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MR. POTEET:
Kim, roll call, please.
MS. BARON:
John Poteet?
MR. POTEET:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Brewer?
MR. BREWER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Dino Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Tony Cormier?
MR. CORMIER:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Ron Duplessis?
MR. DUPLESSIS:
Here.
MS. BARON:
George Floyd?

MR. FLOYD:
Here.
MS. BARON:
Kirby Roy?
MR. ROY:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Darty Smith?
MR. SMITH:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Steve Olave?
MR. OLAVE:
Here.
MS . BARON:
Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
MR. POTEET:
We have full attendance. All
right. The next thing on the agenda is we have a new Commissioner, Steve Olave, and so we have an oath of office that we have -we'll come back to that, steve. You can't vote until we -- okay.

MR. HALLACK:
Steve, could you raise your right
hand, please? We're about to give you the oath for public office for the state of Louisiana. So, I, Steve Slave -MR. OLAV:

I, Steve Slave --
MR. HALLACK:
-- do solemnly swear or affirm
that I will support the Constitution -MR. OLAVE:
-- do solemnly swear or affirm
that I will support the Constitution -MR. HALLACK:
-- and the laws of the United
States --
MR. OLAV:
-- and the laws of the United
States --
MR. HALLACK:
-- and the Constitution and laws
of this State --
MR. OLAV:
-- and the Constitution and laws of this State -MR. HALLACK:
-- and that I will fully,
faithfully, and impartially discharge -THE WITNESS:
-- I will faithfully, and impartially discharge --

MR. HALLACK:
-- and perform all the duties
incumbent on me.
MR. OLAVE:
-- and perform all the duties
incumbent on me.
MR. HALLACK:
That's it.
MR. POTEET:
Welcome. Okay. We have someone here on public comments, I think. MS. BARON:

Yes, we do. Mr. Eric Stroderd. He has concerns and he wants to speak today on the finance license.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. Eric, do you want to come forward, please?

MR. STRODERD:
My name is Eric Stroderd and I'm speaking on behalf of the Louisiana

Independent Auto Dealers Association. You know, it's been brought to our attention multiple times from our members and/or dealers the concerns with the New Motor Vehicle Commissioners showing up to independent lots, and what they're requesting or asking of some of these independent dealers is to provide or sign off on a finance license that supposedly we're required to sign off on.

After doing further investigation or looking into this finance license, which would be governed by the New Motor Vehicle Commission, it also states that the independent dealer will be governed -- if you would sign this finance license, it would be governed -- you would be governed under the New Motor Vehicle Commission according to the advertising and the marketing laws or rules, which basically states that the New Motor Vehicle Commission will govern the independent dealer according to the advertising laws and the marketing of what the independent dealer does.

You know, my concern for our
dealers is the fact that we're already being governed by the Used Motor Vehicle Commission according to our laws and advertising and marketing. So we don't feel that there's a necessary need to have two governing bodies over the same information and we feel that it would do harm to the dealers long-term and we just don't feel like it's needed.

MR. POTEET:
Any comments on that, especially from any of the used car dealers on the Commission?

MR. BREWER:
The New Car Division, it would seem like they would be almost controlling the used car dealers and it probably would do better if it was governed by the Used Car Commission, in my opinion, as far as a specialty finance license. We never did get that straight, anyway. We have some dealers that are taking credit applications and according to the New Car Department, that's wrong. I mean, we're not supposed to be taking those. It's private information. So
we need to get that straight about the finance license for governing by us or the New Car Department.

MR. TAYLOR:
Well, we've -- Derek, we've had several different stances on this. And, Derek, correct me if I'm wrong, but number one, how long has this been written into the legislation that they're -- or the Motor Vehicle Sales Act?

MR. PARNELL:
Well, it was initially written in the '50s, but since 1999, the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act has been with the New Car Commission.

MR. TAYLOR:
Eric, what's happened is, is that this term, origination of loan -- and origination of loan has made all of us independents that don't actually offer finance. At one time, we felt that that meant that we might -- that we were equivalent to people that were financing cars. Okay. So if you're originating a loan, indirectly, you are still a lender is
how it was classified. And if that was the case, then we were supposed to assume or buy this license.

We went down and talked to the New Car Commission, several of us did. They gave us some time for both of us to try to work some things out. We get back from the meeting -- and, Mr. Hallack, you can correct me if I'm wrong here. We get back and after discussing it with our attorneys, we decide that, you know, well, we might not have to -- was my last conversation we had, we might not fall under this, and then the last one I got was from you now saying that you're being told that we do need it. I don't see this under the Used Car Commission we have a clear stance on this. I haven't heard a clear stance on this, and -- excuse me, I've heard several clear stances on it. MR. POTEET:

No consensus.
MR. TAYLOR:
Correct. So I agree with you wholeheartedly that we don't need to be governed by two bodies. As a matter of
fact, it's not two bodies. We're probably governed by several bodies and we don't need another one. And once again, Eric, $I$ kind of feel like you do. I really don't know the stance that we're taking as the New Car Commission now and I think that we need to address that and have a stance, right, wrong, or ugly. That's my opinion.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I spent considerable time looking at not so much talking go to the New Car Commission. I think that this matter goes straight to the law books and that's what I did, and Derek and I spent some considerable time on it last week. We spent previous time on it as well. It's, in my opinion, quite clear that they do have -- the way that the sales finance act is written, they do have the authority and you are originating loans and they have that right, but what $I$ didn't read in the law was the broad -- the broad authority to govern marketing and advertising. I didn't see that in there and I think that's a point of contention and that's really, I think, where
we're going with this. I think it has some self-interest there and $I$ have a couple questions for you. Are they actually going out and soliciting the licenses and in that solicitation, they actually say that if you sign this that you're capitulating your authority to the New Car Commission in sales and marketing and advertising?

MR. STRODERD:
We had two occurrences and multiple occurrences within those two. So the first occurrence happened over seven or eight months ago. There was a commissioner running around the Baton Rouge market telling dealers -- independent dealers that they needed to sign a license and at that time, they were walking in with the application saying, this thing needs to be signed, because it's according to the law. So we advised at that time to our dealers that they should not sign it until further information was -- came up and we knew for sure where to stand on this. This last occurrence has been threatened at some level to sign the finance license. Nobody has
walked in with the license saying, hey, you must sign this, but they've walked in and made it very clear that it is part of -- as an independent dealer, you must have this signed and it's part of the law and it needs to be signed by the dealer. So that's what the two occurrences have been.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Was this actually a commissioner or was this --

MR. STRODERD:
This was a New Motor Vehicle Commissioner.

MR. PARNELL:
Was it a Commissioner or investigator or -MR. STRODERD:

A field officer, I'm sorry, a field officer.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's an enormous difference.
MR. STRODERD:
It was a field officer that
showed up to the dealership multiple times. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

Okay. You know, I think there is a consensus and I think probably what the Commission is feeling right now is that we need to address it with them, but I think possibly it might be a legislative issue going forward for the session. I think that it would usurp all the authority that we have and it's going to put the used car dealers in peril to comply with all of the issues the new car dealers have. They don't have captive lenders. They don't have buy down rates. They don't have repays. They don't have the manifest list and the conditions, the tentacles that we have to deal with as new car dealers and to try to draw common lines, it might be unusually complicated.

So, you know, I think maybe, Mr. Chairman, I'd probably like to see this on the agenda for the next meeting and move towards -- right now, it's going to be pretty complicated. We would like to have all of our legislation formed and maybe in by December. So I think it's going to be several meetings that have to take place.

MR. POTEET:
Yes. I think that we kind of -you know, I wouldn't say we've skirted the issue, but that there are so many conflicting things that we'd have to look at. You know, I think Ron is right. It's probably a legislative approach is what we're going to have to do, as I understand it. You know, we've got a couple of different things going on here. We've got the finance license, which has certain requirements, but we've ventured off into this marketing and advertising thing and there's sort of like two circles that are just converging just a little bit and that's where we run into the problem. I think before when we just had the finance license, it wasn't such an issue.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
That's what it was and you knew if you were financing people, that was it. And then where we came into the real problems -- when we started seeing real
problems was talking about this marketing and advertising, what are you advertising or what can you actually do and whether or not you need a finance license to do that, and who's going to regulate you when you start doing all of these things. I don't think there's any doubt -- my position has been, and I think all of the Commissioners here would agree with this, is that one of the reasons that we have a Used Motor Vehicle Commission in addition to a New Motor Vehicle Commission is because the issues are different. They're different for used motor vehicle dealers than they are for new motor vehicle dealers. So $I$ think that what we need to do is move forward with something. I don't have anything in my mind. So don't try to read it, but $I$ think we need to move forward with something, you know, that would address this marketing and advertising thing within this Commission, and $I$ think that might -- I don't know if it would alleviate all of the issues, but $I$ think that would be the start.

Does anybody have any comments on
that?
Do the attorneys have any comments on that?

MR. HALLACK:
I could write a book on it.
MR. TAYLOR:
I have two comments. The first comment would be, $I$ think quite a few of us have talked to Eric. Eric, you've talked to about half of the state on this issue last week. And I think when you mention the word finance, the Motor Vehicle Sales Act, and then -- so when they get to regulating used car dealers advertising, that's in direct conflict to anything that they say that has anything to do with financing, but $I$ think that you got reprimanded or one of your friends got reprimanded or threatened or questioned about using a term that had nothing to do with anything to do with financing, none whatsoever, and so there's the bleed over right there. I think once somebody advertises, that is a wholesale dealer.

Okay. Whether that's correct or
incorrect, I don't believe that's the place of the New Car Commission to come in and regulate you. That has nothing to do with financing, nothing to do with the Motor Vehicle Sales Act. So there's number one.

And, number two, I think that we need to land on a platform right now and tell our dealers what to do between now and next year, because -- and, Derek, I believe you have been telling them, you need to do what the law says to do. So I guess we need to tell our dealers or I need to tell our dealers -- maybe I'm talking to myself here, that we need to buy the license.

MR. PARNELL:
Well, from what I understand, the way the statute is written, you know, if you originate a loan or if you're in-house financing, you do need to have a finance license, but as Commissioner Duplessis just said and Chairman Poteet, where that bleed over happens is when we start talking about marketing and advertising. Within that statute -- within the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act, I didn't really see a lot of
language that addressed advertising and marketing. So as far as getting the license, yes, $I$ do agree that the authority -- with the way the language is currently written, it does state that if you're doing those two things that you do need to hold a motor vehicle sales finance license, but I'm not really sure how we can look at the advertising and marketing. I mean, is that something that you would say -- what should I tell dealers in regard to that? I'm not -- that's what I'm not sure about. MR. STRODERD:

I mean, the concern on our part -- whatever the law reads, we want to follow the law. I mean, I think what the association and LIADA represents is making sure that we deliver the correct information to our dealers and we're highly concerned with compliance. We're highly concerned with following the rules and we want it done the correct way. The concern that I have is that the broad spectrum of advertising and marketing is being governed by the New Motor Vehicle -- going back to what Mr. Dino said
is that what ends up happening is, we're not on the same level. The independent dealer is not on the same level as the new car franchise dealer and the rules are applied strictly for the new car franchise dealership. These laws and the way that these guys advertise are directly in competition with each other as new car franchise dealers. So if we as independent dealers enter that area, all of a sudden, things can change, and $I$ just don't feel it is necessary, especially when, again, we have laws and we have statutes for the Used Motor Vehicle Commission of how we do -- or what we're supposed to be doing regarding the advertising and marketing. There's just no need.

So I think on behalf of the state -- the association for LIADA, I think our goal is to be able to find out what we need to do, make a decision on what we need to tell our dealers to do, and obviously follow the rules and doing what is right is number one concern for us. And right now, there is a gray area and, you know, we would like to
address this with making sure that we come up with some sort of decision.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, I think you're in the worst position you can be in. You have conflict of two governing agencies that can't come to an agreement with each other and we even passed legislation to compromise this year about certain aspects of advertising and marketing and that was in our legislation we had in the past. You know, the lawyers -Sheri, any thoughts, Robert? I mean, I think we need to send these guys away with at least something that can help them between now and next meeting.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, we have discussed that at several different meetings. This is not a new issue for us. I mean, we've been dealing with this for well over six months. I think finally at some point, both Sheri and I read the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act and it was really an eye opening deal. One of the things that the act says -- and I'm going to say some things that people
might not like. Okay. I'm going to preface that right now. But one of the first things that the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act states is that if you're licensed by any other government agency, you don't have to be licensed under this act. And now we have the Consumer Protection Agency, and I may not be saying it right exactly what it is, but that federal agency regulates everything that the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act does. So, I mean, it is a federal body of laws that preempt the State body of laws. So if you're regulated by the -- if you have to make truth in lending decisions, if you have to make certain financial disclosures and all of that, you are now being regulated by a federal agency, which really just came to being, what, last year.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, Regulation $M, Z$ and TILA
has been around since --
MR. HALLACK:
Well, they've been around, but
I'm saying there's now a federal body that regulates you now. So I'm thinking the way
the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act was written, it's very old. It's very old. It hasn't been updated. So I believe that under the first part of that act where it says if you're regulated by somebody else, you don't have to apply to this act. So that's a problem.

The other problem is, the loan origination. I mean, I think we've kicked this around a lot, but in the end, it is only the lender who makes the loan origination, and I thought we had agreed on that, that it's not the dealer. It's not the dealer handing somebody a paper and saying, prepare this, sign this. It was always the lender that any time when you go to look at loan origination -- loan origination is an obligation and duty for the lender, for the financial institution, for the bank. It is not an obligation on part of the dealer. The dealer has no obligation when he's passing somebody off to a bank or whatever financial institution to really discuss these things.

Now, I know it may be a little
different for a new car dealer, but it is really the -- a relationship between the lender and the consumer, not really the dealer and the lender or the dealer and the consumer. He's giving them paper. They're signing off on it and he's banking it off a financial institution. So I thought that what we looked at -- when we were trying to find the definition for loan origination, the only thing that made sense under all of the statutes and laws that we looked at was that it was an obligation on the -- on behalf of the lender, the financial institution, not the dealer. I just -- it's hard for me to imagine most used car dealers having somebody that's financially savvy enough to understand truth in lending and Regulation $M$ and Regulation Z. Perhaps, they should, but it's really an obligation on the part of the financial institution to make sure that the customer knows what they're signing, not so much the dealer.

Now, I know that it may be a little different for new car people, that they have people that are trained to do
that, but -- so that's two things. I mean, one is whether or not the act even applies; two, every definition that we looked at for loan origination was an obligation on behalf of the financial institution, not the dealer. So those are two things.

Now where do you go from here? I think you either have to make a decision on whether you're going to want to get along with the New Car Commission and play their game with them or stand up and fight it, because one of the biggest problems that you've got -- I think we ran the numbers a while back and I think there were like 1,800 used motor vehicle dealers that did not have a finance license that were going to need to get finance licenses. I think that's one of the numbers that we looked at several months back.

Now, like I said, we've discussed this several times, but for 1,800 people to have to pay $\$ 400$ additional money, and then -- to an agency that's going to license them and according to that agency, they're going to regulate them particularly with regard to
advertising. And you've got all those people that are going to have to get that license, yet they have no voice, no say in that agency, none whatsoever. So I don't know how you're going to pull that off, but, I mean, it's just going to have to be a decision that we're going to have to work with the people or we're going to have to make a stand, because apparently they're not going to go away.

I think we had tried to meet with them and we had a period where the status quo was going to be maintained, but it wasn't and they're still after the dealers to get this license. So you're going to have to make a decision, either get tough and try to find a way to make this a better place for the dealers or you're just going to have to work with the New Car Commission, one or the other.

MR. TAYLOR:
Do you believe that loan
origination statement you made that if the dealer profits from the interest rate -MR. HALLACK:

Well, now that's a new question. I don't know if I've heard that one or not. So a dealer can profit from -MR. DUPLESSIS:

Certainly.
MR. CORMIER:
They can on the interest rate. MR. DUPLESSIS:

In fact, under the State law, one of the fine points, it's against the law not to offer the customer gap insurance and -you know, which is a profit for a lot of dealers, and I think there's a whole lot of issues there. I think they've asked you to change the name of your car company, is what I've understood, which is going to be a catastrophic material change for you in a short period of time and they are going to cite you again.

MR. STRODERD:
Well, there are multiple dealers in the state of Louisiana that use the name wholesale in their name and -- for example, in the New Motor Vehicle rules of advertising and marketing, one of the rules
states that the word "wholesale" cannot be used in an ad. It's a forbidden word. So for companies that advertise, the company that has been spent a lot of money marketing themselves or advertising themselves over the last however many years, if we can't say the word, which has been in the name of our business for last past -- I mean, some of these companies have spent over millions and millions of dollars advertising their name and all of a sudden, because of signing a finance license, now I'm governed by the New Motor Vehicle agency. They can tell me that I have to change my name or tell all of these independent dealers they must change their name, because it says the word wholesale in their ad, it follows the rule. So I think at some level, we either need to make a decision on what we're going to do or how it should be handled or what information we should be giving to all 1,800 of these independent dealers. And to go back to -- one of the things that we continue to hear is the origination of the loan is not necessarily from a relationship
between the -- I don't know what -- exactly what the law reads, but what they're telling us is that based on the fact that we take -we have a credit application and this goes for any independent dealer, and I'll tell you guys, of the successful independent dealers, in my opinion, all of them do this, 100 percent of them, when they take a credit application, they fill out the customer's information on a credit application, and then from there, will send it off to the banks and/or by digital or by paper. So what we understood according to these guys, the fact that we do that requires us to have a finance license.

MR. HALLACK:
And like I said, that's something that we researched at length. There's nothing in the law that explains what loan origination is. So we have to go and look at other sources and all of the other sources that I've looked at trying to find an explanation for what loan origination -I think Ms. Morris even called the Office of Financial Institutions, that's an obligation
on the part of the lender, on the part of the financial institution, and not on the part of the dealer. I mean, that was my research. That's what I found. Ms. Morris may have found out something different. I know that she called some people in the Office of Financial Institutions and talked to them about where does the loan origination begin, but, I mean, this is an issue.

Just because I say it's an obligation on the part of the financial institution, they're saying it's an obligation on the part of the used motor dealer. So you've got a legal dispute that can only be resolved either in court or in the legislation.

MR. OLAVE:
Robert, if I could add something.
I believe if you're an independent dealer, if you have a dealer agreement or an agreement with a lender for indirect purposes, whether you make profit off the interest rate or not, you're still required, if you're going to sign a contract, to go
over to the Regulation $Z$ box. So you're acting as a limited agent of the lender. So I think that may convolute the origination term, if you will, because you're acting as an agent of the bank that you're sending that contract to and they require you to sign -- you know, if you're signing the contract at the dealership, independent or otherwise, you're required to go over the finance terms, the Regulation $Z$ box, everything.

MR. HALLACK:
But $I$ don't know if all used car dealers do that.

MR. OLAVE:
No. I agree with you, but I'm just stating, if you have a dealer agreement with a bank, you're acting as an agent of that bank.

MS. MORRIS:
That bank is regulated by OFI. So why do you need another regulating agency? Because --

MR. OLAVE:
But it doesn't convolute the
origination term, though. Does the loan originate when you sign the document on behalf of a bank or if you're an agent of that -- you know, a limited agent of the lender?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
It starts under the definition -you can read the annotated notes. And Derek and $I$ read the annotated notes of the New Car Commission. They have definitions by rule, which is somewhere between a statute and a policy. So they address origination and under that rule, y'all would qualify. When you take a credit app, you're a third-party lender. So you're on the hook for that one. The question is, do they govern everything else and in the meantime, what do we tell this young man about his problem and having to change the name of his company? I think -- if you ask me to change the name of my company, my God, do you know how much work that is? And, I mean, that's a lot of work and it's a big commitment. It's a lot of time and hours and we don't even know if that statute applies.

MR. TAYLOR:
I don't know the correlation between the Motor Vehicle Sales Act and if he wants to call his company wholesale.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's correct.
MR. TAYLOR:
It might aggravate them, but there's no direct correlation with those two -- with those two subjects there. I mean, they have nothing to do with each other. It's fire and ice.

MR. BREWER:
Well, my company has wholesale in it and we've advised our people do not take a credit app since we do not own a finance license. If you take a credit app without that finance license, in my opinion, you could get yourself in trouble, because private information from those people -let's say the worst thing could happen is they didn't get their loan, and then come back and say, well, you know too much about my personal life. It could get you in trouble, I believe. So it really is a mess.

Some are doing it and some are not.
MR. POTEET:
Well, that's where, you know, the federal -- the new federal agency CFPB, because at the auctions, we're under the same thing. You know, we're -- you have a repossession. You have information about a customer. You know, how do you safeguard that information? So once you start taking private information, now you're going to be -- you've got a lot of other things that can come up, a lot of different agencies that can come in and say, well, you didn't do this right or you didn't handle this right or -- you know, what do you do with the applications that don't ever go anywhere? Do you shred them? Do you file them away? Do you -- what do you do?

MR. STRODERD:
Multiple dealers now have gone digital, they take application and you shred the application and go digital to where it's in the Cloud or it's somewhere in a protected service where it can't be pulled back up to be able to maintain the level of
compliance. This isn't something -- I mean, the reality is that every association, every convention, everything that these guys are standing on is about compliance and about making sure that the dealer is doing what he's supposed to be doing and from -- again, from the Louisiana Independent Auto Dealers Association, we believe in compliance. We believe in following the rules. We believe in getting rid of what we need to and it needs to be done and, you know --

MR. POTEET:
Well, I think that we definitely have some issues. They're just hanging over us. They've been hanging over us for a while. I don't think it's -- I don't think it's in the best interest of -- to your point, Robert, $I$ don't think it's in the best interest of this Commission or used car dealers to get into a fight with the New Motor Vehicle Commission. It doesn't mean we can't disagree, and then come up with a solution, but $I$ think that what we've got to do is -- you know, back to Ron's point, I think we've got to come up with some kind of
a legislative package that can address this, because right now all we can do is issue our opinion and opinions can end up in a court battle and that doesn't help anybody. So, you know, I think at this point -- Derek, what we have told the used motor vehicle dealers, what is our official stance?

MR. PARNELL:
What we've been telling them, the investigators and myself, when I speak with them, telling them if they're originating loans, they need to hold a motor vehicle sales finance license. That's what we've been saying. That's what I gathered from everything that we've discussed as a whole, is that you have to hold that license.

Now, when it gets into the marketing standpoint, that's kind of something more recent that we really haven't given a point or stance on with the dealers. As far as $I$ understood, that if it falls under the Motor Vehicle Finance Act, you do fall up under the advertising. That's what has been said, but going back -MR. TAYLOR:

That's what has been said or is that --

MR. PARNELL:
-- going back through it,
Commissioners, I haven't -- I didn't see the language in the statute about advertising. MR. POTEET:

So your opinion is, the New Motor Vehicle Commission is interpreting it? MR. PARNELL:

That's my thought process. Again, that's my opinion, but $I$ think -because there's some language in other statutes that state that if you hold a license with them, you hold a license -you're regulated by them on the other terms. So that was just my opinion on it. It could be --

MR. POTEET:
That seems vague to me if you hold a license with them. I mean, the finance license is a different license. You're not licensed as a new motor dealer. MR. PARNELL:

From what I understand, new motor
vehicle dealers themselves don't have to carry a finance license.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's correct.
MR. PARNELL:
If you hold a new motor dealer license, we don't have to --

MR. TAYLOR:
And I asked them about that in that meeting and they said the only reason -- the reason why they wanted us to do that versus the new car dealer is the only way they could regulate us. That's a fact.

MR. HALLACK:
Okay. Your option for a quick remedy right now is one of two things Sheri just mentioned, is that you either request an opinion from the Attorney General's Office or somebody -- an aggrieved dealer or something like that files a request for declaratory judgment and have a court decide the issue. So you're either going to have the Attorney General's Office decide the issue if you want a quicker fix or you're going to have a judge decide the issue.

MS. MORRIS:
You have to file it with the New Vehicle Commission first, and then appeal it to the judge.

MR. HALLACK:
Really.
MR. POTEET:
What --
MS . MORRIS:
To get an interpretation of the rule. It's the Motor Vehicle Commission that has interpreted the statute as requiring the license and the applicability of the advertising rules. So you would have to get them to put in writing their formal opinion, because these are just conversations that we have. We don't -- we do have some paperwork from them from 2007, and then they have to define what origination is, but that's not really defined -- origination has not been defined by any rule of the Commission of Financial Institutions or by the state law. And so I think you would have to put it before that Commission, let them issue a written
decision, and then if you're dissatisfied with that decision, appeal it to the court.

MR. HALLACK:
Once we started the process the other way and we wrote a memorandum telling our dealers that we didn't think that we needed to get it --

MS. MORRIS:
I think the position that Derek has been in is that they -- it is clear that the Motor Vehicle Commission interprets the finance license as applicable if do you anything toward originating the loan, filling out the paperwork. And so if you don't obtain that license, you run the risk of getting a citation and having to go a hearing before the New Motor Vehicle Commission. We can't -- we are not enforcing the dealers to have their license. It's the New Commission. So we can't really say, you don't have to get it. We know that the agency believes that you do and they have the power to fine you and sanction you if you don't.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

Let me add one thing real quick. Under the annotated notes, under the rules, you do have the right to appeal a ruling under their rules themselves. So before you get into a real argument and pissing match with them, you can write an application to the Board to review -- and review their rules, especially on this issue of clarification. Then, that would probably give you enough to go to the AG's Office or to get to a declaratory judgment without being fined or getting in trouble.

MS. MORRIS:
One of the issues that we face in being able to address the question is that there are different types of arrangements. You know, if you're just taking the information on the credit application and forwarding it and you don't have any authority to make any judgment calls and you're not receiving any compensation, there are different factors, which might affect the interpretation, and then some dealers might be dealing with the local credit union or local bank that is regulated by OFI.

Some dealers may be sending that paperwork to other financiers that are not regulated by OFI.

So there's a lot of different
scenarios and until somebody presents them with a concrete scenario, if I'm doing this, am I required to have a license, we don't have a real clear ruling, but there are some factors that could influence what the rule is and it could be different for some types of arrangements versus other types of arrangements.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, I don't think they're getting into that much detail.

MS. MORRIS:
No. They're saying everybody needs to have it.

MR. HALLACK:
Well --

MS. MORRIS:
If somebody is going to file a request or if the Attorney General is going to have to -- all of that kind of needs to be delineated. Otherwise, we won't have something that's --

MR. POTEET:
Well, there's something that we need to look at, too. Really, all of this -- you know, for Eric to come here and make his statement, obviously things have started happening. So at this stage of the game, I would say that from where we were six, eight months, or maybe even a year or two ago, things have changed. So now what I think we need to do is challenge their interpretation only to the point to say, look, you've interpreted it this way, but we don't understand it that way. So we need -- we need more detail before we start subjecting our dealers to a certain type of guideline or a certain type of law that we feel comfortable as a Commission with. I don't think anybody in this room -- I'm going to speak to all of that. I don't think anybody feels comfortable with where we are. So I think we've come far enough along and their attempt to enforce their laws to say, wait a minute, this is really not the way we understood this enforcement. I don't think
that's an outlandish opinion, that we didn't understand that you were going to enforce it and interpret this way. So now we feel like we need -- we need more discussion of the interpretation of definitely the origination, the marketing and the advertising, and how that's done.

I don't -- you know,
philosophically, I don't have a problem with the New Car Commission enforcing this law, but I do have a problem with us having so many vague ideas that build the foundation for interpreting or for enforcing the law. I think that's my problem. If they want -if they can and want to do financing licenses, I'm okay with that, but you can't do and say, you know, we're going to interpret all of these different things the way we want to without your input or without anyone's input.

MR. HALLACK:
Well, Mr. Poteet, the bigger
problem really is not just advertising. You can't go and cherry pick portions out of your laws that you want to make people abide
by.
MR. POTEET:
I agree.
MR. HALLACK:
So in the end, they can make finance license holders abide by every provision in their law, really. I mean, if you're going -- you've got to pick one.

MR. POTEET:
That's why I'm saying,
philosophically, I have no problem with their law -- or them enforcing their law, but how far do you carry that down to other enforcement capabilities is an issue for us and should be an issue for everyone. I think what we should do is we should ask them -- or we should send them something -maybe the attorneys need to do this, along with Derek, and we can pitch in where we need to and say, look, this is where we stand and this is what has happened over the past few months. Now, you're enforcing it and now there's -- what we thought was going to create less confusion has created more confusion. And I think that's a difficult
position for used car dealers who are the people that we're regulating. We've kind of put them in a tough position.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I agree.
MR. HALLACK:
So one of -- the two issues that we need to have them address is loan origination, and then why is it you believe advertising -- your advertising rules and regs should apply to our -- to people that hold --

MR. POTEET:
Well, I think that's the beginning.

MR. TAYLOR:
What did you say about if another governing body is already governing us, if that could be a problem to everything?

MR. HALLACK:
Sure.
MR. TAYLOR:
Well --

MR. POTEET:
Maybe, but we don't have any --
we don't really regulate financing.
MR. TAYLOR:
But we are regulated by the CFPB
$\qquad$
MR. POTEET:
Well --

MR. TAYLOR:
-- and much more than they will ever regulate.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, that's a federal agency and we're talking about a state scheme of law. The reason that the new car dealers got the finance license provision put into law, because $I$ remember $I$ was there watching it, was the fact that it got out of the hands of the OFI, and that manufacturers were changing the incentives on a daily basis, and they still are, and then you have captive lenders and write downs. Only the industry could keep up with the rapid changing pace of what would be proper and how it would be represented for the new car dealer. So that's the reason why it was presented that way. It really should have
nothing to do with the used car dealers, because we have none of those conditions.

MR. POTEET:
That is exactly right. The essence of this thing is that has nothing to with the used motor vehicle dealer.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
No. I think they just kind of threw this in as a bargaining chip to get the legislation passed, and I think that's where we are now, but it was to get away from the OFI, this original TILA law.

MR. TAYLOR:
If it matters to you, I will buy a finance license for my lot. I can't answer to you what I will do about the other regulations, I can't answer that, you being and LIADA right now, but $I$ can tell you that I will buy that license. Thank you. MR. POTEET:

I think the situation here is that we can't give you a hard answer right at this point in time and, you know, that's -- that's -- I'm sure that's what you want, but $I$ think what we can say is that we're
going to have to pursue this further and we're going to do it quickly, as quickly as we possibly can and, you know, I think that the AG opinion would be the best way to go. But then again, any time you ask for a judicial opinion and once it's handed to you, well, that's it. So you're kind of throwing it out there to someone else to interpret. Now, we're going to have somebody to interpret what's been interpreted by all the people that are interpreting. So I think that's the best way to go eventually, but $I$ think before we get to that point, we've got to at least express our position and our concerns, and I think that -- I think that's the way we need to go.

And I think, Sheri, you need to -- you and Robert need to come up with something.

MS . MORRIS:
And one thing I had discussed with Derek this week and it might take us a little while to get it, is maybe get the tapes of the Legislature of the discussions
when the bill was put forward as to what the reasons for the regulations were and that might help us to show why it was enacted and who it was meant to apply to.

MR. POTEET:
Right. I think that once you get -- when we can frame this and say this is what you're trying to do, but this is what you're doing, then we can start squeezing that in a little bit. I also think that Ron might be right in the fact that we may have to do some legislation to address this, so we can -- I don't want to use the word override, but I'll use that anyway right now. We can override what we have right now. So we can look at what makes sense for these guys. We're not trying to make it easier for the used motor vehicle dealer. We're just trying to make it fair and easy to understand and easy to follow the law. I don't think they're trying to skirt anything. They just want to say, well, we're not sure about this, we're not sure about this. You know, you could now -- you know, you've got one investigator on one
part that's telling them one thing, and the one in another part of the state telling you something else. That's not good for anyone either.

MR. TAYLOR:
It also might be a good idea to have the New Car Commission and the LIADA work hand in hand together. It might be a good idea for the LIADA and the new car representing body to get together and talk, too, about this. I think that would be a very good idea.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
LADA?
MR. TAYLOR:
LADA, right.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
That's a possibility.
MR. TAYLOR:
Versus the Commission itself, which you'll be talking to the Commission when you're talking to them.

MR. STRODERD:
Right.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
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Does this requires an action of the Commission or is it even actionable not being an agenda item?

MR. HALLACK:
No. I think you have given him some good information.

MR. POTEET:
We've given them enough leeway to work with the attorneys to come up with something and take the first step. I don't think that alleviates your issue, but it does put you moving forward trying to address it.

MR. STRODERD:
Moving forward.
MR. POTEET:
It's not going to get addressed by -- I mean, we could sit here all day and say what we think, but that's not really what we're looking for. We're looking for making some progress towards getting it resolved.

MR. STRODERD:
All right. Thank you.
MR. POTEET:

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

Thank you. Eric.
All right. Before we move into items for discussion, we've got a guest here today, Major Paul Edmonson and I think -Derek, would you like to introduce, Mr. Edmonson, please?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. One thing that we've been trying to do with this agency is continue to change the professional and public perception of this agency and it's my hope in the future that we're able to do more partnerships with various agencies and law enforcement agencies. We have an investigator who is out speaking with State Police and Major Edmonson mentioned that he would like to come by and meet with us just to meet me and meet the governing body for this agency, so we can work together in the future.

So, Major Paul Edmonson, if you will.

MAJOR EDMONSON:
Well, thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Parnell, thank you
very much for the opportunity to sit here and just to meet you guys. At first, I had wanted to meet with Director Parnell, but the timing was such that it was a pretty cool opportunity for me to come and introduce myself and say, hello and good morning to all of you as well, so names and faces and things like that. As he said, I'm Paul Edmonson. I'm with the State Police. I've been there for 20 years. I'm a Major over our Special Investigations Division. One of the sections underneath that is the insurance fraud/auto theft section. So what I wanted to do is just to come say, good morning, in the hopes that we can begin to build a relationship -- a better relationship and get names and faces between the staff that work on the issues throughout our state as well as you guys and to answer any questions that $I$ could possibly answer. So, over here, we have Captain Kelly Dupuy, who is the captain over that particular section. We have an analyst who works on the analytics of insurance fraud and auto theft and puts together a report
and crime trends and does some of the case specifics and knowledge of what is occurring, and that is Michelle Aucoin. And we have also our lieutenant, who is the officer in charge of the various field offices we have around the state, Lieutenant Jeff White. So I don't want to take a whole lot of you guys' time. Y'all have a lengthy agenda and a lot to get to, but thank you for the opportunity to say, good morning, and I guess I need to give out my e-mail address. That's probably the best way. MR. POTEET:

Why don't we give Major Edmonson our list of the Commissioners and all of our data, and then if you could provide us with the same list maybe for your people, and then everybody has a --

MS. BARON:
I have your e-mail, also.
MR. POTEET:
If you have all of ours and we have all of yours, I think that would be -MS. BARON:

I'll send you that list.

MAJOR EDMONSON:
And I will e-mail Mr. Parnell our list, contact information. And if there's anything we can do, anything we can work together on and help you out in any way, please get in touch with us.

MR. POTEET:
Thank you.
MAJOR EDMONSON:
Thank you for your time. MR. POTEET:

I think that it's no secret or surprise that for several years, this Commission has had some issues with some other agencies and yours was one of them. We spent a considerable amount of time over the last, I would say, five, six years trying to repair our reputation and $I$ feel confident saying that we're now a respected Commission, that we've done a lot of good things. We're trying to help our constituents as much as possible, but I think that for us to work together with a group like yours is very important and I'm very glad you came today and we got to meet
all of your people. I'm sure we'll be talking in the future.

MAJOR EDMONSON:
Mr. Chairman, thank you very
much. I completely agree and if there's anything we can do or help with, do not hesitate to let us know. Thank you for your time and y'all have a great day. MR. POTEET:

All right. Moving along. All right. Items for discussion. We need an approval of minutes from the previous meeting. The previous meeting was in July. We didn't have an August meeting. MR. SMITH:

I make a motion.
MR. ROY:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Motion. Second.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)

MR. POTEET:
The motion passes. Okay.
Financial matters, we've got a lot of things here. Mona, do you want to get us rolling on that?

MS . ANDERSON:
Okay. We have our auditor, John McKowen is here to present our annual audit. He would like for us to do the resolution, to adopt the compliance questionnaire. Generally, that's done -- that would have been done at the last meeting, but we didn't have a meeting. So if we'll proceed with that, I think you have the resolution, and once that resolution is signed, then you can sign the compliance questionnaire.

MR. POTEET:
Okay. So we have this
resolution. On the 15th day of September 2014, the meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission, with a quorum of Commissioners present, the following business was conducted: It was duly moved and seconded that the following resolution
be adopted. So here is the resolution. Do you want to read that and make that the resolution?

MR. McKOWEN:
All the questionnaire says is that $y^{\prime} a l l$ discussed it and everybody is aware that they have responsibilities and nothing has gone on behind the scenes.

MR. POTEET:
Dino, you make that motion?
MR. TAYLOR:
Yes. I'll make that motion.
MR. POTEET:
All right. We need a second.
MR. CORMIER:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
So this resolution is accepted and $I$ will sign it in ink.

MR. McKOWEN:
I think everybody has my audit report. If you flip to Page 1, that's the
page on the letterhead. And I will be brief. I know you guys have a long day today. So I'll just take a couple of minutes, because there absolutely no surprises again this year.

But I do audit your financial statements as of June 30 th every year. Paragraph 2 points out the statements are the responsibility of management. My responsibility is to offer an opinion on whether those statements are presented fairly.

On the top of Page 2, I say, yes, in my opinion, they are stated fairly according to generally accepted accounting principles.

The next section beginning on Page 4 -- or Page 5 is Derek's management, discussion and analysis. That basically just gives an overview of the Commission and the operation of the Commission. So I will not go through all of that.

On Page 10 is the statement of net position. That's nothing more than a balance sheet. Cash and equivalent, you
have a million four. That's just your checking account and your savings account. Investments of $\$ 500,000$, that's nothing more than CDs.

Accounts receivable, that's the fines and the hearing costs that you guys have assessed. Mona also has set up an allowance for uncollectible accounts. That doesn't mean that you're not going to pursue the collection of the fines that you have issued. It's just the idea that you don't want your receivable to build up to an unreasonable amount over a period of time when you know you're not going to collect everything. So you don't want to end up five years from now with half a million dollars in receivables, and then say, oh, wait a minute, sorry, everybody, we are only going to collect $\$ 100,000$ of that $\$ 500,000$, and it's just an estimate. And as I said, you continue to try to collect what you have written off. So you had two million one in current assets.

Non-current assets, that's just your building, the vehicles that you own.

So you had total assets of two million three. Current liabilities, the biggest one is unearned revenue and that's the second year of your two-year license cycle.

Long-term liability is $\$ 706,000$. Most of that is over post-employment benefits, which is inherently the amount of insurance, health insurance you're going to have to pay for your retirees somewhere down the road. So your total net position, which is assets minus liabilities, is a million two.

The next page, Page 12, you had total revenue for the year of a million three, and, of course, the largest item there was licenses and fees of $\$ 800,000$. You had operating expenses of a little over a million. $\$ 800,000$ of that was for salaries and benefits. Operating income is a little over $\$ 220,000$. You had some interest income. The total change in net position was almost $\$ 230,000$.

Pages 13 and 14 are the statement of cash flows. That's just a reconciliation between net income and the change in the amount of money that you had in the bank.

So I will skip over that. I will skip over the notes. I looked at them again this morning and there's really nothing of much -- I mean, no surprises to any of you. Required supplemental information on Page 26, that's your budget versus actual. You had a positive variance of $\$ 137,000$ in revenues, another favorable variance in expenses of $\$ 67,000$. Everything looked fine.

On Page 29, I'm also required by the Legislative Auditor to disclose your per diem, per diems for the year, and that's, as I said, on Page 29. And in the very last section is my report on internal controls and compliance of the Commission with the laws and regulations that apply to you. I had absolutely no findings. And then that, Mr. Chairman, is my report.

MR. POTEET:
Thank you very much. I would say that indicates a good job by our staff here, particularly Mona Anderson.

MR. McKOWEN:
Absolutely. I have to tell you,

Mona is on top of the issues that concern the audit, not only the accounting -keeping up with the accounting, but she knows what she's talking about when it comes to the report, too. So that's very unusual and I'm impressed.

MR. POTEET:
Well, I sit on several boards and
I can tell you, this is the best kind of audit report to get, because the other kinds are not fun.

MR. McKOWEN:
I keep trying to find something.
MR. POTEET:
That's your job.
MR. McKOWEN:
So this is the third year of our three year contract. I understand from Mona that y'all are going to go back up for bids next year. I would love to be included in your request for proposal.

MR. POTEET:
All right.
MS . ANDERSON:
I would like to thank Mr. McKowen
for his work, because he has just been very understanding and thorough in going through our books and is very helpful and his knowledge of all the changes that have gone through accounting this year.

MR. McKOWEN:
Thank you.
MR. POTEET:
Thank you.
Do we need -- no, we don't. It's not an action item here, is it?

MR. HALLACK:
No.
MR. POTEET:
Thank you.
MR. MCKOWEN:
Thank you.
MR. POTEET:
All right. Mona, after all of that good news, you should be in a great mood to present the financial statement.

MS . ANDERSON:
Okay. If you'll turn in your packets, we have -- actually have two financial statements to go over today. So
we're going to go through the first one quickly. The financial statement for the month ending July 31st, on Page 1, our cash balance was $\$ 1,387,358$ at the end of July. Accounts receivable hearings and fines was $\$ 201,650$. At the bottom of the page, your current liabilities, which were mostly benefits, was $\$ 42,335$.

On Page 2, our deferred in-flows were $\$ 271,650$. And turning on to the revenue and expenses, on Page 3, the first month of our fiscal year, both the month-to-date and year-to-date revenues were $\$ 36,409$.

Under expenses, our salaries and related benefits were $\$ 48,581$ compared to $\$ 46,582$ last year. The remainder of the expenses for the month increased by about \$5,000. So you'll see on page -- I'm sorry, on Page 5 the total expenses were $\$ 61,458$. The increase in expenses included -- we had several expenditures that went through this month. We purchased a new server and software, which we discussed with you last month, and we renewed our CAVU maintenance
agreement. And we also did some work on one of our air-conditioning units, replacing motor and control board. So that would be the difference in the expenditures from last year. The negative change in net position was a negative $\$ 25,000$ for the month and year to date, of course.

On the following page, you see our revenues and expenses on a monthly basis compared to last year. On Page 7, is a graph of those figures. And on Page 8 are our fee revenues, which are mostly auction -- auction transaction fees at this time of year. On Page 9, is our certificate of deposit report and there's no changes for July.

In the -- on Page 10, the accounts receivable, we added fines for -that were assessed for Brown's Auction and for Dixieland Auto Sales and we also collected those amounts showing our balance of $\$ 201,650$. And that ends the July report. MR. CORMIER:

I don't guess we collected anything from Shawn Calvit?

MS . ANDERSON:
We have not, yet. This month we did -- it appears that we -- if you -- when we get to August, we referred those two accounts, Shawn Calvit and Larry Brown, to the Attorney General's Office and the Attorney General's Office has collected some money from Larry Brown. So, you know, if they have assets, we're -- they're going after them.

MR. POTEET:
I need a motion to approve the financial statements.

MR. CORMIER:
(Makes motion.)
MR. TAYLOR:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
We'll go on to August.
MS . ANDERSON:
Okay. So if you'll turn in your packets to the August statements, the
balance in the operating account was $\$ 1,318,963$, and our fines were $\$ 203,900$. We increased our prepaid expenses by paying for our annual premium on our insurance -- what I termed to be business insurance, our general liability, workers' compensation, and automobile insurance to the Office of Risk Management. We actually had an $\$ 1,800$ decrease in premium this year. So that was a good thing for us. Current liabilities were $\$ 40,948$.

And on Page 2, the deferred in-flows was $\$ 274,050$. On Page 3, the revenue and expenses statement, our revenues year to date were $\$ 63,751$, which was a $\$ 20,000$ decrease, but this is only our second month of the fiscal year. The majority of the decrease was in the fees. Like I said, it's early in the year for that.

Under expenses, the salaries and benefits were up $\$ 3,400$, which is about a three percent increase from last year. The remainder of the expenses were approximately $\$ 12,000$ more than last year under the
professional, in addition to the expenses that $I$ just explained under the professional services, we paid for the installation of the server and the migration of our data to the new server. So we ended that month with net -- a negative net position of $\$ 86,345$.

Again, the following page, Page
6, shows our month -- month-to-month comparison. And Page 7 shows our graph, which again our revenues are down, because we have not started our renewal season. Page 8 is our fee revenues. It pretty much looks like the month before. On Page 9, our certificate of deposit summary shows we changed banks. We had a $\$ 100,000$ certificate of deposit that came up for maturity on August 22 nd at Community Trust, and thanks to Ms. Morris' research on CDs, we found Business First Bank was offering a point 99 percent, which was significantly better. They did require that we have two CDs. The maximum -- they couldn't do a $\$ 100,000 \mathrm{CD} . \quad$ So they did two $\$ 50,000$ and Community Trust inadvertently sent our interest to Business First in with that
transfer. So that's why you see the excess $\$ 19$ or whatever on there. But that was a little better interest rate than what we were receiving. We're happy to see that. Less than one percent, I never thought I would see that.

On the following page, the
accounts receivable hearing and fines, we assessed $\$ 3,500$ more in fines. You can see those in the far left-hand column. It shows the August addition and we collected $\$ 1,250$ of that. And as I said, we transferred the accounts for Larry Brown and Shawn Calvit to the AG's Office and I did get an e-mail from them Friday saying that they had collected a little bit from Larry Brown. So I'm hoping that' a payment plan that they've worked out.

MS. BARON:
Is that going to be monthly?
MS . ANDERSON:
They only collected $\$ 250$, but I'm hoping that they will have their eye on him. So maybe we'll start seeing some transfer of funds there.

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

MR. POTEET:
All right. Do $I$ have a motion to approve the August?

MR. SMITH:
Motion.
MR. OLAVE:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
All those in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Thank you, Mona.
Mona, that audit report is excellent. I just want to congratulate you again on good work.

> All right. Next thing is -- I
think we've got an approval for an invoice.
MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
Mr. Hallack's invoice.
MR. PARNELL:
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Commissioners, please find in your packet Attorney Robert Hallack's bill for July of 2014. I have reviewed the -well, I have reviewed the services performed and accounting reviewed the calculations. His bill for services for July 2014 is $\$ 3,456.25$. Commissioners, I ask that you approve payment for July 2014 for Commissioner -- I'm sorry, Counsel Hallack's bill for services. Excuse me.

MR. CORMIER:
I make a motion.
MR. TAYLOR:
I second.
MR. POTEET:
Motion and a second.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. That passes.
All right. The next thing on our agenda is the -- we've got a policy and
procedure -- revenue policy imposed non-exchange revenue. And when you read that, if you thought, what the heck is that, Derek is going to explain it to us. MR. PARNELL:

Commissioners, you will find in your packet terms for the proposed revenue policy for imposed non-exchange revenue. This proposed policy is in accordance with GASB, General Accounting and Standards Board, Summary Statement \#33, Accounting and Financial Reporting For Non-Exchange Transactions. Imposed non-exchange revenues include civil penalties pursuant to LA Revised Statute 32.7:88 and cost pursuant to Revised Statute 32:785.

Specifically, questions and concerns came up with regard to when to record and impose non-exchange revenue on our books. And I will ask Accountant Supervisor Mona Anderson to explain why the discussions took place regarding the non-exchange revenue and Commission Counsel Morris to talk about the draft that was presented before you in your packet. Also,
counsel Hallack was in these discussions, So.

MR. POTEET:
So this is essentially how we recognize revenue for fines?

MR. PARNELL:
Yes.
MR. POTEET:
A little more than that?
MS . ANDERSON:
So, basically, what we're looking at -- after discussing with Sheri and Robert at length, we were advised that, you know, we were not giving enough due process to the individuals that were responsible for these fines. From the viewpoint of accounting, whenever $I$ was looking at the letters that were being sent to dealers and it said, you owe this and if you -- if you agree, pay this and send this in. To me, that's a receivable. I recorded that in the month in which they were advised that happened.

But Ms. Morris and Mr. Hallack advised us that, you know, there is more to the story and that we have to go through a
due process with that in allowing them time to come before the Commission if they want to and various other steps. So we came up with this policy, mostly Ms. Morris helped us with writing the legal parts of this, and tried to get into how do we -- how do we do this, how do we physically do this process when we put it on our books, so that -because it's getting more and more complex. You know that we've sent some accounts to the Attorney General's Office. So we have to give them notice that we're going to do that. We have to give them days to respond to that, so on and so forth. So I'm going to turn this over to Sheri and let her tell you a little bit more about the legal part of this.

MS. MORRIS:
Basically, I think when you have a violation, there's some opportunity to settle the violation before Mr. Hallack really files the charges, but sometimes those were showing up on our accounts receivable. Somebody owed $\$ 500$. Well, they maybe were sent a proposed consent to settle
the case, but maybe they decided not to and at that point, it's got to go back to Mr. Hallack, so he can prepare the charges and set the hearing date and still you might have some people that settle then.

The State does not want anyone to hold money undeposited. So in order to settle something, it really has to be approved by the Commission. The Commission has to accept the amount of the fine, but you don't want the person -- I think the problem is that even though there was some agreement in the office on the amount of it, the person just never paid it. So I think the procedure now is going to be that you'll have an opportunity to settle and if you sign the settlement agreement and tender the funds, then it can be approved, but we won't be accepting a signed agreement without the funds. But until that agreement is finally approved, it -- really, the funds don't belong to the Commission technically. So Mona is going to have a special account to recognize these non-exchange revenues, is what they're called in the accounting world,
because they're not really revenues yet, and then once they get final approval, they can just be moved to the operating account. If for some reason the consent is rejected, it will have to be returned to the licensee, and then the proceeding goes forward.

That also can happen if somebody pays the fine when an order -- before the appeal delay runs. I don't know that that happens very often, but if there's a Board hearing and there is an assessment of cost and fines and someone pays before the appeal delay runs, we technically don't know that that is our money, because if they do appeal it, we may have to refund it. So you really don't want it in your operating account, because you don't want to think you have that money to spend. So this is just going to segregate any funds that we may have to return to somebody basically and keep them out of the operating account temporarily, but once everything is approved, Mona can just move them, because they'll already be accounted for.

Some agencies that I've worked
with, they just request certified funds, that they were holding the certified funds check, but the board was not comfortable with that. They want it deposited, so that there can't be any misappropriation of funds. So this provides how they will be deposited and how they will be transferred within the agency. But it will also avoid these people that maybe signed a consent and didn't pay. It's not going to be an option not to pay. You're going -- if you're going to sign the consent, you're going to tender with the funds. It's not going to be accepted and we can move forward with the hearing. So it should help our collections as well.

MR. POTEET:
Does anybody have any questions about that policy?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
So, really, the policy is
formalizing what we should be doing anyway. MS. MORRIS:

Yes. We should have never had
those consent people on the receivables. My concern was that you saw a dealer's name on the receivable and you didn't even know that there was a case, yet. So -- and then once I think it got on the receivable list, it maybe wasn't moved through the hearing process as fast. So this way, it won't get to that point. You won't have a receivable for a consent. You'll only have receivables for orders that you issue.

MR. POTEET:
Does anyone have any questions?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Do we need to approve this policy?

MR. HALLACK:
You need an action on it, yes.
MR. POTEET:
Do I have a motion?
MR. SMITH:
(Makes motion.)
MR. POTEET:
I have motion from Darty.
MR. ROY:

Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Kirby.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
Okay. The motion passes. Thanks for that work.

MR. PARNELL:
Chairman Poteet, there is one other item I kind of wanted to let Mona address about collection of fines. If you can add that to the agenda.

MR. POTEET:
Yes. Is that okay with everybody -- I think we need a motion for that. MR. HALLACK:

Yes.
MR. TAYLOR:
I make a motion to add it to the agenda.

MR. CORMIER:

Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Tony.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
All right. Okay. Mona.
MS . ANDERSON:
Okay. Commissioner Taylor had asked me to discuss a little bit about the collectability of fines and the impact that it has on the financial statements.

Particularly when, you know, we're doing this due process, giving them -- fines are assessed and parties are given their due process, we record the fines as an accounts receivable and as revenue. Okay. So the fines -- and I understand that the fines represent something different to everyone. To the Commissioners, it represents violation of the Commission's laws and regulations and, you know -- but to accounting, they also impact the budgeting, the planning, that type thing, in particular, fees that -- fines that are set
at the end of the fiscal year.
You know, we've had fines and I think we had some a couple of years ago and we did this year in May and June that were in the neighborhood of $\$ 200,000$. And so in the planning stages, that affects how you see our net position. I don't know if you noticed on the audit that, you know, if you just looked at our fees, our net position would not nearly have been as high as what it was, but there was $\$ 153,000$ of fines that were levied at that last -- I think it was the May or June meeting. And so, you know, we're trying to say that that needs to be kept in mind whenever fees are set for those -- whenever those fines are set that it's a possibly that it can be uncollectible, that we could only collect on the bond, and that the remainder would have to be offset.

The new accounting regulations require us to offset that in the income as well as -- we're not just able to make it a bad debt anymore. And so $I$ don't know if -Commissioner Taylor, if you'd like to speak a little bit about this issue that we have,
it looks on the financials whenever we go over those --

MR. TAYLOR:
I'll be very brief. You know, my -- you know, we levee fines for two reasons, to -- one reason is to a good dealer and show him what he's done wrong, hopefully that he gets back compliant, and then another reason is that that this type of dealer is never going to do right, in my opinion, and make sure that they have trouble ever getting back in this business or maybe even affect them in another business. But looking at our -- if you go -- like your Page 6 like she always does or -- you know, that's a report that shows net position. You know, it looks like we're doing a lot better than last year, you know. It looks like we're bringing in a lot more revenue. Well, it's uncollected revenue, right, Mona?

MS . ANDERSON:
Right.
MR. TAYLOR:
Long story short, we're just
trying to set up some type of journal entry, I guess, to offset that to make sure that we don't have this false and misleading bottom line and that's basically it. And I think we should keep in mind that when we're levying these huge fines, what can we actually collect and what is our goal here, what do we want to do, because it is going to affect us right here. That's it. I was just concerned about the way it looked. It looks like we're putting it in our system to keep our bottom line from looking so big. MS . ANDERSON:

To be realistic of what we are collecting. You know, if you take that net position at the end of the fiscal year and take that $\$ 153,000$ out of it totally, then it's a different picture that you paint. And while we may collect, you know, we'll collect on the bond and we may collect -you know, what assets we can collect from and get a better avenue now that we're going through the AG's Office, but to just keep those things in mind is all we wanted to say.

MR. POTEET:
It was a bookkeeping procedure that you --

MR. TAYLOR:
And we did, we did correct it. MR. DUPLESSIS:

Can you set a policy for collectability?

MR. POTEET:
Well, I mean, that's what this new revised policy does.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Right.
MR. POTEET:
And, you know, it's like -- I think at the last meeting, we had levied some fines and it was that meeting or the meeting before, we discussed that we're going to levee fines, but we know good and well that we're not going to collect them.

MS . ANDERSON:
I would like to speak to that, too. Whenever -- okay. So if you levy those fines in May or June, we're not -it's not good practice to write them off
before the fiscal year. That was what happened a couple of years ago. I think it was Affordable Imports. You know, we knew pretty much that the entity was not viable, and so we wrote -- everything except the bond off before the end of the fiscal year. And no matter whether you write it off or show it as an uncollectible, it's still -you can't do that right away. So normally that would not be done until the following fiscal year. I'm just saying in the history when you're looking at it, it sort of distorts the total revenue is what it does. And what we did this year, that $\$ 24,000$ that you saw was the amounts that we're going to the AG, I told them we need to keep ours, unlike some entities write off a percentage of their receivables. Well, we do it by account, because it's basically our fines. So what we're currently doing is using those accounts that are going to the AG's Office as our estimated uncollectible even though we might collect on them.

MR. TAYLOR:
I was sitting on a board and they
discussed our bottom line. At one time, there was no employee benefits considered or anything like that and $I$ remember sitting in that meeting and everybody said, oh, my God, these guys are sitting on a million dollars. And it is perception. Nobody went in there and looked at the employee benefits. Nobody goes in there and breaks it down. Some people, including myself, were pretty simple to look at the bottom line and look and it don't always paint a pretty picture. So I felt it necessary to get those off as soon as possible.

MR. POTEET:
Thank you, Dino.
All right. So Executive
Director's report.
MR. PARNELL:
If you'll turn with me to your packets, you will find some reports. You will find the July 2014 alleged issue counts of July and August. In July, we had 150 alleged issues. The second document is the August report, which shows 83 alleged issues we're sending through our office. The third
document is the case report for July 2014. There were 98 cases assigned for that month. 20 of those cases were completed. 78 cases remain open. The next document is the August 2014 case report. There were 59 cases assigned. 8 of those cases were closed. 51 cases remain open. The next document is a department summary report for August -- I'm sorry, for July. The department summary illustrates 48 total cases that were closed in July and in August. The next document, the department summary illustrated 44 cases that were closed. The investigators are doing a real good job of getting out there.

We had discussed in the past about putting in place -- when we put in place in this legislative session our advertising guidelines and we informed investigators to go out there and give some warnings initially in the beginning until some time had passed and then we will go forward with doing violations against our advertising law and informed the investigators to ahead and do a warning and
write the violation ticket out, so they will actually have something tangible in their hand and see that, okay, this is a violation moving forward. It will be a second violation that we run into that issue. I know in the northern part of the state, we find that this is much more prevalent, I would say, in the northern part and the middle areas of the state as well as far as advertising issues that we run into, but, again, it's just different throughout the entire state. You have different areas of concern. They're all the same concerns pretty much, but different areas concentrated more on other issues.

The next document $I$ want to go into the general information. This kind of piggy backs something -- what we were talking about a little while ago. We had a meeting with the Motor Vehicle Commission a few weeks ago, myself, Sheri Morris, and Kim Baron was with us. We met with Lessie House and Burgess and Stacy. We had some discussions about the Motor Vehicle Sales Finance Act and in that discussion, we asked
if they currently had anything planned to put in place to -- something to educate dealers about possessing a finance license. They had nothing in place, and so Lessie asked would it be possible for them to come and kind of talk with our dealers at the seminar. So I did allow them to do that last week, just to discuss the finance license and it wasn't very much other than what we already thought it to be.

But in the future, I will have our staff discuss holding a finance license in the seminar. I was just opening up the doors just to allow them to come and speak, because they asked. And so I'll make sure in the future -- in light of our last discussion earlier on this morning, I want to make sure that we're not giving them any extra leeway into our agency in that regard. Other items in general discussion, in our continuing efforts to become more effective and efficient with our process, we installed these video monitors. The monitors are going to assist us with providing a clear and less cumbersome
project, other than the projector screen that we were using, and it's going to help us greatly in our seminars and our

Commission meetings and/or hearings that we may have. The monitors are going to be connected to our laptop and will mirror what is on the laptop screen, which we found at the last hearing did kind of help paint a picture of what was going on in that dealership.

That's something -- I've wanted to do it for some time and we found a really good deal on this and we had a guy come out -- our electrician came out and did some good work and our IT person helped us configure everything. So we're up and running right now and we're ready to go. So that pretty much completes the Executive Director's report.

Are there any other questions or concerns?

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I'm curious why we're -- as you say, adding to our seminar, if they have 1,800 dealers, that's 400 bucks a lick.

They've got a $\$ 750,000$ budget. They ought to be putting on their own seminar.

MR. PARNELL:
Yes. I agree. That's what $I$ was really alluding to, but, you know --

MR. DUPLESSIS:
Well, I'm curious. I mean, what does our seminar have to do with getting a finance license, because we're -- this is not a timely event.

MR. PARNELL:
Sure.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
So if they get a finance license and they're committing $M$ or $Z$ or TILA or other violations, we haven't given our constituents an opportunity to get trained and they've got a pile of money.

MR. BREWER:
It's a shame that we can't get that money.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
I think we need to get that.
MR. BREWER:
It seems a shame for them to have
any control over what we do. New Car Department -- I mean, the New Motor Division and the used car people are two different -MR. POTEET:

That's right. That's why there are two different commissions.

MR. BREWER:
You know, a lot of new car dealers dislike the used car dealers. I mean, they're competition for us. For them to regulate anything that we do doesn't seem right.

MR. OLAVE:
It provides a unique conflict of interest, doesn't it?

MR. BREWER:
It really does.
MR. POTEET:
Hopefully, we'll make some headway in that -- in that area. I think it's going to be a -- it might be a long fight, but we've got to do what we need to do for the dealers and for the clarification of the laws. I think there are too many things -- for me, I'm not a used motor
vehicle dealer. So I don't have to deal with it, but $I$ get regulated by two different governing bodies, and sometimes there is a little bit of a conflict. And I think ours is much simpler than what dealers have to deal with. So if we can make some movement in that direction, Derek and Sheri and Robert, I think it will help, but eventually I think we're heading towards a legislative solution.

MR. DUPLESSIS:
The playing field has changed in the last couple of years.

MR. POTEET:
It has.
MR. DUPLESSIS:
You know, it's a 15 year old law that was interpreted 15 years ago and we owe a safe harbor to our dealers. If we can't figure out where they can park their boat in a safe harbor, then that's not right. That's an unfair playing field. MR. POTEET:

Well, you shouldn't be regulating people with the preface, $I$ think this is
what you are supposed to be doing.
MR. BREWER:
They could come in and say, okay, you said you sold this wholesale, now prove to us that you sold it wholesale. I mean, where does it stop?

MR. POTEET:
You're right.
MR. OLAVE:
I agree with you earlier, a clear indication of what our intentions or interpretations of the law I think is necessary to figure out what the rules are before we can, you know, determine how to play with them.

MR. POTEET:
I think about six months ago, we thought we were kind of there, but apparently we weren't even close.

Okay. Thank you, Derek.
All right. The next thing that is on the agenda is the ratification of the license revocation. We have a few her. So we'll ratify these all at once.

```
            MR. PARNELL:
```

Please find in your packet the chart of the dealerships that have been revoked. I ask that you ratify the revocation to make it official. Each dealer was given an opportunity to become compliant before the ratification.

MR. POTEET:
See if anyone is here.
MS . BARON:
No one is here.
MR. PARNELL:
The first one on this is Direct Auto, LLC. The their address is 1907 Alfred Lane in Bossier City, Louisiana 71112 . License UD number is 243841. A suspension letter was sent May 22 nd, they had 10 days to respond, because of no license salespersons. The license was revoked on August 18, 2014.

The next one is C\&C Auto Sales, 6505 Hearn Avenue, Shreveport, Louisiana 71108. The license UD number is 243618 . A suspension letter was sent out on April 17, 2014 because of no licensed salesperson. They had 10 days to respond. The revocation
-- it was revoked on August 28, 2014.
The next one is Bye From Me, LLC, 1905 Roselawn Avenue, Monroe, Louisiana 71201. License UD number is $242822 . A$ suspension letter was sent July 1, 2014, 10 days to respond, because of no salesperson. License was revoked on September 2, 2014.

Bayou Country Trade Mart, LLC, 3012 Opelousas Road, Ville Platte, Louisiana 70586. License UD is 240471. A letter of suspension was sent on March 31, 2014, 10 days to response, because no salesperson. The license was actually revoked in the system on September 2, 2014 with the effective date of 12/31/13.

Richard's Auto Wholesale, 10502 Plank Road, Clinton, Louisiana 70722 . License UD number is 243513. The investigator posted notice of revocation on August $27 t h, ~ g i v i n g ~ t h e m ~ f i v e ~ d a y s ~ t o ~$ respond, because there was no phone, no contact with our office. The revocation -the license was revoked on September 3, 2014. The revocation was made effective on 09/05/14.

PJ's Auto Sales, 226 1/2 Loul Street in Broussard, Louisiana 70518 . License UD number is 243778. The investigator posted notice of revocation on August 13, 2014, giving him five days to respond, no phone, no sign. License was revoked on August 19, 2014. Revocation was effective on 12/31/13.

AAA Affordable Glass, Incorporated was -- it is located at 6276 Airline Highway, Baton Rouge 70805. License UD number is 242558. The investigator posted notice of revocation on August 19, 2014, giving them five days respond, for no phone, no sign. The license was revoked in the system on August 26, 2014.

Majjor Deal Auto Sales, LLC, located at 1400 Martin Luther Drive in Jeanerette, Louisiana 70544. License UD is 244062. The investigator posed -- excuse me, posted notice of revocation on July 30 , 2014, giving them five days to respond, for no phone, no sign. License was revoked on August 26, 2014, in the system. It was effective on the 26 th as well.

GI Auto, 701 The Boulevard, Rayne, Louisiana 70578. License UD number is 243444 . A suspension letter was sent August 18, 2014, 10 days to respond, no licensed salesperson, no phone, and the insurance expired. The license was revoked on -- effective on 4/4/2014.

Covington Autoplex LLC, 2445
North Highway 190, Covington, Louisiana 70433. License UD number is $242391 . \quad$ The investigator posted notice of revocation on August 3, 2014, giving five days to respond, no phone, no sign, no salesperson. License revoked on August 6 -- no, I'm sorry, August 6, 2014 .

Commissioners, I'd ask that you ratify the above revocation for licenses for the dealers listed above.

MR. POTEET:
Any discussion?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
I need a motion.
MR. SMITH:
(Makes motion.)

MR. POTEET:
I have a motion from Darty.
Second?
MR. OLAVE:
Second.
MR. POTEET:
Second from Steve.
All in favor, say, "Aye."
(All "Aye" responses.)
MR. POTEET:
Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. POTEET:
So those would be revoked.
Next, we've got some hearings.
So we need to adjourn and come back to that.
We also -- I think we want to move -- for planning purposes here, Derek, do you want to move Deidra Boyd to the top to A, and then we will do Latino.

MS . BARON:
Interstate Tire needs to be removed from the agenda.

MR. POTEET:
okay. That's fine, too.

Do $I$ have a motion to adjourn?
MR. TAYLOR:
I make a motion.
MR. SMITH:
Second.
(Meeting adjourned at 11:14 a.m.)
MR. SMITH:
second.
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| months [6]-13:13, | 2:8, 2:10, 2:11, 2:12, | 82:25, 83:2, 83:6, | 46:20, 47:8, 50:16, | Non-Exchange [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22:20, 26:18, 44:9, | 2:13, 2:14, 3:4, 3:7 | 85:3, 85:24, 87:1 | $50: 18,50: 19,56: 1$ | $75:$ |
| $\operatorname{mood}_{[1]}-66: 21$ | 3, 4:17, 4:21, 5:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 4,87: 6,87: 9 \\ & 87: 12,87: 14,88: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $69: 12,81: 15,81: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { none [3]- 18:21, } \\ & 27: 4,49: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| morning [5] - 55:7, | 13, 5:17, 5:24, 6:4 | 89:14, 89:18, 93:22, | 82:19, 88:16, 94:23 | rally [1] - 88 |
| 55:15, 56:10, 64:3, | 6:6, 6:9, 6:12, 6:15 | 94:3, 94:6, 94:11 | 95:22, 101:23, 102:16 | orth [1] - 101:9 |
| 92:17 | 6:18, 6:21, 6:24, 7:5, | $94: 13,94: 19,94: 2$ | needed [3] - 9: | northern [2]-91:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MORRIS [11]-2:23, } \\ & \text { 32:20, 40:1, 40:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 8,7: 11,7: 13,7: 20, \\ & 7: 23,9: 10,9: 14,10: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 24,95: 4,95: 7, \\ & 95: 13,95: 16,95: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:16, } 41: 7 \\ & \text { needs }[7]-13: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:8 } \\ & \text { notes }[4]-33: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| 41:8, 42:13, 43:16, | 10:11, 10:16, 11:20, | 96:11, 96:14, 96:16, | 14:5, 36:11, 43:18 | 33:9, 42:2, 64:2 |
| 43:21, 50:21, 77:18, | 12:9, 13:9, 14:8 | 96:23, 97:7, 97:9 | $43: 24,84: 14,102: 2$ | nothing [12]-18:20, |
| 80:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:11, 14:14, 14:17, } \\ & 14: 20,14: 22,14: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:16, 97:25, 98:7, } \\ & 98: 11,101: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { negative }[3]-68: 5 \text {, } \\ & 68: 6,71: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 19:3, 19:4, 30:19 |
| 31:4, 75:24, 76:23, | 16:1, 16:19, 16:21, | 101:22, 101:24 | neighborhood [1] - | 60:8, 61:24, 62:3, |
| 77:4, 91:21 <br> Morris' [1]-71:18 <br> most [2]-25:15, | 18:4, 18:6, 19:15, | 102:1, 102:4, 102:6, | 84:5 | 64:3, 92:4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 13,22: 3,22: 16, \\ & 23: 19,23: 22,27: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:10, 102:13, } \\ & \text { 102:24, 103:2, 103:4 } \end{aligned}$ | net [11] - 61:24, | notice [6] - 77:12, |
| 63:5 mostly [3] - 67:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 25,28: 4,28: 6, \\ & 30: 16,31: 18,32: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MS }_{[37]}-3: 3,3: 5, \\ 4: 7,4: 11,4: 19,4: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:5, 71:6, 84:7, 84:9, } \\ & 85: 16,86: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:21, 101:11 } \\ & \text { noticed }[1]-84: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:12, } 77: 4 \\ & \text { motion }[20]-58: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 15,32: 24,33: 6, \\ & 34: 1,34: 5,34: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 3,5: 7,5: 11,5: 15 \\ & 7: 16,32: 20,40: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { never [5]-9:20, } \\ 72: 5,78: 14,80: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { number [12] - 10:7, } \\ \text { 19:5, 19:6, 21:23, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 58: 20,59: 2,60: 10 \\ & 60: 12,69: 12,69: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $4: 13,35: 2,35:$ | $41: 8,42: 1$ | 85:10 | 8:15, 98:22, 99:4, |
| $73: 5,74: 12,81: 20,$ | 38:3, 38:7, 38:10, | $56: 19,56: 24,59: 6,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { New [29]-8:4, 8:13, } \\ \text { 8:18, 8:21, 9:15, 9:23, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 18,100: 3,100: 12 \\ & \text { 101:2, 101:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 81: 22,81: 24,82: 10 \\ & 82: 19,82: 23,101: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 19,38: 24,39: 3, \\ & 39: 5,39: 8,39: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 24,66: 22,69: 1 \\ & 69: 23,72: 19,72: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 3,10: 14,11: 5, \\ & 10.5 \quad 1 \cdot 11 \quad 12.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { numbers }[2]-26: 13, \\ 26 \cdot 18 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:25, 102:2, 103:1, } \\ & 103: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 40:5, 40:7, 41:3, | 76:10, 77:18, 80:24, | $14: 12,17: 11,19: 2$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 25,43: 13,43: 19 \\ & 44: 2,45: 21,46: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:8, 85:22, 86:13, } \\ & 87: 21,98: 9,102: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 24,26: 10,27: 19 \\ & 28: 24,29: 12,33: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| Motion [2] - 73:8, 74:16 | 47:13, 47:16, 47:20, | 13:11, 14:24, 28:21, | 41:17, 41:20, 45:10, | oath [2]-5:21, 6:2 |
| 2:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 22,47: 24,48: 2 \\ & 48: 5,48: 7,48: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 35:20 | 52:7, 95:2 | obligation [9] - <br> 24:18, 24:20, 24 |
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