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 MS. KIM BARON MR. DEREK PARNELL MR. MONTIE WISENOR MR. DREW KRAUS, CPA, CFE (Pledge of Allegiance.)MR. WATTS:
Roll call.
MS. BARON:
Richard Watts?
MR. WATTS:
Here.
MS. BARON: John Poteet?

MR. POTEET:
Here.
MS. BARON: George Floyd?

MR. FLOYD: (No response.)

MS. BARON: Tony Cormier?

MR. CORMIER: (No response.)

MS. BARON: Matthew Pederson?

MR. PEDERSON: Here.

MS. BARON:

```
                                Jefferey Britt?
```

MR. BRITT:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Ricky Donnell?
MR. DONNELL:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Travis Brown?
MR. BROWN:
Here.
MS. BARON: Bobby Hines?

MR. HINES:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Wydette Williams?
MR. WILLIAMS:
Here.
MS. BARON: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

MR. WATTS:
Thank you.
Anyone here for public comments?
MS. BARON:
No.

MR. WATTS:
Adoption and approval the minutes
from March '23. I need a motion.
MR. POTEET:
I make a motion that we approve the minutes.

MR. WILLIAMS:
I second.
MR. WATTS:
Wydette seconds.
Items for discussion today is our
financial discussion.
MR. PARNELL:
Commissioners, we have for us
Mr. Andrew Kraus. He is the auditor that conducted the audit of -- with the company

TWRU. He will present it for us.
MR. KRAUS:
Good morning, everybody. As Derek
said, my name is Andrew Kraus. I am the auditor insurance manager of TWRU CPAs \& Financial Advisors here in Baton Rouge. I just wanted to go over a few things about the financial statements with y'all.

First of all, as to your cash
position, y'all are sitting pretty well. Very similar to the prior year with just over 3 million dollars in current assets which a good portion of that is in cash.

Next item is debt. The total
liabilities for the Commission fell by about $\$ 400,000$ or just under 10 percent. So another good indicator of your financial position as your debt is going down, your current assets are staying relatively stable over time.

The next thing I want to cover was the revenue -- by all means, stop me if you have questions. MR. WATTS:

What page are you on? You are going through the booklet?

MR. KRAUS:
Yes, sir. From the book I am in the MD\&A section, so the first few pages. Page 5 shows your current assets and the discussion of the cash position a little bit, as well as the current liabilities amount which is about halfway down on this statement of net position there.

The revenues, if we go to the next
page, page 6, you will see that your revenues did very well. Y'all went up by almost 50 percent, which is to be expected for two reasons. One, y'all's licensing fees are on a two-year cycle. So between that and the House Bill that y'all had to deal with and COVID, we would expect your revenues to increase for the second year as well as the catch-up revenues that you received after that bill left effect. So again, very good position with comparison to the prior years. We also looked during our review at your fiscal year '19 and fiscal year '20 numbers and this seems to track with growing revenues that we have seen from our other governmental clients and also our not-for-profits and our public sector clients. So y'all are sitting pretty good with revenues as well.

As for expenses, there was a slight increase in expenses, which we again expect to see as -- with revenues increasing, we expect expenses to increase. Y'all also had a few other things to deal with, like, COVID-related expenses that kind of flowed over from fiscal year '20 and fiscal year '21. Especially for
y'all's fiscal year ends on 6/30. Y'all have to basically -- y'all's fiscal year began shortly after COVID hit. So instead of only having a couple of months in a fiscal year, y'all had something like nine months that really got hit hard with COVID. So, again, this a similar trend that we see with all of our other clients as well.

With that being said, y'all's change in net position or y'all's net income for a lot of public sector, was a better position than it was in 2021. There was a net loss of about 340,000 in 2021 and in 2022, it was about 87 . So, again, this is a similar trend where 2021 was a very difficult year. 2022 makes everything look a bit more promising.

Any questions with regards to the statements as far as $I$ presented them so far?

Okay. The next thing, just a couple of notes about our audit. This was our first year doing it. Everyone that we dealt with at the Commission was very professional, very helpful. Everyone seemed to know exactly what they were doing and how it needed to be done. Personally, that's a very good thing to see.

Whenever people are confident that what they are doing is the right way to do it, it shows in the numbers and in the documents when we go to do our audits. So I want to commend Derek and Kim and Mona and Rhonda for keeping that up. Everything was very easy to get.
Everything was very organized and seemed to go through the property channels as best as it could be.

The only other things that we
noted -- and I have talked with Kim and Derek about this before, there were a few long-outstanding checks which they were going to check with the -- I think it is the Secretary of Treasury on or the Department of Treasury, checks that are outstanding for longer than one year are required to be surrendered to the State as unclaimed property. So they were in the process of dealing -- of looking into that program.

MR. WATTS:
What is that total?
MR. KRAUS:
I don't have the number in front of me, but I don't believe it was very much. It
was maybe a couple of thousand dollars. Those checks were more likely was refunds, maybe something like that. And a lot of times they get lost in the mail, people don't know that they should have received them and they just kind of go by the wayside. So there is a program with the treasury department to have it surrendered. And then those people can go online and search their name and it will come up and they can get -- they can receive those funds.

The other thing is we had a few small improvements in internal controls. When it comes to writing checks, paying checks, paying invoices, that sort of thing and I think those were implemented or in the process of being implemented the last we spoke.

The only other thing to mention as far as the statements themselves is that there was one write-off that we recommended and that was in regards to an outstanding amount for Lauco, which $I$ think it was a fine, that was instituted by the Commission and it had been outstanding for over eight years, and so we recommended that since there was no -- there
was no sign that the Commission was going to recover those funds, that they be written off because it wasn't -- it wasn't conceivable that they were actually going to get any of that money back. So recommended that. So that is also in the financial statements back in the notes.

And so that's all that $I$ have for the financial statements themselves. We were also engaged by the Commission to conduct what are known as statewide agreed-upon procedures. These are procedures that are required by the Louisiana Legislative auditor for all public agencies that very much track with the kind of things that we do in an audit, but nonetheless are required to be done as a separate engagement along with the audit.

That's the second packet that I
included. And the only things that $I$ wanted to -- and you can see in there our -- what we determined to be an exception and management's responses to those exceptions. Nothing -nothing ongoing was in there. There was maybe one thing about IT which I think was addressed by Mr. Parnell. There was another regarding --

I think it was the sexual harassment report which they are going to be rectifying. So that's pretty much all that I have. Like I said, it was a very clean audit. We issued an unqualified opinion which means we did not find anything that would suggest that the statements are anything other than what they appear.

Any questions?
I also included one of my business cards. If you later on look at the statements or the Statewide Agreed Upon Procedures and you do have further questions, please feel free to contact me and I will be happy to address your questions or concerns.

Thank you.
MR. WATTS:
Thank you. Anybody have any
questions?
MR. POTEET:
I have a comment. I would like to once again commend the staff. I have been on this Commission for a long time and I was actually part of the group that hired Derek. And $I$ will say unequivocally this is something that shows the improvements that we have made
over many, many years, shows the professionalism and the competency that we have in this Commission. I don't know if we had a bad -- I will call it bad audit since Derek's ascension to this post.

So, once again, I commend the staff. I commend you, Derek, for your leadership and once again thanks a lot. And thank you for your work. MR. KRAUS: Yes, sir.

MR. WATTS:
I would like to make a comment that Derek has been under a little stress here as far as getting our accounting department lined up, hiring people. I am going to let him dwell on that if you want to. MR. PARNELL:

I will do it my comments. MR. WATTS:

Comments, okay.
Ratification and imposed penalties. MR. PARNELL:

Commissioner, you will find in your packet a chart that illustrates the licensees
or the licensee that was in violation of state law. These cases were investigated. I have determined that the public interest can be served without further administrative proceeding; thus, civil penalties were imposed. I will announce the name of this dealer. Do we have anyone representing this dealer present?

MS. BARON:
No, sir.
MR. PARNELL:
This dealer is Executive Used Cars \& Finance, LLC, from Shreveport, Louisiana. His fine amount was $\$ 250$. It was a misuse of temporary tag, a temp tag, that he issued out more than once. A total for civil penalties is \$250. Commissioners, I ask that you ratify the imposed civil penalty and assess. MR. DONNELL: So moved.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Second.
MR. WATTS:
Legal matters.
MR. PARNELL:

I will do the first one because Sherri Morris, she is unavailable to be here. Today her daughter graduated college over the week and so she is still dealing with that. But she did send the information about Federated Mutual Insurance Company, $H$ and $N$ Auto Sales, LLC.

This case was transferred from Civil Court District Court out of Orleans Parish to the 19th JDC court. The suit was allotted to Judge Wilson Fields. The Attorney General's office filed exceptions on behalf of the LUMVC which are set for hearing on Monday, May 22 of 2023.

That's all that I have. Robert, he will discuss the other concern. MR. HALLACK:

Also in that case, $I$ don't know how much background you want on the case. MR. WATTS:

Which one? MR. PARNELL:

H and N . MR. WATTS:

Just tell us a little bit about it.

MR. HALLACK:
This was a claim that was made against the bond for $H$ and $N$ Auto Sales by -- I don't know if it was the insured of the new car dealership or the actual new car dealership. What happened was the new car dealership sold a vehicle to a couple in New Orleans and it turned out that vehicle was stolen. And so he claimed that the used car dealer that sold it to him, H and $N$ Auto Sales, knew that it was stolen. But the fact is he paid $\$ 30,000$ for a Tahoe and then turned around and sold it for 50. So it sounded a little suspicious. But in order to make a claim -MR. WATTS:

He bought the -- new car dealer traded with $H$ and $N$ ? MR. HALLACK:

No. He bought it from a -- the new car dealership in New Orleans bought it from $H$ and $N$ Auto Sales. MR. WATTS:

Bought it from $H$ and $N$, okay. MR. HALLACK:

So he made a claim against $H$ and $H$

Auto Sales against his bond for the stolen vehicle. We denied that. There are two ways to make a claim against the bond; one is tax, the title, and license; and the other is if there has been a violation of the Commission's statutes.

So we investigated. We looked into it. His claim that maybe the used car dealer knew that it was a stolen car and, therefore, defrauded him. So we looked into it and the state police, who investigated the criminal aspect of the case, told our investigator that he did not think that the used motor vehicle dealer knew that it was a stolen vehicle.

In the interim during all of that, the used motor vehicle dealer was assassinated on the streets in New Orleans. So because we denied the claim against the bond because we did not find any violation of our statutes, they went ahead and they filed a suit against us and the bond company. And the bond company was let out of the lawsuit. This lawsuit was dismissed against the bond company. So if you can't sue the bond company, why are you maintaining an action against the Commission
anyway? Our only job is to administer the bond. If you can't sue the bond, then why are we still in the lawsuit? It makes absolutely no sense. So that's where that is at.

The next one is Kandice Burnett. As you know, the Commission had denied Ms. Burnett's application to be a used motor dealer. There was an association, in fact, she ended up marrying Clark Crain. Clark Crain has a new car dealership name in St. Francisville. And we thought because she was married to Clark Crain that we could not extend the license to her. What I just passed out is the 792(A) basis for which the Commission can deny a license. And there are five reasons by which you can deny a license. The first one is if the dealer -- if the applicant is unfit. Now, if it's unfit, according to the standards that the Commission imposes, and we never developed standards for this. Am I correct, Kim? MS. BARON:
Yes.

MR. HALLACK:
We have talked about doing it. We
should do it and we should do that as soon as possible, perhaps the next meeting. And what I mean by that, what would you think would be some of the standards for which you believe somebody should not have a license as a used motor vehicle dealer. But because we never developed those, we don't use Part A or 1 or whatever it is. But we need to do that. Because, I will tell you, years ago -- Mr. Poteet probably remembers this, I think he was still on the board then, we had a used car manager for Coleman Toyota who applied for a license to be a used motor vehicle dealer under this Commission. And we had a couple commissioners who were adamantly opposed to it because this individual, who was the sales manager for Coleman Toyota, had stolen money from Coleman Toyota. And he stole excess of a million dollars. And, therefore, they believed that he should not hold a license with this agency.

And you look at what we have there, there is not a whole lot upon which we could deny the license. We ended up denying the license under the first section there that he
is unfit to be a used car dealer.
MR. HINES:
Would that follow under Number 2
being a convicted of a felony?
MR. HALLACK:
He had not been convicted.
MR. HINES:
Oh, he was not convicted.
MR. HALLACK:
He was under investigation, but not convicted.

MR. WATTS:
He finally was.
MR. HALLACK:
He finally was? I think so, yes. But at the time that he applied for a license here, he was not -- he had not been convicted. Now, he had some convictions -back then, we had a different rule with regard to convictions. If it was beyond 10 years -and he did have a felony conviction beyond 10 years, but he still didn't come under any of those provisions except for being unfit. And that's what the Commission decided to do with regard to his application; the Commission said
that he was unfit to be a used motor vehicle dealer.

Originally, we had tried to do Number 5 and that's what happened to Ms. Crain -- Ms. Burnett, her application, we did do it under Number 5. But actually you can't do it under Number 5 .

You see she has a relationship with Clark Crain. Clark Crain gave up his license to the New Car Commission, but not to us. So he had not lost a license with our agency. And that statute specifically says that it has to be our agency that his license was revoked or suspended.

So when somebody, a used motor vehicle dealer, say XYZ, XYZ loses their license with this Commission and the daughter or wife or whoever of $X Y Z$ then reapplies, and then this provision comes into play. But Clark Crain had never actually lost his license with this Commission.

So, therefore, the section upon which we relied upon in denying the license actually shouldn't have been. And we couldn't use the first one because we really need to develop
some standards on what is unfit to be a used motor vehicle dealer.

MR. PEDERSON:
So we should have read through this before we made our decision. I mean, we can't go back, but in the future whenever we -- maybe we need to look at these when we go into executive session, pull this out and say, okay, can we legitimately revoke this request under 1 through 5.

MR. HALLACK:
Right. That's correct.
MR. BRITT:
We need to set up a policy.
MR. HALLACK:
Yes, sir.

MR. BRITT:
And an understanding here and then
there might be -- we might have to go back
because this is a statute, correct?
MR. HALLACK:
That's correct.
MR. BRITT:
Might have to go back and fix the wording on this at some point to either give
you -- like for Number 1, give us a little more purview to do. Or Number 5 reword it. You can really combine 1 and 5 with the right wording. MR. PARNELL:

I think if we draft it in rule and regulations as it relates to Number 1 that would be sufficient.

MR. BRITT:
Right.
MR. HALLACK:
Yes.
MR. PARNELL:
I don't think that we would have to go back to statute; we would need to change it in the rules and regulations.

MR. HINES:
Did Clark Crain have violations that his lines should have been revoked? MR. HALLACK:

He had some with our agency that went back to 2016.

MS. BARON:
But he didn't own the dealership.
MR. HALLACK:
He did not.

MS. BARON:
He was just in charge of the dealership.

MR. WISENOR:
He was running it.
MR. HALLACK:
But that's from back from 2016. He was never revoked or suspended. Was he ever found in violation? I don't remember a hearing.

MS. BARON:
I think so.
MR. WISENOR:
Didn't he have like 100-some-odd
complaints filed and it was found out that he was associated with two different dealerships? It was two separate dealerships that he was involved with it.

MR. PARNELL:
That he was associated with this Commission.

MR. WISENOR:
Before he moved over to the new side,
the new car dealership.
MR. HALLACK:

Now, he had over 100 with the new car commission.

MR. WISENOR:
I think we determined that we had over that with us throughout.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, I would say that anytime you have a license whether it's a plumber's license or a real estate license, if you have been -if you have been revoked or suspended of any state agency license, then that should be grounds for which you should be denied a license.

MR. PARNELL:
That was the reason -- the one that I
used was Number 5 initially when $I$ did the initial denial, because $I$ had authority to do the initial denial and then they can appeal my denial and come before you guys. Because I believe Clark had some dealings with our agency where he was fined in the past. And where it says that the persons who believe are going to operate -- the same person or the person who is related to this person or knows them is going to operate the same business as the person that
they are related to in the past. So that was the reasoning for me using Number 5 initially because $I$ understood that he had violations with this agency before and also with the New Car Commission.

But that language is not real complete. We need to add to that language. MR. HINES:

Is that something that we can change as of right now?

MR. HALLACK:
No. What he is talking about doing would have to require an amendment at the Legislature. But Number 1, you can do something right now without having to go to the Legislature. You can develop standards by which you believe someone is unfit to hold a license as a used motor vehicle dealer.

MR. PARNELL:
Which would be a rules and regulation
process. We do that ourselves.
MR. DONNELL:
That will be if you have been denied any state license. MR. HALLACK:

That would be a good start.
MS. BARON:
We can add that. We put that in the rule.

MR. BROWN:
If we put that in there, would that sill be up to Derek and then up to us -MR. HALLACK:

Yes.
MR. BROWN:
-- yes or no?
MR. HALLACK:
Yes.
MR. PARNELL:
The initial would be.
MR. BROWN:
It would be irrelevant to, you know, being any license in the state and it really didn't pertain to what we are doing, we can say, yes, we will go ahead, get him a license or not.

MR. HALLACK:
I have been with this agency for over
30 years. I have seen convicted murderers, two at least, get licenses. I have seen somebody
convicted of marijuana who did not get a license.

MR. WATTS:
Convicted, serve your time and debt to society, and then they come up here and apply for a license.

MR. HALLACK:
That's correct. And had preachers with them and all of that.

MR. PARNELL:
When they send the applications in, if they have been convicted of any crimes, I get a background check. So I review each person's background, you know. And so usually -- Robert kind of mentioned this a little bit about it in the past -- if it was beyond 10 years that they been convicted and they hadn't any issues throughout that time, I will go ahead and, most often, I would approve them and put some stipulations on them and they are going to be watched. But if it is something that's stealing money and/or the industry, $I$ will deny and let them come in, and if they want to kind of talk about the situation, if $I$ feel more comfortable with them
moving forward and then $I$ will go ahead and agree to allow them to have the license.

But in any situation and all situations, if $I$ deny it, it goes to you-all second as -- just to make sure that $y^{\prime}$ all agree with that.

MR. HALLACK:
But in this case, we have to make the -- we have to take some kind of action so that the appeal -- because it is on appeal right now. And it is also in front of Judge Wilson Fields. And so on appeal, I think we can end up losing and we can be liable for her court costs, not for her attorney's fees, just her court costs. And $I$ think it's important that we go ahead and reverse that decision and that not be an impediment to her getting a license. She is going to have to reapply. She is going to sign an affidavit to the effect that Clark Crain will have no involvement in her dealership.

So that's where we are at. So we need a motion to reverse the Commission's -MR. PARNELL:

What do you mean no involvement? You
mean no involvement in the business of the dealership, but him being on the premises? MR. HALLACK:

Well, because he's her husband.
MR. PARNELL:
He is going to be there.
MR. HALLACK:
We can't prohibit.
MR. PARNELL:
I just wanted to make sure that we are clear.

MR. BROWN:
If we reverse the decision and then we make this rule change before she applies. Can we deny it again? MR. HALLACK:

That's correct.
But, Kim, that takes about six months to do a rules and regs. MS. BARON:

And she is supposedly going to be handing in her application next week. She is looking for a new place because she couldn't hold the lease on the last one.

MR. HALLACK:

Judge Fields, he did not make a ruling. We already appeared before him. He didn't make a ruling. He said y'all need to work this out:

MR. BROWN:
Can we look into another state agency
from another state because that dealership right now there is not hardly any cars. It looked like they shut down at the state line. MR. HALLACK:

Well, we have information that he is already out of trust. MR. WATTS:

She or him?
MR. HALLACK:
Him, with the Mississippi lot.
MR. DONNELL:
Well, I will go ahead, make the
motion.
MR. BRITT:
Hold him, Ricky, just a second. I
have a question before that.
How long did you say it takes to
reword Number 1?
MS. BARON:

About six months.
MR. PARNELL:
To go though the process of creating new rules and regulations is about six months. Once we get it all drafted out, and then we have to send it to several places. MS. BARON:

We have to appeal to two different commissions. MR. BRITT:

Okay.
MR. PARNELL:
It's a process.
MR. BRITT:
That's all.
MR. DONNELL:
Now, wait a minute. Now I got a
question. After we invoke this, can we go back
then and deny a license after?
MR. PARNELL:
If it's prior to her -- hopefully I am answering correct. If it is prior to her applying again, $I$ would assume yes.

MR. BRITT:
But she is going to apply the moment
that we resolve this or the judge resolves this.

MR. DONNELL:
And they Judge has said y'all have to work it out. MR. HALLACK:

Well, with Daddy Warbucks out of
trust on the last dealership he has got, I am not sure where she is going to get the money to
open up a used motor vehicle dealership. MR. BRITT:

How long could this be postponed?
MR. HALLACK:
60 days once she applies. She hasn't
applied.
MR. BRITT:
No, I am talking about this current
case.
MR. HALLACK:
We got to have to take action on it today. The simple fact of the matter is that Number 5 cannot be the basis for which to deny her application.

MR. BRITT:
I get that.

MR. HALLACK:
Now she is going to have reapply and
it is a whole new process. In fact, Kim -- I asked Kim Friday, her lawyer wants to get her money back, her application fee, \$450. So I asked Kim if we can do that. She said, well, would we do that if she's reapplying.

Read between the lines.
MS. BARON:
But they want the money back. MR. WATTS:

We are at an impasse. We can sit
here and see what she does.
MR. HALLACK:
No. You have 60 days upon the application being filed with the Commission in order to act on it. MR. PARNELL:

So I will put in to give her her refund back this week so that will be out of the way so the attorney won't be complaining about that. MR. WATTS:

Then, when she wants to reapply, she has to bring money back and apply.

MS. BARON:
And we already told her that she would have to have a new inspection and everything because she is looking for a new place.

MR. HALLACK:
The original place that she applied for, which we all thought belonged to Clark Crain, actually doesn't belong to Clark Crain. It's been leased to somebody else. So she has to find a new location.

MR. PARNELL:
And at that point after she reapplies, it is 60 days. It has to be made within 60 days.

MR. DONNELL:
So we what we are doing today is just getting dismissed out of court?

MR. HALLACK:
Yes, absolutely.
MR. DONNELL:
Well, I am gong to make the motion. MR. WILLIAMS:

I second.
MR. WATTS:

What's your motion?
MR. DONNELL:
To dismiss the case.
MR. HALLACK:
His motion is to dismiss the appeal
to rescind the action of the Commission in
which we denied her application.
MR. WATTS:
So he makes a motion to the appeal, right?

MR. HALLACK:
And to rescind the Commission's
action on her application.
MR. WATTS:
And seconded by Mr. Commission
Wydette Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Yes.
MR. WATTS:
That's good.
MR. PEDERSON:
On decisions like that moving
forward, I am not going to say that we need to do a better job at it, but $I$ think -- I mean, these things are so -- there are so many ways
opposing teams are going to dissect our decisions. Maybe -- I mean, maybe we just -- I don't know, maybe make sure our i's are dotted more clearly. Do you know what I am saying? MR. HALLACK: Yes, sir.

MR. BRITT:
You had a lot of moving parts in
this.
MR. PARNELL:
This one was.
MR. BRITT:
There was a lot of moving parts in
this. And the majority of the stuff that they were involved in should have been criminal. MR. POTEET:

This is our definition of a loophole. MR. HALLACK:

Absolutely. Absolutely. And Mr. Crain had applied for a
license through our agency.
MR. WATTS: We denied it. MR. HALLACK: He withdrew.

MR. HINES:
Why wasn't his license revoked?
Clark Crain?
MR. WATTS:
We weren't going to issue him a license and he withdrew. MR. POTEET:

He had a license with the new car. MR. BRITT:

He was with the new car commission. MR. POTEET:

Clark Crain Dodge. MR. HALLACK:

So he opened up one in Woodville. MR. WATTS:

I know the insight to Clark Crain, the reason he wanted a license for used because he was selling that place to get out of debt, Clark Crain Chrysler. Gerry Lane bought it. And he had a bunch of inventory that he could not floor. Chrysler wouldn't let him keep the floor plan unless he was a dealer. So that's why he wanted to be some kind of used car dealer. And Gerry Lane called me and his representative asking if y'all are going to buy
the place, you might as well just buy his inventory would be the easiest way to get this resolved with Chrysler. And that's what he did.

MR. HALLACK:
Looking at the violations from the new car commission, most of his problems were with regard to used cars.

MR. WATTS:
Yes.
MR. WISENOR:
He wasn't making the payoffs on
vehicles that were traded in.
MR. HALLACK:
He wasn't paying his sales tax. MR. WISENOR:

His service contracts. Gap. MS. BARON:

Does she have to appear before the board when she applies again?

MR. WATTS:
Yes. I want her to appear again. I think we will do the same thing. If we can't deny her license again, we can tag along different scenarios.

MR. PEDERSON:
He can't sell cars at my auction anymore just for the fact you never get a title. And those are reasons why because he wasn't paying them off and getting them.

MR. WATTS:
But that is him; this is her. So I just didn't know how you are going to -MR. BRITT:

Well, it's the same time.
MR. DONNELL:
So, Matt, he is not good with your auction?

MR. PEDERSON:
Yes. He was selling cars and comes to a point where, you know, I can't sell your cars anymore because he won't give me titles to them. And that's been, you know, three years ago or whatever it was.

MR. POTEET:
We had the same problem.
MR. BRITT:
I've had multiple sheriffs call me and $I$ put some of them on Montie, but it was -all of it was used stuff they bought at the new
dealership. We had that all of the way to Richland Parish south there were complaints. MR. WATTS:

He was doing finance here and stuff like that, self-financing and sell them from the used car inventory and then he would sell it through the Chrysler store which is all -MR. HALLACK:

Speaking of Richland Parish, would you believe that Tahoe in the $H$ and $N$ Auto Sales case ended up in Rayville.

MR. BRITT:
Nothing surprises me. It went through Tallulah and Lake Providence before it landed in New Orleans.

MR. WATTS:
So what do we conclude here?
MR. HALLACK:
We concluded that y'all are going to dismiss the appeal.

MR. WATTS:
We had a motion already. All right.
So we are done.
MR. HINES:
As far as changing the wording in 5,
we are in the processes of doing that now. That's in the works already.

MR. PARNELL:
No. We hadn't started that. We need
to. If we change the language in this one as it is written, yes, and that would have to go through the statute. But rule and regs with proof prove unfitness, we can get it to where we want.

MR. POTEET:
You don't have a rule that backs that up anyway. MR. HALLACK:

That's correct.
MR. POTEET:
It's just a continuation without having passing an extension. MR. HALLACK:

So I recommend that we put it on the agenda for the next time that we discuss this to change our rule and regs to develop standards for what we deem to be unfit.

And what Mr. Donnell said earlier is a good step. You know, any time you have lost your license with any regulatory agency, that
should be part of being unfit.
MR. PEDERSON:
Maybe each one of us between now and our next meeting, we can each come up with two reasons to be unfit. And we will throw them around and we will talk about them and pick ten.

MR. HALLACK:
Kind of, like, to be out of trust
with your floor planners.
MR. PARNELL:
If you want to send them in an email
to me.
MR. PEDERSON:
And then we can kind of discuss and
put it all together.
MR. WATTS:
All right. Moving forward. The compliance investigator record.

MR. PARNELL:
Hold on one second.
MR. HALLACK:
So we have one other thing. We had a potential appeal in $A B C$, $A B Z$ fiasco. And they didn't actually perfect the appeal. So it's
final. The Commission's decision is final. And Kim, I believe, you submitted a claim against the bond.

MS. BARON:
We have been paid for it. As of
Friday we got the check for ABZ's part. And ABC's part, their bond company hasn't paid yet. MR. PARNELL:

What was the amount of the payment? MS. BARON:

The amount of the check?
MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MS. BARON:
It was 49,000.
MR. HALLACK:
So the Commission got 49,000?
MS. BARON:
No, we have to pay restitution out of
that. We have to pay the 12,5 and 6,850 restitution out of it.

MR. WATTS:
One was in New Orleans and one in
Franklin.
MS. BARON:

It was 12,500 for one and 6,850 for the other. And then we get to keep 19-or 18,000 of it. And then $I$ will send him a letter that he owes the rest. We may end up sending to the justice department.

MR. WATTS:
So do we get the titles to their
vehicles? The one we are paying restitution to.

MS. BARON:
No. Those vehicles will have to be given up. MR. WATTS:

They are getting their money back. MS. BARON:

They are getting their money back and
they will have to give the vehicles up. One is for the floor planner in Tennessee. The other one belongs to United Auto Credit. MR. HALLACK:

But the lawyer has filed with this office a notice to withdraw as counsel of record and asks Mr. Parnell to sign it. So we just want to let y'all know that she is -MR. WATTS:

What was the attorney's name?
MS. BARON:
Charlotte McDaniel.
MR. HALLACK:
So we have been paid on ABZ and we are waiting to be paid on $A B C$. And $I$ want to let y'all know Mr. Parnell's allowing her to withdraw as counsel of record. Not that there is anything for her to do anyway.

MR. WATTS:
Okay. Montie.
MR. WISENOR:
Mr. Chairman, yes, these are the monthly production report totals for the field for the months of March and April 2023.

For March of '23, there were -- these are ongoing and new audits have started -- been started, but there are 10 ongoing audits in the process. We have no notice of revocation issued. We had 63 site visits conducted. Two cease and desist orders issued. 19 consumers that were assisted in receiving title or registration. One violation issued. One refund issued in the amount 9,225. There were 23 cases closed that were assigned. There were

32 cases closed that were not assigned, and 27 physical inspections conducted for the months of March.

Month of April, there were -- there are 8 audits conducting, again some ongoing already. There were two notice of revocations issued. There were 51 site visits conducted. There is one cease and desist issued. 23 consumers that were assisted in receiving titles or registration. There were two violations issued. There were two refunds that were -- the field assisted consumers in receiving which added up to $\$ 284.92$. There were 12 cases closed that were assigned. 31 cases closed that were not assigned. And 27 physical inspections completed for the month of April. And those are the totals for those months.

MR. WATTS:
All right. Finally, Derek's
director's report.
MR. PARNELL:
Yes. So I will give you several
updates of what has been going on. Barrett-Jackson, they are going to host in New

Orleans an antique auto auction that is scheduled for the end of September. That's going to be something pretty large at the Convention Center in New Orleans. So we issued them the dealers's license. The way we kind of have it structured as it relates to them is that the dealer's license is going to be housed in Baton Rouge with their, I guess, their attorney that's here in Louisiana. And the Convention Center address is going to be where we have the auction license. So we should be finishing that process up at the end of this week so they will have everything that they need squared away.

A few months ago, I kind of expressed to you guys that $I$ was trying to restructure my accounting department to try to get me in a better position. When Mona retired, of course she has 30-plus-years experience. So there is a lot that she was able to do top to bottom in the department herself.

And moving on right now, $I$ brought Rhonda in. She is very strong, but I need other bodies that can be as -- on that level or higher as well. So I am actually having a lot
of problems fighting with Civil Service. A lot of what happens with Civil Service is a lot of bureaucracy, of course, but a lot what happens is they kind of gauge all position titles for large agencies. And I am looking for an accounting manager. That position title would be more so what I need here because the position to actually lead this department, it would have to have someone with a skill set of a CFO. And a lot of what the position titles offer to me is not that level of expertise in accounting that I am looking for. So I am kind of going through a process and I have been battling with Civil Service for a few weeks now and $I$ am trying to get a meeting so $I$ go up there and sit down with somebody because this is becoming incredibly problematic for me moving forward to get the department structured how I see it and how $I$ know that it could actually work better and it would be more efficient. So they are battling with me on our size. We are not a large agency.

Oh, well, what they are telling me is
that position titles of that nature may have five or six people that has to be under that
person in order to conduct -- even use that position title. So that's what $I$ am running into a lot of issues with that because, as I say, they do one size fits all. What works for the large agencies, they expect it to work with everybody, you know. But even through the process of hiring, you know, I may have people with that level of experience in years that meet their minimal requirements. For example. They have people that work for 20 years in the State but they have been doing Box A in the State for 20 years. They are not doing the entire accounting process. So when they come in sometimes, they don't really understand and it is hard for them to adjust and actually do the entire process is what $I$ have to have here. So I was in the battle with them. Civil Service as it relates to them, I think it is going to work out. I may have to appeal and go before their board or whatever, but that's what I got to do because I have to get to a certain level here so $I$ can really continue to operate at the level that we have been operating at.

I also restructured the licensing
department. I have persons that were here that weren't doing the job that's required so we had to move on from them. But $I$ also realized going through the interviewing process, you know, we have people call, they want the job. We call them and set up interviews and five times straight, people don't even show up for interviews. We have interviewed three people. And so we interviewed someone last week that we are going to make an offer to her this week. But that process is a little bit slower but we are going to be fine as it relates to getting those persons in place because $I$ did add an additional person, a fourth person if you noticed in that office. We resurplused a lot of furniture we had sitting around here and we purchased two desks to put in that office. We got that put in there. And just to some other areas around the office to try to update our office space so we can accommodate more persons. So we are going through that process. I believe we will be fine as it relates to the moving forward.

I do want to employ upon you-all to please be sure that you are here during the

June commission meeting because this will be our last opportunity to approve our budget for the 2023 fiscal year. We have been working. Rhonda has been working with Roy Hebert, our CPA. We are getting all of that prepared so we will be ready to present it to you-all for our next commission meeting. MR. WATTS:

That meeting date is the 17 th . MS. BARON:

The 19th.
MR. PARNELL:
I have a contractor coming this week to re-sand and refinish the sign, the post for the sign. It is pretty bad. And I have a new sign they are going to come in and install that this week as well.

MR. POTEET:
Going back to the accounting
situation. Can't -- I know the governor is a lame duck, but can't the boards and commissions people kind of intercede here and say, wait a minute, we know about all of these boards and commissions, we know what they are, how big they are, how they operate, theoretically, why
can't they intercede on our behalf to go and say, this is a little bit different than what the Civil Service Commission is trying to push. MR. PARNELL:

Right.
MR. POTEET:
We should have some -- the governor's
office should have some power in that position, and say, look -MR. BRITT:

I think the Division of
Administration would have to push that through. MR. PARNELL:

I mean, that's something.
MR. POTEET:
I mean, this doesn't fall just on
you. There is more.
MR. PARNELL:
I am sure other agencies our size deal with that problem, yes. But it's just the way the structure of Civil Service is all -everything is by the book and they are not listening to what $I$ have to do in order to accommodate that person. Now, what $I$ can do is go to the board and get an unclassified
position, which I am thinking I may need to go ahead and pursue that.

Currently, I have only two
unclassified positions my size which is myself and I recently gave that position to Kim. So I will have to go before the boards -- I mean before the HR Civil Service Commission and get approved to get an additional unclassified position. At that point, if I get another unclassified position, $I$ can title it what I want and pay what I want. So that may end up being the easiest way. MR. BRITT:

That might be your quickest route. MR. BROWN:

That's what $I$ was thinking. MR. BRITT:

You are going to have to got -- I get what John said, it is going to be under the Division of Administration purview to get to where you need to get. MR. PARNELL:

It might be an unclassified, like I said, there is a list.

MR. BRITT:

That's your best way.
MR. PARNELL:
Then, I can do what $I$ want and what title I want.

MR. DONNELL:
You have to get, like, a young CPA. MR. HINES:

So unclassified is not a Civil
Service and they don't get the same benefits. MR. PARNELL:

No, you get the benefits.
MR. BRITT:
You don't have the protection.
MR. PARNELL:
You are at-will. I am at-will right
now. Kim has been with this agency a long time and $I$ was running into the issue as well of trying to get her to a level of what she does. And I was running into a huge problem with Civil Service on the job titles and how I can move it so $I$ can pay her a decent wage so to speak. But so I went that way and went ahead and, you know, know she is unclassified. MS. BARON:
I appreciate it.

MR. WATTS:
What's the pay scale you are hiring
in here? Does that seems to be a problem?
MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MR. WATTS:
So what can we do about Civil
Service?
MR. PARNELL:
Unless $I$ can go unclassified. MR. WATTS:

For people behind man the desk -- the girls behind the desk. MR. PARNELL:

Here? For the licensing department? MR. WATTS:

Yes, for the licensing department behind there. The positions that you are having trouble filling.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. They set all of the amounts. MR. WATTS:

That's all within the Civil Service? MR. PARNELL:

That's all unless it's unclassified.

If it is unclassified, it's me. That's just slow. It is just slow. You know, you meet -I am starting to see and I've talked to some other friends that are -- they are running into these same kind of issues with hiring that level of employee. They will call. They will accept the interview and just don't call or show up at all. It's surprising, I guess, the newer worker.

But that's all that $I$ have for
updates. Any questions, comments, or concerns you want me to address? MR. WATTS:

Anybody?
You are going to do the regular legislative session. MR. PARNELL:

Yes. I will go through that.
All right. So House Bill 53 by
Representative Sherman Mack provides relative to the authorization of the Office of Motor Vehicles to impose fines on contracts. Within that law, it kind of -- I am talking about that law because it affects our agency. Within our law, there is a section in there because we are
now considered an auto title company and a public tag agent, it defines auto title company and public tag agent where it includes local governmental subdivisions, political subdivision, and/or state agency. The reason why we needed that to happen because it exempts our agency from getting a bond and insurance. Because they are sending them now, but initially when we became a public tag agency, I was still required to get a bond and insurance. So when I requested a bond insurance from the State, they said it doesn't make sense for me to give you a bond and insurance because it is the State.

So now if this bill passes all of way through, it's passed the House committee on transportation and highway and public safety, passed favorably and no opposition, currently it is going to Senate committee scheduled to be Monday. So if that bill passes, even part of this I don't have to have bonding and insurance through Office of Motor Vehicle, plus being a public tag agent and auto title company.

Our bill, House Bill 547 by
Representative Riser provide relative to the
catalytic converter bill under the sales law. This is an LUMVC law that provides a licensed person may purchase or sell used or detached catalytic converters. Commission Counsel

Sherri Morris and I, we were down at the Senate meeting this past week and it passed favorably with no opposition. But I did get a call right before -- well, not a call when we were down at the Capitol, Hunter Duke, he is the one who just actually called me right before we started. He has some concerns, and I forwarded you the email so we can kind of talk to him about it to see what those concerns are. He said he feels like there is a loophole in it. MR. BROWN:

What he is asking makes no sense. If
you read this, he is wanting to basically exempt people that's buying a junk car and taking it to the scrap yard and cuts the converter off of it and then they can sell it. And he is kind of -- what $I$ am reading it as, he wants to exempt those people and that's exactly the people that you are trying to stop. MR. PARNELL:

Right, right.

MR. BROWN:
If they are only selling a converter off of one VIN number and bring me two or three, then what's the problem?

MR. PARNELL:
So I will try to get a meeting with him this week so we can kind of discuss it. Even right before, the bill passed on the House committee and the day was going -- about hours before it was going to the House floor, he called me and he wants to pull it so we can have a discussion. No, just let it go through. I would rather it pass the House completely and then if there is an issue, if there is something that we add to the bill, it would have to go back to the House, but I was, like, keep it moving. I don't want to pull it at all. I really want it to finish through the process and then he waited a week or so and he sent me that.

MR. BROWN:
Well, 28 and 29, that's after they
put it in there, it is a little confusing still, on line 28 and 29. Do you have a copy of that?

MR. PARNELL:
I don't have it in front of me.
MS. BARON:
It is in the packet.
MR. BROWN:
Let's see. That is what he was asking about.

MR. PARNELL:
On page 2 ?
MR. BROWN:
This says page 2.
MR. PARNELL:
This is what we were talking about.
I think Sherri was saying that she was going to
try to amend this and move it to another section. That would be with the amendments that didn't pass. I think we are going to try to maybe get with her.

MR. WATTS:
Why is that?
MR. PARNELL:
On page 2 of 12, 28 and 29. I think
that's the one that you had concerns.
MR. BROWN:
That's the one that $I$ had concerns
about and I kept asking her about it because it wasn't basically exempting.

MR. PARNELL:
I'll try later in the week get with her and we can discuss it. MR. WISENOR:

Would that apply to auto repair facilities and bumper shops? Is that what that would be basically applied to?

MR. PARNELL:
I think Commissioner Brown was saying
that in the normal cause of business, for example, if a dealer already has a dismantler's license, they are buying the entire car already. And so they should have the ability to use that catalytic converter and sell it. MR. BROWN:

Trying to protect the salvage yards on the cars that don't want to buy converters. MR. WISENOR:

I see that would possibly fall under that definition. MR. BROWN:

I think there is a need for some explanation.

MR. HALLACK:
Yes. That needs explanation.
MR. PARNELL:
Yes, that is not real clear.
MR. BROWN:
But what this guy is asking is when an individual brings a car into us to sell it to us and he takes the converter off and comes around and sells the converter, also. He is wanting to know if they got to have a license to do that. But by the law, actually they don't because they can sell off of one VIN number, the converter. MR. WISENOR:

But they are doing multiples. MR. BROWN:

They are doing multiple. MR. WISENOR:

If they are doing that on a routine basis, that kind of excludes them from the exemption of the whole thing.

MR. BROWN:
Right.
MR. WISENOR:
If you can prove that individual has
done more than one vehicle over a period of time.

MR. BROWN:
Well, the law says they can't have more than one.

MR. WISENOR:
Right.
MR. BROWN:
It doesn't say how many days. He can
have one every day for ten days, I guess. MR. WISENOR:

Well, I thought that it read that they had a -- personally owned like registered in your name versus you just going out and buying vehicles that are just in somebody's yard, $I$ was thinking that would apply to something that's owned by you that's proven and with registration or title, you know, that is the capacity.

MR. BROWN:
As of right now, we don't check if they own the car. We are checking, you know, what car it came off of plus their driver's license and all of their other pertinent information.

MR. WISENOR:
Because you are talking a whole car under the --

MR. BROWN:
No. I am, talking about a converter.
Somebody brings the converter in, we buy it under the rules. And they can come in. There is nothing that says they can't come in tomorrow and sell us another one. MR. HALLACK:

So there is no limitation on it. It could be one an hour. MR. BROWN:

But they can't get caught with more
than one is what the law says. MR. HALLACK:

I am sorry. Say it again. MR. BROWN:

They cannot be -- have more than one in their possession. MR. WISENOR:

Well, that was part of the amendment because most people have multiple converters anyway.

MR. HALLACK:

But an exception to the rule is an individual owner can sell his converter and yet he doesn't have proof he owns it.

MR. WATTS:
He has to have to prove of ownership where he bought.

MR. BROWN:
No, you don't need to have any paperwork.

MR. WATTS:
No paperwork.
MR. BROWN:
It used to 10 years and older; it is not even that now. We still require anything older -- I meant new to have a title, but that law is gone. MR. WATTS:

You just have to have that VIN number off that car to match it. MR. BROWN:
Nothing on the converter right now, that is what's in this new bill. You have got to have a VIN number.

MR. HALLACK:
How does this stop people from
stealing converters.
MR. BROWN:
It doesn't.
MR. HALLACK:
What's the purpose of the law?
MR. PARNELL:
That was the purpose.
MR. BROWN:
You can buy them right now without even having the VIN number of the car it come off of.

MR. POTEET:
You have to have possession.
MR. BROWN:
Now you have to have a VIN number;
that's why we put it in there.
MR. HALLACK:
So the thief has to get the VIN
number.
MR. BROWN:
There you go.
MR. WATTS:
He is going to have to do a little more work. MR. PARNELL:

It is important to go back to reiterate that we actually need next month everybody to be here so we can approve this budget for the next fiscal year.

MR. HALLACK:
We will probably have a couple of hearings.

MS. BARON:
We should.
MR. WATTS:
Items for next meeting.
MR. HALLACK:
We are going to discuss some rules
and regulations. MR. WATTS:

Rules and regs.
MR. HALLACK:
To set the standards for unfitness.
MR. WATTS:
Commissioners, anything y'all want to
add to the agenda for June? If y'all think of something, give Kim a call. We are adjourned.
(Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.)
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