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MS. BARON:
John Poteet?
MR. POTEET:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Dino Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Tony Cormier? He's on his way.
Ron Duplessis?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Floyd?
MR. FLOYD:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Darty Smith?
MR. SMITH:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Steve Olave?
MR. OLAVE:
Here.

MS. BARON:
Ricky Donnell?
MR. DONNELL:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Richard Watts?
MR. WATTS:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
MR. MOTET:
Excellent. Anyone here for public comments today?

MS. BARON:
No, sir.
MR. POTEET:
So, apparently, the meeting got cancelled last month. So we need the adoption and approval of the minutes from the prior meeting.

MR. OLAV:
Can I offer a motion?
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)

MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
That passes. So that will be the minutes from the January meeting. So we've got financial reports from both January and February. Mona is ready to go.

MS. ANDERSON:
So if you'll turn in your binders to the financial statement for January 2018. The operating account balance at the end of January was $\$ 2,347,927$. The fines accounts receivable were $\$ 66,458$. The current liabilities on page 2 were -- total $\$ 42,681$. The long-term liabilities decreased. We moved -- $\$ 314,280$ of deferred fees for 2018 became revenue on January 1st. The total long-term liabilities and deferred inflows is $\$ 3,231,370$.

Turning to page 3, which is the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position. The year-to-date revenues were $\$ 1,079,065$. On page 4 , the salaries and related benefits were higher than the
previous year. The remainder of the expenses were also higher primarily due to our insurance coming due at a different time. We received the invoice from Office of Risk Management at a later date last year.

And on page 5, the year to date change in net position was $\$ 396,881$. On pages 6 and 7 is a four-year revenue comparison. So on this report and the chart, you can see that the '17-'18 revenue is in line with the '15-'16 revenue for the same district that renewed that year.

On page 8 is a chart of the year-to-date budget to actual expenditures and those are pretty much on target for this time of year. Page 9 is the certificate of deposit summary. There were -- in January, there were two Business First Bank CDs and one Landmark CD that renewed. They matured and renewed. The Business First rate remains at 1.15 percent. And the Landmark $C D$ renewed at point 60 percent.

On page 10, the accounts receivable hearing report, $\$ 42,900$ in fines
were assessed in January and 13,300 was collected. And on the last page, the balance for January 31st was $\$ 66,458$.

Moving on to the February
financials.
MR. POTEET:
Could I ask a question?
MS. ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

MR. POTEET:
Why are --- why are these
Landmark Bank rates so low?
MS. ANDERSON:
I don't know. They fall way
behind the other banks in their rates and it doesn't seem to be getting better. But there aren't that many banks that are out on the list of banks that are fiscal agents that are approved by the state. And we're at our maximum 250,000 in all the other banks. So I can't move it to those banks. I can't move that money to those other banks that pay the higher rates.

MR. DONNELL:
How long are we locked in for?
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MS. ANDERSON:
We only -- we do more than a year. We're -- and that's part of our policy is to not invest for more than a year. I had been investing at six months, but the rates weren't changing that much. So we went ahead with the year, so we can lock in some of those higher interest rates. But we've tried a number of other banks, some of the smaller banks around here, and they weren't able to offer more. But we'll continue to try each time.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Are there checking accounts that we can open? I know several checking accounts are paying CD rates.

MS. ANDERSON:
Well, we'd have to go through the state treasury for that. So we'd have to apply to state treasury to open another -MS. MORRIS:

I was in a board meeting last week where they invested a CD at Whitney, which is approved. And I think their rate was close to 1.2.

MS. ANDERSON:
Whitney?
MS. MORRIS:
But they're in New Orleans. So I think the rates will be similar.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
They's here in Baton Rouge.
MR. POTEET:
We'll take a look at that.
MS. MORRIS:
Chase is usually competitive with Whitney.

MR. POTEET:
They're approved?
MS. MORRIS:
Yes. They should be on the list.
MS. ANDERSON:
I had checked Whitney previously and hadn't found anybody that was any better, but it changes all the time. We did put some in Bank of St. Francisville. They had originally said their rate was less. And I said, well, some other banks are giving us this much. And then they went to the higher rate, you know. So it just
depends on each bank.
MR. POTEET:
Let's take a look at those others, Whitney and Chase.

Okay. Does anybody have any questions before we move on to February?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. Thank you, Mona.
MS. ANDERSON:
And so we'll move on to the February financials. At the end of February, the operating account balance was $\$ 2,322,621$. The accounts receivable hearing fines were $\$ 60,658$. Current liabilities at the bottom of page were $\$ 51,278$. The escrowed fines were a little higher, 11,666 due to the fact that we didn't have a Commission meeting and we couldn't -- we couldn't move those into revenue until they were approved.

On page 2, the long-term liabilities were $\$ 255,490$. On pages 3 through 5, the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position, the
year-to-date revenues were $\$ 1,126,910$, which was about a $\$ 27,000$ decrease from 2016. And that's primarily due to the '16 auction fees being so high after the flood.

On page 4, the salaries and related benefits were $\$ 170,000$ higher than the prior year. That's due to the addition of new staff positions. The remainder of the expenses were about 15,000 higher than the previous year, the same as in January. And on page 5, the change in net position for the month was a negative $\$ 51,512$. And the year to date was $\$ 344,668$.

Again, the four-year revenue comparison is on page 6 and the graph is on the following page and that does show the decrease in revenue, primarily fines. Turning on to page 8, that would be the four-year expenditure comparison. And you can see the difference in the salaries there. The operating expenses are pretty much the same.

On page 9 is the certificate of deposit summary, the same as January, no changes in February. And on page 10, the
accounts receivable hearing fines, since no fines were assessed in February, we didn't have a meeting. $\$ 5,800$ was collected on one account. And the balance at the end of February was $\$ 60,658$.

So unless there are any questions, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

MR. POTEET:
Any questions? Guys?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
I guess there's no questions for you today.

I need a motion to approve. MR. SMITH:

I make a motion.
MR. OLAVE:
Second the motion.
MR. POTEET:
Second, Steve.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
The motion carries. All right. Let's see. The next thing we've got here -Derek, do you want to lead this discussion, certification request approval?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. Commissioners, according to Revised Statute 32:792(B) (17)(J) in our law, it is an advertising violation to use the term "certify," "certification" or other civil terms without having approved the certification process approved by this Commission. There have been several submissions since this law has been put in place. I've done my review of many of them. Some were approved. Some were not.

Commissioner Taylor's was one of the earlier submissions of his certification process approved throughout this. As of recent, I have received two requests from two companies, American Guardian Warranty Services, stating that, you know, some of their independent used dealers have some concern about violating our law as it
relates to using the term, "certification" by using their product to offer as a benefit from a marketing standpoint to their customers. This may be simply something that was outside of our scope.

I just kind of wanted to have a discussion and get some guidance from you-all in this matter. This is more -it's a little bit different from what I had been approving in the past, because this is much more related to the warranty certification of the marketing versus the certification process, dealer markets with their inventory.

I did have Investigator Perry Esponge kind of look into the matter a little bit deeper for me and he does have some information he kind of wanted to share with you-all as it relates to this. With American Guardian Warranty Services, we have Mr. Harold McDermott, who is present. And he can speak to their product themselves. But if I can, I'd like Investigator Esponge to kind of give us a little rundown on kind of exactly what he researched and found out.
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So I'll let him give a little bit of guidance on which direction to go.

MR. ESPONGE:
I looked at both of these
warranties. As Director Parnell said, the way that $I$ understand the law is that we can approve a dealer to say, "certified." These are actual warranty companies who are selling their products to dealers. So my question was, do we have the regulatory authority to approve a warranty company that we don't regulate to use the word, "certified" as they are selling their product to dealers. So I looked into the warranties. I had some concerns. Neither warranty that I'm aware of covers vehicles off road. That includes four-wheel drive vehicles. The first company, the AGCLW, they will not cover vehicles used in -- as -- for commercial vehicles -- commercial retail business even if it's delivering pizzas, you know, young kid that works at Domino's. If their vehicle breaks down while they're delivering pizzas, they do not have a warranty on their vehicle, because
that's considered commercial use.
No vehicle is covered off road. And there were several concerns with the AGWS as well with their marketing towards dealers where they had, it looks like, window stickers and they have Dodge, Jeep, you know. They're advertising the manufacturer on their window stickers on an independent used vehicle. Mr. McDermott is here with that company. I spoke to him last week. They also do not cover vehicles off road, even if it's a four-wheel drive vehicle.

Their understanding, a four-wheel drive vehicle is for weather conditions, like, in the north as far as snow and things like that. And I spoke to Mr. McDermott's supervisor, who is Mr. Dwyer. I said, well, here in the south, we don't really have snow. Most four-wheel drive vehicles in the south are going to be for hunting, swampy areas, when you go fishing or something to that aspect. And that wouldn't be covered under these two warranties that they want to advertise as a publicly certified vehicle.

MR. PARNELL:
Well, my concern was that, you know, I have dealers requesting approval to use these companies, because in the advertising language of the company, it says, "certified." And the dealer was trying to understand if they use that language as it relates to this company, are they in violation of our statute.

For me, I just needed some guidance from you guys. And maybe I'm missing a point here. This seems a little bit farther outside of our scope as it relates to it, because they're warranty companies. But if our dealers are -- their purchases of these warranties to give to their consumers and they use the term, "certification," do you find that they're in violation of our statute and/or do we not even need to touch any certification requests for approval from a warranty company.

MR. POTEET:
Well, here's the way I see this.
The person -- if you had -- if Dino came in
here and said, this is my certification program, and he gave you this, and you approved it, then you could say anybody that gets this company would be approved. I don't know that we should be approving the warranty company, per se, but if I have one dealer that comes in with this company, and then we approve it, then it would seem to make sense to me that they would be essentially approved for anybody that used that. I mean, you wouldn't have to go through this process. What we're doing right now is, we're looking at their program and we say, okay, this is okay, but we need somebody to come in and ask to be approved. Your program is one -- you just have your own, right?

MR. TAYLOR:
Right, correct.
MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MR. PARNELL:
And so that's a little bit different. It just may be me.

MR. POTEET:
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That's okay. No, I understand -I understand the question, is which comes first, the warranty?

MR. PARNELL:
I would say the dealer --
MR. POTEET:
The licensee coming in and says, this is my company. This is the company I'm going to use. Then, we look at it and once we've looked at it --

MR. PARNELL:
Do we approve the dealer?
MR. POTEET:
Do we approve the dealer? And then we could kind of have that on file, that any dealer that uses this company would be approved. And the only thing we would really need to do -- somebody tell me if I'm wrong on this -- but the only thing we would need to do is make sure that the warranty company stays up to date. If there's any changes made to -- if they make a change to their program, they should -- they should copy us. I would say that would probably be true with any certification program.

MR. TAYLOR:
And in terms of an eligible vehicle. Ron, I'm sure you run GM certified vehicles, but you've got a pile of vehicles on your lot that are not certified. That's not uncommon. I've got a pile of vehicles that are not certified on my lot, because I don't carry the badges of being certified, like, Ron does at a new car store than anybody else's. I exclude sports cars, four-wheel drive trucks, lift kits, and things of that nature. But my customers, they know what they're buying when they come in.

MR. ESPONGE:
Okay.
MR. POTEET:
Yes. I would say your -- the issues here would be something that would be, you know, up to the dealer to properly -- if he's going to exclude vehicles, he shouldn't be slapping one of these warranties on that vehicle.

MR. ESPONGE:
AGWS has more of a comprehensive
-- if you look through their advertisements to the dealers -- this AGCLW, all they sent us was five pages and a checklist. They have no policy relating to what they want to cover, where like AGWS says, you know, 10 year maximum, $80,000 \mathrm{miles}$. It's more comprehensive. This other company is basically something that you would by from AUL with the checklist and that's it. Where, you know, one dealer that would approve certified advertising in Baton Rouge is no longer in business, but his request was, like, 17 pages, very comprehensive. And that's what $I$ was used to seeing with certified. But this one is, like, four or five pages and a checklist.

MR. POTEET:
Well, as I understand the law -and if anybody here sees it differently -as I understand the law, the dealer has to come with us to get approved -MR. ESPONGE:

Right. MR. POTEET:
-- to use the word, "certified."
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So Mr. McDermott --
MR. McDERMOTT:
Yes.

MR. POTEET:
-- Mr. McDermott, I appreciate you being here, but that's not part of our job, to approve your company, unless a dealer wants it approved. And then that makes it convenient for us -- I don't know if it says it that way, but it makes it convenient for us if more people use something that we've approved. And that's what we were talking about this law. If I remember right, that's what we said, was if we -- you know, if we look at a program and say that it's approved for this dealer, that makes it easier for that dealer or for other dealers to use the same program.

Do you want -- if you want to say something, you're welcome to speak.

MR. McDERMOTT:
So that's the reason why I -- we were actually at the meeting, because the gentleman, Mike Lee, from G\&C Auto Sales in Marrero, he asked that $I$ get some kind of
approval from the LUMVC in order to, you know, say that he can use it.

MR. POTEET:
It's the other way around. He has to ask us.

MR. McDERMOTT:
Okay. He has to ask, okay.
MR. POTEET:
Yes. And, you know, I -- and then we -- you can approve it. Isn't that right?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.

MR. POTEET:
And the only way it would come to us is if he fails it, and then somebody wants to contest it.

MR. McDERMOTT:
Right. We just want to be compliant with them, with the State, and he - -

MR. POTEET:
Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT:
-- wanted to be compliant as
well. So that's the reason why we're going through the steps to get that down.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I appreciate having the
information here, because it gives us a head start when he asks. But he has to ask to have it approved.

MR. PARNELL:
That's what $I$ understand, yes. MR. POTEET:
Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT:
So what message does he have to leave? Does he have to email someone?

MR. PARNELL:
Submit a request in directly to me. You absolutely send the information that we already have, but he submits that with his request for approval using the term "certification" in his advertising.

MR. POTEET:
And then --
MR. PARNELL:
And we'll go from there.
MR. POTEET:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR
-- and then either Derek approves it or doesn't approve it. And he'll tell you what -- you know, if he says, no, I can't approve it, he'll tell you what's missing. He'll tell the dealer what's missing. And then he can come to you and tell you what's missing. I mean, yours looks pretty thorough. The other one, to Perry's point, was not very thorough. So I would say, good luck. So just tell him he needs to go through that process. It's not a big -- it's not a big deal.

MR. McDERMOTT:
Okay.
MR. POTEET:
We have -- we have a Commissioner that went through it and he seems to be okay.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. It's more of a -- I just needed clarity from you-all --

MR. POTEET:

> Yes.

MR. PARNELL:
-- just to make sure.
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MR. POTEET:
No. I think it was good for us to talk about it.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Mr. Chairman, I do have a couple of comments.

MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
On the new car side, you know, let's don't forget what the certification is about. It's not certifying what the car is going to be in the future. It's certifying what the car is at this condition.

MR. POTEET:
Yes.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
So I think we need to consider, you know, some minimal standards and those being safety standards of brakes, tires, gosh, alignment, that sort of thing. And we don't get into some of other off road. All the GM stuff excludes off road. And most of my warranties exclude sports cars, all sports cars and $I$ would exclude them also
knowing what $I$ know about the drivers of sports cars. So I think it's really simple. Those exclusions probably are universal and are fit. But we need to talk about what we're certifying at the time the car is delivered to the customer, not the intended use, because, basically, commercial vehicles for GM, 12 months, 12,000 miles. That's the factory warranty. Consumer warranty is $36 / 40$ or something of that nature. So there's a defined difference in those, too. But I do think that we need to make it easier on Mr. Parnell and that's to have a minimal set of standards, by which we -MR. POTEET:

Don't we have that?
MR. PARNELL:
Well, yes. I mean, I don't think we've set out and put a minimal set of standards. But, I mean, what I'm looking at, it has to be fairly comprehensive. What I have been approving does cover all of those items that you talked about and more. Some of the -- one of the ones I did approve, they had, like, a 110 point process
that they go through and they showed all of the information that they put all their vehicles through and they had the documentation to back that up and that's why I looked at it like that. Some of the ones that were very short, I didn't approve those, because I didn't think it was thorough enough for them to be using that terminology, so.

MR. POTEET:
Approximately, how many have you approved?

MR. PARNELL:
It's only been about 11.
MR. POTEET:
Okay.
MR. PARNELL:
Yes.

MR. POTEET:
So, I mean, after you do a few of these, you pretty much --

MR. PARNELL:

> Yes.

MR. POTEET:
-- get the idea that that isn't
what we're looking for.
MR. PARNELL:
Some, they come right away and I send it right back and don't approve it. They send me a paragraph.

MR. ESPONGE:
Mr. McDermott's company, this is his checklist.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. It's a very thorough
checklist.
MR. ESPONGE:
It's very -- their whole program is very comprehensive.

MR. POTEET:
Yes. I wouldn't -- you know, I guess I have to be careful about how we say this, but, you know, because we approve it once doesn't mean we're endorsing it for other dealers. But, in reality, that's what we're doing once it's approved and everything.

MR. PARNELL:
That uses that product.
MR. POTEET:

How you use that information is up to you, Mr. McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT:
Thank you, sir.
MR. POTEET:
Any other questions or comments on this?

MR. McDERMOTT:
I'm happy. Thank you.
MR. POTEET:
Okay. So ratification of imposed penalties, Mr. Parnell.

MR. PARNELL:
Commissioners, you will find in your packet a chart that illustrates the dealers 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, as usual, go through the names of those dealers that have imposed civil penalties.

Do you know if we have anyone present representing these dealers?

MS. BARON:
I'll go check.
MR. PARNELL:
And, granted, these are from January and February.

MS. BARON:
No, sir, we do not.
MR. POTEET:
I just thought of a question. How often do you have to get it approved? Every time you get your license renewed?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes, yes.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. So when you approve it, it's for two years maximum?

MR. PARNELL:
That's when I've been doing, yes, nothing in writing or anything like that. MR. POTEET:

That makes sense.
MR. PARNELL:
That's what we have been doing. MR. POTEET:

Okay.

MR. PARNELL:
They submit for their license and we submit the information.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. Thank you.
MR. PARNELL:
All right. Premier Auto Sales from Slidell, Louisiana, fine amount was -violation fine amount is $\$ 4,700$. Kessler Auto Sales, LLC from Kenner, Louisiana, fine amount is $\$ 2,550$. Auction Rep, LLC, doing business as, Louisiana Direct Buy, from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, fine amount is \$300. Hedam Auto Sales, LLC from Marrero, Louisiana, fine amount is \$800. Value Motors Company, Incorporated, Marrero, Louisiana, fine amount is $\$ 300$. James Walker, doing business as, Walker's Auto Sales, from Marrero, Louisiana, fine amount \$1,050. D\&C Auto Express, LLC from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, fine amount is \$400. Sheldon Johnson, doing business as, City Auto Mart, from DeRidder, Louisiana, fine amount is $\$ 600$. Cars 2 Go Opelousas, Incorporated, Opelousas, Louisiana, fine
amount $\$ 250$. Revolution Auto Brokers, LLC from LaPlace, Louisiana, fine amount $\$ 1,250$. VTI, LLC, doing business as, VTI Auto Sales, in Leesville, Louisiana, fine amount is \$3,400. Xeres Rent to Own, LLC from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, fine amount is \$700. Car City Autoplex, LLC from Metairie, Louisiana, fine amount is $\$ 900$. The total of civil penalties was $\$ 17,200$. Commissioners, I ask that you ratify the imposed civil penalties assessed.

MR. OLAVE:
I make a motion, Mr. Chairman. MR. SMITH:

Second.
MR. MOTET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. MOTET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. MOTET:
All right. Those are approved.
Those are ratified.
All right. So what do we have
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next?
MR. PARNELL:
We have ratifications of
revocations. Commissioners, you will also find in your packet a chart that illustrates the dealers who their license has been revoked. Please note that each dealer on the list has been through the revocation process.

Once again, do we have anyone present?

MS. BARON:
We do not. I checked while I was out there.

MR. PARNELL:
All right. I'll go through this. Dealership, Andrews Auto Sales from Oakdale, Louisiana, notice of revocation is for $2 / 26$ of 2018. Kentwood Auto Salvage from Kentwood, Louisiana, the notice of revocation was $2 / 26$ of 2018 as well. Commissioners, I ask that you ratify the revocation of dealers that $I$ have announced. MR. TAYLOR:

I make a motion.

MR. OLAVE:
I second the motion, Mr.
Chairman.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Those revocations are now ratified.

All right. I think you're next on the agenda.

MR. PARNELL:
All right. Commissioners, you'll find in your chart -- your book the alleged issue reports that we have for the last two months. There are 171 alleged issues for January and February of 2018. The next report you will find is the case report. It illustrates the amount of cases that were assigned to the investigators for the month -- for the last two months, I should say. There were 108 cases assigned during the
months of January and February. Also -- you will also find the department summary report, which illustrates the amount of cases that were closed for the month. And there were 55 cases that were closed.

In other news, I kind of wanted to go through and let you-all know that Nestor Guillory, whose area of responsibility was District 3, he's no longer with our agency. I do want to thank him for his service over the years. With that said, I would like to take this opportunity to announce our newest compliance investigator, Mr. James D. Fail. Mr. Fail's area of responsibility will be District 3. He is a retiree of the military and also a retiree of Louisiana State Police, where he has many years of extensive investigative experience. Please allow me at this time to introduce Mr. Fail.

I don't know if you would like to say -- address the Commission?

MR. FAIL:
It's nice to be here.
MR. POTEET:
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Good morning and welcome. MR. FAIL:

Thank you.
MR. PARNELL:
We are still kind of going
through our process looking at licensing software. We -- the -- what we were looking at before, System Automation, we did get a quote from them. It was incredibly high. I mean, it was, like, sticker shock when we looked at it. But we're still going to continue our process to try to find a solution that can really work for this agency to bring us forward that we can use for the next 15, 20 years that, you know, can adapt to our growth and our change. It's not that easy to find. The ones -- if we do find it, it's incredibly high, which goes outside of our regulatory authority that we can hire someone to do that, we can purchase. We have a purchasing dollar amount, a limit, and that kind of puts us in a strange place when we're trying to look at these kind of solutions. But with that said, that's pretty much all that's really
been going on day to day. If you have any questions or comments, please at this time. MR. POTEET:

Are there any other state agencies that are having this issue or this problem with their software?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. A lot of state -- we have several state agencies that have CAVU that are actually working with them. And most of the ones that are using the exact product that we are, they're having the same concerns that we have. And they've kind of been branching out looking at other entities. We've looked at most of the ones that they have looked at. Some of them wanted an entity -- they went in with a very small software solution company and they're really kind of disappointed with it right now. They've only had it for about three months and they really feel like they've kind of wasted their time and their money moving with that product. And that was someone who came and sat with us.

We just felt like they were too
small. They weren't ready to be able to deal with what we are looking to do presently, not only presently, but for the future. But there are several out there. Some agencies are not really trying to change, because they kind of want to stay specific to what they're doing. But the vision that $I$ see us moving towards, we're going to need to really have a software solution that can kind of really help us be more proactive on what we're doing day to day versus reactive. And $I$ think a strong solution, a proper solution, will allow us to do that. Right now, again, we're really -- our software right now is really cumbersome. It doesn't allow us to really do -- move into the new millennium with our investigations out in the field and relaying information back to our staff here on site. And it just -- it's just not working for us, you know.

MR. POTEET:
So there are solutions?
MR. PARNELL:
There are solutions that are too
expensive or not good enough, basically. Some are not even as good as what we're currently working with, you know. We've found that as well, you know. But for the long haul, I just -- we just don't believe that we can go forward with the company that we're currently with. It's just -- not only from the customer service standpoint with us, but also just the product is just not that good, you know. So we're going to continue the process, you know. We had hoped that that licensing software came back at a reasonable number. We will be trying to look towards trying to have something within the next year, in the 2019 licensing period. But, again, when they came back, we were in a little sticker shock. I mean, so that's kind of where we are with that. We'll continue the process. MR. POTEET:

Any Commissioners have any
suggestions?
MR. TAYLOR:
Georgia, Texas, Alabama, any of
those three states? Because those three
states seem to be leading the way with their association.

MR. PARNELL:
We looked at a few programs from them. Again, we've kind of run into that same issue. We have a flat program. We can't really go above with purchasing unless we do -- I mean, we still have to bid some things out. We're going to try that next and move forward with that. But we've been shopping around and this was a company that actually came to us understanding that we were a company that was -- agency that was looking to try to move in a different direction, you know. I thought the product was great, but it just was more than we can handle. It was more than what we can handle if we did most of the leg work versus letting -- allowing them to put everything together for us. And that was still beyond what our dollar amount was.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, you were looking at one all encompassing term solution?

MR. PARNELL:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

Yes. I found that, you know, in the past when we've talked about it initially, I remember you recommended us to kind of look at something that was a little bit broader. But $I$ think that if you really look at exactly what we're doing, day-to-day licensing and our investigations and -- it needs to be kind of -- it really needs to be -- we need to get enough to really handle all of this, so with the communication between the field and the staff and what we're doing out dealing with our consumers -- I mean, I should say licensees, going out on the website, getting updates and doing all this information. I -- we looked at some various entities like that, but I don't know if we can find something that can really give us -- provide us what we need, that's going to be better than what we have. That's my concern. We've looked at several things and they're not really better than what we have. I want to see us move to something that can actually grow this agency, not keep us here. I mean, we can keep this forever, you know, but.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
You know, I operate a number of businesses in a number of states and we do our own thing. And we couldn't find that encompassing solution at a reasonable price. If you would like, I have a hardware guy and a software guy. I'd be willing to have them come over and take a comprehensive look, because $I$ can name four or five softwares right now that are extremely inexpensive. MR. PARNELL:

Well, $I$ will get that.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
You know, I am pretty tight. I
can tell you. But I'd be willing to try and - -

MR. PARNELL:
Well, I'll get the information from you. And that way, we can reach out to them and see what they have to offer. I mean, I think that's a great -- another avenue that we can look through.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Okay.
MR. POTEET:
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Any other questions for Derek?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
So where are we? Legislative Session. All right. Legislative Session. So, Derek.

MR. PARNELL:
I -- let me -- if I can, I just want to make an announcement about the committee -- the Legislative Session. A few days ago, I did receive an email from Ellen Palmintier, Boards and Commissions, advising that according to Revised Statute 49:191 -what was it, (8)(j), requires the Used Motor Vehicle Commission to begin sunset on July 1 of 2018. They have a House Bill, Senator Danny Martini, he has filed Senate Bill 62 to recreate this Board and it would extend our time to July 1 of 2023. This bill will be heard in Senate Commerce on Wednesday, the 21st. And he just sent me another email this morning at 1:30. They're requesting a representative to come down and -- just in case if committee members would have some questions about who we are, what we're
doing, and, you know, budgetary issues, just to answer some questions for them.

Five years ago when it started in the Senate side -- I'm sorry. It started in the House side. We went down there and went down there, but we didn't have to say anything. But $I$ don't know -- the Senate side is starting it. I'm pretty sure there will be a lot of questions on that side. But this is a bill that if they don't recreate us July 1, we sunset and we're over. So every five years this has to happen.

And I was talking with Ms. Morris. She was talking to other agencies -- large agencies. They all go through this process. So that will be a Senate bill. If we can add that to our legislative discussion, that will be fine.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. What else?
MR. PARNELL:
House Bill -- Commissioner Duplessis, do you want to speak on it or do you want me to kind of go through it?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
No. Go through it. I have not been up to speed.

MR. PARNELL:
All right. House Bill 514 by Representative Shadoin. This is a Commission bill that arises relative to the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission. We have received a little bit more opposition to some areas in the law and what we're trying to do, than we were expecting. I will have -- Ms. Morris, if you will, kind of go through some of the concerns that we ran into and some of the amendments that we're trying to clear up before we get to session, get to committee tomorrow, so we can kind of have a smooth sail through.

MS. MORRIS:
Okay. The status of House Bill 514, as I understand it, Mr. Parnell, pursuant to the agreement that we have with the Motor Vehicle Commission, did send this information about this bill to the Motor Vehicle Commission and we have not received any comments.

MR. PARNELL:
So after the -- after the meeting today, I will -- I will send Lessie another email just to try to touch base with her before tomorrow. I don't want any surprises tomorrow when we get down there. So I'll shoot her another email and ask, and I'll call her, if she has any concerns, because I didn't hear anything back from her.

MS. MORRIS:
You might want to sent her the amendments as well.

MR. PARNELL:
Okay.
MS. MORRIS:
We got some concerns from SEADRA and also Insurance Auto Auction. So what we did -- there were some things that we didn't feel like we had enough information to address this year. So our recommendation was to put them on the list for potential legislation next year and do some research in the interim. And that related to the airbag provisions. So we struck the airbag provision to allow the other things to go
forward. And then there was a request with the educational seminar to exempt those entities that have dealer licenses, which do not sell to consumers. They only transfer to other dealers to purchase vehicles. So we drafted an amendment, which would allow for that very limited exemption to the educational seminar.

MR. DONNELL:
Now, Ms. House did call me this past week. Of course, I had a meeting with her the first of the week, last week. She was concerned about the language about if we got in a conflict, who supercedes. And the way Derek explained it to me, basically, the same thing. Y'all can comment on it or whatever.

MR. PARNELL:
That provision is in 782, the jurisdiction or authority of the Commission. That was one of the things that we were initially going through. I felt like that they would oppose, they would have a problem with that. "The provision of this Chapter shall not apply to any person, partnership,
corporation, limited liability company, or other entity licensed or regulated by the Louisiana Motor Vehicle Commission. If any provision of this Chapter conflicts with any provision of Chapter 6 of this title, provision of Chapter 6 of this title shall prevail." That was something that $I$ know we felt like we did want to change or get rid of, delete. But I felt like trying to move our legislation forward this year, it would be not a good idea to put that -- take that -- take that completely out. So what I did -- it's still here. If you would, just -MR. DONNELL:

Yes. Check and make sure the language is -MR. PARNELL:

What happened was, the -- we -Section A, we put a little bit more information on the Used Motor Vehicle Commission, who we are and what we are and what we license. And it was much more of a mission statement and we just moved that from A to B, but that language stayed the same. So I'll find out from her today if
that's really a problem.
MS. MORRIS:
In the actual bill draft, there is no change to the current language.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes, exactly.

MS. MORRIS:
It's the same as the current language. So I know that there was a draft circulated before.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MS. MORRIS:
It was actually sent to the staff. It does not change that language. But, right now, the only change -- the only reason it's even in the bill is because there was an new paragraph that's lettered A added. And so, now, that paragraph that's currently the law becomes paragraph B. So there's no --

MR. DONNELL:
She -- yes. She was telling me that while $I$ was doing 80 down the Interstate.

MS. MORRIS:
Well, it might be that their concern was seeing a prior draft. But what was submitted to the Legislature has no change in that language as to which commission would supercede. So I think we've addressed all the concerns. I have responses. I think we've got information from SEADRA and Insurance Auto Auctions that they were fine with the changes. So we have those drafted. They were sent to the staff, I believe, yesterday. I think this bill is in good shape. Eric Sunstrom with independent dealers with this bill also helped.

MR. POTEET:
Do you work on Sundays?
MR. SUNSTROM:
I'll work all weekends until June. We did submit an amendment on behalf of the LIDA with regards to an issue that the new commission brought to my attention on page 5, or any provision right down there by line 25 , or any other provision of law relating to. And we inserted the coma and
put language in there that they suggested to protect them.

MS. MORRIS:
Nobody submitted that to us.
MR. SUNSTROM:
I sent that to y'all last week. I told you I was doing that.

MS. MORRIS:
We didn't get a draft of the amendment.

MR. SUNSTROM:
Okay. I'll check. But I sent it to staff, so.

MS. MORRIS:
Well, we also amended that provision.

MR. SUNSTROM:
Okay. So if it overlaps, then -MS. MORRIS:

We didn't amend that provision, but this provision in 16 only was -- 16 previously said that it's a violation in the chapter for any rule, regulation adopted by the Commission or any provision relating to the disposition of certificates of title or
permits to dismantle in connection with the purchase or sale of a motor vehicle.

Mr. Hallack suggested that that language should be broader and that it should be a violation of the chapter, not just for title violations, but for any law that related to a motor vehicle transaction that was between a dealer and consumer. And so it does not change anything having to do with the New Car Commission, because it only says that this Commission can revoke or suspend or fine a dealer for a violation of any law related to a sales transaction with a consumer. So we would need to see the other amendments, because I don't believe we were provided with copies.

MR. POTEET:
Who did you send that to?
MR. SUNSTROM:
Staff. I thought it was sent to Thomas, also. No, the committee staff to have it submitted Thursday evening. So it was drafted within the 24 -hour time frame. MS. MORRIS:

I can check and see if it -- do Betty D. Glissman, CCR
you know if it's on the site?
MR. SUNSTROM:
I'm trying to look right now.
No. There are no amendments listed on there yet.

MS. MORRIS:
I don't really understand the purpose of the amendment.

MR. SUNSTROM:
It was the same language we discussed in the conference call we had about two weeks ago.

MS. MORRIS:
I understand that. But this -- I guess what they said was -- what you are saying was that it affected somehow the jurisdiction. It does not, because it's just a part of paragraph B, which says that this Commission can suspend or revoke the license of anybody -- any dealer that violates any provision of law or rules in the transaction of a sale, which means that even if they were fined by another
commission or licensed by another commission, even, like, our auctioneers are,
the other commission taking action against them allows them to continue to operate, because only this Commission can revoke the motor vehicle license. So I don't know understand why --

MR. SUNSTROM:
On page 5, line 25, they suggested to me in order for them to be more comfortable with the bill, so they would not oppose it, after the word, "law" on line 25, insert a coma, "not administered by the Louisiana Motor Vehicle Commission."

MS. MORRIS:
Again, if they were in violation of the motor vehicle sales finance license, then this Commission would not be able to revoke their dealership license.

MR. SUNSTROM:
I am trying to -- on behalf of my client, I'm trying to remove the opposition from the bill and that is what the New Car Commission suggested to me when I approached them.

MS. MORRIS:
It doesn't seem to make sense
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that you could -- would allow the dealer to continue to operate if this Commission didn't feel they should continue to operate.

MR. SUNSTROM:
Well, Derek, I suggest that you talk to Leslie about that and find out what exactly they're looking for there.

MR. TAYLOR:
Derek, I apologize. When I called last week in reference to some of the problems we have, I thought that me and you were on the same page. I'm sitting here looking at an email that was forwarded to me from Eric Strodert that came from Eric Sunstrom that went to five other people. And I don't see any of this Board on that email right here. I see Kevin Dixieland, Jacob, Daniel, Gwen, Eric, and Robert Perry, but I don't see anybody from the Commission on this.

MR. SUNSTROM:
That was not a Commission email. MR. TAYLOR:

Okay.
MR. SUNSTROM:
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That was an email from the Governmental Affairs Committee of the Used Car Dealers Association, LIADA. MR. TAYLOR:

So it's from Eric's Sunstrom to these people, okay. It's the same thing and I really thought that the Commission had this already.

MS. MORRIS:
That's not sounding like the same language. So we all just probably need to get together after the meeting and see exactly what the language is, because that's not the same thing.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. We'll do that.
MR. DONNELL:
And they're going to hear this bill at 10 o'clock in the morning? MS. MORRIS:

Yes. It's scheduled for hearing tomorrow.

MR. POTEET:

$$
\text { All right. So that's } 514 .
$$

MS. MORRIS:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

Next, is 412.
MR. PARNELL:
Yes. Some of these bills are just some bills that I'll just let you know that we're watching during this legislative process. Senate Bill 412 by Senator White adds employees to those individuals authorized to keep and register motor vehicle sales and salvage pool. I'm just going to watch this bill to make sure that there's no amendments that's added on that could affect some of our licensees.

So the next bill is House Bill 157 by Representative Bagley modifying requirements for motor vehicles issued certificate of destruction. This is another bill that we will watch for possible concerns related to the certificate of construction -- destruction, I'm sorry. And this is an Office of Motor Vehicle bill.

House Bill 489 by Representative Carmody requires the Used Motor Vehicle Commission to report information collected by salvage pools and salvage disposal sales. If you remember, last year, Representative

Carmody's bill in the 2017 session required LUMVC to maintain a database and also submit monthly auction transaction fees to the Department of Revenue. This year, the bill at this time requires only the LUMVC to report the monthly transaction fees to the Department of Revenue. We made requests and amendments to maybe change some of that language as it relates to the monthly sales report versus auction transaction fee. But this is something that they were trying to push last year. I don't see any issues with it if that's all it stays as. But, you know, I know what the purpose is behind this bill. So we'll watch it.

MS. MORRIS:
This bill is set for hearing tomorrow as well.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MS. MORRIS:
And it requires this Commission to adopt rules and regulations no later than January 1, 2019. It's not really necessary for us to adopt rules and regulations in
order to share the information with the Department of Revenue if the bill says that we're to do that. So I drafted some amendments, some other technical amendments, that requires us to report certain -- all information kept by the salvage pools while we can only report what they file with us. So it would be that we would report the information received from the salvage pools in the following month. And so I drafted amendments and I'll submit those to make the process a little bit less cumbersome.

MR. POTEET:
We don't already do that?
MS. MORRIS:
We agreed to do it if they wanted it.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. I mean, we can take a
month. It's not an issue.
MR. POTEET:
We already have the information. MR. PARNELL:

Just submit it in electronic
form.
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MS. MORRIS:
Then, we wouldn't have to go through the rule making process.

MR. POTEET:
Got you. Okay.
What else?
MR. PARNELL:
House Bill 522 by Representative Davis provides relative to motor vehicle service contracts.

House Bill 568 by Representative Hilferty establishes requirements for temporary registration of license plates. This is another Office of Motor Vehicle bill.

House Bill 646, Representative Landry, provides relative to certificates of destruction issued for water damaged vehicles, Office of Motor Vehicle's bill.

And House Bill 674 by
Representative Norton provides relative to the documents that an owner sells a vehicle as scrap metal to the purchaser. That's -most of these bills, other than the two that we discussed, are bills that we're already
just kind of watching to see and make sure what's going on with them. And we have them in Lexicon. So we'll be -- if anything pops up other than what we've already seen, we'll mention it.

MR. TAYLOR:
On 522, I was reading through it last night. What's -- that's the Department of Insurance, I believe, or the Insurance Commission wanting to, I guess, send service contracts to the Secretary of State, let them regulate that. Is that -- did you read that?

MR. PARNELL:
I didn't -- I've read that, but -- yes, I did. I don't really know. MR. TAYLOR:

It looked like they were trying to maintain and keep some of the mechanical breakdown in the Louisiana Department of Insurance, but as far as service contracts are related, it goes to the Secretary of State. I didn't understand their intent there.

MR. PARNELL:

Nor do I.
MR. TAYLOR:
Okay. All right. Just so we agree that we don't understand.

MR. PARNELL:
Right.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
It's simple. The service contract is not insurance. A mechanical breakdown contract is different.

MR. TAYLOR:
Okay.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
So you have a division of the two. So the question is: Do you have a service contract or do you have someone, like, LDS --

MR. TAYLOR:
Okay.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
-- who has a mechanical
breakdown. They offer the service contracts, they have the jurisdiction. MR. TAYLOR:

They've been involved with the

LDS and those guys. Do you see any problem with that bill at all? Did you read this? MR. DUPLESSIS:

I did briefly and it's kind of redundant reading. And I think somebody needs to look over the service contracts, because you can have, you know, the -- what we say, the mutuals and put out a service contract. That really doesn't have any backbone to it, kind of like the certification. So, you know, it prevents trying to scam companies. So I would think that if it does have a separation of power, then it would be the way to go.

MR. POTEET:
Any other comments? Did we cover that? I think we did.

MR. DONNELL:
I think we should adjourn. MR. POTEET:

We'll take a 10-minute break and we'll come back for a hearing.

We need a motion to adjourn. MR. OLAVE:

I make a motion.

MR. TAYLOR:
Second.
MR. POTEET:

> All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
All right.
(Meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.)
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