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## ALSO PRESENT:

 MS. KIM BARON MR. DEREK PARNELL MS. TONYA BURKS MR. ROY HEBERT MR. DREW KRAUSMR. WATTS:
Call to order.
(Pledge of Allegiance.)
MR. WATTS:
Roll call, please.
MS. BARON:
Richard Watts?
MR. WATTS:
Here.
MS. BARON: George Floyd?

MR. FLOYD: Here.

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:
(No response.)
MS. BARON:
Robert Hines?
MR. HINES:
Here.
MS. BARON: And Wydette Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS:
(No response.)
MS. BARON:
Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
MR. WATTS:
All right. Any public comments?
MS. BARON:
We have no public comments.
MR. PARNELL:
We don't have public comments, but I
did want to make a request to make an amendment
on the agenda. The compliance investigator report, he is unable to attend today. So we can delete that from the agenda.

MR. WATTS:
I need an adoption and approval of the minutes of the May $23 r d$ meeting. MR. BRITT:

I make a motion.
MR. WATTS:
Any second?
MR. PEDERSON:
Second.
MR. WATTS:
Second by Mr. Pederson.
All right. Items for discussion,
financial matters.
MR. PARNELL:
I will get started. Estimated fiscal ending 6/30/2023 and fiscal year 2023-2024 proposed budget.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Roy Hebert, our contract CPA, who worked with me to get the budget prepared. In addition, $I$ would like to thank Rhonda Robertson for working hard to get the
commission finances caught up so that we can have a budget to work on.

Commissioners, you will find in your packet, agenda -- you will find in your agenda packet the estimated fiscal year ending 6/30/2023 and the fiscal year 2023-2024 proposed budget. You will notice that the budget spreadsheets are in a different format than what we have done in the previous years. Roy Hebert suggested that we need a format that he uses with other client agencies. The spreadsheet is much more concise than we have used in other years. The spreadsheet includes actual fiscal year ending 6/30/20, 6/30/21, 6/30/22. It also has a three-year average on it. The estimated fiscal year 6/30/23 and the proposed '23 and ' 24 proposed budget numbers. I have had the discussion. I got a call this morning that our finance chairman, Travis Brown, would be unable to attend today, but he and I had a discussion last week. He advised he liked the format of the budget much better. In addition, he wanted to go through some areas that he had some concerns about. I don't know. Did you have anything
that you wanted to say at this point?
MR. HEBERT:
I have not looked at the year-to-year financial statement for Commission. I've just gotten calls periodically about different accountant matters rather than going through the whole Commission. And it appears the way the districts are broken, we are in a cycle we are going to have a deficit one year and a surplus the following year because of the numbers of licensees that are in the two batches that renew their two-year licenses. And that's the only remarkable comment that I would have.

Derek and I went pretty much line by line over the budget and developed the '23-'24 numbers.

## MR. PARNELL:

A few areas that Commissioner Travis Brown wanted me to kind of go through with you guys. If you look at the revenues on the first line, UD licenses. Fiscal year '20, our actual fiscal ending balance as $\$ 473,623$. Fiscal year '21 was $\$ 260,000$. That primarily was because during that COVID year for two years, agencies
were prevented from collecting any fees on any other -- any entities that are coming in to try to renew their licenses. If you noticed in the fiscal year, 2022, we jumped to $\$ 650,000$. That is primarily because -- because we didn't collect the fees, we were able to collect them that next year and so. But I like -- what I like a lot about this budget format is that we get a three-year average from those three years. You really kind of see where we have fallen in those three years. And you look at the line, the third from the right, the original budget for the 2022-'23 budget was $\$ 485,000$. So the budget basically shows that we were down from the original budget projections on license fees by, like, \$32,000. We went ahead and we looked at the '23-'24 proposed budget and it came in at $\$ 475,000$ for the proposed for the budget for this year. Next item was the automotive dismantlers. We are down 22,000 from the original budget. It was projected at 48,000. So we projected -- the new proposed budget is 48, 000.

If we go down to auction transaction
fees, that was a section that we were positive $\$ 72,000$. The original budget for ' 22 was $\$ 364,000$. And it shows on this estimated remaining for our estimated was about $\$ 100,000$ that we were looking to get before the end of this year closed. But during the months of May and June, we did receive 57,000 in fees. The auction transaction fees, that's pretty much the salvage pool. Every month they send our agency what sales they have had, $\$ 5$ per car. I think that was what was the deal that happened because of the Legislature when we got rid of the buyers' card. And I think after the buyers' card was done away with, that's when we would get a fee of $\$ 5$ per vehicle every month from whatever sales they did for auction transaction fees. So that was up $\$ 72,000$. The proposed budget was $\$ 445,000$.

Another area on the second page with expenses and salaries times the field. It kind of illustrated that we were down negative $\$ 62,000$. The original budget for '22-'23 was $\$ 214,000$. The three-year average was $\$ 242,000$. The estimated fiscal year ending in ' 23 was \$270,000 -- 276,000.

I think at that point, we budgeted it too low. The only change in our field salaries was cost of living increase and salary for the compliance investigator supervisor. If you look in the back of your packet -- in the back pocket, yes. There should be a listing of the entire staff. All of the titles and position and the salaries of the entire staff.

If you look down to Montie Wisenor, Compliance Investigator 4-B, that's the supervisor position. That was the only change that took place over the time. As well as I hired a full staff in the accounting -- I mean, the licensing department which falls under Tonya Burks as the program manager of the four positions that we -- three of them are here and one comes tomorrow. So we will be fully staffed in the licensing department.

I still have a vacant position, the accounting professional. That's what I am working on right now drafting the job description and detail job description that Civil Service is looking for to give me the approval to classify it, but $I$ wanted that to reflect on the budget what we are looking at
doing so the commissioners would have the breakdown of everyone's salaries and where each person on staff falls.

With that said, the original -- the
'22-'23 original budget, it was presented with a negative $\$ 592,000$ but the estimated fiscal year ending in '23, that this year the Commission will end in a positive 310,000. If you go back to your chart, you will see that on the third page all of the way at the bottom. We will end this year with a net positive. MR. PEDERSON:

Good job.
MR. PARNELL:
So with that said, I ask if you have any questions or comments, concerns, or we will go ahead and move to approve the '23-'24 proposed budget.

MR. WATTS:
Derek, explain to us about the fines we don't collect. We fine these people and it goes against the bond. Can you talk about that? Wipe the slate clean. I am trying to get it off of our statement.

MR. PARNELL:

So a lot of -- for example, when we have -- we do fine in two separate ways. When I first came on, I kind of went through a lot of hearings that we had why exactly how much and making a note listing exactly how much fines per count was charged. And the Board gave me authority to go ahead and deal with -they didn't want to deal with every single person or every fine that comes into the agency. So what we did was we created a spreadsheet where a lot of smaller fines, smaller problems, dealers that are causing less egregious problems, we will go in and fine them at our level. We will send it out and then it comes back.

But the bigger issue, sometimes we run into is when we have hearings and we do large fines, 200-, $\$ 300,000$. We have one that's out there right now. We fined $\$ 250,000$ but this individual is very rare because he's the only one that has ever every month come in and paid on that. He has actually paid half of that fine down.

Typically, whenever we fine someone $\$ 250,000$, our bond is only $\$ 50,000$. And the
problem that we have run into the last 4 or 5 years -- and I think that is something legislatively we have to look at moving forward -- is get that bond to increase back to where our agency can actually collect $\$ 50,000$ out of the bond. It is currently $\$ 50,000$ bond and we can only collect $\$ 25,000$ out of that. So when we have fines that are $\$ 200,000$, our books have to reflect that $\$ 200,000$, is owed basically to the agency. And a lot of that is not collectible for us.

When we go through the State, they go after certain individuals but they really haven't done a lot in relation to collections of outstanding fines. MR. HINES:

How long has it been the $\$ 50,000$ bond?

MR. PARNELL:
The bond has been -- when was that?
MR. HALLACK:
Probably 2017.
MR. HINES:
Is it time to raise that amount?
MS. MORRIS:

There was an attempt to raise at one time and it didn't pass the Legislature. MR. PARNELL:

I think initially when I came onboard, we tried to get the bond raised and it didn't go through. And then it was at 50, but the issue is, you know, I think it was 2017 is when you are referring to when the bond that we can only collect 25,000 of the bond. I think the thought process behind it was that if we have restitution, consumers, and/or we have to make payment to, say, Office of Motor Vehicles, that there would be something left on the bond for them to receive. But that's kind of hurt the agency as a whole because we are not able to collect that amount in between there, so. MS. MORRIS:

That was the compromise to get the $\$ 50,000$ bond because the bond was lower. MR. DONNELL:

The bond was $\$ 25,000$.
MS. MORRIS:
The bond was $\$ 25,000$. It need to be higher because we had had several cases that involved 80 vehicles or, you know, high numbers
of vehicles. So that's not sufficient to pay when the tax, title, and license hasn't been paid.

MR. HINES:
That's what I am thinking. The price of vehicles are so expensive now. MS. MORRIS:

Right. So we went to the Legislature to kind of get it -- it is kind of on a sliding scale so the smaller dealers wouldn't have very high bonds but the larger ones would have, you know, sliding scale by a number of vehicles. And, in that process, it was brought up that sometimes the agency is getting the full $\$ 25,000$ because their cost by the time you get to a hearing and the appeal and all of that is $\$ 25,000$ which leaves no money for restitution.

So that was kind of a compromise to get it through the Legislature to get $\$ 50,000$ for some dealers, but part of the money had to be reserved for restitution claims.

MR. HALLACK:
It's always been our policy that the customer gets their money first. Right, Kim? MS. BARON:

Yes.
MR. HALLACK:
Whether it is a claim for bond or restitution, the customer always get their money first.

MS. BARON:
A lot of times when you have a
hearing, you have a lot of people that are having to go through the claims against surety and get their title and stuff that way. But then you also have people that have to go and wait for the title so they can go pay their tax, title, and license, and then they have late penalties and interest. So they send in a request and we have to reimburse that out of the bond as well.

MR. BRITT:
Was that a single bill by itself? Or did y'all try to tag on another?

MS. MORRIS:
I think we had multiple revisions, but there was focus on the bond because some of the dealers were not for it because of the cost to them, that that's why kind of compromised to a $\$ 50,000$ cap which is still insufficient for
the cases that we were looking at. We had kind of several cases that by the time the Commission knew about it, there are some vehicles involved that people don't have the titles to that.

MR. BRITT:
So this is really probably something we should look at last year and probably regroup or run it back this last session probably. I wonder if it is something we can tag it on with next session.

MS. MORRIS:
We can look at that. Cases that we
have had, and look at what our costs have been and what was left on the bond or something like that. Maybe we can use some historical data. In the beginning, we didn't have a lot of historical data to work with. We just didn't. I don't know if we had some of those very large cases. I don't think we had a lot of historical data to be able to look at what the claims were and what the bond covered and how many other people -- other potential people -MR. BRITT:

We got out of that now.

MS. MORRIS:
We have better data now.
MR. BRITT:
We can regroup.
MR. PARNELL:
It is definitely something during the next legislative session we need to address. Definitely in my opinion, we need to address that.

MS. MORRIS:
Some of the hearings have been very costly with delays and different parties involved. When you have that many vehicles you have financing companies, you have related bankruptcies. I don't know, Robert can give you a longer list. But there are some other related federal litigation, bankruptcies. We have had cases where there has been a whole lot of related litigation.

MR. HALLACK:
And I don't keep up the Attorney General's efforts to collect for us, but, I mean, we have got several large verdicts out there.

MR. PARNELL:

It is not what you think.
MR. HALLACK:
It is not existent.
MR. PARNELL:
It is not like we thought it was when
it was suggested to us that the Attorney
General was the way to having to force to actually get some collections on some of those fines. It is so small, I mean.

MS. MORRIS:
We might want to look at the Office of Debt Collection because we were with the Attorney General's Office before the Office of Debt Collection was formed. And we had the option to switch over, but we stayed the Attorney General because the Office of Debt Collection was new and they didn't have -- you know, when they presented to us, I don't think that they really knew exactly how they were going to do things. They do have the ability to freeze certain accounts, seize certain accounts that we wouldn't have if we did the collection process in-house.

So the Office of Debt Recovery has even around for a while so maybe we need to
look at that option.
MR. BRITT:
Sheri, we do have an option to do it ourselves.

MS. MORRIS:
We did before. It wasn't cost
effective when $I$ looked at it, because in order to seize people's accounts, the amount of work that's necessary to do that and then the office of the -- the Attorney General's Office and the Office of Debt Recovery have the ability to seize accounts that we probably couldn't even get information about.

MR. BRITT:
We might need to look into the Office of Debt Collection.

MS. MORRIS:
It might be. I think when we met with them, they weren't really set up. We already had a contract with the Attorney General's Office so we may be able to switch over.

MR. BRITT:
We need something more aggressive. Whether we contract you two out to do it some
more out of y'all's office or have a point person here, it needs to be more aggressive. I mean, ever since $I$ have been on here, I mean, the Attorney General's Office has just not done much to me.

MS. MORRIS:
One of the issues is that a lot of the entities are LLCs and they don't have any assets. So it not easy collection work. When I looked at it, there were complications because of the way the businesses are sometimes set up.

MR. HALLACK:
But we always go against the dealer individually, too, for that very reason. So they can't run away from their liability. MS. MORRIS:

Right. And once the bond is exhausted, also the bond company is going after them as well. MR. HALLACK:

Do they really, though?
MS. MORRIS:
They say they do. I don't know. MR. HALLACK:

I don't think they have.
MS. BARON:
Because I have had people get another bond and they wouldn't be able to.

MR. WATTS:
So that number on our statement is a false statement really for dollar-wise. It goes into our liabilities and total liabilities for your financials, you know. We never are going to collect it. Most of it. Matamoros is the only one paying. He ought to get a discount. That's the only one that $I$ know that paid their fine.

MR. PARNELL:
He comes every month. Out of the $\$ 250,000$ fine, he's already paid half. Another area on our expenses, salaries, and benefits, and I wanted Roy feasibly to go ahead and just kind of explain, like, the net pension liability and OPEB liability that's out there for our agency. Before, as I understand it, the net pension liability wasn't something that had to be shown on the financial for state agencies. Am I correct? I may be wrong, but if you can kind
of explain that to the board, please, the net pension.

MR. HEBERT:
The net pension liabilities, it is smoke and mirrors. I mean, the State has that liability. The Commission is never going to have somebody present an invoice and ask you to pay it. Under the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, which is the accounting gods as far as governmental entities are concerned, have mandated that if you want to be in compliance with these standards, these things have to be booked on your financial statements. It is not something the Commission is responsible for. I mean, what you can control are your -- well, to some extent, you really can't control it very much -- is actually the retirement that you pay and the actual group benefits that you pay rather than these numbers that are forced for CPAs to calculate and put on your financial statements to keep them in compliance with governmental auditing standards.

But, you know, I met with funding pension benefit financial advisors and asked
when we first came out with different stuff, how much attention do they pay for those numbers on governmental financial statements, and he and we don't. We don't.

And so government is going to
actually fund the liabilities; they are just going to be there.

MR. PARNELL:
And on our books, that pension
liability is about 2.2 million.
MR. BRITT:
When they did that about five years ago?

MR. HEBERT:
The pension came first and that's probably what, seven, eight years?

MR. KRAUS:
That's about right.
MR. BRITT:
What that does, Derek, is the little municipality or if it is us or the sheriff's office, whomever, you see these numbers and when you first look at them you say, oh, my God, you know. Especially when you get to local politics and they say, oh, that mayor,
that sheriff, that clerk, look at what they have got, they are running a deficit. Well, every agency in the state is going to run a deficit if you look at on what their retirement is going to be. And it's just magic. It is just the numbers and there's nothing that you can do except try to understand it.

MR. HEBERT:
And the only way you can remove those liabilities is to actually fund it. And if you fund it, you are putting money in a trust fund that you cannot get back out, so. MR. BRITT:

There is not an agency in the state
that can probably do that.
MR. HEBERT:
Probably not.
MR. WATTS:
Anybody got any questions on the budget? Everybody good.

I need an adoption to approve. MR. DONNELL:

So moved.
MR. BRITT:
second.

MR. WATTS:
Items for discussion and action.
MR. PARNELL:
We also need a resolution adopting
the fiscal year operating budget that was just approved '23-'24. Kim, do you want to read it?

MS. BARON: You want me to read it?

MR. PARNELL: Yes.

MS. BARON:
Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle
Commission, Resolution Adopting the 2023-2024 Fiscal Year Operating Budget.

Whereas, in order to receive approval of its proposed operating budget for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 2023, and ends June 30, 2024, it is necessary for the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission to adopt a proposed budget based upon anticipated revenues and expenditures; and whereas, the Commission, which operates solely on self-generated funds receives no state-generated funds; therefore, Be It Resolved, that the attached detailed
estimate of revenues for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2024, be and the same is hereby adopted to serve as an Opening Budget of Revenues for the Commission; and therefore, be it further resolved, that the attached detailed estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2024, be and the same is hereby adopted to serve as an operating budget of expenditures for the Commission; and therefore, be it further resolved, that the adoption of this budget of expenditures be and the same is hereby declared to operate as an appropriation of the amount therein and set forth within the terms of the budget classifications; and therefore, be it further resolved, the funds available for operating expenditures are available only to the extent such funds are included within the fiscal year of the 2023-2024 budget; and therefore, be it further resolved, that the Commission's Executive Director may authorize transfers between line items of expenditures with a function or department, provided such transfers shall not exceed 10 percent of the
total budget for the department or function. All other budget adjustments must be approved by the Commission.

The foregoing resolution with the attached budget for 2023-2024 fiscal year was duly adopted on the 19th day of June 2023.

And it calls for the Commission
chairman's signature.
MR. WATTS:
Thank you very much. At this time I don't think we need the accountants anymore. MR. PARNELL:

I brought in Drew just in case any commissioners had any further questions as it related to the audit that we had the other day.

Gentlemen, $I$ do appreciate it. MR. WATTS:

Thank y'all very much.
Revocation of imposed penalties. MR. PARNELL:

Commissioners, you will find in your packet that illustrates the licenses that were in violation of state law. These cases have been investigated and $I$ have determined that the public interest can be served without
further administrative proceeding; thus, civil penalties were imposed. I will announce the name of the dealers that have been imposed civil penalties.

Do we have anyone here representing any of those dealers?

MS. BARON:
No, sir.
MR. PARNELL:
Anthony's Auto Sales, LLC, from New Iberia, Louisiana. Violation was failing to maintain records. Fine amount was $\$ 500$. This was a complaint that was given to us by Louisiana State Police. Our investigator went out and he had 275 temp tags that he couldn't account for. He wasn't putting those items in the state database. State police reached out to Travis Gallo, our compliance investigator, and advised him that that was not happening. So he and Montie went out and did an investigation on him. He just -- he had no record of some of these items. The fine that was issued to him was $\$ 500$.

Backyard Rides, LLC, from Metairie, Louisiana, fine amount was $\$ 450$ for employing
unlicensed salesperson and not operating from the place of business shown on his license. He was actually having persons go to the Racetrac gas station and selling vehicles from there. I fined him \$450.

So, Commissioners, I ask that you approve the $\$ 950$ fines that have been imposed. MR. WATTS:

I need a motion. MR. DONNELL:

So moved.
MR. BRITT:
Second.
MR. WATTS:
Legal matters. Federal Mutual
Insurance Company versus $H$ and $N$ Auto Sales, LLC.

MS. MORRIS:
There is an update. It was
transferred to East Baton Rouge Parish. It is being handled by the Attorney General's office. MR. WATTS:

How about the next one?
MR. HALLACK:
She never made an application. She
never re-applied to be a dealer. So she asked for her money -- her application money to be refunded and we did that. And we never heard any more from her. So she made no effort to re-apply.

MS. MORRIS:
Didn't she appeal?
MR. HALLACK:
She did. But nothing has happened. MR. WATTS:

All right. Compliance investigator
report.
MR. PARNELL:
I asked about that earlier. We
delete that.
MR. WATTS:
That's what we deleted, okay. Put it on next month's agenda.

MR. PARNELL:
We would add it to the next month's
agenda.
MR. WATTS:
All right. Executive report.
MR. PARNELL:
The main thing was getting the budget
completely getting caught up. Like I said before, we were probably about eight months behind on the financials and Rhonda did a great job with catching us up with that. That was not a small task to do. Just coming in when she did come in and $I$ am still working at restructuring that accounting department. I am working on Civil Service. I finished drafting the job description and the role that I see that person in. That's why I did add it to the budget. But I did finish that so I am just working with them right now, Civil Service, and I am trying to see what kind of approval I can get moving forward with the unclassified, classified, or what's necessarily on that. I am working with them on it. What they always suggest to me is I have to prove why -- if I want an unclassified position, I have to prove why I can't have that classified in Civil Service first. So sometimes being that we are a smaller agency, my thought process, it would be granted easier for her than us because our function was just as broad as a large agency, but $I$ don't have as many people doing separate tasks. But they look at it just the opposite.

They are probably mad at me, but I think they are going in my direction. So I feel really good about.

The licensing department, like I said before, we have fully staffed the licensing department. Our last person that is starting is going to be tomorrow. I know we talked about with Commissioner Britt suggest that we start a bit earlier this year in our renewal period in mid-August. So that is what we are gearing up to do this month. Finishing up training a full month and then we get to go straight into that.

Do I have any questions? That's pretty much all that I have.

MR. WATTS:
Where is the licensing coming from?
What section?
MR. PARNELL:
4 and 5.
MR. WATTS:
Anybody have any questions for executive director?

I did want to mention $I$ was talking
to Derek, I am going to get the field
supervisor or whatever they call them, come in once a year so we meet them all. Going there, Montie, I just kind of like putting my eyes on them.

MR. BRITT:
We see Montie and we see Monroe a lot because of this area. MR. PARNELL:

Usually what happens you will see them primarily because when they have hearings comes up. But he is suggesting that we have everybody come in more periodically so you-all can know them. Most of them you may know, but a few $I$ don't think. MR. BRITT:

When I get a complaint, I call Montie
or $I$ call Monroe. I just skip y'all and go to them.

MR. PARNELL:
This fiscal year next month, we are going to meet the field staff. I talked to Montie about it already. I really want the field staff to be much more progressive than what they are doing. Not so much reactive. Primarily to be more active. I want them to be
out there investigating.
MR. BRITT:
Do a little more proactive.
MR. PARNELL:
Much more proactive.
MR. BRITT:
It is just like running a sheriff's office. You can't run a sheriff's office and be reactive. You can lose track of everything. And the more proactive you are, the more stuff you are going to find. And then it is just like we don't -- Richard and I talked about this last week. We don't want them dumping tickets on everybody, but we want them doing their job and we want them to find the stuff. And if you are proactive, you are going to find more stuff, you know.

MR. WATTS:
Not waiting until people file complaints.

MR. BRITT:
But that's a good word. Make them proactive instead of reactive. MR. PARNELL:

Absolutely.

MR. WATTS:
With that being said, the legislative session.

MS. MORRIS:
Okay. The first item has Bill 53, it is now Act 357. It was signed by the governor and it's effective August 1. This is a little bit of a cleanup. This was actually a bill of the Office of Motor Vehicles to clean up some things. But what it does is it relieves this Commission from the requirement to file bond in order to issue dealer plates. And so we were having to procure that through the Office of Risk Management. We won't have to procure another bond.

Some other agencies were exempt, but they didn't contemplate another state agency issuing dealer plates when they drafted the law. So it exempts state agencies as well.

House Bill 547 was the bill that we requested and worked with Commissioner Brown from early on. It was introduced by Representative Neil Riser and Senator Womack was on the Senate floor. It was to clean up some things that were inconsistent with the law
regarding catalytic converters that the dealers that are registered here. So now it's instead of just being the catalytic converters sales law, it is for both sides of the transfer; the sale and the purchases are regulated under this provision.

It had -- it's a lot of cleanup.
Also, we picked up all of the disciplinary proceedings that are in our title, Title 32, and we moved them to this title so that they are -- I just copied them over. So it's the same process that we use for disciplining these dealers since we only had registered them last year, we don't have any discipline cases, but if we do, it is going to have the same process. It also requires the dealers to comply with the secondhand dealers law which is a local registration with municipalities and parishes because there really are secondhand dealers. And so that also will get some legal oversight to the local governments as to who now are in their area doing this.

We did get some calls. It kind of sailed through the House and then on the Senate side we got some calls of people that were
concerned about vendors of catalytic converters that kind of did them on an infrequent basis, almost kind of like sounds like curbstoning to me and what is going to happen to them. Well, if they are not registered with the local government and they don't pay taxes and do all of the things they are supposed to do, they are already in violation of other laws. So we kind of looked at the law. Commissioner Travis looked at it again to make sure it wasn't having any unintended impact on other licensees of this Commission or other lawful businesses like repair shops or anything like that. And so at some point, you really can't structure the law to assist people that are operating outside of the law because that's -- because the whole thing is for everybody to know who is dealing with used catalytic converters.

So I think it's a big improvement over what we had and it gives a little bit more guidance to the commission as to who is regulated. And, I guess, if we get some disciplinary cases, the process is clear. That it will be the same process that is in

Title 32.
We had the benefit of looking at some other state laws that were in place this time. The year before, Mississippi had a law that had just been put in place but not really implemented. So there were some other laws that we looked at in California and some other states that we looked up and had some good ideas that weren't picked up. MR. BRITT:

And our problem needs to be similar to Mississippi and Arkansas and Texas. That way you are dealing with the same people.

I never looked at Texas. Did y'all
look at a Texas?
MR. HALLACK:
We did, yes.
MS. MORRIS:
We looked around. I think we looked at Arkansas, too. We were looking at some things from Arkansas. So there are more states that are regulating it now and hopefully that will help us as well. MR. BRITT:

Yes. We just need to be co-existing
with our neighbors because they are going to be dealing with the same people that we are dealing with.

MS. MORRIS:
Ours pretty much tracks Mississippi, but Mississippi was one of the first laws, so. MR. BRITT:

Yes. They were three years ahead of us.

MR. WATTS:
Is this state by state?
MS. MORRIS:
Yes.
MR. WATTS:
It is not federal? The federal
government hasn't gotten involved in this yet?
MS. MORRIS:
No. But the number of catalytic converter theft is still pretty high from all of the reports that we have read.

MR. WATTS:
It hasn't deterred anybody yet?
MS. MORRIS:
I don't think it's made a noticeable difference in the data yet.

MR. WATTS:
That being said, items for the next agenda.

MR. HALLACK:
We will have a hearing next month, a fairly big one. MR. WATTS:

Anything else? Well, we are adjourned.

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETTY D. GLISSMAN, Certified Court Reporter, Certificate No. 86150, in and for the State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission June 16, 2023, meeting was reported by me in the stenotype reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

This July 5, 2023, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.







```
4:1, 4:4, 4:8, 5:19,
6:4, 6:9, 6:13, 12:19,
23:5, 26:18, 27:1,
29:9, 29:17, 31:8,
31:14, 31:22, 32:10,
32:16, 32:22, 34:16,
34:21, 36:18, 37:1,
41:10, 41:14, 41:21,
42:1, 42:7
    ways [1]-13:2
    week [2] - 7:21,
36:13
    Whereas [1] - 27:16
    whereas [1] - 27:22
    whole [4]-8:7,
15:15, 19:18, 39:17
    Williams [1] - 5:14
    WILLIAMS [1] - 5:15
    wipe [1] - 12:23
    wise [1] - 23:7
    Wisenor [1] - 11:9
    Womack [1] - 37:23
    wonder [1] - 18:10
    word [1] - 36:22
    Wydette [1] - 5:14
            Y
    y'all [4] - 17:19,
    29:18, 35:17, 40:14
    y'all's [1] - 22:1
    Year [1] - 27:15
    year [36] - 6:19, 7:5,
    7:6, 7:14, 7:15, 7:16,
    8:3, 8:9, 8:10, 8:12,
    8:22, 8:23, 8:25, 9:4,
    9:7, 9:9, 9:19, 10:6,
10:23, 10:24, 12:7,
12:11, 18:8, 27:5,
27:18, 28:1, 28:7,
28:20, 29:5, 34:9,
35:2, 35:20, 38:14,
40:4
    year-to-year [1] - 8:3
    years [9]-7:9, 7:13,
8:25, 9:10, 9:11, 14:2,
25:12, 25:16, 41:8
    you-all [1] - 35:12
```

