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QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Hello. The meeting is now called to
order. Bridgette, would you do a roll call,
please?
MS. HULL:

Misty Finchum?
MS . FINCHUM:

Here.

MS . HULL:

Durell Pellegrin?
MR. BLACHE:
Not present.

MS. HULL:
Mark Williams?

MR. BLACHE:
Not present.
MS . HULL:

Edward Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON:

Here.

MS. HULL:
Marian Pierre?

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Here.
MS . HULL:
Maria Landry?
MR. BLACHE:
Not present. On her way.
MS. HULL:
Wilbert Sanders?
MR. SANDERS:
Here.
MS. HULL:
Ritchie Rivers?
MR. RIVERS:
Here.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We have a quorum?
MR. BLACHE:
We do.
MS . HULL:
Yes, we do.
MR. BLACHE:
All right. Can we stand for the Pledge?
Thank you.
(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE)
MR. BLACHE:
And can we briefly have a moment of

| 1 | silence -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 3 | Yes. |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | -- for all of our law enforcement and |
| 6 | security officers who have been injured and/or |
| 7 | killed in the line of duty and anyone we've |
| 8 | lost from our security family? |
| 9 | (MOMENT OF SILENCE) |
| 10 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 11 | Thank you. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 13 | Would it be necessary to read the |
| 14 | previous minutes of the meeting? I think |
| 15 | everybody has had a chance to review them. |
| 16 | Could we just move to adoption of the previous |
| 17 | minutes? |
| 18 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| 19 | So moved. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 21 | He needs a second. |
| 22 | MR. SANDERS : |
| 23 | I'll second. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 25 | It's been moved and seconded and we'll |

adopt the minutes of the previous meeting as is.

Okay. Ron, legal updates?
MR. CROUCH:
We had two hearings at the last Board meetings. Those decisions are being drafted at this time. We're not quite through circulating that through the office yet. And I think the Director and I will be giving you a comprehensive, legislative overview or revision of your statutes that are probably sometimes out of date, but we are going to be starting on that next month and any rule revisions.

Have I explained to you -- oh, Amy from Taylor Porter contacted me yesterday. She informed me that none of -- neither the Board nor any of you members have been properly served with that lawsuit. Consequently, she is just waiting on the time to run. And this is kind of the end of the rope at this point. Once the time period has run, she will file a motion to dismiss the lawsuit with every expectation that that motion will be granted. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Would you mind, Ron, just telling what lawsuit we're talking about? MR. CROUCH:

We're talking about the Feti lawsuit in Federal Court and there's also been a separate filing in State Court.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Right.
MR. CROUCH:

And she will be dealing with both of those at the same time. And, additionally, Fabian was sued separately and individually, and he has his own separate attorney has been assigned to represent him. I represent the Board. Amy and I work together on that part of it. I'll leave Fabian to address you with regard to the other one.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
If I'm not mistaken, we were sued
collectively --
MR. CROUCH:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- and individually?
MR. CROUCH:

And individually, that is correct. And she's representing each of you individually and the Board. So we have every expectation that that lawsuit will be dismissed for failure to serve it properly in Federal Court.

One other thing that I'm not sure you're aware of, do you guys or have you familiarized yourself with the dentistry situation? There was a U.S. Supreme Court decision dealing with boards that are made up of market participants. That's you guys, okay. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Right.
MR. CROUCH:
And the U.S. Supreme Court said that you can't do that. As a result of that decision, the Federal Trade Commission came to Louisiana and brought suit against the Board of Real Estate Appraisers. The State has fought that lawsuit and it is presently in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

But as a result of that litigation -- and litigating against the Federal Government is so incredibly expensive and incredibly difficult to deal with. At the last
legislative session, a commission was created by the legislature that is part of the Governor's Office, and I do not know whether there have been any appointments to that commission yet or not.

But any regulation that boards like you that are made up of market participants, those proposed regulations will have to be approved by that commission. And the commission is made up of people that are not market participants before it can go to the register and be promulgated. It's an extra step in the process.

I don't think it will be a great
impediment. Because generally speaking, the people on those commissions don't know the first thing about what you do, but it's something that's kind of been expected for a number of years. Because while I've never actually experienced it, the U.S. Supreme Court said there's every opportunity for you guys to affect the free trade, the free market. You don't do it, but you see the possibility that you could.

And the dentistry, the dentists were
doing it. They wanted to prevent dental
hygienists from practicing their trade, unless
they were employed by a dentist. Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Right.
MR. CROUCH:
So I just wanted to make you aware of
that. I don't think it's a big hill to climb.
But any regulations that we propose have to go
through that commission.
MR. BLACHE:
Have they picked the members of that yet?
MR. CROUCH:
My last check was probably a month ago.
And to my knowledge, it has not been done.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So that will be done by the Governor's
Office; is that correct?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. So I guess we need to stay in
touch and find out when they --

MR. CROUCH:

Yeah. We check the website pretty regularly, because every lawyer in my section promulgates rules. And so we're all faced with it. And I don't think there's -- except
for the State Uniform Construction Code
Council, every board --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Is composed of --
MR. CROUCH :
-- or commission that we represent is exactly like that, made up of market participants. And so ...

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Well, who better to police the
industry --
MR. CROUCH:

Yeah. Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- than people who participate in it --
MR. CROUCH :
Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- on a daily basis?
MR. CROUCH :

```
Absolutely. It makes perfect sense to me.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Absolutely.
MR. CROUCH:
But --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We have doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs --
MR. CROUCH:
Absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- on a Water Board that makes no sense rather than having people who are familiar with water intake on that Board.
MR. CROUCH:
There's a Federal decision out of California that's likely to do away with the Bar Association because the Bar Association doesn't regulate lawyers. They just collect money.
MR. ROBINSON:
Wow.
MR. CROUCH:
You know, I aged out on continuing legal
```

education and I've said since then, they don't care whether I'm incompetent or not, they just want my money.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But they -- don't you have to have the -do the annual courses? You don't have to do that anymore?

MR. CROUCH:

I don't.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Because you -- okay. Because
after a period of time, you age out of it?
MR. BLACHE :
Hmm, I didn't know that.
MR. CROUCH:
That's correct. They're not going to
teach me anything anyway.
MR. BLACHE:

I didn't know that.
MR. CROUCH:
But the -- I'm too existence.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
You can't teach an old dog new tricks. MR. CROUCH:

Absolutely. I've been doing this too
long. Thirty-eight years, I've got my mind made up. But the -- they don't regulate us. We are Officers of the Supreme Court. We are licensed by the Supreme Court. And the Disciplinary Council is what regulates us.

So the Supreme Court in California said you're just a -- you're just a conduit for money. So anyway, I don't know where that's going to all go. So I believe that's it for me. I'm going to go back to -MR. BLACHE:
And you --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, that's the same thing we're fighting against right now in New Orleans because we have the special officers -MR. BLACHE:

Yeah, and we're going to --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- that they don't regulate.
MR. BLACHE:
We're going to talk about that.
MR. CROUCH:
Did that get resolved?
MR. BLACHE:

We're going to --
MR. CROUCH:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:

That's in my update. We are going to have a spirited conversation about that.

MR. ROBINSON:

Oh, good.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And we have a date coming up and $I$ have
to get with you for the --
MR. BLACHE :
For the judiciary chair?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Yeah, for the -- you to meet with the chair.

MR. BLACHE:
Okay. Great. I just want to mention
just so that you feel lonely and on an island, Feti also decided to sue law enforcement too now; right? Didn't he?

MR. CROUCH:
Yeah.

MR. BLACHE:
He's now sued the Sheriff's Office and
the City Police and some other folks for when they arrested him at the Texas Club for false imprisonment charges that stem from illegal activity he was engaging as a security operator. So he's still wallpapering the town with --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, it's good to have company. It's good to have company.

MR. CROUCH:
Lawyers are not cheap by the way.
MR. BLACHE:
No. No. No, definitely not.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, I meant I guess she's going to give us an update as to where she is at some point because $I$ haven't heard from her. MR. CROUCH:

Amy?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Amy. Since we sent her the information that she requested.

MR. CROUCH:
Yeah. She had a conflict for today. She was going to come, but she passed on to me, no
worries. You know, if for some reason Feti survives the Motion for Summary Judgment, then we will get into the real catfight of the litigation by taking depositions and so forth. But I don't anticipate, $I$ really don't anticipate any of that happening.

I anticipate the judge dismissing the thing on the Motion for Summary Judgment because you guys have not been served properly. Now, he may then have an action against his attorney for malpractice, but ... MR. BLACHE:

I'm sure he'll file it. I have no doubt in my mind.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So that's our legal update for today, Ron?

MR. CROUCH:
That's it, unless you have some questions for me.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I don't have any. Does anybody else have any as it relates to the Feti case or what's happening with it?

MR. ROBINSON:

No, we just sent everything to Amy. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

So I guess now, we move to the budget. MR. BLACHE:

Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Want to go over the budget with us?
MR. MCRIGHT:
Yeah. Y'all ready to go?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Let's go.
MR. ROBINSON:
We're ready for you.
MR. MCRIGHT:
I think y'all have a handout with the financials as of June 30th.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Uh-huh.
MR. MCRIGHT:
We'll start off with the balance sheet. Once again, the main thing to point out is y'all have cash in CDs or money markets totaling $\$ 951,000$. And y'all have property, land, and equipment depreciated value of $\$ 390,000$. With the cash of $\$ 950,000$, y'all
have liabilities at the bottom of the page of $\$ 946,000$. So y'all are in real good shape as far as being able to pay off any potential liabilities y'all have. That includes the post-retirement benefits of $\$ 587,000$, so that puts y'all in real good shape.

As far as the year ending June 30th, y'all end with an operating loss of $\$ 159,000$. That will be presented on the June 30th, those three pages, numbered pages one, two, and three. And it starts off with the revenues.

The first column is what actually was entered on the books as of June 30th, 2018. The second column is the original budget. The third column is the variance with that original budget. And then the last column is our projected income and expenses and amended budget for 6/30/18. This is -- we present this so that we can -- when y'all accept it at the end of the discussion, this meets the qualifications that the legislative auditor requires that y'all approve a budget, even though we were supposed to have done this back in June. We didn't have a quorum, so we wasn't able to do it. So we have to do it
now. They didn't write us up on it because it was just nothing we could do about it.

All right. Coming down this one here, during the year ending June 30th, y'all had $\$ 757,000$, roughly $\$ 800,000$ of actual fees taken in. This compared to us budgeting 732. So y'all were really $\$ 25,000$ to the good on that.

Then below that, y'all have fines of \$165,000. We originally estimated 150. So y'all were above there.

Fingerprint income, you had $\$ 90,000$, and we budgeted 76 .

Bank card fees is kind of a new category because we're collecting monies through ImageTrend.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
ImageTrend.
MS. VALLERY:
ImageTrend.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Right. So there's some income that we get from that -- those monies that we post those separate. It's just like interest income, which is the next item. And then we
have our other miscellaneous income and the NSF recovery, which is just redeposit of checks and that people had given us and didn't clear the first time.
(MARIA LANDRY ENTERS THE PROCEEDINGS)
MR. MCRIGHT:
The expenditures on the first two pages are broken down for the biggest item y'all have is salaries and benefits. Y'all spent $\$ 889,000$ on all of the salaries and benefits for the employees. This is up over what we have budgeted by about $\$ 124,000$. That was due to some change in personnel. And increased health insurance, retirement, and all that went up at the same time.

We had contractor services totaling $\$ 120,000$. The other travel and education was \$15,000. Total repairs and maintenance was $\$ 27,000$ for the year.

Going over to the other page was other operating expenses of $\$ 72,000$. And occupancy received costs was $\$ 27,000$. Excuse me. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Excuse me. Would you like to get some water or something?

MS. VALLERY:
She's getting it.
MR. MCRIGHT:
All of a sudden, the sinuses started working.

Down at the bottom was the -- now, I can't read through my glasses. I'm doing real good this morning. The total fixed asset additions was $\$ 35,000$ during the prior year. Coming down to a total, then it comes to net loss, in effect, was $\$ 159,000$. And we had projected a breakeven. So we ended up with a variance of 159,000.

The last column, we budgeted for next year, this was a rough budget. This will have to be amended. We're already going to make some changes to it, but this was just to meet the June 30th deal that we had to have a budget presented by that time.

So we already know we're going to make some adjustments to it and we'll see when we get into the current operating expenses here.

So as part of today's deal, we really need to, if y'all agree with what we've presented here, y'all will need to accept this
and approve it as far as the official budget for the year; and also, that we've presented the final financial statements for the year as required by the legislative auditor.

Y'all also have a group of papers called -- dated November the 30th. This is where we're up through and then the books, as I know we've got everything posted up to date to that point. MR. ROBINSON:

Just a question.
MR. MCRIGHT:
At this time, we're showing for the, I want to say, five months ended, we're showing $\$ 112,781$ loss so far this year. This is not unexpected. We've made some changes to the way the fees are renewed and stuff. So it's more of a timing difference. This should take care of itself, I think, by --

MS. VALLERY:
By March.
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- March.
MS. VALLERY:
Uh-huh.

MR. MCRIGHT:
Then, we should start showing this number going down the rest of the year.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Any questions?
MR. ROBINSON:
Yeah. I just had the question that, we approving this budget, but you also say there's going to be some changes. So we're approving it without the changes; is that what you're saying?

MR. MCRIGHT:
Well, the reason we ask you to approve this one, this is the one that was published on the website and this is accepted by the Legislative Auditor's Office.

MR. ROBINSON:
All right.
MR. MCRIGHT:
So we need to have one approved that they got a copy of.

MR. ROBINSON:
Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Now, it's not unusual for us to amend it
during the year. Like, $I$ know we're going to have some repairs and maintenance that we've already done some of it during this coming year that we didn't anticipate. So we will have to amend for that. When we do that, we'll take care of any increases in revenues and stuff that we are now projecting we didn't have knowledge of in June 30th.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. And thank you. And we'll be getting a copy of that when you make the amendment; is that correct?

MR. MCRIGHT:
Yes. It has to come before y'all. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Any questions?
MS. FINCHUM:
I have some questions in regards to the overspending as far as the loss is concerned. The budget that we approved whenever these expenditures came in that we're exceeding what the budget was, when were those approved by the Board and by whom?

Because we -- the budget has been overspent by over a hundred thousand dollars,
so I've got lots of questions about that. MR. BLACHE:

So we had a meeting in June where we didn't have a quorum. That's where Mr. Dalton was going to present that budget, if $I$ remember correctly; right?

MR. MCRIGHT:
I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.
MR. BLACHE:
We had a meeting in June that we didn't have the quorum for and that's where we were going to present the budget --

MR. MCRIGHT:
Yes.
MR. BLACHE:
-- and then whatever legislatively
mandated adjustment for any variances that had
to appear.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
That would have been in June.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So which means that because we did not have the general meeting, that wasn't a
discussion because we did not have a quorum. MR. BLACHE:

And then in the September meeting, we had the two hearings, and then that ran very long. There was a motion to adjourn and address the budget at the next meeting, which is this meeting.

MS. FINCHUM:
Well, my questions come into play as far as the spending beyond the budget at the time those spending, those expenditures are occurring. Is any of that being addressed with the Board over and above what the amount is budgeted?

MS. VALLERY:
This budget is going to be amended, but we had to present this one because this is the one the Legislative Auditor had to have. MS. FINCHUM:

My question really isn't about what the budget is. MR. BLACHE:

Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
My question is --

```
MS . LANDRY:
About the overspending.
MS . FINCHUM:
-- about exceeding that budget. When is
that getting approved?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So I think we -- I think what her question is, is that who approved when it was overspent? Who approved the overspending? MS. FINCHUM:
Correct.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And so if the overspending was not approved and what they're saying, I think, Misty, I think they're saying to us is that this is the -- this is the budget that they had to turn in that actually will be an offset. There will be no overspending. This will be adjusted. MS. FINCHUM:
No, ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Is that not what you're saying?
MR. MCRIGHT:
Well, if you look at --
```

MS. FINCHUM:
No. The year is already over. MR. MCRIGHT:
-- the budget versus actual for June 30th that we were going to present in June, we showed that salaries were up, salaries and benefits were up by 124,000 by what we had budgeted. And that's the majority of what we were out for the year. We were out a total of 159. The 124, we really had no control over other than to let somebody go before -MS . LANDRY:

But I'd like to ask, how did we over budget $\$ 124,000$ in salaries? MR. BLACHE:

So it's a combination of, we had two WAE positions, which are temp positions, that we brought in because we were transitioning into ImageTrend. And we had, starting from January of '17, where we were just back in the offices normally from the August '16 flood and rebuilding the building, we were then six months behind on paper applications. So we had just an incredible backlog of paper applications that we had to deal with.

So we brought in a WAE position, which was Ebony at the time, to help us with the front so we could reallocate people to doing the backlog work. That involves the WAE.

Then, we brought in a student worker so we wouldn't have, you know, benefits there necessarily. And we brought them in to assist us with scanning and other related duties that related to ImageTrend and implementation of ImageTrend.

So we're in this flux right now where starting in May and through now, we've been in this transition from going to paper to electronic, but we still have an obligation to address all the paper applications that we've had that have had this five-, six-month long tail running on it. So by bringing in -- by creating the WAE position, which is a mechanism Civil Service affords us to be able to bring somebody in and limit them to 1250 some odd hours, and then you can reallocate it, we've had one, two -- we've now -- we've had three WAE positions in that time frame, in addition to the fact that we had planned increases for staff with the changes of the

```
salaries from administrative coordinators up. There was a market rate adjustment. And then, it's retirement and the other elements that are factored into that that are not within our control.
MS . LANDRY:
Now, and you mentioned the paper
applications. Are we caught up on that or do we still have --
MR. BLACHE:
We are still entering and scanning paper applications.
MS. LANDRY: How many would you think we still have? MR. BLACHE: We probably have 1500.
MS. VALLERY: At least.
MR. BLACHE:
When I -- yeah. When I got to the agency
in March of 2016, when I looked at what we were entering at that time, we were about six months behind. And we were catching up towards the end of the year. We were tracking to catch up and close the gap. Then, we
```

flooded in August and that threw it completely out of kilter.

So we basically stayed static on how far we were going to be behind because of what happened with the office. So, like I said, when we got in the offices again officially with phones running and fax line, and the whole nine yards, that wasn't until mid November, we were then just now, okay, getting everything back in place. We're six months behind fingerprints, applications, renewals, et cetera.

MS . LANDRY:
And I know I'm getting off track here -MR. BLACHE:

No. No, that's fine.
MS . LANDRY:
-- but it has to relate to the budget. MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh.
MS . LANDRY:
So do we have checks attached to those applications still that are 1500 applications? MS. VALLERY:

Oh, no.

MR. BLACHE:
No.
MS. VALLERY:
Absolutely not.
MR. BLACHE:
No. No, I've -- revenue wise, we've brought in more in fees and fines than we had projected. That wasn't an issue. No, we don't hold checks. MS . LANDRY:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
We process payments and get people where they need to be. That old Legacy system and with the paper system, that was the huge issue that we walked -- that I walked into when I got here was, we're six months behind the day I hit the door. And the question is why. And the why is because you got 20 days to send in all the paperwork. It's coming in 30 and 40 days later. Everybody is doing this. You get your football season starts up. Landmark dumps 800/900 apps on you. Before you know it, you've got what we have.

So we're now at the point, we had 3,000
in change at one point. Now, we're down into the $12 / 1500$ range at this point. And I'll get into some more of the ImageTrend numbers and explain to you what's really happening in real time with that, but that's something we want to work ourselves out of so that we can put the paper to rest once and for all.

But we knew that we couldn't do that overnight when we turned this on basically June 1st. But we've been ramping up for it all along trying to work the backlogs down and using extra personnel and things of that nature.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Because, if you remember, we had a lot of people that had not been processed for a long period of time and we're still waiting on cards for them.

MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh, cards. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And we were calling saying, we're waiting on cards for them, and they had a backlog then to six months or more that we were waiting for cards for guards themselves, the official

| 1 | cards. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 3 | Yeah. And I don't want to get off track |
| 4 | from the budget. |
| 5 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 6 | Uh-huh. |
| 7 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 8 | But just having paper applications still |
| 9 | in a box that's 1500, and those guards are |
| 10 | still working off of the temporary ones. |
| 11 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 12 | Many of them are now transitioning to |
| 13 | ImageTrend. And, like I said, when I get to |
| 14 | ImageTrend numbers and show you the |
| 15 | difference, you'll see what I'm talking about. |
| 16 | But most of them are now in the new system, |
| 17 | but we're still needing to maintain that |
| 18 | documentation because of the retention |
| 19 | schedule at the Secretary of State's office. |
| 20 | So that's why we couldn't just do away with |
| 21 | it. |
| 22 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 23 | Okay. |
| 24 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 25 | We have to touch it and we have to |

address it.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
I guess my other question $I$ have is with the addition to the additional staff and things of that nature, that would be something brand new that wasn't included in our budget. And I just feel like that's something that should have been brought to the Board and not just added on by the office without at least discussing it with us since this is what we had budgeted for.

MR. BLACHE:
But we had it on the agenda for September, but we motioned to -MS. FINCHUM:

When were those people hired?
MR. BLACHE:
We had -- we have had three -- two WAEs. So let's see, Wendy Loften was hired in May, right, and then Ebony was prior to that, and then Raven was even prior to that. So that was back in January.

MS. FINCHUM:

But knowing that was going to push you over the budget, that should have been brought to us --

MR. BLACHE:

That's --

MS. FINCHUM:
-- beforehand --

MR. BLACHE:
But that's --
MS. FINCHUM:
-- not in June.
MR. BLACHE:
That's what we prepared to -- no, that's
what we -- that's the purpose of the
Legislative Auditor's mandate that the budget be amended. You're made to --

MS . FINCHUM:
We're not required to approve this.
MR. BLACHE:

No.

MS . FINCHUM:
So if you're going to spend over what we're approving to be budgeted, then that needs to be addressed with us before those dollars are spent, knowing that's going to
push you over this budget.
MR. BLACHE:
The way it works with the Legislative Auditor's requirement is that you amend the budget to within 10 percent of whatever your real expenditures are. One year -MS. FINCHUM:

This is beyond 10 percent.
MR. BLACHE:
I know that. One year, we exceeded it by 10 percent. We were above and we had to amend it down. We did that in 2017. We had the converse of it where we had -- I think we were -- can't remember the exact number we were over, but it was a significant number. And we had said we were going to bring in $X$ dollars and we brought in tremendously more money, and we still had to amend that budget for the legislative auditor's purposes down to within -- is it five percent?

MS. VALLERY:
Five percent.
MR. BLACHE:
Five percent.
MS. FINCHUM:

Amending the Legislative Auditor's budget
is not what I'm referencing.
MR. BLACHE:
No.
MS. FINCHUM:
I'm strictly talking about what we
approve --
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- versus what's being spent.
MR. BLACHE:
No. We're amending the Agency budget to present to the Legislative Auditor. Am I stating that correctly?

MS. FINCHUM:
I understand what you're saying --
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. I just want to --
MS. FINCHUM:
-- but it's not what I'm talking about.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
I'm just talking in general what we

```
approved --
MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- it's making it appear that we're -- we made an approval, and then the office, yourself, chose to hire all these extra people that knowingly was going to send this over budget, and you just did that. And now, you're just wanting us to approve it after the fact. I just don't think that's appropriate to handle it in that manner.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. I have an obligation to run the agency and make sure that we're doing things that we're doing. I've had mandates from the Board in other board meetings saying, why is it taking so long to get this done? Why is that taking long? In those minutes in those meetings, it's like, if you need to hire somebody, then you need to hire somebody. Okay. I've had individual conversations with Board members who have asked me that question; do you need additional personnel, et cetera? The WAE mechanism is designed to make it a
```

nonpermanent situation so you can scale up and scale back as you need to.

MS . FINCHUM:
I just think proper approval is necessary when it comes to overspending at that dollar amount.

MR. BLACHE:

I'm not disputing that.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I don't disagree with what you're saying. But $I$ think if we had had that June meeting and if we had the appropriate amount of people at that June meeting, we would not be at this issue today. Because then, we would have known about it and we would have an opportunity then to make any adjustments or ask any questions at that time. But because we didn't have a quorum, and this is an important part of being a part of this Board is being able to attend the Board meetings so that we will have a quorum so that these kinds of things won't happen without our further discussion about it and moving forward.

But we knew that there was a problem. We knew that when we went into ImageTrend, we
knew that when we changed over that we were going to have to have a lot of help to change over to the new system. We knew that the paper system was not a workable system. So we have to know when we were hiring these people that when we were bringing on these people, we had the people before us on several occasions talking about their positions.

I think, Misty, you've met with some of them, some of the people, the temporary people who were here, Ebony and some of those people, so we knew that they were aboard. So we knew that they had to be paid. So to be able to move over to this system that we're presently using, we knew that those people like Ebony and some of the other people that followed Ebony or preceded Ebony had to be paid for those positions.

So in our June meeting, that would have been a discussion. And I agree with you that nothing should go forward without the Board's approval. So moving forward, that's the way it will be handled, but we have to be here to handle it.

Any other questions?

MS . LANDRY:
No, just discussion. I just, I don't know -- unfortunately, I got here late because there was a semi with a bunch of apples that was all over the road in Hammond, so I did not have time to look over this and read it. And I -- I just cannot approve this. And I understand where you're coming from, Fabian, but $I$ also understand where Misty is coming from. MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh. Yeah.
MS . LANDRY:
And I agree with her. One hundred fifty thousand or whatever it is over budget, that's excessive. I think it's excessive.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Any other questions? Any other discussion?

MR. ROBINSON:
Okay. If we're not going to approve it, then what is the other direction? CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Well, I meant, that's up to the Board whether or not we approve it with the
adjustment --
MR. ROBINSON:
Yeah. I'm just --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- that was recommended. I meant, that's your decision to make.

MS . LANDRY:
I mean, why can't we just table it?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Those are options. I mean, it's up to the Board. It's up to the membership of this Board to decide whether they want to table it and review it later.

Is there a deadline for us to do this? MR. MCRIGHT:

Not now. We're past the deadline already. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
I'd like to point out one thing, if I could, if the Board would give me just a second here. The last column on the projected budget for this coming year, that's the column y'all are operating under right now.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Right now, uh-huh. MR. MCRIGHT:

And it is y'all's prerogative to direct Fabian to review this, come up with a better budget for your next meeting. We can then tie it in a little closer. Y'all would have access to what we're looking at. And that way, you would know what you're operating under the current year. All the other stuff is in the prior year. It's just not anything we can do about it right now other than put procedures in effect to say, we need to be informed how the budget is going to affect.

Like when they get a Civil Service raise, do we anticipate that at the next Board meeting? Y'all need to be informed of that and y'all need to amend it at that time, instead of waiting until June 30th to do it. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Because June 30th may be okay, but we may be past it like we were this time. And then it really -- it really looks a lot worse

```
because of that because we might could have
made some adjustments in May to take care of some of that loss that showed up at June 30th. MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
MR. MCRIGHT:
And I think that's what you were getting at too.
MS. FINCHUM:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
MR. MCRIGHT:
But you need access to the current information.
MS. FINCHUM:
Right.
MR. MCRIGHT:
I mean, what happened happened. We just, we got some stuff in and there were raises and pensions, all, everything just went up at one time in there, and health insurance and all that went up. And so it wasn't an election that we wanted to pay this. We didn't have any --
```

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Choice.
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- chance but to do it. But y'all needed to be informed that we were going to be digging into some of the reserves to pay this. Luckily, y'all have plenty of reserves. So it's not a big financial problem on y'all. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Thank you. So if you want to make a -if you'd like, Misty or Maria, you can make a motion to table it if you'd like.

MR. SANDERS:
Wait. Question?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah, go ahead.
MR. SANDERS:
We have two budgets here, November and June.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Right.
MR. SANDERS:
Are we considering approving both of them or just one each or disapproving or tabling one each? Are we considering both of them or
what?

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

That's a question for you, sir.
MR. MCRIGHT:

I'm sorry?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

The question was whether or not we're
considering tabling both or one?
MS. VALLERY:

There's only one budget.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

There's only -- but what he's talking
about --
MR. SANDERS:
There's only one budget?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

But what he's talking about, he's going
back to the November --
MR. MCRIGHT:

The fourth column is actually --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- through June.
MR. SANDERS:
Right.

MR. MCRIGHT:

That final column is actually a budget that for -- amended budget for last year and projected budget for next year. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Uh-huh.
MR. MCRIGHT:
You can actually amend -- I mean adopt the first three columns and say, okay, no, we'll adopt this as our official yearend statement. We can come back next time with this last column broken out between amending last year's and projecting what we're going to do for this coming year and present a budget for that if that would be to the Board's approval.

## CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

That sounds like a simpler way to do it. Would that -- would you guys be in agreement with that?

Any questions?
MR. SANDERS:
No. I don't have any.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So if there's no questions --
MS. FINCHUM:

I do have one question. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
In regard to the report that you've given to us, I would like to see about getting this sooner than the day of the meeting. It's -when we come in here and have to look at it right now, I don't really have a lot of time to kind of see if $I$ have additional questions. I mean, I'm sure you guys are in the same boat.

So when is -- when could this possibly be available to us prior to a meeting? How much time could you give us to review this? MR. MCRIGHT:

It could -- if we would have done it through October, we could have given it to y'all a week or so ago. MS. FINCHUM:

So, I mean, a week in advance, we could start doing that in the future? MR. MCRIGHT:

Now, we may be a month off depending on

MS. FINCHUM:
But, I mean, it would just give us some time to have some time to review it. MR. MCRIGHT:

Right. You know, it's almost impossible to do it, say, the week after the end of the month.

MS. FINCHUM:
Yeah.
MR. MCRIGHT:
But it's not a problem to do it the month prior to that and give you current figures up to that.

MS. FINCHUM:
Okay. If we could please request that we -- would you all be interested in also receiving that?

MS . LANDRY:
Oh, I would. Absolutely.
MR. MCRIGHT:
And if y'all want to put it off, like I say, y'all have already passed your due date, we could just bring it back before the Board next time with the statements and go actually, go ahead and amend prior year's a little bit

```
better to show what -- it's still going to end up showing a loss. We just can't do anything about that because we can't project monies that we're not going to get in.
We could say, okay, the Board is going to approve us moving \(\$ 159,000\) from surplus to cover known overages for 6/30/18. That's still after the fact and it's -CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Let me -- let me ask a question. Okay. What -- I guess my question is this, is that while we're getting it early, if you're able to get it to us earlier, what -- is there a problem with getting it to us earlier than us receiving it the day of the Board meeting? Is that an issue for you? Because you need to let us know that, if that's an issue. Or would that be possible for you? MR. MCRIGHT:
No. Like I said, we can -- we could do it -MS. VALLERY:
Time could have been --
MR. MCRIGHT:
If we'd have gave it to you for October,
```

you could have had it a week or so ago.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
That's just -- I mean --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But is that a possibility moving forward?
MR. MCRIGHT:
If there's a policy y'all want to
establish, we can live with it.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. That's what I'm asking, can you get it ready for then?

MR. MCRIGHT:
Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
You can?
MR. MCRIGHT:
Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So that might be something that we, moving forward, that we do it that way. And that's why I wanted to ask you, is that possible for you to have it ready for us in advance? Sharon, you've got --

| 1 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Yeah, I have to look at Sharon on that -- |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 4 | Yeah. |
| 5 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| 6 | -- because she's the one that gets the |
| 7 | information to me. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 9 | She gets the information, I know. |
| 10 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| 11 | But a month behind, we should have no |
| 12 | problem with it. |
| 13 | MS. VALLERY: |
| 14 | Right. Like if your next meeting is |
| 15 | March, we can have it ready January, end of |
| 16 | January. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 18 | Okay. |
| 19 | MS. VALLERY: |
| 20 | Right? |
| 21 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| 22 | Yeah. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 24 | Okay. Yeah, I just needed to know from |
| 25 | you, Sharon -- |

MS. VALLERY:
Yeah. Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- and from you whether or not you can get those numbers, because I know you're doing those numbers.

MS. VALLERY:
It would just be a month ahead -- it would be a month behind. Those numbers are going to be January 31st.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Right.
MS. VALLERY:
Instead of February 28th.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay.
MS. VALLERY:
So, yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So that's possible?
MS. VALLERY:
Yeah, we can do that.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So that's something we'll look at moving forward.

MS . VALLERY:
Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So as it relates to this particular
budget, do we have a motion to table it or to
approve or a motion to approve every column,
the three columns?
MS. FINCHUM:
I would like to make a motion to table it.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Maria?
MS . LANDRY:
I'm going to second it.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Cool. It's been moved and
seconded. So the budget will be tabled until the next meeting with the provision that the adjustments will be made; is that correct? MR. MCRIGHT:

I'm sorry?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
With the provisions that the adjustments
will be made by the next meeting?
MR. MCRIGHT:

Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
All right. It's been moved and seconded, so the budget has been tabled for until the next meeting, March meeting, date to be determined.

Okay. Let's move on. Mr. Blache?
MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- any executive reports for us?
MR. BLACHE:
I do. I've got a bunch of stuff for you guys. In your packet, you have, well, first on my list is the audit. This is something we've talked about several times in the past. I mentioned to you, I guess a year ago or so, that when I got here, the first thing I did was I looked at the last five audits before I arrived to see what was going on there, but I think this is a very important process that, fortunately, the Legislative Auditor requires every year that we go through.

Every several years, they do a full audit, which is where they send a Legislative

Auditor staff member in, and they spend basically about six months going through everything. We had Mr. Odoms do that year before last and we got some good recommendations out of that audit. And it was a very good audit.

The subsequent one, it was done in three-year cycles by a contractor that they hire. They notify us by telephone who they've hired, and then we get to meet them when they show up at the door. This company, J. Walker \& Company, last year, they did the review. That review was exponentially better than the ones in the prior years.

MS. FINCHUM:
Fabian, I'm sorry. Can I ask you a quick question?

MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MS. FINCHUM:
What was the date of this?
MR. BLACHE:
This is --
MS. FINCHUM:
It's just not on here.

MR. BLACHE:
Oh, yeah. Give me one second. It was --
I'll tell you in one second.
MS. FINCHUM:
No problem.
MR. BLACHE:
I might have to ask --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
October 22nd?
MR. BLACHE:
I might have to -- yes.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
It's on the last page.
MR. BLACHE:
Oh, it's on the last page?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
That's where it is. Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
Oh, under his name.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. It's weird.
MR. CROUCH:
Under the signature line.

MR. BLACHE:
Okay. So -- thank you. So J. Walker \& Company have the audit again this year. They sent a different individual who brings a different experience with different boards and commissions and a different perspective to it. There were two recommendations primarily that came out of it. One was that they want someone whose not in the financial pipeline for check writing approval or handling of anything to also review bank statements in addition to me.

So we've implemented a response. You have the response document where we're going to do that and we're going to assign someone to do that task. It's just an additional check and balance process. I think it's smart. I did put some emphasis on -MS. FINCHUM:

Can I ask a quick question? I'm sorry. MR. BLACHE:

Yes.
MS. FINCHUM:
The response that you've provided for us, is that what they're referencing as Appendix

| 1 | A? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 3 | Yes. |
| 4 | MS. FINCHUM: |
| 5 | Okay. |
| 6 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 7 | Yes. So I did highlight some things |
| 8 | because we were really pleased with some of |
| 9 | the stuff that we saw. So, for example, Page |
| 10 | 2 talks about ethics. They didn't note any |
| 11 | exceptions there. We were real clean there. |
| 12 | If you go to Page 4, you'll notice under |
| 13 | bank reconciliations, we confirmed that they |
| 14 | are done timely. This is the second time in a |
| 15 | row in the first time in eight years that |
| 16 | that's the case. And, you know, they were |
| 17 | pleased to see that. |
| 18 | They also mentioned that they were being |
| 19 | done in the right time frame. So not only are |
| 20 | they being done, which in many times past, |
| 21 | they weren't, they're being done in the right |
| 22 | time frame, which was something the |
| 23 | Legislative Auditor wanted to make sure that |
| 24 | was happening. |
| 25 | With respect to Board activity, they have |

a paragraph in there about reviewing the minutes and making sure that we're doing what we're supposed to do as a Board in these meetings. They had no exceptions there.

Under collections, they get into a variety of different things with respect to transactions and reconciliation of bank accounts about the collection of money from the industry that comes in. And, obviously, most -- in the past, mostly, it was all checks and money orders. And now, most of it is done electronically, but they found no problems with that. They looked at a variety of different transactions.

They also looked at highest dollar weeks as a litmus test to kind of get an average and see what things look like there. There were no exceptions there either.

So now, I'm on Page 5. They also looked at renewals. This is where $I$ want to stop and make a comment about renewals. Just so you're aware, remember, we used to take renewals 260 renewal days of the year. We've moved all the guards, almost all the guards, to March 31st expiration dates.

So going forward, our renewal revenue will not be a static monthly income. Our renewal revenue will come 30 to 60 days before the deadline in March. So we'll see most of our renewal revenue January to the end of February; whereas, before, all the years prior, we used to see it every single month. So that's changed, because of moving to the bi-mobile licensure cycle. So that's going to reflect in future budget views as, oh, wait, if you look back, '17, '16, '15, there was a static number each monthly budget that showed in the renewal income. That's all going to flow in one more lump sum, you know, probably been, like I said, January and February because they're due 30 days in advance.

So I just wanted to point that out. But they looked at that. They picked ten different ones. They made sure that the fees paid were appropriate, and that if there were any penalties assessed, that they were appropriate. And they found no exceptions with any of those transactions.

Credit cards, debit cards, fuel cards, we only have two individuals that have purchased
cards in the agency. They are people other than myself. And then we have the fuel cards for the vehicle, the fleet vehicle, and we have an Office Depot account that we use for office supplies and such. They looked at all of those statements and saw that there were no exceptions in the way that was being handled. No problems there either.

They also looked at, from a transactional standpoint, they looked at the purchasing and disbursement policies, making sure that we're adhering with Public Bid Law, things of that nature. They found no exceptions there either.

Travel expenditures, this is one of the ones where a lot of agencies tend to get tripped up, you know, especially the big ones. We don't have that problem here. Thank goodness. We do it right. We follow PPM49. You know, the Board's expenditures are covered in total, so they don't have to use the PPM49 model that we have to do. It kind of limits us more and gives you a bit more broad authority. Everything that we've submitted and that we paid was in order and in proper
standing. So there were no exceptions there.
The next one is payroll and personnel. They went through all of that with Mr. Dalton and Sharon. They found no exceptions there either.

Attendance and leave records, that was good. Let's see, personnel files, they went through that. They looked to make sure that we're maintaining personnel files that the documentation is proper; that we're current on any employee related paperwork that has to do with changes in position, et cetera. So that was good too. Disbursements as well turned out fine.

There was one concern that was a repeat concern from last year. I mentioned last year that this auditor, unlike the Legislative Auditor, said that we were paying our IT vendor in advance and that the Constitution of the State of Louisiana doesn't allow you to pay it in advance. You're supposed to pay it on a net whatever, whether it's a five, 10, 30. But the rate that we get on the contract is discounted based upon the fact that it's a 30-day in advance payment. So we submitted a
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response to the auditor last year about that, saying that if we started -- if we have to rearrange the contract, the contract cost would increase. They didn't seem to have an issue with it, but it did show up again because sometimes we're paying it after the fact. And sometimes when the bill gets in, Sharon is a bit manic about it, she just pays
it. So they just mentioned it again as something that we need to be mindful of.

So we'll be talking with General
Informatics about trying to reconcile some kind of way where we can issue the payment for
an invoice that is not an invoice in the future. That's what we need to do with that.

Like I said, as they said, it's not a big deal
but it's a technicality and we need to --
MS. FINCHUM:
I have a question about that particular
issue.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Go ahead.
MS. FINCHUM:

Is -- that contract that we have with them, is it a consistent monthly fee or is it something that changes that they need to -MR. BLACHE:

It is a consistent monthly fee because it gives you a certain number of IT tech hours every month. If you exceed those hours, even of a special circumstance, then there could be an additional charge, which we've always had that when there's an inflow and outflow of an employee. You just shut down the email account and you get a new one.

MS . FINCHUM:
So they're just billing us like a month in advance --

MR. BLACHE:
They bill you a month in advance.
MS . FINCHUM:
-- basically what we're --
MR. BLACHE:
Right, and it's not anything tragic. But from a technical standpoint based upon the way the Constitution is written --

MS . FINCHUM:
Sure. Sure.

MR. BLACHE:
-- it's a violation of sorts. It's a
finding.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Maybe because they're giving us a discount, maybe we could offer up something
like instead of paying them in advance, that we pay them in less time, 15 days.

MR. BLACHE:
Right. Yeah, something --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We pay them within a 15-day period or --
MR. BLACHE:
-- where we're not --
MS. LANDRY:
And even upon receipt or...
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
Well, yeah. So, technically, if it's --
MS. FINCHUM:
I mean, we're under contract, so it's not like they're not going to get --

MS . LANDRY:
Yeah.

MR. BLACHE:
True.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- what's coming to them.
MR. BLACHE:
No, absolutely. And, but technically for
us to -- basically, the way the contract is written, for us to do it, we have to wait until we're 30 days late and then pay it, which they wouldn't impose a fee. I don't think they have. They have a fee. MS. VALLERY:

They would, yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
But, you know, so that's -- that's not the cleanest way to fix it. So we're going to look at possibly seeing if there's a work around --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Pay upon receipt.
MR. BLACHE:
Well, yeah. When Tech Norris had it, it was easier because they were just a local small company. Now, they've been bought by this big conglomerate, and it makes things a
little more cumbersome. But $I$ wanted to point that out to you while I'm showing you all the good stuff, you know. I wanted to make sure you saw that. So, yeah, disbursements.

Budget, they detected no differences between the budget information contained in the database and what was adopted by the Board for that fiscal. And that pretty much wraps it up. So this is an incredible outcome. I mean, this is exactly what we were pursuing all along as opposed to having repeat audit findings for low-hanging fruit in some of the high level things. And this gives me a great comfort level that the office is doing what it's supposed to do.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And I thank you, Mr. Blache, and your staff for what you've done. Because in the past, and I don't know if any of the Board members have any historical knowledge of what has happened in the past, but in the past, we were blasted, this Board. And I wasn't a member of this Board at that time, but this Board was blasted on the audits because of not complying --

MR. BLACHE:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- with the regulations. No bank
reconciliations were done on a timely basis and stuff like that.

MR. BLACHE:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I don't know if any of you remember some of that, but thank you, Mr. Blache. MR. BLACHE:

I know. I was determined to -CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

This looks a lot better than it has in past. MR. BLACHE:

That was too easy to get right with a little effort. So we've changed some of our internal controls, we wrote some recommendations, we adhere to the recommendations. We kind of tripped up on that 30 -day one that $I$ just mentioned to you because of a transition from the local company to the big boy operation, but we'll work on
that. But I'm really, really pleased about it.

So that's three years running. Every year has been better than the last. And the first one was great. So we're doing real well on that.

MS. FINCHUM:
Have we received any other bids from any other IT companies since that's been bought out?

MR. BLACHE:
We've talked about pursuing that, and you may remember this. Remember when I mentioned when we were getting ready to go to ImageTrend I said, at some point, our Legacy system, we're going to export it to an Excel database searchable and just shut that server down. The biggest cost in that is the maintenance of that server.

So once we get to the point where we're comfortable that everything industry wide, statewide is flowing through ImageTrend in the cloud with our Minneapolis-based operation, we're going to pursue shutting down the server. That will immediately reduce the cost
of that contract. But then, at that time, I think would be the appropriate time to put it out to rebid. Because, at that point, all we're maintaining is office 365 accounts on desktops and we're not having to do server backups and all that kind of stuff. So I think that would be the appropriate time to do it.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But even though it's --
MR. BLACHE:
I just don't think we're there yet. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Even though it's in the cloud, sometimes server backups are good. MR. BLACHE:

Yeah. Well, see -- no, I'm with you. No, the ImageTrend system is backed up on dozens of servers out of state for disaster recovery purposes, so we can always recover that. But this, the game plan, according to the IT people that we've talked to, Tech Norris, then their consultants at General Informatics and some other folks is, once you're done with that system, export it to a
searchable database, put it on a shared drive, back that up, shut the server down, and take half that expense out of the contract. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: Right. MR. BLACHE:

And that's the goal. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Because we presently use a server, and so we're looking at some of the same things because we use our server as a backup away from the City of New Orleans, the State of Louisiana as a backup in other places, but we find it very useful when something happens that we have those backups and our server being backed up. So, I meant, those are things we have to look at and see what the best move is for the -MS. FINCHUM:

When does our current contract end with that particular tech company? MR. BLACHE:

It's every fiscal year is the contract. It's a fiscal contract, so July (sic). MS. FINCHUM:

```
So we just need to keep an open mind that -MS. VALLERY: June. MR. BLACHE: June. MS. FINCHUM: -- if for some reason they'll only accept us to pay it the way it is now -MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
MS . FINCHUM:
-- I mean, we'll have to put that out for bid just because we have to do that to keep it in line with the --
MR. BLACHE:
No, I've gotten no objection to that. We've already gotten rid of Michael Morgan's contract now that we've gone to ImageTrend. That was a pretty hefty one. It was about the same as the tech -- I keep saying Tech Norris -- the General Informatics one, because we don't need him to build anything for us in that system anymore.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
```

Right.
MR. BLACHE:
So, you know, we had a weaning plan for this all along. We're just tracking that direction right now.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
The roof, we did replace the roof on this building. I don't know if you remember, you used to see lots and lots and lots of leaks and things here. The roof over the last 15 years has been repaired once. That didn't hold very well. It was time, so we got that done. We put that -- we contacted the Procurement Office before we did anything, talked with them. They took it through their entire process, bounced it back to us because it was under $\$ 150,000$. It was actually significantly under that. It was about 67 or so?

MS. VALLERY:
Sixty-seven.
MR. BLACHE:
We got the bids we needed. They reviewed
everything. We got the roof taken care of. This is a 25-year roof. It lasts -- should last us longer than the one we had. It's actually -- the materials, we found out when we took the roof off, were RV materials, not roofing materials. And the coating was also an RV type coating, not an industrial coating. So what we have now has an overhang so that water is not running down on the windows.

You may not know this, and I learned this in the process, those windows were supposed to be recessed nine inches, not flush, and that would have allowed the water to run off and not pool on the windows. So since the flood, that has cracked in the corner of that one and some other areas because of the way the windows are positioned.

So what they did when they put the new roof on is they gave us a bit of an overhang to push that water farther out. So we got all that done. They got it done in four days, I believe it was. We gave them a holiday weekend. They knocked it out without too much disruption to the staff and the office. So I was real pleased that we were able to get that
taken care of and now we can move forward without having ceiling tiles falling down on people's desks anymore.

MS . LANDRY: Was that done recently?

MR. BLACHE: It was done -- when was it?

MS. VALLERY: February, it was done. We paid for it in October.

MR. BLACHE:
October.
MS . LANDRY: Yeah.

MR. BLACHE:
All right. IASIR, you have a press
release in your kit just letting you know that I attended the IASIR conference in Scottsdale. It was an amazing conference. You know, we have people from regulation and industry that come from the alarm monitoring and installation businesses, from the PI firms, and from security. And they get together to do exactly what we do in this boardroom, talk about things from the industry side and from
the regulatory side and identify problems and concerns and errors of opportunity.

We had a really interesting presentation from a man who runs an organization called FARB, which is the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards. Turns out, he's an attorney whose had this organization for quite a number of years. I think they were formed in 1974. And their sole purpose is to educate licensure people and companies and regulators on how the regulations in your state are supposed to work. They identify misapplication of regulation, overregulation, things of that nature. That was kind of like the highlight of that event.

But the big outgrowth of that event was that there is a serious concern in the security industry about cannabis security because that's taken root all over the place, right -- that's funny, I didn't mean to do that -- taken root all over the place right now. And because of the intricacies with the way it works, there's a conflict right now because many banks because of federal law can't even take money. So a lot of these are
cash operations; because until they change the federal laws allowing the banks to take the money, they can't -- you know, they have to basically do this as a cash business. So you've got concerns with transporting cash and then you have concerns with transporting the actual materials themselves. It requires a lead car and a trail car.

It's a great opportunity for security companies is the bottom line because it's a pricier product and it involves a lot more bodies and in vehicles and things of that nature. Louisiana is just kind of getting into this. Many other states are just now getting into this. On the other hand, there are many states that have been doing this for a little while. So our next conference is projected to be in Canada potentially. They have a pretty hefty cannabis culture there, and --

MS . LANDRY:
Is that FARB or IASIR?
MR. BLACHE:
IASIR.
MS. LANDRY:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
And FARB will be there. FARB will be there.

MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
And what we're going to do is have a primary focus on this issue, so that while we start rewriting the statutes, Ron and $I$ in January, we can start implementing some stuff around that and the other things we're missing; drones, robots, canines -MR. ROBINSON:

All that.
MR. BLACHE:
-- all that stuff.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I find that along that line is that we're already getting questions as it relates to that in our industry. I don't know if anybody else has had anybody to come to them saying that people from other states and stuff that they're transferring to this state, they're becoming guards and they're guards, and that
they have been given a prescription to use marijuana as a health issue. So we're going to be faced with that and how we handle that in this industry is going to be interesting, because you're going to have people who have prescriptions from doctors that will allow them to use. And how we regulate that is going to be very, very difficult. It's going to be like walking a fine line because of that. MR. CROUCH:

It's a very difficult legal issue.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
It is. It's a very difficult legal issue. I've already been faced with it. We have one person that can't -- that is waiting for Louisiana to hit the green light so he can start using it for his seizures. So it's going to be interesting. MR. BLACHE:

Well, thank -- I thank you for those comments because this is going -- it really is going to be interesting. I mean, this is something we've got to get right the first time. And there's good examples out there.

There's some bad examples out there. But what I want to make sure of is that whatever we do implement that it doesn't make it prohibitive or cumbersome and that it's clear and it's easy to stay in compliance with. That's the real goal with what we're going to do it. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Our big concern too, Fabian, I don't know if anybody has been talking to the insurance industry, because as it relates to security, they have real concerns about how they're going to deal with it with insurance for security companies -MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- that when they have people who are actually prescribed to use this. So in talking with some of the people on the Board in the insurance industry, they have great concerns about how they'll regulate this as it relates to providing us with security -- I meant with insurance for our security. MR. BLACHE:

Yeah. No question.

I'm going to move to the NOLA Commission. MR. CROUCH:

Wait.
MR. BLACHE:

Yes. Go right ahead.
MR. CROUCH:

Perhaps I'm just too easily impressed --
MR. BLACHE:

Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. CROUCH:
-- but he was elected, Fabian was
elected --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Right.
MR. CROUCH:
-- President of this International
Organization.
MR. ROBINSON:

I was getting ready to say that.
MR. CROUCH:
And I felt like it was important enough,
so I passed this onto my Colonel because I wanted Colonel Reeves to know that we have somebody in the department that was President of the International Organization.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And I want to take this opportunity from this Board to congratulate you, Mr. Fabian -MR. BLACHE:

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- on your new election. And I'm sure
you'll do a wonderful job in representing us on this Board.

MR. BLACHE:
We're going to -- we're going to do our best. We've got two years to make an impact, so we're going to do our best.

MR. ROBINSON:
You've made an impact already.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And I'm sure that's why you were elected.
MR. BLACHE:
We just got South Africa to join --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Great.
MR. BLACHE:
-- as another organization. So we have the UAE, South Africa, France, I can't think of all the other international partners.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Well, when you come back and start saying
oui oui, we'll know that you --
MR. BLACHE:
Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate that, guys. I wasn't going to get into that, but... CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

You're welcome.

MR. BLACHE:
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE :
Do you have any more --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes. Yes, I have two things I want to discuss.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
The NOLA Commission, so Ms. Pierre and I
met with a City Councilman, $I$ think his name
is Giarrusso --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yes.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. I wanted to make sure I said that
correct -- to have a conversation about New Orleans Commission cards, which is a big issue, and I wanted to let you know that I've been passionate about for taking up for quite some time. The long and short of the discussion without getting too detailed is Ms. Pierre presented her position on it to him as a constituent and as an industry person. I presented my position on it as the leader of the agency whose law has supremacy. And he agreed with us.

He said that the law does not say that the superintendent must issue a commission card; that it's not intended for him to issue a commission card in those instances; and that he prefer the language to say that only in an exigent circumstance, such as a disaster declaration where the New Orleans Police Department needs direction and control over additional personnel to maintain order and lawfulness would the superintendent be allowed to issue the Special Officers Commission.

The first thing I asked him was if he was an attorney, and he said he wasn't. And I was like, good, because I'm not. So you can help
we with this, but I'm going to sell it to you the way I understand it. He absolutely agrees that New Orleans is on the hook if a guard who holds a card does something that is above the level of a private citizen. I said it, he agreed with it right off the top.

So he -- so my statement to you is correct, you have two guards, one has a card, one doesn't. The guard without the card does something that a law enforcement would do, that would be a problem. Your insurance is on the hook to address that problem. The guard who has the card has the effect of a law enforcement officer without all the training that the consent decree is requiring of New Orleans police officers. New Orleans is on the hook for that and any lawsuits that grow out from that.

They don't want that. And he doesn't see from his position how the NOPD could even threaten to enforce it because there's nothing they have a leg to stand on, which is what $I$ said before. So the next step towards killing this once and for all is to meet with the leader of Judiciary Committee, which is?

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Jason Williams.
MR. BLACHE:
His name is what?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Councilman Williams. Jason Williams.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. That meeting is forthcoming. I have every reason to believe that he will understand my position. But let me state my position to you as the Board members what I say the agency's position is. My position is our law has supremacy, and in fact, it does, Councilman said so, and they don't have any authority to impose a further regulation on top of what we already require; what I've said all along, and he agrees with that.

So this is the same thing I'm going to present to the next gentleman in the hopes of getting them all to agree and understand that the idea that a guard in New Orleans must go to the Special Officers Commission to get a yellow card is absurd and cannot be enforced. That will be a huge time and financial boom to the industry folks that work in the City of

| 1 | New Orleans. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 3 | Which is one that I've been trying to get |
| 4 | approved for the last 15 years. And so now, |
| 5 | we have two members of that Committee that are |
| 6 | attorneys that do understand that. I have |
| 7 | spoken to Councilman Williams and he agrees |
| 8 | with Councilman Giarrusso, that this is a |
| 9 | matter that should be handled and that it |
| 10 | should not be -- that Special Officers permits |
| 11 | should not be issued to an officer unless he |
| 12 | is a special officer assigned to the New |
| 13 | Orleans Police Department. And people in New |
| 14 | Orleans, those of you who have companies in |
| 15 | New Orleans, you understand exactly what I'm |
| 16 | speaking of because you know that they do have |
| 17 | special officers who help the New Orleans |
| 18 | Police Department and they are deputized to do |
| 19 | so. |
| 20 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 21 | And they don't enforce it across the |
| 22 | board, which is another problem that they face |
| 23 | -- |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 25 | Yeah. |

MR. BLACHE:
-- because it's not enforced across the board; not that it's enforceable to begin with, but they're trying to make the case and they're doing a poor job of it. The other thing that we made a point of in that process, I'm just thinking of one more thing that relates to that.

MS. FINCHUM:
I just have a quick question --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- because I'm not familiar with what you're referencing. So the cards that they're issuing --

MR. BLACHE:
So --
MR. ROBINSON:
Yellow cards.
MR. BLACHE:
So, yeah. Only in Orleans Parish, they have a city ordinance that says -- so they have a division, it's called the Special Officers Commission.

MS. FINCHUM:
Uh-huh.
MR. BLACHE:
And what they have done for a long, long
time --
MR. ROBINSON:
Years.
MR. BLACHE:
-- is they have said, if you are going to have -- they focus on the ones with the weapons, but it doesn't say anything about armed in the statute.

MS. FINCHUM:
Sure.
MR. BLACHE:
But if you're going to be armed as a guard in the City of New Orleans, you can't do it unless the NOPD gives you a Special Officers Commission. It's a yellow piece of paper.

MS. FINCHUM:
So all of you guys who have businesses in New Orleans, your guards have to have that? MR. ROBINSON:

Yeah.

MR. BLACHE:
And it's \$50.

MR. ROBINSON:
If they're armed, yeah.
MR. BLACHE:

And they have to -- and they're enforcing
them to go through another background check after we've already done a background check. Then, they're imposing this $\$ 50$ fee, and then you wind up with a company on Canal Street that's got ten guards, but only three have the card --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

That's correct.
MR. BLACHE:
-- or four have the card. The ones that have the card literally have the authority of a law enforcement officer.

MR. CROUCH:
And no additional training.
MR. BLACHE:
No additional training at all. Yeah, it's insane.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

There's no oversight. That's my
position. There is no oversight. You have some companies that will follow the law and some who do not.

MS. FINCHUM:
Sure.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So there's no oversight. There's no penalties enforcement. There's no enforcement for any penalties as it relates to that. No judge will accept any penalties that the New Orleans Police Department --

MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- imposes on a company because they didn't have it if a police officer goes out to the site. So what's the point? If they want $\$ 50$, just ask for $\$ 50$. Don't try to make it part of the law, a requirement, when you don't enforce the requirement.

MS. FINCHUM:
Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And no judge will support it in New Orleans. So that's where we are with that.

MR. BLACHE:
And the thing -- and one of the pre-reqs
for getting the card is that they have to
verify that they're already registered with us
in the first place.
MR. ROBINSON:
Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yes.
MR. BLACHE:
So it's an infinite loop of
overregulation is what it boils down to. It's what FARB exist to teach about. That's what they talk about. So that's a textbook case. It came up in Scottsdale, in fact.

MR. ROBINSON:
Sure did.
MR. BLACHE:
That's a textbook case of what shouldn't happen and it's an overreach. And, honestly, if they were impacting all 6,000 guards in New Orleans, maybe they were making some money. But the truth is I don't think they're probably hitting 30 percent of them. And that's a problem.

So we're trying to get it addressed once and for all and get that off the table and make it what it was intended to be. It's very clear in the language and the statute what it was for. It's so that NOPD can say, okay, you five are coming with us and you're going to watch this building.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
That's right.
MR. BLACHE:
And now, they're under their direction and control. And if anybody goes in there -MS. FINCHUM:

And they're supervised.
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
That was the intent.
MR. BLACHE:
If anybody, detain them and cuff them. Well, now, that's a different ballgame.
(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS SPEAKING)
MR. BLACHE:
Now, that's not security anymore. That's policing.

MR. ROBINSON:
Home Rule Charter.
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
That was the intent.
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But it was never carried out.
MR. BLACHE:
Right. Oh, I know what I wanted to mention. I didn't go in there without my guns loaded. I had already contacted the Commission, asked them to broach the subject with the City attorney to see if they would be amenable to amending the law to insist, knowing that they wouldn't, but to insist to change the language from the superintendent shall issue. And the City attorney said, we will not do that; don't want to take away the discretionary aspect of it; that's not what this is for. So if the City attorney gets it, you know, only concern, industry concern is, well, my guards are being told by the police
or by somebody, if you don't have this, they're going to lock you up.

MR. ROBINSON:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
Well, that's one we're just going to have
to test and fight at this point because I don't see it happening.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And once again, our mayor is in concert with this. She understands from her legal department that it's not something that the City wants to get involved in --

MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- and be liable for.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. The potential 150,000 to $\$ 200,000$
that they're making off of this --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Is not worth the liability.
MR. BLACHE:
-- is not worth the one time, the one
time that it makes headline news that a guard
did something, involves a weapon, and they're sued for it. Because they're going to spend that tenfold just fighting the lawsuit. MR. CROUCH:

It's a plaintiff lawyer's festival life.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, it's bad. It's bad.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But we're going to keep you guys posted on it. MR. BLACHE:

Certainly.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We're going to be meeting with Councilman Williams, so I'm sure we'll have more news to come back to you and tell you about it. And some of you that are in New Orleans will see this as a welcome relief.

MR. BLACHE:
So my last part of this update is
ImageTrend to kind of give you a feel for where we are. You know, we've talked in March before we implemented May $28 t h$ or so, and then we implemented May 28th. We'll call it June Ist for argument's sake. So all along, I've
been preaching this notion to you guys based upon my inspections that we were at 40 percent compliance. And I said I know that, because every time I check ten guards, four have cards; every time $I$ check 20, you know, and so on. And I said that going to ImageTrend and forcing people down the pipeline to do it online is going to really reveal how many guards we actually have working for the industry. Well, it sure has.

On May 28 th when we went live, there were 9,864 registered guards in the Legacy system. That was pretty consist over the last couple of years. It was always 9,000 and change with X number anywhere from 800 to 3,000 in some sort of pending status. But we knew they were working, so we would kind of try to count them in where we could. So you're basically talking anywhere from 10 to 11, five, somewhere in that general vicinity.

So we turn ImageTrend on, we'll call it June 1st. As of today, and I'm -- this number is not 100 percent solid, but it's as close as what I remember from this moment, we have almost 17,000 guards in the system.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
That sounds about right.
MR. BLACHE:
Seventeen thousand. That's an increase of almost 69 percent in six months. That's all the people who were working for companies that were not submitting blue applications that can now not do that because they have to app through the system. So we were spot on with our suspicions about that.

And I had said to the staff that I thought we'd get to 18,000 by year's end in June, and we're probably not going to hit that, but we'll be a thousand off, not too shabby. And it's still ticking upward. It slowed some because we had a big influx in June, July, August. But still, every week, we're having more and more and more people develop profiles.

## CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

And what we uncovered, just as a caveat to what Fabian is saying, what we uncovered is that for many years, $I$ guess eight to ten years, that you had guard companies operating, having doing the -- doing a 1099 for employees

| 1 | for over a ten-year period; that their guards |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | were never registered with the State Board. |
| 3 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 4 | Yeah. The U.S. Federal WHO Office is |
| 5 | actually investigating two security guard |
| 6 | companies right now. I know, because they |
| 7 | called me to ask me a question about it. The |
| 8 | Wage-an-Hour Division is investigating two |
| 9 | companies right now. One is based on a |
| 10 | complaint about 1099s. And the other one is |
| 11 | based upon an unrelated type of complaint |
| 12 | related to wages. But I don't know if this is |
| 13 | true, but the agent involved in doing these |
| 14 | audits said that there is an initiative |
| 15 | underway to investigate all PI and security |
| 16 | companies or a vast majority of them to see if |
| 17 | they're compliant with Federal wage standards. |
| 18 | Again, only two right now; one is wrapping up |
| 19 | and we'll know what the outcome of that is in |
| 20 | the near future. |
| 21 | Some other things on ImageTrend, we have |
| 22 | almost 5,000 training classes that were |
| 23 | created since June in the system training tens |
| 24 | of thousands of people. So now, we're finally |
| 25 | getting real numbers on how many people are |

actually getting trained. That's pretty impressive.

We also now have a mechanism that's being developed to let us know from the hire date when a person hasn't been trained. It can actually tell us so we can do something from a compliance perspective on training; something we didn't have in the other system. It wouldn't, you know, spit out something that told us. It was an ad hoc style deal. This is going to be more automated. MS . FINCHUM:

I have a quick question.
MR. BLACHE:

Yes.

MS . FINCHUM:

Going back to the number of guards --
MR. BLACHE:

Sure.
MS . FINCHUM:
-- based off of 2018 numbers versus today, that's almost doubled the amount of guards. So we should also see that revenue go up to almost double --

MR. BLACHE :

Once --
MS . FINCHUM:
-- while that starts renewing.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. As they all begin to app and actually pay for them, we should see that. MS . FINCHUM:

Uh-huh.

MR. BLACHE:
We've got a thousand sitting in the queue right now pending affiliation that the companies that they applied to or said they were going to work with haven't -MS . FINCHUM:

Haven't responded.
MR. BLACHE :
-- haven't done anything with the apps. And some of those, we've already found out, were working those people and not processing the application in the same manner they were not processing the paper applications. So we've got some reporting design, and mechanisms and work that we're going to do to help us drive what we're now capturing so that we can stay on top of it from a compliance
perspective.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And we have to consider the smaller
companies. The smaller companies, it is a -and the mom and pop shops that have very few people working for them, that they have to get up to speed to what we're doing here -MR. BLACHE:

Yeah, we've had a few stragglers. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- and giving them some ability to -MR. BLACHE:

We do. We've had some stragglers. We've got a company that has five guards.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah.

MR. BLACHE:
They just started getting involved in getting it done, even though they've gotten the notifications and had the opportunity to come to the trainings, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE :

Uh-huh.
MR. BLACHE:
But this just gives us such a good
overview of what's really going on. So we have, in our queue, we have different things. We have initiated apps, we probably have 500, I don't know, initiated applications. We have pending affiliation. That means the app was done by the guard, but not picked up by the company, we have almost a thousand of those. We have some that are pending payment, we have hundreds of those. So I'm focused more so on just right now just the number of guards that are -- these are people that are hitting the site, creating a profile, and starting activity in the system, either training and/or applications.

And it's just vastly different, and we knew it would be. So over time, again, we're still new, we've got to get some age under this system now and start to be able to develop some trends out of it and figure out what's really going on.

MR. ROBINSON:
So you --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I have --
MS . LANDRY:

| 1 | I -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 3 | Everybody just be silent. |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | No. No. No. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 7 | So I'm going to jump into this. Okay. |
| 8 | So let me ask -- the question I have is that, |
| 9 | I know we've talked about this before about |
| 10 | having, the companies having the ability to go |
| 11 | in and terminate a guard -- |
| 12 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 13 | Uh-huh. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 15 | -- instead of waiting for you guys to |
| 16 | send it in to you guys and ask you guys to |
| 17 | terminate this guard -- |
| 18 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 19 | Uh-huh. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 21 | -- so we can do it in a timely manner. |
| 22 | Are we looking at any idea of when that can |
| 23 | happen? |
| 24 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 25 | Yeah. I have a document that will do |

that job. I'm trying to get it to work in tandem with a reinstatement process. Because one of the problems we run into is we've got companies that term people very quickly and reinstate them just as quickly. So we want to have both mechanisms in place, so that when you do it, the concept is, you will literally pull up a simple form, type the guard's name, it will verify by age and date of birth and social, you can indicate the reason for term, submit it, it pulls them off your guard list and records the termination date.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But you know what that game is about. MR. BLACHE:

But if you have to reinstate -- yeah. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

You know what that game is about. MR. BLACHE:

Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
When they get close to the time when they haven't trained them --

MR. BLACHE:
Right. That's correct.

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | -- they would go and terminate them -- |
| 3 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 4 | That's exactly right. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 6 | -- and then rehire them -- |
| 7 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 8 | And so -- |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 10 | -- and to avoid fines. |
| 11 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 12 | -- the reason I haven't made that |
| 13 | document public and put it in play yet is |
| 14 | because I'm trying to make sure I catch all |
| 15 | those loopholes, so that if someone is doing |
| 16 | that, throttling that, we know it. That's -- |
| 17 | but I do have a term for it. It functions. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 19 | Okay. |
| 20 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 21 | I just want to make sure it works in |
| 22 | conjunction with the reinstatement and that |
| 23 | it's watching the training, it does a training |
| 24 | validation. And that's logic that has to be |
| 25 | built that I have to do, and it's time |


| 1 | consuming and tricky. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 3 | And so, but it's -- it's coming? |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | Yes. I could pull up a system right now |
| 6 | and actually show you the term form and |
| 7 | execute it and show you how it pulls the guard |
| 8 | off the list. I can show you that now if you |
| 9 | wanted to see it. That form is done. But the |
| 10 | tie-in to catch all these games that are |
| 11 | played -- |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 13 | Yeah. |
| 14 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 15 | -- that's the part that takes a little |
| 16 | longer. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 18 | And that's the part we need. |
| 19 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 20 | Yeah. |
| 21 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 22 | I have a question or concern -- |
| 23 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 24 | Sure. |
| 25 | MS . LANDRY: |

-- with the March 31st renewal date for all guards across the board? MR. BLACHE:

That's -- yeah. So every two years -MS . LANDRY:

Every two years?
MR. BLACHE:
Right. That's --
MS . LANDRY:
And it's going to be March 31st.
MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.
MS. LANDRY:
Just that as far as the Board is concerned, we're not having a flow of funds. Everything is coming in at one time. And then from the company standpoint, I see it as a financial burden on the company, especially companies that have several hundred guards -MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh. Okay.
MS . LANDRY:
-- even smaller companies, because most of the companies put out the money for the security guards and then maybe take it out of
their check and out of so many paychecks. MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh.
MS . LANDRY:
But yet, that company has to take in and funnel a huge amount of money to the State Board at one time. MR. BLACHE:

So we're talking about renewals. That's the only impact, it's on the renewal side, not on the initials and all the others. MS . LANDRY:
Uh-huh.

MR. BLACHE:
And this is something we've -- I mean, we -- we've talked about this for a long time and didn't implement without discussion and approval. I kind of see your point. It's done this way in a lot of industries that have a large number of licensees. It's done in Louisiana in other industries that have a large number of licensees. They use a static expiration date to simplify the internal work that goes into having to track 260 expiration dates a year, and so it simplifies that.

And that's why I said we would open up, and we did, we opened up the renewal app to the guards months in advance. So a guard can actually renew three months in advance and still get his new card with his new expiration date for the two years that he would expire from March 31st to make it easier and simplify the process.

MS. LANDRY:
But we both know that does not happen. Yeah, we both know that doesn't happen. Usually, we have to chase the guards down to renew their license.

MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.

MS . LANDRY:
And, usually, it is at the final hour.
MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.
MS . LANDRY:
And a lot of times, $I$ don't know about you all, I mean, my compliance officer is sitting in the room, so I don't know what she could tell you. But a lot of the times, the branch managers are chasing down the guards to
renew their applications.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
And -- and I understand that because that happens to industry.

MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

But if we don't start moving towards the responsibility of the person who is licensed, that they have some responsibility for what we're doing, this is never going to change. We'll always be chasing them down. But if they understand that this is their livelihood, this is their license like any other industry, attorneys or doctors, they know that they have to renew, they know that it cost money to renew, they know that if they want to continue to work, they have to renew, put the onus on them. In Texas, that's the way it is also. MS . LANDRY:

I understand that. But the onus really isn't on them because it's the companies that are fined. It's not the security officer that is fined.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Well, once --
MR. RIVERS:
We're dealing --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Once -- go ahead, Ritchie.
MR. RIVERS:
We're dealing with a lot different caliber person as a nurse or a doctor. We're dealing with --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But how do you change it if we don't start somewhere?

MR. RIVERS:
-- 8-, 9-, 10-, \$12-an-hour guard who will just go work at Burger King -MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh.
MR. RIVERS:
-- and not worry about it. I agree, we -- it's our -- it's their responsibility, but it falls on us as companies.

MS. LANDRY:
If falls on us.
MR. RIVERS:
And we --

```
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But they're also fined.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
MR. RIVERS:
But they won't pay it.
MS . LANDRY:
They -- in this state. I don't think
they can pay a fine.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, one of my guards were fined \(\$ 500\),
and she paid it.
MS . FINCHUM:
Fined for what?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
She was fined for not doing what --
MR. BLACHE:
There was a fine on the renewal because
it was late --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE :
A fine on her renewal.
MS . LANDRY:
Mine wouldn't.
MR. BLACHE:
-- and the guard checked out and paid it.
```

```
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So my --
MS. FINCHUM:
But the actual charge was to the company; correct?
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. The fine goes -- the fine is in the rule -- let's see. In the rule, the fine is to the company. MS. FINCHUM:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
The guards have the opportunity to pay for their renewals, their blue apps. They have the option to do so. And in this particular case, this individual cleared it out and we issued it and then later learned that there was a fine on the application. MS . LANDRY:
But the way I understand something with a State law or statute, and I don't -- I couldn't even tell you where it is, but if a company is fined, if it's the company that's fined, that company can have that employee pay the company fine. Even if it was the
```

```
employee's responsibility to get it renewed,
that company can't --
MR. BLACHE:
That's correct.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, that's correct. Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
She paid the fine.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, that was --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But I'm just saying --
MR. BLACHE:
She was -- this individual went in, one
case of it, but this is one person that went in and did that.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But it --
MR. BLACHE:
To get it done in a timely fashion, she was focused on not having it expire. I think it was a couple of days of expiration date -CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
```

But here's -MR. BLACHE:
-- which is why it was late. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

But here's my issue with it is that when we started talking about ImageTrend, we talked about everybody going to moving over to one date, one month. And we talked about it being March when we started talking about ImageTrend. And we said that it's going to be easier for companies to remember when the renewals were, for guards to know when they needed to renew by moving everybody to that March date. I don't know if everybody remembers that discussion, but we had it more than one time. And I'm sure we can go back to the minutes and look at it. And we all agreed that ImageTrend was the best thing in the world; that the moving to March was not going to be an issue for anybody, and we talked to this into nauseam about that; how it would work, samples of what would happen. We saw it on the board. They showed it to us, and we all agreed to it.

MS . LANDRY:

I didn't --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So now, we're into ImageTrend. We've moving everybody -- we've started to move everybody over with a number of hours spent doing that to March. And now, we're back talking about the impact?

MS . LANDRY:
Well, and then it's contradictory to the statute and the rules and regulations, and then that's going to have to be changed because --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Absolutely.
MS . LANDRY:
But we're doing this before the rules and regulations are being changed in the statute. The guard's license expires two years after their date of hire. And their date of hire is the date that they begin work.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
But --
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, but remember -- so let me give you an example. I'm a guard and I come into the

| 1 | industry for the first time on July 4th, blue |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | app. |
| 3 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 4 | Uh-huh . |
| 5 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 6 | They're getting a card that actually |
| 7 | expires two years and six months later in that |
| 8 | instance because we do it three years in |
| 9 | advance from July 1st to December 31st for a |
| 10 | new app and we do it two years from January |
| 11 | 1st to June 1st -- |
| 12 | MS. LANDRY: |
| 13 | But that's not -- |
| 14 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 15 | -- to put them on the cycle. |
| 16 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 17 | -- what the rules and regulations say and |
| 18 | the statute says. I understand we're giving |
| 19 | the guard six months more, but it goes against |
| 20 | the rules and regulations in the statute. And |
| 21 | if we're to follow the law -- |
| 22 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 23 | Well, let me -- I'm with you and I follow |
| 24 | what you're saying. And to say this, that can |
| 25 | be changed. Let me just make that clear. We |

could change the logic in the system to say, use the hire date -- use the issue date or the hire date, whatever. We could do any date. We could tell it to do it 24 months from whatever. It can do that.

Our intent and design was to make it easier for companies to know when people are expiring and to give them full-time access to their list so they can see the expiration dates, which takes care of the notification issue because you can see all your 2020s, all your 2019s, all your 2021s, et cetera to simplify that. The reaction from the industry to that has been quite favorable. They love it. Allied did 82 renewals yesterday -CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: But it --

MR. BLACHE:
-- and had no -- you know --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Fabian, it seems to me that if $I$ know that it's going to be a March date or whatever the date is going to be, and I hire a guard, you can -- I meant, it simplifies it for them. Because if you as a company are going to pay
for their licensing, if that's your choice --
MS . LANDRY:
No. No.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Wait. Wait. Let me --
MS . LANDRY:
This is not my argument though.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Let me finish, Maria.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. And so that you can start to
deduct for that licensing over a period of
time, because that's what you're going to do anyway. At some point, you're going to deduct for you paying for their license; is that not correct?

MS . LANDRY:
We are, but that's not my argument.
MR. BLACHE:
Uh-huh.
MS. LANDRY:
My argument -- that's fine.
MR. BLACHE:

Uh-huh.
MS . LANDRY:
And I did mention the financial burden, but I'm going by what the rules and regulations in the statute says.

MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, let me ask you something. This is what -- these are the kinds of things we're talking about with your committee about the rules and regulations about coming up with it, knowing that we were going to ImageTrend, talking about changing some of the rules and regulations as it relates to what we're moving forward to do. Now, I don't know if we've ever finished the report on that or where you guys are with that.

MS . LANDRY:
We met, but it wasn't on that. We met on policies and procedures -MR. BLACHE:

Yeah. Yeah.
MS . LANDRY:
-- for office staff.

| 1 | MR. BLACHE: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Right. Right. |
| 3 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 4 | That's what we met on, policies and |
| 5 | procedures for office staff. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 7 | So was that ever completed? |
| 8 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 9 | It -- other than -- |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 11 | The report? |
| 12 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 13 | -- the Board approving it. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 15 | So you do have a report for that? |
| 16 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 17 | I don't have it on me right now, no. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 19 | No. No. I'm saying, but you all have |
| 20 | completed that? |
| 21 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 22 | Yeah. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 24 | Okay. Because I haven't seen it. That's |
| 25 | what I'm saying. Has anybody else had a copy |

of it or seen it?
MS . FINCHUM:

I don't think so.

MR. BLACHE:

So let me say --
MS . FINCHUM: Mr. Crouch, may I ask you a question?

MR. BLACHE: Yeah.

MR. CROUCH: I'm sorry?

MS . FINCHUM:

Can I ask you a question?
MR. CROUCH: Certainly.

MS . FINCHUM:

If in our policies and procedures,
because it does state date of hire, what
ramifications does that put us as a Board into
since it has been implemented already without
proper approval that the date is going to be changed to March for everyone?

MR. CROUCH:
It -- it's starting to sound to me like
the train has already left the station --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah.
MR. CROUCH:
-- but can be fixed, if that's the desire of the Board, but let me -- let me interject something here just as a general thing. I'm -- you're not my only client and so I can't be as deeply involved in your business as I'd like to be, but you are perfectly free any day or any hour to ask me for a legal opinion about some proposal that the Board or the Executive Director is going to take, and I can render a legal opinion.

I have always had the impression in listening that the Board was online with this at some point and that the -- that we were going to clean it up in the legislative package that was going to go forward or by rules and regulations. Rules are easy to change. Statutes are a little more politically cumbersome to deal with.

So I don't know how to answer your question. It -- Maria may be technically correct, but it was -- it never came to my attention as a formal request for an opinion
to say, whoa, put the brakes on, I'm going to give you some advice that you don't have to follow to begin with. All we do is advise and represent. I'm kind of dancing around your question here, but $I$ gather that you're technically correct, Maria. But it was my understanding, and $I$ don't know where $I$ got it from, that the Board was all online with all of this based upon discussions and so forth. MS . LANDRY:

And I will say this, I still like the ImageTrend idea. I like where we're going with all of that, but $I$ also represent, as a Board member, companies throughout this state, and $I$ am just bringing up some questions that some of those companies have contacted me about. MR. CROUCH: Gotcha. MR. BLACHE :

Okay. Let me -- let me pivot from that.
Because like I said, I will do whatever you folks tell me to do. I can $g o$ in and rewire things and we can go right back to 260 expiration dates a year. I have no problem
with that. Because for me, it's not -- it doesn't benefit me nearly as much as it benefits the companies. You know, it's the Ray Coxes of the G4Ss and other companies that are saying, this is saving me money, because now, I don't have to have as many people tracking all this stuff. That was the intent of what was done.

MS . LANDRY:
Uh-huh.

MR. BLACHE:
But let me -- let me say this, the statute also says that no person may apply for a registration or a license if they have a felony background. So if we're going to do this letter-of-the-law approach as opposed to the spirit of the law and then use the legislative vehicle, to get this right, the very first thing that should happen from the top down is no one in this industry gets to go into ImageTrend and do an application until the State Board gets $\$ 48$ and a set of fingerprint cards. We run them and send -and give you a disposition, because you can't apply, by law, if you have a felony that's not
aged ten years or if you're convicted of a violent crime. That is in the statute. It's clear in the statute.

That would be a crippling game changer for this industry. I mean, literally, the statute supports me saying, this is how we're going to do business going forward. So start-up company, you're hiring 20 people, you send me 20 times 48, cover sheet, fingerprint card. We run the fingerprint. We get the dispositions back. You've got seven good. Now, you can go apply and your other three can't, and we block them out of the portal. That's how business would function per the statute.

We've never done that. I tried to bridge the gap between that extreme measure and what we did in the past. What we did in the past is we let the industry run the henhouse. We let the industry issue state credentials to people and decide when they wanted to share them with us and when they didn't. And we've bridged the gap by going to ImageTrend by saying, you're going to go through our pipeline, and we're going to tell you when
you're registered. And we still allow them to apply and work provisionally while we wait 20 days potentially for fingerprint cards.

So I don't -- I'm bringing that point up because I come from a law enforcement background. And if we're going to be letter-of-the-law and right down the pike, then we can do that. And I am comfortable with that. I have no problem with that. I just didn't want to be the guy that came in and upset the entire applecart along the process. Because I read the statute and I understand how it works.

I also understand what the intent of it is. I mean, there's a section in the statute that says, to be a trainer, you have to have three years of supervisory experience, but the qualifying agent requirement doesn't say you have to have it. That's not where it belongs, but we enforce that.

And Wendy is not in here right now, but we enforce that when people apply to be a trainer. That's like telling a person, man, woman, or otherwise, you can't teach kindergarten because you don't have a baby or
a toddler. It doesn't make sense.
So, you know, where feasible, we do everything we can to take a veteran military person or a veteran law enforcement person and find a nexus for them to get to the point where they can, in fact, become a viable, good trainer for the state Board in spite of what mistakes are in the statute. But this particular thing under suitability that I'm referencing is not a mistake. We've talked about this ad nauseam as well. It's very clear, you can't apply or be issued a registration or a license if you have a felony background.

MR. CROUCH:

That is what the statute says.
MR. BLACHE:
That's what it says. So I just throw
that out there in the midst of the
conversation about people in the industry wanting to calibrate towards the rules and the law.

MR. RIVERS:
Fabian, did it ever change from the past or were they totally doing it incorrectly in

```
the past?
MR. BLACHE:
Totally doing it incorrectly.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Totally incorrectly.
MR. RIVERS:
What -- what is that -- what is the --
MR. BLACHE:
3276 --
MR. RIVERS:
What were they using?
MR. BLACHE:
They weren't using -- they were ignoring
the statute, I mean. So --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Because, remember --
MR. RIVERS:
What is it?
MR. BLACHE:
3276.1.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Because, remember, you were -- companies
were able to issue the cards themselves --
MR. RIVERS:
Right.
```

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- before the people were actually
vetted.
MR. RIVERS:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
And if you remember, if you look at a
blue form -- could somebody get me a blue
form, please?
MS. FINCHUM:
I appreciate all this information --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- but I feel like we're kind of getting
off track just a little bit.
MS . LANDRY:
Yeah, I think we're getting off track
too.
MS. FINCHUM:
Because I think what Maria was referencing is kind of our responsibilities, and we kind of need to go back to that. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

No, I think what she was referencing was
the cost involved, the burden that it's
putting on the company to --
MS. FINCHUM:
Well, both.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure. I get it. Correct.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
I think that's what she was referencing.
MR. RIVERS:
Well, the registration date and the
ImageTrend, that's two -- I mean, we can keep
ImageTrend going just like we're going and
still have the, like you said, different --
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. I mean --

MR. RIVERS:
-- renewal dates.
MR. BLACHE:
-- you know, if it would be -- if it's the wish of the industry and the Board to go to the dates the way they're written verbatim in the statute, we can make that happen.

That's not a problem. But we started talking about bi-mobile licensure cycle in 2016 well in advance of implementation to many audiences
of folks. And I've had over 42 training sessions with industry people that have come here and learned about that, and it's never been an issue. But $I$ appreciate the fact that somebody has, in fact, taken issue with it.

I just wanted to point out, even on the blue app and to your question, it said, this serves as a temporary card showing that a security officer registration on the below-named individual has been submitted to the State Board; not will be in 20 days. So everything about it was completely out of alignment. And I'm just -- you know, my efforts are designed to try to make it simpler, quicker, and easier to get somebody from Point $A$ to Point $B$.

I mean, look, on background checks, by going to ImageTrend, you know, Mr. Rivers was the man that asked the question before we implemented, how long is this going to take me, because you might cause me some serious problems here. I mean, we're averaging under five days, in many instances, three days from the moment the prints are submitted to the moment we can render a disposition; some
cases, one day. And $I$ said in that meeting, I can't tell you, Mr. Rivers, if it's going to be ten or 12 , but $I$ know $I$ can do better than four months and five months. And we lived with that for $20-s o m e ~ o d d ~ y e a r s$.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yes, we did.

MR. BLACHE:

So, you know, I understand. I just want to make sure we have a good vision on what the impact of that could be --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, let me --
MR. BLACHE:
-- if we start tacking --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Right.
MR. BLACHE:
-- in different directions.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Let me just make a suggestion here is that because it's a concern and because, Maria, you said you had several calls from companies because of it, why don't we, because of the lateness of the hour, because of the
weather that we're confronted with now, the weather conditions that are out here, so why don't we table this to the next meeting to have further discussion about it. And then why don't, Ron, you can get some opinions for us? We can request an opinion on it to see how that flows with the state statute. We know that the state statute needs to be changed. We know that there are some provisions in the state statute that's older than anybody here, I meant, that does not apply anymore.

So let me just say that $I$ make a motion that we table this until the next meeting for further consideration and opinion. Do I get a second?

MS. FINCHUM:
Did you have something you wanted to say, Mr. Crouch?

MR. CROUCH:
I'm sorry?
MS. FINCHUM:
Did you have something you wanted to say?
MR. CROUCH:
I just wanted to --

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Um, Misty --
MS. FINCHUM:
Well, he wanted to say something. I'm not going to --

MR. CROUCH:
Yeah, that's okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
-- do anything to --
MR. CROUCH:
Go ahead and deal with the motion.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, $I$ don't know how we suggest that a person wants to say something unless they actually say, I want to say something. If they don't say $I$ want to say something, then we have no way of knowing that they want to say something.

MR. CROUCH:
Deal with your motion, and then I'll say something.

MR. ROBINSON:
Second.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. We have a -- we have a motion and
we have a second. So we're going to table this until the next meeting.

Now, Mr. Crouch, did you want to say something?

MR. CROUCH:
I just want to say, I want to give you guys some advice about what's going to happen in the coming year. Fabian and I, and I'm going to assist him in coming up with legislative changes to your law that will bring it out of the decades past. But all of those -- any legislative package, any change to a rule, any change to a statute has to be approved by you guys. And once there's a record vote of proving it and it moves forward, you guys just got to live with that, okay. And, of course, legislation, I'm not a politician, but you guys know legislation better than I do, but I resort back to two things you don't want to watch made are law and sausage. And the legislative process is the legislative process. The rule making is my process. That's the part that's easy for me. And drafting legislation is easy for me, and then good luck.

MS . LANDRY:

Yeah. And $I$ see where you're coming, because $I$ know there can be consequences we don't want to see --

MR. CROUCH:

I got it.

MS . LANDRY:
-- because I do work with legislation on
the federal level a lot.
MR. CROUCH:
Bless your heart.
MS . LANDRY:
And that affects this industry. And so I don't want to see consequences that do present a burden to our industry. But anyway, that's it.

MR. BLACHE:
That's all I have from my report.
MR. CROUCH:
And feel free to ask me for a legal opinion any time you want.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Thank you, Ron.
MR. CROUCH:
Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
All right. Does that complete your
report, Mr. Fabian?
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, I'm done.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Anybody has any questions or comments?
If there is no questions or comments, we'll
move on to the old business.
Any old business?
Any new business?
MS . LANDRY:
I do want to ask to go into executive session.

MR. CROUCH:
You want to what?
MS. LANDRY:
Ask to go into executive session.
MR. CROUCH:
You'll have to amend -- you'll have to amend the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We have to do an amendment to the agenda
for that.
MS . LANDRY:

Well, I'd like to amend the agenda to go
into executive session.

MR. CROUCH:

It requires a unanimous vote.
MR. RIVERS:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:

Would you take a vote, please, on whether or not they'd like to go into executive session?

MS. HULL:

Misty Finchum?
MS . FINCHUM:
Yes.

MS. HULL:
Edward Robinson?

MR. CROUCH:
We have to -- we have to state what it's about.

MR. ROBINSON:

Yeah, what it's about.
MS . LANDRY:

Okay. I'll state this is about the recent changes to policies and procedures and any legal ramifications that would come from

| 1 | that. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 3 | Now, take a vote. |
| 4 | MS . HULL: |
| 5 | Misty? |
| 6 | MS . FINCHUM: |
| 7 | Yes. |
| 8 | MS. HULL: |
| 9 | Mr. Robinson? |
| 10 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| 11 | Okay. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 13 | Yes. |
| 14 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 15 | Yes. |
| 16 | MR. SANDERS : |
| 17 | Yes. |
| 18 | MR. RIVERS: |
| 19 | Yes. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |
| 21 | It's been voted on and we have all nays |
| 22 | -- I meant, I'm sorry -- all yeas to go into |
| 23 | executive session. So we will be going into |
| 24 | executive session -- |
| 25 | MS . LANDRY: |

7

And I don't expect it to take very long. CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: -- to discuss policies or procedures -MS . LANDRY:

Recent policies --
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
-- recent policies and procedures from --
MS . LANDRY:
-- and any legal ramifications.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Would everybody kindly leave the room?

MR. CROUCH:
Except the court reporter.
(WHEREUPON, THE MEETING WENT INTO
EXECUTIVE SESSION)

| 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |
| 23 | (WHEREUPON, THE | OUT | OF |
| 24 | EXECUTIVE SESSION) |  |  |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON PIERRE: |  |  |

We're out of executive session. We'll look at the determination for the next Board meeting, look at a March date, please. Can anybody get their calendars out and see what would be good for them in March or if there's any dates that's not good for them? That might be easier. Anybody has anything that would not be good for them in March? Would a Thursday still be good, like maybe March 14th? March 14th? March 21st? Does a Thursday work for everybody? We can do it again on the Thursday?

MS . LANDRY:
Yeah, I'm good on Thursday.
MS . FINCHUM:
I will not be available March 14th.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
How about the 21st?

MR. ROBINSON:
I have something.
MS . FINCHUM:
I take that back. I'm sorry, Marian.
The 14th, I would be. I had the weeks switched.

MS . LANDRY:

The 14th?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. Well, does the 14 th work for
everybody else?
MR. RIVERS:
Nine a.m.; correct?
MR. SANDERS:
9:30.
MR. BLACHE:
We gavel at 9:30.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
We gavel at 9:30.
MR. BLACHE:
But we do that on purpose just in case we have, you know, traffic issues.

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Okay. So March 14th.
MS. FINCHUM:
So the official start time is not until 9:30.

MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, we gavel at 9:30. We were setting them at nine and trying to start at nine and we always had, you know, straggler stuff going on. So we just --

```
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Let's try and finish the date, the 14th, because the weather is getting worse and worse out there.
MR. BLACHE:
The 14th.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
So the 14th is good for everyone?
So it's March 14th.
MR. ROBINSON:
Is there any way next year that we could set the year's calendar?
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah, we can do that. Of course, we can do that.
MR. ROBINSON:
I've got other things, so you like to be able to put -CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah. So we can look at -- we can look at, like for instance, the third Thursday in the month or set it up like that?
MR. BLACHE:
And then, you guys can decide if those dates are good for you.
```

CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
That works.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Is everybody back in --
MS . LANDRY:
So would the next one be June or July?
MR. BLACHE:
June.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
June.
MR. BLACHE:
Always towards the end of June, because
--
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
No. No. No, I'm saying we can talk about that for the next meeting. MS . LANDRY:

Okay.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
All right. So do we have any public comment comments or questions?

MR. BLACHE:
No.

MR. CROUCH:
The public is gone.
MR. BLACHE:
The rain keeps people away.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
Well, I make a motion for adjournment.
MS . FINCHUM:
Second.
CHAIRPERSON PIERRE:
It's been moved and seconded. This meeting is adjourned. (WHEREUPON, THE MEETING ADJOURNED)
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