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(Pledge of Allegiance.)
MS. BARON:
John Poteet?
MR. POTEET:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Brewer?
MR. BREWER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Dino Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Tony Cormier?
MR. CORMIER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Ron Duplessis?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Floyd?
MR. FLOYD:
Here.

MS . BARON: Kirby Roy?

MR. ROY: Here.

MS . BARON:
Darty Smith?
MR. SMITH:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Steve Olave?
MR. OLAVE:
Here.
MS. BARON: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum. MR. POTEET:

Okay. All right. Do we have anyone here for public comments today?

MS . BARON:
We do not.
MR. POTEET:
So we need the approval of the
minutes from the January meeting.
MR. SMITH:
I'll make a motion.
MR. POTEET:

I have a motion.
A second?
MR. BREWER: Second.

MR. POTEET:
Second from George.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. That's done.
The next thing on our agenda is the review of financial reports. So, Mona. MS . ANDERSON:

Okay. If you turn in your
packets to the financial statements for the month ending January 31, 2015, on the statement of net position, the cash in the bank increased to $\$ 1,782,055$. Hearings and fines accounts receivable increased to $\$ 533,150$. The current liabilities at the bottom of the page is $\$ 39,417$.

And on Page 2, you will notice
that the long-term liabilities only have the fee -- second year fee revenue for 2016, effective January 1st when we moved $\$ 282,350$ to revenue as it was fully earned the second year of those licenses. The remaining deferred revenue was $\$ 271,765$.

On Page 3, your statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position, year-to-date revenue was \$1,304,419 and that was compared to \$881,000 last year, but, again, the big increase last year, we moved those revenues on a portion basis throughout the renewal year and this year, we changed our procedure and moved all of the revenue for that second year effective 01/01. Under expenses, the salaries and related benefits increased $\$ 22,449$ and nearly all of that was due to the increases in retirement and health insurance costs. The remainder of the expenses increased $\$ 23,000$.

And on Page 5, your -- the year-to-date net position was $\$ 695,684$. On Page 6, you can see the revenues compared on a month-to-month basis, and, again, that big
jump there had to do with the way we moved those revenues around. It is a new procedure this year.

On Page 7 is a graph of the revenues, expenses, and net position. And Page 8 is the fee revenue increase. On Page 9, the certificate of deposit summary, we had two CDs that were at Concordia Bank that matured in January and we split those up between Business First and Landmark. So we were able to get a better rate. Concordia was only offering . 25 percent and we got a . 99 and . 65 rate from Business First and Landmark.

On Page 10, the accounts
receivable hearings, we increased the fines.
There were $\$ 125,050$ in fines assessed and payments of $\$ 15,700$. And on Page 11, you can see our total balance is $\$ 533,150$.

And if there are no questions, that concludes my report. MR. POTEET:

Are there any questions for Mona? MR. BREWER:

Can I mention Wego Auto Sales,
what are we doing about that $\$ 115,000$ ?
MS. BARON:
It's going to be collected from the bond company. That's going to be a claim against the surety. It's just going to be $\$ 20,000$.

MR. POTEET:
$\$ 20,000$ bond.
MS. BARON:
Yes.
MR. BREWER:
That's all that they have?
MS. BARON:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
All right. Anybody else have any
questions?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
I need a motion for approval of the financials.

MR. ROY:
I move.
MR. POTEET:
Kirby.

Second?
MR. OLAVE:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second Steve.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. That passes. Thank
you, Mona, good job.
Regulation of golf carts.
MR. PARNELL:
This was -- in other words, this was something that was brought up by one of our licensees, Tim's Custom Cars. He was scheduled to be here at the meeting today, but he decided not to come, because his situation got handled and rectified.

I've had Nestor Guillory kind of working with Office of Motor Vehicles and Tim just to try to figure out or see what -what they can do to help out the situation.

I have -- I think we have with us today Jennifer Vallo. She's with DPS, Office of Motor Vehicles. She's the manager in the Lafayette area. And Ms. Shantel Lage. They -- they are here as well to help us kind of -- kind of go through the situation, what we're dealing with.

We know that -- now that carts can be inspected, must be inspected by a post certified peace officer who has received requirement training. Prior to -initially when they were going out to try to certify these golf carts, there was a requirement of having that 17 digit VIN number in the system, but now, as I understand it, the serial number could be in place rather than the VIN number. So I would ask Mr. Guillory if he can kind of talk about what his investigation into it was and what he found and I will have our guests from Office of Motor Vehicles kind of help out.

MS. GUILLORY:
I had two different of our -- the
first two licensees in my district for the
golf carts that they're trying to get compliant, they initially ran into a deal -when they contacted state police, state police refused to do an inspection, because their form requires the 17 digit VIN number and when I first met with state police -actually with Sergeant Loque out of Troop I, he said, well, $I$ did tell those guys that, because at this point, that's what we have to go by, because they're training up to that point you have to have a 17 digit identification.

At some point, I did get with Ms. Shantel and Ms. Jennifer over at Office of Motor Vehicles and I think Jennifer pointed out that, yes, they had worked on an interface to be able to use a serial number where you didn't have to have that 17 digit VIN.

So at that point, I got with the Troop Commander at Troop I, Captain Robin, and they have a trooper that's assigned to desk duty right now and Trooper Johnson came out and we did a test run on one of the carts. We put in the serial number and we
worked out what needed to be on the inspection form, because $I$ was licensed in the past to do inspections.

So all of the form except for
that one, that was the one thing they taught us in class was you do not inspect anything that doesn't have -- that you can't put 17 digits in there. That has been changed, and so we did one and we actually did a test run on a cart.

Ms. Lage was in the office that day and she was able to put it in. She put in what needed to be put in code-wise for a golf cart and she was able to generate a registration. So we know that it can be done now. I think the biggest -- the thing right now is moving forward was -- the most recent question was about the taxes, right.

MS. VALLO:
Right.
MS. GUILLORY:
Whether or not people -- people
that find out about -- you know, that they have to register their carts now by law, if they bought a cart in the past, it was
always sold as a commodity. So the people that were doing it legitimately would report -- they would collect the taxes and remit them to the parish and the state, and so we had a guy that went to do his cart with his invoice showing that he had paid that and at first there was some confusion in Breaux Bridge about it and they rejected it. So there was no mechanism in place for them to, what's the word I'm looking for, not -MS . VALLO:

I don't know.
MR. GUILLORY:
-- they couldn't -- you couldn't
collect taxes. There was no way to exempt them, because the only way for an exemption on an ATV was for farm use, and golf carts are classified on that inspection form as an ATV. So we got to that point and I think now -- y'all want to jump in here as far as how we're going to handle the taxes? MS. VALLO:

From what $I$ understand, there's a dealership who is selling golf carts and they've already collected the taxes. So now
at this point, when they're coming in to register the golf cart, we're unsure of how we're supposed to just collect state tax when they've already collected the Parish initially.

MR. GUILLORY:
I am finding out that they are collecting the full -MS. VALLO:

They are collecting the full -MR. GUILLORY:
-- the full eight point or
whatever the parish tax combined is.
MS. VALLO:
Well, if they are actually
collecting those and it's listed on the invoice, then they can show it as taxes paid.

MR. GUILLORY:
And that's if it's on the
invoice.
MS. VALLO:
It's on the invoice.
MR. GUILLORY:
Okay. And does that invoice need
to be notarized, because there was some question about that. In the law, it says that the bill of sale -- legal bill of sale notarized or an original invoice. MR. PARNELL:

If you look in the packet, there is the Office of Motor Vehicles -MS. VALLO:

Yes. It's listed as itemized
invoice from dealer to purchaser or original notarized bill of sale or invoice from the owner. So if it's a bill of sale, then we need it to be notarized. If it's an invoice, then, no.

MR. GUILLORY:
The one thing when I originally spoke to her was that the dealer only indicated he collected the parish part of the tax, but he actually -- when he went back and pulled the records, he collected the entire amount and had already submitted it.

So with that said, now we know to advise them moving forward that as long as they -- that consumer, he decides -- and
here's where the trick is. Now, they are classified as ATVs, if you go on to any federal or state lands or you live in a municipality like maybe -- Youngsville is one of the first ones, their Sugar Mill Ponds, they now allow golf carts to be used within that private community or that development. The trick is, is that they're also required to have an inspection sticker from the Office of Motor Vehicles on the back showing that it's been registered and they paid their taxes on it.

The mechanism in the law right now as far as enforcement goes, Wildlife and Fisheries, it's an automatic forfeiture of your property. They seize it and you have no leg to stand on, because it came into play with the ATVs and they weren't registering them. So that was the mechanism that went into play.

> Talking to the Chief of

Youngsville, he basically will write them a summons and bring them in before the Mayor's court to find out why they haven't done it. And I did explain to them that really up
until just recently, that this was going to be in effect, but it hadn't actually passed in the 2013 and it was taken up again in early '14.

MR. PARNELL:
Well, we wrote some legislation
in our language last year in the 2014
legislative session that would allow us to go in and use a golf cart as a -- what's it called, ATV, all terrain vehicle. MS. MORRIS:

Right. The New Car Commission had changed their definition, so that it fits under ATV, but our definition of ATV has been changed. So last year, we incorporated it under ATV, so that dealers selling only used carts would be regulated by this Commission.

MR. POTEET:
So was the issue -- I'm a little
confused. Was the issue with the dealer or with the consumer?

MR. GUILLORY:
Initially, with the dealer. The dealer -- we -- as of -- in my district that

I know of, I have two dealers that got into compliance that we had originally met with. Some of them decided they're just not going to sell them anymore, but these two guys wanted to. You know, they actually -- they do all of their stuff legitimately. They can show taxes submitted for every cart they ever sold, whether it's charge, or cash, or check. They wanted to get in compliance and what happened was, when they initially were given a copy of the law and they contacted state police, they wanted to get their carts registered ahead of time. That way, when they -- when they do a sale, they're going to do a form -- we suggested a form that notifies that consumer, this is the law, you're responsible for your taxes and registration on this vehicle, because they're not required -- now that they're moving under the -- you know, becoming used car dealers, they have the option not to collect that tax, because as far as I know, there were some questions about the ATVs. There was a rule with ATVs that the ATV dealer had to collect it, but I haven't
gotten anything more on that. And so does anybody know?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I don't think that's the case. MR. GUILLORY:

Because I understood that it was just a rule they had put in place to try and curtail that, and then it just kind of went by the wayside.

MS. MORRIS:
We did have a complaint many
years ago that people were -- in Louisiana, it was mandatory to collect the tax. So people were going to Mississippi and buying them and bringing them back. They might have had a rule at that time.

MR. POTEET:
So if you buy the ATV -- golf cart, if you buy the golf cart out of state, what are you supposed to do as a consumer? MR. GUILLORY:

As a consumer here in Louisiana, you're required to register that cart -you're required to get it inspected and go and register the vehicle.

MR. POTEET:
Is that only if it's being used
by -- on --
MR. GUILLORY:
Anything other than non-farm. If
you use it for anything other than farm
purposes, what's classified as farm purposes, then --

MR. POTEET:
So if $I$ buy one for my dealership
or my auction and it never goes off that property, I've got to still get it registered?

MR. GUILLORY:
Legally, yes.
MR. POTEET:
All right.
MR. GUILLORY:
Or are you taking a chance that you'll get caught? Probably not, because it will never leave your private property, but the law does state that -- by Louisiana law, they are supposed to be registered.

MR. POTEET:
So a consumer buying a vehicle --
a used golf cart in Mississippi or Texas -MR. GUILLORY:

And brings it back here.
MR. POTEET:
-- brings it back and he would
take his bill of sale down to the tax office

MR. GUILLORY:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
-- they're going to know -- the Office of Motor Vehicles is going to know what to do with it?

MR. GUILLORY:
Yes.
MS. VALLO:
Yes. They'll have to take it back up for physical inspection.

MS. GUILLORY:
But, I mean, if he just goes
there, because he heard he has to get it registered, they'll notify him that all he has to do is go to the state police or any law enforcement. Like in Lafayette Parish -- it's the only one I know, Lafayette

Parish has six deputies. That's all they are there for is to do an inspection -vehicle inspections and state police, every -- every trooper with state police, with the exception of some of the older guys that aren't trained, they are able to --

MR. POTEET:
They'll even come to your
auction. We have people out there inspecting almost daily. So for me it's not a big issue if $I$ had to do something, but just a regular consumer, they'll come to your house?

MS. VALLO:
Yes.
MS. GUILLORY:
You can call and schedule to go
to your home or -- or you can go to the -on your way to the Department of Motor Vehicles or any one of the inspection stations, you are going to pass by a sheriff's department -- you know, if you're going to pass by the sheriff's department or substation, city police, you just need to call and find out, because a lot of them do
have at least one guy on staff that works the day shift that can do an inspection.

MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MS. BARON:
Going back to the bill of sale,
the bill of sale has to be notarized but the invoice does not?

MS. VALLO:
Correct.
MS. BARON:
Okay.
MS. GUILLORY:
Do y'all have any questions for
these ladies while they're here?
MR. TAYLOR:
I would like to clarify
something. If it has a VIN number and a title, in state or out of state, I still have to the title it in my name, I still have to have it inspected; did I hear that correctly?

MR. GUILLORY:
If it has a title, if you -- what is it, MOV for a title?

MS. VALLO:
MSO, yes, manufacturer --
MR. TAYLOR:
Okay. So on this bill of sale transfer, I have to go have it inspected, but if has a title --

MS . VALLO:
Then you do not --
MR. TAYLOR:
-- I am fine, and take my title and throw it down and pay the taxes like a car?

MR. POTEET:
That would happen like if you
bought it brand new.
MR. GUILLORY:
And $I$ think moving forward, now
that the new car guys, you know, they're having to get them done, so they can issue that deal. So I'm hoping in the next, you know, 24 months -- what's coming in now -because that's normally the flow cycle of used cars. They come out new. They go into leases with golf courses and what-not, and then they come out of that lease inventory
and they become available for sale.
MR. BREWER:
Can you explain about they can
seize the property?
MR. POTEET:
Wildlife and Fisheries.
MR. GUILLORY:
Wildlife and Fisheries -- if
you're caught on state or federal land and you do not have a registration on that ATV --

MR. BREWER:

> Just on their property?

MS. MORRIS:
Public property.
MR. GUILLORY:
Now, in municipalities that are going to allow them on the road, they make it clear to you when you get your permit to use them on the road. Youngsville, they didn't have this in their -- in their little -- their town rules or law, but they're going to change it. They are going to make an amendment to it to where the only way to get that little certificate to use it in
town, you have to have a registration. You have to get the registration from DMV. MR. BREWER:

In our parish, they're illegal to put on the street. In fact -MR. GUILLORY:

Is that low speed vehicles or golf carts? MR. BREWER:

Golf carts. So, yes, they gave my son's mother-in-law a ticket for riding his kids in a subdivision. MR. POTEET:

All right. Any more questions about -- do you ladies have anything else you want to add? MS. VALLO:

No.
MR. GUILLORY:
Do y'all have any questions while they're here?

Any Office of Motor Vehicles questions? She is here, so she can answer them.

MR. POTEET:

Do y'all have anything? We've got them here.
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Thank you, ladies.
All right. Let's see. The next
thing we have on our agenda is the discussion of additional location requirements. I think he have Eric Strodert here from the LIADA.

MR. STRODERT:
So I'm here on behalf of Don's Wholesale dealership in Lafayette, Louisiana. We ran into an issue -- our first issue was actually about 30 days ago when we got written up for a violation of having a vehicle that wasn't parked where it was supposed to be parked, which was one particular vehicle out of place, and so through that process we were already currently landlocked at that location.

So we've been trying to acquire more property to put more inventory and sell more cars. So we did. So we acquired a large piece of property adjacent to the
building that we're currently at, within roughly 60 feet or so of the building is the property. But this is what we ran into according to -- one of the officers came by and said we can't have our cars parked there, and so there's that -- we can't have them on display, because that -- our license doesn't have that registered address, which is normal. But this is the problem that we have. I'm going to kind of read through this, so we're kind of -- so we're on the same page.

Basically, dealerships are landlocked due to the growth limited due to the property limitations and must -- and dealers must acquire a new dealer's license to grow their expanding facility. So dealers attempting to grow their current business by acquiring more property within a close proximity of the current facility to handle additional customer parking and/or increased inventory for display.

So that's the issue that we're having. According to the laws and the officer that gave us -- and told us about
this, he's saying that we must acquire a new dealer's license in order to have the property that is separated by a commercial road. This law is specifically -- in my opinion, this law is specifically targeting the prevention of motor vehicle dealers opening multiple locations in our market without the necessary facility requirements, which is to protect the consumer. And the issue in this particular situation is that -- and I'm speaking on behalf of Don's Wholesale in Lafayette, but I'm also speaking on behalf of many other dealers that are out there and have run into the exact same situation.

In order to acquire the property,
which is roughly within 60 feet of the current business establishment, the Used Motor Vehicle Commission is telling us that we must have a -- we have to have a new license and in order to have a new license, you have to have a building, you have to have a phone, you have to have a sign and all the necessary requirements, but my issue based upon the property being adjacent to
the current facility, this should not require a new building or a new phone or a new anything.

The inherent cost is not the dealer license fee. I don't want to get that mistaken that we're concerned about the fee for the licensing issue. I think the trouble that we had was the fact that you -that some dealers -- like in our particular situation in Lafayette, we have a facility worth probably a half a million to a million dollars and we're acquiring more property to enhance the inventory or give those customer a parking spot, so we don't run into violations from the Commission of having a single vehicle or so parked out somewhere where it shouldn't be and customers are parking on the side of our road.

So we acquired more property, but it's ridiculous that we would have to go and invest money into a whole new building and a whole new phone just to say that we -- to follow the rules of the Commission that we need that when he have a facility that's within -- literally adjacent to the
property, but according to the officer and according to the Commission, there is a commercial road that's preventing us from being able to put cars there.

And after looking through -- I went ahead and I printed up -- inside there's a printed up Chapter 29, which is the qualifications and eligibility for licenses, which I didn't see, it will be a little more clear. I also took pictures of the thing. On both pages, if you notice that -- where we're actually parking the vehicles and where our building is at and the argument saying that we don't need a new building or a building on that piece of property based on the fact that it's so close to the current facility.

And I'll mention the solutions that the Commission offered, which was that based on the fact that we acquired the property, to just take that property information, bring it down to the parish government, wherever we need to bring it to get it annexed and make sure that physical address gets associated with the dealer's
license to avoid all of this, but it's like -- which is okay based on the fact that I own the property and at some point, I'll be able to do that. But the other issue is, is what happens to other dealers that are in the state of Louisiana that are growing their business and have to end up renting a facility or renting land very close to them to basically give customers either a parking option or park more inventory in order to sell more cars.

MR. POTEET:
The problem I see with the first solution is that -- how many parishes do we have in this state?

MR. PARNELL:
64.

MR. POTEET:
So there's 64 different ways of getting something done. So I don't view that as a good long-term solution. It might work in one parish, and then another parish it's slow. Another parish, they just won't do it. Another parish, they can't get to anybody, you know. We know every parish is
different. So each government is going to be handled a little bit differently.

Does anybody have any comments about any of this? MR. TAYLOR:

You know, Eric called me Wednesday or Thursday of last week and we talked about it a little bit, and then $I$ went and talked to a couple other dealers about it, also, and I agree wholeheartedly that he's got a wonderful facility where it is at, and if you look at the pictures, it looks like he bought a piece of -- what is that, some cotton field or something there, some type of agricultural or just a blank lot --

MR. STRODERT:
Just a blank lot.
MR. TAYLOR:
-- just across the street. I
don't see where we should hold this guy and make him go there and build a new facility. And $I$ wrote down a list of about 8 or 10 different things and it would concern me that at end of the day, the law says for him
to get a license that he has to follow all of those -- all of these qualifications here, you know, have the building, have the phone, et cetera, et cetera. I think that's ridiculous, also. I do.

It's our law right now, but in my opinion, $I$ think we need to do something to kind of clean that up. There's a lot of -a lot of little minor things that $I$ think we need to do. I think it needs to be operated under the same company veil, number one. You've got to have signage either way. I would think so. Of course, you have to check your zoning, which we require you to do already or we already discussed it. Adjacent properties that have a business in between them, I think -- you know, I think it's your own discretion to be able to tell people whether they can or cannot do it and that's about it. I mean, I think it's a little ridiculous myself. I understand the law and I understand what it was trying to do, but I just -- I think -- I think we need to clean that up. That's my opinion. MR. HALLACK:

We had a situation with Ronnie Wisenor one time, you know, where somebody was selling travel trailers -- used travel trailers and they did not have enough room to display the travel trailers at their dealership location. So they put them in somebody's pasture and we told them that you had to fence it in. You couldn't display anything there. You couldn't take customers there. If you wanted to show one of those travel trailers, you would have to bring it back to the dealership and show it and we were okay with that. As long as that happened, we didn't make them get a separate licensed location for a holding area -- a storage facility.

Is this kind of like what we are talking about here? MR. OLAVE:

My first question to the Commission would be, is this something we can deal with on a case-by-case basis? Because I'm in agreement with Dino, I mean, you know, in this particular case, I mean, it's obvious that he shouldn't be able to do
business across the street, but is that something we have latitude with, with the way the law sits?

MR. TAYLOR:
Not today.
MR. POTEET:
I don't think we have latitude with it. I think we can express our opinions here. I agree with Dino, too. I think, you know, when we're looking at these things, what $I$ always try to think about is what's the purpose, I mean, what's the underlying reason we're going to do it and I think the reason is, essentially we want to, you know, protect consumers and we want to protect our legitimate dealers from curbstoners and if those two things are what's most important here, I don't see how having an adjacent property would be a problem. I mean, I'm not even sure how would a consumer know if you had -- you know, you're on Lot $A$, and then you buy Lot B next to you, how would you know that that's even a separate property? I mean, the --

MR. OLAVE:
You can curbstone across the
street.
MR. POTEET:
Yes. My sign might be here, but still, you know, if you go to one of Ron's new car stores, the sign is at one end of the property. It doesn't have a sign every 35 feet saying, you know, here's our dealership.

So as far as the across the street thing would be, $I$ tend to be pretty much in agreement that it falls in the same category. Now, I think if you have something across the street -- again, I'm just stating my opinion here -- if you have something across the street, you would be required to put up a sign and there should be something that says, you know, this is Don's Wholesale and this is also Don's Wholesale with a phone number and a website or whatever it is you would have to put on there, and put maybe something that says, main office located across the street. So, you know, my feeling is as
long as it's adjacent and to me across the street is maybe stretching the term adjacent, but $I$ don't see any problem in protecting our consumers and protecting legitimate dealers by allowing somebody to have adjacent property. That's my opinion. Now, I think that we could certainly say, you know, there are some very small businesses like -- the one that comes to mind is a Rally's hamburgers. It doesn't take up much space. So you could be on the other side of the Rally's, but on the other hand, you could be here and have a Walmart between you and have the other location. I think definitely the Walmart location, you would have to say, well, that's far enough away, you're going to have to have a different license and everything. So -- but if I had a Rally's between me and my property, maybe that's something we might have some latitude in. I don't know. So that -- I'm throwing all of that out there. I'm in agreement. I don't think it does anything. I don't think this law helps consumers. I don't think it helps us
properly regulate dealers in terms of curbstoning. So does anybody else have any opinion about it? I'd like to see us change the law or change the wording or give ourselves some latitude in that area.

MR. CORMIER:
I agree with y'all. I think with
the proper signage, you know, just maybe a little more detail, you know, to know it is the same business just for additional inventory, because you don't have any choice where your property is. You can't buy behind. You can't buy on the side. You have to go across the street. So I don't see an issue with it. I really don't. We just have to be looking out for other dealers that have similar situations, but, I mean, it's across the street, you know. MR. DUPLESSIS:

How does the New Car Commission
handle it? Because I know they've had -that's fairly common, especially in New Orleans. I know Lakeshore and I know Ray Brandt has it where there's -- you're on tight quarters, and then they have storage
lots. Those are not -- and then they have certain conditions. Even used car lots can have off premises. I have multiple addresses on my property. One of them just includes the address in the license. MR. POTEET: Well, that's what $I$ was just asking. Just make sure that you have a license -MR. DUPLESSIS:

Make sure you have a sign and a phone number on the sign and we'll call it a day.

MR. POTEET:
That's one of the questions I
had. I mean, can we have more than one address on the license? I think when you do that, the problem with that -- Ron, I think that now you're getting into the -- because you could say, these two addresses, 123 Main Street and 345 Smith Street.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, the main location also
included.
MR. POTEET:

Yes. I think if we go back to what Robert was saying, I just can't imagine if I'm located here and 15 miles away, maybe 2 miles away, I've got a storage lot -MR. TAYLOR:

Two blocks.
MR. POTEET:
-- that might be different, but here we're talking about everything is sort of connected. I mean, the street is in between, but, I mean, I would be for allowing the addresses, too, but you'd have to have something that would have to say -I think you'd have to have something that would have to say, you can have more than one address, but the addresses must be adjacent and that just is kind of flipping around how you would word the whole thing. MR. DUPLESSIS:

We can rewrite it in the session.
I don't think that's an issue, but what do we do in the meantime, should we just suspend the violation and put it under advisement until -MR. POTEET:

I'd be for doing that.
MR. HALLACK:
Well, it's a rule and regulation.
MR. PARNELL:
It wasn't a violation.
MS. BARON:
It wasn't a violation.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
This is under State law.
MR. HALLACK:
It's actually a rule and
regulation. So you can change it on your own.

MR. PARNELL:
Just a requirement for the
additional location, just the established place of business that we're talking about not requiring that dealer to have?

MR. POTEET:
Yes. What I would say is, okay,
the way it's worded now -- and you guys that are dealers, correct me if I'm wrong on this, because you probably have it memorized -- but right now, if $I$ have one location, I've followed all the rules, I got
my license, I got my bathroom, my sign, my phone, et cetera, I'm right here. Now I go next door, I got to get another sign, another bathroom, another phone, another license, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So the -- what we're saying is we want it to be associated. You don't need another building. You don't need another phone to be answered. You don't need another license, but you would have to have something designated publicly, a sign that says, Don's Wholesale and maybe something that says that's where the main office is or something, but it would have to be in an adjacent location. It couldn't be -- you couldn't have anything in between. Now -MR. GUILLORY:

The only word I would ask, you know, if you -- if y'all go down this road to change would be an unobstructed adjacent location, because if you've got a big tree line or you've got a building like what you're talking about, that's -- well, then you've got consumers walking from that facility coming across other property to get
to their office.
MR. POTEET:
Well, the only thing $I$ would say about that is, yes, I agree. I think we -Derek and I talked about, you know, you've got a street, somebody is walking across the street, but aren't there dealers across the street from each other? I mean, how -MR. GUILLORY:

I understand.
MR. POTEET:
And if you -- if you're -- let's
think of this from -- from a logical
standpoint. If I'm out driving around and I'm looking for used cars and $I$ whip into the lot on this side and I look around and I say, I've got to go over there to talk to somebody. So I get back in my car and drive around, I saw this Camaro over here. I think that's -- I mean, maybe we're stretching it a little bit, but -and, again, I'm trying to think of what we're accomplishing by doing that other than creating more expense for the dealer. I don't see how we're helping the consumer or
how we're stopping curbstoning, and if there's some other issue that this does or something this prevents, let me know, but that's the way $I$ see it right now. I think we're putting an undue burden on the dealer. MR. DUPLESSIS:

We're making a big deal out of
nothing.
MR. OLAVE:
Is there anything we could do on like a case-by-case basis, though? MR. POTEET:

Well, I don't think we have to.
I think we -- I mean, maybe if we get to the point where somebody -- you know, I will go back to my Rally's example, if you've got some kind of little tiny thing in between your two lots, maybe that might be something we've got to work at, but $I$ think we can rewrite this thing, because according to Mr. Hallack, it's a rule and regulation. We can MR. DUPLESSIS:

Yes. We can -- what I'm looking at is R.S. 32:791 and it's a promulgated
rule. This is not a statute. So we can take this under consideration and we can have it rewritten to accommodate -accommodate not only this situation, but the ones coming in the future. So this is not something that we have to legislate.

MR. POTEET:
Can we get this rewritten within
30 days?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes. I'm sure we can.
MS. MORRIS:
The New Car Commission -- but I
pulled up their rules and $I$ don't see it in their current rules, but they used to have that it could be within so many feet or so many blocks, but there are some restrictions to it, because Lakeside Toyota is the one that I remember.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Exactly, Lakeside, right.
MS. MORRIS:
But after Hurricane Katrina, I
think they bought the property in between and all attached, but there was a block --
on the next block, they had to have -MR. DUPLESSIS:

That was the poster child for this.

MS . MORRIS:
And then $I$ know the Cosmetology Board has satellite classrooms that can be on an adjacent property, but you are
restricted as to what type of operations can occur on there. So there are those boards that $I$ think that have had to -- have had restrictions and $I$ think some of them are by distance, maybe by site.

So there are some restrictions that it can't be two separate properties that are, you know, functioning separately. MR. PARNELL:

As long as we have clear
restrictions, $I$ don't know that that would be a problem.

MR. POTEET:
Yes, and I think we can come up with something that would make them happy and make all of us happy. Again, whenever I'm looking at things like this, who are we
protecting here and how -- how are we protecting them, and this -- I don't see this as protecting anyone. It just seems like an undue burden and we can certainly fix that.

MR. STRODERT:
Thank you.
MR. POTEET:
All right. Thanks, Derek.
Is there any more discussion on

## that?

(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Next on the agenda is the ratification of imposed penalties. MR. PARNELL:

All right. Ratification of imposed penalties.

Commissioners, you'll find in
your packets a chart of the dealerships that I have imposed penalty against and violations of the LUMVC statute. Each dealer has signed a stipulated agency order and has made payment of the civil penalty. I have determined that the public interest
can be served without further administrative proceedings. On the chart, if you notice -I'll go through and I'll kind of -- and I'll ask for your ratification at the end.

The first one we have on the
chart is Angelo's Auto, case number 2014-9 -- excuse me 790. They're in violation of committing three counts of fraudulent act in selling, one count of non-delivery of title, and two counts of misuse of temporary tags. Their fine amount that they paid was $\$ 2,750$. The second one on the list was Geaux-Geaux Auto Sales, LLC. Their case number was 2014-871. They had nine counts of employing an unlicensed salesperson, one count of non-delivery of title. Their fine amount that they have paid is $\$ 1,150$. The third one on the list is

Don's Wholesale. The case number was 2014-872, one count of parking vehicles in a right-of-way. The fine amount that has been paid is $\$ 300$.

The fourth on the list is
Southern Auto Direct. The case number is

2014-874. They're in violation of one count of business sign being removed, seven counts of committing a fraudulent act and 18 counts of operating from an address not shown on the license, which the fine amount was $\$ 4,150$ 。

The last one on the list is RCA
Auto -- Used Auto. The case number is 2014-741. They're in violation of one count of business sign being removed and the fine amount was $\$ 300$. That has been paid.

I ask that you ratify the imposed civil penalties assessed and accept the signed stipulated agency orders and payments.

MR. POTEET:
I need a motion.
MR. TAYLOR:
(Makes motion.)
MR. CORMIER:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:

Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. Next thing.
MR. PARNELL:
All right. If you'll turn with me in your packets at -- toward the end of the packet, compliance investigation and complaint totals. The first report that's in your binder is the alleged issue counts. There were 102 alleged issues for the month of January 2015. The second report that you'll see is the case report, which illustrates that there were 74 cases that were assigned in the month of January. Twelve of those cases have been completed. Sixty-two of those cases remain open investigation.

And the last document is the summary report, which illustrates the total of number of cases that were closed for the month, which is 28.

Other things that have been
happening, the five day -- there were eight five-day notices that were issued. Twenty
physical inspections took place. Assisted dealers to get delivered -- get titles delivered to consumers, there were five of those that took place. There were 59 site visits done. Two audits have been conducted and 15 violation tickets have been issued. Assisted with consumers receiving funds was $\$ 4,500$. And that's all $I$ have on investigation complaints totals. Are there any questions on that?
(No response.)
MR. PARNELL:
The next thing is the general
information. Toward the end of last year, we received a letter from the Division of Administration, Officer of Commissioners, Louisiana fleet management program. It was for the fiscal year 2014 for under utilized vehicles. Louisiana Property Assistance conducted an analysis on the State for a 12-month period and what they showed was that we have two vehicles of our agency that were being under utilized. What they want us to do every month is to use those vehicles 15,000 a month. During that time,
we did not have investigators that -- we do not -- we have now on force and what they did was, they used -- it was pretty much old information that they used. So what we did was, we sent a letter to Louisiana Property Assistance just asking if they'll allow an exception for us to continue use of those vehicles. We've definitely begun using those vehicles much more with the adding of new investigators. We're just waiting to hear a response from them as of right now. One of our other vehicles kind of died out on us about two weeks ago. It has about 146,000 miles on it. And, typically, when -- I'm just getting ready to start the process now of -- we budgeted this year to purchase two vehicles. So I'm going to start the process of trying to purchase that vehicle, but as it always is, they kind of have to -- they kind of tell us whether or not we can get the vehicle or not. We have to ask permission to purchase the vehicle. In the past, they've kind of initially rejected the notion that if it just has 146,000 miles on it, it's not
really enough. The vehicle has to be in dire traits, you know, for them in order to do that. The one vehicle that we have outside now is no longer running and the cost to get it fixed is about $\$ 2,000$ and it's not worth that at all. So what I will do is just have them come pick that vehicle up and I still will try to purchase two more vehicles. But that kind of concludes my report and my general information. Are there any questions or comments?

MR. POTEET:

> Yes, I have a comment. You're
talking about the -- what was the name of the group that wanted you to get rid of the car?

MR. PARNELL:
Louisiana Property Assistance.
MR. POTEET:
Property Assistance, yes.
MR. PARNELL:
They want us to get rid of one vehicle that we have.

MR. POTEET:
Can't you show them that when
they did that analysis, you know, our investigator total -- I mean, could we show that at the time, we had this many investigators, because we still had June, didn't we, at that time?

MR. PARNELL:
We had her at that time, but she wasn't really on the road --

MR. POTEET:
So here's what we've done. We have -- you know, we added investigators, which we had in our budget, but we had to hire people and we had to go through the process of hiring people and all of that. Now, we're doing more investigation and you can look at these numbers and you can see that. So you just present that and say, look, you're right, back at that time we were not utilizing that vehicle, but now this is where we are today. I mean -MR. PARNELL:

The correspondence that we did send did say -- it pretty much said that to them. You know, we kind of broke out the amount of mileage that we're using now and
one of those vehicles we're using about 3,500 miles per month on that -- per week, I'm sorry, on that vehicle and some of the others are just a little bit lower than that, but we did say that actually exactly pretty much, just so they can understand that at that time -- that information was old information and things have changed with our agency as it continually does. So we just asked to be exempted on it. We just haven't heard anything back as to why. MR. POTEET:

But you feel confident that -MR. PARNELL:

I feel good about it, but that's my opinion. To me, it's logical. It's in black and white. The difference is very clear, you know, but --

MR. OLAVE:
Could we perhaps back that up with a letter from the Commissioners, like, you know -- I mean, I don't know if that would help at all, but we go through the budget every week and -- I mean, every month.

MR. POTEET:
I would only say if we ran into problems, yes. If we run into problems, we'll go to that step, but $I$ think that the letter is going to do it.

MS. MORRIS:
Another issue that was mentioned in the correspondence was you are on of the few agencies that self-fund the vehicles. So it's not costing the State General Fund any money to keep these vehicles. It's all paid for by this agency and there are not a lot of self-funded agencies with fleet vehicles.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
This is a fiscal year. They're selling the over 90 -day units to pay off the budget cuts.

MS. MORRIS:
So the money should come back to
us. There was some question about whether that would happen or not.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
They're trying to clear out stuff and raise capital.

MS . ANDERSON:
And it was from the Division of Administration that it came. So property said they didn't know other than to tell us how to surplus it.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Any other questions for Derek?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. The next thing is the committee reports, legislative session. Ron.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I take it, Mr. Parnell, we have not heard anything back from the Governor's Office on the issue of finance license?

MR. PARNELL:
I spoke with him this morning, Mr. Parker Dearman, and he stated to me that he was still working with his policy director on trying to set up a time for us all to meet. He wants Office of Motor Vehicles as well to be involved in that meeting along with the Motor Vehicle

Commission and ourselves. So at this point, he has no definitive date upon which we will have the meeting. He said he's trying to work on it this week to try set up something for it.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
So that's what's holding that up
that issue from moving forward.
Ms. Morris, do you have an author
for that?
MS. MORRIS:
He wants to meet with the
Governor's Office whether or not we have the support of the Governor's Office. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Any other update on any other
issue, everything else -- the clean up
legislation with Mr. Hallack?
MS. MORRIS:
We're waiting for this piece to see if we can move forward with it. We do have an author for the clean up.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. I spoke with Representative Dave Price, He's been handling our bills for
us the last few years. He's on the Commerce Committee and he said he would be happy to continue working with us on our legislation. He did stress he did not want controversial issues. I said, we do have one type of legislation that we're trying to work out with our clean up legislation and we -- but we still have to make a meeting just to make sure that some scrap metal guys are not going to have a lot of opposition for what we're trying to do, but other than that, he's ready to go and he's happy to do it for us.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
But that issue is going to be -the scrap metal issue is going to be the main body of clean up?

MR. PARNELL:
Right.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
And then the finance issue is
going to be separate?
MR. PARNELL:
Right. I think that would be the best way to tackle those issues.

MR. TAYLOR:
Jay still has not said no, Jay Morris. What he has done is he wanted us to meet with the Governor's Office. He's talked to new car dealers around there and they have some concerns whether we can regulate or whether we will regulate our dealers. They're not even talking to Derek about it. They're not even really aware of the clean up that we've done on advertising already.

MR. PARNELL:
They're just operating off the old way of thinking.

MR. TAYLOR:
That's right. I think their
mindset is five years ago or how many ever years ago versus where we're at today. But I went and sat down and talked to the ones that were going to give Jay the most grief, and then he talked to them and he didn't get a lot of opposition out of them. One of them sits on the New Car Commission and one of them is just one of his supporters from Monroe. But once again if we get through
the Governor's Office just fine, we might get Jay on it, might.

MR. PARNELL:
He sits on the Commerce Committee as well where all of the legislation goes. MR. POTEET:

Maybe I'm just optimistic, but I've got a feeling if we can all sit down in the same room and have somebody there as sort of a mediator, an independent, to listen to the whole thing, I think our story is pretty good. I mean, it just makes sense that that goes under us and what else -- if you're going to be in the position of regulating a certain group of people, why do you have to have some extra thing that, okay, this part gets regulated by these guys and this part -- I mean, I don't know. It just seems like we have a pretty good story and I think -- Ron has carried the ball again on this. So $I$ feel like if we get in there, it's going to -- when it all gets laid out -- sort of Dino's point, when you get out and talk to them, they may have an initial reaction to it, but then when you
sit down and talk to them, it's like, well, maybe it's not such a big deal.

## MR. HALLACK:

It's going to take a strong
mediator. The last time we had a problem with them, it was during the Foster administration and Governor Foster actually came in and sat in and said, this is how it's going to be, and they were well behaved children after that, but if you're going to have somebody in there that they think they can push you around, you can forget it. MR. DUPLESSIS:

The problem we had under that administration was our children weren't well behaved at that meeting. And I do remember seeing a chair fly across the room. You know, $I$ think there is a case, but the whole thing is and $I$ think the key is, there's no representation from the Used Car Commission on the New Car Commission to regulate the finance act. If that's the case, then I really don't think they're going to want a used car representative, a dealer, on that commission. I'm not sure about that, but I
feel fairly safe in saying that.
MR. POTEET:
How many members is their
commission, how many members do they have on their commission?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Oh, God, it's like 16 now,
because everybody represents -- and I want to say there are like six -- one district or maybe six or eight from the new car side. MR. POTEET:

I think it's eight.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
And they have recreational -MR. HALLACK:

They have only one for
recreational products -- they have only have three for recreational products.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's a whole group of them, yes. MR. HALLACK:

But then they added trucks. MR. DUPLESSIS:

There has always been a heavy duty truck dealer. That's always been in
place and there's been a separate consumer panel.

MR. POTEET:
I think -- to your point, I think
that, you know, that's one of the things that -- the next logical thing is what we've got, some representation. We've got -- how many dealers do we have, 3,000?

MR. HALLACK:
3, 800 .
MR. POTEET:
3,800 -- we've got 3,800 dealers
and we have no representation and we're going to regulate them?

MR. HALLACK:
We have 3,800 independent used motor vehicle dealers and how many new car dealers do we have, 500?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Less than that.
MR. HALLACK:
3,800 compared to 300 .
MR. POTEET:
Maybe 16 used car dealers. But I think that that's one of the paths that
we've got to kind of take is -- to Ron's point, you can't have all of this. I mean, this is major -- this is a major part of their business, at least the ones that do financing and you can't just have them with no representation. That's just -- that may be the ace in the hole, really.

## MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, I think there's two other
aces in the hole, a couple that we ought to think about. Number one, there's a consumer panel for interagency conflicts and I'm not sure all people are aware of that, consumer panel, that an issue couldn't be taken towards the New Car Commission, that would be separate from the New Car Commission. It's two different hearing panels. And the other aspect is, you know, we go to the Governor's Office. You know, we had another issue like this last year and virtually it was out of our hands and it was with the buy here -- the rent-to-own here and the insurance issue. At some point in time, we saw an impressive demonstration by a small group of organized dealers that just said,
oh, no, we're not going to take any more, and they went and got their own legislation and they marched on the Capitol year after year after year until they eventually got a small army and won this issue and we were caught in the middle. We represent those dealers. We can't control their issues and -- when it comes to them legislating and being motivated about making change for their own business. So, you know, I think they have to understand that with the most recent rent-to-own insurance, for example, which was last year. So I think a passionate plea by passionate people, that's a hint, could motivate and move the world more than we could at times.

MR. HALLACK:
Kim has it up on the screen.
MS. BARON:
There are 14, plus 3. They have
heavy truck sales, recreational vehicle sales, motorcycle sales, recreational vehicle sales, again. MR. DUPLESSIS: So it's watered down pretty good.

MS. BARON:
And three consumer board members. MR. DUPLESSIS:

So, actually the new car dealers is somewhat watered down, and to be watered down even more might be fairly repugnant for them.

MR. POTEET:
If we put 12 representatives on their commission --

Do we have anything to put on the agenda right off the top of our heads while we're thinking about it?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. So just as a follow up, we're going to work on this and just try to get that out and maybe get a copy to Eric and to all of us and see if you guys have any comments. I think we can get that pretty well taken care of.

All right. I think we're set for adjournment.
(Meeting adjourned at 10:31 a.m.)
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