

1

Appearances of Board Members Present:
Robert Adley
Millie Atkins
Robert Barham
Mayor Glenn Brasseaux
Representative Thomas Carmody
Major Coleman
Manuel "Manny" Fajardo
Jerald Jones
Heather Malone
Senator Ronnie Johns for Danny Martiny
Charles R. "Robby" Miller
Jan K. Moller
Secretary Don Pierson
Ronnie Slone
Bobby Williams, Jr.
Steve Windham
Dr. Woodrow Wilson, Jr.
Staff members present:
Tam Bourgeois
Eric Burton
Kristen Cheng
Danielle Clapinski
Frank Favaloro
Brenda Guess
Richard House
Becky Lambert
Mandi Mitchell
Joyce Metoyer
Melissa Sorrell
Hud Usie
Anne Villa

MR. WINDHAM:
I'd like to call this meeting to order.
So the meeting of the Board of Commerce and Industry for February 28th is called to order at 9:35 a.m.

I believe our first order of business will be rollcall by Ms. Sorrell.

MS. SORRELL:
Robert Adley.
MR. WINDHAM:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Robert Barham.
MR. BARHAM:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Representative Devillier for
Representative Abramson.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Millie Atkins.
MS. ATKINS:
Here.
MS. SORRELL:
Mayor Brasseaux.
MAYOR BRASSEAUX:

$\square$
MR. JOHNS :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Robby Miller.
MR. MILLER:
Here.
MS . SORREL:
Jan Moller.
MR. MOLLER:
Here.
MS . SORRELL :
Senator Chabert.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Secretary Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Present.
MS . SORRELL:
Scott Richard.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Darrel Saizan.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL:
Daniel Shexnayder.
(No response.)
MS . SORRELL :
Ronnie Slone.
MR. SLONE :
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Bobby Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Here.
MS . SORRELL :
Steve Windham.
MR. WINDHAM:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
Dr. Wilson.
DR. WILSON:
Here.
MS . SORRELL:
We have a quorum.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Ms. Sorrell.
I do need to point out, because we're back in this building, we are live streaming. We have a gentleman over here taking care of that piece of it, but we need to make sure that when we speak, if we have any questions or comments or observations, that we need to pull the microphones down in front of us.

With that said, I will move on to ask if anyone would like to move for the approval of the minutes from last meeting?

MR. SLONE :
I move.
MR. WINDHAM :
Motion by Mr. Slone; second by Dr.
Wilson.
Any questions, comments, observations?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:

Motion carries.
Next we have Mr. Eric Burton with the Quality Jobs Program. Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON:
Good morning. I have six new applications for Quality Jobs. 20161677, A.S.A.P. Industries Manufacturing, LLC; 20160741, BBQ Guys Manufacturing, LLC; 20170253, CellXion, LLC, dba Sabre Industries Building Systems by CellXion; 20161821, LeMoyen Mill \& Timber, LLC; 20170398, Lotte Chemical Louisiana, LLC; and 20151049, TCI Packaging, LLC.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Burton.
Are there any questions from any of the Board members concerning of any the applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions or comments from the public concerning any of these applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve?
Motion made by Mayor Brasseaux; seconded by Mr. Fajardo. I never get his name right.

MR. FAJARDO:

Fajardo.
MR. WINDHAM:
Manny. Fajardo. I'm getting closer.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON:
Next item up is going to be Quality Jobs Renewals. We have two renewals. 20121249, America's Auto Auction Baton Rouge, Inc., East Baton Rouge Parish; 20120245, BASF Corporation in Ascension Parish.

This concludes the renewals.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions for those renewals of any of the Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from any members of the audience?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:

Is there a motion to approve?
Made by Mr. Slone; seconded by Dr.
Wilson.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye." (Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON:
I have two specials on the agenda. A request in change of name only for the following contract: 20100919, from Great Southern Galvanizing, Inc. dba Great States Galvanizing to Great Southern Galvanizing, LLC dba Great States Galvanizing in East Baton Rouge Parish.

I also have a request in change of ownership only for the following contract: Contract 20121249, from ABC Baton Rouge, LLC to America's Auto Auction Baton Rouge, Inc. in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Burton.
Are there any questions or comments from the Board members concerning the name change or the
request in ownership change?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve?
Made by Representative Johns; seconded
by Mr. Jones.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. BURTON :
This concludes Quality Jobs.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Burton.
Next on deck we have Ms. Becky Lambert to do the Restoration Tax Abatement Program.

MS . LAMBERT :
Good morning.
MR. WINDHAM:
Good morning.
MS. LAMBERT:
We have five new applications for
Restoration Tax Abatement, for which all have met the
local requirements prior to receiving approval to be
placed on the agenda. We have received local
resolutions approving all.
The first one is 201615828,801 Magazine
Street in New Orleans; 20141099, Bradshaw Family, LLC in
Orleans; 20170233, Brentwood Acquisition - Shreveport,
Inc., Caddo; 20170018, Georgia Tucker, LLC, Ouachita;
20170016, Monroe Development, LLC, Ouachita, for a total
investment of $\$ 19,933,758$.
This concludes the applications.
Board members concerning the applications for
Restoration Tax Abatement?
(No response.)

## Heather.

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

All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . LAMBERT :
We have one special request to correct the construction ending date on a contract that has already been approved by the Board on October 25th, 2017.

RTA 20161637, Market Street Shreveport,
LLC. This contract was approved with an estimated construction ending date of October 17th, 2017. The correct estimated construction date is actually for 2018, October 15th, 2018. The company recognized the error after the contract was fully executed and notified LED staff to request a correction. It is required that any changes to an approved contract be approved by the Board. So with Board approval, the contract will be reissued with the revised estimated construction date to reflect the company's correct date of October 15th, 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
And this has been reviewed by legal
staff, no problems or anything with it?
MS . LAMBERT :
There are no issues with the -- and it's really -- it's relatively -- it was basically a typographical error on the company's part, and they recognized it when they were signing the documents.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any other
questions?
Motion's made by Mr. Jones to approve; second by Secretary Barham.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . LAMBERT :
All right. This concludes the RTA
requests for this meeting.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Lambert.

Ms. Metoyer, the Enterprise Zone Program presented by Ms. Joyce Metoyer.

MS . METOYER :
Good morning.
MR. WINDHAM:
Good morning.
MS . METOYER :
I have 10 new applications.
First one is 20161499, CDG Energy, LLC in Rapides Parish; 20150157, Metairie Hotel Ventures, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20150863, New Hotel Monteleone, LLC dba Hotel Monteleone, Orleans Parish; 20150864, Palmisano Contractors, LLC, Orleans Parish; 20150193, Providence Classical Academy, Incorporated, Bossier Parish; 20151375, Sai Ram Lodging, LLC, Ouachita Parish; 20141318, Shree Madhav, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20150949, The Kroger, Company, Calcasieu Parish; 20131435, University Medical Center Management, Corp., Orleans Parish; and 20131330, Vantage Health Plan, Incorporated, Ouachita Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.
Are there any questions of any of the Board members for the Enterprise Zone applications?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public for the
Enterprise Zone applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?
Motion's made by Mr. Slone to approve;
seconded by President Miller.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
Any opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . METOYER :
I have five termination requests.
20131101, Summit Credits, LLC, Livingston Parish. Their existing contract period is $8 / 23 / 2013$ to $8 / 22$ of 2018. The requested term date is $8 / 22$ of 2015 . The program requirements have been met. No additional jobs are anticipated; 20120206, Associated Grocers, Incorporated, East Baton Rouge Parish. Existing contract period $1 / 28 / 2013$ to $1 / 27$ of 2018 . The requested term date is 7/28 of 2015. The program requirements have been met.

No additional jobs are anticipated; 20071374, Stirling Properties, LLC, St. Tammany Parish. The existing period is $7 / 1$ of 2013 to $6 / 30$ of 2018 . The requested term date is $12 / 31$ of 2016. Program requirements have been met. No additional jobs are anticipated; 20110863, Royal Orleans Hotel Partners, LLC, Orleans Parish. $8 / 1 / 2012$ to $7 / 31$ of 2017 is the existing contract. The requested term date is January 31 of 2015. The program requirements have been met and no additional jobs are anticipated; and 20131123, Carondelet Partners, LLC, Orleans Parish. The existing contract period is 1/1 2013 to $12 / 31$ of 2019, and the requested term date is September 30, 2017. All requirements have been met. No additional jobs are anticipated.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.
Are there any questions or comments concerning the termination requests from the Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public concerning termination requests for Enterprise Zone contracts from the Board members?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion?
Made by Mr. Williams; seconded by Ms.
Atkins.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . METOYER :
I have one special request to delete an owner for from an existing contract. It's 20151855, Performance Contractors, Incorporated, East Baton Rouge Parish, and the owner that needs to be deleted is Brent Boe.

MR. WINDHAM:
Can you give us an overview of what that effect has?

MS. METOYER:
He sold his interest. He is no longer an owner.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So he wouldn't receive any
future benefits?
MS . METOYER :
No.
MR. WINDHAM:
He may have received past benefits, though?

MS . METOYER :
It's possible, yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Possible.
Any questions from any of the Board

## members?

(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve?
Made by Mr. Slone; second by
Mr. Fajardo.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . METOYER :
That concludes Enterprise Zone.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Ms. Metoyer.
MS . METOYER :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Next up we have Ms. Cheng to do the Industrial Tax Exemption Program. Ms. Kristin Cheng.

MS . CHENG:
Good morning.
MR. WINDHAM:
Good morning.
MS . CHENG:
I have 28 new applications with advances prior to the Executive Order on June 24th of 2016.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. Mr. Adley would like to make a suggestion.

MR. ADLEY:
I want to make a suggestion to the committee. Much to your surprise, I think we can probably get out of here pretty quickly today. At least
the Governor's office met with LED, unless all of you have questions, I doubt that you probably do, but if you do, we certainly welcome them, but we only have a couple of questions. I think we resolved all of the issues we had on the -- I think there's 28 of them, and if we could get those two questions clarified, we might be able to take these in globo.

MS . CHENG:
I have two I'd like to defer before you get to those questions.

MR. WINDHAM:
That will be fine. Please indicate
which ones.
MS. CHENG:
The companies requested that 20161523,
Kennedy Rice Dryers, LLC in Morehouse Parish be deferred, and 20150086, Monsanto Company in St. Charles Parish be deferred.

MR. WINDHAM:
Can you repeat the first one?
MS. CHENG:
20161523, Kennedy Rice Dryers, LLC in Morehouse Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So We have Kennedy Rice

Dryers and Monsanto requesting deferral.
Any objections from anyone?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Please proceed with your questions, Mr. Adley.

MR. ADLEY:
In the group there were two that didn't appear to give a clear description of what they were doing.

MS . CHENG:
Okay.
MR. ADLEY:
They simply list an addition. They described the manufacturing what they did, but not what they were adding. So if I could just ask, is Delta Terminal Services and DOW Chemical...

MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have a representative from Delta Terminal Services with us today?

Please step forward. And, DOW, please be on deck.

Please identify yourself.
MR. LEONARD:
Hello. My name is Jimmy Leonard. I'm
with Advantous Consulting here on behalf of Delta Terminal Services.

MR. ADLEY:
The issue was pretty simple. You have a very good description of the process and what you were manufacturing, but you just simply said it was an addition, and we'd like to know what it was that you -what you added.

MR. LEONARD:
Yes, sir. The addition was process piping in order to move the finished product from the facility to the docking area.

MR. ADLEY:
Just piping?
MR. LEONARD :
Yes, sir, just piping.
MR. ADLEY:
Okay. Thank you.
MR. LEONARD :
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions for Delta?
MR. ADLEY:
No. And I ask these two questions, we'd ask our staff that when they send those applications, if
they don't have something telling us, it would be good if $y^{\prime}$ all go ahead and just ask them. They need to put them on the application. We don't even have to ask these questions, but there were only two.

The other one was DOW Chemical.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Leonard.
MR. ADLEY:
They, too, had an addition, and I'm just curious what it was what they added.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself and who you
represent.
MS . MYLES :
Lakeisha Myles with DOW Chemical.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes, ma'am. Can you just -- it was a good description, again, of the plant and what it does, but I didn't see a description of what the addition was.

MS. MYLES:
The addition is to add downstream derivative for the ethylene oxide at the Glycol II plant.

MR. ADLEY:
And so the equipment that was put in for
that would have been?
MS . MYLES :
For the downstream, the downstream part of the operations.

MR. ADLEY:
I got you. Do you have any idea what it was, the equipment that went in to do that?

MR. WINDHAM:
So when you say "downstream," is what you're saying -- is what you're describing the producer of the raw material within the facility or is it downstream and away from the operations altogether?

MS . MYLES :
No. It's within -- it's the downstream, the production, the operations within the facility.

MR. WINDHAM:
So is it a unit?
MS . MYLES :
It looks like it's several. The request, it looks like it's several units that were placed in to add to the value preservation of the Glycol II plant.

MR. WINDHAM:
And those units take the raw material that may either be imported or brought into the facility
or produced at another location within the facility and then they process that into another product?

MS . MYLES :
Yes, that's correct.
MR. ADLEY:
I still don't know what was added.
MR. MILLER:
I think Mr. Adley's question is what actual equipment. Like the previous one was piping. Was it pumps, piping, heat exchangers? I mean, what is it?

MR. ADLEY:
Does the staff know? I mean, do $y^{\prime}$ all have anything in file just...

I mean, knowing DOW, as we all do, I'm sure they added a lot of equipment, but when you put in these applications and give them to us and you don't tell us what it is, at some point, you have to give us an idea of what you're tax exempting, what is the piece of equipment that's being tax exempt.

MS. CHENG:
It looks like pressure temperature sensors, valves, steel, things that would make up a unit to -- riders, cables, something that would make up the unit to -- at the Glycol II facility.

MR. ADLEY:
So this is all one large piece of
equipment, is that what this is?
MS . CHENG:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Okay.
MS . CHENG:
It all makes up one (indicating).
MR. ADLEY:
Okay. All right. Thank you. That's the only question that we had of these, but it would really help us in the future, most of these applications, all of them have a description of what they added, but these two just, they didn't say anything. They just said an addition, and you need to know what the equipment is and what it is that's being tax exempt, that would help.

Thank you, ma'am.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, ma'am.
I don't know if Melissa got Mr. Coleman, Major Coleman, his...

Okay. Make sure you get registered.
Are there any other questions on any of
the applications by any of the Board members?
MR. MOLLER:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, please, Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLLER:
I have a question. We got some
information right before this meeting, and I apologize, I haven't had the chance to go through it, but concerning the timing of some of the these applications. The rules that we adopted talk about these have to be filed no later than 90 days after the beginning of operations or the end of construction, and it seems like several of these were filed, you know, outside of that time. And, again, I haven't gone back and double checked that, but it seems like the one for Cameron LNG was 314 days after the project end date, CB\&I Walker, 144 days.

MS. CHENG:
In the rules, Section 523, it allows for an extension to the application due date.

MR. MOLLER:
So they have all received application
extensions?
MS . CHENG:

Yes.
MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other questions by any of the Board members?

MR. MILLER:
One quick one. About the extensions, those are just done through LED?

MS . CHENG:
Yes.
MR. MILLER:
Great. Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM :
So that's a staff extension, and it's perfectly within the guidelines.

Any other questions from any of the Board members?

MR. MOLLER :
Is there a limit on how many extensions of time they can get?

MS . CHENG:
No. If it goes past a certain -- if it goes past six months, we like to get a statement from the assessor saying that the assets haven't been taxed
because assets that have been taxed aren't eligible, but that's all.

MR. MOLLER:
And do they have to provide a reason, or is it just kind of --

MS. CHENG:
Sometimes they can't get their costs together in time or, you know, it varies from application to application.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other questions by any of the Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe we have a comment from the public concerning this.

Please step forward and identify yourself.

## MR. BAGERT:

Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana.

And it does go to the question of timing, but from the rule's perspective or a broader
perspective, what we are saying right now in this meeting is in order for an investment that was completed in December of 2016 to take place, it needs a public subsidy that won't be approved until 314 days after it has already taken place. This retroactive granting of subsidies that are still being called incentives is not practiced in other places. It's not the norm, and it breaks not just the rules of normal economic development, but the rules of causality, chronology and cause and effect, that these were completed so long ago is on one way the standard practice for how the program has operated. We think that is a serious concern and needs to be addressed more narrowly within the rules. We wanted to know, did these, in fact, receive a specific request from each company before the filing deadline? Because there are some limits to extensions that are not automatically granted. They have to receive a specific request, according to 523, before the filing deadline has taken place. And did that take place so that is done the way that's in accordance with the rules?

MR. ADLEY:
But you don't -- if I heard you correctly, I didn't see a violation of the rule. MR. BAGERT :

If the companies provided a request for an extension prior to the 90-day deadline, so that is to say if before 90 days has elapsed since project completion and they provide a request for an extension prior to those 90 days, then that's abiding by the rules if that extension is granted. If they don't request that extension within those 90 days, then they are in violation of the rules, and they're in violation of the rules as these applications go. So it wasn't clear, and that's just a question for the staff. We don't receive those extensions.

> Did they, in fact, file an extension requesting -- or a request for an extension prior to the 90-day deadline elapsing since the construct project had taken place?

MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Cheng?
MS . CHENG:
If you can give me -- I don't even know which ones you're referring to. If you could give me a list, $I$ can go back and check for you.

MR. BAGERT:
Right there.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So I don't think we are
going to able to do that at this meeting.
MR. ADLEY:
And then when she goes and checks and we find that, in accordance with the rule, that the rule was not followed, your view is it should not be approved, but if the rule was followed, clearly, I mean, it should be.

I guess I'm asking the staff or LED, somebody to give us some direction here. If there's question about whether or not they actually complied with the rule, if we approve them subject to verification that they did, is that plausible to do?

Richard, I guess you're the best guy to ask. I mean, it's pretty clear to me that she doesn't know here.

MS . CHENG:
Late applications can be considered with -- just like the late renewals, they can be considered with a penalty.

MR. ADLEY:
I understand, but we deal with the late application differently than we have with everybody else. If they complied with the rule and met all of the extension requirements, then $I$ don't have a problem with what they're doing. If somebody didn't, then you've got
a different situation.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Before you say anything, Mr. Leonard, I believe Mr. Adley has a question for LED. SECRETARY PIERSON:

I'll respond for LED.
If there's a request for a specific set of documents to verify that the rule was followed, we'll be happy to provide that, and we would ask that you submit that request and do it succinctly so that we can identify the specific contract numbers that you are requesting to see documentation on.

MR. ADLEY:
I guess the question is, $I$ guess what he's -- I'm not speaking for him, but I guess the question is, let's say they made the request, and then when they made the request, the Board has already approved it and the documentation came back that it didn't follow the rules, what happens?

MR. WINDHAM :
Mr. House or Ms. Clapinski, can you describe what happens when somebody breaches these contracts? And I mean, breaching by if you don't follow the rules, then the contract was never valid, I would think.

MR. HOUSE:
Well, I think we'd have to take a look at that in the entirety of the circumstances and what action would then be appropriate by the Board at that time. I'm not going to fly on the basis of Mr. Bagert's or anybody else's interpretation of the rules. We'll take a look at, number one, take a look at whether or not there is compliance either under the terms of the rules or his terms, or if they're the same, that's fine, too. But, secondly, we would also, at that point in time, if there's a problem, we'd assess the situation and provide you with an opinion on that.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
Mr. Adley, do you have another question? MR. HOUSE :

I also would add, on the question whether or not you could provisionally approve something today, I think you could if you come up with the right words in the motion, but, again, that could be made subject to further review and the recommendation of counsel, if necessary. MR. ADLEY:

Mr. Chairman, it appears that some of the people who have applications are trying to get to
that table. Maybe they can clarify it for us, and if -we just -- I think what we need here, we just need to clarify when we say we don't know, that makes it difficult.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MR. LEONARD :
Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Jimmy Leonard with Advantous Consulting. I just want to make two comments for the record.

First comment is the Cameron LNG application was actually formally approved. The project was approved in 2013 for a \$9-billion-plus investment in the State of Louisiana. The assets in question are just pieces of equipment that went into service before the project was complete, and we've been working with LED for a number of months to properly document that activity and make sure that these assets only receive the 10 -year term exemption that are due. So the project is still under construction, and it is not, as a project, formally complete.

MR. WINDHAM:
Does that clear everything up for all of the Board members?

MR. LEONARD :

Yeah. So there is a contract that's been pre-approved for the project and --

MR. WINDHAM:
Because of the monetary volume of the contract, $I$ remember a number of years back.

MR. LEONARD:
Because of the size of the investment and the timing and the construction timeline is what is causing this to come before us today.

MR. WINDHAM:
Certainly.
And let me indicate to Ms. Sorrell that Representative Carmody is in the audience now.

MR. CARMODY:
Good morning. Thank you, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions from the Board members related to that concept from Mr. Leonard?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Second, I have someone else from the public that would like to address the scenario.

Wow, Doug, you've got a new beard.
MR. LEBLEU:
Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, I
have a copy of an e-mail that I received from Ms. Cheng approving the extension of our application. Our request was made March 14 th of 2017 , and her response to our request was, "Doug, the extension to June 15th, 2017 has been granted for Advance Number 20151342, which is the application in question." I'd be happy to read our request. It's quite lengthy and detailed as to why we're asking for the extension. Would you like me to read it?

MR. WINDHAM:
No.
MR. LEBLEU:
Good.
MR. JONES :
Who was the client?
MR. LEBLEU:
I'm sorry?
MR. JONES:
Who was your client?
MR. LEBLEU:
CB\&I Walker. I'm sorry.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there questions from the Board members concerning Mr. LeBleu and his client, CB\&I?
(No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you, Mr. LeBleu.
MR. LEBLEU:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM :
Any other comments?
Yes. Please step forward and identify yourself again.

## MR. BAGERT :

Once again, my name is Broderick Bagert. I'm with Together Louisiana. We withdraw the concern from CB\&I. They clearly had the -- or it appears they had the request for an extension in a timely fashion.

On Cameron LNG, it's a bit of a different scenario. They've got this huge investment, one of the largest in the history of this country, but there are discreet projects for which they submit discreet applications with separate part numbers, and each of those has a project end date that's submitted in the application. The project end date indicated here is for the discreet part of the overall investment, and it's, at least by the company's own likes, their end of construction date.

So the fact that the project itself in the totality investment is ongoing and will be for many
years doesn't affect the part of it for which an exemptions being sought in this meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
Are there any questions by any of the Board members for Mr. Broderick concerning this? Please identify yourself.

MR. LEONARD :
Jimmy Leonard, Advantous Consulting. Just for the record, this is not a discreet project. This is not an additional project. We are fitting facts and circumstances onto the documentation that LED provides us so that we can properly document the exemption. So this was not a separate project. This was not a smaller, discreet project inside of a bigger one. This just happened to be a number of items, it was a building and it was other pieces of equipment that went into service, and, therefore, should go on the tax rolls as exempt the year following it going into service.

MR. WINDHAM:
If $I$ remember correctly from my days of bing there, if a project has a -- the construction project has an extended period of time, this was one of the things to make sure that these projects don't
have -- and a unit goes online during the interment before the big picture project is completed, this was done to eliminate the possibility of extensions beyond 10 years. Because if it's a two-year project and year one it gets started and you wait until the end, then that entity, that unit, would get an 11-year exemption.

MR. LEONARD :
That is absolutely correct. And with the application, there is an additional commentary that says, "Cameron LNG is constructing a multi-billion-dollar liquefaction manufacturing facility addition to their existing facility. The application is not for a separate or new project. This application is being filed for the sole purpose of properly assigning an exemption term to assets that went into service prior to completion of the project." This is information that was submitted with the application.

MR. WINDHAM:
And it is part of the public records, which you should -- I mean, you have the ability to go and look at it; right, Mr. Broderick?

MR. BAGERT:
Yeah. And I think my meaning wasn't clear. I wasn't speaking to the nature of it. It is discreet enough to go into operation separately and have
its own application, which we entirely endorse because that does allow it to become taxable at a time when it's providing value and benefit to the company. But if it goes into operations in December of 2016, then you have 90 days from that point to submit an application, and these were submitted 314 days after that.

That's the -- whether it's discreet or a part of it, that it has its own application and went into operations sets the date when the clock starts. That's the --

MR. WINDHAM:
I think I do need to point out that this application was submitted and approved on the front end because of the size of the investment.

MR. BAGERT :
Right.
MR. WINDHAM:
So an application has already been submitted. So when you say one needs to be submitted, it was when they started the $\$ 9$-billion investment from the ground up. Yeah. So it's been submitted.

MR. BAGERT :
You have our concerns around it. I mean, that if a separate application is submitted, which we think it ought to be, it ought to comply with all of
the existing rules that limit when an application ought to be provided once a piece of equipment goes into operations. If not, you have this very -- and let me say this for the record, we are not interested in nit-picking the rules, and we have ignored lots of small rules that we don't think have any substantive value or contribution to the discussion. We are raising this for very specific reasons. The timing with which these exemptions have been granted in the past is against all precedent in other places because it is so retroactive, and a retroactive incentive is pretty close to a contradiction in terms. If something's approved or doesn't get approved until the thing happened, it can't have affected it. That needs to change going forward is something that we're concerned about, that the status of assets and properties that are in operations but are not being reported to an assessor for a full calendar year, that is a gray area that ought to be corrected as we go forward.

> So I want to make clear this is not about trying to nit-pick this company or that. It's to try to establish some concerns we have so that they are fixed in the future and we don't have property not on the roles that doesn't have an exemption and we try to move away from approving an incentive after a project is
already complete where it can't affect this behavior anymore. Thank you.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
MR. JONES :
Mr. Chairman, can we move on?
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Mr. Jones.
Are there any other questions?
MS . CHENG:
Can I make a comment?
These applications do all have advances filed, so the company did notify the state that they were going to be, in fact, completing a project in the future, so it's not really after the fact. We were already put on notice that a project was going to be occurring.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
I believe Mr. Adley has made the motion to -- since he got his answers, to approve all of these applications in globo.

Is that correct?
MR. ADLEY:
Yes.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second?
MR. JOHNS:
I second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Mr. Johns. Or
Representative Johns. I'm sorry.
All in favor --
MR. JOHNS :
Senator.
MR. WINDHAM:
Senator. I am really sorry now.
MR. JOHNS :
I've been called worse.
MR. WINDHAM:
I knew you a long time ago when you weren't.

Are there any other questions by the Board members?

MR. ADLEY:
I would only point out so that Together Louisiana would know that the Governor's office appreciates very much all of the work that you do. We do. And we recognize it's an ongoing process dealing with these rules to make it clearer all of the time, but

I believe, based upon what we've heard here today, we should go ahead and move these projects. That doesn't mean we won't move forward in dealing with some of the rules here in the next month or two, but I think where we are today, we should approve them.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Motion is on the table by Mr. Adley and second by Senator Johns.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
All right. The next item on the agenda
is renewals.
MS . CHENG:
No. We have three more new applications that have advances that were filed after the Executive Order --

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm sorry.
MS. CHENG:
-- on June 24 th of 2016.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please proceed.
MS . CHENG:
I do want to make a note that the salary
for Barriere Construction on the summary sheet says 45,000, but in their CEA with LED and the state, it's actually 53,000.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Can you read those?
MS . CHENG:
I can.
20171647, Barriere Construction Company, LLC in St. Charles Parish; 20161576, Louisiana Sugar Refining, LLC in St. James Parish; and 20161674, Tin Roof Brewing Company, Inc. in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions from any of the Board members concerning the post-EOs?

MR. MOLLER:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
I believe -- first let me say, I believe we received, subject to our original agenda, a package that had 103 pages of exhibit information in them. I hope everyone got a chance to review that.

Are there any questions on the exhibits? (No response.)

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Mr. Moller.
MR. MOLIER:
I haven't read all of the 102 pages, but do they include the return on investments statement that is supposed to be part of these according to the rules? MR. HOUSE :

Yes. Page 1.
MR. MOLLER:
Where? Because I looked through -- I mean, I did look through the first one, Barriere Construction, and I could not find it.

MR. WINDHAM:
Ms. Cheng?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
You review the total packet, which is maybe not provided to you in globo, but all of these will include a certification of return on investment.

MR. ADLEY:
But I think the question is, and what I'm trying to find out is, is the ROI, is that part of the application so that it's just easily accessible by the public or is that an in-house document? What do we
have there?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Well, it's essentially both, but the document that's released as part of the application is a certification that $I$ render.

MR. MOLLER:
Does that include an Exhibit $A$ or $B$ or is that in the backup?

## SECRETARY PIERSON:

No. Exhibit A is the agreement as to what the company will provide. Exhibit B is the local governments all attesting to their support of tax abatement.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay. And the ROI statement is included in our backup?

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Correct.
MR. MOLLER:
How is that calculated?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
It's calculated differently for each deal because each deal is different. Largely, we follow IMPLAN models using codes established by a national organization, the National Industrial Codes, which help
us in this analysis because they provide the specific job multipliers, the indirect jobs that are created with each application. Each application will have different wage scenarios, different investment scenarios, may cover a broad range of different industrial opportunities, certainly, not in retail or service, but in manufacturing. And so all of these elements are considered, along with construction jobs, sales tax revenues generated and the term that we'd anticipate that this proposed asset would remain on the tax rolls, which is typically a period of time far in excess of either the eight or the 10-year -- in the past, 10 years, now, today, eight-year -- abatement period that they would enjoy.

So it's actually a complex amount of effort that would go into that, and certainly we would want to assure the Board that these investments serve those communities with long-term, positive return on investment.

MR. MOLLER:
But so you use the same method to calculate ROI that other economic development agencies in other states, or, say, BRAC or somebody like that would use when they're evaluating a project?

SECRETARY PIERSON:

In a general sense, the IMPLAN model,
yes. If parties choose to abbreviate the term of the analysis, if you said you're doing an eight-year ROI from the day the plant opened and you excluded all of the construction jobs and all of the sales tax generated by that, you can arrive at different figures. So what we do is determine what our view of the value of the investment is to the community, and we consider all of the associated elements with construction as to contributing to a positive return on investment.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Slone.
MR. SLONE:
So we can presume that when the
documents come to you, you have an ROI as required, you have that information before you bring that information -- before it actually comes to us?

MS . CHENG:
The project managers do, yes.
MR. SLONE:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Slone.

Any other questions by any other Board members concerning these three post-Executive Order applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Any comments from the public concerning these three post-Executive Order applications?

Please identify yourself.
MR. BAGERT :
Broderick Bagert, Together Louisiana.
We have not been able to find the ROIs. We did a public records request after the nine that were approved in December for Exhibit A, Exhibit B and the return on investment statement. Lots of documents were provided. There was a lot of useful information. That was not included.

We followed up with Mr. Thibodeaux and said, "Can you send us the return on investment that wasn't included there?" And the response was, "No documents were found responsive to your request."

This is the center of the entire discussion, what is the return on investment. These are public resources, what is the public benefit. That ought to be much more transparent, much more easily accessible, evaluated by the members of this Board,
evaluated by the local communities and determining whether a specific return on investment is worth it, not just a generic statement that, "Yes, it's good." There are also different ways to determine return on investment. From the ones that we've seen not conducted by LED for the new ITEPs, because we don't -- we have not been able to see those, we would have a couple questions. One is, does the return on investment analysis assume that 100 percent of the benefits of the investment are attributable to the exemption? That's not an assumption that's characteristic of ordinary best practices. And what I mean by that is, under that scenario, we've allowed all the capital expenditure of manufacturers to be submitted for public a subsidy, or very, very close to it. The assumption is that without an exemption, manufacturers would make no capital investments in their facility. So how is that question dealt with?

Second, a return on investment analysis would need to compare the benefits that accrue from the private investment to the benefits that would accrue if the taxes went to the public sector, and the difference between those two is the benefit; right? None of those thing can be evaluated because we can't get our hands on them.

MR. WINDHAM:
Let me ask one question on that. Can
you give me or this Board a model that does that?
MR. BAGERT :
We've engaged an economist to do just that.

MR. WINDHAM:
But can you give us the model?
MR. BAGERT :
Yes. I mean, he can. I can't, but he can. We'll be back to you in and the public within a couple weeks on that.

MR. JONES :
But one does not exist today?
MR. BAGERT :
A model for doing return on investment absolutely exists.

MR. WINDHAM:
No, no. For what you said. For what you said, is there is a model?

MR. BAGERT:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
That $I$ can go to?
MR. BAGERT :

Yes, there is a model.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. Where is it? Where is it?
MR. BAGERT :
I think it's called the REMI. It's a piece of software that revenue estimating committees use.

MR. WINDHAM:
I'm very familiar with the REMI, and it doesn't do what you said.

MR. JONES:
Two different things.
MR. WINDHAM:
It's not doing what you said, what you just described.

MR. BAGERT :
Which part?
MR. WINDHAM:
REMI II is not doing what you said.
MR. BAGERT:
Which part does it not do so I can make sure --

MR. WINDHAM:
It's not taking the difference between your public sector and your private sector investment
and telling me what the return would have been had that not occurred.

MR. BAGERT :
Well, you run it in both scenarios and subtract; right? You run it for the private investment and determine the benefit, and then run it for the public investment and determine the benefit and then take the one from the other with some assumption about how much the public investment caused the private investment.

According to this economist, the academic literature says it's about 9 to 11 percent of manufacturing capital with an ad valorem exemption can be attributable to the subsidy. So you adjust for that, but --

MR. WINDHAM:
Can you supply that to me, to me, specifically his recommendations, his analysis of what is or isn't occurring?

MR. BAGERT :
That's precisely why we've engaged somebody to do that, but it also would be helpful -MR. WINDHAM:

But not today, though? It doesn't exist. You don't have it today. You can't just send me
an e-mail where he's already given you this information?
MR. BAGERT :
For these specific projects or in
general?
MR. WINDHAM :
No. In general.
MR. JONES :
The model. Does the model exist?
MR. BAGERT:
Mr. Windham, I'm not trying to be obtuse. I don't know what the complexity around the model is. You run it for either side and then subtract one from the other. That's the way that you determine that benefit.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES :
The problem I'm having with what you described is both have inherently subjective assumptions, incredibly inherent subjective assumptions, and I'm going to be hard-pressed to see a model that can objectify subjective assumptions. That's what's going to be very difficult, one that can apply in every single situation, and that's why I'm very eager to see the model, the assumptions that go into it, because -- and
if it doesn't exist already, if it's being developed, which is what I'm hearing, it's being developed for you, I'm going to be very interested to see how he does that. MR. BAGERT :

To be clear, the model is not being developed. The model is used every day. The analysis when you run the model has not been completed yet for specific context in Louisiana.

The fact that there are subjective assumptions that can be made is precisely why we think it's so important to look at the assumptions that are made in the current and future return on investment analysis. Assuming that 100 percent of the benefits of the investment are attributable to a subsidy when the investment preceded the subsidy is itself an assumption. Not running any comparative analysis to the benefits that would accrue if the tax revenue went to public entities as though it would have no impact at all is itself a subjective assessment, and we think -- or assumption and one that has some problems.

But you're right about that, but that doesn't mean you take the most extreme version of one side of assumptions and run with that. And we're not even saying that's what you're doing. We don't know what this department does because we have not been able
to see the return on investment analyses that have been conducted on projects that have gone to date.

So seeing those, understanding those so that local entities, the public at large and this Board can have some reasonable judgments about it, including a discussion about what assumptions are made, and arriving at something that $y$ 'all feel is reasonable that we understand better than we do, we think is our goal for testifying today.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Secretary.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Everyone is entitled to their opinion. We respect that. We'll look forward to receiving your documents, and when we do receive your documents, we'll evaluate them.

For the knowledge of the Board, every project that comes before you seeking this, $I$ think what Mr. Bagert calls a subsidy, which is a direct monetary aid furnished by a government to a private industrial undertaking, I prefer incentive because it acknowledges what Ms. Kristin Cheng talked about, which is there is an advanced notification, an agreement that makes this an incentive, that they're going to move forward based on what will be allowed by the government at some point,
which is their anticipation.
But to the point, each one of these documents contains this statement, that, "Whereas the economic benefit to the state resulting from this project is projected to exceed the value of the obligations of the state undertaken herein considering a multitude of factors, including, but not limited to the following: Capital expenditure, direct payroll tax revenue, indirect payroll tax revenue and additional indirect tax revenue streams, such as property tax, sales tax and other payroll tax, and other local taxes associated with the jobs supporting the project."

And so with this and attesting that it has a public purpose, and that is to grow the economy of our state, to provide for jobs and investment, the purpose of our meeting here today. So please know that that is included in the formal application for each one that you ratify.

MR. MOLLER:
It's not in our backup.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
MR. MOLLER:
Just to be clear, so it's not in our backup; it's in the application that they submit or --

```
because I --
```


## SECRETARY PIERSON:

It's in the documentation supporting the contract.

MR. ADLEY:
What he's asking, does he get that?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
If he would like to see those, I'm certain that we can provide those as another document that you would request.

I think, as you see today's Board packet, it might have been 127 pages, but if it's their desire to see these attested statements, we could include those.

MR. MOLLER:
But so it's a statement of attestation;
it doesn't show the math --
SECRETARY PIERSON:
That's correct.
MR. MOLLER:
-- of what we expect to get?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
That's correct.
MR. MOLLER:
Is that math available somewhere, the
results of this IMPLAN model that you do?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
It's done on the majority of projects.
MR. MOLLER:
Yeah, but not all projects?
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Correct.
MR. MOLLER:
Okay. And is that available? I mean, is there a way for us to find out what the public expects to receive in tax revenue for the incentive that we grant?

SECRETARY PIERSON:
Certainly.
MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM :
Mr. Slone.
MR. SLONE :
We're having this discussion, these are post-Executive Order. Many times, our Chairman, during the rules committee, talked about deferring to the locals. So we have had local approvement exhibits here; correct? And the locals had to have considered the return on investment, otherwise we wouldn't have their

```
exhibits approving this.
```

MR. WINDHAM:
That is correct. That is correct.
MR. SLONE:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
It's required.
President Miller. Point made?
MR. MILLER:
My comment was about the local support.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other --
SECRETARY PIERSON:
In fact, the Constitution protects the public bodies. We have to demonstrate that there's a value that they receive in order to participate in these programs.

MR. BAGERT:
Secretary Pierson, can we see that demonstration? Not the attestation or the statement or a conclusion, but the demonstration of it, because if the assumption made is that 100 percent of the investment is causally attributed to the incentive and it's not compared to what would accrue if the tax dollars went to the public sector, it is mathematically
impossible for that model to produce anything but a positive return on investment. There's no way to get a negative return if you leave out the negative side of the equation. We're not saying that that is what is happening. We're saying in order to evaluate it, that has been done in the past, is that still taking place in this new day, to know what the assumptions behind the model are. The public, the local entities, everybody needs to see them. So that would be the request is, we've asked for them with the proven information. We've asked for them today. Can we see those so that we can all contribute to making this better in the future?

Thank you.
MR. ADLEY:
I guess, Don, is there any reason why we couldn't do a demonstration of some sort to resolve this and get it behind us?

SECRETARY PIERSON:
We'd be happy to conduct a seminar of Economic Development 101 , which would include a cost analysis model so that there would be a greater understanding of the factors that go into the decision that's made to verify that there's an ROI.

MR. JONES:
Mr. Chairman?

MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES :
I'd like to make a request.
Mr. Broderick, when you put the model together, I think we're all pretty familiar how ROI is determined from projects, I'm going to be very interested in seeing how you determine the benefit that comes from tax dollars going into the general government. I'll be real -- I'm going to be more interested in how that is objectified, because there can be a lot of discussion, and I think that's what the legislature does every year is trying to make that determination. So if economists have figured out a way to objectify that, I'll be extremely interested in reading that. So please provide it.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please step forward, sir, and identify yourself and who you represent.

MR. CHAMPLIN:
Justin Champlin, I'm the Chief Deputy Assessor for Ascension Parish, and $I$ was holding off comments till later, but I'll go ahead and speed up the timeframe.

MR. WINDHAM:

Certainly.
MR. CHAMPLIN:
First of all, $I$ would like to -- you know, Assessor Mert Smiley and I would like to thank the Governor, the Board here, the Secretary Pierson and, of course, the staff at LED.

The changes with the program have been positive. You know, this is a good, positive role having the local input, and the things that have been done are moving in the right direction, I should say.

I was saving most of my comments today because, you know, there has been the ongoing process where, you know, the assessor has to be fully involved in this process from start to finish because we're obligated to make sure that these things are timely and accounted for and on the roll. And how can we improve that? And that's where the discussion lately has been with LED, and ongoing discussions of how we can improve what already exists.

Now, as discussion of ROI and those things, I can tell you, for somebody that personally here, I have been, you know, personally involved with all our local entities, involved in these processes for the last few that have gone through Ascension Parish on how they impact them, you know, from a property tax
standpoint, you know, from the impact from that. You know, there's been -- our economic development has been heavily involved with those decisionmaking processes. So as you're saying that, you know, do the local entities need to know, let me tell you, our people in Ascension know what they're looking at, you know, and they're going make that decision what they believe is best upon the information that is there. And, you know, we're very --

MR. WINDHAM:
So let me ask this real quick. Is it fair to say that you're doing your own ROI?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
And your ROI ultimate answer could differ from what the state's ultimate answer is?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Because of what?
MR. CHAMPLIN:
Well, we're just looking at straight, you know, using current information to say, "Okay, what would the potential tax revenue be for property tax
based upon here's the current depreciation tables.
Here's what you're" --
MR. WINDHAM:
Based upon your assumptions, they can be different from the state's, and the state could be different from Together Louisiana's?

MR. CHAMPLIN :
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
So are we ever going to come to a single point of agreement?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
You will never. Ever.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
MR. CHAMPLIN:
Ever. It's all on the local level to make those decisions based upon the information we have. It's hard numbers based upon if you're going to invest "X," if you deprecate it as of today -- the depression tables change every year -- you know, this is projected, this is what you should expect.

MR. WINDHAM:
And I believe that was the intent of the Executive Order that we all -- I mean, we all have
bought into, is that we want to locals to be the deciders.

MR. CHAMPLIN:
It's working is what I'm tying to say. We are looking at, from the assessor's perspective, how can we improve it, and we're asking for your help to help us continue to improve that process and be involved in the improvement of it because from one that has personally invested a lot of time and resource in the past year, not only because of the change in the new rule, but also because of the new GASB 77 , which requires us to provide every single taxing body a full list of their tax abated, you know, for the future, and so that takes a lot of time.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right.
MR. CHAMPLIN:
And so the things that you're doing are right. We're doing it for our standpoint because we want to know, the local bodies want to know what they're faced with from a personal perspective, but from the state, I mean, you have other, you know, aspects to look at. I mean, you know, as far as, yes, we may get five jobs with $\$ 80,000$ in payroll, you know, per person and benefits; okay, that's great, but, you know, that
affects state from income tax, you know, but it doesn't affect local income tax. But how does that new person now go eat at a restaurant and go pay sales tax, you know, go shop at Tanger Outlet, you know, go shop at local grocery stores. Those are impacts that you're talking of as return on investment, and that's part of the economic side of this project and that's where the economic development people to present to us, you know, and that's part of the puzzle. It's only one part of -it's one part of the puzzle, and if you put it all together, it ends up coming down to what is a good deal, what is a good, fair handshake between both to say, "Hey, we have a long-term investment here." But at the same time, too, you know, we want to continue a long-term, you know, partnership for both in a way that makes sense for both parties.

MR. WINDHAM :
Absolutely. Thank you for your comments.

Are there any questions for the gentleman from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other comments related to the post-Executive Order applications?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other comments from the public?
MR. JONES:
Move to approve.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion has been made by Mr. Jones;
seconded by President Miller.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Ms. Cheng, please proceed.
MS. CHENG:
I have Hud Usie here. He is now administrating the Industrial Tax Exemption Program with me, and he is going to be presenting the renewals to you-all.

MR. WINDHAM:
Welcome aboard.
MR. USIE:
Thank you.

We have 148 timely renewals.
MR. ADLEY:
Yes, and --
MR. USIE:
We also have a deferral.
MR. WINDHAM:
We have one deferral?
MR. USIE:
Yes, from Phillips 66.
MR. WINDHAM:
Can you identify that one by number?
MR. USIE:
We have 14 of them.
MR. WINDHAM:
Fourteen numbers?
MR. USIE:
Fourteen numbers.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. I'll take the latitude to say all of the Phillips 66 have requested deferral.

Is there any objections to deferral?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
No objection noted. Those are deferred.
Mr. Adley, do you have questions for a
few of these?
MR. ADLEY:
Yeah. Obviously we'll move to approve these in globo in agreement with what the Governor has said he would do before, but there was one issue. Was the WestRock applications inside this 148? Is WestRock in that?

MR. USIE:
They are.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative from WestRock?
MR. ADLEY:
I really don't need them. I want to point something out that I think the Board ought to see if they have hadn't got a copy of it.

How many applications are in there for WestRock?

MR. WINDHAM :
Looks like 25 or so.
MR. ADLEY:
Yeah, it's 25 or so, and it's a great example --

MR. USIE:
Thirty-four.
MR. ADLEY:

Thirty-four. It's a great example of what we used to do when we had the MCAs where we allowed people just to separate out projects without having to go through the pre-application process. Now they're obviously up for renewal and will be renewed as they came under prior to this Executive Order. But it's really good example for people to see where a company took 34 applications all rolled into one, all up for renewal at the same time. Clearly not a whole lot of separate projects that were going on.

But just for the record, it is probably the best example I have seen as we've gone through all of these renewals thus far because it was 34 of them. It clearly caught your eye with that.

With that, we don't have any other questions.

MR. WINDHAM:
Anyone else have any questions of any of the renewals?

Mr. Adley has made the motion that we approve the renewals in globo; seconded by Representative Carmody.

Any comments from the public concerning the renewals?
(No response.)

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

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Please proceed.
MR. USIE:
Next we have 20 late renewals. The first one is 20130480, Advanced Products \& Systems, Inc., Lafayette Parish. Initial contract expiration date 12/31/17, late request date is February 1st, 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a representative from Advanced Products \& Systems?

Please step forward and identify yourself.

MS HUNT:
Hi. Priscilla Hunt with Advanced Products.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Can you pull the mic a little bit closer to you, please?

Can you tell us why you were late? MS. HUNT:

We actually had that FedEx'd for January 31st, so I'm not sure why it had the date of February the 1st, but, also, we thought that it was already taken care of because we received corres- -- or I received correspondence in November for approval on the renewal, and it wasn't until $I$ was working on current ITE projects in January that $I$ realized it said that it was not received.

MR. WINDHAM:
And do we have any precedence for mail
date versus received date?
MS . CHENG:
It still would have been needed to have been received December 31st of 2017.

MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, okay.
MR. ADLEY:
Ma'am -- if I can.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please. Please.
MR. ADLEY:
I know particularly with Senator Johns here, hasn't been with us before, when these late
applications come in, we only have three choices, totally reject it, reduce it to some degree or approve it. In the past, with every late application, because it's to your benefit to get it there, this Board has decided to reduce all late applications by basically 20 percent. In other words, going from five years to four. I'm going to suggest and ask the Board to seriously consider following that same guideline as we go through these late examples. I mean, that's the only way to be fair about it. Everybody's got a reason, but that is what we have done, and I would -- I would move that we do it not only with this one, but with -- at least with this one, and I think there's some other questions on some of the others that go actually deeper than that. But for what it's worth, ma'am, that's, what we determined was, that it's to the company's advantage to get it done.

MS . HUNT:
Sorry. Like I said, I thought that it was already filed. When we realized that that was the one that was submitted in 2016 that was received in November .

## MR. ADLEY:

Well, the Board only has three choices is what they explained to us $I$ know when we came here,
you can reject it altogether, you approve it or you find some middle ground. And in the past, that's what the Board has done, and I would hope the Board would do the same here.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other questions for the lady?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
So I take that as a motion to approve in globo? I'm going to give a chance for questions and for other things, but I take that as a motion, Mr. Adley, to approve, after all questions have been answered related to these, in globo with a one-year reduction?

## MR. ADLEY:

Well, I think there's -- let me suggest that you approve the first one, two, three, four, five down to Cos-Mar and handle Cos-Mar separately, simply because, unlike you, ma'am, being late 24 hours or whatever, they were late 13 and 14 months, and I think there's some questions about that. And so I would move that you at least do the first everything but Cos-Mar, however you say that, with the 20 percent reduction of one year.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Is there a second to that?
MR. MILLER:
Well, what about --
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Dr. Wilson. I'm sorry.
Please.
MR. MOLLER:
I understand Cos-Mar, but also Graham
Packaging, Hunt Forest Products?
MR. WINDHAM:
Well, we're doing the first five.
MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
The first five, and we'll give everyone
a chance to ask questions on them, and from the public's perspective, to come up and speak on them if Mr....

MR. USIE:
Usie.
MR. WINDHAM.
...Usie will read them off.
MR. USIE:
Okay. The first five?
MR. WINDHAM:
Please.

MR. USIE:
20130480, Advanced Products \& Systems,
Inc., Lafayette Parish. Initial expiration date
12/31/17, renewal receive date February 1st, 2018; 20110079, Bradken, Inc., Tangipahoa Parish, 12/31/17, renewal received February 1st, 2018; 20120506, Bradken, Inc., Tangipahoa Parish. Initial expiration date 12/31 of 2016, renewal received February 1st, 2018; 20130707, CertainTeed Corporation, Calcasieu Parish. Expiration date 12/31/2016, renewal received 1/4/2018; 20130708, CertainTeed Corporation Roofing Products Group, Caddo Parish. Initial expiration date 12/31/2016, renewal received January 4th, 2018.

Those are the first five.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any questions on these?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from the public concerning the ones that were just read?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
All right. The next ones we're going to speak specifically to, is there a representative from Cos-Mar in the audience?

Please step forward and identify yourself. We have some questions.

MR. HARRIS:
Morning, Mr. Chairman.
MR. WINDHAM:
Bring your mic in a little closer, please.

MR. HARRIS:
Shawn Harris with Ryan, LLC representing Cos-Mar as well as TOTAL Petrochemicals, which will be the final item on late renewals.

MR. WINDHAM :
All right. Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
I guess the question is, what makes it stand out is that these were 14 to 26 months late. Can someone explain to us how that actually happens, and if
they were 14 to 26 months, what happened? Did your property go on the tax roll during that period? I mean, what happened? We hadn't seen any that was 14 to 26 months.

MR. HARRIS :
To the -- Ryan became engaged with
Cos-Mar Company and TOTAL Petrochemical in 2017. We discovered that there was lapse with the IT renewals, so once that was discovered, we wanted to bring forth our good faith action and try to comply with those.

As to why those were not renewed in the past, that information is trying to be gathered. However, because of turnover at the plant itself, we're not able to exactly see why those were not renewed. MR. ADLEY:

Let me ask the staff, if it's one to two years late and we gave approval similar to what we did with the others, where we reduced it to 20 percent and you got down to four remaining years, you've already passed two years in some of it, so what happens? Is it four years forward or is it two more years from here?

MS . CHENG:
Two more from here.
MR. ADLEY:
And what role does the assessor play
when that happens? Does he get notified or what happens? If it's been a year or two, does somebody notify him and say, you know, they're not exempt anymore? How does that work?

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley, maybe I can get the Assistant Assessor to come up and speak just from an assessor's perspective in general, you know, how you guys might handle it, how it's supposed to be handled or how it's required to be handled.

MR. CHAMPLIN:
Normally we would -- if we do receive a late notification, then we add it to, you know, the parcel listing for that company to add it to the tax roll. One of the issues that why $I$ was here today and continue to work with LED is the speed of receiving the notification of late filing or, you know, if something's not done fast enough. You know, in other words, you may rule -- I'd have to sit here and watch every single Board of Commerce and Industry meeting to find out if it happened, but by the time our office actually receives a copy of it, it may be two, three -- you know, it may be too late for the year is what I'm trying to say.

MR. WINDHAM:
For that single year, though?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
For the single year. Well --
MR. WINDHAM:
So it goes onto the roll and --
MR. CHAMPLIN:
Well, it depends on what it is. I mean,
just, you know, sometimes they're sooner, sometimes they're faster, but an item that happened, you know, just trying to speed up is just when do these things expire, when do they come off, when do these things change. The speed of actually receiving the copies of these documents and things that occur, that's what we're looking for in order to effectively and properly, you know, assess property.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. So when it goes under your roll and you send out the bill, does --

MR. CHAMPLIN:
It's added.
MR. WINDHAM:
If the company pays it, or do they have the ability to say, "We're not going to pay on this item because it's currently in limbo," or --

MR. CHAMPLIN:
I will say that I normally -- you know,
we have a conversation with that tax rep.
MR. WINDHAM:
You would have that conversation?
MR. CHAMPLIN:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
For some reason, they're not --
MR. CHAMPLIN:
I'd say probably, you know, anything that's a late file or anything that's out of ordinary, there is usually a phone call and e-mail, you know, involved.

MR. WINDHAM:
So in this case, it's, what, 16 months late, it's probable that you could have spoken with them at some point during that time? Not this gentleman because it's not your area.

MR. CHAMPLIN:
But, I mean, if $I$ had a tax rep in my area, you know, that represented one of these industrial plants, and normally if there's some special circumstance or something happens, I'm getting a phone call. That's par for the course.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any questions for
the Assistant Assessor?
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES :
What month are the assessments normally
finalized?
MR. CHAMPLIN:
We have to produce a preliminary roll typically in between August 15th through September 15th, in that 15-day time period for the public disclosure period. Generally, you know, by the end of July, everything's shut down.

MR. JONES:
So if we grant the renewal at a December meeting, what happens then?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
I have to look at the timeframe. I go straight on contract end, you know, dates, you know, and at that point --

MR. JONES:
My point is, if we granted a renewal in December, obviously it can't affect the tax rolls that have happened in that year; is that --

MR. CHAMPLIN:
Right. The assets were as of January 1st.

MR. JONES:
So if it's a late renewal there, I mean, nothing can be done at that point; is that accurate? MR. CHAMPLIN:

Right. We would have the information, we would produce -- I mean we've been trying to keep up with the, you know, pull the reports, you know, keep up with everything, but every time you pull it, then you have to go through and sort all of the data all over again.

MR. WINDHAM:
Now, if they had paid under protest, though, then you could do something? If they informingly paid under protest.

MR. CHAMPLIN :
If they paid under protest, but the issues related to anything that's at a state level, Board today level, we defer to the Board, your decision, to how we handle it.

MR. WINDHAM :
So you hold that money; you don't really count it as being paid on that asset, so -MR. CHAMPLIN:

We haven't had that situation yet, so... MR. WINDHAM:

Okay. Good. But I know it can happen.
MR. CHAMPLIN:
It's possible.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Any other questions for the
Assistant Assessor for Ascension Parish?
Not related to this specific company, though.

MR. CHAMPLIN:
No.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you very much for your input.

MR. JONES:
I have a question for Cos-Mar, though.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES:
And, I'm sorry, I didn't get your name.
MR. HARRIS :
Shawn Harris.
MR. JONES :
Mr. Harris. I apologize.
So it's my understanding that your group was hired to come in and clean up an issue; is that

```
accurate?
```


## MR. HARRIS:

No. Just a general engagement, and while we are working with the client, it came to our knowledge that there has been a lapse in the IT application.

MR. JONES:
So you just discovered the issue once you came in?

MR. HARRIS :
Yes.
MR. JONES:
Okay. And the company was unaware of it at that time?

MR. HARRIS :
No.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
Is the company still in business?
MR. HARRIS :
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
Okay. I'd like to move that we apply the same penalty here, but we make it very clear that
it's going forward. In other words, you only have two years left. If you're 24 months left, you only have two years left. You don't have four going forward.

MR. JONES :
Second.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any other questions from any of the Board members concerning Cos-Mar?

MR. MOLLER:
Wait. So how much -- we're reducing them by two years?

MR. WINDHAM:
No. By one. Still by 20 percent, I believe.

Is that correct, Mr. Adley?
MR. ADLEY:
Yeah, applying the same 20 percent that we've applied to everybody else. It's a five-year extension. If you're late, you lose a year.

What $I$ was trying to clarify is is that because he's got one here that's actually two years late. He's already had two years of the remaining four. I just want to make it clear, he's not going to get anymore then two more from here because then he hits the 20 percent penalty, which takes him to four years.

MR. MOLLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
And are we also applying that motion and second to TOTAL Petrochem since he also represents them?

MR. ADLEY:
And they ought to pay you a bonus.
MR. WINDHAM:
So Mr. Safed (sic)?
MS . CHENG:
Usie. Hud Usie.
MR. WINDHAM:
Usie. I'm sorry. Can you read that
last one for us, the last one that this gentleman, Mr .
Harris, represents, TOTAL?
MR. USIE:
TOTAL. Okay.
20120433, TOTAL Petrochemicals USA, Inc., Iberville Parish. Initial contract expiration date $12 / 31 / 2016$, late renewal request date January $9 t h$, 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
And does your motion apply to that,
Mr. Adley?
MR. ADLEY:

Yes, same thing.
MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Mr. Jones.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Sir, is it related to these?
MR. JACKSON:
Yes, sir. I'm sorry. I thought prior to taking a vote, you were supposed to receive public comments.

MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, I'm sorry. I thought we had -we're in the middle of that. Please --

MR. JACKSON:
I thought prior to taking a vote, you were supposed to receive public comments; am I correct?

MR. WINDHAM:
That is correct.
MR. JACKSON:
Okay.

MR. JONES :
Move to let the gentleman make a public comment.

MR. WINDHAM:
Move for the public comment by the gentleman; seconded by Mr . Slone.

Any objection?
(No response.)
MR. JACKSON :
I would also request then that that vote
you just --
MR. WINDHAM:
Please step forward and identify
yourself and speak clearly into the mic for us.
MR. JACKSON :
My name is Isaac Jackson. I'm speaking on behalf of my family. Private citizen of Iberville Parish.

And, again, I thought that prior to the taking of any vote, so I would believe that that vote would probably need to be rescinded. Prior to the taking of any vote, we were supposed to have received this public comment; am I right?

MR. ADLEY:
Sir, I'm going to suggest to you, in
fairness, once you make your statement, the Board can always reconsider its action if it chooses to do that. It would be helpful if you would give us your statement.

MR. JACKSON:
Okay. Thank you.
I want to say that $I$ was very, very
impressed by everything that's going on here today, and I definitely especially appreciate the comments and information given by the Assistant Assessor for Ascension Parish. I am in Iberville Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please speak closer to the mic for us. This is being broadcast over the web, live streamed. MR. JACKSON :

Absolutely.
Again, $I$ am in Iberville Parish, and I'm going to be honest with you, my officials, I don't believe, have a clue. Okay? I really believe they don't have a clue as to their responsibility and what should be done in this.

I don't think we need to rush this until we can actually visit with our people in Iberville Parish. These people went and got somebody from out of town to come here and explain and look at their books and y'all granted it. That's great. And you reduced it
by a certain percentage, and that's great with respect to this company. But if I look at it, I didn't see that this company produced any jobs. I don't see that this company did anything that would really qualify, mainly, for, you know, what they are seeking.

Now, I don't know what's going on here, but I would request that you delay at least one month so that private citizens can look at it, visit with the taxing authorities in Iberville just to get a little input, and then maybe they'll be here next month and we might want to ask them questions or maybe give an explanation at to what actually occurred here. If it's two years late, one month won't hold up anything, would it?

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are there any questions by any of the Board members for the gentleman?
(No response.)
MR. ADLEY:
I think it's fair to make this at least a statement to you, sir, so you understand where we find ourselves. When the Board changed under the new administration, we found that there were many renewals coming to us that where the State of Louisiana had made a commitment. The Governor made a decision that it was
more important to make sure that the state reputation for honoring its commitments was met.

The department made it very clear to us that they felt that commitments had been made to these companies for these five-year renewals. The Governor had intended to do something otherwise, but felt that keeping your word, from a state's perspective, was more important, and so we have moved forward pretty much in globo with most of these things that happened long before we got here.

To my knowledge, this is at least the first time anybody's even been penalized for being late. So something positive has already happened, so that you know that. The miscellaneous applications that used to come to this Board, many, many of them, that's no longer allowed. Some pretty dramatic changes have been made.

I think I would personally agree with you, it's difficult at the local level, but sooner or later, the locals are going to have to take it upon themselves to be part of this process, because every state in America does it that way but ours, and we've changed that. So I just wanted you to know there's a lot of positive things that have happened.

We can delay this a month, but the truth is, once we delay it a month as a renewal that came
prior to the Governor's Executive Order, it's probably going to move in the exact same fashion that it moves now, probably with the exact same penalty because that's what's been -- we've applied to everybody else. So I just think you need to know there's a lot that has gone on prior to this point.

Appreciate you being here. Appreciate you taking the time, but I think the motion the Board made is probably consistent with what the Governor has said he is willing to honor, and it's my job to make sure that, you know, at least his wishes are met.

MR. JACKSON :
So I won't have an opportunity to visit with my taxing authorities to just --

MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, absolutely. You can visit with your taxing authority at any time. We're not going to stop you.

MR. JACKSON :
I was talking about with respect to these items if your decision is has already passed. MR. WINDHAM:

Well, I was going to see if there's some other public comments. I believe the lady and gentleman might also have some comments. So that all of the
public's comments can be taken into consideration before a decision is made to reopen the vote.

MR. JACKSON :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other questions for the gentleman?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, sir.
Please identify yourself and who you represent.

MS. JOHNSON:
Thank you very much. My name is Linda Johnson. I'm a citizen of Iberville Parish, and I'm representing myself. I'm here and thank you-all for allowing me to speak.

I personally thought that you were going to follow the terms of the renewal contract, which says that it will be reduced one year for each calendar month until I heard Mr. Adley say that typically you've done a 20 percent. So I don't have a real problem with the 20 percent if that's what you've done in the past because I really don't want you to change. However, I would like for you to consider those that were in 2015 maybe having an additional 20 percent, and the ones in 2016 having
the percent that you've already established.
Now, my reason for doing this I'm a firm believer in quality education. Education is my passion. And I became concerned because I thought what the Governor's Executive Order did was to allow all of those things that were already in existence to just move forward and that $I$ would not to have to see anything like this. That's what I thought. So I was concerned about it.

Then I saw Cos-Mar, and Cos-Mar is in my parish. And let me say something else. I want the chemical industry in Iberville Parish. I do not want it in some other parish, nor do $I$ want it in some other state. That's not what why I'm here. But I believe that they could have met the terms that are in here by applying in a timely fashion. They delayed. I have not heard -- and I heard the young man come to the table. I have not heard a concrete reason for the delay. Now, there may be a concrete reason, but I did not hear it in what he said.
I told you earlier my passion is
education. Last night in my parish I was told that our school board could give a $\$ 500$ bonus to its employees if it had money. So I'm here to try to get $\$ 1.8-m i l l i o n$, which I know I'm not going to get because of the way
that you do this, but that's how much this money would add up to if we got it. But I can go back and I guess you can say that $I$ could be the hero for education because I tell them to give the teachers a raise. They are asking for moneys in the MFP this year, and I know they're aren't going to get it because I watch the budget. So any way that we can help educators, and that's my goal, to get some additional funds, I'm all for it.

So what I'm requesting is that you look at what you're currently doing with the 20 percent, but then you look at those at 2015 and you make an additional 20 percent for them.

And thank you-all for allowing me to speak.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions for the lady?
MR. ADLEY:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Adley.
MR. ADLEY:
I don't have a question for you. I will tell you, you make perfectly good sense.

MS . JOHNSON :

Put it in a motion.
MR. ADLEY:
We've penalized people 20 percent
because they're two days late.
MS . JOHNSON :
Right, but the top of your information says that "We may reduce by one year for each calendar month." And so, you know, I was looking at, wow, that's about \$1.8-million that could come back to Iberville Parish for our teachers.

MR. WINDHAM:
I think we came to the conclusion, because it's a five-year extension, if you dropped off the year, that was equivalent to the 20 percent.

I would move for the Board to reconsider its action on this application to increase the penalty, because it is two years, and then leave it totally up to the Board what the Board would like to do.

MS . JOHNSON :
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. There's a motion to reopen --

MR. MOLLER:
There may be another.

MR. WINDHAM:
-- this vote. Yes. So before I move forward, I want to see if there's anymore public comments.

Thank you, Ms. Johnson.
Oh, I'm sorry. President Miller, you've got a question.

Ms. Johnson.
MR. MILLER:
Well, actually, it's not Ms. Johnson. It's more -- I'm sorry. I don't remember your name, the Deputy Assessor for Ascension.

What would happen if the application renewal, the renewal -- or any of the Industrial Tax reps could probably answer this -- never comes, we never get it? If this consultant hadn't gone and found that these were late by two years, if he found it was late five years and it was never put on the tax rolls, how do you back up and get it?

MR. CHAMPLIN:
There is a way to submit a supplemental tax roll for past years, but it can only go back for three years.

MR. WINDHAM:
Because of the prescriptive laws in

Louisiana.
MR. CHAMPLIN:
Correct. And that follows the Louisiana
Tax Commission Rules and Regulations, and, you know, state law that applies.

I will say that from our proactive standpoint and our sincere requests to improve, you know, the ability to communicate between our office and LED and the Board here, will greatly, you know, eliminate any lag in time or the lack of information that may occur to make sure it is appropriately done. I will say that we've always deferred to the state, you know, LED, you know, through this process, to let -- you know, if there's any questions or issues, you know, let it get resolved. They're applying the rules. You know, follow the rules.

Look, I am an attorney as well. You know, I practiced in the title industry as a title attorney for seven years before I became the Chief Deputy Assessor in Ascension Parish. I practiced law, you know, then; $I$ filed lawsuits. If you didn't file something timely, the judge could kick it out of court. It's the same situation. You play by the rules. You have rules in place. Follow the rules. And it's the same principal we are going to apply for anybody. There
is penalty for not following the rules properly. That's what we teach our kids, you know, to do what you're supposed to do correctly. And if you don't follow the rules properly, then there should be a penalty and you should assess a penalty according to the rules that are in place. And that's what you -- those are there, and that's what you're doing today.

The question that you posed is that, okay, when do we know and then when do we actually receive notification, and I will say this has been an issue that I've, you know, found out, you know, a year later, they never received notification timely enough to put it on soon enough. You know, and it was just -- it was one late filing, you know, but that's -- you put it on, you deal with it and you move forward and you talk to them. You know, say, "Hey," you know, and then you try to figure out how to improve that process.

You know, we are proactive in trying to improve it, but it is a situation where we hope that the efforts being made by LED right now, you know, with the steps they're taking, they've asked, you know, for that, even I personally would help, you know, maybe look at some of the things that they're doing and see what we can come to a resolve to make sure that it is proper.

I will tell you that, you know, like I
said earlier, if there is an issue with any of these things that comes up, I mean, sure, I mean, there's not a tax rep that $I$ know in Ascension Parish that won't give me a phone call, you know, and put it to our attention as well. And you have to look at it for what it is. But at the same time, too, what's the rules, did you abide by the rules, you know, and whatever penalties is proper. You know, we take it for what it is and we move forward. It is what it is, as they say, is the cliche. And that's what you should do.

MR. MILLER:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, sir.
I believe we have more comments from the public.

Please step forward, identify yourself and who you represent.

MR. CAGE :
My name is Edgar Cage, and I'm with Together Louisiana.

I love rules that help us to be civilized and know what to expect. And, Senator Adley, I appreciate the Governor honoring commitments, but I think corporations and manufacturers have commitments to
this state and the people of Louisiana to do what they supposed to do, too.

This should be denied, in my opinion, and I'm not an attorney like the Assistant Assessor. I'm just an average Joe citizen concerned about trying to make this state a better place for everybody, businesses and the average man.

If this property had been reported as it should have been required by law on the LAT 5 form, would it not then be placed on the tax rolls? That's a question, if somebody can answer that for me.

MR. ADLEY:
It would have been placed on tax rolls, and it would not -- it could not apply for this exemption.

MR. CAGE :
That's it. Bingo. That's exactly the point I'm getting to. The process and commitment from the company was not honored. The governor gave a commitment, but the company did not do their part. So why should we reward someone for violating the rules that we have in place already? So I'm for an actual denial because it should be contiguous. If we're granting these exemptions and the renewal, it should be contiguous, not any separation by 24 months, 36 months
or even six months really. We should play by the rules across the board. The rules of Commerce and Industry are not in conflict with the rules that require LAT 5 and the assessors who put this property on the rolls.

So I appreciate you going on your motion to reconsider, but let an option be to deny this exemption because they did not live up to their commitment by placing this property on LAT 5 denying the people of Iberville Parish getting that ad valorem tax that they should have.

Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions for Mr. Cage?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Cage.
Is there a motion to reconsider the previous action?

MR. ADLEY:
I would make that motion that we would reconsider. And if you reconsider, obviously then the Board can decide whatever action it wants to take, whether penalty or reject, whatever, but if you reconsider, $I$ think we can take that action.

MR. JONES :


Mr. Chairman, I would, if I can, just start off this discussion by saying that this is the heart of the matter. The state makes the commitment, the company makes a commitment, and then how we decide to deal with that is now up to this Board. I, for one,
do not believe that the normal 20 percent penalty that we have imposed certainly does not apply here.

MR. WINDHAM:
And what is your motion?
MR. ADLEY:
That a very good argument was made that it should have been on the tax rolls already and that it should be just totally rejected.

MR. WINDHAM:
Please state your motion.
MR. ADLEY:
I just really in hell sitting here don't know what the hell I think I ought to do.

MR. WINDHAM:
I have heard two. I heard one for two years and one for rejection. So I believe Mr. Adley -MR. ADLEY:

I think that Robby's making a suggestion that probably fits, and those applications that went out there, as far as two-year period, if I can, I'll just relinquish this microphone to him.

And, Robby, you make your suggestion, but let's try to find some way to deal with this.

```
MR. WINDHAM:
```

Mr. Miller, specifically they were
talking about Cos-Mar and TOTAL Petrochemical. That's the one that we're reconsidering.

MR. MILLER:
I understand that, and I'm looking -- I understand. I'm looking at if we do reconsider those, then we have to reconsider Hunt and Nalco, because they're in the '15s also.

MR. JONES:
We haven't acted on Hunt yet.
MR. MILLER:
Oh, we haven't got there. Okay.
The ones that are '15, if we're going to --

MR. WINDHAM:
The only ones we've done --
MR. MILLER:
It may not be an exemption, but it gets us better that we go the 20 percent per year, which would then -- on those '15s, it would be a two-year reduction. After all, like we said, we hit them for a full year if they're a few days late up to a full year late. If they're over a -- pushing two years late, then maybe we ought to go 20 percent or one year for each year they're late. How about that? Then it makes it the same.

MR. WINDHAM:
So within the Cos-Mar ones, we have multiple differing years. We have '15s and '16s of the expiration dates. They were all done in a all-renewal request, $I$ believe is the proper phrase, were done in '18. So you want to parse out the ones that were supposed to be in expiration dates of '15, separate those from expiration dates of '16?

MR. MILLER:
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. So you can make the motion.
MR. MILLER:
I will, if that's -- I've got to say it
now, huh?
All right. So the ones that are for Cos-Mar -- and who's the other one?

MR. WINDHAM:
TOTAL Petrochemical.
MR. MILLER:
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
-- USA.
MR. MILLER:
Oh, okay.

MR. WINDHAM:
And it was a '16 year one, so it was a one-year.

MR. MILLER:
The one with the expiration date of 2016 would receive the one-year penalty, and the ones with the expiration date of 2015 should receive a two-year penalty.

I don't like punishing my kids either, but it happens sometimes.

MR. WINDHAM:
So that is the motion. I see counsel at the table.

MS . BOURGEOIS:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Please identify yourself.
MS . BOURGEOIS:
Tam Bourgeois from LED.
I just wanted to make sure that we were considering the 2015 versus 2016 since it was an in globo motion that we're reconsidering.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Thank you.
All right. I need a second.

MR. ADLEY:
I'll second that.
MR. WINDHAM:
Second has been -- motion has been made
to for the 2015 -- we're talking about the 2015 ones right now; correct? 2015 ones, Robby.

MR. JONES :
They need to be handled separately, I think.

MR. MILLER:
However $y^{\prime}$ all need to do it.
MR. WINDHAM:
The 2015s need to be read out, Us...
MS . CHENG :
Usie.
MR. WINDHAM:
Usie.
MR. USIE:
I'm reading all of the 2015 ones only?
MR. WINDHAM:
Only for Cos-Mar because the TOTAL Petrochemical is a '16, so you don't have to read it. MR. USIE:

20080162, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish. Initial expiration date $12 / 31 / 15$, late renewal
request date $1 / 9$ of 2018; 20080941, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish. Contract expiration date 12/31/2015, received $1 / 9$ of 2018; 20110331, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish. Expiration date of $12 / 31 / 15$, received 1/9/2018; 20110332, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish. 12/31/2015, received 1/9/2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
So we have four of those. The motion is to restrict them by 40 percent or by two years. There's a motion and a second.

Is there any further comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
Mr. Cage, please step forward, identify yourself.

MR. CAGE :
Yes, Edgar Cage with Together Louisiana.
I just want to, where we can be sort of clear, and offer a suggestion. And I like your analogy about punishing your kids, and, you know, depending on what they did, we don't punish them in the same way.

So you've already adjusted Advanced Products a 20 percent penalty because they were a few
months and we'll say less than a year. So we agree with that. We think it should be less than a year, 20 percent, over a year, but less than two, 40 percent, over two years, 60 percent. That way you got...

MR. ADLEY:
Isn't that what you did?
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any questions for Mr. Cage?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you for your suggestions.
MR. ADLEY:
Yeah. I think to clarify what Robby's saying, because he's trying to run the two together, the simplest approach would be 20 percent per year you're late. That would probably be the best approach. Most of these we get, they come in and they may be a few days, they may be few weeks, a couple of months, but we've never run into it where they were years late.

I think if $I$ understood his motion correctly, it would be 20 percent each year you're late. So if you were late with one application by two years, it would be 40 percent. If you were one year, it would be 20 percent. If you were three years, it would be 60 percent.

MR. CAGE :
Good. That's...
MR. ADLEY:
And you have to go backwards in time and pick up the two years that applies because they can't pay this property tax now. It's not on the rolls. So those two years, if he's down to three years, you pick up those two, he's only got a year left. That's what that means.

MR. CAGE :
Okay. Good.
MR. JONES:
Mr. Chairman?
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES:
Two points. Number one, this is one of those times, Mr. Harris, you may tell your client they should be glad they're coming under this Board rather than the previous Board, because under the previous Board, you would have been denied altogether.

Number two, and this isn't -- I'm not criticizing you, Mr. Harris, or necessarily your client, but we've made the point several times in this Board than when -- especially on these late renewals, when the
client doesn't see fit to come and explain to us why they're late, that doesn't strike well with me. If it's important enough for them to file for the renewal, it's important enough for them to come explain to this Board why they're late personally, because obviously you have no way of knowing because you weren't there at the time.

So for all of the people who represent clients out there, I would strongly suggest that you recommend to your clients that they be at these Board meetings, especially when they're asking for special dispensation.

That's all.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Jones.
Any other comments from the public? MR. ADLEY:

We can do a substitute.
MR. WINDHAM:
Any other comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor of a two-year for these
ones that were just read out, a two-year reduction in exemption length renewal, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. CAGE :
Which one we just gave the two-year to,
may I ask?
MR. WINDHAM:
'15. The ones that were due December 31st of 14.

MR. JONES :
There's four of them, Mr. Harris --
excuse me -- Mr. Cage.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Usef (sic).
MR. USIE:
Usie.
MR. WINDHAM:
Usie, please read the ones that expire in '16.

MR. USIE:

061914, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville
Parish. Expiration $12 / 31$ of '16, renewal received 1/9 of 2018; 2008-0162A, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish. Expiration $12 / 31$ of '16, received 1/9/2018; 20080941A, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish, 12/31/16, initial expiration date, received 1/9 of 2018; 20090678, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish, expiration 12/31/2018, received $1 / 9$ of 2018; 20120205, Cos-Mar Company, Iberville Parish, expiration 12/31/2016, received $1 / 9$ of 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
And the TOTAL Petrochemicals.
MR. USIE:
20120433, TOTAL Petrochemicals USA, Inc., Iberville Parish, contract expiration 12/31/2016, renewal request January 9th, 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. There's motion on the floor to -- I believe those are the ones -- by Mr. Miller to restrict those by one year for their renewal; seconded by Mr. Slone.

Any questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?

Please identify yourself.
MR. BAGERT :
Broderick Bagert with Together
Louisiana.
When you set the precedent, you only want to get it right, and that's the only reason I rise that right now, someone who was supposed to have submitted it by December 31st, 2017 and was a month and a day late is being treated the same as someone who was supposed to have submitted by December 31st, 2016. And I think that, Mr. Miller, that was your intent to have the different radiations, and just in terms of how the motion was worded, we didn't do that. We gave the 2015 a two-year, which would give the 2016 a one-year, and we already gave the 2017 a one-year. So if they're going to be a consistent standard, it ought to be under a year, 20 percent, a year to two years -- and since this looks like it may be something that is carried forward in the future, we would propose amending that to have it being consistent across the board.

MR. MILLER:
I do understand I did that, and I took it under consideration. I guess I'm just a lenient parent on the first time you mess up.

MR. WINDHAM:

Any other questions or comments from the
public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Usie, please proceed.
MR. USIE:
The next one, 20130816, Graham Packaging, LLC, Tangipahoa Parish. Initial expiration 12/31/2015, late renewal received $1 / 25$ of 2017.

MR. WINDHAM :
All right. Is there any anyone here for Graham Packaging, LLC? Gentleman rising in the back, I believe may be him. No. All right. We have no representative from Graham Packing.

MR. JONES:
Motion to deny.
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion has been made by Mr. Jones to
deny; seconded by Dr. Wilson.
Any other questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor of denying this
application, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. USIE:
Next we have 20130874, Hunt Forest Products, Inc., La Salle Parish. Initial expiration $12 / 31$ of '15, renewal request date $1 / 3$ of 2018. We also have 20130873, Hunt Forest Products, LLC, Grant Parish. Initial expiration $12 / 31$ of 2015 , renewal received January 3rd of 2018.

MR. WINDHAM:
Do we have a representative from Hunt Forest Products?
Please step forward and identify

yourself.

MS . BOATNER:
Rhonda Boatner with Didier Consultants.
I'm waiting to get the PCR from my client, but looking at this advance number or this application number, unless it was filed late, I can't imagine that a 2013 advance would have expired in 2015.

You think it was filed late, so they lost on the -- okay. Well, I'm waiting on the PCR from my client, which is a project completion report, to show the dates that this contract covered, but if it were filed late, then that would explain why the 2015 expiration date rather than 2017 expiration date.

MR. WINDHAM:
Are you saying it was filed late on the front end, so the first five-year period was shortened? MS . BOATNER:

Was shortened, correct. Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
Therefore, it came up for renewal before 2018, which would have been the normal expectation? MS . BOATNER:

Correct. Correct. And so I'm waiting for the client to send me the PCR.

We just got engaged with them in January of this year, and so -- but Kristin is saying that she thinks that this application -- original application was filed late.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So --
MS . BOATNER:
So could we defer this to have further review at the next meeting, we could have a better information for this?

MR. JONES:
Ms. Boatner, would that be for both Hunt Forest Products?

MS . BOATNER:
Correct, correct.
MR. JONES:
So move.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Motion's been made; seconded by -- I'm sorry. Motion has been made by Mr. Jones; seconded by Mr. Slone -- I'm sorry -- by Major Coleman to defer this application.

Any objection?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :

Seeing none, these are deferred till the next meeting.

MS . BOATNER:
Thank you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
Usie, please proceed.
MR. USIE:
Next we have 20110439, Nalco Company, West Baton Rouge Parish. Initial expiration 12/31 of '15, renewal request date 12/28/2017; 20110442, Nalco Company, Lafayette Parish. Initial expiration date 12/31 of '15, renewal request date 12/28/2017.

MR. WINDHAM:
Welcome. Please identify yourself.
MR. FATHEREE:
Thank you. My name is Bruce Fatheree.
I work for the DuCharme McMillen. I represent Nalco.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. And why were your
applications late?
MR. FATHEREE:
Our circumstance is very similar to
Cos-Mar's. While preparing the 2017 renewals this year, we noticed that the 2015 s had not been done. And

1
looking back through it, the paperwork had been done, but the clerk at the company, whose job it was to prepare the check and get the final signatures, apparently had fell through the cracks on that end. And that's it.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
I make a motion we reduce the renewal by two years.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second?
Second by Mr. Fajardo.
Any questions or comments from the Board
members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor of a two-year reduction for these applications, please indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion Carries.
MR. FATHEREE :
Thank you.
MR. USIE:
That concludes the late renewals, and Kristin will take back over for the specials.

MR. WINDHAM:
It wasn't that painful, was it?
MR. USIE:
No.
MR. JONES :
When you got his name right.
MR. WINDHAM:
That's always a challenge for me.
MS . CHENG:
I have two change in name contract amendment requests. Entergy New Orleans, Inc. - AB Patterson Solar Plant, Contract 20151305 in Orleans Parish is changing to Entergy New Orleans, LLC - AB Patterson Solar Plant. And we have Westlake Petrochemical, LLC, Contract 20130803 in Calcasieu Parish changing to Westlake Chemical OPCO LP.

MR. WINDHAM:

All right. Is there a motion for the name changes only?

Made by Secretary Barham; seconded by
Mr. Slone.
Any questions or comments from the
Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public concerning the name change?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
I have one change in location only request, and it's from Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Contract 20170493. I think this was just an address change from the post office. They're not actually moving their site, but the previous address was on the
contract as 9156 Highway 75, Geismar, Louisiana 70734 in
Ascension Parish, and their new address is 9190 Highway 75, Geismar, Louisiana 70734 in Ascension Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to accept the change
in location?
Made by Dr. Wilson; seconded by
Representative Carmody.
Any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS. CHENG:
I have eight Tax Exemption contract transfers. Georgia-Pacific Wood Products South, LLC in Beauregard Parish, Contracts 20090733, 20100582,

20110341, 20120368, 20130719, 20140920, 20150719, 20140920, 20150703 and 20161077. They are requesting a transfer to Georgia-Pacific Wood Products, LLC.

MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a motion to approve the transfer of these contracts to the new name?

Motion by made Mr. Williams; seconded by
Mr. Slone.
Any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions from the Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM :
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
I have seven partial contract transfers for Hexion, Inc., Contract 20090375 in St. Charles Parish will be retaining $\$ 2,077,435$ in assets and Shell

Chemical, LP will be receiving $\$ 993,455$ in assets; Hexion, Inc., Contract 20100539 in St. Charles Parish will be retaining $\$ 3,909,958$ in assets in St. Charles Parish and Shell Chemical will be receiving $\$ 856,872$ in assets in St. Charles Parish; Hexion, Inc., Contract 20110167 will be retaining $\$ 1,794,987$ in assets in St. Charles. Shell Chemical, LP will be receiving $\$ 2,481,247$ in assets in St. Charles Parish; Hexion, Inc., Contract 20120228 in St. Charles Parish will be retaining $\$ 2,513,919$ in assets and Shell Chemical, LP will be receiving $\$ 1,075,740$ in St. Charles Parish; Hexion, Inc., 20130603, Hexion will be retaining \$1,067,311 in ST. Charles Parish, Shell Chemical, LP will be receiving $\$ 1,215,614$ in St. Charles Parish; Hexion, Contract 20140607 will be retaining \$1,454,407 in St. Charles Parish, Shell Chemical will be receiving \$1,335,202 in St. Charles Parish; Hexion, Contract 20150448 will be retaining $\$ 2,296,942$ in assets in St. Charles and Shell Chemical, LP will be receiving $\$ 2,690,493$ in St. Charles Parish.

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

## REPRESENTATIVE CARMODY:

So moved.

MR. WINDHAM:
Made by Representative Carmody; seconded
by Ms. Atkins.
Any questions from Board members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MS . CHENG:
I have 30 contract cancelations. Dolese
Bros. Co., Inc. in Ascension Parish, Contracts 20100335 and 20140470 requests location has been closed. Company requests cancelation; Dolese Bros. Company, Inc. in East Baton Rouge Parish, Contracts 20080373, 20090921, 20090922, 20100323, 20100333, 20120437, 20130446, 20130447, 2015-218 and 20161160, location has been closed. Company requests cancelation; Dolese Bros.

Company, Inc. in East Feliciana Parish, Contracts 20120436 and 20130449, location has been closed. Company requests cancelation; and Dolese Bros. Company, Inc. in Iberville Parish, Contract 20130451, location has been closed. Company requests cancelation.

Hexion, Inc. in St. Charles Parish, Contracts 20090375, 20100539, 20110167, 20120228, 20130603, 20140607, 20150448 and 20150449, LED was notified by the assessor that the manufacturing facility has been closed. Company has been notified. Staff requests cancelation.

And Intralox, LLC in Tangipahoa Parish, Contracts 070758, 20100431, 20101093A, 20130440, 20140547, 20150471 and 20161163, Intralox entered into a PILOT with Tangipahoa Parish. Company requests cancelation.

MR. WINDHAM :
I have two -- I have one question actually. So when we cancel these contracts, LED, unless it's initiated by the assessor, notifies the assessors that we have canceled these contacts?

MS . CHENG:
Correct. Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.

|  | Is there a motion to approve the |
| :--- | :--- |
| cancelations? |  |
|  | Made by Dr. Wilson; seconded by Ms. |

Heather.
All in favor -- I'm sorry. Any
questions or comments by the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Questions -- yes, Heather.
MS . MALONE:
So the contracts that are being canceled
by Hexion, will it just be their portion that they retained?

MS. CHENG:
Yes.
MS . MALONE :
Okay. So Shell will keep their portion?
MS . CHENG:
Correct.
MS . MALONE :
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
Hence the need for the transfer first before you do the cancelation.

Any other questions?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM.
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Now, I believe we are to the appeals.
MS. CHENG:
CARBO Ceramics has requested that we defer their appeal to the April Board meeting.

MR. WINDHAM :
All right. Can you remind all of the Board members what these appeals are related to, just the high-level.

MS. CHENG:
These appeals are related to the motion that the Board passed in December allowing applicants that filed applications after the Executive Order, but without an advance, but had their project complete prior
to the Executive Order to come to y'all for consideration. These were denied previously.

MR. WINDHAM:
And there were 16 of them, I believe, that were still outstanding; is that right?

MS. CHENG:
There were -- I think there were about 16, but a few of the companies declined to go through this process.

MR. WINDHAM:
Go through the process?
MS. CHENG:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
And they're noted on here?
MS . CHENG:
The ones that declined, no.
MR. WINDHAM:
No. Okay.
Mr. House, do you have observations or comments?

MR. HOUSE :
Okay. On this request for deferral, what you need to be aware of is that the motion that was passed -- offered by Mr. Miller and passed unanimously
by the Board requires that all of these --
MS . CHENG:
Oh, that's a different appeal. CARBO's
not related to --
MR. HOUSE :
I'm sorry. I apologize.
MS . CHENG:
It's okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
We spoke -- I spoke with staff related to this CARBO and asked for some evidentiary information to show that they had, in fact, operational before we took an action, and they didn't -- they're gathering it. So they asked for a deferral until they can gather it.

So motion for the deferral of the CARBO ones?

Made by Dr. Wilson; seconded by Jan
Moller.

## All opposed to deferral?

(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Approved. Deferral is approved.
Please proceed.
MS. CHENG:
We have two applications where we
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received all of the documents that $y$ 'all requested, the local approvals for Hunt Forest Products, Inc.

Application 20170137 in Grant Parish and Shield Pack, LLC, Application 20170083 in Ouachita Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
All of these have been reviewed and verified by staff and --

MR. CHENG:
I have reviewed those local approvals.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. If everyone will remember, they were originally denied, and we were able, with Mr. Miller's motion, to open them back up for consideration, and that's where they are today. We asked them to bring forth letters of no opposition or letters of support or just document -- you know, for the locals to show they were in support of the project before we would take any action to the contrary. So I don't know if I need to reopen or reconsider the approval that was done before.

MR. HOUSE:
I'd recommend that you grant the appeal, and then once the appeal has been granted, you can, at that point in time, reconsider, by a motion, the exemption, but you need to do both things today under
the terms of the prior motion.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Absolutely.
Is there a motion to grant the appeal?
Motion is made by President Miller;
seconded by Mr. Jones.
Any questions or comment from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Now we have to reconsider or consider the request being made. These companies have, in fact, provided all of the documents that we asked for, Mr. Miller. So since it was your ball before, I'm going give it back to you.

MR. MILLER:
I do have a question. Were they denied only because they were considered MCAs? Did we look at what they manufacturer and all of that? All of that's
been clarified and verified?
MS . CHENG :
Yes, sir.
MR. MILLER :
Okay. I make the motion that we grant the first five year -- is this a renewal or new?

MS . CHENG:
It's new.
MR. MILLER:
-- the first five-year exemption.
MR. WINDHAM:
For both Hunt Products --
MR. MILLER:
For both, yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
-- and Shield Pack, LLC?
MR. MILLER :
That's correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
So specifically it's Hunt Forest Products, Application 20170137 in Grant Parish and Shield Pack, LLC, Application 20170083 in Ouachita Parish.

## Is there a second?

Second is made by Major Coleman.
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Are there any questions from the Board
members?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Are there any comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
MR. JONES:
Good save.
MS . CHENG:
The following companies requested to have an appeal, but I have not received any of the local resolution approvals. That would be Cactus Wellhead, LLC, Application 20170165 in Bossier Parish; Calumet Lubricants Company, LP, Application 20170189 in Bossier Parish; and Calumet Shreveport Lubricants \& Waxes, LLC, Applications 20170190 and 20170191 and 20170192 in Caddo Parish.

MR. WINDHAM:
And, Ms. Cheng, can you verify that we, me specifically, have had conversations with the staff, and I directed you guys to reach out to all of the companies, send them an e-mail and go the distance to give them an opportunity to gather the documents, make the calls, have someone show up here, anything that we could do to extend the hand to them and help them to move this forward?

MS . CHENG:
Correct.
MR. WINDHAM:
We did all of that?
MS . CHENG:
We did.
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. House, as I understand the motion and from your statement earlier, action has to be taken today as per the previous motion?

MR. HOUSE :
Correct.
MR. JONES:
MR. Chairman?
MR. WINDHAM:
Please, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES :
Ms. Cheng, do we know that -- have their applications been denied by the local government or have they not gone through the -- taken the steps to get the approval?

MS . CHENG:
I just haven't gotten an approval and never gotten a denial, no.

DR. WILSON:
I can answer that question for you.
MR. WINDHAM:
Dr. Wilson. Please speak into the mic.
DR. WILSON:
Yes, sir. We have received the local application from Calumet, and it should be coming before our board next month sometime. So we've gotten the applications I think last Thursday. They updated the applications. We have a local ITEP review committee. They're going to convene, which is the school board, the City of Shreveport, the sheriff department as well as Caddo commission.

Once that committee convenes, they make a recommendation to the governing authorities, then we will act on it, but right now, it's in the process of being renewed.

MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. House, can you help me out on that? MR. HOUSE :

I don't believe that's with respect to those, sir. I think that's a new application for something else. It's not with respect to this application as far as we know. They have not -- I think that's a new application that they have with --

DR. WILSON:
That's what it says at the bottom of the footnote that they have not received support from the local governing authority on the request.

MR. WINDHAM:
Well, Dr. Wilson, I believe maybe I can help a little bit. We have -- these were projects that were completed before the Executive Order placed into service, and the argument's made that they didn't file subject to the Executive Order. And I believe Mr. Miller's compromise, motion, worked that out where those could move forward because these don't have to have a resolution. They just have to have support. That could have been someone coming and saying, "We support the project."

DR. WILSON:
From local government?

MR. ADLEY:
I think Mr. Miller may ought to address that. I thought he required the local approval even with his compromise. I believe that's what we did. MR. MILLER:

I'd have to read the motion to make sure, but I'm pretty sure.

MS . CHENG:
I think Dr. Wilson is referring to other applications that Calumet has in with advances from after the Executive Order. These fall into a completely different bucket.

MR. ADLEY:
Okay. But is this the list, is this the list that was a group of them that --

MS . CHENG:
Yes, sir.
MR. ADLEY:
This is that list. And that motion was made as a compromise so we can file the -- I remember it was a very small company that started all of this and, Robby, you fought the battle and put it together for everybody, but he required -- I think in that motion, $I$ think he clearly required that you had to get that local approval.

MR. HOUSE:
Yes.
MR. ADLEY:
And I think that would apply to these.
MR. WINDHAM :
The only thing that $I$ was pointing out,
Mr. Adley, is that local approval wasn't a formal resolution. It was more of, you know, "We'll come" -because I've told them they could come to the table and say that they supported it and this Board would probably accept that. It didn't have to be a formalized resolution, a formalized letter.

MR. ADLEY:
I don't want to correct you, but local government doesn't operate in a unformalized manner.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay.
MR. ADLEY:
They have to pass resolutions and do things. I mean, that's -- you can't have somebody from a local government show up and say, "Oh, I'm for that." MR. WINDHAM:

Okay.
MR. ADLEY:
They have to take action. I think he's
correct. I think they're going to have to do that. MR. WINDHAM:

All right. All right. So those that did not comply with the wishes that have to have this in today, $I$ don't think anything needs to be done because they've already been denied.

MR. JONES:
I think we have to act. They've asked for an appeal, so we have to consider their appeal.

MR. WINDHAM:
Oh, we have to consider their appeal.
Okay.
Is there a motion --
MR. MILIER:
I have a question first. In my motion, which, of course, $I$ don't remember every detail of it, is there a deadline that they have to have everything in and filed so we can move forward or did we give them a timeframe?

MS . BOURGEOIS :
There wasn't a date in your motion to have the information in. However, we did issue a letter to all of the companies issuing internal deadlines, and the key for consideration today is that for consideration, these applications must occur today, by
today, and they can't occur after this date. So we can't postpone. And, yes, those companies are in violation of the LED internally set deadlines for providing us the required documentation.

MR. MILIER:
With that being an internal deadline, though, the Board has the ability to extend this or not?

MS . BOURGEOIS :
At this point, you don't have -- you can't extend the consideration; therefore, you can't extend any of the deadlines.

MR. WINDHAM:
So in that motion, there was a deadline for consideration?

MS . BOURGEOIS :
Yes, sir.
MR. WINDHAM:
And I asked you guys to tell them to send this stuff in by a certain date because $I$ was really trying to push them to sign, just tell us one way or the other. So within your motion, it had to be considered at this Board meeting. I don't know if that was date specific or not. MR. HOUSE:

It is date specific.

MS . BOURGEOIS :
February 28th.
MR. MILIER:
We did tell them. Okay. And these
were -- not necessarily these specific. These five were the only ones out of 16 that even attempted to begin the process?

MS . BOURGEOIS:
Yes.
MS . CHENG:
And the two that you just approved.
MR. MILLER:
Right. Yeah, I counted those. So -all right.

MR. WINDHAM:
These five companies have had more than five applications, just to point that out.

MR. MILLER:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM :
So is there a motion concerning the request for the appeal?

MR. MILLER:
I did all I could do to help them. I make the motion that these contracts, Wellhead, Calumet
and Calumet Shreveport, that they're denied.
MR. WINDHAM:
So the motion to deny the appeal
request -- deny to the hear the appeal has been made.
Is there a second?
Seconded by Mr. Jones.
Any other questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
Please step forward, identify yourself.
MS . SADLER:
Jennifer Sadler for Calumet.
We did send the information over to Caddo and Bossier requesting them to look at this and give us the resolution that you guys requested at the December meeting. We also have the Northern Economic -(inaudible) -- with us, and she also sent the information over. So it wasn't that we weren't trying. We just don't have an answer yet.

MR. JONES:
Excuse me. Mr. Chairman?
MR. WINDHAM:
Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES :

When did you request the information of
Caddo Parish?
MS SADLER:
In January, the first time, when Zell sent it over, Zell Dudley. And then also we sent it at the beginning of February.

MR. JONES:
I'm trying to understand the timeline.
It looks like, to me, the first time this was decided was by the Board in December, and so you asked for it in January and just did not get action at all?

MS . SADLER:
Nope .
MR. JONES :
Did any of the -- anybody from --
MS . SADLER:
I know they're working on it because Erica Bryant contacted us.

MR. JONES:
And is this Caddo and Bossier?
MS . SADLER:
That's Caddo. And then we also heard from Joe Buffington, $I$ think is his name, from Bossier. So I know they're looking at it.

DR. WILSON:

Mr. Jones, could I answer that?
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, Dr. Wilson.
DR. WILSON:
Yes, sir. We did consider that
initially in January, and for some reason, the application didn't meet all of the matrix and we asked them if they want to consider putting that in or putting in a compelling reason why they should go beyond the not listing of jobs. And they did send us another revision of that application in February that we have yet to act on.

MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you.
Any other questions?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Any other comments from the lady?
Mr. Miller.
MR. MILLER:
I have a question. With the new information, because we have the motion to deny, if we vote yes to deny, I understand what that does. If we vote no, what does -- how does that change the result of their application?

MR. JONES:
Can I come at it from a different
direction?
MR. WINDHAM:
Please. Go ahead, Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES:
If you're sympathetic to their plight, you want to deny your -- we want to turn down your motion denying their appeal and grant the appeal, and I'm not sure what happens at that point, Mr. House. If we have to act by this meeting.

MR. MILLER:
Can I remove --
MR. JONES:
Wait. Before we -- because we have to act by this meeting. Can we defer the appeal -- once we grant the appeal, can we defer acting on the appeal? I'm just trying -- what it sounds to me is that Calumet has done what we asked them to do. They've simply not gotten responses from the government agencies yet through no fault -- I'm assuming through no fault of their own.

MR. MILLER:
And I understand with -- with our council, you have to --

MR. JONES :
It takes time.
MR. MILLER:
-- on the agenda and all of the things that have to happen to get it done. It just might have not fallen within the right dates.

MR. HOUSE :
Not advocating for one thing or the other. The only thing I'm advocating is that this thing come to an end, you know, one of these days. And you do have two people, who between December and now, two companies that you approved the appeal and approved the exemption for that complied with what needed to be done during this timeframe.

It's in the discretion -- you know, your motion can be amended. It could be amended to keep it open for everybody for a while. It can be amended, I guess, to keep it open for this company that's come here and explained its circumstances. So it's -- and I'm just relying on Robert's rules of order here, and the Chairman and Mr. Adley know more about it than I do. So my view is that you can do that. Whether you should do that, again, that's up to the Board's discretion.

MR. MILLER:
I think, just to add, if Dr. Wilson
wasn't here and wasn't intimately knowledgeable about the process, and he's part of the process, I would probably be a little more harsher or stubborn about it, but we know what the process is happening and we know where they are.

DR. WILSON:
May I offer a substitute motion to
defer --
MR. WINDHAM:
Yes, to defer.
DR. WILSON:
-- until the next meeting and we can complete our work at the government level at the time.

MR. WINDHAM:
I don't think that's the appropriate motion.

MR. JONES:
If I may suggest -- and, Richard, I need your help on this, but it seems to me, what I'm inclined to do in order to accomplish what Dr. Wilson is asking for, I think, on behalf of Calumet, is what we need to do is to deny the motion, turn down the motion that's on the floor right now, which is to deny the appeal, substitute -- and then come back to move to grant the appeal for Calumet and then defer any action on the
appeal until the next meeting.
MR. HOUSE :
And you can either do that -- I'd
recommend you do that solely for this company.
MR. JONES:
Yes. Yes.
MR. MILLER:
Is that both Calumet Lubricant and
Shreveport?
MR. JONES:
The two Calumet entities.
MR. ADLEY:
And the reason for solely this company, all of the others had the same opportunity already. We just want to make sure the door is not open one more time, so we can get into this, "Oh, you let so and so do something, you've got to let me do something."

MR. HOUSE:
This company is still in process with Shreveport authorities, though, so that would be the reason for the exception if you grant it.

MR. WINDHAM:
Can I ask one quick question? When I spoke with you, Ms. Cheng, y'all sent them an e-mail asking them what they were doing?

MS . CHENG:
Uh-huh.
MR. WINDHAM:
Did they tell you?
MS . CHENG :
What do you mean?
MR. WINDHAM:
Did Calumet respond to your e-mailing
asking for an update?
MS . CHENG:
Yes.
MR. WINDHAM:
Okay.
MS . CHENG :
They just said they were working on it and they didn't have them yet.

MR. WINDHAM:
Okay. All right.
DR. WILSON:
Can we include the Cactus Wellhead in that discussion as well?

MR. WINDHAM:
Closer to the mic, please.
DR. WILSON:
Can we include Cactus Wellhead in that
discussion as well? I think probably the same issues taken place in Bossier.

MR. WINDHAM:
Have they also come to your meeting?
DR. WILSON:
No, sir, not Bossier Parish. I think the same thing is going on in Bossier as well.

MR. JONES:
Is anybody here representing Cactus?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
I know what that shake means.
MR. JONES :
I'm going tell you, of all of the people in this room not getting paid, I'm one of them.

DR. WILSON:
I'm speaking for the Parish of Caddo.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So there's a motion on the floor to deny the appeals. The proper vote, if we want to move forward with this, is to reject that motion.

MR. HOUSE:
I think you could do a substitute motion that would take Calumet out of that motion. Strike Calumet from the motion, and then proceed with the
motion to deny the appeal.
DR. WILSON:
So move. I'd like to make that motion.
MR. WINDHAM:
So moved by Dr. Wilson; seconded by Mr. Miller.

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

MR. HOUSE :
Now the motion you have is to deny the appeal of the other company.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So now -- I'm sorry.
All opposed?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Now, is there a motion to deny the appeal of the other company, Cactus Wellhead, LLC?

Motion has been made by Mr. Jones; seconded by Dr. Wilson.

All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
Next up is to --
MR. JONES :
I would then move that we defer any
action on the appeal of the two Calumet entities until the next meeting.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Motion has been made to defer; seconded by --

MR. JONES :
Wait. Mr. House, I want to make sure.
MR. HOUSE :
And if that -- I just want to say, if that motion passes, then you need to amend Mr. Miller's motion back in December, written motion, doesn't need to be in writing at this time, but amend that motion so as to allow the time period to stay open until the next meeting for the two Calumets.

MR. JONES:
For Calumet.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is the next meeting enough?
MR. MILLER:

Is that the deadline?
MR. HOUSE:
I think --
MR. WINDHAM:
I keep looking at these deadlines, and this process has been going on since the Executive Order was out. So it's impossible, in my eyes, to say the people that were in this boat didn't know that this might be coming and could have been preparing their oars to paddle, but for whatever reason, they didn't.

MR. HOUSE:
And that's worthy of consideration in the motion now before you.

MR. ADLEY:
I think it's a matter of you passed one motion, you've got it before you. You've denied some. You've got one you're granting an extension to. I think we're overcomplicating this. I do. It's limited to only those companies that's already happened, and now you're down to this one you want to grant an extension of time to.

MR. WINDHAM:
All right. So the motion has been made to extend the period by Mr. Jones; seconded by Dr. Wilson.

Any further discussion on that motion? MR. JONES :

Well, one thing I think's important to consider is that local government, through Dr. Wilson, has expressed a desire on this issue, and I think that is significant. And it's not just the company asking for the extension. The local government is agreeing with it. So I think that is -- as we think about this moving forward, if we're ever faced with something like this again, people, tell your clients to bring local government if you want extensions. That sure helps.

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

MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion for the extension carries.
Ms. Heather.
MS . MALONE :
I just wanted to ask one thing. In the rules, with the regular application, don't we give the local governments a timeframe to reply within?

MR. WINDHAM:

I believe we do. 120 days.
MS . MALONE :
Okay.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Now, Mr. Miller, I believe you need to open your previous motion to extend it by one board meeting to a certain date.

MR. MILLER :
Okay. The motion that opened these small projects, as I've tried to argue, small projects without advanced notification, should be completed by April meeting.

MR. HOUSE :
By the April Board meeting.
MR. MILLER:
By the April Board meeting.
MR. HOUSE :
Only for...
MR. MILLER :
Only for Calumet, the contracts that Calumet has here.

MR. WINDHAM:
I think it's four applications.
MR. MILLER:
I think it's one, two, three, four
applications.
MR. WINDHAM:
Is there a second?
Dr. Wilson.
Any further questions from the Board

## members?

(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
All opposed with a "nay."
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM :
Motion carries.
All right. The last thing we have is election of officers, but before that, $I$ want to take a moment of personal privilege and ask Ms. Clapinski to step to the table. Ms. Clapinski to step to the table.

> Ms. Clapinski is leaving Economic

Development to return to her home or -- I guess you call it home, Louisiana Department of Revenue and Taxation,
so I wanted to personally thank her for all of the years that I've been around on this Board for the service and assistance that she has provided to previous Board members, existing Board members, thoughts, advice and everything, and I wanted to publicly recognize her and say thank you.

It's been fun.
MR. JONES :
A true professional.
MR. WINDHAM:
All right. Are y'all telling me there's one more thing on here?

SECRETARY PIERSON:
There's at least two.
MR. WINDHAM:
Post-CEO/CEA application summary. That is not on my agenda. I did Number 9. I mean, I did Number 8. That was the appeals; right?

MR. JONES:
Yes. You're down to Number 9.
MR. WINDHAM:
We're on election of officers, which is Number 9, which is why I wanted to do before -- that was the summary of the pages we dealt with a second ago.

All right. So we have election of
officers. Secretary Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
In accordance with our enabling
legislation, Revised Statute 51:926, our officers serve for a period of one year. So, therefore, our process requires an annual election of a chairman and vice chairman. There's no prohibition against officers succeeding themselves. All members serve with no compensation.

So I'll now open the floor for nominations for chairman.

MR. MILLER:
I nominate we stay with all of the same officers for another term.

DR. WILSON:
Second.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Motion has been made and seconded to retain the current chairman and vice chairman of the Board of Commerce and Industry.

With no others submitted, that will move forward by --

DR. WILSON:
Close.
SECRETARY PIERSON:

Okay. Nominations are closed as a motion by Dr. Wilson.

MR. WINDHAM:
Seconded by Mr. Slone.
SECRETARY PIERSON:
And all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
SECRETARY PIERSON:
Thank you for helping us dispatch that important housekeeping feature.

MR. WINDHAM:
I get a raise; right? I get double my salary.

MR. ADLEY:
Don, before you begin, I just want the record to reflect the Governor's office didn't keep us past the noon hour today. Y'all did very good work on your own, so it was enough that kept you here.

SECRETARY PIERSON:
I'll proceed with some comments and remarks, and recognizing that the hour grows late, just for your overall information, we've been tracking very well here in the first part of 2018, certainly with DXE Technology that announced in New Orleans in November. We've been very active in moving them forward with
meeting throughout the community and various education institutions, continuing to make progress against that.

I hope you had a chance to see that we released an economic impact statement relative to what the Department of Defense allocations mean to our state, Barksdale, Fort Polk, Belle Chasse, our National Guard component and others, with a 7.7-billion annual impact. Quite impressive. And those statistics help us continue to lobby and work on their behalf in Washington DC.

Pleased to see Entergy break ground on an \$872-million power plant in Calcasieu Parish. As you know, we have $\$ 110$-billion of construction either completed or underway there, so to have the power capacity to continue to serve those plants is very important and a great opportunity to move forward.

BASF announced for Ascension Parish an additional investment of $\$ 150-\mathrm{million}, ~ C e n t u r y I i n k ~$ adding 150 jobs in Monroe. Excited about that.

Some great news yesterday. Up in Shreveport, you'll recall that you provided some support to Metro Aviation, but they announced they're purchasing 25 Airbus helicopters, and they do a conversion there in Shreveport. So that's a lot of work moving forward with some really advanced manufacturing. It's a very impressive facility to tour, and they employ more than

150 people in Shreveport.
I would also point out that at 8 o'clock this morning, we announced that Hunt Forest Products will construct a state-of-the-art lumber production facility, and that will be a \$115-million investment. It will be a sawmill that will create 110 new direct jobs and 307 new indirect jobs for a total of 417. That's random that that happened at 8 o'clock this morning.

But I have heard clearly from some Board and from someone in the audience that they'd like a better understanding of how we calculate return on investment. So I'm going to take this as a case study and formulate a document that walks you through a return on investment analysis of this particular project, and that information will be provided to the Board and made available to Together Louisiana and others with an interest on just how you calculate return on investment. And as had previously been stated, depending on assumptions made and many factors that go into a model, you will never find two that have the same outcomes. I find that economists don't always agree on things, but hopefully we are going to demonstrate that there's no reason to have concern, that this is a mathematically-supported analysis and does provide a
great return on investment for this state.
With that, I'll conclude my
remarks.
MR. WINDHAM:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
Is there any further business?
(No response.)
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion to adjourn?
Made by Mayor Brasseaux; seconded by
Major Coleman.
All in favor, indicate with an "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. WINDHAM:
Motion carries.
(Meeting concludes at 12:11 p.m.)
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