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| 1 | QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P R O C E E D I N G S |
| 3 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 4 | Good morning. The Board of Private |
| 5 | Security Examiners is in session. |
| 6 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 7 | Roll call. |
| 8 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 9 | Roll call, please? |
| 10 | MS. HULL: |
| 11 | Misty Finchum? |
| 12 | MS . FINCHUM: |
| 13 | Present. |
| 14 | MS. HULL: |
| 15 | Durell Pellegrin? |
| 16 | MR. PELLEGRIN: |
| 17 | Present. |
| 18 | MS. HULL: |
| 19 | Mark Williams? |
| 20 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 21 | Present. |
| 22 | MS. HULL: |
| 23 | Edward Robinson? |
| 24 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| 25 | Present. |


| 1 | MS . HULL: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Marian Pierre? |
| 3 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 4 | Present. |
| 5 | MS . HULL: |
| 6 | Maria Landry? |
| 7 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 8 | Present. |
| 9 | MS . HULL: |
| 10 | Ritchie Rivers? |
| 11 | MR. RIVERS : |
| 12 | Present. |
| 13 | MS . HULL: |
| 14 | Wilbert Sanders? |
| 15 | MR. SANDERS: |
| 16 | Present. |
| 17 | MS . HULL: |
| 18 | Hector Echegoyen? |
| 19 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 20 | Not present. |
| 21 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 22 | May we have the Pledge of Allegiance? |
| 23 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 24 | Yes. Please stand for the Pledge. |
| 25 | (PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE) |
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```
MR. BLACHE:
And can we please stand for one moment and have a moment of silence?
(MOMENT OF SILENCE)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you.
MR. BLACHE:
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Call for the reading of the minutes?
MS . LANDRY:
I'll make a motion to waive the reading, if everybody has viewed them already? MR. ROBINSON:
Move.
```


## CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

```
It has been moved and seconded, and so the waiving of -- to waive the reading of the minutes.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. The next agenda item is -CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
The first thing on the agenda is -MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
```

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- a hearing on the Motion.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay. Board Members, what's before the Board this morning is a Motion to Intervene filed by Ms. Pam Spees on behalf of a number of clients intervening in the TigerSwan hearing in which the -- that is the result of their application being denied. Ms. Spees will address the Board.

There's an opposition filed by Mr. Ross Dooley on behalf of TigerSwan. They will argue their motion. I didn't file any responsive pleadings to this because I represent you with legal advice and I don't want to -- I wouldn't want to prejudice your decision-making ability.

However, once they have completed their argument, $I$ do have a responsibility to advise you of what the law is with regard to adjudication and the Administrative Procedures Act.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you. Okay. Do we have the members representing TigerSwan?

```
MR. DOOLEY:
Morning, Ross Dooley on behalf of TigerSwan.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you.
MS. SPEES:
And I'm Pam Spees with the Center for
Constitutional Rights on behalf of the petitioning organizations.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you. I don't know which one of you would like to go first to support your argument.
MS. SPEES:
Well, it's a petition that we filed, Madam Chair, and we're happy to explain the basis for that.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MS. SPEES:
First of all, as you know, TigerSwan applied for a license in mid-2017. It was denied on July 19th. And we understood that it was going to be appealing -- in November -and we thought that that would happen in
```

December of 2017.
And in November, we filed a Petition to Intervene into that appeal on behalf of a number of petitioning organizations. And as we set out in our filings, those petitioning organizations are based here in Louisiana. They are all working on various issues of, you know, in their communities around a controversial pipeline.

And the reason that's relevant -- this is clearly not a Body that has anything to do with regulating pipelines. But the reason that that's relevant is that the company that is running pipeline through the state has contracted in the past with TigerSwan in another -- for another pipeline project in North Dakota.

And so what we've set out in our filing is a number of concerns about the way that TigerSwan operated. And so these groups stand to be directly affected because of their work, because of their opposition to this project if TigerSwan is allowed to come into the state and provide security services for the same company.

And so before $I$ go into some of the specific concerns, let me just say that, you know, we obviously agree with what the Executive Secretary determined at this point in terms of the initial denial. And our qualms are not with that.

The concerns of the petitioning organizations are that there are a number of very serious issues with the way this company has conducted itself in other states, that perhaps should be part of this record; especially, if there is at some point going to be a judicial review of these proceedings. So we're here to make sure that those concerns are addressed beyond what is already part of the record.

We believe this Board has discretion to allow this intervention under the Administrative Procedures Act. It doesn't address it explicitly, but it is something that happens in other agency contacts when there are permits or licenses at issue. For instance, within the Department of Environmental Quality, they will often allow organizations or individuals who have a stake
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in that issue to intervene in that proceeding.
And so we also, you know, think that it's possible to manage that kind of proceeding. We don't anticipate this getting -- it doesn't need to get -- it can be done in a way that's organized and well-managed, even though you're allowing another third party into the proceeding. It's not something that's unmanageable.

The -- in terms of the concerns, we understand that the basis for the original denial was that TigerSwan had been denied a license in another state in North Dakota. And under the Statute governing private security companies, as was sit up here, they were denied on that basis here in Louisiana. But in our petition, we set out a number of other concerns about the company and reasons we think there are other provisions in the Statute that would also apply to bar TigerSwan from entry into this state.

And, you know, I can just sort of briefly summarize, but we go into some detail with in the petition is the way the company operated in North Dakota. And that's based on, not
just news reports, but leaked internal documents. This is a company that has gone in and exaggerated the threat posed by people who opposed that pipeline project in North Dakota, referring to them as terrorists or as Jihadist insurgents. And these are basically people who are exercising their First Amendment rights to protest this kind of project. And we have folks here in Louisiana who are exercising those rights as well and would stand to be affected if you have a company that comes in and attempts to cast them in the same light.

We know that TigerSwan had been coordinating with other law enforcement and security companies and there was a lot of controversial surveillance that has come to light and infiltration of protesters. And, you know, so you can -- that is all resourced, all of that in the petition.

We've tracked it back so that you can see that these aren't just sort of claims that the petitioning organizations are making. These are very well-documented concerns that have been reported on extensively and that are even
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based on the company's leaked internal documents.

What we found really concerning most recently, and $I$ think this is, you know, another testament to the work of those working here at the Board of Private Security Examiners is that, through a public records request, you know, we were able to obtain a deposition that was taken of someone who applied for a license shortly after the TigerSwan denial, did not acknowledge to the Board that they were a TigerSwan employee at the time and had been. And so there was a deposition that was taken and we've made that deposition part of our last filing that we submitted earlier this week. And just for your convenience, $I$ did bring copies of that. I don't know, Ron, if --

MR. CROUCH:
Sure.
MS. SPEES:
Ron, can we -- Mr. Crouch, can we -MR. CROUCH:

Sure.
MS. SPEES:
-- pass these out?
MR. BLACHE:
Sure. I'd be happy to.
MS. SPEES:
Okay. Thank you. So, you know, there's -- it's additionally concerning because of the timeline and the questions this deposition raises in the sense that TigerSwan had been denied on July 19th; and within two weeks, we have someone who is an employee of TigerSwan seeking a license in the state through this Board, and not disclosing that they are a TigerSwan employee. So there are clearly a lot of concerns and questions we all have about that, and the petitioning organizations in particular.

Now, I mentioned some of the concerns about the way that TigerSwan has been known to operate in other contexts. I will say that the brief that we received from TigerSwan's counsel earlier this month seemed to suggest that this is all a political maneuver; that the only interest that the petitioning organizations have is opposing this pipeline, and that's why TigerSwan is being targeted in
this proceeding. That was the -- basically the gist of their motion.

And to somehow suggest that any private security company that would seek a license through this Board might meet that same opposition. And what $I$ want to make very clear, and we've set this out in the petition, the concern is not about the pipeline. This is not the place for that fight.

This is a concern about this company and its irresponsible and reckless conduct that it has shown elsewhere. And we've made that very clear in the petition. And that's why the petitioning organizations are here is because they stand to be directly affected by this Board's decision ultimately.

And in terms of the grounds I mentioned that the basis for the denial was that portion of the statute, which says that if you've been denied in another state, you can be denied here, that's the basis. And we understand that that's very clear, because they were denied in North Dakota. And they're being -they're in the middle of a lawsuit now because they were alleged to have continued operating
even after the denial. So that's playing out in North Dakota right now.

But in addition to some -- to that ground, we think there are other grounds that merit some questioning and including the portions of the statute having to do with efforts to deceive or defraud the public and aiding and abetting a person to obey the provisions of this law or combining with an unlicensed person or acting as agent partner of an unlicensed person with the intent to evade the provisions of this law. We think that this latest deposition in particular sort of suggests that there may be questions there.

Whether TigerSwan poses a threat to the public interest of this state or to the effective regulation of private security companies, we can -- based on what we've provided you in our briefings, that this is something that is -- clearly creates or enhances the danger of unsuitable or unfair or even possibly illegal practices, methods, or operations. These are all other grounds in the statute that we think may actually apply in this situation.

And it's, you know, it's one thing, we understand and appreciate that there may be a narrow ground upon which to deny a company, but if there is a judicial review later on, we think it's important that those who stand to be directed by the decision also are able to make the record that will be reviewed by a court possibly at some point in the future.

The other thing $I$ would say, and one of the facts we pointed to, is that, you know, one of the petitioning organizations in particular may have already been the target of TigerSwan efforts. We point you to some smear campaigns that were attempted on social media, and there is evidence or there are allegations that TigerSwan may have been behind that. And, again, that's just to -- we're not -we -- I think there are more questions about that.

And, you know, that's something that should also be part of the questioning here. If they are in fact involved in efforts to defame and smear local residents who are opposed to a pipeline, that's something that should be part of this record, at least the

Page 18

| 1 | questions could and should be asked. And so |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | those are some of the concerns. |
| 3 | Again, we've set these out in the |
| 4 | petition and we filed a reply to TigerSwan's |
| 5 | opposition and are happy to answer any |
| 6 | questions you have about the Petition to |
| 7 | Intervene. I know that this is not something |
| 8 | that this Board has encountered, at least to |
| 9 | my knowledge. That's -- I don't know that |
| 10 | there's ever been a Petition to Intervene and |
| 11 | a licensing decision before this Board, but we |
| 12 | want to assure you that we do believe it's |
| 13 | something that can be conducted in an |
| 14 | organized and well-managed manner. So, happy |
| 15 | to answer any questions. |
| 16 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 17 | Thank you. Does anyone on the Board have |
| 18 | any questions? Any Board members have any |
| 19 | questions? |
| 20 | Mr. Blache? |
| 21 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 22 | Yes, ma'am. |
| 23 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 24 | Mr. Blache, let me ask you a question. |
| 25 | MR. BLACHE: |

```
Yes?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I just want to make this clear.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
The company that applied for the license
for TigerSwan to provide the security, they
have been denied; is that correct? I think we did deny them.
MR. BLACHE:
Both TigerSwan and LTSA have been denied. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I just wanted to put that on --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- the record again --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- for the Board members to know that
they have been denied. Thank you, sir.
MR. DOOLEY:
Good morning. Ross Dooley on behalf of
```

TigerSwan. I want to first point out that this is, of course, not a rule-making proceeding. This is an adjudication. If it was a rule-make proceeding, I would agree that the parties who have an interest in opposing a particular adoption of a rule or a regulation do have a broader interest. But here with an adjudication, the issues -- the parties, rather, to the adjudication are driven by the issues before the particular Body. And in this instance, the issue before the Board is TigerSwan's fitness.

Now, the environmental groups position has been to mold two things together, take two separate things and say they're the same thing. They're saying the Bayou Bridge pipeline equates to TigerSwan's application in Louisiana. They'll have you believe they're one in the same issue. And, in fact, they are not.

If the words Bayou Bridge pipeline were soaken in an adjudicatory proceeding for licensure for TigerSwan, I would object to relevance on every single time, every single time because it's not relevant. They are not
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applying for a license to do work at the Bayou Bridge pipeline. Their license application is to do security work in Louisiana generally. That's what we're here for.

And that's where the environmental groups' position as to whether or not they have standing or not is completely deficient.

What they're really arguing to you is that, if it isn't just about the Bayou Bridge pipeline, then of course their standing, their argument to you has to be, well, we oppose TigerSwan's work on any security project throughout Louisiana. And that does not provide them with the standing they need.

The First Circuit in Louisiana, Bond versus Louisiana State Board of Examiners of Psychologists stated what the standard is, are a party to have standing in an adjudicatory proceeding. And it says, without some peculiar, special, and individual interest, a citizen has no standing in a court to champion a cause or subject matter that pertains to the whole people in common, nor has an individual citizen legal standing in court to enforce the performance of a duty owed to the general
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public.
Counsel just sat here and said to you, their concern is about TigerSwan's reckless behavior. Well, that's got to be a concern that she attributes to all the people in Louisiana, which necessarily undercuts their entire claim of standing here.

And last but not least, if they were allowed to intervene, bear in mind, they would become a party. It's been suggested, well, it could be regulated. No, you would have to, as a Board, make a specific determination as to some right that these environmental groups hold.

What is that particular right? It's certainly nothing that's specific to them. It would have to be something broader in nature which, again, suggests that they do not have any standing to intervene into this matter.

And if the Board has any questions, I'd like to answer them. If not, that concludes my argument.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you.
MR. DOOLEY:

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Are there any questions?
MS. SPEES:
May I rebut?
MR. CROUCH:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Ron?
MR. CROUCH:
I believe Ms. Spees has a rebuttal.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MS. SPEES:
Thank you, Madam Chair. Just very quickly, we clearly pointed out that there is a very peculiar and particular interest on the part of these petitioning organizations because there is evidence to suggest, and we've noted this in the petition, that one of them in particular may have already been targeted by an effort that may involve TigerSwan. And that's something playing out in a case in Pennsylvania in a civil rights case in Pennsylvania where -- you know, and I
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can go more in if you want. I can speak more about that situation, but it is set out in the brief that we filed in the Petition to Intervene originally.

And this is a -- I think it's very disingenuous to suggest that TigerSwan is just showing up in Louisiana to operate as a private security contractor generally. But even if that were the case, yes, everyone in the state should be concerned about that.

But given the timing and given that we know that they have continued to operate as a contractor for this particular pipeline company in North Dakota, we know that they've done some work in a similar pipeline with this company in Pennsylvania, and it's just disingenuous to suggest that there's not a connection. But even if there weren't, there would be serious cause for concern.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you. Ron?
MR. CROUCH:
Board Members, you are one of the rare agencies in Louisiana that, when the Division
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1
of Administrative Law was created, the legislature chose to allow you to continue to do your own adjudications. Most adjudications with most agencies in the state, any appeal would be conducted downtown at the Division of Administrative Law. But the rules are the same whether the hearing is down there or whether it's here.

When an agency takes an action, any action that requires an adjudication, the individual, the company, the partnership, whatever the entity, legal entity, the entity that's affected by that action has a right to appeal that action. And the entity -- the state agency has an obligation to inform that entity of exactly what action has been taken and the factual basis for that action. In the TigerSwan situation, they were denied on a very, very narrow factual situation. They were denied a license in North Dakota. That's what we asserted in the denial letter. The problem is that once we issue that notice letter to that entity, we are bound by the four corners of that letter. If $I$ try to -- at the adjudication, when
it takes place, if $I$ try to introduce evidence outside of the four corners of that letter, it's immaterial, irrelevant, inadmissible. It can be proffered for appeal, okay, in the event that the appellate court wanted to determine that your ruling and admissibility was wrong. But as a front-end decision, that evidence would be inadmissible.

We are bound by the letter that we sent out and we can't introduce any evidence outside of that realistically. Some hearsay evidence is accepted in administrative hearings, but it cannot be dispositive of the hearing. There must be a strong, factual proven basis for the action that you took. And your job as an adjudicatory body is to determine what the facts are. Once we know the facts, once you've established the facts, then the law can be applied. I just wanted you to be aware of how adjudications are conducted under the ADA in Louisiana. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Any questions for Ron?
So, Ron, what you're saying is that the fact that we denied TigerSwan, based on the
rules and regulations of this Board, we're within our rights to have done that.

MR. CROUCH:
Absolutely.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Whether or not we do -- whether or not we allow anybody to intervene is up to us; is that what you're saying?

MR. CROUCH:
That is correct.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
That is the decision that we'll have to make based on the facts of the denial? MR. CROUCH:

That is correct. And the Intervention, whether you decide to allow it or not, you are faced with the dealing of evidence that is outside of the four corners of your notice letter. It's -- if you understand what I'm saying. TigerSwan is a very narrow factual issue.

With all due respect to Mr. Dooley, unless he can come in and show that TigerSwan was not denied in North Dakota, I think our -CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

It stands.
MR. CROUCH:
-- I think our denial stands. Okay. And that's the only fact at issue as far as I'm concerned and as far as the notice letter is concerned.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any questions by any Board Members?
MR. ROBINSON:
Yeah, one.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Go ahead.
MR. ROBINSON:
Were they denied in Pennsylvania also?
MR. CROUCH:
I don't know about Pennsylvania, and that's -- that's -- again, that would be irrelevant to the notice letter. MR. BLACHE:

I don't know the answer to that question. I believe that any action that took place in Pennsylvania was after the application process ran its course here.

MR. ROBINSON:
Okay.

| 1 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Any questions? Then $I$ move for a vote if |
| 3 | there's no further questions. |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | So to bring clarity on what you're voting |
| 6 | on, the Board will be voting on whether or not |
| 7 | to grant the Petition to Intervene? |
| 8 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 9 | To grant the Petition to Intervene. |
| 10 | MR. BLACHE : |
| 11 | That is correct. And we'll do that as a |
| 12 | roll call vote. |
| 13 | Ms. Finchum? |
| 14 | MS . FINCHUM: |
| 15 | No. |
| 16 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 17 | Mr. Pellegrin? |
| 18 | MR. PELLEGRIN: |
| 19 | No. |
| 20 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 21 | Mr. Williams? |
| 22 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 23 | No. |
| 24 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 25 | Mr. Robinson? |


| 1 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | No. |
| 3 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 4 | Ms. Pierre? |
| 5 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 6 | No. |
| 7 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 8 | Ms. Landry? |
| 9 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 10 | No. |
| 11 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 12 | Mr. Rivers? |
| 13 | MR. RIVERS: |
| 14 | No. |
| 15 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 16 | And Mr. Sanders? |
| 17 | MR. SANDERS : |
| 18 | No. |
| 19 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 20 | That's a unanimous no vote on the Motion |
| 21 | to Intervene. |
| 22 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 23 | So -- |
| 24 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 25 | One final piece of legal advice, your |
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| 1 | statute provides that any action taken by you |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | as to a party or in this case, Ms. Spees and |
| 3 | her clients, they always have the right to go |
| 4 | to the District Court. That would be an |
| 5 | interlocutory matter. And, generally, |
| 6 | appellate courts don't fool with that unless |
| 7 | it could be dispositive, but they could always |
| 8 | file a separate action in District Court. |
| 9 | That's the only other piece of legal advice I |
| 10 | need to give you. |
| 11 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 12 | We understand that, and they have that |
| 13 | right. I think the Board has made its |
| 14 | decision. It's unanimous that we do not allow |
| 15 | the Intervention. |
| 16 | So thank you, guys, for your presentation |
| 17 | this morning and good luck to you both. |
| 18 | MR. DOOLEY: |
| 19 | Thank you. |
| 20 | MS. SPEES: |
| 21 | And thank you for your time. |
| 22 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 23 | Let's move to the next item on the |
| 24 | agenda. |
| 25 | MR. BLACHE: |
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```
Okay. That would be -- do we have any
legal or legislation pending on any --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
That would be the legal update on any
legislation. Ron?
MR. CROUCH:
I'm sorry?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Legal?
MR. BLACHE:
Any legal or legislation update?
MR. CROUCH:
Not that \(I\) know of.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Anything?
MR. BLACHE:
I don't have anything.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
No update?
Okay. Well, if there's no update, we'll go to the report from the Executive Director. MR. CROUCH:
Did you want to talk about the
```

```
    designated --
    MR. BLACHE:
    Not really. I just don't have enough
    information to work with on that.
    MR. CROUCH:
    Okay. It doesn't directly deal with the
    Board.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    Right.
    MR. CROUCH:
    It's a piece of legislation.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    We understand that there's some --
    MR. BLACHE:
        Yeah.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    -- industry things going on out there in
    the senate and legislature, but that's not
    something you're going to bring up today.
    So, Fabian?
    MR. BLACHE:
    Yeah.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    Let's move to the --
    MR. BLACHE:
```

We're going to the --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- report from the Executive.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, absolutely. One of the things that's in my report is financials.

Mr. McRight is here.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Oh, okay.
MR. BLACHE:
In your packets, you have the documents
that he was able to furnish us for the meeting. So if you want to review that, and he can take us through. And then we'll do the presentation on the eLicensure.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. You want to take us through the report that you've presented, the Budget Report?

MR. MCRIGHT:
Yes, ma'am. Y'all should have four pages there that are -- the first one ought to be the balance sheet and then we ought to have three pages of --

MR. ROBINSON:

Got it. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Yes.
MR. MCRIGHT:
First of all, I'm Dalton McRight. I'm with the firm Jeanette R. McRight, CPA. We're the outside financial consultants for the Board, just to clarify who I am. We'll look at the balance sheet first. As usual, y'all are in very good cash position right now. Right now, y'all have $\$ 975,000$ of cash in banks and y'all have liabilities of $\$ 906,000$.

Now these liabilities, the biggest item of those liabilities is long term is post-employment retire benefits. That's a total of $\$ 587,000$. This money is monies that will be paid some day. It's what y'all will owe employees over their lifetime. Y'all are one of the few boards in the state that can actually say, we could pay them off today if we had to. So y'all are in very good shape as far as that goes.

Another big item on there is we have, under the current liabilities, we have $\$ 260,000$ payable to the State Police. What

| 1 | happens there is y'all as a Board collect a |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | fee for fingerprints and then we submit those |
| 3 | to the State Police, then the State Police |
| 4 | sends us a bill for what they process. They |
| 5 | are behind, so we're holding their money. So |
| 6 | that's included in that \$900,000; \$260,000, |
| 7 | eventually, they're going to ask for all of |
| 8 | it. So we're just holding it for them. |
| 9 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 10 | Eventually, they're going to ask for all |
| 11 | of it. |
| 12 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| 13 | All right. It looks real good to have |
| 14 | \$900,000 up there, but 260 of it is already |
| 15 | obligated to somebody else. |
| 16 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 17 | I hear you. And I believe we recently |
| 18 | paid about $\$ 100,000$ to them. I think they |
| 19 | billed us not long ago for some, but we've |
| 20 | already paid it. |
| 21 | MR. MCRIGHT: |
| 22 | Yeah. |
| 23 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 24 | So that's not -- |
| 25 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |

Is that aside from this?
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
So that's going to be there until they make a decision. We send them over -- we can only send them fingerprints in matches. I'm -- they process those matches, and then they send back a bill to us. And we take that bill and we take it out of this $\$ 260,000$. It's never the same amount, and we don't get a detailed list of exactly who they're billing us for. They just send us an invoice for $X$ number. From that point, we try to do the best we can to do it.

Eventually, I'm going to -- I'd like to propose to the Board that we change our way we're accounting for them. And that is that we'll pick up the income and we'll pay the State Police as an expense whenever they get around to billing us. That way, we won't have this potential liability sitting there. And it's going to get less and less with the new

```
fingerprint machine, if I'm right on that, Fabian?
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah, ultimately, that will happen over time.
MR. MCRIGHT:
If they've been approved -- and I don't
know the exact detail. But if they've been approved for the fingerprints already, they don't have to resubmit. You used to get it every time you change jobs -CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Right.
MR. ROBINSON:
Right.
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- you have to resubmit. So that's going to cut down that number. And, hopefully, they'll eventually just go away. I just wanted to bring that up.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yeah. Well, we don't think it's going away, but ...
MR. MCRIGHT:
Okay. The next page is -- the next three
```

pages -- excuse me. I should have pointed out, on the balance sheet, that's a snapshot of where the Board stood at the end of business on February 28th. So we're dealing with basically February 28th.

On the next three pages, we have the
financial statements for the eighth month ended February 28th. And let's just go straight to the bad news, and that's on the last page. That says y'all spent $\$ 96,000$ more than y'all have taken in for the eight months. Okay.

Now the next column is what the annual budget was that y'all approved last year. And the third column is the remaining change from actual to the budget based upon that budget you approved a year ago. The last column is what we're projecting our income to be and our amended budget as of June 30 th of this year.

And when you look at that, if you look at the bottom line, we show where the $\$ 96,000$ is, we're showing a loss of $\$ 36,045$. Now, truthfully, that's almost a breakeven because we have $\$ 32,000$ worth of capital assets we bought because of the flood and everything and

FEMA is supposed to reimburse us. They haven't got around to reimbursing yet.

And my suggestion would be, when we do the June 30th budget, instead of showing this as an operating expense, if we still expect to be paid, and I discussed this with Fabian just before we came in here, we do expect to get this money, I suggested that we move that to the balance sheet as a prepaid item and take it out of the budget. So then you're $\$ 32,000$ that you would write at a breakeven on the budget for the year end. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Excuse me. Do we have any idea or have we heard anything about our reimbursement? MR. BLACHE:

Yeah, it's an ongoing process with them. Every month, I have to fill out forms and send to update them on what they call a project worksheet. What happened with this situation is they -- the company that the state uses to provide the furnishings for the office did not get paid directly by Sedgwick. It waited a long time. We decided, since we had the money, we would go ahead and take care of that
so that we wouldn't have that as an outstanding bill.

The reimbursements on the flood expenses were originally at 75 percent. Then, they moved them to 90 percent. Then somehow, they found another way to allocate an additional 10 percent. So we've basically had to file three claims along the way.

Now, we're in the throes of the third claim where they're going to try to use that money to offset the $\$ 15,000$ that we spent on the AC units that failed because they were under water, which we paid for out of our building maintenance and repair fund, and then these furnishings, which really comes to a total of about $\$ 47,000$ or so that they're looking at what percentage they can reimburse.

Currently, according to the person whose adjusting this, we're looking at potentially 90 percent of the $\$ 40,000$. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. So we have been approved? Basically, we have been approved? MR. BLACHE:

Yeah, we've made all the deadlines for

```
sulomission --
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
        Uh-huh.
        MR. BLACHE:
        -- per their requirements, and every
    report that they required us to submit to stay
    in contention for the refund has been done.
    So we're supposed to get this money back.
    Nobody ever puts it in writing a hundred
    percent that they're going to do it --
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    I understand.
    MR. BLACHE:
    -- but what we've been told --
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
        But I just want to make sure that we're
    in compliance and --
    MR. BLACHE:
    Absolutely, }100\mathrm{ percent in compliance.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
    -- have submitted in a timely manner --
    MR. BLACHE:
    Yeah.
    CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
        -- so that there's no pushback --
```

MR. BLACHE:
Absolutely.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- on payment.
MR. BLACHE:
Every form we've received from them -- we get three different budget -- project worksheets I have to do every month. We submit them timely every month. In fact, we found out in the process, Ms. Sharon is not here today to tell you this, but she found out that after the flood occurred, we were the first state agency to actually file a claim with GOHSEP and with Sedgwick in the entire state. So we were on top of it from day one. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. Thank you.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Also from an auditor's point of view, every year when your statements are audited, an auditor is going to look at it and say, okay, now, you're saying you're going to get back $\$ 47,000$, we'll look at the documentation
that he has, claims he's submitted, and if he has no denials already, then we would just set it up as a receivable or a prepaid expense and take it away from your budget. So it wouldn't reflect your budget at June 30 th. It would be just a balance sheet item. When the money comes in, it would just be used as a balance sheet item.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I don't have any problem with that. And I don't know if any of the Board Members have any problems with that. I don't have any problems shifting it around, but I just want to make sure that we do receive the money -MR. MCRIGHT:

Right.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- and that we're not moving it around -MR. MCRIGHT:

Oh, no. We wouldn't --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
You understand what I'm saying?
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- unless we were fairly certain it was going to come in.

```
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yeah, that's what \(I\) just want to make sure.
MR. MCRIGHT:
There's always a --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I know there's always that chance.
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- chance that 97, they could go back at 80 or something like that, but you will get the majority of it.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. That's the only questions I have. MS . FINCHUM:
I have a question on Page 2 for the Equipment, Maintenance, and Repair. MR. MCRIGHT:
Okay.
MS. FINCHUM:
What is that big additional expense?
MR. MCRIGHT:
Oh, the --
MS. FINCHUM:
The \(\$ 14,000\).
MR. BLACHE:
```

That's the AC, I believe.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Oh, the --
MR. BLACHE:
Let me look at it so that --
MS. FINCHUM:
I guess my question is, you mentioned the AC.

MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
MS. FINCHUM:
Is that not in fixtures and furniture?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
No. No.
MR. BLACHE:
No.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
No, that wouldn't be in fixtures and
furniture.
MR. BLACHE:
No. That's been --
MS. FINCHUM:
Because y'all were talking about the
fixture and furniture; right?
MR. BLACHE:

```
Uh-huh.
MS. FINCHUM:
And we were talking about the FEMA money coming back.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Right. That's on --
MS. FINCHUM:
And the AC was brought up, and that's why I'm asking about the -MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. No, that makes sense. I'm just trying to find the page. Hold on one second so I can look at it. MR. MCRIGHT:
The air conditioning went out, not necessarily because of the floods or anything, they just went out. And so we had to replace them.
MS. FINCHUM:
Right. I understand that. MR. BLACHE:
Yes. And so -- yeah, the 15,201 , is that
it? Am I finding --
MS. FINCHUM:
Yes.
```
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```
MR. BLACHE:
So when -- these are -- there's a claim
filed on these as well.
MS . FINCHUM:
Okay. So we have -- that's two
different --
MR. BLACHE:
Correct. That's the 15 that I was
referring to.
MR. MCRIGHT:
That's how you get up to the 47,000.
MR. BLACHE:
Right. That's correct.
MS. FINCHUM:
Okay. Just wanted to make sure.
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. And so we used that fund to cover
that expense. We had three go out in exactly
ten days of each other.
MS . LANDRY:
I have a question.
MR. BLACHE:
Yes?
MS . LANDRY:
The NSF expense of \(\$ 1,764\), is that NSF on
```

our part or people paying us?
MR. MCRIGHT:
That's people paying you.
MR. BLACHE:
People paying us.
MS . LANDRY:
People paying us. Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
That's people giving you bad checks and
then we collect it. If you look at the first Page 1 of three, you have NSF recovery, we've also recovered $\$ 1,186$ of that --

MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- bad checks. So it's not a --
MS . LANDRY:
It's a washout?
MR. MCRIGHT:
It's almost a washout, yeah. And then we expect it to --

MS . LANDRY:
Do we incur --
MR. MCRIGHT:
-- wash out. People are going to pay us.

```
MS . LANDRY:
Do we incur any expenses from our bank on that?
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. And that's why the rules have --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Sure.
MR. BLACHE:
-- a charge that we can charge back to
the offender of the NSF --
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
-- so we can offset that.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any questions?
MR. MCRIGHT:
Okay. Basically, you know, taking those
items and everything else is just operating within the guidelines of the budget. There's been no other major differences. We expect
```

that the operations to continue. We don't have any big surprises coming, hopefully, that we're not aware of that may show up. But right now, we don't have anything anticipated that would influence the operating system before June 30th.

And y'all are scheduled to have another Board meeting before June 30th, at which time, we will bring y'all an updated budget for y'all to amend this budget. Instead of amending it this time and turn around and amend it two months later, just do it one time and be in compliance with the law. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. Does that conclude your report? MR. MCRIGHT:

I believe so, unless y'all have any questions about any specific items.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any questions by the Board? If there's no questions by the Board, I move adoption of the financial report. MR. SANDERS:

Second. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

```
It's been moved and seconded. Yeas?
(YEAS BY ALL)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Nays?
None? So moved.
MR. MCRIGHT:
Thank y'all.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Mr. Blache?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I think you have something else that --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Is that the eLicensing?
MR. BLACHE:
It is. It is. I have been really, really, really looking forward to this.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I have one question --
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
```

-- about the eLicensing.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Could you provide us with some type of report on the companies that have been trained already or the companies that still need training?

MR. BLACHE:
We're working with them right now. We've had about 200 individuals come through to the trainings that I've been doing. I've been doing quite a bit of them.

I also have some that I'm going to be doing on site around the state as well, but we've had a lot of representation from a lot organizations, the very small mom-and-pop type organizations, all the way up to the, you know, the big ones like G4S and such. We are talking daily literally through email and phone calls with companies.

I've got -- this is just a screen shot of one of the videos that's gone up. We finally figured out how to get the videos properly compressed and uploaded with the sound onto
the site. So already, I've got nine prepared. I'll be uploading the rest of those today. We should have about a dozen when I'm done. They're very short and succinct and get you right to what you need to know.

When I'm doing this demonstration for you, you're going to see some screens that might make you cringe a little bit. Those are not your screens. They're my side of the equation. But as Board members and as the public, I have been sharing those screens in the trainings because $I$ want the partnership between the industry and the Board to recognize what we're looking at versus what you see and to understand the flexibility of what we have in this system.

I talked to two people yesterday from two large companies that were present for a training and they were talking to me about other states that they're licensed in that use electronic systems. And I posed the question at the end of the training, have you seen anything that eclipses what we're able to do here that you like better, et cetera. The collective answer was no. They were
unequivocally impressed with the system and blown away by the flexibility of what they could do with this system.

They told -- I followed up on that question and said, well, why. And the big deal was the systems tend to get you to the point of getting something back. But in terms of all the other pieces that we've created, they don't exist.

So I'll start taking you through this a little bit and explain to you what we've done. I want to focus very heavily in what $I$ talk to you about today on some things that we've talked about that have been problems for a long time. I'm going to show you how we've solved those problems by literally spanning one foot from 1985 and putting another foot in 2018 .

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Let me -- let me just say this to you.

MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I know a lot of companies, and we have a
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```
lot of mom-and-pop shops --
MR. BLACHE:
Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- I just want to be perfectly clear that I'm in total support of this system, but I just want to make sure that the mom-and-pop shops are brought along that they can participate too. MR. BLACHE:
Yeah. They're the easiest ones for us to do.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Oh, really.
MR. BLACHE:
Absolutely.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Good.
MR. BLACHE:
Because the smaller companies, we can deal directly with the person whose running the operation, running the desk. They have a smaller footprint of officers. Within a matter of 15 minutes to an hour, we can have them set up in the system, profile created,
```
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```
assignments for administrative rights set, bring their guards over from the old system in guard tracking, put the credentials in, let them see their list immediately.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well --
MR. BLACHE:
And 24/7, they have access to that information. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, what I'm hearing from some of the mom-and-pop shops is that they're not computer literate and they don't have computers. MR. BLACHE:
Well, I don't --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
So I --
MR. BLACHE:
I haven't gotten that one yet.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I don't know what we're going to do about that, but we need to -- we need to provide some type of provision for those who can. MR. BLACHE :
Yeah. I haven't heard anything from an
```
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agency standpoint where people are saying they can't do it.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
That, I haven't heard. My staff, I don't think we've heard that. From individuals, we've heard some feedback --

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
-- well, Mr. So and So has a flip phone and doesn't really -- is not really, you know -- okay. In that case then, obviously, the company that hires that individual can assist them with getting what they need. It's once every two years that that person will have to touch the system basically. The people who have to touch it daily will be the people who run the desks and the instructors and so on. So I think -- I think we're fine. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE :
Like I said in previous presentations to
the Board, this isn't the first state agency to do this. This isn't the first state agency with 13/20,000 people that have had to migrate to something like this. It's where we need to be. And for the most part, the reception has been really fabulous. So if $I$ keep doing my job well and make this transition as painless as possible, and we're going to hit bumps in the road, you know that, we always do, every situation is different, we should be in good shape.

Let me talk to you real quickly conceptually through something I want you to notice before I start showing you screens and bombarding you with visuals. We have -- when you do your work, when you do your business, you pull out a blue form and you give that person a temporary registration card. In that process, the company is issuing a state agency's credential.

Okay. And unless that application finds its way to the Board, whether it was intended to and was mailed and didn't get received or something happens or it's forgotten or an employee separates and it's locked in a desk
drawer, whatever the case may be, there are numerous instances where those people's registration applications don't make it here. So they're on a post a year, two years. Then, they get a renewal green card and the same thing happens. All along that person is operating with a company, they're not registered at the State Board.

In this iteration of what we're doing, we're changing the concept of a temporary registration card to that of a provisional card. It's a very key distinction that we're making on purpose. And it aligns us with our laws and our rules. Temporary infers like when you get a driver's license and you take a driving test and you pass, that you have a temporary document and you can drive with until you go get your license.

In this industry, what you should be getting is a provisional credential pending the requirements to get to where you're going. So, for example, to be a provisional guard, there is no training requirement. Therefore, when we built the training component of this system, which I'll show you, there is no
relationship between the provisional credential and training.

But when the guard needs to go from provisional to unarmed, and all provisionals have to be unarmed because there is requirements to be armed, right, to be unarmed, the requirement is first and second eight hours and a cleared fingerprint background check. Right now, what happens often times in the industry is people get a blue card that says they're an unarmed guard, that's the temporary card, we wait for the registration app to come in, we put the app in the system, and then we wait for them to get trained and then record the training. And then at some point when the fingerprints get cleared, we go back into the system and then mark them as unarmed and issue a card per se. That's the process.

In this process, what we'll do is we'll say, okay, there is no training requirement for a provisional unarmed guard. In fact, there presently is no background requirement for a provisional unarmed guard; because, again, the industry is issuing the State's
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credential. So what we're going to do in this case is we're going to issue a provisional unarmed registration card after two variables are met in the system, the first variable being payment, and the second being that we will conduct a provisional background check. We have a lot of companies that sit right here on this Board and some that are out here that already do background checks on people. Some do drug testing on people, and we don't know about that in all cases. But there are many companies that don't do background checks.

And so when they hand someone a temporary registration card and that person stands a post at the State Fair on Airline Highway, that company may or may not know that that person has a criminal history that would be a significant factor in the decision to issue the credential in the first place. And it's incumbent upon the State per the statute, the first three sentences of the statute to do better than that.

Okay. So what we're going to do is allow them to put the application in the system, and

I'm going to show you that process in realtime with a profile associated to a company. Then, we're going to show you how you, the company owners and operators, will answer that application response from the employee or the perspective employee. And I will show you where we step in on our side and start to do the provisional -- the preliminary background check. Which once we make that green cleared and the payments made, we can then issue the provisional credential.

And, obviously, the next question is, well, how long is that going to take? That's very relative to how many applications we receive, just like any part of the workflow. The good thing is, is that in our present construct, when Fabian got to the Board March of '16, so this month is my second-year anniversary, the one thing that stood out to me the most was that when an application came through the door, we didn't just hand a bunch of people stacks of applications to put in the system, which would have made sense.

The construct that we had in place for many years was that it got broken into pieces
in some instances or separated by a type. So if it was a reapplication, it went to one person. If it was an initial app, it went to another. If it was a renewal app, it went to somebody else. If it was a form to do a change of status, that might have gone to someone else.

That means that the staff over those years were all basically programmed and formed into one particular process, which meant that they couldn't assist other staff members with those processes. Because when that person vacated that desk, that process came to a screeching halt.

So what we're changing, now that everyone at the State Board and all the industry, except for the people deeply involved in the development in this, basically are neophytes on this system. We get to bring everybody in at the same time and bring everybody up to the same level. That means that in the next couple of months, every member of this organization who works here will be able to run this system as proficiently as the next. They can take -- they'll be able to take any
call, troubleshoot any issue.
And when an application gets processed, it gets processed in its entirety, not in parts. Because if I give you the biggest part and give Ms. Landry the smallest part, you're going to be behind her pace. That's what's happened over the years.

Okay. So let me show you what I'm talking about by starting off with logging into the system and just basically giving you an idea of what does it look like from your perspective and how is this going to work. So on one of these tabs, what I'm going to do is I'm going to put up on the screen -- I'm going to switch these lights off if you don't mind. MS. FINCHUM:

Is there a focus button on there?
MR. BLACHE:
It's about as focused as it's going to get unfortunately. You're closer to it. MS. FINCHUM:

Maybe that's why.
MR. BLACHE:
But let me -- I can try to -- that's about as clear as it's going to get. I'm
sorry.
I'm just going to log in to these screens real quick. Okay. So on the front end of this system, what I'm going to do is I'm going to log in as a gentleman who is involved in development, and we're going to just get into his profile. And on these screens, I'm going to show you what our side of it looks like.

Any time you see the words ImageTrend in this icon, don't panic. That's not your stuff.

Okay. Your stuff is designed deliberately to be very, very streamlined. Okay. And a couple of decisions that were made in this process were anybody working a desk, that means a QA, an office staff member with signature authority, an instructor, company owners who are overlooking or whatever the case may be, security officers, everybody sees the same thing on this particular screen with the exception of what shows up in this column on the left. And I'll explain that to you in a minute.

So the point is that the view is exactly the same. So if somebody called you with a
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question about something and said, hey, Mr. Robinson, I'm going to do my event temporary registration for Jazz Fest. I'm in the portal; what do I do? You'd be able to tell them, click applications, it's on the left side. And there, you'll see that event temporary registration.

So in this case, we're going to act as if we're talking someone through this process. Applications is where everything begins, right. We use blue forms. We use green forms. Well, we've called everything basically the same thing. For the security officer view, when $I$ go live with this, we're not going to even show them this instructor app. If somebody who is a security officer wants to be an instructor and you tell me they're going to apply, we'll just push them that application.

What $I$ intend to do is keep it so that everybody that already is registered will only see two options on the screen. They'll see this blue provisional unarmed and the event temporary registration, which is something I specifically created to address a need that
many companies have. Okay.
Now, if this person is already registered with a company, they will still have the option to do this because people are allowed to do them and try to affiliate, right. Okay. So in this case, what I'm going to do is very simply just go right in here and $I$ want to show you how easy it will be for a new hire to get plugged into your organization.

Okay. They're going to click this right here. And on my side of the equation, what's going to happen is there's going to be an application that automatically appears on my screen showing the things that we're waiting to figure out. It's going to show initial application and company affiliation blue form for provisional unarmed. Every initial will be provisional unarmed; has to be. Because until we get the fingerprint background check back, by law, we cannot give that person a permanent credential.

Okay. Once that's done on the side where the person is doing the app, the beauty of why everyone has to have a profile is because the application pre-fills itself. I don't have to
worry about handwriting, something getting wet, not being able to read it, or whatever the case may be.

Now, this person's on this application, this takes them literally less than three minutes to do. All they have to do on here is pick what company they're trying to work for, one. In this case, we're going to use one of the dummy companies I've created, it defaults to the role of security officer. And the only option they have available to them is provisional unarmed.

So let me answer another question, well, what about the people that $I$ have them coming in from the old system? We're doing this on purpose so that we don't -- when we bulk issue, we don't want to mistakenly arm someone in a bulk issue. We are going to one-on-one crosswalk what their real credentials may be in the old system and make sure we have fingerprints, training, and certification for a weapon, and then we will adjust it here on this system. And then once that handshake is done and we issue the credential, from that moment forward, everything will flow with

1

``` ease.
Okay. We ask them to answer these questions. And we've expanded these questions according to the questions that all State agencies tend to use, which goes beyond just have you ever been arrested and/or have you ever been convicted. If they answer yes to any question, they will be prompted and mandatorily have to answer information that explains their answer in this system. It's not an option. If they click yes and go to the bottom and sign the application, it's going to jump to the top, validation failed, answer to yes question not filled in. Okay. Very simple.
So we've engineered in the process a way for people not to spin their wheels and just go round and round in circles. Now, the only thing they have to do is hit today and then put their password in and submit this application.
All right. In this process now, what's going on is the system on my side of the equation is updating the status of this application. So I'm going to go in here and
```

try to refresh this screen and see what we're seeing right now on it and just get that done.

Okay. That -- you -- that -- a moment ago when $I$ pointed at this, it said, initiated. Now think about this from a process standpoint for my staff. They saw the app come in. Now, they see it says, received, pending affiliation. What does that mean?

What we did was the State Board gave the guard an entry point into the portal that gave us the information we need to start their preliminary background check, so that by the time you answer this, we should be pretty much caught up with you, hopefully; right. So that says, received, pending affiliation. That means that something has happened on your side of the equation. Let me show you what has happened.

So I'm going to log out of this guard's profile. But before $I$ do that, let me just point two pieces of information out. The security officer sees that on May $29 t h$, he did a provisional unarmed application and he sees that he completed it on May 29th, and it shows a PDF copy of the file. Today, when you're
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sending me an application, my people have to enter the data.

That means they have to type the name, the social, so on and so on and so on, go through all that information. Then, they have to scan that application to get it in the system. This system creates the PDF automatically. Great time saver, great way to perpetually have the information we need.

So if the guard wants to even view their application, they can. Why is that important? What if the guard, after the fact, says, oh, my God, I had been diagnosed with PTSD when I was in the military and $I$ said no on the mental health thing; do I need to -- and they might have a question about that. I can go back into this application on my side of the equation and $I$ can reopen it to that guard and it comes back to them so they can correct their response. Okay. That's just an example of what they could do.

So in this case, we're going to log out and we're going to go in now as someone in the organization with this company that has the ability to process applications. That could
be, again, QA , that could be a company rep, that could be an office manager. Whatever designation you have, all you need to do for us is say to us in a phone call or email, Fabian, these are the people $I$ want to be able to handle apps and see the guard list. That's basically what you need to do.

Notice what this shows. It shows the person's name here. It also shows that they have one application to be reviewed. So remember the workflow? Guard goes in, creates a profile; guard says, I'm going to work for Mr. Rivers; guard chooses Mr. Rivers; he puts today's date, he answers the questions, he signs, he's done. Now, it's on your desk with your people in your office and you even. You can all see it at the same time. Whoever grabs it first can finish it or they can look at it and back right out of it.

In this case, what we're going to do is look at this and this is where I'm going to show you the first problem we solve. Right here, this person that is the QA for this company has this form to fill out for this person. Okay. He's going to be asked a
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question.
The question is, are you affiliated with this person with your company? That means, are you hiring them. If he answers no, this is the first piece that $I$ want to explain to you in detail and show you what happens. I'm going to say no to this. I'm going to sign it today and I'm going to sign my password to it.

Now, the no could be for a couple of reasons. It could be for the first reason I've discussed, you ran a background check and you don't like what you saw and you've decided not to proceed with hiring this person. It could be because the person chose the wrong company. And when they chose the wrong company, they wanted Allied, not Amazon. You don't know who they are, because when you looked at it, it showed you their name; and you said, I don't know who this is, I'm not doing that.

This is where we've solved problem number one, which is I go to work for Durell, Cindy finds out that my background is not good, sends Durell a notice that you have to term me; you send in a term, you try to get your
uniforms back, you're out the money you paid for the first and second eight hours that you already paid for, I'm on the street. I come to you. I say, I want to work for you, you give me a blue app and temporary card. And a couple of months later, you find out there's a problem.

Then, I go to Mr. Robinson to work a festival or some other event, and this is what does happen all day long. Cindy can tell you that I'm not lying if I've said, in one year, she might send 70 denials on the same guard because the system didn't have a way to address the problem, right, the paper system and the database.

In this case, already an alert has been placed on this guard's account. That means that when they walk into your shop and say, I would like to work for you, the very first thing that you're going to do before you ever even take a step in that direction is hit, look up, and put their name in this lookup. This lookup is public. You don't even have to be logged into the system under your account to do this lookup. Anybody can look this up.

And what happens is, there it is, right here, what's the first thing that I've solved? Mr. Rivers says, hey, what's your name, kid? Catsenburger. Ooh, there's a problem, you're denied.

We didn't deny him. You just said no, but I built this this way on purpose because I want to slow them down. Now, they've got to contact me and I've got to have a conversation with you to figure out what's going on.

Did you deny them because you didn't know who they were or did you deny them because you did what we're about to do and you found something already, and we're going to verify it; right? And it's really easy to resolve, but here's the other thing that I did. And this is the part that $I$ want you to understand.

When I did this denial, which was system generated, so we coded this to do this, when this guard goes back into the system -- let me just give that a second. When they log in, this front end of the system is looking at my end of the system. Let me show you this real quick. There you go. Let's go into his

```
application. I went into mine, not Jay's. That's me, by the way. I just want you to know.
I want to go into Jay's real quick. I'll show you what \(I\) have set up on mine. I've got it set up for another part of the demonstration. Okay. So when this guard goes to \(\log\) into his account, in this case, it says, the user status on this account has been set to lock.
So what have I done now? That means he can't fill out a form to get someone else to react to. So he's trapped right now. Right now, what they do is they just run around. They go from company to company to company to company, and everybody is losing uniforms on them and training time and you're spinning your wheels doing training all over again and you're paying them, and they shouldn't even be working.
And the exposure to you is, they're a felon, they are a sex offender. They're working, and we catch it later and tell you, and you make them go away, but they're on somebody else's clock now. And if they do
```

something egregious, there's going to be a litigious problem on your hands. By locking them out of the account, $I$ force them to call my office and say, Fabian, I can't get into my portal account; I applied with a company and they denied me, but it was the wrong company. Okay. I call Mr. Rivers and say, did you deny their affiliation? Yes. What was the reason? We didn't know who they were. In that case, then it's a really simple thing for me to resolve. I simply go into their account on their profile here, and $I$ just activate them again.

But I'm going to show you a second fail safe that $I$ built into the system. Even if I change this from account inactive to active, which $I$ can do in an instant while I'm on the phone with them, which will allow them to then log into the system, which $I$ will do now for this guy, I want to show you the second thing that we built in to make sure that, if for some reason, the lockout component of that entire complicated process fails and they are in the system or they were in the system when the lockout occurred, when they go to the
applications page, notice what's not there anymore, the blue app that they filled out. There is no app.

So until I delete the denied app and verify the basis for the denial, I lock them out of the system. Even if they're still in it when it happens, when they click applications, they're not going to see a blue application to do in the first place.

And the same thing is about to happen in a few hours to the event temporary. When that happens, the event temp and the blue app will be gone, they will see nothing on this screen until I do this. There's the app.

So no more running from company to company wasting your time, wasting your money, exposing you to litigation like they do right now. That ends with this system. It's a game changer for this industry because we have one of the most poorest, exposed processes because it's outdated. It's from 1985.

We have a bad sequel database finicky old system. It doesn't do things for us. It just receives information. This system does things for us. In fact, this system does a lot of

| 1 | things for us. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | So the time that it took from when we got |
| 3 | the delegation of authority to do this and |
| 4 | signed the contract in December of '16, and we |
| 5 | began development of the system in '17, |
| 6 | January of '17 to be precise, what I've been |
| 7 | doing every single day, virtually, is |
| 8 | designing in these workflows. I've been |
| 9 | building the forms, building the licenses, and |
| 10 | designing the workflows. |
| 11 | So what this means, and again, I said, |
| 12 | you don't need to remember this, but I need |
| 13 | you to understand it because you're going to |
| 14 | call me with ideas that are going to be |
| 15 | amazing and we're going to be able to |
| 16 | implement those ideas, which we could never |
| 17 | have done without calling a developer. I can |
| 18 | do this right from my desk. |
| 19 | So this says, if they apply on the public |
| 20 | site, they do this form. The form is |
| 21 | submitted. You, the company, gets this form |
| 22 | and then you either answer yes or no. And |
| 23 | when you do, those things happen. And that's |
| 24 | all automated. |
| 25 | Here's where we're going, provisional |
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unarmed, once we get the electronic background check that DPS State Police is using from a guy by the name of Mitten, I don't know what his company is, when we get that plugged in, and that guard does that provisional application on his side of the equation, that system will automatically ping the background check system and come back with a yes or no; in effect, a redtail type response. MR. PELLEGRIN: What's the time frame on that?

MR. BLACHE: Immediately. MR. PELLEGRIN: Immediately. MS. FINCHUM:

I have a question about the denial. MR. BLACHE:

Yes?
MS. FINCHUM:
Is there -- and there might be a reason why we don't have it, but is it a possibility to have the option to put reason, especially like on the unknowns? Like, if I don't know it is and if $I$ just type to you, unknown, you
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| 1 | wouldn't have to make that extra call and you |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | can go ahead and get that person back on |
| 3 | track. I mean, I would assume that that would |
| 4 | probably be the largest reason as far as -- |
| 5 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 6 | This is one of the reasons -- |
| 7 | MS. FINCHUM: |
| 8 | -- an accident in the system, you know. |
| 9 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 10 | Yeah. This is one of the reasons why we |
| 11 | have these conversations all the time. I |
| 12 | don't think that that's necessarily a bad idea |
| 13 | at all. |
| 14 | MS. FINCHUM: |
| 15 | I mean I can understand if you're going |
| 16 | to want to talk to -- |
| 17 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 18 | I'm not -- |
| 19 | MS . FINCHUM: |
| 20 | -- whomever makes that decision that's |
| 21 | not an unknown. |
| 22 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 23 | Part of -- sometimes I get locked into |
| 24 | some of my thoughts. |
| 25 | MS. FINCHUM: |
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Sure.
MR. BLACHE:
What I wanted to do in this process and, you know, as things evolve, things change, was I wanted to make it so that the industry knew more of the people on the agency side too, right. So we're trying to design ways to change not only their workflows and improve the speed of it exponentially, but also create equality amongst those desks. And, therefore, you would have opportunities to interact with the agencies.

But two questions came to me this week that were really good ones. The first one was, well, what if the person really isn't provisional, and I know it because I hired him seven months ago and $I$ trained him and certified him, could I indicate on the app that they're really not going to be provisional unarmed and show you what you should be looking for? And we were able to do that.

So in the case of what you're asking me, yeah, theoretically, what $I$ can do is I can go into this form later today and click on this
one right here, and where you are, after you've indicated yes, I can add a question right here and give you a box to write in. MS. FINCHUM: Okay.

MR. BLACHE: I can do that.

MS. FINCHUM: I mean, I'm just --

MR. BLACHE:
No, that's good. That's good.
Okay. So from a process standpoint, I
want to stay on this provisional unarmed for a minute because it's very important before we get to the next step. Everybody that is new that comes in comes in that way. The only way they go from provisional unarm to unarmed is if they meet three criteria, which are what? First eight hours, second eight hours, completed fingerprint background check, right.

So in this case, we denied this guy and now I've taken all that stuff out. So now I'm going to show you how you would actually proceed with this to get to a point of payment, which doesn't take very long to do.
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So in this case, what I'm going to do is create another application for him because I got rid of the denied one to give him back access to the app. There it is already in its initiated status.

You know what else we succeeded in doing by doing this? Remember when I read to you at one of the meetings that the card that you give out says, this is evidence that a registration application has been submitted to the Board? It has been submitted to the Board. In this case, it is. In the other case, it isn't. It's evidence that you gave them a card, but it's not evidence that the application has made it to the Board, which is what the card says which is patently not true.

So in this case, the application is at the Board. Now, what status is it in? Well, it's initiated, it's received in process, whatever. That's what these status codes do for us.

So in this case, the guard is going to, again, do his normal thing, he's going to choose the company he wants to be with, he's going to indicate that he's provisional
unarmed. That's his only option. And we're adding some little language boxes there to say that this is the default, your record will be reviewed in the old system. And if your level is different, we will adjust it accordingly, right. And then they hit today, this is the security applicant, and then they submit it. So as far as the guard's interaction with the system is very limited, very easy, very straight forward, very limited. It's not complicated on their side at all. Typically, when most companies hire people, you're doing some sort of a face-to-face type of hire, I would assume; is that correct?

Okay. So that means you have them in front of you. When we had them fill this form out, you didn't get the answer to those disclosure questions. We did; right. So we can start doing our vetting process. So what we've done in this process, is when we present the company person, whoever that is, and you can have more than one, you can have as many as you want actually that can get in here and do stuff with these, what we did is we added those questions back.

I want to make the obvious question clear. We're not holding you accountable for the answers on that part of the form. We're giving you an opportunity to ask them the questions. You don't even have a write-in if you click yes, because they have to write it in. They're not even sitting with you and you have this form to do if they haven't done their part.

So if they lie, it's on them. That's why they have to sign their user name and password to it, and that is legally binding.

Okay. So here is the review app that you need to do. You'll see 12 there, 15, 20, whatever. They show up in a list. You can open multiple tabs. So let's say you do have a lot of activity, like a lot, you're going to do 15 people a day, you can open up ten tabs on the top, go to the first screen, hit start, go to the next screen, hit start on the next one and go right down the line, come right back to the first one and continue on, and you can just roll like that.

Know why I know? Because $I$ was the only person doing it for 20,000 people for two
years. I had to do it myself, and that's how I did it. And it worked. I mean, it just rolled right along. Okay. So that's the other beauty of this is it's not unlimited to screens or users. It's that large and robust that it can handle that kind of activity.

So in this case, we're going to be presented with a question again. Okay. The question is, are you affiliated? Now, we're going to say yes. Notice what just happened. All these tabs just appeared and the application opened up. What I deliberately did in the coding is $I$ hid all that from you because I don't want to bombard you with information that's not relevant until you've answered the question.

Now that you've said, yes, you're going to hire this person, now we go through the rest of the application. So here's the thing I just talked about that relates to the fix that you just suggested. Is this level correct? Yes, you move on. No, and this would be because you have some reason to believe, you have the option now in this application to tell me what you know they may
have. And we can then cross verify it and grant it accordingly on the back end.

We're going to do that anyway. It doesn't matter. But the fact that we give the QA, the office person the opportunity to say so and help the process along, not a bad idea. So we plugged it in.

And this one, I'm just going to go ahead and say it is correct, because I want to show you the provisional credential and then show you how they move from there to the next one. So all these other things are locked because there are things that relate to identity theft. They can change certain things. We can only change certain things with their approval. And there's certain things that's in the system in updating and we'll update their profile and certain things you can't.

Let me briefly explain what $I$ mean by that also. See this address piece right here, that you can write it. The reason why is because I have it set up so that if Mr. Rivers is on boarding somebody and they say, that's not my address, that was my address when $I$ set up my profile four months ago, but my address
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now is something different, they can enter it there and it updates the profile. This way, we're not sending stuff to them at the wrong address like we do all the time now because people change addresses frequently, phone numbers, things like that. It's also for the phone number. It allows for the email address and those things.

There's a military question, yes or no. That's a conditional question. If it's no, it's no. If it's yes, then it pops up, what's the discharge type, honorable/dishonorable. And it gives you an opportunity to upload their DD214. Everything with the exception of cover sheets and two sets of fingerprint cards will get uploaded into this system. The fingerprint cards still have to come here because they have to go through Kim, and she has to run them through State Police in the manner that we have the contract to do so.

So in this case, I'm just going to go ahead and indicate that this person didn't serve, because he didn't, and we're going to save and continue. This is going to take us to the next step. Meanwhile, back at the
ponderosa, right, we've got this application sitting in here and we're just looking at the status; right. We're looking at this payment thing, background, fingerprints, et cetera. Okay.

So you're now at the part where it says, if the registrant has not uploaded a photo. In many instances, once folks get in here, they're going to notice that they can do this. We're uploading some photos as we set up accounts as we're able. I've got mine up on my phone here, the photo of me.

You can have them sitting right there and say, hey, just log into your photo account and let's take a look at your picture while you're in the app. And if you're satisfied with it, okay, great. If not, you can tell them to touch the picture, take another one and upload a new picture.

So I don't have to worry about receiving thousands of tiny pictures. We have gotten pictures printed on Post-it Notes, okay, and we put them in the feeder and they gum up the feeder and stuff, because you don't even realize in the moment what it is. We get them
on thin, thin paper, thick paper, actual passport photos. You get my point. This solves the whole issue with pictures.

It's also a big deal for people who are transgender because we have encountered a lot of that recently where he is she and she is now he and the long blond hair is gone and it's a short, you know, twisted blue. And there's contacts that make their eyes ice blue and, you know, you name it. And people who change their appearance a lot want to actually have a card that represents the way they presently look. We get that call all the time too. So this solves that problem.

In this case, you've looked at their phone, you've said, yeah, that picture is great, and you just skip that. You can just buzz right past that. You don't even have to bother with it.

The next step it takes you to some conditional question about fingerprints. Where's my little thing? I lost it somewhere. Conditional questions about fingerprints. The reason why we put the conditional questions in is because, as Mr. McRight alluded to before
and as you well know because it's impacted your bottom line, you're not paying $\$ 48$ a set of prints on everybody anymore. You're not paying that extra $\$ 38$ on those re-apps that have been printed after May of 2011. We're not gumming up the system with more prints. We're getting updates on them anyway. Everything is good.

Okay. So in this case, you answer the question, has the registrant ever been fingerprinted for the State Board? A lot of times you're asking them that, you may see them in the system already as unarmed guard.

Here's the hint, if you do a check and it says, Durell, unarmed; Mark Williams, armed 0.40 caliber; Mr. Robinson, armed, 9 millimeter, they've been printed, because we're not issuing credentials out of this system if training isn't done, certification isn't valid, and fingerprints haven't been cleared; right. So if they've got a registration level other than provisional unarmed, they've been printed.

Okay. So in this case, we're going to say, I'll game it out, we'll say, yes, they've
been printed in the past and, yes, it was after May of 2011. That means that app is going to come out as $\$ 50$ on the back end for the payment side. It's going to calculate it automatically for you. So we don't have to worry about, you know, adding all that stuff up.

Now, it asks you the questions I talked about. You notice it says, has registrant, because I am not holding you accountable for the answers you're going to ask them and you're going to record what they tell you. Real simple.

So you put the nos in because 77 percent of all applicants lied on their form; right, and that's a -- you know that. That's a fact. We've tested this now three, four times. It's just true. So it's going to advance you to the last steps of the process.

This is the upload component. Remember, I said the only thing you're going to send us are cover sheets and two sets of fingerprint cards. That's it. Everything else, I9, social, DD214s, green cards, state IDs, driver's license, whatever you have copies of,
it goes in here, okay. So you have to upload something. It makes you do that.

So we're just going to grab up something and we'll stick it in there, and we'll save it, and we'll save what it is, supporting doc, and we'll pick a document type and we'll save it. All right. At this point now, you sign the application. You're basically done with the entire blue application process on this officer with the exception of payment.

So you can do 20 of these in the amount of time that it took me to show you this and then go to your roster and bulk pay for these licenses; right. Okay. It's going to ask you hire date. If it's today, you click today. That means you're doing this application 34 days or less from this point in time.

Why is this here? This is here because if it's late, let's say the hire date is $1 / 29$, and you're signing it and doing this today -this is going to ask payment by credit card, yes or no. The reason that question is there is because if you're paying by credit card, when you check out and go to the payment it's going to add the 3 percent convenience fee.

If you say, no, you're going to ACH, it's going to be feeless. It charges -- the fee is $\$ 0.40$ per transaction, not per check.

So if you do 40 guards on one ACH, it's only $\$ 0.40$ to the Board. It's a wash each direction. It's actually, American Express, I think, is 7 percent and Visa/Mastercard are like one point something percent or two point something percent. I can't remember. The math magicians at the banks know it, so they came up with the 3 percent.

So, basically, we've got everything where we need it to be, right. So you're going to say, yes. Well, the issue here is that you are doing this application on the security officer who has been working for you since January. This is a late app, right. So you sign it and now it's done on my side.

Once this screen finishes, this is now going to -- let me get in here -- this is now going to update. So it should be, received, pending affiliation. When this is finished, and I'm going to look for it to resolve here first. It's all in realtime. So everything -- and this is production data.

So what I'm showing you is this system running on Wifi in this room doing exactly what you're going to do, okay. Only difference is that my Wifi signal looks like it's really low over there. If you're using a standard office connection or CAT5 or whatever, you'll be in good shape.

On this side of the equation, I'm going to show you we also have a transaction screen. So one of things that we can do from the accounting side of our responsibility is now we have a system that actually tracks every transaction, tells us if they fail, if they complete. We can run reports on this. It doesn't mean that Ms. Sharon has to then sit down with checks and money orders and do all this entering and stuff that she has to do to post, right.

So let's see if we can get this to resolve. There it is. This is done. All right. So on this side, on my side, this screen should now indicate -- okay. So now it says received, pending payment. So what would you do to pay for this? This is the next part you're going to be interested in seeing.

Your view, all of you and those of you that do this stuff is going to look exactly like the view you see right here. When you click on this -- and this is -- we've got a ticket in to change that to the word company because you're going to see on the next screen and going through the templates and changing them, right. When you get into the services section, what you're going to be doing is you're going to be looking at what in effect is our company list, the company rosters, right.

So here's companies. This person actually has two relationships. They have a relationship with Crescent, but they are just a security officer. They have a relationship, this would never happen, but I wanted to show you the difference, they can't do anything with that. That's just text. They have a relationship with Amazon and they have the role of security officer and qualifying agent, and so they can see that roster. They can manipulate that information for them, right.

So here's the company, here's the personnel section. And once this finishes
doing what it's doing, and I'll kind of show you what that looks like on our side too just for fun. We'll look at it from both perspectives. All right. There you go.

So here is something you cannot do today that you will be able to do going forward. You will never have to call and ask me for a list everyday because your list will be right there on your screen. Not only is your list there, but your training reports on your people are there as their training starts moving forward through the system.

Documents that have been uploaded are there. So instead of you keeping all that stuff, if they're with you, you've got it. If they come back to you, you still have it, because we're going to keep every document uploaded perpetually forever in that spot. So if they have 37 documents over ten years, they'll be there.

MR. PELLEGRIN:
So will the companies no longer have to keep any files at the office? MR. BLACHE: You wouldn't have to. You can rely

| 1 | solely on this system. Now remember, this is |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | a cloud-based system that is maintained on |
| 3 | dozens of servers with a 99.9 percent up time. |
| 4 | Have I ever seen it go down? Yeah. Never for |
| 5 | longer than 60 to 90 minutes ever. |
| 6 | So once you've got all this going, I mean |
| 7 | you've got access to everything you need to |
| 8 | know at your fingertips, including the ability |
| 9 | to sort by name, by position, by security |
| 10 | officer number, or even by level. So if |
| 11 | you've got 60 percent of your workforce is |
| 12 | unarmed and 40 percent is armed, when you sort |
| 13 | by level, it's going to give you all your |
| 14 | unarmed in row a row; then, it's going to |
| 15 | start showing you your armed and it's going to |
| 16 | group them; 9s, $0.357 \mathrm{~s}, 0.40 \mathrm{~s}$, whatever. |
| 17 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 18 | Well, then that would eliminate the need |
| 19 | for audits, the in-house audits that you all |
| 20 | do? |
| 21 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 22 | No. |
| 23 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 24 | All of the information will be on your |
| 25 | side. |

MR. BLACHE:
No, we're not.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
Audits are designed to do what we're encountering right now. Here's what's happening in some of the conversations with the companies, not small companies, but the bigger companies will send us a copy of our guard list and we will get those people to create their accounts. Oh, no, no, no. I want who you pay. Who are you working? That's who needs to create profiles and needs to be added to your account, because your guard list might be 12, 20 people short in two days.

So, no, audits will always be a thing because we're looking as to juxtapose whose working versus whose registered. Does that make sense?

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
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CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
But you can also do it electronically.
MR. BLACHE:
Oh, yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
There will be more opportunities for us
to do what we would call test desk audits.
And we'll just say, hey, look, send me a
random sampling of people that you've hired in
the last whatever to whatever. And they will
look and see if there's people missing.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, we've been doing that for 12
years --
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- to send you electronic audits so that you have the information and payroll. MR. BLACHE:
Absolutely.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Right.
```

MR. BLACHE:
Absolutely. Here's the other thing that
you now have at your fingertips, you can expand this information and there's your person's email address and phone numbers. So you've also got that information at the ready in addition to, as I said, whatever documents have been uploaded for that person. And you can click on those documents and see those documents at any time. This is transformative, you know, in the way you're handling your day-to-day operations in your office. Okay.

The other thing, remember when I said that provisional unarmed people don't have a training requirement and what we're looking for is a preliminary background check and payment, right? So in this case, we're going to choose everybody on the list. This is how you would actually execute a payment.

So let's imagine you've spent half the morning putting on a lot of people or several people, and you're back from lunch, and you want to go ahead and just pay for those and get those to the point where we can issue the
card. You would pick all the people you know have a balance due on and you would execute the next task. The interesting thing is if you pick people on that list that don't have a balance due by mistake, it's not going to charge you for them because there's no balance due.

Now in this case, I should have, I believe, only one person that there's money owed on. And I'm going to say, pay for selected users. And you're going to notice up here that this is going to change a little bit and it's going to take you to another screen. And on that screen, it shows you what you owe. And there's the amount. It's $\$ 550$ plus the 3 percent because you chose to use a credit card.

Presently, there's an ability in the system, and this is why we're not at April 1st yet, right, to short pay this, right. That's being taken out. If there's anything that needs to be done like that, that would be something that you deal directly with the Board with and we would address it. So this option for you to just change that will not be present, okay.

If this is ACH, that's \$550. Okay. So when you say no on the question about the credit card, when this screen pops up, it will be feeless. Okay. Then you say, continue. Now you're going to see the handshake with the bank and the first data pay using Gateway.

And this is the screen where you would then enter that you're going to use a card and it gives you access to every card type, and you put it in and you pay for it. You'll get a receipt. You're going to get a transaction number and you'll get an invoice number that we can track back to anything. Okay.

I think at this point $I$ probably don't need to adjust that fee and actually pay it in realtime for you to see that. I think you know that it works, right. But if there was a problem, let's assume that somebody in the office messed up and they did put $1 / 29$, and it really wasn't, they just had the wrong thing; and you call me and say, Fabian, that's not correct. What $I$ would do in that case is I would come into this, I'm just going to show you and I'm going to point. See where it
says, $\$ 566.60$ ? Notice what $I$ did here too for you.

When you call me with a question about a charge, I will be able to answer your question very accurately because $I$ can tell you exactly what shows on the screen. I've got the 44 days or more, the criminal tracking fee, the application admin fee, and the app fee. So I can see that all broken down. If I add the charge -- what was it, Misty? Was it five what?

MS. FINCHUM:
It was \$566.50.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay, $\$ 566.50$. So just for fun, if $I$ come in here and put in minus $\$ 566.60$ and save that, and then go back to this application and we refresh the screen -- and, again, this is realtime. This is happening between us and Minneapolis right now, it's adjusted to a dollar, which means that $I$ can then tell you on your side of the equation -- see if I can get back to where you were. Well, I'll do it right here. Let's go back one step to this screen. There it is.

So from a legislative auditor's standpoint, taking negotiable instruments of money orders and checks out of the pipeline is a huge, huge, huge deal and making sure that money is flowing directly from you, the end user, to the bank directly, which is exactly what happens with this. The moment this transaction completes, I can walk into Whitney Bank and see that transaction and see that money in that account. Okay.

Now remember we talked a while back about the fact that the State has a no refund policy; that application and fingerprint fees are not refundable? Okay. That's within reason, right, if there's a mistake. If there is a mistake and something just happens, one of the other things that we have available to us in this system is the ability to go to view payments and we can go to, let's get in here and do this, pay now.

MS. FINCHUM:
I have another question.
MR. BLACHE:
Sure.
MS. FINCHUM:

When you made that payment adjustment, can you also add a note box to that too as well as to why that adjustment is made so that you -MR. BLACHE:

I can --
MS. FINCHUM:
-- (inaudible) later on?
MR. BLACHE:
Sure. That line that $I$ typed in where I put in $A D J$, that's actually my note box. MS. FINCHUM:

Where you can type a note in?
MR. BLACHE:
Right. And this way, when there's a question about it, I've got documentation. MS. FINCHUM:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
The other thing too to dovetail into this, whoever is in the system, if it's Cindy, Stephanie, Renee, Kim, it doesn't matter, whoever is doing something on our side, it's time and date stamp and recording it by that individual's involvement in the system. Very
important. Down to the point that when I show you this application real quick -- let's go back to the app for one second and let me show you something interesting about this application.

Remember I talked about how the forms come in here, you know, we stamp them in and then we break it up and all this stuff happens? All right. In this workflow, there's everything that has happened on this application down to who did it, whether it was the system, the QA, the guard, and the time and date. Everything about it, I know just by looking at the screen. Okay.

So in this case, what we're looking for is two form conditions to be met for this application to be ready to issue. We're looking for two things, our background and payment. So for purposes of showing you guys that, I'm just going to mark the background complete, assuming that we've run our clear report and we're satisfied that this provisional can move forward. And, again, just because $I$ want to get this done, I'm going to mark payment complete as well, even
though there's a pending balance of a dollar on the application, right.

So once this is saved, if you look at my cue now, and this is one of the workflow things $I$ want you folks to know is that I'll have staff members watching applications ready to issue. Let me get back in here real quick and refresh these screens. Let me just get in here. I wish my internet was a little bit faster right now, but it's not.

Okay. So once these form conditions are met, then we'll go ahead and issue this application. So what I'll do in this case is I'll click on this and I'll move down here and I'll say, issue. What that's going to do is on the guard's side of the equation, it's going to populate all that information, the photo, the level, the issue date, and the expiration date.

So once this is done, and it's going to take a moment to do that, because the system is doing what, making a PDF file, regarding who did it, the date, the time, all those different little things. Once it resolves all those processes, on the guard's side of the
equation, he will now be able to generate a provisional unarmed card. So you don't have to wait for us. You know, the current workflow is you issue it.

This workflow is we don't give them anything until we've at least checked to see that they're not a registered sex offender or have some egregious felony or something along those lines. And so what I'll do in this case is I'm going to log out of this account and I'm going to make this a little smaller real quick. I'm going to log out of here and then go back in as the security officer who applied. Let me get in there real quick and show you what is going on on that side.

So if you've got all his documents set to go and you've got everything ready to upload and you've got your payment cued up and ready to go, he does his little three-minute deal, you do your little five/ten-minute deal and you've processed it, there he is. He's ready to go with refresh. Bingo, provisional unarmed, right. Real simple.

The next thing that I've done that's in test and will be implemented is the moment
this person is trained, first and second, and the moment this person's fingerprints are cleared, the system will take this provisional off. So you'll know that that has been recorded properly on our side.

What's also nice about it is that on your side of the equation, if you're the one that does the training, because it's in-house, and you think that this person is ready to rock and roll with a movement from a provisional status to an unarmed -- full unarmed status, there is a way to execute what you're commonly referred to as a change of registration type or change of status. You can do that in the system as well. And that's done from your guard list screen.

You simply go to that same screen on your screen. You're in your portal account, you click company, you click your company, you go to personnel, you see your personnel, you type the person's name, they pop up, you put a checkmark next to their name, and we go back do that same little drop down where we paid for it, and we do the next one. And then it brings us to a form. It's the change of
registration type. We say, unarmed, submit.
And then on our side, we see it. The system checks for the training, checks for the fingerprints to come back. If the training is done and the fingerprints are not back, the ask to change it will fail. And it will go into a cue where we can monitor the fingerprints. And when they come in, we can make the change, which brings me to the next step of the process. And that is this, once the person is unarmed, which means that their fingerprints are back, right. It's a process, right. The fingerprints are back and you want to change their status to armed, when you do that form, the form looks for the training, it looks for the fingerprints, and then it looks for the firearm certification.

Let's say you get this situation, which will happen very soon, you're going to contact me and say, Fabian, this guy's card says provisional unarmed and we know for a fact that he is certified with a 0.40 caliber, we're going to open up guard tracking and go look. And when we look, we're going to see,
yep, that's right, he does everything, he was cleared by Cindy several months ago, we're going to go ahead and adjust his registration type to match what his actual current level is, because that could happen.

All it takes for me to do that is what you're about to see me do right now, which is to go into his registration type, edit it, and take this off and give him this, and save it. Once this is done and that record is saved, that guard can log into their account and that same guard that just a moment ago for them said provisional unarmed will now indicate that it is armed with 0.40 caliber in that moment that you're on the phone with me and we're resolving whatever that issue is. So there it is.

MR. PELLEGRIN:
So quick question, the background company that does the instantaneous thing, until they have the training and the fingerprints are put in, they will be unarmed? MR. BLACHE :

No, not the background part. MR. PELLEGRIN:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
The statutory requirement is the fingerprint. MR. PELLEGRIN:

Fingerprint.
MR. BLACHE:
Right. We're doing the background part to make sure we're not putting temp cards into felons and sex offenders hands, right. That's what we're doing that for. That's our way of stepping forward and saying, we're not just giving everybody a green card, right.

The only requirement to be an unarmed guard is first and second eight and a cleared fingerprint background and unarmed to armed, first and second eight and a cleared fingerprint background and a firearm certification. MR. PELLEGRIN:

Right.
MR. BLACHE:
Right.
MR. PELLEGRIN:
So we have to wait for that -- everybody
is going to have to wait for that background check to complete for an armed guard? MR. BLACHE:

Yes, because that's how it's been written into statute ever since. Yes, that's correct. That is right. MR. PELLEGRIN:

Okay. So how does the company know that that background check has been cleared? He's got to keep checking the system every day or is there an alert that's sent out? Is there an email saying this person has backed the background?

## MR. BLACHE:

Yes. When we mark the fingerprint background check cleared, you get a merge template that says, this person's background check was cleared.

MR. RIVERS:
So how long do you think we're looking at? Because $I$ know we run into situations where we hire guards, we train them, we get them certified armed because we need them. MR. BLACHE:

Right.

```
MR. RIVERS:
So how long are we -- what's the time period that you're thinking before actually hiring a guard and being able to put him on a post as an armed guard?
MR. BLACHE:
Because we're going to go from one person looking at backgrounds and rap sheets, because we have to look at physical rap sheets, our system that we own and have right now is we scan cards, get back rap sheets that we have to print. And then, we have to sort through them and look for the ones that say felon, and then read them, right. We have one person that does that. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
But they could do a word search on it. MR. BLACHE:
Cannot.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
No?
MR. BLACHE:
Because when I started sending them from the system to the person directly on an internal server so they could word search
```

them, and she started doing that, we were told by State Police we can't do that. Because for some reason, and some of you who know what I'm about to say are going to laugh, for some reason, sending the system's response through an internal server that doesn't leave the building to another desk wasn't secure enough. And they send them to us on Lotus notes. See, I knew you were going to laugh.

It's absurd. But what we have to do is we have to print them. So let me -- I'm still answering your question. Because we won't just have one person doing this, because everyone will be looking at these cues, working at these cues issuing credentials, we can spread that workload over across the entire agency theoretically and significantly increase the amount of time it takes for us to ferret out the felon ones and address those first, because that's the big key. The big key is to look for the ones that say felon and look for the ones that have any aggravated charges on the list.

So I don't have that answer for you just yet, but $I$ have an idea that we will be way,
way faster on the final disposition side of it than we are today. On the entry side of the equation, Kim can basically put in whatever she receives that day that day.

State Police, that's a different issue on what comes back. Sometimes we get nothing that day. The next day, we might get three days' work. And that's where the problem begins, because then we have to print them, which takes time, and staple them together and then sort through them.

They don't come out in alphabetical order. They don't come out felony priority first. That's the issue. I promise you this, because as you can see as I'm explaining the process to you, you can tell that I'm intimately familiar with how it works, right, I'm going to do the best that we can to make this as fast as we possibly can. I don't know what that is yet. But if we're going to do this according to the laws and the rules, which was the mandate that $I$ was given, then $I$ can't issue a credential that doesn't meet those requirements.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

But it's unfortunate that we're unable to, as an agency that provides this service, that we're -- we aren't able to be a part of the DPS system so that we can put the information in and get the response quicker. MR. BLACHE:

So when I mentioned -- and I'll get back to you because I'm coming back to you again. Remember when you asked me about the company that does the background check? MR. PELLEGRIN:
Uh-huh.

MR. BLACHE:
According to the vendor -- and we've had two meetings so far, $I$ just want proof -- it is a CJIS Triple I background check. If that's true -- this is what my intention is, but you guys would have to decide on this. If that is true, which in effect does mean it's like a redtail response --

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
-- I wouldn't have an issue with using
that to trigger that as a complete but still
execute the process as the doublecheck on that result.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Checks and balances.
MR. BLACHE:
Right. Because he's got a contract as a sole source vendor with DPS, DOC, and State Police to do background checks. And he's using name, date of birth, and social and giving them a CJIS Triple $I$ compliant background check. Well, as far as I'm concerned, at that point, me, this is just me talking, I don't need your fingerprints, but my statute right now says that I have to do it that way.

So if we can get that service plugged in, I would have no problem with telling my developer, help me make it more background and fingerprints okay provisionally on the fingerprints, cleared on the background, which would allow the issuance of the armed piece and then reside -- rely on the fact that we're going to more quickly go through these rap sheets and identify problems.

Cindy is sitting right here, she's been
here a long time, she can stand up right now -- I'm not going to make you do that -but she can stand up right now and tell you that there are just, $I$ mean, numerous people that she comes across every single day that have been working for months in the industry that are absolute, unequivocal, disqualified felons. So we're trying to help you keep your compliance up to date. Because the bigger issue for me is the fact that if something happens, your insurance policies are not going to cover any of that. You're going to be deeply exposed.

So the question becomes, what takes priority? Briskness to getting a person with a weapon on post? Look at what happened in Terrebonne Parish, and this is my linchpin example. Terrebonne Parish Courthouse has an armed security officer, this is December 17th, walked through the corridors, and two deputies see it and they identify him as a felon who was in the trustee program. And they arrest him on site for possession of a firearm.

That's bad enough. But what's really bad is that it made it into the newspaper, and the

```
chief lambasted the company for it and said that they were dumping them and it was an egregious failure and this would never happen again. I don't even think that person was registered with us yet. They had a temp card. They trained him, put a gun in their hand after certifying him with a weapon, and they should have never touched a weapon.
So from my perspective, I'm trying to mitigate that exposure. And I -- I'm committed to doing it as quickly as we can. MS . LANDRY:
How far back do the backgrounds go? MR. BLACHE:
With Mitten's company?
MS . LANDRY:
Yes.
MR. BLACHE:
If it's a CJIS Triple I background check, it gives us exactly what comes out on the rap sheets.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
I have -- I have very little doubt about
```

```
that. In fact, I believe he said that he also checks denied firearms requests and no flag lists too and terrorist watches. I believe he checks all of that.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
And CJIS is more in depth than the one that the State goes through right now? MR. BLACHE:
Right. So if I get --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Because it even goes through the military.
MR. BLACHE:
If I get that, I think I've solved my biggest headache for you guys.
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Would there be an additional cost for that?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Of course.
MR. BLACHE:
I'm certain there's going to be a cost.
What \(I\) don't know is if it's as minuscule as Redtail's was.
MR. PELLEGRIN:
```

Uh-huh.
MR. BLACHE:
Redtail was talking somewhere in the neighborhood of $\$ 0.50$ per run, which is really not a lot of money.

MR. PELLEGRIN:
No.
MR. BLACHE:
I don't know what Mitten's cost is. I don't even know if we can successfully just dovetail right onto the contract, because we are a part of DPS. We -- it could be negligible or nothing. I don't know yet. That's what we're trying to sort out right now.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
But that's where we're going with this. So the plan -- oh, back to what I was talking about. The way the system looks to move someone from provisional to unarmed to armed is by looking for validations in the system. The last piece that $I$ want to share with you is this. When we arm someone in this system,
we're going to have this widget here that tracks the certification. This is another functionality that we've built in.

If the guard's firearms registration expires, the system is going to open up this widget and unarm that guard and send you and the guard an email telling you they were unarmed, because this expired. Right now, we find people that are unarmed by the by as we come across them, and then we have to start running around to notify you because our existing system doesn't help track that organically like this does.

This is going to have a scheduled task that runs every night at 12:01 a.m. looking for expired firearms certifications on guards with a current active registration. If it finds a current active registration, it's going to mark this expired and mark that unarmed. It's not going to stop them from working. It's just going to say that they can't work with a weapon. When they get trained again, we can come back in, verify their training, reinstitutes this certification and change that back to an armed
status.
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Will this system notify the officer and the company that they are expired ten days or -MR. BLACHE:

The system is going to do batch reports for you on that, and then we will get those to you. Company licenses and instructor licenses, you'll get an automated 60-day in advance notification on those. On the guards, it's going to do it in a list form, and then we'll send you the list. MS. LANDRY:

Now, Fabian, another question, with the -- when the payment is done, the application is accepted, the background comes back, the officer has so much time or the company has so much time to get the officer their training. If the training is not put in here in the appropriate amount of time, does that keep the officer from working or ... MR. BLACHE:

So that's one we're working on. MS . LANDRY:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
And we've got some of it built already. What it's going to do is it's going to look at the hire date, which will work off the hire date from the application.

MS. LANDRY:
Right.
MR. BLACHE:
This is where it gets into the weeds, but it looks at the hire date on the application, and it starts looking for eight hours in the first 30 days, eight hours in the second 30 days and so forth.

MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
It will do that.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
It is literally that flexible.
Everything that you're thinking of and that $I$ thought of, it was, yeah, I can do that, give me a minute or two, let me show you where you
have to go to to do it, test it. Okay, no, that's not turned on for you. Let's turn on that module.

But most of what you're asking me, now that we've built the foundation -- see, this was a Ferrari in a box literally. It was in pieces. And then it gave it to me and so we had to start putting it together. Now that we've got it built to the way our industry works, the things that you're talking about are things that $I$ can definitely tell you, yes, it can do that.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: So he can tweak it as we go.

MR. BLACHE:
I can tweak it as I go. No question. And, remember, we're still going to be living in the old system, which is where most of the records are right now, for a while. And we're going to cross one. We deliberately decided not to bring legacy data over into this system because $I$ just have no faith in that data.

I don't like the data. It didn't line up very well with what we were doing. And we thought the smart thing to do was, no, let's
not do a spreadsheet of all the companies and dump them in. We added every company in, these ladies did, step by step, one by one over the period of a week.

Some other things that it does that we couldn't do before that you guys are going to absolutely like, a lot of companies have branches, so we do branch licenses. A lot of companies don't have branches because it's optional, but they have multiple locations. We can put locations in the system and primary contacts for the locations.

So instead of just pulling up a guard record in guard tracking that says, Rivers 10A, 10B, 10C, or whatever it is, I can actually go Shreveport, Bossier, Sulfur, Houma, and see who the contact is, their phone number, email address. Why? Because in this system, I have to have your phone number and your email address for you to even get in the system.

In my existing system, all $I$ had was the company name, the company number, the issue date, the phone number, qualifying agent's name and email address. And often times,

| 1 | those don't even match; right? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 3 | Uh-huh. |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | So minority owned, minority gender |
| 6 | minority owned, minority ethnic owned, |
| 7 | minority veteran owned, I can capture all that |
| 8 | data now. I can enter that information as I |
| 9 | get it. |
| 10 | Who owns what percentage of the company? |
| 11 | And then when it changes, they say, hey, look, |
| 12 | so and so is out, we've got a new guy in and |
| 13 | we shift -- the percentages are different now. |
| 14 | It's 50 percent for one person and 5 percent |
| 15 | for these other ten. I can do that now, which |
| 16 | means I can generate data off of that and |
| 17 | reports and things that we should be able to |
| 18 | do that we've never been able to do. |
| 19 | Same thing just real quick on the same |
| 20 | screen, instructors captured the same way, the |
| 21 | same way. One of the things in our new system |
| 22 | that we don't have today is that when we put |
| 23 | an instructor in, the only thing we capture is |
| 24 | the issue date of the license and the |
| 25 | expiration date of the insurance policy. We |

have nowhere in guard tracking, and I can pull it up and show you, to find out if their firearm certification is expired.

So what happens? Instructors' firearm certifications expire and they teach classes. That training is no good. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

They're suspended and they teach the classes. MR. BLACHE:

Even that. Now in this system, what's beautiful is, you saw the way I locked the guard out before? CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Uh-huh.

MR. BLACHE:
If an instructor's firearm certification expires or if an instructor's expiration date hits, the system is going to shut them down, take their instructor status away from them. When they log into the system, they won't be able to add a class. So, immediately, their ability to -- they might teach the class, but they will not be able to record to the Board that they taught ten people. They're dead in

1

```
the water until they solve the problem.
And then when they say, well, I taught a class yesterday; sorry, you're going to have to teach it again, you figure that out on your side, but you're not going to record training in this system with an expired license on an expired firearm certification. It happens all the time right now.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yes, it does.
MR. BLACHE:
So I don't want to belabor the point. I still have a couple of more days before we actually go live. And, of course, I'm expecting all kinds of flurry of activity and stuff.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Busy day.
MR. BLACHE:
That's why we kind of started early. I'm used to it. Like I said, this is my third time implementing a system, second time implementing this system; two different agencies but the same basic concept. I'm excited about it. This is like a game changer
```

for our state. This is going to bring us where we need to be. This is going to show people how it's done.

I was just in Florida at NASCO talking about this very thing eLicensure, investigations, training, certifications, the whole nine yards. It's a big topic right now. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

So Easter, we'll be able to go in and put in stuff; right? MR. BLACHE:

You'll be able to put in stuff, yep. Your companies are in. If you've given us your information about who you want to have access and we've turned your people on, you can start playing around in there right off the top. I'm going to be in New Orleans, for example, Monday hitting a bunch of companies, probably yours, maybe yours, definitely Mr. Ed's, and some others, and I'm going to sit down for about an hour, hour and a half at each place and deal and show people exactly how to do it. I have sat a couple of instructors in my office and showed them how to put a class in the system and literally
made them do it right after me, and they had no problem. It's very linear. It says, manage courses, add a course, course topic, first eight hours; topic hours, eight; save; date of course, save; add the people to the course; type the name; add, add, add, that's it.

At the end, they put in a date, pass, save. That's it. They're done. They don't have to mail me a piece of paper.

I don't need to know the scores. You have the scores. If I need to know, I'll ask you. What I need to know to issue credentials is, did they pass or did they fail? So I'm trying to keep it simple, keep it brisk, keep it clean. And this way, the system can do what it does best. And then we can be the compliance inspectors we're supposed to be and get out and about and interact the way we were designed to.

MR. PELLEGRIN:
Monday, the instructors will start using
this system as well?
MR. BLACHE:
Oh, yeah. Yeah. And I told every

| 1 | instructor that I've talked to that I'm going |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to be pushing out an email, a mass email to |
| 3 | instructors, call me. I will personally deal |
| 4 | with every instructor and I will show them |
| 5 | exactly what to do. After the first, second |
| 6 | time they do it, they will never have a |
| 7 | problem entering a course. |
| 8 | You can literally submit about 50 |
| 9 | training reports on a classroom class and it |
| 10 | probably would take about 15 minutes to set |
| 11 | the class up from start and submit every |
| 12 | single training form in about 15 minutes. And |
| 13 | then you don't have to worry about it. It's |
| 14 | done. |
| 15 | MR. SANDERS: |
| 16 | All of it is going to be uploaded into |
| 17 | the system as -- |
| 18 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 19 | It uploads immediately. It uploads that |
| 20 | training record immediately. In fact, let me |
| 21 | show you what a training record looks like |
| 22 | real quick. If I go to -- okay. I mentioned |
| 23 | this before and I'm going to repeat it again. |
| 24 | I said that training is tied to the license |
| 25 | level, right. |

So when I go to this training screen to look at Jay's training, the first thing $I$ want to see is what am I looking at. So it's going to -- this is my side again, not your side. Your training view is very, very different from mine.

This says training levels associated with license level armed 0.40 caliber. You don't see any training there; do you? Right, at the bottom? You see nothing. You know why? Because he's not licensed on a 0.40 caliber. He wasn't trained on a 0.40 caliber.

If he does training in the system, however, that relates to a level, let's pick this level and say, go. And let's let this find that and take this date range out because I'm limiting my view right now, let's see what we've got. There it is.

What is required to have a 9 millimeter? First eight hours, second eight hours, and 9-millimeter certification. The system knows it. It's tied to the license level. That's how it validates the training.

Ultimately, as I continue building this out, right -- we're at the point where we can
start using the system to give you guys what you need to do your business faster and better. But as I continue to tweak this system, I will get to a point where every single issuance of a credential will be rule based, schedule task based, and generated by the system, and all $I$ have to do is watch it and audit it.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Sounds good.
MR. BLACHE:
All right?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any questions?
MR. BLACHE:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you, Mr. Blache.
MR. BLACHE:
You're welcome.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Anybody have any questions? This is exciting. I'm looking forward to it.

MR. BLACHE:
I'm, as you can tell, very excited about
it.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Good. Okay. Let's move along. Do we have any old business? Any committee reports? MS . LANDRY:

I'll let you know where $I$ am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Sure.
MS . LANDRY:
I haven't spoken or set up a meeting with the other two people on my Committee, but I have gone through the rules and the statutes on suggestions that you have given me and highlighted different areas. So I think where we need to go now is to set up a meeting date for us to get together to go over what changes we want to look at and other suggestions. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. So your Committee has some recommendations and -MS . LANDRY:

We have no recommendations yet because we haven't even gotten together to discuss them. But the only thing I suggested is that each of us go through, highlight the areas that you

| 1 | see that we may want to discuss changes, but |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | we have not gotten together to discuss |
| 3 | anything yet. |
| 4 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 5 | Well, you'll keep us briefed on your |
| 6 | Committee meeting and when you guys meet. And |
| 7 | if any Board members have any suggestions for |
| 8 | your Committee, they'll submit them to you |
| 9 | after reviewing the policies and procedures of |
| 10 | the Board. |
| 11 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 12 | Okay. |
| 13 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 14 | Will that work for everyone? |
| 15 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 16 | That will work. And if there are more |
| 17 | than just the three of us, I'll have to get in |
| 18 | touch with Fabian to put a notice out -- |
| 19 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 20 | Okay. |
| 21 | MS. LANDRY: |
| 22 | -- and we'll set the meeting here. |
| 23 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 24 | Sounds good. |
| 25 | MS . LANDRY: |

```
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
So any questions?
So if anyone has any suggestions about any changes to the rules and regulations of the Board, they'll submit them to?
MS. LANDRY:
Yeah, the three of us, you know, to me, Mr. Pellegrin, and I think Mr. Robinson. MR. ROBINSON:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
That's correct. And if anybody else on the Board who wants to be involved in it, they are welcomed to become involved. MS . LANDRY:
Please. Please. Yeah, the more people that can give us suggestions, I think is the best.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Is there any new business?
No new business.
Okay.
MR. ROBINSON:
I think we just went through that.
```

MR. BLACHE:
What was that?
MR. ROBINSON:
I said I think we just went through that.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, that's not our new business.
That's a new procedure.
MR. ROBINSON:
Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. So we need to determine the date of the next meeting. MR. BLACHE:

As late in the month as possible.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Let me just say this to you, let's be cognizant of what they're associated with a holiday because that presents a problem for people that's traveling because we had one of our Board members who is traveling during the holiday weekend.

MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
And I don't think we realized that it was
a holiday weekend coming up. While you guys are looking for a date, thank you guys for coming. If there's any public comment, now is the time to have that. You have our ears. We're willing to listen.

So is there any public comment? Any questions?

Do we have a date? Not yet?
MS. FINCHUM:
Is June 21st an option?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
What day of the week is that?
MR. BLACHE:
That's a Thursday, the week before the last week.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Is that going to work for you guys? Is
that late enough for you, Fabian?
MR. BLACHE:
I think that week is an issue for me, I think.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
Let me doublecheck. Hold on.

MR. ROBINSON:
What date?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
The 21st.
MR. ROBINSON:
The 21st.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
And I'd like to ask that we look at other
dates for the rest of the year --
MR. BLACHE:
Actually, that date is fine for me.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- that we look at dates for the rest of the year and send those to the Members so we'll have advanced notices on that -MR. BLACHE:

Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- and we can plan our schedules around
it.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. We can do that.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Will that work?
MR. BLACHE:

| 1 | Sure. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 3 | Okay. |
| 4 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 5 | That date isn't an issue for me. |
| 6 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 7 | So the 21st is good for everybody? |
| 8 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 9 | We will be doing the TigerSwan that day |
| 10 | on the appeal hearing just so you know. |
| 11 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| 12 | On the 21st? |
| 13 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 14 | Whatever the next meeting date is, yeah. |
| 15 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 16 | Okay. So the 21st works for everybody? |
| 17 | It's good for everybody, June 21st? |
| 18 | So it's June 21st. |
| 19 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 20 | Okay. Great. All right. Very good. |
| 21 | MS. LANDRY: |
| 22 | Did you want to look at three months from |
| 23 | now? |
| 24 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 25 | Well, I'm going to have them do that, |

send it out to everybody, and they can choose a date from there.

MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. All right. Thank you. If --
MR. SANDERS:
Is that nine or 9:30?
MR. ROBINSON:
Oh, it's 9:30.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Oh, it's 9:30, but we put on the call for nine o'clock so that everybody can get settled by 9:30 and people get in the room and stuff like that. MR. SANDERS:

All right.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
All right. Any questions? Nobody has anything?

Okay. Well, then if there are no questions, no public comments, no public questions, we're going to move to adjournment. I make a motion that we adjourn the meeting -oh, I'm sorry. I forgot. Excuse me.

```
I need to ask the Board to make a motion --
MS . LANDRY:
I'll make the motion.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- to go into Executive Session.
MS . LANDRY:
I'll make a motion to go into Executive Session. MR. CROUCH:
It requires a 100 percent vote of the Board. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Would you do a roll call vote of going into Executive Session, please? MR. CROUCH:
Yeah, you have to first amend the agenda.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Let's amend the agenda --
MR. CROUCH:
I'm sorry.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
-- to add to the agenda.
MR. CROUCH:
That's a hundred percent vote.
```

| 1 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Okay. |
| 3 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 4 | And the Executive -- |
| 5 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 6 | To amend the agenda to go into Executive |
| 7 | Session. |
| 8 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 9 | -- Session is two-thirds. |
| 10 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 11 | Okay. Now, roll call? |
| 12 | MS. HULL: |
| 13 | Misty Finchum? |
| 14 | MS . FINCHUM: |
| 15 | Yes. |
| 16 | MS. HULL: |
| 17 | Durell Pellegrin? |
| 18 | MR. PELLEGRIN: |
| 19 | Yes. |
| 20 | MS. HULL: |
| 21 | Mark Williams? |
| 22 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 23 | Yes. |
| 24 | MS . HULL: |
| 25 | Edward Robinson? |


| 1 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Yes. |
| 3 | MS. HULL: |
| 4 | Marian Pierre? |
| 5 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 6 | Yes. |
| 7 | MS. HULL: |
| 8 | Maria Landry? |
| 9 | MS . LANDRY: |
| 10 | Yes. |
| 11 | MS. HULL: |
| 12 | Ritchie Rivers? |
| 13 | MR. RIVERS : |
| 14 | Yes. |
| 15 | MS. HULL: |
| 16 | Wilbert Sanders? |
| 17 | MR. SANDERS: |
| 18 | Yes. |
| 19 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 20 | It's been moved and seconded and it's |
| 21 | unanimous, and we're going into Executive |
| 22 | Session. |
| 23 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 24 | No, that was to amend the agenda. |
| 25 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |

Amend -- now, let's have a motion to go into Executive Session.

MS . LANDRY:
Could I ask a question before we do --
MR. CROUCH:
Yeah.
MS. LANDRY:
Is it 100 percent of the Board members
present --
MR. CROUCH:
Yes.
MS . LANDRY:
-- or 100 percent of the Board members?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yes, present.
MR. CROUCH:
Yeah, 100 percent of the Board members present.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. It's always -- it's always a quorum, whoever is at the quorum. MR. CROUCH:

Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
All right. Then, we're going to -- could

1

```
I have a motion to go into Executive Session?
MS . LANDRY:
Motion to go into Executive Session, I move it.
MR. ROBINSON:
Yes. Second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
It's been moved and seconded.
MR. CROUCH:
And for the record, it will be under the
Public Meetings Law Section 17, Subsection A4.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, Ron, that's what I expect you to
say. Okay. So we're going to have a roll call?
MS. HULL:
Misty Finchum?
MS. FINCHUM:
Yes.
MS. HULL:
Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Yes.
MS. HULL:
Mark Williams?
```

| 1 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Yes. |
| 3 | MS. HULL: |
| 4 | Edward Robinson? |
| 5 | MR. ROBINSON: |
| 6 | Yes. |
| 7 | MS. HULL: |
| 8 | Marian Pierre? |
| 9 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 10 | Yes. |
| 11 | MS. HULL: |
| 12 | Maria Landry? |
| 13 | MS. LANDRY: |
| 14 | Yes. |
| 15 | MS. HULL: |
| 16 | Ritchie Rivers? |
| 17 | MR. RIVERS : |
| 18 | Yes. |
| 19 | MS . HULL: |
| 20 | Wilbert Sanders? |
| 21 | MR. SANDERS : |
| 22 | Yes. |
| 23 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 24 | Thank you. It's -- |
| 25 | MR. BLACHE: |

```
Go ahead. No, you go ahead. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. It's been moved and seconded, voted on unanimously that we are going into Executive Session.
MR. BLACHE:
Okay. Can we have a brief recess so that we can get your photo done before we actually get into that?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
You know what -- you know what, Fabian, I don't know if everybody was notified about that.
MR. BLACHE:
They were.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
They were?
MS . LANDRY:
Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Well, I'm fine with it, but I don't know. Are you fine with it?
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Yeah.
MR. ROBINSON:
```

| 1 | We can go ahead. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 3 | Because -- |
| 4 | MR. RIVERS: |
| 5 | I'm fine with it. |
| 6 | MR. BLACHE: |
| 7 | Okay. We can flip the lights on. We've |
| 8 | got the photographer over here and we can |
| 9 | knock that out. |
| 10 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 11 | Okay. |
| 12 | (WHEREUPON, A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN |
| 13 | THE MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION BEGAN |
| 14 | THEREAFTER ON PAGE 154, LINE 12) |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
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(WHEREUPON, THE MEETING CAME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AND ENDED ON PAGE 188, LINE 17)

MS. FINCHUM:
Motion to adjourn. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

And the meeting is adjourned. Okay.
(WHEREUPON, THE MEETING ADJOURNED)
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