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MR. WINDHAM:
If everyone will take their seat, I will call this meeting to order.

Call the meeting of the Board of Commerce and Industry to order for the February 21st, 2017 meeting.

Ms. Sorrell, if you will call the roll. MS . SORRELL:

Robert Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Robert Barham.
MR. BARHAM:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Representative Abramson.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Millie Atkins.
MS . ATKINS:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Mayor Brasseaux.
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MAYOR BRASSEAUX:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Representative Carmody.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Yvette Cola.
MS . COLA:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Major Coleman.
MAJOR COLEMAN :
Here.
MS . SORRELI:
Ricky Fabra.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Manny Fajardo.
MR. FAJARDO:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Jerry Jones.
MR. JONES :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
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Heather Malone.
MS . MALONE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL :
Senator Martiny.
MS . RIDGE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL :
Michelle.
Robby Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Jan Moller.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Senator Chabert.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Don Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Present.
MS . SORRELL:
Scott Richard.
(No response.)

MS . SORRELL:
Darrel Saizan.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Danny Schexnaydre.
MR. SHEXNAYDRE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL :
Ronnie Slone.
MR. SLONE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Bobby Williams.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Steve Windham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Doctor Wilson.
DR. WILSON:
Here.
MS. SORRELI:
We have a quorum.
MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Sorrell.
Hope everyone has had a chance to review the minutes from our December 20th meeting, and I will entertain a motion to approve.

MAJOR COLEMAN:
I'll so move, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion by Major Coleman; seconded by
Mayor Brasseaux.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
The minutes are approved.
First, we have the Quality Jobs Program.
Mr. Burton.
MR. BURTON:
Good morning. We have four new applications for Quality Jobs: 201751426, Denka Performance Elastomer, LLC in St. John the Baptist; 20150912, Laitram, LLC in Jefferson Parish; 20150027, USA Rail Terminals, LLC in West Baton Rouge Parish; 20141483, W-Industries of LA dba Control Concepts \&
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Technology in Lafayette Parish.
This concludes the new applications for Quality Jobs.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Burton.
Are there any comments from the public regarding the Quality Jobs applicants?

MR. HONORE :
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, sir. Please step forward and
identify yourself.
MR. HONORE :
I'm Russel Honore with GreenARMY.
Denka is currently under significant investigation from the EPA and the LED (sic) for not meeting police jury requirements. Matter of fact, the whole processing plant is under review because they just are not meeting requirements. I suggest the board take a look at that and delay this particular application until that's cleared up with the LDEQ and the EPA. Thank you.

MS. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Honore.
Are there any questions of the board for
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Mr. Honore, General Honore?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Staff, do you have any comments?
(No response.)
MR. BURTON:
If the board would like, we can defer this one and get with the company and try to check the records and then bring it back to the next board meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Is there a motion to defer
Denka?
Senator Adley move to defer. Is there a second? By Major Coleman.

All in favor of the deferral of the application until the next meeting for -- I'm sorry?

MR. BURTON:
Do we know if the business is present to
answer some of the questions?
MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry. Is someone here from Denka?
Please step forward and identify yourself.
MR. LAVASTIDA:
Morning. I'm Jorge Lavastida, plant
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manager with Denka Performance Elastomer.
MR. WINDHAM:
Ma' am ?
MS . BOATNER:
Rhonda Boatner with Didier Consultants
representing Denka.
MR. WINDHAM:
Sir, do you have any information to -do you have any questions? Do any of the board members have any questions?

MR. ADLEY:
I guess you heard what was said. We would just like to know what your response is for that.

MR. LAVASTIDA:
We're in compliance with all
environmental regulation from LDEQ and DPA. We have voluntarily taken the steps to enter a administrative order of consent to review submissions, and a lot of our capital investment is going towards that program.

MR. ADLEY:
From the staff's perspective, I guess you just need to verify that. That would be the reason for deferral long enough to get that done?

MR. BURTON:
Well, it can be the board's decision on
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that because nothing in the application states anything or the rules of the program about the environmental qualities holding up the application.

MR. WINDHAM:
And I'd like to point out, too, that this program is a jobs program, so even though the expenditures are on the equipment, it's not related to the benefits of the program. The reason I'm saying that is that is under the new rules, if it's environmentally required, that would not be eligible for an exemption, but this is not an exemption related to those expenditures. This is an exemption related to the creation of the jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
But if the board decided to defer till the next meeting just to confirm everything that we've heard, that would not jeopardize their opportunity for the Quality Jobs Program; is that correct?

MR. BURTON:
That is correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions by the board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
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All right. We have a motion on the floor with a proper second.

All in favor of deferral, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
MR. JONES:
Nay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Jones opposed.
Deferral of motion carries. Thank you.
So staff will get with you and get some answers for the board and response to this.

MR. LAVASTIDA:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
All right. For the other ones, are there any other questions, comments, observations?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion for approval?
Made by Dr. Wilson, seconded by
Mr. Slone.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Those are approved.
MR. BURTON :
The next item up is going to be the
renewals. We have 20111045, Gravois Aluminum Boats, LLC in Iberia; 20110780, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. in Lafayette Parish; 20110035, Instrument and Valve Services Company and Fisher-Rosemont Systems, Inc. in Ascension Parish; 20120864, New Orleans Cold Storage and Warehouse Company, LTD in Orleans Parish; 20111126, Southern Precision, Inc. in St. Charles Parish.

This concludes the renewals for Quality Jobs.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from the public concerning the renewals?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions from the board members?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?
Representative Carmody; seconded by Mr.
Coleman.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON:
The last item for Quality Jobs is going
to be the specials. We have two requests to add additional affiliates to Schedule 1 of the following contracts: 20110920, Valero Services, Inc. \& Valero Refining-New Orleans, LLC adding affiliate Diamond Green Diesel, LLC in St. Charles Parish; 20110920, Valero Services, Inc. \& Valero Refining-New Orleans, LLC adding affiliate Valero Partners Louisiana, LLC in St. Charles Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from the public regarding the additional affiliates?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve the
addition?
Made by Mr. Slone; seconded by Dr.
Wilson.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON:
We have one request to terminate the following contract: Contract Number 060764, Hexion, Inc. The company requested an early termination as of March 10, 2016. Contract compliance has been illustrated. This is in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Can you explain what happens when a contract is terminated for the Quality Jobs Program for the board members?

MR. BURTON:
Obviously Quality Jobs has a five-year contract with an option to renew for an additional five. In this scenario, the company decided to terminate early, so they'll receive no benefits past this date.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Motion by Mayor Brasseaux -I'm sorry. Are there any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the board members?
Motion has been made by Mayor Brasseaux;
seconded by Representative Carmody.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON:
The last item for Quality Jobs is a correction to a previously approved application. Contract 20111089 for IFG Port Holdings, LLC was approved by the December 20th Board of Commerce and
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Industry meeting. However, the contract effective date presented to the board on $1 / 1$ of '14 was incorrect and should correctly be 5/1e on '14 as reflected by the application received by LED.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public concerning change of date?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?
Mr. Fajardo to approve; seconded by Mr.
Slone.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Thank you, Mr. Burton.
MR. BURTON:
Thank you.
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MR. WINDHAM:
Now we'll do the Restoration Tax
Abatement Program presented by Becky Lambert.
MS . LAMBERT :
Good morning. We have five new applications for consideration of approval. And just as an added note for any new members, this Restoration Tax Abatement Program is for local tax abatement on property taxes for the improvements to the structures that are being approved only: The first one is 20140995, DOTT LLC of Texas in Jefferson; 20160043, New Bridge Partners, LLC in Orleans; 20150051, The Jung, LLC; 201402251, Treme Market Branch, LLC in Orleans. Jung is also in Orleans Parish. And the last one is 20151818, Venyu Solutions, LLC in Caddo Parish.

This concludes the application for the Restoration Tax Abatement Program.

MR. WINDHAM :
Thank you, Ms. Lambert.
Are there any comments from the public regarding the Restoration Tax Abatement applicants?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions from the board members?
Mr. Abraham (sic), Representative

Abraham (sic).
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Thank you. This is a local property tax, so these businesses, because of this, are exempt from paying those property taxes?

MS . LAMBERT :
Yes. For a five-year period, they're exempt from paying the property tax portion, the structure portion on their tax bill. It's the land and the structure, and only on the structure are they exempted or abated for a five-year period.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Is there local government input on
approval of these?
MS . LAMBERT :
Absolutely. The local governing authority receives all documentation from me, from LED, once we receive them and they are aware. The local governing authority and assessor in every parish receives documentation from us and they have to provide us a resolution in support of the project before it can move forward to the board.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
And we received that on all of these?
MS . LAMBERT :

We have resolutions from every one of them. They do not come to you without them.

MR. WINDHAM:
And Representative Abraham (sic), I'd like to point out it's only on additional expenditures, so it's not on previous value.

Yes, Representative Carmody.
REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Yes, sir. Just to clarify, you said that we had the documentation from each of these governing entities, so I'm assuming that includes the sheriff, the school board, the parish commission --

MS . LAMBERT:
No.
REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
-- or the police jury?
Can you tell me who --
MS . LAMBERT :
No. We have a resolution from the governing authority that actually issues the approval from each parish. From Orleans Parish, it happens to be the New Orleans City Council. And as I said, the New Orleans City Council and the Bureau of Treasury in Orleans Parish, because they actually issue these, the tax bill, and they request to be involved with that
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part. And, alto, the assessor's office. I get calls and questions at times, especially from parishes that don't use this program regularly, and they ask for -they ask a lot of questions, so they -- but they take it to the board, to their board or their counsel and make the decisions and issue a formal resolution allowing me to move forward to you.

## REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:

Yes, ma'am. And very quickly since the venue is in Caddo Parish and City of Shreveport, you have a resolution from the city council in support of this?

MS . LAMBERT :
Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Thank you. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Abraham (sic).
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Thank you. I just wanted to follow up.
It's only the New Orleans City Council in Orleans Parish that is required to get the approval? MS . LAMBERT :

Yes.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

Because we have other entities that actually collect local property taxes in Orleans Parish, including the school board and other entities. Are you saying that other entities that collect property taxes don't have to give their approval for this?

MS . LAMBERT :
According to rules of the program, the local governing authority is the only authority that has to respond back to me. Now, how they receive approval from their board or their authority, they may go into different ways of getting additional approvals.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
But in terms of the state requirement, we only require the local parishing authority and not all entities that receive local property taxes to approve it; correct?

MS . LAMBERT :
Correct.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any additional questions or comments?
MR. HONORE :
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Sir, please step forward and identify
yourself.

MR. HONORE :
Russel Honore, sir.
I've been accused of my memory going bad, but I thought the Governor's executive order, sir...

MR. WINDHAM :
That is for the Industrial Tax Exemption Program. This is the Restoration Tax Abatement Program, which has to do with the rehabilitation of buildings, facilities that are blighted that may be in a downtown development district or an economic development district.

MR. HONORE :
That was my question. So the Governor's executive order did not cover this?

MR. WINDHAM:
No, sir, it does not.
MR. HONORE :
Thank you, sir.
MS . LAMBERT :
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Carmody motions for
approval; seconded by Ms. Cola.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye." (Several members respond "aye.") MR. WINDHAM:

All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Thank you, Ms. Lambert.
Next we have Ms. Metoyer to present the Enterprise Zone Program.

MS . METOYER :
I have an application that was requested to be deferred until the April meeting. That's 20151855, Performance Contractors, Incorporated in EBR Parish, so we actually have 14 new applications.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Ms. Metoyer. If you'll proceed. I don't think we need a motion to remove it.

MS . METOYER:
Okay. The first application is 20150023, Elmer Candy Corporation, Tangipahoa Parish; 20130119, GSTVBR, LLC, doing business as Launch Media, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20150874, Hospital Housekeeping
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Systems, LLC, Rapides Parish; 20150875, Hospital
Housekeeping Systems, LLC, Caddo Parish; 20140917, Johnny Sanchez, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20140985 RR Hotel Partners, LLC, doing business as Home2 Suites Lafayette in Lafayette Parish; 20141542, Shaya Restaurant, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20141085, The Greater New Orleans Foundation, Orleans Parish; 20141116, Walmart Louisiana, LLC, doing business as Neighborhood Market, Ouachita Parish; 20141114, Walmart Louisiana, LLC, doing business as Neighborhood Market, Caddo Parish; 20141113, Walmart Louisiana, LLC, doing business as Neighborhood Walmart, St. Tammany Parish; 20141112, Walmart Louisiana, LLC, doing business as Neighborhood Market, EBR Parish; 20141271, Walmart Louisiana, LLC, doing business as Neighborhood Market, Jefferson Parish; and 20141232, Walmart Louisiana, doing business as Supercenter in Caddo Parish.

MR. WINDHAM :
Ms. Metoyer, can you point out for the board members that may not know why Walmart, which is a retail activity, is availed the opportunity of the Enterprise Zone benefits?

MS . METOYER:
Because they were actually excluded as of $7 / 1 / 2015$, and all of these applications were filed --
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I'm sorry. All of these advances were filed in 2014.
MR. WINDHAM:
So these are for advances that were
filed prior to the changing of --
MS . METOYER :
The advance met the clock and governs
that particular project and they weren't excluded.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
So normally we wouldn't see retail
activities and these are the ones that are coming in at the tail of the process. And I believe the same thing for the restaurant?

MS . CLAPINSKI:
Yes.
MS . METOYER :
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Restaurants and retail activities are not, in the future, unless they're advances still pending.

MS . METOYER:
There could be because these are back in contracts. There a couple of restaurants in here, too. Johnny Sanchez and Shaya, those are restaurants.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I just want to make sure that our representatives know when they changed the law, then we're not ignoring it.

Any comments from the public concerning the Enterprise Zone Applications before us?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve?
Made by Ms. Atkins; second by Dr.
Wilson.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Ms. Metoyer.
MS. METOYER:
Yes. We have eight terminations:
20130226, Plains Marketing, LP, St. James Parish. The
existing contract period is 3/8/2013 to 3/7/2018. Their requested term date is September 7, 2015. All of the hiring requirements were met and no additional jobs are anticipated. 20121115, Dyke Nelson Architecture, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish. The existing contract period is 9/25/12 to 9/24/2017, requested term date, June 30, 2015. Again, the hiring requirements were met, no additional jobs are anticipated. 20120797, Raising Cane Restaurants, LLC, St. Bernard Parish. Existing contract period 4/26/2012 to 4/25/2017. Requested term date is April 25th, 2015. Hiring requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated. 20120247, W.R. Grace \& Company, Calcasieu Parish. Existing contract period 5/1/2013 to 4/30/2018. Requested term date, October 31st, 2015. The hiring requirements were met, no additional jobs are anticipated. 20111085, Borgne Restaurant, LLC, Orleans Parish. Existing contract period November 15, 2011 to November 14 of 2016. The requested term date is January 1, 2015. The hiring requirements were met. No additional jobs are anticipated. 20101107, Rapides Healthcare System, LLC, Rapides Parish, and the contract period was February 1, 2011 to January 31 of 2016. The requested term date is July 31 of 2013. The requirements were met, no additional jobs are anticipated. 20100935, Notami

Hospitals of Louisiana, Incorporated, St. Tammany Parish. Existing contract period, October 29, 2010 to October 28th, 2015. Requested term date April 28th, 2013. The hiring requirements were met, no additional jobs anticipated. And 20100936, University Healthcare Systems, LLC, Orleans Parish. Existing contract period 10/29/10 to 10/28/2015. Requested term date, April 28, 2013 and no additional jobs are anticipated.

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

MS . METOYER:
Terminations.
MR. WINDHAM:
Terminations. I'm sorry. Terminations.
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions from the board members?
President Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Just I think we've asked this before, but just for more clarification. When the date has 2015 and 2013, we go -- the governing authority goes back and catches up those abatements or whatever, if there were
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any given, from 2013 through 2016, whenever this --
MS . METOYER:
Are you asking if there's a recouping of the benefits? No, sir, not for terminations.

MR. MILLER:
So it ended on 2013. They're just coming here now in '17 to get this terminated?

MS . METOYER :
Yes. There's nothing in the rules that says they have to request it.

MR. MILLER:
So there was no rebate or tax abatement or anything else --

MS . METOYER:
If they got their benefits --
MR. MILLER:
-- after '13? After '13 in this case.
MS . METOYER :
The rules allow them to term contracts after 30 months and they met all of the requirements and filed all of the forms.

MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Clapinski?
MS . CLAPINSKI:
Sure. Just to clarify, this is another
jobs creation the department has, so there are two benefits. There is a per job credit, and there's also either the investment tax credit or the sales and use tax rebate on the capital expenditures.

Basically what's happened here is the company met their requirements. They have received the benefits on the jobs they have created as well as capital expenditures they have performed, but there's no longer any projected benefits going forward, so they won't -- if they cancel and they create jobs past that, there's no benefit at that point, but they do keep the benefits they've received, but they have met the requirements of the program.

MS . METOYER:
If they term. I'm sorry.
MS. CLAPINSKI:
Correct.
MS . METOYER :
There's a big difference in terming and cancel.

## MS. CLAPINSKI :

That's correct.
MS . METOYER :
If you cancel, everything's goes back to the state, but these are terminations. I do have one
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cancelation.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
Any other questions by the board
members?
There's a motion by Mayor Brasseaux to approve; seconded by Ms. Heather Malone.

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

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Ms. Metoyer.
MS . METOYER:
Okay. I have one contract cancelation. It's 20111146, Dolphin Services, LLC in Terrebonne Parish. The company did not meet the EZ requirements and they requested cancelation, and whatever benefits they received will be recouped from the state.

MR. WINDHAM:
So the Department of Revenue or
whomever --
MS . METOYER:

I will be notifying them today or
tomorrow.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Any comments from the public concerning the cancelation of Dolphin Services' contract?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion? Made by Mr. Fajardo. Is there a second? By President Miller.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Ms. Metoyer.
MS . METOYER:
I have a request to add an additional owner to an existing contract. It's 20071374, Stirling Properties, LLC. The new LLC member is Slidell
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Development Company, LLC. This is in St. Tammany Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
And the purpose of adding a member is?
MS . METOYER:
Usually is for sales and use tax or ITC benefits.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay.
MS . METOYER:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public concerning the addition of a member to an Enterprise Zone Program?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions or comments from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion? Made by Mr. Slone; seconded by Dr. Miller (sic).

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . METOYER :
That concludes the Enterprise Zone.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.
Next we have Ms. Kristin Cheng for the
Industrial Tax Exemption Program.
MS . CHENG:
Good morning.
MR. WINDHAM:
Good morning. We have 16 new
applications.
MS . CHENG:
Sixteen new applications. They all had advances filed prior to the issue of the executive order of June 24, 2016.

MR. WINDHAM:
So none of these would be subject to the executive order?

MS . CHENG:
That's correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley?

MR. ADLEY:
Before we take all of them, the very last one, Tri-State Industries, is the only one on the list that has companies that did not add any jobs in their application and it's new.

MS . CHENG:
They do have -- they have four new jobs. They have zero construction jobs.

MR. ADLEY:
Oh, I found it. I'm sorry. I missed it.

MS . CHENG:
It's usually because of the workers at the company --

MR. ADLEY:
I guess the one I should be looking at is BASF that did the construction jobs. Am I reading that right?

MS . CHENG:
That is correct.
MS. ADLEY:
So when they make -- I understand under the old rules there was no requirement for jobs, but do y'all ask them at all or they just say it's no requirement, so we're not putting anything down? I
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mean, I assume there's going to some am jobs that's created.

MS . CHENG:
I did ask them and they said it was a retention project or something like that. It's on the application. Hold on.

MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have a representative from BASF?
MR. YURA:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Can we please step forward, identify yourself? There may be questions.

MR. YURA:
Good morning. I'm Tom Yura. I'm the site general manager for the BASF Geismar facility.

MR. WINDHAM:
Can you say your name again?
MR. YURA:
Tom Yura, Y-u-r-a.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yura. All right. Thank you, Mr. Yura.
MR. YURA:
Sure.
MR. WINDHAM:

Mr. Adley, do you have a question?
MR. ADLEY:
We were just curious. I noticed the construction jobs. I didn't see any new jobs. I'm just curious. I understand we're not required to offer up any or even put any in your application. I'm just curious, are there any new jobs associated with it?

MR. YURA:
Sure. I guess if you look at the applications for the new ones that you have, you want me to go ahead and address all of them at the same time? MR. ADLEY:

Yeah. That's what I'm looking at. It's zero all of the way down.

MR. YURA:
Sure. Sure. So those are five different; right, those are five different applications for five different jobs. So if you look at the first one, the 20140230, that is one for a compressed reliability project for compressed air. So if you look at it, for us, that is a key reliability project to ensure that all of the installations that we have running at the plant will be able to continue to run. All right. So construction jobs, yes, there are construction jobs that go on. For me, this is a base

MEETING MINUTES
infrastructure project that keeps things --
MR. ADLEY:
So those are more additions to the plant?

MR. YURA:
Well, one is. One is not. The next one that you look on the list, the 45-million, that is our new methylenes plant, and so when we're working with the LED, we can always choose which program we want to be in; right? We can go quality jobs; we can go ITEP. So for this one, we decided to work the state on the ITEP program. This was a brand new facility that we put in.

MR. ADLEY:
But if you had a chance to go with Quality Jobs, there were obviously some jobs coming with this one.

MR. YURA:
Sure.
MR. ADLEY:
How many were there?
MR. YURA:
For the methylenes plant, I don't want to lie to you, sir, so I wouldn't want to tell you what number. We'd have to go back and look that those numbers.

## REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:

What about an estimate?
MR. YURA:
Estimate, sure.
REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Ballpark.
MR. YURA:
Ballpark, you're looking at plus or
minus 20.
MR. ADLEY:
And then the other three, are they
additions or --
MR. YURA:
So the next one, which is our BDO expansion, that is a 20 percent capacity expansion in one of our existing facilities, so what those is, although it didn't add any new operators to that, what it did is it allows us to increase our capacity, which makes us globally competitive. So, for me, from a retention perspective, this is a big one because we have production in other parts of the world. If I can have our Geismar facility producing even more, then I look at downturn in markets. I look at growing our market. This keeps my facility moving. It was a substantial investment; right, that we wound up putting in.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Yura, if I may, on the methylene
project, all of those are BASF employees?
MR. YURA :
Yes, sir. That is correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
MR. YURA :
And then if I move down to the next one on the list, that is an NVP, normal Vinylpyrrolidone. That is an intervenient that is produced, so that's also a large -- or relative, money wise, that's a small expansion when you look at it, but what that will do, that will provide an intermediate that will go then to another plant in another set of production to help that business grow as well.

So what this does is this continues to, I will say, add meat to us, continue to bulk us up and makes us a more viable site to continue to grow in our region and it continues to provide more and more employment, longer term and protect the jobs that we have today because I've got to be viable against my competition. I've got to be viable against -- we produce in other regions of the word.

MR. WINDHAM:

Any questions for Mr . Yura?
Representative Abraham (sic) ?
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
How many jobs do you believe that you retained as a result of this investment that you would have otherwise lost?

MR. YURA:
That is a good question. Again, if you look at ballpark -- and I'd be happy to go ahead and talk about the general job growth we've had at the Geismar plant site and just look at complete --

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I guess let me just ask do you believe that you've retained jobs that you would have otherwise lost?

MR. YURA:
Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Because if you look at any of the products, if you look at BDO, BDO is produced in Japan, it's produced in China, it's produced in Europe, it's produced here. Because of our natural gas pricing, right, it gives us a competitive advantage so that when there's a downturn in the market, you always look at the broad portfolio across the company to determine where we're most cost competitive. REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

Other than these, does BASF have any other applications that have been submitted after the Governor's order?

MR. YURA:
After the Governor's -- no, sir. That I'm aware of.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
These are the last ones that the company has?

MR. YURA:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER:
Would your company have made those investments if there wasn't a potential 10-year break on property taxes?

MR. YURA:
In some of the these cases, the answer would be no, because that would be a deciding factor when you start looking at all things being equal. Again, when we have the capabilities to invest globally, my job; right, is as a supplier for the Geismar sit and to bring investment here to the state. For me, I've got to have every possible tool in my arsenal that the LED
gives me to be globally competitive because you will always look at does it make more sense to expand in Region A or Region B. We do the economic analysis, and these incentives that you allow us to have in which we return ongoing, consistent job growth. We continue to return sales tax, now utilities tax and now inventory tax; right? These are key things that help me fight for investment and be globally competitive.

MR. ADLEY:
I assume most of the different regions that you just referenced are located somewhere inside that natural gas supply that gives that competitive edge; is that a fair statement, or -- when you said "regions," can you kind of tell me what that is, where that is?

MR. YURA :
Regions. Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
You mentioned inside your regions.
MR. YURA:
Right. So for us within a region for me is a business will produce in the region of Asia, will produce in the region of Europe, will produce in the region of North, South America. So in my region; right, North, South America, natural gas can give me an
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advantage. When $I$ compete against other regions, meaning North America or Asia, because many of the raw materials from Asia will come from coal and from more expensive raw materials, $I$ can have a competitive advantage when the delta between oil and natural gas is large.

Now that oil and natural gas is much tighter, the difference in raw material advantage goes much smaller, and once that becomes much smaller, incentive programs --

MR. ADLEY:
I get that. What I'm trying to find out is the geographic location of these regions. I mean, I assume geographically for your plant they really need to be somewhere associated nearby to some supply, particularly pipelines somewhere. Is that a fair statement?

MR. YURA:
It depends, sir. Many of these products are globally moved. I can produce products, and, in fact, one of the products that $I$ have the expansion for, the NVP. Today, we're producing it and loading it in ISO containers and we're actually shipping that to China. So many of these products, if the competitive advantage is strong enough, allows me to export to other
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regions that normally we would import in.
MR. ADLEY:
I got it. Thank you very much.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Mr. Yura.
Any other questions?
I'm sorry. Yes, Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Not for Mr. Yura.
MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, not for Mr. Yura. All right.
Any other questions for Mr. Yura?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you Mr. Yura.
All right. With that, Ms. Cheng, if
you'll proceed.
MS . CHENG:
Did he have a question for me?
MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry. Scott, is yours in general
or a specific?
MR. RICHARD:
It's a question in regards to the two
large projects in Calcasieu Parish.
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MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. Can we wait until we get to
those?
MR. RICHARD :
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Ms. Cheng, if you'll
proceed.
MS . CHENG:
20140230, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish; 20141553, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish; 20150293, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish; 20151372, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish; 20171096, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish; 20121342, Entergy Louisiana, LLC - Ninemile Point in Jefferson Parish; 20151305, Entergy New Orleans, Inc. A B Patterson Solar Plant in Orleans Parish; 20151086, LACC, LLC US in Calcasieu Parish; 20151087, Lotte Chemical Louisiana, LLC in Calcasieu Parish; 20130436, Marathon Petroleum Company, LP in St. John the Baptist Parish; 20150126, Monroe Iron \& Metal Company, Incorporated, dba Auto Shred of LA, Ouachita Parish; 20141270, Performance Energy Services, LLC in Terrebonne Parish; 20141612, Performance Energy Services, LLC in Jefferson Parish; 20141070, Shintech Louisiana, LLC in

Iberville Parish; 20130358A, Shintech Louisiana, LLC in West Baton Rouge Parish; and 20141475, Tri-State Industries of Louisiana, LLC in Rapides Parish. MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Ms. Cheng.
We have some questions concerning some of these applications.

Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
While we certainly are excited about the economic boom going on in Calcasieu Parish, in regards the these two large projects, just last week the Calcasieu Parish School Board had to issue a bond to work towards adding new classrooms at 11 schools in the district to address the overcrowding in many of their schools. I'm just curious, have these two business entities had any conversations with the local school officials or other local government bodies to address some of the strain on the infrastructure with the movement of these projects going forward? And, again, it's not an effort to be critical of the massive economic development going on in Calcasieu. That's probably a shining star in the nation night now, but it's an observation as a member of this board in regards
to the executive order and the effort to have local government more involved in those discussions.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any members from LAC or Lotte Chemical Corporation, please step forward.

Secretary Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
If I may speak while they approach just to help maybe provide some context and some background to the board. Calcasieu Parish is a very dynamic environment today under some great leadership over there at the city and parish level. Mayor Roach lead the community back from Rita, and they've long had what we call a "GO Group" that is working to make sure that law enforcement, traffic, schools, industry, all of the elements that come with this massive investment that they're experiencing there are addressed and coordinated to the best of their ability. So we are very aware that Sasol and a number of other companies are in these kinds of conversations.

I want to yield the floor and let Lotte and LACC speak for themselves, but I do want the board to know that there are very sophisticated and coordinated efforts to deal with more short-term growth that they happen comes with this massive construction
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boom and then what happens when that boom is over and how the community is left in a well-organized manner to proceed forward.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Pierson.
Gentlemen, please justify yourself, tell us who you represent.

MR. ROCK :
My name is Jim Rock and I'm a site executive director for Lotte. Not Latte.

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry.
MR. ROCK :
I get that all of the time. Lotte Chemical Corporation and LACC.

MR. WINDHAM:
Both of them? Okay.
BRODERICK:
Jesse Broderick with SumIT Credit, assisting Mr. Rock.

MR. WINDHAM:
I believe -- can you respond to
Mr. Richard's question?
MR. ROCK:
Yeah. I believe the question had to do
with the local school board, and we have been in contact with the school board --

MR. ADLEY:
Can you get a little closer to the mic?
Thank you.
MR. RICK :
Oh, I'm sorry.
And we have had discussions with the school board superintendent, Karl Bruchhaus, who is somebody I've known for probably 10 or 15 years, and also with the police juries and other chambers. We were recently granted the Enterprise Zone with the Calcasieu police jury and about two weeks ago.

MR. BRODERICK:
I just wanted to point out that we do -and I don't know if you've got it in your package -- we do have letters from the alliance. You know, their comment is, "We're not opposed to the approval of this project," and it is signed by the school board and the police jury.

MR. RICHARD:
Yes, sir. Thank you for explaining that. My intent was not to be critical at all. It was to get on the record as we move forward with the new requirements and rules that there's probably some things
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that other parishes and other areas of the state can learn from the process that you-all have set up in Calcasieu Parish --

MR. BRODERICK :
Yes, sir.
MR. RICHARD:
-- in regards to your conversations and your negotiations with local governmental bodies on how to integrate these massive projects and not overwhelm the basic infrastructure that government provides in regards to basic safety with the police force and your school system for education.

Thank you for being here today.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, gentlemen.
Do any other board members have any questions for Mr. Rock or Jesse?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, gentlemen.
Are there any other questions regarding any of the applications just --

MR. HONORE :
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Are there any comments from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Please step forward and identify
yourself.
MR. HONORE :
Russel Honore. I guess as an individual citizen, the type there would be fundamental issue that I have with continue to improve these very programs right here, while they look good on paper, they're not turning around to the grater good of the public in this very parish that has a school system that can't support the children. The state's broke, trying to find 318-million. Last year, you gave Sasol over 2-billion in this very parish. We've got a fundamental issue here that we need the board of LED to look at. The heyday of giving away tax exemptions when we can't build schools is fundamentally broke. At some point in time, the Governor's going to have to start working for the people. And my objection, sir, is the continuation of this type of tax exemption when we've got schools that are not properly supported in the parish with all of this economic development, if the system was working woe wouldn't have this problem. This is the reason you were
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created, and it's not working.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Honore.
I believe we were going to have a set of
rules that are -- first we had to executive order.
These were applications that were filed prior to the executive order being enforced. We have the executive order, and all applications that come following that executive order are subject to that executive order. This rules committee that was headed up by Mr. Robert Adley and this entire board has taken great steps, along with the Governor's office and with input from the public, to develop a set of rules that will help to address your concerns. Those rules will be presented at the end of this meeting or toward the end of this meeting.

MR. HONORE:
Thank you.
Mr. -
MR. BAGERT:
Bagert.
MR. WINDHAM :
-- Bagert, please step forward and
identify yourself.
MS . CHENG:

Mr. Windham, I just wanted to note that these were advances filed before the executive order, but the applications may have come in after.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you for that correction. I'm am so sorry. It's for advances that were filed prior to the executive order, which is what we are under.

MR. BAGERT :
I'm Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana. I think everyone should have a report we've done, which includes some general analysis of the ITEP exemption issued last year along with some specific analysis of exemptions that are before you today. I'd like, if it's okay, to include some comments that go beyond just these so I'm not coming back and forth, but I can --

MR. WINDHAM:
Let's stick just to these specific.
MR. BAGERT :
All right. So these raise a concern that we don't think is adequately addressed in the rules, and we just heard it play out. If the requirement to create or retain jobs is interpreted to mean that any investment that is where the investment is related to jobs is justified as creating or retaining
jobs, then that requirement to create jobs will be entirely meaningless. The stipulation ought to be that the exemption itself is necessary for the underlying investment to take place.

So one thing that we anticipated when the executive order comes into force for advances filed after the date of the executive order, every company that is not creating any net new number of jobs, the same investments that they need to run their company are going to be related by their own accounting to the retention of jobs, and we won't have any change in what's happened in the Industrial Tax Exemption this far, so this is not an unusual thing.

There are standards that programs across the country put in place for how you distinguish ordinary investments that would happen anyway and investments that would generally create jobs or instances where, for a specific reason, the company is considering moving and there's a direct location in place, and under those circumstances, you can talk meaningfully about the retention of jobs. But this kind of blanket assumption that if you're making an investment that's important for your company that is creating or rentention of jobs is going to render the jobs requirement of the executive order meaningless. So

I say that as a blanket is something to look at going forward.

MR. WINDHAM:
And I have a question related to that. Do you have sources of those programs that show this board, the public, how it's done in other states that you can get us?

MR. BAGERT :
We do. And, actually, you do, too. In the Quality Jobs Program, any element that has a sort of more rigorous assessment of whether jobs are actually created, so there are examples both in this state and others that we will gladly get to you before the next meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I'd appreciate that just for my edification.

Any questions for Mr. Bagert?
MR. ADLEY:
Before he leaves, $I$ just want to clarify one thing. I clearly understand your comments about the retention issue, but let me tell you from the Governor's office that he viewed retention as an issue that's important, but important to the degree that it requires a whole lot more explanation than we ever had before. I
think it's also important to note that inside the new rules, which will not only be this board asking about retention or new jobs, it's going to be the local government who is going to be granting, for all practical purposes, what property tax exemption that they get.

I would like to hope and think that the local government will make their decision based upon what's in the best interest for them and the creation of jobs in their parish. So albeit it has a retention piece in it, it still involves local government who's going to have to make that final decision about what's in their best interest because it is their tax dollars that we're giving up.

MR. BAGERT :
Well, and we think the local input requirement, as we'll here later on, is absolutely fundamental, and the reason why this program was going so out of control was the disconnect between the location of the authority granting the exemptions and the location of where the exemptions are felt.

MR. ADLEY:
I will tell you --
MR. BAGERT:
If there -- go ahead.

MR. ADLEY:
I want to tell you, Broderick, that as y'all participate in the process, we appreciate everything that $y$ 'all have done, but $I$ would just ask everybody to remember we have taken steps, huge steps, beyond where this state has ever been before on this issue. The debate between the retention and the new, when local government is now at the table, to me, is more important.

MR. BAGERT:
We have taken them in principle and they have heroic, courageous and historic steps, but steps taken in principle don't necessarily amount to changes in fact unless they are enforced with real teeth. And I think that's the place where we're at between steps having been taken in principle and those being enforced in fact. And part --

MR. ADLEY:
And real teeth is now the local
government. I mean, they clear -- this state has historically pretty much shown its position where it will be on these things. Locals have not. That's where your teeth is. The locals will have absolute final say on what goes on in their parish as what they are willing to give up.

MR. BAGERT :
And, again, we think that's and extremely important and one part of a maybe three-part plank.

Here's the reality though: Nobody wants to say no to major employers when they're asking for something. We don't. Y'all are okay saying no to us, but not to major employers when there's a specific instance; right. Any -- the members of this board, just like the members of local bodies, don't have the ability to independently verify retention claims. You don't have the ability to go see if, in fact, that this is truly related to an investment that otherwise without this exemption wouldn't be made and without being made would leave the state.

With that being the case, all we have is the company sitting before you, and that is, without those criteria being in place to say here is what we're going to count as retention and here is what we're going to count as job creation, it opens a large loophole through which we could have the retention --

MR. ADLEY:
I get you, but for the record, this state, for all practical purposes, is giving away 10-year exemption. That's what we've always done with
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no say so from local government whatsoever. And the piece that you failed to share with this board is that we met some middle grounds that we thought were very important. Instead of this full 10-year deal that everybody's had, the first five at 100 percent, we capped with rules going forward those renewals at 80 percent. That's \$500-million back to local government, and without them saying a word. And I don't know how much more you can really do then. I mean, it's there. And those are the numbers. And so as we work through this process, when you've been historically doing it one way for so long, I mean, it's just so far you can go and you do the very best. And the Governor has taken huge steps and I'm going to defend what he has done here. Clearly I said in the meetings with him when businesses, when they talk about retention, his view of retention is, I think he's going to say, does that mean the plant's going to shut down? It's not just necessarily retention. It's more about, you know, is it absolutely required to keep it here.

## MR. BAGERT:

So and that's our intent. We see the executive order has got four planks. One is that the investment should have -- or the exemption should be related to job creation or genuine job retention. The
second is that miscellaneous capital additions are no longer eligible. The third is local input, and the fourth is the second year, the renewal should be three years instead of five. Of those, the three years instead of five is, you know, virtually statutory in place.

The other three all require proactive action to implement. MCAs can be just tucked into advanced notices, and without some means to distinguish what were previously MCAs and now are tucked into advanced notices, you're going to get in place of the advanced notices that have MCAs inside of them. Without some way to distinguish between investments that genually are about job creation or retention versus ordinary investments that are going to be presented, and in some general, philosophical way, any investment in a Capital Enterprise is about jobs retention sort of if investments weren't made, so they're not off base without having more clear standards established in saying, "Sure it's related to jobs retention," just like any investment in a capitalist company is going to be related to jobs retention.

So we're saying in order to fulfill the historic and courageous executive order, they're going to need to be some specific measures put in place that
allow these judgments to be made. Otherwise, we think it will end up looking like a lot like we did in the last --

MR. ADLEY:
And that's very possible, but moving forward on the rules committee, we can certainly look at that, but sooner or later, we need to adopt some rules. And every time we put some out here and you come with more changes, it's that further down the road we get before we ever adopt what you say are massive steps forward.

MR. BAGERT :
So what --
MR. ADLEY:
The rules committee continues to meet, but each time you bring something out here to finally get it on the books wanting another little piece here and another little piece there, I'm just telling you it delays the process. It's just the way the process works. You're under the Administrative Procedures Act, and each time you do that, you just continue to delay, for whatever it's worth.

MR. BAGERT:
Well, we've been raising these concerns consistently since the beginning of this process, and
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MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, sir. We have been listening to you, Mr. Bagert.

Secretary Pierson, I believe you have a... SECRETARY PIERSON:

Just a moment of clarification. Part of my responsibilities as a leader is to provide some indication, and you said the word "Quality Jobs." I think it's variety important for everyone here to know that we are on completely different buckets. You see us turn the pages of our agenda up here, and when we do that, we're moving from one program to another program to another program, and so largely your comments, and I'll respond to those later on, are about our Industrial Tax Exemption Program. But programs like Quality Jobs don't yield any money at all until there's an audit, until it's proven that the company employed more people, then they get their benefit relative to what their improved performance is. Every one of these programs is governed by contracts, by audits and by performance requirements, and $I$ want to continue to make that point. That point was weak in our previous Industrial Tax Exemption Program, and that remedy has been afforded by our Governor's executive order to finally provide for
that accountability at the front end of that program where they declare what it is that the local entities are going to get in terms of their participation in the program and in terms of jobs and investment.

So just to wrap up, because you brought Quality Jobs into your discussion, I want people to know these are very carefully audited programs, and we'll talk about philosophies a --

MR. BAGERT:
And, Mr. Pierson --
MR. WINDHAM:
I want to point out --
MR. BAGERT:
May I just ask Mr. Pierson real quickly. Mr. Windham raised the question are there examples in other states where there is the kind of rigorous vetting to separate wheat from chaff in terms of genuine job creation and retention. Job retention and creation. You don't even have to go that far. You have them inside of some programs that are under your purview, Quality Jobs being one of them. So it's a separate bucket, but the example or one example of the kind of more rigorous vetting to genually establish whether jobs are being established. Is it that that would be the one that should be used wholesale? No, we don't think so,
but if you're saying that there will be that kind of auditing and vetting of the Industrial Tax Exemption Program, that's exactly what we think would be needed to have the executive order be implemented in its fullest. MR. WINDHAM:

Let me clarify what $I$ was saying. You said that there are examples in other states that quantify the necessity of the retention activity. The Quality Jobs program is a creation program, so you can't lean to that and say that Quality Jobs provides this staff, this board or the people the aspect of how other states determine whether or not something is in fact a retention activity. So that's all I'm for as related to retention.

MR. BAGERT :
Oh, yeah.
MR. WINDHAM:
The second thing $I$ want to point out is we are moving with the work of this board, this Governor, the rules committee, we are moving now from what you call principle to fact. By changing the rules, we are taking those steps. So if you'll just hold on for a little while, at the end of this meeting, we will go over the rules that will take principle to fact. Those will be the new rules moving forward.

MAJOR COLEMAN:
Mr. Chairman, I have one question.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Major Coleman.
MAJOR COLEMAN:
Yes. Where have you-all been the last 20 years? Why now? I mean, it's been screwed up for years, so why now? We're trying to fix it. Where have you been? Answer the question.

MR. BAGERT :
People say that -- any time a, quote, test historical injustice has been in place for a long time, there are people saying, "Well, we've always done it that way," and anytime there are those circumstances, there are people who say, "Well, maybe that's case, but that doesn't mean we need do it that way going forward."

We're the first to say, on behalf of the citizens of this state, we have all been asleep for 83 years, ever since Governor Richard Leche snuck a constitutional amendment that's got no precedent in comparison to anywhere in the county into a vote of the people tucked behind the exemption for churches and the homestead exemption. It was about nine lines of text that granted the state board the authority to give exemptions at the local level. We think that what the

Governor did eight months ago this month was a huge move to start rectifying that, and we think it is going to take the effort of this board and the community and the legerity of the Governor a lot of continued rigorous effort getting into the details in order to correct what's been the case for the last 80 years.

So, you know, where have we been?
Asleep. Where are we now? Awake. And we think that it is going to take an effort in partnership to make it happen.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any other comments or questions?
MR. ADLEY:
I want to clarify, I threw out a number of 500-million, and I've got some of my legislative friends here, so when $I$ pull out a number like that, I want to tell you where it came from so there's no misinterpretation of what was said.

It would be worth $500-\mathrm{milli}$ on today if you cap the current amount of ITEP that you had in place at the 20 percent would be about 500-million. I think that's where that number comes from.

MR. WINDHAM:
And that's over a 10-year period, not just in one year. That's over a 10-year period.

MR. BAGERT :
That would be the last two years of exemption --

MR. ADLEY:
No, that's not over a 10-year period. That's your annualized -- I believe that's your annualized number that's being removed from local government every year from the property tax.

MS COLA:
Just a word, please.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Ms. Cola.
MS . COLA:
Just a few comments to for you, sir.
I agree. I think we all have been at some level asleep at the wheel, and I guess what comes to my mind is that $I$ know the board and the committee has been working very hard to try to fix some of the things that we know are broken and I think that we all can agree upon that. I think what's troubling to me is that you want instant change, but you were willing to deal with a broken system for many, many years. I don't think that -- I can speak for me. I don't want to speak on behalf of the board. I think that we all want change. What we want strategic, well-thought-out
change, and whatever goes through or however this process ends, we know that it won't be perfect and I think that we've taken your comments to heart and we've tried to integrate that into the rules that you'll hear later on this afternoon. And I think Senator Adley said it, our ears are always open for how we can make this thing better. But I think that for the demands I'm feeling of make this right now is probably just as unfair as the changes that you were not willing to deal with for years past when it was previously broken.

So what I'm going to ask of you, sir, is that you afford us the time and give us the confidence that we want to make this thing right and give us the opportunity to do just that.

MR. BAGERT :
Well, if anything in my statements was taken to indicate an expectation that you make this right right now, I think that was either miscommunicated or misconstrued because what the message was is we anticipate several specific areas that in the future will be essential to determining whether the goal of this board, this department and this governor are implementing. One of them being whether there is teeth behind what retention means. The other being whether there are MCAs. So that is not at all a "When do we
want it," you know, "Right now." We're actually saying please look ahead to the conversation that just happened and imagine that happening again and again and again without some clear, distinguishing criteria to separate job retention from ordinary investments that anybody would need to make just to keep their activity going.

So we want to work with you. We don't have unreasonable expectations about timing, but we do know that if there is nothing to distinguish the past -you know, to the extent we have things to distinguish the past from the future, we'll have change. To the extent we don't, we won't. We think we are beginning to see some real measures that there's local input in some way, that there's three years instead of five on the second term. That -- there's no way to distinguish what counts as job retention is one way where the past -- the future could look a lot like the past unless we start creating some ways to head that off.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Broderick, Mr. Bagert.
Mr. Miller, President Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Yield.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Any other comments from the
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public regarding the applications that are in front of us? Please step forward, identify yourself and tell us who you represent.

MS . WASCOM:
I'm Kathy Wascom. I represent Louisiana Environmental Action Network. I got up to speak because the question was asked where have you been all of these years.

MR. WINDHAM :
Wait, though. Specific to these applications, do you have any comments?

MS . WASCOM:
Okay. No, sir, other than I think I was there at the original Shintech hearing, oh, I don't know, maybe 20 years ago, but we do have -- we did do a lien, since it's environmental organization. We hired an economics firm, ECONorthwest. We did a whole evaluation of the Industrial Tax Exemption probably about 20 years ago, which says essentially the same thing. So that -- people have been not been asleep. MR. WINDHAM:

So this related specifically to
Shintech?
MR. WASCOM:
Thank you for during the conversation.

No, but the same things were brought up during the original Shintech hearing as are now.

Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Wascom.
Sir, something specific to these
applications in front of us?
MR. HONORE :
Sir, my recommendation that all actions to give any more exemptions and/or extensions be delayed in this body until the state is no longer broke. We cannot continue to give away any type of exemptions to any company. Our state is broke. We've driven the truck in the ditch. We cannot continue to give away any type of revenue from the state. The book is broke.

I with worked with the governor for 37
years. If I overspent the money, I could be court-martialed. I'm not asking that to happen to this body, but this state government is broke. We've got a special session going on. This should be stopped now. We should suspend this program, continue to review it so y'all can meet monthly, but suspend any further actions that would give away any type of exemptions. Our schools are broke; our roads are broke.

Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
Any questions or comments? Yes, Mr.
Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Unless you have more comments, I'd like to make a motion, unless you have anymore comments.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any other comments concerning these applications?

Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Is she...
MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, I'm sorry. Another comment concerning these applications in front of us?

MS. COLLINS :
Yes. How are you this morning?
MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MS. COLLINS:
I'm Dawn Collins. I'm a member of East Baton Rouge School Board.

MR. WINDHAM:
And which applications are you addressing?

MS. COLIINS:
All of them.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay.
MS. COLLINS:
Brief comment.
I want to first start off by saying I appreciate the committee's efforts. I also have great appreciation for our Governor John Bel Edwards. I campaigned very hard for him personally, but I would just like to put on everyone's mind that as we have convened for a special session here at State Capitol -or at the State Capitol, rather, to fix huge budget gaps, this is an opportunity -- and I know that many of your hearts feel the same, but I think it just needs to still be said. This is an opportunity to right some wrongs that have come about for the past 83 years.

MR. WINDHAM:
So may interrupt just for a second?
So which application does this apply to?
MS. COLLINS:
All of them.
MR. SLONE:
There's no Baton Rouge applications.

MR. WINDHAM:
There's no Baton Rouge applications on here.

MS. COLLINS :
I'm speaking as a school board member that's a member of Louisiana State School Board Association.

MR. WINDHAM:
I believe -- and I could be wrong, but when we get to the section for the rules changes would be the appropriate time for you to make your comments. Not -- these are specific on these applications.

MS. COLLINS:
Thank you for your time. I just wanted to put on everyone's heart that this is an opportunity to right wrongs.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Look forward to you coming back at the appropriate time.

MS. COLLINS :
I have another meeting to go to, so I thank you for your time.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
All right. Mr. Adley.

MR. ADLEY:
I'm going to make a motion,
Mr. Chairman. Before I do, I just wanted to make some comments. Comments had been made, if you'll follow the agenda today, when you get down to the new MCA applications filed after June the 24 th, you're going get an opportunity to see firsthand how these new rules work, and I think you'll be very pleased with what you see.

The problem is we cannot just simply reject and delay on all of these today is that before this Governor came in office, commitments were made to people, and those commitments, albeit we agree or disagree with them, they were commitments made in the name of Louisiana. And if we start making changes, that makes it appear that Louisiana has violated its word would do us more harm than any good we could accomplish with the delay. That is what we believe. And I think that's true. And LED has made that very clear to the Governor that you just simply cannot tarnish the words of Louisiana. Albeit we disagree, when people enter into contracts other people did before us, but those agreements we have to honor. But going forward, we clearly can make changes, and if you'll be patient, I think when you get on down in the agenda, you're going
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to see some of those changes beginning to take place and they're pretty extensive.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask
that we move to approve in globo this list of ITEP applications filed prior to June 24th.

MR. JONES:
Second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Mr. Jones. Motion made by Mr. Adley.

Are there any further comments from the public specifically to these applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions or comments from
the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.

Ms. Cheng.
MS. CHENG:
Okay. We have six applications that were filed without advance notifications after the Governor's executive order. I do want to mention that 20161569, Motiva Enterprises, St. James has been withdrawn by the company.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you. Let me ask this real quickly. Why are these being presented to us?

MS . CHENG:
These are being presented because they have been presented to LED and the board can take action on them as LED cannot hold them.

MR. WINDHAM:
Because we don't have rules in place that will allow you to hold them?

MS . CHENG:
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
So based upon the fact that the executive order does not allow for miscellaneous capital additions failed after that date, $I$ will entertain a motion to deny these.

Motion by Mr. Moller.

MR. ADLEY:
Before you do that. Yeah, I'll second it, but before you do that, I want to clarify something. MR. WINDHAM:

Seconded by Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
The rules don't necessarily require that they will keep all of these to themselves. I mean, only the board, as I understood it from Mr. House, that only the board could make the decision to deny things, so they will come to us in the future, but I wanted you -this is the place in the agenda, Mr. Broderick, Together Louisiana, that I wanted you to see. These are applications that came after the 24 th and they have no jobs associated with them and --

MR. WINDHAM:
And they're miscellaneous capital additions.

MR. ADLEY:
-- therefore, we disapprove them.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. House.
MR. HOUSE :
Richard House, Louisiana Economic
Development.

Let me add one things to what Senator Adley said. When you pass -- ultimately pass the new rules, which are being considered today and as part of the administrative process, when you pass these new rules, they provide exactly what you're talking about with respect to miscellaneous capital additions, which is basically those would be few and far between. Once that's in the rules for this body, then the staff will not be presenting these any longer.

Any questions about that?
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions from any of the board members concerning Mr. House's statement -interpretation of the rules?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. There's a motion on the floor. There's a second.

Are there any comments from the public concerning the motion to deny miscellaneous capital additions filed after June 24th?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are any of the companies in here who would like to make comments related to miscellaneous

MEETING MINUTES
capital addition applications filed after June 24th, the effective date of the executive order?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions, comments or observations from any of the board members concerning miscellaneous capital additions applications filed after the effective date, June 24 th , of the executive order?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor of denial, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
There are 117 renewals, and these were all filed timely.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I believe Mr. Adley wants to make a motion related to this prior to any questions being made.

MR. ADLEY:
These are all prior to June the 24 th ?
MR. WINDHAM:
And they are renewals.
MR. ADLEY:
And they are renewals. And I want to make a motion to adopt and approve all of them in globo after questions to I think there's three or four of the companies that actually decreased the number of jobs from the time they got the original application, which is simply ask them to tell us why we saw a reduction in jobs so that we can at least gather that information.

And I think there's three of them, Chand, Entergy --
MR. WINDHAM:
Wait. Now, there's a motion, then we'll have the questions, Mr . Adley.

There's a motion on the floor to approve them in globo; seconded by Mr. Jones.

Now we'll proceed to questions.
Questions by board members related to specific applications. Please begin, Mr. Adley.

MR. ADLEY:
There were just three companies. I'm proud the say so all of you can hear it, there were only 22 applications that saw a reduction in jobs out of 117.

I think that's a positive step forward, and those 22 consisted of like three companies making up all of the applications.

So Chand, there's a decrease, small number, but I'd just like to know why we went through a degrease for them. And Entergy, if you will share with us the same thing. And Hexion. Am I saying that right, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{n}$ ?

MS . CHENG:
Hexion.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative from Chand, Hexion and Entergy? Please step forward.

MR. ROUSSEL:
My name is Craig Roussel. I'm the CAO of Bollinger Shipyards, which owns Chand.

The reduction of jobs was just a timing issue from when one of our government contracts ended till the time we pick up another one. The head count goes up three or four periodically.

MR. ADLEY:
I noticed it's only a three-job
reduction. I just wanted to know why.
MR. ROUSELL:
Yeah. We're running ads now to hire
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five new people, so it's kind of just typical of the business.

MR. ADLEY:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Roussel.
Please identify yourself and who you represent.

MR. MIKE :
Mike (inaudible), tax counsel with
Entergy.
And the actual number of jobs, I have another handout here with the updated numbers. The applications show the number of jobs just for the legal entity as opposed to any affiliates, any contractors on site, so the new numbers that actually is an improvement.

MR. ADLEY:
I'm just trying to understand. For your different locations with the applications?

MR. MIKE :
Correct.
MR. ADLEY:
Many of them just saw a reduction. There weren't many. I'm just trying to find out what
happened. For instance, in Calcasieu where we've seen all of the activity. Is it Calcasieu I'm looking at? Yeah, Calcasieu. Entergy now saw a reduction from 160 to 149. I'm just curious what happened.

MR. <<<>>>.
We did go through some attrition in
improvements and efficiency throughout the company maybe three or four years ago. That would lead to some reduction. However, again, we wanted to provide some additional information that shows what the total number --

MR. ADLEY:
I want the board to understand. They're sitting there having to answer the question because they actually gave us some jobs when they came in. Under the old rules, they didn't have to give any at all, so one of predicament the Governor found himself is how could we penalize those that actually offered up jobs voluntarily going in, and those that didn't, approve those that didn't and then those that came in and now may be a little less than what they were. I mean, realistically, we're putting ourselves in a position to disapprove those. So, again, that's where we at least found ourselves where we were.

```
                        I thank you very much.
```


maybe it's to ask it and then deal with it later on, but we also ran the jobs changes numbers, but had different numbers on the initiation date, and it says year one of the application. Is that one year into the exemption or is that when they applied? Because we did just look back at the number of jobs that each entity had when they applied, and sometimes it's the same number and sometimes it's a different number. Sometimes that shift makes the company look worse, but sometimes it makes them look better, and we wouldn't want to unfairly, you know, construe anyone. So that could be something to look at as to understand that.

MR. WINDHAM:
I'll ask the staff to get with you after the meeting and determine the answers to that to make sure that we're all dealing apples to apples.

MS . CHENG:
Hexion did, in their renewal application, state that current employment at the site only includes 15 because the collapse of the upstream oil and gas business starting in mid-2014 and resulting in historically low oil and gas prices has reduced the demand for resin, so they were energy related.

MR. WINDHAM:
So they were energy related, that's what
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they were?
MS. CHENG:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Mr. Chairman, the boardwalk, which is the pipelines, I assume you're going to take the MCAs, the whole 117, and get them all at the same time? Is that what that is?

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Is there somebody here from Boardwalk just to tell us? I assume yours is energy related also.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative from
Boardwalk?
Please step forward and identify
yourself.
MR. THIBODEAUX:
Good morning. Rod Thibodeaux. I'm the director of engineering and construction for Boardwalk Louisiana Midstream.

MR. RHODES :
Dusty Rhodes, property tax manager for Boardwalk.

MR. ADLEY:
You saw some reduction from when you went in. Can you just give me an explanation of what happened? I mean, it's a pipeline business, so I assume it's related to the decline in the energy field. I would be more comfortable if you could tell me more specifically because I know FERC and others implement and regulate what you do. So I'm curious.

MR. THIBODEAUX:
Yes. In our business, it's really
cyclical based on energy costs. I mean, natural gas prices go down, so do storage and transportation. As those prices modulate, we increase people that's doing business for us and also increase employment.

MR. ADLEY:
Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, just two other companies to ask about.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, gentlemen.
MR. ADLEY:
From Eagle.
MR. WINDHAM:
From Eagle. Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. ADLEY:
I mean, it's a pretty big drop in jobs, 1,242 down to 1,115.

MR. ZATARAIN:
Mr. Chairman, Mr. Adley, if you
recall --
MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MR.
Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Chuck Zatarain. I
was here before the board the last three or four meetings, including the last meeting. We had PPG Industry renewals came up at that time. I explained then that part of the PPG plant was sold, actually sold to Eagle.

MR. ADLEY:
That was part of the transfer?
MR. ZATARAIN:
Exactly. That all of four of the transfers of the companies did not come up the last time, so this is the jobs that were transferred into the Eagle Group. In fact, over the last five years, the combined plant has increased jobs with PPG and Eagle.

MR. ADLEY:
I got it. I remember from the last
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meeting now.
Thank you very much.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Zatarain.
MR. ZATARAIN:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
One more?
MR. ADLEY:
One more. UTLX. I don't know who that is. From Rapides Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
UTLX representative, please step
forward.
MR. ADLEY:
581 to 385.
MR. RYDER:
Mr. Chairman, I'm Gary Ryder, chief
plant engineer, UTLX Manufacturing.
MR. THAMES:
Chris Thames, controller for UTLX Manufacturing.

MR. RYDER:
We are manufacturing railroad tank cars, and as much, we are very much oil and gas related,
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natural gas products and bi-products and the chemical corridor going South, the Calcasieu basin areas. As those markets go down, so does our demand for railcars.

This particular application went in with about 589 jobs once completed. We've averaged over 715 jobs during the last 20 quarters, which was the first five years of the renewal.

We're now getting that impact in production going down in the oil and gas business and demand for our railcars corresponding, with decreasing our production and manpower dropping accordingly.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Thank you very much.
MR. THIBODEAUX:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, gentlemen.
MR. ADLEY:
I don't have any others unless other members do. At some point, I would move for approval in globo of 117.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I think we're already had
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the motion made by Mr . Adley and seconded by Mr . Jones.
Are there any other applications on this list that any of the board members have questions about?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
No further comments from the public regarding any of the applications for this motion?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Ms. Cheng.
MS . CHENG:
I have two late renewals: 20100898, Blade Dynamics, LP in Orleans Parish. The initial contract expired 7/31 of '16. We received their renewal request on $6 / 21$ of '16. And 20120803, US Corrugated, Inc. in Ouachita Parish. Their contract expired on 12/13 of '15, and we received their late renewal on 11/7 of '16.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there representatives from those two companies in the audience? Please step forward, identify yourself. I think there will be questions regarding late renewals.

MR. GREEN :
Thank you. My name is Joseph Green. I am the vice president of finance for US Corrugated.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Green?
MR. GREEN:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I believe in the past board meetings, these have been restricted by a year for each month that they were late.

MS . CHENG:
We only penalize one year for --
MR. ADLEY:
I think what we have done in the past that we determined that all of these tax breaks are for you and for your benefit, and when you are late, what the board has now done with all of others is to reduce that period of time, which is under the guidelines of what is given it can do, by one year, which is basically
a 20 percent reduction in what the exemption would have been over the four or five-year period of time. Because we have done that with everyone else and that is how we've handled it, $I$ would move that we do the same with this one. The benefit really rests with them.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Abraham (sic).
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
We haven't asked why he was late.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. That was the next question. MR. GREEN:

There was some confusion on our end. The original contract was granted to an organization that we purchased their assets, which the contract was transferred to us. The original contract application was filed a year late from my understanding, and, thus, the original term was only four years instead of five. So when the we were expecting to renew it after five years from when it took effect and not after the four years from the original contract. I believe that's correct.

So just some clerical confusion on our end. Obviously we're a smaller business compared to a lot of the ones you talk about here today. The amount

MEETING MINUTES
of this contract is the bulk of what it was granted over the 10 years, so this contract is certainly important to us and we wouldn't have obviously let it slip if not for an oversight, but $I$ understand what you've done in the past, and if that's what you feel is appropriate here, we'll accept that.

## REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

When did you acquire the company, before or after the original due renewal date?

MR. GREEN:
Before the original renewal date. We purchased the assets in the Summer of 2013.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
All right. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Mr. Adley made a motion that we reduce this by one year. Is there a second?

MR. SLONE:
Second.
MR. WINDHAM :
Seconded by Mr. Slone.
Any discussion from the board members?
MS. CHENG:
Is this for both of the late renewals?
MR. WINDHAM:

I'm sorry?
MS. CHENG:
Is this for both of the late renewals?
MR. ADLEY:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have a representative from the other company or do you represent both?

MR. GREEN :
No. Just US Corrugated.
MR. WINDHAM:
Just US Corrugated. Okay.
Is there anyone from Blade Dynamics?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I'll entertain a mention for them to be deferred until they have a chance to explain or do you want to apply it to both of them?

MR. ADLEY:
Excuse me. I think what we have done in the past -- let me back up and make a motion solely for the one company that is here so that we'll have the opportunity to reject the other one altogether. I mean, that's what we have done. Those that do not show, we simply don't take any action, just reject it, so
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certainly wouldn't be fair to grant them what you had the courage to come here for.

So this motion would alloy solely --
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So we'll take them up
separately.
Blade, seconded by Mr. Slone, I believe still.

Any further comments from the public? MS . CHENG:

This is US Corrugated.
MR. WINDHAM:
Sorry. US Corrugated. I apologize.
All in favor, indicated an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries, one year restriction.
MR. GREEN :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Or one year shorter term.
All right. Concerning the other one, I
believe Secretary Pierson is making a motion to --
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Well, I'd like to a least make a point of information that Blade is housed at the Michaud Assembly Facility in New Orleans East. There have been some near-tornado damage over there and they've got their hands full, so I'd like to ask for them to be deferred on today's topic.

MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Representative Carmody.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
That one is deferred.
Ms. Cheng.
MS . CHENG:
Okay. I have eight changes in location only: NovelAire Technologies, LLC, Contracts 20100405, 20130169 and 20140187. The previous location was 10132 Mammoth Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70814 in East Baton Rouge Parish. The new location is 9927 Perdue Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 7814 in East Baton Rouge

Parish. NovelTech, LLC, Contracts 20090507 and 20130168, previous location 10132 Mammoth Avenue, Baton rouge, Louisiana 70814 East Baton Rouge Parish. The new location is 9927 S. Perdue Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70814 East Baton Rouge Parish.

I do want to mentions these are being done because we did a site inspection and realized they have two locations with two different addresses and all of the original contracts only had one address, so this is housekeeping on that to get --

MR. WINDHAM:
Part of our due diligence in making sure that we know.

MS. CHENG:
Yes. So we found out that they were actually at two different sites. This is housekeeping that needs to be done to correct the contacts.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right.
MR. ADLEY:
I'm curious. How is it that Halliburton would transfer from St. Martin to Lafayette?

MS . CHENG:
Okay. So I have Halliburton Energy
Services, Inc., 20090121, 20110128 and 20150371, 1187

Evangeline Thruway, Broussard, Louisiana 70518 in St.
Martin Parish moving to 700 West Pont des Mouton Road in Lafayette, Louisiana 70507 in Lafayette Parish. I believe the St. Martin location has closed, and these assets that were at the St. Martin location are being moved to the Lafayette location.

MR. ADLEY:
So under the new rule, what happens if that occurs, we move from one parish to the other?

MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Clapinski?
MR. ADLEY:
I remember some discussion. I just want to know how we deal with that.

MS. CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir. Good morning. Danielle Clapinski, staff attorney for LED.

Under the new rules, if it's a contract that falls under post-executive order rules, then the company will have to receive approval from the local parish officials to the parish in which it's moving.

MR. ADLEY:
So leaving St. Martin, they would clearly still have to go to Lafayette Parish to get approval to continue with the ITEP. Okay.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
What happens to the tax exemption that the local parish was giving up? Do they go back on the books? Is that part of that rule?

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I think what happens is if the assets are moving, then they're being removed from one parish into another, so there would be no property tax in the parish it's moving from. The assets are no longer there. The new parish and their local governing officials will have to go through the same process and make a determination on whether they would like to give the exemption as well.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Okay. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any more?
MS . CHENG:
Those are the only change in locations.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any comments from the public regarding changes in location?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Is there a motion to approve the change
in locations?
Made by Dr. Miller (sic); seconded by
Mr. Moller.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye." (Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
I have 19 contract transfers. These all of Noranda Alumina, LLC's active contracts. They were purchased by Gramercy Holdings, LLC. They're actually in St. John the Baptist and in St. James Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
I do not believe you need to read all of the numbers out. We'll just make sure that they're in the records for those transfers.

Are there any questions, comments from
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the board members concerning transfers?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public concerning transfers of Noranda to Gramercy Holdings?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?
Mr. Slone makes a motion to approve the transfer. President miller makes the second.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed, "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
We have five partial transfers of tax exemption: NovelAire Technologies, LLC, Contract 20140999A, NovelAire Technologies, LLC retains 17,390 in East Baton Rouge Parish and NovelTech, LLC receives 80,647 in East Baton Rouge Parish. Halliburton Energy Services, Contract 20080134, Halliburton Energy Services in St. Martin Parish retains 833,251. Halliburton
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Energy Services in Lafayette receives 3,701,533.
Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., Contract 20080879,
Halliburton in St. Martin retains 74,926. Halliburton
Energy Services in Lafayette receives 1, 322,288.
Halliburton Energy Services, Contract 20140319, Halliburton in St. Martin retains 45,227. Halliburton in Lafayette receives 320,168 . Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., Contract 20160794, Halliburton in St. Martin retains 7,115. Halliburton in Lafayette receives 271,789 in Lafayette.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Cheng.
Now, can you explain just for the board members how the transfers work versus the change in location?

MS . CHENG:
Okay. These are partial transfers because only portions of the existing contracts have been moved to the new location, not the entire contract.

MR. WINDHAM :
So is it safe to assume that the St. Martin facility transferred some of the contracts in their entirety?

MS . CHENG:
Yes.

MR. WINDHAM:
And then they sent some of the assets that were under exemption. Under one contract, they sent a part of those assets to Lafayette Parish?

MS . CHENG:
That is correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
I think that makes it clear for the board members just in case?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any questions from the board members?

Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
I'm cheating and looking ahead, the cancelation of contract said Halliburton has 20080134 that's -- so they're canceling just the St. Martin piece, so it's no longer going to exist?

MS . CHENG:
Correct. That is correct.
MR. MILLER:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?

MR. SLONE:
Just a question. Sort of look back, we had the change in location and then all of a sudden we've got a partial transfer. Shouldn't some of that match up, if you will?

MS. CHENG:
So some contracts, everything that was on that contract moved to the new location, but these partial transfers, they were separate contracts where only part of the assets went to Lafayette and the rest stayed in St. Martin they're all separate contracts, so they won't match up necessarily.

MR. SLONE:
Okay. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion by Dr. Miller. I'm sorry. Dr.
Wilson.
Is there a second?
By Mr. Schexnaydre.
Any comments from the public concerning the partial transfers?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Questions, comments from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
I have 14 cancelations of contracts:
Gesipa Fasteners, these are all of their active contracts. The facility was closed in December of 2016 in Caddo Parish. The company requests cancelation. Halliburton --

MR. WINDHAM:
We are going to take -- I don't think you need to read all of these. Basically Gesipa is closing out and shut down in Caddo Parish.

MS . CHENG:
Yes.
And Halliburton Energy Services, 20080134, 20080879, 20120265, 20140319 and 20160794.
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The facility has been closed in St. Martin Parish and the company is requesting cancelation.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Motion by Representative Carmody; seconded by Ms. Heather Malone.

Any comments from the public concerning the cancelation of these contracts?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any questions from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
That concludes the Industrial Tax Exemption Program. Thank you, Ms. Cheng.

MS . CHENG:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Next we will have review of proposed
changes to ITEP Notice of Intent. Ms. Clapinski, you are on deck.

MS . CLAPINSKI :
I'm up.
Good morning. Danielle Clapinski, and I believe you-all received with your bode packet a version of the rules that contains some changes that LED staff and the department recommended making. There was a rules committee meeting that was held last Wednesday where there were a couple additional changes that were made. I believe everyone received this morning.

Melissa, is that correct?
MR. ADLEY:
So you clarify for them what we're looking at. The things in red, those are already been adopted. That's what was adopted in the last set of rules or not?

MS . CLAPINSKI:
No, sir. So everything that is in black is how the Notice of Intent was published in November 2016 based upon the recommended changes of the rules commit and the board.

MR. ADLEY:
I got you. The ones in red were the recommendations. Now I remember. The ones in red were
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the recommendation that came from LED after your public hearing.

MS . CLAPINSKI :
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
And the ones in yellow are the ones that came, and when we had an addition meeting for more public comments and additional changes. Is that...

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I don't think it's in yellow. I think that --

MR. ADLEY:
I printed mine out in yellow.
MR. JONES:
Mr. Chairman, there are some of us that don't have colorized versions at all, so the color discussion, while interesting, is not technically helpful.

MS. CLAPINSKI:
Striked through and underlined versions.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So we have striked through and underlined versions, Mr. Adley.

Ms. Clapinski.
MS . CLAPINSKI:

I think the version that y'all received this morning represents the changes recommended by LED based upon public testimony and written comments and those adopted at the rules committee meeting last week. So it's a combination of all of these that's before the board.

MR. WINDHAM:
So, Mr. Adley, as rules chairman, we'll receive your reports and recommendations, and then we'll have comments from the public. We have a number of blue cards up here. Then I believe we'll have comments and questions from the board.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
You want me to go through them?
MR. ADLEY:
Either way. It doesn't make any
difference. I'll give it a shot and you can kind of correct me.

MS. CLAPINSKI:
Okay. Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
If you look at the first page, those
items in red --
MR. WINDHAM:
We don't have the color.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
Striked through and underlined. Yes, sir.

MR. ADLEY:
All right. Under Section $501(A)$-- (B), there was some language in there. If you'll look at the very last sentence, they want to make it very clear everything that we have said is going to be held true. So everything prior to June 24 th under the old rules. And just above that, you'll notice that executive order, they corrected that. They put in both executive orders. John Bel had done one, then two, and industry wanted to make sure that we were very clear that we were going to do what we had promised to do, and so we put those changes in.

If you'll look on the second page under the definition of manufacturing, there were some recommended changes. We had tied most of it back to custom fabrication and machinery. There are some industries that require custom work, but it's a whole lot more manual labor, so they wanted to make sure that, like ship building and the like, we wanted to make sure we covered that, and so that's the change in manufacturing on Page 2.

There was nothing on Page 3. And then I

## MEETING MINUTES

guess what would be Page 4, your attachment fee. Am I at the right place?

MS. CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
Okay. If you'll go down to Item 2, the Exhibit B that's going to be required consisting of resolutions adopted by parish governing authority, they wanted to make sure that if you have -- you have other taxing bodies underneath the jury, for instance, that the jury appoints people to. The same for the sheriff or the municipality that's involved. Industry wanted to make sure that we had language in there to make it clear that they were also speaking for them so we didn't end up with this huge mishmash of -- a great example, up there where Representative Carmody are, there's the -- I live on the lake. They have a lake commission, and they have -- they have a taxing body. They collect taxes, but all of the people that serve there are appointed by the various, by the parish and others. We wanted to make it clear that what the parish did affected them, too so that you didn't have this mishmash, so that was adopted.

The next big issue, $I$ think, was down at Item 3 (b). Come right on down the page. You'll see

Exhibit $B(a)$ then little (i), two little (ii), (iii) and then you'll see (b), and this is what happened if a local entity does not take action, the way we had it in the rules were that was effectively saying no. The Governor's office and others wanted to make sure that if we gave local government a seat at the table, we wanted them to take some action, put them in place somehow. Chairman Windham came up with the idea that if they took no action over a period of 120 days, not 90 now, that was in the rules, but over a period of 120 days, whatever action was taken by the other taxing bodies, the average of that action is what that body would be stuck with on their exemptions. I don't foresee that, frankly, ever happening because politically what happens is I think if you're sitting back home and the other bodies start taking action and you do nothing, this kind of puts you in a position to have to do something. Some of the discussion we had around that rule was about, "Well, why don't we just say 100 percent?" Together Louisiana wanted to say like 50 percent. We thought if we got to just a fixed amount, we were basically getting back to where we are today, take no action and there it is. If you tie them all together, you're having your own peers putting pressure on each other for them to take some action. So we
thought that what Mr. Windham recommended was a good idea and we adopted that.

And then if you'll move to the next page, under Miscellaneous Capital Additions, this was another provision that some of the industry wanted to make clear, that the MCAs prior to June the 24 th were under the old rules, and so we agreed to do that. That's what we've been telling people we would do and so we adopted that one.

And I think, members, those are the total changes after the public hearing and after a second meeting with the public and the rules committee. We think that's -- albeit there's been comment we have to go further and keep moving, $I$ think it's a continual process, but at some point, we're now hopefully ready to adopt these and then publish them, put them on notice and get them before the appropriate committees and the legislature.

MR. WINDHAM :
Thank you, Mr. Adley. And your
recommendation on these rule is?
MR. ADLEY:
To approve, adopt these recommended changes that we've just discussed.

MR. WINDHAM:

So I'll take that as a motion, and seconded by Mr. Slone.

MR. MOLLER:
Are we voting on this.
MR. WINDHAM:
No, we're not voting. We're just getting it on the record that we've got a motion and a second, and then we'll open it up for comments.

So there's a second by Mr. Moller I believe.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay. I'm making it.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. So there's a second by
Mr. Moller. And with that, I will open it up to questions from the board members first.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions?
Yes, Representative Abraham (sic).
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Mr. Adley, on Page 3 right above Section 503, since I don't have a colored copy either, I'm looking at the margin, and it appears that there's a red line slash, which indicates some change was made, but there's no red line version in the -- was something
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```
deleted?
```

MS . CLAPINSKI:
No. I think that the word "site" was accidently bolded. That's what the change is, and we'll remove that when we move forward.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Okay. On the second page, I guess it's Page 4, Mr. Adley described how they came up with the parish bodies and I guess the municipal bodies, so we have, for example, a parish governing authority, which is now going to make the decision for all taxing authorities within that.

MR. ADLEY:
No.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
Explain to me how that works and what's Considered the --

MR. ADLEY:
Under Exhibit B, they're going to have to have, I think it's a letter from the sheriff, resolution from the jury, resolution from the school board and the effected municipality, each one of them. Each one of them can take action in any manner that they see fit. The point was that if one of them or all of them choose to do nothing, how do you deal with that?

How do you, let's say, the sheriff said, "Look, I'm going to give them 100 percent exemption," and the jury said, "I want to give them 50 percent," and the city said, "Yeah, I'll go along with that," and then the school board said, "Well, I'm not doing anything," but took no action, didn't pass any resolution, deny, nothing. Just took no action. They've got 120 days to do that. If they took no action, they would be granted the average between that 50 percent and that 100 percent in the exemption.

## REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

That wasn't my question at this point, but that's a good question for me to ask at this point.

How do you determine the average?
Because, at least in Orleans Parish, different taxing authorities, whether it could be -- the sheriff doesn't have taxing authority in our area, but between the school board, for example, and the city council, they have different percentages of millages. It's not --

## MR. WINDHAM :

Mr. Abraham (sic), it's not related to the millages. It's related to how much of 100 percent they are participating. So if the entity -- I'll just grab the numbers. If one entity decides to participate at 100 percent, the other entity decides to participate
at 80 percent, there's only two in that case, because there could be up to four, there's only two in that case, then the average of those 180 is 90 . And the number of years would also apply. So if one says -REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

I got it.
MR. WINDHAM :
It's just mathematical average trying to get them a little something.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
If all four of them participate, you just take the average?

MR. WINDHAM:
No. It's the number.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
It's whatever the number each of them agree to?

MR. WINDHAM:
And if all four of them do not respond, the average of zero is zero.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
And if each one of them comes up with a different percentage that they'll --

MR. WINDHAM:
That's okay.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
And going back to my original question, I see that there's four entities that have locally the right to have input, the parish governing authority, the school board, the municipality and the sheriff. Now, as Mr. Adley mentioned, sometimes there's other entities that have taxing authorities. You mentioned something in your area that's the --

MR. ADLEY:
We made a change to try to make sure that the entities that, let's say, as you know and I know, the jury, they have some board out there governing something, or maybe --

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I get that. I know where you're going, and here's my question: How do you determine whether something is going to be a parish governing authority, a parish body or a municipal body?

MR. ADLEY:
I think you have to look at how the body was created, how they were appointed. I think they're going to -- I think clearly the jury will know what -MR. WINDHAM:

Mr. Abraham (sic), I believe that would be like the city if it's in the parish. If it's out of
the parish, there is no municipality.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I'm just suggesting to you it might not be clearcut because we created at the state level a whole bunch of local taxing authorities that then allow various appointments. I'm just expressing a concern. Unless the staff feels very comfortable with that. It may not be clear who's a parish authority and who's a municipal authority.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I think the reason this change was done was the question came up if you only have four speaking, what happens to the other millages for those others perhaps that weren't given a more definitive in the executive order and in the rules. We are going to have to get from these different bodies the amount of millages in the state body and find a way as we do this to move forward.

## REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

I think we're going to have to classify who the municipal body is and parish body that these governing authorities are speaking for because I'm not sure its the same in every location or that it's very clear.

MR. WINDHAM:

We can look to the tax commission to answer those questions. I mean, is that something the tax commission would know?

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I just see a whole bunch of questions coming up.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
I want to be clear that $I$ understand your question. So you have townships, you have cities and then you have maybe some areas that are unincorporated.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
You might have a fire department, you might have --

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Yes. We specifically talked about in terms of executive order that we couldn't deal with 17 millage collectors, so levee districts and fire districts, water districts, it would become too complex to deal with.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I understand.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
So we categorized all of those other groups as either being under the parish governing
authority or the municipal governing authority.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I'm just concerned that there may be question as to all of the these different entities in different areas as to which they fall under. They fall under the parish governing or the municipal, and if the parish governing authority and municipal authority take different positions or don't respond at all, how do you take into account that taxing entity that is left off the list? And I'm not so sure with 64 parishes and -I'm not sure that's clear. I could be wrong. I just want to raise the concern so that --

SECRETARY PIERSON:
No. That helps to better understand your question. Yes, sir.

MR. ADLEY:
I appreciate what you're saying. I'm trying to sit here in some language that $I$ could clarify it even better, but the way I'm reading it, if they're sitting outside the municipality, they're in the parish, then the parish will make that call. And if they're sitting inside the municipality -- now, this, adopting this language specifically for $I$ think the industry said they wanted to make sure that they had somebody to go talk to.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I think it's clarifying just to -- I think the concern was is there any exemption, does anyone speak for the rest of them if there's no way to incorporate them into one of these bodies.

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
I think somebody's going to speak for them. I'm just not sure which one is speaking for them, and I think we want to make that clear.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I think that LED will work with the assessors.

MR. ADLEY:
I feel like it is because it does say inside the municipality. I get it if the municipality is inside the parish. I get that, but I think the way they've written it, I mean, if I were to interpret it, the municipality is going to have the make that decision for those that are inside the municipality. I mean, that's way I read it.

## MS . CLAPINSKI:

Yes, sir, that was the intent.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
It doesn't say inside. It says, "On behalf of the parish and all parish bodies who
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```
receive" --
```

MR. ADLEY:
I think why don't you do it this way. This will be a simple way to do it. If you put the "parish governing authority" where you got in paren "speaking on behalf of the parish and all parish bodies who receive millages," outside the boundaries of the affected municipality. And then you've got the next language that says that the municipality speaks for them, and then I think you've got it very clear. There wouldn't be any confusion then.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
Sure.
MR. WINDHAM:
So I will take that as a motion to make a change to the rules made by Mr. Abraham (sic) -- I mean, made by -- seconded by Mr. Adley.

All in favor of the amendment for that.
MR. BAGERT :
I'd like to speak on that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. Certainly.
MR. BAGERT:
Just so you're not wasting your time.
MR. WINDHAM:


20 percent from the parish. So when the assessor or whoever the single tax collector is goes to distribute the money, he's going to get to a bottom line and say this is how much money is there.

MR. ADLEY:
Look, Broderick, I'm -- if we say in the rules that if they're inside the municipality, the municipality speaks for them. You can't --

MR. BAGERT:
They're also inside of the parish and inside the municipality.

MR. ADLEY:
At some point I hope you get you a set of rule to do what you want to do, but about 100 years from now when you get there, put it in front of the Administrative Procedures Act, Broderick.

MR. BAGERT :
We have no dog in that hunt. I was just trying --

MR. ADLEY:
That's good. Before your dogs bite, let us get this thing done and let you go back to hunting. MR. WINDHAM:

Are there any other comments from the public regarding this amendment?

```
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
```

Are there any questions from the board concerning this amendment?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Staff has the amendment?
MS . CLAPINSKI:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor of this amendment, please indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
The amendment for municipality versus
parish --
MS . CLAPINSKI:
Implying that it must be outside of the boundary of affected municipality in order for the parish to speak on that millage if they have any.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.

I believe you had another one,
Representative Abraham (sic), concerning the mathematical averages?

REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:
No. I think that Mr. Adley answered the question previously. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
Are there any comments, any other comments from the board?

Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER:
I would propose, since this language about the 120 days represents a compromise and it's obviously designed to encourage municipalities to participate, that we add to the rules a requirement that LED post this information on its website within 24 hours of notifying the local authorities.

MS . CLAPINSKI:
I'm sorry. Can you repeat that for me?
MR. WINDHAM:
Can you repeat that and verify it?
MR. MOLLER:
That LED post on its website the information about the exemptions within 24 hours of that
information being sent to the local authorities.
MR. WINDHAM:
I think the steps may be backwards.
MS. CLAPINSKI :
We always sent it to the locals.
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe that the locals are going to have this in one of their meetings, so they would notify us, the state and the public, that they have this meeting. So you're asking that that notification from them be received by LED --

MR. MOLLER:
No.
MR. WINDHAM:
-- and then posted on LED's website? MR. ADLEY:

Mr. Chairman, for what it's worth, this provision along with three or four others that Together Louisiana had brought to the Governor's office, this is a provision that we actually think is a good provision. I had told that meetings occur with Mr. House, LED, no one in LED had no objections to that. Anything that we can do to create more transparency in this process, we thought was a good idea. So when $I$, just last night, $I$ was presented with we should support this particular
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amendment, so at least on his behalf, $I$ want to do that. Unless, I mean, this is simply saying that LED would publish you are going to be working directly hand in hand with the locals. That's the way I understand it.

MR. HOUSE:
That's correct. I think that in the amendment you're going to have to require that notice be given to LED and local government, and then LED should have -- they have three working days to post it.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. HOUSE :
How is that?
MR. MOLLER:
Yeah. The intent is is that when this 120 day clock starts ticking, that they're -- that it's publicly noticed and people and citizens can come in if they want to weigh in and see what amount of tax dollars are proposed to be exempted, that they would have the ability to see that information, that everybody knows that the clock is ticking.

MR. HOUSE:
What I understand that we have here is that we're talking about the request that for local authorities request by an applicant or by a company that
local authorities consider the exemption.
MR. MOLLER:
Correct.
MR. HOUSE:
That's now Exhibit B. Exhibit B is what comes out of that. So there's been a request. That request should be given, if it goes to local authorities, it needs to go to LED. LED would then have three working days to post it.

MR. MOLLER:
Correct. Yeah.
MS . CLAPINSKI:
Then I think we'll need an amendment to change it to also require that LED be copied on the request to locals because right now there is no stipulation that.

REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Quick question. I mean, any of those entities, whether they're parish, sheriff -- well, parish or municipality, that request is going to have to be on the agenda for that body, and it would seem like that would be the official notice that at least the consideration was being given. And if that information is being provided back to LED, then at least y'all would know that it's there now. I guess you'd have to wait
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until after the meeting to see if they acted upon it. Then the 120 days, $I$ guess at that point, begins.

MS . CLAPINSKI :
I think the start of 120 days comes prior to it being placed on the agenda. That's the date that we need to memorialize.

MR. ADLEY:
I think they're looking for some centralized location where state would I think kind of track what was happening.

MR. WINDHAM:
That is for the request made by the company, by the applicant.

MR. JONES :
Mr. Chairman.
MR. WINDHAM :
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES :
I'm trying to think mechanically how that's going to happen. The company is going to send the request to the local authorities and CC LED on that request, and that is what will be then posted on the LED website? Is that where we're going?

MR. MOLLER:
That's the intent, yes.

MR. JONES:
Okay. So the request that goes to the local authorities may or may not be what ends up being ultimately proved by the local authorities.

MR. WINDHAM:
You are correct.
MR. JONES:
So although we want the local businesses to work with the local government, and in the interest of transparency $I$ understand, but we're basically putting those negotiations in the public.

MR. MOLLER:
It gives the public a chance to weigh in once that 120 day clock starts ticking.

MR. JONES :
It's going -- I think it's going to have a chilling effect on negotiations. I think what you've now done is made it very difficult to reach agreement with local authority if in fact a company's going to have to negotiate in public, but maybe that's the goal.

MR. HOUSE:
We're in more experienced deals moving forward in different ways at different times, and so you may in fact have an understanding before you ever even make this request.

MR. JONES:
And, Mr. House, that's exactly what I was thinking, but $I$ have a feeling if a company did that and it came to this board, this board could be roundly criticized for doing that because if they have those negotiations with the local government before it showed up on the LED website, I have a feeling there would be criticism from this board. I hope you're right and I'm wrong, but I'm not sure.

MR. HOUSE:
I don't know how to respond to that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER:
I mean, I have a motion I think.
MR. WINDHAM:
So to clarify the motion, the motion is to post within three days of receipt the request from the company made to the locals for participation in the Industrial Tax Exemption Program.

MR. MOLLER:
Three working days.
MR. WINDHAM:
Three working days.
Is there a second?
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Seconded by Mr. Richard. Didn't see you
back there.
Any comments from the public concerning this amendment to the rules?

Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. CAGE :
Thank you very much. Mr. Edward Cage. I'm with Together Louisiana. I just have a question, information, clarification.

Why can't the application be submitted to LED like it is now and why can't they tell us that this application meets the criteria of the ITEP program before it's forwarded to a local entity? Because there may be some component or aspects that you are relying upon or forcing the local entity to know what all of the rules are and all of the I's dotted and the T's crossed. And then once it meet that criteria, then LED sends it to the local entity and that's when the time starts. Just clarification.

MS CLAPINSKI :
I think the issue with that is that when these negotiations occur, there's often a lot of confidentiality, at least in the beginning parts of these negotiations, and the company is not necessarily
on record before they decide whether they want their name out there prior to that. So you're requiring them to file with LED before they have any idea that the may be entitled to anything or everything, and I think that's a concern from the company perspective of that identification that early in the process.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
The way I understood his question was just to prevent projects that don't meet the standards from reaching the local communities, and I would believe the LED staff would correctly screen a project before it was forwarded. If it came to make application for the Industrial Tax Exemption, it would have to meet certain standards, such as manufacturing definition, et cetera, and if it failed to meet those, it would never go out to the locals.

MR. CAGE :
Absolutely. That's --
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Cage, the process is the company is filing advanced notification before the application, so if an advance comes into this staff, this staff says, "Well, you don't make anything." You know, "You're a service industry operation, so you don't qualify for the Industrial Tax Exemption Program anyway," so none of
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those letters would be necessary. Nothing would proceed after that for the Industrial Tax Exemption Program.

MR. CAGE :
Okay. I just don't want the local entities to have the responsibility of determining whether a project meets to criteria or not.

MR. WINDHAM :
That would never -- I don't think that will happen.

MR. ADLEY:
Let me make a suggestion. The clock doesn't start really ticking on the 120 days until the request for that resolution is made, and the way this works, it still goes through LED back to them. So the clock, as far as the clock's concerned, that's when it starts. This just gives you an opportunity to see in some aggregated space what's happening.

MR. JONES:
Mr. Chairman.
MR. WINDHAM :
Yes, Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES:
Point of information, going back to Mr. House's point, which I think is a really good one, as a practical matter, when these companies are trying
to figure out whether they're going to come to Louisiana or not and whether they consider this program is beneficial to them or not, it would seem to me that there has to be some preliminary discussions with the local government now before they even -- maybe before they even come to LED. They may have some familiarity with the program, they've read the program, they know how it works, they understand, but now we've got to figure out am I going to get 50 percent, 100 percent, what is it going to be. So if those discussions with the -- if $I$ were representing a company, $I$ would suggest to them they go talk to St. James Parish first before you get too far down this road.

> I would hope that this board would encourage that rather than discourage it because, otherwise, it's very difficult for these companies to adequately determine whether this benefit is of any benefit at all. So I guess what I'm taking my concern that $I$ expressed to Mr . House and bringing it to this board and want to make me clear on the record, at least in legislative history, that we are not discouraging those preliminary discussions with local government. I don't want this formal notice to become somehow a sacred cow that things can't happen until it's filed. Is that what...

MR. MOLLER:
That's not the intent.
MR. JONES:
Good.
MR. MOLLER:
They wouldn't discourage those conversations from happening.

MR. JONES:
You see what I'm saying, though? They may go to -- they may go to, ABC Parish and ABC Parish says, "We're not giving you exemption for nothing," and they say, "Okay. Fine. We're going to go to the neighbor." You know, then there's no need for advance even.

## MR. ADLEY:

Look, I think you're right and I think pragmatically that's exactly what's going to happen. And then the local government is probably going to say, "Well, we're not really quite qualified to get there," so it's going to end up going to LED. LED is going to get it. They're going to get a package put together and then it's going back, and then that request, if there's ever going to be a request if a resolution is going to occur. Than at that point, it hits the website.

I mean, that's what -- you know, we're
the only state in America that does it other than that.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right.
MR. ADLEY:
And they all seem to do fine, and I think we'll work our way through that, too. I do. I think that's the way it's going to work.

MR. WINDHAM:
Any other comments concerning this amendment?

Mr. Richard.
MR. RICHARD:
I'm making my way up to the mic.
Just a quick note for the record, I
think what you're seeing as we work through these processes, our parishes, like West Feliciana that every governmental entity in their parish recently announced in The Morning Advocate that they're all going to give 100 percent as far as this process goes. So it's going to create a lot of competition amongst local government bodies, and that's probably a good thing.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
Ms. Wascom, now is the appropriate time.
Please identify yourself.

MS. WASCOM:
I'm Kathy Wascom. I'm representing myself.

Right now I currently serve on a board that has taxing authority in East Baton Rouge Parish, so as I understand what's going on, the Metro Council, if the Metro Council decides they're going to issue a 50 percent tax exemption, then the library or the school board or the -- I mean, the library or the rec or whatever would also abide by the 50 percent under this scenario?

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, ma'am.
MS . WASCOM:
Okay. So will each, as the applications come, will there be anything done or will it have to be done locally that says the parish will lose or the perish will not take in like 50-million or the school board will not take in 26-million? Will it be divided so that people could actually see how much they are giving away in tax exemptions? The actual amount seems to be concrete to people as we would go to the Metro Council to ask for our millage. Our millages are all approved by Metro Council before they go to the people. So I was trying to see if there would be an easy way for
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people to understand in actual numbers, you know, from the school board.

MR. ADLEY:
It seems to me that whatever your millage is, now, let's just say that the, say your millage generated $\$ 50,000$ a year for the library or 100,000. That's a better number. It generate 100,000 and the municipality says, "We grant 100 percent of the ITEP for the first five years." Under the rules, they can only grant 80 percent for the second five. Up to 100 percent of 80 . So whatever you're collecting at 100 percent, you know what that number is. If they say, "We're going to do 50 percent," whatever you're collecting, 50 percent of it is -- it's a pretty easy calculation for you to know on the other side is what I'm saying. It's really not very complicated.

MS . WASCOM:
Mr. Adley, I just didn't know how this would be presented to the people, the parish and the school board and the sheriff's office. We're actually going to have to do the numbers because I think particularly at the school board, that actually having the numbers year by year will let folks know how they want the school board to vote. If they're going to lose \$15-million and, say, in October, or, say, this year a
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tax election will be coming up. So that the public is actually going to want to know how they're going to vote, what is being, you know, not taken in and is it worth it. So, I mean, that's going to be their judgment.

MR. WINDHAM:
Representative Carmody.
REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Very quickly. I just want to make sure that I understood what you're saying.

As opposed to that entity providing resolution saying that, "We're offering a percentage," you would like within that resolution to state the dollar amount that they are basically saying that the entity would not be receiving for those years that -MS . WASCOM:

Yes, sir. I just think it would be easier for folks to understand. We see the numbers here, but $I$ don't know if you're going to a school or a meeting and they're going to vote on a resolution. Folks need to know how much money they're not going to be taking in, and then they're also going to be voting as we do millages. They're going to go to Metro Council millages and they're also going to be voting on taxes to support the schools. So that if you have an actual
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concrete number, it's just easier to understand that that number -- and we have these numbers here and we have them year by year. So $I$ think for the general public, it's just easier to understand a concrete number.

MR. WINDHAM:
I believe as Mr. Adley said, it's not going to be a rocket science-type environment. I'll just grab some numbers out the air. Let's say the entire exemption is $\$ 90,000$. There are three entities that share equally. That would be 30,000 per entity. If one entity says, "Okay. We're willing to give up 10 percent," well, 10 percent of 30,000 is 3,000 . Therefore, we will collect 27,000 .

## MS . WASCOM:

It will be -- what you're saying, Mr. Windham, is that it will be incumbent upon the school board, the sheriff, the Metro Council, the library, rec, CATS, to do their own numbers.

MR. WINDHAM:
Well, for each application, though. The application, I'm assuming if Mr . Jones represented a company, he's going to come in and he's going to do -- I would assume.

MR. JONES:

Well, I think the reality is the numbers at the beginning are estimates. They're not even real numbers. This plant doesn't exist. You don't know whether it's 100-million or 200-million. You don't know until after it's built. If it's never built, it will be -- they won't lose anything. It will just be the increment that they get will be reduced. The additional amount, the base doesn't change on any of this. These are all future projects.

## MS. WASCOM:

It is, but a lot of these companies I see have been having tax exemptions for quite a long time, so it's not exactly a new company coming in. So if they are real numbers here on these pages -MR. JONES:

I understand, but you understand on this program is a forward-looking program, and so the -- I may come in and estimate my project as a \$100-million project and it may end up being 75-million. I may have done some amazing engineering. So the numbers you are going to get are going to be at best estimates, and certainly nothing you should budget, because until the money's in the bank, nothing's there. So I think the concern is one -- I understand the concern, but I think the Chairman is correct that the math is not complicated
and it will not be meaningful until the project is completed.

MR. ADLEY:
And, look, Mr. Jones is correct, and I want to point out to you one of the major reasons for doing what we're doing at the request of you and many others was to engage local government to research and make their own decisions. Every one of you have different millages, every one of you have different ways you do things, and the state cannot step in and say this is what it's going to be for you. You're going to have to make that call yourself.

REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:
Mr. Adley, and I think as part of the transparency and the public input, that that would be where the public would come forward and say, "I know this body today is consider this. Do we have at least an idea of what amount of property taxes within our jurisdiction to apply to the millage were affected?" MR. ADLEY:

They will do that inside those meetings. They will.

MS . WASCOM:
That was really when I got up here, it was really for clarification how this is going to work,
and so it will be incumbent really upon the local taxing districts to do their own math. And so that's where we are going to be.

MR. WINDHAM:
Correct.
MS . WASCOM:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. There's a motion on the floor.

Yes, another comment. Please step forward and identify yourself.

MR. CAGE :
Edward Cage with Together Louisiana.
I just want to make it clear. I was just asking for a point of clarification. Not opposing this motion. We support this motion because as it's stated, it will stimulate, encourage and start local input and local dialog, which is what the intent of what we would like to see, so thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Cage.
Motion on floor; second.
Any other comments on the floor regarding this amendment to require the posting of the
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request by the company within three days of receipt, three working days. I'm sorry. Three days. Three working days.

All in favor of the motion, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Are there any other comments, amendments from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe there's a motion from
Mr. Adley and I believe it's been seconded by Mr. Moller to accept these rules.

I will open the floor up for comment from the public. I have a number of blue cards, and so I think for the concern of time, if a comments are already made, you can waive. You'll agree to?

So first I have Ms. Ann Dunn,
"Representing myself and Together Louisiana." Questions or comments concerning the proposed rule changes.

MS. DUNN:
To give some context for my comments, I should tell you that my concerns arise from my experience in state and local government. I served as a drafter of legislation and legislative rules for the House of Representatives for 40 years, and I serve currently on the committee of Louisiana State Law Institute that's revising local government laws.

This experience has taught me and made really dear to my heart the necessity to protect the processes and procedures of representative democracy.

I want to thank the board and the rules committee for the work they have done, particularly to implement the really historic executive of Governor Edwards that we're all really proud of.

This morning $I$ want to just talk about one part of this rule. It's the procedure for local input on the tax exemption process. I strongly urge the board to return to its own original proposed rule that would require submission of a resolution of support by the local governing body as a process by which a local government would establish its support or opposition to an exemption. The present proposed rule essentially provides that no action by a governing body constitutes approval.

MR. ADLEY:
To a degree.
MS. DUNN:
But those that don't act, they're
approving it based on what the other bodies approve. If none of them took action, it would be approved at 100 percent $I$ assume.

MR. ADLEY:
No. No, it would not. If none of them took taction, it would be the average of what exemption they granted. So if they took no action in that 120 days, it would be zero.

MS. DUNN:
Oh, okay.
MR. ADLEY:
It would be zero. And, look, I want to say this to you, and most of these people don't know who you. I happened to have served with you when you were over there drafting up bills. You did incredible work over at the legislation and $I$ want to thank you for that.

And, also, want to thank you for your continued participation. Rarely do we find someone that's got as much knowledge and skill as you have to keep plugging away at it, and I want to thank you for
that.
I will tell you, in this case, if they all don't do anything, it's going to be zero.

MS. DUNN:
Okay.
MR. ADLEY:
We wanted them to be engaged and do the best we could to find a way to make them get engaged. That's why we accepted the idea of the Chairman of just they know that their peers are going to be sitting out there. So if the sheriff decides to do one thing and the parish decides to do one thing and the school board is setting there doing nothing and they're left with, "Oh, my goodness, I'm going to get the average of whatever these guys do," I think they're going to take -- we want affirmative action from them. We do. But if all of them do nothing, it's zero.

MS. DUNN:
Well, my point is just that. If the municipal governing authority, the parish governing authority, whatever it may be, takes no action because that constitutes approval and they basically then can avoid voting on a contingence issue, which we know elected officials sometimes like to be able to not take that vote.

MR. ADLEY:
I don't think it works quite like that. If a resolution is presented, say, a parish commissioner puts forward a resolution to grant a certain exemption for a certain entity and then the parish actually takes a vote and rejects it, they've taken action. Although it may be zero, they've taken action. Then the average provision will not apply to them. If they don't do anything --

MS. DUNN:
Then it would be approval.
MR. ADLEY:
-- it would be the average of what the other entities did. If they sit there and do absolutely nothing, that's correct.

MS. DUNN :
That's right. Well, that concerns me because I think our system is set up to be able to hold those local government officials accountable, and they won't have taken an action for which they are accountable.

MR. ADLEY:
And I think that's more of a reason to hold them accountable than anything else. You will simply say to them, "If you're not willing to do your
job," I think they're going to get rid of those fellows. MS. DUNN:

Well, goodness knows this is a great improvement, but $I$ do have this concern and wanted to raise it.

As a sideline, earlier when
Representative Abramson asked the question about the Restoration Tax Credit and how they went about that, that statute has quite a bit of detail about the local governing authority notifying all of the tax recipient bodies having a public hearing, accepting their input and then voting. And so it's a lot more specific. Sometimes more words help, and it may be a situation -MR. ADLEY:

That's very helpful. MS . DUNN :
-- where more words are needed. So I just urge you to go back to your original motion of a resolution. I think that's much more straightforward and much more understandable to voters.

MR. ADLEY:
I will tell you, we -- from the Governor's perspective, we argued it back and forth for a good while to come to this conclusion thinking this was the best way to get some kind of action. We did. I
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will tell you, I'm the one who argued that they're elected officials. They ought to be held accountable. If they don't want to take any action to take it to zero, that's their business. I lost that argument. The Governor and the legal counsel both made very good arguments about making the local government take some affirmative steps, and if you're not going to take any step, you are going to get stuck with what somebody else did.

MS. DUNN:
Well, perhaps it will have ultimately the same effect that would be, you know.

MR. ADLEY:
We'll see.
MS. DUNN :
It does have the look of a compromise.
But, anyway, I just think that -- I'll just say that and end with that. I think that's the way a deliberative democracy is supposed to work, and I think it would be a better way to go.

Thanks.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Dunn.
Next we have Kenton Cooper.
MR. COOPER:

I'll waive.
MR. WINDHAM:
Russel Honore.
Gone.
John Parker.
MR. PARKER:
I'll waive.
MR. WINDHAM :
Earl Motsenrocker.
MR. MOTSENROCKER:
I'll waive.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is that correct?
MR. MOTSENROCKER:
It was close.
MR. WINDHAM:
I'll get with you afterword and find out
how to say it.
MR. WINDHAM:
Jane Webb.
MS. WEBB:
I'll waive.
MR. WINDHAM:
Gary Meitz (spelled phonetically).
MR. MEITZ:

Yes. I'll waive.
MR. WINDHAM:
Edward Cage.
MR. CAGE :
Waive.
MR. WINDHAM:
That's all the blue cards that I have or blue papers that I have.

Are there any other comments from the public regarding these rules that are presented before this board for adopting by Mr. Adley and seconded by Mr. Moller?

> Please step forward and identify
yourself.
MR. JACKSON:
Good afternoon. My name is Isaac Jackson, Junior. I used to sit in these same chairs when $I$ was counsel for the mineral board.

I want to congratulate $y^{\prime}$ all on doing an excellent job today. This, as many folk have said, this is the way our government ought to work, and it's a shame that it's coming to this, but y'all are charged with a very, very vital duty. At this time, when our state is broke, we should not be just willy-nilly giving away tax exemptions or not allowing our local entities
to be able to survive.
There's some other things that $I$ want to talk about later on with other bodies, but this one has done its job today, and we would love y'all to keep doing it. I just wanted to say that. Okay. I've worked with some of you guys before. Some of you are former legislator; some of you are present legislator.

Okay. I have some other things that I know are essentially giveaways that are not giveaways of the tax dollars. They're giveaways of responsibility for cleanup and all of that kind of stuff, and, you know, that's not y'all's responsibility and I'm carrying that out in other ways up to the extent $I$ can. But when I see people doing a good job, $I$ want to congratulate them. I've kept my mouth shut, and I want to thank y'all for listening to Together Louisiana. I appreciate it.

MR. WINDHAM:
And thank you, Mr. Jackson.
Any additional comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
From the board?
Mr. Abramson, Representative Abramson.
REPRESENTATIVE ABRAMSON:

Just a point of order. The motion currently before Mr. Adley, which was made before the several amendments, I'm assuming that we're going take up as a motion to adopt the rules as amended today?

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes. I'm sorry. I'm new to this side of it, not near the experience that you guys have.

So the motion is to adopt as amended the rules in front of us. Seconded by Mr. Moller.

All in favor of the motion, indicate with "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Motion carries.
Next on our agenda is the election of officers. I believe that it's been requested that that be deferred until the next meeting. If there's no problems with me continuing and running the meeting at the next meeting, I'll be the Chairman. I'll just pull that from the agenda.

We have comments from our illustrious Secretary Don Pierson.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Speaking to you today as a member of this board, but essentially as your executive director over the staff that puts together the rules and implements the programs that are given to us by the legislature and by the Governor, I feel incumbent to make some remarks to you today just so that we continue to have a very clear understanding and direction of where we're going.

I regret at General Honore is not here with us. I would very much like to have been able to face to face a little bit of his conversation with him. I have an extraordinary amount of respect for his leadership, his accomplishments and what he represents, but I would have to bring to his attention, and you, sir, Mr. Jackson, that the state is not broke. I don't want my staff to leave the room because they think they won't get a payroll check at the next payroll date. Certainly we have some fiscal challenges out there, and we're going to meet those.

And General Honore also said he would be court-martialed if he overspent his budget, and we don't do that in Louisiana. In fact, over at the legislature right now, we're working out how we live within our means, and we don't over spend. Can't say the same
thing for our federal government. We've got a huge national debt, but we don't have a huge Louisiana debt. And so I would take issue with the idea that we're broke.

Mr. Bagert, $I$ would -- and in also speaking back to a point that General Honore made about our school systems, their needs for funding. Certainly this is how we make our school system stronger, by attracting industry, by building jobs and investment in our communities. And if General Honore will meet me in three, six months in Calcasieu Parish, he's going to see amazing schools that have been built. But if you correlate -- and I challenge Mr. Bagert to do this -where industrial tax exemptions have been issued in our state and correlate that with the educational systems in those areas, you're going to find that industry and school systems are great partners. And, again, I want to issue that as a challenge to look in that direction.

I'm a bit concerned when I'm provided information like this that's widely being distributed to the media, and then $I$ just don't agree with it. It states that the ship is not turning, I think that this body has given great evidence that things are changing. Speaking to \$4.9-billion in exemptions. That's a huge number. I respect that, but it's also a look at your
future. First of all, do not equate that 4.9-billion provided in exemptions will occur. A number of these projects won't make. They have the ability and framework to try to move forward, but some of these projects are based on additional negotiations out there that may or may not come to fruition. But regardless of whether they do or not, this large number is an example of tremendous investment being paid in your state today, bringing thousands of construction jobs, bringing millions of payroll dollars, bringing thousands of permanent jobs to Louisiana. So when I see that we have a record number of exemptions, that's because we have a record number of projects and we've got a record that we can be proud of moving into the future.

Specifically to this 4.9, represented in that are Sabine Pass LNG's \$19-billion project, Cheniere Energy, much of Sasol's \$11-billion project, two Venture Global LNG projects, 8.5-billion and 4.25-billion. We're the envy of the notion. Most states would just do cartwheels to get investments like this in their community.

So we are all here at LED and from the Governor's office through this board opposed to corporate welfare. We get that. But we are dedicated to growing a vibrant economy in our state. We're going
to do that with accountability, with transparency and with making prudent investment decisions that require performance and in contracts in audits of those contracts as these benefits are awarded.

So I would speak to the record of saying that here we're in a state with 135-billion in capital investment projects that have been announced since 2012, 65-billion of that coming out the ground right now in construction, engineering and permitting. We've got a lot to be proud of, and without our Industrial Tax Exemption Program, out competitiveness would fall from being one of the leading states in the nation. Not the number one. Near the top where we want to be to number 44. You would be turning off the very faucet that can build our future. We don't have to look far out this window to see Exxon Mobil Refinery.

This 10-year look at an exemption is the beginning of a 30 or 40 -year project. When you plant a garden, when you plant an orchard, you don't get your return on day one. You get your return over time. That's the direction that we are seeking to take the state. And we are appreciative of all of the dialog from Together Louisiana, from our business communities that's represented here in various groups and from the citizens. So I look at today as a great thing, a step
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forward, a prudent, responsible, accountable step forward, but we have a lot to celebrate in Louisiana. That concludes my remarks. MR. WINDHAM:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
Any other questions, comments,
observations from the board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I'll entertain a motion for adjournment. Made by Mr. Slone; second by President

Miller.
Any objection?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
(Meeting concludes at 12:20 p.m.)
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