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MR. POTEET:
Roll call, please.
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:
(No response.)
MS. BARON:
Ron Duplessis?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Floyd?

MR. FLOYD:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Kirby Roy?
MR. ROY:
Here.
MS. BARON:
And Darty Smith?
MR. SMITH:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
MR. POTEET:
Thank you. Is anyone here for public comments today?

MS . BARON:
Not at this time.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. We'll start off with approval of minutes from the previous meeting. I'm assuming that everybody has had a chance to read those. So I will entertain a motion.

MR. SMITH:
I'll make a motion.

MR. BREWER:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Smith, and a second.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
It passes.
The next thing we have is the financial matters, review of the financial report. Mona.

MS . ANDERSON:
Okay. If you turn in your packet to your financial statements for the month ending June 2014, these statements are unaudited statements. We've just recently begun working with our auditor. You probably received in your -- in the mail your related party questionnaires, which we'll need completed and put in an envelope for the auditor. If you didn't receive it, you do have one in your binders.

In the pocket of the binder there, you have a copy of it if you'd like to fill it out and leave it today.

Okay. Starting on Page 1, the statement of net position, our cash in the bank was $\$ 1,461,530$. And if we -- in reviewing the cash flow, if we take out the current liabilities and deferred inflows, there was an increase in cash over last year of $\$ 117,000$.

Under accounts receivable hearings and fines, our balance for the month was $\$ 201,650$, which was an increase over last month. Under equipment, the equipment increased by $\$ 4,000$ for the purchase of a new server and software -related software that's going to be installed the latter part of July, and August. Our current server was just requiring constant servicing to allow space. So we purchased a new server and that will be being installed shortly.

Under current liabilities at the bottom of the page, the balance was $\$ 68,312$. We've already accrued the payables and the
payroll for the month of June, those services that were provided in June in anticipation of the audit.

On Page 2, the deferred revenues were $\$ 269,050$. Moving on to the revenue, expenses, and change in net position on Page 3, the year-to-date revenues were \$1,327,013, which was up $\$ 187,400$ from last year. The fee revenue was up $\$ 35,000$ and the remainder of that was in the fines that increased this year.

Under year-to-date salaries and related benefits were $\$ 799,800$ compared to $\$ 725,800$ last year at the same time. Under maintenance/other, we did -- we had some expenses for replacement of the building's fixtures, which have not -- had not been updated since the building was built, so some improvements there.

And on Page 5, the expenditures year to date were $\$ 1,025,273$. There was a positive net change in position year to date of $\$ 301,739$ compared to $\$ 144,855$ last year, a large part of that being the increase in the fines.

Moving on to Page 6, another report of the revenues, expenses, and net position, which shows you the comparison of month-to-date figures, and the following page is a graph of those figures showing a slight uptick in June of this year.

And Page 8 shows you how we ended up the year in fee revenues. Of course, our largest increase was in UD revenues and auction transaction fees, and then our hearing costs and fines.

On Page 9, the certificate of deposit summary remains the same this month. We'll be looking to replace the CD there at Community Trust. So we'll be investigating rates at that time in August.

On Page 10, the accounts receivable hearings report, our total for the month was $\$ 201,650$. Of that, we added $\$ 161,800$ in June. Those fines are- related to Lauco, Sharp's, and Sign \& Drive, and we collected $\$ 500$ on $T \& S$ Auto. And so unless there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. POTEET:
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Thank you, Mona.
Does anybody have any questions for Mona?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
No questions. You must have done a really good job.

All right. So how about I entertain a motion for approve.

MR. ROY:
(Makes motion.)
MR. POTEET:

> Mr. Roy.

MR. SMITH:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Mr. Smith.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
The financial statements are approved.

Okay. So the next thing on our agenda is that we have invoices we need to approve, $I$ think.

MR. PARNELL:
Commissioners, please find in your packet Commission Counsel Hallack's bill for services for May and June of 2014. I have reviewed the services performed and accounting has reviewed that the time calculations are correct. The first document is Commission Counsel's bill for May services for May of 2014 , which is \$3,543.75, and Commissioner Counsel Hallack's bill for services for June of 2014 is $\$ 3,587.50$. The total amount for both months of service total $\$ 7,131.25$. Commissioners, I'd ask that you approve the payment for both May and June of 2014 for Counselor Hallack's bill of services. MR. POTEET:

Any discussion on these invoices?
MR. ROY:
I'll move on it.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. We have a move for approval.

## Second?

MR. SMITH:
I'll second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Mr. Smith.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
We'll approve that -- those invoices.

And the next one is Counsel Morris.

MR. PARNELL:
The next payment of invoices for
June 2014 for Commission Counsel Morris, please find in your packet her first bill of services for June of 2014. I reviewed the services as well that were performed and accounting has reviewed the time calculations that they are correct.

Commission Counselor's bill for services --

Morris' bill for services for June of 2014 is $\$ 3,237.50$. Commissioners, I'd ask that you approve payment for June 2014 for Counselor Morris' bill of service. MR. POTEET:

Any discussion here,
Commissioners?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
I need a motion.
MR. SMITH:
I make a motion.
MR. POTEET:
A motion by Mr. Smith.
Second from -- well, a second?
MR. TAYLOR:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Dino.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:

All right. So that invoice is approved.

All right. So the next thing we have on the agenda, Derek, we've got the discussion of the interagency agreement between our Commission and the Louisiana Auction and Licensing Board.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. Commissioners, you'll find in your packet the terms of the interagency agreement. If you remember, we have been working with the Auctioneers Board in the past several months. We've raised a concern -- we'll seek clarity between the two agencies concerning licensing of auctions. The Auctioneers Board Counsel, Anna Dow, and Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission Counsel, Robert Hallack, worked together in developing an interagency agreement that addresses the concerns. Also, we added language that was in our 2014 legislative packet that addresses concerns as well. I will ask Commission Counsel Hallack to go through and detail the fine lines of the agreement.
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MR. HALLACK:
Gentlemen, you may recall that this started as a concern from some licensees that the Auctioneering Board -that they shouldn't have to have a license with both agencies. So what we did work out -- the primary things that are in this agreement are, first of all, retail auctions do not have to have a license as an auction with this Commission. They only have to have a used dealer license. So retail auctions only need a used dealer license. Wholesale auctions are still required to have an auction license from this Commission, unless they're selling vehicles at retail, they don't have to have a used dealer license. I think basically that covers it.

MR. POTEET:

> Can I ask a question, Mr.

Hallack?
MR. HALLACK:
Yes, sir.

MR. POTEET:
What would -- is there a
percentage -- well, let's say, for example, you know, my business is a wholesale auction, only wholesale. We don't retail anything, any time, ever. Would there be some cut off -- suppose $I$ decided to have a Saturday retail auction, would that -- I'd still have to have my license as long as I was selling some cars wholesale. So there doesn't need to be a percentage. And I'm only asking this, because, for example, the National Auto Auction Association requires that you sell 50 percent plus one wholesale to be in that association. We don't have that here. It would just be if you're going to wholesale, you're going to have to have a license regardless of the percentage of your sales.

MR. HALLACK:
You have to have an auction license with this agency.

MR. POTEET:
I just want to make that clear for any wholesale auctions that may say, well, I'm retailing 75 percent of my cars. It doesn't matter, as long as you wholesale
anything.
MR. HALLACK:
If you're a wholesaler and you sell five or more used motor vehicles retail, then you have to have a license as a used motor vehicle dealer.

MR. POTEET:
Thank you.
MR. HALLACK:
Does anybody have any questions?
(No response.)
MR. PARNELL:
I also have Counsel Anna Dow from the Auctioneers Board.

Did you want to say anything?
MS. DOW:
No. I'm just here -- I'm here to answer any questions you may have about this agreement. This sort of also details exactly where our investigators can go if there's an issue. Obviously, there are some things that are obviously your issue and sometimes it's our issue. So we're working together with your Commission to make sure that enforcement is appropriate in those
cases.
MR. PARNELL:
Thank you.
MR. HALLACK:
Well, we do have to -- somebody needs to make a motion to approve it.

MR. POTEET:
Oh, okay.
MR. SMITH:
I make a motion.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Do we need to redo this
agreement? It was signed in the wrong spot.
MS. DOW:
We do have the correct version. And I apologize for that. We got in a hurry.

MR. SMITH:
I move.
MR. POTEET:
We have a motion to approve.
Second?
MR. TAYLOR:
Second.
MR. POTEET:

Mr. Taylor, second.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Good work everybody.
I think this clarifies a lot of issues for the constituencies on both sides.

MS. DOW:
It does and we will work with
this Commission as we always have. This
just -- this makes it a little easier for me to explain to people what they need and what they don't need.

MR. POTEET:
All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Hallack, good work.

MR. HALLACK:
You're welcome.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. Next thing on the agenda is the Executive Director's report. Derek. MR. PARNELL:

Commissioners, the investigators have been working really hard to try and satisfy consumer complaints and making sure the licensees are in compliance with the laws and statutes. Some of their actions that they've been doing this past month in June, audits conducted was 1,5 day notices issued was 4. 57 site visits and work orders were accomplished. Hand delivered were three. Assisted with title and registration for consumers were 11. Citations issued 7. Physical inspections that were completed was 36. You'll find -in your packet, you'll find the report that shows some of the other of their functions, which is the alleged issue counts. The alleged issue counts for June of 2014 were 80 alleged issues. The next document is the case report with an illustration of cases that were assigned during that month. The assigned cases for the month of June were 58 cases assigned and 10 of those cases have been completed.

The last document is the department summary report, which illustrates
the amount of total places that were closed in the month of June. That kind of completes the review of the complaint totals.

And general information, I kind of wanted to inform everyone that Compliance Investigator Ronnie Wisenor, he retired from his full-time service of 18 years on the 5 th of July. However, I did bring him back as part-time employee. His area in District 2, there's not as many dealerships in that area. He has a really great working rapport with those dealers out there and he typically handles a lot of his business on the phone and he really can work them a lot easier and a lot faster. He doesn't have that many dealers. He's kind of being -kind of stretched him a little thin, because, you know, I have been pulling him down here in the Baton Rouge area a lot working -- helping out, being that we didn't have an investigator in that District 4 area, the Lafayette area, but it's working out very well since we have acquired our new investigator in that area, Nestor Guillory.

He has been doing a wonderful job. He jumped right in. His background in law enforcement has helped out a great deal. He has a lot of connections out there already from law enforcement. So a lot of those players in that area, he kind of knows already. But Ronnie's 18 years of service as a full-time employee, he just kind of got burned out a bit and he had talked to me a couple of years back about getting ready to kind of do that and $I$ knew it was coming, but he wanted to go ahead and step on out of full-time work, but he still wants to be a part of our Commission. He's still going to be coming to our seminars. He's still going to be, you know, an intricate part in our involvement with what we're doing day to day.

MR. BREWER:
He did a great job. I know he helped me out a couple times. MR. PARNELL:

Yes. He's still going to be available, you know. He just won't work as many hours in the week. He won't be working

40 hours anymore, but at the same time, it works well for his area, and I think he does a good job in, you know, conducting investigations and closing things out and getting to the bottom line of whatever the situation is in a pretty quick fashion. So if you can -- if you want to reach out to him and just congratulate him on that, you know. I didn't really say much about what was going on about it, because I knew he was coming right back. So I didn't really make a big deal out of it, per se, but we did take him on -- us here, we did take him to eat. We wanted to have a little meal with him and congratulate him and got him a cake and stuff. So that's what we did.

And I don't know -- other general information, $I$ think all of you saw the update on Damon Bowling's Autoplex that I sent out to everybody. I just kind of wanted to touch base with that.

LUMVC, the replacement commissioner and I did speak with Barker Dirmann on -- last week several times -several weeks before that. I did receive
the appointment letter from the Governor's office. They've appointed Steve Olave of Pearl River. He's a certified pre-owner manager of Ross Downing Chevrolet. Olave will be appointed as service as a consumer selected at state at-large as required by statute. He was not -- unable to be here today, but next month -- he assured me next month he will be ready to go and -- but I will send out the information to you all, so you can kind of be in contact with him. I think he's going to reach out to you, Chairman Poteet, this week, so he can kind of grasp some things. That's all I have in general information.

MR. POTEET:
Good. Does anybody any questions for Derek at this time?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Well, that concludes our meeting.

MR. TAYLOR:
One question, did we send an e-mail out to all of our dealers in regards
to new legislation, have we sent --
MS . BARON:
It's going out today.
MR. PARNELL:
Not yet.
MS . BARON:
It's going out today. It's on the website.

MR. PARNELL:
She posted it on the website, but didn't do a mass mailing. We'll get it out today.

MR. TAYLOR:
Perfect.
MR. HALLACK:
That's a good point.
Commissioners need to realize that we've changed the law in two significant ways, one with regard to advertising, the other with regard to spot delivery. So those are two big important changes that everybody needs to be aware of. And with regard to the advertising changes, $I$ think one of the things that we need to talk about, maybe even today, is how you want to handle that,
because there are some used car dealers that put a lot of money into advertising. What are we going to do if we find a violation? Should we issue a warning? Should we go ahead and issue a ticket? Something like that, we need to think about, because I've seen a couple of ads on TV that probably would be violations under the new statute. So how do you want us to handle those? MR. TAYLOR:

Number one, I wish that all of us in our areas would talk to our auctions and hopefully get our auctions to make an announcement, you know, maybe even for a solid month. I think it would be a great way to get the word out. I'm going to talk to the people in Shreveport and talk to Mike Turner in my area and I'm going to, by word of mouth, tell my dealers around there, hey, please make sure you pay attention to it, but I wish there would be, one, a warning and I wish -- and then from there proceed on with the -- with issuing fines or anything that we need to do to shut it down. I'd like that advertising shut down as quickly
as possible, so it starts ruffling the feathers of the new car dealers here in the state, I mean, just immediate August 1, you know. That's my opinion.

MS. BARON:
Would you like for me to send y'all a separate e-mail with both of the laws?

MR. BREWER:
Yes, please.
MS. BARON:
Okay. Will do.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
You know, I think in fairness, you're going to have to create definitions. I've been under the -- as a new car dealer, I've been under this scrutiny for, let's say, my entire career, and $I$ think that the biggest scrape that dealers have is that they need definitions. It needs to be clear, but what the New Car Commission has done, so that they don't have a room full of dealers with violations unknowing to them, is that they also have a review panel. You can call and send it to Lessie and Burgess
and so forth because, you know, there's a lot of guys that are going through the line and they are being aggressive in their business offering new products and I think that you owe it to the dealers to be fair. I think you owe it to the rest of the dealers to be firm. So I think a good understanding prevents misunderstanding, it's to create definitions and try to backfill those definitions and I think they should go with policy is my thought.

MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MR. HALLACK:
Well, I think, you know, when an investigator has a problem with an ad, he brings it to Mr. Parnell and he reviews it to determine if it's a violation or not, you know. And I think, like Mr. Taylor said, if we issue warnings and tell them, we're not going to allow you to use this type of advertising anymore and tickets will be written after that, maybe that's a good point.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
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And I agree with that, but I think you have to let them know clearly what's expected of them.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I think that kind of combining those two ideas together, number one, I do think we should give warnings before we start writing tickets, because it is a new law and it's going to take awhile to get people in line with where we need to be. And the second part of that is, I think that we need to be clear and maybe the process needs to be this, when a warning is issued, it comes back to Derek and Derek reviews it, and then there should be a response back to the dealer that, yes, this is in violation, because, dah, dah, dah, dah, dah, and we'll fill that in, whatever the case may be, and make it clear, this is how you're in violation, why you're in violation.

So I don't know about a panel, but $I$ know definitely that in the process for the next few months, the next six months, or even a year maybe, we give
warnings and we review it and get back to the dealer that was warned. And if we're wrong, if we think that the investigator was wrong, Derek should say, well, that really doesn't -- you know, that's not a violation, because, and then have the explanation. I think Ron brings up a good point. We need to be fair with everybody, but we need to be firm, because the guys that are following the rules -- and this was back months and months ago when Mr. Taylor kind of brought this stuff up, that was the thing. You know, you've got some people that are playing by one set of rules and a bunch of other people that are trying to play by the right rules. So $I$ think we need to do it in a way that makes sure that everybody understands it and a way that we're not going to, you know, sending people tickets. So if you do it one time, it's explained by the Executive Director, and if you do it again, you're going to get a ticket and you're going to get a fine.

Does everybody agree with that process?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
And then $I$ guess as time goes on, if we need to adjust that, we can, but $I$ think that that would be the best way to go, warning, you know, explanation, next time ticket.

MR. PARNELL:
And did you say you want to do a six-month time frame?

MR. POTEET:
I just said it may take six months or a year to kind of get it to the point -- once you've given, you know, I don't know, two dozen warnings, $I$ think you're at the point where you're starting to get some penetration into the dealer body. I mean, they do talk amongst themselves and people know about it. And then probably the first time somebody actually gets a fine, there's going to be a lot of discussion on that, too, probably even some news about it.

MR. ROY:
Will they be sent a statute of the law?

MR. HALLACK:
Well, Mr. Parnell is going to send information as to why it's a violation. MR. ROY:

Because each dealership receives

MR. POTEET:
Yes. It's on the website now and today we're going to e-mail it out.

MR. TAYLOR:
I think a warning does a good job of finding all the older people that are not paying attention. I think the warnings have already -- you know, hey, you didn't pay attention, here you go --

MR. ROY:
I agree on the warning.
MR. TAYLOR:
-- here's the statute or a field officer will give the statute out to them, here it is, if you have any questions, call me back.

Montie, I've never left him a message, even before $I$ was on this Commission, that in less than a half a day
he didn't return my call. So I'm assuming it's the same way around with other officers around the state, you know.

MR. POTEET:
They're pretty easily accessible. MR. DUPLESSIS:

I think we also need to have clarification on the new doc fee that was passed that applies to our Commission and our constituents as well. It's a $\$ 200$ fee and I think we've spoken -- several of us have spoken about the tentacles to that and where the statute written in the law and how the law has changed and it's a very serious and may be a TILA violation. Is would be a serious violation now and I think it needs to be explained and everybody understands how it works.

MR. HALLACK:
This is the law with regard to people who do financing?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Yes. Well, it's anybody that you put -- you can either finance or indirect finance. You're entitled to a documentation
fee, which was previous capped at $\$ 100$. Now, it's capped after this Legislature at $\$ 200$, but has to be clearly stated with verbiage on the buyer's order and it has to be itemized out, but it has specific disclosure information that has to be on the buyer's order.

MR. HALLACK:
And part of the disclosure is
that people have to know it's not a mandatory charge by statute.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's correct, but the
nomenclature is printed verbatim in the law.
MR. HALLACK:
Mr. Duplessis is referring to a memo that was sent out by the New Car Commission for people -- it was only sent out to new car dealers, but it also applies to any used motor vehicle dealer, like Mr. Duplessis said, that finances or -MR. DUPLESSIS:

Does paperwork in order to
achieve financing. If you get the license, title, the documentation, the loan, that
sort of thing, then you're entitled to recoup your expenses up to $\$ 200$.

MR. TAYLOR:
And that's plainer if you charge $\$ 1$ or if you charge $\$ 200$, you have to explain it, correct?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's correct.
MR. TAYLOR:
And I assume they wanted that doc fee and I'm sure in legislation it says, we're going to give you that bond, but you've got to tell them what's going on. I'm sure that's how it worked out. Is that what happened?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It is, but actually there was a rearrangement in the law and I think Sheri or Robert can actually pull it. They
changed the item numbers where it was ambiguous. It was always in the law and people didn't realize it, because it was so far down. Now, they've brought it back up and it's noted in the black lines of the actual legislation, because I've read it.

I've reviewed it with Lessie. I believe I reviewed it with Derek and it is very, very clear how they want it done. Otherwise, it could possibly be a TILA violation as well as a State violation of the finance commission of a new car.

MR. TAYLOR:
So just to clarify for everybody, there's no governing body here at all. MR. DUPLESSIS:

No. Actually, we could go in now and that would be a violation of State law for our investigators if we chose to pursue that item. We could enforce that, but it would be part of our procedures of the Commission.

MR. POTEET:
So we need to emphasize that,
too, along with the other information.
Thank you, Mr. Hallack.
MR. PARNELL:
Counsel Morris, she wrote an opinion on it. If you will, kind of -MS. MORRIS:

Basically, I reviewed Lessie's
e-mail and I agree with what she's saying is that if you are charging a fee for preparing documents, checking credit, any of those things, you do have to have a disclosure on the buyer's order or the sales contract and it has to be signed by the buyer and you have to give the buyer a copy of it as well. So it's a procedure that you have to follow to be in compliance with the law. I don't -- I'm not sure why she didn't send it to people that have a motor vehicle sales finance license, but in her head -- or that group is not listed. So we can go ahead and send it to the dealers since we're going to send legislation. It changes -- the major change in the law is the fee not being capped at $\$ 100$, but $\$ 200$, and then a little bit more clarification as to the procedure. MR. POTEET:

Thank you.
Any more discussion?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. We needed to adjourn the meeting, and then reconvene for the
administrative hearings. I need a motion to adjourn.

MR. SMITH:
I'll make a motion.
MR. BREWER:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. Let's take about a
five-minute break and we'll start with our first of four hearings today.
(Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.)
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| ```35:22 really [7] - 10:7, 20:2, 21:12, 21:15, 23:9, 23:11, 30:4 rearrangement [1] - 35:18 receivable [2] - 7:11, 9:18 receive [2]-6:24, 23:25 received [1]-6:21 receives [1]-32:5 recently [1]-6:19 reconvene [1] - 37:25 recoup [1] - 35:2 redo [1]-18:12 referring [1] - 34:16 regard [4]-25:19, 25:20, 25:22, 33:20 regardless [1] - 16:16 regards [1]-24:25 registration [1]- 20:11 REGULAR [1] - 1:13 related [4]-6:22, 7:17, 8:13, 9:20 remainder [1] - 8:10 remains [1] - 9:13 remember [1] - 14:11 replace [1]-9:14 replacement [2] - 8:16, 23:22 report [8]-6:14, 9:2, 9:18, 9:24, 19:24, 20:14, 20:19, 20:25 REPORTED [1] - 1:24 reported [1] - 39:8 Reporter [1] - 39:4 REPORTER[1] - 39:25 REPORTER'S [1] - 39:1 reporting [1] - 39:8 REPRESENTING [1] - 2:17 required [2] - 15:13, 24:6 requires [1] - 16:11 requiring [1]-7:20 response [13]-4:19, 6:9, 10:4, 10:22, 12:11, 13:8, 13:24, 17:11, 19:6, 24:19, 29:16, 31:1, 37:22 responses [6] - 6:6, 10:19, 12:8, 13:21,``` | ```19:3, \(38: 9\) rest \({ }_{[1]}-28: 6\) retail [6]-15:8, 15:11, 15:16, 16:3, 16:6, 17:5 retailing [1] - 16:24 retired [1]-21:7 return [1]-33:1 revenue [2]-8:5, 8:9 revenues [5]-8:4, 8:7, 9:2, 9:8, 9:9 review [4]-6:13, 21:3, 27:24, 30:1 reviewed \([7]\) - 11:8, 11:9, 12:21, 12:23, 36:1, 36:2, 36:25 reviewing [1] - 7:7 reviews [2]-28:17, 29:15 River [1] - \(24: 3\) Robert [2] - 14:18, 35:19 ROBERT [1] - 2:18 ROEDEL [1] - 2:21 roll \({ }_{[1]}-4: 3\) RON \({ }_{[1]}-2: 8\) Ron [2] - 4:21, 30:7 Ronnie [1] - 21:7 Ronnie's [1] - 22:7 room [1] - 27:22 Ross [1] - 24:4 Rouge [2]-21:20, 39:14 ROUGE \([3]\) - 1:21, 2:20, 2:23 Roy [2]-5:4, 10:13 ROY [7]-2:10, 5:5, 10:10, 11:22, 31:23, 32:4, 32:16 ruffling \({ }_{[1]}-27: 1\) rules [3]-30:10, 30:14, 30:16``` Saturday [1]-16:6 saw [1]-23:18 scrape [1]-27:19 scrutiny [1]-27:17 se [1] - 23:12 Second [1] - 10:15 second [15]-6:2, 6:4, 10:17, 12:2, 12:4, 12:6, 13:15, 13:17, 13:19, 18:22, 18:24, | ```19:1, 29:11, \(38: 6\) seek [1] - 14:14 selected [1] - 24:6 sell [2] - 16:12, 17:4 selling [2] - 15:15, 16:8 seminars [1] - \(22: 15\) send [8]-24:10, 24:24, 27:6, 27:25, 32:3, 37:10, 37:14, 37:15 sending [1] - 30:19 sent [5]-23:20, 25:1, 31:24, 34:17, 34:18 separate [1]-27:7 serious [2]-33:14, 33:16 server [3]-7:16, 7:19, 7:21 service [5] - 11:16, 13:4, 21:8, 22:7, 24:5 services [10]-8:2, 11:7, 11:8, 11:12, 11:14, 11:19, 12:21, 12:22, 12:25, 13:1 servicing [1] - 7:20 set \([1]-30: 14\) several [4]-14:13, 23:24, 23:25, 33:11 Sharp's [1] - 9:21 SHERI [1] - 2:21 Sheri [1] - 35:18 shortly [1] - 7:22 showing [1] - 9:5 shows [3]-9:3, 9:7, 20:15 Shreveport [1] - 26:17 shut [2]-26:24, 26:25 sides [1] - 19:10 Sign [1] - 9:21 signed [2]-18:13, 37:6 significant [1] - 25:18 site [1]-20:8 situation [1]-23:6 six [3]-29:24, 31:10, 31:12 six-month [1] - 31:10 slight \({ }_{[1]}\) - 9:6 Smith [5] - 5:8, 6:4, 10:17, 12:6, 13:14 SMITH [9] - 2:11, 5:9, 5:24, 10:14, 12:3, 13:11, 18:9, 18:18, 38:3 software [2]-7:16,``` | ```7:17 solid [1] - 26:15 sometimes [1] - 17:23 sort [2] - 17:19, 35:1 space [1] - 7:20 specific [1] - 34:5 spoken [2]-33:11, 33:12 spot [2]-18:13, 25:20 start [3] - 5:19, 29:8, 38:12 started [1] - 15:3 starting [2]-7:4, 31:16 starts [1]-27:1 State [3] - 36:5, 36:12, 39:5 state [3]-24:6, 27:3, 33:3 STATE [1] - 1:6 statement \([1]-7: 5\) statements [4] - 6:17, 6:18, 6:19, 10:24 statute \([7]-24: 7\), 26:8, 31:24, 32:19, 32:20, 33:13, 34:11 statutes [1]-20:5 stenotype [1] - 39:8 step [1]-22:12 Steve [1]-24:2 still [6] - 15:13, 16:7, 22:13, 22:14, 22:15, 22:23 stretched [1]-21:18 stuff [2]-23:16, 30:12 SUITE [1]-2:22 summary [2]-9:13, 20:25 supervision [1] - 39:11 suppose [1] - 16:5``` | ```themselves [1] - 31:18 they've [3]-20:6, 24:2, 35:23 thin [1] \(-21: 18\) three \({ }_{[1]}-20: 10\) ticket [3]-26:5, 30:22, 31:7 tickets [3]-28:22, 29:8, 30:19 TILA [2] - 33:15, 36:4 title [2]-20:10, 34:25 today [9]-5:15, 7:3, 24:8, 25:3, 25:7, 25:12, 25:25, 32:9, 38:13 together [3]-14:18, 17:24, 29:6 Tony [1] - 4:17 TONYA [1] - 3:6 total [4]-9:18, 11:15, 11:16, 21:1 totals [1] - 21:4 touch [1]-23:21 transaction [1] - 9:10 transcribed [1] - 39:9 transcript \({ }_{[1]}\) - 39:12 true [1]-39:11 Trust [1]-9:15 try [2]-20:2, 28:9 trying [1] - 30:15 turn [1] - 6:16 Turner [1]-26:18 TV [1] - \(26: 7\) two [5] - 14:14, 25:18, 25:20, 29:6, 31:15 type [1] - 28:21 typically [1]-21:14``` U UD ${ }_{[1]}$ - 9:9 unable [1]-24:7 unaudited $[1]-6: 19$ under [9]-7:11, 7:14, 7:23, 8:12, 8:14, 26:8, 27:16, 27:17, 39:10 unknowing [1] - 27:23 unless [2]-9:22, 15:15 up $[7]-8: 8,8: 9,9: 8$, 30:7, 30:12, 35:2, 35:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { update }[1]-23: 19 \\ & \text { updated }[1]-8: 18 \\ & \text { uptick }[1]-9: 6 \\ & \text { USED }[2]-1: 5,2: 17 \end{aligned}$ | ```writing[1] - 29:8 written [2]-28:23, 33:13 wrote [1] - 36:22``` |
| :---: | :---: |
| V | Y |
| ```VALLEY[1]-1:20 vehicle [3]-17:6, 34:20, 37:11 VEHICLE [2] - 1:5, 2:17 Vehicle [2]-14:17, 39:6 vehicles [2] - 15:15, 17:4 verbatim [1] - 34:14 verbiage [1]-34:4 version [1] - 18:15 violation [12]-26:3, 28:18, 29:17, 29:20, 29:21, 30:5, 32:3, 33:15, 33:16, 36:4, 36:5, 36:12 violations [2]-26:8, 27:23 visits [1] - 20:8``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y'all }{ }_{[1]}-27: 7 \\ & \text { year }[13]-7: 9,8: 7, \\ & 8: 9,8: 11,8: 12,8: 14, \\ & 8: 21,8: 22,8: 23,9: 6, \\ & 9: 8,29: 25,31: 13 \\ & \text { year-to-date }[2] \text { - } \\ & \text { 8:7, } 8: 12 \\ & \text { years }[3]-21: 8, \\ & 22: 7,22: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| W |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { wants }[1]-22: 13 \\ \text { warned }[1]-30: 2 \\ \text { warning }[6]-26: 4 \text {, } \\ 26: 21,29: 13,31: 6 \text {, } \\ 32: 11,32: 17 \\ \text { warnings }[5]-28: 20 \text {, } \\ 29: 7,30: 1,31: 15 \text {, } \\ 32: 13 \\ \text { ways }[1]-25: 18 \\ \text { website }[3]-25: 8 \text {, } \\ 25: 10,32: 8 \\ \text { week }[3]-22: 25 \text {, } \\ 23: 24,24: 13 \\ \text { weeks }[1]-23: 25 \\ \text { welcome }[1]-19: 21 \\ \text { wholesale }[8]- \\ 15: 13,16: 2,16: 3 \text {, } \\ 16: 8,16: 12,16: 15 \text {, } \\ 16: 23,16: 25 \\ \text { wholesaler }[1]-17: 3 \\ \text { Wisenor }[1]-21: 7 \\ \text { wish }[3]-26: 11 \text {, } \\ 26: 21,26: 22 \\ \text { wonderful }[1]-22: 1 \\ \text { word }[2]-26: 16 \text {, } \\ 26: 18 \\ \text { works }[2]-23: 2, \\ 33: 18 \end{gathered}$ |  |

