STATE OF MINNESOTA

PRIVATE DETECTIVE AND PROTECTIVE AGENT SERVICES BOARD

May 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Location: 1430 Maryland Avenue East, St. Paul, Minnesota
Members Present: Drew Evans, Jim Hessel, Richard Hodsdon, Steve Wohlman
Members Not Present: Pat Moen
Attorney General Representative: Jacob Fischmann
Agency Staff: Greg Cook, Executive Director

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m. by Evans.

Evans asked if the Board had reviewed the April 2014 meeting minutes and if any corrections needed to be made. With no corrections needed Wohlman motioned to approve; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Previous Contingencies and/or Renewals with Issues Completed:

Glenn Fladmark PDI #807
Charles Loesch PDI #742

Evans inquired if the two listed here were complete or if they were continuing. Cook advised the contingencies listed here are complete. Wohlman moved to lift the contingencies as noted here; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Current Contingencies

American Security Associates, LLC PAC 335 –Due July 2014
Joe Collins PDE #1037 –Due July 2014

Cook advised that more time is still needed with the current contingencies. Evans advised the contingencies will be left in place and the meeting continued.

Consent Agenda

Cook requested a motion of approval for the following reissuance's due in April 2014, as they have provided all materials and had no issues:

License Number	License Type	License Holder
296	PAC	Semper Fi
942	PDC	Arden Investigations
939	PDI	Michael Atkinson

The Board reviewed the renewals listed above. Hessel moved to approve all the renewals on the consent agenda; Hodsdon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Renewals With Issues:

The Executive Director is asking the Board to determine if the following license holders should be:

A. Renewed upon remaining items corrected

— AND/OR —

B. Granted a contingency

— AND/OR —

C. Penalty imposed

Inspection Services PDC #1036

Evans inquired about the reason for requesting a contingency. Cook explained that the license holder failed to take training in 2012-2013. Cook advised that upon contacting the license holder he explained to Cook that he lives in North Dakota and did not make the drive into MN to take the training. Cook advised that he educated the license holder and also directed him to the online classes for the future. Cook also stated that he explained to the license holder that the Board may impose a penalty. Cook noted to the Board that the license holder has no previous disciplinary history with the Board and provided the Board with the license holders explanation for the lack of training.

Evans asked if there was any discussion from any of the Board's members. Wohlman inquired if the license holder was planning to take training and Cook confirmed. Wohlman asked if the license holder had indicated when he would be making the training up by and Cook advised that the license holder is signed up for the classes and that he has sent Cook a receipt but Cook advised he was not sure on when the training is taking place. Cook also advised that the license holder stated he only has about 1 case a year in Minnesota and that training requirement just didn't become an emphasis to him.

Wohlman inquired if a Letter of Education and Conciliation would work in this case and Cook stated he feels it would be appropriate. Wohlman moved to place the renewal into contingency with a letter of Education and Conciliation until Cook can determine that the training has been completed; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Contemporary Services Corporation PAC #260

Cook advised that at the time the renewal packet was sent out the qualified representative had left the company. Cook stated that the corporate office had not received a renewal packet so they contacted the agency and he sent another packet immediately. Cook made not that they returned the completed and well organized packet very quickly, but that the agency needs more time to review the renewal because of the number of employee's that have.

Wohlman inquired who the Qualified Representative was and Cook advised it was Wesley Ellis. Wohlman advised that Ellis had been the Minnesota Manager and Cook confirmed. Wohlman again asked who the Qualified Representative was and Cook advised that Ellis was both the Qualified Representative and the Minnesota Manager. Cook also advised that after a period of looking for someone to take over they have found someone and they have an officer change request into the agency now.

Wohlman inquired how long ago Ellis has left the company and Cook advised it was back in February 7th, 2014. Wohlman asked if Cook had been notified of the change and Cook advised that they had notified him of the change. Cook advised that the company has a full legal department that deals with licensing and the State but in this situation the packet did not get to them because Ellis had left.

Wohlman moved for a contingency; Hodsdon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Lapsed Licenses:

- **Kern Innovative Security Solutions, LLC (PAC 327): Lapsed status expires 6/1/2014**

Evans noted there is one lapsed license that will expire on June 1st, 2014 and placed in expired status. Evans inquired if Cook believes this will occur. Cook stated that he does believe it will occur, and that the license holder is done.

Surrendered Licenses:

None at this time.

Training Course & Instructor Approvals:

None at this time.

Officer Changes

License Holder Business Name:	Apollo
License Type/Number:	Corporate Protective Agent License #1069
Type of Officer Change:	Inge Black to Patrick Smith QR/MM
Physical Address:	2150 Providence Highway Warpole, MA 02081

Evans asked if there was any discussion by the Board. With no questions Hodsdon moved to approve Patrick Smith as the Qualified Representative and Minnesota Manager; Wohlman seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

New License Applicants – Consent Agenda:

Applicant Business Name:	Point to Point Global Security, Inc.
Qualified Representative:	Stephanie Lynn Point
Minnesota Manager	Gordon Hinds
Physical Address:	14346 Jarretsville Pike, Ste 100, Phoenix, MD 21131
Local Address	575 4th St SW, Plainview, MN 55964
Type of License Applying For:	Corporate Protective Agent
Scope of Business:	Security Services

Evans inquired if there was any discussion for the Board members. Evans inquired if there were any issues with the bond. Cook confirmed that the applicant said they sent the bond but Cook could not locate it. Cook advised he is working with them to get the bond and that he is looking for an approval contingent up receipt of the bond. Wohlman inquired if everything else was in order and Cook confirmed.

Hodsdon moved to approve Point to Point Global Security, Inc. for a protective agent license contingent upon receipt of the bond; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Business Name:	Kelly Consulting
Qualified Representative:	Daniel Kelly
Physical Address:	PO Box 16284 St Louis Park, MN 55416
Type of License Applying For:	Corporate Private Detective
Scope of Business:	Litigation Support, Corporate Investigations, Fraud Examinations and Full-scope Background Investigations.

Cook advised the bond is good and that the applicant is a qualified individual with experience from working with the FBI and Cargill. Cook also advised that the applicants firm also works in Colorado but that he has family here and wants to open an office here. Evans inquired if the applicant will be located here and Cook advised that they will be opening a Minnesota office. Wohlman inquired if the applicant would have any employee's and Cook advised it is just the applicant and his wife.

Wohlman moved to approve Kelly Consulting for a protective agent license; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Business Name:	HillTac Corporation
Qualified Representative:	Mark Hillstrom
Physical Address:	17310 Creek Ridge Pass Minnetonka, MN 55345
Type of License Applying For:	Corporate Protective Agent
Scope of Business:	Patrol, Access Control, Consulting and Special Event Security.

Cook advised the Board that Mark Hillstrom was in attendance at the meeting should they have any questions for him. Cook advised the bond is good and that Hillstrom has a good mix of experience with no issues. Cook advised that he will be working with Signal 88 which is a franchise situation and asked Hillstrom to give the Board a brief explanation of how Signal 88 works.

Hillstrom explained that Signal 88 is one of the only security companies that offer franchise business opportunities. Hillstrom explained that Signal 88 provides the back end services such as accounting and legal advice. Hillstrom explained that each individual owner is the license holder and that what the owners get from the franchise aside from support is leads and help with signing national accounts. Cook advised the Board that there is another Signal 88 franchise licensed up north.

Wohlman inquired how many employees Hillstrom plans to have and Hillstrom advised that he plans to have about 10; all dedicated patrol officers. Wohlman asked to confirm that the name of the business will be HillTac and Hillstrom confirmed.

Hodsdon moved to approve HillTac Corporation for a corporate protective agent license; Wohlman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Business Name:	Alan Garber
Physical Address:	1223 Blossom Boulevard Isanti, MN 55040
Type of License Applying For:	Individual Private Detective
Scope of Business:	Criminal Investigation, Background Investigations, Expert Witness and Evaluate and Investigate Police Tactical Operations

Cook advised that the bond is good. Cook also noted that the applicant has great experience and that Hessel could likely speak on that as well. Hessel advised that he has known Garber for many years and have never know of any problems with him. Cook advised that Garber has 25 years with the FBI.

Wohlman moved to approve Alan Garber for an individual private detective license; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Business Name:	Charles Anderson

Qualified Representative:	519 Appletree Lane Moorhead, MN 56560
Physical Address:	Individual Private Detective
Type of License Applying For:	Criminal and Civil Investigations for Attorneys and Investigative Services to Private Individuals
Scope of Business:	Charles Anderson

Cook advised that the bond is good, there were no issues, and the applicant has extensive experience. Evans inquired if there were any questions and the Board members had none. Hessel motioned to approve Charles Anderson for an individual private detective license; Wohlman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

New License Applicants – Present:

Applicant Business Name:	ICON Consulting Group, Inc.
Qualified Representative:	Charles Jennings
Physical Address:	1821 University Ave W S-142, Saint Paul, MN 55104
Type of License Applying For:	Corporate Private Detective
Scope of Business:	General Investigations

Evans welcomed Jennings and asked him to provide the Board with an overview of his experience and what the scope and purpose of his company will be.

Jennings replied “I worked as a private detective doing private investigative type of work for between 13 or 14 years now. Primarily focusing on work comp fraud, accident fraud investigations, background check and skip tracing. The scope of my business will be that.”

Evans asked Jennings to provide a little more background information. Evans stated “I mean ICON, is this a business that has been in business for a period of time, and what are we trying to accomplish.”

Jennings replied “I formed the corporation in 2012 when the former company that I used to work for, ICON Services Corporation, the owner of that company decided to quit and dissolve his business and informed me as such I was an hourly employee for that company, not an officer of the company. I was close with the owner in terms of you know he confided in me and when he made the decision to end the business he came to me and told me what was going on. Kind of to give me a heads up in term of employment and at that point I decided to begin the process to go on my own and in the mean time when back to my computer consulting work.”

Evans handed the floor over to the Executive Director.

Cook asked Jennings how many years he worked for Elisha Shaw. Jennings replied that it was somewhere around 11 or 12 years. Cook then stated “So you understand the business and the legalities involved in the business, right, from working that closely.” Jennings affirmed. Cook then inquired “So you have read and understand our statutes. That is part of the application that you sign off that you have read and understand our statutes.” Jennings affirmed stating that he has them on a link on his desktop.

Cook then stated that Jennings was applying for a private detective license and that he has also just received Jennings application for protective agent license. Jennings affirmed. Cook then asked “So you do understand the difference between the two types of licenses.” Jennings affirmed.

Cook inquired if Jennings was still working with Mr. Shaw and Jennings advised that he is not.

Cook inquired of Jennings what Associations he belongs to. Jennings replied “Well one Association that I got involved with, and again that was more from a computer consulting standpoint, I assisted with the North American Body Guard Association.” Jennings explained that it is an offshoot of a British Body Guard Association. Jennings advised “When they wanted to start in North America here they had some webpage issues and email issues. Things they called micro pages they were putting together for individual body guards. So I assisted them with that.” Cook inquired what micro pages were and Jennings replied “It’s like an online miniature CV. You know for the picture, height, weight, skill sets; things like that.” Jennings then explained that he began helping them put together webpage stuff, logos, and other little things like that and as a result he got a membership that seems to be a lifelong membership.

Cook then inquired if there were any other Associations that Jennings belongs to. Jennings advised there are not.

Cook then inquired “So that is basically the work you have been doing recently computer related.” Jennings affirmed and stated “well one of the reason why I named the company ICON Consulting Group is that I saw kind of a support industry for body guards, private investigators and my background being in the computer field and webpage design, things like that, I have bought a domain called ‘protectingvips.com’. So I’ve been putting together webpages professional sounding email addresses for body guards, security professionals, private investigators; things like that. Again it’s on that micro page aspect. It is just a single, simple, one page website.”

Cook asked Jennings if this is the type of work he has been doing since he and Elisha Shaw split off in 2012. Jennings affirmed.

Cook then stated that he had no further questions.

At that time Hodsdon inquired if Jennings currently had a license issued by the Board. Jennings stated “I don’t, no. I worked under ICON Services Corporation, that license, up until… well I split off and started forming my corporation in January of 2012.”

Wohlman inquired if Jennings has a webpage. Jennings replied “I do, it’s still being rebuilt trying to get it designed to fit. I purchased a number of items from Mr. Shaw when he was closing his office. I bought a domain; I bought two phone numbers; a primary officer number and a fax number, and five PC’s and a computer server from him, for cash.”

Wohlman commented stating that the website mentions several things such as that Jennings is licensed, bonded and insured. Jennings replied that the webpage is still completely being revamped. Wohlman replied “But it’s still up and running, correct.” Jennings affirmed. Wohlman then inquired if anyone can access the website and Jennings affirmed.

Wohlman stated to Jennings that the website shows he is a member of MAPI and asked if that Is correct. Jennings stated “No, that is not correct. I think, I believe ICON Services was again this is part of… the focus hasn’t been.” Wohlman stopped Jennings and stated “But does it say that on your website.” Jennings affirmed.

Wohlman asked Jennings why the website would say he was a member of MAPI if he wasn’t. Jennings advised that the old company was. Wohlman inquired if Jennings meant the old company was a member of MAPI and Jennings stated “I believe so, yes.”

Wohlman then inquired about the website saying that Jennings offers a wide variety of investigative and protective agent services and Wohlman asked Jennings if he does that. Jennings stated he does not.

Hodsdon then stated “The problem I have is once you advertise it our statute says it’s a gross misdemeanor to commit unauthorized practice. It also says it is a gross misdemeanor to advertise. Well I am looking at a document that makes me think I should turn this over to a prosecutor.” Jennings replied “My domain that I have is theiconconsultinggroup.com.” Hodsdon responded to Jennings that he was looking at ICON Consulting Group, Inc. Evans then stated that it says it’s a national body guard service.

Wohlman quoted the website “Well it also says on there that ‘our diverse roster of protection client leads as a virtual who’s who motion picture, fashion and recording industries. ICON has been the hand-picked choice to provide VIP protection for world recognized artists such as Prince, Usher and 50 Cent. That is what it says on there.” Jennings acknowledged.

Wohlman then inquired if Jennings would call that advertising. Jennings advised that he would not call that advertising for his company but for the previous company. Wohlman advised that the advertising is being done under Jennings webpage. Jennings replied “Well the webpage, the domain name is industry-icon.com.”

Wohlman then inquired why ICON would have a webpage out there that Jennings is in control of showing that they are set to do this type of work if ICON is not licensed. Jennings replied “That webpage is being stripped down and converted over to.” Wohlman responded that the website is being stripped down but it hasn’t been yet. Jennings replied “No, it hasn’t been moved over to my domain name which is theiconconsultinggroup.com.”

Wohlman then inquired if Prince, Usher and 50 Cent know that Jennings is using them for advertising. Jennings advised that he is not using them for advertising. Wohlman stated “Well it says we’re privately held, 11-50 employees in the security industry January of 2012 to the present. Two years, two months, St. Paul Minnesota. ICON Consulting Group. That’s exactly what you are under is ICON Consulting Group.” Jennings affirmed and stated “Right, but that webpage is still under construction, sir. I’m trying to get it.”

Wohlman stated “It’s still out there available to the public, correct.” Jennings advised that it was but under the old company’s domain name. Wohlman responded that it’s still out there.

Evans inquired “But you have changed portions of the page, right.” To which Jennings replied “I’ve been trying to work on it, yes.”

Evans advised Jennings that even if the website is under the old domain, he purchased the domain with the interest of using it. Jennings advised that he is not planning on using that domain name and that he purchased it so that he could own the website. Evans then asked Jennings “But that’s the site, that domain is the one your website is currently utilizing, correct.” Jennings replied “Well yes, I mean it is an under construction." Evans responded “But it doesn’t say under construction when a search of it, it comes up as a normal webpage, correct.” Jennings replied “I guess that would be true.”

Evans then stated to Jennings that it can be seen that Jennings has changed at least portions of the webpage. Evans asked Jennings “You’ve changed that page to ICON Consulting Group, correct.” Jennings advised that he has tried to do a mass update and replacements to a few things.

Evans inquired why Jennings would not have taken the website down until all changes have been completed. Jennings replied that he could have taken it down but that he has not promoting to anybody that his company’s domain name is industy-icon.com.

Evans then explained to Jennings that he has indicated to the Board that he understand the policies and the statutes of the State of Minnesota in relation to this field and one of them is that you cannot advertise your services without being licensed. Jennings affirmed Evans statement.

Evans explain that in looking at the website some of the consumers of the state of Minnesota certainly would not know the difference between a domain Jennings had purchased from a former company and a domain he is utilizing now for his new company. Jennings affirmed Evans statement.

Evans inquired if Jennings has done any private detective or protective agent license work since he has been split off from the company he previously worked for. Jennings replied “I have not.”

Wohlman asked “What about Surly Darkness Days. Can you tell me what that is.” Jennings replied “Surly Brewing Company is a small microbrewery in Minnesota and they have a couple of events a year that we used to do their uniform guard security.” Wohlman inquired if Jennings had done work from them in October of 2013 as it stated that on his personal webpage. Jennings replied that he had not.

Cook explained the website Wohlman is referring to is Jennings LinkedIn page.

Evans asked Jennings if he has a LinkedIn page. Jennings stated he does have one. Evans then stated “I assume, as most who use LinkedIn, you would advertise work that you have done about yourself, is that correct.” Jennings replied yes.

Evans then asked Jennings if his LinkedIn page is correct where it lists a 2013 Surly Darkness Days event. Jennings replied “There was a bunch of items that were copied and pasted. If you look at my LinkedIn page right now it is accurate, without any of those things that were put on the page inaccurately.” Evans questioned Jennings advising that there are a number of events in 2013. Jennings advised that things has been copied and pasted from previous events he had worked. Evans inquired why it says 2013.

Wohlman then stated “But says 2013 on there; that had to be changed to that because the other ones would have had to show 2012.” Jennings replied “Right, I did not put that stuff out there. I had somebody maintaining my LinkedIn page for me and they were copying and pasting items from previous forward. They showed it to me and I said no that’s not correct we haven’t been doing that sort of stuff, that ended with ICON Services Corporation, and it’s been removed from the LinkedIn page.”

Evans inquired who has been maintaining Jennings LinkedIn page. Jennings advised he had his wife maintaining it. Evans then asked Jennings to help the Board understand why there would be 2013 events listed if they had not occurred. Jennings replied “She was just copying and pasting items that I had previously done over and over and over again under ICON Services Corporation. She pasted that stuff faultily.”

Cook asked the Chair if he could speak. Evans agreed. Cook explained that he had come across Jennings LinkedIn page back in February and he had captured it with time and date stamp, and it did have mention of all those events that Jennings promoted that he had done security for. Jennings affirmed. Cook then advised that when Jennings had sent him a LinkedIn invitation a few weeks prior to the Board meeting and he had looked at Jennings page again and Jennings had removed the events. Cook then added he was just making Jennings aware that at one point, and we do have it time and date captured, you were promoting around twelve events there, in the year 2013. Jennings acknowledged that he is aware of that, and that he has since deleted all of that stuff. Cook then asked “Just so I am making absolutely sure you are saying you did not do any Surly events.” Jennings replied “No.” Cook reiterated “Protective agent security for any of those Surly events.” Jennings replied “No. Those items, if you look at them, they were all items that had occurred over and over again going back in time.”

Hodsdon explained that it had not been a pure cut and paste because there were typos, such as Surly Fest for 2012 showed as Surly Fest for 2013. Hodsdon stated “Somebody wasn’t just cutting and pasting they were manipulating the information as well.” Jennings replied “I didn’t pay attention to that when I was deleting the stuff off. It was basically brought to me, or when I deleted it off of there, is when she was done doing all the cutting

and pasting and said take a look at this and see if it looks OK. And at that point that point I said no, none of this stuff can be on there, it's inaccurate. So we went back and deleted it all out of there."

Wohlman inquired if Jennings wife has any involvement in the company. Jennings advised that she does not have any involvement other than assisting him with stuff like LinkedIn website maintenance. Jennings explained that his wife is an artist so she spends a lot of time working on her own webpage and sometimes he will have her do a few administrative things.

Evans then inquired if Jennings was working to contract with Lifetouch Services. Jennings advised that Lifetouch Services had reached out to him about an event that was occurring on May 22nd which would have been prior to him being licensed and in addition it has been for security work.

Cook addressed the Chair "May I please read the email." Evans replied "Please do."

Cook explained that Lifetouch, in doing their due diligence to make sure they hire those who are licensed, bonded and insured, had contacted him asking if Jennings was licensed; to which he said no. Cook further explained that he then received an email forwarded to him that Jennings had sent to Lifetouch and that advised that he was going to read that email. Jennings acknowledged.

Cook advised the email was sent to him on May 19th, 2014 and it showed Jennings talking to a Lifetouch representative. "Thank you for getting back to me with these details. This is perfect for me to be able to respond to your request. We do not do "uniformed" security any longer; however, we can provide unarmed protection agents in black Security Polo's and Slacks. The Security Polo is plainly marked with "Security" on the front and back, so in a way, it is a more casual uniform. The hourly rate for agents like this would be $25/hour (with a 4 hour minimum per agent that your event already covers). The total cost (without taxes) for this event would be 5.75hrs x 3 x $25 = $431.25. Regarding the 1 armed protection agent in business casual (polo or dress shirt w/o tie, slacks, jacket), I am assuming you mean for the same event? Our Executive Protection services are charged on a daily rate of $300.00 per day. That price is typically for an unarmed agent, but I will extend the same price to you for the armed agent. Additionally, because he would be working armed, I would need to know what potential threats exist so that we can be fully prepared. I would also need to know if you would like the agents (all or some of them) to have walkie-talkies. That would be an additional equipment charge. Now, regarding the business references… Because of the confidential nature of our business, and especially, the Executive/Celebrity/VIP protection portion, I cannot provide contact information for any clients – current or past. We have active Non-Disclosures in place. I can tell you that in the past, we have provided the security services for the following celebrities – Usher, 50 Cent, Naomi Campbell, Diana Ross and many others. We currently have 5 agents active with 5 well known celebrities on a full time basis. As for similar events, for the past 3 years we have provided event security for Hay Days Snowmobile Grass Drags in North Branch, MN. This event requires 15 agents on the clock 24 hours a day, for 3 days. The event has between 50,000 and 100,000 attendees. We were the first company to ever repeat security services for more than 1 year with the Sno-Barons (who put on the event). We also provide event security for 2 events per year put on by Surly Brewing Company, Darkness Days and Surly Fest. These events have between 1500 to 2500 people attending and we have been the security provider for the past 5 years. I hope I have answered all of your questions. If you have any additional questions, or need ANY more information, please feel free to contact me at any time. Sincerely Charles Jennings president ICON Consulting Group." Cook added that back in April he had actually been investigating another applicant, and someone had contacted him asking if ICON was licensed to which he said no. Cook then explained that the consumer had then gotten on the internet, came across Jennings websites and he contacted him, and explained to Cook over the phone that Jennings had also offered him protective agent services for a fee. Cook advised that this was all being stated for the record.

Evans asked Jennings if he had sent that email. Jennings replied "No." Evans then inquired who had sent the email. Jennings replied "That email sounds like a copy and paste out of what is left of that website."

Cook then asked Jennings “So, for the record you are saying you never spoke to the Lifetouch representative and you never sent him these emails.” Jennings replied “I did send him an email but not that email, I don’t know where that email came from.” Cook inquired why the Lifetouch representative would send him an email that had incorrect information. Jennings replied “Sir, I do not know.”

Evans then inquired “Does anybody else have access to your email accounts. I don’t know where this was sent from but who else would be able to do that.” Jennings replied “Well, I don’t know.”

Hodsdon asked Jennings “Did you send the email before that that said “… I would certainly like to further discuss our services and your needs with you at your convenience. Please feel free to contact me at 651-236-8731 direct line. Is that your phone number.” Jennings replied “Yes, that I sent.” Hodsdon then stated “OK, so you did send that and get the response back ‘Thank you for the fast response Mr. Jennings! I am currently traveling and will not have access to a secure phone line until late next week. The catered private event is for approximately 125 adults in Burnsville Minnesota and is tentatively scheduled for Thursday May 22, 2014 from 10am to 3pm. No alcohol will be served.’ Did you get that.” Jennings replied “I do not remember that email coming back to me.”

Wohlman inquire what Jennings email address is. Jennings advised that his email is c.jennings@theiconconsultinggroup.com.

Hodsdon asked Jennings who the webmaster is for theiconconsultinggroup.com. Jennings replied “Well, in the past a company called, well it used to be called internet business IBSEO. They were a search engine optimization company; handled the webmaster. But, more recently that, all of our emails were taken from Microsoft Exchange over to GoDaddy hosting. And so the webmaster email is more under my control but nobody checks, typically we never get any emails to it. So I’d have to actually log into it to see if there were any emails there for it.”

Evans asked to confirm again if Jennings has received the email that Hodsdon first referenced. Jennings replied “The one where he was asking about services and so I wanted to find out more.” Evans affirmed and then stated “So based on the information we have here the same email address is going back and forth to webmaster@iconconsultinggroup.com. So, you received that.” Jennings advised he had received that. Evans then advised that according the documentation given to the Board the return email that had been referenced and read for the record is from the same email address webmaster@iconconsultinggroup.com. Jennings stated “OK.”

Evans inquired if Jennings understands the Boards concerns when they see this information. Jennings replied “Yeah, I have my own concerns about the big long email that Mr. Cook read.”

Evans stated “The big long email that Mr. Cook read, is that in conjunction with your website that we have expressed concerns about as well that, at least in my opinion as a Board share, your advertising services in the State of Minnesota being unlicensed. And, as a result there is a prohibition before you becoming licensed within; there is a period of time that unlicensed activity needs to not occur before you can apply to this Board.” Jennings affirmed. Evans stated “So I don’t know if Board members have any additional information but as it appears to us you’re violating the statutes of the State of Minnesota and it would be my inclination to deny this application at this time.”

Wohlman stated “The statute he is talking about is section 326.3382 subdivision 4 and it says that ‘An individual, partnership, corporation, qualified representative or Minnesota manager engaged in the business of a private detective or protective agent without a license, issued by the Board, is prohibited for applying for a license for a period of 1 year from the date of finding of the violation.’ And I would say that our finding of the violation would

be May, this month, of 2014. This would mean that according to statute we would not even be able to. Personally this is how I would feel and how I am reading the law, the statute here, we wouldn't even be able to consider a license until May of 2015. That's the way I am interpreting it."

Cook advised there is another statute. Wohlman inquired if Cook was referring to the one that talks about the prohibited acts; Statute 326.3381. Cook stated "Yes, thank you very much. Subparagraph 3 disqualification and number 2, and I'll cut right to that. This is disqualification for licensure "made any false statement in an application for license, or any document required to be submitted to the Board, or failed to demonstrate to the Board good character, honesty, and integrity."

Evans then inquired if there are any other questions from the Board members or if the Board was prepared to take action on the applicant. At that time all Board members confirmed they have no further questions.

Evan asked the Board if there were any motions. Hearing nothing Evans stated "If not, I will move that we deny this applicant a license at this point in time based on the unauthorized practice in the State of Minnesota that is apparent to use by advertising your services in the State of Minnesota and you've provided some explanations on that but it is your duty to ensure that you're complying with the statutes of the State of Minnesota. The indication and the reason for denying that and the statutes are in place to protect the consumers of this State and there is a website that you acknowledge operating, regardless of the status of it, that you're operating advertising those services. We've also been provided with emails that appear to be some sort of communication between your company and possible clients. Part of the job of this Board is to protect the consumers of this State, that when people are operating they are operating in a manner that is consistent with State statutes so that proper oversight, training and all the different limitations that go along with possessing a license of this State are met. And so you certainly can comply with the statutes and then be it a period of time before reapplying and there are other course of action that you will have to follow up from this matter, if this is an approved matter. But at this time that would be my motion."

Wohlman seconded the motion. Evans asked for all Board members in favor of the motion to say aye; all Board members said aye. Evans asked if any Board members opposed; no Board members opposed. Evans addressed Jennings and advised him that his license was denied at this time.

At that time Attorney General Fischmann stated to Jennings "Sir, just for the record you do have the right to have a contested case hearing under Chapter 14. Chapter 14 specifically talks about the administrative law hearings before an administrative law judge. You do have that right and you can discuss that matter with an attorney or research it on your own. But because of the Boards action today you do have that right. It was explained to you in the motion why your license was denied and so you have been given the information about why the license was denied as well as your right to a contested hearing under Chapter 14."

Hodsdon stated "And I would just like to add for the record in terms of if either this applicant did have this exchange of email or he is the victim of fraud or he's allowed people to have access to his internet website, email etc., and so people are acting on his behalf. And if it is anything other than he is the victim of absolute identity theft I think he is responsible not only for his own activity but those that are within he per vial control."

Evans thanked Jennings for appearing before of the Board.

Jennings inquired if there is any way he can get a copy of the email that Cook read. Evans advised yes, and if Jennings wants to work with the Executive Director he will get him the documentation that he needs. Jennings affirmed and thanked the Chair.

Cook advised Jennings that he would be interested to know what his findings are. Jennings affirmed.

Evans thanked Jennings again.

Request to Speak to the Board:

None at this time.

Other Issues and Discussion:

A. SEIU

Cook invited Svendsen to come before the Board. AG Fischmann advised Svendsen of the Tennessen warning and explained that Svendsen has asked to come before the Board, and that he was not subpoenaed to come before the Board and that anything Svendsen says is public because it is a public meeting. Fischmann also advised that his statements could be used in future trials. Fischmann asked Svendsen if he understand and Svendsen advised he understands.

Evans welcomed Svendsen and asked him to address the Board with his concerns. Svendsen advised that he is a steward for SEIU; the security guard union. Svendsen advised that recently he has been working as an organizer for SEIU on a couple of campaigns on a suspended employee of G4S; a protective agent whose qualified representative is Isaac Luten. Svendsen advised that his questions for the Board are relative to those things. Svendsen advised there is a problem that would be easy to answer with some of the Board's licensed protective agents such as dishonest behavior, filing reports and management taking action against employees by filing intentionally dishonest reports.

Wohlman asked to clarify what Svendsen means by dishonest reports and Svendsen advised that he is talking about putting things in writing or verbalizing things that are damaging to an individual. Svendsen advised the Board that he could provide specifics if the Board would like but that it is not why he was at the meeting.

Wohlman asked Svendsen to clarify what he was saying. Wohlman asked Svendsen to clarify if he was saying that a company is filing a counseling report, or a write up on an individual that Svendsen does not agree with. Svendsen advised that he feels the report by the company is demonstrably false and damaging and has resulted in suspension.

Svendsen began to explain a situation in which he has been in a meeting with the operations manager of a licensed protective agent and Wohlman stopped him advising that he believe Svendsen may be appearing before the wrong Board, and advised Svendsen that it sounds like his issue should be taken up with the Department of Labor.

Cook advised that there are provisions in the statutes that discuss false reporting. Svendsen offered to read the statute and Wohlman stopped him advising that he knows the statutes very well.

Hessel inquired from Svendsen who is filing the report and who the report is being given to. Svendsen advised that a G4S employee's is filing the report and that one of the parties the report is being given to is the G4S administration.

Hodsdon quotes statue 326.336 and advises that he does not think Svendsen is talking about the first section discussing a license holders or employee's not breaching confidentiality, but that he is referencing the next section that talks about employee's not making and false statements about employment or wilfully making a false report to the employer. Hodsdon continues and explains that someone who breaks this statute is guilty of a misdemeanor and again inquires who the false statements and reports are being filed with.

Svendsen again advises that the false statements and reports are being filed with G4S and that it is G4S information that could end up in someone's personnel file or possibly in a Security Officer Report.

Wohlman again inquires who else the report is being made to, other than just to G4S's own personnel files. Svendsen advises that the report would then be seen by anyone who reads the personnel file such as other employee's.

Wohlman explained to Svendsen that he does not understand how other employees would see the personnel file. Wohlman stated that he has been in business for many years explained that he does not believe an employee can just walk in and view another employee's personnel file.

Svendsen explained that he believes it is common that employees view documents that are generated by other officers as well as employee's other than management read other officers reports all the time.

Svendsen then explained to the Board that the reason he is before the Board is to get clarification as to whether or not someone who has had been victimized by the filing of a false report be considered a victim under this statute.

Hodsdon advised Svendsen that the statute is a criminal statute. Hodsdon explained that if an employee makes a false statement to the employer about another employee the statute says it is a misdemeanor. Hodsdon then explained that the jurisdiction would then fall to the police department where the lie took place, and to the city attorney of the place where the lie took place. Hodsdon explained that it is a criminal enforcement statute and that the Board does not have any criminal enforcement authority. Hodsdon also explained to Svendsen that the Board is not in a position to give legal advice. Hodsdon explained that the police would need to investigate what happened and the city attorney would need to decide whether a prosecution is needed. Svendsen advised that Hodsdon's explanation made sense to him, and that was also the way he read the statute.

Svendsen went on to explain that the police departments are reluctant to investigate this, advised it seems like an obscure statute, and asked the Board if anyone can point to an occurrence where the statute was prosecuted. Wohlman advised that he had had an employee who was left his employment and was giving out false information on one of the management of his clients. Wohlman explained to Svendsen that he contacted the police and they went out and enforced the statute because the confidentiality stays with the individual.

Svendsen acknowledged that Wohlman was talking about the confidentiality part of the statute, but that he was talking about the false statements about an employee side of the statute.

Evans explains that the Board would not know specifics on all the cases but that Svendsen does have to go to the local police department that would have jurisdiction. Evans explained that there are a lot of statutes on the books that police and city attorneys are reluctant to enforce. Evans also explained to Svendsen that Board has no ability to influence the police department in this particular matter. Evans stressed that the Board does understand his concerns and that they do seem to read the statute similar to Svendsen but that the Board cannot offer Svendsen any legal advice. Evans explained to Svendsen that he would need to pursue an attorney or the city attorney. Evans expressed that Svendsen is more than welcome to pursue the issue through the jurisdiction but it is not an issue that is under the purview of the Board.

Hessel inquired from Svendsen what his problem was and if he wanted to briefly explain to the Board what his problem was and why he wanted to file charges. Svendsen affirmed that he would explain the problem to the Board and agreed to try and be brief.

Svendsen explained to the Board that a security officer filed a three page report that contained a lot of false information. Hessel inquired if the false information was regarding Svendsen and he affirmed that the false information was regarding him and an incident. Hessel inquired if Svendsen had also been a security guard at that time and Svendsen affirmed.

Svendsen continued explaining that there was simple and convincing evidence that the report was false. Svendsen advised that two days later he was surprised by the G4S operations manager, area supervisor and the site supervisor and called into a meeting to discuss the report. Svendsen explained that at the conclusion of the meeting he was suspended and that he was suspended for something that was not a violation.

Hessel inquired if the suspension was due to the report and Svendsen advised that it was related to the report. Hessel then advised that if it wasn't necessarily the report that caused the suspension it could have been something else that Svendsen was suspended for; Svendsen affirmed that could be true. Svendsen then explained that it was easy to see that the suspension and the report were clearly related.

Svendsen went on to explain that there is easy to understand evidence that the report was false and that the G4S management lied and made up a regulation to suspend Svendsen. Svendsen also explained to the Board that there is audio on both occurrences.

Hessel inquired if he remembered correctly that Svendsen was a member of SEIU and Svendsen affirmed. Hessel inquired if Svendsen has gone to his union steward regarding the issue. Svendsen affirmed that matter has been in the grievance process and the process is running its course successfully.

Hessel stopped Svendsen and explained that the matter seems to be where it should be but Svendsen explained that he has not gotten to the part where he is looking for clarification.

Evans intervened and explained that as previously noted the Board will not clarify the statute and that he needs to get an attorney or talk to the city attorney because the Board does not provide legal advice. Evans stressed that he has seen the questions that Svendsen has listed and they are not something the Board can answer for him.

Svendsen asked to be able to briefly allow the Board to know the details but Evans explained that regardless of what the details are Svendsen appears to be looking for clarification of the statute and the Board cannot take a scenario and advise if the statute applies to the scenario.

Svendsen again asked for the ability to be able to provide the Board with the facts of what happened. Evans explained that the Board has examined the matter and asked Svendsen to be very brief.

Svendsen went on to explain that the incident happened at Bear Path in Eden Prairie on March 31st and on April 1st Svendsen went to the Eden Prairie Police Department and they declined to take the evidence. Svendsen explained that per their request he returned to the police department 2 weeks later after he had contacted the city council and after a long interview with an officer they declined again to take the evidence.

Svendsen went on to explain that one week later, after more correspondence with the city council, the police department set up an appointment for him to go in and provide the evidence. Svendsen advised the evidence he provided was the report and the audio from the incidents.

Svendsen advised that the police department's investigation involved calling the G4S human resources manager and asking her if G4S felt they were a victim. Svendsen explained that she said no that G4S did not want to play the part of the victim, and that was the extent of the investigation.

Svendsen went on to explain that the Eden Prairie Police Departments perspective is that no one other than the protective agent can be a victim under this statute. Svendsen stated that he believes the Board has clarified for him that that's not true and that an individual, society, or a client could be a victim under this statute and inquired if this was correct.

AG Fischmann addressed Svendsen and explained to him that the Board has not clarified any statute to him. Fischmann stressed that all the Board has done is ask questions and that they have made no comments on the breadth of the statute. Fischmann advised that clarification of the statute is up to an attorney if Svendsen chooses to hire one, and that it is also up to law enforcement in Eden Prairie and also the Eden Prairie city attorney. Fischmann again stressed that the Board has not, will not and cannot take any position on the interpretation of this statute and what it can and cannot be used for.

Svendsen expressed that this is very surprising to him. Evans stated that it is clear that Svendsen is before the Board because he is very frustrated with the Eden Prairie Police Department. Svendsen disagreed and stated he just wants the case to run its course.

Evans restated, as Fischmann stated, this it is not in the Board purview to provide a statutory interpretation to him and that it is up to the individual cities and jurisdictions where the violations may have occurred to make any determinations. Evans also again stressed that the Board has no oversight or regulatory purpose with the Eden Prairie Police Department or the city attorney.

Evans thanked Svendsen, and Svendsen thanked the Board.

At this time Evans asked if there were any other items that needed to be address. With no other items needing attention Wohlman motioned to adjourn the meeting; Hessel seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:02 am.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 24, 2014 at 10 a.m.

There will be a Complaint Committee meeting following the Board meeting.