

The sixty-second (62nd) Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) Plan Board of Directors (Board) meeting was called to order by Avelino Gutierrez, Chairman at 8:05 a.m. MDT.

Attendance - Board of Directors:

Present – Adam Anderson, Sandy Bowling, Woody Chambers, Gene Eckhardt, Avelino Gutierrez, Dave Lazarides, Scott Morris, Neal Murphy, Angel Oliver and Bob Pitcher.
Absent – Bill Bronrott, Jay Gingerich, Bill Leonard, Rick Schweitzer and Bob Voltmann.

Avelino Gutierrez conducted a roll call of the States with **self-introductions** of government and industry representatives made by those in attendance.

Scott Morris moved to accept the **meeting agenda**, which was seconded by Neal Murphy. There was no discussion and the agenda was approved (Exhibit A).

Avelino Gutierrez established the **teleconference ground rules**.

Woody Chambers moved to accept the **minutes of the May 12, 2011, Board meeting**. Neal Murphy seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

UCR Legislative Update – no update.

FMCSA Update – Bill Bronrott will be on the call a little late. Rick Wood deferred to Jose Rodriguez – Jose stated he will be going ahead and getting a new list of the non-compliant UCR which will be a cleaner list based upon the recommendations by the Procedures Subcommittee. Rick Wood announced there have been four appointments to the board. Avelino Gutierrez stated he has received electronic copies of three reappointments (Angel Oliver of Texas, Sandy Bowling of Indiana and Neal Murphy of Massachusetts) and one appointment (Adam Anderson of Utah) all expiring May 31, 2014. The FMCSA appointment/reappointment letters are attached as Exhibit B.

John Jabas asked FMCSA about progress on the Registrant only procedure and if there has been any type of direction given for the states to take for the September 1st implementation date. Jose Rodriguez stated Julie Otto is handling this process right now and has recommended anyone with recommendations or suggestions on how this process impacts the state to email her at Julie.otto@dot.gov. They are looking at the whole procedure now. Any information from the states will be appreciated. Rick Wood additionally said this process is under review in the Program Office currently and that he relayed concerns to Julie that were expressed in the last meeting.

Avelino Gutierrez wants the Board minutes to reflect Scott Morris is now the Chair of the Depository Subcommittee and David Lazarides is the Temporary Chair of the Revenue and Fees Subcommittee.

UCR System & Best Practices Subcommittees - Dave Lazarides – Nothing new on the systems side. On the Best Practices side, a document named UCR Performance Review Recommendations is presented (Exhibit C) that sets forth seven areas that, if adopted, would help the Board to put a framework around. Dave asked the Board to come back to his report once the projector is ready.

Registration System of the State of Indiana – Sandy Bowling – Advised that broker registrations within the last month have not been uploaded to the SAFER system. When FMCSA performed a major overhaul one weekend, for some reason it ceased to update brokers. FMCSA is aware of it, they are working on it, and it is a priority. As soon as it gets completed, Sandy will email the UCR team. The only concern is not only the Indiana system but all systems that upload brokers, in that it is not known yet if they will have to resend all the information or if FMCSA has retained the data.

Industry Advisory Subcommittee - Bob Pitcher – Understand they met informally over lunch yesterday. Nothing of substance to report except the hamburgers were pretty good.

Depository Subcommittee - Frank LaQua will tie things up and then the Subcommittee will be shifted to Scott Morris. The Depository report (Exhibit D) contains figures from the national system through June 11, 2011 and from the individual state systems through May 2011. One state is a couple months behind. The report shows for 2007 \$74,404,000; 2008 \$78,217,000; 2009 \$83,202,000; 2010 \$93,000,000; and for 2011 \$89,000,000.

Payments made by the Depository for 2007, eight payments of \$13,000,000, 2007 is done. 2008 has disbursed five payments close to \$13,000,000 with a little left. For 2009, three payments of \$13,500,000, there will be some more but not a lot. For 2010, one payment of \$17,500,000. For 2011 one payment of \$4,500,000. Gene Eckhardt asked if there was a balance remaining for 2011 for disbursement. Frank LaQua responded he expects another \$12,000,000 will be disbursed in the future, but this year is running slower than 2010, so he doesn't know yet. Scott Morris advised some new numbers on 2011 reflect there will be \$13,000,000 due to be distributed but it has not all been invoiced or received by the Depository.

Frank LaQua has begun some work on the next distribution. Scott Morris' goal in the next month or so is to have the 2007, 2008 and 2009 distributions completed (through April of 2010) while the 2010 and 2011 distributions will be made throughout the end of the year. Once they get caught up, they will then begin work on the remainder of 2009, 2010 and 2011. Based upon the totals have been completed, the next distribution will be the final distribution for those years.

In the transition from Frank LaQua to Scott Morris, they will keep the bank where it's at and will work on getting everybody further guidance. They will be working on that over the next couple of months. Much work will be completed by the next Board meeting.

Avelino Gutierrez gave a heartfelt thanks to Frank LaQua for his dedicated service to the board. Mr. Gutierrez stated Frank LaQua has done a lot, stepped up and did certain things relative to the Depository that were difficult for other states; he had the attitude he could do it and he did it. Mr. Gutierrez continued the Board is very grateful to Frank LaQua and the State of North Dakota for loaning us his service.

Best Practices Subcommittee - Dave Lazarides resumed – The Audit Subcommittee needs direction from the Board as to things they can look at; therefore the Best Practices Subcommittee is suggesting performance areas that, if approved, will lead to the

activities being modified and approved next. He likes the performance in other programs with red, green and yellow lights and to tie benchmarks to the activities and the performance areas. This will give the Audit Subcommittee something specific to review and report. He envisions the Best Practices Subcommittee can incubate the activities, but the Board will approve. This has nothing to do with incentives or punitive matters, simply activities and benchmarks to reflect the red, green and yellow which in turn allows us to determine where improvement needs to be made.

[The seven (7) review areas were announced.] Dave Lazarides confirmed they have not placed any quantitative measures on these, they are just factors to be considered and that others may be added later. Gene Eckhardt asked if on the enforcement slide, which was described as Roadside, where does administrative enforcement fit in? It was discussed administrative enforcement may fall between one and two, or it may lead to another review activity.

Frank LaQua commented in the IRP and IFTA worlds, they vote on rules where the UCR Board makes those decisions. Mr. LaQua believes there should be more state input and comments. Gene Eckhardt responded that is the purpose of Dave Lazarides' presentation in that he's identified the areas that should be considered by the Board and he's offering those to the Board on a first cut basis to go forward and develop more specific activities. The 3rd step will be working on developing performance measures. Mr. Eckhardt continued that if the Board were to accept Dave Lazarides' recommendation, they are saying these are important areas to consider and to start developing the activities under those areas. Dave Lazarides is asking for comments from the states for additional areas, which as an example will be administrative enforcement. The process is in place at the Subcommittee level, as both state and industry people can serve on the Subcommittees. Frank LaQua commented he wants to go slow and wants it to be an open process so everybody has their say and provide more input into the specifics. Dave Lazarides responded they will announce Subcommittee meetings and everybody that wants to can provide input.

Avelino Gutierrez moved to accept the review areas as factors that, at this time, merit consideration as determinative of state performance and directing Dave Lazarides, as Chair of the Best Practices Subcommittee, to develop quantitative measures and specific activities of these measures. Adam Anderson and Scott Morris vied to second the motion. Gene Eckhardt moved for a friendly amendment to add to the motion, in response to Frank LaQua's comments, to solicit comments and input from the states on those areas as well. The friendly amendment was accepted and the motion was adopted. Dave Lazarides stated he will figure out the best way to make that happen to encourage maximum participation.

Revenue and Fees Subcommittee - Dave Lazarides, Temporary Chair – One item in the form of a motion to direct the chair of the UCR Board to draft and send a letter to USDOT/FMCSA recommending no changes in the fee structure for the 2012 registration year from the 2011 fee structure and begin registration for 2012 on October 1, 2011 and recommending to the states an enforcement start date of January 1, 2012. Scott Morris seconded the motion.

Rick Wood reminded the Board the letter must provide the annual list of state revenue

and entitlements. Avelino Gutierrez stated there was some discussion on that yesterday and we are “on it” and understand that will have to be included in the body of the letter. Mr. Gutierrez stated there will no changes at this time.

Frank LaQua asked the Board to entertain some thought of all the work Bill Leonard has done for this Board over the years. Avelino Gutierrez clarified Dave Lazarides has been named “Acting Chair” of this Subcommittee, as he wants to speak with Mr. Leonard before any permanent change.

It was noted January 1, 2011 enforcement date is a Sunday. It was determined the day of the week doesn't affect the enforcement date or the fact that it is also a holiday. The motion passed.

Dave Lazarides stated there is a compelling need in regard to 2013 fees, to begin working on the rationale for 2013 fees in a couple of weeks. The Subcommittee is trying to decide whether to reference a full registration cycle that is a normal one, but 2011 has not concluded yet. He stated he will convene a Subcommittee Meeting shortly unless Bill Leonard pops back in.

Sandy Bowling commented since the decision has been made that October 1, 2011, we will accept 2012 registration; the online system will be ready October 1, 2011 but that 2009 will no longer be available. States should ensure those transactions are completed by September 30, 2011. Avelino Gutierrez thanks Sandy and the State of Indiana for hosting the UCR Self-Registration website and agreeing to have it ready October 1, 2011 for 2012 registrations.

Dave Lazarides and Gene Eckhardt headed some additional discussion on the 2013 registration, noting a prior discussion with Jose Rodriguez and knowing how the rulemaking process works to some extent, it will require plenty of lead time. Dave Lazarides stated they don't necessarily anticipate a change in fees, but if they do discover in analyzing the numbers that a fee adjustment is required, they will need a lot of lead time to cause a rulemaking. Jose Rodriguez advised the Board to get going early and get the information to FMCSA if in fact the Board thinks there will be a change. FMCSA will need a minimum of nine months to set fees for 2013, as the analysis will take some time. Gene Eckhardt said to meet that time frame they need to make a complete filing in December 2011 or January 2012.

Procedures Subcommittee - Scott Morris – Stated some of the Subcommittee's proposals have fallen by the wayside, some are ready to adopt and some need more work.

Scott Morris moved acceptance of a new Q&A that addresses the tribal reservation issue (Exhibit E), Neal Murphy seconded. Angel Oliver stated she understood the issue as it was discussed yesterday, but now she's confused if it is a private entity and not part of the tribe. Scott Morris explained there are a couple of issues, one being exempt while on federal or government or tribal lands while the other is the principle of this program in that we take carriers at their word (if he registers with USDOT and says he's an interstate carrier). The reality is we may not be able to get to him and therefore we can't

enforce it. Adam Anderson clarified the carrier is based on the reservation, he goes into New Mexico and Colorado but he never leaves the reservation land but he is a for-hire carrier. They have no jurisdiction to go on the reservation and he's on the unregistered list.

Rick Wood commented it is difficult to generalize about situations like this. He has looked at this in other contexts and there is a continuum depending upon the treaties and whatever statutory enactments that gives a lesser/greater degree of autonomy to these jurisdictions. Not knowing the specifics, there are situations where the federal authority may have a greater opportunity to be involved in some places rather than others. Scott Morris asked Rick if he would recommend this fact specific issue to be answered in a Q&A. Rick stated he would like to talk to their Enforcement Programs Office for insight with carriers with a DOT number operating on an Indian reservation. He thinks if they get a DOT number, they are subjecting themselves to federal jurisdiction whether it is the new entrant program or a CR. Scott Morris moved they table this motion until the next meeting once Rick and his folks have a chance to discuss it. Avelino Gutierrez seconded. The motion carried.

Sandy Bowling asked how this may affect the new lists from FMCSA that will not include tribal DOT numbers. She was advised this would not affect that list filter as this situation relates to for-hire entities, not tribal governments.

Scott Morris introduced the next issue for the Board to send an email to the 2011 unregistered carriers and he additionally introduced draft email language (Exhibit F). Scott Morris moved for the Board to authorize an email to be sent to all 2011 unregistered carriers from the Board encouraging them to register, with the caveat that any state that has a registration percentage of 80% or higher may opt out of the email. Discussion ensued prior to Neal Murphy seconding the motion.

Scott Morris stated the non-participating jurisdiction allocation needs a lot more work. One of the first steps is for all participating jurisdictions that are interested and want to be responsible to send notices to a nonparticipating jurisdiction, to let Scott Morris know by July 1, 2011. This is the process they are taking with Bill Leonard unavailable, as they don't know how they were divvied up before or to whom. Once they know who is interested, and based upon that, the lists will be divvied up. Avelino Gutierrez asked if the allocations will need to be decided by the Board before the data is provided to the states in advance of September 1, 2011. Scott Morris responded that given the 2012 time frame, they will likely not have a permanent solution to this; therefore they intend to do it similar to past years. They are looking at this for a long term permanent basis for 2013, where each state will have individual carriers assigned and they will maintain that association throughout the following registration years. Scott Morris clarified that in the past, states like Florida, New Jersey and Maryland were split into various groups one year and different groups the following year where some carriers may have heard from multiple states. Scott continued that they are to the point where they can address that and come up with a permanent solution for the carrier and easier for the states to follow and track a specific carrier base.

Sandy Bowling offered to notify her UCR team and ask who previously sent out the non-

participating states and will do so by Monday. She asked what she should do with the non-compliant non-participating state list, as she had not yet forwarded the data. It was discussed to hold off until the new FMCSA master list is received, which will exclude from that list all private passengers and all federal, state, local and tribal governments.

Scott Morris returned the discussion to the proposed email from the UCR Board to all non-compliant carriers. He stated the email will be on UCR Board letterhead, and while it will come through the Alabama email system, the letter will be from the Board. Sandy Bowling asks what the sender email address will be. Scott Morris replied it will likely be a no-reply email address, and may be similar to ucr@psc.al.gov. Scott Morris reiterated it will go to all unregistered carriers, except for those carriers that belong to a participating state who's registration percentage is 80% or greater and who has opted out.

Sandy Bowling commented she thinks it's a good idea, but if you start sending out an email from the State of Alabama going to the entire United States, people will think it's a scam. Sandy Bowling continued that you have to look at the states' staffing situation as some states may already be utilizing the list previously sent to them. She would also want to ensure every state would have the staff to handle registration applications that don't go through the online system as this will also impact their phone calls also. She recommends any emails be sent in groups, not all at once, so staff could handle the callers and applications. She continued that in her state, the calls might even go to the governor's office and she would want to opt out.

Scott Morris responded they would break down the email into groups and not send them all at once. He also advised Sandy Bowling that Indiana is over 80% on that date.

Gene Eckhardt asked if the UCR self-registration link is in the email letter. Neal Murphy commented that as a state that doesn't have certain capabilities, he's appreciative of this effort.

Mike from Pennsylvania commented they currently use ITERIS' automated e-mailer; in addition to that they also use the FMCSA list from Sandy's. They have been tediously going through the list and calling them but he wondered if there were other considerations for those non-compliant carriers in non-participating states.

Scott Morris said we are six months into the calendar year and nine months into the registration year, if they haven't registered yet, they need all the encouragement they can get. An email from the Board on letterhead will certainly add to the encouragement. They have heard about it, they have been emailed, they've all gotten a letter until as new entrant, all have likely had multiple contacts, he believes one more attempt is good ... it says "we know you're out there – go register"!

Mike from Pennsylvania stated he understands. He continued that folks need to know there are states out there using the ITERIS auto e-mailer. They just started using it this spring for 2011 and they get great results from that and from the telephone calls.

Bill Bronrott came on the line at 9:35 MDT. He apologized for his tardiness and for the fact he has to leave in ten minutes to another set of meetings. He wishes he were in

Utah, and sorry he can't fully participate. He stated he knows Rick and Jose are holding the fort down and he has no additional comments.

Adam Anderson requested the email include instructions on what to do if they have gone out of business, which would be how to deactivate their DOT number. Scott Morris stated he would be happy to add that. Sandy Bowling will draft some language to send to Scott for that purpose.

Sandy Bowling asked, if the motion passes, what is the time frame for states to opt out? Scott Morris responded it would be after July 1, 2011, and only after the new federal list is available. Scott Morris continued that once he knows which states opt out, he can create a schedule. He will send the schedule to the UCR Board Secretary and Sandy Bowling before any emails goes out so they can notify the states. During the first week of July after the holiday, he will batch the non-participating state jurisdiction emails out first.

Scott Morris clarified this motion is just for one time, that after they see what kind of a response we get, future emails can be determined. It is important to monitor any returned emails to remove the email address from MCMIS. This information can be forwarded to Sandy Bowling. It was clarified this is just an email process at this time; there will be no hard copy mailings.

Avelino Gutierrez called the pending motion by Scott Morris, seconded by Neal Murphy, to approve the email blast to all unregistered carriers; with a friendly amendment by Adam Anderson adding information on deactivating DOT numbers agreed to by both Neal and Scott. The motion passed.

Scott Morris then presented a modified L 21 Q&A (Exhibit G) on leasing. Scott Morris moved for adoption, Neal Murphy seconded. Bob Pitcher stated he agrees there's nothing factually wrong with the revision, but that it is too compact to be clear and he would like to expand that. Scott Morris accepted the offer and moved to table it and to bring it back as amended for the next meeting. Sandy Bowling seconded. The motion was approved.

Scott Morris stated the next and final item presented on behalf of his Subcommittee is the Proposed Distribution Method for 2012 v. 2.0. (Exhibit H). This motion was presented at the last Board meeting and tabled. Scott Morris moved to bring the motion off the table and substitute the prior proposal with this amended version. Adam Anderson seconded. During the discussion, Gene Eckhardt offered an amendment to add at the end of paragraph 3 "Any such funds held in the Depository for a state shall be considered as having been distributed to the state when subsequent distribution amounts due to the states are calculated." Scott Morris and Adam Anderson accepted the amendment. Scott Morris stated the Depository Commission is striving to do a distribution three times a year but no less than twice a year.

Scott Morris explained it would impact the distribution if you didn't reach certain levels, as the amount would be held, then they go back into the pot for the next distribution. In

this matter, as an initial trial performance measure, they're not going to redistribute that money. They're going to hold it and when the state reaches that level, the state will be able to receive that money. The only point at which a state might tend to lose that money is at the very end of the three years, as any money that's remaining will be distributed to all states short under the cap.

This proposal gives states three years to get their levels up. This proposal comes down off the 90% for the first year; it is down to 85%. At 70% the state would get its registration percentage. Paragraph 2 C addresses states with less than 70%. No. 3? In paragraph four, the state would get all the held money once the state reaches the registration percentage. No. 5? Paragraph six addresses at the end of registration period (2015), each state's distance from its cap would determine the final distribution. Paragraph 7 addresses when there are sufficient funds to make all states whole, those funds would be distributed as soon as possible.

Bob Pitcher commented at which point a vote is taken on the motion, he will abstain.

Gene Eckhardt asked for clarification on 2C (less than 70% registration) relating to the state being subject to two conditions; in that the calculated disbursement is inconsistent with 2B when those states' disbursement is equal to the registration percentage. Gene Eckhardt continued that it seems if that would be applicable to 2C. Scott Morris stated that it's the lesser of the options, this is a diminutive amount and in all likelihood the state will reach its cap in a month or two. This eases administration of the formula and ensures states will have enough money to do a registration mail-out.

Gene Eckhardt said if a calculated disbursement is \$8,000 and the state has a registration percentage less than 70% then the state would get \$8,000 while a state with 70% registration percentage would get \$5,600 and wonders why are we giving the state with the lesser registration percentage more money? Gene Eckhardt asked if Scott would entertain an amendment, which Scott Morris responded favorably.

Gene Eckhardt asked why they are proposing to hold the funds for three full years, even though it isn't known how much money is being considered, it is held out of the system. Registration history shows accumulated funds over a period of time, and if 95% of the registration is the first year, why wouldn't the account be closed out at the end of the first year? Scott Morris explained there are two options for performance incentives; one is to withhold the money and not distribute it until they meet a threshold while the other option is to give it to somebody else. The committee determined that wasn't the route to take initially. It's up to the state when to achieve the goals and receive the money. By 2015 with the balance of options, a state with a registration percentage in 2C can go to 2A or 2B when they put in the effort. Each state has three years to achieve success even though it is not anticipated for a lot of money to be there at the end of three years. We have \$300,000 in 2008 funds. It gives the state incentive. The intent and hope is to encourage those states to get their registration percentages up and access that money. He hopes the money is all gone by the end of the three years.

Sandy Bowling stated with the percentages proposed, there may be some states that are working hard to reach their cap versus some states that aren't doing anything or only one mailing. Sandy Bowling does not think it's fair to the states that are working hard

and that there needs to be something in place that doesn't penalize the states that are working hard. Sandy asked if there is some other verbiage that could be used for relief for the states that are working hard. Scott Morris responded who(?) did not put that language in there. He stated the proposal can be changed by another Board motion, if adopted. He understands states are working hard and as a Board member, he would be open to any state coming to the Board and making a case they should receive the funds that are being held. That language is superfluous and not needed.

Angel Oliver stated their attorneys have reviewed yesterday's proposal, not today's, and they have concerns. They don't think the Board has the authority to implement this type of prorated or performance based plan. They are concerned the Board is overstepping its authority because the statute doesn't give the Board authority to apply performance based measures. Dave Lazarides asked if the Texas attorneys are aware the distribution method currently used was chosen as one of several and that this proposal may actually be a distribution method that meets a closer definition of prorata? He asked Angel Oliver if the problem is with all distribution proposals or just this one.

Angel Oliver responded that she can't speak for the attorney, but from her review, this proposal doesn't meet the standard. One of the main reasons is because it is performance based.

Scott Morris stated he has reviewed the statute and he believes it is well within the scope and authority of the Board. Scott Morris said if there are three attorneys, you will get five opinions. Gene Eckhardt brings to the table an economist opinion and says what is different about this proposal is it uses the registration performance of the state as a way to establish three categories and treats states different in those categories. Where there is two elements, is using the registration percentage of itself a valid prorated disbursement on a stand-alone basis? In that scenario they are treated exactly the same. Gene Eckhardt asked if a two-step process may be the problem instead of just of just a one-step process. Gene believes the current disbursement is also performance based, but it is a perverse incentive because the greatest reward goes to the worst performing state. Angel Oliver stated that while the largest amount does go to the state that is furthest from the cap, that doesn't mean they are doing the least amount of work.

Randy from Michigan stated he understands the need for states to work hard, but the proposal for qualitative analysis should be in Dave Lazarides' proposal, not this one.

Frank LaQua stated he wasn't sure if this is legal or not, but the statute talks about entitlement and distributing revenue on a prorated basis. He thinks that means the distance from the cap. A donor state that has a 20% registration receives all their money and nothing happens to them. States have already been penalized if they haven't reached a high percentage. Scott Morris stated this proposal might not impact anybody, but there are states that got over a million dollars that aren't even close to the 70% mark, so there could be quite a lot of money.

Bill DeBord stated he doesn't think this is the place to apply the standards. He concurs with Michigan and with Angel Oliver.

A gentleman from Pennsylvania stated he has concerns about legality. He believes the

Best Practices Subcommittee has set forth procedures the states should be utilizing, and states should utilize them and work for a while before we do an incentive/disincentive program.

Rick Wood stated Bill Bronrott has left, but had previously expressed his views of the proposal. Rick Wood is speaking for himself and not for the agency, but his concern is one already expressed about whether a temporary delay in the distribution is a valid option. The language within the conference report doesn't give them much help. Rick Wood says they need a careful opportunity to look at it before they express their views. They need to think carefully about the prorate basis, and he realizes that Scott Morris' proposal covers that, but he's not sure a temporal delay characterizes the purpose of the language.

Avelino Gutierrez believes the percentages listed are arbitrary and not calculated based upon a legal method based in law as used in the UCR Act, that the definition of prorate may not be applicable here. He has concerns with this proposal. He encourages Gene Eckhardt to come up with an alternative within the lines he described,

Scott Morris stated that given the concerns, he would like to move this back to the Procedures Committee, to which Neal Murphy seconded. The motion was approved.

Sandy Bowling has a question for Scott Morris; she said she has a few states that have contacted her on N 9. Scott Morris replied there is an interlocking trail of statutory citations which were more than he could handle out of the office. He will revisit that issue back in his office and he will have something at the next meeting.

Audit Subcommittee –Gene Eckhardt – They met briefly yesterday. Much of the discussion in the Subcommittee has focused on performance measures and goals and it has been clarified those activities are properly placed in the Procedures and in the Depository Subcommittees. Those activities are moving forward in those subcommittees. Gene plans to circulate, for consideration at the next Board meeting, a proposed charter to clarify roles and responsibilities, establish goals and set forth a framework on a concept for state compliance.

Old/New Matters:

- Thursday, July 14, 2011, 12 noon – 3 p.m. EDT by teleconference
- Thursday, August 11, 2011, 12 noon – 3 p.m. EDT by teleconference
- Thursday, September 22, 2011, 12 noon – 3 p.m. EDT by teleconference

Avelino Gutierrez stated at the last board meeting the Board adopted minutes without Exhibits B and C listed at the bottom of the minutes. He moved the minutes reflect they contain the exhibits; the motion was seconded by Adam Anderson. The motion was approved.

Sandy Bowling stated beginning next month at the July 14, 2011 Board meeting, there will be a new phone number to call into and a new passcode. She will forward that

information to Avelino and to the Board Secretary to send out to everybody.

Avelino Gutierrez moved the Board appoint Adam Anderson as Secretary to the Board, which was seconded by Scott Morris. The motion was approved.

Avelino Gutierrez wants the minutes to reflect thanks to Lynne Jones for stepping up and being Secretary. The Board has found her to be highly organized, very friendly and helpful in anyway she can be.

Neal Murphy reiterated the board member list needs updated on the website. Avelino Gutierrez stated they will be taking pictures, and updating the website with biographies and the terms of office.

The Board adjourned at 10:30 a.m. MDT.

Minutes approved by the UCR Board on July ____, 2011.

Lynne Jones, UCR Board Secretary

Exhibit A – Meeting Agenda

Exhibit B – FMCSA Appointment and Reappointment Letters (Anderson, Bowling, Murphy and Oliver)

Exhibit C – UCR Performance Review Recommendations – Best Practices Subcommittee

Exhibit D – Depository Report

Exhibit E – Tribal reservation QA

Exhibit F – UCR Non Compliant Email

Exhibit G – Leased Vehicles QA (L 21)

Exhibit H – Proposed Distribution Method for Registration Year 2012 v2.0