



Minutes of the Automotive Affairs Advisory Board
held on August 16, 2012 at 10:00 am
at the Nevada Legislative Council Bureau
Room 2134, 401 S Carson St, Carson City, NV. 89701
Videoconferencing to Nevada Legislative Council Bureau
Room 4406, 555 E Washington Ave, Las Vegas, NV. 89101

These minutes are prepared in compliance with NRS 247.035. Text is in summarized rather than verbatim format. For complete contents, please refer to meeting tapes on file at the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles.

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON AUGUST 7, 2012.

Department of Motor Vehicles 555 Wright Way Carson City, NV. 89711	Nevada State Library 100 N. Stewart St. Carson City, NV. 89701	Department of Motor Vehicles 2701 E. Sahara Las Vegas, NV. 89104	Department of Motor Vehicles 305 Galletti Way Reno, NV. 89512
--	--	--	---

Department of Motor Vehicles Website
www.dmvnv.com

1. Call to Order

- A. Steve Yarborough called the meeting of the Automotive Affairs Advisory Board to order at 10:05 am.
- B. Board introductions took place along with the public that was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Steve Yarborough - Chairman | Sierra Service Station Co. |
| Robert (Bob) Compan | Farmers Ins |
| Steven Craig | AAA Nevada |
| Troy Dillard | DMV |
| Gil Grieve | Concours Body Shop |
| Lou Gardella | Jiffy Smog |
| Keith Grammier | Ins Auto Auctions |

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dick Mills
Richard "Michael" Lee

Pick -N- Pull

INTERESTED PARTIES:

None

2. Approval of Agenda

- A. The Board approved agenda.

3. Board's Biannual Report

- A. Every Legislative session the Board is required to submit a report. The board decides what they want to include of the activities that have occurred over that particular biennium. The Department of Motor Vehicles is then directed to put together the draft that would be approved by the board at the second meeting of the year. Motion by Troy to discuss this meeting topic further down on the agenda after other topics have been discussed. Motion in favor and any further discussion is moved to just before the scheduling of the next meeting.

4. Legislative Update

- A. Troy; no sitting members of the Legislature have contacted the Department regarding Bills that would affect any of the industries that are represented by the Board.
- B. Troy was asked if DMV put their legislative packaging together for the Governor's office.
 - a. Troy; the Department is scheduled to meet the next day with the Governor's office to discuss bills the Department recommends to put forward. None of those would affect the industries of the Board.
- C. Since the Board has expanded and now represents insurance companies, Troy explained that the Department doesn't have the leeway to reduce fines. A bill regarding that ability is planned to be discussed at the Governor's meeting.
- D. Troy; the new tiered system of lapse of insurance on vehicles register in Nevada.
- E. Gil had concerns of how the proof of insurance can be better enforced as many people will pay their first month's insurance bill and receive their certificate as proof. Then, cancel their policy and continue to carry registration.

- a. Troy explained; the bill passed in the last session regarding this issue. DMV was able to identify the people who would drive their vehicles without insurance. The Department discovered that people would rather pay the \$250 fine every year than the thousands of dollars that could add up over the year by actually paying for insurance. The Department put in a tiered system where the fees increase as more time without insurance has passed leading up to and including carrying an SR22. Also included in that tiered system, how many times the person has offended, up to and including losing their driver's license. The Department has seen a dramatic drop in offenses. Approximately 15% offense rate to 7%.
- b. Bob; the Department for their new system. He also had concerns with the time of day insurance policies lapse. Most insurance companies allow a 30 day lapse but, DMV has a no-tolerance policy when insurance lapses. Robert says a system is being worked on to educate the people.
- c. Gil; sees most of the problems with the online companies, among other concerns.
- d. Bob; replied that he agrees with Troy; with the new tiered system the occurrence of offenses should be dropping with the body shop industry, just like they have been seeing at DMV. But, we could still see some people buying and trying to use false/fraudulent policy cards. He recommends this issue be discussed with the AG's as well.
- e. More concern was mentioned by Gil about body shops being able to report incidences regarding customers not carrying insurance when they should be. Robert asked the Chairman if the Board could recommend DMV to require body shops to report these incidences. Chairman Steve Yarborough said we could make a recommendation but, wanted Troy's input.
 - i. Troy did not feel that right now would be a good time to implement any new procedures as it has barely been a year since Bill 323 went into effect. In addition, DMV projected to collect \$3.5 million but, actually brought in \$12.5 million but, is expected to drop as people catch on and follow the new regulation. He went on to say, the Department cannot stop uninsured motorists 100% however, this piece of legislation was a large help in reducing the total uninsured motorists. His concern is in implementing a non-automated reporting system is the man power to handle it. With anticipating the reduction in revenue, our budget will drop and won't have funds to add resources for the new areas. Not to say the Department would not look at reallocation.
 - ii. Gil asked Bob, the cash out rate on smaller repairs has been pretty high? If I'm a claimant with a cash settlement on a repair, do I have to show my liable carrier my insurance policy that I have insurance?

- iii. Bob answered no. They have no responsibility to require that the third party carry insurance. The only one they have to verify is their own insured. And even further, they don't have to verify that the insured has a lienholder.
- iv. Gil, would it be in the insurance company's best interest to implement a system to see who's insured? It seems that it might be a sales opportunity.
- v. Bob didn't feel he was qualified to answer the question as the subject gets into other judiciary and tort codes that would be a lot of work and effort to go before a judiciary committee. Bob gave an example of another type of law in Oklahoma that may be more palatable to the legislature.
- vi. Gil went on to ask about salvaged vehicles being put back on the road without repairs but still go through the inspection process, how are they able to get insurance coverage?
- vii. Bob answered; most carriers he knows will reinsure the car but if it's rebuilt, will only give liability, not collision.

5. Consumer Complaints – Statistical Data Review

- A. Chairman Steve, commending Troy on his report as it gives the Board something substantial to work with and shows where the needs are for future legislation. He added, to regulate the industry, you have to understand what the problems are and the report does a great job defining what the problems are.
- B. Troy explains to new members of the Board that this report is a product of the Board and been refined over about a two year period. He pointed out he thinks there is a big difference between complaints against the industry and complaints against the industry made to the department. This report constitutes complaints made to the Department that fall within the guidelines of the regulatory structure of the Department. He gave an example of; a television station calling in to the Department's Public Information Officer. This station has a Consumer Complaints Reporter looking into issues. The comment that was said to the Public Information Officer was that the number one complaint with them was garages and auto dealers are the second. What you won't see is that reflection in this report. And it needs to be understood that the Department does not regulate something that does not fall into the regulatory environment charged to the Department that the business is supposed to follow, those don't fall within the jurisdiction. So, this report is not necessarily the perspective of the public as a whole as it is what actually was reported to the Department and investigated with the findings.
 - a. Troy then went on the explain the format of the report itself:
 - b. Steve Yarborough asked if emissions complaints were included.

- i. Troy responded with no. The report has not been modified to include that information as this is the first time emissions has been part of the Board. Troy is going to have the Compliance Enforcement Division add that to the report so it can be reviewed by the Board in the future.
- c. Troy continues to explain for report.
- d. Steve; if a workmanship issue was brought to the Department, would they still need to create a case to determine if it is regulatory or workmanship?
 - i. Troy answered, yes. But it's usually not that straight forward. If someone contacted the Department about a workmanship issue, many times it will be explained to them that the Department doesn't have jurisdiction over workmanship issues and it is a civil issue and the complainant won't file a complaint because they're already being told the nature of their complaint. If somebody simply sends one in to the Department, than there would be a letter generated.
 - 1. Steve then asked if there would be an investigation started to determine if regulatory or not in that case.
 - 2. Troy answered, if there's an official complaint filed, yes. That would be part of the process. But many times, that is not the disputed issue. Troy continued to give an example of what a typical complaint would be.

Compliance Enforcement Division						
FY12						
License Type:				Active		
Body Shops				280		* Active Numbers through 6/30/12
Salvage Pools				6		
Wreckers				66		
Garages				1532		
			Total	1884		
Total Cases			695			
Cases with Complaints				360		52%
Case data July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012						
Cases		Cases	Complaints	Actions	Action Defined	%
Body Shops	Total	92	40	92		43%
108 Mechanic Liens	<u>Total</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	1 RT - Remedial Training	
Repair, Removal & 487 Disposal of Vehicles	<u>Total</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>28</u>	11 CD - Cease Desist 4 IC - In Compliance 4 IE - Insufficient Evidence 1 IR - Case Referred to Master case 1 OB - Out of Business 1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 1 RT - Remedial Training 5 US - Unsubstantiated	
UN Unlicensed Activity	<u>Total</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	3 CD - Cease Desist 1 IE - Insufficient Evidence 2 OB - Out of Business 1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 1 RT - Remedial Training 1 US - Unsubstantiated	
WO Work Order	<u>Total</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	2 CD - Cease Desist	
Actions Defined without Complaints	<u>Total</u>			<u>52</u>	3 AP - Approved 24 CD - Cease Desist 1 CI - Citation 1 DE - Denied 1 IR - Case Referred to Master case 10 IC - In Compliance 8 OB - Out of Business 1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 2 RT - Remedial Training 1 US - Unsubstantiated	

Garages	557	315	557	57%
108 Mechanic Liens	<u>Total</u> 12	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	4 CD - Cease Desist 1 IC - In Compliance 1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 3 RT - Remedial Training 1 US - Unsubstantiated
482 Dealer Violations	<u>Total</u> 6	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	1 CD - Cease Desist 1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency
445B Pollution Control	<u>Total</u> 11	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	1 IE - Insufficient Evidence 1 IR - Case Referred to Master Case 2 RT - Remedial Training
Repair, Removal & 487 Disposal of Vehicles	<u>Total</u> 440	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	1 AF - Admin Fine 1 AS - Admin Stop 41 CD - Cease Desist 3 CI - Citation 39 IC - In Compliance 24 IE - Insufficient Evidence 1 IM - Impound 8 IR - Case Referred to Master Case 4 OB - Out of Business 1 RE - Revoked 55 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 25 RT - Remedial Training 47 US - Unsubstantiated
GF General Fraud	<u>Total</u> 1	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	1 IC - In Compliance
PD Purchase Dispute	<u>Total</u> 3	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	2 CD - Cease Desist 1 IC - In Compliance
PW Paperwork Issues	<u>Total</u> 1	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	1 IE - Insufficient Evidence
TP Trade Practices	<u>Total</u> 1	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	1 CD - Cease Desist
UN Unlicensed Activity	<u>Total</u> 78	<u>42</u>	<u>42</u>	23 CD - Cease Desist 1 IC - In Compliance 2 IE - Insufficient Evidence 2 IR - Case Referred to Master Case 1 OB - Out of Business 6 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 2 RT - Remedial Training 5 US - Unsubstantiated
WO Work Order	<u>Total</u> 1	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	1 CD - Cease Desist
Actions Defined without Complaints	<u>Total</u>		<u>242</u>	3 AF - Admin Fines 1 AR - Arrest 83 CD - Cease Desist 1 CI - Citation 75 IC - In Compliance 4 IE - Insufficient Evidence 1 IM - Impound 7 IR - Case Referred to Master Case 46 OB - Out of Business 1 RE - Revoked 6 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency 9 RT - Remedial Training 5 US - Unsubstantiated

Wreckers		44	5	44	11%
Repair, Removal & 487 Disposal of Vehicles	<u>Total</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	
				1 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency	
				3 US - Unsubstantiated	
UN Unlicensed Activity	<u>Total</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	
				1 US - Unsubstantiated	
Actions Defined without Complaints	<u>Total</u>			<u>39</u>	
				1 AF - Admin Fines	
				2 AP - Approved	
				1 AS - Admin Stop	
				7 CD - Cease Desist	
				5 IC - In Compliance	
				2 IE - Insufficient Evidence	
				8 IM- Impound	
				12 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency	
				1 US - Unsubstantiated	
Salvage Pool					
Actions Defined without Complaints	<u>Total</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	0%
				2 RO - Referred to other Gov Agency	
	Total	695	360	695	52%

6. Body Shop Storage Fees

- A. Bob handed out invoice samples of body shops charging storage fees for vehicles that are not being worked on or looked at very little before the work actually happens. He continued to give examples of what other fees the body shops will charge during that time as well; auction fees, processing fees, etc. Robert is looking to the industry to remedy this problem and stated that there is already a Bill Draft Request carried by Senator Kelvin Atkinson started for the next Legislative Session. He basically suggested that the Board discuss the subject.
- B. Gil stated that he can't speak for the whole industry but, only for his store; storage has been up for debate for some time. Sometimes those storage charges are the only leverage to get the vehicle off their lot. Because it becomes a total loss, it becomes a liability to the body shop and they want it moved. He can sympathize with the ones that have high charges. Gilbert continues saying that the consumer is the one that owns the car and the one that needs to be put in the loop because they are ultimately responsible even though the insurance company pay them. The education needs to flow through the consumer first so that you don't get the huge charges. The consumers are the ones that usually don't care because there is question as to who authorizes the tow, dismantle, etc. of a vehicle and the consumer may never know what is actually going on. It's up to the body shop to tell the consumer what the charges are going to be before anything happens.

- a. Steve asked a question to the Department; doesn't this all fall under the signed estimate requirements? Shouldn't it be clearly stated on the work order what the storage and other fees are up front? So that the consumer knows that the clock is ticking the min they sign that work order and they put the pressure to the insurance company and claimants and so forth.
 - i. Gil agrees. He stated the laws already regulate what they can charge and if they don't get a signed repair order, they have to hand them the keys and collect nothing. So it goes back to, the consumer is the one that should be responsible for knowing the charges before anything is done to their property. It's only up to the carrier to pay whatever is an agreed cost going in. The body shop does not have control of the tow bill but they do for storage and they have to let the consumer know up front what those fees are and they have to sign for it understanding that before the body shop can start.
- b. Troy stated at this point that he thinks where Robert is coming from is, the consumer doesn't care what the storage fees are because they know their insurance company is going to pay for it. Ultimately that drives up the cost of insurance for everyone. So, he then asked Robert exactly what direction he was trying to take this.
 - i. Bob; right now they just have the BDR as a place holder. But, he thinks there is a place in statute that has something already for the Consumer's Bill of Rights. Then started talking about a survey that was being asked of the insurance companies.
 - ii. Troy then stated there's nothing universal across the industry, each shop determines their own regulations and that's where the problem lies.
 - iii. Bob; and if the industry wants to work on something like that, it would amicable. But, the circumstances would need to be considered and find the common ground to get those regulations started. Can it be mirrored the model tariffs set forth by the NTA? Robert suggested a sub-committee.
- c. Gil; where do the fee regulations come from for a tow company? It seems the body shop gets the nod of what they can charge from the tow companies. That's how he's guessing they come up with what they think they can charge for storage; charges based on a different industry.
 - i. Bob gave an example where the Clark County Sheriff set the fees for what could be charged by the tow companies when they pick up for the Sheriff's officers. But once it leaves the tow operator and shows up at a body shop, the fees are at the discretion of the owner, their responsibility to move it there.
 - 1. Gil; the owner or the carrier.

2. Bob; a carrier will never move a car unless they have permission of their insured.
 3. Gil; agreed, owner's consent.
- ii. Bob; so once he gets there, if that's the case, there is usually an agreed upon amount. But, when the car comes in from other places and the insurance company finally comes in, usually as a third party, unpronounced to them, they come in and see these crazy fees.
 1. Gil; if there's going to be standards put on storage fees, they need to be across the automotive world from wrecking through the body shops.
 2. Bob; if that's what it comes to, so be it. again, Bob recommended a subcommittee
- C. Steve; given there is no BDR to review, the Board is not in the position to make a recommendation on legislation. But, the fact that a BDR was brought forward and there is a Board member representing body shops and another with insurance, the Chairman suggests that a committee to have those meetings offline so there is an opportunity to hammer it out before they are sitting in the chairs in front of the legislators. Then, if a piece of legislation is drafted, the Board can decide if they want to make a recommendation or not.
- D. Troy; agreed with Chairman Steven. It sounds like Bob has already got his place holder for this particular item to be brought before the legislature. So, maybe the industry design, with the support of the industry, and with the support of the sponsor (the wording can always be amended), if all parties are in agreement, it has a much better chance of moving through. Maybe the tariff model, like they did for the NTA, may be the starting point. And then start adjusting the things that are unique to this industry as opposed their industry because there are two different sets of rules that go between the two.
- E. Steve; says it needs to be flexible too because a cap established now may not be realistic in five years.
- a. Troy recognized that two different surveys were being discussed and distinguished the difference between two; Emissions survey and Body Shop survey.
 - i. Emissions surveys are binding with percentages of prevailing labor rates, and a percentage of that is applied for what can be charged for the emission tests in Clark and Washoe Counties. And there's a slight difference typically between the two.
 - ii. Body Shops survey is nonbinding. The only binding part is that the body shops have to complete the survey electronically on the website before they are allowed to renew their license. But once the survey's completed, there's nothing binding to that survey that ties the body shop to any of the rates or the insurance company to any of the rates. It's literally a survey.

- F. Steve suggests that the Board move on as there really is nothing more to discuss on this topic right now.
- G. Bob would like to get to subcommittee together to start working on everything immediately.
- H. Troy; the word "subcommittee" keeps coming up and his suggestion is not to form a subcommittee but to let the members go forth and discuss with all the industry partners. Otherwise it becomes an action of this Board. When actually what the Board is looking for is for the direction to be provided to the Board for the Board's support or input on to the subject. If it becomes a subcommittee, the member get assigned, are subject to the open meeting law and has to occur in this format and will be more difficult to get into the meat and potatoes of the issues by the industry members because they would have to present ideas and action items versus the industry coming up with something they want to present with our approval.
- I. Gil, Bob and Steve agreed to set up an unofficial meeting and move on.

7. Informational Items – Discussion Only

- A. Troy; maybe not so much of an informational item as much as a request for information. Addressing Lou, since this is the first time Emissions has been represented in the Board, same as Bob for Insurance, he's interested hearing how the environment and emissions industry is now and welcoming any input and comments to the Board.
 - a. Lou; one thing that was brought up that sparked his interest during the discussion of the survey was, it has always been strictly for G2 stations and did not include G1. The issue they have is majority are G1's and they have no say in their price setting which has been a fallacy in the system. He doesn't know of any other business that doesn't have a say in what they charge and would like this to get addressed. He doesn't know if that would be done internally through DMV or through the environmental commission or it if would have to be something legislatively done.
 - i. Steve; asked Lou, because Steve is also G1/G2, although he's not representing emission testers he's spoken on behalf, one of the things the survey does is sets the maximum rate of what they can charge on emission controls. Which he thinks is a waste of energy because the competitive environment is what actually sets the rates and has not seen shops that are able to charge the maximum, other than dealerships, when street price posted and advertised is what drives what gets charged. Are you thinking that G1's were able to help establish that rate, that we would raise the maximum we could charge and that would impact the industry per say?

- ii. Lou; agreed that the dealers are the only ones he's seen that charge the maximum and a couple G1 station that did at one time. The open market has driven down the price and basically there doesn't need to be any price controls on it. As we saw in the last Legislative Session, where the biannual issue came up and there was no removal of that price gap. If we do ever seen a biannual testing that price gap really needs to go away and used California as an example of how high prices can be which would not be possible here in Nevada because of the current regulations. It's an issue that a lot of other shop owners feel (including himself) is unfair that you have no say in your own pricing and doesn't believe it would affect the pricing. A matter of principle that a business has no say in its pricing.
 - 1. Steve; the challenge is, it's based on a percentage of the hourly rate and if a G1 shop has an hourly rate they can include in the survey would be one thing but if there is no hourly rate established for auto repair, which the premise of the survey and setting cap rates was based on the amount of time that was given by the industry through flat rate, to do a smog, he doesn't know what the industry can come up with a formula that could be applied in both Washoe and Clark counties, other than a survey. Which he feels would be counterproductive, unless they came up with some kind of formula for example, "no more than 2 ½ x than the average industry...".
 - 2. Lou; about 2 Legislative sessions ago, tried address some of the maximum and minimum and Legislators had no tastes for minimum. I think as a whole, it needs to go away, that if the free open market sets it, it's the price. With the amount of time it takes to do a test is not the issue, it's the cost of your lease for the building, your employees, etc. and those costs have risen and they are basing the rate on outdated information. If you did a survey of the stations, they would rather see the pricing controls go away. Plus, he thinks there has to 50% response rate when we do participate we never hear back on what the actual response rate is and if there is going to be any change. And pretty much what it's used for now is a basis for couponing, other than any opposition you might get from the dealers and emissions where they do charge full price.
- b. Steven Y; suggests that the industry see if they can get a legislator to support bill, run that as a BDR, to remove that cap rate.

- c. Troy; when that was designed, and how it's set, there were a couple factors; first, your taking specified areas within the state and requiring the individuals who have vehicles registered in those areas to have a smog test performed therefore creating the industry. He believes the intent was consumer protection. And what Troy is hearing is the rate doesn't really damage you in any way because the going rate out there, driven by consumer, is less than what the that maximum rate is but, that many of the dealers and some shops do charge the maximum rate but, those aren't G1's and aren't the ones that are advertising for smog business, that's a secondary offering to their customer base. If was removed, and they started charging exorbitant amounts, that could negative impact to the industry as a whole and should be taken into consideration as well.
- B. Steven Y; if this is an issue the industry would like to bring something forward, we would look at that and make our recommendation as an Advisory Board. Thank you Lou and Troy for your comments.

8. Public Comment – Discussion Only

- A. Bob; asked if he could back up, being new to the Board (and thanking everyone for allowing the opportunity to be on the Board), has the Board taken advisory items to the Governor and have they been acted upon as something that's viable, working? Doesn't know much history on the Board.
 - a. Steven Y; from his experience, the Board has taken certain legislative pieces and made recommendations to support them and during the legislative hearings, have come forth as the State Advisory Board saying we've reviewed this and yes we can support this or not. And for whatever the reasons may be as a unified voice representing the industry. So, the intent of the Board was to be able to do that and circumvent some of the donnybrooks, if you will, that happen in the legislator when an industry finds out that there is a bill being heard and sometimes try to talk about these items, make a consensus and make recommendations on that. And the DMV has worked very closely with the Board and he applauds DMV for actually support this Board and being part of this Board and be a venue by which we can look at these items and make recommendations.
 - b. Bob; any action items, are they pushed to the industry or do they stay [with the Board]?
 - i. Troy; historically there have been issues that fell within purview of the Department that the Board has made recommendations on and the Department was able to craft legislation or included those recommendations in pieces of legislation that were moving forward on behalf of the Department. Additionally, recommendations have gone into the biennial report, which we've pushed back to the end

of today's agenda, to make those recommendations that go to the legislature. And a copy also goes to the Governor's office. So, the activities of the Board recommendations of the Board are being delivered to the entities of the state responsible for laws. However, when it's come to specific action items, it's been varied. The board has sought out legislator to sponsor pieces of legislation that were contained in those reports as recommendations, as we as individual members or industry groupings have sought out legislators to work with pieces that the Board has discussion on and provided direction.

- B. Gil; would also like to thank the Board for allowing him to be part of the Board as he has wanted to for a long time. Has been in his industry for a very long time and watched as the environment has changed, as far as regulations and laws go through the years. Feels that the majority have been good for the industry, to bring the industry together, find common ground, and to move forward with a happy consumer. At the end of the day, that's what it's all about.

9. Board's Biannual Report

- A. Steve Y; Do we have recommendation for that report or do we want to schedule our next meeting at the beginning or prior to the start of the legislative session to see if we have recommendations on the discussions of the insurance and storage fees that we've talked about, possible changing the way the fees are structured and how we want to proceed.
 - a. Troy; addressing Chairman, he believes the Board has to meet this calendar year which would be before session starts so, we'll have to meet one more time to meet the Board's obligation for that. If the Board can set that meeting early enough that we can determine what the report needs to contain to report on the activities and any recommendations that come forth, potentially we can agendize that as the last item, again, at the next meeting this calendar year. So, that if any members bring forth anything on any of the items discussed or others the Board chooses to include on that report. Troy believes there are previous meetings that occurred in the legislative timeframe that we will also craft the report on from that and give Aja the freedom to include the base activities that occurred during those meetings within that report, as well as this meeting. And recommendations we can determine, finalize, and vote on at the next meeting at which time those can be included in the report for the chairman's signature for submission.
- B. A request for motion; that the Board does bring forward items for the recommendations to the legislature at the next meeting this year.
 - a. Motion seconded and passed by all members.

10. Next Meeting and Adjournment

- A. Next meeting, second week of December. Upon availability of meeting places and members.
- B. Meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.