

STATE OF MINNESOTA

PRIVATE DETECTIVE AND PROTECTIVE AGENT SERVICES BOARD

October 28, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Location: 1430 Maryland Avenue East, St. Paul, Minnesota

Members Present: Drew Evans, Richard Hodsdon, Pat Moen, Jim Hessel and Steve Wohlman

Attorney General Representative: Jacob Fischmann

Agency Staff: Greg Cook, Executive Director, Kelly Guralnik, Administrative Assistant

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

Review of September 2014 Meeting Minutes and Aging Reports

Wohlman motioned to approve the minutes and stated that the person who typed them up did an excellent job. Hodsdon seconded the motion. Moen added there were a few typos that she wanted to show Guralnik but the substance of the minutes was correct. The motion passed unanimously.

New License Applicants – Additional:

Applicant Business Name:	Schallock Fire Investigations, LLC
Applicant Name:	Alan J. Schallock
Type of License Applying For:	PDC
Chief Executive Officer:	Alan J. Schallock
Chief Financial Officer:	Alan J. Schallock
Qualified Representative:	Alan J. Schallock
Minnesota Manager:	N/A
Physical Address:	1109 Rosehill Dr. Albert Lea, MN 56007
Local Address:	1109 Rosehill Dr. Albert Lea, MN 56007

Cook asked Alan Schallock to come to the witness stand. Cook also advised the Board that Schallock has been working for Central States Fire Investigation, Inc. who is terminating their business so Schallock is looking for a license to take over the Central States Fire Investigation, Inc.'s business. Evans welcomed Schallock and asked for a brief summary of his background and the scope of his proposed business. Schallock stated that he has worked for the Albert Lea fire department for the last 17 and a half years; the last 10 as lieutenant on shift investigating fires for the City of Albert Lea and also doing fire safety inspections. Schallock then stated he has been working with Mr. Duncan from Central States for the last 2 and half years and due to health issues he is letting his license lapse. Schallock stated he is a Certified Fire Investigator through the International Association of Arson Investigators (IAAI), he is also a member of the MN and IA chapter of the IAAI, he belongs to the National Association of Fire Investigators, and he has an Associate of Science degree in Fire Science.

Schallock stated that he is not buying or taking over Central States Fire Investigation, Inc. and that his plan is to obtain a license so he can continue working with the clients he had. Schallock also added that he has not been doing any work since October 1st and has been telling clients that he will get back to them when he has a

license.

Schallock stated he will not have any employee's and he will not be armed in his work. Schallock also stated that he did an irrevocable letter of credit but has since secured liability insurance.

Evans asked if any Board members had questions. Wohlman asked if the Bond was approved. Guralnik advised the Bond was good.

Hodsdon inquired if Schallock's time with the Albert Lea fire department was full time. Schallock confirmed. Hodsdon then asked if he has been doing work with Central States Fire Investigation, Inc. part time. Schallock confirmed. Hodsdon noted that Schallock clearly meets the hours of experience required for licensing.

Hodsdon moved to approve a PDC license for Schallock Fire Investigations, Alan J. Schallock; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Board thanked Schallock.

Applicant Business Name:	Crew Consultants
Applicant Name:	David LuVerne Borchert
Type of License Applying For:	PDI
Physical Address:	405 South Broadway New Ulm, MN 56073
Local Address:	405 South Broadway New Ulm, MN 56073

Evans welcomed Borchert to the Board and asked him to provide a little on his background and the scope of the proposed business plans.

Borchert stated he has been a license police officer since 1993 and has worked for the Mortin Police Department, the Tracey Police Department and currently works for the New Ulm Police Department as a Commander. Borchert stated he has a Bachelor's degree in Law Enforcement from Mankato State, a Bachelors of Arts degree in Spanish from Southwest State and a Master in Business Administration degree from Concordia. Borchert stated in New Ulm he was hired as patrol but was moved to investigator soon after. Borchert stated he worked as a senior investigator for several years and was then promoted to commander about 4 years ago.

Borchert stated his proposed business is private investigations in asset protection and background investigations in both the private and public sector. Borchert also stated he does not plan to be armed.

Wohlman asked Borchert if he could expand a little on what he means by asset protection. Borchert advised that primarily he would investigate if individuals were stealing from a company and working surveillance.

Hessel asked if Borchert planned to have employees. Borchert stated he does not. Hessel asked if Borchert sees any possibly conflict of interest. Borchert stated that he has discussed his plans in detail with his boss, and that he does not foresee any issues because he does not plan to do any work the area of New Ulm but if anything would come up he would deter. Hessel inquired if Borchert understands that he cannot use any information from the police department of the sheriff's office for his benefit. Borchert acknowledged this.

Moen asked if the Bond was good. Gurlanik advised the Bond was good.

Moen moved to approve a PDI license for Crew Consultants with David LuVerne Borchert as the applicant and also waiving any pre-assignment training; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Applicant Business Name:	T & R Investigations & Protective Services
Applicant Name:	Thomas Mutchler
Type of License Applying For:	PAI
Physical Address:	19443 Hines RD Hines, MN 56647
Local Address:	19443 Hines RD Hines, MN 56647

Cook asked Thomas Mutchler to come to the witness stand and to complete the Tennessean Warning. Evans welcomed Mutchler and advised that he understands there is a few matters at hand today. Mutchler stated he had been given a contingency on his renewal. Evans then also asked to confirm that he is applying for a protective agent license as well; Mutchler confirmed.

Evans then asked Mutchler to provide his background and the scope of his business. Mutchler advised that this had all been covered in 2012 but that he a licensed police officer since 1981. Mutchler stated he has worked for several departments but the last 23 years with the Cass County Sheriff's office in Walker Minnesota. Mutchler stated he has done work in charitable gambling investigations, homicide investigations, drug investigations, and he has been a team leader on the SWAT team for 17 years. Mutchler stated that the last 2 years he has gained private investigator experience in criminal defense, investigation type work, and lately he has had some inquiry into personal protection issues by several entities, which is why he is approaching the Board to obtain a protective agent license.

Evans asked if any of the Board members had any questions and inquired of Mutchler if there is anything in his background that would warrant explanation to the Board. Mutchler stated he did not believe so. Hodsdon stated that he would like an explanation on the continuance for dismissal on the theft prosecution. Hodsdon stated that he understands that a continuance for dismissal is not a conviction, because if it was under Minnesota Statute 214.10 a person would not be eligible for license by this Board and they would lose their POST license, but stated that it is troubling.

Mutchler stated he is 54 years old and at the counter at a convenient store, he paid for his product and when he picked up his receipt and his bag of merchandise there was a brown leather billfold wallet that he inadvertently thought was his so he put it in his pocket and walked out to his car. Mutchler advised that an hour later, he got a call from the police department that stated they have him on video stealing something from a store and the situation became confrontational. Mutchler advised that he told officers he has been a cop for 30 years and he has never stolen anything. Mutchler stated that the matter was resolved and he went out to his car to get the checkbook that was in his center counsel and he realized it was the same brown leather checkbook he had, but it had someone else's ID in it. Mutchler stated they had left it at the checkout and he picked it up inadvertently thinking it was his.

Hessel inquired what department Mutchler was with at the time this occurred. Mutchler stated he was with Cass County Sheriff's officer, which is the same department he is with now. Hodsdon inquired if they did a disciplinary investigation in internal affairs are all. Mutchler stated they did not. Hodsdon inquired if they were aware of the incident. Mutchler confirmed they were aware.

Evans inquired if Mutchler has ever had any sustained disciplinary complaints against him as a police officer. Mutchler inquired what Evans meant by sustained. Evans stated that for lack of a better term they found Mutchler guilty or that they found he had wrongdoing. Mutchler stated that in 1988 he had been accused of

misconduct but the matter was resolved. Hessel inquired if Mutchler was in Cass County at that time and Mutchler stated he was not; he was in Beltrami County at that time. Hessel inquired why Mutchler left Beltrami County and Mutchler advised they terminated his position. Hessel inquired what position he was in at the time and Mutchler stated he was a deputy. Hodsdon inquired what it means that they terminated the position because they clearly still have deputy Sheriffs. Mutchler stated that they terminated that positions based on things unknown to him that were not his business. Hodsdon stated that the material found by the executive director indicated that Mutchler had been fired. Mutchler advised that he had been terminated. Evans inquired what Mutchler had been terminated for and Mutchler stated it was for policy misconduct.

Moen inquired from Mutchler that he indicated that the matter was resolved and asked him to expand on it. Mutchler stated that the POST Board took no action against his license, he lost no employment because of it, he went on to another department and passed a background check and he is still employed to this day as a full time police officer in Minnesota.

Hessel inquired what Mutchler position is right now with Cass County. Mutchler stated that he is team leader of the SWAT team and he runs the recreation department, which is boat and water, snowmobile, and ATV. Hessel inquired if Mutchler is in uniform and Mutchler confirmed that to be correct.

Wohlman inquired what the "R" stands for in T & R Investigations. Mutchler stated the "R" is his business partner whose name is RoxAnn Gendron. Wohlman acknowledged Gendron in attendance at the meeting and inquired if she is an employee. Mutchler stated she is a business partner. Wohlman inquired if Gendron does investigations or if she is just a business partner and Gendron stated she is just a partner.

Hodsdon stated that there seems to be a theft issue that the executive director found as well and inquired what the roll of the business partner is. Gendron stated she does the bookwork, and Mutchler stated she does correspondence with the executive director. Wohlman inquired if it would be like of like a CFO and Gendron confirmed that yes she does the bookwork and the calling of areas of investigations to law offices and other contacts. Hessel inquired if she does any of the investigations herself and Gendron stated she does not. Wohlman inquired from Mutchler if he would consider Gendron a CFO and Mutchler confirmed.

Mutchler address Hodsdon and stated that both the issues in his background have been covered and he just mentioned a third. Hodsdon stated that the theft issue he just made note of was not Mutchler; it was Mutchlers CFO that was his concern.

Wohlman inquired if, as CFO, Gendron has ever had a conviction of theft. Gendron confirmed she had.

Evans inquired if Mutchler challenged his firing; Mutchler confirmed he did. Evans inquired if it had been done through arbitrations and Mutchler confirmed it had been done through binding arbitration. Evans inquired the outcome and Mutchler stated he did not win.

Evans then stated that he knows Mutchler has noted that the POST Board has not taken any action against his license but that this is a different Board so he would like to know a little bit more about what the allegation were that Mutchler had been fired for. Mutchler stated they are sealed records by the court, and that he believes he supplied those sealed records. Mutchler advised that they should have been in the file from his last interviewing with the Board.

Hodsdon inquired if the Court sealed the arbitration records. Mutchler advised he was not sure about the arbitration records but he gave the agency the court record because that was the only record he was ever given. Cook inquired if Mutchler gave the court record to Marie Ohman and Mutchler confirmed. Cook stated that he would check in the file. Cook also asked to note that Mutchler's application was almost 5 years old

when Cook first came on board with the agency and Mutchler was then licensed in 2012.

Evans stated that since Mutchler is not aware of the court sealing anything in relation to the arbitration Evans asked if there is anything that Mutchler would like to share. Evans stated that it is important for the Board to determine that someone has integrity in front of the Board and that they are forthright with the Board on any background issues that may be concerning as a consumer protection measure for the state of Minnesota and the citizens that live here. Evans explained that is why Mutchler is appearing before the Board today and that the Board appreciates the background on anything that warrants explanation.

Mutchler stated that the integrity goes both ways, and that this case was a witch-hunt. Mutchler stated it is the only case in Beltrami County that had been recommended by the second prosecutor that it be disposed of and dropped. Mutchler stated that his defense never even got a chance to ask for it to be dismissed. Mutchler advised that the prosecutor that looked at it stated it was a witch-hunt and to dismiss it; and the judge did. Hodsdon inquired who the prosecutor at the time was and Mutchler stated it was Jim Wilson from Clearwater County; Hodsdon stated that the prosecutor has since passed away.

Hessel inquired why the prosecutor was from a different county, and asked if it was due to conflict of interest. Mutchler stated that it was the County's opinion that it was a conflict of interest.

Hodsdon inquired if it was a complaint made to the POST Board and Mutchler stated it was a criminal complaint. Hodsdon inquired if there was a complaint made to the POST Board about Mutchler's license as well; Mutchler stated he was not sure. Hessel inquired if the POST Board ever contacted Mutchler about the issue. Mutchler stated they did not.

Evans inquired if there was any complaint to the POST Board on Mutchler's most recent issue. Mutchler stated it had been dismissed. Evans stated it would not have been automatic and that inquired if there were any complaints to Mutchler's knowledge. Mutchler stated not to his knowledge. Evans then inquired if the matter had been investigated by internal affairs at his current agency. Mutchler stated that he shared all the information with his boss the next day and as far as he knows he did not conduct a criminal or internal investigation of his own.

Hessel inquired if Mutchler could inform him of what his relationship is with his CFO, Gendron. Mutchler stated she is his business partner and long-time friend. Hessel inquired if they are married and Mutchler stated they are not married.

Hodsdon stated that another concern he has is that the Board has a requirement for people who have employee's to run a background check to make sure there are not any integrity issues. Hodsdon also stated that to call someone a partner and not an employee and not submit a license to them seems like a way around that requirement and that he finds that very troubling. Wohlman agreed. Hodsdon stated that as a law practice, you cannot ethically have lawyers and non-lawyers be partners together in a law practice and added that he is not aware of any situation where the Board has partners who are licensed and unlicensed. Wohlman added there are stipulations in the Statutes for CFO also.

Cook inquired if Gendron was aware that her LinkedIn page she lists herself as an investigator and vice president. Gendron inquired what Cook was talking about. Cook explained it was on RoxAnn's LinkedIn page, which is a site where you put up a professional profile. Gendron stated she does not remember ever doing that.

Mutchler then stated that he has conducted Gendron to do investigations under his direction and she has done that for him. Cook then asked to confirm that Gendron has done investigations and Mutchler stated at

his discretion she has.

Hodsdon stated that then Gendron would need the 12 hour required training and background and inquired if it has been submitted. Cook stated this is the first renewal and the agency did not get an Affidavit of Training, as well as a number of other issues. Mutchler added that they both have taken pre-assignment training though. Hodsdon stated that he understands that there is a contingency and there are a number of things that need to be submitted so presumably the agency will be getting the continuing education for Gendron as well then. Gendron stated that hers was sent in at the same time as Mutchler's was sent. Cook advised that Mutchler had sent in an emailed scanned copy of the packet but no hard copy has been received. Gendron stated that all the documents should have been received by now. Cook inquired when Gendron sent it via mail and she said she would have to look.

Gendron stated that the person they did the pre-assignment training with told them he was required to send the certificates to the agency as well. Gendron inquired if Mutchler remembered his name but Mutchler did not. Hessel inquired if the training they took was up where they live and Mutchler stated it was down in the cities. Gendron started to remember the name and Cook inquired if it was Charles Thibodeau and Mutchler stated he believes that was it. Cook added that the agency needs to receive the record of the training and Mutchler stated he was not sure whether he was supposed to hold the documentation pursuant to an audit or whether it had to come to the agency. Cook confirmed that with the renewal packet it needs to be sent in. Gendron said it was very unclear to them but Mutchler added that they could provide it.

Cook stated that the point the Board is getting at is that all employees have to be background checked, they have to be issued an ID, they have to receive pre-assignment training and they have to have 6 hours a year of continuing education. Gendron stated that she knows there is another training coming up in November. Cook stated that he is trying to steer the license holders away from sending training certificates at the time they occur that they only need to be tracked at renewal time. Mutchler added that was why he felt it was apparent that he hangs onto the hard copy in case there was an audit.

Cook inquired if Mutchler brought the hard copy along and Mutchler stated he did not because he did not think it was going to be an issue.

Wohlman inquired if Mutchler's business is a corporation. Mutchler confirmed it is not.

Evans inquired if Mutchler could give the Board a little more background, and while he understands that Mutchler has given some explanations, Mutchler has had some contact as a deputy that required criminal investigations be conducted over the years. Evans inquired why Mutchler believes that multiple investigations have occurred with him, and inquired if Mutchler feels that it is normal in the course of employment as a police officer. Evans also inquired if Mutchler could give the Board his perspective on it because it is the Board's job is to ensure that applicants demonstrate good character, honesty and integrity when the Board is looking to license them, and some of Mutchler's contact with criminal investigations conducted is what Evans would consider a little more than the average police officer in the state of Minnesota. Mutchler stated there have only been two investigations. One being the wallet incident, which Mutchler stated, was an absent-minded mistake and that he has been a police officer for 32 years and that there is nothing in his background that will indicate any integrity issues.

Evans inquired if those were the only two cases that Mutchler has ever been investigated for. Mutchler stated that there is one more, and that as part of the SWAT team there was an allegation by a suspect on a search warrant that money had been stolen from a bedroom. Mutchler stated all SWAT operators were interviewed and that it went nowhere and it was never confirmed. Mutchler stated there was a sum of cash that the SWAT team was accused of taking, the BCA sent two agents up to interview all 16 officers. Mutchler stated he was

not sure if there is a record of his interview but that is the only other criminal investigation that may show up.

Evans inquired where Mutchler was working at the time and Mutchler stated Cass County. Evans then asked Mutchler to confirm that the allegations were not against him individually but against the SWAT team as a whole and Mutchler confirmed. Hessel inquired the monetary amount involved and Mutchler stated he believed it was \$50.00.

Hodsdon inquired if Mutchler's termination went to arbitration and Mutchler stated that it did. Hodsdon stated that the Bureau of Mediation Services should have some records of these issues. Hodsdon stated there is enough information that is troubling, as well as some issues with the license renewal. Hodsdon stated that he would not want to vote the license down today but that he would like the applicant to sign an informed consent that would give the Executive Director access to his personnel files.

Hodsdon stated he is not in favor to vote in favor at this point and he moved to table until Mutchler will sign an informed consent for any of the personnel and criminal records referenced can be retrieved by the executive director.

Mutchler inquired about the informed consent the agency already has. Cook explained that the informed consent was only for the BCA record check for the application and that Hodsdon was referring to something more intricate. Hodsdon stated he would work with the counsel as far as standard informed consent for personnel and criminal type records.

Mutchler inquired if Cook has his letter from the Sheriff and Cook confirmed that he does have the letter. Mutchler stated he will sign anything the Board wants him to sign and that he has nothing to hide. Hodsdon stated that he appreciates that. Evans asked for a second for the motion. Moen seconded the motion. Evans restated that the motion is that the Board is not denying the application at this time but that they are asking to explore a couple of the issues that have been discussed today. Mutchler inquired if this was just on the protective agent status and Evans confirmed but also stated that the Board would like Mutchler to continue to work with the Executive Director on the renewal status.

Wohlman asked if he could express one other concern on Statute 326.338s1.2 addressing conduct of the Minnesota Manager and if appropriate a partner, which Wohlman addressed that Gendron has stated that she is a partner, and that an investigation should be done and that theft is a disqualifying offense. Wohlman stated that this is an issue for him that he has a partner that has a theft conviction and that Mutchler may want to look into that because it would be a disqualification for a license. Hodsdon stated he would echo Wohlman's concern. Mutchler inquired if he would need to change Gendron's status and Wohlman stated he is not telling Mutchler what to do, he is simply stating his concerns. Evans confirmed that Wohlman is highlighting part of the Statute that Mutchler may want to consider as he proceeds in the process. Hodsdon also advised that Mutchler may want to consult counsel regarding what the business organization options are, and that the Board is not in a position to give legal advice. Hodsdon also stated that the business organization could also affect his renewal and that he is not making any prejudgment depending on how he organizes his operation but advised it may be worth discussing with counsel about it.

With no further discussion, Evans moved forward with the motion to table the license application at this time; the motion passed unanimously.

Cook added that since Mutchler was already sitting at the witness stand the Board could discuss his renewal. Cook stated that there was a 60-day contingency but that 30 days has passed. Cook stated that he would correspond with Mutchler what is missing from what he has already emailed to the agency. Cook also added that no hard copies have been received and the process can be started with what has been received but the

agency still needs hard copies. Cook went on to explain the issues to Mutchler.

Cook explained that Mutchler did not list any number of employees and inquired if the number of employees should be one; Gendron confirmed that number should be one. Cook explained that the Bond number was not listed on the application. Gendron stated she sent a copy of the Bond and Cook explained that it all needs to be listed on the paperwork itself because it makes it difficult for the agency to quickly process things if they have to keep looking back in the file.

Cook inquired if the check is with the hard copy that has been mailed. RoxAnn questioned what the check was for and stated she sent a check for half the protective agent license fee. Cook explained that was for the additional application and there is still a renewal fee of \$540 for the private detective license. Mutchler advised a check was sent to the agency and that the check was cashed, RoxAnn stated that was for the protective agent license back in April.

Cook stated that the agency needs the Affidavit of Training what would show pre-assignment training for Gendron. Cook also stated that Mutchler should provide his POST license along with the Affidavit of Training. Mutchler stated that should be in his file.

Cook inquired how proof of financial responsibility is being handled. Gendron stated that insurance certificates were sent back in 2012. Cook stated that they could choose to do an insurance liability policy, an Irrevocable Letter of Credit from a bank, or a net worth statement. Cook inquired if Mutchler was choosing the insurance liability policy and Mutchler confirmed. Cook explained that the agency needs to be able to confirm that they are still covered. Mutchler inquired if the agency needs a hard copy of it every year. Wohlman stated for renewal the agency does need this. Mutchler stated that these are things that are a little unclear to them so he is glad that it is being settled here at the meeting.

Cook stated that is all he has. Evans and Cook thanked Mutchler.

Request to Speak to the Board:

Suzie Lenzen & Terry Voight:

Evans welcomed Suzie Lenzen and Terry Voight to the Board. Cook addressed the Board and informed them that back in April of 2014 Mr. Dan Seman/Blackwell of Avalon Security appeared before the board regarding an application for protective agent license. Cook informed the board that at that time the license was denied. Cook stated that two weeks ago he received a call from Suzie Lenzen, who worked for Avalon before and after the April 2014 board meeting. Cook stated that Lenzen was unaware that Avalon wasn't licensed. Lenzen informed Cook that she had come across the meeting minutes and once she found out that Avalon wasn't licensed herself and her son Terry Voight terminated their employment with Avalon. Cook commended both Lenzen and Voight for the actions they took in terminating their employment.

Cook stated that he is curious about Avalon's activities since April. Cook asked Lenzen and Voight if they were performing security type services per MN Statutes 326.32-326.339. Voight stated that in both of their opinions they were performing security services, and that was based off the duties they performed.

Fischmann from the Attorney General's office introduced himself, and said that he was not a part of the Board and just wanted to make sure they understood a couple things. Fischmann asked both Lenzen and Voight if they were here on their own accord, they both agreed. Fischmann informed both Lenzen and Voight that neither of them were currently under investigation, however, if anything they discussed in a public meeting was incriminating against a license they had or someday would have, it could be used against them. Lenzen

asked Fischmann what type of license he was referring to, Fischmann stated a protective agent license. Fischmann stated that it is a fancy way of saying `anything you say can and will be used against you`. Fischmann informed Lenzen and Voight that they did not have to speak today. Moen stated that the Board was grateful for their actions.

Hessel asked how long they both worked for Avalon. Voight stated that he was a supervisor for the company for roughly two years, and before that he was a General Security guard for six months. Voight stated that Avalon was seeking employees for over a year, and that his Mom (Lenzen) had experience working asset protection for Target, and he thought it was a good idea to hire her on. Voight stated that Lenzen had worked for Avalon for approximately one year and four months.

Evans asked Voight to explain what he meant regarding the services he considered guard services. Voight informed the Board that currently as of Friday, they have accounts with multiple apartment complexes which involve foot patrols and video surveillance. Voight stated that the apartment's host parties and that they are supposed to monitor and make sure no one is out of line. Voight said that if someone is out of line they are directed to remove them, unless they are a resident. Wohlman asked if Voight would actually intervene and remove people. Voight replied absolutely. Lenzen added they could also call someone and have the person removed.

Wohlman asked if they carried any protective equipment, such as cuffs, or mace. Lenzen stated that she did not. Wohlman further asked if at any point during their employment if they had? Lenzen replied that yes she had carried protective equipment before. Voight stated that he absolutely carried protective equipment; he further stated that as of April 28th he was instructed to carry a firearm. Voight informed the Board that it wasn't mandatory but that it was allowed. Hessel asked Voight if he had had firearms training, Voight replied that he had and that he has a conceal and carry permit.

Voight said that Avalon had an account for a CEO of a pharmaceutical company out of Maple Grove, outside his residence for roughly 35-36 days. Voight stated that he worked there for 28 days. Hessel asked if they worked at his residence, Voight replied yes. Wohlman asked if they did private security for the CEO, Voight replied yes. Hodsdon asked Voight if he was referring to 2014, Voight said yes in April of 2014. Lenzen stated that she works for a lot of reputable business such as D&M management, PetCo, and strikes. Lenzen said that they are reputable businesses that hired Avalon based on their history. Lenzen further stated that she believes these businesses are unaware that Avalon isn't licensed.

Hodsdon asked who is running Avalon that they interact with. Voight stated that on a daily bases he is instructed by Dan Seman. Voight further stated that he understood the company was under the supervision of his son Austin. Hessel asked if it was Dan who gave the orders, to which Voight replied yes. Voight said that he calls Seman when he has a question or needs instruction, and that he can contact him 24 hours a day. Hessel stated that Seman is the go to guy. Voight agreed and said that he has always been instructed to call Seman if there is a problem or if he has a question.

Wohlman asked what the name of the supervisor was up to the termination of employment, Voight stated Dan Seman. Wohlman asked if Seman ever went by a different name. Voight said the first time he heard a rumor about a different name was the 14th of October. Voight stated he ran a google search to determine if it was true. This is when Voight found the transcripts of the Board meeting. After read through them he realized they were no longer licensed. Hessel asked if Voight was refereeing to two weeks prior. Voight stated yes.

Wohlman asked if Seman ever used the name Blackwell to Voight. Voight stated no, and that the first time he had heard of the name Blackwell was a few months ago. Voight further said the name was on a website of Avalon's, he believed the website was AvwellBlackwell.com. Voight said he believed it was some kind of

financing company. Voight ran a google search on Blackwell financing and found that it is a kind of financial company in the Twin Cities area. Voight also stated that he's not 100% sure on the facts. Voight said the next time he heard the name Blackwell was on the 14th, and that it was brought up by a coworker. Voight said that lead to finding out about everything they weren't aware of. Lenzen stated that she printed out the meeting minutes from the board at her work, and the following day she wrote an email of termination.

Hessel asked if they informed any other employees that Avalon no longer had a license. Voight replied that he let two of his supervisor know. Lenzen stated she informed D&M management, because she worked for them at local fusion.

Lenzen stated she received her last pay check yesterday, because she is no longer an employee. Lenzen stated that she is upset because Avalon said on the record that they have no employees, but that she received her last pay check which means that she was an employee. Hessel asked who the check was signed by, Voight stated Austin Seman.

Cook asked if Avalon is currently servicing clients for security work. Lenzen replied absolutely. Cook asked who the clients were that Avalon was servicing. Voight stated Folocal apartments in Minneapolis near the University, The Walkway condominiums in Minneapolis, and to his knowledge Upsure laboratories in Maple Grove which is Monday through Friday. Hessel asked if that was at a residence or at a business, Voight stated the business. Voight further stated that they also have Petco in Eden Prairie Monday through Friday, Lakewood Cemetery which they've had for a long time, Marriott which an overnight shift on Friday and Saturday.

Wohlman asked what they do at the Marriott. Lenzen stated that she works at the Marriott and that they monitor people coming in and out of the building, close the pool, make sure people leave the bar, ensure all the doors are locked on the outside of the building. Hessel asked if Lenzen is in uniform when working at the Marriott, Lenzen said yes. Hessel asked what the patch says on Lenzen uniform. Voight said the most recent example is on their jacket. Lenzen said that her other jacket has an embroidered badge that says Avalon Monitor. Hessel restated Avalon Monitor, to which Lenzen replied yes.

Lenzen said that she reports to the watch commander, which is what her son is. Lenzen said that when she picked up her paycheck yesterday Dan Seman informed her that he never said she was a security guard. Lenzen stated that she had never met Dan Seman before. Lenzen asked Seman if she is a monitor, to which Seman replied no. Lenzen said that a spade is a spade is a spade, call her what you like; a hospitality worker, a monitor, a spades a spade. Lenzen said that Seman started to get frustrated with her and she didn't want to have an altercation. Hessel asked where Lenzen met with Seman. Lenzen replied they met at his office/home. Voight said that his office is his house.

Cook asked if they would please include some dates with when the events took place. Such as when they met with Dan Seman, when they worked at the Marriott, or if it was document on anything they may have. Lenzen said yes she keeps track of her hours. Voight replied that he doesn't have personal possession of the documentation but that they are kept. Hessel asked if they have a log they complete during their shifts. Voight stated that all employees call the watch commanders. Lenzen showed the board her log of hours and stated that it only covered one week, because she then quit. Voight stated that yesterday October 27th is when they met with Dan to receive their final paychecks.

Cook asked if they were informed of anything regarding terminating their employment. Voight replied that they were informed they would not be granted unemployment and that Dan tried to have them sign a piece of paper stating they could no longer talk with Avalon employees, accounts, or any clients. Voight said that by signing the piece of paper they wouldn't be able to apply for unemployment if they show choose to. Wohlman asked if they signed the piece of paper. Lenzen stated that she crossed out and initialed what she didn't agree

with, and wrote no next to it. Lenzen stated she asked for a copy. Voight said the only thing they agreed to sign was that they received their paychecks so they couldn't come back and claim they weren't paid.

Wohlman asked if they received their pay in full. Voight replied absolutely. Hessel asked if they keep copies of the logs they turn in. Voight stated that to his knowledge all the copies are documented on computers at their office. Hessel stated that there should be a record of their logs, Voight replied absolutely. Voight stated that the chief operator, Mike Earl. Wohlman stated they do a daily report every single time they work. Voight said yes. Wohlman asked if everyone fills out their own reports or if they are all on one report. Voight said they are all handwritten and signed by him every day he works. Wohlman asked if they've both done daily reports, Voight replied yes. Wohlman asked if the reports are turned into both the client and Avalon. Voight stated that it depends on the client; he said some of the clients don't ask for logs, but that other accounts such as Folocal and The Walkway do ask for copies of the reports. Wohlman asked if then the client or Avalon would get the copy and the other work get the original, Voight replied yes.

Wohlman asked about ICR or incident reports. Voight said they haven't had incident reports in a long time, probably since April. Voight said they would have filled them out but they never received copies of them. Wohlman asked if there was an incident report if it would go directly to the client. Voight said yes a DAR, Daily activity report.

Cook asked what some of the last dates they worked for Avalon and at what account. Voight stated that for himself, he worked as a supervisor in a rover job. He stated he was constantly in the vehicle driving, going around checking on guards. Voight stated that they do detox transports. Hessel asked if it was a personal vehicle or a provided vehicle. Voight stated it was a provided vehicle. Hessel asked if the vehicle had any markings. Voight stated that vehicle was unmarked, but that it does have a cage. Cook asked what the date was of the last time Voight did that job. Voight replied October 14th. Cook asked 2014? Lenzen replied 2014.

Cook asked if they could quickly go through a couple things. Cook stated they have done private patrol. Voight replied yes, at a cemetery in Maplewood. Cook asked if they have been protecting persons or their property. Voight replied correct. Cook asked if they responded to any alarm service devices. Voight replied negative, Lenzen replied that she had. Voight stated that he would like to retract his last statement. Voight stated that they receive phone calls from a security company for alarms that go off at Lakewood cemetery; Voight said they are basically door alarms throughout the property. Cook asked if they control monitor traffic. Voight stated that he hasn't personally but that he knows they do for Monday funeral escorts at the Maplewood cemetery. Cook asked if they control crowds for the purpose of safety and protection. Voight said yes at FoLocal, and that three weeks ago they performed those duties at Hopkins football games along with checking bags at the entry points of the game. Cook asked if that was crowd control as well. Voight stated that in his opinion it was. Lenzen said that she was there performing those duties. Cook asked if they remember the dates. Voight said he could look them up, and that they were all Fridays. Cook stated that just to reiterate that since April they have been providing security services for Avalon. Voight stated that yes in his opinion they have.

Hodsdon asked Voight to tell him about the detox transportation with the cage. Voight stated they have roughly 8 hospitals that they transport patients to detox facilities. Voight stated the detox facilities are located in Ramsey county, Hastings detox in Dakota County, Missions detox in Plymouth, and Hennepin county detox in Minneapolis. Hodsdon asked if for example Regions hospital calls up. Voight stated that when he's working he has the phone for the company, and that the hospitals, such as Regions, would call him personally.

Hessel asked what they would do when they picked a person up. Voight stated that depending on their behavior they would met with the nurse who is providing care, they would pick up paperwork for billing purposes, and they have a transport hold an officer hold sheet which states that the person isn't allowed to

leave from point A to point B and that they will be locked in a secured vehicle. Hessel asked if they handcuff the person there transporting. Voight replied yes, but not everyone. Voight further stated that some people have behavioral issues and for the officers safety they cuff them. Hessel asked if they are there handcuffs. Voight replied correct.

Hodsdon stated he had two questions, but first he thanked them for coming forward and providing information to the board. Hodsdon asked if they would allow the executive director to make a copy of the paystub. Hodsdon asked secondly because it could take a while, for a full debriefing by either the executive director or an investigative police officer. Hodsdon further stated that what they are describing is something the board has pursued in terms of individuals who have engaged in unauthorized practice and have caused several of them to be prosecuted and have witnesses with their caliber and integrity. Hodsdon asked if either of them cared if they make those referrals. Voight and Lenzen replied no, and that it was fine. Lenzen stated that the only thing is that she feels like Dan has put her son in jeopardy for advancement in his career in law enforcement, and that she feels he's doing that to others. Lenzen further stated that her son will be going to Florida for his law enforcement career and that she doesn't want anything to affect that. Cook stated that he can't comment on Voight's work but that he would be more than happy to send a letter to any agency regarding Voight's integrity and the situation at hand. Both Voight and Lenzen thanked Cook.

Lenzen stated that again as soon as they heard of the situation she wrote the email. Lenzen said she didn't go to work that night so she didn't give proper notice. Hodsdon stated that there are enough people here with investigative backgrounds that they could be here for hours doing a detailed briefing, and that he didn't want to cut it short. Hodsdon stated that he needs to get to a funeral. Hessel asked if they would be willing to meet with an investigator or someone in the further. Lenzen stated sure absolutely. Evans stated that the board appreciates them coming before them and sharing their information. Evans further stated that they will be in contact, and like several of the board members have noted they really appreciate their honesty and integrity. Evans stated that he understands that when it affects your bottom line and paycheck it's difficult to do the right thing for the right reason, and that the board commends both of them for coming to the board and for doing the right thing. The board thanked Voight and Lenzen, and Voight and Lenzen returned thanks.

Hodsdon stated that the board has dealt with the Avalon issue multiple times. Hodsdon said he hopes that the board can connect the 8-10 criminal justice agencies, police departments. Hodsdon stated he'd like to send a referral to each of them or criminal prosecution of certain individuals, but that it doesn't appear to carry much of a threat. Hodsdon said he believes it's time to bite the proverbially bullet and bring an action for injunction relief to Avalon and its various incantation, to prevent and join the unauthorized practice of this profession. Hodsdon stated he'd like to see the entity named as a defendant, and that he'd like to see Mr. Seman Blackwell named as a defendant in that civil proceeding. Hodsdon further stated it now appears there are others he's involved in; Austin Seman was referenced as a source. Hessel asked Cook if Austin Seman was licensed. Cook replied no. Hodsdon stated that also not licensed, they now form Mr. Blackwell Seman's testimony that they have a family relationship. Hodsdon stated that he isn't venturing down this road lightly and between criminal prosecutions he hopes to gain some justice for the community, public safety, and consumers of the state of Minnesota.

Hodsdon further stated that he believes that in the meantime, because they can't control that, but that as aboard they can control through their legal representative, is to seek injunction relief. Hodsdon stated that he moves in that regard as to Mr. Seman Blackwell, Avalon and it's various incantations, Austin Seman as well based on information they have, and anyone else they determine through investigation that they believe is appropriate to be named, to enjoin there continued unauthorized practice of this profession. Hodsdon also stated to enjoin their advertising of unauthorized practice. Hodsdon stated that the executive direction sent him the most recent link, which he believes in another violation of the unauthorized practice statute, and what that firm is advertising to do. Hodsdon stated that it was long winded but that was his motion. Wohlman

stated he will second the motion. Cook stated that the executive director works at the direction of the board and he will seek their direction as to how to go about this. Evans asked if there is any further discussion, and input from counsel. Evans stated if not all in favor to seek an injunction against Mr. Blackwell Seman or Avalon and companies say I. the board unanimously replied I. Evans stated that the motion passes and that they will start working that issue. Hodsdon stated that he knows there are limited resources and that he will assist, and give whatever resource he can give. Hodsdon stated that he knows there is a limited budget, but at some point the money has to be spent if we are going to protect the consumers of Minnesota. The board agreed. Lenzen stated that they were going to leave and that if the board needs anything they can ask.

Rick Hodsdon regarding injunctions:

Hodsdon explained that the Board has dealt with the Avalon issues several ways and that a referral for criminal prosecution does not seem to carry much of a threat. Hodsdon stated he would like to see an action for injunctive relief brought to Avalon to prevent unauthorized practice and to have Avalon and Daniel Seman/Blackwell named as the defendants. In addition Hodsdon added that others have now been named such as Austin Seman. Hessel inquired if Austin Seman is licensed and Cook confirmed he is not. Hodsdon went on to say that Daniel Seman/Blackwell's own testimony states there has been a family relationship within the business.

Hodsdon stated that he hopes that the criminal prosecutions will work towards some kind of justice for the community, public safety and for consumers of the State of Minnesota. Hodsdon explained that the Board cannot control criminal proceedings, but in the meantime they should move forward with what they can control, which is to seek injunctive relief with the help of their legal representation.

Hodsdon stated that he would move that the Board proceeds with the injunction with regard to Mr. Seman/Blackwell, Avalon and it's various incantations, Austin Seman, and anyone else determined through investigation as an appropriate person to be named, to enjoin their continued unauthorized practice of this professional as well as to enjoin their advertising unauthorized practice. Hodsdon stated that he believes that the most recent link sent to him by the Executive Director reflects another violation of the unauthorized practice statute based on what the firm is advertising to do. Wohlman seconded the motion. Cook added that he works at the direction of the Board so he will seek their guidance on how to go about this.

Evans as if there was any further discussion by Board members. With none Evans asked the Board to vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Hodsdon added that he feels the Commissioner added him to the Board because of experience with the POST Board and some other things he has done so he will make sure to give the Board access to whatever resources he can give them. Hodsdon added that he knows the agency has a limited budget but that at some point money has to be spent if the Board is going to protect the consumers of Minnesota. Wohlman and Cook agreed, and thanked Hodsdon.

At this time Hodsdon left the meeting.

Dean Mikel regarding Federal Prison Contracts:

Mikel introduced himself, as well as Steve Johnson who was with him, and provided a little about their professional backgrounds. Mikel is seeking some guidance from the Board on two issues.

Mikel stated that the first of his concerns have to do with federal contracts and there are two different kinds; those that require a Minnesota license and those that do not. Mikel asked for some guidance from the Board

as to what is really required as far as hiring someone to work on the federal contracts. Mikel inquired if someone hired to work on a federal contract needs to have pre-assignment training, background checks, fingerprints and ID cards. Mikel stated that he took the philosophy that they need all that. Wohlman stated that they do need this. Mikel stated that when he hired them they complained that they did not have to do that with previous companies, and now that they have been handed off to another company they have not had to do it with that company either. Mikel asked for the Board to give him guidance on which is correct.

Cook addressed the Board stating that Mikel provided him with the copy of the federal contract and that on page 9 it states that the contractor shall possess a license issued by the State of Minnesota Board of Private Detectives and Protective Agents Services. Cook stated that therefore they still need to abide by the state law. Hessel inquired if that comes from the Federal Government and Cook confirmed.

Mikel added that this goes back to the former Executive Director, because he dealt with it with her as well and she would verbally tell him that they let the feds do their own thing. Mikel advised that he would tell her there was a difference and would ask for that in writing because the owner would like to see this but she would never provide it in writing.

Evans stated what the Board has previously determined is that on some of the federal contracts is that the federal laws and rules apply and you may not have to be licensed to work on some of those contracts. Evans stated that the contracts are something they are creating and it does not necessarily guide the Board for what they do or do not need, that is for the prisons only that they are making that determination. Evans then added that the Minnesota law is clear that if you are licensed in this state therefore any employees of the company that you are operating need to comply with our licensure statutes. Mikel stated that is what he wanted to hear. Evans continued to say that because they are employees of that company that Mikel would need to discuss with his own counsel that if he were to form a different company that solely contracted with federal entities then you would have to comply with your own contracts with those entities but there are some different rules if it is strictly federal work that is being done.

Mikel added that he is an FBI VICS investigator as well and is aware that he doesn't have to have a license because they fall outside of that, but they don't do guard work either. Mikel added again that he just wants to clearly understand from the Board that as a licensed protective agent in the State of Minnesota that if he, or another licensed protective agent, hires somebody that they have to comply with all state requirements as far as pre-assignment training, background checking and the whole works. Mikel stated it is duplicating the Federal Government's effort because they require these people to have a clearance and they are background checked by the Federal Government and they have to be fingerprinted and drug screened and they do a much more extensive background that takes usually a year to get done because of Homeland Security.

Mikel asked again that what the Board is telling him is that they have to meet both requirements. Wohlman stated if it requires a state license then they have to meet state requirements. Mikel advised that was the first issue and he thinks they are very clear now. Moen added that there will be a copy of the issue in the meeting minutes.

Mikel then asked to confirm that if there is a competitor that is not background checking, fingerprinting, doing pre-assignment training and continuing education training they are in violation. Evans confirmed that is the case if they are licensed in the State of Minnesota and they are hiring them as part of that company. Mikel thanked the Board for that.

Mikel advised that the next issue is that another company had approximately 40 of these types of people who were employees of the company and now they are independent contractors. Mikel added that half of them knew that this was wrong, Johnson being one of them, and said they knew it was a violation and that they

were not going to do that. Mikel stated that half of them, as it is not their job to really understand state law; they are now working as independent contractors guarding federal prisoners down in Rochester. Mikel advised that Cook has spoken with a number of them to back up Mikel's statements, and he has also provided Cook with their entire payroll for every guard that works there. Mikel advised that you can see that nobody has had any withholding at all. Mikel stated there is no FICA, no state withholding and no federal withholding. Mikel stated that he is still pretty close to all these people and so they sent him copies of them. Mikel advised that when these workers ask the company, which is what Johnson can vouch for, they are told they will get a 1099 at the end of the year. Mikel advised that he feels that is a significant violation and he would ask that Cook have the authority to file a cease and desist order against both the company and the individuals. Mikel stated that he feels the individuals are sort of pawns in this situation and they just want to have a job because some of them have been doing it for 10 or 15 years and they are upset about it, and many of them have quit, but they feel sort of tugged in both directions.

Cook addressed the Board and stated that he would like to ask the Board to bring the license holder he is talking about before the Board to discuss the matter.

Wohlman stated that if you are 1099 at the end of the year sales tax has to be charged out of the amount. Mikel stated that no sales tax has to be charged for federal accounts. Wohlman acknowledged stating he was concerned that the State of Minnesota would collect another 6.5 percent. Mikel stated he does not believe they even have an account with the Minnesota Department of Revenue, and that they do not have one with State Unemployment or Federal Unemployment. Mikel stated when he first lost the account he beat himself up a little but you win some and you lose some, usually by nickels and dimes but they lost his account by over five dollars an hour. Wohlman confirmed if you are contracting employees you can charge less. Wohlman advised it's possible to charge much less if you don't have to match FICA, Workers Compensation and Liability. Mikel added it's about 30 percent.

Mikel added that when they first saw it they needed to sit back and watch what was going on, but when they see the numbers they know the whole story very quickly. Therefore, they are just asking Cook to follow through.

Cook added that what happens when they make these people independent contractors is that each one of them is actually committing unlicensed activity. Wohlman agreed. Cook added that, like Mikel said, it is not the employee's job to understand the laws, while some of them have questioned it. Cook advised that what disturbs him is that this licensed individual is doing this, and it is his job it is to understand the law and statutes.

Evans inquired what authority the Board has to order them to appear before the Board. Cook advised that they just need to tell them to come before the Board. Wohlman agreed. Evans inquired if they get a determination as to whether they want to speak to the Board or not. Wohlman advised that at least it allows the license holder the opportunity to answer questions. Cook advised if the license holder declines then he is sure there would be another step, but the agency cannot allow this to happen.

Evan stated that he certainly would support that Cook gather the background information for the Board on that individual license holder. Mikel stated most of the guards are retirees from law enforcement and meet the criteria to do the work and understand that this is wrong but if you look at the state violations Mikel advised he can't even begin to imagine the federal violations of the contracts and that is being explored with the Department of Labor. Mikel advised that they wanted the State of Minnesota to be aware of this.

Cook advised that he will send the license holder a notice to appear at the November meeting. Evans added that he does not believe this needs a motion. Cook added that any information Mikel wants to send him he

can. Mikel inquired if these applicants who are getting licensed just for one federal contract, if they are required to prove that they have an account with the Minnesota Department of Revenue so they know there is withholding going on. Wohlman inquired if they provided a federal ID number; Cook advised that Guralnik was checking that. Cook added that part of the application process is that the applicant has to provide both a Federal and Minnesota tax ID number. Guralnik confirmed that the applicant listed both a Minnesota and Federal tax ID number. Mikel added that it doesn't mean they are using it. Cook advised that he has tried working with the Department of Revenue to verify if the numbers are correct and they would not work with him on it yet.

Johnson added that he has another concern related to this, and while he knows the states do not regulate the feds, if the company has a Minnesota contract it opens them up to take on other work outside of that federal scope doing the same type of thing. Johnson added that he feels if he is required to have a Minnesota license the license holder should be required to conform to all the regulations as well.

Mikel added that some of the officer requested to fill out W-4's and some sent them to the company without solicitation and the license holder will not accept them. Mikel added that he has a letter from one officer detailing the situation. Mikel stated that two of the officers requested a copy of the independent contract they are working under or a copy of their wages per hour paystub and the license holder told them they do not need to see either and that they would get a 1099 at the end of the year. Mikel stated when the officers told him that they could not do that and that they needed to be an employee of the company the license holder told them to turn in their uniforms and terminated both of them. Mikel advised that one has contacted an attorney and is seeking relief through that attorney.

Mikel also added that the license holder stated he would not provide a uniform that they officers needed to go buy a shirt and he would provide them with a patch to put on the shirt. Johnson added that he has made contrary statements that he would provide Class A police uniforms with his patches and then it deteriorated down to the officers buying a Dickie work shirt and he would give them the patches. Johnson added a number of them have incurred expenses for tailoring; getting the patches sewn on, buying shirts and getting an ID photo ECT and these are expenses that are supposed to be carried by the contractor. Johnson also added that many of them are now aware that Social Security expenses are going to result in a cut in pay for them. Mikel added that it will be about \$1.30 an hour that they will now have to pay themselves.

Johnson added that some of his issues are federal issues that don't belong here at the meeting but that he wanted to continue working for Mikel but that he would work for any reputable contractor that took the contract so when this license holder took the contract Johnson contacted him and he was told that they would not be hiring any of the current Twin City security officers and the reason given was that he could not afford to pay their recent vacation accruals. Johnson added that the license holder was told he would have to take the officers on because they are the only ones cleared to do the work. Mikel added that their anniversary date goes back to when they started the work and so many are up to 4 or 5 weeks of vacation and that has to be bided in. Johnson stated that he has not been made an employment offer yet as he is required to do but he does not really want him to because he does not want to put his uniform on. Johnson added that this is not the concern of the Board but the thing that he wants the Board to be aware of is that the license holder had no integrity and that the very first day he called he was told the company was going to violate the law. Cook questioned what statement was made about violating the law. Johnson advised that the statement was not directly made, but in so many words he was told that the Service Contract Act did not apply to him, that he was not going to hire any of the officers and the reason he was not going to hire them was because he could not afford to pay the vacation accruals that were due. Mikel added when you bid on the contracts the vacation accruals are not known, and the only person who really knows what that cost is would be the current contractor.

Cook stated that if these allegations were correct it is apparent that there are some serious violations going on and that he would like to continue to communicate on this and he will take any documentation that they have on the issue. Cook added that he will request the license holder appear in November, the Board will ask some direct questions, and then the Board will act according based on the statutes regarding licensure in Minnesota. Cook thanked Mikel and Johnson for appearing. Wohlman added that it will be a public meeting so they are welcome to attend.

Lapsed Licenses:

Joe Collins PDI #1037-

Evans acknowledged that in the database information there was an error in the record keeping and the license should have expired in September and there needs to be a contingency. Wohlman moved to grant a contingency, Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Past Contingencies With Issues:

Contemporary Services Corporation – PAC #260

Cook explained that he has been in communication with them and while they still have a few items to take care of there have been some officer changes within the company. Cook explained that the key point that Cook wanted the Board to know is that he asked the license holder if there are any employee's working that have not been background checked, give ID cards and trained and the license holder confirmed there are none.

Gold Star Security – PAC #312

Cook explained that the agency made an error in managing this renewal. The renewal got mixed up with another similar named company. Cook explained that they issued a contingency. That was up at the last Board meeting (Sept). We presented it as renewal due in Sept and the Board granted them a contingency, when actually their contingency is up. I have attempted to contact the license holder for the (3) remaining items – W/C form, Affidavit of Training, and insurance certificate covering the last year. As of the writing of this report I have not heard back.

Current Contingencies:

PATS, LLC – PAC-E #303 (Expires Nov 2014)

Cook advised he is working with the Commissioner's office and there is still another 30 days on the contingency.

Great Plains – PDV #648

Cook advised the agency is just waiting on the check.

North Country Security, Inc.

Cook stated that he has attempted to the individual and he has not heard back from him.

Fairview Health Services, Inc. PAC #275

Cook advised that the plan to correct the issues has been provided. Wohlman advised the letter is OK.

Renewal Consent Agenda:

Cook is requesting a motion of approval for the following reissuance's due in October 2014 as they have provided all materials and have no issues:

License Number	License Type	License Holder
1063	PDI	Chris Geister
223	PAC	Twin City Security, Inc.
601	PDC	The McDowell Agency
632	PDC	R&D Agency
987	PDC	AAA Ventures

Hessel moved to approve the reissuances listed above; Moen seconded the motion. Cook added that Geister should not be listed because it is lapsed. Evans stated the motion would be that #1063 comes out of lapsed status and the rest are renewed. Hessel and Moen agreed. The motion passed unanimously.

Renewals With Issues:

G4S PAC 294

Cook advised that the license holder did notify agency of officer change (CEO) but the paperwork got lost during the agencies transition. Cook advised that the officer change is now complete and so it the renewal.

Wohlman moved to approve the renewal; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Robert Steven Rogers PAI #341

Cook advised that the issue is with the Secretary of State. Guralnik stated that the way it was explained to her by the Office of the Secretary of State is that if it is not a corporation the State does not require them to register. In addition, if they are a corporation is their full name they do not have to register. Guralnik stated that he does not feel he needs to register and the state does not require him. Cook stated that this comes up a lot with individual license holders. Hessel stated that the Secretary of State should make the decision as to whether or not they need to register. Guralnik added the rest of the renewal is complete.

Wohlman moved to approve the renewal; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

MS Professional Services and Safety Consultants, Inc. PDC #1040

Cook stated the check was for the wrong amount and it is being mailed in and other than this the renewal is in order.

Wohlman moved to approve a contingent on the check; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

First Advantage Background Services Corporation PDC #1068

Cook stated this is another issue that comes up. The license holder signs the application stating they understand the statutes, and then has an assistant complete the renewal with no idea of what they are doing. Cook advised them he is working on educating them as well as on the missing items so he is requesting contingency.

Wohlman moved to approve a contingency; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Gerald Whalen PDI 759

Cook advised that the agency needs Secretary of State and Affidavit of Training but that he is out of town until October 29th so a contingency is being requested.

Hessel moved to approve a contingency; Moen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Vaughn Robert Norberg PDI #1067

Cook advised there was a lapse in insurance coverage of a few days. Guralnik stated the Affidavit of training has been received. Guralnik advised that the license holder stated it was a miscommunication and ensured that this will not occur again.

Wohlman moved to approve the renewal; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Surrendered Licenses:

Signal 88 - PAC #325

Central States Fire Investigation, Inc. – PDC #950

Training Course and Instructor Approvals:

There were no training courses needing approval.

Officer Change - Present:

There were no Officer Changes present at the meeting.

Officer Changes – Consent Agenda:

License Holder Business Name:	Frasco, Inc.
License Type/Number:	PDC - 972
Name of Officer	Cory Wagner replacing Jeffrey Thone
Type of Officer Change:	MM
Physical Address:	215 Alameda Ave W Burbank, CA 91502
Local Address:	10526 Kingsway Ln Woodbury, MN 55129

License Holder Business Name:	Per Mar Security Services
License Type/Number:	PAC - 270
Name of Officer	Richard Sidlowski replacing Dean Guyette
Type of Officer Change:	CFO
Physical Address:	1910 E. Kimberly Rd, Davenport, IA 52807
Local Address:	5701 Shingle Creek Suite 130 Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

Evans asked if there were any questions on the consent agenda officer changes.

Hessel moved to approve the officer changes; Moen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Additional License Applicants – Consent Agenda:

Applicant Business Name:	United Protective Agency, INC
Chief Executive Officer:	Abdulkardir A. Ali
Chief Financial Officer:	Abdulkardir A. Ali
Qualified Representative:	Ronald Douglas Oslund
Minnesota Manager:	Ronald Douglas Oslund
Physical Address:	2718 Anthony Lane S Suite 200 Minneapolis, MN 55418
Type of License Applying For:	PDI

Applicant Business Name:	AAA Ventures
Chief Executive Officer:	Thomas Hoppenyan
Chief Financial Officer:	Thomas Hoppenyan
Qualified Representative:	Thomas Hoppenyan
Physical Address:	323 W Superior St #2 Duluth, MN 55802
Type of License Applying For:	PAC

Applicant Business Name:	MS Professional Services And Safety Consultants, INC
Chief Executive Officer:	Mamie Singleton
Chief Financial Officer:	Mamie Singleton
Qualified Representative:	Mamie Singleton
Physical Address:	10150 City Walk Drive Suite 222 Woodbury, MN 55129
Type of License Applying For:	PAC
Scope of Business:	Private Detective and Protective Agent Services

Evans inquired if there were any questions by Board members on the additional license applicants.

Evans moved to approve the additional license applicants listed on the consent agenda; Hessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Issues and Discussion:

November Meeting:

Cook inquired if Tuesday, November 25th would be OK for the meeting but it is the week of Thanksgiving. Moen advised she is not available that week. All other Board members that were present are OK with the normal meeting date.

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

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 25th, 2014 at 10:00am.