



BioDistrict New Orleans
Board of Commissioners Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2025 | 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Location: Greater New Orleans Foundation, 919 St. Charles Ave, New Orleans, LA 70130

I Call to Order

The BioDistrict Board Meeting was called to order by Chairperson, Andy Kopplin, at 2:38 pm.

II Board Member Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Blake Stanfill, Emily Arata, Charlotte Parent, Nicole Honoree, Gregorie Tillery, Josh Fleig, Arnel Cosey, Patrick Norton, Andy Kopplin

Commissioners Present via Zoom: None

Commissioners Absent: Kaneisha Akinpelumi, Larissa Littleton-Steib, Michael Hecht, Lowry Curley, Judith Dangerfield

Quorum: Present

III Introduction of Guest(s)

Andreas Pashos (Consultant to BioDistrict), Sharonda Williams (Counsel to BioDistrict), Kris Khalil (NOBIC), Lyle Montgomery (MCNO), Evie Poitevent (GNO Inc), Jacqueline Cooke (Trepwise), Ayame Dinkler (Tulane), Kerry Stockwell (Tulane), Ian Morrison (Tulane)

IV Adoption of Previous Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kopplin requested approval of the minutes from the previous BioDistrict board meeting on September 3, 2025. Dr. Cosey motioned for approval, and Ms. Arata seconded. There was no discussion or public comment, and the motion was unanimously approved.

V Financial Report

Mr. Pashos began by informing the board that the district received the City's second EDD payment. He also said that our bank account balance is currently a little over \$800,000. Along with the first payment received in January of 2025 the total earned by BioDistrict under the City CEA to date is \$1,179,000. The only new expenses since the last board meeting were the

payments for services from Mr. Pashos and the first payment to Groundwork New Orleans per the CEA for the tree planting project on Tulane Ave. That first payment was \$15,035. Mr. Pashos said his financial report is updated to end September.

Mr. Pashos also shared details related to encumbered but not yet spent obligations. For the consulting support that includes \$37,500, and \$25,000 for sponsorship of the BioChallenge, which took place the previous week. There is also \$91,250 CEA with NOBIC related to entrepreneurship support as well.

For year to date expenditures, \$310,000 went towards programming, which includes the bulk of \$295,000 to support landscape work in the downtown section of the BioDistrict back in January in preparation for the Superbowl, and the rest is the first payment to Groundwork New Orleans. All this data is related to City funds.

The last page of the report captures State fund information, however the district has not yet received any State funds.

Mr. Kopplin made a note that on the second page of the budget it displays data for 2024, but since the district had not received any funds that year, it was not able to spend any funds that year. That budget for 2024 was carried over to 2025. It may look like the district is underspending on the budget, which it is, but that is simply because the district hadn't received the cash until very recently.

a. Update on City Funds

i. Andreas Pashos is working with multiple City departments to finalize the 2025 Q1, Q2 and 2024 balance payments

Mr. Kopplin mentioned that the City is supposed to be paying the district quarterly, however due to the City's cash flow crisis, the district might not request those funds on schedule, as to help the City meet payroll needs. The liability still exists however.

b. Update on State Funds

i. District is working to submit the annual budget and annual plan requirements for LED review and approval before receiving state funds

Regarding State funds, Mr. Kopplin mentioned to the board that a letter was sent to LED Secretary Bourgeois outlining our proposed budget, and the BioDistrict needs written approval to proceed with asking the Department of Revenue at the State to receive those funds.

VI Chair's Report / Action Items

a. Review proposed board meeting schedule for 2026

Mr. Kopplin shared the proposed board meeting dates for 2026 and asked the board for feedback of any dates that are conflicts. Mr. Pashos will follow up with calendar invites to the board for the 2026 dates. It's usually the first or second Wednesday of the month but the district worked around various holidays, so there are some outliers.

b. Reminder that board member ethics training must be completed by end of year, Mr. Pashos will begin communications

Mr. Pashos communicated that the annual ethics training for board members is due at the end of the calendar year on December 31. It takes about an hour to do and can be done at any point up to the end of the year. Once completed members are asked to send certifications to Mr. Pashos to add to the district's documentation.

Communications for the training will go out after this meeting.

c. Request for consideration of a CEA for \$52,250 with New Orleans BioInnovation Center to support development of an application for Economic Development Administration disaster funds

Mr. Kopplin summarized that the board has had multiple discussions related to this EDA funding opportunity. He mentioned that NOBIC has a recommendation for a consultant, Jason Rittenburg, to assist the district in submitting a proposal and invited Mr. Khalil to speak about that proposal. The structure would be Mr. Rittenberg working through NOBIC, with a CEA between the district and NOBIC. Mr. Rittenberg would identify a collection of important projects to the district. After the district chooses the projects to move forward, Mr. Rittenberg would assist with submitting that application.

Mr. Kopplin reminded members that since this is a CEA with NOBIC, and there are district board members that are also members of NOBIC's board, they should recuse themselves from discussion and voting. Those board members are Mr. Norton, Mr. Fleig and Ms. Honoree.

Mr. Khalil mentioned that Mr. Rittenberg worked at STTI in DC and worked closely with EDA. The proposal and Mr. Rittenberg's CV were shared with the board. Mr. Fleig and Mr. Stanfill mentioned that they have worked with Mr. Rittenberg in the past while at STTI and recommend his work.

Ms. Arata agreed that doing deeper work around district priorities would be very beneficial, regardless of outcomes of this specific opportunity.

Mr. Stanfill moved to approve the CEA with NOBIC to support the EDA application. Ms. Parent seconded. Mr. Norton, Mr. Fleig and Ms. Honoree recused themselves from the discussion and voting. There was no further discussion or public comment and the motion was unanimously approved.

d. Presentation by Tulane University regarding Charity Hospital

- a. Request for consideration of a partnership from the State of Louisiana to increase the BioDistrict EDD agreement to add additional state resources for Charity Hospital redevelopment**
- b. Request for consideration of investment from the BioDistrict to support Charity Hospital redevelopment**

Mr. Kopplin invited Tulane University representatives to share a presentation related to the Charity Hospital project. Mr. Kopplin asked Mr. Norton to recuse himself from the

discussion and potential voting as he represents Tulane University. In his stead, Ian Morrison presented to the board.

Prior to the presentation Mr. Kopplin summarized the district's strategic plan and how it laid out a number of smaller projects for consideration, but highlighted three projects as paramount for the district to support. One of these was the redevelopment of Charity Hospital as a critical anchor in the district. The second was achieving National Cancer Institute designation, led by LSUHSC. The third was advancing the Xavier Ochsner College of Medicine. All of these are beyond the scope of the BioDistrict alone, but the district should play a role in supporting their progress.

Mr. Morrison, VP of Public Affairs at Tulane University, began by highlighting the Charity Hospital before, during and since Hurricane Katrina. Tulane's goal in redeveloping Charity Hospital is to transform downtown New Orleans into a nationally recognized center of research, medicine and innovation. Over the last decade Tulane has made a deliberate decision to expand their downtown presence and impact. Tulane is already investing significantly downtown to support a nursing school, student gathering spaces and other improvements.

Tulane plans to occupy about half of 1 million sq. ft. redeveloped Charity Hospital. They plan to use it to bring together researchers, educators, innovators and clinicians and allow them to work side by side to drive discovery, prevention and better care for generations to come.

The post construction impact will include hundreds of positions in research, teaching, healthcare and operations. It is estimated every \$1 investment will generate \$5-\$7 of regional economic activity.

Tulane wants to finalize this deal before the end of the year, and requires BioDistrict support to make it happen and is requesting an annual commitment over 15 years to move the project from planning to construction. Tulane's part of the project will cost \$425M and has strong City and State support. This BioDistrict financial support will help fund the public infrastructure to make this project work. Tulane is proposing a total net present value of ~\$11M, with fewer dollars per year requested earlier and higher amounts in later years as the BioDistrict's revenues grow.

After the presentation Mr. Kopplin added that there have been multiple attempts historically to redevelop Charity, but they all failed. Tulane has re-energized the project. He summarized that the city has a lot of available and affordable office space, so Tulane could have chosen many other more affordable paths forward, but is committed to re-opening the Charity Hospital facility. He mentioned that if Charity is not transformed, there will continue to be a gaping hole in the middle of the district, but opening it will help revitalize the whole district. He noted that Tulane is probably the only entity with the capacity to develop Charity Hospital right now, and if they don't, it probably won't get developed.

Mr. Kopplin then explained another part of Tulane's request. He said that state leaders approved legislative changes in June that would allow additional financial support for

the Charity project and Tulane via the BioDistrict through an amendment to the existing CEA between the BioDistrict and the State. Ms. Williams and Mr. Kopplin have been reviewing possible amendments to ensure that they protect the original State commitment to the BioDistrict, while adding this opportunity for the BioDistrict to help advance Charity redevelopment by passing through additional state funds.

Mr. Kopplin summarized that the first request is for the BioDistrict to approve an amendment to their CEA with the State to support a pass through \$4M/year in new resources from the State for Charity project through the conclusion of the CEA in 2040.

The second request is the financial commitment of funding from BioDistrict funds for infrastructure and/or programming to the Charity project of annual appropriations equal to approximately \$11M in net present value from the BioDistrict's state and local funds, also through 2040.

Ms. Arata shared her belief that if everything the district dreams about in the district comes to fruition, but Charity stands vacant, the success of the district will be far less than we hope. To make this project a reality every partner needs to have skin in the game, and stretch themselves and give significant support. She expressed very strong support of the requests. She had a question regarding whether district support needs to be categorized as either infrastructure or programming. Mr. Morrison clarified that district support will go towards public infrastructure work.

Ms. Honoree said that she also sees this as a very important project. She wanted to clarify the total amount of passthrough funding which is \$4M/year. Mr. Kopplin and Mr. Morrison clarified that it would be for 14 years, which adds up to \$56M.

Ms. Honoree also asked for more detail related to the amendment language and how the initial State support would be protected. Ms. Williams shared that they had gone through multiple drafts of the language to explicitly state that this new support is above and beyond the original \$25M support from the State. Ms. Williams expressed that she is comfortable with the current version of the language.

Mr. Kopplin added that if the BioDistrict were to approve such an amendment, it would then have to go to the State's Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget to be approved just as the original CEA did.

Ms. Honoree communicated that in addition to the State's investment in Charity, there are equally important investments the State should strive to make in this space, such as the NCI initiative LSUHSC is leading in partnership with LCMC Health. She is supportive of this request, and wants to highlight she would be equally supportive of the district taking a lead in securing State dollars for the public hospital and university system, which are also key assets of the BioDistrict. Both of these projects would have incredible economic impact. She summarized that each of the three highlighted major projects for the BioDistrict: Charity, NCI and XOCOM, need similar strong levels of support.

Relative to the BioDistrict investment towards the Charity project, Ms. Honoree stressed that the district's financial commitment should go towards public infrastructure, and

clearly showing that connection publicly is worthwhile since it resonates with the district's mission.

Ms. Honoree shared feedback about the volume of district funds being committed to a project at a time when the district has only ever received two City payments, and when the commitment represents ~20% of our annual City inflow. She urges the board to support this request, and to be strategic at maximizing our financial resources because they are limited.

Mr. Morrison shared support for LSUHSC's NCI designation project and commented that all the district members should continue to work together. He also mentioned that Tulane is close to securing all needed support and the BioDistrict's investment is critical to closing the financing gap.

Ms. Honoree recommended that as Tulane moves forward it should remember to publicly recognize that the BioDistrict is a partner and supporter of the Charity project. As the district works to establish its brand with the community and industry, this connection to the project will be beneficial.

Mr. Morrison communicated that he envisions a district presence in Charity.

Mr. Kopplin thanked Ms. Honoree for her well-stated feedback.

Ms. Parent seconded the comments by Ms. Honoree. She agreed that the district needs to make sure it communicates what it accomplishes. Ms. Parent supports the request as well and also wants to point out that it represents a significant investment as a portion of total district resources.

Mr. Kopplin highlighted that the new Trader Joe's in the district will help maximize City revenues, and he estimates that the district will receive the maximum revenues and the City and State lifetime revenue caps.

Mr. Stanfill shared that he envisions establishing a system or rubric to evaluate future proposals and projects on various attributes such as: financial feasibility, return to community, institutional goodwill, etc. Looking at these factors, mission alignment, and the strategic plan, however, he sees the benefit of this project and supports the requests.

Mr. Kopplin shared a message he received from Mr. Hecht who could not attend due to travel, in which he shared strong support for these requests and that Charity is very important to the City's story and the district's impact.

Ms. Arata moved to approve the first request to increase the State BioDistrict EDD agreement to pass through \$4M in new resources per year through 2040 subject to state approval of an amendment to the BioDistrict's State CEA. Mr. Tillery seconded. Mr. Norton recused himself from the discussion and vote. There was no further discussion or public comment, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Parent moved to approve the second request to invest BioDistrict funds in the amounts presented (2026, \$300,000; 2027, \$400,000; 2028, \$506,181; 2029, \$600,000, 2030, \$1M; 2031, \$1M; 2032, \$1M; 2033 \$1.35M; 2034, \$1.4M; 2035, \$1.5M; 2036

\$1.6M; 2037, \$1.7M; 2038 \$1.8M; 2039, \$1M; 2040, \$1M) towards the Charity project. Ms. Cosey seconded. Mr. Norton recused himself from the discussion and vote. There was no discussion or public comment, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Kopplin wished Tulane success on the project.

Mr. Norton, who had recused himself from the discussion and voting, shared some thoughts after the vote. He thanked the board for its support and assured that the BioDistrict will be recognized for its support, and believes the support is a significant statement by the BioDistrict. Tulane is looking to get Charity back in commerce by early 2029 with work beginning in early 2026 if all goes well.

Mr. Kopplin pointed out that the district isn't just contributing resources, but also the provided the vehicle with which the State can most easily provide support to the project.

VII Chair's Report / Discussion Items

a. Update on Groundwork New Orleans Tree Planting Project on Tulane Avenue (Currently in design/permitting/documentation approval phase)

Mr. Pashos shared with the board that the project is starting on the Claiborne side of Tulane Ave and going down towards Carrollton. Close to Claiborne is the LSUHSC campus which will get trees on their own property which mitigates the need for permitting those trees as they are on the property side of the sidewalk. Trees will be purchased soon.

Mr. Kopplin thanked Ms. Honoree for working with Groundwork to identify and prepare their property for those trees. Some trees currently on Tulane Avenue will be relocated by Park and Parkways that don't comply with the state requirements since Tulane Avenue is a State-owned thoroughfare. Ms. Honoree mentioned that they are trying to mirror the UMC campus which is full of trees. She mentioned that establishing an extensive tree canopy around that area of the district will draw attention and be another visible accomplishment the district can point towards.

Mr. Pashos will connect Ms. Parent with Groundwork to hold discussions related to the tree planting project.

Ms. Honoree reminded the board that getting banners and signage for the rest of the district would be beneficial. Mr. Kopplin asked Mr. Pashos to reach out to the DDD and the City to work together to explore the process of installing the banners and finalizing locations for the banners. He also mentioned the CEAs may have language related to signage as well, which should be reviewed first.

b. Review budget submitted to City & LED

Mr. Kopplin reminded the board that they had already approved budgets for 2024, 2025 and 2026. The district submitted the same budget to the City and State. Changes can be made down the road, and the completion of this process satisfies the CEA requirements.

c. Review Annual Report submitted to City & LED

Mr. Kopplin thanked Mr. Pashos for putting together the annual report, which was submitted on time to the City and State.

d. Update on Bus Shelters & RTA

Mr. Kopplin shared that conversations with Dwight Norton at RTA and Mr. Pashos are continuing so the district can provide support for high quality bus shelters in the district.

e. BioDistrict meeting with VOASELA

Mr. Kopplin shared about a facility development right outside the district bounds focused on health wellness concept.

f. BioDistrict presentation to DDD Board

Mr. Kopplin summarized the district presentation to DDD in which he thanked them for the support towards completing the strategic plan in 2024, and for their partnerships for the pre-Superbowl improvements that were undertaken. He also asked them if they would be able and willing to support BioDistrict efforts outside of the downtown area for a fee.

g. RFP Process Updates

Mr. Kopplin highlighted that a review of RFPs is ongoing. Counsel is also reviewing.

VIII Vice Chair's Report / Discussion Items

a. Update on CEA with NOBIC to support SBIR/STTR grant writing efforts

Mr. Stanfill invited Mr. Khalil to summarize SBIR/STTR funding. Mr. Khalil shared positive impact NOBIC has had historically with these grants. He also shared that due to the government shutdown, and the lapse in this program, there is no new funding provided, so the focus is on phase two proposals. This CEA has not been executed yet. Mr. Stanfill thanked Mr. Khalil and communicated that this CEA is in draft form currently.

b. Update on BioChallenge

Mr. Stanfill congratulated the NOBIC team on hosting a successful BioChallenge and shared that Mr. Kopplin presented the audience favorite award to a company who was also the first place winner. The winner was JuneBrain and they do remote retinal scans to diagnose retinal and neurological diseases. Mr. Khalil thanked the board for their sponsorship, and shared that the show is available online, included five companies from across the country, and 110 applicants from across the world with \$100K cash prize. NOBIC is planning on focusing on brain health again for next year's competition.

Mr. Khalil also shared that the day before, Texas passed Prop 14, a \$3B moonshot initiative funded by their State Legislature to attract researchers and innovators in brain health and neuroscience for the next 10 years. Our community and state can learn from it and try to push similar initiatives.

c. Update on discussions with entrepreneurial ecosystem partners regarding potential BioDistrict investments

Mr. Stanfill shared plans to work with Idea Village to help accelerate bioscience technology and companies. There is also a national accelerator that wants to bring its model to the area. Mr. Kopplin added that other organizations in the same space are also going to be invited to give the BioDistrict input, such as Tulane Innovation Institute, LSU and Xavier tech transfer, LED, Ochsner Ventures, etc. The goal is to figure out the best overall strategy and investment.

IX New Business

There was no discussion or comment.

X Partner Updates

There was no discussion or comment.

XI Public Comment(s)

Mr. Kopplin opened the floor to Ms. Montgomery who shared she is a resident of the Tulane-Gravier neighborhood. She shared appreciation for the invitation to talk to the board and communicated that her neighborhood has been overrun by commercial short-term rentals. One reason is because the City never instituted a density cap on commercial STRs. These neighbors are adjacent to the district and quality of life issues that affect this neighborhood also affect the district. The City is currently going through a process to revamp the ordinance for commercial STRs after a two year moratorium with no new permits. However, it looks like all existing STRs will be allowed to continue in the upcoming ordinance. For new STRs there is a density cap of one commercial STR per block. In the lower Mid City neighborhood there are 65 commercial STRs in eight blocks, with an average of 52 guests per block. Meaning that what is there currently is significantly above and beyond what the new ordinance will allow going forward. The problem is that the neighborhoods are gutted because there is less housing for residents, less stores, less businesses and less restaurants. As an example there is a block on Tonti that has 10 brand new commercial STRs. Mr. Montgomery isn't looking for money, but looking for support from the district to limit the grandfathering of existing commercial STRs.

Mr. Kopplin responded that typically non-conforming uses are difficult to undo. Ms. Williams summarized that there is a circuit court decision that may affect the ordinance. Mr. Kopplin thanked Ms. Montgomery for her feedback and would like the district to explore if they can play a constructive role in the conversation.

XII Adjournment

Mr. Kopplin moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Arata. The Chair called for discussion and public comments, of which there were none, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:07pm.
