

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TRANSCRIPT OF A MEETING  
OF THE  
STATE OF NEVADA  
PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR'S LICENSING BOARD

Thursday, September 10, 2015  
9:00 a.m.

Northern Nevada Location:  
Office of the Attorney General  
100 North Carson Street  
Mock Court Room  
Carson City, Nevada

Southern Nevada Location (Videoconferenced):  
Grant Sawyer State Office Building  
555 East Washington Avenue  
Attorney General Conference Room, Suite 4500  
Las Vegas, Nevada

REPORTED BY: SHANNON L. TAYLOR, CCR, CSR, RMR  
Certified Court, Shorthand and Registered Merit Reporter  
Nevada CCR #322, California CSR #8753, Idaho CSR #485  
(775) 887-0472

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Board Members Present:

Mark Zane, Chairman (Las Vegas)  
Jim Colbert (Carson City)  
Raymond Flynn (Carson City)  
Peter Maheu (Las Vegas)  
Jim Nadeau (Carson City)

(No Board Members were absent.)

Also: Kevin Ingram (Las Vegas)  
Executive Director

Raelene Palmer (Las Vegas)  
Deputy Attorney General  
Board Counsel

Jason Harris (Las Vegas)  
Compliance Investigator

Lori Irizarry (Las Vegas)  
Compliance Investigator

James Batchelor (Las Vegas)  
Compliance Investigator

Matthew Schmelzer (Carson City)  
Investigator

Mary Klemme (Carson City)  
Investigative Assistant

Other Participants:

John Theel (Las Vegas)  
David Cospers (Las Vegas)  
Justin Porties (Las Vegas)  
Mike Spriggs (Las Vegas)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE
1. Roll Call of Board members	4
2. Public Comment	5&6
3. All applicants and witnesses to be sworn in	6
4. Agenda items carried over (from yesterday)	6
5. Request for Exemption, John Theel, Qualifying Agent for Special Operations Associates, Inc., license number 525	6
6. Registration Appeal Hearing, Aaron Green	12 35
7. Registration Appeal Hearing, Keith Frick	12 36
8. Registration Appeal Hearing, David Cosper	12
9. Registration Appeal Hearing, Erik John Kooi	28
10. Registration Appeal Hearing, Justin Porties	28
11. Board Comment and future agenda items	37
12. Public Comment	66
13. Adjournment	67

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015,

2 9:00 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All right. Okay. Good  
5 morning. We're going to get day two of the quarterly  
6 meeting of the Private Investigator's Licensing Board  
7 underway.

8 And since I've been here early, I didn't  
9 prepare with my glasses.

10 Generally, we want to make sure that all cell  
11 phones are put onto quiet, so they don't interrupt the  
12 proceeding.

13 The first item on the agenda is the roll call  
14 of the members.

15 MR. INGRAM: You want to do your gavel? You  
16 want to do your gavel?

17 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: (Tapped gavel on the  
18 table.) I'd like order.

19 MR. INGRAM: Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, Board  
20 Member Colbert?

21 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: Here.

22 MR. INGRAM: Board Member Flynn?

23 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Here.

24 MR. INGRAM: Board Member Maheu?

25 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Here.

1 MR. INGRAM: Board Member Nadeau?

2 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Here.

3 MR. INGRAM: And Chairman Zane?

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Here.

5 And the second item on the agenda is the  
6 notification regarding public comment. And that  
7 notification is that you're able to speak to any issue  
8 that's germane to the Board in public comment, which  
9 exists now. Or it also exists toward the end of the  
10 meeting, when we announce it.

11 This is generally issues that are not on the  
12 agenda, but something that affects the Board or concerns  
13 the Board, that you'd like to voice your opinion or  
14 concern about.

15 Public comment is also welcome and encouraged  
16 with regard to agenda items. But we like to have that  
17 happen during the agenda item presentation, so that it  
18 flows properly.

19 And the other notification I need to make is  
20 today's record is being transcribed stenographically.  
21 So the lady sitting there at the lower left corner needs  
22 you to speak up clearly. You'll hear her remind me  
23 several times. So she needs to take down what's said  
24 here so that there's a record of the proceedings. So  
25 please try to speak up and be clear, so she doesn't have

1 to ask us what we said, and we don't have to repeat  
2 ourselves very often.

3 If you intend to give testimony today, or  
4 you're here for official business, you'll need to be --  
5 to stand, raise your right hand and be sworn to testify  
6 under oath. If you could do that now, I'd appreciate  
7 it.

8 MS. PALMER: Do you solemnly swear or affirm  
9 that the testimony you give before this Board today  
10 shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the  
11 truth?

12 (Potential witnesses were sworn/affirmed.)

13 MR. PALMER: Thank you.

14 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Is there any public  
15 comment for anything that's not on the agenda that you'd  
16 like to be heard right now?

17 I see none in Las Vegas.

18 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: None in Reno.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Do we have any  
20 agenda items that were carried over from yesterday's  
21 meeting?

22 MR. INGRAM: No. They've all been postponed  
23 until December.

24 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Okay. Then, we  
25 have -- moving on to agenda item number five, item

1 number five is a request for exemption from John Theel.

2 For anybody that didn't pick one up, there is  
3 an agenda. So I don't intend to read things verbatim.  
4 So there's an agenda at the back of the room that you're  
5 welcome to take a look at, to make sure you're following  
6 us and following what we're doing.

7 Good morning.

8 MR. THEEL: Good morning, everyone. John  
9 Theel, qualifying agent for Special Operations  
10 Associates, here to request the use of five out-of-state  
11 active law enforcement officers for the Consumer  
12 Electronic Trade Show, which comes to Vegas in January.

13 These officers -- I've been to the Board for  
14 years and years asking for this. These officers work  
15 for me in other states. However, Nevada doesn't allow  
16 you to use active officers without the Board's approval.  
17 So that's why I'm here.

18 These people will be here with me from January  
19 2nd to the 11th, working at various convention areas  
20 throughout Las Vegas. And that's what I'm here to ask  
21 for.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any public comment?  
23 Any Board comment?

24 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Yes, Mr. Chair. I have a  
25 question for the applicant. And this is the first time

1 I'm hearing one of these, being the new guy.

2 What agencies are these officers from, and do  
3 they have permission from those agencies to engage in  
4 off-duty employment in security in another state?

5 MR. THEEL: Yes. And like I said, they've been  
6 working for me for 10 years. And they all have, you  
7 know, cards here from -- they're all, you know,  
8 registered with the Board. Two of them are from  
9 Chicago, two from New York, and one from Texas.

10 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: And do they have  
11 permission from those agencies to engage in security in  
12 another state?

13 MR. THEEL: Yes.

14 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Thank you.

15 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I only have one comment,  
16 and it's mostly historical. But over the years, in the  
17 last 10 years, and this is not directly to Mr. Theel,  
18 but security companies have come down here during CES  
19 and asked for exemptions of as many as 50, 75 officers  
20 from out of state to work the Consumer Electronics Show  
21 specifically. And my attitude has always been that we  
22 have people that are qualified within the state to do  
23 the same job.

24 And we've asked, the Board has asked  
25 consistently for the security companies to reduce the



1 number. Mr. Theel is an example of reducing the number.  
2 But my concern is that we start again and we start  
3 increasing the number. And, I think, we have officers  
4 in the state that are just as qualified to do the work  
5 that's required. And I have a concern about going  
6 outside of the state, bringing in out-of-state police  
7 officers. I think, our officers are just as qualified  
8 here. And, again, we're going through the police  
9 process.

10 So that's just a general comment.

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any other Board comment?

12 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I guess, if you give me  
13 an opportunity to speak, I will.

14 Mr. Theel has been -- he started, I think...

15 When you first came in, you started with like  
16 40 or something like that. And you've reduced it down  
17 to like five.

18 And he's consistently kept that number.

19 And I know I raised the same questions that  
20 Board Member Flynn raised initially about the law  
21 enforcement perspective. But these gentlemen are ones  
22 that have consistently worked with Mr. Theel. And we've  
23 not had any issues, that I'm aware of, with any of them.

24 So that's why I've become a little bit  
25 comfortable with this in that sense. And the

1 conversation, I mean he could contract with Metro, or he  
2 could contract with some law enforcement office, agency,  
3 to bring in armed law enforcement officers. But this  
4 seems to have worked. So I tend to support this.

5 MR. THEEL: These officers are unarmed. And  
6 they're not doing police work. They're working for me,  
7 supervising my people that work for me. They're not in  
8 an armed position. They're in a law enforcement  
9 position. They're a supervisor just like my supervisors  
10 that live here in Vegas. They're not in a law  
11 enforcement capacity.

12 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Well, my position, pretty  
13 much historically, and echoing the same things that have  
14 been said, and historically approving these, we did have  
15 a pretty good rock and roll regarding the number of  
16 people that were brought in from out of state. But the  
17 justification was the working with the different vendors  
18 that travel around the world. They get comfortable with  
19 the diamond shows, the CES. They get comfortable  
20 working with a company whose supervisory people are  
21 consistently the same bodies, the same faces. They feel  
22 comfortable that their product's being protected.

23 So I understand that there's a little bit more  
24 justification. It's just I've always just simply been  
25 critical of the numbers. I don't have so much critique

1 about supervisory-type people. But I do have critique  
2 at if the numbers are getting there when there's people  
3 available within the state to do the job.

4 So I've always pretty much supported these, as  
5 long as they're reasonable. And this is clearly  
6 reasonable, I believe. So.

7 Any other Board questions?

8 If there's not, I'll entertain a motion.

9 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair, I'd move to  
10 approve the request by John Theel, qualifying agent for  
11 Special Operations Associates, Incorporated, license  
12 number 525, to grant the exemption, as outlined in NAC  
13 648.338, to allow them to utilize five active  
14 out-of-state police -- peace officers to work as  
15 supervisors in Nevada during the Consumer Electronics  
16 Show between the period January 2nd through the 11th,  
17 2016, in various locations in Las Vegas, subject to all  
18 statutory and regulatory requirements.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: A motion. Do we have a  
20 second?

21 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Second.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Second. Any Board  
23 comment on the motion?

24 All in favor, say "yay."

25 (Board members said "yay.")

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any opposed, say "no."

2 The motion carries. Thank you.

3 MR. THEEL: Thank you all very much. Have a  
4 good day.

5 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Good seeing you.

6 And I have to come back from my philosophy  
7 earlier about the revolution. That's where I got the A.

8 MR. INGRAM: They follow direction.

9 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All right. Item number  
10 six. We're looking at Aaron Green, who applied for  
11 registration and was denied.

12 Is Aaron Green present?

13 Not in Las Vegas. Apparently, not in Carson?

14 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: No.

15 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Not in Carson City.

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All right. How about we  
17 trail this until we get toward the end of the agenda,  
18 and see if maybe he got stuck in traffic.

19 Keith Frick, who applied for registration and  
20 was denied.

21 Is Keith Frick present? This is item number  
22 seven on the agenda.

23 Not appears to be so. So we'll trail number  
24 seven till the end of the meeting.

25 Then, number eight is David Casper, who

1 applied --

2 MR. COSPER: Cosper.

3 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Pardon?

4 MR. COSPER: Cosper.

5 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Cosper? Thank you. Come  
6 on up and have a chair.

7 That thing in front of you there is a  
8 microphone, so.

9 MR. THEEL: Okay.

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: It'll pick up what you  
11 have to say.

12 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair?

13 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yes, sir?

14 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: We kind of had this  
15 problem yesterday. Maybe could we move that chair  
16 closer to the microphone? In other words, toward the  
17 investigators. And the reason for that is we don't --  
18 we're not able to watch the person testifying. So.

19 (The chair in Las Vegas was moved.)

20 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Thank you. This works  
21 perfect.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All right. Thank you.  
23 Okay. Let's see. We're at number eight.  
24 Okay.

25 MR. INGRAM: He was one of Bruce's denials.

1 Are you prepared to --

2 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. The investigator  
3 that handled your denial is out on medical. So we'll  
4 still continue today.

5 MR. COSPER: Okay.

6 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I'm just letting you know  
7 that he personally is not here.

8 MR. COSPER: Right.

9 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Ready to proceed?

10 MR. HARRIS: All right. Jason Harris. I'm  
11 picking up on Bruce's denial here.

12 Mr. Cosper was denied back on May 26 for a May  
13 22nd, 1978, charge for carrying a loaded firearm in a  
14 public place. There was no disposition on it.

15 So that was the reason for Bruce's denial.

16 MR. COSPER: What does that mean, no  
17 disposition on it?

18 MR. HARRIS: Well, when your fingerprints came  
19 back, there was nothing stating that, what the outcome  
20 was, where you did probation, or it was dismissed under  
21 something else.

22 MR. COSPER: Yeah, I did 10 weekends.

23 MR. HARRIS: 10 weekends in jail?

24 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative). And paid a  
25 fine.

1 MR. HARRIS: And there was also September 24th,  
2 1978, a burglary conviction, trespassing. You failed to  
3 list it on your application.

4 MR. COSPER: I didn't think about any of that  
5 stuff I did back in the '70s, 40 years ago.

6 MR. HARRIS: And on that one, the fingerprints  
7 came back where you did a year probation.

8 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative).

9 MR. HARRIS: That was all.

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: What was the reason why  
11 you didn't include those, because of the age?

12 MR. COSPER: Yeah.

13 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay.

14 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Well, you said you didn't  
15 remember it. Did you not remember, or did you --

16 MR. COSPER: I didn't remember the dates.

17 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Or did you not include  
18 them, but you recall them?

19 MR. COSPER: Well, I didn't think 40 years ago  
20 would be coming up to bite me in the rear-end right now.

21 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Well, it has.

22 MR. COSPER: Uh-huh (affirmative). Well, I'm  
23 61 years old, just trying to make a living.

24 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair?

25 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yes, sir.

1 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Cospers, could you  
2 just explain what was going on then?

3 MR. COSPER: Back in the '70s?

4 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: If that's what we're  
5 talking about, yes. I mean, in other words --

6 MR. COSPER: Back in --

7 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: In other words, explain  
8 the circumstances of these arrests, if you could. Or  
9 maybe you can't remember. I don't know.

10 MR. COSPER: Well, back in the '70s, I was full  
11 of pee and vinegar. I made some wrong choices. I'm not  
12 denying that. The circumstances were just foolishness.  
13 But that, like I said, that was 40 years ago, and I'm  
14 still paying for it today.

15 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Mr. Cospers, Ray Flynn up  
16 north. What have you done like in the last 20 years for  
17 employment, background? Tell us a little bit about  
18 yourself.

19 MR. COSPER: The past 20 years, I've been --  
20 I've worked 15 years out at Lake Mead Marina as a scuba  
21 diver. That company was sold, and I went to work for  
22 TiMet, Titanium Metals Corporation. I was laid off from  
23 there and went and got a guard card, because I needed to  
24 do something to bring in money in the household.

25 So my past 20 years have been busy.



1 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Are you a registered  
2 ex-felon?

3 MR. COSPER: No, not at all.

4 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Thank you.

5 MR. COSPER: These are all just misdemeanors.  
6 And I did my time, I paid my fines, and I took care of  
7 business.

8 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: For the investigator,  
9 please, do we have any other arrests other than these  
10 that were on here?

11 MR. HARRIS: That is all that came back on  
12 his fingerprints. They're both -- the last one was in  
13 '78, and there's nothing since.

14 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. HARRIS: You're welcome.

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: So the denial was based  
17 upon the failure to disclose?

18 MR. HARRIS: That and then the firearms one,  
19 the weapons from '74.

20 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: But there's no  
21 disposition on whether or not there's a conviction?

22 MR. HARRIS: That's right.

23 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Do you have an  
24 understanding why you're here today?

25 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative).

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: What's your  
2 understanding?

3 MR. COSPER: My understanding is I was denied  
4 because of what I did back in the '70s. And it came up,  
5 came up on my fingerprints. That I did not put it down  
6 on the paperwork, I didn't think it was relevant for --  
7 in today's date.

8 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Do you have an  
9 understanding what the Board's purpose is?

10 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative). That is to  
11 either let me continue working or take away the guard  
12 card.

13 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Generally our purpose is  
14 to protect the public from somebody that shouldn't --

15 MR. COSPER: Right.

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: -- be dealing with them.  
17 And that's why we take it so seriously. And that's why  
18 this stuff goes back forever, as long as there's some  
19 record.

20 MR. COSPER: Right. Well, to quote from a  
21 movie, if I could go back in time and talk to that young  
22 man and tell him how things are, I would. But that,  
23 that young man's gone, and I'm the one that sits before  
24 you.

25 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you.

1           Is there any -- I don't think we do public  
2 comment for this, do we?

3           MS. PALMER: No.

4           BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: No. Any further Board  
5 comment?

6           BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just  
7 have -- the card that he keeps referring to, that was  
8 the temporary card that was issued at the time he  
9 registered, or does he have an existing card?

10          MR. COSPER: No, I just have a provisional.

11          BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Okay. That answers my  
12 question. Thank you.

13          BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: And one last question.  
14 Where are you currently employed?

15          MR. COSPER: Unified Protective Services. I  
16 work at Walmart.

17          BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Thank you.

18          BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I guess, I do have one  
19 last question. And that is, does it reflect on the FBI  
20 fingerprint report, does it reflect on whether the  
21 burglary and the trespassing were reduced to  
22 misdemeanors?

23          MR. HARRIS: It just says one year probation  
24 and pay the fines. That's all it says.

25          BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: All right. Thank you.

1           Mr. Chair, I'm prepared to make a motion, if  
2 you're prepared to accept one.

3           BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I am prepared, sir.

4           BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I would move that in the  
5 case of David Cosper, that the denial be reversed, and  
6 pending the changes in the legislation effective October  
7 1st, that he would be granted a card. A registration.

8           BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: There is a motion. Do we  
9 have a second?

10          BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Ray Flynn. Second.

11          BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Discussion on the  
12 motion?

13          Hearing none, call for the vote.

14          BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Well, let me go ahead and  
15 just give the rationale behind my motion. As we  
16 discussed at our meeting yesterday, there's certain  
17 things that go on when -- and this is a -- not 40 years  
18 yet, but 38 or 30 some years ago. That's a long time  
19 ago. You have no other record that we've been able to  
20 find.

21           I think, there's plenty of time and distance  
22 from the activity to now. And that was my rationale.

23          BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you, sir.

24           Do we need to put this forward to the October  
25 1st, since there wasn't a conviction with regard to the

1 firearm charge?

2 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I guess, I'd ask legal  
3 counsel if that's allowed.

4 MS. PALMER: I'm sorry. What was the question?  
5 I was talking with the Executive Director.

6 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: In the motion, Mr. Nadeau  
7 had indicated that he -- based upon our conversation  
8 yesterday about when things will be effective.

9 MS. PALMER: Yes.

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Since there is no  
11 conviction on the firearms charge, that wouldn't fall  
12 within the exception that we would need to postpone till  
13 the 1st of October, since there was no conviction. I  
14 mean we're making a decision based upon his failure to  
15 disclose, not the fact that it's prohibited.

16 MS. PALMER: Well, if you don't have a  
17 disposition, but I don't know that there isn't a  
18 conviction, and I mean do you know what the end result  
19 was? Because you said you spent 10 weekends in jail  
20 over that.

21 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative).

22 MS. PALMER: Did they dismiss it at the end?

23 MR. COSPER: That's what they did.

24 MS. PALMER: At the end, it was dismissed. So  
25 you've still got the other charge.

1 I mean, I think, the safest thing to do --  
2 because, again, you have the ability to refuse him, in  
3 spite of all that, even before the law changed. But the  
4 problem is, with the licensee and the licensee's  
5 obligation, as of October 1st, they no longer are  
6 restricted to the same things. All they have to do is  
7 ensure that he's registered.

8 So I think that what you need to do is -- my  
9 understanding, and this is what the Executive Director  
10 was just asking me, is that he does have a provisional  
11 work card. So if that card's active, he could go out  
12 today and get employment. But because the law doesn't  
13 change until October 1st, he should not get employment  
14 until that time, so that a licensee isn't in a situation  
15 where they're employing somebody where the law says they  
16 can't.

17 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: But the provisional  
18 wouldn't be in effect, because the registration was  
19 denied to this point, though.

20 MS. PALMER: Okay. And that's what the  
21 Executive Director was asking me when I didn't hear the  
22 question posed by the member. I apologize. I'm not  
23 sure what you were getting at as far as --

24 MR. INGRAM: We can have him provisional status  
25 right now. And I have to ask staff. Have we revoked

1 that, based on this? And, unfortunately, we may not  
2 have this answer, because Bruce isn't here today.

3 MR. HARRIS: I'd have to look at the computer  
4 to see what was done.

5 MR. INGRAM: Normally, when the fingerprints  
6 come back positive for firearms convictions, as the law  
7 is currently in place, we, as Board staff, have the  
8 authority to revoke while they're provisional. I  
9 believe, he's probably been revoked in status in our  
10 computer. That's what should have happened. I would  
11 have to verify that. But because of that, his  
12 provisional would be revoked. But it then could be  
13 reinstated on October 1, if you so choose.

14 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: It would, the revocation  
15 would be for the failure to disclose, because we don't  
16 have a conviction for the firearms charge.

17 MR. INGRAM: Other than his testimony that he  
18 spent 10 weekends in jail.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Right.

20 MR. INGRAM: Correct. We don't have a final  
21 disposition on the actual fingerprints.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Government entity  
23 verifying that you're convicted of something?

24 MR. INGRAM: That is correct.

25 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: M-hm (affirmative).

1 MS. PALMER: It may also be for subsection 5 on  
2 making a false statement of material fact or failing to  
3 disclose. That's the other arrest.

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: My only issue is whether  
5 or not we just want to bind it to be October 1st, or  
6 whether or not, when he walks out of here, given a  
7 couple of days of for processing, he gets back in the  
8 system. That's my only.

9 MS. PALMER: He shouldn't go to work until  
10 October 1st.

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Answers my  
12 question.

13 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Is that included in the  
14 motion?

15 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Jim made it as part of  
16 his motion.

17 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Yeah, the October 1st was  
18 part of my motion.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yeah.

20 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Why don't I have Shannon  
21 read the motion back, so that everybody's clear on what  
22 the motion was.

23 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Please. If you would,  
24 please.

25 (The Reporter read back the motion.)



1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you.

2 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Could I speak to the  
3 motion, Mr. Chair?

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Please.

5 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Mr. Cosper, are you  
6 working now?

7 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative).

8 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: And what are your duties  
9 at Walmart?

10 MR. COSPER: To check receipts and -- and  
11 receipts on high ticket items, such as big screen TVs,  
12 vacuum cleaners, and what have you, and alert the  
13 officers that run the cameras if I see anything that's  
14 being stolen.

15 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: So you're doing security  
16 work now at Walmart?

17 MR. COSPER: M-hm (affirmative).

18 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I have a concern with the  
19 motion that, if we're to do this, this gentleman's going  
20 to have to go to Walmart and remove himself from  
21 employment until October 1st.

22 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Peter, I understand what  
23 you're saying. But, I think, legally, we might --  
24 legally, and I think our legal counsel has agreed, we  
25 don't have the ability to -- well, we have the ability,

1 but we open up liability for both his current employer  
2 and that if we allow the issuance of the -- his card  
3 before October 1st. We have the legislative authority  
4 effective October 1st -- or excuse me -- yeah, October  
5 1st. We don't, in my view, we don't have it today.

6 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I don't disagree with  
7 that.

8 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: And I get it. I know  
9 exactly what you're saying. I mean we're talking 20,  
10 we're talking 20 days. But that's -- I mean, you know,  
11 we can vote on this motion, and if it dies, and there's  
12 another motion, then we can go with the other motion,  
13 you know. You know what I'm saying.

14 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Yeah, I got it.

15 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Mr. Chairman, I've got a  
16 question for the applicant. And maybe he can help us  
17 out.

18 Mr. Cosper, you understand that what we're  
19 trying to do is try to help you? And it has to do with  
20 some laws and regulation changes, and we're dealing with  
21 that on October 1st. Is there a possibility you could  
22 take a few weeks vacation and still keep your job?

23 MR. COSPER: They don't give vacations where I  
24 work. If you don't work, you don't get paid. I have a  
25 sick wife at home and a special needs son. I cannot

1 miss any hours whatsoever.

2 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Okay.

3 MR. COSPER: I mean, if I can't go to work, I  
4 got to go do something.

5 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any other Board  
6 questions?

7 Okay. Then, we'll call for a vote. All in  
8 favor of reversing the denial as proposed in the motion,  
9 vote by saying "yes."

10 (Board members said "aye.")

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any opposed?

12 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: No.

13 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: The record will reflect  
14 one No vote. And the motion carries.

15 So, what that would mean is a licensee can  
16 employ you after October the 1st.

17 MR. COSPER: So I'm out of work.

18 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All I can tell you is  
19 that a licensee can employ you after October the 1st.

20 MR. COSPER: Okay.

21 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chairman?

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Is that it?

23 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chairman, may I make  
24 one clarification?

25 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Sure.

1 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Cospers, if it wasn't  
2 for our ability to have you get a work card on October  
3 1st, you would have been denied a work card, and you  
4 wouldn't have been able to get a work card for a year at  
5 the earliest. So, this may --

6 MR. COSPER: All right.

7 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: This may be 20 days, but  
8 it's better than a year, I think. So.

9 MR. COSPER: Tell that to my family.

10 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Well, sir, I get it.

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you for coming.

12 MR. COSPER: All right.

13 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. The next item on  
14 the agenda is item number nine, Eric John Kooi, who  
15 applied for registration and was denied.

16 MR. INGRAM: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kooi contacted  
17 me late last week and informed me that he was no longer  
18 going to appeal. So he has withdrawn his appeal.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Number 10, Justin Porties  
20 applied for registration, was denied.

21 Come on up.

22 MR. PORTIES: How are you today?

23 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Let's see. Who had this  
24 one?

25 MR. HARRIS: This was another one of Bruce's.

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Were you here  
2 earlier when we made the -- the investigator that made  
3 the determination on your case is not here due to a  
4 medical problem?

5 MR. PORTIES: (Nodded head affirmatively.)

6 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay.

7 MS. PALMER: Sir, you have to speak up, because  
8 the recorder, she can't get "uh-huh," you know, when  
9 you're shaking your head.

10 MR. PORTIES: Okay. I'm sorry. Yes, I  
11 understand.

12 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Speak louder.

13 MR. PORTIES: Yes, I understand. Thank you,  
14 sir.

15 MR. HARRIS: Okay. Mr. Porties was --  
16 Porties ("Por-TEEZ"), correct?

17 MR. PORTIES: Yes, Porties ("Por-TEEZ"), yes.

18 MR. HARRIS: -- was sent a denial letter on  
19 July 22nd. The basis for his denial was, when his  
20 fingerprints came back, there was a 2005 for driving --  
21 well, basically, driving without a license. He was  
22 convicted of that, 24 months of probation.

23 There was another one for possession of a  
24 stolen vehicle. He listed it as being dismissed on his  
25 application. But when the prints came back, it showed

1 that it was reduced to a gross misdemeanor. And that,  
2 as well, he did, looks like, 24 months on that charge as  
3 well.

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. What year was  
5 that?

6 MR. HARRIS: That was 2007.

7 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Seven. And these were  
8 listed on the application, or not?

9 MR. HARRIS: That one was not, no.

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: It was not?

11 MR. HARRIS: It was not listed.

12 There are a few other charges he had in here.  
13 The stolen vehicle. And then, in 2010, he had a battery  
14 on a person, but there's no dispo on that one. Received  
15 a battery, 24 months; looks like the same cycle on that  
16 one. Same.

17 Did you list that on your app, the battery?

18 MR. PORTIES: I don't think I did. No.

19 MR. HARRIS: That was 2010, 24 months probation  
20 on that one.

21 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Is that it?

22 MR. HARRIS: That's it.

23 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. What do you have  
24 to say?

25 MR. PORTIES: Honestly, I can't think of

1 anything.

2 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: You have to speak up a  
3 little so that the lady can get you.

4 MR. PORTIES: Okay. I'm sorry. I can't even  
5 refuse anything that I did not list. That 2010 thing, I  
6 did not -- obviously, I do not remember the whole  
7 situation. And I did not remember the disposition. So  
8 I did not put that in.

9 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Do we have any Board  
10 questions?

11 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: No.

12 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: No.

13 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: No.

14 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Were there any other  
15 arrests besides '05, '07 and '10?

16 MR. HARRIS: Not that he was charged for, no.

17 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. What were the  
18 circumstances behind those arrests?

19 MR. PORTIES: The biggest one I remember was it  
20 was supposed to be attempted possession of a stolen  
21 vehicle, but it was actually a rental a car that didn't  
22 get returned on time. I was in a rental car didn't get  
23 returned on time. And it was actually rented through my  
24 brother, and I did not know, because he ended up moving  
25 to Florida.

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: He had what?

2 MR. PORTIES: He ended up moving to Florida.

3 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Oh. So you were driving  
4 the rental car?

5 MR. PORTIES: Yes, sir.

6 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Well, how much  
7 time did you do -- well, did you actually do time, or  
8 was it probation?

9 MR. PORTIES: It was probation.

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: How much time have you  
11 spent in custody for any of this stuff?

12 MR. PORTIES: I want to say maybe, at the most,  
13 I would maybe say maybe 30 days, 35 days at the most.

14 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: What's your employment  
15 history since you've become an adult?

16 MR. PORTIES: Honestly, I opened a small  
17 business, selling like shoe cleaner products at Nellis  
18 Air Force Base. I did it for about four years before I  
19 tried to receive my guard card. I also opened one at  
20 rental swap meet, doing the same thing, pretty much same  
21 type of work. It was retail sales.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay.

23 MR. PORTIES: Yeah.

24 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Is this your first  
25 attempt or foray into security --



1 MR. PORTIES: Yes, sir.

2 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: -- type work?

3 MR. PORTIES: Yes, sir.

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Can you give us a  
5 compelling reason why we, as a board, should set aside  
6 the public's safety and say you're somebody that's due  
7 special consideration?

8 MR. PORTIES: I don't want to say I'm due  
9 special consideration. But I would like to say that  
10 those things that I did, I don't feel like they should  
11 reflect the person that I am now. Yes, I have made  
12 mistakes. And, I guess, the biggest mistake I did was  
13 not actually putting on things, which I should have  
14 done. And that's the fact that I can't make an excuse  
15 for.

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Thank you.

17 Any other Board questions?

18 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: No questions.

19 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Yeah, I do. On the 2010  
20 charge of battery, what was the circumstances on that?

21 MR. PORTIES: It was a situation that happened.  
22 This was actually out in Los Angeles, California, out in  
23 Hollywood. Me and a person, we got into an altercation.  
24 Security came, and they broke up the situation. But me  
25 and him, he did get into a little bit of a scuffle, me

1 and another person.

2 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: What was the scuffle over?  
3 That's my question.

4 MR. PORTIES: Oh, we were just on -- we were  
5 just out in Hollywood. We were -- you know, me and my  
6 friends were just having fun. And the situation just  
7 got out of hand.

8 I'm not sure if that answers it correctly.

9 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: No, it doesn't, but in a  
10 way it did. Thank you.

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any other questions?

12 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: I have one question,  
13 Chairman.

14 Were any injuries involved here, did anyone  
15 require medical treatment? From the fight?

16 MR. PORTIES: No, sir.

17 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: From the battery?

18 MR. PORTIES: No. No, sir.

19 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: Okay.

20 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Anything else?

21 Is there anything else you would like to say?

22 MR. PORTIES: No, sir.

23 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Then, I'll  
24 entertain a motion, please.

25 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: This is Ray Flynn. I'll

1 make a motion that we deny Justin Porties' appeal.

2 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Second.

3 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Or I'll -- let me rephrase  
4 that. That we uphold the denial from staff.

5 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I'll second.

6 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Second.

7 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. We got a motion  
8 and a second to uphold the denial. Any Board questions  
9 on the motion?

10 All in favor, say "aye."

11 (Board members said "aye.")

12 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any opposed?

13 It carries unanimous.

14 The denial of your work card application has  
15 been upheld. Thank you.

16 MR. PORTIES: Thank you, sir. Thank you for  
17 your time. Thank you.

18 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay.

19 MR. INGRAM: We trailed six and seven.

20 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: And eight.

21 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Six and seven. Aaron  
22 Green. Aaron Green here? Aaron Green in Carson?

23 MR. INGRAM: Mr. Chairman, Aaron Green was  
24 appropriately informed of his appeal hearing today. He  
25 confirmed verbally on August 31st that he would be

1 attending. He was also sent notice via certified mail,  
2 return receipt requested. We received that back, that  
3 he would be attending today. That's all I have.

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. As to item number  
5 six, for Aaron Green, any Board questions?

6 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I make a motion that  
7 Mr. Green's application be denied.

8 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Do we have a second?

9 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I'll section that.  
10 Basically, the motion, I just want to confirm, we're  
11 upholding, we're affirming the denial, we're upholding  
12 the denial, correct?

13 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Correct. I'll make a  
14 motion that it be upheld, the denial. Is that right?

15 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: That's all right, Peter.  
16 I did the same thing.

17 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: That's it.

18 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: We got a motion and a  
19 second. All in favor?

20 (Board members said "aye.")

21 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any opposed?

22 Carries.

23 Number seven, Keith Frick.

24 MR. INGRAM: Mr. Chairman, Keith Frick, we  
25 attempted to contact him. The telephone number that he

1 had on his application is no longer in service. He was  
2 sent an e-mail to the e-mail address we had on file,  
3 with no reply, and there was no read receipt. And we  
4 also sent out a certified letter, return receipt  
5 requested, on him, and we did not receive the return  
6 receipt back.

7 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair, I'd move that  
8 it we uphold the...

9 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Motion. Do we have a  
10 second?

11 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Second.

12 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any Board comment on the  
13 motion?

14 All in favor?

15 (Board members said "aye.")

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Any opposed?

17 Carries unanimous.

18 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Nine.

19 MR. INGRAM: What's that?

20 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: We're missing nine.

21 MR. INGRAM: Nine withdrew.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: We're down to 11, right?

23 MR. INGRAM: Correct.

24 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Board comment and  
25 future agenda items for possible action.

1 I've got a couple things. I've been working  
2 with staff a little bit to streamline some of the  
3 proposals that we can put forward in a workshop form for  
4 regulatory changes. Legal counsel's been involved with  
5 staff regarding it. And, I think, that's moving forward  
6 pretty good.

7 I think, we're going to need some statutory  
8 changes, which puts us on a different time track for  
9 submission to the next session. So that, I've kind of  
10 got on fast track with Kevin for staff as we have people  
11 available.

12 So I would anticipate that we're going to have  
13 some proposals and some workshops scheduled for industry  
14 participation and discussion and making some sausage  
15 here in the next little while. But I would expect to  
16 propose some fairly radical items for consideration,  
17 both from a revenue standpoint, as well as a  
18 jurisdiction and authority standpoint.

19 I'd like to see the definition and purpose and  
20 our ability to do things by regulation expanded  
21 somewhat. Or, if we can get a firm, clear understanding  
22 of what our authority and our jurisdiction is with  
23 regard to the current statute, there may not need to be  
24 much of a change. But we need to be able to feel good  
25 and comfortable about what statutory authority we have,

1 so that we can go forward and clearly establish  
2 regulations that we have support for, legal support for.  
3 That's one issue.

4           Number two, from a revenue expectation, I  
5 think, we need to look at a couple of different things  
6 that we haven't looked at before, that are a little bit  
7 unconventional, that would probably bring us into  
8 compliance without a lot of expenses and staff to force  
9 compliance.

10           But one of the things in particular that I had  
11 in mind was -- and this would apply most particularly to  
12 the repossession industry. And that would be the  
13 imposition of a permit process that would allow -- we'd  
14 have to get involved the -- I think, we've discussed  
15 this before. But it would -- the easiest process is to  
16 involve the Department of Motor Vehicles and require  
17 that -- and the reason for that is the end result always  
18 flows through DMV.

19           When you repossess a car on behalf of -- or  
20 repossess any collateral on behalf of a lienholder,  
21 there has to be an affidavit of repossession associated  
22 with that recapture. And that affidavit of repossession  
23 flows through the Department of Motor Vehicles. And the  
24 DMV won't retitle the vehicle for a clean title after  
25 it's processed through the system.

1           So that's, that's where you could have control  
2 at a very little cost associated with compliance. And  
3 where I see compliance coming is there's probably -- we  
4 should be able to get the honest numbers. But there's  
5 probably somewhere in the neighborhood of a minimum of  
6 15,000 to a maximum of 25,000 repossessions, both  
7 privately and by licensee, in the state a year.

8           I don't see it as a very substantial imposition  
9 to, let's say, put forward something in the neighborhood  
10 of maybe a \$5.00 fee to issue a permit. And that would  
11 probably be after the fact. I don't think that we need  
12 to interfere with the process. But I think that we need  
13 to have a tracking mechanism. And any new tracking  
14 mechanism that we put in place is going to have a cost  
15 associated with it, if we're administering it.

16           So if we can determine, for example, if  
17 there's -- let's say there's 25,000 repossessions in a  
18 year, and we charge a \$5.00 fee to track all of that and  
19 to make sure that the Department of Motor Vehicles, as  
20 part of their affidavit of repossession, puts down the  
21 information about who picked it up, where it was picked  
22 up, that leaves us with a trail from the point in time  
23 that the legal owner set it for repossession to the  
24 point in time it got to the auction. And we wouldn't  
25 having to be guessing or going out and beating on doors,



1 conducting audits, blindly, to determine whether or not  
2 there are illegal actors out there doing it.

3           The place I'm a little bit sketchy is whether  
4 or not we have the legal authority to require  
5 proprietary lienholders to commit to this program, and  
6 that being that a private dealer who sends out his own  
7 employee, who is not licensed by us, do we have the  
8 wherewithal under Public Safety to require that they pay  
9 a \$5.00 fee and receive a permit, so that that  
10 repossession can be tracked as part of the system, or  
11 without that type of action, we only accommodate a half  
12 of what we're attempting to do.

13           Probably, as a guess, most likely, and this is  
14 a guess, 30 percent of everything that's happening  
15 privately is probably being done illegally. You know,  
16 from a legal perspective, an employee can work for ABC  
17 dealership and get a W-2, be a bona fide employee, and  
18 ABC dealership can say "Go get our cars that are subject  
19 to repossession." And that activity is not covered by  
20 the regulatory system that we have, because they're not  
21 doing it for hire.

22           But when ABC looks across the street to his  
23 friend DE and F dealership and says "My truck cost me a  
24 lot of money. So I'll let you have my truck and my  
25 employee to do your repos, and I'll let you have my

1 truck and my employee to do other repos," then that  
2 truck and that employee are for hire.

3           And, you know, that's one incident. Other  
4 incidents that are becoming widely knowledgeable in the  
5 industry are towing companies simply allowing their  
6 employees to conduct repossession activity on behalf of  
7 local dealers. That's legal as the day is long as long  
8 as the local dealer or his authorized employee is  
9 standing there directing that repossession.

10           But that's not the case. Currently, I'm  
11 following up on a situation that occurred this weekend,  
12 for example. A towing company licensed by the  
13 Transportation Authority, I believe, has an employee in  
14 a coma from being beat severely on Friday night,  
15 attempting to do a repossession. They don't -- they  
16 lack the fundamental training, and they really lack a  
17 fundamental knowledge of the legal requirements to  
18 successfully conduct a lawful repossession. And which  
19 the vast majority includes the issue of no breach of  
20 peace, so that we don't have people getting hurt, except  
21 for on those strained circumstances.

22           So, in that particular industry, there's a  
23 significant amount of illegal activity going on. And  
24 it's not going to be too far along before somebody's  
25 going to get hurt or killed. Not to mention, the

1 federal -- the federal government, through the Federal  
2 Trade Commission, is exerting a tremendous amount of  
3 authority over privacy matters and then propriety of  
4 collection activities.

5           So, I think, unless we want to defer some or a  
6 lot of our responsibility, jurisdiction or authority to  
7 the federal government to show up and dictate the way  
8 life's going to be, we may want to implement statutory  
9 changes or at least regulatory coverage that addresses  
10 the issue.

11           And, but I see the -- and this isn't something  
12 that I dreamt up. This was most recently enacted in the  
13 State of Illinois, who went from a totally nonregulated  
14 state to a totally and completely regulated outfit. And  
15 the permit process -- they call them medallions. The  
16 process works in such a fashion that me, as a licensee,  
17 if I go away, if I have employees that repossessed 20  
18 cars over the weekend, I could go on a state computer,  
19 pay \$5.00 a permit and make notification of where it  
20 came from and who the lienholder was, all of this stuff,  
21 and that would go into a common database, and that would  
22 charge me \$5.00, whether I paid for it with a credit  
23 card or a standing account. It would be similar to the  
24 DMV accounts that we have now for driver's license and  
25 registration information.

1           But our previous attempt to work with the DMV  
2 on the issue probably fell a little bit on deaf ears.  
3 But that was prior to the current administration. And  
4 we have a change of chiefs, change of director, or the  
5 chief of the DMV. So there's no reason not to maybe  
6 make an attempt again, but we need to do it early enough  
7 so that if there needs to be statutory authority or a  
8 change to a statute.

9           I'm not suggesting this is something that we  
10 accomplish overnight, because we're talking about having  
11 to create an automated format, which is a computer, and  
12 it means IT, it means connections, it means privacy  
13 issues. It's not just something that we can jump into  
14 and say "Let's get to it."

15           But, and I know we don't like to talk about  
16 this in an open forum, but we need to have sources of  
17 revenue other than the licensees' revenue, fine revenue.  
18 We need to have something that we can pick up. If we  
19 charge \$5.00, and DMV gets a dollar, and it costs us a  
20 dollar fifty, there needs to be something that puts, in  
21 this case, probably 30 or 40 thousand dollars a year  
22 into the pot that assists us in enforcement and doing  
23 what we need to do.

24           Because, I think, as we've recently learned,  
25 litigation is going to be the thing of the future and

1 not necessarily a thing of the past. I don't want to  
2 sit here and be part of a government agency that has a  
3 golden bucket of litigation funds, because that can  
4 create government arrogance, and we can sit here and say  
5 "We're going to pick on you because you can't afford to  
6 defend yourself, and you're going to like it."

7 I don't want to get that type of fund  
8 established, but I do think that we need to have a fund  
9 to adequately defend the Board or put forward a legal  
10 position for the Board without worrying about whether or  
11 not it's going to cause us to dip into the pot, that we  
12 might have to lay somebody off, or we may have to  
13 curtail improvements, or anything of the sort.

14 Like I say, I don't think that we want to have  
15 a \$200,000 litigation bucket. But I do think we need to  
16 have the money to sit here and say -- if we're going to  
17 go for this question of law, and we're going to  
18 litigate, you know, and it's something that we feel  
19 strongly about, I don't think that the budget should be  
20 the dictation, dictate to us whether or not we have to  
21 give or not.

22 So I'm hoping that we can find some ways that  
23 aren't a hundred dollars here and a hundred dollars here  
24 or a thousand dollars there, so that we can  
25 incrementally increase in the future the budget ability

1 for the whole Board and staff.

2 And that was just one idea for that particular,  
3 a portion of the industry that we represent. There very  
4 well may be other areas where we can incrementally do  
5 something that creates an environment where we can get a  
6 buck here and a buck there, and we don't have to worry  
7 about being broke or operating so close to the red that  
8 it affects our judgment.

9 Other things that could be considered are  
10 things that are already vetted through state government.  
11 Take, for example, the Nevada Transportation Authority  
12 has the ability for impounding for violations. And they  
13 do it quite regularly. And it's a pretty good  
14 deterrent. You know, if the NTA sends an investigator  
15 out, and some guy's got a tow truck, and he's hauling  
16 people around for a \$20 bill, the NTA impounds that tow  
17 truck and sells it and recoups the revenue from that.  
18 And it's a pretty good deterrent.

19 You know, you don't see these guys go out and  
20 buy brand-new stuff to do it illegally, you know, by any  
21 stretch. But, and I don't like to -- if you look at the  
22 legal periodicals of the docket for the NTA, you'll see  
23 U-Haul having to show up and collect all of their moving  
24 vans for everybody that comes out and offers to move  
25 your household goods for \$20 and then holds it hostage

1 for 2,000.

2           You know, so I mean there's a lot of deterrents  
3 available just for a few of those actions, that we could  
4 curtail illegal activity just by the simple fact that if  
5 you're -- if you've got a computer bank that you pay  
6 for, and you're mining data and selling it to a broker,  
7 we're going to walk in and take your computer bank and  
8 everything else, office furnishings, that we think  
9 you're using in order to get this illegal revenue.

10           So I'd like -- and maybe if we could think  
11 about it in those terms. Also, these things are  
12 negative. But I don't see anybody in the industry  
13 wanting to really put up a great fight. I don't see  
14 anybody, any licensee of the repossession industry  
15 saying "I don't want to pay \$5.00 per repo in order for  
16 you to have the funds to enforce existing statute and  
17 regulation." Because they want it done. It's us that  
18 can't do it.

19           We don't have the staff. We haven't had the  
20 harmony in the staff, I mean when we have had staff,  
21 we've had bursts. Sometimes we've had staff and haven't  
22 had an executive director. Other times, you know, in  
23 the history of the Board, we've all had our reasons for  
24 things not being able to get accomplished.

25           But it all takes -- it's all going to take

1 money. And that brings us up to the other issue about  
2 the consideration maybe at the December meeting, make  
3 sure that it gets agendized, so that we can make a  
4 decision on a hearings officer for these issues, so that  
5 we can maybe keep some of this revenue and it doesn't by  
6 statute have to flow to the state treasurer.

7 And, quite possibly, it would take away -- it  
8 would allow for things to be litigated prior to having  
9 to wait for a quarterly meeting. And we would actually  
10 sit here in a true appellate capacity if a hearings  
11 officer system of some sort were to be available. And  
12 whether or not we want that to be an independent  
13 hearings officer, like reaching out to the Department of  
14 Administration and saying "Hey, would you do our  
15 hearings as well?" Or if we wanted to have staff do it.  
16 Or if we wanted a Board member, a single Board member to  
17 do it.

18 I don't know how we work that out. But I think  
19 it's imperative that we look at a system that creates an  
20 environment for a hearings officer to exist before the  
21 matter comes to the Board. And a lot of it is based  
22 upon the revenue factor that we are entitled to retain  
23 those fines if it goes through that system. Whereas,  
24 now it goes through the state treasurer, and after a  
25 certain point, even if they do collect it, it doesn't



1 flow back to us.

2           So that's another issue where, you know, we  
3 would probably work a little bit harder to make sure  
4 that we collect on the things that people owe us money  
5 for, if we had the reasoning that it was due us and  
6 where it was coming back to us.

7           Because, I think, we have a couple of five or  
8 10 thousand-dollar issues that nobody has ever made any  
9 satisfaction on. And we've never done anything about  
10 it. So for all intents and purposes, we had citations,  
11 we had the staff part, we had appeals, we had hearings,  
12 we had evidence, we made a determination, and pretty  
13 much they just said "Catch me if you can." So. And our  
14 reasoning for not going to do it is just simply, if we  
15 go catch them, the state general fund might get a few  
16 bucks, but we're not going to get anything. So.

17           That's probably enough for this list.

18           Anyway, that's where I was coming from, not to  
19 mention the fact that each individual profession  
20 probably has areas where we can nickel and dime a little  
21 bit and make a little bit of revenue where it won't kill  
22 the bottom line of the licensee. But, and they  
23 shouldn't have any complaint as long as we're putting it  
24 to good use, even if that complaint's going to be "That  
25 was the worst audit I ever went through in my life," you

1 know, I mean.

2           There is a substantial amount of complaining  
3 that the only people held to answer here are the people  
4 that are licensed and paying the bills. Now, I think,  
5 all of the industries need a little bit more, a little  
6 bit more observation. Because everybody knows other  
7 people that are getting away with a few things they  
8 probably oughtn't. But by the same token, those  
9 licensees pretty much have a right to gripe when they  
10 see a lot of illegal activity and we're not doing  
11 anything about it.

12           So if we're going to hammer the licensees a  
13 little bit more, then we need to go out there and make  
14 an example out of a few clear, ex-felon violators.

15           BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Mr. Chair, a quick  
16 question. If you're planning on a workshop in December,  
17 would we be adding a third day to the meetings; is that  
18 something we need to block out?

19           BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I think that with the  
20 workshop, I think, I'd like to let Kevin speak to where  
21 he's at on scheduling for the workshop. I was, for the  
22 December issue, I was -- I'm hoping to get some of the  
23 workshops before December so that we can address the  
24 findings in December and roll on with the formula for  
25 timing.

1 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: All right. That's fine.  
2 Also, all is I'm saying is we need to block out dates,  
3 because it's hard to get five of us together.

4 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay.

5 MR. INGRAM: Yeah, on the workshops, the way  
6 that works, you're more than welcome to attend a  
7 workshop as a license holder or as a private party. The  
8 Board is not represented at the workshops.

9 The workshops are something that we notice, and  
10 we set up a -- we'll videoconference, like we do now.  
11 So our next step is to gather dates for both locations.  
12 We have everything ready to go forward. We're  
13 currently -- I'm currently looking at the proposals that  
14 we have to separate out, to have multiple workshops  
15 instead of one, because we have some proposals we want  
16 to move forward with, that I think we need to put the  
17 ones that are going to -- that we anticipate a lot of  
18 communication on from the public or license holders on  
19 one day, and the ones that we think we'll probably  
20 breeze through, do that on a separate day, to try to,  
21 you know, get through them as quickly as possible.

22 Those workshops, sometimes we have nobody show  
23 up. Well, we usually have Mr. Spriggs show up for all  
24 the workshops. We might have one or two in the  
25 audience. Other times, you're going to have a whole

1 room of 50 or 60 people that want to speak their mind on  
2 it.

3 And so, once the workshops are completed,  
4 that's when our work really starts. We have to put  
5 everything together in a nice little package to bring  
6 before the Board, for the Board to review the outcome of  
7 the workshops. And then you guys will make a decision  
8 on whether you want to move forward with the proposed  
9 changes or not.

10 Once that happens, that's when I contact the  
11 LCB to get the proposals agendized. Because anything in  
12 Nevada Administrative Code must go before the LCB for  
13 approval. Anything that's Nevada Revised Statutes, as  
14 most of you know, go before the legislature. So right  
15 now, we're looking on Nevada Administrative Codes.  
16 Those are the quicker fixes. And then the statutory  
17 changes that Chairman spoke to earlier, those are things  
18 we need to get on right now, because the next  
19 legislative session will be here quicker than we think.

20 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Okay.

21 MR. INGRAM: Even though it's a year and a half  
22 out.

23 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: I misunderstood. When I  
24 sat on the POST commission for 10 years, they required a  
25 quorum of commissioners at any workshop. So if we don't

1 have to be at any workshops, that's fine with me.

2 MR. INGRAM: Yes, it's a little bit different  
3 here.

4 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: Okay.

5 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair?

6 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yes, sir.

7 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: For consideration of the  
8 agenda item for the future, we've worked under the  
9 paradigm that we meet two days every quarter; you know,  
10 June, September, December, et cetera. Statutorily,  
11 though, I don't see where there's a requirement that we  
12 meet quarterly. In other words, part of the  
13 conversation yesterday was the time table it takes for  
14 to us get an application and then get the application  
15 before the Board.

16 What my discussion for the next, for the future  
17 meeting would be, why are we stuck on that paradigm? Is  
18 there some statutory? Why couldn't we met every other  
19 month, or something along that line, so that the Board  
20 meets, so not everything is packed into one two-day  
21 session quarterly? Just a consideration. So. And we  
22 could have the deliberation and everything at a -- you  
23 know, with everybody having notice.

24 But it just seems to me, because part of our  
25 discussion yesterday was, when we -- that things were

1 stacking up and weren't moving through, and that type of  
2 thing. So.

3 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Well, you're the  
4 grandfather here.

5 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I know. And, you know,  
6 but there is -- you know, it's interesting. It's a  
7 paradigm that we're working under.

8 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yeah.

9 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: That we've been working  
10 under.

11 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Is there some reason  
12 other -- is there some reason that you remember?

13 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Hey, it's --

14 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I never even thought  
15 about it.

16 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: It's just the way it's  
17 been.

18 BOARD MEMBER COLBERT: It's always been that  
19 way.

20 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: It's always been that  
21 way. You know, we went from one day to two days. But  
22 particularly since we've gotten -- just historically  
23 speaking, one of the reasons that drove the two-day  
24 quarterly meetings was that we had the one day for  
25 approval of licensures, and then, when we went to a

1 statewide licensing process, where it wasn't Metro doing  
2 and Washoe doing it, we went statewide. Then we started  
3 having the appeals on the denials. And so, therefore,  
4 because of the number of appeals we were getting, we had  
5 to transition to a two-day, two-day meeting. Because,  
6 when Washoe and Clark were issuing them, they handled  
7 it. They handled the appeals. They handled that kind  
8 of thing. So that kind of transitioned when we went to  
9 the statewide licensing process.

10 But it just seems to me that we may want to  
11 look and change that paradigm. I don't see anything, I  
12 don't see a statutory requirement that we meet  
13 quarterly.

14 MR. INGRAM: And then, to speak on the comment  
15 about, you know, backing up, I can tell you that we  
16 don't have anything that's untimely or that's backing  
17 up. In fact, that's why you're seeing so many licensees  
18 per quarter. We give them a cutoff, to allow us to have  
19 a minimum of three months to complete the backgrounds,  
20 because we know how long it's going to take to complete  
21 the background. And then, those individuals that don't  
22 meet our cutoffs for the following Board meeting, we  
23 automatically tell them You're going to be scheduled out  
24 to the next Board meeting."

25 So we're very much real-time right now.

1 However, that has changed exponentially over the last  
2 couple of days with Mr. Yarborough being out of the  
3 office. We have our new investigator, James Batchelor,  
4 who I didn't officially recognize yesterday. He's here  
5 with us today. James was hired on to do more of the  
6 compliance audits and also to do the background  
7 investigations for the Board meetings. So we have got  
8 him up and running and as quickly as we can on  
9 completing backgrounds. But Mr. Yarborough's absence is  
10 going to definitely affect that turnaround.

11 But because of -- right now, we're real time  
12 with all of the applicants for licensure. Not a huge  
13 backlog.

14 Okay. So we want that agendized. We want --  
15 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: And I would just like to  
16 make one comment, Mr. Chairman.

17 There is some things that do not produce  
18 revenue, yet are very costly. And audit is one of  
19 those. Our audit fines are so small that they can  
20 barely -- they cannot pay the audit investigator. And  
21 that's just a basic business management call. But  
22 rather than enforcing unlicensed activities, and I'm  
23 speaking on the investigator side, we're being,  
24 investigators are being subject to audit, which is fine,  
25 but it's a very costly process, because we're paying



1 that investigator to do the audit. And the end the  
2 result is usually a 25- or 50-dollar fine.

3 And to do a proper audit, in like my business,  
4 it would probably take, I don't know, five days. They  
5 did one of Mr. Spriggs.

6 How long did it take, Mike, your audit?

7 MR. SPRIGGS: The first, it was about -- it was  
8 most of a day.

9 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: So most of a day, an  
10 auditor is there. So we're paying the cost of the  
11 auditor. And, I think, he got fined \$25.

12 MR. SPRIGGS: I didn't get fined on that, but I  
13 got fined \$25 on something else.

14 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: And, I guess, my point is,  
15 is we have to look at some of this stuff, in generating  
16 revenues, in a business sense more than in a  
17 governmental body sense. And when we have things that  
18 aren't generating income, if income is our concern,  
19 which I'm taking it to be a fact, Mr. Nadeau, and I'm  
20 aware of that and in agreement with it, I think we have  
21 to look at our business model and say, why, why not have  
22 that audit person out doing unlicensed activities where  
23 we can fine somebody? And then use your hearing officer  
24 to keep your money.

25 I mean I'm just throwing out some business

1 situations here. And in my business, if we don't make  
2 money on a project, it ends. It's over that day.

3 And we have projects that don't generate  
4 income. And if we want to run this like a business,  
5 let's run it like a business. If we don't, then let's  
6 keep doing whatever we want to do.

7 But we have so much unlicensed activity out  
8 there that's eligible for fine collection. And we use a  
9 whole nother investigator and probably one after that.  
10 And then, if we implement Mr. Nadeau's plan, or  
11 Mr. Zane's plan to work on repossessions, where we  
12 actually have a collection ability, collect annual  
13 funds, you're going to have to have somebody monitoring  
14 that. But that's probably going to pay for itself.

15 MS. PALMER: I just want to caution the Board  
16 about deliberating. This is -- when you're putting  
17 ideas out there for future agendas, that's great. But  
18 when the Board starts commenting about the ideas, now  
19 it's almost as if it were on the agenda. And it's not  
20 on the agenda. I just don't want anybody to violate the  
21 open meeting law.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you.

23 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Thank you. So I'm done  
24 now.

25 MR. INGRAM: And then, just for clarification,

1 some of the proposals we're putting forward are going to  
2 affect revenues, citations, fines. We've got a whole  
3 large group of things that we're going to be taking  
4 before the workshops, that, again, I'll share with you,  
5 once the workshops are done and we've received input  
6 from those that show up for the workshops to give us  
7 input, then you will be able to see everything that we  
8 have going forward at that time.

9           Again, not able to discuss it here during the  
10 meeting, because it's not an agenda item. However,  
11 these are all things that we are, as a -- as Board  
12 staff, have been really working hard on to make things  
13 better. And, I think, you're going to be very pleased  
14 when we bring those proposals before you at, hopefully,  
15 the December Board meeting that's -- that Lori and I  
16 have on our agenda.

17           Lori has put in a lot of work on this for us.  
18 And those of you that know Lori, you know she's  
19 phenomenal on the computer. And she's put a lot of work  
20 into this. And we believe we're going to bring a whole  
21 new life to our Board and how we do business. And we're  
22 looking forward to making that presentation.

23           So we'll keep you posted on when they're, the  
24 workshops are being scheduled, in case you want to  
25 participate, as an individual, not as a Board member.

1 And be looking for those in the next few weeks.

2 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: But for legal counsel, if  
3 three of the Board members attend a workshop, does that  
4 require -- I realize it depends on the deliberation. I  
5 understand that. But if three were attending a  
6 workshop, does it require the posting?

7 MS. PALMER: It has to be posted anyway.  
8 We're talking -- and I'm not sure if the Executive  
9 Director is talking about the workshop for actually  
10 adopting a regulation.

11 Okay. So the workshops when we're actually  
12 adopting the regulation, that does have to be agendized.

13 MR. INGRAM: Our workshops are agendized.

14 MS. PALMER: So I'm not familiar with the  
15 workshops that this Board has done in the past. So I'll  
16 have to familiarize myself with the requirements, and I  
17 know there's been changes to the open meeting law, and  
18 what will be required for that.

19 So this, I'm hearing about this part of it for  
20 the first time, as we sit in the meeting right now. So  
21 I'm sorry. I'm not prepared for the question.

22 MR. INGRAM: And we do agendize all of our  
23 workshops, not for adoption, but for actual workshops,  
24 per the open meeting law. This is all handled exactly  
25 the same way. You just don't deliberate on anything

1 until we do the Board adoption or review at adoption  
2 meetings, so.

3 But we'll be working very closely with our  
4 newest legal counsel, because she has taught us a lot in  
5 the short time she's been here. We're very glad to have  
6 her on board. And, I think, all of the Board members  
7 will agree with that.

8 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I can yell from the  
9 tallest mountain, I'm happy about it.

10 MR. INGRAM: At least, what, eight inches off  
11 the ground?

12 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yeah.

13 That's all I had. Anybody else have something?  
14 Something for December that we need to look to put on  
15 the agenda?

16 MR. INGRAM: So, for clarification, we have the  
17 review of hearing officer, decision on that. The  
18 meeting review that Board Member Nadeau brought up. And  
19 then that's the two items I heard that we needed  
20 agendized for December. Is that correct?

21 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: And then whatever happens  
22 with regard to workshop activities.

23 MR. INGRAM: Correct. Okay.

24 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: So you're talking about an  
25 extra day meeting. It looks like it.

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Well, it all depends upon  
2 the -- do we have an understanding on what license  
3 applications we'll be dealing with?

4 MR. INGRAM: About the same.

5 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: About the same?

6 MR. INGRAM: Yes.

7 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I don't know that we need  
8 an additional meeting, but we might have to have a long  
9 day. It's up to how you guys feel comfortable.

10 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: I'm comfortable with two  
11 days. We're -- what time is it? It's almost time for  
12 my 11:00 o'clock meeting, right?

13 MR. INGRAM: It's 10:20.

14 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: You know what I'm saying.

15 MR. INGRAM: Yeah, the only, the only days that  
16 go long, on day two, would be, once we start bringing  
17 these licensees before the Board for disciplinary  
18 action, which we have two we're working on with legal  
19 counsel right now, those could be some long appeal days.

20 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: And I concur with Board  
21 Member Flynn that if we're going to start blocking days  
22 in December or planning on long meetings, we need to  
23 block out those days sooner rather than later. And I  
24 don't know how your calendar's going, but my December is  
25 about history.

1 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: M-hm (affirmative).

2 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: So.

3 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: I mean would we rather  
4 add a day, and if we get through half days on two of  
5 them, then -- I'm just trying to figure what's easiest  
6 for scheduling staff and what's easiest for scheduling  
7 individual members.

8 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I would prefer to add a  
9 day and then drop it if we don't have to use it. But  
10 I'd prefer to block it, personally, and then drop it if  
11 we don't need it.

12 MR. INGRAM: Some things to think about, as far  
13 as cost-effectiveness, you know, Shannon does a  
14 fantastic job for us as a transcriber; she's here on the  
15 second day. Board staff is tasked with minutes on the  
16 first day of the Board meeting. Some thoughts that we  
17 threw out to prior Board, that we never really made a  
18 decision on, possibly look at scheduling the licensing  
19 and the appeals on the same day, so that we have the  
20 transcriber there for the entire day. It's not going to  
21 cost me that much more. Bringing her back two days is  
22 going to cost me more.

23 The other thing is, is the cost of per diems  
24 for Board members run up pretty high each day. So  
25 that's another hit to our budget. Again, I don't want

1 the budget to dictate how we do the job, but just being  
2 real.

3 If the first day we get through 90 percent of  
4 the agenda, to be the review of the applicants and the  
5 appeals, and we have the second day scheduled for any  
6 carryovers and then the remaining of that day to take  
7 care of other business, that might be an option as well  
8 for you to think about.

9 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Mr. Chair?

10 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Yes, sir.

11 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: And I don't want to --  
12 maybe this is an agenda item in and of itself that we  
13 should set for the future, but, because I don't want to  
14 get into discussion deliberation. But one consideration  
15 for the items that we have brought up for next, next  
16 meeting is to put those on the first day. And if we --  
17 if our first day goes a long time, then we can just roll  
18 it to the next day.

19 So, you know, that might be how we might want  
20 to try it. But, you know, of course, the agenda is up  
21 to you, Mr. Chairman. But that's just a suggestion.

22 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. I think, that's  
23 the way a lot of the different enterprise agencies do.  
24 I know the medical board does it that way. And, I  
25 think, the nursing board does it that way. And it's



1 just an overall agenda that flows into two days.

2 MR. INGRAM: Well, I'll go ahead and place that  
3 on the agenda for actual deliberation and decisions to  
4 be made in December.

5 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Put that on the agenda  
6 for the December meeting so that we can take a formal  
7 action on meeting dates and how they're going to flow.

8 BOARD MEMBER NADEAU: Sounds like a winner to  
9 me.

10 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I guess, my question,  
11 then, is what if -- if there's a workshop, that subject  
12 matter that had been discussed in that workshop is going  
13 to be presented in the December meeting. Are you going  
14 to have enough time in two days to do that, and the list  
15 you just read?

16 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Well, the --

17 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I mean I don't, again,  
18 I don't want to get into discussions, but.

19 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: The stuff I read is stuff  
20 that I just wanted to put forward and maybe set on the  
21 agenda so that it can be discussed. Most of this stuff  
22 here is not part of the current workshop product.

23 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Okay.

24 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: So the workshop product  
25 now is some revisions to NAC and different things of

1 that nature. So, I think, it's going to be a summary of  
2 do we like it, don't we like it, do we want to kick it,  
3 do we want to accept it, send them back to the drawing  
4 board?

5 So I don't see that portion of working with  
6 more than about an hour for the Board. Plus, who wants  
7 to work extra in December?

8 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Not me.

9 MR. INGRAM: I think, that's Peter's input.

10 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: You got it.

11 MR. INGRAM: I'm taking December off.

12 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Okay. Anything else?

13 I appreciate everybody being kind to me for  
14 this first meeting. Now you can hold me under strict  
15 adherence and expectation. And I won't let you down.

16 MR. INGRAM: We do have fines in place for  
17 nonuse of gravel. So.

18 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you.

19 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I'll make a motion to  
20 adjourn.

21 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Oh, we have public  
22 comment.

23 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: Sorry.

24 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Anybody got public  
25 comment in Carson?

1 BOARD MEMBER FLYNN: No.

2 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Anybody got public  
3 comment in Las Vegas?

4 Now, Mr. Maheu.

5 BOARD MEMBER MAHEU: I make my motion to  
6 adjourn now.

7 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: All in favor?

8 (Board members said "aye.")

9 BOARD CHAIRMAN ZANE: Thank you.

10 \* \* \* \* \*

11 (The meeting adjourned at 10:26 a.m.)

12 -oOo-

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SHANNON L. TAYLOR, a Nevada Certified Court Reporter, Nevada CCR #322, do hereby certify:

That I was present at the Office of the Attorney General, 100 North Carson Street, Mock Court Room, Carson City, Nevada, on Thursday, September 10, 2015, at 9:00 a.m., and commencing at 9:00 a.m. took stenotype notes of a meeting of the State of Nevada Private Investigator's Licensing Board;

That I thereafter transcribed the aforementioned stenotype notes into typewriting as herein appears, and that the within transcript, consisting of pages 1 through 68, is a full, true, and correct transcription of said meeting;

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel for any of the parties, not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the actions, nor financially interested in the actions.

DATED: At Carson City, Nevada, this 16th day of September, 2015.

-----  
SHANNON L. TAYLOR  
Nevada CCR #322, RMR