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```
(Commencing at 9:30 a.m.)
MS. PIERRE: Good morning.
The meeting for the State Board Of Private Security is now in session.
May we have the roll call, please?
MS. HULL: Hector Echegoyen?
MR. ECHEGOYEN: Here.
MS. HULL: Misty Finchum?
MR. BLACHE: Not present.
MS. HULL: Maria Landry?
MS. LANDRY: Present.
MS. HULL: Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN: Present.
MS. HULL: Edward Robinson?
MR. ROBINSON: Present.
MS. HULL: Wilbert Sanders?
MS. LANDRY: Here.
MS. HULL: Mark Williams?
MS. PIERRE: Present.
MS. HULL: Ritchie Rivers?
MR. BLACHE: Not present.
Could we please stand for the pledge of allegiance.
```

(Pledge of Allegiance)
MR. BLACHE: I'd also like to
have a moment of silence. We recently lost one of our state license instructors and a longtime person from the industry, Mike Jurina, and also for all those lost and/or injured from our security families throughout the state.
(Moment of Silence.)
Thank you.
MS. PIERRE: If there's no objection, we'll have readings of the minutes from the previous meeting.

MR. BLACHE: The entire minute package is about 365 pages, so we published it --

MS. LANDRY: I'd like to waive the reading of the minutes.

MR. ROBINSON: Second.
MS. PIERRE: The motion has been moved and second and so we'll move on.

MR. BLACHE: I'll state just for the record that we did have a hearing scheduled for today that was canceled because of a continuation request. We do not have a rescheduled date yet at this point in time. As

```
    soon as we do, we will notify the board.
    MR. ROBINSON: I'd like to bring
    up the subject that at the last board meeting we
    entered some scenarios. And then we said at
    this board meeting we would recommend a board
    chair. And at this time I'd like to recommend
    that Ms. Marian Pierre, who is acting, become
    the chair of the board.
    That's my recommendation.
    MS. LANDRY: I'll second that
        recommendation.
    MR. BLACHE: So there's a motion
        and a second.
                            MR. SANDERS: There's a motion
        and second.
                            MR. BLACHE: Do you want to do a
        roll call vote?
                            MR. ROBINSON: Since we have a
        quorum.
            MR. BLACHE: Okay. I'll do a
        roll call vote then.
                            MS. PIERRE: Thank you.
                            MS. HULL: Hector Echegoyen?
                            MR. ECHEGOYEN: Nay.
```

MS. HULL: Maria Landry?
MS. LANDRY: Yes.
MS. HULL: Wilbert Sanders?
MR. SANDERS: Yes.
MS. HULL: Edward Robinson?
MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
MS. HULL: Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN: Yes.
MS. HULL: Marian Pierre?
MS. PIERRE: I can't.
MR. BLACHE: I did that in my first office council board meeting.

MS. PIERRE: It has been moved and second, and the vote has been taken?

MR. BLACHE: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: So Marian Pierre becomes chairman of the board.

I'd like to make a motion
that -- and put a name and nomination for vice chair. Maria Landry.

MR. ROBINSON: Second.
MS. PIERRE: All in favor?
Do we need a roll call?
MR. BLACHE: We'll take a roll call.

MS. HULL: Hector Echegoyen?
MR. ECHEGOYEN: Nay.
MS. HULL: Wilbert Sanders?
MR. SANDERS: Yes.
MS. HULL: Edward Robinson?
MR. ROBINSON: Yes.
MS. HULL: Ms. Pierre?
MS. PIERRE: Yes.
MS. HULL: Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: Moved and second. Maria Landry is now the vice chair for the State Board of Private Security Examiners.

MR. BLACHE: Congratulations.
MS. LANDRY: Thank you. I'm actually surprised.

Congratulations to you too.
MS. PIERRE: Thank you. I think with two women, we can't lose. I always believe the best man for $a$ job is a woman. So that way we got there.

All right. We're going to move on to the financial data updates on the financial. And I think everybody has a copy of the financial report in front of them or they

```
received one prior to this meeting.
    If anybody has any questions or
```

    comments as it relates to the financial
    statements --

MR. ROBINSON: Accountant's here.

MS. PIERRE: And I know. But you guys received this in a package earlier, and if you have any questions and stuff, the financial people, the accountant is here, and he can explain it to you.

If not, we're going to turn it over to the accountant and let him go through the financial statement with us.

MR. McRIGHT: Financial
statement will be presented for the two months July and August for this year. And the first section we'll do is going to be the balance sheet and it starts off with the assets.

Y'all have on hand as of August 31st $\$ 945,000$ in checking and savings. That's offset at the bottom by $\$ 816,000$ worth of payables, some of which are due currently in the payables. The state police is the biggest item on there that has to be paid. And that depends
upon when they process the fingerprints and send us a bill. But we're holding $\$ 176,000$ for the state police.

Reserved - compensated absences. That is just the amount, the 43,000 due to employees for accrued vacation that they should be taking within a year's time.

All the other payables total right at \$9,000.

There's also an OPEB payable. That's for amounts payable after the employees retire and have their health benefits and everything carry on to the future.

Y'all are one of the few boards still that have -- y'all designated the money market of 594,000 to cover that 587. Y'all have enough funds if you had to pay it off today, but there's no requirements anywhere in the near future y'all would ever have to pay this amount off. That's just a number that's been required to be put on a financial statement for full disclosure purposes.

Y'all have assets. A net of depreciation of $\$ 390,000$ at this time.

All right. Then we move on to
the income statement, which is the next couple of pages. This starts off with revenues.

The revenues for July were 84,115.86. It went down to $\$ 63,786.99$ for August. Year to date is 147,000.

The decrease between July and August is the $\$ 20,000$. We are down about 8,300 on guard renewals. We're also on guard apps are down about 9,300. And fingerprint income is down 7,120 but that's because the state police didn't process anything in the month of August. So that will come back up. It probably will be doubled in September. Then will get the money in there.

Then move over to the next section would be the expenses. Once again, the biggest item y'all have on expenses will be the salaries and benefits for the employees. That runs right around $\$ 40,000$ a month. As you can see in July it was 39. In August it was 43. The main difference there is overtime was paid in August.

The difference -- the total
expenses for July were 96,775. The total
expenses in August was 87,000. That's a
difference of about $\$ 9,500$. The main difference there, if you look at equipment, repairs, and maintenance, which is about two-thirds of the way down the page, in July it was 14,836, where it's only $\$ 365$ in August. So it decreased from one month to the other. The difference there is in July we had some major air-conditioner repairs to the tune of about 14,000 that had to be made. That was a one-time charge.

And a lot of this, I think -Fabian, you may want to correct me on this. MR. BLACHE: Sure.

MR. McRIGHT: That really is going to be part of an insurance claim eventually. And we may get that money back. MR. BLACHE: Yeah. That's correct. The two gentlemen that are adjudicating the claim from the flood, the units failed because they had been submerged under water. They were operational the entire time, but they attributed it to the claim. So they had me submit these invoices to that claim. And the anticipated outcome of that is that the claim is going to cover that expense, so we'll recoup those funds.

MR. McRIGHT: Offsetting the $\$ 14,000$ decrease in expenses is increase of \$5,494 for officer mismanagement insurance. That bill came up in August, and we had to pay it. And, basically, everything else is pretty much in line.

For the year our income, we're showing a loss of 36,000 . That will gradually go away as we get our fingerprint income. And we're assuming hopefully that the guard renewals will pick back up, and that will bring back more income to even this out.

MR. BLACHE: Right on the tail end of that action, the football season started.

MS. PIERRE: I was just getting ready to ask you how could that possibly have gone down based on the fact that we know how many guards --

MR. BLACHE: That's all being posted now. So it all levels off.

MR. McRIGHT: We have plenty of them on hand now to be processed. That should take care of it.

I'd be happy to answer any specific questions y'all have.
had.
MS. PIERRE: That was the one I

Does anybody have any questions or comments as it relates to the financial statements?

MR. ECHEGOYEN: \$14,000, that's coming back, that's coming back straight to the board or does it go to the state?

MR. BLACHE: Yes.
MR. ECHEGOYEN: Or do they go to the general fund of the state?

MR. BLACHE: We are not a general fund agency at all.

MR. ECHEGOYEN: You explained to me last time that usually when they pay, that kind of money goes to the state and the state pays us. Isn't that what you said?

MR. BLACHE: No, sir. I said that with respect to the claim, we had -- most of the claims expenses, we've had the adjustors pay the vendors directly. So when they did the building, it was $\$ 300,000$. We didn't pay 300,000 and recoup the funds. We had Sedgwick pay the vendor the $\$ 300,000$.

That's between the vendor and
the claim side. We don't have any general fund dollars. We are a self-generated fund agency. Fines and fees are what drives the day-to-day operation.

MR. ECHEGOYEN: Bottom line that
14,000 will come to us?
MR. BLACHE: Come to us. And we will recoup the funds that we put out for those two air conditioners.

MR. ECHEGOYEN: Thanks.
MS. PIERRE: Are there any other questions? Comments?

If there are no other comments
or questions, I move that we accept the financial report as given.

MS. LANDRY: I make a motion to accept.

MR. SANDERS: I'll second.
MS. PIERRE: It's been moved and second, so the motion is accepted.

The financial statements are accepted.

MR. McRIGHT: Thank y'all.
MS. PIERRE: Thank you.
There are some recommendations.

I see some new faces in the audience today from the convention center.

AUDIENCE: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: Thank you for joining us today. I don't know if you guys are here for purposes.

Is there anything that they're here to discuss, Fabian?

MR. BLACHE: Mr. Mark did ask to be able to speak.

MS. PIERRE: Okay. At the end of this, if you don't mind, we'll go through the agenda and then we'll get back to you, okay?

AUDIENCE: Thank you.
MS. PIERRE: Special projects. As we go forward as a board there's been -- we know that we have statutes in place. And with those statutes in place, I've given you some recommendations as to some of the things under the statute that we could possibly clear up, meaning making rules and procedures that when something happens it's not a subjective answer that's given to a company or a guard, that we have specific regulations and rules that will accommodate those disciplinary actions.

And what I'd like to see if there's anyone, any board members, who would like to serve on that committee to bring some of these things back to us to discuss.

It should never be a situation where a company doesn't know what's going to happen to them when they violate a rule or a policy of this board. It shouldn't be something that's suggested by us in making a decision. It should be something that's written very clear that they understand if you do this -- if you drive without a driver's license, you're going to be arrested. So those are the things that we need to clear up. And I think we can do it in committee.

And I'd like to ask you, Maria, to serve on that committee.

MS . LANDRY: Sure.
MS. PIERRE: Durell, would you be interested in serving on that committee?

MR. PELLEGRIN: Sure.
MS. PIERRE: Ed? Committee?
(Nonverbal response)
MS. PIERRE: Hector?
MR. ECHEGOYEN: I don't think I

```
can. I'm sorry.
```

MS. PIERRE: You don't think you

```
can?
```

MR. ECHEGOYEN: I just have too much on my plate now. I'm sorry. MS. PIERRE: All right. Well, thank you.

So that committee will be composed of Maria Landry.

MS. LANDRY: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: Ed Robinson and Durell Pellegrin.

So at that time they will bring back information to the board and, Fabian, we'll probably need to get the attorneys involved to make sure we're in compliance with all the statutes when these rules are presented, okay. So we'll discuss that further at the next meeting. You have some examples before you and that's just recommendations for you committee members to have. I think I gave everybody a copy of them, so.

MR. ROBINSON: Can we get the phone numbers of both of those?

MR. BLACHE: Yes. I'll make
sure you have all the contact information.
MR. ROBINSON: We can have a conference call.

MS. PIERRE: Yeah. You guys can do it however you choose, to come to the board meeting an hour ahead or, you know, a couple hours ahead.

MS. LANDRY: Okay.
MS. PIERRE: Or stay a couple hours after the meeting and come up with some suggestions.

Now we have the executive director's report.

MR. BLACHE: So the first thing on my agenda is notifications in the January -I'm sorry -- June. I get my Januarys and Junes messed up with fiscal years in my head.

In the June meeting, we had a conversation about notifications, so I just wanted to give a quick update on that. Pursuant to that meeting effective July 5th, we immediately reimplemented rigorously sending out the notifications.

What that entailed was a couple of things. If you remember at the meeting, I
mentioned that one of my concerns about the letters that were going out was that they were incorrect. The letters were basically talking about a month and day. And so what you'd get is you'd get a notification that says this person has to be renewed by this month and year. But it wouldn't specify what date.

The rule accounts for the fact that it has to be done 60 days in advance. Well, 60 days in advance then meant to us that we needed to send these notifications every day, not just on Friday covering a week, and then not knowing what that expiration date was in the future.

So we worked with the database administrator of the guard tracking system. It took about five attempts to get it right. But what we did is we got those letters changed so that we could run them in such a way that if we ran the letter on a Tuesday and we're looking out 60 days, it accurately reflected the 60-day notice so that we wouldn't have the possibility that somebody could say, okay, well, we've incurred some sort of a fine for this now and the notice didn't come in 60 days, it came in 55
days, right? So we wanted to mitigate that exposure. So we did that. And then we began every day sending out those notices. We started doing that, $I$ believe it was right around July 5th, if I'm not mistaken.

In addition to that, we also made an enhancement, and this was done by Summer who picked up that task. She started sending out the ones that fall on weekend days. Because the prior year could have been a weekday, she sends those out on Friday before that weekend. So you're still getting the notices for those days too.

We try to be as literal about that as we can be because, you know, it was something that was brought up. And we agreed that, you know, there needed to be some rigors of that process. And it was probably -- now that we have gotten caught up on the application side, an opportunity for us to task someone to doing that specific thing.

On any given day it can take anywhere from two hours to do that for the day to -- it can go until 2 o'clock in the afternoon. It just depends how many firearm
renewals, company registrations, instructor rules, and guard registration renewal notifications we're sending out. But they're going out as the board asked for. I just wanted to give you an update on that.

MS. PIERRE: Fabian, I have a question as it relates to that.

MR. BLACHE: Sure.
MS. PIERRE: You said we're caught up. We're caught up on ID, on recertifications. Are we caught up on cards going out too?

MR. BLACHE: So there's two answers to that question.

MS. PIERRE: Okay.
MR. BLACHE: The first one is on renewals and applications. We want to be within 30 days. When the flood happened -- let me backtrack.

When I got here in March of last year, we were behind months before the flood happened. When the flood happened, it pushed us back even further. At any given point in time we've been behind on just entering applications into the system of upwards of six to seven

1 months. Now we're to within about 30 , 35 days. 2 That's what I call functional zero.

Functional zero is what you're receiving in a 30-day period about what you can enter in a 30-day period. That's a good place to be. Because we can easily put our hands on something if we have to find it. And we can get it into the system which will correlate with returning the background checks so we can get the person moved from pending to active. So I'll share a number with you that relates to your question.

A month ago our pending -- and this is people who are not active and aren't eligible to have their permanent card yet. Our pending was 2,333 guards. Yesterday our pending was down to 2,007. So we've moved 300 off of pending. That's a pace that will eventually eradicate that pending to a functioning zero level.

So we have several things we have to get to functional zero. The first one we achieved. Renee's been working tremendously at this, is getting us to where we're within about 30,35 days on apps. The second thing is
making sure that all the renewals process the week they arrive. The third thing is making sure that the people who have submitted fingerprints, for those that do submit fingerprints, get the fingerprints into the system, get them back from the system, and then we can change that guard from --

MS. PIERRE: Pending.
MR. BLACHE: -- from a pending status to an active status with the caveat that their training is also in.

So there's all those other pieces. We don't make a guard active so he can get a card until the training is also recorded. So we've made a tremendous amount of headway in the last two months on these issues because we finally had everyone who was swarming to the applications to get that to 30 days. Got that done. Now we've pushed those people and tasked them to other things, and now we're impacting other things that were impacted by the flood.

Make no bones about this. We are still recovering. We still have a garage that doesn't have a car in it because it has stuff in it that we have to go through and get
out of here or get somewhere else to be able to get that vehicle back in the garage. So anyone who's of the notion that the place looks great and the flood is a thing of the past, needs to disabuse themselves of that notion.

We're still working through a lot of other issues that are contingent to that. There's a long tail on that. But we've done what $I$ think is an incredible job in a short period of time.

This right now, if $I$ was putting pictures on the wall of what this place looked like right now, this desk would not be here. The floors would be concrete. You know, we'd be gutted, you know, to the four-foot level. So that was just a year ago. So that's where that is.

Now, on the ID cards themselves, which there's another part to that. The second thing that came up in the June 28 th meeting was hard copies. Right after that meeting, Tina and I got together and made sure that, you know, she had all of her supplies and equipment and such. And then we started running cards. I think the first batch of cards that we ran was about

2,700.
Is Tina in here?
MR. BLACHE: It was how many?
About 3,000 did you say?
AUDIENCE: No. 2,000.
MR. BLACHE: 2,000. It was
2,000. And then subsequent to that we ran another batch that was pretty -- pretty
substantial. At this point looking at this pending number dropping the way it is, which correlates to the issuance of those cards as well, we're on a rapid pace now to get people who are waiting to get off of a temporary blue card into their hard card.

That's working out beautifully.
So the cards are being mailed out weekly, generally speaking.

MS. PIERRE: Well, there should be -- one question. There should be no one that has a temporary card that's six months or a year old --

MR. BLACHE: Oh, no.
MS. PIERRE: -- on the dates of
those cards.
MR. BLACHE: There shouldn't
be .
MS. PIERRE: 'Cause that's what
I'm finding is happening, Fabian. I'm seeing blue cards, that people are coming in with temporary cards that are over six months to a year old. And I'm going, like, how can that be?

MR. BLACHE: That's been a
problem ever since I arrived. In June of last year, I went to Essence. And I walked that floor for two days by myself. And I was inspecting cards, and I have pictures of the cards where those cards were a year and a half old. And that was in June of last year. So there were a lot of mitigating factors to that. A lot of it did have to do with the older fingerprint system. We're on a newer system now.

A lot of it had to do with volume. A lot of it had to do with the fact that we have -- we generate the most number of fingerprints submitted to state police than any other agency in the state. We have one fingerprint tech who they claim is the best, and we know she is. But, you know -- she is. Slow and steady wins the race. I mean she prints

100, 120 prints a day --
MS. PIERRE: And none come back,
right?
MR. FABIAN: -- and 60 a day
their individuals can do.
We've got the right components. What we had was bad workflows. We just didn't have -- and good oversight on the workflows. Putting more rigor to it, more oversight on the workflows, getting people involved in helping determine does this card have two 8-hour classes? Yes. Is their background clear? Yes. Well, they can be made out. All that drives that process.

So the fact that we moved 300 in a month, $I$ think we can get this down to a range of 250,300 as a pending in the not too distant future by year's end.

MS. PIERRE: So I guess your answer is we should not see cards with those --

MR. BLACHE: Not age that long, no. Absolutely not.

And it's curious to me why --
there's just a couple of things that are curious to me, and it's just food for thought so that as
you deliberate as board members and as industry people you think about some of these things.

For example, why did we not set a time limit on a blue card in the first place? If you look at the way the system is designed, it's designed to be abused. The blue card has no expiration date. The renewal card actually is missing information that would be vital to the renewal card. It doesn't tell you much. It's just a place holder for them until they get their card.

MS. PIERRE: Hence, the committee.

MR. FABIAN: Yes. Absolutely.
MS. PIERRE: Those are the kinds of things that the committee will be looking at.

MR. FABIAN: Another thing that will be --

MR. ROBINSON: Let me add to what you're saying.

MR. BLACHE: Yes.
MR. ROBINSON: I understand what you're saying. But there was some cases where the regular card did not come back --

MR. BLACHE: Right.
MR. ROBINSON: -- for six months or better.

MR. BLACHE: Right.
MR. ROBINSON: And that was, I guess, processing.

MR. BLACHE: Oh, yeah. No doubt.

MR. ROBINSON: So therefore, they would have a six-month --

MS. PIERRE: While I do understand that -- but here's the thing, if it's going to be a temporary card -- and I have to agree with you. If there's going to be a temporary card, there should be a time limit on it. It should be given three months, six months. And then that company would have to issue another blue card, if that was the case.

MR. ROBINSON: I agree with that.

MR. BLACHE: People all work in a variety of different environments, right? You know the Hawthorne effect. If you're observing something, it changes its behavior. So if you put a time limit on the card, even the agency
that produces the product has to do something. Because you don't want to run into a situation where you're eclipsing that time period over and over again, right?

Here's another example of a process that just plays into that. We have a blue form. And we have event industry people, for example, who work events. And we make them do a separation form. They call it termination form. I call it separation, okay. But we make them do a separate form after they do an application on someone. We give them 20 days to send us the application, right. So the person can work a five-day event and be gone before the application arrives.

No one had the foresight to say why don't we just put something for the termination, the separation, on the blue form in the empty space at the top. So that if you're doing that, you simply fill out this one thing. You put when they were released on there. We receive it. We have one piece of paper to track. We enter the information. We enter the separation date, we move on.

Instead, it's two different
mailings sometimes. So think about that from a process standpoint. I've got a stack of apps in one person's office. And then I get mail that gets busted and I've got termination forms in somebody else's hands. And there's a crisscross there sometimes. And that will impact card generation as well. Because if we term somebody, why would we be issuing a card and making them active if they're not working at the time.

As it stands right now, the credential is not the guard's, it belongs to the company. And technically the individual is supposed to send it back to us. So why would we spend the resources, the time, pay the salary, and use the materials to generate a card on somebody that when you get it, they're already termed. And the terms in the mail this way, and the cards in the mail that way.

So I'm just pointing that out so that you understand the complications of the process and how they all dovetail into spiraling into these type of pending numbers when there's a hiccup or an issue. And these are things that we meet about and talk about, looking at, and
finding ways to resolve them.
MS. PIERRE: It is our intent --
it is this board's intent to make sure that we streamline some of those things, to look at those things individually and come up with ways to make it work better in our system. Work better for the companies. Work better for the guards, and work better for the agency. Because I agree with you, we're doing stuff -- we're doing double work in some cases.

MR. BLACHE: Absolutely.
MS. PIERRE: And it's the same thing for the companies. We're finding ourselves doing terminations, doing temp cards and all this kind of stuff when we can do one form that says this guard is going to work from this date to this date and the termination date will be this date, if they're working a convention or a festival.

MR. BLACHE: I'm glad you said
that. So I've showed you guys different iterations of our Image Trend database, which we're moving towards. And one of the things that we are doing in that, because it is a database and it generates the license, we are
creating an event credential. It's very specific to that scenario.

So when a company owner, a QA, or office manager is bringing someone on board who is going to work a small event, they will be able to choose that application, specify the duration of the event. We'll be able to run the clear deal on our side because we're not going to have fingerprints yet or anything. Make sure that that person doesn't have something egregious in their background that would exclude them from being able to work the event. Generate the card, which will come out with the $Q R$ code with the expiration date 15 days in the future or whatever the case may be. And then that scenario resolves itself. Now that's covered.

Because now not only do we know who they are the moment you generate the app, rather than 20 days later, paper app, but we have the ability to do some things to make sure they're not on a sex offender registry, those types of things. And then that credential basically expires at sunset and that's the end. And then they can come back through that process
again the following year for the same event and go through the same thing all over again.

And then, of course, there will be a separate application for the standard two-year credential for the guards who work in the industry because it's their livelihood rather than the ones that do it to supplement their income.

The other thing I have on here, and this is just real quick. I won't belabor you with this. We talked in June about training and testing. And we're still moving forward with taking advantage of the fact that the statute says we can implement continuing education. We want to do that.

One of the mandates from the board or the bulk of the board that hired me was -- and what they had litmus tested with the industry was -- and $I$ hear this all the time. In fact there was a gentleman sitting in my chair in the office last night who said the exact same thing. He said, I just don't think 16 hours is enough. I said, well, you know, that's a slippery slope. Because when you start talking about more time, more training, you're
talking about more dollars.
So the way we think that we can address this is a couple of things. First of all, during the flood we lost one of the computers that had the entire training curriculum on it. Hector saw what was the last printed vestige of it, which was pathetic. We have spent since -- it was bad. We have spent since August until -- it was earlier this week. We finally now have captured whether it was through scanning or flash drives or server or other trainers, the entire original manual that's the most up-to-date version. And it's now editable, and we have multiple copies of it. Because that's our starting point.

Within two weeks, the education committee is going to get a copy -- the whole board will, but the education committee will receive a copy of the proposed revisions to that manual. It will be probably the first revisions to that manual in a decade. It's going to have an entirely new section on it that focuses on the event industry and counter-surveillance in particular.

```
                                We want to make sure that we're
```

teaching security officers the value of their presence and their eyesight and their vision and their knowledge of their locations. And making sure that they understand the things they should be reporting to supervisors, things of that nature.

We're going to brush up a bunch of things that are woefully out of date. For example, $I$ think it says felony level is $\$ 500$. That's now up to a $\$ 1,000$. It's changed twice and never got adjusted in the official manual. And what we're going to do ultimately is come up with twelve prescribed hours of revised material that everyone will get a chance to put their eyes on. Put it on the website. You know the website post section allows you to comment. Everyone will have a chance to chime in and give their ideas and inputs. We want that.

And then the goal would be down range in a month or so to come out with something we can recommend to the board through the committee that would be ratified and then submitted to every licensed trainer in the state to say this is what you teach now. Throw away
anything else that you had from the board and you start with this.

And we're prescribing 12 hours because we feel like companies, as you mentioned one day, companies do a lot of different types of security business. You have armored car. You have just unarmed. You have armed. You have events. You have different type of venues; hospitals, whatever. We want to leave some hours in there for the trainer and the contractor or the companies' discretion to say here's some proprietary stuff that we want you to teach to the officers that we would be spinning our wheels trying to figure out in every single scenario and every site what that would be.

And then design a test around
those 12 hours so that the remaining -- the remaining four hours make up the two eight hours. There's your 16 hours.

And this would be a 2017
iteration of the state board training. We'd make sure we get all the trainers in. They go through it, that they understand it. And then there's another part to that where once that
happens, we'll start having inspectors going out and sitting in classes and making sure that they're training to the curriculum. And making sure that the training that we've developed is being effective and get feedback in the field from the students and the trainers so that if we need to make revisions, we need to make revisions.

One thing I don't want to see happen, once this training is revised, is that we spend another ten years waiting to revise it again. That should never happen. Every trainer that I have talked to says we need to be looking at this annually and making revisions as we go. We can do interim things with it. We can add stuff. We can subtract things. But it needs to be a living, breathing document, not just a stagnant binder of information that has a decade life span. That's not how training is done. So that's a really important piece of that. That's for the curriculum update.

The last part of that is the SORT Louisiana. SORT is the security officer's remote training that we want to start using for certain scenarios. So for example, we've got
people that come from Alaska that want to take the test to be a $Q A$ or a company owner, because they don't have to physically have a office here. The only thing they have to have is a location of service, okay?

Well, I don't know what the exact expense is to fly in from Alaska and stay in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, but I can imagine it's pretty exorbitant. I think that it would be prudent for us to design a system where if someone is getting licensed remotely, they would have the option to pay a different testing fee. And they could use an online portal to take their test that would grade the test and tell us whether or not they understand the rules, the law, and how to administer their program in the state of Louisiana.

In this way, instead of -- one quote $I$ got one time was nearly $\$ 12,000$. Instead of spending $\$ 12,000, \$ 7,000$, you can spend a couple hundred dollars and you can take the test online. So that's one thing we're still in the developing stages of. I have some samples of that that I'm not yet ready to actually demo because there's some things in it

I want to brush up and change. I want you to see it the way we envision it.

The other way we would use SORT would be for refresher training. We know that there's nothing in our rules and law that already says how refresher training should go. So what we would like to do for refresher training for security officers since we don't want to monkey with the 8 -- with the 16 -hour, two-day class deal is have it so that before they renew two years down range, they go online, they do a very noninvasive, noncumbersome type of online training program that we develop. They go into the portal. They go through the training. They take the test at the end, and it grades the test. They produce their certificate. They furnish that to us. We update it in the system that says they have done their refresher. And then when they put their renewal through, we look at it and say you've done the refresher. We have the renewal. We have the fee. We can issue the renewal.

And the goal of that is to try to start taking some of the onus on the expense of that off of the industry side and start
making the guards more responsible for the credential. The big vision, the big play, is to eventually migrate to a point where we've got a security credential for officers that is their credential, and then the registration is what it was intended to be. It was intended to be a nominal fee to register the guard to say they're affiliated with your company.

But right now the way it's been administered for many years, and I don't agree with it, is that the card belongs to the company. The guard leaves. They have to send it back. And then it's like they're starting all over again. Now, there's dollars and cents aspect and component to that, that you guys will have to sort out and figure out.

But from a process standpoint, what we want is you to be able to log into my portal and say I have Joe Green, Junior here. He is a state board licensed security officer. He's got his training. His firearms are still certified. I can put him to work on an armed post. And I don't have to wait 20 and -- 14 more days to find out that you actually have a sex offender on an armed post, who should never
have a gun in the first place and shouldn't have gone to the range to shoot at all, which is what happens right now.

MS. PIERRE: I totally agree.
MR. BLACHE: And that's the part of it that we have to fix because the statute requires us to protect the people of the state of Louisiana. And any time I can go out and do an inspection and find somebody on the post that doesn't have eight hours training here or 16 or certification with a weapon, we're in trouble.

MS. PIERRE: The other component to that is if it's the guard's license, it gives them the ability to work for multiple companies, if they choose to. And so that way you can go into the portal. You can see if the guard is certified, has all the qualified training. And he can register now to work for $A, B, C, D, E, F$ company and work for them. And you can see that that guard is working for those companies.

And then it becomes the guard's responsibility to make sure that they keep their license up-to-date.

MR. BLACHE: Right.
MS. PIERRE: I think that's the
best scenario. It's being used across the country.

MR. BLACHE: And that doesn't preclude people from subsidizing the fee upfront and getting it back and things like that. You know, that's a different issue. But I think it really is important if -- I've said this before. I know I do a lot of refrains of things that I say, but $I$ never know who's in the audience so I always like to repeat certain things.

We're the 14 th largest tourist destination. We are in the top three in the nation for critical infrastructure and key resources. We've got pipeline, petro, oil and gas, you name it. The Mississippi River, one of the most vital drainage arteries in the North American continent. There's so much about this state that a lot of people take for granted and don't understand. And professionalizing the security industry and making people accountable to themselves for how they present themselves in this industry is critically important.

You know, there's a lot -- you look at SMG. They have their own department of public safety. They got their own officers,
right? Because there's a certain persona that they want to present because they're a big venue used for a lot of things. They want to make sure that, you know, they present it the right way.

And in addition to that, you're going to find companies there, the landmarks, the $L$ and R's and so on, right? And they work in tandem. For the public who really doesn't know much about security policing, it's all the same thing to them, you know. It really is. They don't blur that line. They just don't. It's all the same to them, and I think that's the importance of what we're trying to do here, is make sure -- you know, we can't create a six-month police academy like the one that $I$ went through. We don't have to necessarily tack in the direction of some states where they have 60 hours of security training before you can even get a license. Some people here, just because of the economic background that we have and the way our state is postured, don't have the capacity to do that.

But with what we already have as a foundation, we can make some substantive
tweaks and start getting the people who function as security officers on board with the idea that when you get locked into this industry, this is something that belongs to you and you should do everything in your power to make sure you maintain it and keep it in good standing. And it makes you at the ready.

We want -- I've said this
before. We want you to be able to go to Craigslist and say I need 55 people. Because you can then go on to the system and look and see if those 55 people are licensed and credentialed. We don't want you going on Craigslist today and then saying you need 55 people because we know for a fact that 77 percent of those 55 people are going to lie on their application and say they've never been arrested or convicted.

Cindy and I had a conversation yesterday. A gentleman sent me a sheet out of a notebook requesting a hearing. And we told him we'd be happy to grant him a hearing once he answers all of our interrogatories. But the point was the man said on his application I've never been arrested or charged for a felony or
misdemeanor. He, on the second question, said I've never been convicted of a crime. He has 18 charges on a 15-page rap sheet.

And then proceeded to cuss her out when she was -- she reached out to see if she could possibly clear some things and see if maybe he could be considered. And his response to her was you have no business asking me anything about my background. There's laws against that.

So this is what we're dealing with. And that's sadly the norm in a lot of instances. So I think it's our responsibility as a board to try to help the people that service our marketplace, raise their game up. And I think we have ways that we can push them in that direction without being cost prohibitive and without it being difficult.

So by using an online system, they can use a phone, a tablet, a computer. They can start and stop their refresher training. It doesn't have to be something that takes them a whole day. It could be a couple of hours. It could be an hour. It's got to just be more than what they have now, which is
nothing, so that they understand it. And that they're getting something out of it. And every year we'll revise it and tweak it, based upon the recommendations from the instructors.

So that's my update.
MS. PIERRE: Does anyone have any questions for Fabian as it relates to notifications?

MR. PELLEGRIN: Only question I have is how close are we to the e-licensing phase?

MR. BLACHE: We're getting very close. Where we're bogging down and have bogged down was with our data. Our data has been real sketchy. As we -- you know, it's always funny sausage making. When you dig into the database and you start looking at the data and you say, okay, export me a spreadsheet that gives me everybody's name, address, phone number, date of birth, height, weight, social security number, you know, all that stuff, and who they've worked for and how many times they've been registered, etcetera. You find all kinds of anomalous stuff. We've got a lot of duplication. We've got bad socials. We've got bad name spellings.

We've got people in the system twice with different last digit and an $S$ on the end of their last name. Just really weird stuff. So what we're trying to do is clean a lot of that up so when we do our second data export -- which we had planned actually for July and it wasn't ready. We was also still at that time a little too far behind on applications. We want to make sure we're capturing at least everybody who's in that functional zero range, right? We found a lot of problems with the data.

So me and the staff have been working on termination forms and active status. That's why you see that pending dropping so fast. We want to get that to a good level and then do our data export and then start our testing. So I think we're probably -- we end our contract with them November. We started development in December of last year, so I think we're probably on track for November, December, somewhere right around there. We should be ready to have tested the new data and be comfortable enough that we can go live and then fix things along the way as we encounter each
applicant. But it's going to be amazing. MR. ROBINSON: Question. I remember one time you were discussing the fact that hopefully eventually that dues would be at the same time.

MR. BLACHE: We've already started doing that. We're using an attrition process for that.

What Mr. Robinson is talking about, we're moving all the guards to one expiration date, and that's March 31st in two years. Some of you have heard about that before and you've been to some of my sessions.

So the way we're doing that is we're not just wholesaling, pushing everybody to a March 31 date. But as we come upon renewals, we're adjusting those expiration dates, with the goal being that over a period of time you eventually will know that every guard that you have that works for you and renews every year, every two years, will renew on the same day, which will be a blessing for you administratively.

If we could really, really get fancy, do what some of the other states have
done and get our firearm recertifications to every two years with firing twice in that period and then we could match the certification date the same way the EMS does it, because EMTs and paramedics certify on $3 / 31$ and renew on $3 / 31$ with their license. And this way the whole process happens between October 1st and March 31st. Then it's a big swell of activity. You knock it out. And then you get a breather for a while.

That would be the ultimate goal. The first step toward making it easier for you to run your offices is getting that $3 / 31$ expiration date. That means every year some percentage of your staff will expire on March 31. Over time it will probably be nearly a $50 / 50$ split. But this way you get a reprieve on that whole process throughout the year. You know exactly when you need to ramp up and who you need to touch and who you need to make sure has done their refreshers, if we have that implemented at that time.

But we're starting that already.
So as the renewals are going in -- Bridgette does the vast majority of the renewals right
now, she's putting 3/31/2020 expiration dates. Because anything after July 1st goes out three years in advance, and then everything up between until January 1st and June we push the date out two years in advance. So a first-timer could, you know, have an extra bit of time or a slightly shorter bit of time. But when they renew, then they're on a solid two years schedule. Great question.

MS. PIERRE: So did that answer your question, Mr. Durell --

MR. PELLEGRIN: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: -- on the
e-licensing?
Anybody have any questions for
Mr. Fabian as it relates to reporting?
Make a motion that we accept the executive report.

Do I have a second?
MR. ROBINSON: Second.
MS. LANDRY: Second.
MS. PIERRE: Okay. Thank you.
We move and second.
Thank you, Mr. Fabian, for the presentation.

MR. BLACHE: You're welcome.
Yes.
MS. PIERRE: I think your comments are very good. I think we need to move in that direction. And what I'd also like to add to that is that we need to look at continuing education for guards and as state laws change and as we move forward, there may be some continuing education points that we can look at with you guys. And look at it if we can legally do it, because other states are doing it. Other states are doing it. We're trying to clean up the industry, making sure that the guards that are out there are well-trained and they understand and know the laws as they change. 'Cause laws change all the time. And so they need to be familiar with what their regulations are, any regs that affects them.

MR. ROBINSON: I think what you said is going to be real good. I don't know if you remember, you and $I$ were at a meeting with the chief of police.

MS. PIERRE: Um-huh. I do.
MR. ROBINSON: And now the police is starting to depend on security
officers. They have vision because they're not everywhere. So therefore, if they pull up on the scene or they're there, they want to take the security officers.

MR. BLACHE: Right.
MR. ROBINSON: They have more security officers than you have police officers.

MR. BLACHE: Yeah. That's why that vigilance counter-surveillance component is being added to the revised curriculum, and we're going to try to touch up on all the different aspects of that. Because I think it's important for them to know how valuable a role they can possibly play in the omnipresence aspect of policing.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, and the shortage they have right now, they need more eyes and individuals.

MS. PIERRE: So it's a
partnering agreement that they're looking to get into, an endeavor with the security industry not just, you know, a --

MR. BLACHE: And I didn't mention something, but if you'll give me one moment, I will. One of the things that we have
coming down the pike, and I've discussed this already with the person who has the LSA and the LACP, is we're working on a project we call Operation Forged Alliance. And what that would be is a way for us to do what police does with security. It would be an opportunity for law enforcement officers to understand our statute and the fact that they have a right to inspect. And what we would be encouraging is for when they see armed guards, don't just assume that that person should be armed and should be there. Check their credential and notify the board if they're not properly credentialed.

If you get state troopers, constables, sheriffs' deputies, and police officers doing that, we have the entire state blanketed.

MS. PIERRE: I've got to tell you, I don't know about any other parish or city, but in New Orleans they do check. That's one of the things we ask for. Whenever they come on the scene, let me see your license.

MR. BLACHE: We would like to see that everywhere. It would be a boom to us, it would be a benefit to them. My pitch on it
to the officers, having been a law enforcement officer since 1985 myself, is don't assume the person standing near you, behind you with a weapon is supposed to have that weapon or supposed to be there. You might want to do some due diligence because there's a possibility --

MS. PIERRE: The only thing you need to make sure is they take step two. Step one they do already. They ask you for your license. Step two is that they don't report it to the state board. That might be the step that we need to talk to the chief about.

MR. BLACHE: But that's what the Operation Forged Alliance thing is about. And you'll hear more about that as I continue my dialogue with them on that.

MS. PIERRE: Okay. Thank you.
Anything else? If not, we'll
open the floor to public comments.
Do we have anybody here who wants to make a public comment?

Okay. Come on up. Why don't you go right over here and that microphone should be on if you can't speak loud enough for everybody to hear you.

Why don't you introduce yourself. Tell us who you are, your name and where you're located.

MR. KAUFMAN: My name is Mark Kaufman. I'm the Director of Public Safety for the New Orleans Convention Center. I'm new to the position. I just arrived here in July, but I'm from Louisiana. I've known Mr. Robinson for probably 25 plus years.

And today once we were notified that the committee or the formulation of the committee was on the agenda, we had some concerns. Because in the past there were some exceptions made to prevent the -- or to keep the convention center from not competing or not being able to compete with other cities for conventions like Vegas and New York.

And what we're looking at is -it's fine to put all these rules into place, but please allow us some input, like, we could come back to you in 30 days and see how this is going to impact the convention center. And maybe increase some of the fees of these conventions coming to New Orleans and may influence them to either come or not come or go somewhere else.

And also, give us the
opportunity -- the conventions we already have booked, they already know what the fees are going to be for security, badge checkers, ushers, thing of that nature.

So how would that impact the conventions already coming, already booked, if you now change the rules and, you know, require them to pay additional -- instead of having a badge checker, now everybody becomes a guard, so now you have to pay across the board as a guard. Just allow us to come back in 30 days and show you as a committee how it's going to impact us in the city, that's all we're asking.

MS. PIERRE: We'll be glad to take that under consideration, Mr. Kaufman. But what I must say to you is that I need to ask you a question.

MR. KAUFMAN: Sure.
MS. PIERRE: When companies come and they book conventions, they specifically ask for what they want in contract. Is that not, correct?

MR. KAUFMAN: I think you need to be more specific.

MS. PIERRE: Okay. If they -if a company presents a plan -- and correct me if I'm wrong. When a company presents a plan to the convention center, someone contacts them and say that $I$ want to do a convention here and I'd like you to do the security for me. They give you the rooms that they're going to use, the amount of people that's going to come. And so then it's the companies', the security companies' job to then put together a proposal of some kind that then has to be approved by you guys?

MR. KAUFMAN: No.
MS. PIERRE: You don't review them anymore?

MR. KAUFMAN: No.
MS. PIERRE: Okay. They used to review them.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
MS. PIERRE: So let me just say then they ask for security. But here's my issue with that. If you ask for security, then it should be security. If that person is going to be identified as an usher, identify him as such, an usher. Because far too many times you call
an usher a security guard, and that usher is not a security guard. They've not been licensed by anyone. And they're performing the functions of a security guard, not an usher. An usher tells me where to sit. They don't inspect my bags -my bags. They don't look in them. They don't inspect my badges. Ushers direct you.

So that's my confusion with what happens when a company comes in. And it used to be -- and I think Ed could speak to this, that it used to be that you would present your proposal to the convention center, and they would say, oh, no, you don't have enough guards or you don't have enough coverage here. And then they would approve or disapprove it, making you add or subtract from where you needed to have them. If they had roll-down doors, they would say you have to have somebody there for so many hours.

MR. ROBINSON: They've stopped that.

MS. PIERRE: They've stopped that? So that kind of helped the companies to be in compliance. But I just have a problem when a company calls an usher a security guard,
and then they're not -- they're not a security guard, they are an usher or vice versa.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
MS. PIERRE: And that's what we want to be clear on. And I think we've had some conversation about it before as to what they are. Because we've had not only the convention center, we've had people come before this board, the previous board before, where the UL or LSU or Southern or one of them, they say, I put out a contract and I need security guards. And then when we get -- when an investigator gets there, they say, oh, that's not a security guard, they're ushers.

And so -- but the company didn't hire ushers. Their contract called for security guards. So if they call for security guards, then they should be registered with the state board, is that correct?

MR. KAUFMAN: If they're a security guard, yes.

MS. PIERRE: Right. So we just want to not have blurred lines between what that is and not call one something that they're not. MR. KAUFMAN: Well, okay.

Perfect example, all right. You have ushers that work at the Superdome. They're there to keep people from going into aisles that they don't have tickets for. Are they a security guard?

MS. PIERRE: Not if they're doing that.

MR. KAUFMAN: They're keeping somebody from going to a designated place. As a door check, they're checking tickets.

MR. BLACHE: Can I comment on

```
that?
```

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, can I

```
finish?
```

MR. BLACHE: Go ahead.
MR. KAUFMAN: What we do at the convention center is when somebody books the room, they book a certain amount of halls. They submit to us a fire plan. We recommend to them on the fire plan, you have to have guards, not ushers, guards, at all these locations because they're emergency exits.

From there, that fire plan is submitted to the New Orleans Fire Marshal for approval. They determine that's correct or they
may look at it. If it's over 50,000 square feet, you have to have so many firemen present. We give the companies a list of vendors to choose from. And they'll say -- for instance, Mary Kay. Mary Kay is a bunch of ladies, well-dressed, they're there for a makeup show. They're coming for their convention. They're used to going to different cities. They're not hard to police. They go and come. They're very polite. But they're asking for somebody at that door to be an usher, check my ticket, look at my badge. Because we could have multiple shows going on at the same time.

Can I come into the convention?
You have the correct badge. So I think there is a difference between a guard --

MS. PIERRE: There is.
MR. KAUFMAN: -- because other
buildings, the Superdome, they have ticket takers. They have guards. They have event staff. And they all have the overall function of keeping people from going certain places, but they don't exactly have the same licenses.

What we're saying is, let us come back to you. Let us make a proposal to you
of how this is going to affect tourism, affect conventions coming to the building, affect shows that are already booked. And let us show you the difference that maybe the committee will take and listen to some exceptions. That's all. Yes, we understand guards need to be certified. Guards need to be trained. We welcome you to come in and make sure that those guards have the proper certification. We welcome you to penalize the companies that don't play by the rules. We welcome all of that. But still, let us show you that it's not just a blanket guard or a guard card across the board. There are some exceptions. That's all.

MS. PIERRE: Mr. Kaufman, that's exactly what this committee will start to do. MR. KAUFMAN: Perfect. MS. PIERRE: Is to be able spell those things out that are gray areas for some companies, to spell that out and they will identify that. Because the statute is not very clear on that. So we want to make sure that anybody that's operating understands exactly what a guard is, exactly what an usher is and exactly what a ticket taker is.

MR. KAUFMAN: And that's all

```
we're asking for.
```

MS. PIERRE: So that's exactly what we want to do.

You want to say something, Mr. Fabian?

MR. BLACHE: I do.
With respect to the analogy you gave, was it about the Superdome?

MR. KAUFMAN: Sure.
MR. BLACHE: Once I'm in the Superdome, with the exception of areas that are ticketed differently, if I'm in -- whatever, the loge area, $I$ don't know what they call it.

MR. KAUFMAN: The loge.
MR. BLACHE: I can go and visit anybody in any seat $I$ want. They don't prevent me from going into other aisles that $I$ don't have a ticket for.

MR. KAUFMAN: If you have a loge ticket.

MR. BLACHE: That's what I
said --
MR. KAUFMAN: That's not correct.

MR. BLACHE: -- the section I'm referring to. But I go to football games. I have people that have seats in the general vicinity where I am. I can go and sit next to them and talk to them during halftime or break. No one stops me from doing that.

The difference, I think, is the controlling of the entrance into the building in the first place. I think those two things are different.

But I want to point something out to you that's in the definition of a security officer in our statute. And I'm just going to read two short lines. The first one under 1886 says prevention of unlawful intrusion or entry. And then $H$ says control regulation or direction of the flow or movement of the public except on public streets.

So you can kind of see where we are talking about the same things, and there are some definitional concerns there. But when you're talking about unlawful intrusion and entry and control regulation or direction of the flow or movement of the public, by the definition of Title 37, that's a security
officer.
MR. KAUFMAN: Then everything you just said says that ushers aren't allowed to control their sections. They're not allowed to direct patrons to other sections. They're not allowed to keep people from going in sections without being properly ticketed, therefore they're a guard.

MR. BLACHE: I'm not saying that. I just wanted to point out what that language is and make sure that you understand that from our perspective, here's the bigger point. This is the convention center, this table. It's about that long. It's about a mile long when you walk it. The person who's manning the door and the roll-up gate at $H$--

MR. KAUFMAN: Should be the guard.

MR. BLACHE: -- who is a security person and the plan calls for that, should be the same type of person that's at B. Because it's the same door and it's the same roll-up gate. That's my only final comment. MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. MS. PIERRE: Well, Mr. Kaufman,
thank you for coming before us today.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MS. PIERRE: We are taking a look at those kind of things because we want to clear up those gray areas that are not completely clear because we don't want to have companies misunderstand what a security guard is versus what an usher is. Because nine times out of every ten, we see contracts all the time that says I want -- you know, it says that they have a request for proposal for security guards. They don't say ushers. They don't say ticket takers.

Now, if they use that guard as an usher or a ticket taker, that's a story of a different color. But the thing is, is that they need to understand and they all need to be clear on what a security guard is and what an usher is, what their performance can and cannot be. So when a company says like -for instance, the LSU games or Southern games, they never put anything out and say they want ushers. They say they want security officers. But then we go to those sites, and everybody's an usher. Where's the security guard? Your
contract says that they're contracting with you for security.

So I've heard this in the past over 24 years that I've been in business. I've heard companies come before and say, oh, no, they're not security guards, they're ushers. That's why they're not licensed. But if you look at that contract with those agencies, it says that they're hiring security officers.

So either they're misleading
their client or they're trying to mislead the board. And so those are the areas we want to clear up. And we agree with you that it should be spelled out.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
MS. PIERRE: So there will be no misunderstanding about who does what. That's our effort. That's what we intend to do. That's what this committee is going to do. But we welcome your comments.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MR. CROUCH: I just want to say something. The board cannot do anything without you knowing about it.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

MR. CROUCH: The promulgation process for rules is pretty elaborate. And us as lawyers, our job is to keep our clients between the chalk lines. And so there's a 90 -day or 120 -day process that's wide open to everybody whenever an agency wants to change its rules.

But also keep in mind that there are limits to what an agency can do by rule. One of the things that an agency cannot do is change a statute by rule. The Administrative Procedures Act is primarily designed to let the public know how an agency is going to implement the statutory law. But you can't by rule change a definition or something that is in a statute that -- you just can't do that. That's illegal.

So any change that this -- I'm sure the board will be glad to receive input in the process of --

MS. PIERRE: Sure.
MR. CROUCH: -- developing
what's going to be done with any rule change that's -- you know that's contemplated. But the actual process, everybody in the industry will know about it.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
MS. PIERRE: And I think some of the recommendations and some of the things that we've heard from committee members and board members, I think you're going to be very satisfied with what the outcomes are and we would welcome your input.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MS. PIERRE: So thank you very much for being here. Congratulations on your new position.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MS. PIERRE: Any more public comments? No public comments? None?

Anybody have any questions? If not, then $I$ think this was a short meeting, and I thank you all for coming. And I make a motion that we adjourn.

MS. LANDRY: I'll second.
MS. PIERRE: Meeting's adjourned.

The next meeting will be December 14th at 9:30, Thursday, at this location.
(Deposition concluded at 10:45
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