



6000 Doug Attaway Blvd. | Shreveport, LA 71115 | P (318)524-2272 | F (318)524-2273 | port@portsb.com | www.portcb.com

**Regular Board Meeting**  
**Regional Commerce Center, Board Room**  
**6000 Doug Attaway Blvd., Shreveport, LA 71115**  
**September 17, 2015**

The regular monthly Board meeting of the Caddo-Bossier Parishes Port Commission was called to order by President Capt. Thomas F. Murphy at approximately 4:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the Regional Commerce Center, 6000 Doug Attaway Blvd., Shreveport, LA and everyone welcomed.

Commissioner Prescott led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Murphy called on Eric for roll call: Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins. A quorum was present. Guests: Joe and Zachary Johnson; Ryan Roberts, Wieland-Davco; Scott Wieland, Wieland-Davco; Anne Gremillion & Daniel Strickland, Gremillion & Pou; Tyler Comeaux, BKI; Terry Lars, Logistics Electrical and Linda Biernacki, Fire Tech Systems, Inc. Staff: Eric England, Danyne Malone, Brenda Levinson, Gloria Washington, Ted Knight and Hettie Agee.

Commissioner Murphy said we open the floor for any public comments at this time. Ryan Roberts was recognized and said good afternoon commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to come forward today and talk to you. I would like to discuss our work that we have performed under contract for Walbridge at the Benteler facility. Specifically we've been contracted at Weiland-Davco to build the administration building that Benteler will preside in. So Walbridge contracted with us to construct the facility. I wanted to bring to your attention the fact that Walbridge and Benteler owe us well over a million dollars since last May for work that has been completed and accepted. Of that amount of money, over a million dollars, over a quarter of a million dollars is owed to MBE's. Weiland-Davco has a solid track record of working at the Port on private projects in support of the MBE program. I ask for your assistance to ensure that the hard working Shreveport-Bossier contractors get paid for the work that has been completed at the Port and accepted by Benteler and Walbridge. Benteler has noted they want to be an upstanding company in our community and their project at the Port received awards for MBE participation. Unfortunately the MBE firms that worked on the administration building are suffering from their lack of payment. I would like to add that to date there has been no issue brought to my attention by Walbridge or Benteler about the work we have performed on the administration building. We

*"The Caddo-Bossier Port Commission is an equal opportunity provider."*

*MEMBERS: Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, President; Sam N. Gregorio, Vice President; Rick C. Prescott, Secretary-Treasurer; Lynn Austin; Erica R. Bryant; Roy Griggs; James D. Hall; James L. Pannell; Steve Watkins*

have completed our contractual obligations to Walbridge and to Benteler. We are also under the understanding that there is no dispute over the administration building between Walbridge and Benteler so we don't understand why we haven't been paid. I wanted to bring this to your attention in order to give you a heads up and ask for your assistance in any way possible. Thank you.

Commissioner Murphy called Linda Biernacki to the podium. She said thank you Mr. President, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to stand in front of you and share a little bit of our story as well. We have performed the fire sprinkler/fire alarm work for Benteler Steel. We were contracted under Walbridge to perform that work. We have done so a hundred percent. We have received approval from the Louisiana State Fire Marshal. They've accepted our work; they've accepted the buildings. Benteler Steel is using these buildings and a large portion of our contract, about 30%, was contracted to MBE's which one of the companies is here today, Terry Lars with Logistics Electric. He is still owed money. We're owed over \$500,000. We do have a lien filed for \$549,000. I have paid Logistics Electric 100% of their contract with the exception of thousands of dollars of change orders that have not been paid. So I have not been paid my contract 100% but in an effort to keep Logistics Electric afloat and help him with his cash flow, we have really extended what we could pay him. But it's come to the point where he has had to lay off people. And when we were first contracted to do this job, we were very excited. We were thrilled that we were going to be a part of this very exciting project at the Port. So we never thought that a day like this would come that millions of dollars are being owed local subcontractors, contractors and MBE's. So anything that the Port Commission can do to expedite payment to get these people around the table to talk about what the issues are—I've spoken to Logan Anderson who is the council for Benteler. He told me yesterday that they have absolutely no issues at all with Fire Tech Systems. So there should be no reason that we should not be paid. So I don't understand it, but I'm a small company. I'm owed \$549,000. That is a lot of money for me. That is a lot of money for anybody so I'm reaching out and asking for any assistance possible. I have filed a lien so a lien is in place. So thank you very much. Commissioner Murphy said we appreciate that. Anyone else like to make a comment at this time?

Commissioner Watkins said Eric, do we have any trailing money that we have committed for Benteler project for Benteler incentives to come here? Eric said the trailing money that's in place right now is in the form of a contingency fund of approximately \$3 million dollars that has yet to be applied for. The rest of the monies have been spent on infrastructure to date. Commissioner Watkins said could we put a freeze on that money until all of the vendors have been paid. Eric said the ability for the Port to hold those payments is there. Those invoices that, if

you will, that flow of invoices begins with Benteler, is directed to the Port and then it goes to the State. So we are the first line. Commissioner Watkins said I certainly think that we ought to do what we need to do to help things. Commissioner Pannell said the only comment I would like to make, Capt. Murphy, is the issue of not being paid, we would not from this Board care whether they were minority contractors or any local contractors they need to be paid. And that's the bottom line and I'd like to ask Danye and Eric if there's any way we can look at future contracts where we would have some kind of control over when these people---I know it's probably going to be limited but I would like to know how we can ensure that this does not happen again. Because one of the problems--I had a conversation with Patrick a couple of weeks ago and my comment to him was, we spent a lot of time trying to encourage local minority contractors to come here and do work and even though we have nothing to do with that, when people say Port, they don't know it's not us doing that. And that hurts us in the long run. So I'd just like to see if there's anything that we can do and I think expediency is required at this point. And don't know if it can be done with phone calls or letters to make it plain that this money will not be given to them unless something is done. If they're going to be late with these peoples' money, we need to be late with their money. Thank you Capt. Murphy. Anyone else?

**Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes of August 20, 2015:** Commissioner Prescott said the regular meeting minutes of August 20, 2015 are included in your package. If there are no corrections, additions or deletions, I make a motion for approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Austin. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that the minutes of the regular meeting of August 20, 2015 be approved. Any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the vote was called for. All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passes unanimously.

**Approval of the August 2015 Financials:** Commissioner Prescott said the August 2015 financial reports are included in your packages. If there are no corrections, additions or deletions, I make a motion for approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pannell. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that the August 2015 Financials be approved. Any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the vote was called for. All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passes unanimously.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

**Port Expansion Committee Report of August 20, 2015:** The Port Expansion Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chairman Steve Watkins at approximately 3:30 p.m. on August 20, 2015 in the Board Room at the Regional Commerce Center. Public comment and introduction of guests was called for.

Committee members in attendance included Steve Watkins, Lynn Austin, Sam N. Gregorio, James L.

Pannell, and President Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, Ex-Officio. Commissioner Prescott was also in attendance. A quorum was present. Guests: Joe and Zachary Johnson; Tyler Comeaux, Burk-Kleinpeter, Inc. Staff: Eric England, Rick Nance, Kathy French and Hettie Agee.

Commissioner Watkins moved to the first item of business, Technical Memorandum No. 5, and turned the meeting over to Tyler Comeaux.

Tyler gave a Power Point presentation consisting of an update on Technical Memorandum No. 5 that was discussed on July 16. He said during that meeting we discussed a couple of things about the replacement plan, implementation plan and wanted your feedback. We went back to the wood shed both BKI and some Port staff and we'll bring you the updates today.

Tyler said very quickly I'll go through the process of the Port Expansion Study for everybody's recollection. We collected a bunch of GIS information, developed a historical trends from the inception of the Port to now and with the developmental trend, basically we took a 5 year rolling average from the inception in 1996 and every 5 years showed a growth rate. As you would all expect, the trend line of the Port is on the up and up and that historical growth projection for the next 2 5 year periods is roughly 60 acres a year. So between the total of the 5 years, it would be 300 acres for each 5 year period if that makes sense. The project goal and selection criteria, as you know you did the survey, and that was how we developed what the Commission wanted to look at and how we wanted to find properties within Caddo and Bossier Parishes. The GIS models, we went ahead and input that in the GIS and built the model to prioritize and select suitable sites within Caddo and Bossier Parishes based on y'all's selection criteria. After the GIS models had the "hot spots", whatever you want to call it, the very suitable pieces of land and we went ahead and developed sites. After developing a preliminary site, we went ahead and did a due diligence on the parcels within those sites. There were 429 parcels within the sites and we went ahead and looked at each parish courthouse to make sure everything was accurate and if they had any red flags. From the initiative due diligence we noted the information that needed to be noted on the candidates sites and either moved up or down the sites based on what the findings were in the initial due diligence. That helped us develop the final ranking and prioritization and that's where the TM 4 basically ends, the TM adopted at the last Marketing & Operations Committee meetings.

Now we're on Phase 5 which is the Implementation & Replacement Plan. The implementation is essentially taking this study and moving forward with it. I have in the report--I went ahead and took a stab at it, in fact, it was what you wanted---and we talked about the replacement planning and what we want to target for the purchasing following this study or what actions you would want to do following the study. As you can see, we sought your input and got great feedback at the last meeting. From that feedback, we went back to our office, talked to Eric and worked with staff on a few things you had asked for and we're here to present the updated findings. Just a side note, the last bullet, the costs were developed by David Volentine. He is an appraiser as you know and he looked at each candidate site where it was at in each parish and developed cost based on that candidate's attributes. So that's site specific for each of those candidate sites. That report from David will be included as an appendix to our Port Expansion Study for your reference. Any questions thus far on anything?

Just a kind of review, a recap of what we (that I and Eric as well) got from your feedback is several items and some of them are action items from us and some of them are action items we just followed up on. These are what we have incorporated into the TM 5 and what we want you guys to buy in or talk about/discuss about TM 5.

So the first need is it's apparent that the Port's dwindling on property available at this time and we all need to look at purchasing something for a larger industry and also for the smaller ancillaries that are

coming about that are looking for prospective lands to develop on. And so there is obviously an apparent need and kind of the reason for this study as you all envisioned. At the meeting it was discussed that we plan for the next 25-30 years and that we would need at least two mega sites. With that we had talked about our absorption rate that was developed based on the Port's growth is roughly 60 acres a year as I said a while ago. And with that 60 acres a year, X's the 30 planning years, it's roughly 1800 acres. That's for planning purposes. Obviously if you grow quicker, there's a potential for you to grow quicker, you may/may not need more acreage than the 2,000 that is proposed currently. I'll finish up real quick with this and then I would want your comments. The 2,000 acres would accomplish two things: it would get you two mega sites and it would also get you two 400 acre sites that are smaller divided acreages similar to what's inside the center of the Port, smaller style tracts for businesses that can be supportive to the large industries or self-supported. Right now I have budgeted 100 acres per for the infrastructure. I, in my opinion looking at the property now currently, it's roughly a third. So I feel like that's a little bit low for the infrastructure acreages, so I just want to throw that out there. I just want to see your thoughts on that because right now on the Port property it's 750 acres and that's roughly a third of what the Port, 2100 acres, is. That gives you an idea. I just want to see what your thoughts are on that.

Commissioner Gregorio asked if he wanted some thoughts now. Tyler said I would like to stop here and then I'll continue. Commissioner Gregorio said I think experience should be our guide. And if our experience is one third non usable for infrastructure, we should use one third. If we use less than that we run the risk of doing all this work and under estimating our acreage needs. So that's number 1. Number 2 is we have Benteler; we have some expansions about to happen; we have some new companies about to happen. Things are going to accelerate and so I think that the 300 per five years is a good experience. It's for over a 5 year rolling period. But our recent experience is one of acceleration and so I would use those two experiences together, 300 plus more recent acceleration, and I think so therefore I think our 300 is too low also. Tyler said so the 60 per year may be a little low as well. Commissioner Gregorio said and I think both of those comments are grounded on our actual experience which should be our guide, so I would say more than the 2000 acres would be needed.

Commissioner Watkins said Tyler when you came up with the 750 acres that's presently infrastructure, what constitutes that. Does that include the RCC? Is that simply roads and easements or? Tyler said I have a site map right here on the screen. You can see the brown outlying areas on your screen or the unusable acreages. And a lot of it is like Tones Bayou and the easements within the Port, you see all these little easements these plot lines everywhere and so that makes up—it says it at the bottom—I can't read it but you may be able to. Commissioner Watkins said so part of that 750 is wetlands and things that we can't use. So going back to Sam's comment, certainly if we're going to be on the River side of the levee, then we may need that one third. I would think if we're not gonna be on the River side of the levee, you'd probably need less than a third. Does that make sense? Because you've got so much of this acreage is unusable because of....Commissioner Gregorio said I hear you and I would mostly agree, however, I would say it like this. On the non-River side of the levee our experience is one third and we should honor that experience. If we're on the River side of the levee, we'll have even higher than one third. Commissioner Watkins said what's he's saying is the one third is on the River side of the levee. Tyler said as you know the Port's both on and off, so and you can see a decent portion of the unusable space is on the River side as you can see on the top of the page here. It's all River frontage and then Tones Bayou through there. The experience, I mean we have--the sites that are top sites have Bayou Pierre either contiguous to it or very near it, so it may have some unusable space. One third, in my opinion, I think one third would be a slight bit high. I think 25/30% is something that's realistic. In our experience, we typically do 25% but with bayous and such down here it may a little bit higher than the 25%. Commissioner Austin said well we can look at it before we purchase it and determine how much of it is usable and unusable. But if the 1/3 is on the River side, then it's probably going to be less than that unless there's an unusual circumstance on the other side. Commissioner Watkins said if you look at the

Cupples plot now, it looks like it may be 5% unusable. Tyler said yeah. Commissioner Gregorio said on the other hand if the norm is 25% and we're on a River and bayou which is gonna have a higher oil and gas and higher use of non-usable, I think we would need to be above 25 which gets you to the 30 or a third or as I would say, because of our trend line, well, that's my second reason. For that second reason we'd still need more. Tyler said okay. I guess with that if we were to use the third of unusable space or unusable land, it would roughly bring us to about 2500 acres. It's actually 1200 acres because you look at--you want to accomplish two things: you want to accomplish that one mega site and that 400 acres for each of the purchases and so that's 900 acres and a third of that would make it 1200 acres total and then you'd have 900 usable acreages for each one of those sites, so it would bring it to 2400. Does that make sense? That's just a note and again, is everybody kind of on the same page there? That's a little bit of an adjustment. That's not a big deal. Eric said we adjust from 2 to 25. Tyler said and I can make that adjustment in TM 5 pretty easily.

Commissioner Gregorio said do you know what our original land, the amount of the land, when the Port got started? Eric said the original land purchase. Commissioner Gregorio said from that until the present how much land has been purchased. Eric said I do. It was (pointing to the screen) this property, pretty much what we called Cupples, 820 acres. Commissioner Gregorio said but then it's been acquisitioned since then. So the total over time. Eric said the total is 2300. Commissioner Gregorio said 23 up to the present, gotcha. Commissioner Watkins said we're essentially looking to double the size of the Port. Commissioner Austin said and the growth rate has been kind of like this because the first ten years it was kind of level and flat and we didn't have anything and then we just started moving up and I think the trend line is moving up dramatically from what it was the first 10 years. Commissioner Gregorio said the time period for this first 2300 acres that we're now short of land, is how many years. Eric said I'm sorry, the time period for the shortage? Tyler said from the beginning, from the inception until now? It's 23 years. Commissioner Gregorio said let me just argue a little bit more for this. If in 23 years we've used up 2300 acres and we're trying to go for a 30 year program, don't we need more than 2500—don't we need 2750, 3000? Tyler said okay. Commissioner Watkins said and I agree other than we have not used up all the 23. We still have a good bit of inventory. We're still sitting on six or seven or 800 acres. Tyler said it's roughly 700 with 200 being the Cupples tract across the street. Commissioner Pannell said would the need be based on more than just land itself, but the size. I mean that seemed to be—to me that would be the primary issue as to how we go forward based on what we anticipate the land would be and then the rest would probably—some of it would come on what becomes available that we may not have a need for but it's too great a deal to pass. If I'm understanding, the largest piece of land that we have, then if we concentrated on getting that larger piece of land, then we need to break that large portion up because of the businesses that are coming in we have the advantage to do that. But if we just bought small land without any indication---if we bought small land, there's probably gonna be enough small areas here to accommodate that. So I don't see that as being our initial problem. Commissioner Austin said it definitely would be an advantage to buy a large tract and let us decide how we split it up as the need arises. Commissioner Pannell said to me that should be where our focus should be for the short term. Because if somebody came in here tomorrow, we couldn't accommodate them so if someone came in, it would be two different issues. One of them we would have the amount of property if they came in to accommodate them; but if a large business came in, we couldn't do anything. So I think that is our major problem and long term, we still need to deal with what we're talking about long term. But to me, that seemed like that was... Tyler said it's the need for a mega site to accommodate a large industry if they were to come. If somebody comes and wants to locate on that large site, it's one thing. But you still have let's say, they take 100 of the 500, you still have the 400 remaining, or if you purchase 1,000 acres, then you have 900 out of the 1,000 remaining. Commissioner Pannell said my next issue would be the decision that seemed like would be here would be here is what would be important for that mega site. Would it need to be attached to the Port or do the people—what we're doing is we're dealing with land that our people are out there selling. So that's why we would need

input from them to say we'll take the first site that we see or we need something that if an industry is coming in that has use for something that's contiguous with the Port. I'm saying those two questions—they may have already been answered and I didn't hear them or... Tyler said what we did was we looked in the selection criteria. The way we looked at each one of the sites was based on how they fit with the non-selection criteria we had discussed and that you guys had ranked. And so, we didn't look specifically contiguous to the Port but as you will see in the top 5 ranking sites, all of them except for one which is on the other side of the River in Bossier at the ag farm is very very close to the Port. Now it may be across Hwy. 1 but the first site is right here, where Robson Road is. It backs up to the back of Cupples somewhere in here. The second site basically borders Cupples and this is all the second ranked site. So I don't know if that answers your question, Commissioner Pannell. Commissioner Pannell said it does. I guess my question should be more to Eric than to you. Inquiries that we're getting, as far as possible moves and people wanting to come to the Port, of those businesses what would be the percentage of those that have no waterborne use? Eric said a large percentage. The access to the River has not been a "deal killer" per se on any of our deals that we've seen thus far. So having a site suitable with the other industrial features is more important than necessarily River access, direct River access. Commissioner Gregorio said although some, it would be critical. Eric said some that we've--- Commissioner Watkins said and we have some of that land in our inventory now. We have access to the River in our inventory now. Commissioner Pannell said the overriding issue to me would be would be a mega site. Commissioner Watkins said a mega site and the two that he just talked about really do kind of fit in well with all that we're doing. A good rule of thumb is what we have now, Sam, from the original and what we've added. A third's leased; a third's up we can lease and a third is infrastructure and unusable. So that's kind of what we set. So we still have a third of our original inventory of land that can help us and some of that is waterfront. So that helps and so I think as we go forward, you're exactly right. We need to make sure we put in that 30% bumper and --- Commissioner Austin said and it does not necessarily have to be waterfront for them to use barge. Commissioner Watkins said Benteler said that waterfront was not important; they just needed to be able to get to a dock. That was one thing that came out in our very last meeting that struck me was we've got to be more dock sensitive. That's where we need to be thinking... Is our dockage enough? Do we have enough dockage and I think Eric can answer that question. Tyler said we can talk about it now. It's the next bullet actually. And that's why I brought this map. The reason I brought this map is for Eric to demonstrate where the Port docks could be.

Eric said as Commissioner Watkins was talking about capacity of the Port in terms of docks, our main general cargo facility is in this general area where the blue warehouses are. Then our Slack Water Harbor is right here. As you know, we built one dock within the Slack Water Harbor. We also have leased docks at Oakley, Genesis and Red River Terminals. Red River Terminals is where we handle the liquid. In talking about potential dock access for the Port and to handle its growth, I want to eliminate some sites so we can focus in on Port docks. North Whittington, it's easy to conclude that we are preserving this site for a potential River user because it has this direct River access. So one dock would ideally be plenty to serve this site. So this would be a dedicated dock to this site in our master planning eyes. The same thing for Scopini Island. We're preserving Scopini Island for that River user one to two docks. So through the process of elimination we bring back to where could you develop docking facilities for Port general cargo. The Port's Slack Water Harbor---I mentioned we have one dock that's already been built. There's capacity for two additional docks within the harbor and finally you could place a third dock at the end of the harbor. So for a total of three docks now, just for the Port. We have no intention of leasing this space to an entity. We have master planned that this space would be preserved for the Port Commission's service of the remainder of the Port complex. Are there any questions? Tyler said do you want to mention just south of Oakley. Eric said in addition there is one other site south of Oakley which is the fertilizer terminal. It would be a limited area but there is access to the River. In our discussions, we not only discussed sites, but we also discussed capacity. Capacity was measured in the way of cycle time, cycle time being how quickly you can make a pick from a barge. Just imagine a crane, it takes a

certain number of minutes to go from a point of rest over the River into a barge, make a pick, back over. There's a limited cycle time based on your equipment and then that helped us bring back an analysis of how many tons a year you could theoretically handle per dock. And then if you take that tonnage and you begin to multiply it by the berths that we currently have at our general cargo dock and multiply that out by the additional dock space that we could have, it is incredible capacity, more than enough capacity than we think we could handle or that would theoretically could be barged, that would be consumed in this northwest Ark-La-Tex region. It's a huge number. I'll be glad to answer any questions. Commissioner Gregorio said Eric, was the huge number you referred to, was that if we developed all the docks you just mentioned. Eric said it is. It's millions and millions of tons. Commissioner Watkins said so if we go across the street, just say, and pick up another 1000/1500 acres, we're still good. Eric said it's a drop in the bucket. Commissioner Watkins said so we're dock rich. Eric said yes. Tyler said dock inventory can be rich.

Commissioner Pannell said I've just got one last question and I guess that's kind of to Steve and Lynn. The other side of the River I've been told and been told several times has no infrastructure over there. I understand that. But one of the lemons that we have is that when people see the Port being close to them, the cost of that land goes up. My question is are there any long range master plans over there and if not, would it be in the interest of the Port to make sure that we know when those are because if they have long range plans, that means that the land over there would be at a fraction of what we're paying for. And I'm saying that we should not be in the position of not knowing ahead of time what's going to be available for a reasonable cost. Commissioner Watkins said now there is no infrastructure. At the end of Sligo Road is where. Commissioner Austin said it's not growing that way. The City is not growing that way; the City is growing north. Of course, you know the City can't grow west. It can only grow south or grow east and right now, the City is growing north and that's kind of been the trend with Benton Road and Airline Drive and the new four lane all the way on the other side of the lake up there. I think that Swan Lake area is going to grow faster than any place in Bossier, but not south. It's not growing south. And the main reason is there's no water; there's no sewer; it's a two-lane highway and access is just not there. Commissioner Watkins said I think from Sligo Road north will grow big. That's not helping us. Where Sligo is and that's where the Arthur Ray Teague Parkway ties into, there's a lot of acreage out that way that's going to grow over the next few years, but that would not be anything that would help us. Tyler said Sligo Road, if I'm not mistaken, has water and can have sewer if needed. So it does have water down Sligo because it feeds down Sligo. Commissioner Watkins said but once again, Lynn's right. It's a two lane road. There's just not very many advantages. Commissioner Austin said and there's nothing that I've seen in the plans and the future plans of the DOTD to four lane past where they're at right now. Commissioner Pannell said thank you. Commissioner Austin said and if you ever looked at the Mercer property over there, if you ever looked at the pipe on top of the ground, the way they used to lay pipe, you can't walk ten feet without stepping on a pipe that's above the ground. The old gas lines and oil line pipes they are on top of the ground. But most of that property over there, the large property like the Cooley's have about 6,000 acres. And then you've got the Mercers that have property and you go on down and you've got Blackie Snyder, the same large land owners that are not interested in really selling their property. It's been in their family 100 years. Tyler said another thing, as a note, a lot of that acreage on the eastern side of the Red River has a ton of oil and gas wells. That's another thing that demoted some of those properties is there's the density of oil wells there compared to the west side of the River is a lot more than the west side. So that's just a note. Commissioner Watkins said if we were just representing Bossier, we'd say yes, but it's not.....Commissioner Austin said directly across from us John Turner has 1600 acres. When the River flooded, he had 160 acres dry.

Tyler said that's some good feedback. With the feedback I think the consensus is that we need to at least look at 33% infrastructure, a third of infrastructure, and we'll take a look at the absorption rate of 60 acres per year or 300 for every five years and may adjust based on the trend lines and see where we

need to go for the next 30 years. That's some good feedback. So the dock analysis, as Eric just went over, I think everybody's got a good understanding of where we're at with the docks and the capacity of the docks.

I think the cost of the infrastructure. That's the next item. We looked at the past---Rick did a very good job and Eric did a very good job with the auditors to look exactly what the costs were to develop the existing Port infrastructure and what they were able to do is develop a cost per 600 acres easily from the auditors with real dollars that were used for this Port and basically use inflation to get 2015 dollars and the cost per 600 acres straight infrastructure for roads, water, sewer and rail was roughly \$13.5 million dollars per 600 acres. When you extrapolate that out to the 2000 that we had talked about and this is the number that we have now, it's roughly \$50 million dollars for infrastructure. The \$50 million, the reason why it's a little bit more than three times is because---I'm sorry \$50 million is just for water, sewer, rail and roads. An additional \$10 million dollars is estimated for an additional water tower if needed and also a lift station. Those two items will more than likely be needed. You may or may not be able to tie in to your existing system. The water you will. You will eventually have to tie in. But the sewer you may or may not be at a gravity flow back to where the Port existing location is. So we budgeted for that. And so the total infrastructure costs for 2,000 acres would be \$60 million. It's gonna increase when you're talking about 2400, 2500, 3000. Whatever we end up deciding on, just keep that number in mind that it's \$13.5 million per 600 acres chunk and then an additional \$10 million or so for a lift station and water tower. That kind of gives you a ball park. And that is in TM 5, the draft that I'm giving to you now. Any questions on that? Commissioner Watkins said so just off the top of my head, for every dollar we spend on land, we'd spend \$2 in infrastructure. Tyler said roughly, at least \$1.5 budget.

Eric said and going back to what one of the other discussion points at the last meeting was a question of how much would a million dollars of our property tax revenue potentially bond and that was reported to us by Commissioner Hall was today's rates was around for every \$1 million dollars of property tax revenue, it equated to about \$15 million dollars that you could generate in a bond issue. At our current 2.5 mills, that's roughly \$7 million dollars a year in Caddo and Bossier Parishes. So it equates to roughly \$105 million if we did a bond issue today at current rates could be raised if we kept our millage at 2.5 mills. Commissioner Watkins said you would almost have to take all of it to be able to do the land first and then the infrastructure. Tyler said it would roughly be \$100 million. If you look at the two top candidate sites, their cost, and the infrastructure costs based on \$2000, it varies as you can expect. Commissioner Gregorio said and that would fit our recent experience and projected experience that we operate the Port out of ongoing self-generated operations and any tax money goes to infrastructure and land, in other words, a long term investment. Eric said that's right. That would be totally consistent. Commissioner Watkins said that would basically set the Port up for the next 30 years. Commissioner Austin said \$10 million would be on the extreme side of the high side, I'm telling you. \$12 would be more reasonable. Commissioner Gregorio said you mean bonding per million. Commissioner Austin said just from my experience with LCDA on bonds. Eric said okay.

Tyler said the last thing is one of the follow-up items we had from the last meeting was to investigate the sites that are proposed, the candidate sites, and see if any of the land was available. There was none. I talked to David Volentine about this. He ran some searches on MLS, some other searches as well and there were no listings that he could find as industrial land use sites or land usage that was available for sale. One item that did come about and Eric, I don't know how much we want to get into because we don't know that much about it. It's just an email some lady had sent to us but---Eric said we believe it's in the I-69 corridor. Tyler said exactly. And it's a smaller style tract. It's nothing big. Commissioner Watkins said does anybody have anything else for Tyler or Tyler do you have anything for us?

Tyler said the last two items are the next steps and basically I wanted to get your final comments. We'll incorporate what we have talked about today in the TM 5. And then now, I don't know the path moving forward now, Eric, I don't want to put you on the spot. Eric said I will be glad to discuss it if you're at a break. We propose with the discussion that we've received from the committee today to hold a Port Expansion Committee meeting on September 8, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. which is the same day as our Marketing & Operations meeting. The purpose of that would be to do what we would call the Final Presentation of the Port Expansion Study and that would be number one. Number two is upon Tyler making these final comments to TM 5, distribute it to all the Board members that are not in attendance today with a summary of it and place TM 5 on the Operations Agenda for September 8th for adoption or ratification by the Board to accomplish TM 5. At the September 8<sup>th</sup> Port Expansion meeting, in addition to receiving the final presentation, discuss how to wrap up the Port Expansion Study and bring it to a close, whether we do that at the end of September or possibly even at the Board meeting in October.

Commissioner Watkins said my plan is to urge all the commissioners to be at the committee meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> and flesh all of these final things out so then when we come back as a Board we can ratify the whole thing without going into deep discussion and use the September 8<sup>th</sup> date as the opportunity to have our final say and look at everything. And then the last comment I would make is that I think the work really begins. Tyler has done the work up to this point, and I think now it's going to be incumbent on us and the staff to put this in motion because we're going to have an unbelievably nice document in front of us as a tool and guide to go out and do what we need to do. We certainly need to—because these things have a life on them, a shelf life. It's incumbent on us, once we do pass the final thing, is to start to work.

Commissioner Gregorio said this says Final Draft. Were there going to be some tweaks to this? Tyler said yes there were. I incorporated the infrastructure costs that you had asked for as well as the--- Commissioner Gregorio said tweaks from our discussion today. Tyler said there will be, yes. Commissioner Gregorio said this is not truly the final draft. I had the draft delivered to you for the first initial discussion, so it's still a draft. Commissioner Gregorio said I struck out the word Final on mine. Eric said we thought it was final but the final draft will be redistributed to the Board to prepare you for the meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> at 11:00 and also for the vote at the September 8<sup>th</sup> Operations meeting of TM 5. Tyler said I suspect I could get something, based on the comments today and what I received. In the next week we'll email a PDF of what you have now but updated, and you can review that if Eric's okay with that. Eric said absolutely. Yes.

Commissioner Watkins called for anything else for Tyler or the staff and adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:17 p.m.

Commissioner Watkins said the August 20, 2015 Port Expansion Committee report is in your packets. If there are no additions, corrections or deletions, I move for their adoption into the minutes of this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bryant. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that the Port Expansion Committee report of August 20, 2015 be accepted. Calling for discussion and hearing none, the vote was taken. All in favor please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passed unanimously.

**Port Expansion Committee Report of September 8, 2015:** The Port Expansion Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chairman Steve Watkins at approximately 11:30 a.m. on September 8, 2015 in the Board Room at the Regional Commerce Center. Public comment and introduction of guests was called for.

Committee members in attendance included Steve Watkins, Lynn Austin, Sam N. Gregorio, James L. Pannell, and President Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, Ex-Officio. Commissioner Prescott and Commissioner Griggs were also in attendance. A quorum was present. Guests: Joe Johnson and Tyler Comeaux, Burk-Kleinpeter, Inc. Staff: Eric England, Dannye Malone, Rick Nance, and Hettie Agee.

Commissioner Watkins moved to the first item of business, Technical Memorandum No. 5, and turned the meeting over to Tyler Comeaux.

Tyler said we met on August 20, 2015 and at our last meeting we all agreed the amount of acreage that we're targeting from what was originally 2000 to 2500 to 3000 acres. So between 2500 and 3000 acres is what we have recommended within the report. With that 2500 to 3000 acres the cost for both the purchase of the land is going to increase a little bit but also the infrastructure costs which Rick and Eric did a very good job of investigating prior items for this Port facility of rail, roads, the water and sewer infrastructure. All that was black and white. It had very good documentation and so we utilized that with extrapolating for inflation to estimate the cost. All that is incorporated in the now what we're considering the Final Draft TM 5 which Eric distributed to you on Friday. There was a little bit of a text change from Rick. It really wasn't content, but it was just reading better. That was the last one. Eric, with that I think you guys consider--the plan is for you to consider adopting it. Eric said at the Operations Committee meeting, Commissioner Watkins. It's on the agenda.

Commissioner Watkins said the one thing that we need to talk about is after we adopt the Technical Memorandum No. 5 is do we want a final presentation, maybe a 15 to 20 minute presentation, from Tyler to encapsulate everything we've talked about to go through it, open it up for any final discussion and have a final presentation in front of the entire Board. I would think that something that has this much impact on our future needs to have a full presentation and a full voice of the Board. I know that this coming up Board meeting is slammed good with Financial Advisors etc. so I would suggest, if everybody agrees, that the October Board meeting would be a good time to have a final presentation on this.

Commissioner Pannell said I think you've done an extra good job on this, so if that's your recommendation. Commissioner Watkins said if that's good with everybody, we would have one final presentation hitting the high points of the entire study because I think it's very important that now we take this document after we have it and approve it, is now the work begins. It's going to be more important to implement this plan than it was to get it together because without implementing it, we're just sitting on a quarter of a million dollar plan.

Commissioner Gregorio said at that presentation can we also have the steps that we'll be taking to implement it. Commissioner Pannell said that was my question. Commissioner Gregorio said who would give that? Tyler would that be you or Eric? Eric said a combination with staff. Tyler said and I think just to kind of give you a little bit of implementation, I think we have identified the highly suitable sites within Caddo and Bossier Parishes and the finalization, the top priority sites, you will select from based on the Board's thoughts about these sites. Does that kind of?

Commissioner Watkins said I am sure staff is with us and a couple of the sites out of all of them really stand out heads and shoulders above the others, so I would think that would be the ones we would probably pursue first. Everybody keep in mind what we have found out from all this is for every dollar we'll spend in property, we'll spend two in infrastructure. So if something is gonna cost us \$10 million, we're gonna spend another \$20 million in infrastructure. So just kind of keep that figure in the back of your mind.

Commissioner Gregorio said at the meeting then could we have the recommendations of which to pursue, would that be possible also? And then number two is do we need—as either a committee or a Board to give us any more feedback? I think you asked for some more feedback, and if so, when do we do that? Tyler said Eric do you want to kind of? I think as a part of our plan as it is now, and we can discuss this with Eric and Rick is where do we go with implementation is where you're getting at is. We have identified the 2500 to 3000 acres as the site, based on everybody's feedback, and we can see which of the highly suitable sites fits that bill, or a combination of suitable sites. I think with Eric and Rick's input we could probably come back with some type of recommendation as you're saying. Eric said there are 18 candidate sites in the plan and there are those, as Commissioner Watkins was saying, that are at the top or are ideal and we in this time period between now and the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting that we're discussing, can come with a preliminary plan to discuss with the Board. Commissioner Gregorio said do you need any more feedback from the Board about which sites or which ones or is that something you would do without any more input from us? Eric said I believe the latter. I believe the Board has done, if you will, enough at this point. Commissioner Gregorio said I thought so too. I thought I might have heard that he wanted one more input, so if we don't, I'm good with that. Commissioner Watkins said I think two or three have risen to the top, and if. Eric said that's right.

Commissioner Watkins said does anybody have any further questions of Tyler or Eric. Eric said we will plan the next meeting—we'll call it then a Special Board Meeting of the Port Commission to discuss the Port Expansion Study prior to our October 15<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, probably in that 3:00/3:15 p.m. time frame and we'll work out the details of the presentation about the timing. We thank you and we thank all of the commissioners for their input and support.

Tyler said I appreciate all your feedback. This has been great, especially the latter half of this getting the feedback from you for the planning of the future. It's important but a fun study to be a part of for sure.

Commissioner Watkins said maybe my expectations were too low, but the information we've gained from this study is just invaluable. It's really been good. Commissioner Watkins adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:43 a.m.

Commissioner Watkins said the September 8, 2015 Port Expansion Committee report is also in your package. If there are no additions, corrections or deletions, I will move for their adoption to be incorporated into the minutes of this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bryant. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that the Port Expansion Committee report of September 8 be accepted. Calling for discussion and hearing none, the vote was taken. All in favor please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passes.

**Marketing Committee Report of September 8, 2015:** Commission President Capt. Thomas F. Murphy called the Marketing Committee meeting of September 8, 2015 to order at approximately 12 Noon in the Board Room at the Regional Commerce Center and welcomed everyone.

Commissioners present: Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Sam N. Gregorio, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, James L. Pannell, Rick C. Prescott and Steve Watkins. A quorum was present.

Commissioner Gregorio led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Murphy called for introduction of guests. Guests in attendance: Liz McCain, City of Shreveport, Tyler Comeaux, Burk-Kleinpeter; Anne Gremillion, Daniel Strickland and Ashley Ellingsen,

Gremillion & Pou. Staff members: Eric England, Rick Nance, Brenda Levinson, Dannye Malone, Gloria Washington, Ted Knight, Hugh McConnell and Hettie Agee.

Commissioner Murphy called for Public Comments. Commissioner Murphy said the next item on our agenda is to welcome Commissioner Roy Griggs and have him sworn in the Oath of Office. He called on Dannye to come to the podium and administer the Oath of Office. A welcome applause followed.

Commissioner Murphy said the By-Laws require us to have the three principal officers of President, Vice President and Secretary-Treasurer. We need an election for Vice President and I would entertain a motion for nomination for that office. Commissioner Pannell said I would like to nominate Sam Gregorio as position of Vice President and seconded by Commissioner Prescott. He said it's been moved by Commissioner Pannell and seconded by Commissioner Prescott that we accept and elect Commissioner Gregorio as Vice President. Calling for discussion and hearing none, he said all in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It's unanimous. Will you accept it? Applause followed. Commissioner Gregorio said thank you.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Sam N. Gregorio, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell, Rick C. Prescott and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Commissioner Gregorio will continue in his appointed position as Chairman of the Operations Committee. We will also need to elect a Secretary-Treasurer at this time. I would entertain a motion.

Commissioner Pannell said Mr. Chairman, being elected Vice President, he should change his position. Commissioner Murphy said Commissioner Pannell, I did that for the purpose that in three months we have to do it all over again so continue now with this one and in three months we have to do it all over again. Commissioner Pannell said I'm not sure I see the difference in making an appointment. Our precedence has been that the person we appoint has the specific duties. So I mean if it's okay with everybody else. Commissioner Watkins said I'm confused. Commissioner Bryant said is it just precedent that we do that or is it in the By-Laws anywhere? Eric said with regard to the position of Chair of Marketing & Operations, is that what we're discussing correlated to the office of Vice President. They have in the past rotated and there have been instances where an officer, when they held that office two years in a row, has moved from one committee to the other to provide experience. But I was just doing a scan of the By-Laws and I don't see a reference to serving a particular committee as Chair. Commissioner Gregorio said it makes me no difference on that Operations Committee. My first preference would be Rick would do it. Commissioner Austin said we're going to be changing officers anyway and I think that's a good idea what you're doing now. Commissioner Pannell said I'm good. Commissioner Gregorio said it makes me no difference. Commissioner Murphy said so everybody's....Commissioner Pannell said oh yeah we're good....Commissioner Murphy...content with the way with the way it is right now. In December we'll follow the precedent that the Vice President takes over the Marketing. Commissioner Pannell said I never made a motion, so it's dead. Commissioner Murphy said oh no, I'm just explaining my reasoning. Commissioner Bryant said don't we need a motion for Secretary-Treasurer.

Commissioner Murphy said we need a Secretary-Treasurer. Is there a motion. Commissioner Watkins said I move Rick Prescott as Secretary-Treasurer. Commissioner Murphy said it's been moved by Commissioner Watkins and seconded by Commissioner Austin that we elect Commissioner Prescott. Any discussion. Hearing none, he said all in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". Hearing no "Nay's", Commissioner Prescott is elected as the Secretary-Treasurer and will take over as Chairman of the Marketing Committee. At this time, I will turn the chair over to you.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Sam N. Gregorio, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell, Rick C. Prescott and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Commissioner Prescott called on Brenda for a Customer Update. Her report included: ADS Logistics; Carbo Ceramics; Pratt Industries; Ronpak, West Louisiana Aggregate, and Ternium. In August we responded to a project that SWEPCO had. It's a small project being handled out of their AEP Columbus office. They will be back in touch as they get through the initial pieces of those. Benteler reported that officially August 1<sup>st</sup> is when the plant went into operation. They were successful as they started up and started producing pipe. In the coming months they're gonna focus on ramping up the plant and optimizing all the processes. They're still doing commissioning and testing in some areas of the mill. Construction continues on the extension for the quenching and tempering area. Their hiring and training is on track, and they're currently sitting at 325 employees. On August 26<sup>th</sup>, Eric, Rick, Ken Guidry and myself made a trip to Priefert to take our proposal for their manufacturing facility. We had a great visit and tour through their facility. They truly are an American success story. They're working on their due diligence and th numbers to take a look at what makes sense to them as far as that facility. We were contacted by a company out of East Texas that had been talking with Benteler. Once Benteler starts making their pipe, they're producing a certain amount of scrap and will continue to do so until the melt shop is up and running. So they they have been looking for someone that will handle their scrap for them. Since it's for a term of two years or less, depending on the melt shop, the company needed access to a rail spur. We ended up talking to WLA and they worked out a deal with them the company, they're making a proposal, WLA did, which the company is taking back to Benteler to share a space on WLA's leased space and have access to the track. They're going to put it in a defined area blocked off. They would be moving 4-6 cars of rail a week. If the market becme such that they could ship some of it out by barge, they have entertained the idea to do that as well. Even though it's pretty well good clean scrap coming out of Benteler to be loaded on rail cars, one of our stipulations in our release to WLA to sublet the space is that they require a Phase 1 on that piece of ground when they get through with this project. We continue to work with two of our tenants talking with them about their expansion plans. Brenda called for questions.

Commissioner Prescott called on Kathy for monthly reports and Eric said Kathy was downstairs with the Leadership Shreveport Bossier giving a presentation. They have their transportation segment this month. So I will be giving the report. Before I give that, let's look at Google Earth while I make some follow on comments to Brenda's report about some of our customer activity. As you know, we're out for proposals for a Financial Advisor (FA) and that's tied to our Omni project. The goal is there to issue bonds for that project and we're going to need the FA in place for that. Most of you will recall the Port did a conduit finance bond issue for the Tire Rack project years ago. In that deal was an organization called Ten Cal and subleased the building to Tire Rack. We know that Ten Cal who's headed by a gentleman called Ted Swartz is visiting with Omni about a possible construction financing plan that would be more advantageous than the Port issuing the bonds on day 1. So it may very well be that we issue the bonds toward the tail end of construction instead of on the front end just given the fact that what leads to it being more advantageous to Omni, taking the construction financing from Ten Cal as opposed to the Port is if we issue the bonds on the front end or on day 1, we're going to ask for an increased rental from Omni to cover the debt service payments, whereas the other option it will be at a lesser amount. These are things that are still up in the air but we wanted to share with you that Omni is shopping proposals but however they do move forward, it appears as though we still will need the bond issue. We'll still need the approximate \$12-\$14 million dollars.

Some of you have been made aware and commissioners that served on that time recall there was a scrap steel company in addition to the one Brenda was discussing in her report that's located in downtown Shreveport. Previously (referring to the screen) they were interested in a site here and we were not. We had a lot of issues with a scrap company being located in this area just because of these industries given the nature of the operation, the dust, the noise and then to make things even less advantageous for that, we now have Ronpak as a lessee who's producing bags for consumer use in the food business. So there really isn't a site that works for them. However, given what their current needs are, there is an approximate ten-acre tract of land next to Oakley down on the south end of the Port. Keep in mind Oakley handles things such as fertilizer in a very corrosive type product. That's why their building is made out of concrete and there aren't a lot of industries that would be willing to locate next to a fertilizer facility. If ever the Port was going to have an industrial scrap facility that would have a railroad and barge terminal, this is one of the best sites as compared to these larger tracts which most of your scrap companies are not going to need that 100 or so acre site. This is an idea site. We met with the gentleman from Monroe Iron & Metal and just had a preliminary meeting. They're going to evaluate the site a little bit more, do some due diligence on their end and then get back with us. Preliminarily in our discussions, we discussed the concerns that were the concerns of the Commission before largely to do with what I previously described and also with the fact it wasn't desirable for the Port to have a lessee that was in the business of receiving, if you will, residential or just more on a non-industrial basis. His preliminary discussions were that this would be strictly industrial loads, mainly for ultimate supply to Benteler. Coupled with that would be that they would be receiving large amounts of scrap in addition to local industrial supplies by barge. Just wanted to make you aware because I know several of you have heard about this prospect and let you know where the dialogue is. I will be glad to answer any questions anyone might have at this time.

Finally, just following up on Brenda's report on Priefert, I wanted to mention that Capt. Murphy and I will be traveling to the Red River Waterway Commission on Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> to attend their Ports Committee meeting and to make a presentation attached to our \$4 million dollar request for the Priefert Manufacturing facility. The goal of the meeting is for them to provide not only the authorization but also authorize the cooperative endeavor agreement which will be the conduit for the \$4 million dollars to be matched with \$1 million dollars of Port funds which was part of our proposal to Priefert in late August, a \$5 million dollar infrastructure incentive.

With regard to Kathy's report, if there aren't any questions, it's in your report as you can see the public affairs report of August 2015 with all the various web links attached to it and the backup material as well. I will be glad to answer any questions that anybody might have about it. If not, that concludes my report, Mr. Prescott.

Commissioner Prescott called on Gremillion & Pou to present the Public Information and Business Development Plan. Anne Gremillion said today I'm here to bring an update for where we are with the Public Information and Business Development Campaign we'd been talking to you earlier about. Today we are presenting the creative for the television. The commercial proposed was then read to the committee. The outdoor message ties along so that it reinforces our message on television. We are scheduling to begin the television on September 28<sup>th</sup>. We'll be on for six weeks ending the first week in November. We'll be on KTBS, KSLA and KTAL. The achievement of this campaign will have 75% reach meaning that we will reach within the community watching television and our DMA we will reach fully 75% of those people and the frequency is 10.7. The minimum frequency in this day and age is 4 so we are doing really way more than that. It's a very strong placement and we're achieving 1.3 million impressions per flight. Outdoor will begin at the same time, September 28<sup>th</sup>. It will be a six week flight ending the first week in November and estimated achievement of 640,000 impressions in this one flight. We're going to be utilizing digital outdoor with multiple messages as we've just shown which support the TV campaign. We're going to create the spot, doing a video, on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September and will need to enlist

the assistance of our stevedores for extras and we're shooting at multiple locations at the Port including the general cargo dock, the rail system and aerials. The estimated budget for 2015 will be a total of \$27,900. \$20,000 of that is for the media placement, \$5,050 for the production and \$2,850 to accomplish public relations. Does anyone have any questions? Thank you.

Commissioner Prescott called on Eric for the Calendar of Activities review. Eric said the calendar is in your packages. I did want to point out I mentioned earlier we are out for our RFP's on the FA. We're opening those proposals this week on Thursday around 4:00 p.m. and we're aiming to have a Special meeting of the Board next Thursday prior to the Board meeting for presentations to be made from the FA candidates. We'll let you know as soon as we have the proposals in hand, how many we have and how much time we plan to allow and that will dictate the time of calling the Special Meeting next Thursday. We don't know how many proposals we're gonna have, but we would like to plan that meeting hopefully around noon just to give each one in that 20-30 minute time frame per proposal for transitions, Q&Q. As we know it takes that much time for each one.

We'll have an MBE Committee also that day where we're gonna have the CMAR presentation (Construction Manager at Risk program). Our goal is to have that in the Steering Room at 3:00 p.m. So we will have some meeting overlap during those presentations and the MBE Committee, but the goal of the MBE Committee is to invite other governing organizations that would be interested in the CMAR presentation at that time. We'll have that as well.

We have the AAPA Annual Convention upcoming. If you are making plans to attend that, please let Mary or me know as soon as possible and we'll start getting those reservations made for you. That concludes my report unless there are any questions.

Hearing no further business for the Marketing Committee, Commissioner Prescott adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:31 p.m.

Commissioner Prescott said included in your packet is the Marketing Committee report of September 8, 2015. If there are no additions, corrections or deletions, I make a motion for approval of this report. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved that the Marketing Committee report of September 8, 2015 be accepted. Any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passes.

**Operations Committee Report of September 8, 2015:** The meeting was called to order by Vice President Sam N. Gregorio at approximately 12:32 p.m., September 8, 2015, at the Regional Commerce Center Board Room. I see someone came in since the last meeting. Steve Melvin with EJES introduced himself. Any public comments?

Commissioners present: Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Sam N. Gregorio, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, Capt. Thomas F. Murphy, James L. Pannell, Rick C. Prescott and Steve Watkins. A quorum was present.

Guests in attendance: Liz McCain, City of Shreveport, Tyler Comeaux, BKI; Anne Gremillion, Daniel Strickland and Ashley Ellingsen, Gremillion & Pou; and Steve Melvin, EJES, Inc. Staff members: Eric England, Rick Nance, Brenda Levinson, Dannye Malone, Gloria Washington, Ted Knight, Hugh McConnell and Hettie Agee.

Commissioner Gregorio called on Hugh for the Operations report. Hugh said rail activity increased a little bit in August, a little more than 19% in tonnage increase. Benteler is starting to receive more rail cars with billets for their process. We're also seeing trucks looking for Benteler as well with billets, trying

to find their way to the industry there. They had about 16 cars in the Port now. Ternium and West Louisiana Aggregates (WLA) carry the lion's share of the tonnage for the month. Ternium recorded nearly 15,000 tons of coils coming into the Port. That's about 34% of the monthly total. West Louisiana Aggregates reported a little over 20,000 tons which is about 47% of the total for the month. Those two companies carry the bulk of the tonnage. West Louisiana Aggregates had two trains. One was an aggregate train that we normally see coming out of Little Rock. The second train was an ag lime train that came out of the Austin area. They've landed a contract with the Dolet Hills Mining Venture so they're supplying this ag lime to Dolet Hills as they reclaim property to get vegetation and things to grow back where they're doing the strip mining. That should be a continuing project. Petroleum shipments are about the same. The frac media shipments are about the same. The frac media is pretty slow right now. We did meet with the folks with WLA about installing an air line down at the track so that when these 90 car trains come in and they break them in half, there's two 45-car streams. When the UP goes to depart, they have to put them back together, connect the air line and then a man has to physically walk from one end to the other about a mile each way to make sure the brakes are actuating. So we've been talking to WLA about possibly putting in an air line so that they can apply air to those cars in the two pieces and the man has a much shorter distance to walk. They don't tie up the roads as long. They're happy; we're happy so it should be a pretty easy fix. Wanted to mention that McDevitt, the contractor to repair the flooded rail cars, is on site today. Contracts have been signed. We've had meetings with him and his people. We've got cars staged and ready to begin repairs. We've had a meeting with the UP as far as them blessing everything and making sure it's done properly. So he's saying in about 10 days those 63 cars will be repaired and it will all be history at that point. So we're excited about that and hope it moves quickly as he expects. I also wanted to mention that Hexion, even though they aren't moving a lot of frac media right now, they are spending money. They're adding a concrete parking lot and they also met with us about installing some car scanners. Each rail car has got an RF ID tag on the side of it and the big railroads have scanners in different locations to tell where traffic is moving and how it's moving. We've always thought about maybe installing a scanner at the Port so that we would know when cars come and go and have an accurate count. Hexion has asked if they can go ahead and install scanners to not only record their traffic for their purpose but they're also going to share that information with us so that we'll have real time date stamp on the cars that enter and leave the Port. So we've been working with Danye about getting a Right of Use Agreement in place and they're going to do all this on their dime. At this time, there's no cost to us other than allowing them to install these scanners. We're glad to see that. We're hoping to take that information and upload it to our data base and it will cut down on typos and bad numbers and improve our reporting. In total, there were 43,667 tons of cargo moved through the Port by rail. With regard to barge traffic, the River is back down to pool stage, just under about 15 ft. at the Shreveport gauge. We know the public ramps opened this weekend and that dredging still continues and the dredge was expected to be at Campti which is up around the Port of Natchitoches. So they're working through those low water areas. We know there are two Priefert coil barges on the water and expect them maybe end of the week. Priefert brought a representative from Mobile to see the Port, see how we handle product and how we handle cargo. So we're glad to see these customers and potential new tenants bring folks to the Port and show off and hopefully improve commodity flows and competition. Wanted to let you know that Explo over at the Army base in Minden—you know we've heard our name in print a few times about this incinerating the propellant. So we reached out to the camp, got ahold of somebody there who then turned us on to the freight forwarder that is coordinating the move. There is a piece of equipment that will come out of Port of Catoosa in Oklahoma by barge and will come here to the Port and then they will roll on and roll off and use our Ro/Ro ramp—they will be on trailers—and it will be a little over 100 ft. in length. This piece of equipment will then travel through the Port and over to Camp Minden for that project. Oakley reported 4 barges of frac media, a little over 6,000 tons and Genesis Energy reported 10 barges of petroleum, 21,000 tons. So in total there were 14 barges, 27,988 tons. We don't have tonnage reports to you yet, but it should be in the next couple of days we'll have those to you.

Commissioner Gregorio called for questions. Hearing none, he called on Rick for Port Projects. Rick said 1) On the Riverline bature rail, we have placed and formed the pit that the scale sits in. We're letting it cure right now. The scale bridge has been delivered; 2) The RCC parking lot expansion, we've cleaned it up a little bit more. Waiting to get water in here to improve the moisture content in the slope so we can seed it; 3) The dock stevedore building was reviewed and sent back to the designers for some corrective action and we should see the final draft design sometime this week late and have one more review with our guys about the operational aspects of it, and 4) The City of Shreveport's main lift station is still about 3 weeks behind but the pumps are on site, wet well is now in and they're doing the electronic aspects of it.

I wanted to go over FEMA for you so that you have an understanding of the recapture for damage. We have four project worksheets (PW's) that FEMA will ultimately do. Hugh's already briefed the rail repair that we're doing. The contract's been let and they're out there beginning the process of pulling off the wheels and inspecting the bearings etc. and shipping them back to be redone. That's going to be one PW. We've already submitted the PW for the immediate scale work on our other scale to get it back in operation right immediately after the flood itself. My next one is the PW for debris. I'm pretty much done with the bidding for any repair. I've got to finish up our own in-house labor costs. The last one would be a PW for permanent repair. An example would be to get the conveyor contacts, rehab the old scale house; rehab 4-6 panels of concrete on the road where it was inundated. The Waterway took care of the dredging requirements. We've got one down, we're close to having the second one down, close to having the third one down and then there would be the fourth. Calling for questions and hearing none, Commissioner Gregorio called on Eric for the monthly reports.

Eric said the reports are in your packages and I would be glad to answer any questions. We'll get those tonnage reports to you just as soon as we get the numbers in from our customers.

Commissioner Gregorio called on Eric for the Port Expansion Study Technical Memorandum No. 5. Eric said we have before you today this item for adoption by the Board. If we could ask the Commission to adopt Technical Memo No. 5. A motion to adopt was made by Commissioner Pannell and seconded by Commissioner Prescott. Any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passes unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Sam N. Gregorio, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAINING: None

Eric said if I may, we will plan for that October 15<sup>th</sup> Special Board Meeting to receive the final presentation of the Port Expansion Study and steps forward. I believe we had the majority of the commissioners here, but for those commissioners that were not here, we will have that meeting prior to our Board meeting to receive the final presentation and the plan for moving forward.

Eric said with regard to the Property Tax, as you will recall at last month's Executive Committee meeting, we had on the agenda a line item for a reserve fund and during the discussion of the reserve fund, the topic of the Port property tax came up. And as a result of the discussion among the Executive Committee members, it was recommended that it come before the full Board for a discussion at the next meeting. We've placed it on the agenda for the Board to have that discussion regarding the Port property tax as to whether we needed to have any Q&A among the Commission and staff and timing etc. and wanted to allow the Board to discuss it and also fulfill the request of the Executive Committee's discussion last month. Commissioner Gregorio said we're open for discussion. Commissioner Bryant

said this is when you say the Port property tax, are you relating to when we would be having renewal. Eric said right. The Port property tax of 2.5 mills was passed in 1993 and it's set to expire in 2018. Commissioner Bryant said I guess you would need to have an election in '16 or '17. You wouldn't want to have it in '18, so it's just a matter of when we want to have it. Commissioner Watkins said I would think coming on the heels of Benteler would be a smart time to have it, on the heels of Benteler opening and any positive publicity that would provide us. Commissioner Hall asked Eric, when in 2018 does it expire? Eric said April. It was in April of 1993 that it passed so. Commissioner Bryant said actually you get to assess it in '18. Eric said we'll get revenues in '19 from the assessed property in 2018. Commissioner Bryant said the revenue in '19 is for the property tax that was paid as of December 31, 2018. Commissioner Pannell said I agree with Steve that we...Commissioner Gregorio said if it expires in April of '18, though that's before December of '18, would we get anything in '19? Commissioner Bryant said no, it expires but you get to assess it in the year that it expires. So if it expires in '18, you can assess it in '18. The problem though is once it expires, and you don't have the opportunity to come back and have another election, that's why you don't usually wait until the year it expires to have the election. Now if we're having the election in '16, then we would have to get moving in order to get it to the State Bond Commission and get it on whatever ballot in '16 we would want it on. Commissioner Gregorio said when does Benteler open using that as one of the suggestions? Eric said Benteler is in operation. They commenced in August so they are operating and ramping up. Commissioner Gregorio said when is their Grand Opening? Eric said it's going to be early next year. Commissioner Gregorio said early '16. Eric said yes. Commissioner Bryant said if you had it in, the only date is May; you don't have a July anymore, right? Eric said you have the fall and the spring. Commissioner Bryant said you have the March and the May and then after that you don't have one. May would have to be...Commissioner Gregorio said one suggestion I want to throw out for discussion is should we ask Eric and the staff to look at what dates are available in '16 and '17 and to see if we need any political consultants to advise us any on this or not. Those would be the two things I would suggest. What are y'all's thoughts? Commissioner Pannell said I just think, and I'm saying I agree with Steve. I think we need to do it in '16 and should it not be favorable, we'd have an opportunity at some point reassess it and go back so at least if we do it early enough, you've got two shots. Commissioner Gregorio said part of that is Erica's point of how much time do we have now to get it on '16. I just don't know. Commissioner Bryant said you probably can make May. Commissioner Pannell said the second one. The first date is too close already. The second one is you've got to be moving to get it on that. Commissioner Gregorio said which is the reason I was thinking we ought to have somebody look specifically at our options of which dates and then we can make some choices. Commissioner Bryant said Eric can you come back to us. Can you look at the dates in the spring of '16 and what's the deadlines for us to approve it and get it to the State Bond Commission in order to call the election. Commissioner Gregorio said and maybe even the interim steps that we need. Commissioner Bryant said you probably could check with Boles, our bond attorney. They should know. Commissioner Watkins said just by happen-stance it would dovetail well in that election with some things we're doing with Gremillion & Pou but just by happen-stance. Eric said that's good feedback. We'll get moving on those types of things. That's the communication we were looking for. Calling for any other discussion and hearing none, Commissioner Gregorio called on Eric for Reserve Fund.

Eric said this was the item which was on the agenda again during the Executive Committee meeting in August and there was some discussion as to the advantages and disadvantages of a reserve fund. And like the property tax, it was suggested that it be also brought before for discussion by the Board. So again, we would open it up and ask that you please open it up and ask that you open it up for any feedback that you could provide in that way. Commissioner Bryant said I think we're not quite ready yet to start talking about what the number is for the reserve fund. Commissioner Hall said I agree with that. Commissioner Watkins said I agree. Commissioner Gregorio called for any other discussion. Hearing none, he moved to the 3132 Update.

Eric said, as he referred to the projector screen drawing of Buchart Horn, he wanted to give you a status update on 3132. As you know, we're in the Stage 1 and earlier this year I presented to you all the overall time frame and project schedule for the Stage 1 completion. I attended a recent Project Advisory Committee. It's known as a PAC. During that PAC meeting the four routes were discussed in detail. Referring to the screen and drawing of Build Alternatives, this being Route A, Route C, and the two B Routes, B1 and B2 are down here. As you know we did a Stage 0 Study and that's where these four routes were developed and it's been Burk-Kleinpeter's job who's the consulting engineer to take it to the next level of evaluation. At this point in the project, it was foreseen that we would be narrowing down from four routes to two routes. At this time, the Project Advisory Committee is being advised that DOTD Traffic was not consulted for these two routes (A and C). As you can see A and C have what they call trumpet interchange. This is the Relay Station. Again DOTD Traffic did not weigh in on the effects of this trumpet interchange during the Stage 0 process. But they have done it during Stage 1. Had they done it during the Stage 0 process, it's likely that they would have been completely reevaluated. This trumpet interchange would not have been a part of the plan for evaluation. Just imagine if you were at the Port of Baton Rouge and Baton Rouge Port Allen area and you tried to get up on I-10 at the I-10 Bridge. That's basically now what you would have here, an incredible amount of height to gain because you would be spanning the railroad. Likely the Relay Station would be relocated. They could not continue to operate because there would be an extreme control of access placed in this area. All of this area along here where's there's Highway 1 access would be eliminated. So at this point, what I foresee is that the PAC which has DOTD as a member of it is going to provide guidance to the COG MPO, Metropolitan Planning Organization, who then the MPO is going to be asked to take a vote on which routes to recommend for BKL to narrow their focus from four to two. At this time, it looks like the two routes that are going to be evaluated further are likely B1 and B2 just because of the significant issues that have been brought forth for Routes A and C. That concludes my report, Commissioner Gregorio, unless there are any questions.

Commissioner Gregorio called on Eric for Sand Bag Filling Machine. Eric said you all will recall the conversations that we've had regarding the sand bag filling machines and the progress we made with Bossier Parish and Bossier City, I'm pleased to report that we've received positive feedback from both Caddo Parish and the City of Shreveport working with Brian Crawford and Tim Weaver at the parish. What we would propose to do is bring forth an authorization at the Board meeting for you all to consider for us to enter into a like agreement with Caddo and Shreveport as we did with Bossier Parish Police Jury and Bossier City. Calling for discussion and hearing none, Commissioner Gregorio moved to the Organizational Chart.

Eric said the final item on the agenda is the Organizational Chart. We had a By-Laws Committee meeting recently and during that time we discussed organizational structure with regard to the staff including the reporting relationship of the Director of Legal Affairs directly to the Board. While we were making those changes, we also made some other organizational changes. As you can see on there, we have placed the Director of Business Development in a position where in the absence of the Executive Port Director the Director of Business Development/Deputy Port Director will assume the duties of the Port Director. Commissioner Pannell asked what does the dotted line do. Eric said the dotted line denotes in the absence of the Executive Port Director. So in other words, the other department heads report to the Director of Business Development and then directly to the Board. It takes into account that I'm not available and it bypasses me so that position can report directly to the Board. Commissioner Gregorio it would be our goal today to get the Board to adopt this organizational structure so that we could then move forward with making the necessary changes to the job descriptions. We would propose to have that meeting on October 5, 2015 at 11:00 a.m., the Personnel Committee meeting, so that we could consider the job descriptions and also some items that we recognize we need to make in the personnel handbook. Commissioner Gregorio said as I understand it, the chart really makes one change

which is the Deputy Port Director in case you are absent. Eric said and the...Commissioner Gregorio said and Director of Legal Affairs comes directly to the Board. That's two changes. Is there a third? Eric said there is. The Director of Operational Services moves from being a direct report from the Executive Port Director to the Director of Business Development. Commissioner Gregorio said that's the third change. Eric said correct. Commissioner Gregorio said do I hear a motion. Commissioner Bryant said I move we accept the Organizational Chart. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pannell. Any discussion? As you've just heard, it involves three changes. Discussion? If none, all in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passes unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Sam N. Gregorio, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAINING: None

Commissioner Gregorio said that's the end of our agenda. He adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:59 p.m.

Commissioner Murphy said the Operations Committee report of September 8, 2015 is in your package. If there are no additions, deletions or deletions, I move that they be accepted. Any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The motion passed unanimously.

#### NEW BUSINESS:

**By-Laws:** The revised By-Laws were emailed to you this week from Dannye Malone and they are on the agenda today for final approval. They've been presented at a previous Board meeting and this, if you will, is their second presentation to the Board. So I have nothing further regarding the By-Laws. We'll follow the Commission's lead on this. Commissioner Austin said I've read those and I think you did a good job on that, Dannye, and I appreciate it. I make a motion we approve the By-Laws. Commissioner Pannell seconded the motion. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that the By-Laws revision be accepted. Any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passed unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Sam N. Gregorio

ABSTAINING: None

**Committee Assignments:** Mr. England said the committee assignments were also distributed this week. They're in your packages as well. As you'll see, most commissioners have participation on about four to five committees with the exception of Commissioner Prescott who, by his position, has extra duties as chair of the Finance Audit Committee. They've been prepared in accordance with my conversations with Capt. Murphy. In accordance with the By-Laws, they're to be confirmed by the Board today. The motion was made by Commissioner Pannell and seconded by Commissioner Watkins. Commissioner Murphy said it had been

moved and seconded that the committee assignments be approved as printed. Any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passed unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Sam N. Gregorio.

ABSTAINING: None

**Authorization – Parish of Caddo/City of Shreveport CEA for Sand Bag Filling Machine:** Mr. England said the authorization is for the item as Capt. Murphy described. What's different about this authorization is that where Bossier Parish Police Jury and Bossier City are purchasing two machines, the City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish have a need for only one machine. Our contribution for Bossier was approximately \$60,000. We recommend and it's in accordance with the City of Shreveport and Parish of Caddo is that our contribution be equal, approximately \$60,000, and that the City and Parish will split the difference which will be approximately \$15,000 each. We would ask the Board to move that this provide us authorization to enter into a CEA for this sand bag filling machine. The motion was made by Commissioner Bryant and seconded by Commissioner Prescott. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded we authorize the CEA with the City of Shreveport and the Parish of Caddo for the sand bag filling machine. Any discussion? Commissioner Austin asked where is that going to be located at. Mr. England said I don't know if they've determined the location yet. It's my understanding from the conversation with Tim Weaver they were going to get with Bossier Parish Police Jury and utilize the negotiation that they had done to—if you will—I believe there was a unit price discount and they were going to seek to buy the third machine under that unit price discount. Commissioner Pannell asked if the machines were permanent or movable. Mr. England said they are movable. Commissioner Murphy called for any more discussion. Hearing none, he said all in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passed unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Sam N. Gregorio.

ABSTAINING: None

**Authorization – RRWC Agreement Regarding Project Pleasant/Priefert Steel:** Mr. England said the Red River Waterway Commission yesterday authorized for the execution of the CEA between the Caddo-Bossier Parish Port Commission and the Red River Waterway Commission to provide us up to \$4 million dollars of funding to be matched with up to \$1 million dollars of funding from the Port for a total max contribution of \$5 million dollars for the Priefert facility. If for some reason the facility appraises for less than \$5 million, Red River Waterway Commission will adjust their contribution to 80% of the total which is their current contribution based on the 4/1 split. In the CEA that they have prepared, they have noted that the Port authorized me to sign such a document. Today we ask you to authorize me to sign that document. The motion was made by Commissioner Hall and seconded by Commissioner Austin. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that they authorize Eric for the Red River Waterway Commission agreement regarding Project Pleasant. Any discussion? Commissioner Watkins said I just have one tangent and it goes back to earlier in

the meeting. Dannye, would it be something we could do on our money to say that we'll release whatever money we want---I'm not just picking on this project---but any project once they get a lien free affidavit from the courthouse after they've completed the project, that might help us on some of these issues of getting local people paid that we wouldn't pay our part of it until they have a lien free affidavit. Dannye said I think it depends largely on the contractual obligation. I think that the Commission has with the State of Louisiana and also with Benteler Steel and that's something I need to take a look at first. Commissioner Pannell said you're speaking of Priefert. Mr. England said I can speak to that, Dannye. I can speak to the differences between Benteler and Priefert. I believe that we'll be able—I know that in this situation with Priefert we will not be in the same situation with Benteler. For example, our commitment to Benteler was to provide roughly \$29 million dollars of infrastructure. Obviously they didn't spend \$29 million dollars at once. It came in multiple invoices and so the process was for Benteler to send us invoices. For example, if they built a road or railroad and we process them and paid them and that's how we have spent the majority of the money because we're now two plus years after they began. With the Priefert project, Commissioner Watkins, the funding stream will be at the end of the construction, at the end of a lien clearance process and at the end of appraisal. Our agreement with Priefert Steel will be such that they will build their facility and upon completion of that. Rather let me say it this way. No money will be exchanged between the Port and Priefert Steel until after construction and the lien clearance and the appraisal. Commissioner Watkins said I would think that would be something you'd want to look at for any future projects if we're gonna put our money into it. Mr. England said absolutely. I think that's a good idea. Commissioner Murphy called for any further discussion. All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passes unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Sam N. Gregorio

ABSTAINING: None

**Port Property Tax Announcement – Intent to Discuss Property Tax Proposition at November 19, 2015 Board Meeting:** Mr. England said at the past couple meetings of the Board we've discussed the Port property tax and at the last meeting, we were instructed to gather some information about timing and process if we did want to go forth in the spring of 2016. I handed out to each of you this document, as you can see on your desk in front of you. As I wrote to you yesterday, the simple summary is if we're going to move forward in the spring, we've got to start moving now and that first process, or if you will, the first action of the Board, as you can see what we're proposing is on November 19<sup>th</sup> which is to pass the Election Call Resolution. Even before we do that, there is a requirement of us as a Board to announce our intent to discuss and to possibly consider that resolution at the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. So at this meeting today what we are doing, so long as the Board is wanting, or at this time considering moving forward in the spring of 2016, it's our duty to announce that on November 19, 2015 it will be our intent to discuss the Property Tax Resolution which will contain the proposition. We will also announce that intent at our October Board meeting and we will also publish notices

in accordance with the law as well no less than 30 days before the meeting, nor greater than 60 days before the meeting. Our intent has to be done the same way. So given the timing of our meeting today, unfortunately we are within a 30 days of our October meeting. But the November meeting is greater than 60 days so that's why we will have two announcements, one today and one at the October meeting. In terms of housekeeping, I wanted to make sure that we did just that today is announce what our intentions are. There's no action to take today in form of a parliamentary action other than just he announcement. Commissioner Hall said what about the adoption of the schedule that's been presented. In an effort to be abundantly open, I would like to make a motion we adopt this schedule and proceed in accordance with the schedule that we have so that no one misunderstands the intention of the Commission. I offer a motion to adopt the time schedule that is presented and proceed towards an election in April. Commissioner Pannell seconded the motion. Commissioner Bryant said the election will be in May. Dannye said April. Mr. England said April 9<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Murphy said it had been moved and seconded that we adopt the time schedule for the property tax election. If there any discussion? All in favor, please say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". It passed unanimously.

AYES: Commissioners: Thomas F. Murphy, Rick C. Prescott, Lynn Austin, Erica R. Bryant, Roy Griggs, James D. Hall, James L. Pannell and Steve Watkins.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Sam N. Gregorio.

ABSTAINING: None

## PUBLIC NOTICE

### NOTICE OF INTENT TO CALL AN ELECTION

Notice is hereby given in accordance with R.S. 42:19.1 that the Caddo-Bossier Parishes Port Commission at its regularly scheduled meeting on November 19, 2015 at the offices of the Caddo-Bossier Parishes Port Commission at 4:30 p.m., will discuss and consider adopting a resolution ordering and calling an election, to authorize a renewal of the existing two and one-half (2-1/2) mills tax on all property subject to taxation by the Caddo-Bossier Parishes Port Commission, upon approval by the qualified voters therein, and if passed, for such tax to be levied thereafter.

BY ORDER OF THE CADDO-BOSSIER PARISHES PORT COMMISSION

**Port Director's Report:** Mr. England said Commissioners, as we prepare for November, one thing to keep in mind again with the resolution for the property tax renewal is of course the amount of mills that we will seek to collect. Our current enabling legislation in the statute allows us to collect up to 2.5 mills and bond council, Bill Boles, has advised us that we are capable—we discussed this during

one of our previous meetings today---about the ability to pass a property tax for an indefinite period. Our 1993 tax we passed was for a period of 25 years. But between now and the time that we prepare the resolution which contains the proposition, we will need to get an understanding from the Commission the desired millage and the desired term.

As we also prepare for the future meetings, we will have a Personnel Committee meeting on October 5<sup>th</sup> about the 11/11:15 time frame before our regular committee meetings. It will just depend on the final number of edits that we're going to have to the handbook and to the job descriptions.

We're also going to have that Special Board meeting to discuss the Port Expansion study as a whole on the same day as our Board meeting in October. That meeting we think will be in the 3:15/3:30 range. We're not going to know that until we run through the presentation a time or two. We'll be in touch with you on that.

Will be glad to answer any questions you have and hope y'all have a great weekend.

**Adjournment:** Commissioner Murphy said if there's nothing further to bring before this Board, then we're adjourned at approximately 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Commissioner Rick C. Prescott  
Secretary-Treasurer

### **October Meeting Notices!!**

***Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting: Thursday, October 15, 2015, 4:30 p.m.***

Board Room, 6000 Doug Attaway Blvd., Shreveport, LA 71115

***Special Board Meeting, Thursday, October 15, 2015 3:30 p.m.***

***Personnel Committee Meeting, Monday, October 5, 2015, 11:15 a.m.***

***Marketing and Operations Committee Meetings, Monday, October 5, 2015, 12 Noon***

6000 Doug Attaway Blvd., Shreveport, LA 71115