TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

CONSUMER SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

OPEN MEETING VIA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL PURSUANT TO GOVERNOR'S MARCH 16, 2020, TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN OPEN MEETING PROVISIONS

Thursday, September 30, 2021

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John Ames, Presiding Officer Billie Aliu Linda Carter (absent) Richard Cavender Brian Daugbjerg (absent) Thomas Drake (absent) Christopher Gaston Ruben Gonzalez (absent) Russell Hayter Kristen Hoyt Lori King Stephen Palacios Melissa Peace (absent) Bruce Stidham (absent) Susan Sutton (absent) Ford Wagner

I N D E X

	AGENDA ITEM			
	1.	. Call to Order		
		A. Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum	7	
2. DISCUSSION, BRIEFING AND ACTION IT		DISCUSSION, BRIEFING AND ACTION ITEMS		
		A. Implementation Plan for Advisory Committee Recommendations Regarding Senate Bill 876-TxDMV Vehicle Titles and Registration Division (BRIEFING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM)	10	
	3.	Public Comment	none	
	4.	Adjournment	52	

1

PROCEEDINGS

My name is John Ames, and I'm pleased to open

2

MR. AMES: The time is 9:01, and this is the Customer Service Advisory Committee.

4

3

5 the second meeting of the Customer Service Advisory

6

Committee. For ease of reference, I will refer to the

advisory committee as CSAC, C-S-A-C, which is the acronym

I'm now calling the CSAC meeting to order.

7

for this committee. 8

9

10 want to note for the record that the public notice of this

11

meeting, containing all items on the agenda, was filed

12

with the Office of the Secretary of State on September 22,

call in accordance with the Texas Government Code, Chapter

1.3

2021.

14 This is a meeting being held by teleconference

15

16 551.125. Members of the public may physically attend this

17

meeting in person at 4000 Jackson Avenue, Building 1, Lone

18

Star Room, Austin, Texas 78731, or they may attend this

19 20 meeting by calling the toll-free telephone number, which is both posted on our agenda and was filed with the Office

21

of the Secretary of State on September 22.

22

2.3

I understand we have no members in person, the vast majority of our members present today are using Webex

24

or by phone, including myself.

25

At this time will all attendees please mute

your phone for the entire duration of the meeting. I'm asking our meeting host to make sure all participants' phones are muted except for the advisory committee members and those who are presenting.

1.3

2.3

Callers will be muted for any disruption, including background noises. If you can just minimize any background noises you have, that would be great, members.

I would like to remind all participants that this is a telephone conference call. Because this meeting is being held by telephone conference call, there are a few things that will assist us in making the meeting run smoother and assist the court reporter in getting an accurate record.

One of those things is we need to identify ourselves before speaking, so when you are called on, please just say, For the record, this is John Ames, and move forward with your speaking. Speak clearly, please, and speak up. I hope everyone can hear me well this morning.

Number three, remember that there might be a slight delay due to the telephone conference call meeting, so please wait a little longer than usual before responding to participants. Number four, do not speak over others. If you need to be called on, please raise your hand. Number five, please ask the presiding officer

to proceed and be sure to be recognized before speaking.

2.3

For advisory committee members participating by phone only, please use the instructions provided to raise your hand. Once unmuted by the meeting host, your line will remain unmuted for the duration of the meeting.

Again, please be mindful of any background noise.

To limit background noise, please keep your line muted on your end until you're ready to speak, and when ready to speak, unmute your line, state your name for the record, then ask for the floor and wait to be recognized before speaking.

I would also like to thank your court reporter today who is transcribing this meeting. To make sure that we have an accurate recording of this meeting, it is very important that advisory committee members and anyone presenting today identify themselves before speaking and speak clearly and slowly. And I'm going to remind myself right now to slow down.

If you wish to address the advisory committee or speak on an agenda item during today's meeting, please send an email to GCO_General@TxDMV.gov. Let me repeat that; the email address to send an email to is GC General@TxDMV.gov.

In your email please identify the specific item you are interested in commenting on, your name and address

and whether you are representing anyone or speaking for yourself. If your comment does not pertain to a specific agenda item, we will take your comment during the general public comment portion of the meeting. Comments should be pertinent to the issues stated in your email. When addressing the advisory committee, please state your name and affiliation for the record.

2.3

Before we begin today, I'd like to remind all presenters and those in attendance of the rules of conduct at our advisory committee meetings.

In the department's rules under 43 TAC Section 206.22, the presiding officer is given authority to supervise the conduct of the meetings. This includes the authority to determine when a speaker is being disruptive of the meeting or is otherwise violating the timing or presentation rules that I just discussed. Disruptive speakers will be muted, given a warning about disruptive behavior, then removed from the meeting for any continued disruption.

Advisory committee members, please let us know immediately if you are no longer able to participate for any reason. If your phone call drops or you are disconnected, TxDMV staff will interrupt the meeting to let us know and to get you back on the line before we proceed.

1	And we do have a very tight quorum today so		
2	it's important that we try to stay on as long as possible		
3	or if you do get disconnected or have technical problems,		
4	we will definitely stop the meeting to get you back.		
5	So item number 1 is the roll call and		
6	establishment of quorum. Right now I'd like to roll call		
7	the advisory committee members. Please respond verbally		
8	when I call your name and indicate you're present.		
9	All right. We're going to start with Member		
10	Aliu, are you present today?		
11	MS. ALIU: Yes. This is Billie Aliu, I am		
12	present.		
13	MR. AMES: Thank you. Good morning.		
14	MS. ALIU: Good morning.		
15	MR. AMES: Linda Carter, are you present?		
16	Linda Carter?		
17	(No response.)		
18	MR. AMES: Okay. Member Cavender?		
19	MR. CAVENDER: Good morning, everybody. I am		
20	here. Thank you.		
21	MR. AMES: Good morning, Member Cavender.		
22	Member Daugbjerg? Member Daugbjerg?		
23	(No response.)		
24	MR. AMES: Member Drake? Member Drake?		
25	(No response.)		

1		MR. AMES: Member Gaston?
2		MR. GASTON: Member Gaston is present.
3		MR. AMES: Thank you, Member Gaston.
4		Member Gonzalez? Member Gonzalez?
5		(No response.)
6		MR. AMES: Member Hayter?
7		MR. HAYTER: Russell Hayter present.
8		MR. AMES: Thank you, Member Hayter.
9		Member Hoyt?
10		MS. HOYT: Good morning. I'm here.
11		MR. AMES: Good morning, Member Hoyt.
12		Member King?
13		MS. KING: Member King present.
14		MR. AMES: Wonderful. Glad to have you with
15	us, Member	King.
16		MS. KING: Thank you. Glad to be here.
17		MR. AMES: Member Palacios?
18		MR. PALACIOS: Member Palacios is here.
19		MR. AMES: Fantastic.
20		Member Peace? Member Peace?
21		(No response.)
22		MR. AMES: Member Stidham? Member Stidham?
23		(No response.)
24		MR. AMES: Member Sutton? Member Sutton?
25		(No response.)

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. AMES: Member Wagner? 1 2 MR. WAGNER: Wagner is here. 3 MR. AMES: Fantastic. Good morning, Member 4 Wagner. 5 And I, John Ames, the presiding officer is here 6 also, so I do believe we have a quorum. Let me verify, 7 one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. That is correct, we have nine members, which is what is 8 9 required for a quorum. Congratulations, committee. 10 Okay. Let's dive right into it. The purpose of this committee is to assist the department in obtaining 11 12 feedback regarding important legislation. 13 The advisory committees such as CSAC provide 14 valuable input for the department in their advising 15 capacity concerning issues related to improving and 16 enhancing the department's customer service. 17 I just want to thank all the members for 18 definitely being here and taking the time. I know this 19 isn't your full-time job, but it is amazing what this 20 committee can offer to the DMV to help them serve the 21 public and work with their business partners. 22 Okay. Item number 2. Mr. Richards, if you 2.3 would assist me when a hand goes up? I'm trying to 24 monitor that, but I don't see any hands up right now.

MR. RICHARDS:

I'll be happy to, sure.

25

MR. AMES: Thank you, sir.

1.3

2.3

Agenda item number 2.A. Implementation plan for advisory committee recommendations regarding Senate Bill 876.

Members, I will now move into agenda number 2.A., which is the implementation plan for the advisory committee members. This is on Senate Bill 876. I will turn the meeting over to Director Luna of the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division, and he will be assisted today by Clint Thompson, the deputy director of VTR, and various designated staff to lead the discussion on implementation.

Director Luna, the floor is yours.

MR. LUNA: Good morning, Presiding Officer

Ames. Committee members, welcome to the Customer Service

Advisory Committee. My name is Roland D. Luna, Sr. I'm

the director of the Vehicle Titles and Registration

Division, and Vehicle Titles and Registration Division

we'll refer to as VTR.

During our first Customer Service Advisory

Committee meeting, VTR discussed and outlined the major

tasks and efforts associated with the implementation of SB

876, and today we want to provide an in-depth description

of the implementation plan, which includes four major

components: the first component is transaction processing

and the impact to stakeholders, which includes the public, dealers and county tax assessor-collectors; the second component is programming enhancements to TxDMV systems; the third component, funds structure; and then lastly, the fourth component is our communication plan.

1.3

2.3

In your committee packet you can find the materials I just mentioned in the exact same order. Each of the four components of the implementation plan has its own page.

For efficiency and focused discussion on a particular component, we ask the committee to allow each presenter to complete the presentation of the materials and then we can proceed with discussion and any questions that the committee may have.

With me today is Clint Thompson, VTR deputy director, who is an excellent resource and available for questions and will help facilitate discussion as well, as well as other VTR staff who will assist with the presentations.

Now I will turn it over to Lisa Resendez, section director of Title Services. Ms. Resendez.

MR. AMES: Ms. Resendez, can you hear us? (No response.)

MR. AMES: Director Luna, she may be having some technical difficulties. Would you like to take her

part? 1 2 MR. LUNA: Officer Ames, if I could have 3 everyone, committee members, refer to your materials and 4 you will find a document that says at the very top "Senate 5 Bill 876 Implementation Plan" and right below that you'll 6 see it says "Transaction Processing." Was everyone able 7 to locate that document? And I'll continue with the 8 presentation until Ms. Resendez is able to join us. 9 MR. AMES: Thank you, Director Luna. Will Ms. 10 Resendez be able to share the presentation once she 11 arrives? 12 MR. LUNA: Yes, sir, we can do that now. 13 MR. AMES: That would be fantastic. Thank you, 14 sir. 15 MR. LUNA: Absolutely. 16 (Pause.) MR. AMES: 17 Members, thank you for your patience while we get this presentation up on the screen and 18 19 Director Luna gets prepared to present this first section 20 to us. MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, Presiding Officer 21 22 Clint Thompson, deputy director of VTR. If I could 2.3 have the floor, please? 24 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 25

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON:

Jeff, are you going to be sharing, or I don't 1 2 know who is going to be sharing the document. I'm not 3 sure we have that ability as participants. 4 MR. TEMPLETON: My understanding, because 5 there's call-in users, we're not sharing documents because 6 the won't be able to see them. 7 MR. THOMPSON: Gotcha, okay. So it's my understanding that this material was emailed out -- either 8 9 emailed out to everybody or I know it's posted on our 10 website, so if everybody has access to that and starting on page 5. And apologize for the technical difficulties 11 12 that we're having. 13 MR. AMES: No, it's on problem. Mr. Thompson, 14 Presiding Officer Ames here real quick. 15 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. MR. AMES: In the future, Mr. Richards, if at 16 17 all possible we'd love to be able to share these documents virtually. I know some people have called in, and we'll 18 19 ask them to print them and have them ready for them. 20 MR. RICHARDS: I will check into that for you, 21 Presiding Officer Ames, and get back with you. 22 MR. AMES: Okay. Thank you. 2.3 Members, does anybody not have the document or 24 do you need a minute to get the document? 25

MR. LUNA: Officer Ames, may I be recognized?

MR. AMES: Yes, sir, Mr. Luna.

MR. LUNA: For anyone that is calling in and is near a computer, as Deputy Director Clint Thompson mentioned, the materials are available on our website, and they can easily be accessed that way as well, in the event that they lost it in the shuffle of email.

MR. AMES: Thank you.

1.3

2.3

And it was emailed out to all of the members, so in the future, members, if you don't have access or you won't be dialing in via Webex and you'll be using your phone, please preprint these documents, because they are extremely helpful.

Please proceed, Mr. Luna.

MR. THOMPSON: Presiding Officer Ames, Clint
Thompson, deputy director of VTR. I'm going to cover this
particular portion.

MR. AMES: Fantastic, Clint. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

Again on page 5, hopefully everybody was able to pull these up. Good morning. I'm going to discuss transaction processing, and what we've presented here is basically a chart outlining the current state of title applications as well as registration renewals compared to the future state relative to Senate Bill 876, again effective March 1. I want to cover this briefly, and then

we'll get into the impact to the various stakeholder groups.

1.3

2.3

So for title applications from a dealer perspective, the transactions currently must be processed in the purchaser's county, dealer's county, or the lienholder's county as specified by the purchaser.

If the purchaser's county of residence happens to be closed and was selected, the dealer then has the ability to submit to any county that's willing to process the transaction.

Likewise, for a private party the purchaser has the option to submit the title application in their county of residence, the seller's county, or the lienholder's county, and it is at the designation of the purchaser, and likewise, if their county of residence happens to be closed, then they can submit the transaction to any willing county.

So for title applications with Senate Bill 876, once it's effective, they must continue to be processed in the purchaser's county and the dealer's county, which obviously is synonymous with the seller's county or the lienholder's county.

The provision that has been removed in statute is the requirement that the resident's county be closed for any other county to be able to process the

transaction. So essentially we have the three statutory counties, that I know we discussed at the last meeting, and now we have any willing county, and again, there is no requirement that the resident county be closed.

1.3

2.3

I do want to point out that in a dealer transaction there is no longer the requirement that the purchaser specify the county where the transaction will be processed; that is at the discretion of the dealer.

And as far as registration renewals, today we know that the transaction must be processed in the owner's county of residence unless the resident county is closed, and the customer can submit the transaction to any county willing to process the renewal, and again, the future state is continued, the statutory county is resident county, or they can submit the registration renewal to any county willing to process it.

So impact to various stakeholder groups: For the public this affords them the ability to process these transactions anywhere that a county is willing. No longer are they confined to those statutory counties or the requirement that their county of residence be closed for them to seek another county willing to process it.

So again, this just gives them the flexibility that they have if they're traveling, things of that nature, or happen to be close to a county line, whatever

the case may be, this is just a benefit for consumers.

2.3

But obviously one of the requirements here being a willing county, they would be required to contact that county that is going to process the transaction to ensure that they are in fact willing to process transactions outside of the statutory defined counties.

So for dealers impact, again, the processing county is now determined by the dealer and not the purchaser. What that means is the county of title issuance Form VTR-136 is no longer required, and it will be obsolete effective March 1, since that is the form where the purchaser specifies the processing county.

Again, the dealer has the ability to select between the purchaser's county, the seller's county -- i.e., the dealer's county -- the lienholder's county, or identifying any county willing to process the transaction.

The one thing we certainly want to point out here, this is an impact to everyone but certainly the potential impact to dealers who may require programming of the dealer management systems, the title application fee with this implementation will be assessed based on the purchaser's county of residence, no longer will it be based on the processing county. Even if it's not a willing county and it's a statutory county, the title application fee again will be assessed based on the

purchaser's county of residence.

2.3

And as far as impact to county tax
assessor-collectors, at a high level the county is going
to obviously have to make a determination if they're going
to process transactions as a willing county outside of
those which they are statutorily required to process.

Understand any changes to RTS, the funds remittance, things of that nature -- which we're fixing to get into in the remainder of this presentation -- obviously we'll have release notes and things of that nature as well, but I think it's important for counties to understand the programmatic changes that we're going to implement with this.

And then the other consideration -- or another consideration is when providing fee estimates to customers, need to make sure that the staff providing estimates to customers are taking into consideration the customer's county of residence and whether or not your county is going to be a statutory county or not, because that's obviously going to impact the fees.

So today, as a county, when you provide an estimate to someone who is applying for title to your county, you're going to tell them that it's your respective county's title application fee. That will change tomorrow if the applicant's county of residence is

actually a county that charges a different title application fee.

1.3

2.3

Likewise, if you are going to be a willing county for registration purposes, including in conjunction with a title application, those fees will be assessed based on the owner's county of residence for registration renewal notice or the applicant if it's a title application, so that's something that certainly staff is going to need to consider when providing information on potential fees for transactions.

And so I will open it up if anybody has any questions on that particular portion of it, again, impact to stakeholders.

As Roland indicated, we will be going through the programming enhancements, fee structure, and our communication plan. I don't see any hands up; I'll give you just a minute, and in the meantime I'll hand it to Romeo McCain for programming enhancements if we don't have any questions.

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Members, any questions about what we heard from Mr. Thompson? Members?

(No response.)

MR. AMES: Mr. Thompson, I do have a few questions.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

2.3

MR. AMES: Briefly, you stated that the VTR-136 will be no longer required and will be obsolete effective March 1. Correct?

MR. THOMPSON: That is correct.

MR. AMES: I just wanted to confirm that.

And then secondly, under the dealer section you spoke about the assessment of title fees based on the purchaser's residence -- and I'm sorry; this is Presiding Officer Ames that's asking these questions, for the record -- the assessment of title fees will be based on the purchaser's residence county. Can you give the committee an example of how those fees would change from county to county?

MR. THOMPSON: Sure. Make sure I clarify, Clint Thompson, deputy director of VTR.

So the title application fee essentially is assessed based on the county being a non-attainment county or an affected county, and really that's, simply put, do you have an emissions program or not. That's the simplest way to put this.

\$28, and today it is based on the processing county, whether the processing county meets the clean air standards or not, and again, it's either \$33 or \$28, and

it does not change.

1.3

2.3

So March 1, Dallas County, for example, charging the \$33 title application fee, if a customer from another county, a resident of another county is applying for title in Dallas County and their county assesses a \$28 title application fee, RTS will assess that \$28 fee as opposed to the \$33 that Dallas assesses themselves today as a processing county and after March 1 as the purchaser's county of residence.

Does that make sense?

MR. AMES: It does, Director Thompson. Thank you. This is Presiding Officer Ames again. And for the education of the committee members who are not familiar, the counties do not choose whether they're emission counties or not emission counties; that is not a choice.

And the large counties are emission counties and adjacent counties to them are emission counties, but most of Texas is not emissions. Is that correct, Director Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: That is correct.

MR. AMES: Thank you.

Any other questions? Members, any questions based on the information that Mr. Thompson just presented to us?

(No response.)

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342 MR. AMES: Okay. Hearing none, we're going to move forward to out next presenter.

2.3

MR. McCAIN: Thank you, sir. Good morning to everyone. For the record, my name is Romeo McCain, and I am a program supervisor for Registration Services. I will be speaking to you today regarding page 2 of our handout regarding department programming enhancements.

So before we get into the specific system changes, I'd like to just reiterate some of the information provided by Deputy Director Clint Thompson in terms of it's important to remember that a statutorily required county stands apart from a willing county.

So even with the new opportunities being provided by Senate Bill 876, statute still mandates that a purchaser, dealer, seller, or lienholder county is still required to process a transaction if presented to them by a purchaser or dealer. Conversely, a willing county is a county processing a transaction that is not bound by statute in that respect, thus truly making them a willing county.

So the department, in its endeavor to automate the needs of Senate Bill 876, we're continuing to implement system programming that will alleviate the need for end-users to make live-time, real-time determinations of what a statutorily required or willing county actually

is.

1.3

2.3

We want to make this a seamless endeavor as you're assisting customers at your desk or work station, so one of the programming enhancements will include the use of address validation software to determine and verify the Texas resident county.

So as some of you may be aware, our systems offer multiple entry options for an address that is stored as a part of the vehicle record. As a result, any of these addresses can be filled with any number of variations, addresses that a person may have. We found it important when using this address validation software to determine which order to evaluate and consider these addresses.

Based on current system functionality and varying scenarios, we thought it most appropriate to consider the renewal address, owner address, and then the vehicle location address in that order when validating a resident county.

Utilizing this approach, we think, allows the continued use of multiple Texas addresses, P.O. boxes, and out-of-state addresses that one may present when conducting business related to their vehicle, be it renewal or title.

So with all those opportunities for varying

addresses, we had to make sure that we are honing on what are we looking at first and how are we working our way through the various opportunities address-wise.

1.3

2.3

So this address validation programming will also be used to determine the statutorily required counties using data elements currently provided and available when processing title transactions.

When processing a title transaction, a purchaser's county is going to be determined by the residence county. Dealer information, such as the dealer's license number, is required when processing a title transaction and will be used to determine the dealer's county, utilizing the address associated to their actual license. So again, we're looking to use what information we currently have to, again, alleviate any pressure points for the end-user.

In a private-party sale, the determination of the seller county will be based on the previous Texas owner's resident county when available. And of course, the last one listed there, the lienholder county will be determined by the address validation using that lienholder address.

So all these validations will take place behind the scenes, and the system will determine which of these statutorily required components needs to be considered

when identifying the willing county scenario.

1.3

2.3

Working our way through, another programming enhancement involves adding functionality to the Registration and Titling System, which is referred to as RTS.

Just taking a moment, a bit of a refresher from our last discussion, RTS is the department's primary system, if you will, that is used by internal staff and county tax assessor-collectors offices to process various title and registration related transactions, so those transactions are including, but not limited to, title transfers and registration renewals, so it's a very key component in what we're discussing here today.

RTS currently has existing functionality that allows users known as administrators to set up varying levels of access for county users, depending on the nature of the transaction, so these transactions within the system are referred to as events, if you will.

That's just some internal ways that we describe the various types of transactions that you can process. So what we've done is we've looked to leverage this capability and add functionality under one of those events, referred to as the local options event, to allow for a county to specifically designate the transactions that they are willing to process, other than those

transactions they are required by statute to process, of course.

1.3

2.3

So as we are developing and working through requirements, we're looking to develop to allow a county to designate whether they are willing to process registration renewals, title transactions, or both, if they choose. So it's not an all-or-nothing type of situation, we're looking to set it up so that you can determine which of the two or both that you're willing to process.

Otherwise, what we're doing is looking to set the system up to prevent counties from processing transactions as a default. So what that's meaning is when the change takes place in March, everyone will be defaulted to not accept out of county, unstatutorily required transactions, so you, as a county, would make the decision to turn that feature and functionality on.

And we thought that was the best approach to make sure that everyone that is participating is making that decision. So this functionality works in tandem with the statutorily required parameters previously discussed.

So although RTS will serve as the initiating point for this county-driven designation, the impact of that decision will also carry over into other systems. So as some of us are aware, and we've discussed in our

previous meeting, we have other systems in place,
webDEALER and webSUB, that are involved with this any
willing county situation, so the decision point made in
RTS will carry over into these other systems as well.
Again, looking to do the best we can to make sure that
decision points are easy; once the decision is made
everything is done automatically with that decision.

So with that, as I mentioned, if any of you

1.3

2.3

So with that, as I mentioned, if any of you recall in our last meeting, I just want to reiterate that the department, we continue to work through implementation and programming requirements, and consideration is and will continue to be given to all program options that will assist in streamlining this process for everyone that's involved.

At this point I'd like to ask if there are any questions, comments, concerns that anyone would like to discuss.

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. McCain.

Presiding Officer Ames here. Members, any comments or questions for Mr. McCain? Any comments or questions on what you just heard from Mr. McCain?

(No response.)

MR. AMES: Mr. McCain, I'm not seeing any questions from the members. I do have a few things I'd like to ask.

Can you discuss a little bit more about the 1 2 address validation software? Is this a software currently 3 in use or one that's designated by the state? 4 MR. McCAIN: For the record, this is Romeo 5 McCain, program supervisor for Registration Services. 6 Presiding Officer Ames, may I have the floor? 7 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 8 MR. McCAIN: All right. So we do currently 9 have address validation components that we utilize within 10 our system. If you are aware, IVTRS, there are certain components there that check whether an address is 11 12 appropriate or if there are any differences between what 1.3 the system pulls versus what a customer may enter. 14 So using that type of functionality and 15 software and building on it, there are opportunities to 16 add additional components and layers, which is what we're 17 doing, when you start wanting to make sure of county selections and things of that nature. 18 19 So it is something that we currently utilize 20 within the department. Now, it is a matter of within our 21 requirements and development portion to dive deeper, add 22 functionality and features to what is already in 2.3 existence. 24 MR. AMES: Thank you, sir.

One clarification, or a few clarifications,

25

actually, on the ability to turn the system on and off.
This is Officer Ames speaking.

2.3

So I love the ability for the tax assessor-collector to determine within their county whether they want to process out-of-county transactions for either title or registration, and you said that would carry over to webDEALER and webSUB.

So I guess my question is is it an all or nothing? If we turn it off for one of our representatives or frontline clerks, do we turn it off for everybody? Is it all or nothing for the county?

I understand we can either choose to the titles and/or the registration separately, but can we have some people in our county processing them and some not?

MR. McCAIN: Again for the record, my name is Romeo McCain, program supervisor for Registration Services.

As it stands right now and as we are, again, walking through and developing the concept, we have is structured to be an all-inclusive designation. I think it's something that we certainly can take back as we continue to move forward to discuss if there are any opportunities there to drill it down to the individual processor or county user level.

As it stands right now, the idea is that that

selection or designation would cover everyone within your county, and then, as stated, webDEALER and webSUB opportunities as well. But I think that's definitely an idea very much worth considering as we move forward in our requirements and development.

1.3

2.3

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. McCain. John Ames here again.

I would like for you to explore that further.

I can see where some counties would want to turn it off
and only give maybe their supervisors the ability to do
that and that allows that transaction to be vetted through
a process before it's just willingly done by a frontline
staff member. So if you would explore that for future
programming, that would be great.

One other question. Because you mentioned webDEALER and webSUB, if we have dealers that are outside of our county but they're on webDEALER processing work within our county and we turn off the willing county label, or switch, if you will, will those dealers still be able to process through webDEALER in our county?

MR. McCAIN: The functionality in webDEALER I am not 100 percent certain on, so I would ask any of my associates who have a lot more understanding in that area to speak to that. I know that's something that we've considered, and I don't want to misspeak when it comes to

that.

2.3

MR. THOMPSON: Romeo, I've got it. Clint Thompson, deputy director of VTR.

MR. AMES: Yes, Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. So I want to make sure I understand the question. So opting to turn off the willing county functionality, you have a dealer that is outside of your county, not located in Dallas County, or whatever the particular county is, and they submit a transaction to your county, they would have to be the selling dealer.

If they are the selling dealer, i.e., they're a statutory connection, you do not have the willing county functionality on, they will continue to be able to submit those transactions to you as they do today.

MR. AMES: But if they were not -- oh, I see what you're saying about being the selling dealer.

MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

MR. AMES: But if a dealer is outside of our county, Clint -- John Ames here -- if a dealer is outside of the county -- and let's use Harris county, for example. Say the dealer is in Montgomery County and they want to process the work in Harris County because their purchaser is in Harris County. As a webDEALER user they can do that under the statutory requirements. Correct?

MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director of VTR.

1.3

2.3

The dealer, obviously to be submitting a transaction is going to be the seller, otherwise they wouldn't be submitting a transaction, but if they are located, you said, in Harris County. Correct?

MR. AMES: Use any example you'd like.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Located in Harris County and the purchaser is in Montgomery County, then they can submit that transaction -- statutorily today they would be able to submit that transaction statutorily tomorrow, assuming that they have been set up with the county where they are submitting it, so in this situation they would have to be previously set up by Montgomery County to submit the transaction. But this does not have any bearing on that functionality.

So the example would be a selling dealer in Harris County, the purchaser resides in Montgomery County, the selling dealer tries to submit the transaction to Dallas County.

If Dallas County has not enabled the functionality and set that dealer up or even if they have not set the dealer up, if they have not enabled that functionality, the dealer will be prevented from submitting the transaction to the alternate county because

you have not enabled that functionality.

2.3

So essentially, if the willing county functionality is not turned on for title applications, a dealer who is not in your county or submitting for the purchaser or a lienholder, they would be prevented from submitting that transaction to you.

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. Thompson, for the clarification.

MR. THOMPSON: Certainly.

MR. AMES: Members, any questions based on that discussion just now? Committee members, any questions, comments or discussion?

(No response.)

MR. AMES: Okay. Hearing none, we'll move on to the next section. Mr. Luna, your next presenter, please.

MS. JASO: Good morning, everyone. This is
Kimberly Jaso. I'm the Title Services program supervisor,
and I will be covering page 7 of the materials on the
funds structure. There is a chart that represents the
current and future state.

So currently, for private party and dealer title transactions -- which we touched on some of this already -- title fees and optional county fees are assessed based on the processing county.

The processing county also retains their county's portion or what would be their compensation from the title fee and the processing and handling fee, and they also retain their local county fees, and then they remit the applicable fees to the state and receive credit for those taxes and fees that they collected.

2.3

With SB 876 for private party and dealer title transactions, it will go back to whether it's a statutorily required processing scenario or a willing county scenario.

If the processing county is required to process the transaction by statute -- again, that means the processing county is either the purchaser or dealer/seller or lienholder's county -- then the only change to the funds structure is that the title fee will be assessed based on the resident's county instead of the processing county.

Optional county fees are still based on the processing county. There's no change to any county compensation from the title fee or the processing and handling fee. The processing county will still remit any applicable fees to the state that they collected and they'll still receive credit for those taxes and fees that they collected.

However, if the processing county is not

statutorily required to process that title transaction and they are willing to process it, then that's where the funds structure changes slightly.

1.3

2.3

So at this point both the title fee and the optional county fees will be based off the resident county, the resident county will receive credit for any taxes and fees that are collected by that processing county on their behalf.

The processing county will retain their compensation still from the title fee and any processing and handling fees, and they'll still be required to remit the applicable fees to the state since they were the ones that collected them.

For registration renewal, the resident county is also the processing county so those optional fees that are collected at registration are based on the resident county. The resident county again will retain their county portion of the processing and handling fee, their county optional fees, they remit the applicable fees to the state and receive credit for the registration fees that they collected.

With 876 the renewals processed by the resident county will have no change to the funds structure since they're still statutorily required to process those.

However, it if it's a willing county that's processing it,

meaning it's a county other than the resident county, the county optional fees will still be based on the resident county and the resident county will still receive credit for the registration fees. The processing county will just be able to retain the county portion of the processing and handling fee and be responsible for remitting those fees to the state.

1.3

2.3

So as far as our reporting goes, clearly there are some funds structure differences for willing county type situations, so we want to ensure that we programmatically update reports and things that are going to assist the county with funds reconciliation and remittance.

One of those reports that we will make changes to is the funds remittance report. This is used by counties today to reconcile the fees and transactions that were processed. This report currently has an out-of-county amount section of that report, and we will be utilizing that section to reflect the transactions that were considered willing county transactions, non-statutorily required process transactions. And this will help the county to see on the report both the fees that the county collected on behalf of another county, as well as seeing the credit for the fees that were collected by another county on their behalf.

We also have the county closure sales tax report that's an existing report that we'll also be re-purposing for the willing county transactions, and this report allows a county to see the sales tax related fees that were collected by another county on their behalf.

1.3

2.3

So since sales tax is remitted to the comptroller outside of our Registration and Titling System, this report is to assist a county in determining the sales tax amounts that they will receive credit for that they weren't the one that processed the transaction and collected those amounts.

We're also looking at the ability to include in this report the sales tax related fees that a county collected on behalf of another county, so those will be representative of sales tax amounts that they processed but would not receive credit for, and so we're also in discussions with the Comptroller's Office regarding the sales tax reporting and remittance to make sure we're covering all these.

The last report that we have that will have some programming changes is the vehicles sold by dealer report. This again is also an existing report that a county can run to see the total number of transactions that a specific dealer in their county processed, and this is usually used to help a county verify against the

vehicle inventory tax that a dealer pays the county. 1 2 Currently this report the county can only run 3 it and see the transactions they processed from a particular dealer, but going forward, as part of the 4 5 changes of SB 876, we're going to allow the county to run 6 that statewide so that they can see all the transactions 7 that were processed for that particular dealer that 8 resides in their county. 9 So with that, if anybody has any questions or 10 concerns or any discussion, I'll open it up. MR. AMES: Thank you, Ms. Jaso. 11 12 Members, any questions or concerns for Ms. 13 Any discussion or questions for Ms. Jaso? Members, 14 any questions or comments? 15 (No response.) 16 MR. AMES: Ms. Jaso, I have a few questions or 17 This is Presiding Officer Ames. comments. Number one, thank you to the department for 18 19 doing this programming. With 254 different counties and 20 the accounting systems within each county being somewhat different, this will make a more streamlined and 21 22 consistent process and I think will be good not only for 2.3 the State of Texas but for each county tax assessor, so we

I also want to commend the department on

24

25

appreciate this.

working directly with the Comptroller's Office because, as you stated, those are two separate state agencies that tax assessors remit funds to, but the requirement of those funds does come from the RTS system, so having those reports will greatly benefit and help us with our fund procedures.

1.3

2.3

And huge kudos to the department on the vehicles sold by dealer being statewide. That will really assist in our auditing of SRT with various dealers and verifying that funds are remitted properly. So thank you and kudos to that. You did a great job explaining all this.

Members, any questions or concerns?
(No response.)

MR. AMES: Hearing none, I would like to go back real quick to Mr. McCain. I do have one question.

When Ms. Jaso was discussing her options I thought of the question, and I think it's probably more appropriate for you, Mr. McCain.

If a county chooses to turn off the willing county feature for the in-house transactions, the ones processed by county staff, can they turn it on for a webSUB transaction, those processed by our neighborhood or subcontractor locations?

MR. McCAIN: For the record, this is Romeo

McCain, program supervisor for Registration Services.

Presiding Officer Ames, may I have the floor?

MR. AMES: Yes, sir.

2.3

MR. McCAIN: Thank you, sir.

At this point in time, again, the designation is all-encompassing so that selection once made either on or off would include both your county users and webSUB and webDEALER users as well. The only break would be between, at this point, registration versus title transactions, the transaction level opportunity to distinguish between the two is all that is in play at this point.

MR. AMES: Thank you, sir.

Officer Ames here. I would like the department to consider having that functionality split. I can see where a grocery store would be on a county line and may service constituents from both counties, citizens from both counties, and they would be willing, if the tax assessor is willing, to process vehicle registrations from both counties at a webSUB.

So if the department would consider adding that to the agenda to have that split, as well as the ability to have individual staff members within the county be able to process willing transactions and not process willing transactions.

MR. McCAIN: I just wanted to say, sir, we'll

definitely take that back for consideration. 1 2 MR. AMES: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. McCain. 3 I appreciate that. MR. THOMPSON: Presiding Officer Ames, Clint 4 5 Thompson, deputy director of VTR. If I can have the 6 floor, please? 7 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 8 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. 9 So I want to make sure I understand the request 10 and the scenario. The scenario would be to turn off the 11 willing county functionality for staff of the county tax office in RTS but allow for a subcontractor, a limited 12 1.3 service deputy of that particular county to process 14 registration renewals for out of county residents? 15 MR. AMES: Yes, sir, Mr. Thompson, that is the 16 recommendation. 17 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Then the question I would pose to the counties is if you were turning that 18 19 functionality off in RTS, would you not be declaring 20 yourself as unwilling, thus your subcontractor limited 21 service deputy cannot process transactions that you're not 22 processing? 2.3 MR. AMES: I believe that would be the 24 discretion of the county tax assessor. Officer Ames here

25

speaking.

Some counties may not have the capacity within 1 2 their own staffs, but their subcontractors may have the 3 capacity to do out-of-county transactions, and as a 4 convenience to the public, the county tax assessor may 5 choose to allow their subcontractor to continue doing out-6 of-county registrations even though they themselves don't 7 have the capacity to do that within their office. 8 MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director 9 of VTR. 10 Thank you for that. We'll certainly take a look at it. 11 12 MR. AMES: Thank you, Clint. 13 And the other thing is as long as we're doing 14 it for webSUB, we may also consider it for webDEALER. 15 Okay. Thank, Ms. Jaso, Mr. McCain, and Mr. 16 Thompson. 17 Mr. Luna, the next presenter, please. MR. KRISCH: Good morning. My name is Stefan 18 19 Krisch, and I'm the section director of Registration 20 Services. May I have the floor? 21 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 22 MR. KRISCH: Thank you. 2.3 The communications plan I'm going to outline 24 was developed using our customary processes for 25 communicating policy and procedural changes. That said,

we do understand that this bill is very impactful to our county partners, and we encourage you to make any suggestions that strengthen this proposed plan.

1.3

2.3

So we anticipate proposing the rule changes this November that should allow the rule to be adopted in February of next year. On February 17 we will then distribute the associated Registration and Title bulletins and any revised forms.

The following Tuesday, February 22, we will conduct a training webinar in the morning and one in the afternoon for county tax office staff to attend. As always, these webinars will be recorded and posted on our website for future reference.

On the following Wednesday, February 23, we will hold a morning and afternoon training webinar for the dealer community, and then on February 25 we will provide the release notes for the Registration and Titling System.

The release notes will detail the changes to the system and provide any procedural information for county staff. Then the RTS update will occur the following weekend, and the bill-revised administrative rules and RTS programming will then be in effect on March 1, 2022.

Were there any questions on our communications plan?

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. Krisch. 1 2 Members, any questions on the communication 3 that has just been proposed? Members, do we have any questions or discussion? 4 5 MS. ALIU: This is Member Aliu. 6 MR. AMES: Member Aliu, please. 7 MS. ALIU: Yes. I just have a question about 8 the training. We have one on February 22 at two different 9 times, morning and afternoon, for the tax assessor-10 collectors, and then one on February 23 at two different times for the dealers. 11 12 It seems like that's not enough training 13 sessions. Is there any way another one can be held the 14 week before in the same manner? 15 MR. KRISCH: Appreciate the comment. Stefan 16 Krisch, for the record. 17 We can certainly take that under advisement. Are you requesting for additional seminars in different 18 19 weeks or different days during the same week? I just want to be clear on the ask. 20 MS. ALIU: Yes. Billie Aliu. 21 22 Yes, different weeks with the same webinars, so 23 perhaps the week before can have the same setup as the 24 week of February 22 and 23, but the same week prior to

25

that.

MR. KRISCH: Stefan Krisch, for the record.

Absolutely, we'll take that under consideration, look at scheduling and see what we can put together. I don't think that's going to be a problem.

MS. ALIU: Thank you.

1.3

2.3

MR. AMES: Thank you, Member Aliu.

And I also agree with Member Aliu. This is Officer Ames.

This is the department's standard communication plan when riders come out, but this is a huge, huge change to the system and to the procedures and how things go, and so additional training for both the tax assessors and the dealers is definitely something that I would agree with.

I, as the county tax assessor of the second largest county in the state, you know, I've got 150 people that need to learn this, so having two options is not really enough. So I would concur with Member Aliu's comments and encourage the department to have more communication as far as webinars.

And that said, that process is important that this communication be timely and that it be earlier rather than later. I believe tax assessors and car dealers would rather get two or three notifications than not enough, or get more than they needed earlier than they needed them to be prepared.

With today's COVID situation and the pandemic and not knowing our staffing situation from day to day, we are planning further in advance than we ever have before, and I know car dealers would appreciate the advance notice also.

2.3

For example, I noticed yesterday the notice of this meeting came out to tax assessors at 4:26 yesterday afternoon. It would have been nice if it had come out earlier in the week so that people had more plans to attend this meeting. And in this case also with the communication on Senate Bill 876, the more communication earlier would be great.

MR. CAVENDER: Officer Ames, Member Cavender wishes to speak, please.

MR. AMES: Yes, sir. You have the floor.

MR. CAVENDER: Yes. Just from the dealer's perspective, title clerks in our Cavender operations, we have as many as six to eight title clerks working at any one time, so I would agree with Member Aliu that dealers certainly need a second option on the webinar, so a week prior to the February 23 would be very helpful for the dealers so that we could put our title clerks on that webinar.

MR. AMES: Thank you, Member Cavender. I completely agree.

Any other comments or questions at this time, 1 2 Any comments or questions, members? members? 3 (No response.) 4 MR. AMES: All right. Hearing none, Mr. Luna, 5 would you like to wrap up the presentation? 6 MR. THOMPSON: Roland Luna, VTR director. 7 Officer Ames, if I may? 8 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 9 MR. THOMPSON: I just wanted to make sure that 10 we understood as an organization TxDMV that the committee 11 has talked about, as it relates to the communication plan, 12 having more communication and further out prior to March 1.3 1, more webinars to give staff members, whether they work 14 for dealerships or they work for county tax assessor-15 collectors, to give them an opportunity to attend the 16 webinars. And so we certainly want to make sure that we 17 consider those things and make sure that we have opportunities that are available for all staff members to 18 19 take part. 20 We have discussed the four components of our implementation plan. There's been several questions that 21 22 have been raised by the committee members. We hope that 2.3 we have answered all of your questions. 24 If there's any questions that you have now

regarding any of the four components, we want to make sure

25

that we give you an opportunity to ask those questions now.

1.3

2.3

Also, as it relates to just our implementation overall, as we continue with the programming, there were some recommendations that were made. We will certainly take those under advisement, and we will work with our information technology staff as well as our subject matter experts in VTR to see if any of those options are viable.

And since we're not going to have and we don't plan to have another Customer Service Advisory Committee meeting related to the implementation of 876, we want to make sure that we hear any other questions, concerns, or recommendations that the committee may have.

So Officer Ames, would you like to ask the committee if there's any last questions that they have?

MR. AMES: Thank you, Director Luna.

Committee members, do you have any other further questions at this time for Mr. Luna or his team regarding the implementation of Senate Bill 876? Any questions, members?

(No response.)

MR. AMES: All right. Seeing or hearing none, Mr. Luna, I would like to say that your team did a great job. I really appreciate the visuals that you provided for us. At the last meeting we heard a lot of

information, at this one, seeing it and reading it has definitely sparked some questions.

1.3

2.3

You did mention that there's no scheduled next meeting for this, but I don't believe that this committee is prepared to make a recommendation to the DMV Board just yet. We still have lots of things that we would like for you guys to consider and come back with us.

And so at this time I would recommend to the committee that we allow DMV staff to read through the recommendations and the questions that we had today and make one more final presentation to the committee in the next two or three weeks when they have that ready, and at that time then the committee can decide if we're ready to move forward with this.

Do any of the committee members have any comments or questions about that statement? From any members?

(No response.)

MR. AMES: All right. Mr. Luna, is that acceptable?

MR. THOMPSON: Officer Ames, Roland Luna, VTR Division director.

I will need to defer to our general counsel,

Tracey Beaver, or an associate general counsel to answer
that. What we can do at this point is we can take that

information, and then we can get back to the committee and 1 2 to you as the presiding officer, if that's okay. 3 MR. AMES: Wonderful. Ms. Beaver, are you on the call? I believe Mr. 4 5 Richards is. Mr. Richards, do you have any comment? 6 MR. RICHARDS: Yes. Officer Ames, David 7 Richards, associate general counsel, for the record. We can definitely take what commentary and 8 9 recommendations that have set forth this morning during 10 this call and get back with you and also the committee members with what we need to do. But we'll continue to 11 take it under advisement and communicate with the 12 1.3 committee. 14 Thanks. 15 MR. AMES: Wonderful. Thank you, Mr. Richards. 16 All right. John Ames here. Hearing no 17 opposition to the discussion just had, we will move forward without a recommendation at this time, and we'll 18 19 wait to hear from Mr. Richards and Mr. Luna as to the next 20 meeting of this committee when we can discuss the final presentation of this. We'll come to as a committee moving 21 22 forward to make a recommendation to the full DMV Board. 2.3 At this time we're at section number 3. At 24 this time we'll go to public comments.

David Richards, are there any comments from the

25

public? 1 2 MR. RICHARDS: David Richards, for the record. 3 There are no public comments at this time, Officer Ames. 4 5 MR. AMES: Okay, fantastic. 6 Since there are no public comments, I want to 7 thank everybody for their time today. Before we close, I 8 would like to reiterate that this is an important 9 committee to the DMV. Mr. Luna has some ideas in the 10 pipeline, after we finish with SB 876, to provide input to the DMV. 11 12 Mr. Luna, do you have anything that you'd like 13 to say regarding that? 14 MR. THOMPSON: Officer Ames, Roland Luna, VTR 15 Division director. If I may? 16 MR. AMES: Yes, sir. 17 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, sir. The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles values 18 19 the recommendations, the commitment, and the time that all 20 advisory committee members make to the committee and to 21 the department. 22 Whether it's the Customer Service Advisory 2.3 Committee or Consumer Protection, all of our advisory 24 committees play a vital role in development of programs

25

and processes.

And we value this committee, we value the partnerships we have with the committee, we value our partners at the counties with the tax assessor-collectors, and one of the things that we want to do in the future is continue to evaluate items that could be brought to this committee for discussion and briefing and possible recommendations.

1.3

2.3

I spoke with Officer Ames about trying to develop items that are appropriate for this committee. It could enhance the customer service experience when those individuals have business with the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles or any of our partners.

So we want to continue to look at opportunities and things that we can bring to this committee to enhance that customer service experience. So more to come and I look forward to continuing to work with CSAC.

MR. AMES: Thank you, Mr. Luna.

We as a committee are willing to serve and help provide the DMV with as much input as possible on customer service relations, and I think we have a great committee with a great diversity and they will definitely have input.

At this time we will head to item number 4, which is adjournment. Boy, just a little over an hour, so I think our committee is doing great on time, not the two

1	or three hours that we had predicted, which is good.
2	Do we have any comments or closing comments
3	before we adjourn? Committee members, any comments before
4	we adjourn?
5	(No response.)
6	MR. AMES: Hearing none, do I have a motion to
7	close the meeting and adjourn?
8	MR. HAYTER: Move. Russell Hayter.
9	MR. AMES: Thank you, Russell Hayter.
10	MR. CAVENDER: Member Cavender seconds.
11	MR. AMES: All right. So we have a motion by
12	Member Hayter and a second by Member Cavender to adjourn.
13	I don't believe we need to take a roll call vote. All
14	those in favor say aye.
15	(A chorus of ayes.)
16	MR. AMES: Mr. Richards, we are adjourned.
17	MR. RICHARDS: Thank you, Officer Ames. Great
18	meeting, committee.
19	(Whereupon, at 10:06 a.m., the meeting was
20	adjourned.)

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 MEETING OF: TxDMV Customer Service Advisory Committee 4 5 LOCATION: via Webex 6 DATE: September 30, 2021 7 I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 54, inclusive, are the true, accurate, 8 9 and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the 10 11 Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. 12 DATE: October 13, 2021 13 14 15 16 17 18 /s/ Nancy H. King (Transcriber) 19 20 21 On the Record Reporting & 22 Transcription, Inc. 23 7703 N. Lamar Blvd., Ste 515 24 Austin, Texas 78752