

*U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission*

FINAL REPORT OF THE  
TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL SEC

Government-Business  
Forum on  
Small Business  
Capital Formation

*San Francisco, California*

*September 19, 2005*

24th Annual SEC Government-Business Forum  
on Small Business Capital Formation

**FINAL REPORT**

November 2005

*The SEC hosts the annual Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, but does not seek to endorse or modify any of the Forum's recommendations. The recommendations are solely the responsibility of the Forum participants from outside the SEC, who were responsible for developing and prioritizing them. The recommendations do not necessarily reflect the views of the SEC, its Commissioners or any of the SEC's staff members.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Introduction.....</b>                          | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>Planning Committee .....</b>                   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Agenda .....</b>                               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Recommendations .....</b>                      | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Securities Regulation Recommendations.....</b> | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Tax Recommendations .....</b>                  | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Advisory Committee Roster.....</b>             | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Registered Forum Participants.....</b>         | <b>26</b> |

# INTRODUCTION

## **Background**

As mandated by the Small Business Investment Incentive Act of 1980, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission hosts an annual forum that focuses on the capital formation concerns of small business. Called the “SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation,” this gathering has assembled every year since 1982. A major purpose of the Forum is to provide a platform for small business to highlight perceived impediments in the capital-raising process and address whether they can be reduced. Each Forum seeks to develop recommendations for governmental and private actions to improve the environment for small business capital formation, consistent with other public policy goals, including investor protection. Prior Forums have published numerous recommendations in the areas of securities and financial services regulation, taxation and state and federal assistance, many of which have been implemented.

The Commission hosted the 2005 Forum, the 24th, at the Hyatt at Fisherman's Wharf Hotel, San Francisco, California, on September 19, 2005. The Forum was held in conjunction with a meeting of the SEC Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies on September 19 and 20, 2005 at the same location. The Forum's recommendations were presented publicly at a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the morning of September 20, 2005.

## **Planning and Organization**

The SEC's Division of Corporation Finance, through its Office of Small Business Policy, organized a Planning Committee to provide advice and assistance in organizing the 2005 Forum. Consistent with the Forum's statutory mandate, the Planning Committee's membership included representatives of federal and state government agencies as well as business and professional organizations concerned with small business capital formation. The members of the 2005 Forum Planning Committee are listed on pages 5 and 6.

The Planning Committee recommended that this year's Forum be held in conjunction with a fact-finding meeting of the SEC Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies in San Francisco in late September. The Planning Committee made this recommendation after concluding that holding the Forum in conjunction with a meeting of the Advisory Committee offered a unique opportunity. This arrangement allowed the Forum's recommendations to be considered by a blue ribbon panel established specifically by the Commission to provide expert guidance on issues historically of deep concern to Forum participants.

## **Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies**

The SEC organized its Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies in March 2005 to assess the current regulatory system for smaller companies under the

securities laws, including the impact of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The Advisory Committee was asked to make recommendations for changes in the system and submit a final report by April 2006.

The areas of inquiry of the Advisory Committee are:

- frameworks for internal control over financial reporting applicable to smaller public companies, methods for management's assessment of such internal control, and standards for auditing such internal control;
- corporate disclosure and reporting requirements and federally imposed corporate governance requirements for smaller public companies, including differing regulatory requirements based on market capitalization, other measurements of size or market characteristics;
- accounting standards and financial reporting requirements applicable to smaller public companies; and
- the process, requirements and exemptions relating to offerings of securities by smaller companies, particularly public offerings.

The Advisory Committee is charged with considering the impact of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in each of these areas. The Commission has directed the Advisory Committee to conduct its work with a view to protecting investors, considering whether the costs imposed by the current securities regulatory system for smaller public companies are proportionate to the benefits, identifying methods of minimizing costs and maximizing benefits, and facilitating capital formation by smaller companies. The Advisory Committee was also asked to consider providing recommendations to the Commission as to where and how the Commission should draw lines to scale regulatory treatment for companies based on size.

A roster of the 21 members and three official observers of the Advisory Committee is set forth on pages 23 through 25. Additional information on the Advisory Committee, including written statements submitted and presentations made to the Committee, is available on the Advisory Committee's website at <http://www.sec.gov/info/smallbus/acspc.shtml>.

## **Participants**

The SEC's Office of Small Business Policy worked with members of the Planning Committee to identify participants for the 2005 Forum. Invitations were sent to participants in previous Forums and to members of various business and professional organizations concerned with small business capital formation. The SEC issued two press releases announcing the time, date, place, and Internet webcast address of the Forum.

Approximately 100 participants attended this year's Forum in person, including 18 Advisory Committee members and 20 speakers, moderators and SEC staff. The webcast of the Forum received 375 hits on the day of the Forum, indicating that many individuals participated by listening over the Internet. The webcast archives received another 603 hits by the end of October 2005.

## **Proceedings**

The agenda for the 2005 Forum is reprinted starting at page 8. The two morning roundtable discussions were attended by 18 members of the Advisory Committee and 12 guest roundtable participants. The roundtables were moderated by Alan Beller, the two Co-Chairs of the Advisory Committee, Herbert S. Wander and James C. Thyen, and Marc H. Morgenstern, a long-time participant in past Forums and an active member of the Forum Planning Committee. SEC Commissioner Paul S. Atkins and Gerald J. Laporte, Chief of the SEC's Office of Small Business Policy, also participated in the morning roundtable discussions. Commissioner Atkins also gave a luncheon address.

The afternoon proceedings included five breakout groups designed to elicit and discuss recommendations for governmental and other action to improve the environment for small business capital formation. Three breakout groups discussed smaller public companies, one discussed venture capital and angel investing and another discussed tax issues. Participants chose to participate in a specific type of breakout group based on their area of greatest interest. Each of the five breakout groups was attended by approximately 20 participants, including members of the Advisory Committee.

Each breakout group was moderated by a leader. The breakout group leaders were Charles L. Bennett, Brian T. Borders, Ralph V. DeMartino, Lance J. Kimmel, and Marc H. Morgenstern. The discussions of the break-out groups resulted in three sets of recommendations: (1) a group of recommendations concerned with issues being considered by the Advisory Committee and relating to the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act; (2) a group of recommendations to the SEC relating to matters not specifically being considered by the Advisory Committee; and (3) a group of recommendations directed to Congress from the tax break-out group.

The five breakout group leaders made a presentation at a public meeting of the Advisory Committee on the morning of Tuesday, September 20, 2005, during which they discussed the Forum's recommendations. Following the presentation, the Advisory Committee heard public testimony from Larry E. Rittenberg, Chairman, Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO). The four subcommittees of the Advisory Committee (Accounting Standards Subcommittee, Capital Formation Subcommittee, Corporate Governance and Disclosure Subcommittee and Internal Control Over Financial Reporting Subcommittee) then discussed their activities before the meeting of the Advisory Committee was adjourned. Many Forum participants stayed to observe the entire Advisory Committee meeting on Tuesday.

## **Webcast and Transcript**

Audio and written records of the proceedings described above, other than the breakout group meetings, are available on the SEC Forum website at <http://www.sec.gov/info/smallbus/sbforum.shtml>. The archive of the audio webcast of the Forum and Advisory Committee joint meeting is available for listening on the SEC's website under "Webcasts – Other SEC Webcasts" at <http://www.connectlive.com/events/secadvisory0905/>.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### ***Chairman:***

Gerald J. Laporte  
Chief, Office of Small Business Policy  
Division of Corporation Finance  
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

### ***Government/Regulatory Representatives***

Anthony G. Barone  
Special Counsel  
Office of Small Business Policy  
Division of Corporation Finance  
U.S. Securities and Exchange  
Commission

Dan Covitz  
Economist, Capital Markets  
Division of Research and Statistics  
Board of Governors of the Federal  
Reserve System

Denise Voigt Crawford  
Texas Securities Commissioner  
Corporate Finance Committee Chair,  
North American Securities  
Administrators Association, Inc.

Jeffrey Mahoney  
Counsel to the Chairman  
Financial Accounting Standards Board

Mauri L. Osheroff  
Associate Director (Regulatory Policy)  
Division of Corporation Finance  
U.S. Securities and Exchange  
Commission

Michael R. See  
Assistant Chief Counsel  
Office of Advocacy  
U.S. Small Business Administration

Mary M. Sjoquist  
Special Counsel to  
Board Member Bill Gradison  
Public Company Accounting Oversight  
Board

Joani Ward  
Associate Supervisor  
Public Offering Review  
Corporate Financing Department  
NASD Regulation, Inc.

Denise Kirk-Murray  
Community Affairs Officer  
Office of the Comptroller of the  
Currency

***Representatives of Business and Professional Organizations***

Brian T. Borders  
Borders Law Group  
Washington, D.C.  
*Representing National Venture Capital Association*

Giovanni Coratolo  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce  
Washington, D.C.

Serena Davila  
Director  
Private Companies  
Financial Executives International  
Washington, D.C.

Christopher W. Frey  
Managing Director  
CFO Solutions, Inc.  
New York, New York  
*Representing American Institute of Certified Public Accountants*

Erin Fuller  
Executive Director  
National Association of Women  
Business Owners  
Vienna, Virginia

Gregory Giammittorio  
Shaw Pittman, LLP  
McLean, Virginia  
*Representing American Bar Association Business Law Section, Committee on Small Business*

Bruce Goldberg  
PricewaterhouseCoopers  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

John J. Huntz  
Managing Director  
Fuqua Ventures, LLC  
Atlanta, Georgia  
*Representing National Venture Capital Association*

Daryl W. Jackson  
Deloitte Tax LLP  
McLean, Virginia

Lee Mercer  
President  
National Association of Small Business  
Investment Companies  
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence R. Moreau  
Moreau Group, Inc.  
Manhattan Beach, California  
*Representing National Investment Banking Association*

Marc H. Morgenstern  
Managing Partner  
Kahn Kleinman  
Cleveland, Ohio  
*Representing American Bar Association Business Law Section, Committee on Small Business*

Gregory C. Yadley  
Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick  
Tampa, Florida  
*Representing American Bar Association Federal Regulation of Securities Committee, Subcommittee on Small Business Issuers*

## **FORUM SEC STAFF**

Mauri L. Osheroff  
Associate Director (Regulatory Policy)  
Division of Corporation Finance

**Office of Small Business Policy**  
Division of Corporation Finance

Gerald J. Laporte, Chief

Anthony G. Barone

William A. Hines

Corey A. Jennings

Kevin M. O'Neill

Twanna M. Young

## **Agenda**

*Monday, September 19, 2005*

**8:00 a.m.      Introductory Remarks**

Gerald J. Laporte, Chief, Office of Small Business Policy  
SEC Division of Corporation Finance

**8:05 a.m.      Opening Remarks**

Alan L. Beller, Director  
SEC Division of Corporation Finance

**8:15 a.m.      Joint Meeting of Forum and SEC Advisory Committee on Smaller  
Public Companies**

**Moderators:**

Alan L. Beller, Director, SEC Division of Corporation Finance  
Marc H. Morgenstern, Managing Partner, Kahn Kleinman, Cleveland, OH  
James C. Thyen, President and Chief Executive Officer, Kimball  
International, Inc., Jasper, IN, and Co-Chair of Advisory Committee  
Herbert S. Wander, Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman, Chicago, IL, and Co-  
Chair of Advisory Committee

**Advisory Committee Members**

**First Roundtable Presenters:**

Kenneth Hahn, Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Borland  
Software Corporation, Cupertino, California

Gerald V. Niesar, Partner, Niesar Curles Bartling LLP, San Francisco,  
California

Donald C. Reinke, Partner, Reed Smith, Oakland, California

Lynn E. Turner, Managing Director of Research, Glass, Lewis & Co.,  
LLC, San Francisco, California

Richard Ueltschy, Executive, Crowe Chizek and Company LLC,  
Louisville, Kentucky

Ann Y. Walker, Partner, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Palo Alto,  
California

**Break**

**Second Roundtable Presenters:**

Chris Ailman, Chief Investment Officer, California State Teachers Retirement System, Sacramento, California

Irwin Federman, General Partner, U.S. Venture Partners, Menlo Park, California

Bill Hambrecht, Founder, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, W.R. Hambrecht + Co., San Francisco, California

Jon Hickman, Vice President, Equity Research – Technology, MDB Capital Group, LLC, Santa Monica, California

Michael McConnell, Managing Director, Shamrock Capital Advisors, Burbank, California

Andrew Shapiro, President, Lawndale Capital Management, LLC, Mill Valley, California

**12:15 p.m. Break**

**12:30 p.m. Luncheon**  
**Speaker:** SEC Commissioner Paul S. Atkins

**1:45 p.m. Forum Breakout Group Meetings**  
(with participation by members of Advisory Committee)

- **Smaller Public Companies Breakout Group(s)**
- **Venture Capital and Angel Investing Breakout Group**
- **Tax Breakout Group**

**3:15 p.m. Break**

**3:30 p.m. Continuation of Forum Breakout Group Meetings**  
(without participation by members of Advisory Committee)

- **Smaller Public Companies Breakout Group(s)**
- **Venture Capital and Angel Investing Breakout Group**
- **Tax Breakout Group**

**6:00 p.m. Networking Cocktail Hour with Members of Advisory Committee**

## RECOMMENDATIONS\*

*Set forth below are three sets of recommendations of the 2005 Forum: (1) a group of recommendations concerned with issues being considered by the Advisory Committee and relating to the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act; (2) a group of recommendations to the SEC relating to matters not specifically being considered by the Advisory Committee; and (3) a group of recommendations directed to Congress from the tax break-out group.*

### Securities Regulation Recommendations

#### Introductory Remarks

*The five Forum breakout group leaders, Charles L. Bennett, Brian T. Borders, Ralph V. DeMartino, Lance J. Kimmel, and Marc H. Morgenstern, worked together to compile and edit the two lists of securities regulation recommendations of this year's Forum that follow these introductory remarks.*

*The introductory remarks below are an edited version of the introductory remarks delivered by the breakout group leaders at a meeting of the SEC Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies on Tuesday, September 20, 2005, where this year's Forum recommendations were discussed with the Advisory Committee.*

This year's Forum participants formulated over 20 recommendations in areas being considered by the Advisory Committee, of which Recommendation Nos. 1 and 2 are the two overwhelming priority recommendations of this year's Forum, namely that: (1) an appropriate definition of smaller public companies reflect several categories of issuers; and (2) that new rules be adopted to legitimize the role of finders in the small business capital formation process.

The consensus among the Forum participants is that significant distinctions should be drawn between different companies based on size and other identifiable economic variables. Substantial additional flexibility should be provided in both the definition and the application of the rules, to reflect the significant differences in the: (1) financial, capital, and human resources available to smaller public companies; (2) costs and benefits of the federal securities laws to smaller issuers; and (3) desirability of having more than one line of demarcation and, therefore, more than one set of rules. Most particularly, "micro-cap companies" should be distinguished from "smaller public companies" which, in turn, should be distinguished from "larger public companies" (*i.e.*, "well-known seasoned issuers").

---

\* The SEC hosts the annual Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, but does not seek to endorse or modify any of the Forum's recommendations. The recommendations are solely the responsibility of the Forum participants from outside the SEC, who were responsible for developing and prioritizing them. The recommendations do not necessarily reflect the views of the SEC, its Commissioners or any of the SEC's staff members.

Requiring the SEC to conduct the annual Forum represents Congress's acknowledgement of several important facts. First, smaller public companies are genuinely different from larger public companies, and the differences are of kind, rather than simply degree. Smaller public companies have different operating characteristics and capital structures. Chief financial officers of smaller public companies frequently play a more integrated operational role than their larger company brethren and are frequently deeply enmeshed in operations. Because of the limited revenues or profitability of smaller public companies, these issuers are commonly required to disclose the existence of contracts and transactions that are material to them, but which would not be material to their larger competitors. Requiring the disclosure of these material contracts puts the smaller public companies at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis their larger public company competitors, because disclosure permits larger competitors to know the strategy and business relationships of their smaller public company competitors. Although there are significant benefits to being public, there are also increasing costs, both legal and operational.

The SEC has demonstrated that it is critical for the nation's capital formation process that smaller public companies continue to believe that entering the public marketplace, with its concomitant financial and disclosure obligations, constitutes a benefit that more than adequately compensates for the associated cost. If private companies continue to reach a different conclusion, and choose strategic sales of their businesses as their exit strategy rather than an initial public offering, or limit their revenue growth to that sustainable only through debt and private equity financing, we anticipate that the domestic economy, job creation, innovation, and the capital marketplace will all be negatively impacted. Both small investors and large institutional investors require a securities marketplace that: (1) consistently replenishes the universe of investment choices by having new entrants; and (2) funds emerging growth companies that are responsible for so much economic vitality.

Finally, because of the clear impact and importance of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, and the critical nature of the Advisory Committee's work in proposing revisions to Sarbanes-Oxley Act rules, the Forum participants hope that the Advisory Committee and the SEC will each take bold and dramatic action. This is an historically unique opportunity to acknowledge that size does matter. It would be appropriate and helpful to treat smaller public companies differently from larger public companies from both a regulatory and economic perspective. This year's Forum participants encourage the Advisory Committee and the SEC to acknowledge, and more importantly, celebrate those differences.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Securities Regulation Recommendations in Areas Being Considered by SEC Advisory Committee

*The following recommendations are presented in the order of their importance and priority, as established by the five breakout group leaders based upon their respective breakout group discussions.*

### **1. Classification and Definitions of Public Companies**

**Adopt the following three-tier classification system of public companies:**

- **micro-cap companies;**
- **smaller public companies; and**
- **large public companies.**

***Rationale:*** “Micro-cap companies” and “smaller public companies” would be eligible for relief from certain regulatory provisions under the Securities Act of 1933 and/or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. We urge consideration of *significant* relief, including relief from substantial parts of the internal control requirements under Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for “micro-cap companies” and *scaled* relief for “smaller public companies.”

#### **(a) Definition of “Micro-Cap Company”**

A “*micro-cap company*” should be defined as a public company having *any* of the following characteristics\*:

- **\$100 million total market capitalization or less;**
- **\$25 million annual revenues or less (the current metric in the definition of “small business issuer”); or**
- **a public float criteria based on standards to be established.**

***Rationale:*** To avoid inconsistencies in the calculation of “public float” from one company to another, “public float” would be defined, for classification purposes only, as “total market capitalization” less the market capitalization of shares held by directors and executive officers. The calculation of a company’s “public float” would include ten-percent holders who file a Schedule 13G and founders who are currently neither directors nor executive officers who file a Schedule 13D.

#### **(b) Definition of “Large Public Company”**

**The definition of a “*large public company*” should be the same as that of either a “well-known seasoned issuer” (“WKSI”) or a “large accelerated**

---

\* The foregoing metrics are for reference purposes only. The proposed definition can either use specific dollar criteria or scalable measurement metrics to avoid the problem of having to rewrite dollar-amount definitions periodically.

filer,” both of which apply to companies with a public float of \$700 million or more.

**(c) Definition of “Smaller Public Company”**

**In order to avoid any gaps in the classification system, a “*smaller public company*” would be defined as a public company that does not meet the definition of “micro-cap company” or “large public company” and, in effect, becomes the default definition to encompass all public companies between the two ends of the spectrum of “micro-cap companies” and “large public companies.”**

***Rationale:*** We support the use of market capitalization as a good initial criterion for the classification of the size of public companies. We believe that additional criteria are also important for the two smallest categories of public companies to account for different business models and other forces that may be in play for less mature public companies.

We believe that use of a revenue test will allow flexibility in circumstances where a pre-revenue or early-revenue company has a high premium market capitalization because of the perceived desirability of its industry group by the marketplace at a given point in time. For example, market forces are currently valuing small biotech companies with large aggressive market capitalizations, despite the fact that these companies are not expected to generate revenues in the near-term and have limited accounting and legal staff available for a more rigorous compliance regime. Vis-à-vis public companies in other industry groups, the market capitalizations of such small biotech companies are grossly disproportionate to the number of employees they have on staff that are available for financial and accounting functions. In these cases, revenue as opposed to market capitalization more accurately reflects the status of these issuers as younger, emerging, resource-constrained and with limited administrative staff.

We also believe that the use of a public float test is an appropriate and important criterion, as it most closely focuses on the protectible risk at issue – that of the truly independent, third party, public investor. Smaller public companies frequently have a high percentage of shares held by founders, directors and executive officers, the classic insiders who do not need significant SEC protection. We believe that the proposed definition of “public float” – which consciously avoids the less precisely defined terms “affiliate” and “control” – addresses the need to include larger outside investors as part of the protected class, even if they hold more than 10% of a company’s issued and outstanding shares and might, for other purposes, be deemed to be an “affiliates.”

**(d) Exemption from the Definition of Public Company**

**The concerns of the creeping or inadvertent public company should be addressed under Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act, including providing a definitional exemption that excludes from the calculation the number of shareholder employees who receive options as part of compensatory arrangements.**

***Rationale:*** Companies that compensate their employees in part through the granting of options are attempting to conserve cash and retain talent with the promise of a deferred reward. We do not believe it is in the public interest and do not see the protectible interest for such companies, which are otherwise closely held, to expend the capital and resources, or be required to institute the internal controls, that are part of becoming public reporting companies. This is particularly burdensome since they have not received the capital infusion that ordinarily comes from an initial public sale of their securities.

**2. Private Placement Broker Dealers**

**The SEC should embrace the thoughtful, well-reasoned and analytically sound *American Bar Association Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Private Placement Broker-Dealers* dated June 20, 2005. Addressing the ambiguous standing of “finders,” as recommended in this report, has been a high priority recommendation of the Forum for each of the past two years. The ABA report reflects a thoughtful and thorough approach for addressing this issue. It will provide a good starting point for the SEC to assert its leadership on this issue, which necessarily involves the NASD and state regulators.**

***Rationale:*** Finders play an important role in introducing small businesses to sources of capital and advising them on the capital infusion transaction. Creation of a limited purpose private placement broker-dealer (“PPBD”) and appropriate regulatory regime would eliminate legal uncertainty surrounding participation of legitimate finders in small business capital formation. PPBDs should readily register under a regime that is appropriate to the function they perform and that restricts their activities to those necessary to performing that limited function. Further, witnesses testifying before the Advisory Committee have indicated that other bodies, such as state regulators and self-regulatory organizations, have or are formulating legal and regulatory responses to the activities of finders that place NASD members in jeopardy when they interact with and compensate such persons. These responses have, in some cases, placed finders in the untenable position of facing criminal sanctions for engaging in an activity that, if properly conducted, is generally recognized as fulfilling an important role in small business capital formation.

### 3. De-Registration or Opting Out of SEC Reporting System.

**(a) The SEC should consider modifying the shareholder and asset criteria for the deregistration of a public company under Section 13 of the Exchange Act to: (1) adjust for inflation on the asset side; and (2) shift the focus of ownership from record to beneficial ownership.**

*Rationale:* Micro-cap companies that became subject to Section 12(g) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act before the enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in July 2002 are the most deeply affected by the disproportionate costs of Sarbanes-Oxley Act compliance. However, the ability of these smallest of public companies to exit the reporting system is often limited. If they are not eligible to file a Form 15 under current criteria, based upon having only a limited number of shareholders of record, they must comply with lengthy and time-consuming going private transaction provisions under Rule 13e-3. The criteria triggering the requirements of a Rule 13e-3 transaction, based upon the number of shareholders, are historically arbitrary. The extensive time and costs involved in a Rule 13e-3 transaction, including the professional costs involved in preparing the SEC filing, the time and effort associated with the regulatory review of the filing, fairness opinions, potential shareholder lawsuits, and the fundamental requirement to obtain the necessary financing for the buy-out of the minority shareholders, often renders a Rule 13e-3 transaction impossible as a financial or practical matter, or both.

Beneficial ownership should be determined based on a current position or non-objecting beneficial shareowner (“NOBO”) list.

**(b) The SEC should create a “safe harbor opt-out” mechanism for micro-cap companies having fewer than 1,000 beneficial holders and which became subject to Exchange Act reporting obligations before the enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.**

*Rationale:* Companies meeting these criteria should be automatically eligible to file a Form 15. Additionally, for the 90-day period subsequent to the filing of the Form 15, such companies should have the benefit of transitional relief so that they would not be obligated to comply with any new requirements that otherwise would be applicable to a reporting company because of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. We believe these companies lack the true characteristics of a public company, yet they have to pay the full compliance costs without an offsetting shareholder benefit.

### 4. Modifications to Prohibition on General Solicitation

**Eliminate the prohibition against general solicitation in offerings exempt under Rule 506 of Regulation D in which sales are restricted to accredited investors.**

## **5. Deferral of Application of Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act to Non-Accelerated Filers**

**The requirements of Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for non-accelerated filers should be deferred an additional year. We believe this relief is appropriate for micro-cap companies and smaller public companies, as those terms are defined above in Recommendation No. 1.\***

***Rationale:*** Non-accelerated filers currently confront a great deal of uncertainty as to what framework of internal controls will be adopted for smaller public companies by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (“COSO”) and what new definitions of smaller public companies will be adopted by the SEC and how the requirements of Section 404 will be applied to these new classifications of public companies. Because of the extensive lead time, non-accelerated filers should not be placed in a position of adopting frameworks of internal controls (or preparing to do so), or incurring the required expense of such implementation, until a clear regulatory framework is adopted.

## **6. Elimination of Independent Auditor Certifications Pursuant to Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act for Micro-Cap Companies**

**No Section 404 certification should be required of independent auditors of micro-cap companies. Certifications currently required by the CEO and CFO under Sections 302 and 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act should continue to be required.**

***Rationale:*** Micro-cap companies generally have not matured to the stage that business models or revenues and profits justify the complexities of internal controls which have been adopted by accelerated filers. In addition, investors in the micro-cap market generally place greater emphasis on the strength of management and management’s ability to execute against the business plan. Thus, we are of the opinion that the certifications required of the CEO and the CFO under Section 302 and the potential for penalties which would attach for false certifications under Section 906 should be viewed as sufficient deterrents for managers of this class of issuers.

## **7. Single Audit Attestation for Micro-Cap Companies**

**A “safe harbor” from Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act should be created for micro-cap companies that would permit the use of a single audit standard for Section 404 attestations.**

---

\* On September 21, 2005, the Commission voted to extend for an additional year the compliance date for its Section 404 internal control reporting requirements for companies that are not accelerated filers. Under the new compliance schedule, a company that is not an accelerated filer will begin to be required to comply with the Section 404 requirements for its first fiscal year ending on or after July 15, 2007. SEC Release No. 33-8618, *Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and Certification of Disclosure in Exchange Act Periodic Reports of Companies that Are Not Accelerated Filers* (September 22, 2005).

**Rationale:** The "Single Audit Act" establishes the standards for independent auditors when they audit non-federal entities that receive federal funds either directly or indirectly. The technical rules are laid out in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133. The circular directs that the auditor conduct the audit in accordance with either generally accepted auditing standards ("GAAS") or generally accepted government auditing standards ("GAGAS"), as appropriate, and opine on the financial statements, as appropriate.

OMB Circular A-133 also requires that the auditor test the internal controls as described in OMB-Circular A-122. The auditor's report on management's responsibility for internal controls is described in the circular. Finally, the auditor is required to report on any material weaknesses in internal controls.

## **8. Transition Rules for Classification of Public Companies**

**Transition rules should be adopted for all disclosure purposes, including Regulations S-B, S-K, and S-X, to provide companies with guidance when they transition between market segments, such as between micro-cap and smaller public companies and well-known seasoned issuers. The SEC should also determine the U.S. market capitalization as of calendar year-end and average this figure over a number of years. Similarly, company market capitalization should also be averaged over a number of calendar quarters.**

**Rationale:** The transition rules for graduating up or dropping down to different market classes based on the definition of a public company must be made clear and drafted with sensitivity to avoid subjecting companies to different standards solely due to fluctuations in market value or company market value that may merely reflect short-term market or economic activity, specific to the issuer or generally reflecting broader industry or marketplace issues. Market participants will demand certainty regarding the classification of any particular company and the disclosure standards they are expected to adhere to when reporting. Similarly, companies will not want to be placed in a position where they might be forced to institute costly changes to disclosure and internal control standards if the change in their classification is due to volatility in company market capitalization. Thus, for example, in order to reduce the chances that companies will "bounce" between market classifications, as might be the case if a capitalization based only upon a single point in time is used, we believe that: (1) the calculation of U.S. market capitalization should be averaged over three to five years; and (2) companies should be required to average their market capitalization over four to eight calendar quarters.

We are concerned that companies could migrate between definitional classifications (both up and down) over several years while their actual businesses and operating characteristics may have undergone almost no change. Companies will need time to prepare for and comply with the applicable rules.

## **9. Clarification of Sarbanes-Oxley Act Loan Prohibitions**

**The Sarbanes-Oxley Act loan prohibitions should be clarified to avoid their application in the following instances:**

**(a) Cashless exercise provisions in options granted to officers and directors should not constitute a violation of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act loan prohibitions.**

**(b) Advancement of costs in litigation (indemnification) should not be deemed to violate loan prohibitions provided that the recipient is obligated to repay such funds if the outcome of the dispute is such that the governing law and indemnification provisions would not have allowed for indemnification or mandated such repayment.**

## **10. Delayed Implementation of New Accounting Pronouncements**

**The effectiveness of new accounting pronouncements should be delayed for both micro-cap and smaller public companies. These two categories of smaller publicly-held companies should always be provided an additional one-year period from the date with which new accounting pronouncements become effective for large public companies to comply.**

***Rationale:*** Micro-cap companies and smaller public companies do not have the internal resources and expertise to construe and apply new pronouncements absent substantial guidance. Such a delay in implementation would allow the accounting profession to become better acquainted with the new literature and allow custom and practice to develop, thereby diminishing the burden on the micro-cap and smaller public companies when the pronouncements become effective for them.

## **11. Guidance on Materiality in a Financial Reporting Context**

**The SEC staff should provide guidance to issuers and auditors on “materiality” in a financial reporting context.**

***Rationale:*** SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 99 is difficult for financial professionals to construe and is being inconsistently applied. SAB 99 is a fair recital of the law of materiality, but it affords little tangible guidance to financial professionals with respect to the practical application of the law. Thus, internal accountants, external auditors and audit committee members often find themselves at odds with respect to the materiality of particular financial items. The circumstances cry out for guidance to make SAB 99 more accessible for non-legal financial professionals. The Forum recommends a question and answer type staff accounting bulletin addressing a host of hypothetical materiality issues.

## **12. Guidance on Permissible Advice of Independent Certified Public Accountants**

**Clarification should be widely distributed advising that independent certified public accountants may provide guidance with respect to accounting literature and its application without impairing their independence.**

***Rationale:*** The initial guidance provided to the accounting industry by the PCAOB was too narrowly construed. Subsequently, the PCAOB provided further guidance by way of a question and answer release to clarify the extent to which independent public accountants may advise their audited companies. Further clarification needs to be issued because the auditing profession is still acting in a manner that is more reserved than that allowed by the PCAOB guidance. This conservatism has resulted in substantial financial burdens on micro-cap and smaller public companies.

## **13. Modification of Treatment of Consents and Audits Prepared by Predecessor Auditors**

**(a) Auditor independence standards should not preclude a predecessor auditor from issuing a consent to the use of a previously issued audit opinion if it was “independent” under the standards that were in effect at the time the opinion was issued merely because it is receiving installment payments with respect to a prior invoice.**

**(b) A predecessor auditor should also not be precluded from certifying a restatement of previously audited financial statements based upon the new independence guidance if the auditor was independent at the time of the initial certification.**

***Rationale:*** In the circumstances addressed above, the independence standards in effect at the time of issuance of the original opinion should be the standards that address any opinion on a restatement or the issuance of a consent. In both cases, the Forum contemplates that there would be special disclosure in the opinion that discloses which standards govern and highlights that the auditor would not be deemed independent under today’s standards and the basis in fact and under the literature for those conclusions.

## **Additional Securities Regulation Recommendations**

*The Forum break-out groups developed the following additional recommendations, which were not presented to the Advisory Committee on September 20, 2005, due to time considerations. These recommendations are not presented in any order of importance or priority.*

**14. Regulatory Structure for Private Pools of Accredited Investors**

Create a regulatory structure through the use of regulatory authority, including no-action letter relief, allowing private entities to be formed for the purpose of building secure pools of accredited investors to whom pre-qualified pool sponsors can distribute offering documents seeking early-stage capital without violating the prohibition on general solicitation. This approach would be an improved version of the SEC ACE-NET no-action letter but operated by one or more private entities.

**15. Exemption of Certain Pooled Investment Vehicles from Investment Adviser Compensation Limits**

Create a mechanism for accredited investors to pool funds for investment in non-public operating companies without the compensation limitations of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

**16. Establishment of Advisory Committee**

Establish an advisory committee to address the problems and concerns of small business entities trying to raise \$5 million or less in capital.

**17. Expansion of Small Business Registration Exemptions**

Adopt Securities Regulation Recommendation No. 5 listed in the 2004 Forum Final Report that the SEC should issue a concept release on small business capital formation with a view to improving the utility of small business securities registration exemptions and to increasing the limits for the use of Regulation S-B, Regulation A, Rule 504, Rule 505 and Rule 701.

## Tax Recommendations

*The Forum tax breakout group developed and prioritized the following recommendations for Congress.*

### **1. Monetization of Small Businesses' Net Operating Losses**

Currently, Internal Revenue Code Section 1244 allows a preferential write-off of an initial investment in a small business. This benefit only saves *failures* after the fact. What is often needed is an extra infusion of capital to help small businesses *succeed*. We recommend that Congress investigate ways to monetize qualified small businesses' net operating losses ("NOLs"). For example, allow a small business to sell its NOLs to another company. Congress may want to consider thresholds and limits on the dollar amounts of NOLs that could be sold.

### **2. Small Business – New Jobs Incentive Act**

Allow a 10% credit for a "qualified investment" in a "qualified small business." The credit would be available to carry forward only. A qualified investment would have a yearly limit for the purchase of an equity investment of no more than \$1 million per investor. A qualified small business may include a C corporation, S corporation, LLC or other legal entity structure. In keeping with the desire to promote "patient capital," the investment must be for a period of at least three years, or the credit would be subject to reasonable recapture. In addition, the small business must be in an active trade or business and would not include investment companies or personal service corporations. Further, the credit could be used to offset either the regular tax liability or the alternative minimum tax liability. The credit would reduce the investor's tax basis in the original investment.

### **3. Modification of Alternative Minimum Tax**

The alternative minimum tax ("AMT") is an impediment to investment in our country, because it introduces further complexity and reduces rates of returns in small business investing. The preferential rate or treatment of capital gains or investment incentives should not be subject to the AMT.

### **4. Tax Simplification**

The current tax code is so burdensome and complex that it has become an impediment to the successful functioning of small business as an engine of economic growth to the overall economy. Over the course of the last 90 years, the Internal Revenue Code and attendant regulations have evolved in such a way that, due to their complexity, they now deter investments in domestic businesses. The environment of a complex tax code has spawned tax shelters. We believe that our system of taxation should be simplified, and this simplification should be designed in light of the global nature of business today.

## **5. E-Commerce Restriction**

Federal and state taxation or restrictions of e-commerce will cripple small businesses' ability to raise capital and increase employment. It will also adversely affect small businesses' product distribution due to increased regulatory compliance and financial burdens. We recommend that Congress prohibit the imposition of any restrictions on e-commerce and ban the states from imposing any state sales, use or telecommunication taxes on e-commerce.

## Advisory Committee Roster

**Patrick C. Barry**

COO and CFO  
Bluefly, Inc.  
42 West 39th Street, 9th Floor  
New York, NY 10018

**Member**

**C. R. “Rusty” Cloutier**

President and CEO  
Midsouth Bancorp  
P.O. Box 3745  
Lafayette, LA 70502

**Member**

**George J. Batavick\***

Member  
Financial Accounting Standards Board  
401 Merritt 7, P.O. Box 5116  
Norwalk, CT 06856-5116

**Official Observer**

**James A. “Drew” Connolly III\***

President  
IBA Capital Funding  
14 Pullen Drive  
Perrineville, NJ 08535

**Member**

**Steven E. Bochner\***

Partner  
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

**Member**

**E. David Coolidge, III**

Vice Chairman  
William Blair & Company  
222 West Adams Street  
Chicago, IL 60606

**Member**

**Richard D. Brounstein\***

CFO and Exec. VP  
Calpte Biomedical Corp.  
5000 Hopyard Road, Ste. 480  
Pleasanton, CA 94588

**Member**

**Alex Davern**

CFO and Senior VP  
National Instruments Corp.  
11500 N. Mopace Expressway  
Austin, TX 78759-3504

**Member**

**Pastora San Juan Cafferty**

Professor  
School of Social Science Administration  
969 E. 60<sup>th</sup> Street  
Chicago, IL 60637

**Member**

**Leroy Dennis\***

Exec. Partner, Assurance Services  
McGladrey & Pullen LLP  
3600 American Blvd. W.  
Third Floor

Bloomington, MN 55431-4502

**Member**

---

\* Members and official observers with an asterisk alongside their names attended the 2005 Forum held on September 19, 2005.

**Janet Dolan\***  
President & CEO  
Tennant Company  
701 North Lilac Drive  
P.O. Box 1452  
Minneapolis, MN 55440  
**Member**

**Daniel L. Goelzer\***  
Board Member  
Public Company Accounting Oversight  
Board  
1666 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-2803  
**Official Observer**

**Jack E. Herstein\***  
Ass't Director, Securities Bureau  
Nebraska Dept. of Banking and Finance  
Commerce Court  
1230 O Street, Suite 400  
PO Box 95006  
Lincoln, NE 68509-5006  
**Official Observer**

**Richard M. Jaffee\***  
Chairman  
Oil-Dri Corp. of America  
410 N. Michigan Ave., Ste. 400  
Chicago, IL 60611-4213  
**Member**

**Mark Jensen\***  
National Dir., Venture Capital Services  
Deloitte  
225 W. Santa Clara Street  
San Jose, CA 95113  
**Member**

**Deborah D. Lambert\***  
Co-Founder  
Johnson Lambert & Company  
700 Spring Street, Suite 335  
Raleigh, NC 27609  
**Member**

**Richard M. Leisner\***  
Partner  
Trenam Kemker  
2700 Bank of America Plaza  
101 East Kennedy Blvd.  
PO Box 1102  
Tampa, FL 33601-1102  
**Member**

**Robert E. Robotti\***  
President & Managing Director  
Robotti & Company  
52 Vanderbilt Avenue  
New York, NY 10017-3808  
**Member**

**Scott R. Royster**  
Exec. VP and CFO  
Radio One, Inc.  
5900 Princess Garden Parkway  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Lanham, MD 20706  
**Member**

**Kurt Schacht\***  
Managing Director  
CFA Centre for Financial Market  
Integrity  
477 Madison Ave.  
Suite 220  
New York, NY 10022  
**Member**

**Ted Schlein\***

Managing Partner  
Kleiner Perkins Caulfield & Byers  
2750 Sand Hill Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
**Member**

**John Veihmeyer\***

Mid Atlantic Managing Partner, Audit  
and Risk Adv. Services  
KPMG (Mid-Atlantic)  
2001 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
**Member**

**James C. Thyen (Co-Chair)\***

President and CEO  
Kimball International, Inc.  
1600 Royal Street  
Jasper, IN 47549  
**Member**

**Herbert S. Wander (Co-Chair)\***

Partner  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, IL 60661-3693  
**Member**

## REGISTERED FORUM PARTICIPANTS

**Mark Y. Abdon**

Richardson & Patel, LLP  
10900 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
310-208-1182

**Kristen Buck**

Stoecklein Law Group  
402 West Broadway  
Suite 400  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-4882

**Charles L. Bennett**

Intercom Consulting & Federal Systems  
44084 Riverside Parkway  
Suite 150-A  
Lansdowne, VA 20174  
215-869-7035

**Karin C. Carter**

Abrams Garfinkel Margolis Bergsen  
LLP  
3245 Dublin Blvd.  
Suite 426  
Dublin, CA 94568  
925-828-3555

**Brian T. Borders**

Borders Law Group  
1828 L Street, NW  
Suite 908  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-203-9855

**Lillian Ceynowa**

AICPA Center for Public Company  
Audit Firms  
Harborside Financial Center  
201 Plaza Three  
Jersey City, NJ 07311  
201-938-3759

**John A. Braden**

John A. Braden & Company, PC  
12941 Interstate 45 North  
Suite 422  
Houston, TX 77060  
281-873-5005

**Ted Celentino**

SCM Microsystems  
466 Kato Terrace  
Fremont, CA 94538  
415-990-2354

**Julius Brecht**

Wohlforth, Vassar, Johnson & Brecht  
900 West 5th Ave.  
Suite 600  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
907-276-6401

**Patrick M. Clawson**

P.O. Box 470  
Flint, MI 48501-0470  
810-730-5110

**Cathy Connally**  
Issues Cential  
347 Bay Street  
Suite 1008  
Toronto, ON  
416-977-1496

**Anthony N. DeMint**  
Securities Law Institute  
770 E. Warm Springs Road  
Suite 250  
Las Vegas, NV 89119  
619-595-4882

**Cromwell Coulson**  
Pinksheets LLC  
304 Hudson Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10013  
212-896-4444

**Victoria Duff**  
CEO  
aBusinessPlan.com  
3131 S. Kerckhoff Avenue  
San Pedro, CA 90731  
310-514-1913

**David Crane**  
Office of the Governor  
State Capital  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-552-8606

**Jerry Eicke**  
Cornell Capital Partners, LP  
101 Hudson Street  
Suite 3700  
Jersey City, NJ 07302  
201-985-8300 (Ext. 120)

**Denise Voigt Crawford**  
Texas State Securities Board  
208 E. 10th Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Austin, TX 78727  
512-305-8306

**Gayle Essary**  
Investrend Communications, Inc.  
P.O. 750471  
Forest Hills, NY 11375-0471  
718-896-5060

**Serena Davila**  
Financial Executives International  
1325 G Street, NW  
Suite 1020  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-626-7809

**Todd Essary**  
Investrend Communications, Inc.  
P.O. 750471  
Forest Hills, NY 11375-0471  
718-896-5326

**Ralph V. DeMartino**  
Cozen O'Connor  
1667 K Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-912-4811

**William D. Evers**  
QOL Health Programs  
1700 California Street  
Suite 470  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
415-202-0906

**L. J. Fay**  
Alpha Management Group, Inc.  
897 Cayo Grande Ct.  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320  
805-375-6096

**Jason Ferguson**  
Calvetti, Ferguson & Wagner, PC  
13105 Northwest Freeway  
Suite 1250  
Houston, TX 77040  
713-895-9393

**Peter Friedman**  
The Mountain Corporation  
59 Optical Avenue  
Keene, NH 03431  
603-355-3700

**Bill Griffin**  
INSWEB Corporation  
11290 Pyrites Way  
Gold River, CA 95670  
916-853-3300

**Scott W. Hatfield**  
S.W. Hatfield, CPA  
9002 Green Oaks Circle  
2nd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75243  
214-342-9635

**Liz Heese**  
Pinksheets, LLC  
915 D Street, NE  
Washington, DC  
202-544-8275

**Suzanne Herring**  
Opus Pointe  
770 E. Warm Springs Road  
Suite 250  
Las Vegas, NV 89119  
702-866-5833

**Victor A. Hollander**  
Weinberg & Company, PA  
1925 Century Park East  
Suite 1120  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
310-601-2200

**Karin C. Horn**  
Alberta Securities Commission  
300 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, SW  
4th Floor  
Calgary, Alberta  
403-297-4698

**David S. Hunt**  
CAREIC  
66 Exchange Place  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
801-355-7878

**Lance Jon Kimmel**  
SEC Law Firm  
11693 San Vicente Blvd.  
Suite 357  
Los Angeles, CA 90049  
310-557-3059

**Frederick K. Koenen**  
Schinner Law Group  
96 Jessie Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415-369-9050

**Gladys Lam**  
Sox Automation, Inc.  
3527 Mt. Diablo Blvd.  
Suite 333  
Lafayette, CA 94549  
925-788-4192

**Eric Robert Loos**  
E-Manda Corporation  
35 Jacklyn Terrace  
Mill Valley, CA 94941  
415-389-6909

**Marc Lumer**  
Marc Lumer & Company, CPAs  
221 Main Street  
Suite 735  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415-222-9913

**John McCoach**  
TSX Venture Exchange  
650 West Georgia Street  
Suite 2700  
Vancouver, B.C. V6B 4N9  
604-602-6941

**Michael Membrado**  
M. M. Membrado PLLC  
115 East 57th Street  
Suite 1006  
New York, NY 10022  
646-486-9772

**Girard P. Miller**  
Lindquist & Vennum PLLP  
80 South 8th Street  
Suite 4200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-371-2467

**Elizabeth Mooney**  
The Capital Group Companies  
One Market Plaza, Stewart Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415-646-7620

**Gerard P. O'Connor**  
Foley & Hoag LLP  
155 Seaport Blvd.  
Boston, MA 02210-2600  
617-832-1249

**James B. Parsons**  
Parsons Law Firm  
10900 NE 4th Street  
Suite 2070  
Bellevue, WA 98004  
425-451-8036

**Nimish P. Patel**  
Richardson & Patel, LLP  
10900 Wilshire Blvd.  
Suite 500  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
310-208-1182 (Ext. 728)

**Eric Von der Porten**  
Leeward Investments, LLC  
1395 San Carlos Avenue  
Suite B  
San Carlos, CA 94070  
650-592-2181

**Brian Rabinovitz**  
Stonefield Josephson, Inc.  
1620 26th Street  
Suite 400 South  
Santa Monica, CA 91307

**Troy J. Rillo**  
Cornell Capital Partners, LP  
101 Hudson Street  
Suite 3700  
Jersey City, NJ 07320  
201-985-8300

**Michael E. Stevenson**  
Washington State Securities Division/  
NASAA  
150 Israel Road SW  
Tumwater, WA 98501  
360-902-8797

**John K. Romano**  
International Open Finance Association  
Inc.  
10201 Hammocks Blvd.,  
#153-PMB 464  
Miami, FL 33196  
305-773-7663

**Donald J. Stoecklein**  
Stoecklein Law Group  
402 W. Broadway  
Suite 400  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-4882

**William F. Ross**  
Public Securities, Inc.  
300 N. Argonne Road  
Suite 202  
Spokane, WA 99212  
509-444-4800

**Robert D. Suderman**  
Tower Brokerage Services, Inc.  
2104E West 27th Street  
Lawrence, KS 66047  
785-766-4569

**Tim Ryan**  
Pinksheets LLC  
304 Hudson Street  
New York, NY 10013  
212-896-4426

**Joseph M. Sullivan**  
CPA  
949 University Avenue  
Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
916-849-7698

**Marshal Shichtman**  
Marshal Shichtman & Associates, PC  
1 Old Country Road  
Suite 120  
Carle Place, NY 11514  
516-741-5222

**John F. Trotter**  
Brockson Capital Partners, LLC  
7119 E. Shea Blvd.  
Suite 109  
Scottsdale, AZ 85254  
602-508-9020

**Dean Skupen**  
Stonefield Josephson, Inc.  
1620 26th Street  
Suite 400 South  
Santa Monica, CA 91311  
310-339-9901

**Ray Verlinich**  
Esco Corporation  
2141 NW 25th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97035  
503-778-6256

**Mark Uyeda**  
California Dept. of Corporations  
1515 K Street  
Suite 200  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-327-6698

**Daniel Weston**  
League of American Investors  
254 Camino Toluca Drive  
Camarillo, CA 93010  
805-375-6400

**Kristin L. Yokomoto**  
1920 Main Street  
Suite 210  
Irvine, CA 92614  
949-752-5370