bottom line is jobs, $I$
appreciate that. Being a public
servant $I$ want to make sure we
have employment for our people
but there also got to be some consideration given to the fact
that there are no buggy whip
factories left in Louisiana
because people don't use horse drawn conveyance, correct? And
so I think that that's another
thing that we need to be thinking
about, though, as a Commerce and
Industry Board is that some of
these applications that are made
for consideration for relief of
taxes have to do with the fact
that they are tying to maintain
their competitiveness not only in
Louisiana and United States but
also internationally, and so I think you brought up a very good point and I just wanted again to reiterate that $I$ think there are
many factors that we need to be
considering. I know the Governor
takes all of those under
consideration as he has these on
his desk, but thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Representative
Carmody. Representative
Broadwater.
MR. BROADWATER:
As you mention, there's other criteria other than just pure head count and the thought in my head that my guess is probably a fourth element there, I know you have seen it from companies in
the district that $I$ represent, they plan on creating $x$ number of jobs, and as it turns out, they may not reach that benchmark, may miss it by two or three, but they find they are able to create jobs that have an average annual payroll that far exceeds what they were expecting, so they
create a greater quality job, and one thing that $I$ would encourage
because I probably won't be
invited back to sit as a proxy
after today, that the Board consider as well not just a raw head count because if you create
a raw head count of 20 new jobs but their jobs that pay a rate that the individual can't live on but instead you create 15 new jobs but they are jobs where the folks are self sufficient and they are a living wage that that is just as important or even if we don't create a single new job
but because of the investment we're able to lift what we were able to deliver to the existing employees. You don't have a single new nose there but you improve the life of every one of those employees that remained employed there, so I encourage you to look beyond just counting
noses.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Representative

## Broadwater.

I believe there is a motion on the floor and $I$ believe it's been seconded to accept the
applications for renewal by
Exxon. I believe they've been
read. No. Please read it.
MS . CHENG:
20101140, ExxonMobil
Corporation dba ExxonMobil Corp
(Chemical) .
20101141, ExxonMobil
Corporation (Lubes).
20101142, ExxonMobil
Corporation (Plastics).
20101137, ExxonMobil
Corporation (Polyolefins).
20101138, ExxonMobil
Corporation (Refinery).
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. All in favor all
indicate in an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Mr. Pierson.
MR. PIERSON:
I want to, on behalf of the
Governor and the citizens thank you for your continued investment and confidence in Louisiana, particularly in this region, but we know we are in competition both internally and externally
for the capital investments that
you have that you are able to
deploy. We know we are in
competition for some of those
right now today that we'll
continue to have some
conversations on. We are
including those local parish
officials in those conversations, and, again, thank you for more than 6,800 employees and contractors that reside here and
the annual contribution of $\$ 491$
million in payroll that you bring
to the table. It's important for
us, you heard previously that
more than $\$ 33$ million in annual
taxes being paid, so to rebate a
portion of that seems like a good
deal to me and we'd like to do
more of it.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Copski and Ms.
Cargile. All right. The next
section you would like to cover,
Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Can we take up Gulf Island
and we'll come back to the
individuals and knock them out.
MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have representatives
from Gulf Island present?
MR. ADLEY:
There are three of those and
one is a marine fabrication and
different LLC. Anybody here for
them? Just for the staff because
they are a part of your prior commitment, I remove approval.

But can you ask them for me, contact them at some point and just ask them what did they do
when they just say capital
improvements, what that is so we
at least have some record of it.
I move for approval of Gulf
Island those three ITEP requests.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second? Second
made by Mr. Williams. Motion
made by Mr. Adley. Any discussion
made by the Board.
MR. RICHARD:
Just a question. They were notified that these applications were on the agenda today?

MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir. They were.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any addition questions?
MR. RICHARD:

No one here from that
company.
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Do we need to
read those numbers into the record.

MS . CHENG :
20091178, Gulf Island Marine Fabricators, LLC.

20101104 and 20091177A, Gulf Island LLC.

MR. WINDHAM:
Have all been approved with the preceding actions.

Mr. Adley, which group would you like to do next.

MR. ADLEY:
Marathon.
MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a representative for
Marathon Petroleum in the audience?

MR. ADLEY:
I move for approval but that
I need to know when you talked
about to comply with refinery MA
CT11 standards, I don't know what
that is. I need to know if that
is an environmental issue or not.
MR. CRUSACK (PH):
Hi. My name is Steven
Crusack. I work for Marathon
Petroleum and the MACT actually
stands for the maximum achievable
control technology and it's for
regulatory purposes.
MR. ADLEY:
Is it environmental or not?
MR. CRUSACK :
It is not.
MR. PIERSON:
Is it safety?
MR. CRUSACK:
It's more safety based.

MR. ADLEY:
Thank you very much.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional questions by
any of the Board members? Motion
has been made by Mr. Adley to
approve the ones by Marathon, which Ms. Kristin will read for
us.
MS . CHENG:
20090050, 20101213, 20101214,
20101215, 20101217, 20101224
Marathon Petroleum Company, LP.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second for the
motion to approve these?
Seconded by Ms. Atkins. Any
additional discussion from the
Board? All in favor indicate
with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.

I think too all of the people in the audience and $I$ think the message will get out that when
these applications are filled out in the future, no matter what kind of application it is, please describe what you do, how you did it, what the equipment is without acronyms and make it clear so the Board members can understand what they are looking at.

Mr. Adley, next group.
MR. ADLEY:
Union Carbide. They had two
applications and it was for an addition to the facility with zero jobs, and so $I$ just want a clarification. You want to come tell me, ma'am. If you added to the facility but created no jobs, I am just curious what that was.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative from Union
Carbide, please.
MS. DAIGLE:

Rema Daigle, Dow Chemical tax
manager. Again, we had 40 new
jobs for these two projects.
MR. ADLEY:
How many?
MS . DAIGLE:
40 .
MR. ADLEY:
So why are they not listed.
Wait a minute, you have a second one that list -- well, both of them list zero.

MS . CHENG :
That was because it was from the original application when
jobs were not a requirement and
it was not listed on the original
application.
MR. ADLEY:
So this addition created 40.
MS. DAIGLE :
The two that you have on here together they created 40 and that was put on the renewal
application.

MR. ADLEY:
I would suggest to the staff
we really ought to see that.
Going backwards five years and ten years in time doesn't help us. I move for approval, Union

Carbide.
MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Cheng, can you read those out.

MS. CHENG:
It actually is shown on the renewal summary that the first year they had 971 jobs and currently they have 1011, so the creation of new jobs is shown.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. Thank you.
MS . CHENG:
20100941 and 20100820, Union Carbide Corporation.

MR. ADLEY:
The spreadsheet shows the
jobs?
MS . CHENG :

Yes, sir. The summary sheet shows it on the back.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley makes the motion to
approve for Union Carbide and
seconded by President Miller.
Any further discussion regarding Union Carbide? We read the numbers. Yes. Mr. Bagger. MR. BAGGER :

This is again a question going forward. They have several applications all of which have the same jobs differential of 40 and that does show the creation of jobs, 40 jobs, but it's not that each one of those created 40 jobs, and does that delineating which projects created the jobs or if they are taken into their entirety?

MR. ADLEY:
I think, Mr. Broderick, as you know from all of the conversations we've had, once we
adopt, hopefully today, the new
rules going forward, you will
have that before you where we
don't have it now is what $I$ think
the new rules will do.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley, one challenge with
that will be even if they are
aggravated for one program, if
there are multiple programs, if
you are not familiar with the
intricacies of it, you may
presume that jobs that are put on
an Enterprise Zone Program
application can be added to the
jobs of an industrial tax
exemption program or Quality Jobs
or whichever ones are applying
and if you don't know the
intricacies you just can't make that presumption, so you have to be very careful when numbers just get combined because it's not
always accurate.
MR. ADLEY:
Moving forward, there will be
an Exhibit $A$ and $B$ in all of
these applications from local
government and LED and it will
show you the jobs and the salary and what they've been paid.

MR. BAGGER:
This gets into the
intricacies of it in applications
that creates jobs -- one
application that creates jobs,
the same jobs couldn't be
attributed to another
application.
MR. ADLEY:
No. I don't think it will be, but we are grouping them
together today because the current rules didn't require any jobs whether it be one of them might have shown jobs, the other one was zero, it doesn't really make a difference. To keep our word we are moving forward with that.

MR. BAGGER :
This is more oriented toward
the future and what you said is
that there wouldn't be multiple
applications each of which
respectively would take credit
for jobs that are repeated
throughout there, and that's all
I wanted to ask you.
MR. ADLEY:
I can't imagine that
happening.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Bagger. Ms.
Clapinski, please. Come forward
and identify yourself if you
haven't done so.
MS . CLAPINSKI :
Danielle Clapinski, staff attorney LED.

I just want to clarify that applications are due within a certain amount of time that a piece or the entirety of the project is placed in service, so
if you have things placed in service in stages, you are going to have multiple applications that can be for one project, and that one project is responsible for the totality of those jobs, so I just want to clarify that because that is an issue that you may see ongoing because there are deadlines. I believe
applications are due nine days after placing service which means, I believe, is -- what's the term we use, operational or complete. Not operating, but operational, so if it's there in April.

MR. ADLEY:
I get that. I see that. But the difference will be where in the past you had all of the MCA's that would come in on the heels of some advanced notice is not going to be there anymore.

MS . CLAPINSKI:

Correct.
MR. ADLEY:
You are going to get an
advanced notice, you will know in
advance exactly what you have in
front of you.
MS. CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir. I just wanted to clarify it still could be multiple contracts related to that one project.

MR. WINDHAM:
And also point out that an advanced notification is an estimate, so you don't know exactly what you are going to have in front of you.

MS. CLAPINSKI :
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Clapinski.
Next group you would like to cover?

MR. ADLEY:
Agrillectric. Is that the
next one?
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe we still have some
at the top that were --
MR. ADLEY:
Go back to those if I can.
I'm trying to get the groups or companies out of the way if that's possible. And then go
back to the individuals.
MR. WINDHAM:
So we don't want to do all of
the ones that had an advance in
the original application and get
those out of the way and then
move on to --
MR. ADLEY:
I can do that.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So let's go back to those. Do you want to do those by group or remain in-globo?

MR. BROADWATER:
While you are looking at
that, Mr. Chairman, I think we
also are going to need a motion.
There was a request that Air
Liquide be deferred and at the
appropriate timeline move to defer that one too.

MR. WINDHAM:
I will take that motion right now. Representative Broadwater,
is there a second to deferring
it. Ms. Cola seconded it. Is
there any discussion on the
deferral of Air Liquide? No.
20081170.

All in favor indicate with an
aye with a deferral.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
The Brazos, I think is the next one. That shows the startup new with ten jobs. Is that from the past also?

MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Or is that with the renewal?
MS . CHENG :
That's -- that should be from
the past. The renewal
information is on the next sheet
where it says renewal data.
MR. ADLEY:
So four?
MS . CHENG:
Yes. Four new jobs have been
created since.
MR. ADLEY:
I move for approval of

## Brazos.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please read the number into
the record, Ms. Cheng.
MS . CHENG :
20100916, Brazos Forest
Products, LP.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second for that
motion. Ms. Heather Malone.
MR. ADLEY:
Let me ask the staff, too,
once you get this motion
approved.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Is there any
further discussion related to
Brazos Forest Products. All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All oppose with a nay?
Motion Carries.
MR. ADLEY:
These four in that group,
these were the ones that were creating some jobs, is that what was in your group there? What was in there?

MS . CHENG:
It just wasn't part of a big
company group, that's why they
are --

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. I got it. The next
one -- let me, if $I$ can, did Cleco have -- they are in the next group. Cleco Power; the product -- the only question that

I have just so we can get this into the record today and $I$ won't have to do it again when we get to the rest of Cleco, someone explain to me what you -- how you came to the conclusion of manufacturing. I want to know what you brought together and what you changed created electricity. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative
from Cleco? Please step forward and describe your manufacturing process.

MR. ADLEY:
The reason I'm asking that question is because a number of people ask about how it got on
the list and I'm not sure myself, so I am going to give you an
opportunity to just tell us.
MR. BROADWATER:
And if staff could identify what their next code is as well, please, if they have it.

MS . CHENG :
I believe it begins with a
22, 22112.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MR. MIKE :
Mike with Cleco's tax
department.
(Unidentified individual):
Manager of taxes with Cleco.
MR. ADLEY:
I'm not sold for sure but the code is going to apply into the future. The kind of code that we will be refining the definition of manufacturing, but just share with us, if you will.

MR. MIKE :

We take several raw materials
that could be fuel source, could be natural gas, petticoat, lignite, coal, also we have other raw materials we have imported into the plant, into the plant site the manufacturing facility. We then have to -- for instance, coal comes in very large clumps. We have to take that and then run it through a pulverizer to then change the form of that coal to a very fine mist, almost like talcum powder. The talcum powder is then run through a boiler where it is used as a fuel
source, and there are several
different methods. You have one
where you take the fuel source and boil water and run it through
a turbine. The steam is produced and run through a turbine which then spins the rotor which
contains the copper wires inside
the magnet which then produces or
manufactures the electricity.
There is another process where
the direct heat from the fire is
used to run the spin the rotor,
and, again, within the copper
wire magnet to manufacture the
electricity. So we clearly take
raw materials and bring it into
the site, change that and then
change the form into the final
product, which is electricity.
MR. ADLEY:
Thank you. I will move for
approval of Cleco.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions by the
Board members? Motion has been made by Mr. Adley to approve the single number.

MS CHENG:
20080295, Cleco Power, LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:
Application. Is there a
second. Second by Ms. Malone.
MS . CHENG :

Did you skip C\&C Marine and
Repair?
MR. WINDHAM:
We did. We did. All in
favor of approving this Cleco application as just read out the number please indicate with an aye.

## ALL BOARD MEMBERS:

Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
Mr. Chairman, if $I$ can, $I$
will move for approval of those
that are remaining on the -- on
this list of advanced
notification filed with the
original application.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. The motion has been made to approve these in-globo. I don't believe you will need to read them out since
they are going in-globo. Is
there a second? Second by
Representative Broadwater. Thank
you very much.
Any discussion from the
public? Any discussion by
members of the Board? All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS :
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
That moves us forward to the no advanced notification filed. How would you like these to be grouped, Mr. Adley?

MR. ADLEY:
One second. This begins with Agrillectric, 197, 198. I move to approve Agrillectric down to was Boise in this group.

MS . CHENG:
It's already approved.
MR. ADLEY:

Let me move to approve
Agrillectric Power, both of
those, and let's take
Agrillectric, C\&C, Century down
to Cleco, Dow, that group. I
think we've heard -- is there any
of those that we have not heard
from?
MR. WINDHAM:
We have not heard from
Century Marketing Solutions.
MR. ADLEY:
So can we take Agrillectric and $C \& C$ and move for approval of those and then take Century Marketing.

MR. WINDHAM:
So there is a motion to
approve the three that Ms. Cheng will read out.

MS. CHENG:
20120197, Agrilectric Power Partners. And 20120198,

Agrilectric Research Company.
And 20110736, C\&C Marine and

Repair.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from
the public? Any questions or comments from the Board? I am
sorry. Is there a second?
Seconded by Ms. Malone. Any
comments by the Board members?
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
Is there a representative
from Century Marketing Solutions?
If so, please step forward and identify yourself.

MS . MANN :
Melissa Mann, Director of
Governing Affairs for Century
Link.
MR. INGRAM:
Steven Ingram, property tax
manager, Century Link.
MR. ADLEY:
Just tell me all that $I$ saw
was printed material. Just tell
me what you manufacture.
MR. INGRAM:
Yeah. This is a commercial
printing company that produces
high end commercial printing
materials. You take in raw materials such as paper goods and
ink and you turn it into high end materials that you would mail out to customers or potential
customers.
MR. ADLEY:
So give me an example of high
end material.
MR. INGRAM:
Something you would receive
in the mail from Century Link
asking you to sign up for
internet service.
MR. ADLEY:
A mail out of some kind.

MR. INGRAM:
Yes. Or printed information
that are bound and sent out.
MR. ADLEY:
I would move for approval, is
that Century. Two applications.
Move for approval of those two.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please read those for us, Ms.
Cheng .
MS . CHENG:
20120613 and 20120611,
Century Marketing Solutions.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Representative
Carmody. Any further discussion?
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
MR. BARHAM:
Can I ask you one question, since we've got them here, what $I$ read yesterday about the merger.

MS . MANN :
Yes, sir. As we said previously in that report, we
cannot comment on speculation or
rumor, but $I$ will certainly keep
this Board informed if there is
any information.
MR. BARHAM:
Well, in a merger if it
occurred -- well, we are not at
risk of Century Link moving out
of Louisiana, are we?
MS . MANN:
I really do not have any
information to share at this point in time, but $I$ will certainly keep this Board informed.

MR. BARHAM:
Pretty important to us.
MS . MANN :
We agree.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Mann. I am sorry. Ms. Millie Atkins.

MS . ATKINS:
I would like to be recused
from voting on this, too.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Ms. Atkins is
recusing on this vote. Second by
Representative Carmody.
Are there any additional
comments from the Board? All in
favor indicate with an aye. I am
sorry. Please step forward, sir.
Identify yourself.
MR. CAGE:
Yes. Good afternoon. My name
is Edward Cage with Together
Louisiana.
Just wanted a little
clarification. It sounds like
Century Link is printing, taking
paper in and, for lack of a
better term, just making it look pretty. Does this fit the
definition of manufacturing going
forward with the amended
Executive Order? And, if so, how
does it just printing and making paper look pretty.

MR. ADLEY:

I think it's the
determination that the Board has
to make going forward, but the
definition of manufacturing has always been nearly the same. We make it a little more strict going forward. I'm not so for sure in that it will be mass production or it will be production based upon an order.

For instance, you take someone who is a ship builder, they don't just mass produce ships, they get an order for it and they go build one that complies. I'm not for
sure that this will into the
future, but $I$ think it's an issue
that the Board will have to
determine whether or not they
believe that as a manufacturer.
MR. CAGE:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Cage. Any
additional comments from the
public? Comments from the Board?
All in favor of the motion
indicate with an aye.
PARTIAL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
I move for approval then for
those following Cleco and Dow in
that we heard from all of them
and move for favorable approval
of that group and then be able to
bring up Foster that we have not
heard from.
MR. WINDHAM:
So you are approving in-globo all of the remaining Cleco's and Dow in-globo?

MR. ADLEY:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by President

Miller.
Are there any comments from
the public regarding Dow or
Cleco? Any comments from the
Board members? All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
Next one we'll take up will
be Foster Poultry Farms. Is
there a representative from
Foster Poultry Farms? Can you
read those into the record.
MS . CHENG:
20120332 and 20120333, Foster
Poultry Farms.
MR. WINDHAM:
So there is no one
representing Foster Poultry Farms in the audience today.

MR. ADLEY:
Staff, tell me what they
manufacture.
MS . CHENG:
Chicken.
MR. ADLEY:
They don't manufacture
chickens. I don't think they do
that.
MS . CHENG:
They have chickens and I
think they process to where
you --
MR. ADLEY:
Process.
MS . CHENG:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Barham, you want to tell us
how to process a yard bird.
MR. BARHAM:
I never had a processor,
Senator.
MR. ADLEY:
And, so, do they take it from
life to dead, is that how they
change it?

MS. CHENG:
We just did a site inspection
on this one, so $I$ believe
Danielle -- Ms. Clapinski can
tell you.
MR. WINDHAM:
It's not a pretty sight.
MS. CLAPINSKI:
Back in, I believe, April of
2016, the Quality Jobs
administrator and myself visited
Foster Farms and saw their
process, so it does come in
clucking and -- it comes in
clucking and it goes through the
whole process. There is --
obviously they put it out of its misery and -- I won't go through the whole process, but they defeather, they cut it up. There is further processing for chicken nuggets and chicken patties and all kinds of other products and there is also packaging and getting ready for sale as well.

MR. ADLEY:
Move for approval for dead
chickens.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion by Mr. Adley to
approve Foster Poultry Farms for
approval. Is there a second?
Seconded by Mr. Moller. Any
further discussion. All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed indicate with a
nay. Motion carries.
Next one we have on are Louisiana Plastic Industries.

MR. ADLEY:
The only question $I$ have -is anybody here from that company?

MR. WINDHAM:
Louisiana Plastic Industries, is there a representative from them in the audience?

MR. ADLEY:
The description they
polyethylene blown film for use of multi-wall bag, and I don't know what that is. I was just curious what it was.

MS . CHENG :
Probably like a ziploc bag.
MR. ADLEY:
But this would be supplies for manufacturing, is that what this would be? Used in a manufacturing process. That's what I'm trying get to. Okay. I'm favorable.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Is there a second for Louisiana Plastic Industries?

Seconded by the Mayor Brasseaux.
Any additional questions or comments from the Board members?

All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed? Motion carries.
Next one you have is four by
Rain CII Carbon, LLC. Are there any representatives from Rain CII

Carbon?
MR. ADLEY:
The only question that $I$ had when $I$ was reading their
application if there is somebody here that it talks about boil
level control and shatter box.
I'm trying to find out if that,
too, was part of maintenance or not or if that was a replacement.

What is that?
I only bring that up -- I
hate to drag us through all of this but $I$ bring that up as we are going forward it's not going to work. These kinds of
explanations are not going to
work. They are working now
because we committed to them in
the past, but at least from the

Governor's perspective that is not going to work. Somebody is going to have to tell us what they did and why they did it and the jobs. I move approval.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second for the
approval of Rain CII. And
seconded by Representative
Broadwater. Any additional
comments from the Board members?
Questions? Motion Carries.
Next one we have is Sapa
Extrusions.
MR. BROADWATER:
Mr. Chairman, while we are doing that, $I$ know that Senator Adley may have additional questions and I don't want to deprive him of that opportunity, but I do think the Board has made a pretty clear point that things may change going forward, and if -- in the interest of time because I think I've got
somewhere to be Sunday, I would
like to make a motion in-globo
for the rest of them for
approval, but $I$ don't mean to

```
deprive --
```

MR. WINDHAM:
We only have three days left.
MR. ADLEY:
That's all we have left. Go on with your motion and be fine with me.

MR. BROADWATER:
Okay. All right. Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Anyone from Sapa Extrusions
in the audience? No
representatives. Sapa
Extrusions. Can you describe
what they do. Read the number at
least. We'll get started while
Mr. Adley gets organized.
MS . CHENG:
20120441, Sapa Extrusions,
LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:

We'll take Representative
Broadwater's in-globo's move for
those next three. Can you read
all three of them for us.
MS . CHENG:
20120441, Sapa Extrusions,
LLC.
20110906, Schambough
Investments, LLC.
And 20120046,
Schoeller-Blackmann Energy
Services, LLC.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much. Is there a second to the in-globo second? Seconded by Mr. Richard. Any additional comments or questions by the Board members? By the public? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye. All opposed with a nay? Motion carries.

Now we will move to five late renewal requests which were
deferred.
MR. ADLEY:
Before we go to those two, we ask you for -- there's a couple of people there that have not been to our meetings before. On
late renewals, what are our
options.
MS . CHENG:
You can either approve the five year renewal going back from when their initial contract expired. You can approve it with
a penalty or you can deny the
request for renewal. And in the rules it says that the terms of the contract may be reduced by one year for each calendar month or a portion thereof that the renewal is filed late.

MR. ADLEY:
Is there anything in the current rule that allows for the reduction of the percentage.

MS . CHENG :

The Board may impose any
other penalties for late renewals
submission that it deems
appropriate.
MR. ADLEY:
So you can approve, reject or
reduce the number of years you
can get, is that -- that's the three options; is that correct?

MS . CHENG:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Thank you.
MS . CHENG:
Before we start, 20140939 and
20140960, CARBO Ceramics, Inc.
would like to be deferred to
December.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion made by President
Miller. Is there a second to
defer the two referenced?
Seconded by Representative
Broadwater. All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All oppose with a nay?
Motion carries. Those two are deferred.

Please proceed, Ms. Cheng.
MS. CHENG:
20091227, Georgia Pacific
Consumer Operations, LLC. The
initial contract expired on
12-31-15. They requested late
renewal on 6-16 of 2016.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative
from Georgia Pacific in the audience? If so, please step forward. Identify yourself.

MR. GUIDRY:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. My name is George Guidry. I am in the company's public sector. I represent GP in this matter, and with me is Patty Brass, who is
public affairs manager at Georgia Pacific.

MR. WINDHAM:
And this was deferred from maybe two meetings ago.

MS . CHENG:
One meeting.
MR. WINDHAM:
I am sorry. One meeting.
Please explain why you were late and why this Board should not penalize you in the fullest.

MR. GUIDRY:
Let me make the explanation and explain. All $I$ will start is saying that we take responsibility for this. We are the contract holder and I think contract holders do have responsibility for requesting renewals and getting those applications in. I will say for the explanation is that prior to, I want to say, sometime maybe in 2014, the usual and customary
practice is for LED staff to spend you a letter letting you know that your contract was up for renewal and also including a renewal contract in there for execution. You would execute it and send it back with your application payment.

Sometime in 2014 that changed. We are aware that an e-mail blast was sent out from the department letting contract holders know that would no longer be the case. That no contract would be mailed out except upon execution, so it was entirely up to the contract holder to make the application and follow it up with the contract.

Unfortunately, the person with GP that had always done this was no longer with the company, and, therefore, they did not -- we did not get that e-mail. When it was discovered about the middle of
2015 that the contract had
expired we contacted LED and
said, hey, what is there that we
can do. We were advised that we
could go ahead and apply for
renewal but there was no
guarantee that it would be
renewed. That was done and it
was done quite quickly. It takes
a couple of weeks for a check to
come out of GP. I think we knew
about this in mid-May. By June
16th, the department had our
check and our application.
I want to emphasize that is
not an excuse, that is just
telling you what happened.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Please,
Representative Carmody.
MR. CARMODY:
Thank you. I wanted to direct
a question to Secretary Pierson,
and $I$ see, $I$ guess, in the past
there was an e-mail sent to
recipients to exemption, and are
we no longer contacting them or
is that now to be done by hard
mail or how do we correct the
situation because -- and I
appreciate the responsibility is
on the recipients to make sure they are compliant, but are we still trying to formally contact these persons and let them know that your --

MR. PIERSON:
We do use methodologies by
which to reach out. Would you please respond.

MS . CHENG:
Yes. Previously we would
send all of the renewal
documentation, renewal contract
and they would return it to us.
Now we do send them a letter when
they filed their Affidavit of
final cost and project completion
report stating the date that they need to file the renewal by and
that they are supposed to request it from us at that point.

MR. CARMODY:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Any additional
questions or --
MR. ADLEY:
Now, just -- George, as much
as I hate to say it, at least
from the Governor's office our
position is very clear on this
issue, the ITEP is for your
benefit. It's your benefit, and
you are not filing for it. As
you said, clearly does not fall
upon us, and we have only four
choices now I have been told. We
can defer. We can accept. We
can reject or we can shorten the
term. This one falls outside of
the normal agreement that the
state made that you would get
these renewals provided that you
did certain things and you didn't
do what you needed to do to get that renewal. So at least knowing that the Governor's office wants to put an 80 percent cap on all renewals, $I$ think is fair, at least from our perspective, to reduce the length of this renewal term that would at least equate to that number, which would reduce it by one year. And at some point $I$ would like to make a motion to do that.

MR. RICHARD:
That's a motion, I'll second it.

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion made by Mr. Adley and
seconded by Mr. Richard, I
believe. Any additional
questions, comments, comments
from the public regarding this
application or this situation?
MR. PIERSON:
The staff, we've had similar circumstances in the past.

MS . CHENG:
We have always accepted late renewals, yes, sir.

MR. ADLEY:
I think we've turned some down since we have been on the Board.

MS . CHENG:
I think so, yes. But
previously we accepted the applications is what I'm saying.

I'm not saying that y'all
approved them necessarily.
MR. PIERSON :
There was a scale of amount
of time lapsed between the
renewal period, did I hear one
month per or words to that
effect?
MS . CHENG:
Yes. In the rules it states that it may be reduced by one year for each calendar month or a portion thereof that the renewal application is filed late.

MR. PIERSON:
So that's in our current
rules.
MS . CHENG :
In the current rules, yes,
sir.
MR. PIERSON :
And what Senator Adley
proposes is in compliance with
our current rules?
MS . CHENG:
Because in the current rules
it also states the Board may
impose any other penalties for
late renewal submission that it
deems appropriate.
MR. ADLEY:
Just for what it's worth, I think that motion is absolutely more than fair compared on the absolute turning it down.

MR. PIERSON:
I simply ask the question --
MR. ADLEY:
Based upon what the Board has
done in the past.
MR. PIERSON:
I think we have the question
to be in compliance with our
rules and to be consistent with
the way the rules have been
applied in the past.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional comments on
the motion? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. You will be
reduced by one year of exemption.
MR. GUIDRY:
Thank you so much.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Guidry.
MS . CHENG:
The next one is 20110354,

```
Flowers Baking Company in Baton
```

Rouge.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative
from Flowers Baking Company of
Baton Rouge in the audience,
please step forward.
MS . CHENG :
Their initial contract expired on 12-31 of 2015, and they requested late renewal on
June 20 of 2016.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MR. KELLER :
Aman Keller, superintendant
of Flowers Baking Company of
Baton Rouge.
MR. BROCK :
Larry Brock, President of the bakery.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please, Mr. Brock, describe your situation.

MR. BROCK :
I have no idea why we were
late. It was held by our
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corporate office and it just didn't get sent out in time, and
we have no excuse and I'm not
trying to make any.
MR. ADLEY:
How many months late was this
one?
MS . CHENG:
Six.
MR. ADLEY:
Same as the last one? I would
like to make the same motion that
you reduce it by one year.
MR. WINDHAM:
The motion has been made by
Mr. Adley that this contract
renewal be reduced by one year.
Seconded by Mr. Richard. Any
additional comments from the public? Any additional comments by the Board? Representative Carmody.

MR. CARMODY:
Can you identify where your corporate headquarters are?

MR. BROCK :
Thomasville, Georgia.
MR. CARMODY:
Thomasville, Georgia. Thank
you.
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. You have been
penalized one year.
MS . CHENG:
20110343, Oxbow Calcining.
MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have anyone from Oxbow Calcining? Please step forward.

MR. ADLEY:
And this one was five months
late?
MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:

Please identify yourself and
describe your situation.
MR. POSTLEWAIT:
I am David Postlewait. I am the plant manager of the Baton

Rouge plant. This essentially is something that is handled by our corporate office in West Palm Beach, Florida. In this particular case, it was an oversight from the fact that the person in the tax department that normally handles that was out of work and away from the company for eight and a half months and came back. I will like to state that we did have two renewals that were submitted recently and in a timely fashion, so we recognize that oversight and corrected that. Going forward, we have developed through our internet process and calendar that will do a notification to the tax department and not just
to a particular individual.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Any questions of
Mr. Postlewait? Any questions of
Mr. Postlewait?
MR. ADLEY:
No. I would like to make the
same motion.
MR. WINDHAM:
Same motion is made for a
four year renewal. Seconded by
-- sorry. A motion was made by
Mr. Adley. Seconded by Mr.
Richard. Any additional questions
or comments from the public?
Comments from the Board? All in
favor indicate with an Aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Thank you.
That passes -- those are the
ones that have late renewal
requests that were deferred from
our previous meeting. Now we have in front of us four late renewal requests.

MS . CHENG:
We have four late renewal
request but three of them would
like to defer to December.
20120375, CVD Incorporated.
20110044 and 20110198 Voith Paper
\& Roll Systems, Inc. would like to be deferred until the December meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:
So the first one and the last
two are requesting deferrals. Is
there a motion to defer those
three to the next meeting. Made
by Ms. Malone. Is there a
second? Representative Carmody.
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?

Motion carries. Those three are
deferred. Now we'll take up
General Electric Company in Caddo
Parish.
MS . CHENG:
20110338, General Electric
Company. They initial contract
expired on 12-31-15 and they
requested late renewal on August
5th of 2016.
MR. WINDHAM:
So that would be eight months, roughly. Is there a representative from General

## Electric Company?

MR. ADLEY:
Now, tell me what the difference is between these and the ones we just handled?

MS . CHENG :
Nothing except for the ones we just handled were previously scheduled on September's agenda.

MR. ADLEY:
This is for a five year
period. This is a request for
five years, right?
MS . CHENG:
It can be for five years.
MR. ADLEY:
And are the options the same here.

MS . CHENG :
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Then I would like to make the same motion. This one was later than the others.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Mr. Adley makes the motion to restrict that this contract, this renewal contract by one year. Is there a second for that motion. Made by Mr. Moller. Motion is seconded. Any discussion from the public? Any additional discussion from the Board?

MR. RICHARD:
Just a quick comment. I
failed to thank the
representatives of the business
entities that have afforded to to
be here today, and unfortunately
the one from General Electric is
not here but they received the
same penalty. Whatever that's
worth.
MR. WINDHAM:
So noted. All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
Next we have 13 name changes.
MS . CHENG :
We have 13 changes in name.
Contract amendments.
Almatis Burnside, Inc.
Contract 20110680, 20120391,
20141325, and 20150657 requesting
to change their name to Almatis
Burnside, LLC.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to accept
the changes for those contracts?
Made by Mr. Coleman. Is there a
second by Mr. Representative
Broadwater. All in favor
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
General Electric Company.
070608, 20080652, 20090717,
20100419, 20120412, 20130499,
20140563 and 20160993 are wishing
to change their name to General
Electric Company to GE Grid
Solutions, LLC in Caddo Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. A motion is made by Mr. Miller to approve the name Change for the General Electric Company contracts previously
read. Is there a second by Ms.
Malone. Any comments from the
public? Comments from the Board?
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG :
Hunt Forest Products, Inc.
Contract 20160711 is changing its
-- is requesting to change its
name to Hunt Forest Products, LLC
in Grant Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to accept
that motion -- accept that
change. Yes. Ms. Cola.
Seconded by Representative
Broadwater, I believe.
Any comments from the public?
Any questions from the Board members. All in favor indicate

```
with an aye.
```

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG :
We have two Change in
Location Only. Contract
amendment request.
Gulf Island Marine
Fabricators, LLC. Contract
20091178 and 20111134. They are
changing from 301 Bayou Dularge
Road, Houma, Louisiana 70363 to
301 Gulf Island Road in Houma,
Louisiana 70363 in Terrebonne
Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to accept
the location changes. Made by
Secretary Barham. Seconded by Mr.
Williams. Any comments from the public? From the Board? All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG :
I have one request for
Partial Transfer from Premium
Products of Louisiana, Inc.
070154. Premium Products of

Louisiana, Inc. retains $\$ 60,649$
in Lafayette Parish and Mackenzie
Real Estate, LLC will be
receiving $\$ 448,372$ in Lafayette
Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to accept
the partial transfer of these
assets from one entity to the
other? Made by Ms. Atkins.
Seconded by Ms. Cola. Any
questions from the public?
Comments from the public?
Questions from the Board members?
All in favor indicate with an
aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
We have two Cancellation of
Contract requests.
Dow Hydrocarbons and
Resources. Contract 062154.
Company requests cancellation in
West Baton Bouge Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions --
motion -- moving along. Motion
was made to accept the
Cancellation by Major Coleman.
Mr. Coleman. Is there a second?
By Ms. Heather Malone. Any
comments from the public?
Questions from the Board members?
All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:

Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
We have St. Joe Brick Works,
Inc. 20081184. And the company
requests cancellation in St.
Tammany Parish.
MR. WINDHAM:
We have a motion made by Mr.
Miller to accept the
cancellation. Seconded by Mr.
Coleman. Any questions from the
public? Comments? Questions
from the Board members? All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
Now we have the three appeals
that were on the agenda in

September. These are companies appealing for the decision of y'all's got cancelled. They are late contract renewal request.

Two of them are wishing to defer
to the December 20 th meeting.
CARBO Ceramics and Hauser
Printing.
MR. WINDHAM:
Which ones are --
MS . CHENG:
These are CARBO Ceramics.
Contract 20110334 and 20110335.
And Hauser Printing. Contract
20110172. They are appeals.

They want to defer them to
December.
MR. WINDHAM:
So may I ask this: On the previous ones that deferred from the other meeting that came here, we restricted them by one year. These people are denying that we canceled theirs last time.

MS . CHENG:

These were cancelled.
MR. WINDHAM:
These were cancelled last
time.
MS . CHENG:
In June.
MR. WINDHAM:
So they are appealing that.
If we canceled them it's because they didn't show.

MR. COLEMAN :
All three of them?
MR. WINDHAM:
Two of them are asking for deferral.

MR. COLEMAN :
I know, but $I$ am saying all
three of them.
MS . CHENG :
Yes, all three are asking for
the same reconsideration. Two
are asking to be deferred to
December.
MR. COLEMAN :
What I'm asking is --

MR. WINDHAM:
Any of the representatives of
the companies here? Any of the
reps here?
MS . CHENG:
The representatives from
Frymaster are here because the other two could not make it as they wanted to defer.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Mr. Coleman.
MR. COLEMAN :
I was trying to find out did we deny them because they weren't here. All three of them.

MS . CHENG :
Yes, sir. That is what
happened.
MR. WINDHAM:
So the two that are
requesting deferrals, is there a motion to defer them? Secretary Broadwater makes the motion to defer them. Is there a second to the deferral of those two?

Representative Carmody seconds
that. All in favor indicate with an aye for the deferral of those two.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
All opposed indicate with a
nay. Those two are deferred. I believe Frymaster has a
representative. If you will
please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. BROADWATER:
Point of order on the appeals
and not being familiar with your rules, is there some standard or review on the appeal that is
different from the initial
consideration or is it sufficient under the rules that someone can make a motion to reverse the earlier decision? I just want to know under the rules what the standard review is.

MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Clapinski, I hope you can
address that.
MS . CLAPINSKI :
Yes. Yes. The Board rules
state that any action of the
Board can be appealed to the -against the Board. There is not contained within those rules a standard or a standard appeal.

MR. BROADWATER:
OKAY. Thank you. That answers the question.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. All right. So
Frymaster. Yes. She needs to read your number in.

MS. CATON (PH) :
My name is Sherri Caton and I'm the controller of Frymaster. I'm asking that you re-look at your opinion to deny that renewal, the late renewal. We had same circumstances as you heard described today. We did not get the e-mail telling us that we needed to do a renewal.

The person that was doing the
renewals left, so we had a
personnel issue, and then when it came up for renewal, $I$ wasn't
able to come.
MR. WINDHAM:
How late was this renewal?
MS . CHENG:
I do not have the June agenda
in front of me, but $I$ can get it.
MS . CATON :
I think it was like three or
four months.
MS . MALONE :
It was April. April 7th.
MR. ADLEY:
I think the Chairman made a
valid point. In being fair we
deferred all of those people were not here, as $I$ remember it, but it is a late renewal. I would make the same motion for this one that we made by the others that we reduce it by one year. Assume the fact that she can come back
on the agenda to denial based on what they told me.

MR. WINDHAM:
They had the opportunity to appeal it so they are appealing the denial. So I believe we have
to reverse the denial first and
then make a decision about what
the penalty or benefits will be
going forward.
MR. CARMODY:
I would make the
recommendation the denial --
(microphone off)
MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Carmody, the
motion to reconsider the denial
of Frymaster. Is there a second?
MR. BROADWATER:
Second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Representative
Broadwater. Any discussion? All
in favor reconsidering the denial
indicate it with aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed indicate with a
nay? Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
I move to reduce the renewal
by one year.
MR. WINDHAM:
So the motion is made to reduce the renewal set by Mr . Adley. Seconded by Mr. Carmody.
Any further discussion on the
item? Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Just for the sake of
consistency it looks like we're
backtracking on some things and we have members of the Board that fill in that weren't here in the past and that's just the way it works, but if we're shooting for consistency, General Electric and the four late renewals have no member present and we didn't take
consistent action in that regard.
MR. WINDHAM:
I appreciate your position.
I believe that's where I was going with the deferrals of the two that are not here today with representation. In my opinion if you are going to do one then you should treat the rest of them fairly equally.

MR. RICHARD:
The meetings in which we
denied renewal is the main
reason, if $I$ recall correctly, is
that no representative was
present.
MR. WINDHAM:
That is correct, to my
recollection also, Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
So at the appropriate time I would like to revisit General Electric to be -- to provide a consistent penalty at that time if the Board sees fit, and I'm
not sure how we do that.
MR. WINDHAM:
I can appreciate that and I
will look to Ms. Clapinski
possibly to describe what that process might be. But in front of us we have the motion, the
second, the discussion. Any
further discussion? All in favor
of the one year restriction for
the renewal for Frymaster please
indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Ms. Clapinski.
She may have gone to make copies of a rule, so $I$ will just wing this.

I believe we are going to
reopen the consideration at Mr .
Richard's request for the General
Electric application for renewal
which has been previously acted
upon. Please describe again your position.

MR. RICHARD :
As I noted earlier for the
sake of consistency, we are going
through these agenda items and
imposing the one year reduction.
In the past couple of meetings since the new Board has been seated, the reason we just dealt with some other deferrals is
because no representative of the business entity came before the

Board and they were completely denied and they have the ability to come back before the Board and appeal that denial, and it
appears as if we are moving in a direction of trying to be
consistent as possible, and I appreciate that as a Board member of a Board that's learning its role and such an important role in dealing with huge amounts of money, and I think if we're going
to be consistent $I$ would divulge the Board in their discretion to revisit General Electric to provide a consistent penalty
since they had no representative here.

MR. WINDHAM:
So you are making a motion to reconsider the General Electric action previously taken?

MR. RICHARD :
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
And a second is made by President Miller. Is there any
further discussion on the
reconsideration of the action?
All in favor of reconsideration, please indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay? That motion carries.

And now we'll move on to the
reconsideration.
MR. RICHARD :
The motion would be to deny.
MR. WINDHAM:
The motion to deny.
MR. RICHARD:
Renewal.
MR. WINDHAM:
Renewal of the General
Electric application number --
MS . CHENG:
20110338 .
MR. RICHARD:
With the understanding that they have the opportunity under
the current process that we
follow to appeal that denial and come back before the Board as these others.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second to that motion of denial?

MR. BARHAM:
As a substitute motion, I would propose that we defer a
decision on General Electric and have the staff contact them and put them on the December agenda.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you. There's been a motion and a deferral -- I am sorry. There's been a motion and a substitute motion. Are you willing to accept that substitute motion, Mr. Richard?

MR. RICHARD :
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second? Seconded by Mayor Brasseaux. Is there any further discussion on the deferral of that application? All in favor indicate with an aye to defer action on that application.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS :
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries. Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER:
Just to clarify a little bit
and agree with Mr. Richard, I
think this is very important
business, and to show up it means
a lot to us that it's important to you, but if you are going to file a late renewal application and in June we turn down three, at least, for late, that -- make sure you guys come. It's important to be here, especially if you are going to be late.

Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much, Mr.
Miller.
MS . CHENG:
And this concludes the
Industrial Tax Exemption Portion of the agenda.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. The next item on the agenda are Approval of Rules to be submitted by the rules
committee of this body. However, we are waiting for the rules to be copied for us, and in light of that fact, we need a five minute break. Is there a motion to
adjourn on recess for five minutes but you have to come back because we have to maintain a quorum. Motion is -- motion for
a break is made by Ms. Atkins.
Seconded by Mr. Williams. All in
favor of taking a break for five minutes indicate with an Aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
With a nay indicate you are opposed. Motion carries. (Whereupon a break was taken.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Everyone gather back. Make sure we have a quorum Do we need to do a roll call on that. I
don't think so. We have 15.

Before we proceed with the rules.
All right. So we have two
documents. Last meeting we
approved the continuation of the exemption of Lake Providence. We asked for letters of support. We have two of those letters. Is that all of the letters we should have or should we have more.

MR. BLUNT :
Dennis Blunt with Phelps
Dunbar. We have additional
letters that we understand are headed our way. One that we know of is the sheriff, but in light of the fact that we thought it best to be here with what we have in light of the approval and make certain that we were very appreciative of the approval granted by the Board, we wanted to make certain that we got you what we could and when we could.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you very much. The Town
of Lake Providence in support of the project and support of the operation as well as the Town of

Lake Providence.
MR. ADLEY:
Can I help here just a minute. That those two letters were helpful, but when we say governing authority we mean the parish, the sheriff and the School Board in addition to any municipality that falls within
that particular task and authority.

MR. BLUNT :
Understood. And I think the
sheriff is coming and we are
further reaching out to the
superintendent, but what $I$ also mentioned that the note from the City of Lake Providence makes mention of the fact that in 2013 as a result of this project the East Carroll Parish School Board was able to provide the largest
bonus to its employees in the
history of the district, so --
MR. ADLEY:
So it won't be hard to get a
letter from them?
MR. BLUNT :
Should not.
MR. WINDHAM:
Does anyone have any other questions of these letters or of these representatives -- ma'am, if you could state your name.

MS . HINTON :
My name is Rebecca Hinton.
MR. WINDHAM:
Rebecca --
MS . HINTON :
Hinton.
MR. WINDHAM:
And you are with the company?
MS. HINTON:
I'm with Phelps Dunbar on behalf of the company.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you. Any
questions? Introduce these into the record, Melissa. That will be great. Thank you very much. Have a great afternoon.

With that we're going to move to the presentation of the rules.

I would like to thank all of the -- Oh, I am sorry. Ma'am, please come forward.

MS . CARLSON:
My name is Laney Carlson.
I'm with Together Louisiana, and we just want to make a comment about the myriads request. Our
leaders in Lake Providence has
been meeting both with the
superintendent and the police jury. They were not aware of the exemptions and we are of the understanding that they don't support them. The jury has taken out a loan to do improvements on the port. They are stuck for
that loan. They are being --
myriad is being exempted from
property taxes, which means they
are losing money on that. It's a
double whammy to one of the
poorest parishes in the country.
MR. WINDHAM:
Does anyone have any
questions? Thank you, ma'am.
All right. Now we will move on to the discussion of the
rules. I would like to thank the
rules committee members for all
of their hard work that has been
put into this. I would
definitely like to thank the
staff for all of the hard work
that they have put into this
process, and with that, I will
let Mr. Adley describe the
proposed rules.
MR. ADLEY:
Members of staff has passed out to you a copy of what would be the rules. I thought the
easiest way to handle this if I could tell you what we are going
to try to do here. I will just kind of walk through for you what is in the new rules. Once we've adopted those -- LED has asked me for, I think there's three changes that we plan to make, once these are adopted so I can amend the ones we've adopted.

Mr. Broadwater, I think, has one for clarification that will help clarify some of our language, and once we adopt the first set and get the amendments on, we'll have that behind us. Then we have to
deal with the general rules for
LED that deals with two issues
that will ask you for your
approval. It make engage a little more transparent than what it is today.

MR. WINDHAM:
If I may, the process-wise, we're going to approve the rules then as submitted and recommended from the rules committee. Then
those three amendments, four amendments can be made after
those rules are approved as
opposed to doing it the other way around. Mr. Broadwater.

MR. BROADWATER:
Before there is a vote on the adoption of the rules, will the public be provided an opportunity to comment?

MR. WINDHAM:
Absolutely.
MR. ADLEY:
Maybe I left something out.
This is -- I mean, you can allow the public comments you want, but this has to go through the Administrator Procedures Act, so there is going to be a lot of comments. The final adoption of these rules will not occur until sometime late January or February once you get through that process and it goes back to the necessary legislative bodies that then
review the rules and then back to the Governor's office, so we have to get them into play with
whatever we adopt here today and
then begin that Administrator
Procedures Act.
MR. BROADWATER:
Forgive the lawyer coming out in me, but we also have to comply with the open meetings law that requires that you have public comment before any vote is made on the agenda item. I just want to make sure we don't run afoul of that in the process.

MR. ADLEY:
That's fine. So if $I$ can, I'm going to begin -- let me just go through the list of the changes that were made. The Rules Committee did a lot of work, and I'm really proud of what they have done.

There is a requirement for jobs in the new rules and there
is a def -- there will be a
definition and requirements of what the jobs are. Jobs will be new, not previously within the state. They will be permanent but there will be no specified term. They will be permanent. They will be full time 30 hours or more. This will be employed directly or through their contract or affiliate. They will be filled by domicile residents and when we change it, we will make it a moment to make that clear that they're residents within 60 days. That will allow
time for those companies that
come here to locate so that whoever is working with them can become a resident. There will be local input. There will be ITEP
for environmental requirements.
The MCA's will be gone. They
will all be advanced notice
except for special circumstances
that deal with the retention of jobs.

There will be a stricter
definition of maintenance and maintenance capital so that we get a clearer understanding of what is actually being done.

There will be a clearer
definition of manufacturing and what is integral to that manufacturing. Late filings will be penalized. There will be a return on investment report with every filing so that we can see the value attached to that particular request.

There will be some added
transparency in the next set of rules, talk about the
broadcasting live stream of all
of these meetings. And new
contracts will not exceed five
years with an allowable up to 100 percent with local government having the authority to establish
how much of that local -- that
100 percent they want to give away.

The renewals will not exceed three years with a cap of 80 percent with local government allowing themselves to decide how much of the 80 percent they want to give away. There will be an

Exhibit A and Exhibit B. A is with LED and $B$ is with local government. Those two exhibits basically will give out the number of jobs and the payroll created or maintained. They will
give the term of the exemption, as I said the five percent. The hundred percent, they will give the term for the renewal. They will give the percentage of property exempted. There will be penalty provisions and a statement of return on investment all in that exhibit.

Now, with guidance from LED,

```
there will be an Exhibit B for
local government that requires
resolution from the parish, the
school board and the sheriff and
municipalities impacted. The
number of -- in that exhibit will
be the number jobs and the
payroll required. The term of
the exemption and the percentage
of the property to be exempted.
    Now, the salary and the
payroll are in those exhibits
because in the original rule that
we adopted tied it back to some
federal website or something that
we received testimony on it that
said that was really not
available. Now, we'll make that
change once we get these adopted.
But that is basically the change
that you have by going line by
line through these rules. Those
are the changes that you will be
looking at with these rules.
    MR. WINDHAM:
```

Are there any questions by
any of the Board members? Has
everyone had a chance to review
these rules?
MR. CARMODY:
I definitely don't want to go
line by line, but $I$ do want to make sure that we at least cover
the high points regarding the
definitions. Please, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes, sir. The word
"establishment" was used
throughout those rules and it
never had been defined before,
and we defined it as a economic
unit at a single physical
location. We took the word
"maintenance capital" the biggest change there, the old rules had maintenance capital
environmentally required capital
upgrades and replacement parts
except those replacements
required and rehabilitation
restoration of an establishment
shall not qualify for the ITEP.
What we added to that is that in
the rehabilitation or restoration
of an establishment to conserve as nearly as long as possible the original condition. We want to make sure that whatever they were doing it wasn't just the same.

You are adding to it. And that was the major change.

And then, let's see,
integral. The definition for
integral used to be essential or
fundamentally required in order
to conduct the manufacturing
operation at a manufacturing
establishment. That, to us, was
very vague. Now integral simply
says required to make whole the product being produced.

The reason for that was is
that in a lot of the discussion
we had, front office work, for instance, cutting payroll checks or doing whatever has been subject to the ITEP, this would remove that to make it clear that it's only dealing with that part that is making the product whole. Some people said, you know, you got to have a computer on the production line. Well, this would apply to that. This part of that integral part of making it whole, and so we did make that change.

On manufacturing what we put was working where it used to say working raw materials in and the wear suitable for use which gives new shapes, qualities, blah, blah, blah. We would now say working new raw materials by means of mass production and machinery. Once we adopt these we will go back to that
definition to add -- make it
clear by means of mass production
or custom fabrication and
machinery. Because there are
those people who are in
manufacturing that manufacture
once they received the -- ship builders, pipe suppliers and the
like, we would make that change.
I think those are the major changes in definitions that we have made.

MR. CARMODY:
Can I ask a question. Under
this new definition of
manufacturing, the gentleman, $I$
believe, that was explaining to
us how they manufactured
electricity. If you were
crushing a hydrocarbon product
into basically powder or vapor is that now going to be considered manufacturing?

MR. ADLEY:
As I remember what he said, he takes coal, takes natural gas,
burns it, he takes -- changes that substance into creating electricity. My personal view is that you can clearly say that's manufacturing. On the other hand you can say it's not what we typically view -- it's not making a widget, for instance, but I believe working raw material by means of mass production or custom fabrication and machinery, the Board obviously would have to make that decision, but it sounds like to me it will fall within those guidelines.

I will tell you when it comes to electricity one of the things that is really intriguing about trying to deal with that is that when -- they go get their electric rates, the oil taxes and everything they pay is worked into the rates for the consumer. So my guess is over time people realize that, you know, maybe we
give them this it may cut the cost over here. I don't know
that was in the decisionmaking, but I think the Board will have to make that determination. But based on the way he explained it, it may very well fit.

MR. CARMODY:
That might be right. In
thinking of other ways, people
manufacture electricity, I guess
solar panels would be one way
they generate electricity, and
I'm not sure that --
MR. ADLEY:
The only change from what the
current law is is by means of
mass production or custom
fabrication and machinery. Those
are the only new words.
Everything else is the same.
MR. CARMODY:
Thank you, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions?

MR. BARHAM:
I heard you ask the question
when we talked about the rice
mill and you were saying -- my
question is are you manufacturing
anything. Would an agriculture rice mill be considered mass production using that commodity?

MR. ADLEY:
I think the catch phrase or custom fabrication probably fits them, it sounds like, because what happens is they are seasonal. It is not day in and day out. It's based on orders that they received. Based on that it sounds like they fit, Robert. I don't know that. I think the Board clearly can make that call, but the only words changing again are by means of mass production or custom fabrication and machinery.

MR. BARHAM:
Well, my only concern is
custom fabrication that implies, to me, that you are creating a new and different product. You
are modifying grain as you
process it through a rice mill but you are not fabricating a new product, and I certainly wouldn't -- I don't want to inadvertently
step into our agriculture
commodities and by definition
rule out cotton gin, warehouse,
rice mill that deal with those
commodities because they were not
fabricating a new product.
MR. ADLEY:
I got it. But that's an or.
It doesn't have to fit
fabrication. It can be mass
production. I mean, I assume
it's mass production. If it's manufacturing, I assume it is. I mean, I'm not -- I can't argue the point to --

MR. BARHAM:
I certainly want it to be
considered manufacturing.
MR. ADLEY:
I am sorry?
MR. BARHAM :
I certainly want it to be considered manufacturing.

MR. ADLEY:
Well, at the end of the day this entire group will have to make that call. I don't care how many times we swap the words around and change them around, at the end of the day that's what's going to have to happen. I can tell you I haven't come here for the purpose of saying it's not. I haven't. We just try to come up with what we thought were clear, and I will tell you, these definitions the way we got to them we basically went to business dictionaries to take their definitions and create them and put them into -- into the rules. And I will say through
the Administrator Procedures Act
there will be lots of opportunity
for people to review and make suggestions.

MR. WINDHAM:
Speaking of the Administrator
Procedures Act, Danielle, can you tell us what our timeline and process is for this Board.

MS. CLAPINSKI :
Sure. So it's -- (microphone making loud noise)

MR. WINDHAM:
I have shut you down.
MS . CLAPINSKI :
Okay. So assuming that the rules are approved today by the Board, we have to get a fiscal and economic impact statement from the fiscal office. Generally they require that it be received the request for that by the 20 th of the month following publication, so I don't know that we will make November publication
as we are at the -- beyond that
date. If we do not make the
November publication then you would have a December 20 th notice of intent published. That would put a public hearing at the very end of January where we would receive public comments during the period from written comments
from publication to the public hearing date as well as take oral testimony or oral comments at the
actual public hearing. Those
comments then have to be vetted
whether we intend to make any
changes based upon those. The
Board has the obligation to
promulgate the rules for this program, so $I$ believe that those comments would have to come back to the Board for approval of whether or not we could -- or whether you want it to make any additional changes.

That Board meeting following
the public hearing will be in
February. Once we decide if you do not want any further changes, then you have you got to notify the oversight committees, which are the two commerce committees. They have 30 days from the date of notification in order to call their own public hearing or hearing, whatever you would like to call that, and they either approve or disprove the rules.

If we make substantive changes to
the rules, based upon comments received at the end of June, we
start over. Either with the
potpourri that explain the
changes and there's a second
public hearing again or you go
all of the way back to the NOI process. Whichever you go time-wise, I don't think it makes any difference.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Any other
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questions or comments on the rules as presented now? Ms.

Malone.
MS . MALONE :
From a local standpoint, I was going to ask a few things.

So based on the rule changes, if
the locals agree to a five year
renewal term that would not be
granted?
MR. ADLEY:
I didn't hear you. Can you
get closer to that thing for me.
MS . MALONE :
If the locals wanted a five
year renewal at one hundred
percent they would not be
granted?
MR. ADLEY:
No. It would be capped at 80 percent.

MS . MALONE :
Okay. The other question that
I had, if all of the local
governing bodies listed did not
agree it has to be all of them.
So, for example, if the parish
government, the municipal
government and the sheriff all
agree but the School Board did
not want their taxes to be abated
or exempt, rather, it just would
be a no go. It's an all or
nothing?
MR. ADLEY:
No. It's just like when $I$ was
in business, $I$ got tax notices
from every different body and
they were all different and $I$
paid them accordingly. If I am
in industry looking to locate in
a parish and I meet with LED and
they have sales to East Baton
Rouge Parish and they get over there and the School Board says,
look, I'm only willing to give
you 50 percent of what I got.
The rest of them say, I'm willing
to give you one hundred percent,
and the business says, I'm still
willing to go in there then he
will pay that property tax to the
School Board but he won't pay
with the other says, so it's not
an all or nothing where they all
have to agree.
MS . MALONE :
But I believe the rule states
"and" so we --
MR. ADLEY:
Show me where you are reading
from. Maybe I can help.
MS . MALONE :
So, on -- let's see. D2 for
Exhibit B.
MR. ADLEY:
No. I think the "and"
applies. I do. I think if you follow it down, let's see, down into $B$, each one of them will be able to layout exactly what they want.

MS . MALONE :
In their own resolution.
MR. ADLEY:

I'm sorry?
MS . MALONE :
In their resolution.
MR. ADLEY:
In their what.
MS . MALONE :
Resolutions.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes.
MS . MALONE :
And then my last question on E2A, it talks about --

MR. WINDHAM:
What's the subject?
MS . MALONE :
E2A.
MR. ADLEY:
Which section?
MS . MALONE :
Sorry. 503. It talks about preventing relocation to another state or country. Again, on the local level if they wanted to capture job retention to keep a company from relocating to
another parish, would they be
allowed to consider job retention
for that?
MR. ADLEY:
You are under 503E?
MS . MALONE :
$2 A$.
MR. ADLEY:
2A, to prevent relocation to
another state or country.
MR. BROADWATER:
Her question is what about if a company wants to leave Caddo Parish and come to Tangipahoa Parish, like they are going to want to, there is no incentive for the state to move parish to parish.

MR. ADLEY:
No. I don't think that's what it means, but I will tell you industry is going to make a decision on parishes they want to go to based on what parishes offer.

MS . MALONE :
Right. Right. In this
particular section it talks about being able to use job retention as a reason to approve the application, and it says to prevent relocation to another state or country, but can the locals use job retention in -- in the application to keep them in their parish instead of new jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
I think this is talking about
the Board if I read E correctly.
Applications which provides the new manufacturing establishment
for which provide for an addition
two of the manufacturing
establishment with the creation of new jobs or compelling reasons for the retention of existing jobs shall be favored by the Board.

Don, let me ask you, as you are putting together these
exhibits, does this fall inside
one of these exhibits or is this
strictly here for the Board?
MR. PIERSON:
In-globo we wouldn't
incentivize a company move from
one parish to another parish as a
state exemption. On the local
level where these taxes belong to
the taxpayers of each parish, I
think they could and they will
compete with each other by what
they submit as part of proposals
either for recruitment or
retention. Again, it's just
exercise in Exhibit B, the local
voice, what they are willing to
do.
MR. BROADWATER:
I think your point is well
taken in that all of these
changes that have started over
the last couple of months have
all been based on what the impact
is to these local governing
bodies and the taxes that they are relying on, and if the job retention criteria is only whether that company is going to
leave the state or leave the country but you don't allow them to submit this application in
order to try to keep them in that parish then you are defeating the very thing you are trying to accomplish by giving the locals some control over their tax
dollars. To me, it makes sense.
I think she raised a very good point that there needs to be --
if you are going to let the
parishes compete and have more say over their tax dollars then give them a chance to defend it and complete if one is going to woo it away from the other, which really gets to the question of whether or not this ought to be a purely local consideration considering we are dealing with
local tax dollars and one of the
states involved in it.
MR. ADLEY:
Richard, where are you at?
Richard House. Let me make sure
that Mr . Broadwater, as I'm going
through this going back to the
advanced notification and then I drop down where it's relief or MCA -- what is this particular piece here under E? Application provides new manufacturing for addition -- are you following this conversation?

MR. HOUSE :
As I understand the
conversation, the hypothetical
situation is that a facility is located in parish A. Parish B, and, I guess in parish $A$ it has -- it doesn't have full exemption or, I mean, I'm trying to figure out exactly where this comes into play.

MR. WINDHAM:

I can describe situations
where it's happened in the past.
For one reason or another a
facility becomes unproductive in
a certain parish so then it has to look around and say, okay, I
can go move my facilities to
Alabama or Mississippi or I can relocate in another parish in the

State of Louisiana, so they are
going to go build a new facility
or construct something new or
create a new establishment, so in
order to retain the jobs maybe
the locals may want to say, wait,
we'll give you a tax break on the
new facilities in order to keep
you here in our parish as opposed
to having you go down there. It
could happen like that. I mean,
is that generally what I'm
describing?
MS . MALONE :
Right. Correct. So if they
were to stay in their current

```
parish they may not create any new jobs but they would retain the jobs that they had, but if they are move to a new parish, they may create new jobs.
```

MR. HOUSE:
Well, it depends again on how you define new jobs because generally we have defined new jobs as new jobs within the state. So they may not be creating new jobs in the new parish. As new jobs in the state if you have 200 people employed in parish $A$ and you are going to end up with 200 people employed in parish B, you haven't really created new jobs in the state. The other issue, of course, is that you might have a new facility without new jobs in that new parish and you are not retaining jobs; whereas in the old parish you have -- you would probably have to have some type
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in the best interest of the
state.
MR. ADLEY:
I remember when this was presented to us, I think the
language to present relocation to
another state, $I$ think in that
committee we added "or country"
for some reason is what $I$
remember. That was the only real
change I remember.
Is the issue about
incentivizing somebody to move
from one parish to another? Is
that what the issue is?
MR. PIERSON:
To me. I don't mean to
interrupt, but, okay, so move
across parish lines you will not be eligible for Quality Jobs.

You will not be eligible for the Enterprise Zone. You will not be eligible for any state sponsored programs, but what we're back to

```
is the jurisdiction of the locals
```

and their determination as to whether they want to incentivize
said proposed move. And then
they would bring an application
before this Board seeking that
tax exemption. And, you are right, that this state doesn't have a dog in this fight so why are we even in the room, but we're in the room because the whole program is created within the constitution and the two gateways are this Board and the Governor's desk, so I think that hypothetical is unlikely that it will come about because when you take the other incentives off the table, it doesn't make much sense to make a move like that. But it's in the realm of possibility.

MR. BROADWATER:
Right. It's in the realm of possibility because businesses don't move only because of tax
incentives but also quality of
education, the $K-12$ system and they move based upon effective tax rates within a given parish.

MR. PIERSON:
Utilities rates. Lots of reasons.

MR. BROADWATER:
Right. All of those reasons, which could be a compelling
reason, and if you are dealing with a company that has been in
existence in the parish for 20
years or 30 years and their
equipment is old and getting to
the point of needing replacement
and they are having trouble
developing a skilled workforce
because of the education system but parish B says you come here and we have a chance possibly to give you the following
incentives, there would be an
incentive, but $I$ can understand parish A saying, wait a minute, we need to keep you here because

```
    if you leave and we lose that tax
    base then you are really going to
    finish off the rest of our K
    through 12 education system and
    our tax base, and so you are
    effectively by giving those
    locals involved in this
    discussion creating that type of
    competition between parishes, and
    I think that's the right thing to
    do. I think we ought to be
    giving the school boards and the
    local parish government some say
    in that because I think that
    competition will be a positive
    thing, but I think that point is
    very well taken and it absolutely
    could happen.
    MR. ADLEY:
    Maybe I can add some comfort.
I don't know if I'm headed in the
right direction or not.
    So you know, we are the only
state in America, in America that
        does it the way we do. Every
```

state in America has locals involved as you are looking at it. Now, what invariably
happens, at least when I'm doing my research and looking at Texas, they went out as individual local entities by themselves and created reasonable economic districts, and inside those districts is how they kind of worked themselves, which is not prohibited here, but that's what they did. Now, I don't know what they did in Alabama or Arkansas, but I can just tell you that every state in America does it that way. And if the way we were doing it really worked they would all be here, but they are not, and so the Governor is absolutely adamant about the local government involvement.

MR. BROADWATER:
So we're clear, Mr. Adley, I don't think either $I$ or Ms.

Malone were suggesting otherwise.
I think what we are saying is
this was -- maybe we weren't
including the locals enough to
give them the authority to say
it's not just about retention of
jobs in the state but retention
of jobs in my parish in Caddo Parish because they want to move to Jefferson Parish because of effective tax rate or education system. We weren't arguing to exclude the locals. I think what was being argued here is give the locals even more authority.

MR. ADLEY:
In your view, the language
that says state and country, you should add the word "parish" with that? Is that what you are saying?

MR. BROADWATER:
I think that's the point.
MR. ADLEY:
Then, Don, is there a reason
not to do that?
MR. PIERSON :
No. I don't think that we
would have a reason to prohibit it. Again, we look at it as the
local resource. Some parishes
have deal closing funds, some
have half cent for economic
development. It just depends on
the tenor of the specific parish
and their local elected
officials, and that's where that
authority should appropriately
reside, and that's what Exhibit B
does in my mind.
MR. BROADWATER:
Also to be clear, just so you
know, E2 provides discretion
there to this Board. It says
that these may be considered. So
there is not a mandatory
application, but $I$ do think it
does provide some additional
flexibility if you have different parishes competing.

MR. ADLEY:
Well, the reason we're before
you is is that if we can adopt
this set of rules, $I$ can tell
you, as I've said before, I've
already got four amendments that we're going to accept, this would be the 5th that we would put on to this before we take up the amendments that deal with the Board and the broadcasting and so forth, so what I would ask of you is sitting here to tell you that we would not object, $I$ wouldn't object, and $I$ don't think the Governor would object. I know he is not objecting to the three amendments that LED has offered.

No one -- Mr. Broadwater, you have and you have, and so if we can get these adopted, I got to have something to make those amendments to and $I$ can't do it until that's why this is first.
I can't make those amendments
until I get a document to work with.

MR. HOUSE :
Could I add one thing. That
this is a statewide Board. I
hadn't really thought about your
example and I understand the
concern. There are other means to reach the considerations that
you are talking about such as
payments in lieu of taxes that really don't have anything to do with this Board, and while
certainly you can put some things in the rules that aren't going to
turn our world upside down, but
it still is somewhat inconsistent
with many of our other programs that rely upon statewide jobs for the count. It's inconsistent with our many cooperative endeavor agreements, so the Board
is -- Secretary Pierson has
expressed our position and the
Board is free to do what it

```
wishes, but whether this is
necessary or whether this is
something that this Board is ever
really going to be called upon to
do is something you need to take
into account.
```

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
I would just like to say that as much as I'm more than ready to complete parish to parish, and we compete to anything with the rules or anything else, over the last ten years or so LED has promoted regionalism for economic development, and the only thing that $I$ see here is we're going back to parishes competing one on one. I guess in theory we could get together and get together with the northshore parishes and make a region of our own and call it our own resolutions but we all stick together, we could make
that happen. But we do want to
look at that idea of statewide and regionally. We've done that
for years and years, and
Secretary Pierson, are we still
sticking to the more regionalized
economic development, statewide
economic development or now just parishes?

MR. PIERSON:
We have to be effective on
all of those levels, and certain
programs thrive when they are worked that way. We'll be doing workshops regionally because we can get to eight regions easier than we can get to 64 parishes. There are parishes that do work for this state and there are those that do not. So from LED's perspective, we want to be responsive to our clients and to those parishes and for those that want to participate we want to be strong partners. Those who want
to be left alone, we'll direct our resources elsewhere.

MR. BROADWATER:
If $I$ could just respond. I am
parish president. I understand your point, and you're right, but

I think the point also still
applies if you are talking about
it compare it regionally. It
still exists in the parish that is getting an exemption or is being affected by the taxes in a given parish, in a given region, so if you take the northwest region of the state versus the southeast region of the state, you still have the same impact. And I guess the point that Ms. Malone was making is give us a chance to compete and if this is one of the tools at our disposal, and the testimony was right that you do have other tools at your disposal; payment in lieu of taxes, etc., but $I$ guess the
point being made is why would we have that tool whenever our region is losing a business to Mississippi but not given that tool when they are moving 300 miles from all cities in

Louisiana to Plaquemines,
Louisiana. I think it's still providing that region the opportunity to compete. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Thank you. I think Exhibit B will work out the issues that we are talking about now, and there's many, many more variables that go into a project than just the $\mathrm{K}-12$ system or just the ITEP program by itself, and I think we're focused on the rules for the ITEP program, and at the appropriate time $I$ would offer a motion to move forward with the
adoption of the rules with the
three LED proposed amendments and
the one amendment proposed by
Representative Broadwater.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. We'll entertain
that at the appropriate time.
Are there comments from the
Board members? I think it's --
there aren't any from the Board members, we can open it up to the public for their opinions and positions on the rules that they -- as they are presented prior to the amendments being made.

Anyone else? Ma'am, please come forward. State your name and who you represent.

MS . CARLSON:
Again, my name is Lady
Carlson. I represent Together
Louisiana. I work in the
northern and central parts of the
state in some of the poorest
areas of the country including

Tensas, Madison and East Carroll.
I also work in Caddo, Bossier,
Ouachita, Webster and Rapides
Parishes. With our delegation
earlier were members of Rapides
Parish police jury and some of our leaders from Rapides Parish, unfortunately they had to leave.

Many of these parishes are struggling financially and they are hurting for dollars, and we think that local input from local entities is essential. We can do
things like put more money into workforce development, early
childhood, roads and bridges,
that these dollars impact us
locally and that, again, there
needs to be some local input.
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Formally I have
cards from three different groups to speak. Mr. Bob Adair, please
come forward and speak. Please
identify yourself.
MR. ADAIR:
Bob Adair. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman, and members of the
Board. I'm representing
Louisiana Oil and Gas
Association. I will be brief. I
only have -- we expressed
concerns about the rules and we
work with rules committee all
along and do appreciate that
opportunity.
I want to echo what
ExxonMobil said earlier about the contract jobs. Contract jobs are often permanent jobs but just not employed with that company. For example, even at my office that $I$ work at 100 feet for me are contract people that I know all of the time. I went to a baby shower a month ago. Those are permanent jobs with us. So that is the same situation in manufacturing plants, so I would
urge you to consider contract
jobs, and I'm not --
MR. ADLEY :
They are part of the rules.
What you've asked for has been
included under the job
description. It's No. 4,
employed directly or through
contract labor or affiliates.
MR. ADAIR:
Okay. Sorry that I missed
that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Now, that is not to say that there will be benefits for other programs because of those contracts jobs. It's only for qualification for this Industrial Tax Exemption Program.

MR. ADAIR:
Okay. Fair enough. The next point -- I only have three points, by the way.

The next point, real quickly, is the process. And I'm --
particularly I noticed it because
I chaired a property tax
committee of the Texas taxpayers and research association, so I'm
very familiar with the Texas system that we've talked about and I spoke before the SCR sticks

Task force last week, and the
current process -- and I realized
the Executive Order has changed things so I'm not suggesting but just to give you an idea whereas we did have two what $I$ call stop signs, which is the Board of Commerce and Industry and the

Governor. We have now added three more to that.

MR. PIERSON:
They are not stop signs, they
are gateways.
MR. ADAIR:
Okay. It's a pause in the
process. It's going to take
additional time. That's my
point. So now there are now
five, which is Exhibit A, Exhibit
$B$ and you are adding the
Department of Revenue in there
also as another check before it
goes back, too. So, anyway,
there's five there. In Texas, just a point of reference, the
locals, this is no police
controlled or schools, but with
the locals it's one gateway.
It's the county commissioners and
the judge, and $I$ recognize there are constitutional reasons why
you are doing this here, but I was urging to be mindful of that as there should be
accountability, I'm not asking
for an easy path, but there
should be a shorter term -- just
be aware of the timeframe of the
path, if you would, as we go
through this, because as it looks
now it looks like it will take significantly more time, which is significant time in the process,
and, by the way, now -- I mean,
previously the companies were
reassured of the property tax
exemption they can file after --
after completion or within three
months of completion. Now I
think you'll be seeing an awful
lot more of applications before
an application -- I mean, the
project is even approved by the
company because they are going to
want assurance of that exemption
before they approve that project
going forward, so -- so that's
going to be a change.
MR. ADLEY:
That's clearly the purpose.
MR. ADAIR:
Okay.
MR. ADLEY:
I mean, it is the purpose --
when we first got here in June what we saw was that the company can go up on the internet, fill
out a form, go start work and
guaranteed to get the exemption.
The purpose is clearly what you
just said, to insure that everybody sees, everybody knows it's totally transparent. I will
just tell you comparing us to
some states there's some states
that do not allow one hundred
percent at all and require a state statute to go get it.

Louisiana, making the changes we're making still remains No. 1
in America as the most
advantageous place to be. It
does, but these legislators
sitting here, I think the one
thing that we would agree upon I
think is that we can look at our
budgets and our state general
fund and a majority of our
budgets go to local government
and it goes to local government because we've taken away all of their money, and if we've taken away from them then property
taxes. We don't have a property
tax. And all of my business
friends constantly tell me, man,
y'all better just let local
government go. Leave us alone at the state level and do what we want to do. Well, here they are. And you are getting what you asked for, but my only advice, be careful what you ask for because it's here. And I got to tell you, I spent 30 something years sitting over in them halls with those guys and I know what you ask for.

MR. ADAIR:
I understand. And I'm never
saying that property tax is the only consideration for location
decisions. But it is a
significant item. I advise on projects for refineries and other options in multiple states it goes in the economic model, so what I'm going to ask -- what is
your-- as we call it P50, what is your percent would you estimate

50 percent we are going to get
it, 50 percent we're not. Before
we're closer to one hundred
percent, and I get your point that you are wanting to put more
scrutiny in that, but I'm just
saying early on I'm having to
advise that there's less
possibility, if any, depends on where you are, the location and in which parish.

MR. ADLEY:
I think that's a fair
assessment. I do.
MR. PIERSON:
I would like to jump in here,
too. We have a room full of
stakeholders here. It's my
belief that even though we have
additional gates boxes to check
right now, we are not
significantly increasing time
required to execute and give a
response back to companies. I
know we've got a bit of a
learning curve here both at the parish level, and the economic development professional level, but I go back to a day when a
local endorsement resolution was
required to participate in the
Enterprise Zone Program. I know
that these connections get built.
These relationships get built.
Conversations happen, and an
answer can come back, and this
can be packaged, and there won't
be a significant time required in
addition to what we have today,
and if this proves to not be true
to my stakeholders then $I$ want to hear about that coming back to me.

Again, learning curve to get
this program adjusted and
amended, but $I$ don't buy into
that it's going to create a
significantly longer process.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adair, your third point.
MR. ADAIR:
Real quick. It relates to where we are in the process and the APA, and it is my experience with rules in the past we certainly need to measure twice, if not once, and it seems that the rules committee has measured somewhat, but the full Board has not measured once completely. So I go -- I see the point where the economic development community needs some clarity and we're out catch going forward, but on the other hand I can see the need to make sure we get this right before it's published in the Louisiana Register; otherwise, you might have a restart later on as Ms. Clapinski mentioned. So I've taken enough time, I think.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Do any of the
members have any questions of Mr . Adair?

MR. ADLEY:
I do want to give you some comfort. I met Don Pierson in

1976 when he was an economic
development director for the region of the area of the states.

We didn't have any problem
meeting, gathering, making
decisions about what we would agree to. We didn't have any problem with that. We really did not. But to get it right, you have to start. It never gets right at the beginning. We found that out through the, I don't know, five, six meetings we had for hours on end. We finding that out now. Got three or four more amendments now. We are going to take those and start to process. We can't just sit here and say, oh, well, we didn't get it right again. That's what this is
about. It's before the whole
Board now.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER :
I can tell you, too, with the parish presidents that we've met with, probably ten or 12 , the majority of petrochemical quarter, each of us are all meeting with our school boards, our sheriff, our municipalities trying to explain to them our new process already and getting them on board to understand that we can have some generalized agreements on what we're willing to do so our economic development personnel can move forward and work with you guys and say, we know that you if you create jobs you are going to get this, whatever it happens to be, and so we're going to -- I think you will see the locals doing that
very quickly and then if a job --
if the project becomes real then
we go back to the School Board
for a vote, but they've already
done it, they just have to ratify
it. You go to the parish council
and so forth and just get it done quickly.

So I feel confident that
we're going to move it quickly.
Just like Secretary Pierson said,
the learning curve, that's just
where we are right now, but we're
getting there.
MR. ADAIR:
It's good to hear several
comments. I'm just giving you
the perspective that we're
hearing a lot of anxiety. So
thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Adair. I
believe next we have Jim
Patterson. Mr. Patterson, please
step forward and identify
yourself.
MR. PATTERSON :
Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
members of the committee. I am
Jim Patterson with the Louisiana
Association of Business and
Industry.
With all due respect, Mr.
Adley, we are not No. 1. We have done some things to our
reputation in this state in the past year, and that was under the previous administration as well, legislatively as we wrote
significantly our situation from
a tax structure standpoint. Over
the decades the legislature took actions that there were piecemeal to try and, if you would, lay asphalt over a very cracked tax structure foundation and it's not the best way to have done it but was the only political solution that we were able to come to. Given that in the past year, a
lot of those patches have been
unwound. We were essentially
back in the position that we were previously and prior to the 1990s when we started to see some
improvement in our posture from
an economic development
standpoint.
Louisiana's economy is in a
decline at the moment. Number of
reasons for that, but $I$ suggest
that we need to be very, very
considerate and careful about the
things that we do with this
particular program because it is
very, very critical to our
economic development. I
appreciate the remarks of
Secretary Pierson and
Representative Broadwater
concerning the long term impacts
of these companies that we have
attempted to attract to our
state. Those companies do a lot
more than just simply generate
taxes and paid wages to our workforces, they also contribute tremendously to the communities, to the non-profits, to the baseball teams. They are a very significant player in those communities in enhancing the quality of life. Ms. Wassam and the representatives from Together Louisiana talked about the lack of tax revenues coming from these companies. They are significant.
They are significant revenues coming from these companies, but I would also add that the impact of any kind of a tax increase will be to the consumer price for
the goods of the products that are generated by those companies.
That means that the individuals they are advocating on behalf of are actually going to see a
higher cost for the goods that they buy and a higher sales tax on those goods as a consequence
of the price being higher.
Companies will, to the extent
that they can, factor that into
their pricing. So we are not
helping these individuals. In
fact, $I$ would argue that we are
hurting most those individuals
that are at least able because
that is going to be happening
through the sales tax and the
cost of their goods and the
property taxes which are
generally made by the wealthy or
property holders are going to, in
large measure, be foregone.
I do think that there is
something that $I$ would like you
to consider very, very seriously
going forward and that is that if
the Governor is intent upon, that
has been indicated, locals having
a say, then let us unfeather them
let us not restrain them and say,
no, you can only do 80 percent in
the second term and you can only
grant three years. How is it
that they are able to make a
determination for themselves in
the first five years better than
in the second five years. I
would suggest that this is not necessarily achieving what has
been indicated as the policy
intent.
These are just some things that $I$ wanted to, if you will, get off my chest, but I would point out to you some things within the rules that you might want to take a look at starting with 501B. There is a reference to Executive Order 1626, no reference to 1673. I'm not saying they necessarily have to be or should be, but I would suggest you might want to consider that.

MR. ADLEY:
Where are we at, 501B.
MR. PATTERSON :

501B. About midway down in
the paragraph this is just a specific reference to the Executive Order 1626 and not to 1673. Seems to me it should be updated. To be fair, 1673 --

MR. ADLEY:
For what it's worth, I think
what they did all of this
language that you are looking at
in black here with new language to us at our last meeting, and
it's language that designated
talk about going forward so that
we guarantee what we did here
today we would do, and I think
that's why it's written that way.
I do. That -- as a matter of
fact if we weren't going to do what we did today we'd actually during the meeting at one point taken all of that out so that we would deal with everything that happened in the past in the same manner we would go forward, so we
put that back in for the sole purpose, using Mr. House's language, to insure that going forward these rules go forward but all of the things that have been done in the past that we protect our word and that's why we done it that way and I think it does that.

MR. PATTERSON :
Again, maybe 1673, which was just issued on Friday, last Friday, a week ago, maybe it doesn't need to be included here but it seems to me that insofar as it sort of expands upon the first Executive Order it might appropriately be referenced here is all I'm suggesting.

MR. ADLEY:
You will also note that when we enforced there was reference to the Governor's office and we took all of that out so that he could put in the rules what was
in that Executive Order. Now you
got it in the rules. You got it
in more places than just one. We
are really comfortable with that.
I felt good about that. We've
done I think what you wanted done
to insure what had been done
before be protected.
MR. PATTERSON :
As I said, I merely want to bring it to your attention.

MR. ADLEY:
No. No. I got it.
MR. PATTERSON :
With regard to 502, the
definition section, under jobs,
respectfully $I$ would suggest that, No. 1 , where we use the word "new" is unnecessary and quite frankly may be problematic in that we are talking about jobs, here the definition of jobs, and there are more than new jobs involved in this particular set of rules. There are jobs
that are retained. I would
suggest that by just simply
confined to the definition of
"new", which we effectively do
here, you are somewhat at odds with 503E where it references jobs that are new and jobs that are retained, and $I$ suggest that simply removing it does not do in any way with what you are trying to accomplish here with regard to when the new job is involved and when the job is retained simply point out that if you just. Just simply start with you start out with permanent, that's certainly full time, that would apply, the job is retained, new jobs as well to suggesting that's a little
more --
MR. ADLEY:
I don't think they are in
conflict with each other but one
is a separate section that deals

```
with a separate issue, it does.
```

The job issue is -- I have to
tell you, Jim, this is -- this
was core to everything that the
Governor wants; jobs and local
support. You heard us here today
repeatedly taking up tax
exemptions and no job
requirements even in the
beginning, and most of us, if $I$
went back home to Bossier today
and ask people, what do you think
you get with the industrial
taxers exemption and they are
going to say jobs.
MR. PATTERSON :
With all due respect, Mr.
Adley, the word "new," you are not doing violence to that. What we are trying to do is make sure that it is clear that, according to the two Executive Orders and
frankly there in the rules that it is not just about new jobs, it
is about jobs retained when the circumstances would apply in such
cases.
MR. ADLEY:
I think we cover them both.
I do.
MR. BROADWATER:
If I can jump in, Mr. Adley, and I understand your point.

Seems to me y'all are saying the same thing. I think where Mr. Patterson is coming from is that while we do have an entire section dealing with retention, the part that he is talking about is the definitional section that applies to everything and every time you see the word "job" it's defined by that definition which includes the word "new" so it's impossible to retain a new jobs, so I think what he is saying if it fact it is for creation of a new job but in cases of retention it will be retention of a job, not -- they are in conflict.

```
Y'all are saying the same thing,
```

as I appreciate it, but you can't
apply a definitional section to another place where it uses the word that's defined somewhere else that describes it as new. I think that's the point.

You can resolve that by defining existing job or
eliminating the word "new" or put "new or retained" just so you are clear that the intent is to allow both.

MR. PATTERSON :
Correct.
MR. ADLEY:
If you can come up with some
language that would be useful, we would certainly appreciate that.

But I am going to tell you I
believe we would fight with our heart and soul the removal of the word "new" because this is about -- if you got to come up with some definition to define what retention is, that's certainly
one thing, but to remove the word
"new" I think goes against
everything the Governor has set out to do and what LED does.

That's what they are trying to do is create new jobs for us.

MR. PATTERSON :
As Representative Broadwater
has proposed is simply add or
retain with the words previously
existing in the state or
something to that effect, I think
you accomplish our mutual goal,
but $y^{\prime}$ all can ponder on that for
the moment and let me finish my
remarks here.
The other thing that I would
like to offer by way of
suggestion, it was brought up at
the conclusion of the rules
committees meeting on Friday a
week ago that we're requiring
under the rules up to $\$ 15,000$ by
way of a fee to be paid by the
applicant, and we are now
creating some new dynamics in
this process to make these things
that has been suggested with
certainties before far less
certain. Given the fact that we
are asking for this significant
fee, if in fact at the end of the
day the application is not
founded to be meritorious, it
would seem not unreasonable to
have in the rules a provision for
a return of an amount less the
administrative cost incurred by
the department in the work of a
processing that if in fact the application is not going to be granted. Those are my contributions for -- this would be 503F, by the way, $I$ imagine.

Those are my contributions of ideas that I think, you know, ought to be looked at. I do believe that Mr. Adair made a good point about not necessarily needing to decide this today,

```
    take some time, consider some
    things and there may be some
    things that could have been
    missed. We've only had this
    document as it's being presented
    to you for a week and we already
    found a number of things that
    ought to be maybe looked at. My
    question is, you know, why does
    it need to go. You know, I heard
    what you said, Mr. Adley. I
    appreciate where you are coming
    from. I know you want to get the
    process started, but if we end up
    with something revealed during
    the course of the APA, which
    will, again, almost immediately
    after you-all were to pass this
    seems that it would be best that
    we try to capture this, you know,
        in a -- I don't know that you
        lose a lot by that two month
        period or period lost between now
        and the next meeting. Just a
        suggestion.
```

MR. ADLEY:
In fairness, I'm going to ask
Mr. House to come and talk about
this retaining idea. But I want
to say this to you, this concept
that we don't lose a lot, every time we delay -- let me tell you, we came in June and we were not going to renew any of these renewals without a cap. We listened to you. We made changes. Everybody never gets everything they want. None of us up here got everything we wanted in these rules, and no one will get all that they want, but that would be nice if you would at least say you listen to us, you didn't cap all of these renewals, you honored all of these other contracts that we came in here in June and said we were not going to do, but we listened to you and we listened to other members of the business community who were
interested and we made that
change. We made some substantial
changes from where we started
before we ever got to this table.
I just think that the Board and
the public needs to know that.
It's not like we walked in here
with a set of rules today and
said, this is it, take it or
leave it. This started back in
June and there have been some
substantial changes and give and
take back and forth. We keep
delaying just to be delaying to me doesn't make sense. Sometimes
you do have to start. I still
believe that. If I add the word
"retain" in with "new," what --
does that work or not work? I
need to know. Is it workable,
then let's get that done.
MR. HOUSE :
Yes, I believe it would be workable. I understand the point you were making, Mr. Adley, too,
and we believe that was
sufficient, but if it -- if it --
it may clarify, $I$ don't see that
it harms by adding that.
MR. ADLEY:
So what we do is recommend,
Jim, that once we get one adopted
and we go through these four or
five amendments we have, we will
take that one and try to put that
in there, too.
MR. PATTERSON :
Thank you, Mr. Adley. Thank
you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. WINDHAM:
Anything else? Any questions
of Mr. Patterson by any of the
Board members? No.
MR. RICHARD:
Mr. Chairman, just a point of order as to where we are, do we have additional public comment cards?

MR. WINDHAM:
We do.

MR. RICHARD:
So I had offered -- I said at
the appropriate time $I$ offer a motion to adopt the rules with
the amendments that we have on
the table at that time, I pull that back, but still offer the motion to adopt the rules and maybe we can deal with all of the amendments post adoption of the rules as being presented. I know we still have to go through public comments, but on the motion to adopt the rules.

MR. WINDHAM:
Well, I'm hesitant to not allow the public to have a --

MR. RICHARD:
Oh, that's what I'm saying. I get it.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. So now it's just a motion to adopt the rules at the appropriate time.

MR. RICHARD:

And then we will deal with
other amendments as deemed necessary.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Next I have Rhonda Reid Curriel. Please step forward and identify yourself and whom you represent.

MR. RICHARD:
Mr. Chairman, if I may before the public speaker starts, the proposals that we're hearing today, I think there was an opportunity to bring those during the rules committee process, if I'm not mistaken. The rules committee met several times. Anybody that was run by the open meetings law there was an opportunity to provide public comments and suggestions, I just hope we don't get into far down the road with amending, as Mr.

Adley noted, in proposing amendment after amendment and we
don't get to the point where we can adopt something to work with moving forward.

MR. WINDHAM:
Absolutely. Last time we spent seven hours here and we're getting close now.

MR. RICHARD :
Thank you.
MS. CURIEL:
Rhonda Reid Curiel my formal
remarks on behalf the idea, I would like to state I live in

Alexandria and $I$ am a citizen of
Rapides Parish and I will
recognize that police juror
Fountaine was here earlier, but I
have confirmed from my own
district juror that this issue has not been discussed formally at the police jury and at this time they do not have a comment on their position on this program.

MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you.
MS. CURIEL:
On behalf of idea which is --
a professional trade association
for economic development
professionals in Louisiana, I would like to offer the following comments. Our organization is made up of persons who are employed by local government whether it's a city municipality, a parish and state government as well as regionals in private entities working in the area of economic development, so my comments come from a culmination of both public and private entities. The rules committee met five times as best that I can count. Not all meetings were noticed on the LED website. You can go back and see that there were several dates that there does not appear to be an agenda there. Additionally documents to
be reviewed and for us to comment
on, Mr. Richard, were not
available prior to the meeting but were handed out during the meeting. Changes were made
during the meeting which made it very difficult for some person to make comments. For myself, I found it difficult and I'm used to testifying in the legislature and having to make comments on the fly, which is one reason I'm glad we are having an extended period of public comments before you vote to adopt these rules.
Because of that and because of discussion that you see amongst yourselves having just received these rules, we would like to suggest a delay. I would like to see you receive these rules as proposed from the committee and then vote to formally adopt them this December. That would give additional time for these
necessary amendments that are
popping up today to be
considered. Each time I have read
this document that $I$ found on
Tuesday, I found something new
and discovered something new that
wasn't issued for myself, and on
my call on Thursday morning, my
members alerted me to other
issues.
One prime example can be
found in the definition of wage,
which is in section 502 of the
proposed document. The
definition of a job calls for
established minimum wage to be
paid. Wage is defined as box 1
of the employees $W 2$ for the
taxable year. Well that in
itself creates an issue. If you
use the standard formula to
convert an annual wage or annual
income noted on a W2, which is
income divided by 2080 hours, to
get an hourly rate you are not
getting a true hourly wage for
that employee. That employee may
have been at that company for one months, three months, five months. A W2 does not show the period of months that an employee worked. It does not show the number of hours during the week that an employee worked. It simply shows the amount of money that was paid to that employee by
that company. It makes it
extremely difficult to use that
definition to determine if the wage paid, which is required under the definition of job, is in fact being met by the company.

Additionally, and I believe this is going to be met, this is going to be addressed with an amendment, the hourly rate is for manufacturing. If you going to file consistency I'm going to say we're doing what our neighbors do then let's do what our neighbors
do. They require an hourly rate.
It is the median wage pay within
that county, for us it would be
parish. It's not defined as manufacturing. When we do not have a minimum wage in Louisiana and I certainly don't want to disencourage manufacturers whether they are large or small from locating in Louisiana because we are going to dictate the minimum manufacturing rate they must pay in order to have their jobs counted under this program. Within a manufacturing facility itself there is a range of wages paid and rates paid based on the position of that person.

MR. ADLEY:
Let me help you with that one before you get too far. One of the amendments that we have here today is removed by themselves, and I've said that several times,

I think. I see you shaking your head in the back, Mandi, I think we did, we are removing hat item because it falls under Exhibit A and $B$ where the local governments and LED, they are going to agree. This is the pay scale.

This is what people are going to pay. You won't have to go through some website and dig your way through it and try to figure it out. That came in public testimony at our last meeting, and we said we would get to the bottom of that and we did, and the amendment that $I$ have when we finished adopting this initial
set -- one of them is to delete

## line 7.

MS. CURIEL:
Does that also mean we can
delete the definition of the word
"wage?"
MR. ADLEY:
I am sorry?

MS. CURIEL:
We can delete the definition
of the word "wage" because it was
only be defined in reference to
No. 7 .
MR. ADLEY:
Show me where you picking up
the word "wage" again.
MS. CURIEL:
At the end of the definition,
the word "wage" just above 503.
MR. ADLEY:
I am trying to find out if wage is here used for inside that Exhibit A or B. Richard, I need to know that.

MR. PIERSON:
It would likely be in both.
MR. ADLEY:
If it's in the two of them then I do need the definition.

MS. CURIEL:
My understanding is $A$ and $B$ delete the word "payroll", note "wage".

MR. ADLEY:
You got something for me?
MS . MITCHELL :
Yes, sir. I am going to add an explanation for item No. 7 not making -- making it through the cutting floor at the very last meeting of the Board of Commerce and Industry Rules committee, so that is going to be addressed, and we also see no issue with removing the definition of "wage" because in Exhibit $A$ which is the cooperative endeavor agreement in which the company is going to make certain commitments to the state and will be measured by that, and in Exhibit B, which is the resolution from the various
local governing bodies, we represent -- we reference payroll, so the number of jobs that the company will commit to and the payroll that the company will commit to will be defined in
those other two documents and the company will be held to that.

And so in the proposed amendment,
removing item 7 under that
definition of job, would
correspond with also removing the
definition of wage within the rules.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. I've added that to the list.

MS . MITCHELL :
Already on there.
MR. WINDHAM:
Anything else, Ms. Curiel.
MS. CURIEL:
Yes. I believe you've
addressed one of our concerns, which was the addition by means of mass production and sharing with them that you are going to offer, which would protect our small manufacturers who do custom work they, do one or two or they do a short run or --

MR. ADLEY:
We have agreed to do that.
MS. CURIEL:
-- they create specialized
hand tools. We can appreciate
the request to have all financial
and incentive program noted on the advanced notification but we want to make certain that in going through the process and making our application that a company still would have the ability to change from Quality Jobs down to Enterprise Zone or either from Enterprise Zone back up to Quality Jobs once they have
had a chance to visit with the
department with respect to --
their actual payroll and
healthcare benefits. One reason
people move down is because their
healthcare benefit does not
necessarily meet the requirement of $Q J$, and we don't want to
prohibit that.

MR. WINDHAM:
Does that have anything to do
with this program?
MS. CURIEL:
It has nothing to do with
this program, but the new --
MR. WINDHAM:
Our goal is to get through
this program.
MS. CURIEL:
In the new proposed rules it
says that all programs must be
noted on the same advanced
notification.
MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Clapinski.
MS . CLAPINSKI:
That is language that is
identical to language that is in
our enterprise Zone, and I
believe also our Quality Jobs
rules as well. So all that is
doing is making our programs consistent. We do allow a company to switch from Quality

Jobs to Enterprise Zone so long as no benefits have been received at that time. If they determine
that they do not meet the
healthcare requirements and one of the other requirements under Quality Jobs, you cannot elect both Quality Jobs and Enterprise Zone on the same advance. I don't think -- it's already the department's practice. I don't necessarily think there needs to be any amendment made to that section of the rules, but that part of the rules is in there to be consistent with all of our programs. That's all.

MS. CURIEL:
Again, we wanted to make sure it wasn't prohibited.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
MS. CURIEL:
You heard a lot of discussion about exhibit $B$ today and one of
the issues concerning developers out in the field because there is
still quite a bit of confusion and there's questions of if one of the three say yes and the other two say no, which way do we go. There's mention of four entities. We're not sure why the municipality would have to give a resolution if the project was not located within their borders, and then we have some parishes that are moving towards the review committee to where they would say yes or no and establish a matrix and then the question is, do they
have the authority once the
review committee is established
by the local governing
authorities to review the project, make the decision to say yes to you and deliver the Exhibit B or does that review
committee have to go back to
those representative entities and
come back with three or four
separate resolutions. It's
easier if we do what -- like they
do in Alabama, which is all of
the entities can elect to get the power to one entity. It makes things move quicker. And, Mr. Adley, I know you said you didn't know what the other states do, but just so you know in Alabama they do a backwards from us. If
the local government authority grants the property tax exemption when it's granted it also foregoes the state property tax that's imposed on the business for years one through ten. If
it's 11 through 20 because Alabama now goes to 20 , which may be why they are successful in attracting and expanding their car manufacturing sites, each of those state and county have to chime in.

MR. ADLEY:

That's a good point, and I'd ask you to go look at Alabama and their statutes and the caps that
they put in that program before they put that in play. That we don't do here.

MS. CURIEL:
I would agree with that. Finally we have great concern including the exact term language from the Governor's latest Executive Order into the rules.

I understand the reason it's
being done is because these
Executive Orders can be changed on when. However, if we are to get a large project or if local government sees there is such a huge benefit that they would like to do both five year terms at 100 percent with that language in the rules they are prohibited.

MR. ADLEY:
That's correct.
MS. CURIEL:

When it's in the rules it's a
much longer process to repeal,
but by leaving that with the
Governor there is flexibility so
that if we have a very large
project, something equal or even
larger, the Governor would have
that flexibility to change what
he does immediately unlike
putting it in the rules and we're stuck here with whatever decision
the committee has to make or
Board has to adopt we have to go
through APA.
MR. ADLEY:
From the Governor's
perspective on the issue, we went
through this discussion a lot of
times, as we did the
environmental issues that were
brought up to us, to quote him,
he is not going to support a ten
year exemption at 100 percent. He
is not going to do it, and his
position after multiple meetings
that we had going back and forth
is exactly what you are looking
at. And I'm going to do
everything that $I$ can to sell
that position. I do believe that
the 80 percent is exactly what
ought to be done in the state
because it guarantees into the
future regardless of what local
government does, $I$ can tell you
20 percent of the existing
industrial tax exemption in this
state exceeds $\$ 500$ million a year and it guarantees that money we
can identify going back to them.
MS. CURIEL:
Mr. Adley, we respect the
Governor's position but we also realize and know that this Board serves as an approval entity along the way and should stand separate from the Governor. The Governor has always had the right to refuse to sign a contract.

It's not just because there's
been an Executive Order now.
He's always had the right to say at what levels and what terms he would sign those contracts, but this Board has, in the past, been one step in the approval process and has stood separate from the Governor's approval. You make a recommendation to him for his contract. You've alluded to the fact that this Board in the past to serve as a rubber stamp. By putting into the Executive Order -- I mean, into the rules everything from the Executive Order is there really a need for companies to come before you because staff is only going to move to the Board what complies with the rules.

MR. ADLEY:
I really like your point.
You have really right hit a hot button with me because $I$ believe this Board does have absolutely
that authority to stand on its own, but what has been presented to us is that because prior administrations before us entered into agreements for five year deals subject to renewal by this Board, this Board, because people gave their word, has not been able to deal with that. At some point it has to be in writing, it does. That's the purpose of that.

MS. CURIEL:
And in doing so, are you now not just becoming a rubber stamp entity because you are complying and you are putting into rules exactly what the Governor wants. You are not standalone entity anymore. Those previous boards sat and reviewed. They took the recommendation of staff who had done all of the work in advance before they moved those contracts to that Governor's desk. Are you
now saying we're not going to do anything unless it's in the

Executive Order. I thank you for
your time.
MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Questions for Ms. Curiel
by any members of the Board? Mr.
Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
I certainly welcome
entertaining the opportunity to model after Alabama in regards to education taxes.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Thank you, Ms.
Curiel. Mandi, do you have a
question or statement?
MS . MITCHELL:
There was a comment that the rules committee meetings were not properly noted and that is incorrect. I wanted to be on record that staff did follow the public meeting law requirements and properly noticing the rules
committee meetings.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Are there other members from the public? I am sorry. I still got Michael

Durisco with BRAC. Please come
forward and identify yourself and
address the committee or the
Board.
MR. DURISCO (PH):
Michael Durisco, Baton Rouge
Area Chamber. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak. I do want to touch upon that issue of the renewal restrictions, the three years and the 80 percent as Ms. Malone, who unfortunately had to leave, I thought she asked a great question, which is if there is a parish, if there are members of the individual local government authorities who would like for it to be five years, who would like
for it to be 100 percent, do they have that opportunity. We have more than just a question about that provision in the proposed rules. We've got a strong concern about it. You know, just starting out, I do believe there has been a lot of tension
expressed today between on the one hand wanting to make sure there is strong input and authorizations of the locals, and
then on the other hand taking
some of that away, and, you know,
I would start for your
consideration just looking at the
provision in the constitution
where it says, the exemption
shall be for initial term no more
than five calendar years and may be renewed for an additional five
years. I want to point out I'm
not a lawyer, I'm not a
constitutional scholar. I would
rather use Mr. Adley's litmus
test from earlier today just using common sense, but when $I$ see that it says may be renewed for an additional five years that's to me, the legislature and ratified by the people saying that option should exist. That option should exist by your action today of passing rules that take away that option, there is tension there. I would also point out another kind of form of tension in this proposed rule on the restriction of the renewal.

One aspect of the Governor's
Executive Order we support and it
gets to that local component of this, one of the goals expressed in the EO is to authorize local
governments to grant discretionary exemptions based on the attractiveness of a particular project, so, again, on the one hand you are trying, you are doing, $I$ think, the right

```
    thing in granting that
    authorization to the locals, but
    the other hand is taking it away
    and against what I would consider
    the spirit at least of the
    constitution that says let's keep
    that option available for it to
    be five years or }100\mathrm{ percent, so
    I'm here actually today on behalf
    of BRAC to ask you not to include
    that provision in the rules that
    you adopt. I think there's
    tension with the constitution. I
    think there's tension with the
    Governor's Executive Order of the
    spirit of that local input, you
    know, to echo Representative
    Broadwater earlier, I'm not here
    to say anything against the local
    participation, I'm actually
    saying there should be more local
    participation in this regard.
    So, you know, that is my
    suggestion. BRAC's
    recommendation is, you know, we
```

would ask that you remove that restriction or $I$ could borrow
from Mr. Richard's friendly
amendments earlier today when he
was asking companies seeking
their exemptions to make sure they go back and speak to all of the local governing authorities in their respected parish, and Ms. Malone's question earlier, are you aware in any of the 64 parishes are there any local government entities who would like to retain that option of the five years and the 100 percent because $I$ don't know how you just take it away from them without asking them, but maybe you can save yourself talking to 250 to 300 local governmental entities by just taking it out. MR. WINDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Durisco. Mr.

Allen wants to ask you a question. I am sorry. Pierson.

MR. PIERSON:
I just want to make a commentary to follow Mr .

Durisco's remarks on behalf of BRAC and we have heard this significantly across the board some concern about what we call the 53 now, but for the Board members who vote their own conscious, and Rhonda, in part, made this discussion, too, but for Board members who may not be as technically aware, if you want to go from Baton Rouge to Mississippi you can take 110 or you can take I-12. If you want an industrial tax exemption that takes the local revenues off the table, you can use the ITEP now for 53 but you also have the ability to affect the pilot that could provide that ten year or perhaps beyond that, so there is other methodologies, other technical ways to achieve this.

By vetting the 53 in the rules we
stay compliance with what the Governor is supporting and if we send things to his desk that he is not supporting, we've taken a lot of time out of the process and been unfair to people that we launch a document that we know is not going to get signed. It's just -- it doesn't work for me personally. I think we have got a pathway and you've got an alternate pathway, so while I respect what you are saying that the constitution would allow up to an additional five years at a time in these extraordinarily difficult fiscal challenges where a tax restructure that can take place next year in February, we hope that the legislature will be able to come forward with a restructured program. Mr. Patterson spoke to it previous. While this is a dial back, we've
dialed back all of the other programs as well. So thank you for your thoughtful comments, but I did want the Board to be aware that these are other pathways that exist to achieve for the important major projects an extended tax exemption period.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Broadwater. MR. BROADWATER:

I just wanted to speak in
support of -- the secretary's reading. As $I$ read that
provision in the constitution, the thing that is interesting to hear and I can understand where the argument comes from but that the first period the constitution provides that the five years there is a cap, no more than five years, so initial term can be less. The second one says may be renewed for an additional five years, which frankly I think is
sloppy drafting, with all due respect to the constitution indention that was there, or the
legislators that probably screwed it up at a later date, but in any event, I think that Secretary Pierson's point is well taken that under the constitution it contemplates less than a ten-year period as being authorized. It just flips it from the way that we're doing it here, but I think ultimately it gets to the spirit of what is there, and so $I$ am taking positions on this side but I want to be clear on this one, I think it actually is getting this one right and it's a defensible position.

MR. DURISCO:
Could I just respond. You know, I agree with you. I said I am not a legal or constitutional scholar. I think it's noteworthy that that second part of the
sentence doesn't include the up
to period. I read it as almost maybe not sloppy but it's just a common sense expression that it may go to five years, an
additional five years. So $I$ was just trying to express, you know, our concern and also, you know, acknowledge that there is some tension there. The Governor can say, and, you know, it's his authority to sign or not sign the contract, but at the same time there is an Executive Order where he has got a very expressed goal to authorize the locals to have that discretionary authority and the constitution therefore seems to say then the locals might have that option to go to five additional years, so it's a tension I think between goals here, and we would love it if in the capital region those parishes and those local government
entities in the nine parish
region be allowed to have what
the constitution says is an
existing option.
MR. BROADWATER:
I think your point is well
taken. I think that if you and I were in court there would be no way for me to argue that you ought to be sanctioned for making an erroneous argument or
misapplication of the law. I
don't think it's abundantly clear
there, but $I$ certainly thought it
was worth while to weigh in to
say that $I$ think their reading is
fair as well. I think it can be
taken either way.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
And I am going to say that
from the parishes side that we
didn't have any input at all.
It's very much welcomed. And
granted we might want to be able to go to five. We know if we send it it's not going to be accepted and the worst thing that we can have which we know right now, the worst thing we apply right now is uncertainty, so we would in the rules have uncertainty from now on. At
least in this case we know that we accept the five years for 100 percent and then three years at 80 percent it's going to be -- if the guidelines are met by Exhibit
$A$ and $B$ it's going to be
accepted, so that we're putting
back in my mind some more certainty. And then we also have -- as Secretary Pierson said, we have the pilot. BRAC can do it. We can do it. The state can do it for that matter. They don't have to fool with us, so the pilot can be used in multiple opportunities if it's the right
project. We don't all get what we want in here, but I think we are moving -- and the idea of holding up, $I$ get it, but the uncertainty just continues. On June 24 th $I$ sat over there and the Governor was over there and this just creates so much uncertainly for us and that's the worst thing that we could do to business. We are trying to get to some certainty.

MR. DURISCO:
I appreciate that, and I
referred to it kind of jokingly
earlier with Mr. Richard's
friendly amendments earlier
today, but on a more serious note, I think it's important that
there be consistency that, you
know, when he makes his friendly
amendment I think there's a
serious aim in mind there which
is to make sure we are -- I am
sorry.

MR. MILLER:
He sets his limit. But this
is the limit I'll do. Agree or
disagree, he gets that
opportunity that the Governor
gets to say you get the local
authority up to and that's what
he did.
MR. DURISCO:
Sure.
MR. WINDHAM:
Anything else? Anyone else
would like to ask Mr. Durisco any
questions? Thank you very much
for your comments.
Are there any other members of the public who would like to comment before actions are taken on these rules with the motion by

Mr. Richard?
MR. MILLER :
I would like to add what
Representative Broadwater said earlier, $I$ just assume it all be local. Let us have it on many
levels where the money comes back
to the state, comes from the parish to the state and then back to the parish. I would much rather -- I mean, there's a whole lot of areas of the law that $I$ would like for us to have complete control.

MR. WINDHAM:
Anything else, Mr. Adley? MR. ADLEY:

No. If I could just summarize and ask that if you could take the motion and adopt the rules that we have in front of us, there's five or six amendments that we need to adopt on top of that to get them in the proper order that we agreed to do them.

I know there is three from LED that we would take care of -that would take care of the wages and the hour things and a couple of other things. We'll take care of the issue raised about -- I
think Jim you raised the issue
about new and retention. We'll make sure we cover that. Mr.

Broadwater's has got one of my commitment to you is to get all
of those in place. What I'm
going to ask, though, is if you
adopt these rules so now there's
a document that $I$ can go to and
say this is where the amendment
is going to, you know where it
is.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Barham.
MR. BARHAM :
Mr. Adley, although I love
you and respect you, I'm not
going to vote for something until
those amendments are on the
instruments or not. And I take
your pledge that you intend to do that, but I think you --

MR. ADLEY:
Mr. Barham, please bear with me. The difference between what
you and $I$ did when we were in the
senate when we had some bill
before us, we don't have anything
before us. I need to get a
document. I got to get these
amendments to the current rules
so I got a document in front of
me so that you and I basically
have a bill, and I'm telling you
we're going to put all of those amendments in there, Mr. Barham.

I don't have a document to put
them into at this stage of the
game.
MR. BARHAM:
But you are asking me to vote
for a set of rules that there
could be an amendment that's a
killer before me, and so I would
lose on the amendment but by
extension I would have lost my
vote because $I$ voted for the
rules.
MR. ADLEY:
I got you. Let me just
clarify for you. There will be three amendments from LED. There will be one that -- under the job description that will say filled by Louisiana residents, domiciled or become a resident within 60 days. They will delete line 7 altogether. They will delete the definition of wage. We will add to the word "retained" at the request of $\mathrm{Mr} .--$ or "retention" at the request of Mr . Patterson.
I believe the amendment that Mr .
Broadwater has clarifies the municipals -- the local
governments that are involved, and the last one that $I$ think we have is adding the word "parish" in with state and country; am I remembering that correctly?

MR. BROADWATER:
You are remembering that and the point was made, and though I believe that that is something that needs to be looked at, I'm
going to withdraw that for this reason, and I do firmly believe what I told you, but if I add that amendment $I$ 'm going to
create problems for you elsewhere and it's not my intention to try to mess up what you have. You have got in sections 513 a provision on relocation from parish to parish that is different and simply adding the word "parish" in 503E would mess up what you've already got on relocation elsewhere, and though

I'm not crazy about it, I'm not here to make your life miserable.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Broadwater, would
changing that statement "and
country" just to read "retention"
cause problems?
MR. BROADWATER:
Here's -- and I'm going on my gut. I would have to study it and encourage you to look at your
legal counsel.
The difference that you have in 503E is that you allow someone in an application to show that they are retaining jobs but they are applying for the entire five year period at the initial outset, but what we provide for in 513 on a relocation from parish to parish, you only allow them to get the unexpired consecutive years and so you would have a conflict, and I think 513, quite frankly, $I$ don't like it. I would rather them be able to get the full amount, but if $I$ had in the amendment we talked about earlier, I rectify 13 and it's not my desire to give you a bunch of headaches.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. That other
amendment that $I$ believe that we have, Mr. Adley, is the one concerning mass production.

MR. ADLEY:
Oh, yeah. We add to allow
for custom fabrication.
MR. WINDHAM:
To my eyes, the custom
fabrication, if it's broad enough
to cover the things where there
are massive items such as Textron where they are building tanks
or --
MR. ADLEY:
All I can tell you, Mr.
Chairman, that's the language came straight from LED.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So that would be
four amendments, then? No. It would still be three. Mr.

Barham, are you comfortable?
MR. ADLEY:
All I can tell you, Mr.
Barham, every one of those we
listed, we are going to support
pass and I believe they will
pass, and if they do not pass I
will not move forward with it. I
don't think you can ask for any more than that. I'm giving you my word. That's the best that I can do.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second on Mr .
Richard's motion to approve the rules as they are presented currently? Seconded by Mr. Moller.

Any further discussion from
the public? Any further
discussion from any of the other
Board members? I assume a roll
call vote will be appropriate.
MS . SORRELL:
Robert Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes.
MS. SORRELL:
Robert Barham.
MR. BARHAM :
No.
MS. SORRELL:

Representative Broadwater.
MR. BROADWATER:
Yes.
MS. SORRELL:
Millie Atkins is gone. Mayor
Brasseaux.
MR. BRASSEAUX :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Representative Carmody.
MR. CARMODY:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Yvette Cola.
MS COLA:
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Major Coleman. He is gone.
Heather Malone is gone. Ben
Hudson.
MR. HUDSON :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Broderick Miller.
MR. MILLER :

Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Jan Moller.
MR. MOLLER :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Don Pierson.
MR. PIERSON:
Yes.
MS. SORRELL:
Scott Richard.
MR. RICHARD :
Yes, ma'am.
MS . SORRELL:
Bobby Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS :
Yes.
MS . SORRELL:
Steve Windham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
If I can, the amendments -- I
think it's --
MR. WINDHAM:

Five.
MR. ADLEY:
Let's go through them.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion passes.
MR. ADLEY:
The first amendment will be under the job description, item 1, which say new and retained. Sorry? New or retained. Under item 1. That would be the first.

The second would be in item 6 under jobs, which say, fill by

Louisiana resident domiciled or become domiciled within 60 days.

MS . MITCHELL:
It's actually filled by
strike through Louisiana
residents and replace that with
United States citizen domiciled in Louisiana, or who becomes domiciled in Louisiana within 60 days after hire date. That is language exactly from our other programs.

MR. WINDHAM:
That's good for you?
MR. ADLEY:
That's good. You would delete
item 7. It would be gone, and
along with item 7 you would
delete reference to wage
definition, you would delete
that. And the 5th would be under
manufacturing, it would say by
means of mass production or
custom fabrication and machinery;
is that correct? And those are
all five of them.
MS . MITCHELL :
That's correct.
MR. ADLEY:
And I would ask for adoption
of those five.
MR. WINDHAM:
So Mr. Adley has made a motion to make those amendments to the rules that were just
adopted. Is there a second?
Seconded by Mr. Miller. Is there
any discussion from the public concerning those amendments? Any
discussion from any of the Board
members concerning those
amendments? All in favor indicate with a yay.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Yay.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
The last piece to the rules
that we have was a change to the rules governing the meetings of the Board, which was in a separate section. I assume they all have a copy of this, do they?

MS. CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir. It was handed out before the meeting began.

MR. ADLEY:
The meetings of the Board under section 107 , the change to the current rule would be in 107C
talking about what you published
for the public before our meetings, the summary agenda for
regular meetings to the Board
shall be posted to the website no
later than one week prior to the meeting when feasible.

MS . CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir. And if I may, I
apologize, but Together Louisiana
came up during our break and
asked us to make an additional
change that I think we're
comfortable with. I don't know
if you want to consider that.
MR. ADLEY:
Let's get these two done and
let us discuss that.
MS. CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
That would be the first change. And the second change would be 107G talking about the meeting place and you would add
language the Board of Commerce
and Industry shall have its
meetings and the meetings of its subcommittees broadcast via live stream when feasible except those meetings or discussions which are protected from public disclosure by Louisiana confidentiality
laws. Those two changes to the general rules of the Board we would ask that you adopt those, and if you adopt those then we
can find out what this last
proposal is for the Board to
decide. I will make a motion for
the adoption of those changes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley makes the motion.
Mr. Moller seconds the motion for
those changes. Are there any
comments from the public? Ms.
Handley, please step forward and identify yourself.

MS . HANDLEY:
We did talk to LED and they
were on board with us.
MS . CLAPINSKI :
This was before that.
MR. ADLEY:
We're not there yet. If you
let us get this done and come back to you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions or
comments for those two changes?
MR. BROADWATER:
I have one question. I
realize that paragraph A says
that all meeting are subject to
open meetings law. I guess my
question is and maybe the
attorney for LED can weigh in, paragraph $C$, you add at the end of that amendment that the posting of the agenda would be when feasible. Is that compliant with open meetings law which generally requires a posting of the agenda.

MS . CLAPINSKI:

No. So we will always post
the agenda at least 24 hours
ahead of time, which is in
compliance with the open meetings
law.
MR. BROADWATER:
You are going to try to get
it within one week, if possible.
Super. Great job.
MS CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions or
comments regarding these two
amendments to the general
operating rules of this Board?
All in favor indicate with an
Aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS :
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
I assume there's one last
issue to discuss.
MS . CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir. It's on $C$ where we
made the changes. They wanted some clarification on what was included in the summary agenda, so the language as it would read now would say regular -- the Board may meet as often as it deems necessary provided there shall be not less than four regular meetings each year. The summary agenda and the summary tables on all applications on the agenda for the regular meetings of the Board shall be posted to the website no latter than one week prior to the meeting when feasible but no later than 24 hours from when the Board -well, the Board packet, we may need to say that, the Board packet is provided to the Board.

MR. ADLEY:
Are you in agreement with

## that?

MS. CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir. We are.
MR. ADLEY:
Then what $I$ would suggest is make a motion now to delete the change we made in paragraph $C$ and replace it with that language you've got written there.

MS CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Does that get it done?
MS . CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir.
MR. BROADWATER:
Can you read it one more
time.
MS. CLAPINSKI:
Sure. The new language will now say, the summary agenda and the summary tables on all
applications on the agenda for the regular meetings of the Board shall be posted to the website no
later than one week prior to the meeting when feasible but no
later than 24 hours from when the
Board packet is provided to the
Board. So the -- just for
clarification so everybody
understands what we are doing.
The Board gets the hundreds and
hundreds of pages. The summary
agenda is what we have available
to the public when you walk in.
MR. WINDHAM:
Shouldn't it say at least one
week and then no later than?
MS . CLAPINSKI :
We can do that.
MR. WINDHAM:
You want it at least a week ahead of time but you don't want it any later than a day ahead of time.

MS . MITCHELL :
Well, 24 hours from the --
MR. WINDHAM:
Yeah.

MS. CLAPINSKI :
That's fine. Yeah.
MR. WINDHAM:
Because later and later don't make sense. Is that your motion, Mr. Adley. So move. Is there a second? Mr. Moller. Yes.

Absolutely. Thank you. Any
further discussion on this item?
MR. ADLEY:
Yes. I do. Look, the
members of this rules committee
have met a number of times for
lengthy meeting. I want to thank
them for that. I want to thank
all of you. You have been very
patient. When the Governor
started this process, it was -- I
know it was totally different
than anybody had ever seen
before. The first meeting we had
here Mr. Barham wanted to start
meeting in the mornings because
it lasted for seven and a half
hours. This is one of the
shorter ones we've had, Mr.
Broadwater. You should feel
blessed. I do want to thank you
all of you, the Chairman, all of
you for your patience. And we
move forward with the AP rules
and $I$ want to plead with you, I
believe we have time to get this
posted by November 20th, I do.
MR. WINDHAM:
First we have to pass this motion.

MR. ADLEY:
I want to move to adjourn.
MR. WINDHAM:
We have to pass this motion
first. All in favor of the motion
regarding the general publication
of the --
MS. CLAPINSKI :
General Board rules.
MR. WINDHAM:
General Board rules. All in
favor indicate with an aye.
ALL BOARD MEMBERS:

Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed? Motion passes.
MR. BROADWATER:
Mr. Chairman, before you
adjourn, will Mr. Adley let me
offer my other amendment that got
referenced earlier but we never
took up?
MR. WINDHAM:
Absolutely.
MR. ADLEY:
What was it?
MR. BROADWATER:
This is just a suggestion.
MR. ADLEY:
This is your definition.
That's right. I apologize.
MR. BROADWATER:
That's right. And it's not
critical. I think all throughout
the rules you reference those
three governmental entities that will always have to be consulted and the possibly of the 4 th that
may sometimes have to be consulted.

MR. ADLEY:
As I remember she had some
language and $I$ read the language
and all it did was clarify that
sheriff --
MR. BROADWATER:
What I'm suggesting is that while you have rules elsewhere that just refer to local governmental entities that you ought to include in the definition section the definition for local governmental entity and restate the language from where you have elsewhere that it would be defined as the parish governing authority, the School Board, the sheriff and any municipality in which the manufacturing establishment is or will be located and so you always know --

MR. WINDHAM:

That's your motion?
MR. BROADWATER:
That's my motion. Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second?
MR. ADLEY:
Move to add that definition
and $I$ second it.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any further discussion
regarding that, which is very good clarification, I might add.

All in favor indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a nay?
Motion carries.
MR. ADLEY:
I now want to more for
adoption of the total set of rules including that amendment.

I done it one more time to make sure we get all the way in there.

MR. BROADWATER:
I will second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Move by Mr. Adley. Seconded by Mr. Broadwater. All in favor with that motion indicate with an aye.

ALL BOARD MEMBERS:
Aye.
MR. WINDHAM:
All oppose with a nay?
Motion Carries.
Now we have the last item on the agenda and that is the addressing of the commission and public by Secretary Don Pierson.

MR. PIERSON :
Thank you. I'll be brief. To our Stakeholders here, thank you for your patience with this process on all important day that we've wrapped up our draft set of rules. This effort began early
in 2016 as directed by our
Governor, and that became, as you
know, far more intense on the $24 t h$ of June, and the Governor
remains committed to a livelier economy of our state, so there should be no question about that we're backing up in any way relative to this Executive Order and the implementation of these rules. LED will continue to aggressively build jobs in our state and will remain strong partners with this Board. Thank you to all of the Board members. Many of you jumped in to circumstances for more than what you anticipated when you raised your hand and volunteered for service here. We thank you for that. Thank you to the LED staff for the long hours of work that made these meetings possible and the program administration program possible, and certainly participation in the then rules committee process. Thank you

Senator Robert Adley and the others that participate in the rules committee. Again, an enormous amount of work has gone into the product that we have today that is going to allow us to move forward.

LED remains proud and enthusiastic in our support of the Governor's Executive Order. It has brought accountability to the ITEP program. This is the for the first time. Local voice has been added. That's a very significant feature and has been added for the first time. We are prepared now to issue templates for Exhibit A and Exhibit B, and with the draft rules in hand, we will now begin to conduct workshops throughout the state and the various regions, not only with economic development partitioners and the various organizations but also with the
elected officials on the School
Boards, police jury, parish commissions and others, the sheriff's included.

This Board will continue to play a very important role in all of our work going forward. You are providing certainty, and as President Miller previously indicated, absolutely critical to our success in recruiting and retaining business. The same this
Board will act and you've done it
today with consistency. Again,
that's another great element of the certainty that the Board can be counted on to act like assistant fashion in compliance with our rules and way we've treated each case in a similar fashion.

And, finally, allows us when you pass these tax exemptions on to the Governor's desk and he

```
signs them, allows us to be
```

> competitive with other states and other jurisdictions. It's absolutely critical to our success. This program has long been the foundation of our competitive offers and it will remain that way and we thank you for the role that you play in that. Thank you for this time, and that concludes my remarks. MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I will entertain a motion for adjournment. Motion by everyone. Seconded by everyone else. Without objection, we are adjourned.
(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.)
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