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MR. JONES: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the November 13, 2020 Board of Commerce \& Industry meeting. Friday the 13th in 2020. What a great day. Sometimes you just can't fall out a hole, you know. But it is good to see everyone here today.

As you know, we have a lengthy agenda. We've combined two meetings into this one because of the storms that our state has had to deal with this year. And before we get started and before we call roll, I -this has been such an unusual year. We've had so much that we've had to deal with at so many different levels from the pandemic to the hurricanes to I know things are going on in the economic circles. I know St. James Parish is dealing with something they didn't know they were going to have to deal with, and $I$ just wish we'd stop just for a few moments of silence and let's remember our fellow citizens within the state and our leadership. I know the Governor and his staff has had to deal with a lot. Let's just remember them and pray for safety, health, wellbeing, wisdom, discernment, all of those things that we could use today. So just a few moments. Thank you.
(A moment of silence is observed.)
MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
All right. Ms. Simmons, if you could call
the roll, we would appreciate that.
MS. SIMMONS: Good morning.
MR. JONES: Good morning.
MS. SIMMONS: Don Briggs.
MR. BRIGGS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: David Toups.
MR. TOUPS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Yvette Cola.
MS. COLA: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Guy McInnis.
MR. MCINNIS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Ricky Fabra.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Manuel Fajardo.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Stuart Moss.
MR. MOSS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Representative Paula Davis.
MS. DAVIS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Senator Theo Fields, proxy for
Representative Senator Johns.
MR. FIELDS: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Kenneth Havard.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Jerald Jones.

MR. JONES: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Heather Malone.
MS . MALONE: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Senator Bret Allain.
MR. ALIAIN: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Representative Stuart Bishop.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Jan Moller.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Secretary Don Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: Present.
MS. SIMMONS: George Nassar.
MR. NASSAR: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Darrel Saizan.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Daniel Shexnaydre.
MR. SHEXNAYDRE: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Ronnie Slone.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Shawn Wilson.
(No response.)
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Woodrow Wilson.
DR. W. WILSON: Here.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Travis Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: Here.

MS. SIMMONS: We have a quorum.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Simmons.
Thank you, everyone, for being here.
First we have, and I think all of you have
been provided a copy of our minutes from April 21, 2020 and June 24 th, 2020 meetings. I would accept a motion on the April 21, 2020 minutes.

MR. NASSAR: So moved.
MR. JONES: I have a motion to approve.
Is there a second?
MS. DAVIS: Second.
MR. JONES: We have a second.
Any questions from the Board, comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

Now I would accept a motion concerning the

June 24, 2020 minutes.
MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: We have a motion.
A second?
Second from Dr. Wilson.
Any comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any comments or questions from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor,
say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being no opposition, the motion carries.

Ms. Booker, if you will -- Mr. Favaloro, good to see you this morning. If you will, walk us through the Quality Jobs Program. Thank you.

MR. FAVALORO: Yes. There are four new Quality Jobs applications: 20190070, A.W. Chesterton Company in Bossier; 20181534, Cabot Corporation in St. Mary; 20180261, Shintech Louisiana, LLC in Iberville; 20180170, Ville Platte Iron Works, Inc. in Evangeline.

That concludes the new applications.
MR. JONES: All right. Entertain a motion
for the new applications.
DR. W. WILSON: So moved.
MR. JONES: I have a move for approval; is
that right?
Do we have a second?
Second from Mr. Briggs.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or
comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: No opposition. That motion
carries.
MR. FAVALORO: We have 10 renewals. One company wishes to defer. The deferral request is for 20151134, Calumet GP, LLC.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion for deferral for Calumet.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
DR. W. WILSON: So moved.
MR. JONES: We have a motion, and a second from Dr. Wilson.

Any questions or comments from the Board on that deferral?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: For those of you who are new to the Board, that simply means as it sounds, that that will be set off at least till the next meeting.

No questions or comments from the Board.
Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: That action, that renewal is deferred.

Carry on.
MR. FAVALORO: 20151137, Brown \& Root Industrial Services, LLC of Delaware and BR Industrial Operations, LLC in East Baton Rouge; 20141138, CGI Federal, Inc. in Lafayette; 20141555, Dis-Tran Steel,

LLC in Rapides; 20151287, Express Lien, Inc. d/b/a, Zlien in Orleans; 20151264, Indorama Ventures Olefins, LLC, Calcasieu; 20151041, Marathon Petroleum Logistics Services, LLC in St. John the Baptist; 20151117, S\&W Payroll Services, LLC in St. Tammany; 20150910, Shintech Louisiana, LLC in Iberville; 20151049, TCI Packaging, LLC in Orleans; 20151251, Zen-Noh Grain Corporation in St. James Parish.

That concludes the renewals.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
And, again, for newer members to the Board, while we normally handle these in an in-globo fashion, as we work through the agenda, as we consider those motions, if for some reason you have a particular application or a particular item that you want to pull out and except it from an in-globo motion, just let us know and we'll handle -- we'll handle all of these individually or we handle them in-globo. With the size of the agenda, we can move a little bit quicker if we handle them all at one time, but if you do want to ask questions about a specific one, always feel free to do so.

All right. Entertain a motion.
We have a motion. We have a second from Ms. Davis.

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

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

All right, Mr. Favaloro.
MR. FAVALORO: I have one change in company name only: 20110680, LALUMINA, LLC to Almatis Burnside, LLC in Ascension Parish.

We have one change of project physical location: 20150140, Redhawk Industrial Services, LLC, previous address 7894 Florida Boulevard, Suite 200 C, Baton Rouge 70806, East Baton Rouge Parish to the new address of 2310 Archie Road, Sulphur, Louisiana 70663 in Calcasieu.

And we have one full transfer of ownership: 20100919, Great Southern Galvanizing, LLC d/b/a Great States Galvanizing. The new company is South Atlantic,

LLC in East Baton Rouge parish.
That concludes the specials
MR. JONES: Okay. We have three special
requests that have been read by Mr . Favaloro. I'll entertain a motion.

We have a motion from Ms. Cola, second from Ms. Davis to approve these three special request.

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

MR. FAVALORO: That concludes Quality Jobs.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir. Are you also Ms. Lambert today?

MR. FAVALORO: I am today.
MR. JONES: Like I say, it's Friday the
13th. We'll get the B-team all the way around.


Abatement renewal requests: 20141014, Grand Lady, LLC in East Baton Rouge; and 20121144, Laura Mauffray Borchert, APLC in St. Tammany.

That concludes the renewals.
MR. JONES: Okay. I would entertain a
motion on these two renewals.
Motion from Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Toups.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Being no opposition, the motion carries.

MR. FAVALORO: That concludes Restoration Tax Abatement.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you, Mr. Favaloro.
Enterprise Zone Program, Ms. Joyce.
MS. METOYER: Good morning.
MR. JONES: Good morning.

MS. METOYER: I have 22 new applications:
20160732, Associated Terminals, LLC, St. Bernard Parish;
20161423, Bridge Senior Living, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20160812, Columbia/HCA of New Orleans, Incorporated, Orleans Parish; 20170496, Community Care Center of Baton Rouge, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20170495, Community Care Center of Hammond, LLC, Tangipahoa Parish; 20161590, D'Ville Home Group, LLC, Ascension Parish; 20170218, Electric Depot, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20160891, Exxon Mobil Corp., East Baton Rouge Parish; 20151761, Exxon Mobil Corp., East Baton Rouge Parish; 20141327, Franciscan Missionary of Our Lady of University, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20160850, Halliburton Energy Services, Incorporated, Iberia; 20180272, Highway Transport Chemical, LLC, Ascension Parish; 20180111, IP Avanti Lafayette OpCo, LLC, Lafayette Parish; 20170676, International Paper Company, Natchitoches Parish; 20170646, Lamarque Ford, Incorporated, Jefferson Parish; 20170647, Lamarque Ford Incorporated, Jefferson Parish; 20152061, Louisiana Children's Museum, Orleans Parish; 20180335, Mid South Extrusion, Incorporated, Ouachita Parish; 20150993, NOVA Chemicals, Incorporated, Ascension Parish; 20180408, Octapharma Plasma, Incorporated, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20151905, Willis Knighton Medical Center,

Incorporated, Bossier Parish; and 20151906, Willis
Knighton Medical Center, Incorporated, Caddo Parish.
MR. JONES: Okay. Before we entertain a motion on this, the Chair will be recusing himself from any consideration of the two Exxon Mobil Corporation, Applications 20160891 and 20151461, but we'll otherwise entertain a motion.

I have a motion from Dr. Wilson to approve. I have a second from Mr. Briggs.

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

Please come forward.
MR. WALTZER: My name is Joel Waltzer.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry. Have a seat right here at the table before the microphone, and if you can, state your name and your address for the record, please.

MR. WALTZER: My name is Joel Waltzer. I'm an attorney for Together Louisiana. My address is 3201 General De Gaulle, Suite 200 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you.
MR. WALTZER: And my basic objection is -or comment is that for each of these applications for subsidy, there needs to be evidence that the residency
requirements have been met by the applicants, that this Board should first do an individual review of each one of these decisions and then ask the question of LED whether or not that evidence is then now existing in the record for each of these applications.

If the evidence is not in the record of each of these applications, then you can't make the fundamental call that the applicants have met the requirements that gives you legal authority to issue the subsidy.

And that's the gist of my comment.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
Can we have someone from staff legal
respond?
MS. METOYER: Yes, all of the applications have been verified. And can you explain why you're asking about their residency?

MR. WALTZER: I believe that the legislature has passed a statute requiring that there be Louisiana residents -- a certain number of jobs created and that the jobs be given to Louisiana residents is what I understood.

MS. METOYER: Well, the jobs have been given to Louisiana residents. That's verified. It's not verified at this point, but once there's a contract, no
benefits are issued until we verify every employee, that they are a resident or domiciled within 60 days of their hire.

MR. WALTZER: So is that done before or
after?
MS. METOYER: These are back-end contracts. That's going to be done. No benefits have been issued yet. They're just trying to get these contracts, but no benefits have been issued.

MR. WALTZER: I believe that if they want the Board's approval, they need to show that the people who are working there are residents of Louisiana.

MR. JONES: They haven't been hired yet.
MS. METOYER: Or if they have been hired, compliance is shown after there is an actual contract.

Let's just say we're going to have a contract, let's just say February, no benefits are going to be issued until they file all of their compliance forms and I go through every employee and check every one. And I'm the only one who does that.

MR. WALTZER: That's my comment.
MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
Any other comments or questions from the
public?
(No response.)

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

Go right ahead.
MS. METOYER: I have one cancelation:
20141329, G.E.O. Heat Exchangers, LLC in Iberville
Parish. The company did not meet the program requirements and the company requested cancelation.

MR. JONES: Motion to approve the cancelation.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry. Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Toups.

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

MR. JONES: Let's vote.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being no opposition, that contract is canceled.

What's next, Ms. Joyce?
MS. METOYER: Okay. We have two deferrals, and a change of ownership and a change in name. We're going to defer those possibly until December.

MR. JONES: Both the Blake Management
Group --
MS. METOYER: Both, yes.
MR. JONES: -- both of them are requesting deferral?

MS. METOYER: Yes.
MR. JONES: So we'll entertain a motion to defer both. There's two Blake Management Group special requests, and we're seeking a motion to defer both of them.

All right. We have that motion from Ms. Davis. We have a second from Mr. Nassar.

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

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

Okay. Mr. Favaloro has requested at this point just to let those who are listening from other places, we're toward the end of Enterprise Zone, be soon moving into the Industrial Tax Exemption Program, so if you can start moving toward the main conference room, then we can start making room for those people who want to be here for the ITEP program.

Okay, Ms. Joyce. Go right ahead.
MS. METOYER: Okay. My last is my contract terminations.

MR. JONES: Right.
MS. METOYER: I have 19. 20161642, South 14th Street, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract period is $9 / 15 / 16$ to $9 / 14 / 2021$, the requested term date is March 14 of 2019. The program requirements
have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20110954, Alliance Compressors, LLC, Natchitoches Parish, the existing contract is October 1, '13 to September 30 of '18. The requested term date is 9/30 of '18. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20141167, Associated Mooring, LLC, St. James Parish, the existing contract is 6/1/15 to $5 / 31$ of ' 20 . The requested term date is May 31 of '18. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20150892, Baton Rouge Hotel Investors, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is March 15 of ' 16 through March 14 of 2021. The requested term date is $9 / 15$ of '18. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20160619, Chalmette Refining, LLC, St. Bernard Parish, the existing contract is May 1 of '16 to April 30, 2021. The requested term date is 10/13 of '18. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20150201, Equilon Enterprises, LLC, St. James Parish, the existing contract period is $10 / 13$ of ' 16 to $10 / 12$ of 2021 . The requested term date is 4/12 of '19. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20151399, Govind Hotels, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is December 1 of '16
through November 30 of 2021 . The requested term date is May 31, 2019. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20130216, HRI Lodging, LLC, doing business as Aloft New Orleans Downtown, Orleans Parish, the existing contract period is $10 / 1 / 13$ to $9 / 30 / 18$. The requested term date is $12 / 31$ of '17. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20151044, Langenstein's of River Ridge, LLC, Jefferson Parish, the existing contract is $7 / 1$ of '15 to $6 / 30$ of 2020 . The requested term date is $12 / 31$ of '17. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20140843, Oil Center Surgical Plaza, LLC, Lafayette Parish, the existing contract is $5 / 7$ of '14 to 5/6 of '19. The requested term date is $11 / 6$ of '16. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20131236, Orion Instruments, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is August 1 of '14 to $7 / 31$ of '19. The requested term date is July 31, 2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20151855, Performance Contractors, Incorporated, East Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is $11 / 18$ of '15 to $11 / 17$ of 2020. The requested term date is May 17 of 2018. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are
anticipated; 20140985, RR Hotel Partners, LLC doing business as Home2 Suites Lafayette, Lafayette Parish, the existing contract period is 12/4 of '14 through 12/3 of '19. The requested term date is December 31 of '17. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20150953, Rampart Mixed-Use Complex, LLC doing business as Homewood Suites, Orleans Parish, the existing contract period is 12/1/15 to 11/30/2020. The requested term date is $9 / 1$ of 2018. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20130358, Shintech Louisiana, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish, the existing contract is 1/1/14 through 12/31 of '18. The requested termination date is July 1 of 2016. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20141547, Southwest Louisiana Hospital Association, Calcasieu Parish, the existing contract period is $12 / 18$ of '14 to $12 / 17$ of '19. The requested term date is June 30 of 2017. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20130880, The Kroger Company, Bossier Parish, the existing contract dates are 1/12/15 to 11/12/2020. The requested term date is 12/31/17. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20131435, University Medical Center Management Corporation, Orleans Parish, the existing
contract is 5/13/14 -- that should be 5/12 of '19.
That's a typo of my part. The requested term date is 11/12 of '16. Program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated; 20160718, Woodlands Health Care Center, LLC, Vernon Parish, existing contract is March 4, 2016 to March 3, 2021, the requested term date is $3 / 3$ of '19. The program requirements have been met, no additional jobs are anticipated.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Joyce.
I'll entertain a motion to approve these contracts for termination.

We have a motion from Mr. Nassar; second from Ms. Malone.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, motion
carries.
MS. METOYER: That concludes Enterprise Zone.

MR. JONES: Appreciate your help.
All right. We're now moving to the Industrial Tax Exemption Program. Ms. Kristen, Mr. Usie, please come forward.

All right. We first have the Pre-EO applications. Who will be handling those?

MS. CHENG: I believe -- were we going to go ahead -- we received some letters of opposition and support.

MR. JONES: Oh, yes. Please. I think we have -- these are comments that were submitted to LED staff for those who could not attend the meeting, and they were submitted by yesterday's deadline; is that correct, Ms. Kristen?

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: So we're going to read those into the record at this point, please.

MS. CHENG: This was submitted by Reverend Sonya Renee Lars. "Together Louisiana has brought it to the attention of concerned citizens that there seems to be some discrepancies in the exemptions being given to companies that do not qualify for. Our communities are
suffering for the tax dollars they're not receiving. Please follow the rules to support our schools, teachers, libraries and other essential community operations. People's needs should outweigh the desires of these corporations. Shame on you. Reverend Sonya Renee Lars, and Elder of the United Methodist Church of the Louisiana Conference."

This is from Wendy King. "Dear LED Board of Directors, I oppose the illegal, apparently fraudulent Marathon Oil Industrial Tax exemptions being presented at tomorrow's, November 13th, Board of Commerce \& Industry meeting. These apparently fraudulent Industrial Tax exemptions are not allowed because the documents submitted for this request was altered to allow these exemptions to make them eligible. Sincerely, Wendy King."

This is from Marsha Cook. "I'm very concerned that the ITEP program is not being administered properly by the Board of Commerce \& Industry. My specific concerns are that, one, Marathon Oil has submitted paperwork for current ITEP exemptions that require parish approval using item numbers for past projects that did not require parish approval; two, Folger Coffee in Orleans Parish has kept some of its property off the tax record and is now requesting
property tax exemptions as if these were newly-acquired properties; three, Genesis claims to be a manufacturing facility when it's, in fact, not one, therefore, it has received tax exemptions that violate ITEP rules. At a time when local governments are incurring increased expenditures because of the pandemic while simultaneously collecting reduced sales taxes, major corporations are receiving inappropriate property tax exemptions in violation of the ITEP rules.

I intend to follow your proceedings carefully. My local parish of Orleans is being starved of tax revenues by the excessive granting of property tax exemptions to large corporations. Sincerely, Marsha B. Cook, retired."

This is from Peter Digre. "Opposition to Marathon Oil and Praxair exemptions.

One, Marathon Oil, which is the worst particulate matter polluter in St. John, is asking to be exempted from about $\$ 43-\mathrm{million}$ in tax exemptions. The parish ad school board recently rejected their request a few months ago. A, Marathon is claiming that an advanced planning document was filed in 2014 for projects in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 and, therefore, those projects do not fall under Governor John Bel Edwards' Executive Order on June 24th, 2016 which made
parish government and school boards the deciders as to whether or not to grant exemptions. B, I believe it is impossible that a 2014 advanced planning document could possibly cover these much later projects, therefore, the parish and school board decisions must stand.

If these exemptions are not stopped, St. John the Baptist school children and citizens will be losing about $\$ 43$ (sic) of tax revenue that Marathon owes.

Two, Linde AG/Praxair is appealing the St. James School Board's decision not to grant an exemption
 legal procedure for them to appeal the Board of Commerce \& Industry, but the Board has placed this item on the agenda anyway without a legal basis. If this exemption
 education services and support. Since there is no procedure to grant this request, the school board's decision must stand. Peter Digre."
"Please do not approve," from Joyce Thomas. "Good afternoon. I'm writing today to strongly request that you not approve the applications for Marathon Oil, Folger, Genesis and Praxair that will be discussed/decided in your meeting on Friday, November 13th.

There are extreme irregularities in the applications being presented by these corporations. These irregularities, once again, strip funds from essential services required by and justifiably belonging to citizens of the cities/parishes of Louisiana. These irregularities are certainly improper and appear to be edging towards the fraudulent twisting of the rules clearly outlined by the state for receiving tax benefits.

I do hope I can trust that you will not approve these or any other applications that allow for tax benefits to corporations that are both irregular and improper. I hope and trust that, rather, you will work for the benefit of the citizens of our state. We all must sadly admit that Louisiana, for so long, has been last and first on all the wrong lists. Surely a large reason for that is that corporations are being given a pass at paying their fair share of the expense of programs and growth for our state/citizens. Please do not allow this to continue to occur. Thank you, Joyce Thomas, Louisiana concerned citizen."

And this is a letter from Joel Waltzer on behalf of Together Louisiana. "Dear Board Members, Together Louisiana submits the following comments with respect to the Industrial Tax Exemption applications
under consideration at the Board of Commerce \& Industry's November 13th, 2020 meeting. These comments together contain Together Louisiana's global objections to the Board's decisions and decisionmaking processes with regard to the ITE Program. Please incorporate these global objections into the record of each ITE decision, as if reproduced therein in full, and consider these objections in each decision before the Board at the November 13 meeting.

One, foundational legal principles. The Louisiana Constitution provides that all property shall be listed on the tax rolls at its assessed value and taxed unless subject to a specific constitutional exemption. Article 7, Section 21 authorizes the Board of Commerce \& Industry ('Board' or 'BCI') to grant Industrial Tax exemptions ('ITE'), but that provision contains important limits as well. Because exemptions conflict with the prohibition from donating public things of value to private entities, it is the exception to the rule. As the Supreme Court said, that means every reasonable doubt is resolved adversely to granting the exemption. Indeed, the Louisiana Supreme Court has labeled ITEs as 'exceptional privileges' that must be unequivocally and affirmatively established by applicants.

The Board of Commerce \& Industry is a state governmental entity. That means every Board decision or action must comply with the Louisiana Constitution, with Louisiana statutes and with its own duly promulgated rules. These sources of obligation set the limits of your authority.

Board actions or decisions that do not comply with the Constitution, laws or rules or taken outside of your lawful jurisdiction or discretion are considered null and void. This is particularly important in the context of the ITEP. Together Louisiana has seen instances where the Board of Commerce \& Industry has acted in an over-reaching manner, likely with the intent to help a business you view favorably. But when you go beyond your authority, you (sic) act is a legal nullity, meaning you are, in fact, creating a liability on the recipient for the return of the benefit unlawfully received.

When acting in your capacity as a BCI Board member, you are deemed a public official, and because you exercise a constitutionally-granted discretionary authority to act upon ITEP applications 'in the best interest of the State of Louisiana,' making you a public trustee. Louisiana Constitution Article 7, Section 21. Board members owe a fiduciary duty of loyalty, prudence
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and care. That includes the duty of a fiduciary to protect the corpus of the trust, here the parish tax base relied upon to pay for public services, and the beneficiaries, the other property owners, who make up the difference. And your duty of care mandates that you are fully informed when making the decisions and that you fully document what you do and why.

Board members cannot discharge their fiduciary duty of independent judgement as to whether granting an ITEP contract complies with the Constitution and governing law and makes sense for citizens of this great state without examining the contents of the records of each application. In this instance, you are considering a packet of approximately 1,429 pages. If you have reasonable belief that you don't have all of the information needed or you don't have independent analysis or, worse, that the information you're being provided is not trustworthy, you must defer and demand an audit of the processes within your jurisdiction before continuing. As explained below, Together Louisiana believes that is we are (sic).

The Louisiana Supreme Court has held that particularly where a board or agency performs as a public trustee, as you clearly do, your decisions must be in writing, include 'basic findings supported by
evidence, ultimate findings flowing rationally from basic findings,' and, most of all, that it must 'articulate a rational connection between the facts found and the order given.'

These requirements have been refined further requiring at a minimum, a general recitation of the facts as presented by all sides, a basic finding of facts as supported by the record; 3, a response to all reasonable public comments; 4, a conclusion or conclusions on all issues raised which rationally support the order issued; and, 5, any and all other matters which rationally support the DEQ's decision. Because written reasons based on record evidence is fundamental to judicial review and agency action, decisions without them are deemed unconstitutional.

To remain constitutionally compliant, the BCI has an independent duty to establish that each ITEP contract it wishes to approve must satisfy the purpose of the program 'to provide an incentive for businesses to locate and/or expand in Louisiana, thereby increasing employment opportunities and is boosting state and local economies.'

Often, if granting a contract cannot or will not be a substantial factor in determining a manufacturer's decision to construct here, then the
exemption is a gift, not an incentive. The same goes if the project creates no jobs and does not substantially boost the state or local economy. This would be the case for industries that are required to be located on specific resources, such as the river.

The BCI most also establish that the exemption incentivizes a new 'manufacturing' facility or addition. Louisiana Constitution Article 7, Section 21 (n). The constitution defines manufacturing to mean 'working raw materials into wares suitable for use or which gives new shape, qualities or combinations to matter which already has gone through some artificial process.'

Louisiana Constitution Article 7, Section $21(f)$. If there is no meaningful end product or change in composition, it is not a manufacturing process and no exemption is allowed. Hazardous waste disposers who claim changing material to ash were found to fail this test.

The BCI must determine that the constitutional requirements discussed above are satisfied before it reaches the decision of whether granting an exemption is truly in the best interest of Louisiana. As explained below, that clearly is not happening.

Two, the current process is flawed and/or abused requiring investigation and repair. A, non-manufacturers are getting exemptions. Even on a cursory review of the applications before you, Together Louisiana has found the record evidence missing with regard to the 'jurisdictional facts' that would permit the issuance of a tax exemption or underpin a determination that a particular ITE is worth the deprivation of public funds requested. For that reason, storage facilities, linear pipelines and terminals have all been allowed tax exemptions though they failed the contusional test.

For instance, Genesis BR, LLC seeks renewal of 20150540 through 20150588. Genesis $B R$ appears to be an entity that owns a piece of land operated by a related company, Genesis Scenic Station. This is clearly obviously a rail terminal. As Genesis told the LDEQ, crude oil is railed and pumped into tanks. From there, the crude oil is pumped into pipeline to the refinery. Genesis has several such facilities. Notably, Genesis self-reported SIC code is not that of a manufacturer. It stated it may be blending oil, but no evidence of that is seen in its LDEQ filings. Even if it did have a paddle that stirred the storage tank, Genesis is no more a 'manufacturer' than would be a
restaurant, which also 'blends' raw materials (and that for sale), or a law firm which purchases expensive equipment that fuses special dyes to processed paper resulting in a product that they then place into commerce. Granting applicants such as Genesis an exemption for tax is clearly unconstitutional.

Even today, you are asked to approve exemptions for other rail transfer stations, pipelines, storage facilities and hazardous waste disposers who are also not manufacturers.

Veolia North America Regeneration Services, LLC, 20200078-ITE operates a facility that processes hazardous waste. Acid regeneration furnaces, mentioned in the application, are regulated as a source of air emissions by the LDEQ, and any HCL emissions therefrom are treated as a 'Toxic Air Pollutant' under the LDEQ's Air Quality Regulations. The application claims the facility operates and sells some byproduct, but does not elaborate on how much, if at all. That information would help BCI to determine if the facility is primarily a manufacturer or if it is a hazardous waste services company like the Rollins facility that was found undeserving of an ITEP. Together Louisiana believes that this application should be denied or at least deferred until more information could be obtained to
make an appropriate determination.
And perhaps the biggest of them all are the two Cameron Parish LNG facilities. They are hugely expensive, yes, but are they truly manufacturers or storage and transportation companies? Given the destruction of the entire tax base of Cameron Parish, which would still only amount to a fraction of the value of these two facilities, evidence is needed. Perhaps the LNG facilities should pay or their contract reduced to make sense for the people of Cameron.

These applicants are all large businesses, most of whom employ specialized 'tax' executives and well-paid lobbyists to assist in gaining public subsidies, but these firms, and surely their representatives, know that they are not manufacturers, just as they know only manufacturers can be granted ITEs. When such behavior is discovered, it is not enough to deny an exemption or renewal. This Board must initiate an investigation of how and why this happened. This Board must enforce the return of ill-gained public benefits already received, particularly as the massive financial benefits were gained by virtue of misrepresentations in sworn applications upon which you relied. And those who enable financial abuses must be sanctioned as well. Would Board members look the other
way if it were your bank account? You are trustees. You cannot ignore the facts or your duty.

The constitution also limits exemptions to new establishments or additions to existing manufacturing establishments. Applications seeking exemptions for property that do not involve the value of a new facility or an expansion of an existing facility must be denied. Those who seek exemptions for non-tangible property such as software or who are simply replacing existing parts or equipment with new parts or equipment or who wish to exempt their maintenance and repair expenses cannot constitutionally be granted ITEP contract or a renewal contract no matter the rule. The constitution requires a new facility or an expansion to an existing facility, one that will create new products or give new shape to the input. Otherwise, the ITE must be denied.

B, Manufacturers appear to be abusing the system too. In many instances, some of whom will be discussed at length in the meeting, Together Louisiana believes that applicants are misusing the ITEP program to gain financial subsidies where no incentives are needed or by mischaracterizing repairs or required pollution control as an addition to the manufacturing facility. Other applicants say they won't produce jobs.

In Pratt (Delta Container), Inc., 20190323-ITE, the company says in the application that '... we are not able to commit to any new jobs for this particular project...' Although the applicant says they will commit to maintaining a 'certain level' of employment and payroll, it is not clear whether the level of employment and payroll referenced in this statement will mean no future loss of employment. This application should be denied, or, if granted, conditioned upon a more clear commitment from the applicant.

Westlake Vinyls Corporation, LP's
application 20190290, describes a broad array of equipment, including tanks, reactors, incinerators and 'distributed control system components' that are involved with the production of PVC, VCM and chlorine. Air emissions from those facilities of this sort are strictly regulated by LDEQ and OSHA with strict ambient air standards, worker/workplace limits and 'emission point specific,' limits/standards, such as percent destruction and removal of efficiencies mandated for VCM incinerators, being established by law. Together Louisiana believes, although it is difficult to tell because processes and equipment descriptions are vague, that many of the components described are required by law, and, therefore, not authorized for inclusion in the

ITE contracts under LAC 13:1.517(A). The applicant should be required to specifically address this issue and prove that the equipment described is not already mandated by law. Absent such proof by the applicant, the application should be denied.

Moreover, it appears that manufacturers are abusing the grandfather clauses that were contained in various changes in the ITE program by improperly backdating projects to come under earlier (sic) regimes. Marathon applies for two ITEs for related projects under a pre-Executive Order contract number bearing 20141606-A. It appears Marathon is illegally trying to backdate these projects, which began in 2018, to a pre-Executive Order Advance Notice bearing 20141606. Marathon was recently denied local approval, so it seems likely it does so in order to avoid having to obtain local government buy-in. A large number of other projects also appear on the agenda that relate back many years and that now simply have an 'A' 'B' behind the historic ITEP number.

In some instances, LED is either aiding and abetting in these attempts to abuse the system or, again, failing to conduct even a basic check of the facts contained in applications. The current system calls for the patch processing of applications and
decisions to be made without an independent analysis of costs and benefits or written reasons based on record evidence. What's more, the LED, the agency delegated responsibility to assist the $B C I$, appears to have little appetite to verify facts contained in the ITE applications or to track job creation performance. LED will not even report canceled or...

Together Louisiana will be giving more comment at the hearing.

Sincerely, Joel Waltzer."
And, lastly, we have a letter from the Orleans Parish Assessor. "Dear Chairman Jones, I have served as an Orleans Parish Assessor since 1985, and I currently oversee one of the state's largest assessment rolls comprising of greater than 165,000 parcels and approximately 10,000 businesses.

I'm writing to express my support for Folgers' ITEP applications pending before the Board for your consideration. Folgers has been an integral part of New Orleans and a major contributor to its economy since 1960.

In an evolving and competitive global marketplace, there is this competition to attract quality jobs producers and the direct and indirect economic impact that comes with them.

The Louisiana ITEP program is a tool that provides incentives and investment in the capital projects including the expansion of existing operations here as opposed to somewhere else.

For New Orleans in particular, there are limited manufacturers, and these incentives are beneficial to the local economy and necessary for the retention of the quality jobs.

Folders, the number three coffee roaster in the world, has also shown its commitment to New Orleans by consolidating all of their US coffee manufacturing operations to New Orleans. In 2011, they consolidated coffee manufacturing and production facilities from Sherman, Texas and Kansas City, Missouri to New Orleans, and in 2014, the company consolidated their operations in Miami to New Orleans. Also, in 2017, they consolidated a manufacturing facility in Harahan, Louisiana to New Orleans.

New Orleans is home to the largest sector of the state's tourism industry. However, the impact of COVID-19 will likely impair the sector and recovery will likely be long.

In addition to being a major employer, Folgers' coffee manufacturing facilities are an economic driver that aids in the diversification of Folgers' New

Orleans workforce, employment opportunities and economy. Through this process, Folgers has remained in communication with my office regarding its assessment, and their accounts are current. Folgers' projects contribute to the economic growth of New Orleans and I support their pending applications and I believe that they will have a meaningful and sustainable impact on our community.

Sincerely, Earl G. Williams, Assessor, Parish of Orleans."

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Kristen.
Just a couple more comments before we actually get into the pre-EO ITEP applications. This is to remind everyone, and I'm going read this just so I don't miss anything, but in an effort to better understand the landscape of pre-EO applications that may continue to be presented to this Board for approval, LED initiated a survey last year that ended in December of 2019. Many you will recall, at the February Board meeting, LED reported on the results of the survey and made a recommendation that the Board start questioning companies seeking approval of pre-EO applications for status of the project, confirming the investment was contemplated at the time that the advance was filed and report on the future of the project, that means whether
the project had additional phase applications for the project that may be presented to the Board in future years.

The board accepted LED's recommendation, and examination of pre-EO applications began at the June 2020 Board meeting and will continue.

If you will look at the transcript from the June meeting, the minutes of the June meeting starting about Page 43, you'll see there was, in fact, robust discussion about these pre-EO applications.

Now, I'm not sure how we -- the lawyer's letter, that was the longest letter that Ms. Kristen read for us, has some allegation concerning the constitutionality of what this Board does and, in fact, this entire system of the Industrial Tax Exemption Program.

Can I -- do we need to address that now or do we -- we want to handle that on a case-by-case basis?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I think case by case.
MR. JONES: Okay. All right. We'll handle them case by case as the need arises.

All right. Ms. Kristen, are you up for pre-EO or Hud? Is that -- okay. Thank you. If you will, walk us down those pre-EO applications.

MR. USIE: We have 22 pre-EO applications.

We have six that have requested deferral. They are all of the Marathon Petroleum Company, LP applications in St. John the Baptist Parish: 20141606, 20141606-A, 20141609, 20141610-A, 20152023 and 20152026.

MR. JONES: All right. We have a request for deferral of these Marathon Petroleum Company applications.

Is there a motion?
We have a motion from Ms. Davis, a second from Dr. Wilson deferring these applications at this time.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public? I know I have some comments -- Mr. Bagert, I know you wanted to speak to the Marathon matter.

Mr. Bagert, if you'll state your name and your address for the record, please, it will be helpful.

MR. BAGERT: Sure. I'd like to distribute a document here if that's okay.

My name is Broderick Bagert. I'm with Together Louisiana.

I just want to describe what appears to be happening with this application or one of these applications, two of these applications, because
deferring it doesn't address the concerns that we have got, which I would characterize as quite serious.

Advance Number 20141606, when you look it up in the LED's database, as that database stands in the present time, has information about an investment for which an advance notice was perceived on December 30th, 2014 for a project start date of January 1st, 2018 for Marathon Petroleum to install four new coker drums. It's unusual for an advance notice to be submitted four full years prior to commencement of the project unless it's a really large project that needs land acquisition or permitting.

On a couple of different occasions in 2017 and 2018, just in the course of our research into the Industrial Tax Exemption Program, we downloaded the entirety of advance notices in LED's system and looked at those records as they stood when the advances were submitted or at least as they stood in 2017 and 2018, and the same advance number has a project start date of January 1st, 2015, not January 1st, 2018, and the project listed on that advance is a U311 natural gas hydro freezer, not for new coker drums.

As is well known, the Governor, when he issued his Executive Order, drew a line of demarcation on June 24th, 2016, and any projects with advance
notices submitted prior to that date was grandfathered in. Any submitted subsequent to that date had new requirements, job creation requirements, a cap of 80 percent and a local approval process, which empowers the local entities who's tax money is being given away here, to have the final yes or no on these projects.

Marathon took its first exemption request subject to the local approval process to the St. John the Baptist School Board and parish council in November of last year, and they were rejected soundly. Between the two bodies, there was one vote for. It was unanimous at the parish council, and all but one member of the school board rejected it.

So why do we have this differentiation between what's currently in the system under the advance notice that Marathon submitted and a different one? Here's what appears to be happing is that for a new project, or at least one that was mentioned and initiated subsequent to the Executive Order, or which the Executive Order and the local approval process should apply, was submitted under a unrelated pre-Executive Order Advance Notice, and a document in the possession of LED was altered to make it appear that that pre-Executive Order Advance Notice, in fact, relates to this project that they're applying for today.

And the consequence of that is that if we had not discovered this, these two applications would be approved under the pre-Executive Order rules at 100 percent with no local input, $\$ 257-m i l l i o n ~ i n ~ p r o p e r t y, ~$ which, over a 10-year period, including depreciation, means \$43-million in public resources. They would not have had those approved at the local level.

This constitutes what I would only characterize as, to me, appearing to be fraud. To amend a public document in order to have a specific result that evades regulations that this state has put in place in order to obtain a benefit without the scrutiny that is required when it's clear the company and it's clear to, I think, everybody that Marathon is not going to be receiving those exemptions in the Parish of St. John the Baptist is a very serious thing. And the main question we've got is who altered the document, when did they alter it and who inside of LED knew that it was being altered?

MR. JONES: Let's see. Thank you, Mr. Bagert.

I have a Gail Buff.
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Okay. Larry Sorapuru. I hope I'm pronouncing your name right. If not, I apologize.

MR. SORAPURU: Sorapuru.
MR. JONES: Please state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. SORAPURU: Yes. Good morning. Larry Sorapuru, Junior, 502 Highway 18, Edgar, Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Thank you. Give us your comments, please.

MR. SORAPURU: Yes. I'm here this morning after seeing the headlines in the newspaper and after seeing all of the work Louisiana Together has been doing in trying to bring awareness about tax exemptions in the State of Louisiana.

I look at my parish, as being a former councilman in St. John Parish, that money could be used for a lot infrastructure, for fire hydrants, fire protection. We're trying to build a community center on the West Bank of that community of St. John Parish. We have a lot of youth. We have some youth that got together to form a fishing organization, a fishing club. These young men are trying to go out, they got awards for fishing in different tournaments across the State of Louisiana. So I just want to make this known for the record that the money that St. John Parish could use, the money that we're giving Marathon and other companies that are getting these massive tax exemptions, could be
used to help our youth, to help the elderly, for fire protection, for our streets.

So I just want to make sure we understand fully that these big businesses are financed with big money on Wall Street. They get bonuses on performance. Don't leave us out in the cold.

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

I have no other cards. Is there anyone else from the public who wishes to speak on this matter?

Ms. Tam Bourgeois.
MS. BOURGEOIS: Good morning. Tam Bourgeois, executive counsel for LED.

I just want to make a couple of comments to get a couple of things straight for the record. Together Louisiana often comes to LED with questions about issues they have with applications that will come before you. We vet them all. We oftentimes can resolve them in advance of the meeting. This one in particular came to us via a meeting request yesterday afternoon, so we just got it.

We will look into it. The company requested the deferral. I would think because they want to look into when and what was potentially changed. We're just
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not sure because we just got this information late yesterday.

I do want to be clear that $I$ have confirmed with staff that there is no indication that any changes were requested after the locals denied Marathon's last application. So I do want to be clear about that.

Based on preliminary investigation, it appears that there was -- the last real active on this advance or application was in December of 2018.

Just the last thing $I$ want to reiterate is what Chairman Jones spoke to earlier, that's why we have been recommending that you start looking at these pre-EO applications to address questions of this nature. We'll do what we can in advance, and if you find ones where you have questions that we can't answer for you here on the day of a Board meeting, we'll go back and we'll get you your answers. But we do think it's important that the companies have an opportunity to come to you and explain the history of their project, if there are differences in past documents to today's documents, why and what the nature of those are.

So that's really all. I just wanted to kind of let you know where we are from the Department's standpoint.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Bourgeois.

Anyone else from the public that wishes to speak?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Just to be clear, is there
anyone here from Marathon that wishes to speak?
Yes.
MR. WALTZER: Thank you for your patience.
MR. JONES: Please state your name for the record.

MR. WALTZER: Joel Waltzer, counsel for Together Louisiana.

We think that the more appropriate action at this point is probably to straight deny these exemptions. If we know when the record was changed and we've got it down to a specific date, then $I$ would say we also know who changed the record.

My other -- and I think you should find out that information. You know, that kind of metadata will be on the database. That's, you know, somebody's immediate computer, somebody's hand did it.

My other concern is to what extent, I mean, if this was in error or if this has been changed, then your body relies on this database. Don't we need to stop for a moment on all of these pre-EO -- it's not that many, but these pre-EO applications to make sure
that they match, that they have not been changed in an effort or -- that they actually are describing the same project with the same investments, that it legitimately relates back.

So we would urge that these just simply be denied as obviously foul play has been involved, and these are not the same projects; right, on the merits. We don't need to wait for that. We already know that. And that we defer -- what we actually defer is action on the other items to make sure that they're properly done.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
Any other comments or questions?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the Board? Before us right now is a motion to defer one, two, three, four, five, six Marathon projects.

Yes, Senator Fields.
MR. FIELDS: And I don't know how this works. I pressed the button. I didn't see a light.

MR. JONES: Just wave your hand at me and I'll...

MR. FIELDS: I think -- I mean, obviously I think Mr. Bagert made some very serious allegations, and I think that the young lady -- and I apologize. I'm just a designee for the day. Can you make sure that
those allegations that were made, that we verify that there is no truth to it before we move forward at any point in the future, and I'm just here for today, as it relates to the Marathon?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Absolutely.
MR. JONES: Ms. Bourgeois.
MR. FIELDS: All right. And have you seen any evidence that would suggest that there was any alteration of any documents up to this point?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I haven't had a chance to look at any documents, but I certainly do not have any evidence, and there's no, you know, suggestion by what little we were able to look at in advance that anything was done in an unauthorized or fraudulent manner. And I think we do need to be careful when we start throwing terms like that around.

MR. HOLLEY: I have a question.
MR. JONES: Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: Please, ma'am, can you give to me an explanation as to why certain property was initially submitted to the governing authorities under St. John the Baptist Parish and then later added to a prior application number?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I think we're talking about two separate projects, so $I$ don't think that that is
happening. There was a separate project that was considered by the Board, and then I'm understanding eventually denied by the locals. That's separate and apart from the applications that are on today's agenda that are seeking to be deferred.

MR. HOLLEY: Do you know if it was the same equipment or property?

MS. BOURGEOIS: No, it would not be.
MR. HAVERTY: I have a question. Do you know, in your research, or if we do defer this, can you go back and look and see when, where and how it was changed, if it was, and who would have authorized that change?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Those are all certainly steps we'll take. I can't -- I don't understand the database, and we have technical people who look into all that, but those are certainly questions that we'll be seeking to have answers for.

MR. HAVERTY: I mean, I would assume you would have a password you have to use to go in to make these changes, so we can forensically look and see who made the changes and -- or maybe not who made them, but why they were made, and -- at that point and get back to us and let us know before we take any action after it's -- I guess it's going to be deferred. I mean, I'm
assuming it will be, but can you get that information to us before we hear this again?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I believe so. I do not want to make 100 percent promises, but that is what we're venturing to do.

MR. HAVERTY: I would like to put a request in, please, as a member, if you can get that information to me and the rest of the members, when, who and how and who authorized the changes.

MS. BOURGOIS: Yes, sir.
MR. HAVERTY: Thank you.
MS. COLA: Question.
MR. JONES: Yes, ms. Cola.
MS. COLA: So obviously there was some sort of anomaly in terms of the Marathon applications, we acknowledged that; correct?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I'm not sure yet. I haven't been able to look at any of it.

MS. COLA: Okay. So there's something that has occurred --

MS. BOURGEOIS: Correct.
MS. COLA: -- that caused some questions to be asked?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Yes.
MS. COLA: So I guess my question goes to
then the remaining applications. How can we have some sort of comfort or be assured that the incident or the event is limited to Marathon? I think that goes to the question that the earlier gentleman asked.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Well, I think my suggestion would be to let's go ahead and look at what happened with Marathon, and then, as we have, you know, done in the past, we can come back with a recommendation of what we can do about potential future issues that might arise similarly.

MS. COLA: So then -- just to add to that, so then we don't know then if whatever has happened is impacting the other applications?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I don't know how it's impacted the Marathon applications, and, so, therefore, I don't know if it can impact the others. I just don't have enough information sitting here today.

MS . COLA: Okay.
MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. We have pending before us the motion to defer these Marathon applications. Are we ready to vote?

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

Okay. Mr. Usie, please walk us through the balance.

MR. USIE: 20130429-B-PT, Cameron LNG, LLC, Calcasieu Parish; 20130429-C, Cameron LNG, LLC, Cameron Parish; 20130429-C-PT, Cameron LNG, LLC, Calcasieu Parish; and 20130429-D, Cameron LNG, LLC, Cameron Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. I'll entertain a motion on these four Cameron LNG.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: I have a motion from Mr. Moss; second from Dr. Wilson.

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

Ms. Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: My name is Lady Carlson, 7640 LaSalle, and I'm in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. And I am speaking in opposition to this. Cameron Parish,

Calcasieu Parish have just gone through devastating hurricanes, two back to back. They are now -- they're requesting money from across the country to help them recover, and that we would consider anything that takes away money from those parishes I think is just beyond imagination. It does not make sense. Folks can't go to school, they need the libraries. We can't keep giving away money like this, and so we're asking you to deny.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Carlson.
Mr. Bagert.
MR. BAGERT: Yes. I'm Broderick Bagert again here with Together Louisiana. This gets to the same matter we just discussed with Marathon. These are advance notices submitted in 2013, parts B, C -- I mean, C-D, all on exemptions that have already been approved. It looks a lot like our hurricane year. And the question is, under the way these are being considered, could Cameron Parish ever be required to pay property taxes on its new investments? Because it sure looks like it can always keep on submitting more and more parts under pre-Executive Order advance notices.

Cameron parish has the highest ad valorem property per capita in the State of Louisiana. It's got the fifth highest property tax rate. Why? Because

paid 13,000 in property taxes. It is 99.98 percent tax exempt. And continuing to allow advance notices submitted now seven years prior when we have just seen an apparent instance of a company submitting an advance notice -- or submitting an application under an advance notice that wasn't related. In this case, they can just keep on submitting additional parts that are amended to reflect the current investments. These aren't investments that were initiated prior to the Governor's Executive Order. They were investments that were initiated subsequent to the Governor's Executive Order.

So at what point conceivably can Cameron Parish be required to begin submitting advance notices on its projects that reflect what they are, which is current day investments? Every one of the investments that are being considered here was initiated subsequent to the Executive Order, tucked inside the skin of a grandfathered-in advance notice in order to evade the local input process that this Board and the Governor has established.

We were fine with the provision the Governor and this Board adopted to grandfather in companies that already had their advance notice. Did we love it? No. But does a world exist for compromise? Never in a thousand years would be have imagined that, now, four
and a half years on, companies would be continuing to make new investments initiated subsequent to that order be allowed to continue to act as they too were grandfathered in. They should not be because they were initiated subsequent to the passing of that order.

We think these ought to be either rejected or deferred and that investigation into how and whether this kind of abuse that Marathon apparently is doing is considered. Also, just establishing a hard line. From now on -- we're four and a half years in. From now on, everything is subject to the Executive Order and the amended rules, in particular, anything that has an investment that was initiated subsequent to that. It is subterfuge.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Before you go, you said something $I$ want to be sure $I$ understand. You said that the way this goes, they would never pay taxes again.

MR. BAGERT: Correct. Property taxes on new investments.

MR. JONES: I understand.
As I appreciate it, as the $A$ rolls off after 10 years, they will pay taxes; is that correct? And as $B$, when 10 years runs, they'll start paying taxes, and as $C$ rolls off, they'll start paying taxes.

MR. BAGERT: They'll pay taxes if they report it. That's not an idle concern. It is routine that companies, even after the 10 years --

MR. JONES: Okay. Let's assume in good faith instead of bad faith. Okay? Let's do that.

MR. BAGERT: What basis is there to assume good faith around this project?

MR. JONES: Mr. Bagert, you're out of order. Mr. Bagert, you're out of order. I've asked a question, and I'm trying to understand, because you said something that was pejorative, and I'm trying to make sure this Board is clear.

Under the way these projects work, there's a 10 -year exemption, and when the 10 years rolls off, they start paying taxes thereafter. So your comment that they will never pay taxes is intellectually dishonest.

MR. BAGERT: Mr. Jones, you're mischaracterizing my comment. My comment was under the way that this Board is considering these exemptions, Cameron LNG would never have to have new investments that are subject to the reforms. They would --

MR. JONES: That's not what you said.
MR. BAGERT: I said that if they would be able to continue to make investments and they would never have these new projects be subject to the reforms
because they can continue to tuck them into older advance notices as though these were part of projects that were initiated prior to the Executive Order, and they're not.

Now, there is a very deep problem with property that does not roll on after 11 years, and if $I$ overreacted, I apologize for that. It is because you see it is routine, it is absolutely routine that after 11 years of being 100 percent exempt, assessors office lose track of that property. And we can show you company after company after company where there's no way to explain how there's not an increase in ad valorem property on the tax rolls after the 10 years. So that assumption of that happening is we think is wrong. But even if it does, why should a company, and only this company; right, not be subject to the rules that all the other companies have? Which is if they're initiating new projects, they ought to be subject to the rules that are in place at the time and not allow it to tuck them into advance notices that were submitted prior that allows them to evade local control. That's a problem that we think needs to be addressed.

MR. JONES: Okay. You're now repeating yourself. Mr. Bagert, the reason we're doing the review that we're doing, the very thing -- the comments I read
into the record at the beginning of this process is we're asking these companies to come in and explain. We're trying to meet the very objection that you're raising. Is come explain to us what's happening and what the future is so that this Board can be aware and we can place on the record what the plans are so we all know. We're trying to be as transparent as we know how to be, and so I know that doesn't meet with your group's approval, but we're doing the best we can. I'm sorry you're displeased with it.

MR. BAGERT: What's hard to understand is why, if you're engaging that process and see the need for it, you would also be approving exemptions without that analysis and review having taken place. In fact, at the time when the most egregious instance of a failure of that very process has just come forth -which, by the way, we found out yesterday; right? We were not waiting till the last minute. I mean, we discovered it yesterday. In that context, it seems more appropriate to at least defer these until there's some clarity of whether the advance notice process is being misused.

MR. JONES: Thank you for your comments. Someone from Cameron is here, I presume. Can we make room for -- we apologize for the awkwardness
of the setup, but we're trying to honor the desire to social distance.

MR. LEONARD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: State your name and your address for the record, please.

MR. LEONARD: Yes, sir. My name is Jimmy Leonard. I'm with Advantous Consulting. I live at 2813 Belle Cherie Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

I'm here before you representing Cameron LNG. I feel that we have a very clear, a very sound explanation and a very valid reason for being before the Board here today with these applications.

Cameron LNG in 2013 came before this Board with a 9-billion, three train liquefaction project prior to the corporation making a final investment decision as to where they were going to make this investment in the world. They came before this Board, they needed some stability and some security that the ITEP was going to be available to them. That Board granted a contract. Not just an advance notification, but the Board granted approval of an application. The Governor executed a contract for this project, and that project has been underway every since.

As previously stated by Mr. Bagert, there is a long federal permitting process, there is long land
acquisition process, there is also a very long construction process for a \$9-billion investment.

What is coming before you today are the assets that the company has placed in service during its 10 years of construction so that no individual asset or group of assets receives any more than the 10 years of exemptions that were originally approved by this Board and entered into contract with them.

We are here procedurally today. There is a contract in place where the State of Louisiana has committed this exemption to Cameron LNG, and we are excited to tell you guys that the \$3-billion application is the first of three trains going into service. They have remained committed to this project and to the state just by a long and very expensive project, and we are very concerned that there are such serious allegations that are being made about this good organization who has done so many great things for Cameron Parish, Calcasieu Parish and Southwest Louisiana.

And fact be known that the original investment made by this organization was an import facility, not an export facility. Its 10-year exemption expired at 12/31/2019, and there is a \$12-million tax payment that Cameron LNG will be making in 2020 because the ITEP expired. And I think it's very important to
know that the Cameron budget for the entire parish last year was less than $\$ 40-\mathrm{million}$.

So with a little support, a little patience there is a very significant, long-term revenue stability revenue-generating factor that investing in ITEP can provide for communities.

And with me here today, I'll let Nicole introduce herself.

MS. FRIES: Good morning, Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Nicole Fries, and I am representing Cameron LNG.

Just to continue to reiterate what Jimmy has spoken to you about, we did apply and receive approval from the Board for the construction of our multibillion dollar three train liquefaction facility that resides in both Cameron and Calcasieu Parishes. We did execute our ITEP contract with the Governor in July of 2013. We sought this ITEP approval prior to making our final investment decision to proceed with the project. It was a key variable in our decisionmaking process. Obviously our project did receive approval, and we have been under construction ever since.

Our applications before you today are procedurally necessary to ensure that the actual dollar amount and the exemption periods are properly
documented.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. LEONARD: Forgive me, if I may. One last comment. As the rules that have been promulgated in 2018 that govern this program in which all parties who have interest in this program came to work together to reach, it clearly sates in Section 501, Statement of Purpose, New Rules, B, Louisiana honors its commitments and the rules governing existing contracts and applications not subject to the new rules are not (sic) to be interpreted in order to promote fairness and commitment to the companies.

MR. JONES: Mr. Leonard, to be clear, and maybe this is too simplistic, and if it is, forgive me, but there are four item numbers on the agenda and each one has a -- there's a B, a C, a CPT and a D. That implies, to me at least, that there are four different parts of this first train. Is that -- am I correct in interpreting it that way?

MR. LEONARD: There are two parishes, each parish requires it's own contract, so you have an application for the equipment that resides in Cameron Parish, and you have an application for the equipment that reside in Calcasieu Parish. This project just so happens to cross the parish lines, so that is why you
see applications in duplicate for the same period. And the majority of the equipment is in Cameron Parish for the applications you have here today, and the other applications represent other pieces of equipment supporting the manufacturing process that are in Calcasieu Parish as well.

MR. JONES: But, again, all of this is part of the first train?

MR. LEONARD: All of this is part of a three-train, pre-approved project, and this is the first train and the equipment supporting it that have gone into service.

MR. JONES: Okay. So I understand that there's a three-train approval in the original contract, but what I'm trying to understand is the applications before us today are part of the first train?

MR. LEONARD: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: It's not part of a second and third train?

MR. LEONARD: No, sir. That is correct.
MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Did you have something to add?

MR. LEONARD: There are some of the common facilities that will support all three trains that go into service.

MR. JONES: Administrative buildings or whatever?

MR. LEONARD: We have docks, we have the administrative facility, yes, sir.

MR. JONES: Okay. Understood. Thank you for that clarification. That helps me.

All right. We have a motion to approve these four applications. Do we have any further comments or questions from the Board?

Yes, sir. Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: I have a question. This first train received a tax exemption in what year?

MR. LEONARD: Okay. That's a great question, sir.

So the way property taxes work is property is subject to taxation January 1 the year following the property goes into operation, goes into service. So the effective date of this exemption would be January 1 , 2021, and it will receive an exemption from 10 years thereafter.

Property is not subject to exemption due to a constitutional exemption regarding construction work and process. So during construction, your property is not subject to tax. As soon as it goes into operation, it does go onto the tax rolls, and that's exactly why
you have one train now, so we can start the 10 years January 1 of 2021, and when the additional trains go into service, we will be right back before this Board, if it happens in 2020, seeking the same approval.

Everything before you today was originally contemplated and presented to the Board in the original applications of 2013.

MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Are we ready to vote?
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Thank you very much.

While disinfecting is going on, something $I$ never thought $I$ would say chairing a meeting, I'm looking to the Board for the Board's pleasure. It's 11 o'clock. My inclination is to forge ahead. If the Board wants to take a break at some point, y'all can revolt and let me know and we'll do so, but I'm going to forge ahead until $y$ 'all start telling me that $y$ 'all want to take a break. Is that fair?

Mr. Usie, please lead us on.
MR. USIE: Next we have 20160361-B, Gravois Aluminum Boats, LLC in St. Mary Parish; and 20161507-B, Gravois Aluminum Boats, LLC in Iberia parish.

MR. JONES: Do we have a motion concerning these applications?

I have a motion from Mr. Allain; second from Ms. Davis.

First let's go ahead and get the -- do we have a company rep here from Gravois?

Frank, can we make sure there's not someone outside?

While Frank is checking on that, are there any questions or comments from the Board concerning these two applications?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Do we have any other questions or comments from the public concerning these two applications?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. We have a motion and a second, no comments from the public, no comments from the Board. Are we ready to vote?

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Hearing none, that motion
carries.
Next .
MR. USIE: Next we have 20160760, Honeywell
International in Ascension Parish.
MR. JONES: Entertain a motion.
We have a motion from Mr. Havard; second from Ms. Malone.

Do we have someone here from Honeywell
International?
Please state your name and your position with the company, please.

MR. SMITHHART: I'm Casey Smithhart. I'm the plant manager of the Honeywell UOP plant here in Baton Rouge.

MR. JONES: All right. Thank you.
MS. SIMS: Phyllis Sims with the law firm of Kean Miller representing Honeywell.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
Tell us a little bit about the project, how it's going and what the future holds.

MR. SMITHHART: Okay. These project are required -- we're required to produce
environmentally-friendly refrigerants for automobiles, new automobiles, the air conditioning systems, and they're all in place and complete and progressing well.

MR. JONES: Do you anticipate there will be additional applications coming before this Board relating to that original advance notification?

MR. SMITHHART: I believe there may be other steps and work that was completed already, there may be some in the future.

MS. SIMS: Mr. Chairman, yes, to answer your question. In connection with this application, no, there are no other applications related to this advance notification.

MR. JONES: Okay. This advance notification.

MS. SIMS: This advance notification, correct.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. SIMS: There are other pre-EO applications pending, but nothing related to this advance notification.

MR. JONES: All right. Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from
the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, if we're ready to vote, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion carries.

MR. SMITHHART: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you. Appreciate you being here.

MS. SUIE: Next we have 20100198-D, Sabine Pass LNG, LP, in Cameron Parish; 20110679-G, Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC, Cameron Parish; 20110659-H, Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC, Cameron Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion for these three.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: Mr. Moss; second from Ms. Davis.
Do we have someone here from Sabine Pass?
MS. CHENG: We also received a letter from them. Do you want us to read it in?

MR. JONES: Please.
MS. CHENG: Okay. We received a letter from

Sabine Pass as well.
MR. JONES: Are we going to do that in lieu, instead of $y^{\prime}$ all making comments?

MS. CHENG: Both. They wanted to do both.
MR. JONES: Okay. Why don't you read the letter while they're getting settled.

MS. CHENG: "Dear Chairman Jones and Members of the Louisiana Board of Commerce \& Industry, in response to request of the Board during its February meeting this year concerning pre-Executive Order applications, we're pleased to provide this project update in advance of the November meeting. We will have a representative of Cheniere at the meeting should you have further question.

Cheniere's Louisiana journey began in 2005 with the construction of an LNG import facility at Sabine Pass LNG terminal located in Cameron Parish in Southwest Louisiana. Today, the facility's five operating LNG production units, also referred to as trains, five storage tanks and two berths comprise the largest LNG export facility in the United States and the second largest in the world, through which we are reliably and safely producing and exporting a cleaner fuel to power the world.

This facility represents more than

20-billion in investment and employs 500 full-time personnel and approximately 450 full-time contractors.

In 2019, Cheniere paid more than $\$ 16-m i l l i o n$
in property taxes in Cameron Parish representing over 33 percent of total property taxes in the parish.

With respect to its pre-Executive Order advance, Contract 20110659-ITE, Cheniere has completed construction of five liquefaction trains and related infrastructure. Construction continues on a sixth liquefaction train and a third berth, which are expected to be complete in 2022 and 2023 respectively. With the addition of the sixth train, total production from this facility is expected to be approximately $30-\mathrm{million}$ tons of LNG per year, processing more than 4.7-million cubic feet of natural gas per day.

We seek to operate in a socially-responsible manner, engage their surrounding communities in meaningful ways and provide support where it's needed most. We live and work in these communities, and we never lose sight of the powerful positive impact we can create there.

Cheniere has a long-term partnerships with governmental education and charitable institutions and organizations in the communities surrounding our facility. The company has a history of supporting
organizations focused on education, including scholarships provided annually to the graduating seniors from Johnson Bayou High School, sponsorship of the Robotic Education \& Competition Foundation in an apprenticeship program established in partnership with SOWELA.

Cheniere also contributes to multiple organizations focused on conservation like Restore America's Estuaries, the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Foundation, the Building Conservation Trust and Cameron Parish Alliance, which is restoring the Sabine Pass lighthouse.

In response to the many needs arising from the Coronavirus pandemic, the company donated more than $\$ 200,000$ to local organizations focused on food and security, educational support and healthcare needs. Cheniere also partnered with Project Cure to hold medical PPE drives and donated medical PPE to 13 Southwest Louisiana health organizations during the peak of COVID-19.

Immediately following Hurricane Laura, Cheniere pledged $\$ 1-\mathrm{million}$ to local organizations including the Community Foundation of Southwest Louisiana, the Calcasieu Cameron Hospital Foundation, the Louisiana Community and Technical College System,
the Second Harvest Food Bank. This amount increased to 1.125-million, which Cheniere's Board, senior executives and employees also contributed their own personal funds to help increase our recovery response.

Through an employee supply drive and a successful joint supply drive with the Houston Astros Foundation, we were able to deliver two semi-trailer trucks full of supplies to the Catholic Charities of Lake Charles along with a substantial amount of supplies to the community of Johnson Bayou. Additionally, our employees have volunteered in excess of 2,500 hours supporting relief organizations, fellow employees and communities as they work to recover from an unprecedented hurricane season.

In 2019, Cheniere issued it's Inaugural Corporate Responsibility Report, which has dedicated a chapter to further showcase some of the company's recent community efforts. This report is available online. We view strong community relations as essential to our business, and as a responsibile corporate citizen, we work with our communities throughout all stages of a project lifecycle from early development through permitting, construction and operation.

Cheniere is committed to continue its priority of creating positive impacts in supporting the
communities where we live and work for decades to come.
Respectfully submitted, Andrea
Carter-Virtanen, Senior Counsel, Tax."
MR. JONES: Thank you.
Would you like to speak? I have some questions.

Go ahead and state your name for the record so we can have it in the record, please.

MS. MILLER: Amy Miller with Cheniere Energy.

MR. JONES: Thank you. And, Rhonda.
MS. BOATNER: Rhonda Boatner with Didier Consultants representing Cheniere.

MR. JONES: All right. Similar to the questions that $I$ was asking Mr. Leonard about Cameron LNG, I notice on these three applications they have the designation of $D, G$ and $H$, which indicate to me we're way up in the alphabet. Were these all part of the original advance notification?

MS. BOATNER: They are. This application was part of a six train pre-approval application that the Board approved many years ago. And, actually, the 20110659-G is the fifth train application, and so we are -- as Mr. Leonard spoke earlier, as assets are completed and placed in service, so they don't get more
than a 10-year exemption, each year those assets, an application is put in for those assets.

So if we were to wait until train six were completed, is under construction now, assets that are being actually operated or could be operational this year could possibly enjoy longer than a 10-year exemption. So that's why you see so many letters behind this number is because these assets, as they come online, we have to put an application for them annually.

MR. JONES: Okay. Since I don't do this the way you guys do this every day, to make sure I understand, as a portion of the facility is completed, construction is completed and the EPC contractor hands the project to the owner, at that point in time is when an application is actually made with LED; is that correct?

MS . BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: And that's when the 10 years for that component part of the train becomes part of the tax record; is that correct?

MS. BOATNER: Correct, so it will not enjoy any more than a 10-year exemption.

MR. JONES: So 10 years from -- when that part of the train is operational or is available for operation, that 10 years starts running?

MS . BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have any of the Cheniere facilities that where the 10 years have already run?

MS. BOATNER: Most definitely. For the regas, and that's in the letter Andrea mentioned that
 some of the assets from the original import facility, the exemption has ended, and they're now paying their property taxes.

MR. JONES: Right.
MS . BOATNER: Yes.
MR. JONES: So as these different portions of facility come online, an application comes to the Board, we consider it, and that starts the 10-year period running?

MS . BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: Got it.
Y'all may have all understood that clearly. I want to be clear on it.

Yes, Ms. Cola.
MS. COLA: Quick question. But all the components of the applications are included with the initial application, so no matter when the units or the trains come off -- completed for construction, that's
when the application process starts; however, the entire project, including all aspects of it, are included in the initial application; is that correct?

MS. BOATNER: It was the amount that was an estimate prior to final investment decision and prior to the EPC contract being let, so, yes, it was an estimate at the very beginning, but as these trains are completed and we get actual numbers, that's when these applications are submitted and then we submit an affidavit of final cost, which actually trues up that application number.

MR. JONES: Ms. Boatner, is it unusual -when the company comes to LED and they've got an idea, at that point they haven't even completed their initial engineering, I presume. Is that fair?

MS . BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: At that point, so what they bring to LED is an estimate, truly an estimate, not even based on engineering at that point?

MS. BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: So the numbers can change once engineering is completed, the matter's put out for bid, the EPC contractor says this is how much it's really going to cost, and sometimes that's a "Yay" and something that's an "Oh, my."

MS. BOATNER: Correct.
MR. JONES: And so the actual number can change from the advance notification?

MS. BOATNER: It will. And we have to provide supporting documentation to LED with asset listings to show each of those assets. So in the very beginning, it is an estimate, but in the end, when the application is submitted and the affidavit of final cost is submitted, that provides the actual cost.

MR. JONES: That is the real number.
MS. BOATNER: That's right.
MR. JONES: And that's the number that goes on the tax roll.

MS. BOATNER: Correct, at a depreciated value.

MR. JONES: I got you. Thank you.
Mr. Nassar.
MR. NASSAR: So year 11 when the assets do come online, is it fair to say that normally they come on the tax rolls at about 40 percent of the original value?

MS. BOATNER: I don't have those --
MR. NASSAR: Without any economic out- -- in other words, that would be strictly because of the depreciation of the equipment?

MS. BOATNER: They will go on the rolls at a 10-year value, so there would be a depreciated value. Whatever the rate is for those assets, their depreciated value at 10 years.

MR. NASSAR: Because I've seen, you know, locally, and in our parish, where a lot of times when it does come on the tax rolls, it's at about 40 percent. That's why I was asking.

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

Mr. Bagert.
Thank y'all very much.
MR. BAGERT: I just want to be clear what we're flagging. Yeah, Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. BAGERT: If this were a new plant, let's say a refinery or a plastics plant, that submitted an advance notice, then once that plant is finished and it made subsequent investments to that same facility, those subsequent investments would be subject to the Executive Order and the local approval process; right? That's
under the scenario that has been in place for the vast majority of projects.

In this case, five trains is the whole facility; right? And there will be additional capital investments and upgrades and things that add value to that property after the project is done.

What we're saying is when does the new regime apply to those investments on that facility? And it's not clear based on the procedure in place right now how to begin to apply. In fact, it seems that you can come up and say "Well, we're making an investment into one of these five trains, so the original contract applies"; right? But that's not the way it with other facilities. Once they've finished their project, if it's in 2017, and then they do, you know, a turnaround or an upgrade or investments that add value in 2018 and 2019, those are subject to local approval.

What we want to flag to be figured out is how does that start with these LNG plants that have multiple parts or are we saying that they are going to be allowed any perpetuity $10,20,30,40$ years to continue to avoid any local approval process? When does the new regime start and what's the procedural process for that? Because investments will always apply to these five trains. That's the entirety of the
expansion.
So just to try to articulate with more precision what concern we're trying to flag, that's the one we're trying to flag and hope that the Board will consider figuring out what the procedure is going to be to distinguish those, that when that starts.

MR. JONES: That's actually very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Bagert.

Ms. Boatner.
MS. BOATNER: I would like to make a comment on that, please. Just to correct him, there are six trains related to this project, and we have already had meetings and discussions with LED to let them know that Cheniere is going to follow the new rules once train six ends. We will -- you know, if there are any additions that require an advance notification, they will fall under the new rules, and we will -- once this project, the final train is complete, that we will -- we will end this contract.

One thing I would like to point out, too, is when the application, the very first application was approved, these projects take a very long time, you know, from the engineering and the planning and financing. They had to get this initial contract to support the financing of the project. So whenever they
go to their investors, they have to say "We're going to have this exemption." So that's part of this process is in getting these applications at the very beginning with an estimate. And so I just wanted to point that out as well, and I'll be happy to answer any questions if anybody has any other questions.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
Any questions or any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, are we ready to vote?

All right. On the Cheniere Sabine Pass projects, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There appearing none, that motion carries.

MR. USIE: Next we have 20150910-B, Shintech Louisiana, LLC, Iberville Parish; and 20161478-B, Shintech Louisiana, LLC, West Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. Is there a motion on the Shintech project?

We have a motion from Mr. Toups; second from Mr. Havard.

Any questions or comments from the Board first?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Do we have a representative here from Shintech?

Please come forward.
Again, if you would state your name and your position with the company, please.

MR. MASON: Yes, sir. My name is Richard Mason. I'm Advisor to the President of Shintech, Incorporated, and I live in Houston, Texas.

MR. BRADFORD: And I'm Jerry Bradford, Director of Credit, Plaquemine, Louisiana.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
Do you wake want to make any preliminary comments?

MR. MASON: Certainly. Happy to talk about both of these projects. These are the build-outs of our Addis, Louisiana plant to expand the reactors from a total of four to six.

MR. JONES: I'm going to ask you to step a
little bit closer to the mic. I can't hear anybody, so just please help me out.

MR. MASON: I have precisely the same problem, so I get yelled at a lot.

This is the build-outs of our Addis, Louisiana plant to expand it from four to six reactors and the build-out of our Plaquemine EDC VC plants to expand them from four to five furnaces. This completes both these projects. Both of them are up and running. Very happy with our local employment, very happy with our minority employment percentage, which runs fairly close to 38 percent, which is representative of the two parishes that we reside in, Iberville and West Baton Rouge Parish.

We have already started a new project to further expand our capacity, which is subject to the new rules. I believe these are the last two things that we're doing under the old rules.

MR. BRADFORD: Yeah. And I'd like to add, the current project did go before local authorities, and there was unanimous support.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. BRADFORD: Shintech's very proud of its investment in Louisiana and continues to do well.

MR. JONES: Very good. Thank you.

To make sure I'm clear on that, so this is the last application under this advance notification?

MR. BRADFORD: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: The other one that's being done at the site will be under the new rules and a new advance notification?

MR. BRADFORD: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: That's precisely what we needed to know.

Any questions or comments from these gentlemen from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Thank you very much.
It seems as though we're ready to vote.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, motion
carries.
Next, Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: 20111126-B, UTLX Manufacturing,

LLC, Rapides Parish; 20161514, UTLX Manufacturing, LLC, Rapides Parish.

MR. JONES: I would entertain a motion.
Dr. Wilson motion to approve, and a second from Mr. Shexnaydre.

All right. We have a motion and a second. Do we have a representative from UTLX?

Please come forward.
If you will, state your name and your position with the company, please.

MS. LEONARD: Candace Leonard. I'm the VP of Finance for UTLX, Manufacturing.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you.
MS. WALLETT: Kim Wallett with Advantous Consulting representing UTLX Manufacturing.

MR. JONES: Any preliminary comments you would like to make?

MS. LEONARD: These are the last applications on this direct notice. The projects have been completed.

And just as a further note, we are very committed to our community, as can be seen recently with the closure of our Texas facility, and we're consolidating into Louisiana. So that wasn't on this directive, but $I$ just wanted to say that, you know,
we're very involved with our community and involved with the local LED and everything there and we're very proud of our community.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you very much.
Ms. Wallett, do you have anything you want
to add?
MS. WALLETT: No, sir.
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Seeing none, thank you. I think we're ready to vote.

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

Next, Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: 20160666-B, Westlake Vinyls
Company, LP, Ascension Parish.
MR. JONES: Do we have -- I'm sorry. First
of all, do we have a motion? Start with a motion.
Ms. Malone, motion to approve; second from
Mr. Wilson.
Do we have someone here from Westlake
Vinyls?
MR. SCROGGINS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Board members. My name is John Scroggins. I'm the plant manager for Westlake's Geismar facility.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much. Do you have any preliminary comments you would like to make?

MR. SCROGGINS: No. This will be the -- the one that we're talking about here is the last filing you'll see from this. That project is closed.

MR. JONES: Great. Okay.
MR. SCROGGINS: And the assets are in operation.

MR. JONES: Good.
Mr. Leonard, anything to add?
MR. LEONARD: No, sir.
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?

MR. WALTZER: Yes, sir.

MR. JONES: Come forward.
MR. WALTZER: Hello, again.
MR. JONES: State your name again.
MR. WALTZER: Joel Waltzer. Sorry.
Attorney and Together Louisiana.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. WALTZER: This also appears to have been an application that had been changed. On the record, you know, it had a previous start date a couple of years earlier that apparently has been modified. There is a rule of the Board of Commerce \& Industry that the application be made -- that if there is an advance notice and the year, the year expires, the advance notice will -- and a year -- and there's a year between the start date that's stated in the advance notice and the actual start date of construction, that that advance notice will be void, and so we need to be sure that we're applying the correct legal regime, because in a case like this, the advance notice has stated that construction would be sometime -- beginning sometime around 2016, and now the event, I believe the advance notice states that it would start sometime around 2018. That would be two years, which would mean that they would have to reapply or give a new advance notice for the old rules to apply.

Second thing is, you know, I don't know to what extent, but I would hope that you would ask. The rules prohibit pollution control equipment that is required by law from receiving upgrades, from receiving from receiving tax exemption, and it's impossible really to discern whether or not that's true. If there was a process in place that the LED had gone through, then $I$ would hope that it would tell you guys because, otherwise, it's impossible for you to know whether you're voting on property, you know, upgrades that have -- that meet the requirements of your own regulations.

And then, finally, $I$ did want to have a discussion at some point about the more global points that we had made in the letter. We're now in an application-by-application review of the ITE applications that are before you, and certainly your right, but, yet, the concerns that we've voiced about the process, about the information of record and decisions and written decisions and analysis being provided to you and the public, they all remain. And so I would reiterate that this objection goes to everyone, including the application before us.

MR. JONES: I think that was made clear in your correspondence, but $I$ appreciate you making us
aware of it again. Thank you very much.
Any questions or comments -- and forgive me, but how do you pronounce your last name?

MR. WALTZER: Like someone who Waltzes. Waltzer.

MR. JONES: Okay. Waltzer. Thank you very much.

MR. WALTZER: And, Ms. Davis, your mic is really far away. It's hard to hear you. I think -- was that...

MR. JONES: All right. Thank you very much.
All right. Do you want to have any reply or comment to...

You're welcome to.
MR. SCROGGINS: There's two points I would like to clarify.

Again, John Scroggins, plant manager for Westlake.

So the two points that were brought up, the time, length of time, I really wish on a \$134-million project I could snap my fingers and complete it in a year. That's not generally how it works in industry. So, again, engineering, you've got to find contractors, you've got to prep the site, you have to put assets in the ground, and it's a staged startup. So addressing
that point.
And then the comment about pollution control
equipment. That was not part of this ITEP exemption application. We will bring further things forward, but that was not a factor in this 0666 filing.

MR. JONES: There's a separate advance notification out there?

MR. SCROGGINS: Continued growth of our facility will address that. We did not expand the pollution control systems under that.

MR. JONES: Under this contract.
MR. SCROGGINS: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Got it. Okay.
All right. Mr. Leonard, anything else?
Ms. Bourgeois, do you have any comments?
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any further questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Appearing to be none, are we ready to vote?

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: No opposition. The motion
carries. Thank you very much.
Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: 20141117-B, YCI Methanol One, LLC, St. James Parish.

MR. JONES: The chair will be recusing himself from any discussion or vote on this particular application, but $I$ will entertain a motion.

MR. NASSAR: So moved.
MR. JONES: Motion from Mr. Nassar; second from Dr. Wilson.

Do we have representatives from the company?
State your name and your position with the company, please.

MR. GUIDRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, Members of the Board. Good morning. My name's George Guidry. I'm the Regional Manager of State Governmental Affairs for the Koch Companies Public Sector. I'm here representing Marc Hoss, who's Vice President of Manufacturing of YCI Methanol One, who had prepared to give you remarks this morning, but was unable to attend. Unfortunately the meeting has been changed a few times, and he had some other commitments he could not get out of.

So thank you for the opportunity to speak.
I wanted to kind of give you an update on the YCI project and a little bit of background on it. Some of you might not have heard about it.

This project began almost nine years ago when YCI's parent company, a privately-owned Fortune 500 Chinese manufacturing company, decided to take advantage of historic low natural gas prices and build a world-class chemical manufacturing facility in the United States. The focus was on the Gulf Coast since it has all of the critical infrastructure such a facility requires, such as deep water for international shipping, gas pipelines, available tracts of land, rail and highway infrastructure.

The focus was on Texas. The project went so far as to auction a piece of property there. However, after meeting with the good folks in LED, the company became convinced that Louisiana's programs, such as ITEP and Quality Jobs, were more sufficient and expedient than the Texas versions, and, moreover, the state's workforce and overall pro-business culture made Louisiana a better choice for YCI to achieve its goals.

At the time of the announcement, this project represented the largest investment in a greenfield project by a Chinese company on the Gulf

Coast, and we believe probably the entire country.
At the time of the announcement, this project represented the largest investment, and to put this in perspective, at the time, YCI was just a small, startup American company with just a handful of employees. Although financed by a Chinese company, they choose an American Citizen and former Shell Company executive to be the President and CEO. He led the company to make this truly American project build the American way with proper attention so safety and environmental protection, and then set about to build a significant Louisiana and U.S. success story.

So back in 2015, YCI purchased approximately 1,300 acres in St. James Parish on the West Bank of the Mississippi River and began the process of developing and building a world-class air liquide mega-methanol technology plant with the capability to produce 1.8-million metric tons of methanol annually.

As YCI moved from reliance upon Chinese contractors, which had never built anything in the United States, to top-tier American engineers and contractors, the project cost grew from the original estimate from 800-million to $\$ 1.8$-billion without changing -- and I want to repeat that -- without changing the scope of the project in any significant
fashion.
The increased costs brought about the need to bring in project financing and equity investors, and in doing so, ownership moved from a Chinese majority to an American majority. The majority now is Koch Methanol Investments, which is part of Koch Industries.

While our applications before you today addresses only the facility assets that have come online during the past year, we are pleased to announce that despite unexpected delays, like work stoppages arising from COVID-19 and hurricanes, we expect to be fully operational by the end of the year or shortly thereafter. In other words, the plant is almost complete.

YCI appreciates the support that LED and the state and St. James Parish has provided the project. And if you want, $I$ can go into a little bit about the financing as far as what we've been able to do so far, but when we broke ground in 2017, we've sought out and done business with approximately 100 Louisiana vendors, including names that you would all be familiar with of subcontractors like Epic Piping, MMR, Boh Bros., Turner, Remora, Brown \& Root and Cajun. So you can imagine the benefit to the Louisiana economy and these companies as they went about to support a $\$ 1.8-\mathrm{billi}$ n project.

We have delivered over 5-million
construction man hours on the project. It is a very large plant. YCI has about 100 direct and 80 indirect employees supporting construction as we speak, but our primary contractor had over 2,000 construction employees at the site. Even now, as we enter final phases of construction, we average around 1,200 construction employees on site.

As we move to operations, we are going to be having about 100 new direct jobs in Louisiana, an average annual salary of $\$ 100,000$. Of those 100,23 , approximately 25 percent, are residents of St. James Parish.

The tax impacts, YCI alone has delivered over 10-million in local sales and use tax in the state and St. James Parish, and that number grows significantly if we include the taxes paid by YCI's construction contractors and subcontractors.

From the time YCI purchased property in St. James Parish through the ITEP exemption period, the parish's annual property tax receipts relating to YCI will be equal to or greater than receipts prior to the purchase. And then when you look 20 years into the future, YCI will pay nearly $\$ 110-\mathrm{million}$ in property taxes. That's over that 20-year period, and that's
without any other additions or anything like that.
Our support goes beyond just providing good jobs and tax revenue in the state. We also want to be great community partners. In fact, what we want to do is be a preferred partner for St. James Parish. We are voluntarily joining the St. James Parish Emergency Management Center's Industrial Mutual Aid Program to enhance emergency service delivery and, in turn, safety in the area. We have contributed to and support the parish's summer programs for STEM education, and we will continue to -- we think we will continue to want to do that. It's a great program. We have contributed to charitable causes throughout the parish and will continue to do. We also contributed to the Community Foundation of Southwest Louisiana to provide relief to victims of Hurricane Laura.

To sum it up, any good business agreement should benefit both parties. I trust that what I've touched on today demonstrates that Louisiana's investment in YCI is a good one, and on behalf of our nearly 100 employees, we thank you for it.

I'm open to any questions.
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments for the company rep?

Ms. Malone.

MS. MALONE: Similar to the questions before that Chairman Jones has had, is this the last application that you'll see in the contract or are there more to come?

MR. GUIDRY: We're not finished with the project yet. These are for the assets that came online this year.

MS. MALONE: Right. But there are more to come? We just should expect more --

MR. GUIDRY: The bulk of the project is
yet --
MS. MALONE: To come?
MR. GUIDRY: -- go come.
MS. MALONE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. LEONARD: Jimmy Leonard with Advantous Consulting, 2813 Belle Cherie Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The project, if they conclude this year, will not result in a return back to the Board. If the project rolls into next year, as we talked earlier about this January 1 date is a very big date in the property tax world, then, yes, we would be back before the Board with the final application to conclude the project.

This year, the plans were to conclude this year, and, as we know, 2020 has been a little odd to say
the least, and we are on track and working hard to finish it up this year.

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

MS. CARLSON: I want to make a comment.
MR. JONES: Yes, Ms. Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: Lady Carlson, 7640 LaSalle, Baton Rouge.

And I just wanted to say this, there's a movie called Groundhog Day, and in that movie, everything keeps repeating and it doesn't -- nothing changes. And I'm just curious, I've been sitting here all morning, you approve everything. You approve everything. You're -- and it just amazes me. We are in the middle of a pandemic, we have economic problems in our communities, families are hurting, and you're approving all of these taxes exemptions like it means nothing. And I just feel like I'm in Groundhog Day, and I'd like to see you say "no" to something. And that's my comment.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Carlson.

Yes, ma'am. Please come forward.
MS. LEBOEUF: Good morning.
MR. JONES: State your name and address, please.

MS. LEBOEUF: I'm Gail Leboeuf. I'm from St. James Parish, and my comment is that -- my sentiments is that we need this ITEP money, but what we don't need and this ITEP money at the expense of the health and wealth of the people. My solidarity is with St. John the Baptist Parish in getting the ITEP money. Our school needs it. I know, Nassar, you and I grew up together. We know that we need this ITEP money. We know that our schools, our hospitals, and right now, we're fighting COVID. We definitely need for the next, not necessarily a pandemic, but we will have another Corona. It's almost automatic. Every five years, you have one.

We need all of this money to combat these things, but we don't need more plants in St. James Parish.

And that is my feelings on that.
MR. JONES: Thank you, ma'am.
Any other comments or questions from the public?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: Seeing none, we're ready to
vote.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion
carries.
Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: Next we have two new applications following the 2017 rules post-Executive Order. One is requesting deferral: 20170399, Plastipak Packaging in Rapides Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion for the deferral.

So moved by Ms. Davis; second from
Mr. Havard.
Is there anybody here from the company? I presume not.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: I think Mr. Bagert had signed up to speak.

No? Okay.
Any other questions or comments from the
public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, looks like we're ready to vote.

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, Plastipak Packing application is deferred.

Next .
MR. USIE: 20180120-A, Reliant Technologies Incorporated, West Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion.
Motion by Mr. Toups to approve; second from Dr. Wilson.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Ready to vote.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?


MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

MR. USIE: 20190070, A.W. Chesterton Company, Bossier Parish; 20180323-B, Bagwell Energy Services, Inc., Iberia Parish; 20190003, C\&C Marine and Repair, LLC, Plaquemines Parish; 20190082-A, Etheredge Electric Company, LLC in Calcasieu Parish; 20180514, Exxon Mobil Corporation (Lubes), West Baton Rouge Parish; 20180148-A, Flopam, Inc. in Iberville parish; 20190259, GMel, LLC in Tangipahoa Parish; 20190029, J\&R Juneau, LLC in Bossier Parish; 20180087-B, LaSalle Lumber Company, LLC in LaSalle Parish; 20190323, Pratt (Delta Container), Inc., Tangipahoa Parish; 20190367, Savoie's Sausage and Food Products, Inc. in St. Landry Parish; 20180226, Sterling Sugars, LLC in St. Mary Parish; 20170466, The Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish; 20170467, The Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish; 20180297, The Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish; 20180298, The Folger Coffee Company in Orleans Parish; 20190391, The Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish; 20190392, The Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish; 20200078, Veolia North America Regeneration Services, LLC, Ascension Parish; and 20190290, Westlake

Vinyls Company, LP in Ascension Parish.
MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have any questions or comments from the Board?

MR. HOLLEY: Is this on the entire group or specifically --

MR. JONES: If there's any you want to pull out, let me know and we can pull them out.

MR. HOLLEY: I have a question or two of The Folger Coffee Company.

MR. JONES: Okay. Why don't you pull all of the The Folger ones out of this motion. I forget who made the motion. Would we accept that as a friendly amendment?

Okay. All right. Let's do it this way:
Mr. Holley moves to take The Folger applications out of the motion; Mr. Havard seconds.

All in favor of that, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposition?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: That motion carries.
All right. So the motion as it stands right now are all the applications except for the three deferrals and the six Folger Company; is that fair? Are we clear?

Great. So any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition.
Now, we have The Folger Company
applications, any, Mr. Holley, did you have questions about those?

MR. HOLLEY: Is there a representative of Folgers?

MR. JONES: Is there a representative here from Folgers?

MR. HOLLEY: May I proceed, Mr. Chairman? I only have one or two questions.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. HOLLEY: May I proceed?
MR. JONES: Absolutely.
MR. HOLLEY: Good morning, sir. My name is Travis Holley, and I just have one or two questions.

I noticed intently in the letter that was written by the Orleans Parish Assessor's office recommending your application, and I've got to admit,
that's the first time $I$ have ever heard a tax assessor that was willing to take property off of the tax roll, so I compliment you on whatever you did to get that letter.

One thing that stood out in the letter to me was the fact that apparently a significant portion of the property that you're seeking tax exemption on was brought to Louisiana from other states. Is that a fair and correct assumption $I$ made?

MR. MOORE: Yes, that is correct.
MR. JONES: Let's do this real quick. Let's state your fame for the record so we can have all of that, then we can...

MR. MOORE: I'm mark Moore. I'm Director of Operations over our Folgers facility in East New Orleans.

MR. JONES: Great.
MR. LEONARD: I'm Jimmy Leonard with
Advantous Consulting.
MS. JACKSON: I'm Helene Jackson. I'm the Associate Human Relations Manager at the Gentilly location of Folgers.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

MR. HOLLEY: No. No problem at all. Thank
you for correcting me.
Was all of the property that was brought from these various states brought in the same year?

MR. MOORE: No. It happened over a period of a few years. Around 2009 we did an evaluation of all of our North American coffee operations. I think, as the tax assessor letter indicated, we had locations in Texas and Missouri and in Florida, Miami, Florida. We brought all of those and consolidated all of those to New Orleans.

We actually have three different locations in New Orleans, two manufacturing facilities and then a coffee intake facility.

MR. HOLLEY: But the property you brought in was not brought in just in one year, it was -- I assume it was --

MR. MOORE: That is correct. That is correct.

MR. HOLLEY: And my real question is was it placed on the tax rolls in Orleans Parish the year that it was brought in?

MR. LEONARD: No, sir.
MR. HOLLEY: And why not?
MR. LEONARD: Because Folgers timely filed their advance notifications, and then Folgers
subsequently filed for the property tax exemptions related to the assets in question.

MR. HOLLEY: So the three or -- excuse me -the numerous advance application numbers that we have here apply to property that was brought in years apart?

MR. LEONARD: No, sir. These applications are not specific just to the transferred-in property. There were expansions to the existing facility footprint, and there modifications made to accommodate new coffee brands being produced at the facilities, and so it is part of the projects that were applied for.

MR. HOLLEY: Okay. That answered my question.

MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

Yes, sir.
MR. SAIZAN: Because I'm familiar -- I'm familiar with this area. I'm a former economic development director. I'm familiar with the Michoud District and all of the businesses around it.

I want to know if you talked to other people, other than the assessor, who wrote an excellent letter, were the city council, school board and mayor's office about this. Are they supportive of it?

MR. MOORE: I speak regularly with our city
council person. I know she's supportive. I don't speak to the others.

MR. SAIZAN: Well, let me just say this: I'm familiar with Folgers, it's ownership by P\&G and now with Smuckers, and I know you're going to be doing better outreach in Orleans Parish because I expressed that to your attorney.

Whenever we do something like this, we take heat. I don't mind the heat. You know, I mean, I want to get -- Folgers is a national brand. We need more of that in New Orleans and in Louisiana. But I just want to make sure you've talked to everybody that you can, and not just the district councilman, other people, you know, in the Mayor's office, the school board and everybody else on this project. I want to be supportive of Folgers. Okay?

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir.
MR. SAIZAN: And that's my only comment.
MR. MOORE: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir.
MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

Mr. Leonard.
MR. LEONARD: Mr. Saizan, after the applications are run through the Board of Commerce \& Industry, they will be brought individually to the city
council, the sheriff's office, as well as the school board for a final opinion regarding these exemptions. MR. SAIZAN: I know that. I know that. I just want to make sure that happens. I just want to make sure that happens because, you know, this is -- I don't know. I don't think this is an unusual situation, but, you know, it's important that you do get local response. And I know the Governor wants that input as well because I've talked to him about it. I've expressed to your attorney my concerns.

Don't get me wrong. I'm happy to see Folgers in New Orleans, and I'm happy to see Folgers expand. I wish we had other companies like that providing employment for people in the city and in the immediate areas around us. Okay? But I just want a commitment from you-all that you-all are going to follow through with that procedure and talk to those people and you listen (inaudible). Okay?

MR. LEONARD: Yes, sir.
MR. MOORE: Yes, sir.
MR. SAIZAN: Thank you very much.
MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any other comments from the

Folgers reps?
MR. LEONARD: No, sir.
MR. JONES: All right. We have questions or
comments -- I know we have some cards from the public.
Mr. Bagert.
Mr. Bagert, you're not going to --
MR. BAGERT: I am.
MS. TREFFINGER: I also submitted a card. He'll go after me.

My name's Grace.
MR. JONES: It's okay.
MS. TREFFINGER: Okay. Great.
MR. JONES: Just state your name for the record, please.

MS. TREFFINGER: Sure. My name's Grace Treffinger. I'm from New Orleans, and I'm with Together Louisiana as well Sunrise New Orleans, a youth-led movement. I'm here -- first I'll read, and I'm surprised this hasn't ben read yet, but actually referencing this question you just had. This is a statement and a letter from New Orleans City Council Vice President, Helena Moreno.
"Dear Louisiana Board of Commerce \& Industry Members, I'm writing to ask that you deny applications by The Folgers Coffee Company before you today. The
company has failed to pay property taxes on improvements dating back several years, and now they're coming before this Board asking for a retroactive exemption instead of paying the City of New Orleans what is owed.

A recent investigation done by journalist Lee Zurik on WVUE TV brought this matter to the public's attorney in August. Due to the alarming length of time not paying millions of dollars in taxes and now seeking a loophole to get a pass. The total owed could be as high as \$12-million.

The exemption, if approved, would cost New Orleans schools and other city services what is owed, plus millions more in lost revenue over the next 10 years.

Like many other communities, the City of New Orleans is facing major budget shortages as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. We cannot afford for a large corporation to not pay it's fair share when your residents and small business owners are being asked to sacrifice so much.

As you know, the overwhelming majority of applicants come before you shortly after improvements are made asking for an exemption. Waiting years later does not make sense at all. I truly believe it is important to spur economic development and provide a
friendly business environment, but companies should not be rewarded taxes dating years back.

I ask what would happen to a small business owner or a homeowner if they hadn't paid taxes for more than three years.

I thank you for your consideration of this matter and for your service to the State of Louisiana.

Sincerely, Helena Moreno."
All right. I have many of these letters. I'll just leave them here. I'm not sure who distributes these. But I also have some personal statements and some other things to add.

First of all, this number, we know that Folgers is asking for retroactive tax exemptions for three years. This could be approximately $\$ 24-\mathrm{million}$ actually in property tax revenue owed to Orleans Parish. While we're seeing city employees being furloughed and taking 10 percent budget cut -- or 10 percent salary cuts and we are watching, for example, with our New Orleans library system huge budget cuts, an issue that relates to the education of our residents and young people in New Orleans and access to resources.

In Orleans Parish, these current library workers are being asked to seek other employment working their full-time job at the library for 10 percent less
of their salaries and while not getting these new jobs that they're being asked to pursue accommodations for their new schedules. This money that Folgers owes and should pay their fair share to the City of New Orleans would cover completely the exact, more or less, the amount of money that is the entire library budget for our city.

This is just one example of so many ways this money could be used to benefit the citizens of New Orleans. And I understand the job's argument, which we hear over and over and over again, but, meanwhile, we're threatening jobs of city workers by not having an appropriate city budget that could be covered partially by these companies paying their fair share in taxes.

Lastly, I just want to add that this is, again, something we see over and over, and I think the Groundhog Day example is quite accurate, and I hope that changes in my lifetime as I plan to live in Louisiana for the rest of that.

If industries paid their fair share of taxes, we would not be seeking -- we've heard so many examples of these industries building, you know, helping fund soccer teams and paying for emergency services and things like this. Rather than asking for philanthropy from these companies and rather than asking them out of
the goodwill of their heart to give us money, we can just get them to pay their taxes and we would be able to cover the basic needs of the people of Louisiana.

So I implore you to follow the leadership of Helena Moreno and other elected officials and follow the leadership of the people of Louisiana and do not give these tax exemptions to Folgers.

Thank you very much.
MR. JONES: Thank you for your comments.
MR. SAIZAN: The question I have --
MR. JONES: Hold on. We'll need to get you a mic, Mr. Saizan, so that it will help the court reporter as well.

MR. SAIZAN: Can I ask for a response to those charges? I mean, I didn't know anything about all of those charges, but can $I$ ask for a response from the company on those charges?

MR. JONES: I think Mr. Saizan is asking for a response to the charges. Is there -- Mr. Leonard and Folgers rep, come back.

MR. LEONARD: Hello, everyone. This is Jimmy Leonard again, Advantous Consulting, 2813 Belle Cherie Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Passing before you today -- and I'll let the paperwork pass through, but what is being passed is an

Exhibit E7 from the New Orleans Annual Financial Report. The most current information available is 2018, and it compares 2008 top 10 taxpayers to 2018 top 10 taxpayers. And before I get to the specific numbers, I want to have a chance for everyone at the Board to have a copy so they can follow me here, but what $I$ am presenting to the Board is how wonderful of an economic development story Folgers has been for New Orleans.

I'm hearing a lot of this "pay a fair share." "We want our corporations to stop avoiding taxes and taking welfare and monies from the public coffers." This sheet by itself tells a great story of how economic development works and how ITEP can help bring investments to communities and change the economic foundation of a local community.

In 2008, there is no listing of The JM Smucker Company. There is no listing of Folgers. Folgers was in existence for decades prior to 2008 doing business in New Orleans. Okay? James Smucker comes in, and as you heard, they had an entire, I'll just call it, project and internal review as to whether they were going to make a long-term investment in making the world's largest coffee production facility.

Folgers, on their own, picked New Orleans, Louisiana, and not just New Orleans, Louisiana, but New

Orleans East, Louisiana, which has had its challenges with its own economics.

So here is Folgers making this decision, still participating in ITEP, relocating facilities from around the country. Those communities are losing entire facilities. They're losing entire jobs. New Orleans is gaining these investments. Over the course of this 10-year period of time, Folgers moves itself to being the number 8 largest property taxpayer in the City of New Orleans. New Orleans now has a revenue-generating asset that is a diversified feature of its economy, which is going strong today, while many of New Orleans' previous economic engines are struggling in light of COVID-19.

We have over 50-some-odd-million dollars in payroll that has been sustained throughout this pandemic. They have provided coffee for folks having to work from home, live at home throughout the pandemic. They have continued to make a significant, strong and consistent commitment to Louisiana and to the community of New Orleans. ITEP was part of their decisionmaking. Okay? ITEP helped drive these decisions.

Folgers is here today, and we will, on record, wish we would have been here sooner. Okay? The timing is some of the challenges that has brought
matters before everyone for discussion, but there has been, for the record, zero deliberate or intentional efforts to avoid taxes. I want to say that again. Zero deliberate or intentional effort to avoid taxes. ITEP is governed by very specific rules. It has a very competent staff at the Department of Economic Development that does its job diligently, and they raise questions, we must respond. And as you are seeing on this agenda and the amount of time that we're spending here today, Folgers was not the only application they had to review over this time. Every agenda has hundreds of ITEP applications, and we must be able to address and work with LED in the time they have available as we respond and work with them.

The letter from the assessor is because Folgers has been transparent because there has been a very deliberate, a very intentional effort to disparage this organization its efforts to pursue, which is a constitutional privilege, it is not a right. They are not entitled to an exemption, but in the constitution, they are offered an opportunity to apply for an exemption, and if granted, they thenfore the benefits of that exemption. There should not be any disparaging.

I received a text of documentation being presented about Folgers this morning. It shows a

Monopoly board. It uses words "illegal," it uses the words "avoiding taxes for four years." The earliest application you have before you today is dated with a 2017 prefix. That means the advance notification was filed in 2017. They listed a one-year project period. It was ending in 2018. As we've had kind of a property tax lesson today, the very first chance any of that property could have been taxed was January 1, 2019. There is no three years of avoidance. There is no 10 years of dollars that are missing. Anyone with a basic understanding of property tax who would take the time to understand how this truly works before making such serious and potentially damaging allegations should do their due diligence and be responsible before making such strong allegations against this organization, who had options.

And I'm not going speak for them, but I am going to say to everyone here today there were communities that lost when Folgers made their decisions to make New Orleans, Louisiana the largest coffee producing city in the entire world. There's a world-class investment, there are world-class professionals that are operating and doing the best that they can to keep people employed and revenue generating into New Orleans during times in which normal economic
engines in the city are not able to work in their normal capacities.

And I'd like to turn it over here because there are also some very important statistics relating to employment, the job opportunities that are here, and with hearing some of this information, $I$ think it would help shed some light for $y^{\prime}$ all as well. I've had the luxury of working with Folgers for the last year to get to know the corporation and the people, and this is a great organization and Louisiana should be proud to have them in New Orleans.

MR. JONES: Mr. Leonard, before, I think Mr. Nassar has a question for you.

MR. NASSAR: Normally when someone's delinquent on ad valorem taxes, the sheriff can file a lien on the corporation or the taxpayer; correct?

MR. LEONARD: That is correct.
MR. NASSAR: Has Folgers been served with any tax liens by the sheriff?

MR. LEONARD: No, sir.
MR. NASSAR: Thank you.
MS. JACKSON: Good morning again. I'm Helene Jackson, the Associate Human Relations Manager.

I can tell you from a professional and personal perspective that Folgers' choice to consolidate
it's American operations to New Orleans has made a difference in the quality of life and enhance opportunity not only for individual growth, but broader community impact and enhance local revenue.

I began my career at Folgers over 30 years ago at the Texas facility, and continued my career in New Orleans once the consolidation was complete.

Folgers closed and consolidated its other coffee operations throughout the United States and chose New Orleans as its global coffee headquarters. As a coffee manufacturer, Folgers is unique in New Orleans and provides diversification in New Orleans' economy as an essential food manufacturer.

As a food manufacturer, Folgers adds uniquely to the diversification and stability of New Orleans area job market. Of the approximately 711 employees, 88 percent are Louisiana residents, a third of our workforce is African-American, 13 percent are woman, 75 percent live in the New Orleans Metropolitan area, and 12 percent are New Orleans residents.

Folgers provides careers. It offers higher-than-average wages and benefits for an employer of its scale in the New Orleans area. Our hourly ranges from 22 to $\$ 40$ per hour with extensive benefits, including medical, dental, vision, 401 K with employer
match and bereavement pay.
In the past year alone, we have enhanced parental leave extending from two weeks to 12 weeks fully paid, expanded paid time off for those with less than five years of experience, accelerated our inclusion and diversity strategy to support gender and diversity inclusion across our organization, including the launch of training on unconscious bias and announcing plans for employee resource groups, pay for 100 percent of COVID-19 testing for employees, provided paid sick leave to individuals who tested positive for COVID-19 or have to care for a family member who tests positive, encourage remote work for all who are able, and introducing protocols in our manufacturing facility to allow for appropriate social distancing and protection of employees, implemented extensive safety and sanitation measures to help ensure employee health and wellbeing. Louisiana ITEP program helps to make these investments possible and allows for reinvestment in facility expansion, reinvestment in the workforce and in the community.

MR. MOORE: I want to address something, the tax question that we had earlier. I do know that Mr. Leonard has already stated that we're the number 8 property taxpayer in the City of New Orleans, and so
just for reference, in 2017 we paid three and a half million dollars in property taxes, we paid 3.8-million in 2018, we paid 4.1-million in 2019. Obviously we haven't received our 2020 invoice from the city, and when that comes, we'll pay that in full as well.

MR. JONES: Mr. Saizan, I think a lot of this was in response to your question to respond to the letter from Ms. Moreno. Is that -- any further questions from you on this issue?

MR. SAIZAN: No, not right now.
MR. JONES: Any other questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: We still have Mr. Bagert. Do you still want to speak?

MR. BAGERT: Thank you, Board members. Broderick Bagert, Together Louisiana, or, in this case, Together New Orleans. I'm a resident of Orleans Parish.

Could I ask your indulgence to find these projects in your Board packet? I don't know if the pages are numbered, but they're Page 673 of the 1,479, so that we can take a look at them. And if you don't it with you, I'll read them.

Mr. Leonard mentioned that ITEP is not an entitlement, that it is discretionary, and there are
standard that guide in that instance whether it ought to be approved. It's called a Cabela standard. My wife is a teacher at a charter school, and she had two hours of training on the Cabela standard; right, in case there comes an occasion where she may be in a position to give a thing of value and what the standards are. And let me just pull them up to reference them.

MR. JONES: I'm hesitant to -- go ahead, Mr. Bagert. I'll respond when you're done.

MR. BAGERT: No, go ahead.
MR. JONES: I know you believe in your heart that the Cabela standards applies to ITEP. That's a legal position that, frankly, a whole lot of lawyers disagree with. So I have no problem with you arguing that Cabela applies to ITEP, but I would ask that you not state it as fact.

MR. BAGERT: I will state as fact of my belief --

MR. JONES: That's what $I$ just said.
MR. BAGERT: -- that this standard establishes and applies to every public body in the State of Louisiana around whether and how and under what circumstances it uses -- it can apply a thing of value to a public or nonpublic purpose. And it gets to whether it's a public purpose.

If it is said to not apply, then we're saying that entities within the State of Louisiana can use public resources for nonpublic purposes, and I don't know many lawyers who have that reading of the constitution. I'm sure there are some.

MR. JONES: There's a lot. There's actually a lot, Mr. Bagert.

MR. BAGERT: The standards established here are that the expenditure or transfer must be for a public purpose that comports with the governmental purpose that which the entity has the legal authority to pursue.

Second, the expenditure or transfer of public funds or property taken as a whole does not appear to be gratuitous.

Third, evidence must demonstrate that the public entity has a demonstrable objective and reasonable expectation receiving a benefit or value at least equivalent to the amount expended or transferred.

Let's leave aside the legal standards. You are tasked as a Board under the Constitution to do what you deem to be in the best interest of the state. So I'd ask each one of you to consider whether considering whether something is gratuitous or not gratuitous is in the best interest of the state, considering whether an
objective analysis has been conducted to determine whether the public at least gets the same amount that they give, whether that is a reasonable standard in your own judgment of what's in the best interest of the state.

Going to the applications. The first one, 20170466, the start date for this project was August the 1st, 2017. The end date for it was July 31st, 2018. It has been in service for two and a half years. Information was presented here that made it sound like this was a delay on the part of the Board of Commerce \& Industry, you had so much to do, you know.
Documentation, an e-mail, shows that that's not that case. Folgers requested that these be not acted upon consistently. You know how quickly you act on things. It's within a season; right? I mean, you have a set period of time. This was not the Board trying to work through details. This was Folgers saying "Don't act on this." I'm going to be editorial here. Why? I think because we don't have the support of our locals, because we want to wait for a different governor to get elected. That's what I think and believe. That's not from documentary evidence.

But the project was complete in 2018. At that point, you need to report it to the assessor. And
the reason why the nonpayment of taxes wasn't subject to a sheriff's office, you know, subpoena was that it was a nonreporting of property. That was the problem; right? It's the second time this has happened with the same company in recent memory. This Board rejected renewals of ITEP several years ago. That property did not go on to the tax rolls for several years. It was not reported until finally, through a lot of undue work and pressure, we were able to show them that this is not exempt. Property that's not exempt needs to be reported. It wasn't reported in 2018.

The next project started in 2017 again and was finished in 2018. Twenty-nine-million dollars of value in the world in operation not reported to the assessor. There's not a special category under Louisiana law that says things on which we're hoping to get an exemption. You either have exempt property or you have taxable property. You either have it on your LAT 5 form or your LAT 5a form. And things for which you kind of hope to get an exemption and are still working decisionmakers is not a valid reason to not report property, and it's certainly not a valid reason to not report over $\$ 150-$ million in property.

The fact that the assessor is going along with that we think is deeply unfortunate. We think it
may have to do with him supporting these exemptions as vocally and enthusiastically as he has is he has come under heat for not reporting this. And if it came to be deemed taxable, then the question would be asked, well, why on earth was it not taxed and did our schools and public resources not receive that revenue in prior years; right? So I think we have to look through it through that lens.

At the end of the day, the question before you is does Folgers need this incentive for these projects to happen, these projects that were completed already in 2018. Is it gratuitous? It is in the best interest of the state? And there's no reasonable argument that we can imagine that it is.

Last thing I want to add, if these had been acted upon in a timely fashion, then the standards and rules at the time would have applied. This Board has passed a resolution now establishing a kind of limited right of appeal for companies, and that limited right of appeal gets enacted anytime a local body has standards that are different from and stricter than your own; right? Those would not have been in place when this Board should have acted on these; right, when these investments were made. And New Orleans does, in fact, have standards. It said "I want jobs to be created at a
certain standard." "We don't want to support anything that already has been gone under construction," because it doesn't make a lick of sense to us that something can be an incentive if it's happening after the thing you're meant to incentivizing. The causality is wrong, the timing is wrong. There's no way something subsequent to something else can cause that prior thing. So they've established those standards. So when they go back to New Orleans, they're going to get rejected, is my humble belief. Okay? Just like I believe that things that are gratuitous should not be approved by any public entity in the State of Louisiana.

And then the question is are they then going to have a right of appeal because they didn't act timely? It's just very problematic that we are creating an incentive to hide your -- to not report your property. I won't say "hide" -- to not report your property for several years, and it's okay if you do that and we'll treat it just like you did and we'll even consider retroactive exemptions and we'll even give you favorable treatment because you have not reported your property. That does not seem to be the rules the vast majority of businesses in this state operate under, and there's no reason why we see that this Board ought to make it attractive because once that becomes the norm,
"Oh, I see. We don't have a council that we like, that likes us, that thinks that" -- everybody loves Folgers; right? But "We don't have a council that's going to support your exemptions. Let's wait a year. Let's wait two years. Let's wait three years. Let's wait until we do have a counsel that's going to support us."

MR. JONES: Mr. Bagert, let's wrap up.
MR. BAGERT: "And then we will submit it."
It introduces the possibility of gaming the system because that appears to be what has happened here, and we don't think that's going to create a healthier program. So we would urge you to deny these. Thank you.
MR. JONES: Mr. Leonard, I see you want to respond.

MR. LEONARD: Please. Thank you, Chairman, Members of the Board. Just a couple of quick points.

$$
\text { Section } 503 \text { of the Louisiana Industrial }
$$ Property Tax Exemption Application Rules and Regulations and Procedures that guide the filing of applications. "An application for tax exemption may be filed where the department on the prescribed form subject to the following conditions: The filing may be either concurrent or after the filing of the advance notification, but no later than 90 days after the

beginning of operations or the end of construction."
In order to suggest that we're retroactively seeking something that we do not have an opportunity, we are following the law of filing the applications after construction is complete is perfectly acceptable inside the policies and procedures and guidelines that guide this Board.

Secondly, we categorically deny any and all claims being made that there are any efforts to not report taxes. The letter from the assessor, we are aware of these allegations and the assessor has opined that there are no outstanding debts, obligations. There has been a transparent discussion and review of the records of Folgers, and everything is in order. I want to make sure that point is clear.

Also, the Cabela standard is not of part of the rules and the regulations that are established in which companies must follow in order to apply for the Industrial Property Tax Exemption.

And I'll stop there.
MR. JONES: I have a question, and
Mr. House, you may be about to answer the question that I want to ask, so I'll let you --

MR. BAGERT: Can we respond to something that was just -- that appears to be a false statement
that Mr. Leonard just --
MR. JONES: If you'll keep it short. I'm trying to get progress here.

MR. BAGERT: I'll keep it very short.
On the --
MR. JONES: No. In front of the mic.
MR. BAGERT: Advance Number 20180297, the application was received by you on the 26 th of February 2020, and the project was completed on July 31st, 2019. That's not in compliance. The other ones that were received timely, it was requested that they not be acted upon, I mean, in writing. They sent an e-mail that said "Please don't act on those."

MR. JONES: Okay. You made your point.
MR. BAGERT: So to make the argument that everything was done in a timely fashion when, $a$, it hasn't, and, $b$, when it has, you not acting on them was specifically requested by the company just appears to be disingenuous and not accurate. Thank you.

MR. LEONARD: We are talking about a specific set of applications at this point in time, and those are a matter of this conversation. And, yes, there are a number of matters before this Board regarding Folgers because there was a long period of time in which Folgers was in the process of getting
everything before the Board in a sufficient manner so that you can have one opportunity to rule on all matters at one time.

MR. JONES: So the example that Mr. Bagert just gave is not one of the six that is before us on this motion right now?

MR. LEONARD: 2018 --
MS. CHENG: I will note that the example he gave was filed late, and it is noted on the agenda that it was a late filing and that application -- a late application filing penalty is assessed on that application per the ITEP rules.

MR. JONES: Okay. But that's not my question. It's not one of the six we're voting on this moment?

MR. LEONARD: I stand corrected, Chairman.
MR. JONES: Is it?
MR. LEONARD: It is one of the six.
MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you.
All right, Mr. House.
State your name for the...
MR. HOUSE: My name is Richard House, 1260 Stanford Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I am a counsel to the Department of Economic Development. I just want to very briefly address the Cabela's case. I was a
counsel of record in the Cabela's case. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that it is probably not applicable to this Board. Nevertheless, under the argument that we made at the time and under the argument adopted by the Supreme Court of Louisiana, what you're doing here today is under the rules established by Governor Edwards, as well as the Exhibit As, which is the agreement between this Board, the Department of Economic Development and Folgers and other parties under the 2017 and 2018 rules is not gratuitous. It has consideration. The consideration is the jobs and the salaries that the companies must maintain in order to have this exemption, and that's the big difference between the old rules and the new rules and the new rules established by Governor Edwards' Executive Order and the rules established by this Board.

So I wanted to make that clear to you.
You're not doing anything gratuitously. You're doing something that's given and bargained for and returned, and that's called a contract.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. HOUSE: If anyone has any questions, feel free to call me at any time. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Thank you.
Yes, sir, Mr. Waltzer. I think I got that
correct now. Waltzer. How's that?
MR. WALTZER: Joel Waltzer with -- and I have a law office in New Orleans East, and for -- since 1992, I've walked out the door, I've smelled coffee, so I appreciate investment in New Orleans.

To me, this is about following the rules that you make. The rule that you make say, first of all, that people need to report their taxes. "The applicant shall file annually with the assessor" -Section 537 -- "in which the manufacturing establishment is located and complete a taxpayer report on forms approved by the tax commission in order that the exempted property may be separately listed on the assessment rolls."

There are other requirements that people report their property unless they're granted an exemption; right? And then in -- we already have the situation where if you're under construction, a project -- an ongoing project doesn't have to report the property under the Constitution. And then in Section 515 -- sorry -- 517, "If an establishment is on the taxable rolls and property taxes have not been paid, the establishment is not eligible unless the assessor and local government entity agree in writing to remove the establishment from the taxable rolls should the tax
exemption be granted." These are your rules.
So 537 says you've got to report your taxes. This doesn't create any exception. You're not overwriting or preempting the law of taxation that the legislature passed or the rules that the tax commission have enacted. You're writing system that's consistent with that. You report the property when the property comes on. That -- this is what this is about. It's about following your own rules. You report the property. Once the property's reported, the proper procedure is for Folgers to go to the city council and to the assessor -- we know what the assessor's going to say -- to go to the city council and the assessor and say "Hey, it's on the rolls. May $I$ take it off rolls and request that $I$ be given -- in the event that I'm given this exemption." That hasn't happened.

So this is the wrong process for determining this particular set of -- at least with respect to the ones that should definitely have been on the tax rolls because they had to put it on the tax rolls when it came into service.

Now, Folgers is roasting life into New Orleans, and I appreciate that. I appreciate that there's some exemptions that we want to grant, but the one thing that we need to be doing is following the
rules; right? And, I mean, that's kind of the problem is that we can't just say "Okay. Yeah, we promulgated these rules, went to public comment, now they're in the Louisiana Administrative Code and now we're going to ignore it." You know, we just don't have that discretion. You don't have that discretion. It would be unlawful. It would be an unlawful act in my opinion; right? It's ultravirus. It's outside of the discretion when the law is clear that's what you got to do, and your own rules are clear. And I think you ought to deny these, let them go and talk to the city council. If they get that kind of approval, they can come back and apply or -- whatever the process is, it is. But what the process isn't is $I$ don't have to report my property. Does that make sense?

MR. JONES: Any questions for Mr. Waltzer? Mr. Nassar.

MR. NASSAR: I have a question for somebody.
MR. JONES: Okay. Yes, sir. State your question. We'll figure out the right repository. MR. NASSAR: So the assessor has to go -I'm going to use St. James Parish parish as an example. The assessor has to go wherever he is to the Board of Review. The Board of Review is the parish council. If there's an issue, it would go to the tax
commission. It could be appealed to the tax commission. If there's an issues on the taxpayer's either -- on the assessed value, $I$ would imagine.

So I guess what I'm asking is, you know, we're looking at a letter from one of the council members that says that the total owed could be -- could be as high as 12-million. So does the assessor of Orleans Parish have to go before the council, the Orleans Parish Council as the Board of Review every year for the tax rolls?

MR. WALTZER: When the taxpayer is
challenged. Yeah, if there's --
MR. NASSAR: So I guess what I'm asking is, so could the council challenge the assessed value of a business when the assessor goes to the Board of Review? That's my question.

MR. WALTZER: There may be some other -- I don't know. I mean, there may be some other avenue of relief that the council could seek, but that's not what's in front of us, in my opinion.

In front of us is whether or not your applicants have to report the property as the projects are completed, and your rules say yes, you do, and then the rules say, and then once that happens and if taxes hasn't been -- you know, if taxes haven't been paid,
then you need to go get this other -- this other mini process to resolve that issue. That's...

MR. NASSAR: I understand. I understand your point. It's just some questions on the amount of money that's owed, and we're hearing all of the property that should be reported is being reported.

MR. LEONARD: Yes, sir.
MR. NASSAR: So we're hearing two different
things.
MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. NASSAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: Is there -- Mr. Leonard, did you have more or did you have any response?

MR. LEONARD: Sure, I can respond.
MR. JONES: I think where the Board -- I can't speak for the Board. I can speak for Jerry. Where Jerry is, I'm just trying -- I'm trying to figure out where the rules apply and when. That's -- I'm trying to pin that down. So if somebody can -- Mr. Waltzer has made his point. If somebody can help me understand where we are.

MR. LEONARD: The rules, as we understand them, is the Board of Commerce \& Industry may not grant an exemption for property that is on the rolls. The rules are intended to ensure that the Board of Commerce
\& Industry does not strip away revenue that is currently being received by a local governing authority.

The rule does not say while your application is under review that you must go report it to the assessor and ask the assessor to not invoice you every year. The rule simply says if the property is on the rolls and has not been taxed, you have the opportunity to go to the assessor and to not -- and have that property taken off of the rolls.

The situation that we have here is when an application is filed, a copy of the application is presented to the tax assessor through LED staff. The tax assessor is keenly aware of the property for which a company is pursuing a property tax exemption.

If the property tax assessor takes that property and puts it on the rolls, the only way for a property tax -- for a company to prevent those taxes from being assessed is to actually file a lawsuit and pay the taxes under protest and file that lawsuit. There is -- I cannot fathom the situation that there was ever an intent that while an ITEP application is under review, taxpayers and corporations are expected to go file lawsuits with local assessors in order to prevent property from being taxed and placed on the rolls.

We have been very transparent with the
assessor. The letter indicates that he is aware that this property is out there. Should we fail in securing these exemptions when we go before the local bodies and there is no appeal, then there will be a situation where Folgers will be assessed taxes in arrears for the periods in time in which their property was subject to tax.

There is no avoidance of tax here. They will be taxed if they do not get the exemption.

MR. WALTZER: The rules to which he's referring don't exist.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. WALTZER:
The rules to which he's referring, his interpretation of it, is simply incorrect. The rule specifically requires, the Constitution requires, the legislature requires everybody to list their property on the rolls unless it's been granted an exemption.

Your own regulations, 537; right, all property shall annually file with the assessor a complete taxpayer report. Then 517 clearly contemplates the situation where you've reported your taxes, your property, and now you're getting your -- right here, and the exemption hasn't been granted. You come here with a letter from the assessor and from the city council and
you say "Here's my letter. They don't object to me taking it off of the rolls. Please grant me an exemption," and this body decides whether to do that. That's what the rule says. That's -- I can read it.
"If the establishment or addition is on the taxable rolls and property taxes have not been paid, the establishment is not eligible for an exemption unless the assessor and local government entity agree in writing to remove it from the rolls should the exemption be granted." That's the process.

MR. JONES: I will tell you, Mr. Waltzer, it's my impression, and I'm not -- I'm, by no means, the authority, but it's my impression -- because we've had that situation where just that has happened where an applicant had to go back to the tax assessor and city council and somehow property got on the tax roll and they had to bring us the documentation so that it can be taken off.

But it is my impression that that is the exception rather than the rule. By far the exception. I'm not aware, and I'm going defer to staff, to LED counsel, but I'm not aware of any applicant that goes and puts property on the tax rolls while these applications are pending. I'm not saying it doesn't happen, but I'm not aware of anybody that's ever done
that.
To the contrary, when they do do it, it creates an issue that then requires a whole new process and we have to prove it. And that has happened -- I know it's happened once, but it my 12, 13, 14 years, it's happened once. So I'm -- you've studied the rules probably much more than I -- I can guarantee you've studied the rules much more than I have, but I will tell you, the practice that $I$-- and the impression of how things work and how things have worked historically for every applicant that's come before this Board since I've been paying attention, that's not what goes on. So somebody help me here.

MR. WALTZER: It's my impression the reason -- the reason we're feeling so strongly about this is because, to our knowledge, in other parishes, this isn't happening. This is the aberration, to our knowledge. The rules of the assessors say unless there's a signed contract of exemption, you put it on the rolls, on the taxable rolls. That's what the rules of the assessor is saying. This is -- that's what the rules -- and I'll be happy to send you --

MR. JONES: NO, I'm not arguing with you.
MR. WALTZER: Right, right. That's also what the statutes say; right? You've got to declare
your property. That's why it all fits together neatly and into a system where people are following the process, they get it done correctly.

In this situation, it may be that Folgers took it out of step or was waiting to accumulate a certain number of things before coming to you, but, I mean, it doesn't change the rules. It doesn't allow us to create a new process simply for Folgers, particularly one that is capable of being replicated all across the state that is in conflict with the rules of the tax commission, Louisiana Tax Commission.

All we need to do is to say "Look, you know, just be consistent. You know, go back, do what you need to do and then come back." You know, the rules are the rules, and these are your rules.

So that's all. I mean, I think I've made the point.

MR. JONES: Okay. The horse may be dead. I don't know.

We have a motion before the Board right now to approve six Folger applications. My question to the Board is are you ready to vote?

Mr. Briggs, you have something to say?
MR. BRIGGS: Yes.
MR. JONES: Yes, you're ready to vote?

MR. BRIGGS: No. I think we ought to defer it.

MR. HOLLEY: I'll second that motion.
He asked for a deferral?
MR. JONES: Yes, sir.
MR. HOLLEY: Second.
MR. JONES: We have a motion from Mr. Briggs to defer. We have a second from Mr. Holley.

Any question or comments on the motion to defer from the Board.

MS. MALONE: I do.
MR. JONES: Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: What information are we waiting on for the deferral, if $I$ may ask?

MR. JONES: So the question is what additional information's going to happen between now and the next meeting that will get us where we need to go? Maybe a better question is what information does the Board members need in order to make a decision? And I don't -- what information are you looking for?

MR. HOLLEY: I would like to hear from staff as to their position on the applications as it stands right now.

MR. JONES: Staff, I think the ball has been tossed to you. Mr. Usie.

MR. HOLLEY: I don't mean today. I mean, if they need time, obviously.

MR. USIE: Do you have specific questions that they mentioned about the application?

MR. HOLLEY: There's been so many questions here today, to answer that, I don't know where the start.

MR. JONES: Let's pin it down.
I think the question that has bubbled to the top as being the most imminent question is the duty to report to the tax assessor under LED rules.

MR. USIE: So pre- --
MR. JONES: I'm not going to start interpreting tax assessor's rules or anybody else's rules. I'm only going to worry about LED's rules today.

MR. USIE: The assessor is copied on all correspondence done in FastLane NextGeneration.

Prior to the system being launched, they were mailed physical paper copies of the advance, the application, anything filed by the company.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. USIE: So the assessor's office has been aware, since these advances were filed for Folgers, their intent to get their ITEP applications approved.

MR. JONES: Okay. In your mind, does that
satisfy LED rules?
MR. USIE: Yeah. In my mind, yes.
MR. JONES: Okay. You may think it's
crystal clear, and you can look at me like I'm a jackass in a hailstorm, $I$ don't care. I'm trying to create a record. Okay?

So in your mind it's clear that the tax assessor received notice of these properties being -MR. USIE: That is clear to me, correct. MR. JONES: Okay.

MR. USIE: Now, the reporting requirements that he discussed before, all I can add to that is that we verify with the assessor's office that they have not paid taxes on any assets from previous calendar years. MR. JONES: Okay. Mr. Havard. MR. HAVARD: I'm not sure if I'm out of line or not or if this is the correct time, but can we -would it be prudent to ask for, if it does get deferred, that they have an exemption or that the locals weigh in on where they're at with this exemption?

MR. JONES: No. That comes later. If we approve it here, then they've got to go to the locals.

MS. CHENG: These are going under the 2018 rules that do require all of these applications to be sent to the parish council, the parish school board and
the parish sheriff all within the 30-day, 60-day timeframe for their approval or denial.

MR. HAVARD: Okay.
MR. JONES: Does that answer your question?
MR. HAVARD: Yes, it does.
MR. SAIZAN: So if this is approved today,
they have to go to the locals?
MR. JONES: Yes, they do.
Ms. Davis, you want to --
MS. DAVIS: Can I make a substitute motion?
MR. JONES: All right. We have a substitute
motion.
Ms. Davis, put your mic down.
MS. DAVIS: I'm sorry. Mr. Briggs.
MR. BRIGGS: May I withdraw my motion?
MR. JONES: You're more than welcome to if
that's your desire.
MR. BRIGGS: I would like to withdraw my motion.

MR. JONES: Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: I'm the one that suggested it.
MS. DAVIS: If he's going to withdraw, then I'm not going to make a substitute because I'm going to move to approve.

MR. JONES: Then you don't need to make --
okay. All right.
Mr. Waltzer, I'm going to give you one last shot, and that's it.

MR. WALTZER: First of all, I don't want to hurt Folgers.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. WALTZER: So if you guys are going to answer it, I'm going to ask that you sever the ones that should have been reported and make that subject of one motion, and the ones that have yet, that are still fresh enough where they shouldn't have been reported to the assessor, that subject of a second motion. The reason is, if I'm going to challenge it, because I'm not hearing an answer to 517 B and 537, I'm hearing, you know, "Were you required to serve somebody," and, you know, we're answering a different question over here, you know.

I mean, 537 requires that it be reported. 517 requires that they first get the local approval before you vote. So if I'm going to --

MR. JONES: No. I don't agree with 517 requiring that.

MR. WALTZER: It says, again -- I mean -okay. "If the establishment is on the taxable rolls." It was supposed to be on the taxable rolls.

MR. JONES: But it's not --
MR. LEONARD: It's not supposed to be.
MR. JONES: That's a presumption that I don't think we agree with.

MR. WALTZER: That's not a presumption. That's the law. But I understand you might have a different opinion. It's a fact. It's -- 537 also requires them to report. So you're required to report your property to the assessor, you report the property to the assessor, he puts -- he's required to put it on the rolls, and then you come and you get your exemption. In this case, you have to come with the letters from both the assessor and the local entity, and that's the reason why it -- if that is an incorrect interpretation of the LED's rules, then $I$ want to hear that directly. MR. JONES: Are you coming to speak, Ms.
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MS. BOURGEOIS: I am.
MR. JONES: Okay. Please speak.
MS. BOURGEOIS: Very quickly.
Tam Bourgeois on behalf of LED.
MR. JONES: Please take your mask off so I can understand. I'm sorry. Just...

MS. BOURGEOIS: Tam Bourgeois on behalf of LED.

The rules states "if the establishment or addition is on the taxable rolls," then we need to go through the process. This is not on the tax rolls. The assessor received notice that the advance and the application were filed. That triggers the assessor up to his discretion to not put it on the tax rolls. If he had put it on the tax rolls, we would have a very different conversation right now, but that's how these rules work and interplay with one another.

MR. JONES: And, Ms. Bourgeois, you are counsel for the Board?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Yes, sir, I am.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
All right. I will -- are we ready to vote?
MR. WALTZER: But 537 create a duty to
report.
MR. JONES: Question's been called.
Question's been called.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. The motion carries.

All right. I have Mr. Nassar asking for a break. It's five till 1. We sill have many moons, many
miles to go before we sleep, ladies and gentleman.
What is the pleasure of the Board? Do we want to take a break for you to go grab a sandwich or do we want to take a bio break of about 15 minutes?

Mr. Nassar needs to put money in the parking meter.

All right. I'm going to recess for 15 minutes. Be back here at 10 after.
(A recess was taken.)
MR. JONES: All right, ladies and gentlemen. What I would like to do, we have to that point in the agenda where we have Industrial Tax Exemption renewals. I know, just based on the number of cards $I$ have in front of me, that the Genesis renewals are going to probably require some time and attention. So what I'm going to propose to the Board, if you all are comfortable with this, is let's carve the Genesis renewals out and then cover the balance of the renewal agenda in an in globo fashion. Is that -- does that work?

All right. I'll need that in the form of a motion.

Dr. Wilson, can I put that motion on you?
MR. W. WILSON: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: All right. We have a second
we've from Mr. Havard.
So that the public is clear on what we're proposing, the Genesis renewals on under the Industrial Tax Exemption renewals, we are going to carve those out and consider them separately. The balance of the Industrial Tax Exemption renewals, we're going to handle in globo.

And I'm just seeing we've got Folgers in there too. We probably ought to carve Folgers out.

We will amend the motion to cover Genesis and Folgers out of the in globo.

Mr. Havard has accepted the friendly
amendment.
Is the Board clear on the motion?
All right. Do I have any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: None.
Questions or comments from the public? And so the public will know what I'm trying to -- I know many of you have been sitting here all morning, you're ready to go back to work, you need to go back to work, so I want to be able to handle those matters for which you may be here as quickly as we can. I appreciate your patience with us today.

Ms. Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: Lady Carlson, 7640 LaSalle... Somewhere.

MR. JONES: Baton Rouge.
MS. CARLSON: Thank you. Baton Rouge.
I just want to say for the record that $I$ hope that you don't do this in globo because then, you know, that was the whole issue when we began is that things were being voted on in globo without really scrutinizing them, and so $I$ just want that on the record.

MR. JONES: And I will tell you, Ms.
Carlson, I mean, as is our custom, when we take this up for a motion, when $I$ ask -- just as I've done, I've asked for public comment, if there's somebody who says, "No. Wait a minute. I want to talk about, A, B, C," then we can do that. We can carve any of them out, and that's the public -- now is the public's opportunity to do that. We're not trying to be -- we're not trying to skip over important issues. Simply having to read every one individually and vote on them individually will take 45 minutes, when we can get them done in three minutes. And so I think the efficiency is worth it, but if you or anybody else has an issue on any one of these, all you've got to do is say so.

MS. CARLSON: Okay. Fair enough.
MR. JONES: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.
Mr. Waltzer.
MR. WALTZER: Yes?
MR. JONES: We've missed you.
MR. WALTZER: Awe.
MR. JONES: I'm lying.
MR. WALTZER: Well taken too.
MR. JONES: I'm glad you can take a joke.
Thank you.
Go right ahead.
MR. WALTZER: I'd like to make sure we carve out any pipelines and other terminals or storage facilities.

MR. JONES: I think while you were out -we've carved out Genesis, we've carved out Folgers. Are there others that --

MR. WALTZER: I believe there was. Because I was expecting to go through them one by one, it's difficult for me to remember which one it was.

There was another -- there was a pipeline facility that $I$ believe is not a manufacturer, and there's also, I believe, another rail terminal and the terminal facility that -- or a storage facility that is not a manufacturer. So $I$ would just ask that --

MR. JONES: You're going to have to do
better than -- please get to your sheet, and I'll give you 45 seconds to figure it out which one you want to -because, again, I'm not trying to shortchange anybody. I want to give everybody the opportunity to debate, but we're just in the renewals is all we're in.

MR. WALTZER: I think it might be, I want to say Energy Logistics Solutions.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. WALTZER: Energy Logistics Solutions. I believe it might be. Etheredge Electric Company. MR. JONES: I've got Energy Logistics Solutions, 20160832, and Etheredge Electric Company.

MR. WALTZER: I believe so.
MR. JONES: Is that 20160690?
MR. WALTZER: I believe PennTex North
Louisiana is going to be one.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
MR. WALTZER: PennTex North Louisiana.
MR. JONES: PennTex North Louisiana, those are three of them: 20141040 and 1403.

MR. WALTZER: And then 20150229.
MR. JONES: Give me the name.
MR. WALTZER: Etheredge Electric Company. MR. JONES: You've already given me

Etheredge Electric.
MR. WALTZER: Oh, okay.
Well, and, again, I'm just requesting that the Board not consider in globo people that are not manufacturers, and I've already made that objection at the beginning.

MR. JONES: I understand.
Okay. So you want me to read this list and you want me to decide who's a manufacturer and who's not a manufacturer without telling me who you think is not? You just want me to divine from your mind who you think are not manufacturers?

MR. WALTZER: I think you have to divine for your own mind who's a manufacturer --

MR. JONES: We've already divined because if it's on the agenda, it's presumed to be a manufacturer because our staff is that good, believe it or not.

I know you disagree, but I happen to disagree with you, and I'm the Chair.

All right. This is the way we're going to do it --

MR. SAIZAN: Can we get on with the meeting? MR. JONES: I'm sorry, Mr. Saizan?

MR. SAIZAN: Can we get on with the meeting? MR. JONES: Yes, we will.

The motion right now is we are goring to take them up in globo with the exception of Energy Logistics Solutions, Etheredge Electric Company, the PennTex renewals, the Folgers renewals and the Genesis renewals.

MR. USIE: We also have a deferral I didn't get to yet. One company is requesting a deferral.

MR. JONES: Okay. I'll get to deferrals in a minute.

MR. SAIZAN: Can you do me a favor and read those in one more time?

MR. JONES: Absolutely, Mr. Saizan.
We're going to handle in globo with the exception of Energy Logistics Solutions, Etheredge Electric Company, the Folgers, the Genesis and PennTex North Louisiana.

What I want to do is carve those out and handle those individually. The rest we handle in globo with the exception of the one that Mr . Usie is about to tell me who wants to be deferred.

Who is that?
MR. USIE: It is 20121330, Garyville Refining Logistics, LLC in St. John the Baptist.

MR. NASSAR: I so move.
MR. MOSS: Second.

MR. JONES: Okay. I haven't found it. Give
me the name first.
MR. USIE: Garyville, Page 19.
MR. JONES: Oh, okay.
So, first, let me consider a motion to defer Garyville Refining Logistics, 20121330.

I have a motion from Mr. Toups; second from Dr. Wilson.

Any comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, any comments or questions from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: I see none.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Okay. Next I'd entertain a motion to take up in globo with the exception of those I've already noted.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: I have a motion from Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Saizan.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the
public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Now that was a motion just to take them up in globo. Now we're going to entertain a motion to approve them in globo.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: Motion from Mr. Moss; second from Dr. Wilson.

Questions or comments from the?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: The motion carries.
All right. Now let's handle -- you're welcome.

Let's handle Energy Logistics Solutions. First of all, I'll entertain a motion.

I have a motion to approve by Mr. Havard;
second from Dr. Wilson.
First of all, do we have a -- are you here for the...

Ms. Boatner, state your name and...
MS. BOATNER: Rhonda Boatner with Didier
Consultants representing Energy Logistics Solutions.
MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. BOATNER: I have a letter from the company explaining why their representative is not here. They're under travel restrictions due to COVID, so they weren't able to attend.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. BOATNER: We have worked with LED. They have a manufacturing NAICS code of 324110 , which is the peto -- petroleum refining company, and they are a blending facility, so they take different types of gasolines and add additives to it. It's a blending facility, and so it's considered a manufacturer for the purposes of the ITEP program.

MR. JONES: Okay. Blending has been considered to be a manufacturer; is that correct?

MS. BOATNER: Yes, that's correct.
MR. JONES: Has that issue ever been litigated?

MS. BOATNER: No. Not that we are aware of.

Not related to this client.
MR. JONES: Not related to this client, but as a -- do you know whether the issue of blending has ever been litigated or not?

MS. BOATNER: I don't know.
MR. JONES: You don't know. I was just hoping that we might have a court decision instead of all us lawyers having to guess what the rules are.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Tam Bourgeois on behalf of LED.

I'm not aware of a court decision addressing blending in particular, but I am aware of a court case addressing LNG activities, and those have been deemed to be -- or have been found by one federal judge to be manufacturing. I don't know if that's helpful at all, but blending would seem to fit squarely within the definition of manufacturing.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Any questions or comments for Ms. Boatner, the Energy Logistics representative?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Questions or comments from public?

Mr. Waltzer, do you have some comments on Energy Logistics?

MS. BOATNER: And maybe the issue that's misleading is the name has "Logistics" in it, but that's not -- they're not a logistics company at all. They're a blending. They're right up Highway 61 in East Feliciana Parish.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. WALTZER: They're adding components to the product --

MR. JONES: They're blending.
MS. BOATNER: They're changing the chemical makeup of gasoline by adding some additives to it. It's a blending process.

MR. JONES: I think Mr. Waltzer has given his blessing. Maybe not his blessing. I don't want to overstate, but his not objection.

All right. Any other questions or comments? (No response.)

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

MS. BOATNER: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Etheredge Electric Company. Is
anybody here from Etheredge?
Please state your name and your position with the company, please.

MS. MANESS: Olivia Maness. I'm the CFO.
MR. JONES: Great. Tell us what you do.
MS. MANESS: So we actually operate under a D/B/A, Etheredge Industrial Services, because there has been some misconception about what we do. We're not an electric company. We repair and remanufacture electric motors for the industrial sector.

MR. JONES: So you manufacture electric motors for the industrial sector?

MS. MANESS: Remanufacture.
MR. JONES: Remanufacture. So what does that mean?

MS. MANESS: So we tear them down to their smallest parts based on whatever the issue is with the motor just to see what's needed. Sometimes we do have to replace the motor, but we rebuild them, stripping them, burning them out in the ovens, cleaning them in our ultrasonic cleaning station, which is one of the pieces of equipment that was purchased under this application that is up for renewal. And then we repaint them. We rewind them, if that's what's needed. It just depends on the particular motor, but the customers that
we represent are all almost entirely in the industrial sector. So that's basically what we do.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. HAVARD: I have a question.
So do you sell like remanufactured motors? Y'all buy old motors and re- --

MS. MANESS: We don't sell remanufactured motor. We repair them, or if we are able to remanufacture them, they go back to the customer.

There are times when we cannot, and then we would sell them a new motor if that's the case, but the majority of our revenue comes from rebuilding, remanufacturing motors for the industrial sector.

MR. HAVARD: So you remanufacture?
MS. MANESS: Yes.
MR. HAVARD: Okay.
MR. JONES: Any other question or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Thank you very much. Appreciate your time.

MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?

Mr. Waltzer.
MR. WALTZER: As much as I like electric
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motors, $I$ don't believe an electric motor repair shop is a manufacturer.

MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have a NAICS code on this or what?

MR. USIE: The one that they used on the application is 335312 manufacturing NAICS. We're going to look it up.

MS. CHENG: The NAICS for that is establishments primarily engaged in manufacturing electric motors, power generators and motor generator sets.

MR. JONES: Okay. So we have a motion and a second to approve. You've heard the objection from Mr. Waltzer.

Any other comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, the motion
carries.
Let's go down to PennTex North Louisiana

Operating, Number 20141040, and there's two more after that on Page 21 for those of you are who are trying to keep up that way.

Thank you, sir. Are you with PennTex?
MR. GEISLER: I am representing PennTex, yes, sir.

MR. JONES: Excellent. Please state -first of all, let me get a motion so we can work from there.

Motion to approve from Dr. Wilson; second from Ms. Malone.

Now, would you state your name and position with the company, please?

MR. GEISLER: Eric Geisler. I'm with Economic Incentive Services in Bellaire, Texas representing the company.

MR. JONES: Great. The question that has come up and the reason that we're handling this on an individual basis is $I$ think the question of whether it fits the definition of manufacturing, so if you could help us with what PennTex does for a living.

MR. GEISLER: I will try. I'm filling in for a colleague, but, yeah, these are not just terminals. They take the natural gas and extract other carbons and that sort of thing out of it, so it does
change the makeup of the product as defined -- as manufacturing is defined. And I don't have the NAICS in front of me, but --

MR. JONES: Mr. Usie, I'm going to ask y'all to go ahead and get ready and be looking those up as we go.

MR. USIE: 325120, industrial gas manufacturing, manufacturing industrial or organic gasses in compressed liquid an solid forms.

MR. JONES: So PennTex is taking the natural gas and converting it to another -- a syn gas or --

MR. GEISLER: Correct.
MR. JONES: Is that -- okay.
All right. Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Mr. Waltzer?
Okay. No comment from Mr. Waltzer.
Any other comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. We have a motion to approve the renewals of PennTex, the three PennTex applications -- excuse me -- three PennTex renewals.

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")

MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is none. The motion
carries.
Thank you for your help. Appreciate you.
All right, ladies and gentlemen. I think we're now to Fol- -- let's deal with Folgers first.

Mr. Usie, I think we're on Page 18, the bottom of Page 18 and the top of Page 19, 20131327 and the four following it; is that accurate?

MR. USIE: Correct.
MR. JONES: Is that all the Folger renewals?
MR. USIE: Yes. Timely renewals, yes.
MR. JONES: Okay. I'll entertain a motion.
Do I have a motion?
Motion from Ms. Davis; second from Ms.
Malone to approve these renewals.
Do we need to have more debate on Folgers?
Are there any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Motion carries.
Now, let' go to Genesis. Give me just a moment. We have a number of cards that have been filed for Genesis. I just want to get them in front of me.

All right. Mr. Usie, let's deal with
Genesis.
MR. USIE: 20150540, Genesis BR, LLC, East Baton Rouge Parish; 20150545, 20150546, 20150547, 20150548, 20150549, 20150550, 20150551, 20150552, 20150553, 20150555, 20150556, 20150557, 20150558, 20150561, 20150563, 20150565, 20150566, 20150569, 20150570, 20150571, 20150573, 20150574, 20150575, 20150577, 20150578, 20150579, 20150580, 20150581, 20150582, 20150586, 20150588. Those are all for Genesis BR, LLC in East Baton Rouge Parish.

MR. JONES: Okay. I know we have a lot of discussion on these, but let's start just with a motion that we can then use to carry on the discussion.

So I'll entertain a motion.
A motion to approve, Dr. Wilson?
We have a motion to approve by Dr. Wilson; second from Mr. Briggs.

First I want to turn to staff to tell us what has transpired since your last meeting with these applications.

MR. FAVALORO: After the June meeting the Board asked -- during the June meeting, the Board asked staff to do a site inspection. We performed a site inspection in mid-August, and the company demonstrated that these contracts listed for renewal are part of the manufacturing process, blending.

MR. JONES: And when you say "part of the manufacturing," you're talking about blending? Did that mean that some of the applications that were on the prior agendas were considered not manufacturing?

MR. FAVALORO: During the inspection, we noted that some contracts were not on a continuous project site, which made them ineligible by rule.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. FAVALORO: Those are not up here for renewal right now.

MR. JONES: Okay. So some applications that had been on prior agenda are no longer there, and that's solely due to they weren't contiguous to the site?

MR. FAVALORO: That's correct.
MR. JONES: Were you able to determine whether there had been a site inspection and
determination of manufacturing back when the project was originally approved?

MR. FAVALORO: No, sir, we were not.
MR. JONES: No, you were not able to determine or, no, there was so site inspection?

MR. FAVALORO: No, we weren't able to determine.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. And when we say "blending," what do we mean by that so that we're all on the same page? What is blending as a manufacturing?

MR. FAVALORO: There should be a
representative here that could orate that much better than I. It's basically mixing --

MR. JONES: I understand, but I want to understand what staff understands it to be.

MR. FAVALORO: Raw crude coming in, mixed and blend to customer specification using chemicals.

MR. JONES: Okay. Good. So from this Board's perspective, since the last meeting, the staff has satisfied itself that the applications presently on this agenda do meet the manufacturing standard?

MR. FAVALORO: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Okay. Now, let's -- company representative?

MR. LOLAN: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Please state your name and your position with the company.

MR. LOLAN: Okay. My name is Wayne Lolan, L-o-l-a-n.

MR. JONES: Mr. Lolan, I'm going to ask you to pull the mic a little bit closer to you if you don't mind. Thank you.

MR. LOLAN: Wayne Lolan. I'm recently retired as Vice President of Engineering, and I've been retained as a consultant to Genesis going forward.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. LOLAN: I am the Louisiana registered professional engineer that led the design, development, construction and startup of all of these facilities. I'm intimately familiar with everything there.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. LOLAN: And much the same fashion that a couple prior, the gasoline facility, was talking about taking components and modifying them to come up with a customer specs, we do exactly the same thing, but as the feedstock to the refinery, not as the output of the refinery. And this allows refineries to take advantage of unconventional crudes that are not typically what we would have thought of in years past. So they're able to
bring these into our facilities, we're able to assemble a feedstock that lets them optimize their refinery and optimize, therefore, their profit.

And I guess as a side note, I would note that the recent refinery closing, there was noted it was because that refinery wasn't able to deal with these unconventional crudes that we're seeing now. So it's a very straightforward process, but it is a manufacturing process, and it's also capable of being messed up just as simply as we do it well.

MR. JONES: What do you blend with the crude?

MR. LOLAN: We bring in, by rail, barge, truck and pipeline, various component crudes. Some of them would not be able to be processed by refineries as their. And we assemble a feedstock that matches the specs of the customers refining unit or whatever he tells us to put it together to.

MR. JONES: So there's actually a spec that you guys developed the formula or they develop the formula?

MR. LOLAN: They tell us what they want.
MR. JONES: Okay. And then you buy whatever component parts are needed to blend with the prevailing crude in order to meet that spec?

MR. LOLAN: They buy it and send it to us.
MR. JONES: Oh, okay. So they even provide the component parts, you actually just do the blending? MR. LOLAN: We do the -- we manufacturer the feedstock.

MR. JONES: Got it. I know you keep saying that, but I still have to understand it. I'm sorry. My wife says saying it louder doesn't make her understand better.

MR. LOLAN: I keep leaning into the mic.
MR. JONES: That's all right.
All right. That answers the questions I had. Any other questions from the Board?

MR. HAVARD: You're changing this specific gravity of the crude, et cetera, that's -- so let's just pick a location, Zachary location of Georgia-Pacific, I think y'all have a location there.

MR. LOLAN: Yeah.
MR. HAVARD: What goes on at that location?
MR. LOLAN: I think those are the items that were excluded. That's our Port Hudson facility.

MR. HAVARD: Okay. The Blunt Road facility, what about that one?

MR. LOLAN: So at Scenic we might receive batches of crude by the barge or through Port Hudson or
by truck through Port Hudson or by rail directly to Scenic, and all of these various crudes will have different densities, viscosities, sulphur content, pure points. And particularly some of the stuff that comes in by rail is totally unsuitable to put into a pipeline, and so you have to look at and working with the customer, you come up with specifications for what we're going to put together to go to the refinery and it will depend on which unit in the refinery the customer is planning on sending it to.

In general terms, heavy sour crude is cheaper, and, therefore, if they can refine it, they can make more money. If it's harder to refine, it requires more effort. Light, sweet crude that's particularly -you know, average sweet crude that we used for 50,60 , 100 years in Louisiana in the initial offshore production, you know, it's easy to deal with, but it carries a higher price.

So, you know, refineries that can't deal with heavy crude wind up chasing that and paying more money for it. So, you know, it's a financial incentive for our customers, and we try to -- well, they try to, we do it for them. They try to run as close to the edge as they can with the specifications the plant can handle, and we build them what they need.

MR. HAVARD: What do you mix -- without giving any proprietary information, what do you mix with the crude to make it -- take it from sour to something sweeter, I guess.

MR. LOLAN: You would take -- if you have too much sulphur, you would blend in more of a sweet crude. If you have a crude that's too heavy to pump, you would blend in more light crude. If you have a waxy crude that has a pour point problem, you would have a choice, you can add pour point depressant or you could blend it out with another crude to lower the pour point. You know, there's --

MR. HAVARD: So you're just taking two different types of crude and changing the specific gravity, you're not heating it or -- I don't know.

MR. LOLAN: We have heated it.
MR. HAVARD: Just running it through a process.

MR. LOLAN: We have heated it sometimes, but that's -- you know, it just depends on what the client wants us to do. We have heaters in our tanks. We have a heating -- we've had to use heaters sometimes on the railcars because that ambient temperature, sometimes nozzles turn to solid, so it's...

MR. HAVARD: Are you heating it?

MR. LOLAN: Sometimes. It's -- every batch is different. You know, it's what they can buy and what we can do for them.

MR. HAVARD: Okay.
MR. JONES: Any other questions from the
Board?
Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: Quickly, would you consider the product that you take in as a raw product and what you ship out as a finished product?

MR. LOLAN: I don't know if you would call it "finished." I mean, it is a product that's finished for what it is. It's a refinery feedstock. It's not the same as what we take in.

MR. HOLLEY: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Any other questions from the
Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions from the public? Let's see. I've got cards. Let me handle the ones who turned in cards, but I'll make sure I give everybody a chance to...

First, Mr. Bobby Edwards.
Thank you, sir.
MR. LOLAN: Thank you.

MR. EDWARDS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and your Board members.

MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
MR. EDWARDS: My name is Bobby Edwards, ex-Air Force, ex-engineer on the space shuttle and advanced cruise missile.

I'd like to know what constitutes a manufacturing company. I can give fiberoptics to a company, I can give a piping system to a company to support that company, but that does not constitute me as being that company. And the reason why I say that is because General Motors back in the day had contractors working for them, they build engines, they build transmissions, deferential rear ends, but they used the name of General Motors for a tax purpose. General Motors left the State of Louisiana owing us tax revenue. We never recouped that money back.

Okay. Now, as we go off into the millennium, into the future, $I$ want to share a few notes with you guys. Now, bear with me as I go through my notes. I won't be long.

Let's move forward in time. When I was in the military, we fueled them fighters in flight as a boom operator. If they're not there on time, if I'm not there on time and if they don't get any fuel, those
planes go down, those fighter planes go down, and those guys can't eject all of the time with parachutes. And what I mean by that is if we don't get our tax revenue from companies, we lose not only our school system, our EMS, our infrastructure, our police department, our fire department, our bridges and roads and everything. We lose. The question $I$ have is how do we recoup that money?

Now, Genesis is one of the companies that popped up here today that we're discussing right now, and one of the things $I$ wanted to know is, Genesis, are they a manufacturer or are they just someone supporting a manufacturing company is what we really want to know.

> We're not opposed to any company doing business in the State of Louisiana, but we do be opposed when somebody don't follow the rules and regulations or the policies and procedures. We've all had those before. We're not here to insult anybody's intelligence on their pros and cons on what these companies are doing in the State of Louisiana, but history dictates that they have came to our city, they have threatened us, and the threat was "We'll leave this state if you don't abide by our ways the way we want to play ball." And we've got to get ourselves together as officials, individuals who are living, paying our property taxes
also because they would kick me out of my house if I don't pay may taxes in Shreveport. I know they will.

But all we're doing is just asking the Board just please dig deep into your knowledge of expertise and make sure that the rules and regulations that we govern ourselves by are followed.

And I appreciate your time there, Mr. Chairman, and make sure all of your people have a nice day. Don't get mad at each other.

MR. JONES: Thank you for your service, sir. Thank you for your service.

Ms. Dianne Hanley.
MS. HANLEY: Hello. I'm Dianne Hanley. I live here in Baton Rouge, 5407 Loranger Drive, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, lifelong resident.

The ITEP applications are for manufacturers. I don't know if I've heard what $I$ need to hear about whether they've been proven to be a manufacturer, not by LED, not by Genesis and not by this Board, and so I think they should be rejected until that is very clear. They've come here three times to answer that question. This time when they came, they said, "Well, we took off 15 or 16 of them." They didn't really count.

So my question then becomes, well, five years of exemptions, where's the money? How do we get
that money back? Do we get the money back? And if we find out this time these really weren't, how do we get the money back?

I also want to bring to your attention that our elected officials in Baton Rouge will not get a chance to go behind you and say how they feel about this. This is a renewal. This is it. Y'all are it. Well, our local elected offices at the school board and at the metro council have sent letters to this Board to say their concerns. I don't know if they made it into the public record because the timing and you have to do it a certain way and I notice the e-mail address is kind of kooky because it has this dash at the beginning, we didn't know if that was included. Anyway, I don't know if you got this trauma our school board members and our metro council, so I'm coming as a citizen and a resident of Baton Rouge, who's represented by those people, to say that they have concerns and they have put them before this Board and they do not have another voice other than that. So I hope that you will take into consideration their concerns.

One in particular was from the metro council member who has this in her district. She said she was told one thing before, now she's being kind of told something else, so she doesn't know what to believe, but
she does not have a say now. You're it. And so I come before you and ask you to be very, very careful. I ask you to figure out in the rules how we are going to get our money back that was lost for five years, and maybe take apart all of these applications. They're putting them in a bundle to for you to do global like they like to do, but we learned 15 or 16 of them really aren't manufacturers. Maybe in this whole long list there's something that not really manufacturer unless the rules, I guess, say "Well, if they're all bundled together, they count. If they're all in the same place, they count." But I'm asking is every portion of this application considered -- can be considered manufacturers?

And so I'm asking you deny them. I'm asking you for my school board, for my metro council. I'm not a member, but they represent me, and I know some of them stand because they told me, they've shown me the letter they've sent to you. So please take that into consideration, make it a part of the public record and know that there are concerns from our local officials.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Just a second, Ms. Hanley.
Have we received any letters from the school board or council members?

MS. CHENG: No, sir, we didn't receive anything from the East Baton Rouge School Board or council.

MR. JONES: I have not seen any, but I -all right. Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. Hanley.
MS. HANLEY: I'll get a copy of it. I meant to have it like the other lady had it. She had it right in front of her. It's like "Oh, I wish I had thought of that," but I didn't.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
Any questions or comments for Ms. Hanley from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Ms. Jenny Hastings.
MS. HASTINGS: Good afternoon.
MR. JONES: Hi, Ms. Hastings. Please state your name and address for the record, please.

MS. HASTINGS: Jenny Hastings, 715 High Plains Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

I started this day today feeling pretty intimidated by you guys. There are a lot of you. If you're smiling, $I$ can't tell. And you sit up sort of high, and that's intimidating. Now, actually, I'm feeling more confused because I've listened to the
in-depth discussion that goes on, and it's leaving me with a lot of questions.

Now, I want you to know that I come from a broken parish, a broken city. Where I live in Baton Rouge is going to be broken off possibly into a different city. We don't know what that's going to change. The public school system that my granddaughter attends is broken in many ways. We don't know what our healthcare situation is going to be. COVID is not our friend and is doing great damage. And I drive over potholes every time $I$ leave my house. So stewardship of our tax dollars is really very important.

As I've listened to your discussion today, which I really appreciate for the attention that you've paid and the depth and the discussion that you've gone through. I'm not so sure that you're not broken either because all of your rules and regs don't seem to be nailed down, at least where $I$ sit as a citizen that's not an attorney, I'm not a lobbyist, I don't represent anybody as a consultant, and a lot of this doesn't make sense to me. What I learned about Genesis indicated it was not manufacturing company. I mix things in the kitchen all of the time and blend them up, but you wouldn't look at me as a manufacturer. So I'm hoping that as you go through this -- and I'm noticing that
you're able to vote unanimously when it comes time to vote. That means that each of you individually must have real confidence with what your hearing, and your staff is presenting itself as though it's investigating and doing return on investments and are doing accountability on these applications as they go forward. And I just encourage you to keep on doing that.

Now, I do have happen to have the school board letter with me, and if you would -- it's a little longer that you'd want to know about, but there are three asks there that might be important to you. One may have already been answered. "We request that LED representatives fully explain at its November 13th meeting why 16 of the application renewals deferred from previous meetings are no longer on the agenda and what specific positive evidence LED now has that the remaining 33 qualify." Well, now that staff has actually done an inspection, you've got something to say there.

The second ask is "We request that LED representatives be prepared to attend the upcoming school board meeting to represent compelling, positive evidence that the initial approval of 49 applications was legitimate" -- that's the first five years -- "that we're now renewing and include e-mails or
correspondence documenting that site visit that was conducted."

And, thirdly, "If LED representatives cannot present such evidence, we request a detailed description how or why these applications were approved and how LED will rectify and recoup for East Baton Rouge Parish the full dollar value of any illegitimate exemptions."

The school board in and of itself has about four and a half million dollars riding on the line, and for a system that just last Spring was looking forward to layoffs for personnel because the money was running short, you can see why citizens like me, thousands of us all over the state are paying really close attention to what you do with these exemptions. It matters to us.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Hastings.
Appreciate your comments.
I'm not sure what the first name is. Last name is Hudson.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He had to leave.
MR. JONES: Okay. All right.
And someone -- please come forward, please.
They'll get it to me. Thank you. State your name for the record, please.

MR. MORELAND: My name is Rick Moreland. I
live at 1723 Blouin Avenue in Baton Rouge.
These Genesis applications seem to me a good example of a problem with how this Board regularly operates. The Board doesn't seem to really get the information it needs to make responsible decisions about the applications that come before you.

The Genesis applications came in February before this Board. Mr. Jones, you said just a moment ago that if an application appears on the agenda, then it is presumed to be a manufacturer because the staff is that good. Mr. Havard asked a really basic question about whether this application came from sites where manufacturing was actually taking place. The Board didn't have the kind of information it needed to know that already. That should be in the agenda packet. The original applications are supposed to have specific descriptions of what manufacturing operations are taking place. They didn't even have that description.

He asked the question, the staff couldn't answer it at that meeting. You deferred your decision. Four months later, the staff still couldn't answer that question. They couldn't say whether there with site visit. They said if there were questions asked, then there would have been a site visit. You're making all of these in globo decisions based on a presumption that
these applications have already been vetted, but the Board doesn't have the information it needs to really evaluate that as a Board. If the Board is here to evaluate these applications, it ought to have more than just the applications. But from what I've seen in the agenda packet, the detailed version of the agenda packet, all they have is the applications. For the Genesis applications, the section where it asks whether any of the manufacturing operations have been altered, they have "N/A." There's no description of what the original -- what the manufacturing operations were. There's no acknowledgement that at one of two sites represented in the original 49 applications, that that has apparently stopped at some point. We still don't know when that happened. As Ms. Hastings said, the East Baton Rouge Parish ought to know when that stopped, when these applications were no longer legitimate because the manufacturing was not happening.

From what I can tell, the Board also doesn't get information at the end of the five years or 10 years of the original application about whether the jobs that were promised have actually been sustained. That seems like really basic information that the Board members ought have before they consider a renewal.

I also know from a recent Pugh Foundation
evaluation of Louisiana's tax exemption evaluation process that Louisiana is one of the only states where the same entity that grants exemptions evaluates their program. I'm not sure if that's LED or this Board.

The auditor doesn't evaluate the program because it's state money. Local governments still, some of them at least, trust that you are making responsible decisions at the state level about their money and have been for the last 85 years, but as others have said, when 99.9 percent of those applications have been approved, when a lot of our local property tax money is going to support these industries, and there's no -apparently no real evaluation of this program, with all the money that is spends or gives away, that's a problem. I would agree with Ms. Hastings that the process is broken.

This Board is a sham. If you don't have the information to make real decisions about the applications that are before you, what are you here for?

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
Ms. Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: Lady Carlson, 7640 LaSalle in Baton Rouge.

And, first, let me say that I realize it's
been a long day and you are a Board that's been appointed, you're not getting paid and you're reviewing applications, and so first of all, thank you, because, again, it's been a long day. But $I$ also want to say this: The Board does not seem to have -- does not seem to have an exemption that it doesn't like because it grants all of the exemptions.

And my other question is this: The staff went to Genesis to check out was it a manufacturer. Who on the staff? Who's qualified to make that determination? Is there an engineer, is there -- so that there has to be more than the staff going and saying -- and people at the company saying "We're a manufacturer," and they take that. I mean, there has to be some proof. What is the proof? The proof of the pudding is in the pudding. What is the proof that the staff got that it's a manufacturing? And I think until they ask answer that question -- I think you shouldn't prove these, but I think they need to answer that question. And I think that, look, we pay taxes, and when you exempt this money, then we pay for it. We make it up. That's why our schools are falling apart, our infrastructure is falling apart. And so we're asking you to do your due diligence. Who makes the determination? Does they say to the staff, "Yes, we
are"? Who makes that determination? And I think until you have an in-depth, detailed report about whether or not this is a manufacturer, I think you shouldn't approve it.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Carlson.
MR. WALTZER: Joel Waltzer, 3201 General De Gaulle, New Orleans 70114 here, attorney on behalf of Together Louisiana.

We previously provide you with evidence that this was not a manufacturer, that this was a rail yard.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry?
MR. WALTZER: A rail yard, a rail terminal. It's evident when you look on Google Earth that it's a rail terminal. It's an "8," rails come in, four tanks, it's offloaded to the tanks and then it's put in a pipeline. It's a transportation company. It self identifies -- if I'm not mistaken, the NAICS code for this is transportation. It's not a manufacturer. It's not a 3300 or a 3200. They're paid to move stuff, put it in a tank and then pipe it to a refinery. He said they don't own the oil, that's what the refinery owns, and then the refinery, they ship it in, offload it, put it in a tank.

According to the DEQ -- and I've looked
through the permits -- there's no blending equipment, there's no on-site storage or chemical additives, unlike the other one. There's just the crude, and there's a heating element to it to keep it viscus enough to move through a pipeline, but that's what crude is going to do anyway. They're going to be heating it in a railcar, the transportation comp, so it doesn't glum up and stick.

It's not a manufacturer. If you read the process that they described themselves in the DEQ permits, which is also done under oath, they say "We're a transportation company. We basically move, you know, oil." Okay.

So is there some element of -- there's no blending equipment that $I$ can see on any of the tanks. There's no blending equipment referenced in any of the DEQ applications. So they may be mixing different grades of crude in a single tank and then pumping it out, but that's not making them a manufacturer; right? I mean, essentially anybody -- and I made it a little -you know, it's true, I'm a lawyer, you know, I purchased this machine and hit the print button and it takes -infuses and dyes and changes the chemical composition of the dyes and infuses it on another input, which is the pulp, you know, of a paper and then it comes out. That
doesn't make me a manufacturer; right?
And so $I$ understand that this is at a different scale, but the Supreme Court tells you you need to narrowly construe your authority; right, because you're dealing with the public fisc, and because this is an exception to the rule that everybody pays their taxes.

So because they, themselves, have admitted into the records of the $D E Q$ and the rec- -- that should be all you need. There is your reasonable doubt, and you resolve the reasonable doubts against the applicant in these situations. That's what the Supreme Court has said.

So, you know, it's a little concerning to me that we would go out and do a site inspection, you know, there are 30 , and 15 are pulled off because what? We couldn't find the evidence that the prop- -- "Oh, it must be somewhere else." Well, did we go somewhere else and confirm that that property was somewhere else, and, if so, why was it -- I mean, they all had the address on it. You know, they all had the same place, the Scenic Yard, Baton Rouge, the same company, which, by the way, is a Shell company, the one that's applying. And I believe the facility is actually run by a different company; right?

Torres Reporting \& Associates, inc.

So what I've heard has not changed my initial review. Maybe it -- you know, again anytime you're storing products or you're doing something, I mean, you got to look at really what fundamentally what this is, you know. And in the case of a manufacturer, fine, it's a manufacturer. In the case of a storage company, that's what it is. We're not going to get around it by saying "Well, we're moving stuff around," you know. And that's my view. I believe that's what the law requires, and I haven't heard anything to --

MR. JONES: I think you're starting to repeat, so I -- if you have something add, I don't want to cut you off, but you're starting to repeat.

MR. WALTZER: Well, I'm actually winding down.

MR. JONES: Okay. Mr. Havard has a question.

MR. WALTZER: So I'll be happy to answer any questions. I just wanted to make sure that the evidence that $I$ put in before is still part of the record.

MR. JONES: It is.
MR. WALTZER: And ask that if there is other evidence, that we be provided with it because I've asked for it before and we haven't been provided any other evidence now other than the testimony -- is that you who
went or -- I mean, are we hearing firsthand information from LED?

MR. JONES: Yes, you're hearing firsthand, yes.

MR. HAVARD: I have a question for you. You mentioned the codes. What codes are they?

MR. WALTZER: The NAICS code?
MR. HAVARD: Yes. What is that code?
MR. WALTZER: It was on their application, I believe.

MR. HAVARD: And is that a manufacture- -what is that?

MR. JONES: What is the NAICS code? I think you give it to us a minute ago.

MR. USIE: The one listed on here is 324110.
MR. WALTZER: The other thing I'm going to ask is that we verify; right? We verify information that's been given to us. An when I say that, I mean all of these companies, and you included, have to put the code when you submit tax forms to the IRS, that it would be probably a pretty good -- a pretty good check for this company, for this Board to require that information as opposed to asking an applicant "What's your SIC code?" Well, you know, somebody that's not scrupulous, and I'm not suggesting that you are, that they would
just write in what they want. That's something that you file with the government, and that has more credibility. MR. JONES: Secretary Pierson. SECRETARY PIERSON: Genesis is a big company with multi-state operations. We're not talking about what their NAICS code is. We're looking at a project located in Louisiana. The renewal is based on a contract that was considered more than five years ago by a different Board and granted.

Today we have an engineer that's testified versus your view from Google. We have had LED personnel on the ground at this location to verify that it's a blending operation. And I don't know what more we can provide, but you can paint the partial pictures of a logistics company, which may be dominus blanc (sic) their operations at a headquarters somewhere, they just do paperwork. But we're talking specifically about the Louisiana element that's engaged in blending here. So we need to narrow the focus onto the topic that's before the Board.

MR. WALTZER: The information that I'm giving you is based on this Louisiana corporation, and I believe it came from Dun \& Bradstreet that gives you the SIC code or the NAICS and it is limited. And it's not my opinion. I mean, it's just research, basic research

I did when I looked at their project that -- their business description to the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality because they have to get permits and when $I$ looked at their business description on their website. I mean, you know, so this isn't my -- I mean, I'm reporting facts to you, and I'm asking you to consider the fact and develop other evidence, and so I'm -- what I'm hearing is -- again, I'm making my public comment to say that nothing that I've heard is overcoming their own words to the LDEQ in three or four different applications in their own words and on Dun \& Bradstreet (sic) on what is this SIC code. I believe it is -- I mean, as I said, it's in the original comments that we made, but I believe -- what is it?

MS . CHENG: 324110.
MR. JONES: What is that?
Ms. CHENG: Industry comprises of establishments primarily engage in refining crude petroleum into refined petroleum.

MR. WALTZER: Right. And that's not the right one. In other words, when you research the -MS. CHENG: Blending or compounding refined petroleum to make lubricating oils, greases, and/or refining used petroleum, lubricating oils.

MR. JONES: I need -- I appreciate -- you
need to read it a little bit more carefully. You're kind of blending your words as well as you're blending petroleum. So I need to hear it better. Thank you.

MR. USIE: So it's petroleum refining involves one or more of the following activities: Fractionation, straight distillation of crude oil and cracking. And then it says "cross references below," and they mention blending or compounding refine petroleum to make lubricating oils and greases and/or re-refining used petroleum lubricating oils are classified -- you also have blending purchased bio diesel fuels and purchased refined petroleum listed.

MR. HAVARD: Purchased and refined petroleum; is that correct, is that what you said? MR. USIE: Refined petroleum. MS. CHENG: Blending purchased. MR. HAVARD: I don't have it in front of me right now, but $I$ was looking, and maybe this is a question for the company, but when I looked it up on the website, just their information, they're a logistics and transportation company. That's what they define themselves as. They're also -- having been part of the legislature at one time and transportation chairman, we -- I think they're regulated by the Department of Transportation, not a manufacturer. So they're
regulated by the Department of Transportation because they are a logistics and transportation company.

And I guess my next question would be to the staff is are we operating under the 50 percent rule still or -- where 50 percent of the time they have to be a manufacturer in operation --

MS. CHENG: No. That's not part of ITEP rules. If they're manufacturing at the site, then they're eligible for the program.

MR. HAVARD: Okay.
MS. CHENG: So just because that company is a logistics and transportation company, if they're doing manufacturing activity at that site, they would be eligible for the program.

MR. HAVARD: And why would they not -- why would they break it down into MCAs not do one application then for that one particular site rather than keeping it under the $\$ 5$-million mark? If you look at the -- if I you look at a application, every one of them is less --

MS. CHENG: At the time, they may not have filed an advance notification, so it was allowed for them to file individual applications of individual projects that were completed under $\$ 5-m i l l i o n$.

MR. HAVARD: Okay.

MR. BAGERT: Broderick Bagert with Together
Louisiana. I do just want to speak to that issue.
If this had been a single application, and presuming that there's blending happening on the location, then the question would be a difficult one to ascertain, is enough blending going on there to make the project, as a whole, a manufacturer? That's not the scenario we're facing. It's broken into 33 separate projects; right? So the question is which ones pertain to manufacturer blending, and which do not? And the notion that they all do really begs credibility. I
 of the value of the property there, it is really close to it.

So I would submit that is entirely implausible and just factually not correct that all of these pertain to blending because there's not enough value left over to do the other things they do because they certainly are, if they are blending, also a rail facility, also a pipeline facility, also a terminal. So they're not all one application, they're separate applications. The question is which of these pertain to blending?

The staff has presented the conclusion that there's manufacturing going on there because blending is
going on there. The same staff that reported back to you at the last meeting that "We verified that this is a manufacturer." "Did you go see it?" "No, but we can verify it" -- and I'm paraphrasing, but I think accurately -- "We can verify it because if they weren't, they wouldn't have gotten an original exemption"; right? When the whole question is whether they are or not. And that is like saying "I don't care what security footage you're looking at, I couldn't have robbed that bank because that would have been illegal"; right?

So now they've gone and done a site visit an said there's blending happening there, therefore, all of these applications -- there is no possible way that the entirely of the value of that plant is dedicated to blending. So without determining which of these, there's no way to split them out.

At this point now, almost a year in, you've got to say they have not met the threshold, and without disaggregating these and saying which specifically have to do with the blending feature, it's just not responsible. It's not within the purview or authority of this Board to approve some 33 applications as though they relate to blending when they factually do not.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bagert.
MS. CHENG: I do want to say, at the site
inspection, the employees that took us around the entire site did show us how every single one of these contracts and the assets associated with them did tie back to their process, if that helps anything.

MR. JONES: So is it fair to say that in your mind or in the staff's mind each one of the contracts did relate to manufacturing?

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: Were there any contracts that were left off because they related to logistics or transportation?

MS. CHENG: No. They were all -- all the assets were necessary for their blending process.

MR. HAVARD: When an applicant applies to LED, do they provide like PNIDs or piping and instrument drawing, diagrams, et cetera, of how that process works?

MS. CHENG: No, sir, but they did show us at the site inspection.

MR. HAVARD: Okay.
MR. JONES: Mr. Nassar.
MR. NASSAR: Have we ever thought about having a third-party auditor go in to audit to see how much crude or raw is actually brought in, how much is blended, a third-party, impartial party to give us an audit or report on what is actually taking place, a
professional?
MR. JONES: Ms. Bourgeois, you're at the table. Do you have something to add to this discussion?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Well, I guess just to quickly address Mr . Nassar, we have the resources that we have. We don't have on-staff auditors that could do that. We would need basically an appropriation and a new position.

But with regard to the individual MCA applications, the rules as they stood in 2016, these applications, as $I$ understand, were part of a larger project for the manufacturing establishment. The fact that they're broken down in individual applications is immaterial to the fact that they're part of a larger product, as an MCA is defined by those rules.

MR. HAVARD: Well, they did that so they wouldn't have to apply for advance application; correct?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Well, they had the option. They had the option to file an advance and, you know, have it all under one or they had the option to do the MCA process, which is what they chose.

MR. JONES: Which was allowed under the rules at the time.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Correct.
MR. JONES: Mr. Nassar.

MR. NASSAR: I understand that you don't have the staff to do it. I guess my point was have we ever thought about hiring a third-party as far as a contract? Because obviously this is a major issue that keeps come up with this particular company.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Well, the way I see the process and how it pans out is companies file a lot of documents with LED and they sign them under oath and then they come to you and they give you testimony. And so the companies explain to you what they do, how they qualify. If we have -- if the staff has questions, they go back, they ask those questions. If the Board members have questions, if anybody has questions, we look into those and we get answers.

MR. JONES: I'm sorry. I think Mr. Edwards, I believe.

MR. MORELAND: Moreland.
MR. JONES: Forgive me. I'm sorry.
MR. No problem.
MR. JONES: Say your name again, please, for the record.

MR. MORELAND: Rick Moreland, 1723 Blouin
Avenue, Baton Rouge.
I read through these applications. I did a search for the word "blend." There was no mention of
blending in any one of these 33 applications. I saw it in lots of other companies' applications. They mentioned blending tanks, blending equipment. In these applications, I saw offloading, uploading, nothing about blending or anything like blending.

I don't know if that's pertinent, but that's what $I$ saw in the applications.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Moreland.
MR. JONES: All right, ladies and gentlemen. Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: We have a -- I'm sorry.
Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: Well, I'm reluctant to, but I want to assure you that not every member of this Board is a rubber stamp for every application that comes across here. You may think that, but that's not true. This has been a difficult decision for all of us because of this so-called blending. So $I$ went to the rule book and I looked at the word, the definition of "manufacturing," and it is "Working raw materials by means of mass or custom production, including
fabrication, applying manual labor or machinery into wares suitable for use or which gives shapes, qualities or combinations to matter which already has gone through some artificial process."

That's what we've got to live with. That's the law. So it's easy to sit out there and say "You're rubber stamping this stuff," but we've got to go by this rule book. If you don't like it, change the rules.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Holley.
All right. We have a motion to approve.
All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
MR. HAVARD: Nay.
MR. JONES: Nay. There are two "nays."
The motion carries.
MS. SIMMONS: Who was the other person that did not vote yes? Mr. Havard and who else?

MR. JONES: Mr. Havard and Mr. Jones.
MR. HOLLEY: I abstained. I didn't vote.
MR. JONES: Mr. Holley abstains.
MS. SIMMONS: Thank you.
MR. JONES: All right. What's next,
Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: Next we have late renewals. One
is requesting deferral. It's 20150339, Mezco
Properties, LLC in Lafayette Parish.
MR. JONES: Motion to approve the deferral of Mezco Properties.

Motion from Mr. Havard; second from Ms. Davis.

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

MR. USIE: 20140054, Boh Bros. Construction Company, LLC, Orleans Parish. Initial contract expiration date $7 / 31$ of 2020 , late renewal request date 9/4 of 2020 .

MR. JONES: Is anyone here from Bo. Bros.?
Yes, ma'am.
MS. TALBOT: Hi. I'm Brittney Talbot. I'm
a Senior Accountant at Boh Bros.
MR. JONES: Okay. What happened on this, Ms. -- Talbot; is that right?

MS. TALBOT: Talbot, yes.
MR. JONES: What happened, Ms. Talbot?
MS. TALBOT: So the person that originally did the application for the company left abruptly in 2018. We called in 2019 to get access to the project on the FastLane and were told at the time -- we talked to Kristin Cheng -- that we were good to go.

We got access for the project and that our renewal was $12 / 31 / 202$ and that we couldn't start the renewal process for six months before that. So we were under the assumption that we could start the process on $7 / 1$ of this year and we had until $12 / 31$. So when $I$ submitted on $9 / 4$, I thought $I$ was way ahead of the game, and then later found out that Orleans Parish has an earlier date of $7 / 31$ because their tax roll is ahead -yeah. So we really thought we were ahead of the game, and we're sorry to take up your time today. You know, we thought we would get it done and any hiccups we had, we would be able to solve it before December. And unfortunately we were actually two weeks behind the COVID extension that was given.

MR. JONES: Okay. So what is normal --
you're a couple months late, but that will cost -- that has been our standard is a one-year penalty on the exemption. That may or may not be what happens right now, but that has been the standard for the Board.

What is the Board's pleasure?
DR. W. WILSON: Penalize one year, for the one year.

MR. JONES: We have a motion from Dr. Wilson for a one-year penalty.

Do I have a second?
MR. MOSS: Second.
MR. JONES: Second from Mr. Moss.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
MR. HOLLEY: How many months was it? I'm sorry.

MR. JONES: It's literally, yeah, two weeks.
MR. HOLLEY: Two weeks?
MR. JONES: Well, it's a month.
MS. TALBOT: Well, the extension was August 23rd.

MR. JONES: Right.
MS. TALBOT: We submitted it on 9/4.
MR. JONES: Right.
MS. MALONE: I'd like to offer an alternate motion.

MR. JONES: Okay, Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: To approve with no penalty for the -- considering the information and the situation and circumstances.

MR. JONES: Okay. We have an alternate motion.

MR. MCINNIS: Second.
MR. JONES: Okay, Mr. McInnis.
We have an alternate motion on the floor right now to approve the renewal without penalty.

Any question or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Looks like we're ready to vote.

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
MS. COLA: Nay.
MR. NASSAR: Nay.
MR. JONES: There's one, two, three "nays."
Motion carries.
MS. TALBOT: Thank you so much.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Ms. Talbot.
Next, Mr. Usie.
MR. USIE: 20121269, Drake Specialties, LLC, Lafayette Parish. Initial contract expiration date $12 / 31$ of 2017. Late renewal request date $8 / 14$ of 2018 .

MR. JONES: Do we have anybody here from Drake Specialties?

Yes, ma'am. State your name and your position with the company, please.

MS. SONNIER: It's Karen Sonnier, Administrator, like part owner, but I'm not a managing partner.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right.
MS. SONNIER: I'm going to try to answer this the best I can.

MR. JONES: Yeah, tell us what happened.
MS. SONNIER: The guy that was supposed to do this is actually on vacation out right now and he wasn't here at that time. We had an office manager who take care of everything, and, actually, it was filed, from what he's telling me, the expiration notice was on the 18th. We filled it on August 14th. And that was actually my fault. I was kind of just in the middle of them two filling in paperwork, and I thought it went through. I sent it to a girl named Kate, and looking
back in my e-mails, I never got a reply from her, so I thought we were renewed and ready to go until we got a late notice that we were -- the taxis were going up. That's kind of how I found out. I thought it was all taken care of, although $I$ was not the one initially in charge of this, just filling in.

MR. JONES: I understand. The standard penalty for this would be a one-year penalty.

What is the pleasure of the Board?
We have a motion from Mr. Allain for a one-year penalty.

Do I have a second?
MS . COLA: Second.
MR. JONES: Second from Ms. Cola.
Any comments or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Comments or questions from public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: All right. It's approved.
You'll still get a four-year benefit, but a one-year penalty.

MS. SONNIER: Yeah. Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
MR. USIE: Next we have 20150229, Etheredge Electric Company, LLC in Caddo Parish. Initial contract expiration date $12 / 31$ of 2019. Late renewal request date July 8th of 2020.

MR. JONES: Is someone here -- oh, she's back.

MS. MANESS: Right here.
MR. JONES: State your name again for the record, please.

MS. MANESS: Olivia Maness, CFO for Etheredge Electric.

MR. JONES: Okay. What happened here?
MS. MANESS: We had a previous CFO, who her time with the company ended unexpectedly and then I subsequently came in and there was just catch up, me not knowing what all was out there, not having passwords, access to things, so we just -- I wasn't aware of all of the contracts that we had out there. So once I became aware, I did file late.

MR. JONES: I guess the most operative question is $I$ presume you've implemented some sort of policy to make sure this doesn't happen again?

MS. MANESS: That is correct.

MR. JONES: That's what I would hope.
All right. Entertain a motion from the
Board.
Motion from Mr. Havard for a one-year penalty; second from Dr. Wilson.

Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Motion carries.
MS. MANESS: Thank you.
MR. USIE: 20131046, Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish. Initial contract expiration 7/31 of 2019. Late renewal request date February 26 of 2020; and we have 20131047, Folger Coffee Company, Orleans Parish. Initial contract expiration 7/31 of 2019. Late renewal request date February 26 of 2020.

MR. LEONARD: Jimmy Leonard again, Advantous Consulting.

As we were working with Folgers and all of the other matters, these late renewals were identified and filed, and we have worked with Folgers to ensure that their tax calendars will not allow this to happen again.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion that would -standard practice would be a one-year penalty for each of those two.

Mr. Nassar; second from Mr. Moss.
Questions or comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Motion carries.
MR. USIE: 20150152, Nalco Company, St. John the Baptist Parish. Initial contract expiration 12/31 of 2019. Late renewal request date June 16th of 2020; 20150207, Nalco Company, St. John the Baptist Parish. Initial contract expiration $12 / 31$ of 2019. Late renewal request date June 16th of 2020; 20150246, Nalco Company, St. John the Baptist Parish. Initial contract expiration of $12 / 31$ of 2019 . Late renewal request date

June 18th of 2020; 20140247, Nalco Company, St. John the Baptist Parish. Initial contract expiration 12/31 of 2019. Late renewal request date June 16 th of 2020. MR. JONES: Okay.

MR. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon.
MR. JONES: State your name for the record, please, and position with the company.

MR. GRIFFIN: Richard Griffin. I'm with DuCharme McMillen, and we represent Nalco Company.

MR. JONES: Great. Tell us what happened on the late renewal.

MR. GRIFFIN: We created the renewals, it looks like in '19 an sent them over to the company for signatory signing and paying of the fee. And this was before I came on with DuCharme, so what I was told is that just basically they didn't keep track close enough of what the company was doing and the company thought that the renewal had been submitted and we thought it had been submitted, but the signature or the fee had not been paid.

And so we're going to make sure in the future that, you know, one, we have a deadline for when they're going to respond, and, two, we've reached out them and let them know that "Hey, your renewal's coming. You have to respond by such and such date. If you
don't, we'll get back with you an make that this doesn't happen again."

MR. JONES: Okay. The standard would be a one-year penalty. I'll entertain that motion.

From Dr. Wilson; second from Mr. Saizan.
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Motion carries.

MR. GRIFFIN: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you appreciate you being here.

MR. USIE: 20141142, Riverland Industries, Inc., East Baton Rouge Parish. Initial contract expiration $12 / 31$ of 2019. Late renewal request date March 5th of 2020.

MR. JONES: Hi. How are you? State your
name for the record, please.
MR. NICHOLS: Dustin Nichols. I'm site manager at Riverland.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MR. NICHOLS: We outsourced our ITEP to a individual who dropped the ball, but since then, we've fired that individual and hired another consultant Group and -- Didier Consultants, and so this won't be a problem moving forward.

MS. BOATNER: Rhonda Boatner, Didier Consultants. And if you notice on the timely renewals, we did renew an application for them. So, no, this will not happen again.

MR. JONES: Understand. Reliance has been stated on the record, so --

MS. BOATNER: Most definitely.
MR. JONES: All right. Again, a standard would be a one-year penalty.

We have a motion from Mr. Havard; second from Mr. Moss.

Questions or comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say
"aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: All right. Thank you, sir.
MR. USIE: 20150402, Sterling Sugars, LLC,
St. Mary Parish. Initial contract expiration 12/31 of 2019. Late renewal request date July 16th of 2020.

MR. JONES: Yes, ma'am. Would you state your name and your position with the company?

MS. GARY: Hello. My name is Ashley Gary.
I'm the CFO for Sterling Sugars.
MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. GARY: We have several locations. We represent -- we are a sugar mill here in Louisiana, and we have several locations throughout the state. Each one of our sugar mills operates independently. The staff member that $I$ had that was in charge of this application at Sterling Sugars missed the deadline. When she realized that she had missed the deadline, she notified me, we filed the renewal application.

We now apologize that we missed our renewal deadline. We understand that there is a one-year penalty, and going forward, I have it marked on calendars to remind all of my staff at all of our operations and locations to make sure any renewals that we have going forward are attended to.

MR. JONES: Standard one-year penalty.
Motion from Ms. Davis; second from
Mr. Toups.
Questions or comments?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, questions or
comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say
"aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Motion carries.
MS. GARY: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you. Appreciate you.
All right.
MS. COLA: Did we go through Mezco?
I'm sorry. I can't hear you, Ms. Cola.
MS. CHENG: We deferred that one.
MR. JONES: We deferred that one, yes, ma'am.

MS. COLA: Okay.
MR. JONES: All right. Ms. Cheng.
MS. CHENG: We have 32 change in name contract amendment requests: Boise Packaging \& Newsprint, LLC, Contracts 20130822-A, 20141044,
20151311, 20160663, 20160664, 20160907, 20160915,
$20160916,20160917,20160918,20160919,20160920$,
$20160921,2016022,20160923,20160927,20160928$,
20160929,20160930 are changing their name to Packaging
Corporation of American, and that's in Beauregard
Parish; Nalco Company, Contracts 20130441, 20140493 and
20160686, are changing their name to Championx, LLC in
Lafayette Parish; and Nalco Company, Contracts 20110112,
$20110462,20140461,20150152$ 20150207, 20150246,
$20150247,20160707,20160762$, and 20160768 are changing
their name to ChampionX, LLC in St. John the Baptist
Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. We have these before us. I would accept a motion to accept the changes in name only.

We have a motion from Mr. Toups; second from Ms. Malone.

I know $y^{\prime}$ all are getting tired. Y'all hang with us a little while longer.

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

```
"aye."
```

(Several members respond "aye.") MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Motion carries.

MS. CHENG: We have three change in location contract amendment requests: DOW Chemical Company, Contract 20150367, the current contract location is 21255 LA Highway 1 South, Plaquemine, Louisiana 70764, West Baton Rouge Parish. The new address is 21255 LA Highway 1 South, Plaquemine, Louisiana 70765 in Iberville Parish; Peppers Unlimited of Louisiana, Contract 20180500, current location on the contract is P.O. Box 211, St. Martinville, Louisiana 70582 in St. Martin Parish, and the new address will be 602 West Bridge Street, St. Martinville, Louisiana 70582 in St. Martin Parish; and Shintech Louisiana, Contract 20180261, current location 26270 Highway 405, Plaquemine, Louisiana 70764 in Iberville Parish, new location 28740 Highway 405, Plaquemine, Louisiana 70764 in Iberville Parish.

MR. JONES: Any comments or questions?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: All right. Comments or
questions from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor,
say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, motion
carries.
MS. CHENG: I have two full transfer of contract tax exemption contracts: Equilon Enterprises, LLC, d/b/a, Shell Oil Products US, Contract 20130142-A is being transferred to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; and Shell Chemical LP, Contract 20140590 is being transferred to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish.

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

MR. NASSAR: So moved.
MR. JONES: From Mr. Nassar; second from Mr. Briggs.

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

MS. CHENG: We have eight partial transfer tax exemption contract requests: Equilon Enterprises, LLC, d/b/a Shell Oil Products US, Contract 20151505 is retaining $\$ 1,041,181$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 46,503,352$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Equilon Enterprises, LLC, d/b/a Shell Oil Products US, Contract 20161204 is retaining $\$ 4,463,787$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 536,213$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, Contract 20191226 is retaining $\$ 8,715,632$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 8,363,465$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, Contract 20110556 is retaining $\$ 4,193,963$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 188,112$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, LP, Contract 20110560 is
retaining $\$ 4,228,900$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 438,183$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, LP, Contract 20110562 is retaining $\$ 3,375,928$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring $\$ 597,830$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, LP, Contract 20131332 is retaining $\$ 14,105,547$ of assets in St. Charles Parish and transferring \$112,878 to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish; Shell Chemical Company, LP, Contract 20140589 is retaining $\$ 52,527$ of assets in St. Charles Parish an transferring $\$ 410,888$ of assets to Triton West, LLC in St. Charles Parish.

MR. JONES: All right. Entertain a motion to approve these partial transfers of exemption contracts.

Motion from Dr. Wilson; second from Mr.
Briggs.
Questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Motion
carries.
MS. CHENG: We have cancelation of
contracts: Etheredge Electric Company, LLC, Contract 20190085 is requesting cancelation of their contact in East Baton Rouge Parish due to location being closed.

MR. JONES: Entertain a motion to approve the cancelation.

MR. MOSS: So moved.
MR. JONES: From Mr. Moss; second from Mr. Toups.

Comment or questions from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is none, from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Seeing none, all in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Motion carries.

We're into our special requests now.
MS. CHENG: We have --

MR. JONES: Several.
MS. CHENG: Five. The first one is from JMS Foodservice, LLC where they're requesting the consideration of their partial transfer of Contract 20140886-A to The Folger Coffee Company. JMS Foodservice reports on the partial transfer of ownership form received on $2 / 26 / 2020$ that the transfer was effective $1 / 18$ of 2018 , which is behind the three-month time period allowed per ITEP rule.

MR. JONES: Okay. Oh, there you are. Mr. Leonard, explain. First state your name and address for the Board.

MR. LEONARD: My name is Jimmy Leonard, Advantous Consulting. It's the same thing from earlier. Board members, as we were putting together all of the other information, we did a thorough vetting of all matters relating to ITEP to Folgers that needed to be addressed. We were unable to find that partial transfer documentation, put the paperwork together and submitted it to the Board for consideration.

This transfer was related to one of the consolidation projects that was discussed earlier during the Board, that the JM Smuckers company acquired the facility in Harahan, and those assets were later -- as you can see, there was 4.7-million of the assets that
were acquired that were subsequently transferred over to Orleans Parish.

MR. JONES: And so this was something that had not been taking care of, but in the cleanup, you realized it had not been taken care of?

MR. LEONARD: The asset, that is correct, yes, sir.

MR. JONES: Was the property on the tax rolls?

MR. LEONARD: The property was being reported on the LAT 5A, which is the exemption form for reporting property, and we were unable to find the contract number for it, which was the flag, so we needed the partial transfer.

MR. JONES: Okay. Staff, any comments on this from y'all's -- recommendations from staff?

MS. CHENG: All other late partial transfers have been approved by the Board previously.

MR. JONES: Okay. Any questions or comments from the Board on this matter?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: First of all, let's have a motion.

Is there a motion to approve the partial transfer?

Motion from Mr. McInnis; second from
Dr. Wilson.
Any other questions or comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There being none, all in favor,
say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition. Motion carries.

MR. LEONARD: Thank you very much.
MS. CHENG: Next special request is from Raeford Farms of Louisiana, Application 20190276, ITE. Upon approval by the Board of Commerce \& Industry at the February 21st, 2020 meeting, this ITEP application was sent to the Lincoln Parish local bodies for consideration. LED received a request from Raeford Farms of Louisiana, LLC to appeal the Lincoln Parish School Board's decision to deny their portion of ITE property tax abatement at their online board meeting held on May 12th, 2020 due to their belief the School Board violated the ITEP rules by not establishing guidelines for approval or denial.

The portion of ITEP rules that applies to this is Section 503 (h) (3).

MR. JONES: Let me be sure I understand. Now, is there someone here from Raeford?

Help me -- I'm not -- I want to be sure I understand the basis for your appeal. I know what the agenda says, but walk me through it.

MR. BRODERICK: Just specific to the -Jesse Broderick with Sumit Credits representing House of Raeford, and this is -- you want to introduce yourself?

MR. TAUNTON: I'm Wayne Taunton, Operations Manager for House of Raeford.

MR. JONES: Thank you, sir. Appreciate y'all being here today.

So who wants to answer my question?
MR. BRODERICK: So to answer your specific question, this is the very first application that the school board ever had before them, and we feel that they didn't fully truly understand what they were approving or relying on, and then I feel that that's why there is a rule in the rules that require that, you know, the locals establish some sort of guidelines or some sort of policies that they're going to go by in approving or denying these applications.

We had tried numerous times to try to meet
with the school board. They didn't want to meet with us, and then COVID hit and we didn't get a chance to meet with them. There was a council meeting, we got deferred. We tried to meet again, did not get a chance to meet. It feels like the decision had already been made.

When we finally did go before the school board, there was a motion to deny us before we finally got our chance to explain this project to the school board. It didn't seem to matter. They focused on the fact that they had already started construction, that they were already in the parish and denied this application.

And so this is a big incentive for this company. It's a new build. It's a green, green build facility in North Louisiana.

So our basis for coming to you is to say that they violated the rules by not having guidelines to follow and not understanding what they were approving or denying.

MR. TAUNTON: Yes, sir, if I may.
MR. JONES: Absolutely.
MR. TAUNTON: We were already in Lincoln Parish with our old feed mill. We've been there 20 years. We decided to invest upwards 50-million in a
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facility which gives is upward mobility within our killing facility. We're not just there. We didn't come out to another parish or move in. We moved and stayed within the parish. Just the sales tax alone from construction is $\$ 855,000$ we've generated.

We just felt like the sheriff's department and the police jury, you know, were in agreement with us, and we just didn't feel like we had a fair share to explain maybe how this worked and, you know, and where the moneys were going to be going and how it was going to be allocated.

MR. JONES: I think the thing I'm struggling with is that $I$ don't understand the rules to require local government to have guidelines. I think the rule, as I appreciate the rules, we ask them to make best efforts to do so, but $I$ don't know of any requirement that they develop guidelines.

And Kristin or Tam, can y'all help me?
MS. CHENG: The rules just state that "Within 60 days of the promulgation of these rules, the local governmental entities for each parish, in consultation with the parish's assessor and upon request for the guidance from the Department, shall make best efforts to develop reasonable guidelines for application approval and/or denial, and if so desired, penalty
guidelines for failure to achieve and maintain jobs and/or payroll as required by the Exhibit A."

MR. JONES: Is there another rule that I'm missing, Mr. Broderick, besides that one that actually requires -- I mean, "best efforts" is one thing.

MR. BRODERICK: Well, it says "shall make," not "may make."

MR. JONES: Shall make --
MR. BRODERICK: There's not -- no other rule, no, sir.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. Because it's my appreciation, at least, that -- and maybe this is just one person on the Board, but it's my appreciation that there's simply not a requirement that they develop rules. You know, do we wish every local government would because that way industry would know, you know, what hoops have to be jumped through, but I don't know -- I don't believe this Board can compel local government to make rules. I don't think that's within our power. I think that's the reason we developed the "best efforts" language.

So if there's not a requirement that they develop guidelines, I'm not sure there is a basis for an appeal for their failure to do. So --

MR. BRODERICK: I mean, and if we can make
one, I guess, request, then that would be can you require them to meet with us and allow us to explain the project to them?

MR. JONES: Mr. Broderick, I think you know the answer to that. If I had that kind of power, this would be a fun job.

MR. BRODERICK: But does this Board have the authority to be able to say.

MR. JONES: No. We don't. We don't. I think what happened after the Executive Order and we developed the rules in 2018 or whenever it was, the whole concept was to give local government a voice, but we can't force them to -- I just don't -- my feeling, at lease, is there's not a basis for an appeal. And under those circumstances, I feel like the appropriate motion right now is either whether to take up the appeal under these circumstances, and I would entertain a motion at this point whether to hear the appeal of Raeford House.

You kind of heard what the situation is and --

MR. BRODERICK: I do have a letter from the Mayor. I don't know if that will make a difference or not.

MR. JONES: Yes, please. I know that Mayor Walker from Ruston was here but had to leave to get back
to Ruston. I know he made a written statement, so I would want his written statement to be read into the record.

MR. BRODERICK: Thank you. He just wanted to reiterate what a great corporate citizen House of Raeford has been in the community. He wanted to make it aware that this was unanimously approved by the police jury and the sheriff. They understand economic development in the parish he. Wanted to, you know, mention that there's 973 jobs in Bienville and Lincoln Parish, 241 of those jobs live in Lincoln Parish.

And he had two points to make, and that was the importance of the jobs that are being created. He wanted to make sure that the Board understood that. And also indirect jobs that come with this project.

And, lastly, the perception. That was his biggest concern was the perception that this vote would leave for other companies looking to move to Lincoln Parish. He says "We are concerned about the school board vote. It looks like Lincoln Parish is not business friendly, but we are. This project is a tremendous economic development project for our parish and northeast Louisiana. We want companies to know that we are truly on for business and are business friendly. Mayor Walker."

MR. TAUNTON: If I may, we, you know, with the construction of this, it's not only just a feed mill. We're growing probably another 80 houses with a lot of those being in Lincoln Parish. Right now the majority of our birds come from Lincoln Parish. I mean, it's just not this that we contribute to Lincoln Parish. There is a lot of other outlying areas. It's mainly completely northeast Louisiana. I mean, we have over 500 houses, over 100 growers, and, you know, this is constructed to help feed those and to add to it. It's a lot more dollars involved, you know, for the whole northeast Louisiana.

MR. JONES: And having grown up in Ruston, I'm sympathetic. The difficulty is is that -- and I like to believe that Ruston and Lincoln Parish are very business friendly, but the school board needs to hear that.

MR. BRODERICK: And I have one last point, and I -- sorry, because of the long day, keeping my thoughts gathered. There is memo that the school board put out -- and I'm happy to provide that if it makes a difference -- on January 30th of 2020, and it was put out by the superintendent to the school board members telling them why they should deny this application. He said it was because they had already started
construction and he had pictures of the company already under construction. And our understanding is is that is not a valid reason to deny somebody approval for their abatement because they'd already started construction. MR. JONES: I understand. I hate to say, but I think this is -- I think you've got a political problem with your school board, and how you solve that is beyond the -- at least in my mind. I can't speak for the Board, but in my mind, that's beyond the providence of this Board to solve that problem for you.

I do not believe that the rules require guidelines. We strongly recommend them. We ask that they make best efforts. They've chosen not to do that. There's been a lot of jurisdictions that have chosen not to do that, and so I don't know that we can -- or at least in my mind we can grant an appeal on that basis. MR. BRODERICK: And I guess, if I may, do you agree with that Tam?

MS. BOURGEOIS: (Nodding head.)
MR. BRODERICK: All right.
MR. JONES: I still need a motion.
Motion from Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: TO deny hearing the appeal.
MR. JONES: To deny hearing the appeal.
Do I have a second?

From Mr. Allain.
Any questions or comments from the Board? MS. MALONE: I do have one comment.

MR. JONES: Yes, Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: So the only portion that will not be exempt will be the school board portion; correct?

Okay. I just wanted to make sure that that was accurate. Okay. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Ms. Davis, did you have -- oh, somebody -- I'm sorry.

MR. ALVAREZ: Good afternoon. Evan Alvarez, 30025 Highway 75, Plaquemine, Louisiana. I'm an attorney representing Lincoln Parish School Board.

Obviously, Mr. Jones, we are in agreement with your position. It's not a requirement. It is a, I guess at best, an aspiration. The school board did not violate any of the ITEP rules, and we just want to put out that, look, when this request was made, the school beard did take it seriously. The school board did what it always does. The did have their finance department conduct a very thorough financial analysis on the proposal. We have shared that with the Board in our package and in our response letter. So I do believe you have that in front of you. It was not a decision the school board took lightly, but at the end of the day,
they evaluated the financial pros and the financial cons of it, and they felt like it was not the best financial investment outcome for the individuals that they represented. So that was why they denied the application. And we respectfully request that the Board leave that decision in place.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you.
Any other comments from the public?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There's a motion on the floor to deny hearing the appeal.

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: There is no opposition.
MS. CHENG: Next we have a special request from Martco, LLC, Application 20180296-ITE and 20190393-ITE. Upon approval by the Board of Commerce \& Industry at the June 24 th, 2020 meeting, these two ITEP applications were sent to the Natchitoches Parish local
bodies for consideration. Rules provide 30 days to provide notice to LED that the council will take action on the application and an additional 30 days to take action approving or denying the application. LED received a request from Martco, LLC ("Martco") to appeal the Natchitoches Parish Council's decision to deny their ITE property tax abatement for both applications at the board meting held on August 17th, 2020. Martco is requesting these denials be deemed approved or, alternatively, have an opportunity to be placed on the council agenda for re-vote due to no notice of agenda being given to Martco or made public prior to the meeting.

Subsequently, on September 28th, 2020, the council took further action took reconsider and approve the application. A timeline of the events was provided to you on the agenda.

MR. JONES: Okay. Do we have someone from Martco here?

Hi. Please state your name and your position with the company, please.

MS. BRUNO: My name is Emily Bruno. I'm the internal auditor for Royal Martin -- Martco.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. BRUNO: In the summary that they had
just read, we were not given a notice that we were going to been on the agenda, which is kind out of the ordinary because we usually do have things on the agenda, but nobody showed up. We were denied and subsequently put on the next council meeting where both of the application were approved, and so we would ask that y'all just maybe respect that vote and allow the exemptions to be passed.

MR. JONES: This is the difficulty I have, the fact that you-all received no notice of being on the agenda, $I$ guess it was the -- let me see. Which meeting was it?

MS. BRUNO: August 17th.
MR. JONES: Thank you. I couldn't find it.
-- the August 17th, 18th meeting, that's an open meetings issue problem. That's not a Board of Commerce \& Industry problem. Whether the entity followed the Open Meetings law and gave appropriate notice, that's something that we can't adjudicate. Either they did or they didn't. There are provisions under the Open Meetings law for Martco to have challenged what they did at that meeting. I'm not sure those opportunities are still available, but there were opportunities under the Open Meetings law to challenge that.

MS. BRUNO: We did send in a request to appeal on September $15 t h$, and just we did that kind of as a safety measure because I think Natchitoches -- I don't really know why they had denied it. I don't know if it was because we weren't there and they felt like maybe they were snub because we weren't there or maybe just wanted further discussion on the projects.

They did a few days after that have a positive vote, and one of our representatives was there with the council.

MR. JONES: The difficulty there is that the subsequent vote came after the 60-day deadline, and right, wrong up or down, this Board has held to those deadlines fairly firmly, and it sometimes swings in favor of companies, sometimes it swings in favor of the local government, but at least -- again, $I$ can't speak for the Board, but from my perspective, the August 18th issue, there could have been an opportunity for Martco to take action against the council under the Open Meetings law, and obviously that probably was not taken advantage of, but I'm not sure that the subsequent vote in favor was timely. I just don't think it was. So I'm afraid, at least in my mind, that the August 18 vote's the only one that is substantively before the Board.

MS. BRUNO: Or could y'all possibly
entertain a late application or...
MR. JONES: I don't believe so, but that's up to this Board.

MR. MCINNIS: Mr. Chairman, just a question. Do we have that authority, if that's the case?

MR. JONES: Authority to do what?
MR. MCINNIS: To approve this exemption based on the parish -- the Natchitoches Parish Council's obvious approval of the exemption. Do we have that authority?

MR. JONES: Well, again, if the approval is not timely. If it has to be done within 60 days and is not done within 60 days, $I$ don't -- it's as if it -and, again, $I$ can only speak -- but in my mind, it's as if the approval didn't happen.

MR. MCINNIS: But if they had no action --
MR. JONES: If they had no action, it would have been deemed an approval.

MR. MCINNIS: Right. And it is clearly, from what I'm reading, that the Natchitoches Parish Council is for approving this, albeit a meeting too late.

MR. JONES: Well, the first vote was a denial.

MR. MCINNIS: Right.

MR. JONES: The only timely vote was a denial. Now, why they did that, why they didn't give notice to Martco, that's problematic, I agree.

MR. MCINNIS: Right.
MS. BRUNO: Is there anybody here from Natchitoches maybe?

MR. MCINNIS: I'm having the same problem in St. Bernard parish. You know, at least your parish council met and voted. Ours didn't. And they were so confused at that first meeting, you know, we got, you know, denials, and now everybody wants to change their mind and we can't. Right. I spoke with you a little bit before that, but in this case, and I guess that's what I ask, because my motion would be nothing if we don't have that authority.

I would move to accept the will of the parish council in Natchitoches.

MR. JONES: The first question is do we grant the appeal, do we allow the appeal to move forward, and then we can determine whether it's, you know, to grant the appeal. I think that's kind of where we are.

So my first -- the first motion $I$ would entertain is do we consider this, this special request from Martco and accept the late vote by Natchitoches

Parish Council. Do you want to consider it first?
MR. MCINNIS: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: We have a motion to consider.
Do we have a second?
Second from Mr. Toups.
MS. BRUNO: Thank you.
MR. JONES: Well, we're not there yet.
We've got you on the lifeline, but you're not in the boat.

Okay. Motion. Any other questions or comments on hearing the special request?

MR. HOLLEY: I've got a question.
MR. JONES: Yes, sir, Mr. Holley.
MR. HOLLEY: Is this going to set any kind of precedence in the future?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir, it is. Yes, sir, it
is. It -- let's see how this vote goes and we can determine, you know, whether we need to talk about that further, but, yes, it does set a precedent, I'm afraid.

All right. Any other comments or questions from the public?

Yes, sir, Mr. Waltzer.
MR. WALTZER: Joel Waltzer, Now Orleans, 3201 General De Gaulle.

We believe -- I believe the court -- that
this Board is without jurisdiction to hear appeals, that it's not unable to do that and that it would be a violation of the separation of powers, that a proper appeal lies in the courts from what she's describing. And we're very concerned that that would create a whole new world of work for you, and it would be unlawful.

MR. JONES: Ms. Carlson.
MS. CARLSON: Lady Carlson, 7640 LaSalle, Baton Rouge.

I just want to remind the Board that a similar thing came before the Board, and I think it was July or June whenever you met, where a council rejected a ITEP application, a new council was voted in that said "We changed our mind," and you said there original vote stood. And I think that is the same thing in this case and I think you set a bad precedent if you start allowing people to appeal because they change their mind. That's not -- and, again, $I$ think it just sets a bad precedent. You've already set a precedent that said you can't do that. You've denied some applications that have come up, and I think you should do the same here and the -- to be uniform.

MR. JONES: Mr. Bagert.
MR. BAGERT: Broderick Bagert with Together
Louisiana. I'll just add that there have been two
occasions where something similar has happened in addition to those. One was when the St. John the Baptist Parish, I think parish council sent in their documentation a couple days late, same council made the decision and sent it in a couple days late, and this Board said rules are rules.

The other was when -- and I forgot what parish it is, but it was when there was a computer virus and they got the e-mail like a day or two before and acted on it. They called a special, kind of emergency meeting, but the calling of meeting, I think, was outside of the 30 days, even though they acted within the 30 days, and this Board said that rules are rules.

So either rules are rules or the rules aren't rules. To have the rules be rules for public entities, but then have flexibility for the corporations would show not only bad precedent, but a double standard.

MR. JONES: All right.
MS. BRUNO: May I just add one more thing that I believe the rules say? And I don't have a copy of them in front of me, but $I$ believe it says that all of the parties deserve a seat at the table when making the decision, and I think, and I don't know how the open meetings notice comes into play with the ITEP rules. I
don't know how they intersect, but $I$ feel that if we had a seat at the table, the vote would have initially been in our favor.

We've been in Natchitoches Parish for 24
years. We pay over $\$ 14-\mathrm{milli}$ ( n payroll to the parish residents of Natchitoches. And I think that it was a mistake that fell through the cracks. The clerk or the secretary didn't give the advice. We own lots of acreage there, so we're normally are at those meetings if we are on the agenda, and we just -- we didn't receive the notice.

I feel like -- I know that the rules are in place about the timeline. I just wanted to make sure that we didn't have a seat at the table.

MR. JONES: I understand. And when Open Meetings laws aren't followed, there are remedies within the Open Meetings law to file suit, to act- -- you can undo actions if they don't dot that "i" and cross that "t," and -- but that is outside the providence of this Board's jurisdiction to basically play that card for you, if you will.

MS. BRUNO: Right.
MR. JONES: That's up to the claimant to do what needs to be done in that regard.

It's always difficult when you see a
government entity express an opinion that simply can't be followed because of the rules, but, believe it or not, I may agree with Mr. Bagert on this. And, Mr. Bagert, you may write that down. But I just think this is where we are, and from my perspective, this is just one vote on the Board, though.

All right. We have a motion to approve -to hear the appeal. We had a second, I believe. We had a motion and a second. We did? Okay. Good.

So the question first is do we hear this, and then we can determine whether to vote up or down on accepting the second vote instead of the first vote.

So the first question is do we hear the appeal, yes or no. All in favor, say "aye."
(A few members say "aye.")
MR. JONES: All right. You've got to -- all right. Let's raise hands. Okay. I've got three votes.

All opposed?
I think the "nays" have it. We're sorry, but I hope you understand where we are.

MS. BRUNO: We will still get the school board and sheriff's office; right?

MR. JONES: Yeah. The entities that approved, that's done. Yeah. Just the parish council.

MS. BRUNO: Thank you.

MS. MALONE: If I could make a comment about that after the fact. I'm sorry. Behind my mask.

I think this is important to note for all of our local entities to really take this process seriously, and I think that if we, you know, do hear these appeals time and time again, that they won't take it seriously. And, you know, that's the reason why I voted no on the appeal because I think they have got to take responsibility and be accountable to these rules and these timelines. So I just wanted to put --

MR. JONES: Well, it goes back to the earlier issue. I mean, if they took it seriously enough to develop guidelines on how they're going to approach these things, that means that they've had to think it through, and I think that's part of what we're asking them to do. And, again, I think some have, some have not, so...

All right. Next.
MS. CHENG: Our last item.
MR. JONES: Is this the last one really?
MS. CHENG: It's Praxair, Application 20190076-ITE was approved by the Board of Commerce \& Industry at the December 13th, 2019 meeting, following which Notice of Board Approval was sent to the St. James Parish Council, St. James Parish School Board and St.

James Parish Sheriff for their consideration along with LED forms for providing the require notices of action back to LED either denying or approving the ITEP application.

On February 6th, 2020, LED received a notice of action from the St. James parish Council in an altered form indicating "St James Parish Council has conducted a public meeting on Industrial Tax Exemption Application Number 20190076 ITE and voted to deny the application as presented by the Louisiana Department of Economic Development in the 12/12/19 Contract for Exemption of Ad Valorem Taxes with Praxair, Inc. Alternatively, St. James Parish Council has agreed to approve Industrial Tax Exemption Application Number 20190076-ITE provided that the alternative yearly exemption percentages of ad valorem taxes as listed in the attached Resolution Number 20-40 are incorporated in the final Contract for Exemption of Ad Valorem Taxes with Praxair, Inc. On the next day, the St. James Parish School Board and the St. James Parish Sheriff's Office returned Notices of Action to LED indicating their same action as the parish council.

LED interpreted these notices from the St. James Parish local officials as denials. However, because the Notices of Action were not provided on the
standard Notice of Action form provided by LED, LED requested that the Board make a determination on the action taken by the St. James Parish local officials. Upon discussion at the BC\&I meeting at the February 21st, 2020 meeting, the special request was ultimately deferred by the Board of Commerce \& Industry for the local officials to determine whether they wanted to present a new Notice of Action on the LED form before a determination by the Board.

On October 1st, 2020, LED received notification that each of the St. James local entities, (Parish, School Board and Sheriff) sent not Notices of Action in the form provided by LED with each denying the application. On the same date, LED received a request from Praxair to appeal the rejection of Application 20190076 by the St. James local entities upon grounds that the denials are not in compliance with the ITEP rules. And we've provided a timeline of events as well as a section of rules pertaining to the timeline of the approvals and denials of locals.

MR. JONES: I'm not going to ask you to read all of that into the record, so thank you.

Let's see. This is coming from Praxair, so I would ask a representative from Praxair to come forward.

And the, Board, again, from my perspective, the way this will unwind is that first we'll entertain a vote as to whether to hear the appeal, and then we can determine -- if we choose to hear the appeal, then we'll determine an action on the appeal. If we choose not to here the appeal, that will by the end of it. But at this time, $I$ just want to hear -- oh, yes. And Mr. Nassar will be recusing himself from both discussion and consideration of this matter because he actually sits on the St. James Parish School Board.

MR. HOLLEY: And I ask that $I$ be recused. I was recused on the first part because I represented Praxair as their attorney.

MR. JONES: Mr. Holley will also be recusing himself from consideration.

MR. HOLLEY: May I ask to be excused, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JONES: Mr. Holley, I thank you for your service.

MR. HOLLEY: Thank you, sir.
MR. JONES: He's from Monroe, so us North Louisiana folk understand one another.

Yes, sir, Mr. Fogarty.
MR. FOGARTY: Yes, sir.
MR. JONES: All right. State your name and
your position with the company and talk to us about what happened here.

MR. FOGARTY: John Fogarty. I'm Commercial Director.

Praxair has become Linde by way of a merger that occurred in 2020, so I may intersperse Linde and Praxair back and forth.

I'm Commercial Director for the business based in Geismar, Louisiana. I think really what we are coming to you with is -- and I think the introduction that Kristin provided was very accurate in that there were several abnormal things that occurred here.

The parish modified the form that they should respond on, they indicated both approval and denial of the modified abatement plan, which we argue was developed as the parish's own rules for granting abatements. They came to us very deep into the 60-day notice period in the original January timeframe, providing an abatement structure under which they were granting the initial five-year abatement at the full 80/20, restructuring the second five years, and then basically spreading that total dollar due over that 10-year period into an annual payment that would be relatively equal over the 10 -year term of the abatement.

As I said, this was presented to us very
late in the process of approval. Up to that point, the parish had always expressed full support for our abatement. We were given 48 hours to respond to that offer from the parish with respect to the abatements. In that 48 --hour period, we attempted -- you know, our first response was "This doesn't feel like it fits the ITEP rules," and, "Do you really have the authority to do that under the ITEP rules?" The parish indicated that they had met with LED and understood rules and that they were acting within their authority to modify this abatement program and offer that to us.

The 48-hour period, we unsuccessful in having further discussions with the parish. We responded, and this has been quoted, as "We agreed with the abatement program." What was left out of their -in all the parish correspondence is "We agree to the extent that the proposal was in accordance with ITEP rules."

Based on our approval, the parish proceeded forward. They provided school board action, parish council action and a letter from the sheriff. They basically approved the modified abatement that they proposed to us.

That went to LED. As stated, LED looked at it, wasn't really sure what they did to us, you know,
what the response represented, and came back and turned to the Board for your consideration in February. I think, Chairman Jones, you described it best when you said, and I'm paraphrasing, "We asked for an apple or an orange, and they sent us a banana." It was close to that.

We were prepared to make all of these arguments in the February Board meeting and advance these same arguments. At that time, we agreed with the Board's decision, concurred with the Board's decision to delay to the April meeting. Recognize, you know, so that we could work something out, everybody could have more time to study this issue and come to suitable resolution. St. James Parish, Linde, the Board, LED, the Governor's office, get everybody on the same page.

So that was the basis of the original February discussion we would have. As the year moved forward, had a lot of things happened in Louisiana. They impacted the parish, they impacted industry. Everybody's borne pain over the course of the year. We note that the parish council, the parish school board continued to meet on a regular fashion throughout the timeframe, yet they declined to speak with us until after they spoke with the Governor's office in August. After the discussion with the Governor's
office -- they continued to express support for our projects and abatements throughout that period. After the discussion with the Governor's office, they requested that we enter into a cooperative endeavor agreement under which we would pay the parish $\$ 300,000$ a year in exchange for broadly-defined infrastructure projects, social services, education projects in exchange for granting the ITEP abatements. We declined to do that.

We offered an alternative structure under Regulatory Statute 47:2138, which, for people receiving ITEP abatements, allows them to make early payment of taxes due for credit in later years. The parish also rejected that concept.

September 28th, we met with the parish, we clearly told them that in order to avoid the appearance of a quid pro quo relationship between the ITEP abatements and cooperative endeavor agreement that could potentially jeopardize the abatements as they went forward, we would, you know, defer doing anything in terms of CEAs, advance tax payments, until after the ITEP abatements were granted.

Literally within hours and emergency meeting of the school board was scheduled for the next day. The item was placed on the parish council meeting for

September 30th, which resulted in the Notices of Action that you received, that LED received in early October.

And I think we would also question whether those Notices of Action were appropriate as well, and that, you know, our understanding is they should first submit a Notice of Action saying it's been placed on the agenda of a public meeting, and then take action -- send a second form back after that meeting has occurred indicating the action that they have taken.

You know, what we're asking the Board to do, as the Board has done, you know, several times in the past, is discuss, I believe, in the prior session that act in accordance with Section $503(\mathrm{~h})(1)$, and that if a local entity does not take action as prescribed in the rules, then that action shall be, you know, overturned by the Board of Commerce \& Industry. And I'm forgetting the exact words there, but I think you have that authority, and you've utilized that authority in the past.

MR. JONES: So is it Praxair's position that the parish's failure was in filing the original form?

MR. FOGARTY: There's several areas where we see the parish has failed. One is in adopting their own rules under which they would grant ITEP abatements. You know, when they do that, they cite the Governor's

Executive Order from 2016. There's a clause in there that says they have the right to modify the parameters of the abatement, whether it's percentages, duration.

What they failed to add is the balance to Section 6 of that order, which states that, you know, if they do so, they should consult with the Secretary of Economic Development. To our knowledge, they never consulted with the Secretary of Economic Development.

They also indicated to us in the January meeting that they had reviewed the rules with LED in the Summer of 2019 and fully understood what the rules allowed them to do. Subsequently they submitted the non-standard Notices of Action. As we look at the actions over the past two months, we're not sure why they were given an opportunity to, once again, resubmit new Notices of Action, you know, almost a year after the initial approval by BCI.

MR. JONES: Okay. Any questions or comments from the Board of Mr. Fogarty?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: I'd like to hear from the parish as well.

MS. BONNECAZE: Hi. My name is Dawn Bonnecaze. I'm counsel for St. James Parish. I represent the school board, the sheriff and the
assessor. Wait. I'm sorry. The school board, St. James the Council. Thank you.

MR. JONES: And the sheriff.
MS. BONNECAZE: And the sheriff.
MR. JONES: Okay. Tell us, from your perspective, what we have going on here then.

MS. BONNECAZE: Yeah, and I just want to clarify. I was engaged late in the Summer, so I'm not privy to anything that transpired earlier in the past, but I am aware of looking at rules, and specifically they keep citing the Administrative Code 503 (h) (1), and they're saying you have to file it on this notice that's sent from LED. There's nothing in the Code that requires you to fill out particular form, and I want to clarify and say --

MR. JONES: Forgive me. I'm sorry. I'm just making sure we still have a quorum.

All right. Go ahead.
MS. BONNECAZE: I'm sorry. So I would like to start it off, and I have sent -- I don't know if y'all all received before the Board meeting, I sent a letter. When we filed the Notice of Actions on October 1st, I also sent a response because we never even knew about the Praxair appeal until October 26th, I think is the date.

But there's nothing in the Code that requires you to fill out that specific form. They did, in their resolutions, which everyone keeps failing to admit, is that all the entities said "we deny," and it was crystal clear in February 6th in the Notice of Actions that were sent back with the resolutions and on February 26 th when their counsel, after talking to LED, made that. LED, in its own thing says "We interpreted those notice from St. James Parish as denials," so we have the deny. All right?

Yes, $I$ will address that the parish, we do not have any ITEP guidelines for the parish. There is none been approved. Each project is looked at and vetted on its own merit. The beginning from this whole process for this one of the vetting of that was that you are taking away $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 - m i l l i o n ~ t h a t ~ t h i s ~ p a r i s h ~ n e e d s ~ f o r ~}$ 15 jobs. That is costing the parish $\$ 1.6-\mathrm{million}$ per job. That was the problem always from all three of these entities when looking at this. It was a financial thing. They tried to work within, they thought, the Executive Order parameters for Exhibit B of coming up with a different approach. Granted, we all know now that might not have been the correct approach. All right? We have acknowledged that. That's what was dealt with in February and again when we revoted on this
in September. It was we filled out the form correctly and we denied it.

It's costing them money. They have all of these facilities in this parish, a lot of plants and stuff are closing, they're losing jobs. All of these local governments, they have constituents. I'm shocked we don't have some of them here today.

Talking about this, they cannot risk losing this kind of money, and it was there was no quid pro quo that they keep trying to say. I was present at that meeting in September the 28th, and I said, on my own accord, these two are separate agreements that need to be. We went with what was told to us by the Governor's office and what was advised by LED as we were trying to come up with a different way to handle this problem in coming up with other ways to get revenues. It had nothing. We denied this application based on what you approved. That's the end.

We denied it correctly in February, so it was within your 60-day period. It didn't need to come back up. We followed what you had requested after the February Board meeting. We then voted again, and it was denied. So my understanding of what is provided, we've done everything that we were supposed to do, so I'm not quite sure how they even have a right to appeal. I
question that. I question the timeliness of that, and for them to question and say that we forced them into some agreement, that's just not the case.

MR. JONES: Any questions or comments?
MS. BONNECAZE: I might have other -- I have other public officials from the parish.

MR. JONES: Okay. All right. First of all, any questions or comments -- how do you pronounce your last name? Forgive me.

MS. BONNECAZE: It's Bonnecaze.
MR. JONES: Bonnecaze.
MS. BONNECAZE: Yeah. I know. It's French. Everyone thinks -- what?

MR. JONES: When you have a name like Jones, it's very difficult to --

MS. BONNECAZE: No. I get it. I understand.

MR. JONES: All right. Thank you.
MR. NOSACKA: Steve Nosacka. I'm the Mayor or the Town of Gramercy. I'm also the parish's economic development consultant. And not inconsistent, but I want to clarify a comment Dawn made about our guidelines and policy. We do have a formal, what we call our stakeholders' committee guidelines that we adopted as a part of the Executive Order that was issued in the past.

All three parish entities approved that, by resolution, approved those guidelines, and we submitted these to LED, which, a couple of years back, when it was required. But it does, to follow Dawn's, the spirit of it, it does require that we individually assess and make decisions about exemptions unique, on the unique situation involved in every industry and every project that would come forward. So Dawn's correct in that, but the reality is we do have those guidelines and policies in place.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Nosacka.
Yes, sir, Mr. Moss.
MR. MOSS: I have a question, just going back in my head during this first preliminary meeting. Staff, isn't there a certain form that's supposed to be sent back in? Because that's coming up now, and I want clarification for myself and I'm sure others.

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir, we do provide them with a Notice of Action form.

MR. MOSS: And that's what you're expecting back?

MS. CHENG: Yes, correct.
MR. MOSS: Can they modify it or do something else with it?

MS. CHENG: NO.
MR. JONES: Ms. Cheng, is the form part of the rules or is it simply what you provide?

MS. CHENG: It's what we provide.
MR. JONES: It's not part of the rules?
MS. CHENG: No.
MR. JONES: The form itself is not part of the rules?

MS. CHENG: It's not, no.
MR. JONES: I guess let me ask my question a different way to be clear.

MS. CHENG: Correct. You're correct,
there's --
MR. JONES: The Board has not dictated the form that has to be filed out and sent in?

MS. CHENG: Correct.
MR. JONES: But LED staff has provided a form for the locals to use?

MS. CHENG: Yes, sir.
MR. BRAXTON: Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: I'm going to get to you in one second, Mr. Braxton, just one second.

Any other questions to Ms. Bonnecaze or to the parish while we're here?
(No response.)

MR. JONES: Thank you very much.
MR. Braxton.
MR. BRAXTON: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Rodney Braxton representing Praxair. I'm with Southern Strategy Group here in Baton Rouge. Just a couple of comments to add on to what Mr. Fogarty said and in response to some of the things that Ms. Bonnecaze said.

I want to be clear, yes, the forms aren't required by the rules, but the rules do say that you have to either vote it up or down, approve or deny, and clearly, by what was read into the record as what appeared on the agenda, that was not done. There was a denial, and then there was an alternative. And if it was simply as straightforward as a denial, then I'm confused as to why we are here in September after a subsequent vote that took place in September -- I mean in November after a subsequent vote that took place in September. It clearly was not a denial in February, otherwise we would not be here.

Simply put, in February they did not follow the rules by simply approving or denying the exemption. According to your rules or 503, they did not respond accordingly, you should have approved it.

In September, when they took up the action,
it was beyond the 60 days. They did not file a notice saying they were going to have a public hearing, and, you know, by the sent in a notice saying they had denied it, it was beyond the 60 days. And by your rules, they should just -- you should approve it. I think that was enough for you to take up our appeal in our opinion, and we believe that it is fair and it would be consistent for you to take up our appeal, to hear the entirety of everything that happened just simply based on those two things. And the suggestion that there is no basis and that there was confusion as to why we're here confuses me, to be quite honest.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Braxton.
Any questions for Mr. Braxton?
Yes, sir, Mr. Waguespack.
Please state your name and your position, please.

MR. WAGUESPACK: Thank you. Glenn Waguespack, St. James Parish Assessor.

It seems like to me that a denial is a denial. The form that it's on has nothing to do with any of the rules. Nobody told us that it had to be on this form, and I think that when you -- I sat here today, I listened to people who filed their renewal late. There's all kinds of different rules that get
kind of juggled around. But to be a denial twice is plenty good enough. It doesn't matter what form it's on. The intent of all the entities, 7-0 on the school board, 7-0 on the council and the sheriff all denied it. That's -- I think it's kind of clear what our intention is, and if we get overridden because of a technicality, then everything that the Governor has done as far as getting the locals an opportunity to weigh in on whether they want these projects or not is really just a sham.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Waguespack.
Question to the staff, going back to the February meeting, the original documentation that LED received from St. James Parish, was it within the 60-day period?

MS. CHENG: Yeah. Everything was received timely.

MR. JONES: So we don't have a timeliness issue on that from that respect?

MS. CHENG: No, sir.
MR. JONES: So the only issue we have on that particular submission would be whether it was on the proper form or not; is that fair?

MS. CHENG: Correct.
MR. JONES: Because it -- and I will tell
you, and I can only -- I'm only one Board member, but back at the February meeting, it became apparent to me, or, again, was my impression that the parish was under the impression that alternative deals were possible, and I thought it important to impress upon the parish, no, it's up or down, and if it's up, it's an 80/20 deal, and if it's down, it no.

And so what $I$ was -- at that meeting, my intent was to make sure that the parish had now understanding that that's the way our rules work. Okay. Is this the decision you want to make? Is the denial the decision you want to make? And as I see it, frankly, the most recent votes are untimely because they're outside the 60 days, but there was a timely vote within the 60 days, and it was a denial. Yes, it was an orange that looked more look a banana, but it was a denial. And I'm not sure that the failure to use the form or adding the extraneous deal offer nullified the denial. I just think it obfuscated the denial, made it more difficult to understand and created the confusion that brought us into where we are now.

But from my perspective, I think that St. James Parish has spoken clearly, and they spoke clearly at the early meeting that they denied the $80 / 20$, and that's where we are. That's where I am today.

Ms. Malone.
MS. MALONE: I would just like to reiterate, you know, my memory's the same from the February meeting, that, you know, I believe we allowed the parish to go back, because at the time, it was, you know, "Well, we didn't want to totally deny, but we wanted to offer this alternative," and we so allowed them to go back and make that decision. And now seeing that they have indeed agreed on the denial, I make a motion to deny the appeal.

MR. JONES: Okay. We have a motion to deny the appeal. We have a second from Mr. Toups.

Any other discussion or questions from the board?

MR. SAIZAN: So if we deny the appeal, then that's it for the company?

MR. JONES: I'm sorry, Mr. Saizan?
MR. SAIZAN: If we deny the appeal, that's it for the company? I'm asking the question.

MR. JONES: Yeah. That means they will not receive the exemption.

MR. BRAXTON: That's correct.
MR. SAIZAN: Thank you.
MR. JONES: All right. Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Questions or comments from the public?

Mr. Bagert first. He beat you to it.
MR. BAGERT: I'm going to hear about this now. Thanks.

Broderick Bagert with Together Louisiana.
First I would wonder whether the appropriate motion would be whether to hear. And appreciate the thoughtfulness of the Board in the way you've dealt with this, including hearing -- I mean, I just want to mark that thoughtfulness of St. James, and maybe excessive thoughtfulness; right, but, like, you cannot say that they're not taking this very seriously in every respect. The question, though, is on what basis is this appeal being made? There's the option of companies to appeal this Board's action. There's not any option that we're familiar with in the rules to appeal a local entity's actions, and if there is, then we've just added another big can of worms. The first time was that ambiguous situation, and it looks to me like St. James is trying to say "We would rather the envelope look different. Let's see if we can push the envelope," and it was in the judgment of the Chair and the Board to say "Let's clarify this to make sure that everybody
understands you can't push the envelope. It is an apple or an orange," or whatever the fruit were.

But at this point, now they've acted, we now have two different measures appealing local entities' decision for which there's no provision in the rules, and that looks like something that you can start hearing a lot of if it starts to continue -- if it continues to be the case that staff puts these on the agenda; right? If I appealed for a tax exemption for my house, you would say there's no provision for that. That's not -we don't hear that. I wouldn't get to come and make a case for it. You would just not hear it because it's not provided for. Appeals of local entities is not provided for, with the arguable exception of when they're saying that it's -- the resolution that you get -- yeah, that's right. That the local entity has rules that contradict those of your own. We have concerns around that, but, nevertheless, a straight-up appeal -- Matthew Block sat in this chair and said "We are not intending to create a blanket appeal of local entities' decisions," ask it was everybody's understanding that that was not what was done with that resolution. Yet here we are hearing several appeals or deciding whether to hear them. We think that could set a precedent. It's going to take a lot of time, but also
is going to really feel like it undermines the ultimate local authority of local entities.

Thank you.
MR. JONES: And I will say, Mr. Bagert, in fairness, $I$ think one of the things that staff had to deal with is the way that Praxair framed their appeal. They were basically alleging that de facto guidelines had been put in place, and so I think -- I think that's what brought it to the agenda from the staff's perspective.

MR. BAGERT: It seems like everybody is pursuing their interest in good will. It just -- it would worry us if this became a precedent where -- so this isn't so much speaking about this instance, but where if the Board starts to act as though there is an appeal option from local entities, which we don't understand to exist under the rules.

MR. JONES: Well, I'm not going to argue that today, but that's...

Mr. Braxton.
MR. BRAXTON: Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent, $I$ do agree with Mr. Bagert because, you know, if this had been dealt with in February, we wouldn't be here.

I disagree that it was a denial, again,
because of how it was presented on the agenda, and if $I$ recall correctly, St. James Parish said they intended -they wanted to approve it, but they wanted to have, you know, a different parameter. They wanted to do it for 10 years, which, of course, the rules don't allow. And so, you know forget the form. It's approve or deny, which is -- they did not do either, and your rules suggest you should approve our abatement as originally presented.

And, yes, we did suggest there were de facto rules in place that prevented us from getting our abatement, and we still maintain that. I think Mr. Fogarty articulated that. Ms. Bonnecaze indicated that she was at a meeting where that was not discussed. That wasn't the meeting that Mr . Fogarty was referring to.

But we believe that we were presented with options that we could not adhere to and we did not receive our abatement and we were denied. Now, sure, we -- you know, I don't know how else to else to present it. If we were to take that -- I don't know how else we could get to this point. If we just took this particular, the September meeting on its face without February and you had sent the abatement down there and St. James Parish did not send in notice within 30 days
of the hearing and they were outside of the 60 days, you would approve our abatement, wouldn't you? I think that's what the rules would call for because they would not have followed their rules. Because that's what happened. Regardless of whether they felt like they had extra rules, you gave them an opportunity to address your abatement up or down, and it was as if you gave them another chance to do it. Great. It was, you know, forget about February. Maybe you misunderstood how we wanted you to handle it, so we're going to send it back.

In my mind, we're not really appealing the -- you know, they did not handle the December 2019 approval in the right way. They didn't do the notice, they didn't do the hearing properly, they were outside the 60 days. They had plenty opportunity to do it. We are here saying they did not do what they were supposed to do, you should approve it. Period.

MR. JONES: Mr. Braxton, $I$ just asked the staff earlier, they did, they submitted within 60.

MR. BRAXTON: You're assuming that, you know, in February that they did not.

MR. JONES: Yeah.
MR. BRAXTON: And that's fine. I'm saying that all of this was entirely so convoluted, and the language that was used in February, you know, created
such an issue, $I$ don't -- I don't believe that the February was simply a denial. The got up here and said that they wanted to approve it. I mean, how can you simply say it was a denial? You can't.

MR. JONES: I think we'll have to respectfully disagree on that, but...

Mr. Waltzer.
MR. WALTZER: Waltzer.
MR. JONES: That too. I'm going to rename you Smith and just be done with it.

MR. WALTZER: You can call me Jones from here on out.

You know, in agency law we have -- boards and agencies have to follow the law, and they derive -your derive your power from the Constitution and from the legislature. And there're basically three functions of an administrative board. One is permitting, the second is adjudication and the third is rulemaking. And we are slipping into adjudication, which requires a whole other set of concerns. And when I said earlier, I just wanted to clarify that there is no jurisdiction to be taking appeals. Really, you know, appeals are provided by the legislature. Your right to an appeal is to a court of proper jurisdiction; right, from an agency action unless there is some other statute or some other,
you know, enabling law that gives it to you; right?
So until you are appointed the arbiter of these kinds of disputes, you really don't even have it. And even if you did have it, the authority; right, the jurisdiction, you know, you have to be following the APA as it comes to adjudicatory hearings to ensure -because in this instance, you have St. James here, you have the other litigant here, but there's due process concerns, there would be notices that have to be provided, there would be literally, you know, judges, or if this body was sitting as a judge, there would be procedures that would have to be followed that are set up by Louisiana law. And y'all aren't it. And that's all. I mean, you're making the right decision, but I just want to reiterate that it would be a very wrong decision to think that, you know, we're going to be taking appeals because that is not the -- okay.

MR. JONES: Understood. I'm not sure I agree, but $I$ understand.

MR. WALTZER: You never agree with me. From Jones to Jones. Come on.

MR. JONES: Ms. Bourgeois, do you have a comment?

MS. BOURGEOIS: Just so we're clear, for the record, Tam Bourgeois for LED and the Board.

The Board has exclusive jurisdiction over -MR. JONES: Exactly.

MS. BOURGEOIS: -- the ITEP, and while parties may have additional adjudicatory appeal rights after the action of the Board, you are governed by your rules as well as Robert's Rules of Order. And you were -- you know, it's up to you whether you want to reconsider any previous actions that you've taken.

And in your general Board rules, which are at the start of the Code for the Board, you talk about how you will hear, we call it appeals, but we're not talking about judicial appeals. We're talking about requests to the Board, and they can be made by any person. It's not limited to the person who might be aggrieved or not aggrieved as far as a standing would be considered. So I just wanted to point that out to the Board.

MR. JONES: Thank you. It's what I thought, but $I$ wasn't going to argue with him.

All right. Mr. Fogarty.
MR. FOGARTY: Yes, sir. Just to comment and maybe to clarify where we get to here. You know, I've got a copy of the forms that they sent back. "Approve" and "Deny" are both highlighted and checked in the same box in the same paragraph, so was it an approval or was
it a denial?
The real basis of this appeal is the resolution that was passed back in February by the BCI that an entity may appeal on the grounds that the rejection is for reasons in conflict with ITEP rules, including, but not limited to alleging that a local governing body rejecting the exemption has guidelines that contradict the ITEP rules.

So the parish taxing authorities came to us, said "We're not going to approve this, but we will approve this." That tells me they have guidelines that differ from ITEP rules. De facto, as you said. You know, and then they -- I think it was when we raised the issue that this is not allowed under ITEP rules, they carefully crafted their resolutions, you know, the parish resolution, the parish council resolutions attached thereto, they crafted those duplicates to say "We deny this, but we prove that." And, you know, it's a form, you know, respectfully. Ms. Bonnecaze was not at those meetings. You know, coming back to us in September, the parish clearly advised us that they would grant us the full $80 / 20$ abatement if they entered into the cooperative endeavor agreement, and that that arrangement would be applied to future ITEP applications in the parish as well. So, to me, they have
demonstrated that they have adopted rules that are in conflict with the ITEP rules.

MR. JONES: Well, I will tell you this, and this is pure dicta. Again, it's one Board member's opinion, but $I$ will say this, that kind of deal is a poignant to me. To tell a corporation "I'll give you your ITEP, but you've also got to sign this other contract where you're going to owe us all of this other money," that, to me, if that ever comes to me that way, then that would be a big problem for this Board member.

I love St. James Parish, but I just don't agree with that approach. I think it's a violation of the rules. And if it didn't happen, then don't worry about it, but if it did, that's a problem.

So I guess the reason I'm saying that and taking -- sticking my neck out on that, I don't want anybody to go back to any local governing authority and say "Ah, we found another way to do this," because that's just not appropriate $I$ don't think.

Okay. We have --
MS. BONNECAZE: Wait. Can I just --
MR. JONES: Ms. Bonnecaze.
MS. BONNECAZE: Dawn Bonnecaze again.
One I want to clarify, February, it says we voted to deny the application, and so $I$ want to make it
crystal clear that the parish did vote deny. And I was at the meeting in September the $28 t h$, and that was not what was said, so I would take my law license as credence to that and the other individuals that were here. I'm not going to go back he said/she said, but I just want on the record to say that $I$ was at a meeting in September, and that was not a requirement that we executed the CEA.

MR. JONES: Mr. McInnis.
MS. BONNECAZE: That's all I had to say. You can ask me something, if you --

MR. MCINNIS: Can we see the denial?
MR. JONES: Sure.
MR. MCINNIS: I mean, I think it's right here.

MR. MOSS: That's what I was looking at. It has blocks --

MR. MCINNIS: And staff obviously, this document is a denial --

MS. BONNECAZE: It has both blocks -- yes.
MR. MCINNIS: -- in y'all's opinion, the staff; right?

MS. BONNECAZE: That makes no sense.
MS. CHENG: The denial that -- the one that was originally provided or the --

MR. FOGARTY: Those are the February
submittals.
MR. MCINNIS: Can you show this to her for me?

Is that the denial that you're saying is the denial within the 60 days?

MS. BONNECAZE: And it says --
MR. MCINNIS: I want staff to look at it.
MR. JONES: Show it to Ms. Cheng, please. He wants Ms. Cheng to look at it.

MS. CHENG: That was the original Notice of Action that was provided to LED in February with the approval and denial -- or the denial and alternative approval.

MS. DAVIS: What do you mean "alternative approval"?

MR. MCINNIS: Okay. I get it now. Can I see that? I understand exactly --

MR. JONES: And, Mr. McInnis, I think what the problem is is that the --

MR. MCINNIS: The approval is not for the ITEP. It's for the alternative deal.

MR. JONES: No. What the approval was "We deny" -- "We deny the ITEP, but we'll do this other deal."

MR. MCINNIS: Right.
MR. JONES: The other deal is not on the table. The rules don't allow the other deal, so that approval, for all intents and purposes, was meaningless because they can't do that under our rules. It was, again, you have an apple or -- whatever, the apple or an orange, and they said "Yeah, but we like the banana better." Well, the banana's not an option.

MS. DAVIS: Who came up with an alternative?
MR. JONES: St. James Parish. St. James Parish came up with the alternative.

Am I correct? That's my understanding at least.

MS. BONNECAZE: Yes. I wasn't there, but, yes, that was the alternative. It was we deny the application as what was presented and accepted by the Board, and in the alternative, this is what we approve.

MR. JONES: We're denying the $80 / 20$, but we'll do this deal?

MS. BONNECAZE: Correct. Correct.
MS. MALONE: And if I may, so initially, after that initial denial and here's the alternative, LED staff marked it as a denial, and then the company brought forth the first appeal to the February meeting; correct, to say they denied, but then they didn't deny
because it's a yes and a no vote, so what do you say. And that's when we heard all parties and then said "Locals, do you want to go back to the table and either say yes or no?" And they said "Yes, let us go back to the table and say yes or no," and they said no again; correct?

MR. JONES: Yes.
MS. CHENG: When we brought it in February, it be was not as an appeal by Praxair. It was just for clarification from the Board.

MR. JONES: It was a special request, wasn't it?

MS. CHENG: It was a special request, but it was not --

MR. JONES: Not an appeal.
MS. CHENG: It was a special request for clarification by the Board because this was -- we'd never received one like that.

MR. JONES: Right, right.
Okay, folks. I know we're all tired, but I don't want to -- this is important stuff for a lot of people, and I want to make sure we get it right.

Right now we have pending before the Board a motion to not hear an appeal from Praxair. I think we have a second.

Are we ready to vote?
Any further questions or comments from the
Board?
(No response.)
MR. JONES: Any further questions or comments from the public?

MS. SIMMONS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
MR. JONES: Yes, ma'am.
MS. SIMMONS: The motion was deny the appeal.

MR. JONES: Okay.
MS. SIMMONS: By Ms. Malone and seconded by Mr. Toups.

MR. JONES: Was it to deny the appeal?
Because --
MS. SIMMONS: To deny the appeal.
MR. JONES: Okay. I would accept a substitute motion to deny the hearing of the appeal.

MS. MALONE: I make that substitute motion.
MR. JONES: Thank you. Because that's what I thought we were -- what $I$ intended at least, but I'm just the Chairman.

Is that all right, Mr. Toups?
MR. TOUPS: Yes.
MR. JONES: Got it. Okay. Great.

So the motion before the Board right now is
to deny the hearing of the appeal.
All in favor, say "aye."
(A few members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: Any opposed?
We have one. Let's do this by rollcall vote, please.

MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Toups.
MR. TOUPS: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Allain.
MR. ALLAIN: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Jones.
MR. JONES: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Davis.
MS. DAVIS: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Secretary Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. McInnis.
MR. MCINNIS: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Wilson.
DR. W. WILSON: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Malone.
MS . MALONE: Aye.

MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Moss.
MR. MOSS: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Cola.
MS . COLA: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Saizan.
Mr. SAIZAN: No.
MS. SIMMONS: I have six noes, five yes.
MR. JONES: I'm sorry. Say it again.
MS. SIMMONS: I have six noes, five yes.
MR. JONES: So the motion to reject the
appeal is defeated.
MS. SIMMONS: Yes, it is.
MR. JONES: Okay. So looks like we're moving forward with the appeal.

All right. Is there anything further the parties want to say as part of this?

Ms. Bourgeois, guide us. If I'm guiding us wrong, please keep me out of the ditches.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Simply procedurally we need a new motion on the floor.

MR. JONES: Okay. So I need a new motion. Presumably the motion is to grant the appeal or to hear the appeal.

MS. BOURGEOIS: The motion is at the pleasure of the Board what action they want to take on
the appeal. I can't tell you which way to...
MR. JONES: All right.
MR. ALLAIN: Can I ask a question?
MR. JONES: Please.
MR. ALLAIN: In your opinion, the first thing that was sent to LED, was that a denial or an approval? Don't say both.

MS. BOURGEOIS: Staff came to me and said that they interpreted the notice as a denial. I that is a reasonable interpretation of what was presented to staff, and we have brought it up to you.

MR. ALLAIN: So you believe that it was a denial?

MS. BOURGEOIS: I believe that is a reasonable determination to make of what has been presented.

MR. ALLAIN: All right.
MR. JONES: Okay. I need a motion. What is the pleasure of the Board? I need somebody to make a motion.

MR. TOUPS: I make a motion to deny the appeal. Is that proper?

MR. JONES: Okay. I think that's an appropriate motion.

Motion to deny the appeal. Do I have a

```
second?
```

"aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: All opposed, "nay."
(Several members respond "nay.")
MR. JONES: Rollcall.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Toups.
MR. TOUPS: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Cola.
MS . COLA: Aye.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. McInnis.
MR. MCINNIS: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Moss.
MR. MOSS: NO.
MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Davis.
MS. DAVIS: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Chairman Jones.
MR. JONES: Yes.
MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Malone.
MS . MALONE: Yes.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Allain.

MR. ALLAIN: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Secretary Pierson.
SECRETARY PIERSON: Yes.
MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Saizan.
MR. SAIZAN: No.
MS. SIMMONS: Dr. Woodrow Wilson.
DR. W. WILSON: Yes.
MS. SIMMONS: I have six yes and five noes.
MR. JONES: So the motion was to deny the appeal, six yes, five noes.

MS. SIMMONS: It's approved.
MR. JONES: Do we have North Carolina
counted? I just want to know.
All right. I think the motion carries to deny the appeal. All right.

MR. FOGARTY: Can you repeat that?
MR. JONES: The motion carries. The motion denying the appeal carries. The appeal is denied.

That is the vote; correct, Ms. Simmons?
MS. SIMMONS: I have -- yeah. I have six -one, two, three four, five, six yes.

MR. JONES: Six yes.
MS. SIMMONS: One two, three, four, five no. And we have one abstention.

MR. JONES: One recusal.

MR. FOGARTY: Can you read the votes back, please, from that?

MS. SIMMONS: Okay. Mr. Toups -- the denials?

MR. JONES: Yes, read them back they way you wrote them down, Ms. Simmons.

MS. SIMMONS: Okay. Mr. Toups, yes; Ms. Cola, yes; Mr. McInnis, no; Stuart Moss, no; Paula Davis, no; Jerald Jones, yes; Heather Malone, yes; Mr. Bret Allain, no; Secretary Pierson, yes; abstaining is Mr. George Nassar; Darrel Saizan, no; Dr. Woodrow Wilson, yes.

MR. JONES: All right.
BOARD MEMBER: Motion to adjourn.
MR. JONES: Well, we're not quite there yet. We have a motion to adjourn, but we still have matters on the agenda. I think. Do we?

MS. SIMMONS: Mr. Pierson.
MR. JONES: All right. It's not on the agenda that I have.

Okay. Let's work this through very quickly. We have other business. Any other business before the Board?

MR. JONES: Seeing none, comments from the Secretary.

SECRETARY PIERSON: We celebrated Veterans Day this week honoring the service of those who have defended our nation and the rights that we have. One of those rights is to our opinion, and it's unfortunate that sometimes people abuse that privilege. I'd like to briefly address the rhetoric around the allegations that have come to light over the last 18 hours calling into question that LED information and personnel are not trustworthy.

I shouldn't have to sit before you and reiterate this, but no one should question how seriously LED takes its responsibility to administer programs according to the rules of this Board and the laws of the State of Louisiana. That unwavering belief encompasses all of LED's approximately 100 employees, no matter if they're classified as civil servants or unclassified political appointees.

I'm not aware that we've ever claimed perfection in our department, although it is our daily pursuit, but please recognize the purpose which drives our work is always to administer programs according to the regulations and to the law. For anyone to suggest that LED employees are participating in activities that run counter to the steadfast belief is an in front to everyone at LED, and, frankly, all public servants. To
use the kind of rhetoric that has been employed in this situation is simply unbecoming.

We can possess different viewpoints, we can disagree on the issues at hand, we can do this while being civil and respectful as opposed to seeking the lowest common denominator that always assumes the worst.

If anyone possesses information they believe doesn't look right or seems out of sorts, they can always, and often do, come to directly to the department, and the situation will be addressed and handled in a professional manner. That approach could have been taken today, but instead, an allegation was taken to a reporter and the media, and apparently they were willing to accept the allegations at face value as opposed to digging into or investigating independently. I suppose that is where we find ourselves in today's political discourse, an era of who can utilize the most outlandish sound bite or Monopoly board and which story gets the most clicks on review pages.

There should be no doubt in the mind of the public that $L E D$ remains a focused and responsive agency acting on behalf of legally-appointed Board members as a trustworthy steward of public funds. As additional safeguards, we have an internal auditor and cooperate fully with the Louisiana Legislative Auditor.

Without question, let me state clearly that
you can have trust and have full confidence in our service to this Board and the citizens of Louisiana.

I know the hour grows late. I'll just simply say that from a department perspective, we continue to be engaged in hurricane recovery, in COVID recovery and the recruitment of business and industry to our state working with our existing industry or small businesses, our Department of Defense communities and being responsive to elected officials at state and local levels as well.

We've enclosed in your packet today your 2021 Board meeting dates and the appropriate application dates accompanying that.

Subject to any questions or guidance, that's all I have, sir.

MR. JONES: Thank You, Mr. Pierson. I appreciate that more than you know.

We also have on the agenda the election of officers. Do we have --

SECRETARY PIERSON: Sir, I would make a motion that the Board defer this election of officers until our next meeting in February.

MS. MALONE: Second.
MR. JONES: We have a motion. We have a
second from Ms. Malone.
Any discussion from the Board?
SECRETARY PIERSON: To be specific, that was
the February meeting of the Commerce \& Industry Board.
MR. JONES: Correct.
We have -- Mr. Bagert has left the building apparently. He had signed up to speak on that issue probably no doubt to rail against the Chairman, but since -- anyway. I'm going to do that Johnny Carson style.

Any other business to come before the Board?
(No response.)
MR. TOUPS: Motion to adjourn.
MR. JONES: NOw I'll entertain a motion to adjourn; second.

All in favor, say "aye."
(Several members respond "aye.")
MR. JONES: God bless you-all, each and every one. Thank you.
(Meeting concludes at 4:23 p.m.)
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