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MR. JONES: Good morning, everyone. It's good to see you at the February 2021 meeting of the Board of Commerce \& Industry.

This day and age, I'm just glad I show up anywhere at any meeting and that there's no snow, ice, that there is electricity, there is water, there's no hurricane and everybody's masked up except me. And I'm apologizing ahead of time simply because I can't speak behind the mask and enunciate, and I've asked both of my seat mates for permission to be without the mask, so I appreciate that they're allowing me to do that.

I think you will see in the notice of the minutes -- excuse me notice of the meeting, there are going to be some COVID requirements we're going to have for the speakers, and I hope you will follow those. If you have any questions about that, see staff over here on the front row of the room.

With that, we will have the rollcall. Ms. Simmons, if you'd help us there

MS. SIMMONS: Good morning.
MR. JONES: Good morning.
MS. SIMMONS: Don Briggs.
MR. BRIGGS: Present.
MS. SIMMONS: Mayor Toups.
(No response.)

MS. SIMMONS: Yvette Cola.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Guy McInnis.
MR. MCGINNIS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Rickey Fabra.
MR. FABRA: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Manual Fajardo.
MR. FAJARDO: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Stuart Moss.
MR. MOSS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Representative Vincent St.
Blanc for Paula Davis.
MR. ST. BLANC: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Senator Ronnie Johns.
MR. JOHNS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Kenneth Havard.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Jerald Jones.
MR. JONES: Here.
Heather Malone.
MS . MALONE: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Senator Cleo Fields for Bret
Allain.
MR. FIELDS: Present.
MS. SIMMONS: Barry Ivey for Stuart Bishop.

MR. IVEY: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Jan Moller.
MR. MOLLER: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Secretary Don Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: Present.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. George Nassar.
MR. NASSAR: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Darrel Saizan.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Daniel Schexnaydre.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Ronnie Slone.
MR. SLONE: Present.
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Shawn Wilson.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Woodrow Wilson.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Travis Holley.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: We have a quorum.
MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
First item on the agenda are the approval of the minutes from our November 13, 2020 meeting and a short meeting of January 29, 2021.

I would entertain a motion.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: We have a motion from Mr. Moss; a second from Mr. Slone approving the minutes of both meetings.

Do we have any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

First up, the Quality Jobs Program. I understand, Ms. Cheng, you're going to be sitting in for Mr. Favaloro.

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: We traded up. And you can tell him I said so.

MS. CHENG: I will.
Good morning. We have three new Quality

Jobs applications: 20180441, Amedisys Holding, LLC in
East Baton Rouge Parish; 20180197, Fibrebond Corporation
in Webster Parish; and 20190510, Valero Services, Inc.
in St. Charles Parish.
MR. JONES: I would entertain a motion to approve these three applications.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: Motion, Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Johns.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

MS. CHENG: Next we have five Quality Jobs Contract renewals: 20160741, BBQ Guys Manufacturing, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish; 20151134, Calumet GP, LLC, in Caddo Parish; 20161943, General Informatics, LLC
in East Baton Rouge Parish; 20151086, LACC,LLC US in Calcasieu Parish; and 20141117, YCI Methanol One, LLC in St. James parish.

MR. JONES: Point of personal information, the Chair will be recusing himself from deliberation or discussion of 20141117, YCI Methanol 1.

Otherwise entertain a motion on these.
From Mr. Nassar -- motion to approve, Mr.
Nassar?
MR. NASSAR: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board? (No response.)

MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye."
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

MS. CHENG: Next we have one late renewal, which the company has asked to defer to the next
meeting.
MR. JONES: I would entertain a motion to defer this 20150264, Matheson Tri-Gas, Inc.

From Mr. Favalaro (sic); second from Mr. Slone.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Motion to defer, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries. That matter is deferred until the next meeting.

MS. CHENG: We have one change of company name request: Contract 20110680, current contract is under Almatis Burnside, LLC, and they're wanting to change it to LAlumina, LLC in Ascension Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve. Motion from Mr. Briggs; second from

Mr. Moss.

Any questions or comments from the Board? (No response.)

MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say
"aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

MS. CHENG: We have one change of project physical location for Project 20170280, Waitr, Inc. is moving from 8444 Ryan Street, 3rd Floor, Lake Charles, Louisiana 70601 in Calcasieu Parish to 214 Jefferson Street, Lafayette, Louisiana 70501 in Lafayette Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve this change of physical location.

Motion from Mr. Briggs; second from Mr. Moller.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?

| (No response.) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say |  |
| "aye." |  |
| (Several members respond "aye.") |  |
| MR. JONES: Any opposition? |  |
| (No response.) |  |
| MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion |  |
| carries. |  |
| MS. CHENG: We have one change of affiliates |  |
| or owners, Project 20160741, BBQ Guys Manufacturing, LLC |  |
| in East Baton Rouge Parish. The old affiliates and LLC |  |
| members are Shopperschoice.com, LLC, Michael Hackley, |  |
| Ladina Hackley and Corey Tisdale. The new affiliates and LLC members are Shopperschoice.com, LLC and Blaze |  |
|  |  |
| Buyer Corp. |  |
| MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve. |  |
| From Mr. Nassar; second from Mr. Johns. |  |
| Any questions or comments from the Board? |  |
| (No response.) |  |
| MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or |  |
| comments from the public? |  |
| (No response.) |  |
| MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say |  |
| "aye." |  |
| (Several members respond "aye.") |  |

MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

MS. CHENG: We have one full transfer of ownership to a new company, Project 20121272, German Pellets Louisiana, LLC \& Louisiana Pellets, Inc. is being transferred to Lasalle BioEnergy, LLC in La Salle Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve.
Mayor Toups; second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, the motion carries.
MS. CHENG: And that concludes the Quality Jobs portion of the agenda.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Cheng.

Let's see. Now we're moving to Restoration Tax Abatement applications. Are you going to handle that as well?

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Excellent. Thank you. Just lead us on.

MS. CHENG: We have 13 Restoration Tax Abatement applications: 20190418, 1315 Gravier Owners, LLC in Orleans Parish; 20200221, 201 North Rampart, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20180126, 226 Decatur, LLC in Orleans Parish; 20200190, 301 Lafitte, LLC, St. Tammany Parish; 20200263, 347 Girod, LLC in St. Tammany Parish; 20190490, 6400 Chef Menteur, LLC in Orleans Parish; 20180067, CNI Redevelopment, LLC in Orleans Parish; 20170221, Gordon Redevelopment, LLC Orleans Parish; 20180449, In Loving Arms, LLC East Baton Rouge Parish; 20200311, Michael Echols Enterprises in Ouachita Parish; 20190359, OFCH, LLC in Lafayette Parish; 2018090, Rahul Properties, LLC, Orleans Parish; and 20180427, SF NOLA FUND 2, LLC in Orleans Parish.

MR. JONES: Do I hear a motion to approve these Restoration Tax Abatement applications?

Motion from Mr. Johns; second from
Mr. Slone.
MR. IVEY: Point of order?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir, Mr. Toups.
MR. IVEY: No. Rep Ivey.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry.
MR. IVEY: Representative Ivey.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Ivey.
MR. IVEY: This is my first time filling in on this Board. I just want to understand what the standards were with respect to a legislator, you know, voting or participating in a vote of what may appear to be another legislator's application? Is that --

MR. JONES: Historically we've allowed. These are ex officio appointments, so...

MR. IVEY: Thank you for the clarification.
MR. JONES: Thank you. Appreciate your question.

We have a motion and a second.
Any other questions or comments from the
Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public on these Restoration Tax Abatement applications?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

MS. CHENG: Next we have five RTA renewals, but we have a request to withdraw 20131425, Gulf Ventures Associates, LLC in Jefferson Parish.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry, Ms. Cheng. Is that a withdrawal or a deferral?

MS. CHENG: It's a withdrawal.
MR. JONES: So I would entertain a motion to approve the withdrawal of this application of Gulf Ventures Associates.

Motion from Mr. Slone; second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Motion carries. Thank you.

MS. CHENG: We have 20121110, 235 14th
Street, LLC, d/b/a 235 South 14th Street, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20141199, Leonard \& Rebecca Rohrbough, St. Tammany Parish; 20141429, Monroe Development, LLC, Ouachita Parish; and 20131410, Super Hospitality Master Tenant, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. I would entertain a motion to approve those four renewals.

Motion from Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Fajardo.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

All right. I think that takes us into the Enterprise Zone Program. Ms. Cheng, you have to give up your seat.

MS. METOYER: Just for a minute.
MR. JONES: We will note our staff is practicing our new procedure of replacing microphone masks, and that will put masks on microphones so we don't have to scrub them down with disinfectant.

Thank you, Ms. Metoyer. Take us through.
MS. METOYER: We have 19 new applications for Enterprise Zone: 20180055, Alliance Compressors, LLC, Natchitoches Parish; 20170540, Brown Eagle Contractors, Incorporated, Iberville Parish; 20161771, Claiborne Senior Living, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20180523, Coastal Process, LLC, Livingston Parish; 20190007, Edward Via Virginia College of Osteo, Medicine, Ouachita Parish; 20150258, Equilon Enterprises, LLC, St. Charles Parish; 20160984, Gator Millworks, Incorporated, Livingston Parish; 20180636, Harvey Hospitality, LLC, Jefferson Parish; 20170453, Houma Family Dental, Terrebonne Parish; 20180115, M\&A Safety Services, Iberia Parish; 20180114, M\&A Safety Services, LLC, Terrebonne Parish; 20170089, New Orleans Steamboat Company, Orleans Parish; 20180172, Moble Plastics, Incorporated, St. Landry Parish; 20170425, Ochsner Clinic Foundation, Jefferson Parish; 20170460, Plantation Management Company, LLC, Livingston Parish; 20180312, Plantation Management Company, LLC, Tangipahoa

Parish; 20170643, Rail Logix Lacassine, LLC, Jefferson Davis Parish; 20151391, SLC Hospitality, LLC, Calcasieu Parish; and 20151903, Willis Knighton Medical Center, Incorporated, Caddo Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. A number of applications, but $I$ would entertain a motion to approve the applications.

From Mr. Briggs; second from Mr. St. Blanc.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

All right. We have some contract terminations now?

MS. METOYER: Yes.
20140222, Blake Management Group, LLC, Lafayette Parish, the existing contract is 7/1/15 to
$6 / 30$ of 20 , the requested termination date is $6 / 30$ of 2019. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20151400, Lafayette General Health System, Incorporated, Lafayette Parish, the existing contract is $3 / 13 / 16$ to $12 / 20 / 21$. The requested term date is $9 / 12$ of 18 . The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20150864, Palmisano Contractors, LLC, the existing contract period is $4 / 17$ of 15 to $4 / 16$ of 2020. The requested term term date is $10 / 16$ of 2017. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20160765, Placid Refining Company, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is 4/13 of 17 to $4 / 12$ of 2022 . The requested term date is 10/12 of 2019. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20141406, Plantation Management Company, LLC, Livingston Parish, the existing contract is $6 / 13$ of 15 to $6 / 12$ of 2020 . The requested term date is $6 / 12$ of 2019 . The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20131140, Westlake Management Services, Incorporated, Calcasieu, the existing contract is $10 / 1$ of 13 to $9 / 30$ of 18. The requested term date is March 31, 2016. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20140297, Westlake Management Services,

Incorporated, Calcasieu Parish, the existing contract is July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2020. The requested term date is 12/31/2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20130040, Rent A Center East, Incorporated, Orleans Parish, the existing contract is January 11, 2013 to January 10 of 2018. The requested term date is $1 / 1$ of 16 . The program requirements have been met, there are no additional jobs anticipated; 20131358, Hotel Ambassador NOLA, LLC, Orleans Parish, it's August 1 of 2014 to $7 / 31$ of 19 is the existing contract period. The request term date is 12/31 of 2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20170216, Rich's NOLA 2, LLC, Orleans Parish, July 1 of 2017 to June 30 of 2022 is the existing contract period. The requested term date is $12 / 31$ of 2019. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20160426, DIVI Hospitality of Port Allen, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is $12 / 15$ of 16 to $12 / 14$ of 2021. The requested term date is $12 / 31$ of 2019. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20150143, Leading Health Care of Louisiana, Rapides Parish, the existing contract is 1/28 of '15 to $1 / 27$ of 2020 . The requested term date is $1 / 30$ of 2019. The program requirements have been met, no
additional jobs are anticipated.
MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
I would entertain a motion.
Mr. Favalaro (sic) motion to approve these terminations; second from Mr. Moss.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, motion carries.

Now we have cancelations?
MS. METOYER: Yes.
We have 10 cancelations: 20130810, BBP Sales, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; 20131314, ESNola Julie Street Hotel Owner, LLC, Orleans Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; 2016035, JNR Hospitality, Ascension Parish, the company
could not meet the program requirements; 20161672, Lyons Specialty Company, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; 20140165, Lusk Eye Specialist, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, company could not meet the program requirements; 20151082, Five S Industrial, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; 20140135, MK Dixon Funeral Home, LLC, St. Mary Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; 20141168, Oge's Rent All Center, Lafayette Parish, company could not meet the program requirements; 20131128, Parc Lafayette, Lafayette Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements; and 20151011, Performance Car Wash, Caddo Parish, the company could not meet the program requirements.

MR. JONES: All right, ma'am. We have these cancelations. I would entertain a motion to approve cancelations.

From Mr. Fabra; second from Mr. Molar.
Any question or comments from the Board concerning these cancelations?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

Thank you so much.
MS. METOYER: Thank you. That concludes EZ.
MR. JONES: All right. Now this takes us to the Industrial Tax Exemptions. First, the Pre-Executive Order applications.

All right. Who's up?
MR. USIE: First we have six Pre-EO new applications. All six are from Marathon Petroleum Company, LP and all in St. John the Baptist Parish.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. USIE: Contract Numbers 20141606, 20141601-A, 20141609, 20141610-A, 20152023, and 20152026.

MR. JONES: Okay. I understand we had someone from the staff wanted to speak to these.

MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Chair, do you want to have a motion on the table first, and then take these individually?

MR. JONES: That's what $I$ would prefer.
MS. MITCHELL: And then I could explain.
MR. JONES: We have a motion from Mr. Slone; second from Mr. Nassar to approve these applications.

Now, Ms. Mitchell, please lead us.
MS. MITCHELL: Thank you. Good morning,
members. Mandi Mitchell, Assistant Secretary, LED. And the Board, the last time these agenda items came up, the Board asked the department to go back and look into the circumstances surrounding the changes made to the advanced notification for applications 20141606 and 20141606-A, and so I'd like to share with you our findings and provide you some additional context.

So on December 30 of 2014, an advance was filed with the project description "install new gas hydrotreater." In 2018, the data was migrated from our old system, our old Fastlane system, to the new system, Fastlane NextGen. And that's important for future comments that I'll be making. And December 5th of 2018, the Fastlane system audit trail shows that ITEP administrator Hud Usie unlocked the advance for Marathon using the information required system function -- that's a technical function -- to modify the description as requested. So essentially the system has to be unlocked in order for an applicant to make some changes.

Mr. Usie has no writings or notes on this occurrence, but based on past common practice, he firmly believes it was a call that was made to him on this pre-Executive Order advance that didn't raise any concerns or red flags. And it's important, keep in mind, pre-Executive Order.

On December 21st of 2018, a Marathon representative went into system and made some changes, presumably changing the description from "install new gas hydrotreater" to "coker max," changing the start and end dates and reducing the capEX from 386-million to 275-million. December 26, 2018, Mr. Usie reviewed those changes and accepted them.

So it's important now that I go into some context for Board members. Historically changes to advances and applications were commonplace without much scrutiny, sometimes prompted by LED staff for additional information and detail, and sometimes prompted by companies or their representatives and consultants as project details shifted, for example, investment amount changes, changes to start and end dates, switching from traditional back-end projects to a front-end application or other legitimate changes in scope.

LED's focus was then, and continues to be, on ensuring that the Board is presented with accurate
information for consideration, which often changes from the time of filing an advance to Board presentation.

As the Board is well aware, this
administration has made substantial changes to the ITEP program. Those changes come with a number of processes that have been implemented. ITEP is the only incentive that has two dedicated full-time administrators instead of only one, and they are operating the program under three different sets of rules.

In the earliest years of this administration, the focus for the administrators of the program was on drafting new rules and analyzing the processes to go along with the new rules, including the affect of these new rules on updates to Fastlane and how to implement the new requirements. Because pre-Executive Order advances were subject to pre-Executive Order rules, those advances and requested changes to them continue to receive the same level of scrutiny as before the Executive Order, which is the case with the application before you today.

As time began to pass from the enactment of the 2016 Executive Order, the administrators began looking at potential issues on a more forward-looking basis. It was sometime in late 2018 and early 2019 -keep in mind that the 2018 rules had just been finalized
in August of 2018 -- that ITEP administrators began applying more scrutiny and asking more questions of applicants on pre-Executive Order advances and applications.

Along these lines, I'd like to remind the Board that at the October 29 meeting, LED announced to the Board that we would begin reaching out to all companies holding pre-Executive Order advances for which an application had not yet been submitted to the Board to inquire about the company's plans. That survey was conducted between November and December of 2018. And at the February of 2020 Board meeting, LED made a recommendation, which the Board adopted, to begin asking applicants for more detail about pre-Executive Order applications coming to the Board and to explain how their pre-Executive Order projects relate back to the advance.

Going forward, staff will continue to review what amendments have been made to advances and applications and report on this to the Board prior to your consideration.

I'd like to address a few statements and accusations that have been made in the public sphere. It has been suggested that the change was made because the locals denied a previous post-Executive Order ITEP
application by the company. That denial occurred in November of 2019. The amendment to the advance was made in December of 2018, almost a full year prior, so the timing doesn't work out for the local denial to have been the motivation for the requested change.

An accusation has been made that LED staff colluded with the company to circumvent local approval or to defraud the process. We believe that it is undisputed that anyone with LED advised, directed or encouraged the company to amend a pre-Executive Order advance.

In December of 2018, what Marathon asked of LED staff on its pre-Executive Order advance didn't raise any flags or questions before the adjustment to the advance was allowed. Today, we have the benefit of hindsight.

Specifically referring to fraud, in no circumstance did LED staff attempt to engage in deception of the Board or the public or in any effort to give one applicant among hundreds any sort of advantage. The request made did not run afoul of the ITEP rules relating to advances, and, again, the request did not raise any flags or concerns for staff. This also is not any falsification of any information. This is the company approaching LED with a request to make a change,
which was granted by staff. This was not fraud.
I'll leave you with these closing comments for your contemplation. From the perspective of LED's ITEP administrative staff, we have a conflux of a number of things: Massive overhaul of a program that essentially functioned one way for 80 years, including two Executive Orders and two subsequent ITEP program rules changes; new staff that had been with a department for just over a year at the time of the request; staff trying to balance grandfathering rules for pre-Executive Order advances and contract holders while implementing a different approach from the previous program administrators; and a gradual shift towards more intense scrutiny of post, and, more recently, pre-Executive Order advances, applications and renewals.

In fact, LED often finds itself the eyer of stakeholders on all sides, "Too lax, too business friendly" on one hand, and "overly burdensome, bureaucratic, nit-picky and difficult" on the other.

I'll reiterate some thoughts shared by Secretary Pierson just a few months ago. No one should question how seriously LED takes its responsibility to administer programs according to the rules and the laws of the State of Louisiana. That unwavering belief encompasses all of LED's approximately 100 employees, no
matter if we are referring to civil servants or unclassified political appointees. I'm not aware that we've ever claimed perfection, although that is our daily pursuit, but please recognize the purpose which drives our work is always to administer programs according to the regulations and to the law.

So I hope that overview and additional context is helpful to the Board as you proceed to hear from the company and others regarding this matter.

I'll be happy to answer any questions.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Mitchell.
Any questions or comments from the Board to Ms. Mitchell?

Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER: I need to clarify -- in December 2018, a Marathon representative went into the system and changed the original advance?

MS. MITCHELL: That is correct, and the request came in to staff presumably by phone, so that staff would unlock the system to allow the company or its representative to go in and make the change.

MR. MOLLER: And has that always been common practice after the 2018 rules?

MS. MITCHELL: So -- and I'm glad you asked that question. We took a look back at other
pre-Executive Order applications, and of about 197 projects, there were 17 changes to advances that are largely date changes or requests from staff for clearer project descriptions. So, to our knowledge, and as best as we could trace the information, there weren't any to the extent of the change made with this particular application before you. But to directly answer your question, yes, a representative of the company logged into the system and made the changes.

MR. MOLLER: What happened to the
hydrotreater project?
MR. JONES: Excuse me, Mr. Moller.
MS. MITCHELL: I believe those questions should be directed to the company.

MR. JONES: Make sure his microphone is turned on. Are we having issues there? For some reason I'm having a difficult time hearing him.

Try again, Mr. Moller, to make sure I can hear you.

MR. MOLLER: Can you hear me now? MR. JONES: No, I cannot. Try one more -try again.

All right. Well, let's continue working on those technical problems. I want to be sure we can hear the Board members' questions. Make sure it's clear for
the court reporter as well.
Any other questions, Mr. Moller? I'm sorry.
MR. MOLLER: Not for right now.
MR. JONES: Okay. Any other questions from any other Board members?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Ms. Mitchell, did you have something to...

MS. MITCHELL: Yes. At this time, I just would like to turn it over to the company so that you can have the full picture as to the events that led to where we are today.

MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have a company representative here from Marathon? Please come forward.

Thank you. If you'd state your name and your position with the company, please.

MR. WORTMANN: Sure. Dan Wortmann, I'm the Division Controller at the Marathon refinery in Garyville, Louisiana. It's located in St. John the Baptist Parish.

MR. JONES: Great.
Ms. AREND: My name is Camille Arand. I'm a Property Tax Representative with Marathon based out of the Findlay campus, 539 South Main Street in Findlay, Ohio.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. WORTMANN: So for the Board, so with regard to the application 2014606 advance, we appreciate the LED's confirmation that our transparent approach adhered to the rules of the ITEP program.

At Marathon Petroleum, we value open dialog with our stakeholders, including the communities we are part of and the government bodies that do the work of the people. Through ongoing engagement with stakeholders, we seek first to listen and then incorporate feedback.

Based on our review and discussion with LED, and given that the rules with regard to advances are not specific, with respect to the contract, we believe it is appropriate to come together in agreement with the LED team or Board of Commerce and Industry, and most importantly St. John the Baptist Parish. Right? That's the three bodies there, the school board, the sheriff, the council; right? That's the important thing I want to bring out.

So with that, we, therefore, respectfully ask that the Board approve Contract Application ending in 606 and 606 -A with a condition that it must be approved by the local tax authorities. They're the ones that, you know, that -- they're not here today. They're
the ones that are the beneficiaries, so, you know, we work in their community, you know, we operate there. We're asking that you approve it with the condition that it's approved by all three of those organizations. So if the answer is three yeses, fine. If it's three noes, fine. If it's somewhere in between, we're fine with that as well. We're just asking that the decision be at the local level.

MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
MR. MOLLER: Yeah. What happened to the hydrotreater project that you originally filed the advance on?

MR. WORTMANN: Okay. So as things happen throughout the budget process, that project, it -- the economics dried up on it. Okay? So the economics were not there for that, so we had, you know, during the budget process, you come up with other ideas, and this coker max project was a nice project for us. It's a nice asset for the refinery and for our competitive advantages going forward, and we went with that. So the hydrotreater project was canceled.

MR. MOLLER: Okay. So the coker drum project came up in December '18, and you filed the previous -- (inaudible) -- that into the 2014 advance;

```
correct?
```

MR. WORTMANN: Correct. Correct.
MR. MOLLER: But by that point -- oh, my mic
is back.
MR. JONES: Mr. Moller has arrived.
MR. MOLLER: But so by that point certainly everybody was aware that the rules had changed on the program and that there was this 20 percent haircut in the local approval; correct?

MR. WORTMANN: Correct.
MR. MOLLER: But you wanted to have it done under the old rules to get the 100 percent exemption; right?

MR. WORTMANN: And, you know, we felt we -to abide by the rules, we asked -- correct. You know, we asked the LED on the procedures and was granted that change.

MR. MOLLER: Okay.
MR. WORTMANN: Yes.
MR. MOLLER: And so what you're asking us today, you don't want to take the 20 percent haircut. You want the 100 percent exemption that applied really before June 24 th of 2016 , even though this project was more than two and a half years later; correct?

MR. WORTMANN: Correct, but it's not really
your decision -- it is your decision, but it is the decision of the parish. You know, we're saying you can approve -- we'd like you to approve it, but with the, you know, contingent upon the three bodies.

MR. MOLLER: So you want to operate under part of 2018 rules, but not all of the 2018 rules? You want the 2014 -- pre-2016 rules that applies to the size of the exemption, but you want -- and it sounds like you're...

MS. AREND: Sorry. Excuse me. If I may respond.

So our approach is to, again, consult with the local tax authorities, and if it is their desire to support us, but at the 80 percent percentage point, then we would be willing to do that. We want to have the opportunity to work with the locals and make sure that they support us. At 100 percent, at 80 percent, we're working with them.

MR. MOLLER: Okay.
MR. JONES: Does that answer your question, Mr. Moller?

MR. MOLLER: Yes.
MR. JONES: Senator Fields.
MR. FIELDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make sure I'm clear on what you're
requesting. You're requesting that we move forward as a Board today on your projects with the understanding that you would seek approval of the local governing authorities, and if they don't approve, then these exemptions will not go in effect; is that correct?

MR. WORTMANN: Correct. And it will be on the tax rolls this year, right, correct.

MR. FIELDS: Okay.
MR. WORTMANN: I guess procedurally we're not saying "How about we defer it," we go back to them and get their approval or denial and then we come back here another -- and go through this process again. I think y'all would probably like to put this to bed and move forward, and that's just kind of the process we came up, "Hey, let's y'all approve it with conditions." And it's the people we work with, the people we live with, the people we operate in, the community we work -you know, we provide lots of stuff to St. John the Baptist Parish. We just want them to decide.

MR. JONES: Mr. Moller, just one second.
Mr. Ivey, I think you had...
MR. IVEY: I do. So it's my understanding that there's -- it's not a statutory control with respect to it's always been permitted to have the changes with the application, the details, the amount
invested, the specific type or the specific equipment or installation, those things, it's always been permitted historically, and so obviously y'all are caught in the middle of some changes in that. And so all y'all are seeking is the opportunity for the local government, local officials to determine whether or not they will grant the application that's the pre-20 -- the pre-change, put it in their hands and let them decide. If they say no, then you're back here?

MR. WORTMANN: If they say no --
MR. JONES: It's over.
MR. WORTMANN: -- it's no. We don't come back to the next meeting and go through it all again. MR. IVEY: It's kind of an all-or-nothing proposition then?

MR. WORTMANN: No. The sheriff, Sheriff Tregre could say yes and the school board and the parish council could say no, or any of those combinations.

MR. IVEY: In theory there may be more risk for $y^{\prime}$ all, you know, seeking that 100 percent versus the 80?

MR. WORTMANN: Correct. Correct. We're putting it in their hands. That's where we operate, that's where we work, that's where we live. We just want to let them make the decision.

MR. IVEY: All right. Thank you.
MR. JONES: Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER: If we approve this today, then we're saying we think you should get 100 percent exemption if the locals agree. What if the locals come back and say they want to give 80 , would they have that ability if we voted for 100?

MR. JONES: Yes. Yes.
Mr. Fields.
MR. FIELDS: Then would it have to come back before -- this is my second time sitting in for Senator Allain.

MR. JONES: Good to have you here. You can thank him later.

MR. FIELDS: Last time I was here, Mr. Chairman, it was this very issue, and it's just -so would they have to come back before the Board if the local government decides 80 versus $100 ?$

MR. JONES: Let me help with procedure perhaps, if $I$ can, and then that may...

The way I see this working is, right now we have a motion to approve these -- all of these Marathon applications. I think the issue that is coming that we're discussing specifically right now deals with the first two, 1606 and 1606-A. So what I would foresee, if
it's the Board's desire, to come back with amended motion for these two projects, 1606 and 1606-A that make them specifically contingent upon whatever the locals vote. So if the locals vote 100 , if they vote 80 , if they vote 20 , then that's the way it is and that Marathon would not be coming back to this Board. Whatever the locals vote, that would be the decision.

Mr. McInnis.
MR. MCINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer that amendment at this time, if that is --

MR. JONES: Okay. I would entertain that amended motion just as to 1606 and 1601-A.

I have a second from Mr. Fabra.
Before we -- any other questions or comments about the procedure of that? And we're not going to vote on it just yet because we have other people who want to comment on all of this and we want to give them adequate opportunity.

So procedurally what we have right now is an amended motion on 1606 and 1606-A that would make the Board approval, if we get that approval, contingent upon action and approval by the locals. Okay?

MS. MALONE: Can I ask one question?
MR. JONES: Yes, Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: Can we ask LED counsel, based
on our current rules, can we allow the locals to choose which ITEP rules to follow?

MR. JONES: Fair question.
MS. MALONE: Or are we getting...
overstepping...
MR. JONES: Fair question.
Ms. Bourgeois.
MS. BOURGEOIS: Tam Bourgeois, LED Executive Counsel.

I think technically we're operating under the 2016 rules, but I also think that regardless of what rules we're operating under -- I will say the 2016 rules, and all of them, say you operate under the facts and circumstances presented to you at the time of consideration, and so I don't think it would be inappropriate if you wanted to put any conditions or, you know, present a motion like this, I think it would be appropriate because these are the facts and circumstances that you're presented with. The rules can't account for every situation that comes before you, and, really, at the end of the day, your charge is to do what you think is in the best interest of the state, and if that is passing a motion like this under these circumstances, then I think you're well within your --

MR. JONES: Ms. Bourgeois, let me make sure

I understand what you just said, and to clarify for the record. When you say we're operating under 2016 rules, pre-EO 2016 rules, that's because this was technically a 2014 advance notification, so, therefore, we're under those pre-EO rules; is that --

MS. BOURGEOIS: Yes, sir, because the 2018 rules say that if you have an application related for an advance that was filed before the Executive Order, you operate under 2016 rules.

MR. JONES: Correct. Okay. Thank you.
MS. MALONE: I have one other question.
So with the conditions, will they be for the locals to choose, you know, between the three sets of rules essentially that we have right now? Because I don't want us to get into another situation where the locals bring back this sliding scale of, you know, first year, this percentage, second year, this percentage. So how should we go about directing the locals on how to determine the percentage exemption that they should receive?

MS. BOURGEOIS: That's a great question, and as y'all have been talking, I've been taking notes of ways to perhaps refine the procedure. So I think -this sounds to me more like a hybrid between 2017 and 2018, and 2017 you went to -- you go to the locals first
and they set their own individual percentages, if you recall. So I think what it sounds to me like the pleasure of the Board would be, with this particular motion that you're considering, would be to go back to the locals and say you pass the resolution, and your resolution will set a certain percentage. And I think it should be clear that it's one percentage for the life of, you know, the initial and/or renewal part of the exemption.

MS. MALONE: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Mr. Slone.
MR. SLONE: Thank you for that explanation. However, this is -- we're considering this because the change in the coker max being the adjustment made to the application? Because if we're operating from that timeframe, it would have been 100 percent; am I correct?

MS. BOURGEOIS: You are correct.
MR. SLONE: We're pulling these two out because of that, because of the changes and the adjustments made by the organization to their application?

MS. BOURGEOIS: That's my understanding.
MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. SLONE: So it would seem to me that we would be, even if we're doing the local piece contingent
upon them, it would be based upon the 100 percent unless locals decide they -- and I think that's what's being presented.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Well, as I understand it, in order for this exemption to go to contract, you will have to receive -- we will have to receive resolutions and letters from each local saying yes they approve it, and then telling us what percentage of the exemption they want to approve it under.

MR. JONES: If I may, let me see if I can help with this just a little bit because $I$ want to be sure. This is an unusual situation simply because the company is coming to the Board and saying we are prepared to live with whatever the local entities want to do. Normally what would happen in a, let's say, pre-EO situation, it's 100 percent, and that's it. And if they went to the locals and asked the locals' opinion, the locals could say we don't want you to get anything and they can basically thumb their no noses to the locals. But I think what has happened here is -and I don't want to speak for Marathon, so if I veer off and hit a tree here, pull me back, but what I think I hear the company saying is we're willing to submit ourselves to the will of the locals, whatever they wish to do, and if they do something less than 100 , then
we're not going to come back to this Board and complain about it.

MR. WORTMANN: Correct.
MS. AREND: Correct.
MR. WORTMANN: Correct.
MR. JONES: So I think that's where we are. The company is saying we will give up any rights that we have and we will submit ourselves to the will of the locals.

I'm sorry. Am I --
MR. WORTMANN: Correct.
MR. JONES: Okay. The company's agreeing with me on that.

MR. MOLLER: I just want to make -- go back to the fundamental point is that you said you were going to build one thing, and then in 2018, after the new rules, you said we're going to build something entirely different. So for all practical purposes, it seems to me this is a project that should be considered under the 2018 rules. I just don't understand why we are considering this under these old rules when this is a post-2018 project.

MR. JONES: Well, but it's not. That's the problem.

MR. MOLLER: But the application was -- the
application for coker drums was December 2018.
MR. JONES: But I think, Mr. Moller, we have a lot of situations that were where the advance notification was pre-EO and the application did not come in until after the EO, and what happens here is that the project, the project changed. And under the -- and, frankly, under the pre-EO rules, that was -- I'm not saying it was done, but I'll say it wasn't frowned upon.

MR. MOLLER: But if the -- I mean, this is a, for all practical purposes, this is a post-EO project.

MR. JONES: Okay. Help me understand -let's assume that your distinction is correct. I'm not conceding the point. I'm just assuming for sake of argument. Let's assume for sake of argument that your point is correct. What's the difference? At the end of the day, the company goes to the locals and the locals will vote yes, no or something in between and the company is agreeing to live with that. What is the difference?

MR. MOLLER: The difference is is that the 2018 rules say there is a 20 percent haircut no matter what. You know, the locals don't have the option under the 2018 rules to grant 100 percent.

MR. JONES: You're worried about the
locals --
MR. MOLLER: I just --
MR. JONES: You're worried about the locals rendering their opinion on this project?

MR. MOLLER: I think they should render their opinions under the 2018 rules because this is a post-2018 project.

MR. JONES: All right. I think you'll have an opportunity to vote on the motion.

Mr. Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: Just a point of clarity I'd like to bring to the table. An advance notification is not a contract. It is notice of an intent to make an investment. It's general in nature. It can't be specific because of all of the market forces out there that we're talking about. So this starts a clock. It helps us weed out who's got a real project and writes a check with that and then triggers that an application will come and sets a deadline for that application to come or they come back and ask for an extension in the process.

So to continue to beat on the advance notification I think doesn't characterize what that document is, in fact.

Thank you.

MR. JONES: All right. Mr. Ivey.
MR. IVEY: Another point of, you know, the application or the advance notice numbers are all dated that were 2014, 2015, so, I mean, what we're -- what's actually, you know, we're going to be voting on this application that were dated back then. So unless they're somehow by statute or by rule required to resubmit a new application or advance notice, well, then, I believe the request and motion to be made are perfectly in order.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Right now I think procedurally I'm rethinking my -- I think we need to vote on replacing the old motion with the new motion procedurally. I think that's the appropriate action under Robert's rules.

So right now we have -- the motion properly on the table is to approve all six, and the motion was made by Mr. McInnis and seconded I think by Mr. Fields -- I forgot who made the second.

MS. SIMMONS: Fabra.
MR. JONES: Sorry?
Mr. Fabra. Forgive me. Thank you.
-- to amend that motion to approve just 1606 and 1606-A contingent upon approval by the local government entities.

Ms. Bourgeois.
MS. BOURGEOIS: The only other thing I might suggest is if the Board wants to put a deadline by which the company would be able to -- so this doesn't drag on indefinitely. Sixty, 90 days in order for them to get their resolutions.

MR. JONES: I'm not -- I mean, that's up to the Board. The only problem is I don't know how I enforce that. I just, you know, as a practical matter.

Mr. Wortmann.
MR. WORTMANN: Ninety days is...
MS. BOURGEOIS: If they don't provide LED with resolution of approval within 90 days, they don't get --

MR. JONES: What you're saying is we need to have this one way or the other.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Correct.
MR. MCINNIS: I would agree with the 90 days.

MS. BOURGEOIS: So they're not coming back in two years.

MR. JONES: Takes a village to raise me. Thank you very much.

Motion. Mr. Fabra, you accept that amendment to the motion, so now the motion is to approve.

Let me restate the motion and then --
MR. ST. BLANC: Could we state the motion, exactly what we're doing?

MR. JONES: That's what I'm going to do.
MR. ST. BLANC: I can give you an idea that we have to approve it with the approval of the locals, and we have to just add with 90 days.

MR. JONES: Exactly.
MR. ST. BLANC: So we're working on one motion. We already have a motion on the floor, so we're working on this motion, this motion, approval of the ITEP, plus the approval of the locals.

MR. MCINNIS: It's an amendment.
MR. ST. BLANC: What are you amending to, what motion?

MR. JONES: This is what the Chair would like to do, if the Board is agreeable, the original motion when we first started was to approve all six. I would like to replace that motion with a motion just to approve 1606 and 1606-A contingent upon local approvals within 90 days.

MR. IVEY: Who made the original motion?
MR. ST. BLANC: Mr. Chair, you have the ability to do that. If you're doing it, you will have
to ask for a point of order, do you have any opposition do this?

MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have any opposition of replacing -- and then we'll come back and handle the other four after we handle that part.

MR. MOLLER: So a point of clarification.
MR. JONES: Sure.
MR. MOLLER: So the locals could then decide how much -- I mean, whether they want to grant the exemption or the percentage of exemption? Because remember we went through this with St. James Parish where they tried to kind of craft their own deal, and we said no, you've got to be fish or fowl.

MR. JONES: That was because they were under a different set of rules.

MR. MOLLER: Okay. So we are creating a special case here, and only this case?

MR. JONES: Again, this is the key to this, Mr. Moller, as far as I am concerned is that under the pre-EO rules, they get 100 percent exemption.

MR. MOLLER: Correct.
MR. JONES: We're carving something out for them and the company is basically represented to this Board and we're operating under this representation that if they don't go and get 100 percent, that they're not
going to come back here and complain and try to appeal and raise cane about it. They're going to accept whatever the local governments give them, whether that's zero or whether it's 100 or anything in between.

MR. MOLLER: Okay. And if we vote down this motion, then we revert back to the original version, which is all six; is that correct?

MR. JONES: Then we would have to come back and figure out where we go from there.

All right. Mr. McInnis.
MR. MCINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my original amendment and ask that we file a new negotiation for 1606 and 1606-A.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. MCINNIS: And being a parish president and having dealt with a mistake, if you will, on denying an exemption for a company that now St. Bernard wants to approve, knowing that this body cannot do that, I believe -- and I don't know if it's been tested, to answer your original question, us allowing locals to do something. I don't -- I don't necessarily agree with that. I think the locals can do what they want, it's just never been tested, and there's no -- there's no prohibition in the Constitution for locals to do their own exemptions. There's nothing that gives them the
authority either. So that's a question. And we want to test that in St. Bernard Parish. I don't think it's been tested.

But to answer the question raised, I don't think this body can enter into a contract other than the 100 percent or the 80 or the 20 based on the rules we're under, but the locals, I believe, can do their own contract if it comes outside of the rules that we operate under. So that's just kind of where I'm at, and my amendment's withdrawn and my motion is set.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. JONES: All right. So where we are right now, and just so -- I know we have some people who have also signed up to speak. Before we vote on this motion, we're going to give everyone a chance to speak, so don't -- I'm not trying to railroad this thing through. We want to give everybody who is here to speak on this issue because this has been a long time coming.

So the motion is 1606, 1606-A, approve those two projects contingent upon local government approval at whatever levels the locals approve each one of them. I think there's three that we're talking about here, and the three of those will do whatever the three of those choose to do and they have 90 days to do it. And if they fail to do it in 90 days, then it's zero. Is that
fair? Do we all understand the motion?
All right. Now, any other comments?
Ms. Mitchell.
MS. MITCHELL: Very briefly, just one point of clarification to Mr . Wortmann's comments, LED staff did not specifically approve for the company to go in and change their project from hydro treater to the coker max, so $I$ just wanted that to be reflected on the record that a request was made of LED staff to unlock the system so a chance could go in and be made, and that was done, but not specifically to go from one project description to another. Point of clarification, that's all.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Mitchell.
Any other comments from the company?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Thank you.
Now let's go to others who want to comment on the project.

We have a -- I'm sorry. I can't read your writing -- a Mr. Washington or Dr. Washington.

They'll need to sit there, please. If y'all can go back to your chairs, please, that would be great, if you don't mind. Thank you.

Dr. Washington, if you'll take a seat right
there, please. Thank you.
DR. WASHINGTON: Thank you. Good morning to each of you.

MR. JONES: Good morning. Dr. Washington, if you would, state your name the record, please, and pull that mic down to you if you don't mind so it will pick you up a little bit better. Thank you.

DR. WASHINGTON: Dr. Alice Washington.
MR. JONES: Yes, ma'am. And you're representing a company or a group?

DR. WASHINGTON: NASW Together Louisiana.
MR. JONES: Great. Thank you very much. Please give the Board your comments.

DR. WASHINGTON: I will be brief, and in the inevitable possibility of being redundant, I'm going to continue with my notes as I have them.

MR. JONES: That's fine.
DR. WASHINGTON: In 2016, Governor Edwards reformed the Industrial Tax Exemption process requiring a vote by local taxing bodies on any ITEP requests with advance notice dated after June 24, 2018. Now, some have attempted to avoid the Governor's orders by seeking or erroneously assuming grandfathered status for unrelated orders posted after June 2016.

LED appears to have known about those
changes, and, to my dismay, they seem to be cooperating with such unacceptable, perhaps even fraudulent practices. Such changes were allow a corporation to avoid a local review of requested exemptions by taxing bodies, thus, local or state municipalities would be deprived of millions of dollars in property tax revenue without consent or review from local government.

Today I come before you to request that this Board review these patterns and practices, unacceptable, perhaps even fraudulent, and root them out immediately.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Dr. Washington.
Any questions or comments for Dr. Washington from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Thank you very much. Appreciate you being here today.

Next, Mr. Bagert, Mr. Broderick Bagert.
MR. BAGERT: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir. State your name and your position.

MR. BAGERT: I'm Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana. And I've got a packet of information that $I$ think most of you have, but there's a few more here.

Let me try to describe what appears to be happening with this. As Dr. Washington stated, the Governor and this Board made changes to the Industrial Tax Exemption Program, and when you make changes, you always have the question of current practice. And I think fairly, even if maybe we wouldn't have it this way, fairly he said but let's just change rules going forward. If you have an advance notice you've already submitted, the existing rules are in place, but for all new projects, any projects that are initiated after this advance notice, that a new set of rules are going to apply, which I think was a very fair thing. We might even at the time have said too fair, but is appropriate, because if things had been done a certain way, even if it's not a good way, that is due some respect because businesses do deserve consistency. They do deserve to have some sense of what the expectations are, and if the expectation has been set for a practice, even if it's not an ideal practice, the decision was made by this Board to continue that practice, but to say going forward, there's going to be a different set of rules, and the different set of rules have been clearly stipulated. Maybe there have been changes here and there, but it's always said you're going have to go to the locals.

So in 2018, not like July of 2016, not August, but in 2018, Marathon Oil initiated a project to install four new cokers. It then takes an advance notice on which it has enacted, empties it of its content and fills it with this brand new project in order to portray it as though it's a pre-Executive Order contract, a pre-Executive Order advance notification. And then goes to LED staff and says "Is that okay? Could I have access to change the system?" And LED staff says yes to changing the system. And in e-mail, Hud Usie says it is appropriate for a company to be able to make changes.

Now, this has been portrayed as though it's just some technical matter. You know when you have a new project, you do an advance notice. To go through the trouble of not doing advance notice, but taking an old advance notice for an entirely unrelated project, a hydro treater; right, which pulls sulphur out of already refined fuel, and instead, emptied of its content, made a special request to have access to the computer system, change the computer system and now have a project not initiated in 2015, but in 2018, reflects clear intent. And the clear intent was to have the 100 percent and the no local approval process apply to a project for which they knew, and anyone who's looking at this in a
reasonable way knows, is a post-Executive Order project.
We find it kind of astounding that these are being contemplated for approval. I mean, you have a company that has tried to abuse and game this system. There are serious problems with the way that this program is being administered by staff, which continually makes the interpretation most favorable to the company regardless of the circumstances.

To allow a company to take a 2018 project and stuff it into a 2015 Executive Order in order to avoid your regulations, and then to have this Board say "Well, because this tiny nonprofit, who's got as many staff statewide as this agency has on this program, happened to have kept a 2017 version of the advance notices" and said "That's funny, a 2018 project submitted in 2014," and it consulted it, we caught this and you've caught them. And having caught them attempting to abuse this board and the taxpayer of this state to the tune of $\$ 43-$ million by changing documents in order to have a project that is not eligible for a certain consideration receive that consideration in a context where there is a serious material benefit, to then say "Well, you've been caught, so now we're going have the same even more favorable than you would have had had you not engaged in the manipulation in the first
place" just seems entirely inappropriate in those circumstance.

We think these ought to be rejected. We think Marathon's applications as a whole, because of their clear intent to abuse the process of this system, of this project, that their applications as a whole should be rejected, and there has to be a serious look at the practices of staff of how they are administering this program to allow things that any reasonable person knows is a totally different project, allow that to be presented as though it's the same.

So we would urge you to reject these applications and to begin initiating external investigation about how this program is being administered.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments for Mr. Bagert?

Mr. Ivey.
MR. IVEY: Just quickly. And, again, this my first time appearing here, so I don't know a whole lot about procedural things, however, being a legislator and serving on ways and means and dealing with ITEP, I'm very familiar with a lot of these programs. And we've talked before as well.

So prior to 2016, were there any rules or provisions -- any rules, basically, because there's not much statute -- that prohibited an advance notice application from being heavily amended or if, you know, like you said, contents dumped out, was that prohibited prior to 2016 by the rule or anything else?

MR. BAGERT: Could you submit an application for advance notice that's on an entirely different subject?

MR. IVEY: Well, is it the same site? I mean, is it a -- I don't know. I'm not very familiar. My first day here. But if it's the same site --

MR. BAGERT: Look, I would say that I content that it's no longer an advance notice for that project. It's an advance notice for an entirely different project.

I mean, now, I'm saying -- I'm not an attorney. We have an attorney who's not able to be here who's looked at this very carefully. This is not -- the advance number being used for this project does not apply to this project. It applies to a different project, which was abandoned, and then that totally new project has been attached to this advance notice inappropriately. So $I$ would say at any time the idea that you can take an advance notice number, submit it
under one circumstance, change the project entirely and consider that advance to be applicable to this entirely different project, it seems ludicrous to suggest that that is reasonable. Or not even reasonable, but illegal.

MR. IVEY: I wasn't suggesting anything. I was just curious if there's any rules --

MR. BAGERT: My interpretation, and I think our interpretation would be that no, you cannot have an entirely different project, not amended to it, but an entirely different project be considered to be applied for under an advance notice when the advance notice was submitted for something unrelated to that project.

MR. IVEY: All right. And then, you know, mentioned -- you know, I'm all about accountability. I do believe that at the end of the day, we're not approving anything. We are requiring the local government, you know, authorities to determine whether or not they want to give that 100 percent or that it 80 percent, you know, or nothing at all. I mean, so I do believe, you know, it's not all one way or the other. You know, we're not deciding they have to go 80 percent or this is 100 percent deal. This is we're requiring the locals to decide what level they want to participate in.

So there is opportunity for -- we're not forcing anything. The locals get to decide ultimately, and I think that's the primary objective that the Governor, you know, had intended in his major reform to the program is that the local government gets to have a say in what goes on in these types of transactions.

So while it may not be tech- -- you know, if the opportunity is up to 100 percent in this particular case, but it's the locals' decision, I think the main objective is being absolutely adhered to, you know, in that the locals get to decide.

MR. BAGERT: Representative Ivey, for us this is no longer about the merits of this specific application. You have a company that has intentionally modified a document in order to attempt to avoid regulations that you've set in place with one goal. There's no other reason why they don't just submit a new advance notice. Why wouldn't they -- I mean, they do an average of four of these a year in the past. Why not submit a new advance notice? And in that circumstance, where a company has attempted to manipulate the rules in order to make an end run around this Board where the staff that you have to rely on; right? Y'all aren't paid. You have to rely on the staff to have effective and appropriate oversight. There are some really
serious things and questions that we think you should be asking about how this is being administered.

To contemplate any -- the actual exemption seems to us to be almost just off the table. At that point, they have attempted to abuse this system in order to avoid your regulations willfully, and there's no other explanation that $I$ can understand of why they wouldn't submit a new advance notice if that was not their intent. So we think no, that's not a compromise to have it just go back to the locals. That's what they would have to do anyway if they had not attempted to manipulate the document in order to have it apply for rules for which is it not eligible to the tune of \$43-million.

We work with a lot of black churches and poor communities, and if a kid steals $\$ 100$, they throw the book at him and they put him in jail and people applaud and they say we have a rule of law and they say that rules have to apply. And now we have company attempting to manipulate a process, attempting willfully to manipulate a process for $\$ 43$-million and they get caught and you say "Well, let's give them 100 percent if it locals decide." We think it's entirely inappropriate and it reflects the double standards of our state around who gets to have the rules applied to them and who does
not.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bagert.
All right. Next in line, Mr. Rich
Mooreland.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Chair, can I make one...
MR. JONES: In a moment.
MS. MITCHELL: Okay.
MR. JONES: Mr. Mooreland, if you can, state your name and the organization that you represent, please.

MR. MOORELAND: Rick Mooreland, Together Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you, sir.
MR. MOORELAND: Like Dr. Washington, I had prepared remarks. Before I get into those, I do want to mention that $I$ believe the advance notice was submitted on December 30th, 2014, and the project was to begin on January 1st, 2015, so I don't think we can talk about economic forces changing in the interim. This was a project that was set to proceed a few days later.

Also, I don't see the logic of allowing changes for whatever investment is in the pipeline to whatever the company decides any time in the future that they want to do. That just defies the whole logic of allowing -- defies the logic of the Executive Order.

But to go on, Together Louisiana's role here for the last few years has been to call on you as a Board to pay closer attention to ITEP applications where ITEP rules seem to be getting stretched, stretching the definition of manufacturing almost beyond recognition, stretching applications for manufacturing in one site to include another site 10 miles away, stretching ITEP rules to fit what looks a lot like routine cost of doing business or required pollution equipment, stretching deadlines for companies, but strictly enforcing them for local taxing bodies. Sometimes it feels as if LED is stretching the rules however they can to make sure companies get the exemptions they want.

LED does promote these exemption programs, they coach companies through the application process and they collect hefty application fees, so LED doesn't want these companies to fail. But these first two Marathon applications, 20141601 and 201461606-A, these go way beyond stretching the rules. We've given you strong evidence that this simply breaks the rules or ignores the rules. This tops everything we've raised questions about before.

And the really disturbing, scary thing is that we don't know whether this is one exceptional case, and now we do know, or just the tip of the iceberg
because we only happened to notice this one case and bring it to your attention. And it's hard to know how many other cases we missed, apparently at least 17, and how long this kind of thing has been going on. And we couldn't expect you as a Board to have noticed this because LED staff gave you no indication in your packets in November or in your packets for today's meeting that the 2014 advance notice record allowing Marathon to apply under all rules had been altered by them or by Marathon to fit another entirely different new project. And this does not seem like just a more detailed description of the same project. I think that's pretty clear. LED hid it from you either deliberately or because this was considered normal practice, part of making sure their companies get the exemptions they want.

Who is looking out for the people who pay for these exemptions either directly in higher property taxes or indirectly in higher rents or cuts in schools and other public services?

Together Louisiana has only a skeleton staff and volunteers, like myself, from its member organizations, and we can't possibly keep up with the room full of company spokespeople and certain attorneys here representing applicants for these exemptions.

Looking out for the public interest, making sure LED is following their own rules and the law when they award exemptions that the rest of us have to pay for, that's not our job. It's your job on this Board. You're supposed to exercise oversight, but your oversight becomes impossible if they're hiding things from you that you need to know, not just in this case, but potentially in many other cases.

So it's now your responsibility as a Board not just to deny this application outright, but to demand a truly independent investigation of whatever patterns and practices allow this, and who knows how many other rule-breaking exemptions to be presented for your approval. We can't make this investigation happen, but you can, and you should because that's your job. And that's what it seems that it's going to take.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Mooreland.
Any questions from the Board to
Mr. Mooreland?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
Next. And, again, I'm having a little bit of difficulty reading the handwriting. Mr. Larry Sorapuru from St. John Parish. Forgive me.

Can you state your name?
MR. SORAPURU: Yes. Good morning. Larry Sorapuru, Junior.

MR. JONES: Forgive me for not reading well.
MR. SORAPURU: 502 Highway 18, Edgar,
Louisiana. I'm a former councilman from St. John Parish. I was here in November, but I ask you to not take any action on 1606 and 1606-A until the local government, the school board and St. John Parish council both have input before this bill moves any forward with this application.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir. Appreciate your comments.

Any questions or comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all right.
Next, Mr. Edgar Cage, please.
Mr. Cage, state your name and your position.
MR. CAGE: Thank you, Mr. Jones. My name is Edgar Cage, and I'm with Together Louisiana and I'm here to speak not about these applications because we shouldn't even be discussing them, but about the process, what's going on and what needs to happen to clear the process. There are a lot of questions, a lot
of discussions because it's not clear. It's not clear why we're even looking at these.

You know, in our society, we have a way of identifying things, and we identify those with numbers. Each individual, we have a Social Security Number, and that number is used to file any and everything we do. In the ITEP system, we assign application numbers, and that is to help file and help keep and help understand what's happening with a particular project. And in this case, it's very, very clear, it's very, very clear that a pre-Executive Order project number was used for a project that was started in 2019 but submitted December 21st, 2018. That should not happen.

And you talk about the scope changes. I understand scope changes, but a hydro treater and a coker is two different things. It's not the same scope. It's two different things. If it was up and up in this process, another application would have been presented for the later project from 2018.

And what I'm asking and what $I$ would like to see and is to protect the integrity of this process and this Board and the citizens of the State of Louisiana, that we have somebody look into this to fully understand the process. And the more $I$ heard this morning, I think the more we need that someone look at this process.

How do we allow company to go into the state's system to change something freely, it seems, without supposedly any approval on an application from 2014? That shouldn't happen. That shouldn't -- you think they going to do something that will make less profit for them? No. So there's so many things that we're hearing, that I'm hearing, that I'm calling for. I'm demanding. Senator Johns, Senator Fields, Representative Ivey, I want to protect you guys' integrity. You can't say after today "We didn't know." We're letting you know there are issues and problems would the system, the process that needs to be investigated that needs to be looked at.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
Any questions or comments for Mr. Cage?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Next we have Ms. Lady Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: Good morning.
MR. JONES: Good morning. Please state your name and your position.

MS. CARLSON: My name is Lady Carlson, and I'm with Together Louisiana. And first of all, I would like to say that our leaders, many of our leaders are elderly, they cannot come to this hearing, they want to
be here, but they're concerned about the virus, and so according to your rules, we sent in comments before 4 o'clock yesterday, mailed and e-mail comments, and I'd like to know if members of the Board have been privy to those. Have they been distributed to the Board?

MR. JONES: I have not seen these comments.
Have we received any from the staff?
MR. USIE: Staff didn't receive any comments. We had a e-mail address stated on the agenda cover page that they were to send it to, and, to best of my knowledge, none were received.

MS. CARLSON: And so I want to disagree with the staff. And, again, a lot of our leaders are elderly, they did send in comments. We worked with people. And so I would ask that they go back and look again at whether or not you received comments because we've talked to some of our folks.

MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you. We'll do that.

MS. CARLSON: And I think you can't make a judgment on this unless you have those comments as well.

And I'd want to say this: Listen, if I called the assessor and said to the tax assessor "I don't like my taxes, and so I'd like to give you -- I'd like you to give me access to my tax records in the
computer so $I$ can go in and change it," that is -- I can't do that, so I'm not sure why Marathon or any other company is allowed to do that.

I think this Board needs to investigate the standards. There need to be standards, there needs to be a look at the way LED operates. I'm not accusing anybody. I'm just saying you need to understand how they operate, and if $I$ can't go in and change my taxes, I don't think other people should be able to. I don't think Marathon should be allowed to go in and change anything in the computer that the state has authority over. And if we can -- if they can do it, then I'd like to ask Mr. Ivey that you pass a bill that I can do it because fair is fair. I don't get out of paying my taxes. Fair is fair. If you're going to let LED work with companies to change their applications, then work with us as citizens so we can change ours.

MR. JONES: Thank You, Ms. Carlson.
Any other comments or questions for Ms.
Carlson?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
All right. I have no other cards of those who wish to speak. We have a motion on the floor -first of all, do we have any other --

MR. USIE: Can I just make one more comment about not receiving the e-mails?

MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. USIE: In the agenda packet, we do have a written comment section, and it says

LEDBoardPublicComments@la.gov. We did receive one public comment that came through. We did not receive any others, so $I$ just wanted to be clear.

MR. JONES: Okay. The one public -- have we received the one public comment that came through?

MR. USIE: Correct.
MR. JONES: No. Have we received it, the Board received it?

MR. USIE: It was from a company that couldn't be here. It wasn't about making a comment to the Board. It was about them not being able to be present at the meeting.

MR. JONES: Oh, it had nothing to do with this Marathon --

MR. USIE: Had nothing to do with Marathon. I just wanted to be clear. She said that other people sent in e-mails, and we did not see them at that address.

MR. BAGERT: I'm CC'd on them. It's just not true. I'm CC'd on them. I've received them.

MR. USIE: I just wanted to state that we knew the e-mail was working because we had one that came through to that e-mail, and we also did a test.

MR. JONES: All right. I'm not going to referee what we did and did not receive. I am in a dilemma about not being able to receive public comments when there apparently have been made available.

Let's do this: I want to take a five-minute recess so $I$ can confer. I'm asking you not to go anywhere. So we're going to come back and deal with this motion, but give me five minutes.

Ms. Mitchell, do you have something to say before we break?

MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. There were just a few comment made, and I promise I'll be brief. I do need to make some clarifications.

I can speak on behalf of LED staff, there was no intent to abuse any system. The rules do not prohibit changes to advance notifications so long as the project end date has not lapsed. Secretary Pierson has already eloquently explained the purpose of the advance notification document. And then also I'd like to say that LED did not hide anything from the Board, and I would just ask Board members to go back to the context that was explained. Yes, the Executive Order happened
in 2016. Subsequent to that, there were two iterations of the rules, the last of which had just been -- the ink had just been dried August of 2018.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Mitchell.
All right.
MR. FIELDS: Let me ask a question about that real quickly. I know, Mr. Chair, just real quickly, Madam Undersecretary.

MR. JONES: Go right ahead.
MR. FIELDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
When a company requests -- I guess they have to request permission to change anything on their application; correct, based on your testimony?

MS. MITCHELL: For the advance. So, yes, it's submitted in the system, and in order to reopen it, they -- it has to be information required or unlocked, so they may ask to make an adjustment. And as Secretary Pierson alluded to, from time to time, the investment dollar amount changes, the scope changes, the project dates shift, and so there are a myriad of reasons.

MR. FIELDS: I guess my only question is do they tell you why they want to change something? Do you know, is there a specific request made or do they just say "Can you give me permission to alter my request?"

MS. MITCHELL: From my understanding -- and

I'm not an administrator of the program. From my understanding, it varies from time to time as to whether or not there is specificity added to the request.

I will tell you, late 2018, early 2019, and you have to keep in mind, this is a pre-Executive Order advance that we're referring to, and everyone, when we were going through the rules changes for the ITEP program, everyone agreed we are grandfathering pre-Executive Order advances at this cutoff date June 24th, 2016. And for some time, there was a certain level of scrutiny that has since intensified, even on those pre-Executive Order advances, applications and renewals.

MR. FIELDS: Well, in deference to the Chair, you know, $I$ respect that, but I do think that we probably need to look at it if a company makes a request, you probably need to know for what reason, and then we need to -- because that's why we're here today because of this.

MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. And that is a commitment we have made to the Board, and as I recounted, when I provided additional context, LED proactively brought to the Board a recommendation that we start demanding and requesting more information from companies, even on pre-Executive Order applications, and
they now come to the Board and explain when they're coming in and submitting an application on a pre-Executive Order advance how it links back to the advance and, you know, why are we here today if it may have been some time predating the Executive Order.

Thank you, Mr. Fields.
MR. MOLLER: I just have one...
MR. JONES: Yes, sir, Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER: I'm sorry.
MR. JONES: No, that's okay.
MR. MOLLER: If I understand your earlier testimony, you said that there have been 17 instances of pre-EO changes -- advances being changed?

MS. MITCHELL: Yes, changes made to those advances, and it varies from date changes to investment amount changes, but mostly those simple technical changes. We couldn't find any in our research that were similar to this one.

MR. MOLLER: Okay. Would it be responsible just to get a list of those just so we understand -- I mean, $I$ understand that this is a unique case where -MS. MITCHELL: This is a unique case. MR. MOLLER: -- where the entire project changed, but I would like to understand what other changes may have been made to those pre-EO applications.

MS. MITCHELL: Okay.
MR. MOLLER: Thank you.
MR. JONES: All right. Let's take five minutes. We'll be back at 11:15. Thank you.
(A recess was taken.)
MR. JONES: All right. Calling the meeting back to order after a short recess. During the recess, we have -- it appears as though there were comments that were sent in to the correct e-mail address. For whatever reason, those comments are not in our e-mail system. I have invited Together Louisiana to send us those comments. Mr. Bagert has refused to do so, so we will not take those comments. So we will now move on to a vote.

Are there are there any other comments or questions from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, any other comments or questions from -- Mr. Bagert, you've had your opportunity. No, sir. No, sir. I will not recognize you today. That ship has come and gone.

MR. BAGERT: What you said is not accurate.
MR. JONES: Now, Mr. Johns.
MR. JOHNS: I'd like to make some comments.
MR. JONES: Absolutely.

MR. JOHNS: I've served in this legislative process since 1996. I represent a very highly-industrialized district in Southwest Louisiana. I've worked very, very closely with the Department of Economic Development over all these years. There were a lot of comments that were made in this meeting today that I think maybe impugns the integrity of this state agency. There are many, many times over the years that this agency has told my area no on something. Not once have I ever asked, never once have I ever seen them bend the rules that were in place at that time to help any business in this entire state. So I just, I want that to be on the record.

The charge of this agency is to bring jobs to this state, and they've done an incredible job over the years considering some of the business climate that we have, some of the obstacles, the challenges that they have faced, and so I'm proud of the work that the Department of Economic Development has done. And I just want that to be on the record that $I$ think that their integrity is A-plus in my eyes, and if somebody can prove otherwise to me, I'd be glad to meet with you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Johns.
Any other comments or questions from the

Board?
MR. FIELDS: I have a comment on the -MR. JONES: Yes, sir.

MR. FIELDS: We're about to vote,
Mr. Chairman, on your motion.
MR. JONES: All right.
MR. FIELDS: I want to first of all thank you, thank Together Louisiana and Dr. Washington, Mr. Bagert, Mr. Mooreland and all of them. I do think that they have identified perhaps a problem, and hopefully in listening to the Undersecretary, we can address more, maybe more effectively. I think the Chair's motion makes me look at this a little different. When $I$ read the agenda last night, $I$ was -- I came in here with my mind made up $I$ was going to vote against these two proposals because, based on the discussion last week, $I$ had a certain perspective, but because of the Chair's motion to basically give the local government an opportunity to be heard. And that's all I wanted was the local governments to be heard. So I appreciate the Chair's motion, and I plan to vote in favor of it. And I would hope that -- and I certainly understand the Chair, my Chair of Commerce comments, and I certainly don't want to impede the integrity of the Department of Economic Development because I know that
we all work very hard to bring economic development to the state.

And with that said, I'm going to vote in favor of your motion in lieu of the fact that the local government will, in fact, have an opportunity to be heard.

MR. JONES: Thank You, Mr. Fields.
Any other questions or comments from the
Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Are we ready to vote? This is a motion on 1606 and 1607-A, approving those applications contingent upon approval by the local governing entities at any level the governing entities wish to with the deadline of 90 days from today's date.

Any questions about the motions?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. It passes unanimously.

Now let's move to remaining four Marathon Petroleum Company applications. They've already been
read into the record by Mr . Usie, but as according to our custom, $I$ would invite a member of the company to come up and explain where we are on these four additional pre-EO applications and what the applications have for us in the future.

Go right ahead. State your name and your position with the company, please.

MR. WORTMANN: Sure. Dan Wortmann, Marathon Petroleum Refinery Controller.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Wortmann. Tell us what these projects are and what -- are there going to be additional developments within these notifications that were filed both in -- one in 2014 and one in 2015?

MR. WORTMANN: So the first one, ending in 609, so that is our wastewater treatment plant capacity increase. So throughout the normal process, we have wastewater treatment plant that cleans the water using bacteria microorganisms. This is to accrue capacity increase over time. We need to increase the capacity of this facility. So this basically allows us to run max capacity at our facility.

MR. JONES: Okay. 1610-A?
MR. WORTMAN: 1610-A, application standard. I believe $I$ was here and chatted about this. This is a safety program, a safety shutdown program. No return on
investment on this project. This project is it allows us to safely shut down the plant in the event of an unplanned outage. And we know that happened here, you know, west side of the state just this past week. It protects our people, community and our equipment.

MR. JONES: Okay. 20152053 and 20152026.
MR. WORTMANN: Okay. Crude flexibility blackwater. So over the years the composition of crude changes, whether it's a particular type of crude or we get different types of crudes in, and what we have to do is we have to remove the dirt, the salt from those crudes. And to do that, we throw water on the crude. We have a desalter that pulls that salt off the water and off the crude. And then you also get dirty water from it, so it's just a part of the process that we got to do.

MR. JONES: Okay. And 2026.
MR. WORTMANN: Sulfur to gassing. So this process, we have to get down to cell specs on gasoline, 10 parts per million, and to do that we have to upgrade our sulfur processing.

MR. JONES: Okay. My next question, on all four of these, do you see any future applications coming out of these pre-notifications or is this it?

MR. WORTMANN: Future applications?

MR. JONES: Right.
MR. WORTMANN: No new applications on these four.

MR. JONES: So this will be the last time we see you on these prenotifications?

MR. WORTMANN: I'm sorry. The SIS. That's the one I did talk about a while back when I came here. These systems are implemented during turnarounds. Those can be on five, six-year cycles. So that is the only one that there will be one that there will be another one to come through.

MR. JONES: And under which Application
Number -- or -- excuse me -- prenotification number.
MR. WORTMANN: Ending in 610.
MR. JONES: 1610-A?
MR. WORTMANN: Yeah, 1610-A.
MR. JONES: So there will be a 1610-B or C;
is that what you're saying?
MR. WORTMANN: Right. To not stretch this out, it will be when those turnarounds happen and this equipment goes in.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Thank you for that.

With those explanations, I would entertain a motion from the Board.

We have a motion from Mr. Fabra to approve, a second from Mr. Moss.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Wortmann. You can give up the seat to Ms. Carlson here.

MS. CARLSON: Lady Carlson with Together Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Thank you, ma'am.
MS. CARLSON: The way I understand ITEP, it is for manufacturing, expansion of a plant or attracting new manufacturing. This sounds like normal operating procedure. It's stuff they have to do. They're not expanding the plant, there are no new jobs added to this, and so $I$ would respectfully ask you to deny those applications based on what the law says, expansion of the plant, relocating and creating new, permanent, high-paying jobs, and it does not do that.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Carlson.
Mr. Bagert, state your name and your position, please.

MR. BAGERT: Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana.

We'd like to object to the process of public input that there was an e-mail address created that --

MR. JONES: Mr. Bagert, that issue has been passed. You're now on -- we've got a motion, and your comments are not directed to that motion, it sounds like.

MR. BAGERT: No, they are. They're directed to public comments submitted for the agenda items under consideration at this moment, and we're objecting to the agenda item under consideration.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. My apologies.
MR. BAGERT: Okay. Public comments were submitted opposing these motions under consideration right now. They're bifurcated. The e-mail address was set up that, to my knowledge, dozens based on the reactions. I got four or five, and the reason I didn't want to share them earlier is because that creates the impression that's it been complied with and it hasn't because if there's a process where you take public input, but then that public input isn't conveyed to the people making the decision, then what you have is the appearance of public input, but not any real public input. Because, you know, the point, Senator Johns, is
to express the public and to the decisionmakers, not just to look like you're expressing that. So we would like to object on that basis.

We'd also like to object to these exemptions exceptions substantively. The evaluation of these -and this is our concern, Senator Johns, with the staff. It's a substantive one. It is not derogatory. It's that there is -- the process of review does not meet the Constitutional standard. There's no meaningful process of review, there's no cost benefit analysis, there's no evaluation of whether these investments would take place without this. In fact, every investment that you're about to consider already happened years ago, and what you're doing is saying that they need this thing to do something that they already did years ago. That doesn't meet the Constitutional standard. It, we believe, violates the Constitutional standard of giving a thing of value for a nonpublic purpose, and we object to it and urge you to object as well.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments for Mr. Bagert?

SECRETARY PIERSON: I do.
MR. JONES: Mr. Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: I just think there's a
fundamental misunderstanding of the program and the way that it's executed, and in this specific instance, you're looking at a set of rules that existed at that point and those are the rules that are applicable today. And we're in complete agreement. The program needed to have more accountability, more transparency, and we've taken some really great steps together with your organization to establish those things. We now have an Annex A, which is a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement, a contract, on what will be executed. Those rules were not in place at the time that this company and hundreds of other companies made decisions and moved forward, and it was allowable. And we don't change the rules in the middle of the game.

I think what I'd like to make sure you understand is this meeting takes place around six times a year, but we're in this building 12 months out of the year, and for you to better understand the process and for you to know whether there's a return on investment calculation that's done that you just said is not done, I can only believe that you're not trying to be less than truthful, but you just don't know. You don't know what you don't know. And I think it's incumbent on you to begin a dialog with LED that we're very open to and stop putting out misinformation to your members and to
the public.
Thank you.
MR. BAGERT: May I respond to that,
Mr. Chair?
MR. JONES: Yes.
MR. BAGERT: Senator Pierson, the basis for me saying that there wasn't a cost benefit analysis was that we've done public records requests of pre-Executive Order applications for the statement on return on investment and the cost benefit analysis and were told by the staff's attorney, Tam Bourgeois, that it is done informally, that it doesn't need to be done in writing, and there's no need for a formal statement of return on investment or return on investment.

Now, if that is, in fact, being done, then we're delighted to hear that. We'll repeat our public records request, but it was not done or said -- in fact, I would say, based on my experience, that we've seen no evidence of cost benefit analysis being done on these or others. In fact, we did a public records request of all the documents that has to do with these specific applications. I have 2,000 documents in my computer, and -- that were responsive to that request, and none of them were a cost benefit analysis.

You have just told me and the public that we
have misled our members. I believe you are misleading me and you are misleading this Board by purporting to have done a cost benefit analysis when you have not, sir. You have not. We have all of the documents responsive to these application numbers. It is not responsible for you to stand up here and tell people things that are not true. It's not true that you've done a cost benefit analysis on these applications. How dare you? You have not.

MR. JONES: All right. That's enough. Any other questions or comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: We have a motion before the Board. Any other questions or comments from the public? (No response.)

MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

I am now going to turn to the Board and ask your thoughts. It is now 11:35 according to my watch. We still have a number of matters to handle. Do we want
to take a lunch break and come back or do you want to work through? What is the pleasure of the Board?

Work through. Thank you very much. I got in trouble because $I$ didn't give $y$ 'all the option lost time. By God, I'll give you the option this time.

All right. Thank you very much. Let's move to the ITEP applications under the 2017 rules.

Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: We have five new applications following the post-Executive Order 2017 rules. One has requested deferral: 20170399, Plastipak Packaging, Inc. in Rapides Parish.

MR. JONES: I will entertain a motion to defer the Plastipak Packaging, Inc.

I have a motion from Mr. Moller; second from Mr. Johns.

Any comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any comments or questions from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. That application is deferred to the next meeting.

MR. USIE: 20180176, Air Liquide Large Industries US LP in West Baton Rouge Parish; 20161561, Calumet Shreveport Refining, LLC in Caddo Parish; 20161562, Calumet Shreveport Refining, LLC in Caddo Parish; and 20170091, Calumet Shreveport Refining, LLC in Caddo Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve these applications.

Motion from Mr. Briggs; second from Mayor Toups.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, motion carries.
Now move to the Industrial Tax Exemption
applications for the 2018 rules.
MR. USIE: We have 13 new applications following the 2018 rules. Two companies have requested deferral. The first is 20200422, Beuche PV1, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, and the other is 20180409, Richard's Cajun Foods Corp. in Acadia Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to defer Beuche and Richard's Cajun Foods.

Motion from Mr. Nassar; second by Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Those two matters are deferred to the next meeting.

MR. USIE: 20200369, Anvil Attachments, LLC, East Feliciana Parish; 20200520, Blue Runner Foods, Inc., Ascension Parish; 20180358, Bollinger Quick Repair, LLC, Jefferson Parish; 20200327, Cabot

Corporation, Evangeline Parish; 202020377, Cargill,
Inc., St. Martin Parish; 20200189, Gron Fuels, LLC, West
Baton Rouge Parish; 20190412, Howell Foundry, LLC, West Feliciana Parish; 20180099, Inferno Manufacturing, Caddo Parish; 20190178, International Paper Company, De Soto Parish; 20200133, International Paper Company, Washington Parish; and 20180470, Stuller, Inc. in Lafayette Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve these 2018 rule applications.

Motion from Mr. Slone; second from Mr. Moss.
Any question or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: That motion carries.
We now move to Industrial Tax Exemption

## renewals.

MR. USIE: We have 308 renewals. We have
five that requested deferral and one requesting withdrawal.

MR. JONES: Okay. Let's first handle the withdrawal.

MR. USIE: The withdrawal is 20180896, Sterlington Power, LLC in Ouachita Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve the withdrawal of the Sterlingten Power renewal application.

Motion from Mayor Toups; second from Mr. Johns.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

Who wishes to defer?
MR. USIE: We have five deferrals. The first 20150982, Flight Safety International, Inc. in

Bossier Parish.
MR. JONES: Move slow, Mr. Usie, so I can mark these down.

Flight Safety.
MR. USIE: Flight Safety on Page 20.
MR. JONES: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. USIE: The next one is on Page 24, 20141575, Procter \& Gamble Manufacturing in Rapides Parish.

MR. JONES: Procter \& Gambel Manufacturing. Okay.

MR. USIE: And the last ones are three or Westlake Petrochemicals LP. All three are in Calcasieu Parish. The numbers are 20161336, 20161337 and 20161338.

MR. JONES: Okay. So I would have a motion for the -- I would entertain a motion to approve the deferral of the three Westlake Chemical Projects, 1346, 1347 and 1348.

MS. CHENG: Sorry, Chairman. It's 1336, 1337 and 1338.

MR. JONES: That's not what it says.
MS. CHENG: Westlake Petrochemical LP.
MR. JONES: Thank you. Forgive me. Good catch. Thank you.

So let's make sure the record's clear, we're moving to defer 20161336, 1137 and 1338 for Westlake Petrochemicals. Thank you.

MR. USIE: Correct.
MR. JONES: Keep me straight guys.
20180896, Sterlington Power in Ouachita
Parish and 201415 --
MR. USIE: Sterlington was the withdrawal
that we handled first.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
And so what --
MR. USIE: One is Procter \& Gamble. There are three of the Westlakes, and the other one is Flight Safety on Page 20.

MR. JONES: Flight Safety. Thank you very much. Chair can't read his own writing.

Great. I would entertain a motion to defer.
From Mr. -- I'm getting tired. Mr. Fajardo. I want to call you Mr. Fabra and I say you're not Mr. Fabra. Mr. Fajardo. Thank you very much.

I'm going to get Mr. Fabra to second that.
All right. We have a motion, we have a second to defer these four projects.

Any questions or comments from the Board? (No response.)

MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, those are -are you for or against it?

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is none. The motion for deferral carries.

Now, we have a number -- we have 300-and-some-odd of these renewals, and I'm speaking to the Board now, so be sure you understand where I'm coming from. My instinct is to, instead of having Mr. Usie read all 300-and-some-odd out loud, is to handle these in globo. However, if there are specific renewals that you want to consider on their own, now is the time to the raise those. And if you have ones you want to discuss or you have questions about, let's raise those now. Otherwise, I would entertain a motion to handle in globo. And if the Board wants to handle them one-by-one, we can do that too. I'm not -- I'm just trying to move things along.

Mr. Moller, you have a motion?

MR. MOLLER: I just want to clarify. I think I know the answer, but these are all pre-Executive Order; right?

MR. USIE: Correct.
MR. MOLLER: If they're coming up because, yeah, because it was less than five years ago.

MR. MOSS: So moved in globo.
MR. JONES: Okay. We have a motion and a second to handle in globo.

Again, are there any Board member want to handle any specific of the applications for renewal independently or individually? We have a motion and a second.

As a point of personal order from the Chair, I need to recuse myself from some of these. Turning to Exxon Mobil Corp, 20141495, 20141498, 20141499, 20141496, 20141497, and 20141494, and then skipping down to Georgia Pacific, 20141573 and 20161078. Let me be sure that's all. And then skipping to Page 21, the Hexion renewals, 20140859, 20161244, 20181245, 20161246, 20161247, and I believe that's all.

All right. I'll be recusing myself. I'll still facilitate the vote but will not be speaking for or against and will not be voting on those.

All right. We have a motion and second to
handle all of these in globo.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?

Lady Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: I do want to speak, but just for --

MR. JONES: Sorry. I can't hear you.
MS. CARLSON: So there's a company I want to speak to, but $I$ want to speak to this about in globo.

MR. JONES: Sure.
MS. CARLSON: My name is Lady Carlson. I'm with Together Louisiana. I understand there are a lot of applications, but $I$ also think -- I also know you're giving away a lot of money, a lot of local tax dollars, and I think doing these in globo does disservice to the local taxing entities because, again, you're giving away a lot of money. And when you give away the exemptions, somebody else has to pay for them, and so I think expediency when it's this amount of money is not wise.

MR. JONES: Thank you Ms. Carlson. Thank you.

Did you say you wanted to speak on one of these?

MS. CARLSON: Yes.
MR. JONES: Okay. Would you like to come back and do that now since we are --

MS. CARLSON: Yes. Again, my name is Lady Carlson. I'd like to speak on Genesis. It's 20160991, and I think they have three applications. And these, we've raised this before, they're not manufacturing and they're not adding any jobs, and if the purpose of the incentive is to get companies to add new, permanent, high-paying jobs, that these do not meet that requirement. And I think that we need to follow what the Constitution says if you really want to be giving these exemptions away.

MR. JONES: To the staff, since we did have an issue with Genesis before, have you reviewed these to determine that these fall into the manufacturing process as we did with the others?

MR. USIE: That's correct. They've been reviewed.

MR. JONES: You have confirmed that they are part of the manufacturing process?

MR. USIE: We have confirmed. They were part of the site inspection from the previous renewals.

MR. JONES: Okay. Great. Thank you.
So we have a motion to approve all in globo.

Any other questions or comments from the Board or from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: I see no opposition. That motion carries.

All right. We now have reached the Industrial Tax Exemption late renewals.

MR. USIE: We have seven late renewal applications. One is requesting deferral.

MR. JONES: Who is that?
MR. USIE: 20131036, Metro Aviation, Inc. in Bossier Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to defer the Metro Aviation renewal.

Mr. Slone; second from Mayor Toups.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

MR. USIE: 20160879, Inferno Manufacturing in Caddo Parish. The initial contract expiration date 12/31 of 2020, late renewal request date February 3rd, 2021.

MR. JONES: Do we have anybody here from Inferno Manufacturing? Please come forward.

Please state your name an your position with the company for the record, please.

MR. ORGANICK: My name is Allen Organick, President, Inferno Manufacturing, Shreveport.

MR. JONES: All right. Obviously we have a situation here where the renewal was filed late. It has become the custom of this Board to look into that a little bit more closely to find out what the reason for the renewal --the late renewal was. Can you explain to us what happened there?

MR. ORGANICK: We forgot to calendar the renewal.

MR. JONES: Okay. You understand that it is
also the custom of the Board to penalize the late renewals?

MR. ORGANICK: Yes, I do.
MR. JONES: All right. Okay. All right.
And just for those, I know we have some members of the Board, and especially members of the legislature who are not here at every meeting, but it has become the custom of this Board that when there is a late application -excuse me -- a late renewal, that those late renewals are penalized usually 20 percent per year for late renewals. So in this situation, Inferno Manufacturing, the contact expiration date was late December 2020, with the renewal being two months late, so that would be a 20 percent reduction in the benefit.

So I would entertain a motion to that effect, that the renewal be approved with a 20 percent penalty.

Motion from Ms. Malone.
Second?
Second from Mr. Briggs.
Any question or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: Thank you. It's good to see you again.

MR. USIE: Next we have 20140507,
International Paper Company in Webster Parish, initial contract expiration date $12 / 31$ of 2018, late renewal request date September 26, 2019.

MR. JONES: Do we have anybody here from International Paper?

Yes, sir. State your name and --
MR. BRODERICK: Yes. Can you hear me okay?
MR. JONES: Yes, sir.
MR. BRODERICK: Jesse Broderick with Sumit Credits. Our office is in Denham Springs, Louisiana. The company, International Paper, would love to have been here today and apologizes for not being here in person. They are under travel restrictions, and they were not allowed to travel down here today. They asked me to step in in their stead, and I can be happy to give you the reason for the late filing.

MR. JONES: What happened?
MR. BRODERICK: In the transition of information, as we began to assist them and take over some of these projects, this one project just kind of fell through the cracks in that transition, and it wasn't realized until after the renewal date that this
site assets were still in place, it was not closed. We thought it was closed, but that was not the case. And we have gotten confirmation that taxes have not been paid on these assets. And we're asking for your consideration, and the company is understanding of your process and accepting of your, you know, whatever the ramifications of the late renewal may be.

MR. JONES: So we're sure there are no
others that have fallen between the cracks?
MR. BRODERICK: Yes, sir. There are no others.

MR. JONES: Okay. Good deal.
Entertain a motion to approve the renewal with a 20 percent penalty.

MR. NASSAR: So moved.
MR. JONES: We have a second -- excuse me -a motion from Mr. Nassar; second from Mr. Moller.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is none. The motion carries.

Thank you, sir.
MR. USIE: Next we have 20150339, Mezco Properties, LLC, Lafayette Parish, initial contract expiration $12 / 31$ of 2019 , late renewal request date August 31st of 2020.

MR. JONES: Do we have someone here from Mezco Properties?

Thank you. Would you state your name and your position with the company?

MS. HEINEN: Hi. Monique Heinen. I'm the office manager.

MR. JONES: Okay. And tell us what happened here.

MS. HEINEN: We had a consulting firm that failed to file that one, and we have since let them go and hired a new firm that will keep track of everything for us.

MR. JONES: Okay. And the necessary notices have been filed within the record?

Ms. Boatner, I see -- I presume it's your company that's now representing them; is that correct.

MS. BOATNER: That's correct, yes.
MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. BOATNER: And, for the record, Rhonda Boatner with Didier Consultants.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Boatner.
All right. You understand that there will be a penalty for the failure to -- all right.

Entertain a motion to approve the renewal with a 20 percent penalty.

Motion from Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Slone.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

Next. Thank you, ma'am.
MR. USIE: 20160621, Morton Salt, Iberia Parish, initial contract expiration 12/31 of 2020,
renewal request date January 28th of 2021.
MR. JONES: Do we have anyone here from Morton Salt?

Yes, ma'am. If you would, state your name and your position with the company for the record.

MS. SIMON: My name is Clara Simon, controller at Morton Salt.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. SIMON: It was not listed in my computer files, and I thought the 2015 was the last year that we were doing our renewals. And it was discovered just a month late that -- or less than a month late that the problem was discovered. We've been displaced with hurricanes from our office and several things. This year has been a crazy year too.

MR. JONES: I understand, and I'm sympathetic, but we also have a policy in place, so I hope you understand.

MS. SIMON: I understand.
MR. JONES: Okay. We have a motion -- I would entertain a motion to approve the renewal with a 20 percent penalty.

From Ms. Malone; second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate you being here.

Next.
MR. USIE: 20141045, Sommer Brothers
Enterprises, Lafayette Parish, initial contract expiration $12 / 31$ of 2019 , late renewal request date October 26, 2020.

MR. JONES: All right. Do we have somebody here from Sommer Brothers Enterprises?

Staff is checking to see if there's someone.
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. It has also been the custom of this Board that if a representative is not here to explain the reason for the late renewal, that the renewal is denied, but that does not have to be. That's not written in a regulation. That has simply
been this Board's custom. So I will recognize a motion however you wish to make it.

MR. MOLLER: Motion to deny.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. MOLLER: Motion to deny.
MR. JONES: We have a motion to deny from Mr. Moller; second from Ms. Malone.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor of the motion to deny the renewal for Sommer Brothers Enterprises, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

MR. USIE: Last we have 20121170, UPS Midstream Services, Inc, La Salle Parish, initial contract expiration $12 / 31$ of 2019 , late renewal request date October 30th of 2020.

MR. JONES: Anyone here from UPS Midstream?

Yes, sir. If you could state your name and your position with the company for the record please.

MR. FRANCIS: I am Russ Francis, the Financial Accounting Manager for Midstream.

MR. JONES: And tell us what happened on the late renewal.

MR. FRANCIS: We had contracted a firm to kind of manage this process for us, and they failed to notify us timely that we are going -- we missed our renewal date. So we have since hired Ms. Boatner and her firm to handle that going forward.

MR. JONES: Okay. Now, we have everything properly diaried, I presume?

Okay. All right. Then I would entertain a motion to approve the renewal at a 20 percent penalty.

Motion by Mr. Slone; second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, motion carries.
Thank you.
Mayor Toups.
MR. TOUPS: I would just like to ask, did we
actually have a vote on the Inferno, the very first one?
I know we had a motion and a second, but I'm not sure
that we -- can you check the --
MR. JONES: It's entirely possible I missed
it.
Yes, we did. Did we vote on your -- yes, we
did. So you were asleep, not I, Mr. Toups. Thank you
for keeping me straight, though. I appreciate it very
much.

MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

MR. USIE: Next we have six change in location requests, all six are for LAD Salvage, LLC, Contracts 20120656, 20130559, 20150636, 20150637, 20161271, and 20140708, previous location 1046 River Road, Berwick, Louisiana 70342 in St. Mary Parish, new location 2575 Highway 662, Amelia, Louisiana 70380 in St. Mary Parish.

MR. JONES: Okay. I would entertain -excuse me. Entertain a motion to approve the change in location.

I have a motion from Mr. Johns; second from Ms. Malone.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, any questions or comments from the public?

with you on that, but...
All right. Thank you.
Entertain a motion to transfer these contracts as noted in your agenda.

Motion from Mr. Favaloro (sic). I don't know why I have a mental block on you two guys. I don't know.

All right. I have a motion. And do I have a second?

Second from Mr. Nassar.
Any questions or comments concerning the transfer of the contracts?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: No questions.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

MR. USIE: Next we have five partial transfer requests. ChampionX, LLC, 20110112, ChampionX, LLC is retaining $\$ 471,841$ in assets, and Nalco

Productions, LLC is receiving \$1,429,977 in assets, and this is in St. John the Baptist Parish; ChampionX, LLC, 20120462, ChampionX, LLC is retaining $\$ 150,020$ in assets, Nalco Production, LLC is receiving \$2,509,913 in assets. This is in St. John the Baptist Parish; ChampionX, LLC, 20140461, ChampionX, LLC is retaining \$613,066 in assets, Nalco Production, LLC is receiving \$3,762,854 in assets, and this is in St. John the Baptist Parish; Sasol USA Corporation, 20150156, Sasol USA is retaining $\$ 37,787,143$ in assets, and Louisiana Integrated Polyethylene JV, LLC is receiving \$775,978,936, and this is in Calcasieu Parish; next we have Sasol USA Corporation, 20150156-C, and we also have two corrections on this item. It should read Sasol USA Corporation is retaining $\$ 1,650,9$ 96,139 in Calcasieu Parish, and the other correction should be that Louisiana Integrated Polyethylene JV, LLC is receiving \$5,924,709,776 in Calcasieu Parish.

MR. JONES: And please let the record note that correction.

With that, $I$ would entertain a motion to approve these partial transfers of tax exemption contracts.

I have a motion from Mr. Johns; second from Ms. Malone.

Any questions or comments from the Board? (No response.)

MR. JONES: Hearing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor, say

## "aye."

(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion
carries.
MR. USIE: Last we have seven cancelation of contract requests. The first is Georgia-Pacific Wood Products South, LLC, 20120368, 20130719, 20140920, 20150703, and 20161077, all in Beauregard Parish. LED was notified by the company of the facility being idled since July 2020. No manufacturing is currently taking place. We did receive a company request to defer these items till the next agenda, and I believe someone is here to speak to that.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Do we --
MR. JOHNS: I make that motion,
Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: We have a motion to defer. We
have a second from Mr. Moss.
For the record, $I$ will be recusing myself from any discussion or vote on the Georgia-Pacific matter.

Any questions or comments from the Board on the deferral?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

MR. USIE: Next is Monsanto Company \& Subsidiaries, Contract 20151094 in St. Charles Parish. LED was notified by the St. Charles Parish assessor that the project was canceled and would not be completed. Company has been notified.

Last we have Wanhua Chemical US Operations, LLC, 20151188, in St. James Parish. And company requested the cancelation.

MR. JONES: Okay. Entertain a motion to approve the Monsanto and Wanhua cancelations.

Motion from Mr. Slone; second from Mr.
Johns.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, the motion carries.

We are through the substance of our meeting. We are down to "Other Business."

Ms. Mitchell, do you have something for us?
MS. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. I'll be very brief. Just because the issue regarding the public comments is of concern to the department, our IT is the researching the issue, and we'll report that to OTS if it in turn comes out to be a statewide system e-mail issue. But we have run several tests just between when
the issue came up and now, and what's happening is e-mails coming from staff at la.gov are going straight through, and there are issues with e-mails coming from gmail or hotmail accounts, from personal accounts from staff. So there could be some sort of issue, stamp issue, but we are testing that. We just wanted it to be clear there was nothing intentional on the part of staff. We're researching that issue, and we'll make sure to get it clarified.

Last thing I wanted to point out is Mr. Waltzer, counsel for Together, has sent direct communication to at least to some of the Board, which we believe you-all have, and we didn't presume that to be public comment and our responsibility to read it into record since it was sent directly to all of you.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
All right. Next item on the agenda are board elections. First position is the position of Chair.

Entertain nominations for that position.
Mr. Nassar.
MR. NASSAR: I nominate Mr. Jerry Jones.
SECRETARY PIERSON: I second.
MR. JONES: We have a motion and a second. Any other --

MR. FIELDS: I nominate Johnny Johns. No. I'm just teasing.

MR. IVEY: I'd like to nominate my chairman, Stuart Bishop, since he's not here.

I withdraw that motion.
MR. JONES: All right. We have a motion to close the nominations and we have a second to the motion.

All in favor of closing the nominations, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition.
So I guess we need to vote between Me and Mr. Bishop.

All right. Let's see. All in favor of Mr. Jones.

MR. IVEY: I withdrew. Mine was a joke. I did withdraw the motion.

MR. JONES: I think the joke would be much better played if we elected him.

MR. IVEY: I got you.
MR. FAJARDO: I might need to make a recommendation on name pronunciation.

MR. JONES: I would go to the chairman
remedial school for knowing board members' names. My apologies always. Thank you.

So all in favor of Mr. Jones, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Motion carries. Thank you for your trust and faith in me. I hope I've earned that and will continue to try to pronounce your name correctly.

Now we have the position for vice chair.
Mr. Slone.
MR. SLONE: I'd like to nominate my
colleague, Heather Malone. This is her actual second term. She's one of the best economic developmenters in the state, so I'd really like to put that on the floor for consideration.

MR. FAJARDO: I second.
MR. JONES: We have a motion and a second for Ms. Malone as vice chair.

Any other nominations?
Mr. Fabra.
MR. FABRA: I'm just seconding.
MR. JONES: We have a third from Mr. Fabra.
MR. FABRA: You're getting close to
pronouncing my last name right.
MR. JONES: If $y^{\prime}$ all would just have a name like Jones we won't have this problem.

All right. And I'm a redneck at that, so you got to deal with it.

All right. Any other nominations for the position of vice chair?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, all in favor of Ms. Malone, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, congratulations, Ms. Malone, and I'll be taking some days off.

All right.
MS. MALONE: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, ma'am. Look forward to working with you.

And now Mr. Pierson, look forward to your comments.

SECRETARY PIERSON: I'll be brief, and then I know the hour grows late, but $I$ would reiterate my statement earlier that while this Board meets every
other month, LED is in this building every working day. And we're very open to meeting and dealing with the public and with companies and would hope that Together Louisiana uses that opportunity to interface with us to get the answers that they are seeking, and certainly I just see a great alignment there.

We are about accountability, transparency. We fully integrate the local voice into our matters, as directed by the Governor's Executive Order. The inclusion of the Annex $A$, which is now a CEA, that accompanies everything.

You heard previously that we had identified those orphans out there, those advance notifications that are associated with pre-Executive Order, and have had an ongoing effort to have those either move forward or fall off as appropriate, and so we hope that that's recognized as our endeavor to embrace this.

As far as to further demonstrate this transparency and willingness to make our records readily available, it should be noted that just as the state has implemented the checkbook program, LED has, over recent years, put together the Fastlane NextGeneration program, which provides statewide interoperability where all these documents are houses at LED. So for parish assessors, for the Louisiana Workforce Commission, for
the Department of Revenue and for local governing authorities, there's full access to this, as well as what is the outward-facing elements for the public, for applicants to the programs, to those that want to be involved in external review and managers. So we feel like we've built a very vibrant and transparent support system out there and encourage fully engaging in it.

It sounds to me like Mr . Bagert downloaded 2,000 documents and poured over them and came back with really one objection here today that we're batting somewhere near 99.9 percent. So I'm just going to take as a complement against the great work that's performed by the department. We recognize that we perform essentially ministerial acts, taking the rules, the laws that are provided to us, and when there's some gray area, it's brought to the Board for that definition. And most of what you see is the certainty that moves through in globo, but when there's the opportunity to say "Hey, wait a minute. Let's look deeper at this," we're fully engaged and happy to do so out of our responsibility back to the public and back to the elected officials that we serve.

So that concludes my remarks for today, sir.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Pierson, and thanks to staff. I know that all of $y^{\prime}$ all are working
every day trying to this make process work, and what we see at these Board meetings, it looks, I know to some rather perfunctory. I know it's not because of the work you-all have put in, and I think I speak for all of the Board members when I say thank you for the work that you do.

Anything else for the good of the order?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: With that, $I$ would entertain a motion to adjourn.

I have a motion and a second.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: We are adjourned.
(Meeting concludes at 12:16 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE:
I, ELICIA H. WOODWORTH, Certified Court
Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this meeting for the Louisiana Board of Commerce and Industry, do hereby certify that this meeting was reported by me in the stenotype reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding;

That the transcript has been prepared in compliance with transcript format required by statute or by rules of the board, that $I$ have acted in compliance with the prohibition on contractual relationships, as defined by Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article 1434 and in rules and advisory opinions of the board;

That $I$ am not related to counsel or to the parties herein, nor am $I$ otherwise interested in the outcome of this matter.

Dated this 21 st day of March, 2021.

ELICIA H. WOODWORTH, CCR
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

|  | 11 20:6 | 19 17:7 20:10 | 20131036 103:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 1137 98:2 | 197 31:1 | 20131128 22:12 |
| \$1,429,977 118:1 | 11:15 79:4 | 1996 80:2 | 20131140 19:21 |
| \$1,650,9 118:15 | 11:35 91:24 | 1st 65:18 | 20131314 21:22 |
| \$100 64:16 | 12 89:17 |  | 20131358 20:9 |
| \$150,020 118:3 | 12/14 20:20 | 2 | 20131410 16:5 |
| \$2,509,913 118:4 | 12/15 20:19 | 2 13:20 20:14 | 20131425 15:6 |
| \$3,762,854 118:8 | 12/20/21 19:5 | 2,000 90:22 127:9 | 2014 20:10 24:14 34:25 |
| \$37,787,143 118:10 | 12/31 20:12,16,20 | 20 19:1 35:8,21 40:5 | 36:7 42:4 48:4 59:16 $65: 1767: 871: 483: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$43-million } 59: 19 \\ & 64: 14,21 \end{aligned}$ | $104: 9$ 106:5 108:8 109:25 111:15 112:23 | $46: 22$ 53:6 97:5 98:14 105:10,13,16 107:14 | $2014013522: 8$ |
|  | 12/31/2017 20:3 | 109:9 110:22 113:15 | 20140165 22:4 |
| \$471,841 117:25 | 13 5:23 13:7 19:22 94:2 | 20062293-A 116:11 | 20140222 18:24 |
| \$5,924,709,776 118:18 | 1315 13:8 | 201 13:9 | 20140297 19:25 |
| \$613,066 118:7 | 1336 97:20 | 20110112 117:24 | 20140461 118:6 |
| \$775,978,936 118:12 | 1337 97:21 | 20110228 116:11 | 20140492 116:18 |
| - | 1338 97:21 98:2 | 20110680 9:20 | 20140507 106:3 |
|  | 1346 97:18 | 20110939 116:16 | 20140708 115:13 |
| --the 104:21 | 1347 97:19 | 20111182 116:11 | 20140859 100:20 |
| 1 | 1348 97:19 | 20111182-A 116:12 | 20140920 119:15 |
|  | 14th 16:1,2 | 20120368 119:15 | 20141045 111:13 |
| 1 8:6 20:2,10,14 116:14 | 15 19:9,18 20:24 | 20120462 118:3 | 20141117 8:2,6 |
| 1/1 20:7 | 16 20:7,19 116:9 | 20120472-PT2 116:12 | 20141168 22:10 |
| 1/27 20:24 | 1601-A 40:12 | 20120656 115:12 | 20141199 16:3 |
| 1/28 20:23 | 1606 39:25 40:2,12,20 | 20121110 16:1 | 20141406 19:16 |
| 1/30 20:24 | $48: 2350: 2152: 13$ 53.1969 .882 .12 | 20121170 112:21 | 20141429 16:4 |
| 10 20:6 21:20 66:7 | 53:19 69:8 82:12 1606-A 39.25 40.2 20 | 20121272 12:6 | 20141494 100:17 |
| 84:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1606-A } 39: 25 \text { 40:2,20 } \\ 48: 24 \text { 50:21 52:13 } \end{gathered}$ | 2013 20:6 | 20141495 100:16 |
| 10/1 19:22 | 53:19 69:8 | 20130040 20:4 | 20141496 100.17 |
| 10/12 19:14 | 1607-A 82:12 | 20130252-PT2 116:13 | 20141496 100:17 |
| 10/16 19:10 | 1610-A 83:22,23 85:15, | 20130252-PT2 116.13 | 20141497 100:17 |
| 100 29:25 35:12,22 | $16$ |  | 20141498 100:16 |
| 36:17 38:20 39:4,7,18 | 1610-B 85:17 | 20130481 116:18 | 20141499 100:16 |
| 40:4 43:16 44:1,16,25 | 17 10:14 31:267:3 | 20130559 115:12 | 201415 98:7 |
| 46:24 51:20,25 52:4 | 17 19:14 31:2 67:3 |  | 20141598.7 |
| 53:6 58:23 62:19,23 | 78:12 | 20130719 119:15 | 20141573 100:18 |
| 63:8 64:22 | 18 19:6,23 34:24 69:5 | 20130810 21:20 | 20141575 97:8 |
| 1046 115:13 |  |  |  |
| Torres Reporting \& Associates, inc. <br> COURT REPORTING \& LITIGATION SERVICES www.torresreporting.com 1.866.982.6878 Toll Free |  |  | Baton Rouge, LA 225.751.0732 <br> 225.752.7308 FAX |
|  |  |  | New Orleans, LA 504.392.4791 504.392.4852 FAX |




THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
122:17
agree $39: 5$ 49:18 52:21
agreeable 50:18
agreed 77:8
agreeing 45:12 46:19
agreement 33:15 89:5, 9
ahead 3:8 76:9 83:6 97:6

Air 93:4
Alice 55:8
alignment 126:6
all-or-nothing 38:14
Allain 4:23 39:12
Allen 20:18 104:15
Alliance 17:8
allowable 89:13
allowed 14:11 28:15 73:3,10 106:17
allowing 3:11 52:20 65:21,25 67:8
alluded 76:18
Almatis 9:21
alter 76:24
altered 67:9
Ambassador 20:9
Amedisys 7:1
Amelia 115:15
amend 28:10 48:23
amended 40:1,12,20 61:4 62:10
amending 50:15
amendment 28:2 40:10 49:25 50:14 52:12
amendment's 53:10
amendments 27:19

America 114:18
amount 25:20 37:25
76:19 78:16 101:21
analysis 88:10 90:7,10, 19,24 91:3,8
analyzing 26:12
and/or 43:8
Annex 89:9 126:10
announced 27:6
answers 126:5
anticipated 19:3,8,12, 16,20,25 20:4,9,13,17, 22 21:1

Anvil 94:22
apologies 87:13 124:3
apologizes 106:15
apologizing $3: 8$
apparently 67:3 75:7
appeal 52:1
appearance 87:24
appearing 60:21
appears 55:25 57:1 79:8
applaud 64:18
applicable 62:2 89:4
applicant 24:25 28:20
applicants 27:3,14
67:25 127:4
application 14:10 15:12 25:22 26:20 27:9 28:1 31:7 33:3,22 37:25 38:7 42:7 43:15,21 45:25 46:1,4 47:18,19 48:3,6,8 61:4,7 63:14 66:15,16 68:10 69:11 70:7,18 71:3 76:13 78:2 83:23 85:12 91:5 93:3 96:9 105:8
applications 7:1,6 13:2,8,22 14:22 17:7 18:6,7 23:12,15 24:4,11

25:16 27:4,15,20 29:15 31:1 39:23 60:4,6,13 66:3,6,18 69:22 73:16 77:12,25 78:25 82:12, 25 83:4 84:23,25 85:2 86:19 90:9,22 91:8 92:7,9 93:11 94:1,2 95:10 100:11 101:15 102:6 103:14
applied 35:22 62:11 64:25
applies 36:761:21
apply 57:12 58:24 61:21 64:12,19 67:9
applying 27:2
appointees 30:2
appointments 14:12
approach 29:12 33:4 36:12
approaching 28:25
approval 5:22 28:7
35:9 37:3,11 40:21,22
48:24 49:13 50:7,12,13 53:20 58:24 59:3 68:14 71:3 82:13
approvals 50:21
approve 7:6 8:8 9:23
10:18 11:16 12:10 13:21 15:12 16:8 18:6 21:4 22:17 24:4 33:22 34:3 36:3 37:4,15 39:3, 22 44:7,9 48:17,23
50:1,7,19,21 52:18
53:19,21 54:6 86:1 93:10 95:9 96:7 97:17 102:25 107:13 109:8 110:21 113:15 114:20 115:18 118:22 121:2
approved 33:24 34:4 105:16
approving 6:3 62:17 82:12
approximately 29:25
Arand 32:22
area 80:9 127:16
AREND 32:22 36:10 45:4
argue 116:25
argument 46:15
Arms 13:16
arrived 35:5
Ascension 9:22 21:25 94:24
asleep 114:12
assessor 72:23 120:20
assessors 126:25
asset 34:20
assets 107:1,4 117:25
118:1,4,5,7,8,10
assign 70:7
assist 106:22
Assistant 24:7
Associates 15:7,13
assume 46:13,15
assuming 46:14 55:23
astounding 59:2
attached 61:23
Attachments 94:22
attempt 28:18 63:15
attempted 55:22 63:21 64:5,11
attempting 59:18 64:20
attention 66:3 67:2
attorney 61:18 90:11
attorneys 67:24
attracting 86:14
audit 24:20
August 20:10 27:1 58:2
76:3 108:9
authorities 33:24

| 36:13 37:4 62:18 127:2 | Baptist 23:16 32:20 | Bioenergy 12:8 | body 52:18 53:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| authority 53:173:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 17 \text { 37:19 116:17,24, } \\ & 25 \text { 118:2,5,9 } \end{aligned}$ | Biosciences 116:14 | Bollinger 94:24 |
| average 63:19 | Barry 4:25 | Bishop 4:25 123:4,16 | book 64:17 |
| Aviation 103:16,19 | based 25:2 32:23 33:12 | bit 44:11 55:7 68:23 104:20 | Bossier 97:1 103:17 |
| avoid 55:22 56:4 59:11 | 40:25 44:1 53:6 76:13 |  | Bourgeois 41:7,8,25 |
| 63:15 64:6 | 81:16 86:19 87:17 | black 64:15 | 42:6,21 43:17,22 44:4 |
| award 68:2 | 90:18 | blackwater 84:8 | 49:1,2,12,17,20 90:11 |
| aware 26:3 30:2 35:7 | basically 44:19 51:23 <br> 61:2 81:18 83:20 | Blake 18:24 | brand 58:5 |
| aye $6: 12,137: 16,17$ | basis 26:24 88:3 90:6 | Blanc 4:12,13 18:8 | break 75:13 92:1 |
| 8:18,19 9:12,13 10:7,8 |  | 50:3,6,10,15,24 | breaks 66:20 |
| $11: 3,4,24,2512: 18,19$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Baton } 7: 2,248: 111: 11 \\ 13: 1616: 2,617: 11 \end{gathered}$ | Blaze 11:14 | Bret 4:22 |
| 16:17,18 18:15,16 | 19:13 20:19 $21: 21$ 22:2, | block 117:6 | briefly 54:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 12,13 \text { 23:2,3 82:18, } \\ & 19 \text { 91:17,18 92:23,24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,693: 594: 595: 3 \\ & 116: 19 \end{aligned}$ | Blue 94:23 | Briggs 3:22,23 9:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 20,2194: 16,17 \\ & 95: 18,19 \text { 96:17,18 99:6, } \end{aligned}$ | batting 127:10 | board 3:3 6:6 7:10 8:12 <br> 9:6 10:1,22 11:18 $12 \cdot 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:20 18:8 93:12 } \\ & \text { 105:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 103:5,6 104:1,2 | BBP 21:20 | 14:7,18 15:15 16:11 | bring 33:20 42:16 |
| 107:24,25 109:17,18 | BBQ 7:23 11:10 | 18:9 21:6 22:20 24:8,9 | 47:12 67:2 80:14 82:1 |
| 111:4,5 112:15,16 | BBQ 7.2311 .10 | 25:15,25 26:2,3 27:6,7, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 113: 23,24 \text { 115:4,5 } \\ & 116: 3,4 \text { 117:17,18 } \end{aligned}$ | at | $\begin{aligned} & 9,12,13,15,2028: 19 \\ & 30: 8,1231: 2532: 5 \end{aligned}$ | Broderick 87:1 106:10,12,21 |
| 119:7,8 120:12,13 | Beauregard 119:16 | 33:2,16,18,22 34:10 | 107:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 121: 11,12123: 10,11 \\ & 124: 4,5125: 10,11 \end{aligned}$ | bed 37:13 | 37:2 38:17 39:17 40:6, $2143: 3 \text { 44:13 45:1 }$ | Brothers 111:13,18 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { began 26:21,22 27:1 } \\ & \text { 106:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 49:3,8 50:18 51:24 | brought 77:23 127:16 |
| B | begin 27:7,13 60:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:13 56:9,14 57:3,20 } \\ & \text { 59:11,18 63:22 66:3 } \end{aligned}$ | Brown 17:9 |
| back 24:9 27:16 30:25 | 65:17 89:24 | 67:5 68:4,9,19 69:9 | budget 34:15,18 |
| 35:4 37:10,11 38:9,13 | behalf 75:1 | 74:13,16 75:23,24 | build 45:16,17 |
| $39: 6,10,1740: 1,642: 16$ $43: 444: 22$ 45:1,14 | belief 29:24 | 77:21,23 78:1 81:1 82:9 |  |
| 47:20 48:6 49:20 51:4 | believes 25:2 | 85:25 86:3 91:2,14,23 | build |
| 52:1,6,8 54:23 64:10 | bend $80 \cdot 10$ | 92:2,17 93:14 94:1 95:12 96:12 98:24 | built 127:6 |
| 72:15 75:10,24 78:3 | bend 80.10 | 99:14,22 100:10 101:2 | burdensome 29:18 |
| 79:4,7 85:7 92:1 102:3 | beneficiaries 34:1 | 103:2,21 104:19 105:1, | bureaucratic 29:19 |
| 127:9,21 | benefit 28:15 59:22 | 6,8,21 107:18 109:11 | Burnside 9:21 |
| back-end 25:22 | 88:10 90:7,10,19,24 | 110:24 111:22 112:8 113.17114 .24115 .22 | Burnside 9:21 |
| bacteria 83:18 | 91:3,8 105:14 | 113:17 114:24 115:22 | business 29:17 66:9 |
|  | Bernard 52:17 53:2 | 121:5 122:12,18 124:2 | 80:12,16 121:18 |
| $60: 18 \text { 61:7,13 62:8 }$ | Berwick 115:14 | 125:25 127:16 | businesses 57:16 |
| 63:12 65:2 74:24 79:12, | Beuche 94:4,8 | Board's 40:1 112:1 | Buyer 11:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5,9,1488: 2290: 3,6 \\ & 127: 8 \end{aligned}$ | bifurcated 87:16 | Boatner 108:24 109:1, 3,4,5 113:10 | C |
| balance 29:10 |  | bodies 33:8,18 36:4 55:20 56:5 66:11 | Cabot 94:25 |
| Torres Reporting \% Associates, inc. |  |  | Baton Rouge, LA 225.751.0732 <br> 225.752.7308 FAX |
|  | REPORTING \& LITIGATI www.torresreporting 1.866.982.6878 Toll | SERVICES | New Orleans, LA <br> 504.392.4791 <br> 504.392.4852 FAX |

Caddo 7:25 18:4 22:14 93:6,7,9 95:4 104:8

Cage 69:18,19,20,21 71:16

Cajun 94:6,8
Calcasieu 8:2 10:16 18:2 19:22 20:1 97:13 116:23 118:12,15,18
calculation 89:20
calendar 104:23
call 25:3 66:2 98:19
called 72:23
calling 71:7 79:6
Calumet 7:24 93:6,7,8
Camille 32:22
campus 32:24
cancelation 119:13 120:25
cancelations 21:18,20 22:17,18,21 121:2
canceled 34:22 120:21
cane 52:2
capacity $83: 15,18,19$, 21
capex 25:11
Car 22:14
cards 73:23
Care 20:22
carefully 61:19
Cargill 95:1
Carlson 71:18,19,22
72:12,20 73:18,20 86:9, 10,13,23 101:6,7,10,13, 22 102:1,4,5
carries 6:17 7:21 8:23 9:17 10:12 11:8 12:4,22 15:4,25 16:22 18:20 21:17 23:7 91:22 93:24 95:22 96:22 99:11 103:10 104:6 108:4

109:22 111:9 112:20
114:2 115:9 116:8 117:22 119:12 120:17 121:16 124:8
carving 51:22
case 26:20 51:17 63:9 66:24 67:1 68:7 70:10 78:21,22 107:2
cases 67:368:8
catch 97:25
caught 38:3 59:16,17, 23 64:22

CC'D 74:24,25
CEA 126:10
cell 84:19
Center 18:3 20:5 22:10
certainty 127:17
chair 8:5 23:23 50:17, 24 53:11 65:5 76:7 77:15 81:23 90:4 98:16 100:14 122:19 124:11, 20 125:7

Chair's 81:13,18,21
chairman 36:24 39:16
40:9 52:11 76:10 80:23 81:5 97:20 119:24 123:3 124:1
chairs 54:23
challenges 80:17
Championx 117:24 118:2,3,6
chance 53:15 54:10
change 9:19,22 10:13, 19 11:9 27:24 28:5,25 30:21 $31: 6$ 35:17 43:14 54:7 57:7 58:9,21 62:1 $71: 2$ 73:1,8,10,16,17 76:12,22 89:13 114:15, 16,18,20 115:10,18
changed $30: 17$ 35:7 46:6 78:13,24
changing 25:9,10

58:10 59:19 65:19
characterize 47:23
charge 41:21 80:14
Charles 7:4 10:15 17:15 120:19,20
chatted 83:24
check 47:18 114:8
checkbook 126:21
checking 111:19
Chef 13:13
Chemical 97:18 120:23
Cheng 6:19,21,24 7:22
8:24 9:19 10:13 11:9 12:5,23,25 13:4,7 15:5, 8,10 16:1,24 97:20,23
choose 41:1 42:13 53:24
churches 64:15
circumstance 28:18 60:2 62:1 63:20
circumstances 24:10
41:14,19,24 59:8
circumvent 28:7
citizens 70:22 73:17
civil 30:1
Claiborne 17:11
claimed 30:3
Clara 110:6
clarification 14:13 51:6 54:5,12
clarifications 75:16
clarified 122:9
clarify 30:15 42:1 100:1
clarity 47:11
cleans 83:17
clear 31:25 36:25 43:7
58:22,23 60:5 67:13
69:25 70:1,10 74:8,21
98:1 122:7
clearer 31:3
Cleo 4:22
climate 80:16
Clinic 17:23
clock 47:16
close 123:7 124:25
closed 107:1,2
closely 80:4 104:20
closer 66:3
closing 29:2 123:9
CNI 13:14
coach 66:15
Coastal 17:12
coker 25:10 34:19,23
43:14 46:1 54:7 70:16
cokers 58:3
Cola 4:1
colleague 124:14
collect 66:16
College 17:13
colluded 28:7
combinations 38:18
comment 40:17 54:18
74:1,5,7,10,15 75:15
81:2 122:14
comments 6:5,9 7:10,
12 8:12,14 9:6,8 10:1,3,
22,24 11:18,21 12:12,
15 14:17,20 15:15,18
16:11,13 18:9,12 21:6,8
22:20,24 24:19 29:2
30:12 34:10 40:14 54:2,
5,15 55:13 56:13 60:17
69:14,15 71:16 72:2,3,
6,9,14,16,21 73:19 75:6
79:8,10,12,13,15,19,24
80:6,25 81:23 82:8
86:3,5 87:7,10,14 88:21
91:11,14 92:17,19
93:14,16 94:10,12
95:12,14 96:12,14

```
98:24 99:1 101:2,4
103:1,21,23 105:21,23
107:18,21 109:11,14
110:24 111:2 112:8,10
113:17,19 114:24
115:2,22,25 117:11,15
119:1,4 120:5,8 121:5,
7,22 125:22
```

Commerce 3:3 33:16 81:23

Commission 126:25
commitment 77:21
common 25:2 30:22 commonplace 25:16 communication 122:12
communities 33:7 64:16
community 34:2 37:17 84:5
companies 25:19 27:8 66:10,13,15,17 67:15 73:16 77:25 89:12 94:3 102:9 126:3
company 8:25 9:19 12:6 17:21,24,25 19:12, 17 21:21,24,25 22:2,3, 5,7,9,11,12,14 23:16 28:1,7,10,25 30:9,20 31:8,14 32:10,13,16 44:13,23 45:7 46:17,19 49:4 51:23 52:17 54:6, 15 55:10 58:11 59:4,8,9 63:14,21 64:19 65:23 67:24 71:1 73:3 74:14 76:11 77:16 82:25 83:2, 7 89:11 95:5,6 101:10 104:14 106:4,14 107:5 108:13,25 110:5 113:2 116:15,17 119:17,19 120:18,22,24
company's 27:10 45:12
competitive 34:20 complain 45:1 52:1

Complement 127:12 complete 89:5 completed 120:21 complied 87:20 composition 84:8 Compressors 17:8 compromise 64:9 computer 58:20,21 73:1,11 90:22 110:9
conceding 46:14 concern 88:6 121:22
concerned 51:19 72:1
concerns 25:4 28:23
concludes 12:23 23:9 127:23
condition 33:23 34:3
conditions 37:15 41:16 42:12
conducted 27:11
confer 75:9
confirmation 33:4 107:3
confirmed 102:20,22
conflux 29:4
congratulations
125:15
consent 56:7
consideration 26:1
27:21 41:15 59:21
87:11,12,15 107:5 124:17
considered 45:19 62:11 67:14
consistency 57:16
Constitution 52:24 102:12

Constitutional 88:9, 16,17
consult 36:12
consultants 25:19 109:4
consulted 59:16
consulting 108:18
contact 105:12
contemplate 64:3
contemplated 59:3
contemplation 29:3
content 58:5,19 61:14
contents 61:5
context 24:13 25:15 30:8 59:22 75:24 77:22
contingent 36:4 40:3, 21 43:25 48:24 50:21 53:20 82:13
continually 59:7
continue 26:18 27:18 31:23 47:22 55:16 57:20 124:10
continues 25:24
contract 7:23 9:20 18:21,25 19:5,9,13,18, 22 20:1,6,11,15,19,23 23:18 29:11 33:14,22 44:5 47:13 53:5,8 58:7 89:10 104:8 106:5 108:7 109:25 111:14 112:23 119:14 120:19
contracted 113:7
Contractors 17:10 19:8
contracts 115:12 116:11,15,18 117:4,12 118:23
control 37:23
controller 32:18 83:9 110:7
conveyed 87:22
cooperating 56:1

Cooperative 89:9
Corey 11:13
Corp 11:15 94:6 100:16 corporation 7:2 56:3 95:1 116:20 118:9,13, 15
correct 30:18 35:1,2,9, 10,15,24,25 37:5,6,7 38:22 42:10 43:16,17 45:3,4,5,11 46:13,16 49:17 51:21 52:7 74:11
76:13 79:9 98:4 100:4 102:18 108:25 109:1
correction 116:23 118:16,20
corrections 118:14
correctly $124: 10$
cost 66:8 88:10 90:7, 10,19,24 91:3,8
council 33:19 38:18 69:9
councilman 69:6
counsel 40:25 41:9 122:11
court 32:1
cover 72:10
COVID 3:14
cracks 106:24 107:9
craft 51:12
crazy 110:15
created 87:4
creates 87:19
creating 51:16 86:20
Credits 106:13
crude $84: 7,8,9,12,14$
crudes 84:10,12
curious 62:7
current 9:20 41:1 57:5
custom 83:2 104:19

THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

105:1,7 111:22 112:1 cutoff 77:9
cuts 67:19
cycles 85:9
Cyro 114:17
D
d/b/a 16:2
daily 30:4
Dan 32:17 83:8
Daniel 5:10
dare 91:9
Darrel 5:8
data 24:16
date $19: 1,6,10,14,19,23$ 20:2,7,11,16,20,24 31:3 75:20 77:9 78:15 82:15 104:8,9 105:12 106:5,6, 25 108:8 110:1 111:15 112:24 113:10
dated 48:3,6 55:21
dates 25:11,21 76:20
Davis 4:12 18:2
day $3: 4$ 41:21 46:17 61:12 62:16 126:1
days 49:5,11,13,19 50:8,22 53:24,25 65:20 82:15 125:16

DDP 116:10
De 95:5
deadline 47:19 49:3 82:15
deadlines 66:10
deal 51:12 62:23 75:10 107:12 125:5
dealing 60:23 126:2
deals 39:24
dealt 52:16

Decatur 13:10
December 24:14,19
25:7,12 27:11 28:3,12
30:16 34:24 46:1 65:17 70:12 105:12
deception 28:19
decide 37:19 38:8 44:2
51:8 62:24 63:2,11 64:23
decides 39:18 65:23
deciding 62:22
decision 34:7 36:1,2
38:25 40:7 57:19 63:9 87:23
decisionmakers 88:1
decisions 89:12
dedicated 26:7
deeper 127:19
defer 8:25 9:3,11 37:10 92:14 94:7 96:23 98:2, 17,23 103:18 119:19,25
deference 77:14
deferral 15:9 92:11 94:4 96:1 97:18 99:11 103:14 120:6
deferrals 96:24
deferred 9:17 93:3 94:20
defies 65:24,25
definition 66:5 127:16
defraud 28:8
deliberately 67:13
deliberation 8:5
delighted 90:16
demand 68:11
demanding 71:8 77:24
demonstrate 126:18
Denham 106:13
denial 28:1,4 37:11
denied 27:25 111:24
Dental 17:18
deny 68:10 86:18 112:3,5,6,14
denying 52:16
department 24:9 29:8
80:4,19 81:25 121:22
127:1,13
deprived 56:6
derogatory 88:7
desalter 84:13
describe 57:1
description 24:15,23 25:9 54:12 67:12
descriptions 31:4
deserve 57:16
desire 36:13 40:1
detail 25:18 27:14
detailed 67:11
details 25:20 37:25
determine 38:6 42:19 62:18 102:16
development 16:4 80:5,19 81:25 82:1
developmenters
124:15
developments 83:12
dialog 33:6 89:24
diaried 113:13
Didier 109:4
difference 46:16,20,21
difficult 29:19 31:17
difficulty 68:24
dilemma 75:6
direct 122:11
directed 28:9 31:14
87:7,9 126:9
directing 42:18
directly 31:767:18 122:15
dirt 84:11
dirty 84:14
disagree 72:12
discovered 110:11,13
discuss 99:20
discussing 39:24 69:23
discussion 8:6 33:12 81:16 120:3
discussions 70:1
disinfectant 17:5
dismay 56:1
displaced 110:13
disservice 101:17
distinction 46:13
distributed 72:5
district 80:3
disturbing 66:23
DIVI 20:18
Division 32:18
Dixon 22:8
document 47:24 63:15 64:12 75:22
documents 59:19 90:21,22 91:4 126:24 127:9
dollar 76:19
dollars 56:6 101:16
Don 3:22 5:4
double 64:24
downloaded 127:8
dozens 87:17
drafting 26:12
drag 49:4

| dried 34:16 76:3 |
| :--- |
| drives 30:5 |
| drum 34:23 |
| drums 46:1 |
| due 57:15 |
| dumped $61: 5$ |
| E |

e-mail 58:10 72:3,9
75:2,3 79:9,10 87:4,16
121:24
e-mails 74:2,22 122:2,3
Eagle 17:9
earlier 78:11 87:19 125:25
earliest 26:10
early 26:24 77:4
earned 124:9
East 7:2,24 8:1 11:11
13:16 16:2,6 17:11 20:5
21:21 22:6 94:23
Echols 13:17
economic 65:19 80:5, 19 81:25 82:1 124:15
economics 34:16
Edgar 69:5,18,21
Edward 17:13
Edwards 55:18
effect 37:5 105:16
effective 63:24
effectively 81:12
effort 28:19 126:15
elderly 71:25 72:14
elected 123:22 127:22
elections 122:18
electricity $3: 6$

Electronic 116:10 elements 127:3 eligible 59:20 64:13
eloquently 75:21
embrace 126:17
employees 29:25
emptied 58:19
empties 58:4
enacted 58:4
enactment 26:21
encompasses 29:25
encourage 127:7
encouraged 28:10
end 25:11,21 41:21
46:16 62:16 63:22 75:20
endeavor 89:9 126:17
ending 33:22 83:14 85:14
enforce 49:9
enforcing 66:10
engage 28:18
engaged 59:25 127:20
engagement 33:9
engaging 127:7
ensuring 25:25
enter 53:5
Enterprise 16:24 17:8
Enterprises 13:17 17:15 111:14,18 112:15
entertain 5:25 7:5 8:7 9:2,23 10:18 11:16 12:10 15:11 16:7 18:6 21:3 22:17 40:11 85:24 92:13 93:10 94:7 95:9 96:7 97:17 98:17 99:21 103:18 105:15 107:13 109:8 110:21 113:14 115:17,18 117:3 118:21

121:1 122:20
entire 78:23 80:12
entities 44:14 48:25 82:13,14 101:18
enunciate 3:9
EO 46:5
Equilon 17:14
equipment 38:1 66:9 84:5 85:21
erroneously 55:23
ESNOLA 21:22
essentially 24:24 29:6 42:14 127:14
establish 89:8
evaluation 88:5,11
Evangeline 95:1
event 84:2
events 32:11
everybody's 3:7
evidence 66:20 90:19
Evonik 114:17
Excellent 13:5
exceptional 66:24
exceptions 88:5
excuse 3:13 31:12
36:10 85:13 105:9
107:16 115:18
executed 89:2,10
Executive 26:19,22
29:7 41:8 42:8 59:10
65:25 75:25 78:5 126:9
exemption 35:12,22
36:8 39:5 42:19 43:9
44:5,8 51:10,20 52:17
55:19 57:4 64:3 66:14
93:25 95:23 103:12
118:22
exemptions 23:11
37:5 52:25 56:4 66:13
67:15,18,25 68:3,13

88:4 101:19 102:13
exercise 68:5
existed 89:3
existing 18:25 19:5,9, 13,17,22 20:1,5,11,15, 19,23 57:9
expanding 86:17
expansion 86:14,19
expect 67:5
expectation 57:18
expectations 57:17
expediency 101:21
experience 90:18
expiration 104:8
105:12 106:5 108:8 109:25 111:15 112:23
explain 24:2 27:15 78:1 83:3 104:21 111:23
explained 75:21,25
explanation 43:12 64:7
explanations 85:24
express 88:1
expressing 88:2
extension 47:20
extent 31:6
external 60:13 127:5
Exxon 100:16
Eye 22:4
eyer 29:16
eyes 80:21
EZ 23:9

## F

Fabra 4:5,6 22:19 40:13 48:20,22 49:24 86:1 98:19,20,21 124:22,23, 24,25



THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
February 24, 2021
impossible 68:6
impression 87:20
impugns 80:7
inappropriate 41:16
60:1 64:23
inappropriately 61:24
inaudible 34:25
incentive 26:6 102:9
include 66:7
including 26:13 29:6 33:7
inclusion 126:10
incorporate 33:11
Incorporated 17:10, 16,22 18:4 19:4,21 20:1,5
increase 83:16,19 incredible 80:15
incumbent 89:23
indefinitely 49:5
independent 68:11
independently 100:12
indication 67:6
indirectly 67:19
individual 43:1 70:5
individually 23:25 100:12

Industrial 22:6 23:11 55:19 57:3 93:25 95:23 103:12

Industries 93:5
Industry 3:3 33:16
inevitable 55:15
Inferno 95:4 104:7,12, 16 105:11 114:6
informally 90:12
Informatics 7:25
information 8:4 24:22 25:18 26:1 28:24 31:5 56:24 76:16 77:24 106:22
initial 43:8 104:8 106:4 108:7 109:25 111:14 112:22
initiated 57:10 58:2,22 initiating 60:13 ink 76:2
input 69:10 87:4,22,24, 25
inquire 27:10
inspection 102:23
install 24:15 25:9 58:3
installation 38:2
instance 89:2
instances 78:12
instinct 99:15
integrate 126:8
Integrated 116:22 118:11,17
integrity 70:21 71:10 80:7,21 81:24
intended 63:4
intense 29:13
intensified 77:11
intent 47:13 58:22,23 60:5 64:9 75:18
intentional 122:7
intentionally 63:14
interest 41:22 68:1
interface 126:4
interim 65:19
International 95:5,6
96:25 106:4,8,14
interoperability 126:23
interpretation 59:7 62:8,9
invested 38:1
investigate 73:4
investigated 71:13
investigation 60:14 68:11,14
investment 25:20
47:14 65:22 76:18 78:15 84:1 88:12 89:19 90:10,14
investments 88:11
invite 83:2
invited 79:11
involved 127:5
issue 39:16,23 53:18 87:5 102:15 121:21,23, 25 122:1,5,6,8
issues 26:23 31:16 71:11 122:3
item 5:22 87:12 118:14 122:17
items 24:8 87:10 119:20

ITEP 24:20 26:4,6 27:1, 25 28:21 29:4,7 33:5 41:2 50:13 55:20 60:23 66:3,4,7 70:7 77:7 86:13 92:7
iterations 76:1
Ivey $4: 25$ 5:1 13:25 14:2,4,5,6,13 37:21,22 38:14,19 39:1 48:1,2 50:23 60:19,20 61:10 62:6,14 63:12 71:9 73:13 123:3,19,23
J
jail 64:17
James 8:3 51:11 120:24

Jan 5:2
January 5:24 20:6 65:18 110:1

Jefferson 10:16 15:7
17:17,23 18:1 94:25 114:17

Jerald 4:18
Jerry 122:22
Jesse 106:12
JNR 21:25
job 68:4,15 80:15
jobs 6:18 7:1,22 12:24 19:3,7,11,16,20,24
20:4,8,13,17,22 21:1 80:14 86:17,21 102:8, 10

John 23:16 32:19 33:17 37:18 68:25 69:6,9 116:17,24,25 118:2,5,8

Johnny 123:1
Johns 4:14,15 7:9 11:17 13:23 71:8 79:23, 24 80:1,24 87:25 88:6 92:16 96:11 115:20 118:24 119:23 121:4 123:1
joke 123:19,21
Jones 3:1,21 4:18,19 5:21 6:2,8,11,14,16,22 7:5,8,12,15,18,20 8:4, 11,14,17,20,22 9:2,8, 11,14,16,23 10:3,6,9, 11,18,24 11:2,5,7,16, 20,23 12:1,3,10,14,17, 20,22,25 13:5,21 14:1, $3,5,11,14,20,24$ 15:1,3, 8,11,17,20,23,25 16:7, 13,16,19,21 17:2 18:5, 11,14,17,19 21:2,8,11, 14,16 22:16,23 23:1,4, 6,10,17,21 24:1,3 30:11 31:12,15,21 32:4,7,13, 21 33:1 34:9 35:5
36:20,23 37:20 38:11
39:2,8,13,19 40:11,24 41:3,6,25 42:10 43:11,

| 23 44:10 45:6,12,23 | Junior 69:3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:2,12,25 47:3,8 48:1, } \\ & \text { 11,21 49:7,15,22 50:5, } \end{aligned}$ | JV 116:22 118:11,17 |
| 9,17 51:3,7,14,18,22 |  |
| 52:8,14 53:12 54:14,17 | K |
| 55:4,9,12,17 56:12,16, |  |
| 20 60:17 65:2,6,8,13 | keeping 114:13 |
| 68:18,22 69:4,13,17,20 |  |
| 71:15,18,20 72:6,18 | Kenneth 4:16 |
| 73:18,22 74:3,9,12,18 | key 51:18 |
| 75:4 76:4,9 78:8,10 | key 51.18 |
| 79:3,6,18,23,25 80:24 | kid 64:16 |
| 81:3,6 82:7,11,18,20,22 | kind 37:14 38:14 51:12 |
| 83:10,22 84:6,17,22 | 53:9 59:2 67:4 106:23 |
| 85:1,4,12,15,17,22 | 113:8 |
| 86:5,8,12,23 87:5,13 |  |
| 88:21,24 90:5 91:10,13, | knew 58:25 75:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16,19,21 92:13,19,22, } \\ & 2593: 2,10,16,19,22,24 \end{aligned}$ | Knighton 18:3 |
| 94:7,12,15,18,20 95:9, | knowing 52:18 124:2 |
| 14,17,20,22 96:3,7,14, | knowledge 31:4 72:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17,19,21 97:2,6,10,16, } \\ & \text { 22,24 98:5,10,15 99:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 87:17 |
| 4,8,10 100:8 101:4,9, |  |
| 12,22 102:2,14,20,24 | L |
| 103:4,7,9,15,18,23 |  |
| 104:1,3,5,11,17,25 | La 12:8112:22 |
| 105:4,23 106:1,7,11,20 |  |
| 107:8,12,16,20,23 | la.gov 122:2 |
| 108:1,3,10,16,22 109:2, | Lacassine 18:1 |
| 5,13,16,19,21 110:2,8, | LACC,LLC 8.1 |
| 16,20 111:1,4,6,8,17,21 | LACC,LLC 8:1 |
| 112:4,6,10,13,17,19,25 | LAD 115:11 |
| 113:5,12,19,22,25 |  |
| 114:2,9,19,22 115:1,4, | Ladina 11:13 |
| 6,8,17,24 116:2,5,7,25 | Lady 71:18,22 86:10 |
| 117:14,17,19,21 118:19 | 101:6,13 102:4 |
| 119:3,6,9,11,22,25 |  |
| 120:8,11,14,16 121:1,7, | Lafayette 10:17 13:18 |
| 10,13,15 122:16,22,24 | 18:25 19:3,4 22:10,12 |
| 123:6,12,14,18,21 | 95:8 108:7 111:14 |
| 124:1,4,6,8,19,24 | Lafitte 13:11 |
| 125:2,3,9,12,14,19 | Lafite 13.11 |
| 127:24 | Lake 10:15 |
| judgment 72:21 | LALUMINA 9:22 |
| Julie 21:23 | Landry 17:22 |
| July 20:2,14 58:1 | lapsed 75:20 |
| 119:18 | Large 93:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } 20: 2,1435: 23 \\ & 55: 21,2477: 9 \end{aligned}$ | largely 31:3 |

Larry 68:24 69:2
Lasalle 12:8
late 8:24 26:24 77:4 103:12,13 104:9,18,21 105:1,8,9,10,12,13 106:5,19 107:7 108:8 110:12 111:15,23 112:23 113:6 125:24
law 30:6 64:18 68:2 86:19
laws 29:23 127:14
lax 29:17
lead 13:6 24:5
leaders 71:24 72:13
Leading 20:22
leave 29:2
led 24:7 25:17 27:6,12 28:6,9,13,18,25 29:16, 22 32:11 33:12,15 35:16 40:25 41:8 49:12 54:5,9 55:25 58:8,9 66:11,14,16 67:6,13 68:1 73:6,15 75:17,23 77:22 89:24 119:16 120:20 126:1,21,24

LED's 25:24 29:3,25 33:4

Ledboardpubliccom
ments@la.gov. 74:6
legislative 80:1
legislator 14:8 60:22
legislator's 14:10
legislature 105:6
legitimate 25:23
Leonard 16:3
letters 44:7
letting 71:11
level 26:18 34:8 62:24
77:11 82:14
levels 53:21
lieu 82:4
life 43:7
lines 27:5
links 78:3
Liquide 93:4
list 78:20
listed 110:9
listen 33:10 72:22
listening 81:11
live 37:16 38:24 44:14 46:19

Living 17:11
Livingston 17:12,16, 24 19:17

LLC 7:1,24,25 8:2 9:21, 22 11:10,11,12,14 12:7, 8 13:9,10,11,12,13,14, 15,16,18,19,20 15:7 16:2,4,6 17:9,11,12,15, 17,20,24,25 18:1,2,24 19:8,12,17 20:9,14,18 21:21,23 22:2,4,6,8 93:6,7,8 94:4,22,25 95:2,3 96:6 108:7 114:17,18 115:11 116:14,17,19,22 117:24,25 118:1,2,3,4, 6,7,11,17 119:15 120:24
local 28:4,7 33:24 34:8 35:9 36:13 37:3 38:5,6 39:18 43:25 44:7,14 48:24 50:21 52:3 53:20 55:20 56:4,5,7 58:24
62:17 63:5 66:11 69:8 81:18,20 82:4,13 101:16,18 126:8 127:1
locals 27:25 36:16 39:5
40:3,4,7,22 41:1 42:13, 16,18,25 43:5 44:2,17, 18,20,24 45:9 46:17,23 47:1,3 50:7,13 51:8 52:20,22,24 53:7,21 57:25 62:24 63:2,11 64:10,23
locals' $44: 1763: 9$
located $32: 19$
location $10: 14,19$
115:11,13,15,19
logged $31: 8$
logic 65:21,24,25
Logix 18:1
long 53:18 67:4 75:19
longer 61:14 63:13
looked 61:19 71:13
lost 92:4
Iot 46:3 60:22,24 64:15 66:8 69:25 72:13 80:6 101:14,16,19
lots 37:18
loud 99:16
Louisiana 10:16,17 12:7 20:23 29:24 32:19 55:11 56:23 65:12 67:21 69:6,21 70:22 71:23 79:11 80:3 81:8 86:11 87:2 101:14 106:13 115:14,15 116:21 118:10,17 126:4,25

Louisiana's 66:1
love 106:14
Loving 13:16
LP 23:16 93:5 97:13,23
ludicrous 62:3
lunch 92:1
Lusk 22:4
Lyons 22:1

## M

M\&a 17:18,19
Madam 76:8
made 24:10 25:3,8 26:4 27:12,19,23,24 28:2,6,
$2131: 6,943: 14,20$
$48: 9,18,1950: 2354: 9$,
$1057: 3,1958: 1975: 7$,
$1576: 2377: 2178: 14$,
$2580: 681: 1589: 12$
mailed 72:3
main 32:24 63:9
major 63:4
make 24:25 28:25 30:21 31:15,18,25 36:16,25 38:25 40:2,20 41:25 45:14 47:13 57:4 58:12 63:22 65:5 66:12 68:14 71:5 72:20 74:1 75:16 76:17 79:24 89:15 98:1 112:2 119:23 122:8 123:24 126:19
makes 59:7 77:16 81:13
making 24:19 67:15 68:1 74:15 87:23

Malone 4:20,21 40:23, 24,25 41:4 42:11 43:10 105:18 110:23 112:7 115:21 118:25 124:14, 20 125:10,15,18
manage 113:8
Management 17:24,25 18:24 19:17,21,25
manager 108:15 113:4
managers 127:5
Mandi 24:7
manipulate 63:21 64:12,20,21
manipulation 59:25
Manual 4:7
manufacturing 7:23
11:10 66:5,6 86:14,15 95:4 97:8,10 102:7,16, 21 104:7,12,16 105:11 119:18

Marathon 23:15 24:21 25:7 28:12 30:16 32:14,

18,23 33:6 39:22 40:6 44:21 58:2 66:17 67:8, 1073:2,10 74:19,20 82:24 83:8

Marathon's 60:4
March 19:23
mark 97:3
market 47:15
Martin 95:2
Mary 22:9 115:14,16
mask 3:9,10
masked 3:7
masks 17:4
Massive 29:5
Master 16:5
material 59:22
Materials 116:10
mates 3:10
Matheson 9:3
matter 9:17 30:1,9 46:22 49:9 58:14 120:4
matters 91:25 94:20 126:8
$\max$ 25:10 34:19 43:14 54:8 83:20

Mayor 3:24 12:11 93:12 96:10 103:20 114:4
MCGINNIS 4:4
Mcinnis 4:3 40:8,9 48:18 49:18 50:14 52:10,11,15
meaningful 88:9
means 60:23
Medical 18:3
Medicine 17:14
meet 21:22,24 22:1,3,5,
7,9,11,13,15 80:22 88:8,16 102:10
meeting 3:2,5,13 5:23, 24 9:1,18 27:6,12 38:13 67:7 74:17 79:6 80:6 89:16 93:3 94:21 105:7 121:17 126:2
meetings 6:4
meets 125:25
member 67:22 83:2 100:10
members 6:13 7:17 8:19 9:13 10:8 11:4,12, 14,25 12:19 14:25 15:22 16:18 18:16 21:13 23:3 24:7 25:15 32:5 72:4 75:24 82:19 89:25 91:1,18 92:24 93:21 94:17 95:19 96:18 99:7 103:6 104:2 105:5,6 107:25 109:18 111:5 112:16 113:24 115:5 116:4 117:18 119:8 120:13 121:12 123:11 124:5 125:11
members' 31:25 124:2
mental 117:6
Menteur 13:13
mention 65:16
mentioned 62:15
merits 63:13
met $19: 2,7,11,15,20,24$ 20:3,8,12,17,21,25

Methanol 8:2,6
Metoyer 17:1,6,7 18:23 21:19 23:9
Metro 103:16,19
Mezco 108:6,11
mic 35:3 55:6
Michael 11:12 13:17
microorganisms 83:18
microphone 17:3 31:15

| microphones 17:4 middle 38:4 89:14 | 35:3,5,6,11,18,20 36:5, 19,21,22 37:20 39:2,3 45:14,25 46:2,9,21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:6 105:15,18 } \\ & \text { 107:13,17 108:3 109:8, } \\ & \text { 10,21 110:20,21 111:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Midstream 112:22,25 | 47:2,5 51:6,8,16,19,21 | 112:1,3,5,6,14,20 |
| 113:4 | 52:5 78:7,8,9,11,19,23 | 113:15,16 114:2,7,19 |
| migrated 24:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:2 92:15 99:25 100:1, } \\ & 5 \text { 107:17 112:3,5,7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:8,18,20 116:7 } \\ & \text { 117:3,5,8,22 118:21,24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| miles 66:7 | moment 65:6 87:11 | $119: 11,23,25120: 17$ |
| million 84:20 | money 101:16,19,21 | 123:5,6,8,20 124:8,19 |
| millions 56:6 | Monique 108:14 | motions 82:16 87:15 |
| Millworks 17:16 | Monroe 16:4 | motivation 28:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mind 25:5 26:25 54:24 } \\ & 55: 677: 581: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Monsanto } 120: 18 \\ & 121: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { move 37:1,14 79:13 } \\ & \text { 82:24 92:6 93:25 95:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mine 123:19 | month 110:12 126:1 | 97:2 99:24 126:15 |
| ministerial 127:14 minute 17:1 127:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { months } 29: 21 \text { 89:17 } \\ & \text { 105:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { moved 6:1 7:7 89:12 } \\ 100: 7 \text { 107:15 114:21 } \end{gathered}$ |
| minutes 3:13 5:23 6:3 | Mooreland 65:4,8,11, | moves 69:10 127:17 |
| 75:11 79:4 | 14 68:18,20 81:9 | moving 10:15 13:1 |
| misinformation 89:25 | morning 3:1,20,21 | 98:2 |
|  | 6:25 24:6 55:2,4 69:2 | municipalities 56:5 |
| sleading 91:1,2 | 70:24 71:19,20 | myriad 76:20 |
| sled 91:1 | Morton 109:24 110:3,7 |  |
| missed 67:3 113:9 | Moss 4:9,10 6:1,2 7:7,8 | N |
| 114:9 | 8:11 9:25 12:11 15:14 |  |
| mistake 52:16 | 16:9 21:5 86:2 94:9 | Nalco 116:15,16,17,19 |
|  | 95:11 100:7 109:10 | 117:25 118:4,7 |
| misunderstanding 89:1 | 110:23 113:16 120:1 | names 124:2 |
|  | motion 5:25 6:2,16 7:5, |  |
| $7 \text { 30:11,13,18,24 31:13 }$ | 8,20 8:7,8,22 9:2,11,16, | Nassar 5:6,7 8:8,9,10 11:17 24:4 94:9 107:15, |
| 32:7,9 54:3,4,14 65:5,7 | 23,24 10:11,18 | 17 114:21,22 117:10 |
| 75:12,14 76:4,14,25 | 14:16 15:3,11,14,25 | 122:21,22 |
| 77:20 78:14,22 79:1 | 16:8,9,21 18:6,19 21:3, | NASW 55:11 |
| 121:19,20 | 4,16 22:17 23:6,24 24:3 | NASW 55.11 |
| MK 22:8 | 39:22 40:2,12,20 41:17, | Natchitoches 17:9 |
| Mobil 100:16 | 23 43:4 47:9 48:9,13, | nature 47:14 |
|  | 16,17,23 49:24,25 50:2, | necessarily 52:21 |
|  | 52:6 53:10,15,19 54:1 | needed 89:5 |
| modified 63:15 | 73:24 75:11 81:5,13,18, |  |
| modify 24:23 | 21 82:4,12 85:25 86:1 | negotiation 52:13 |
|  | 87:6,7 91:13,22 92:13, | Nextgen 24:18 |
| Molar 22:19 | 15 93:10,12,24 94:7,9 | Nextgen |
| Moller 5:2,3 10:21 | 95:9,11,22 96:7,10,22 | Nextgeneration |
| 30:14,15,22 31:10,12, | 97:16,17 98:17,22 | 126:22 |
| 18,20 32:2,3 34:11,23 | 99:10,21,25 100:8,12, | nice 34:19,20 |

night 81:14
Ninety 49:11
nit-picky 29:19
noes 34:5
NOLA 13:19 20:9,14
nominate 122:22 123:1,3 124:13
nominations 122:20
123:7,9 124:21 125:6
nonprofit 59:12
nonpublic 88:18
normal 67:14 83:16
86:15
North 13:9
noses 44:19
note 17:2 118:19
noted 117:4 126:20
notes 25:1 42:22 55:16
notice $3: 12,13$ 47:13
48:3,8 55:21 57:8,11
58:4,15,16,17 61:3,8,
14,15,23,25 62:12
63:18,20 64:8 65:16 67:1,8
noticed 67:5
notices 59:15 108:22
notification 24:11 42:4
46:4 47:12,23 58:7 75:22
notifications 75:19
83:12 126:13
notified 119:17 120:20, 22
notify 113:9
November 5:23 27:11 28:2 67:7 69:7
number 18:5 26:5 29:4 61:20,25 70:5,6,11 85:13 91:25 99:12
numbers 23:18 48:3

THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

| 70:4,7 91:5 97:14 |
| ---: |
| Nutrition 116:13 |
| $\mathbf{0}$ |

opportunity 36:16 38:5 40:18 47:9 63:1,8 79:20 81:19 82:5 126:4 127:18
opposed 6:14 12:20 21:14 23:4 82:20 91:19 92:25 96:19 99:8
opposing 87:15
opposition 7:18 8:20 9:14 10:9 11:5 12:1 15:1,23 16:19 18:17 51:1,3 82:22 91:21 93:2,22 94:18 95:20 96:21 103:7,9 104:3,5 108:1 109:19 111:6 112:17,19 113:25 115:6 116:5,7 117:19,21 119:9 120:14,16 121:13 123:12,14 124:6 125:12
option 46:23 92:4,5
order 13:25 23:12 24:25 25:4,6 26:16,17, 19,22 27:3,8,14,16,25 28:10,13 29:11,15 31:1 42:8 44:5 48:10 49:5 51:1 58:6,7 59:1,10,20 63:15,22 64:5,12 65:25 70:11 75:25 76:15 77:5, 9,12,25 78:3,5 79:7 90:9 92:10 100:3,14 126:9,14
orders 29:755:22,24
Organick 104:15,23 105:3
organization 43:20 65:9 89:8
organizations 34:4 67:23
original 30:17 50:18,23 52:6,12,20
originally $34: 12$
Orleans 13:9,10,13,14, 15,19,20 17:20,21 20:5, 10,14 21:23
orphans 126:13

## Osteo 17:13

OTS 121:23
Ouachita 13:17 16:5 17:14 96:6 98:6
outage 84:3
outright 68:10 outward-facing 127:3 overhaul 29:5 overly 29:18 oversight 63:25 68:5 overstepping 41:5 overview 30:7 owner 21:23 116:13,21 owners 11:10 13:8 ownership 12:6

| P |
| :--- |
| Pacific 100:18 |
| Packaging 92:11,14 |
| packet 56:23 74:4 |
| packets 67:6,7 |
| paid 63:24 107:4 |

Palmisano 19:8
Paper 95:5,6 106:4,8, 14

Parc 22:12
parish 7:2,3,4,24,25 8:1,2,3 9:22 10:16,17 11:11 12:9 13:9,10,11, 12,13,14,15,16,17,18, 19,20 15:7 16:3,4,5,6 17:9,10,11,12,14,15,16, 17,18,19,20,21,22,23, 24 18:1,2,3,4,25 19:4, 13,17 20:1,5,10,14,19, 23 21:21,23,25 22:2,5, 7,9,11,12,14 23:16 32:20 33:17 36:2 37:19 38:17 51:11 52:15 53:2 68:25 69:7,9 92:12

```
93:5,6,8,9 94:5,6,23,24,
25 95:1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
96:6 97:1,9,14 98:7
103:17 104:8 106:4
108:7 109:25 111:14
112:22 114:17 115:14,
16 116:14,17,19,23
118:2,5,9,12,16,18
119:16 120:19,20,24
126:24
```

part 33:8 36:6 43:8 51:5 67:14 84:15 102:21,23 122:7
partial 117:23 118:22
participate 62:24
participating 14:9
parts 84:20
pass 26:21 43:5 73:13
passed 87:6
passes 82:23
passing 41:23
past 25:2 63:19 84:4
patterns 56:9 68:12
Paula 4:12
pay 66:3 67:17 68:3 101:20
paying 73:14
Pellets 12:7
penalize 105:1
penalized 105:10
penalty 105:17 107:14 109:7,9 110:22 113:15
people 33:9 37:16,17 40:16 53:13 64:17 67:17 72:15 73:9 74:21 84:5 87:23 91:6
percent 35:8,12,21,22 36:14,17 38:20 39:4 43:16 44:1,16 46:22,24 51:20,25 53:6 58:23
62:19,20,22,23 63:8 64:22 105:10,14,16


## THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

 Index: programs..recuse29:5,7,12 $33: 5$ 35:8
57:4 59:6,13 60:9,14
63:5 77:1,8 83:25 89:1, 5 126:21,22
programs 29:23 30:5 60:24 66:14 127:4
prohibit 75:19
prohibited 61:3,5
prohibition 52:24
project 10:13,14 11:10 12:6 24:15 25:20 31:4, 11 34:12,15,19,22,24 35:23 45:19,22 46:6,11 47:4,7,17 54:7,11,19 58:2,5,15,17,21,24 59:1,9,15,20 60:6,10 61:15,16,20,21,22,23 62:1,3,10,11,13 65:17, 20 67:10,12 70:9,11,12, 19 75:20 76:19 78:23 84:1 106:23 120:21
projects 25:22 27:16 31:2 37:2 40:2 53:20 57:10 83:11 97:18 98:23 106:23
promise 75:15
promote 66:14
prompted 25:17,18
pronounce 124:10 pronouncing 125:1 pronunciation 123:25 properly 48:16 113:13

Properties 13:19 108:7,11
property 32:23 56:6 67:18
proposals 81:16 proposition 38:15
protect 70:21 71:9 protects 84:5 proud 80:18
prove 80:22
provide 24:13 37:18 49:12
provided 77:22 127:15
provisions 61:2
public 6:9 7:13 8:15 9:9 10:4,25 11:21 12:15 14:21 15:18 16:14 18:12 $21: 9$ 22:24 27:23 28:19 67:20 68:1 74:7, 9,10 75:6 79:16 86:6 87:3,10,14,21,22,24 88:1 90:1,8,16,20,25 91:14 92:20 93:17 94:13 95:15 96:15 99:2 101:5 103:2,24 105:24 107:21 109:14 111:2 112:11 113:20 115:2,25 119:4 120:9 121:8,21 122:14 126:3 127:3,21
pull 44:22 55:6
pulling 43:18
pulls 58:18 84:13
purporting 91:2
purpose 30:4 75:21 88:18 102:8
purposes 45:18 46:10
pursuit 30:4
put 17:4 37:13 38:8 41:16 49:3 64:17 124:16 126:22
putting 38:23 89:25
PV1 94:4

| $\mathbf{Q}$ |
| :---: |

Quality 6:18,25 7:22 12:23
question 14:15 22:20 29:22 30:25 31:8 36:20 40:23 41:3,6 42:11,21 52:20 53:1,4 57:5 76:6, 21 84:22 95:12 105:21
questions 3:16 6:5,8 7:10,12 8:12,14 9:6,8 10:1,3,22,24 11:18,20 12:12,14 14:17,20 15:15,17 16:11,13 18:9, 11 21:6,8 22:23 27:2 28:14 30:10,12 31:13, 25 32:2,4 34:10 40:14 56:13 60:17 64:1 66:21 68:19 69:15,25 71:16 73:19 79:16,19 80:25 82:8,16 86:3,5 88:21 91:11,14 92:17,19 93:14,16 94:10,12 95:14 96:12,14 98:24 99:1,20 101:2,4 103:1, 21,23 105:23 107:18,20 109:11,13 110:24 111:1 112:8,10 113:17,19 114:24 115:1,22,24 117:11,14,15 119:1,3 120:5,8 121:5,7

Quick 94:24
quickly 60:20 76:7,8
quorum 5:20

| R |
| :--- |

Rahul 13:18
Rail 18:1
railroad 53:16
raise 25:4 28:14,23 49:22 52:2 99:19,20
raised 53:4 66:21 102:7 ramifications 107:7

Rampart 13:9
Rapides 20:23 92:12 97:8
reached 103:11
reaching 27:7
reactions 87:18
read 54:20 81:14 83:1 98:16 99:16 118:14 122:14
readily 126:19
reading 68:24 69:4
ready 82:11
real 47:17 76:7 87:24
realized 106:25
reason 31:16 63:17
77:17 79:10 87:18 104:20 106:19 111:23
reasonable 59:1 60:9 62:4
reasons 76:20
Rebecca 16:3
recall 43:2
receive 26:18 42:20 44:6 59:21 72:8 74:6,7 75:5,6 119:19
received 72:7,11,16 74:10,12,13,25
receiving 74:2 118:1,4, 7,11,17
recent 126:21
recently 29:14
recess 75:9 79:5,7
recognition 66:5
recognize 30:4 79:21
112:1 114:19 127:13
recognized 126:17
recommendation
27:13 77:23 123:25
record 42:2 54:8 55:5 67:8 80:13,20 83:1 104:14 108:23 109:3 110:5 113:2 118:19 120:2 122:15
record's 98:1
records 72:25 90:8,17, 20 126:19
recounted 77:22
recuse 100:15

| recusing 8:5 100:22 | remedial 124:2 | 20:11 28:21,22,25 29:9 | 116:4 117:18 119:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120:2 |  | 30:19 48:9 54:9 56:8 | 120:13 121:12 123:11 |
| red 25:4 | re | 58:20 76:12,23,24 77:3, | 124:5 125:11 |
|  | remind 27 | 17 90:17,20,23 104:9 |  |
| Redevelopment$13: 14,15$ | remove 84:11 | 106:6 108:8 110:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 9,11,15,17,196: 7,10, \\ & 157: 11,14,198: 13,16, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | remove 84:11 | 111:15 112:23 114:17 |  |
| redneck 125:4 | render 47:5 | 119: | $21 \text { 9:7,10,15 10:2,5,10, }$ |
| reducing 25:11 | rendering 47:4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { requested } 19: 1,6,10, \\ 14,18,2320: 2,7,15,20, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \text { 11:1,6,19,22 12:2, } \\ & \text { 13,16,21 14:19,23 15:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| reduction 105:14 | renewal 8:24 43:8 96:8 | 24 24:24 26:17 28:5 | $16,19,2416: 12,15,20$ |
|  |  | 56:4 92:11 94:3 96:1 | 18:10,13,18 21:7,10,15 |
| redundant 55:15 | 104:9,18,21,24 105:9, | 120:25 | 22:22,25 23:5 32:6 |
| referee 75:5 | 13,16 106:5,25 107:7, |  | 54:16 56:15 68:21 |
| referring 28:17 30: | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \text { 108:8 109:8 110:1, } \\ & 21 \text { 111:15,23,24 } \end{aligned}$ | $96: 1 \text { 103:14 114:18 }$ | 69:16 71:17 73:21 |
| 77:6 | 112:14,23 113:6,10,15 | requests 31:3 55:20 | $79: 17$ 82:10,17,21 86:4, 7 91:12,15,20 92:18,21 |
| refine 42:23 | renewals 7:23 15:5 | 76:11 90:8 115:11 | 93:1,15,18,23 94:11,14, |
| refined 58:19 | $16: 8 \text { 29:15 77:13 95:24, }$ | 116:10 117:24 119:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { 95:13,16,21 96:13, } \\ & 16.2098: 2599: 3.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| refinery 32:18 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \text { 99:13,18 100:20 } \\ & \text { 102:23 103:12 105:2,9, } \end{aligned}$ | required 24:22 48:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 16,2098: 2599: 3,9 \\ & 101: 3103: 3,8,22,25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 83:9 | 11 110:11 | 76:1 | 104:4 105:22,25 |
| Refining 19:12 93:6,7, 8 |  | requirement 102:11 | 107:19,22 108:2 |
|  | Rent 20:4 22:10 | requirements $3: 14$ | $109: 12,15,20110: 25$ $111: 3,7,20112: 9,12,18$ |
| reflected 54:8 | reopen 76:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 2,7,11,15,19,24 \\ & 20: 3,8,12,16,21,25 \end{aligned}$ | 113:18,21 114:1,25 |
| reflects 58:22 64:24 |  | 21:22,24 22:1,3,5,8,10, | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 13,16,20 \text { 119:2,5, } \\ & 10 \text { 120:7,10,15 121:6,9, } \\ & 14 \text { 123:13 124:7 125:8, } \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Rep 14:2 | 21:22,24 22:1,3,5,8,10, <br> 11,13,15 26:15 |  |
| reformed 55:19 | Repair 94:25 repeat 90:16 | ```requiring 55:19 62:17,``` |  |
|  | replace 50:20 | research 78:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { responsibility 29:22 } \\ 68: 9 \text { 122:14 127:21 } \end{gathered}$ |
| rd 33:3,13 | replacing 17:3 48:13 | researching 121:23 |  |
| regulation 111:25 | 51:4 | 122:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { responsible 78:19 } \\ & 91: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { regulations } 30: 659: 11 \\ & 63: 16 \text { 64:6 } \end{aligned}$ | report 27:20 121:23 | resolution 43:5,6 49:13 | responsive 90:23 91:5 |
| reiterate 29:20 12 | represent 65:9 80:2 | resolutions 44:6 49:6 | rest 68:3 <br> restate 50:2 |
| reject 60:1 |  | respect 14:8 33:14 |  |
|  |  | 37:24 57:15 77:15 | Restoration 13:1,7,22 14:21 |
| relate 27:16 | presentative 4:11 <br> 4:4 25:8 30:16,21 31:8 | respectfully 33:21 |  |
|  | $\text { 32:14,23 63:12 } 71: 9$ | 86:18 | restrictions 106:16 |
|  | 111:22 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { respond } 6: 137: 178: 19 \\ 9: 1310: 8 ~ 11: 4,2512: 19 \end{array}$ | resubmit 48:8 |
|  | representatives 25:19 | 14:25 15:22 16:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { retaining 117:25 118:3, } \\ & 6,10,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| relocating 86:20 | represented 51:23 | 18:16 21:13 23:3 36:11 |  |
|  | representing 55:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:19 90:3 91:18 92:24 } \\ & \text { 93:21 94:17 95:19 } \end{aligned}$ | rethinking 48:12 |
| remaining 82:24 remarks 65:15 127:23 | 67:25 108:25 | 96:18 99:7 103:6 104:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { return 83:25 89:19 } \\ & 90: 9,13,14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | request 9:20 15:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:25 109:18 111:5 } \\ & \text { 112:16 113:24 115:5 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Torres Reporting \& Associates, inc. |  |  | Baton Rouge, LA 225.751 .0732 <br> 225.752.7308 FAX |
| COURT REPORTING \& LITIGATION SERVICES |  |  | New Orleans, LA <br> 504.392.4791 <br> 504.392.4852 FAX |


| ```revenue 56:6 127:1 revert 52:6 review 27:18 33:12 56:4,7,9 88:8,10 127:5``` | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 23 ~ 33: 5,1335: 7,12, \\ & 1536: 6,741: 1,2,11,12, \\ & 13,1942: 2,3,5,7,9,14 \\ & 45: 17,20,2146: 7,22,24 \\ & 47: 648: 1551: 15,20 \end{aligned}$ | ```scrutiny 25:17 26:19 27:2 29:14 77:11 seat 3:10 16:25 54:25 86:9``` | shifted 25:20 <br> ship 79:21 <br> Shopperschoice.com <br> 11:12,14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { reviewed } 25: 12 \\ & 102: 15,19 \end{aligned}$ | 53:6,8 57:7,9,11,21,22 <br> 61:1,2 62:7 63:21 <br> 64:13,19,25 66:4,8,12, | seconded 48:18 seconding 124:23 | short 5:24 79:7 show 3:4 |
| Rhonda 109:3 | 19,20,21 67:9 68:2 72:2 | Secretary 5:4,5 24:7 | shows |
| Rich 65:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75:18 76:2 77:7 80:11 } \\ & \text { 89:3,4,10,13 92:7,10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:21 47:11 75:20 } \\ & \text { 76:17 88:23,25 122:23 } \end{aligned}$ | Shreveport 93:6,7,8 |
| Rich's 20:13 | 94:1,3 127:14 | 125:23 | 104:16 |
| Richard's 94:5,8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { run 28:21 63:22 83:20 } \\ & 121: 25 \end{aligned}$ | section 74:5 | shut 84:2 |
| Rick 65:11 |  | Security 70:5 | shutdown 83:25 |
| Rickey 4:5 |  | seek 33:10 37:3 | sic 9:4 21:4 117:5 |
| rights | Russ 113:3 | seeking 38:5,20 55:22 | side 84:4 |
| risk 38:19 | Ryan 10:15 | 126:5 | sides 29:17 |
| River 115:13 | S | $\begin{gathered} \text { Senator } 4: 14,22 \text { 36:23 } \\ 39: 11 \text { 71:8 87:25 88:6 } \end{gathered}$ | signed 53:14 |
| Road 115:14 |  | 90:6 | similar 78:18 |
| Robert's 48:15 |  | send 72:10,14 79:11 | Simmons 3:19,20,22, |
| Roehm 114:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { safety 17:19 83:25 } \\ & 96: 2597: 4,598: 14,15 \end{aligned}$ | Senior 17:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { 4:1,3,5,7,9,11,14,16, } \\ & 18,22,255: 2,4,6,8,10 \end{aligned}$ |
| Rohrbough 16:3 | Saizan 5:8 | sense 57:1 | 12,14,16,18,20 48:20 |
| role | sake 46:14,15 | September 106:6 | Simon 110:6,9,19 |
| rollcall 3:18 | Sales 21:21 | servants 30:1 | simple 78:16 |
| rolls | Salle 12:8 112:22 | serve 127:22 | simply $3: 8$ 44:12 66:20 |
| Ronnie 4:14 5:12 room 3:17 67:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { salt } 84: 11,13109: 24 \\ & 110: 3,7 \end{aligned}$ | served 80:1 services 7:3 17:19,20 | sir 6:21 8:10 13:4 14:1 |
| root 56:10 | Salvage 115:11 | 19:21,25 67:20 112:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:6 56:20 65:13 68:22 } \\ & \text { 69:13 71:15 75:14 78:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Rouge 7:2,24 8:1 11:11 13:16 16:3,6 17:11 | ```Sasol 116:20 118:9,13, 14``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { serving } 60: 23 \\ & \text { set } 43: 1,651: 1553: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 79:20 81:3 91:4 106:9, 11 107:10 108:5 113:1 121:20 127:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19: 1320: 1921: 21 \text { 22:2, } \\ & 4,693: 594: 595: 3 \end{aligned}$ | scale 42:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 11,18,21,2263: 16 \\ & 65: 2087: 1789: 3 \end{aligned}$ | SIS 85:6 |
| 116:19 | scary 66:23 | sets 26:9 42:13 47:19 | sit 54:22 |
| routine 66:8 | Schexnaydre 5:10 | SF 13:19 | site 61:10,12 66:6,7 |
| row 3:17 | school 33:18 38:17 | share 24:12 87:19 | 102:23 107:1 |
| RTA 15:5 | 69:9 124:2 | shared 29:20 | sitting 6:19 39:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { rule } 48: 7 \text { 61:6 64:18 } \\ & 95: 10 \end{aligned}$ | schools $67: 19$ scope $25: 2370: 14,15$, | Shawn 5:14 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { situation } 41: 20 \text { 42:15 } \\ \text { 44:12,16 104:18 105:11 } \end{array}$ |
| rule-breaking 68:13 | 16 76:19 | sheriff 33:18 38:16 | situations 46:3 |
| rules $26: 9,12,13,14,17$, 25 28:21 29:8,10,23 | scrub 17:5 | shift 29:13 76:20 | six-year 85:9 |


| Sixty 49:5 | specificity 77:3 | statement 90:9,13 | subsequent 29:7 76:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| size 36:7 | specs 84:19 |  | Subsidiaries 120:19 |
| skeleton 67:21 | sphere 27:23 | statements 27:2 | substance 121:17 |
| skipping 100:17,19 | spokespeople 67:24 | statewide 59:13 121:24 126:23 | substantial 26:4 |
| SLC 18:2 | Springs 106:13 | status 55:23 | substantive $88: 7$ |
| sliding 42:16 | St 4:11,13 7:4 8:3 | statute 48:761:3 | substantively $88: 5$ |
| Slone 5:12,13 6:3 9:5 <br> 13:24 15:14 24:3 43:11, | 18:8 22:8 23:16 32:19 | statutory $37: 23$ | suggest 49:362:3 |
| 12,18,24 95:11 103:20, | 33:17 37:18 50:3,6,10, | stead 106:18 | suggested 27:24 |
| 109:10 113:16 114:23 | 68:25 69:6,9 95:2 | steals 64:16 | suggesting 62:6 |
| slow 97:2 | 115:14,16 116:17,24,25 118:2,5,8 120:19,20,24 | Steamboat 17:21 | sulfur 84:18,21 |
| snow 3:5 | staff 3:16 17:2 23:22 | step 106:18 | sulphur 58:18 <br> Sumit 106:12 |
| Social 70 | $25: 17$ 27:18 28:6,13,18, 23 29:1,4, 93019,20 | steps 89:7 |  |
| society 70:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \text { 29:1,4,8,9 30:19,20 } \\ & 31: 354: 5,958: 8,10 \end{aligned}$ | Sterlingten 96:8 | Super 16:5 |
| Sommer 111:13,18 <br> 112:14 | 59:6,13 60:8 63:23,24 67:6,21 72:7,8,13 75:17 88:6 102:14 111:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sterlington 96:6 98:6, } \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | support 36:14,17 127:6 <br> supposed 68:5 |
| Sorapuru 68:25 69:2,3, 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:2,5,8 127:25 } \\ & \text { staff's 90:11 } \end{aligned}$ | stipulated 57:23 <br> stop 89:25 | supposedly 71:3 <br> surrounding 24:10 |
| sort 28:20 122:5 | stakeholders 29:17 | straight 98:5 114:13 | survey 27:10 |
| Soto 95:5 <br> sounds 36:8 42:24 <br> 43:2 86:15 87:7 127:8 | 33:7,10 | 122:2 | switching 25:21 |
|  | stamp 122:5 <br> stand 91:6 | Street 10:15,17 16:2 21:23 32:24 | sympathetic 110:17 <br> system 19:4 24:1720 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { South 16:2 32:24 } \\ & \text { 119:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { standard 83:23 88:9, } \\ & 16,17 \end{aligned}$ | stretch 85:19 <br> stretched 66:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 22,2425: 8 \text { 30:17,20 } \\ & 31: 954: 10 \text { 58:9,10,20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Southwest 80:3 speak 3:8 23:22 44:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { standards 14:864:24 } \\ & 73: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { stretching } \\ 12,19}}{ } 66: 4,6,7,9$, | 71:2,12 75:18 76:15 79:11 121:24 127:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:14,15,17 69:22 } \\ & 73: 2475: 17 \text { 101:7,11, } \\ & 24 \text { 102:5 119:21 } \end{aligned}$ | start 25:10,21 77:24 <br> started 50:19 70:12 | strictly 66:10 strong 66:19 | systems 85:8 |
| speakers 3:15 | starts 47:16 | Stuart 4:9,25 123:4 | T |
| speaking 99:13 100:23 <br> special 51:17 58:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state } 29: 24 \text { 32:15 } 41: 22 \\ & 50: 355: 556: 5,2059: 19 \\ & 64: 2465: 869: 1,19 \end{aligned}$ | stuff 37:18 59:10 86:16 <br> Stuller 95:7 | table 23:24 47:12 48:17 64:4 |
| Specialist 22:4 | 70:22 71:20 73:11 75:1 | subject 26:16 61:9 | takes 16:23 23:10 |
| Specialty 22:2 116:10 | 80:7,12,15 82:2 83:6 84:4 86:24 104:13 | $\begin{array}{rl} \text { submit } 44: 23 ~ 45: 8 \\ 61: 7,25 & 63: 17,20 \\ 64: 8 \end{array}$ | 29:22 49:22 58:3 89:16 <br> taking 42:22 58:16 |
| specific 33:14 38:1 | 106:9 108:12 110:4 | submitted $27: 957: 9$ | 119:18 125:15 127:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:15 63:13 76:23 89:2 } \\ & \text { 90:21 99:17 100:11 } \end{aligned}$ | state's 71:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 16 \text { 62:13 65:16 } \\ & 70: 1276: 1587: 10,15 \end{aligned}$ | talk 65:18 70:14 85:7 |
| specifically $28: 17$ <br> 39:24 40:3 54:6,11 | stated 57:2 72:9 |  | talked 60:25 72:17 |
|  | Torres Reporting \& Associates, inc. |  | Baton Rouge, LA 225.751.0732 <br> 225.752.7308 FAX |
|  | REPORTING \& LITIGATI www.torresreporting 1.866.982.6878 Toll | N SERVICES om ree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New Orleans, LA } \\ & 504.392 .4791 \\ & 504.392 .4852 \text { FAX } \end{aligned}$ |


| talking 42:22 53:22 | 88:14,17 122:10 | traded 6:22 <br> traditional 25:22 | U |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tam 41:8 90:11 } \\ & \text { Tammany } 13: 11,12 \\ & 16: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:14 60:9,22 64:1 68:6 } \\ & 70: 4,16,1771: 6 ~ 89: 8 \\ & 91: 799: 24 \text { 110:14 } \end{aligned}$ | transactions 63:6 | ultimately $63: 2$ unacceptable 56: |
| Tangipahoa 17:25 | thought 107:2 110:10 <br> thoughts 29:20 91:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { transfer 12:5 116:9 } \\ & 117: 3,12,24 \end{aligned}$ | unanimously $82: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{tax} 13: 2,7,22 \text { 14:21 } \\ & \text { 23:11 32:23 33:24 } \\ & \text { 36:13 37:7 55:19 56:6 } \\ & 57: 472: 23,2593: 25 \end{aligned}$ | throw 64:16 84:12 thumb 44:19 | transferred 12:8 <br> transferring 116:16, $18,21$ | Undersecretary 76:8 81:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:23 101:16 103:12 } \\ & \text { 118:22 } \end{aligned}$ | till 119:20 <br> time 3:8 14:6 24:8 | transfers 118:22 | understand 6:19 14:7 23:21 42:1 44:4 45:20 46:12 54:1 64:7 70:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { taxes } 67: 1972: 2473: 8, \\ & 15 \text { 107:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2129: 931: 1732: 9 \\ & 39: 11,1540: 1041: 14 \\ & 53: 1857: 1360: 21 \end{aligned}$ | transparency 89:6 126:7,19 | ,23 73:7 78:11,20,21, 81:23 86:13 89:16, 99:14 101:14 104:25 |
| taxing $55: 20$ 56:4 66:11 101:18 | 61:24 65:23 76:18 77:2, <br> 10 78:5 80:11 83:19 <br> 85:4 89:11 92:5 99:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { transparent } 33: 4 \\ & \text { 127:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 109:6 110:16,18,19 nderstanding 37:2, |
| taxpayer 59:18 <br> team 33:16 | 85:4 89:11 92:5 99:19 <br> timeframe 43:16 | travel 106:16,17 | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \text { 43:22 76:25 77:2 } \\ & \text { 107:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| teasing 123:2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Travis 5:18 } \\ & \text { treater 54:7 58:18 } \\ & 70: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 28:9 |
| te | times 80:8 89 |  | 8:21,2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { technical 24:23 31:24 } \\ & 58: 1478: 16 \end{aligned}$ | timing 28:4 | treatment 83:15,17 | unlock 30:20 54:9 |
| technically 41:10 42:3 <br> telling 44:8 | tiny 59:12 <br> tip 66:25 <br> tired 98:18 | tree 44:22 <br> Tregre 38:17 | unlocked $24: 21,24$ $76: 16$ |
|  |  |  | unplanned 84:3 |
| ```Tenant 16:6 term 19:6,10,14,19,23``` | Tisdale 11:13 | Tri-gas 9:3 triggers 47: | unrelated 55:24 58:17 62:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 2,7,11,16,20,24 \\ & 124: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { today } 26: 2028: 15 \\ & 32: 1233: 2535: 2137: 2 \\ & \text { 39:3 56:8,17 71:10 } \\ & 77: 1878: 479: 2180: 6 \\ & \text { 89:4 106:15,17 127:10, } \\ & \text { 23 } \end{aligned}$ | trouble 58:16 92:4 | unusual 44:12 unwavering 29 |
| termination 19:1 |  | 124: | updates 26:14 |
|  |  | 89:2 | grade 84:20 |
| Terrebonne 17:18,2 | today's 67:7 82:15 | 29:19 64:13 | UPS 112:21,25 |
| test 53:2 75:3 <br> tested 52:19,23 53:3 | told 80:9 90:10,25 tops 66:21 | turn 32:10 91:23 121:24 | urge 60:12 88:19 |
|  | tops 66:21 <br> totally 60:10 61:22 | turnarounds 85:8,20 <br> turned 31:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { USA 116:14,20 118:9, } \\ & 10,13,14 \end{aligned}$ |
| testing 122:6 <br> tests 121:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Toups 3:24 12:11 14:1 } \\ & \text { 93:13 96:10 103:20 } \\ & \text { 114:4,5,12 } \end{aligned}$ | Turning 100:15 <br> type 38:1 84:9 <br> types 63:6 84:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Usie } 23: 14,1824: 21 \\ & \text { 25:1,12 58:11 72:8 } \\ & 74: 1,4,11,14,2075: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| theory $38: 1$ | trace |  | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 192: 8,993: 494: 2, \\ & 22 \text { 95:25 96:5,24 97:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| thing 33:19 45:16 49:2 53:16 57:12 66:23 67:4 | track 108:20 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5,7,12 \text { 98:4,8,12 } 99: 16 \\ & 100: 4 \text { 102:18,22 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Torres Reporting \& Associates, inc. <br> COURT REPORTING \& LITIGATION SERVICES <br> www.torresreporting.com <br> 1.866.982.6878 Toll Free |  | Baton Rouge, LA 225.751.0732 <br> 225.752.7308 FAX |
| COUR |  |  | New Orleans, LA <br> 504.392.4791 <br> 504.392.4852 FAX |

THE BOARD OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

| 103:13,16 104:7 106:3 | 81:20 101:24 122:6,10 | 127:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 108: 6 \text { 109:24 111:13 } \\ & 112: 21 \text { 114:16 115:10 } \end{aligned}$ | wanting 9:21 | worked 72:14 80:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:9 117:23 119:13 } \\ & \text { 120:18 } \end{aligned}$ | Wash 22:14 | Workforce 126:25 |
|  | Washington 54:21,25 | working 31:23 36:18 |
|  | 55:2,4,8,11,14,18 | 39:21 50:10,12 75:2 |
| V | 56:12,13 57:2 65:14 | 125:20 126:1 127:25 |
| Valero |  | worried 46:25 47:3 |
|  | wastewater 83:15,17 | WORTMAN 83:23 |
| varies 77:2 78:15 | watch 91:24 | Wortmann 32:17 33:2 |
| veer 44:21 | water 3:6 83:17 84:12, | 34:14 35:2,10,14,19,25 |
| Ventures 15:7,13 | 13,14 | 37:6,9 38:10,12,16,22 |
| version 52:6 59:14 | ways 42:23 60:23 | $45: 3,5,1149: 10,11$ |
| versus 38:20 39:18 | Webster 7:3 106:4 | 85:2,6,14,16,19 86:8 |
| vibrant 127:6 | weed 47:17 | Wortmann's 54:5 |
| vice 124:11,20 125:7 | week 81:1784:4 | writes 47:17 |
| village 49:22 | west 19:13 20:18 22:2,4 | writing 54:21 90:12 |
| Vincent 4:11 | 84:4 93:5 94:4 95:2,3 | 98:16 |
|  | 6:19 | writings 25:1 |
| violates 88:1 | Westlake 19:21,25 | written 74:5 111:25 |
| Virginia 17:13 | 97:13,18,23 98:2 | Writen 74.5111 .25 |
| virus 72:1 | Westlakes 98:13 | Y |
| voice 126:8 | willfully 64:6,20 |  |
| volunteers 67:22 | willingness 126:19 | y'all 37:13,15 38:3,4,20 |
|  |  | 42:22 54:22 63:23 92:4 |
| vote 14:9 40:4,5,7,16 | Wilis 18.3 | 125:2 127:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:18 47:9 48:13 52:5 } \\ & 53: 1455: 2079: 1481: 4, \end{aligned}$ | Wilson 5:14,16 | YCI 8:2,6 |
| 15,21 82:3,11 100:23 | wise 101:21 | year 28:3 29:9 37:7 |
| 114:6,11 120:3 123:15 | wishes 96:23 | 42:17 63:19 89:17,18 |
| voted $39: 7$ |  | 105:10 110:10,15 |
| voting 14:948:5 | withdraw 15:6 52:11 123:5,20 | years 26:10 29:6 35:24 |
| voting 14:9 48:5100:24 | 123.5,20 | 49:21 66:2 80:5,8,16 |
|  | withdrawal 15:9,10,12 96:2,4,5,8 98:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:8 88:13,15 100:6 } \\ & 126: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| W | withdrawn 53:10 | yeses 34:5 |
| wait 127:19 | withdrew 123:19 | yesterday 72:3 |
| Waitr 10:14 | Wood 119:14 | you-all 122:13 |
| Waltzer 122:11 | Woodrow 5:16 | Yvette 4:1 |
| Wanhua 120:23 121:2 | work 28:4 30:5 33:8 |  |
|  | 34:2 36:16 37:16,17 | Z |
| wanted 23:22 35:1141:16 54:8 74:8,21 75:1 | 38:24 64:15 73:15,16 |  |
|  | 80:18 82:1 92:2,3 | Zone 16:24 17:8 |

