TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES BOARD MEETING

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

Thursday, October 1, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS:

Guillermo "Memo" Treviño, Chair Charles Bacarisse, Vice Chair (absent) Stacey Gillman Brett Graham Tammy McRae John Prewitt Paul Scott Shelley Washburn

I N D E X

| AGENDA ITEM PAGE | | | |
|------------------|--|----|--|
| 1. | Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum | 7 | |
| 2. | Pledges of Allegiance - U.S. and Texas | 8 | |
| 3. | Chair's Reports Proposed 2021 Board Meeting Schedule | 9 | |
| 4. | Executive Director's Reports | | |
| | A. COVID-19 Disaster Response | 10 | |
| | B. Introduction of Motor Vehicle Division Director Roland Luna, Sr. | 12 | |
| | C. Awards, Recognition of Years of Service, and Announcements | 14 | |
| CONT | ESTED CASE | | |
| 5. | Dealership's Protest of Manufacturer's Proposed Termination under Texas Occupations Code \$2301.453 and \$2301.455. MVD Docket No. 16-0018.LIC; SOAH Docket No. 608-16-4676. Star Houston, Inc. d/b/a Star Motor Cars v. Volvo Cars of North America, LLC. | | |
| RULE | S - ADOPTIONS | | |
| 6. | Chapter 211, Criminal History Offense and Action on License New, §§211.1 - 211.5 Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle Distribution Amendment, §215.89 Repeal, §215.88 Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers Amendments, §§221.15, 221.19, 221.111, and 221.112 Repeal, §221.113 and §221.114 (Relating to: Sunset Advisory Commission's recommendation, criminal history evaluations consistent with Occupations Code, Chapter 53: SB 604, relating to changes to salvage dealer licenses; HB 1342, relating to a person's eligibility for an occupational license; and SB 1217, prohibiting consideration of certain arrests in determining license eligibility) | 97 | |

| 7. | Amen (Relatax | ter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration dments, §217.74 ating to SB 604, requirement of each county assessor-collector to make webDEALER availab ny licensed motor vehicle dealer requesting ss) | 104 le |
|-------|------------------|---|-----------|
| 8. | Amen | ter 215, Motor Vehicle Distribution dments, §§215.150 - 215.158 ating to HB 3760, issuance of buyer's tags vehicles sold by governmental agencies) | 109 |
| RULES | S - P | ROPOSALS | |
| 9. | Amen | ter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration dments, §217.3 ating to motor vehicle titling for mopeds) | 113 |
| BRIE | FING 2 | AND ACTION ITEMS | |
| 10. | Legi | slative and Public Affairs Committee Update | |
| | Α. | Sunset Implementation Status Update (BRIEFING ONLY) | 117 |
| | В. | Driver Licensing Study Update (BRIEFING ONLY) | 121 |
| | С. | Agency Process for Legislative Session (BRIEFING ONLY) | 131 |
| | D. | Recommended Legislation to the 87th Legislature Pursuant to Transportation Code, §1001.025 | 134 |
| 11. | Spec | ialty Plate Designs | 144 |
| | Α. | Zeta Phi Beta - New Design proposed by My Plates under Transportation Code, \$504.851 | |
| | В. | Texas is Home - New Design proposed under Transportation Code, §504.801 | |
| | С. | Texas Master Naturalist - New Design proposed under Transportation Code, §504.801 | |
| 12. | | nce and Audit EFINGS ONLY) | |
| | Α. | FY 2022 - 2023 Legislative Appropriations | 147 |

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

| | | Request, Baseline, and Exceptional Items | |
|-----|---|---|-----|
| | В. | | 151 |
| | С. | Report Financial Impacts of COVID-19 on TxDMV | 154 |
| | D. | Internal Audit Division Status - FY 2020 Annual Audit Report | 161 |
| EXE | CUTIVE | SESSION SESSION | |
| 13. | The Board may enter into closed session under one or more of the following provisions of the Texas Open Meetings Act, Government Code, Chapter 551: Section 551.071 Section 551.074 Section 551.076 Section 551.089 | | 165 |
| 14. | Acti | on Items from Executive Session | 165 |
| 15. | Publ | ic Comment | 169 |
| 16. | Adjo | purnment | 175 |

2.3

PROCEEDINGS

MR. TREVIÑO: Good morning. My name is Guillermo Treviño, and I'm pleased to open the Board Meeting of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

It is approximately 8:00 a.m. and I am now calling the Board Meeting for October 1, 2020 to order. I want to note for the record that the public notice of this meeting, containing all items on the agenda, was filed with the Office of Secretary of State on September 23, 2020.

This meeting is being held by telephone conference call in accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 551, as temporarily modified under Governor Greg Abbott's authority to suspend certain statutes due to COVID-19. Governor Abbott suspended various provisions of the Texas Open Meetings Act that require government officials and members of the public to be physically present at specified meeting locations.

Under that suspension the public will not be able to physically attend this meeting in person. Instead the public may attend this meeting by using the link or by calling the toll free telephone number, which are both posted in our agenda which was filed with the Office of Secretary of State on September 23, 2020.

All board members, including myself, will be

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342 participating remotely via Webex. At this time, will attendees please mute your phone for the entire duration of this meeting?

1.3

2.3

I am asking our Webex meeting host to make sure that all attendees' phones are muted and their video is turned off, except for board members and those who are presenting. Callers will be removed for any disruption including background noise.

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

Department staff and any commenters should identify themselves before speaking. Speak clearly.

Remember that there may be a slight delay due to the telephone conference call meeting, so please wait a little longer than usual before responding to participants.

Do not speak over others, and speakers should ask the chairman to proceed and be sure to get recognized before speaking. If you wish to address the board or speak on an agenda item during today's meeting, please send an email to GCO_general@TxDMV.gov.

Please identify in your email the specific item

you're 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.

2.3

In accordance with department administrative rule, comments to the board will be limited to three minutes, then the call will be muted by the meeting host when your time is up. Comments should be pertinent to the issues stated in your email. When addressing the board, please state your name and affiliation for the record.

Before I begin today, I'd like to remind all presenters and those in attendance of the rules of conduct at our board meetings. Under the department's rules under Section 206.22, the board chair is given authority to supervise the conduct of meetings.

This includes the authority of the chairman when a speaker is being disruptive of the meeting or is otherwise violating the timing or presentation rules I just discussed. Disruptive speakers will be muted, given a warning about disruptive behavior, and removed from the meeting for any continued disruption.

We will now move to agenda item 1 which is roll call and establishment of a quorum. And now I will call the roll. Please respond verbally when I call your name.

| 1 | Board Member Gillman, are you here? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. GILLMAN: Good morning. |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Good morning. |
| 4 | Member Graham? |
| 5 | MR. GRAHAM: Present. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae. |
| 7 | MS. McRAE: Here. |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 9 | MS. McRAE: Here. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 11 | MR. SCOTT: Here |
| 12 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn? |
| 13 | MS. WASHBURN: I'm here. |
| 14 | MR. TREVIÑO: And let the record reflect that |
| 15 | I, Memo Treviño, am also here, and we have a quorum. |
| 16 | Also, let the record reflect that Member Bacarisse is |
| 17 | absent today. |
| 18 | Now the Pledge of Allegiance and the Texas |
| 19 | Pledge. Before we begin, I ask that the board and other |
| 20 | panelists please turn off their audio and video except for |
| 21 | Jeremiah Kuntz. We will pause to give presenters and |
| 22 | board members a moment to turn off their audio and video. |
| 23 | We are very fortunate today to have Mr. Parker |
| 24 | Kuntz, member of Cub Scout Pack 333 and the son of |
| 25 | Jeremiah Kuntz, to lead us in the pledges of allegiance. |

Please, once you have turned off your video and 1 2 audio, all stand and honor our country and state with the 3 pledges of allegiance. Parker and Jeremiah, you ready to go? 4 5 (The Pledge of Allegiance and the Texas Pledge 6 were recited.) 7 MR. TREVIÑO: Jeremiah and Parker, thank you 8 very much again. Great job, as always. Well, well done. 9 It's the highlight of the meeting; it's all downhill from 10 Thank you very much, thank you very much. 11 PARKER KUNTZ: Bye. 12 MR. TREVIÑO: Bye. Thank you very much. 13 Okay. How do you follow that? That's just 14 amazing. Well done, Parker. 15 Okay. We're going to move to agenda item 16 number 3, the chair's report. 17 We're going to cover the proposed 2021 Board Meeting schedule which may be found in your board books on 18 page 7. These dates are tentative but we wanted to make 19 20 this available for your planning purposes. 21 We typically meet the first Thursday of every 22 other month, which is reflected in the draft schedule. If 2.3 there is a change, we will notify everyone. As meeting 24 dates are confirmed, they will be posted on the department 25 website.

The only other thing I would add with the chair 1 2 report is I would like to congratulate Chair Scott for 3 running a very successful and productive Legislative and 4 Public Affairs Committee yesterday. So well done, 5 congratulations, and just expect great things from 6 Legislative and Public Affairs. 7 Members Scott, any comments? 8 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, thank you. 9 MR. TREVIÑO: My pleasure, my pleasure. We'll now turn it over to Executive Director 10 Whitney Brewster for agenda item 4. 11 Director Brewster. 12 13 MS. BREWSTER: Thank you, Chairman Treviño. 14 And good morning, board members, staff and guests. 15 And congratulations to you, Chairman, on the 16 birth of your new granddaughter. What an exciting time 17 for you and your family and just wanted to congratulate you on behalf of the department on the new addition. 18 19 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. Very kind of you. 20 MS. BREWSTER: For the record, Whitney 21 Brewster, executive director. 22 I appreciate the time to share a few things 2.3 with you this morning, the first being a standing item 24 that I include in all of my reports and that is an update

on the impacts of COVID-19 on TxDMV. Ms. Flores will be

25

giving an update in the meeting later on relating to the revenue and expenditure impacts of COVID-19, so I won't get into that here.

1.3

2.3

Just wanted to briefly share with you that we remain steady providing all services to customers during this time. All of our regional service centers remain open by appointment to the public. All services are being provided to our customers and stakeholders.

Internally I would say we've adjusted and we're carrying on. Our cases of COVID-19 amongst our staff have fortunately dropped considerably. We currently have one member of our team that is currently recovering from COVID-19.

One of the big focuses during COVID-19 internally has been on wellness. We have a great committee that focuses and makes recommendations on ways in which we can help keep our folks healthy, both mind and body.

We've also continued on with our leadership academy. We've shifted that to a virtual world and it's still as popular as ever amongst our staff, fills up within the first couple of hours of posting a class.

We're also looking at making significant changes to our ongoing telecommuting policy as a result of some of the things that we've learned during COVID-19, and

certainly, come to find out, we're actually pretty good at telecommuting. And so we will continue to have a heavy telecommuting presence I think even post COVID-19.

Currently we have about 30 percent of our employees onsite, with 70 percent telecommuting.

1.3

2.3

As Governor Abbott has started opening up more businesses due to the decline of COVID-19, so has TxDMV started looking at bringing more of our folks back to the office, starting with those that volunteer to come back. And this is actually phase two of our reopening plan, and we're looking at any changes to our facilities that we may need to make as we have an identified list of volunteers before we move into phase two. So the date for moving into the next phase has not yet been determined, but we will certainly share that with TxDMV staff and the board as soon as we know that we can safely bring those volunteers back.

Any questions from the board members before ${\tt I}$ move on to the next item in my update?

MR. TREVIÑO: No. Go ahead.

MS. BREWSTER: All right. Thank you.

One of the things that we've also continued to do is bring on employees, onboard new employees during COVID-19. I know many of our board members have already met him through our various meetings, but I want to

officially and publicly welcome Roland Luna as the new director of the Motor Vehicle Division for our department.

He took on the role back on August 17th.

1.3

2.3

And just a little bit about Roland. He began his service with the Texas Department of Public Safety as a state trooper, and then was promoted into other positions which include serving as, interestingly, an agent on the protective detail for Governor Greg Abbott who was then attorney general. Also has served as a criminal investigations sergeant and lieutenant in internal affairs.

He's also served in various director positions, such as assistant chief with the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission, deputy inspector general, and chief of investigations for the Health and Human Services

Commission Office of the Inspector General, and chief inspector general for the Texas Juvenile Justice

Department Office of the Inspector General where he actually reported to the board. Prior to joining our agency, he served as director of administration for the Williamson County Judiciary.

He has a bachelor of business administration from Sam Houston State University, and also a master's of arts in legal studies from Texas State University. He is certified in mediation and legal research, and holds a

commission on law enforcement, master peace officer license, and he's also a certified inspector general.

2.3

So that was a mouthful. As you can see, Roland has an extremely impressive resume, but also I want to note that he has quickly adapted to our culture of providing great customer service and support. And he's already making a great impact in the Motor Vehicle Division by just really getting up to speed on processes, and working towards continuing and improving upon the good work left by Daniel Avitia.

So I'm really happy that Roland has joined our team, and please join me in welcoming Roland to the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles.

MR. TREVIÑO: Roland, good to have you aboard. Expect great things from you.

MS. BREWSTER: Last but certainly not least is the recognition of years of service. At this time I'd like to recognize our employees who have reached a state service milestone. We celebrate these employees as a show of appreciation for their years of service to the citizens of Texas.

Chairman Treviño and board members, we will first start with congratulating our first recipient who has reached a 20-year state service milestone, and that's Lori Ely from our Human Resources Division. Lori Ely

works in the Human Resources Division where she coordinates new employee onboarding, employee benefits, wellness and a variety of other tasks, including coordinating this service recognition information for you at each of our board meetings.

1.3

2.3

She started her state career at the State

Department of Human Services in 1997 and joined our

department in 2013 but left in 2015 to work at the State

Comptroller. She rejoined our team in the Human Resources

Division last November and has really been an excellent

addition to the team. She brings a strong customer

service commitment to her work every day and always tries

to go the extra mile to support all of TxDMV's employees.

On a personal note, she is eagerly looking forward to her first grandchild in January. Her manager, Matthew Levitt, looks forward to her next 20 years of service at TxDMV, or at least for her not to leave until after he retires.

So please join me in congratulating Lori on 20 years of state service.

(Applause.)

MS. BREWSTER: And Chairman, just a few others that I would like to be able to mention. With 25 years of state service we have John Poole, III with our Motor Carrier Division, and Rachel Vasquez with our Vehicle

Titles and Registration Division in Austin. With 30 years, Lisa Conley with the Finance and Administrative Services Division. And with 40 years, Rosario Villarreal with the Motor Carrier Division. That's incredible. That is a lot of years of service. And congratulations to our recipients, what an enormous milestone.

And last but certainly not least, I did want to mention our employees who have recently retired from the department, and we miss them already: Ellen Blackwell of the Motor Vehicle Division; Juanita Bustos from the

1.3

2.3

the Motor Vehicle Division; Juanita Bustos from the

Vehicle Titles and Registration Division in San Antonio;

and Victoria Nichols of our Compliance and Investigations

Division.

With that, Mr. Chairman, members, that completes my report.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you for all those team members and for their service to the citizens of Texas and just for their years of service. Thank you very much, Whitney.

MS. BREWSTER: Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ TREVIÑO: Thank you to all the team members that you listed there.

Any questions for Ms. Brewster?

(No response.)

MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Hearing none, we'll move

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342 on.

Our next item is a contested case. Before we move on to the contested case presentations, we'll first hear from our general counsel, Tracey Beaver. This is Star Houston, Inc. d/b/a/ Star Motor Cars v. Volvo Motor Cars of North America, LLC, briefing our contested case by Roland Luna, Sr. later.

But Tracey, do you want to get us started here?

MS. BEAVER: Thank you, chairman, board

members, executive director. I'm Tracey Beaver, general

counsel, for the record.

I just wanted to let the board know that each party to this case will have a total of 15 minutes for their initial presentation and seven minutes for rebuttal. A reminder will be given on the record before the end of their presentation and rebuttal time. Upon conclusion of the time allotted for presentation and rebuttal, staff will state on the record that the allotted time has ended.

Additionally, the parties were given the opportunity to provide electronic presentation aids, four pages for their presentation and two pages for their rebuttal, to be provided to the board prior to the board meeting. The presentation aids for Star Motor may be found in the board books beginning on page 300, and the presentation aids for Volvo may be found in the board

books beginning on page 307.

2.3

I'd also like to remind board members and the parties that the board's final decision must be based solely on evidence contained within the administrative record from SOAH, and that the board shall not consider new information or re-litigate cases. The parties will make sure their verbal presentations do not go to information outside the record and may specify where in the record the evidence may be found.

If a question from the board is asked, the speaker will tell you when it's not in the record. And if it's not in the record, you wouldn't be able to use it to make a decision one way or the other anyway.

We will first begin with the Motor Vehicle director, Mr. Luna, Sr., giving an overview of the case, and then the parties will be promoted to panelists, upon your cue, Chairman, to begin their presentation.

And that concludes my remarks. Thank you.

MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you, Tracey.

I would ask counsel, if they could, at the one minute mark to begin to wind down their presentation so that we kind of stop at the 15-minute mark that's the allotted time. That way it relieves me of the burden of having to stop you mid-sentence, which I don't want to do.

But by the rules, that's what we're required to

do at the 15-minute mark is to stop the presentations in fairness to both parties involved. So if you guys would -- I know it's a difficult situation -- but do your level best to please stop at the 15-minute mark if possible -- well, stop at the 15-minute mark, let's just leave it there.

Okay. Roland Luna, Sr. will now address agenda item 5, contested case.

Roland.

2.3

MR. LUNA: Chairman, members, Ms. Brewster, good morning. I am Roland Luna, Sr., director of the Motor Vehicle Division. Michelle Lingo is also available.

Agenda item 5 is found on page 10 of your board books. This protest termination case involves two TxDMV license holders, a franchised dealership, Star Houston, Inc. d/b/a Star Motor Cars, and a distributor, Volvo Cars of North America, LLC.

The issue for board consideration is whether Volvo established by preponderance of the evidence that there is good cause for the proposed termination of the party's franchise. A panel of two SOAH ALJs conducted a hearing across seven days and then issued a proposal for decision.

The ALJs found that Volvo met its burden of proof that Volvo showed good cause for terminating the

franchise. The ALJs recommended the board deny Star's protest.

1.3

2.3

The ALJs also considered Star's defenses and counterclaims. The ALJs recommended the board grant no relief to Star on its defenses or counterclaims. The ALJs considered the parties' exceptions and reply briefs. The ALJs' exceptions letter recommended minor changes to findings of fact 63 and 201 to clarify any overstatement of the degree to which Star's dealership is isolated from other luxury auto dealerships.

The Occupations Code requires the board to include a separate finding of fact for each specific issue the board is required to consider in reaching its decision. In determining whether Volvo established good cause for the termination, Texas law requires the board to consider: one, seven specific statutory factors; two, all existing circumstances; and three, whether the termination is based solely on the desire for market penetration.

Star is represented by David Coffey and Volvo is represented by Brit Brown. The parties' attorneys received notice of this meeting and are available.

Members, this concludes my remarks. Thank you.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Luna.

Are there any questions for Mr. Luna from board members?

(No response.)

MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Hearing none, so before we proceed will the meeting host please move attendee Mr. David Coffey to panelist so the video at his location can be turned on? Mr. Coffey and Mr. Martin Alaniz are both at the same location under this panelist's name and represent Star Motor Company -- Star Motor Cars, excuse me.

Will the meeting host please also move attendees Mr. Brit Brown and Mr. Benjamin Escobar to panelists so they can have their video on as well. Mr. Brown and Mr. Escobar signed in individually and they represent Volvo Cars of North America, LLC.

Tracey, could you just give us a heads up when all that has been accomplished?

MS. BEAVER: I see that someone with the user name "Ben" was promoted to panelist, just for purposes of technology and location check only. Could the person signed in under Ben please unmute themselves and turn on the video. Just want to confirm that this is the correct person, Mr. Escobar, to promote. Wonderful. Thank you.

And I see we also have Mr. Brown and Mr. Coffey. Are there any other presenters that either party needs to have promoted to panelist?

(No response.)

2.3

MS. BEAVER: Looks like we've got it covered. 1 2 Thank you, Chairman. 3 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Tracey. I ask that board members please hold their 4 5 questions to the end of the presentations and rebuttals by 6 both parties. 7 We will now proceed with complainant's presentation by David Coffey and Martin Alaniz. You have 8 9 a total of 15 minutes to present. Out of respect for the 10 process and out of fairness to the parties, I ask that you stick to your allotted 15 minutes. 11 12 Staff will give a one-minute warning, at which 13 time you will need to wrap up your presentation. 14 will then state on the record when your 15 minutes has 15 ended. 16 Please be sure to stop your presentation at that time so that the meeting host will not need to mute 17 the parties. Your time begins as soon as you unmute 18 19 yourself and start speaking. 20 Mr. Coffey, are you ready to go? 21 MR. COFFEY: I am ready to go, Mr. Chairman. 22 Thank you very much for having us. 2.3 MR. TREVIÑO: Welcome, Mr. Coffey. 24 MR. COFFEY: Thank you. 25 MR. TREVIÑO: Go right ahead. I think you can

start your presentation.

2.3

MR. COFFEY: Thank you, sir.

First of all, good morning, board members. My name is David Coffey. I do represent Star Motor Cars. I am attended with my partner, Martin Alaniz, here in our offices today, as well as our clients, Glenn Seureau and Lee Bureau, who have shown intense interest in this case from the very beginning. And actually it's been going on for years now and they haven't missed anything.

I would just add one thing to what Mr. Luna said. He forgot to mention that Star Motor Cars did bring counter complaints against Volvo in this proceeding and we were awarded conclusions to the effect that the retail bonus program, which we had challenged in this proceeding, was found to be in violation of several code provisions. Unfortunately, the SOAH decided that it would not penalize Volvo, while at the same time allowing Volvo to terminate Star Motor Cars when the evidence showed that the two illegal programs had severely suppressed Star Motor Cars' sales performance.

That is very unjust in our opinion and we are vehemently opposed to this PFD. We are asking the board to reject the PFD and to institute instead the proposed order with findings of fact and conclusions of law that we had included as appendix items to our exceptions to the

PFD.

2.3

Now, there are a number of grounds for reversing this PFD. Your statute, the APA, says that you can reverse a SOAH PFD in the event that it fails to properly apply the law or fails to properly apply agency policy. Both of those grounds for reversal are present in this case.

The most glaring error, in our opinion, is that this board is mandated by its statute, the Texas

Occupations Code, to put the interests of the consumer first. In other words, you've got a number of competing interests in this case, the consumer, the distributor and the dealer, but the only thing the statute says in terms of the mandate to the board is to protect the consumer.

You can see this, in fact, even in the board's own mission statement -- I've got a copy of it right here. It says, "About Us. The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles is the dynamic state agency dedicated to customer service, consumer protection, and the success of motor vehicle related industries."

So I believe that this agency itself, much like the agencies which proceeded it, the MVB and the TMVC, all considered themselves consumer protection agencies, as they should. They do not elevate the interests of dealers over that of the public, neither does this agency elevate

the distributor's interests over that of the public.

2.3

That, however, is exactly what happened in this case, whether SOAH does not understand what this agency's mission is and what its mandate is from the legislature. But for whatever reason, the SOAH elevated the interests of the distributor, that is the interest in achieving more sales in the Houston market, over the interests of the public with exemplary service and outstanding warranty, which is what the SOAH found Star Motor Cars provided.

Also, the SOAH PFD ignores prior agency precedent. Back in the 2002 time frame, Star Motor Cars, along with a consortium of other dealers, brought a case against Volvo for very, very similar retail bonus programs. The agency director at that time, a Mr. Brett Bray, determined that they violated the law and they could not be implemented or enforced in the State of Texas.

We made that precedent available to the SOAH ALJs. They ignored it completely, didn't even mention it in their PFD. But Volvo has, in fact, 14 years after that decision brought additional retail bonus programs into this state virtually identical in that they all contain the same components, two of which the SOAH found to be unlawful in the State of Texas.

Nevertheless, sadly, SOAH decided to implement and enforce those unlawful programs by allowing them to

suppress Star's sales performance and then determined that Star Motor Cars was at fault, did not sell enough cars for Volvo, and thus should be terminated.

2.3

The only other ground for termination that was noticed in this case against Star Motor Cars was the facility. The facility is an older facility, granted, but it's perfectly usable, perfectly functional. We demonstrated that it has ample capacity.

It's well kept. Its personnel are well trained. They have all the special tools and parts and everything that Volvo requires. The only thing that Volvo could point to as a deficiency in this facility was the fact that it didn't carry the new Volvo image, which it wanted in all of its facilities throughout the country, throughout North America.

Now, we have to really get into the weeds on this why Star Motor Cars did not build a new facility. Frankly, it tried. The evidence showed that Star Motor Cars went to great effort to get Volvo to assist it in coming up with some sort of plan by which this older facility, which is solid steel and concrete, could be adapted to the new image.

Volvo just ignored Star Motor Cars pleas and basically just let Star Motor Cars wither on the vine until it got to the point where they felt they could bring

the notice of termination against Star Motor Cars. Totally unjust.

2.3

So when we got to that point in the case -- and remember, we have been fighting the fact that they claimed there was something wrong with the facility, it wasn't good enough for Volvo, whatever, never mentioned anything about the location. The location of that facility had actually been chosen by Volvo when it first entered into the Houston market. It chose that location off I-10 and on Old Katy Road near the communities of River Oaks and Tanglewood.

They chose it. Star Motor Cars bought into that by buying the facility from its distributor of the time, a Mr. Neil Seffeld [phonetic] -- I believe his name is pronounced -- bought it from him, continued to maintain that facility in that location all along.

Now I want to take you through a couple of my exhibits in this case. First we have slide number 1 on page 1 of our production. These are the conclusion of law by which the SOAH itself found that Volvo's CSI and SSI bonus programs violated several code provisions.

Then it goes on in slide numbers 2 and 3 to laud Star Motor Cars on how good its facility was in terms of competence, ability to serve the public, excellent warranty work, but then it goes over here on slide 2, PFD

page 82, and says, No, I guess we were wrong, Star Motor Cars' facility is inadequate and that weighs in favor of termination.

1.3

2.3

Well, the way they got to that so-called inadequacy is they came up with this ridiculous argument that if Star Motor Cars would achieve sales effectiveness in its market, it would have so much more service business to work on that its facility would not be adequate. It would no longer have the capacity.

So one of the grounds for termination is that at some point in the future, according to Volvo's metrics, Star Motor Cars' facility might not have the capacity to handle all the business available to it. It is ridiculous. It is pure speculation. They did not prove up the efficacy of the metrics by which they arrived at that conclusion, SOAH just bought into it because it was glossy and slick and they thought Volvo, I guess, should win.

Now I'm going to have to have to skip through some of my stuff here over to -- well, let's go to slide 7 real quickly. These are the bonuses that were paid out in the Houston market over the three-year period for which we have data. You can see that Star Motor Cars, on the bottom lines, achieved bonuses of only \$140,274, whereas, other dealers in the market achieved bonuses as high as

\$990- and \$982-. This was strictly a result of the fact that they had new or remodeled facilities and the CSI/SSI bonus questions -- which were found to be unlawful -- those questions accentuated whether or not the dealer had a facility which portrayed the glossy image that Volvo wanted. Since Star Motor Cars did not, it lost out in the bonus game which means that it lost out in the competitive equation in Houston.

2.3

essentially additional margin that are attributable to sales that a dealer makes if in fact it achieves the bonus criteria. So Star Motor Cars did not have this additional margin to apply towards retail prices — it's called trading margin — did not have the additional margin to apply towards retail prices. It could not lower its retail prices as low as some of the other dealers with which it was competing, and slowly over a period of time it became marginalized to a point where Volvo felt that they could terminate Star Motor Cars.

So let me skip real quickly to the last couple of slides, and these are slides 8, 9 and 10. You'll recall that we talked about Star Motor Cars' facility.

Well, Star Motor Cars saw that it was in a losing game, that Volvo was not going to assist it in adjusting its existing facility, so Star proposed that it build a new

facility for Volvo.

1.3

2.3

You can see the new facility at slide 8 in our packet. This is the facility that Volvo's engineers and designers said that Star Motor Cars must build if it wants to comply with the facility requirements of the contract that Volvo claims is at issue here. It isn't the best site issue.

So then we go on to slides 9 and 10. This is where Volvo rejects Star Motor Cars' proposed facility.

And I don't have time to take you through each line, but basically it's saying, No, Star Motor Cars, we're not going to let you build that big expensive facility because your location will not support it. Your location will not produce the 500 new vehicles per year necessary to support that facility.

So now we find out at the end of the case it's not the facility that's the problem, it's the location, a location that Volvo itself chose and which Star Motor Cars bought into. So now they're saying, No, we're going to terminate you because you — essentially because you do not have a location out on the highway where you make more sales, the amount of sales that we want a Volvo dealer to make, otherwise, you're not worth our time.

MS. BEAVER: You have one minute remaining.

MR. COFFEY: Thank you. I will conclude my

| 1 | presentation at this time, and ask the board members if |
|----|--|
| 2 | they have any questions. |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Coffey. |
| 4 | Does anybody have any questions? |
| 5 | MR. GRAHAM: Memo, this is Board Member Graham. |
| 6 | I do have some questions. |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Go ahead, Member Graham. |
| 8 | MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Actually, Member Graham, why |
| 10 | don't we go through the presentations and then we can |
| 11 | address because maybe |
| 12 | MR. GRAHAM: That's fine. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: So why don't we do that? We'll |
| 14 | just go through the presentations and then we'll ask for |
| 15 | questions at the end. Is that okay with you? |
| 16 | MR. GRAHAM: Absolutely, yes, sir. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Coffey, is that all right |
| 18 | with you, we'll just kind of roll through both |
| 19 | presentations? |
| 20 | MR. COFFEY: That's fine, Mr. Chairman. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. We'll do that then. |
| 22 | All right. We'll now proceed with the |
| 23 | respondent's presentation by Mr. Brit Brown and Mr. |
| 24 | Benjamin Escobar. |
| 25 | You have 15 minutes to present. Out of respect |

for the process and fairness to the parties, I ask that 1 you stick to your allotted 15 minutes. 3 Staff will give a one-minute warning at which 4 time you will need to wrap up your presentation. Staff 5 will then state on the record when your 15 minutes has 6 ended. 7 Please be sure to stop your presentation at that time so that the meeting host will not need to mute 8 9 the parties. Your time begins as soon as you unmute 10 yourself and start speaking. Mr. Brown, are you with us? 11 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. Can you hear me? 12 13 MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, I can, and I can see you. 14 Welcome. 15 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I proceed? 16 MR. TREVIÑO: Please. Please do, Mr. Brown. 17 Welcome. MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you, sir. 18 19 I understand time is pretty limited so I'm 20 going to kind of jump into it. As was introduced at the beginning, we've also provided some presentation aids at 21 22 the eBook page number 307 to 312. I might not reference 2.3 those at all except maybe to address some questions. 24 I'm going to focus my presentation on the

proposal for decision, which is at the eBook number page

25

15 through 155. This was a 140 page proposal for decision with extensive evidentiary references. It has 243 findings of fact and 24 conclusions of law, and it has in an overwhelming sense established and recommended findings that Volvo: one, complied with its duty of good faith and fair dealing to the dealer; two, acted with reasonable — or upon reasonable judgment; and three, met its burden of proving good cause for termination.

1.3

2.3

In that analysis which I'll discuss -- which wouldn't be till later if I have time -- the ALJs, the judges, there were two of them, referred specifically to the Texas Administrative Code -- or Occupations Code -- sorry -- Section 2301.455(a). That's the seven factors that were referenced earlier that the board is required to take into account or to consider when determining whether good cause exists. It's not our burden to establish each of the seven. Any one of the seven can establish good cause for termination, but it's seven factors to consider.

The proposal for decision finds and supports with over a hundred specific findings of fact in the proposal for decision that six of the seven clearly support a finding of good cause for termination. The seventh, which Mr. Coffey discussed briefly, frankly, we did not contest, and I'll talk about that in more detail because I think there may be confusion on that and that

goes with warranty.

2.3

But six of the seven -- and we only need to show one -- six of the seven support a finding of good cause for termination. What they also found was that our motivations were not solely for the increase of market share -- which is one of the items also in the statute -- so in other words, we passed that test also.

Briefly, for the time I have I want to talk about the relationship between Star and Volvo. The dealer agreement that the parties are operating under is from 1970. Now, since 1970, 50 years ago, Volvo, of course, as every other manufacturer has, periodically comes out with new dealer agreements that are more current to the times, more contemporary in form.

Star Motor refused to sign any other agreement. They're the only dealer that refused to sign, so we're operating under that agreement. There's no dispute there; that's the agreement we have, and that's the one referenced by the ALJs.

The agreement is not the only thing that remained unchanged for 50 years. Star Motors is in the same location. Location has been discussed with Star Motors, and there's plenty of evidence in the record about discussions that were had, not only by Volvo to Star management but also by Star personnel, about the location.

When it was formed, and still at the time, they're on the Old Katy Freeway.

2.3

In 1970 it was not the Old Katy Freeway in Houston, it was the Katy Freeway, and that was a pretty high trafficked area. It was right on the major thoroughfare. But Houston, as most cities in Texas, has dramatically changed in the last 50 years.

Now the Old Katy Freeway, which is the road frontage of their facility, is no longer on the major thoroughfare, it's a very low trafficked venue. You can easily cross the street walking it, you don't have to worry about getting run over.

The high traffic thoroughfare going east-west through Houston is Interstate 10. Every dealer in the Houston market, every dealer in Texas in the south market, in the southern region, and frankly, most in the country, are on major thoroughfares. Star is not and has not been since I-10 took over the major load of the traffic.

Now, if you're driving westbound or eastbound on I-10, you cannot see Star. You cannot see the buildings, you cannot see the signage. That's pretty significant both to Volvo and also to Star personnel. It doesn't have, as the Star expert witness, Ted Stockton with the Fontana Group, testified -- it does not have, using his term, the billboard effect, and because of that

it will always be a low-volume niche player.

What did he mean by billboard effect? You don't have in the situation in Houston tens or hundreds of thousands of commuters driving by your dealership every day, seeing your business, seeing the product and running traffic through your store. In this case it's out of the way, it's not seen, and frankly, is not known about.

Now, the sales manager, Al Velasco. This is the Star sales manager who testified in both deposition and at the final hearing. He's referenced throughout the proposal for decision and he had several very significant statements that the ALJs, and frankly, Volvo took as being quite relevant.

To give a little background for Mr. Velasco.

Before he became the sales manager at Star, he was a salesman, a Volvo salesman working with Westside Volvo, also on I-10, also in Houston a few miles down the road off roughly Dairy-Ashford and I-10 is where he was located at the time. He did a good job, he won some awards. I think he said he averaged about eight cars a month, he sold some pretty good product, just that one salesperson.

2.3

1.3

He was asked: When you were a salesman at Westside Volvo, after having lived in Houston for several years, did you consider Star to be a competitor? He said,

No, I did not even know about Star. This is a man that's lived in Houston for many years, worked as a Volvo salesperson at a Volvo dealership, did not even know Star existed. He knew the other Houston dealerships, he knew Texas dealerships, did not know about Star.

2.3

Now, in addition to that, he was asked at one point: You've got lots of problems, right, you've got lots of problems with this dealership?

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, these are facts that are specifically stated in the proposal for decision, not just in the record but they're in the PFD.

But he was asked: What do you really need to overcome all your inadequacies, all your holes to sell more vehicles? He responded -- and this is in the PFD: I could sell 20 to 25 cars eyes closed if I had what I want. The obvious question: What do you want? More advertising. Why? Because no one knows that we're here.

Now, his advertising budget had been slashed in 2017-2018 -- the trial of the case or the final hearing was in 2018 in September -- and that had an impact on him. He even testified that his immediate area has a great demographic for selling Volvos or other premium vehicles -- and I'll talk about that in just a second -- but he said, Even right next door -- and he was talking about the high-end condos that were in the neighborhood

adjacent to the dealership -- don't even know that we're here, and there's a reason for it.

1.3

2.3

But going on to their AOR, area of responsibility, their market area -- different manufacturers call them different things, all of them have a similar concept -- the Star AOR, dead center Houston, Texas, is the highest volume AOR in the Houston market. There's six dealers -- or were at the time -- dealers in Houston.

The Star AOR has the highest volume and that's based on registrations and a percentage of your competitive mix. It's also the third highest in the State of Texas. It's one of the highest in the southern region, and despite that, going back for not just a year or two or five but in fact decades, Star has been significantly an under-performer.

Now, we had evidence that was presented by men like Sandy Seidman, who had known Star for many years. He retired right before the final hearing but he testified at the hearing. Also, Bill De Winne, who had been working at the time of the hearing, been working with Star for over 19 years.

This was a problem that had gone back for many years. Now testifying about where they stood, regardless of the metrics that's being used, be it sales

effectiveness, market penetration or sales proportion,
each of those metrics they were last in the Houston
market, the Texas market, the south market, the southern
region, and yes, the national market.

2.3

You'll see references that the ALJs cite. They use various years for reference, focusing on 2012 to 2018, year-to-date 2018, they were last. In 2012 you had 304 dealers; they were 304 out of 304.

And then the number of dealers went down and started to come back up when Volvo started having a renaissance and very, very heavy sales in '16 and '17, going into '18, and they were still last, 281 out of 281.

Why? It's not just the location, but the location makes a big difference. It's other inadequacies in their personal decisions or business decisions on not to invest.

The record is replete. The ALJs cite the testimony -- they give the transcript page line on where it comes from -- from Mr. Seureau, the owner, dealer and principal of Star Motors, of their sales manager, Al Velasco, of their service manager, Rodney Bunch. There was a systemic, or what they called a longstanding reluctance, or in other places in the PFD, outright refusal to make investments in the business, not just investments in cash but also time and effort.

And this goes all the way back. This is why

you still have a facility that has not undergone any capital improvements since 1950. It's a cinder block, single story, small showroom facility that the sales manager and service manager both admit and readily state that it's a turnoff. It doesn't look like a premium experience and it's not good or conducive to getting customers into our shop.

2.3

Al Velasco, again testimony that was cited in the record -- in the PFD, he testified that, one, very few people know we're here, we have very small traffic, but even of those people that know we're here or see us, he estimated 75 percent -- his testimony -- 75 percent will be turned off by the appearance and not even come in -- 75 percent, and of the 25 percent that come in they have other problems that can't close the deal.

This is a dealer of very high planning volume, very high potential and sells -- I think even one of the demonstratives that Mr. Coffey put in showed two of the years like 29 or 30 per year. One year they did relatively good. It was around 70, that was good for them. The planning volume was close to 400. They just haven't gotten it done.

What else have they had? It's just a stubbornness and a refusal to invest in your own business, a failure to recognize you have to spend money to make

money. The sign that stands out front is a sign that has not been built since the 1970s. It's called the old Volvo hockey stick. No other dealer has those in front of their signs, it's not compliant.

1.3

2.3

They have refused to buy a new sign when offered to sell, they refused to lease the new sign. They turned down a \$45 a month maintenance fee on the sign that Volvo was going to provide. That's in the PFD.

They also refused to pay \$250 a month for inventory management system that every other dealer has implemented. By the way, no other dealer in the country has the old hockey stick signage, it's way out of date. Even the sign on the front of their building -- there's testimony that people have not seen those signs on a Volvo store for 20-30 years, talking about on the face of the building.

But going to the inventory management system, which every dealer embraces, it helps you manage your inventory, not buy too much and get rid of it when it's too old and get paid back by the manufacturer when you return it. Well, it cost \$45 [sic] a month.

Star has never participated in that, and Star loses a lot of money on its inventory management by overbuying inventory, not returning until it's too old and can't be returned, and they lose the money. Now, that's

just one of many examples that's in this 140-page PFD of bad business decisions that cost them money.

1.3

2.3

They have not been profitable. As the ALJs state in the PFD, Mr. Seureau was asked: Over the last ten years -- ten years prior to his testimony in 2018 -- do you recall ever being profitable? He could not recall if they had profitable any one year of those last ten years. And sir, that's even with what is clearly a low cost provider.

Mr. Seureau owns the land. He's only recently charged rent to the occupants -- he has four brands -- and he charges them \$2,500 a month which is so grossly under market it's like paying nothing for rent. They pay their salespeople \$2,000 or \$2,500 a month. They cut their advertising budget, they cut everything needed to have a good experience and a good product for the consumer, for the brand, for themselves to generate a profit, and they've not been willing to.

MS. BEAVER: You have one minute left.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

In the last minute -- and I will cut it short,

Mr. Chairman -- we had them on a Volvo retailer

improvement program, which doesn't cost them anything,

costs us a lot. They didn't cooperate, no improvements

over many years.

We field notice of termination in February of 1 2 2016, we went to the final hearing in September of 2018, eight live witnesses over two weeks, 300-plus exhibits, a 3 4 lot of time, a PFD that gave the rulings I mentioned 5 earlier, and I'll talk more in my rebuttal. 6 Sir, thank you very much. 7 MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Brown, thank you for your 8 presentation. 9 Mr. Coffey, Mr. Brown, I'd like to thank you 10 both for staying within your allotted time.

Now each party will have seven minutes for rebuttal. First we will hear from Mr. Coffey and Mr. Alaniz for the complainant. Again, you'll have seven minutes to speak and staff will say one-minute notice and a notice when your time ends. Time begins as soon as you

And Mr. Coffey, you're up.

MR. COFFEY: Thank you.

unmute yourself and start speaking.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Before I respond to all of Mr. Brown's points,
I want to bring up a couple of things about their
exhibits.

Page 1 of their exhibits shows -- or purports to show a red circle around Star Motor Cars. That is not Star Motor Cars, I don't know what they're trying to do there by circling the facility across the street which is

an entirely different dealership than we have. But our facility is on the opposite side of Old Katy Road from the red-circled dealership.

2.3

That is the Star Motor Cars campus right there. It starts with several sports car brands, then Volvo, then Mercedes Benz, and to the right of that campus you will see some additional unused acreage. That is where we proposed to put the new Volvo facility which I showed you in slide 8. Volvo calls that a relocation, so in slides 9 and 10 where you see Volvo talking about a relocation, they're talking about relocating Volvo two doors down to some vacant property next to Mercedes Benz.

The second thing I want to comment on is the page 2, it shows the write-up desk in the service facility and you can see that there's some splotches on the floor. Well, by the time we got to trial, all of that had been repainted, resealed and was no longer in that condition, so why they chose an old photo of that facility is obvious, but they shouldn't have done that.

Let's go on to some of the points that Mr. Brown made.

He says that six of the seven statutory criteria, they only need to achieve one of those statutory criteria and they've got a good termination. Well, that would be true if it wasn't for the board's mandate to

protect the consumer.

1.3

2.3

That is the overriding consideration. You don't just sit around and juggle the three of the seven statutory criteria and say, Oh, in our opinion sales performance is more important over any of these other things. No. The consumer interests is the most important.

Now, ask yourself what is more important to the consumer: is it close-in, high quality service and warranty or is it the factory getting more sales out on a highway someplace removed from your community? I think the answer to that question is obvious. SOAH didn't see it that way, they saw sales performance as the most important thing and that's why Star Motor Cars is in danger of losing its license.

The old dealer agreement, Mr. Brown mentioned that. Yes, Star Motor Cars did stay under its old dealer agreement, which it is entitled to do under the Texas Occupations Code. If Volvo doesn't like that, they can bring a proceeding under that same code to remove Star from its old dealer agreement and put it under their new dealer agreement, each iteration of which, of course, is harder and tougher on the dealer than the one before which is why Star stayed under the old dealer agreement.

Star's advertising. I want to read you

something from the PFD -- I'm sorry -- our exceptions to the PFD, and it cites to the record, that's why I'm using this. They complained that Star Motor Cars is not visible. Well, Star Motor Cars spends millions of dollars a year to make itself visible to the consumer.

1.3

2.3

Star recognizes that it is off the major highway so it doesn't have the billboard effect of thousands and thousands of cars going by every day, so Star spends a fortune on advertising. Here's what the exhibits show in the record. Exhibits P-171 through 174 show that Star outspent every other Houston dealer by several hundred dollars per new vehicle sold in advertising.

Star spends the money but it cannot overcome the limitations of the sale performance program. You can spend all the money in the world on advertising. It doesn't help you a bit if you can't offer the same retail price to the customer because you are out-bonused by one of these phony programs that awards dealers additional bonus because they have a new facility which caters to Volvo's vanity, its corporate vanity, but doesn't do the consumer a darn bit of good. Those are some of the dynamics that are playing out in this case.

Lack of investment, refusal to invest. You saw the facility that Star Motor Cars proposed that it build.

Yes, it took them a while to get to that point because they were hoping that Volvo would work with them and help them remodel their existing facility. That didn't happen so Star said, Look, we will spend \$16 million to put a new facility on this patch of ground that we own next to our campus.

1.3

2.3

They refused that not because it wasn't a good facility -- it was their design -- it was because they wanted Star Motor Cars, or whoever replaces Star, out on I-10 or one of the other freeways where you can get the huge traffic volume moving past the dealership and getting that billboard effect. It was all about what can you do for Volvo, it wasn't about what we can do for the consumer, it was all about how much more money --

MS. BEAVER: You have one minute remaining.

MR. COFFEY: Thank you -- how much more money can you make for us by selling more cars.

This is the most perverted PFD I have ever seen. The only thing I can say about SOAH producing a PFD like this, knowing what they knew, is that they simply didn't understand the board's mission. They didn't understand the board's mission statement to take care of the consumer over the interests of anybody else, including the almighty distributor.

So we are absolutely opposed to this PFD, we

will fight it every step of the way as far as it takes, 1 2 and Volvo has done an unjust thing by attempting to terminate its oldest dealer in the State of Texas from the 3 4 location that it, in fact, chose just because Volvo wanted 5 another dealer out on the highway rather than on Old Katy 6 Road. And we again urge you board members to reject this 7 PFD and --8 MS. BEAVER: Your seven minutes are over. 9 MR. COFFEY: Thank you. 10 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. We will now hear from Mr. Brit Brown and Mr. 11

We will now hear from Mr. Brit Brown and Mr. Benjamin Escobar for the respondent. Again, you will have seven minutes to speak and staff will state on the record a one-minute notice and a notice when your time ends. Time begins as soon as you unmute yourself and start speaking.

Mr. Brown, are you ready to go?

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, sir, Mr. Brown, you can start now.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

First, a point that Mr. Coffey made which totally agree and I apologize. The photograph does have the wrong circle, and when the circle was superimposed on the photograph -- and we, frankly, just noticed this -- it

slipped down. Actually where the circle is mistakenly shows Star closer to the freeway than they are. Star is on the other side of the Old Katy Freeway, further away from I-10. It's even worse than what my demonstrative shows, but my demonstrative is wrong and I correctly stand corrected by Mr. Coffey.

1.3

2.3

Some other photographs, frankly, these photographs that were submitted were all admitted into the record, I think, without objection. Some of the photographs that we did not submit that maybe we should have to give an idea is the new customer lounge, I think, was just started like a year or so, maybe two before the final hearing. The customer lounge is an interior --

MR. COFFEY: I'm going to have to object to bringing in any new evidence that they did not bother to include in the record of the proceeding. I believe the very first thing that the board told us this morning was -- or Ms. Brewster perhaps told us, or maybe Ms. Beaver told us that there will be no new evidence considered by the board.

If the board is going to consider new evidence, then I want to open up the proceedings right now because we have a lot of new evidence about the pandemic which has reduced jobs in this state by a huge percentage. Thirtyfour jobs will be lost at Star Volvo in the event that

this PFD goes through. I believe that --1 2 MS. BEAVER: Mr. Coffey, I believe Mr. Treviño 3 is trying to speak. It looks like the chairman is muted. 4 MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Coffey, thank you very much 5 for that. 6 Tracey, do you have any comments on Mr. Brown's 7 comments there? MS. BEAVER: You're able to rule on any motions 8 9 or objections, and if there's any evidence outside the 10 record, it should not bed considered in this case. MR. TREVIÑO: So again, if this is outside the 11 record, Mr. Brown, we cannot admit it and I would ask you 12 13 to refrain from -- if it's in the record, go right ahead, 14 but again, to Mr. Coffey's point, if it's not in the 15 record we can't accept it because Mr. Coffey can also 16 bring things in and we don't want to re-litigate the case. 17 And also, just add Mr. Brown's time from when Mr. Coffey broke in so Mr. Brown will have full use of his 18 19 time. 20 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. Before I proceed, I know Mr. Coffey well and if he thought it went outside the 21 22 record, he may have thought of something I'm not aware of, 2.3 but my intent is not to go outside the record. 24 photographs I reference are inside the record, certainly

not part of my presentation materials that we were linked

25

to the page limit, but I don't think I have gone outside the record. Certainly it's not my intent.

But with that, may I proceed?

MR. TREVIÑO: Please.

1.3

2.3

MR. BROWN: The other discussion -- in fact, this is in the PFD -- is of the waiting area, and if you're read it, you might recall. The waiting area is an old salesman's office that was basically recaptured. They used this furniture that was reupholstered, they put the TV in that we gave to them, but it's a cinder block office that has no windows and to disguise the fact that it's an interior office with no windows, there are curtains hanging up against the cinder block.

It's not Brit Brown's testimony, it's even the discussions and admissions of Al Velasco, the sales manager, and Rodney Bunch, the service manager, that said that it has a negative impact when you don't have amenities. We don't have snacks, we don't have beverages, we only have coffee, or we don't have beverages or we don't have a nice sitting area.

Rodney Bunch even testified that he's worried because they don't have air conditioning in the service bays. He's worried of losing good technicians working in a pretty harsh environment.

But more perhaps unique is the fact that

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342 they're the only dealer that does not have an airconditioned customer write-up area for service work. The
customer sits or stands outside in the service bay area,
exposed to the fumes, the noise and the Houston heat and
humidity -- if you're wearing a suit and tie, good luck -and that's where you do your service write-up. The only
dealer in the Texas market, southern market, frankly, that
doesn't have an air- conditioned area for the customers to
write up their service.

1.3

2.3

A couple of things I wanted to refute. I implore the board to look at the evidence that was actually submitted. There were several claims that were made in argument and also on the record during the hearing. No evidence was presented to support it and the ALJs make that clear when there's no evidence to support it.

For example, this trumped CSI/SSI or other bonus programs. The ALJs did find a technical error with the CSI/SSI program. Another case we tried a year before in front of ALJs Bennett and Vickery -- this is in the record because we briefed it -- said that those programs were valid under Texas law.

Regardless, what these ALJs -- ALJs Barnes and Card said that even if there's a violation, there's no evidence that anything regarding the CSI/SSI or any other

program at all deterred from Star's ability to market and sell vehicles. To the contrary, even during those years where all dealers received the same bonus, there was no differentiation. There was no improvement in their performance, and that was key.

1.3

2.3

Even their expert witness, again, Ted Stockton, testified that he had no analysis. He has no reason to believe, based on analysis or study, that the lack of bonuses under CSI or SSI impaired sales at all. And he also admitted that there was no material difference in performance at all even when they were getting the bonus, the years that they were getting the bonus. We do have an exhibit in our set that illustrates that by bar chart.

But he also acknowledged, Ted Stockton -- and not just Mr. Stockton as the expert -- that every one of the bonus programs, all the others were held to be legal and typical in the industry, that all the other programs, all of them, incur a cost and the cost is typically more than the value of the bonus. You spend a lot of money to build a new facility or to upgrade your facility and any bonus that's provided is not going to come close to offsetting that cost. In fact, by the nature of the program, even for relatively small upgrades, the bonus could never exceed 40 percent of the cost that the dealer incurred.

So going to this new facility that they proposed building, and the first suggestion of it was June 2018. This was before the September trial, after the case was already two years, four months old, and after this had been discussed with the parties for years, not just new facility but new location.

1.3

2.3

The new facility is also shown on that map, it's the same place. Ted Stockton admitted that, yeah, you're still not going to have the billboard effect, you're still not going to have the high visibility, or you're still not going to have high traffic. You're still not going to be a high volume dealership when you stay in that location.

But what they propose, to be clear, is a 46,000 square foot facility, which would be larger than any other facility in Houston -- in fact, I think, but I'm not sure of the record, I'll stick with Houston, that's the only thing I know is in the record. They had no budget on how much it would cost, not even how much it would cost to staff or air-condition it.

MS. BEAVER: One minute remaining.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

They had no business plan on who they were going to staff it. They had no cost-benefit analysis.

They had no analysis at all on whether or not they would

1 be able to generate a profit. 2 In fact, Mr. Seureau testified he doesn't like to do business plans. He just had a number in his head of 3 4 500 a year, which the ALJs correctly noted was far, far by 5 many multiples greater than any number they'd ever sold, 6 and he's not even sure if 500 a year would support that 7 facility. So it wasn't a serious offer. It was done 8 9 right on the eve of the final hearing. It was done for 10 obvious reasons, and frankly, had they built it, it would have been a very expensive eyesore. It would have been 11 bad for him and for us. 12 13 He's talking about an \$18 million cost when he 14 hadn't even done anything but change the paint on his 15 existing facility. 16 Sir, I think I'm probably done. Thank you. MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you very much, Mr. 17 18 Brown. 19 Thank you both for staying within the allotted time. 20 21 Now we'll open it up to any questions from 22 board members. Anyone have any questions? 2.3 Member Gillman, the chair recognizes Member 24 Gillman.

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. GILLMAN: Can you hear me now?

25

MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, I can. 1 2 MS. GILLMAN: Brett, I didn't want to jump in 3 front of you. MR. TREVIÑO: 4 No. You're doing fine, Member 5 Gillman. Jump on in. 6 MR. GRAHAM: No problem. 7 MS. GILLMAN: Okay. Well, to address just some 8 of the points, I wanted to say that from my perspective I 9 think that Mr. Coffey, the way you began your presentation 10 is exactly correct, that the main job of this board is consumer protection and serving Texans, and from what I 11 12 have heard, even though there is a whole lot of chatter 13 about other things, Star Motor Cars undisputedly has 14 performed service well. 15 They have sold cars and they have happy 16 customers. They have trained employees, and for many, 17 many years -- I think you said one of the first Volvo dealers in Texas. Fifty years, that's a long time. 18 19 So I think that there's no consumer harm here. 20 Secondly --MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman, I don't want to 21 22 interrupt you but when we start discussing the motions I 2.3 think that's a good time to -- do you have any specific

questions for them? And then we'll move to the

discussions around any motions made by members.

24

25

| 1 | MS. GILLMAN: Yes, I do. |
|----|---|
| 2 | In the testimony of Mr. Velasco, can you tell |
| 3 | me how long did Mr. Velasco work for Star Motor Cars? |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Coffey, you're back on. |
| 5 | MR. COFFEY: I was just asking if that question |
| 6 | was directed to me. |
| 7 | MS. GILLMAN: I don't care who answers as long |
| 8 | as someone does. |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Does anybody know how long Mr. |
| 10 | Velasco worked for the dealership? |
| 11 | MR. COFFEY: I can give you a ballpark figure. |
| 12 | He was relatively new to Star Motor Cars. It was under |
| 13 | two years is my understanding. |
| 14 | MS. GILLMAN: Thank you. |
| 15 | MR. COFFEY: Yes. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Under two years. Okay. |
| 17 | MS. GILLMAN: I'll refrain from discussion |
| 18 | topics until after questions. |
| 19 | MR. TREVIÑO: You will have plenty of time. |
| 20 | I'll make sure you've got all the time you need for |
| 21 | discussion, but at this point I think it would be good to |
| 22 | get through any questions from any board members. |
| 23 | I think you had some questions earlier. Have |
| 24 | they been satisfied? |
| 25 | MR. GRAHAM: Was that for me, Mr. Chairman? |

MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, sir.

2.3

2 MR. GRAHAM: No. I do have questions, yes, 3 sir.

MR. TREVIÑO: Go right ahead.

MR. GRAHAM: I will start with Mr. Coffey.

There's evidence in the record clearly that the facility was dated, the signage was dated, had been for many years, and it appears from the PFD that your contract obligated you in your contractual relationship with Volvo to meet some requirements to maintain those facilities. My question for you would be, how did SOAH misinterpret that part of the contract.

MR. COFFEY: Well, I think, if that's for me, Mr. Graham, I'll be happy to answer it. I think SOAH placed undue emphasis on a provision in the franchise agreement that said -- and it's an ancient provision, no longer valid in the State of Texas -- but basically it said you have to provide a facility reasonably satisfactory to the distributor, words to that effect. I'm not quoting there, I'm giving you my best recollection.

Those types of provisions are not really enforceable in this industry in the State of Texas because of all the protections that we have in the Texas

Occupations Code. In other words, everything now has to

be reasonable from a disinterested observer's perspective.

2.3

You can't go in with a contract and say we're going to terminate you because you didn't satisfy us.

They have to be reasonable criteria in order for you to enforce a provision like that. We argued up and down that these were not reasonable provisions.

Volvo built the facility. It's well maintained, it's well staffed. The only thing it didn't have was the new face that Volvo wanted. So the question comes down: Can Volvo require a new face and in this case a relocation every ten years, or whatever it is, that their market plan called for? We say no. Apparently SOAH disagreed with us and said yes.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

You just clarified but it's -- Mr. Brown did confirm that you said that they -- you discussed earlier that they refused your proposed facility but it wasn't until two years after the termination was sent. So that to me seems that that's after the fact, and really, I don't even know that it should be considered in the case of a termination agreement at the time it was filed. Just like to get your thoughts on that.

MR. COFFEY: And I can understand your perspective on that. You have to remember, however, that this statute says that the board is required to consider

all existing circumstances. We believe that Star Motor Cars' good faith attempt to build the facility and cure the breach is a circumstance that has to be considered because the statute requires it.

2.3

Now, Mr. Brown -- who I respect greatly -- went to the trouble of advising you that it was not a sincere attempt, that it came after the fact. It came too late in the proceedings, and therefore, we have to assume that it is a phony proposal.

The only reason that proposal came late was because for years Star Motor Cars tried to get Volvo to work with it and help them come up with a design, a plan that would conform that facility to their image. They never did that. They never made any attempt, not even a specious attempt to comply to work with Star Motor Cars.

Towards the end of the proceedings, as we felt that that was a big issue for the ALJs, we finally decided to put up the money, and it cost, I don't know, \$116,000 plus another, I don't know, \$8- or \$9,000 just to make the application to Volvo. So it's not a specious attempt.

Star put its money where its mouth is, had those plans drawn up by Volvo's own designers and engineers and made the best application it knew how to make. We were astonished -- after hearing for all these weeks or months that it was the facility, facility,

facility that was the problem, we were astonished to find out, as shown in slides 9 and 10, that it was really location.

1.3

2.3

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Coffey, that's great, and I'm just trying to be respectful of everybody else's time. I appreciate all of that. I want to follow up with that and ask you, as I have looked at the -- and this is just along that same line -- I have looked at some of the locations of other luxury car lines in that downtown area. Is it fair for me to call it the downtown area? Is that generally where it is?

I live in Sherman, Texas, so to me it looks like it's pretty close to downtown. It's very populated, very dense. And I'm looking at these other automotive lines, I really don't see any other lines, yours or others, located on an interstate. Is it even plausible to build -- I mean, I say plausible, whether that's land or spending a reasonable amount of money to build on an interstate location in that area?

MR. COFFEY: Well, I don't know if it's plausible or not, Member Graham. We never explored that.

Volvo never came up with any kind of a specific location for us to consider. I'm sure Star Motor Cars would have at least considered it and run the numbers on it to see if it was financially viable. Never got to that point.

What I can tell you, as far as your earlier question is concerned, Old Katy Road is not exactly downtown but I would call it on the fringes of downtown. It's very close to the neighborhoods of River Oaks and Tanglewood, which are old neighborhoods which were originally developed just outside of the downtown area of Houston, so close to downtown but not exactly there.

2.3

Now, you're getting to a very good point, Mr. Graham, and that is why don't we see other dealerships as close in as Star Motor Cars, and the reason for that is that the industry changed immensely over the last 50 years. Factories used to want their dealerships downtown.

They don't want them downtown anymore. They want them out on major freeways where they can get that billboard effect of thousands and thousands of cars going by the dealership every day. That's the reason why we don't have downtown dealerships anymore.

Star Motor Cars is somewhat of an outlier. It chose to continue to serve those inner -- not inner city but inter-communities of River Oaks, Tanglewood, Jersey Village, all those very highly affluent neighborhoods whose customers Star had been servicing for all those decades.

Star Motor Cars was not as interested in making a lot of money out on a freeway; it was more interested

in taking care of the same customers, generations of them, that it had taken care of for decades. That was what motivated Star Motor Cars.

And we sincerely believe that there is still room in this industry for a dealership like Star Motor Cars that wants to take care of its long-term generations of customers and is not interested in just slinging metal out on the highway. So that's what motivates Star Motor Cars and that's why we're fighting so hard in this case.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

2.3

I have one last question for Mr. Coffey before we discuss a few questions for Mr. Brown.

Mr. Coffey, it appears from the PFD that over the course of the years you did make more significant investments -- and if this is not in the record, I think it is, if it's not in the record, tell me -- I believe it clarified that the other lines, there were investments made in those but not in the Volvo facilities. Was that in the record? Can anyone tell me that?

MR. COFFEY: I think that argument was made,
Mr. Graham, but it isn't true. There was an enormous
investment made in the Volvo facility and much more would
have been made. If we could get Volvo to cooperate with
us and come up with a plan, Star would have spent whatever
was necessary to achieve the face that Volvo wanted.

But they wouldn't help us on that and so 1 2 basically it just got shoved off and shoved off until it 3 got to the point in the case where we felt like, we've got 4 to do something. We can't rely on Volvo to help us, let's 5 just propose the kind of facility that they want or that 6 they say they want on the existing Star campus. 7 That's what we did, and we saw from exhibits 9 and 10 or slides 9 and 10 that it was never really about 8 9 the facility, it was all about location. They wanted us 10 out on the highway. 11 But we were never noticed with termination on location, and there's no provision in the code that would 12 1.3 have allowed Volvo to terminate us because we didn't move 14 to a location which they never told us they wanted us to 15 have and from a location which they, in fact, chose 16 themselves. 17 MR. GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Coffey. MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, before you proceed 18 19 with the other questions, let me just check and see if 20 other board members have questions. MR. GRAHAM: That's fine. 21 22 MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt. You're still on 2.3 mute. 24 MR. PREWITT: Sorry. My apologies.

Mr. Brown, on page 16 of the SOAH proposal for

25

decision, it states in the second paragraph: "Witnesses 1 described a general reluctance on Mr. Seureau's part to 3 make any significant upgrades to the facility or offer amenities that are standard at other dealerships." So I 4 5 quess what they're saying is they're trying to -- you 6 know, I'm going back between that and the slide which was shown on the presentation from other counsel on the 7 customer service desk. That's interesting. 8 9 A couple of questions. When was the decision 10

made to fix the splotched floor and why? Why did you not just leave it the same?

MR. COFFEY: Is that question for me, Mr. Prewitt, David Coffey?

MR. PREWITT: It is, yes.

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. I thought it was for me. I apologize.

> MR. PREWITT: No.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Prewitt.

MR. COFFEY: I think that was for me, Mr.

MR. PREWITT: It was.

MR. COFFEY: I'm not sure that the record reflects exactly when the improvements were made to that part of the facility. I do know that they used a photo prior to the improvements being implemented at the facility. In other words, by the time we got to trial,

they were using an old photo which showed the facility 1 before the improvements were made. 3 Star Motor Cars -- the evidence did show that 4 Star Motor Cars was continuously improving its facility to 5 better serve the customer. We couldn't put a new face on 6 it because that requires Volvo's approval. They have to 7 come in with the plans and say, hey, you've got to do it 8 this way. 9 We kept trying to get them to tell us how they 10 would want it done. They never would tell us how they wanted it done, and we know now the reason for that was 11 12 because they didn't want to do anything with Star Motor 13 Cars' existing facility. If anything, they wanted Star 14 Motor Cars out on the highway. 15 So I hope that answers your question, sir. 16 MR. PREWITT: It does. Thank you. 17 MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Brown, do you know when those 18 changes were made? 19 MR. BROWN: Sorry, sir. Is that a question to 20 me? MR. TREVIÑO: 21 That's for Mr. Brown, yes, 22 because Mr. Coffey couldn't say when they were. So if you 2.3 could just add a little color about the dates when those 24 changes were made.

MR. BROWN:

Yes, sir, I can, and there was

25

discussion at the trial on it. I don't know if it's in the PFD. The changes were made pretty shortly prior to trial.

The photographs that were submitted, and I think admitted without objection, were also taken after the commencement of the termination. So the photographs would be after February 2016, the photographs that we put, you know, without the painted floor. The painted floors were done much closer to the time of trial. I don't recall the month and year but I think it was 2018.

MR. TREVIÑO: If it's not part of the record, Mr. Brown, please leave that out.

MR. BROWN: It is part of the record. I don't think it's part of the PFD. So in other words, there's testimony on it on the record but I don't think it's listed in the PFD, but it was, I think, in 2018.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: And sir, can I ask a question of you, sir?

MR. TREVIÑO: Before you do that, Mr. Prewitt has his hand raised.

MR. PREWITT: Let me ask our attorney, Tracey Beaver, if I can ask this question. But Mr. Brown, was Volvo's permission required for them to paint the floor and maintain the facility?

MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, for the record.

1.3

2.3

Of course, that question can be answered and Mr. Brown can let you know if that's something is that outside of the record and that he doesn't have the information to provide to you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I can't answer that and I can tell you how it's in the record because it wasn't asked in that way but it was painting the floor, the roof, the lighting. All those things were considered nothing but maintenance work, which is the responsibility of the dealer and the total right of the dealer. They don't have to get our consent to do it.

MR. PREWITT: So what you're saying is in opposition, I believe, to what Counselor Coffey said which was, it required Volvo's permission to make those maintenance decisions. Is that correct?

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir, that did not require

Volvo's permission. And that's not how I heard Mr.

Coffey's comments, but definitely they did not require our

permission to do ordinary maintenance, including the

painting the floor, as the example given.

MR. PREWITT: You know, I keep going back to the statement Mr. Coffey made in his comments about putting the interests of consumers first and being part of

our mission statement for the Texas Department of Motor

Vehicles. And I guess what I'm really trying to determine

in a more intangible sense is what the spirit of the

dealership is in terms of how it wants to do that, how it

wants to put the interests of consumers first.

2.3

Mr. Coffey, could you give me examples of how the dealership has done that when I've seen evidence presented by opposing counsel that you guys are sub par customer service in your rating both on a national and regional scale, local scale is where it is?

MR. COFFEY: Well, thank you, Mr. Prewitt. I'm not sure that they have ever made that allegation. I don't see how they could in light of the actual findings by the SOAH.

For example, slides 2 and 3 in our packet -- we have collected in slide 3, for example, findings of fact 151 through 163 and all of those are to the effect that we had a functional facility where all of Volvo's warranty procedures are being followed. Nothing improper or incorrect had ever been done in service. It was competent service which satisfied the customers -- that's finding of fact 161.

And in fact, in the entire proceeding, 50 years of service, they did not bring forward a single consumer complaint on anything that Star Motor Cars has done. That

is exceptional. In fact, in 30 years of practicing in this industry I've never seen a dealership that gets no consumer complaints, but they did not bring forward a single one. That is how Star Motor Cars satisfies the consumer: it does the work right the first time and whenever a customer, if they ever do have a complaint, Star Motor Cars fixes it.

1.3

2.3

Star Motor Cars is not as interested in selling maximum volumes of vehicles, it is interested in serving the same customers that it has served for generations.

That is Star Motor Cars. That is its mission statement.

Volvo does not want dealers like that anymore. It wants dealers that move metal in vast quantities so that Volvo can make more money.

I hope that answered your question, Mr. Prewitt.

MR. PREWITT: Thank you.

MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae.

MS. McRAE: I have a question, Chairman, for Mr. Coffey and Mr. Brown.

I guess I'll start with Mr. Coffey first. As part of the dealer agreement, I think that you mentioned that advertising falls under that agreement and you stated that Star out-advertised other dealers. What is -- how much do they spend in advertising, how do you measure

that?

MR. COFFEY: Thank you, Member McRae. This is David Coffey, I'll attempt to handle that.

We have an enormous amount of evidence in the record about what Star Motor Cars spent on advertising. I don't have any numbers directly at hand right now. I read that one excerpt from the record which references exhibits 171 and 174 -- which should be available to the board members -- those exhibits will contain the exact numbers.

But what we conclude from them is that Star outspent every other Houston dealer by \$700 per new vehicle sold. That, in fact, is how the manufacturer measures whether or not you are doing sufficient advertising is by amount of dollars per new vehicle sold.

2.3

In other words, they want to know how much per vehicle you are advertising on average because a big dealer that spends millions on advertising can look really good over a smaller dealer that spends less but spends more per new vehicle sold. So that's how it's measured, and Star Motor Cars was at the top of the chart in that category. Star Motor Cars spends the money to advertise the product for a number of different reasons.

MS. McRAE: Okay. Thank you.

And Mr. Brown, I'm assuming that based on Mr.

Coffey's statement as far as the advertising, when comparing this data as far as advertising, is it like just the Houston market or is it the national market for Volvo?

2.3

MR. BROWN: I think I can answer that, ma'am.

First of all, I don't believe that's what the exhibit says. It's certainly not what the testimony said. Star is not outspending other dealers. In certain segments, in certain snapshots of time they might on a per car basis, but that's because at that time they may have sold 20 as opposed to 4- or 500 for another dealer.

Now, going to the advertising. The advertising, depending on the year you look at, has both national initiatives, has local advertising initiatives and then has a dealer-only initiative, be it website, email flyers, signage, whatever it might be. In that category the testimony was pretty clear -- and the findings of facts specifically talk about they're just grossly inadequate.

And I can give you a for instance that's in the proposal for decision and a finding of fact. The website -- and the testimony was uncontested -- new buyers look at websites before they go to dealers, a lot of them do. And it was uncontested by both Rodney Bunch and also Al Velasco, their sales and service managers, that their website turned off people, not just the facility.

During the trial we pulled up the website, took screen shots, admitted them into the evidence, it's in the record, their website does not show any price incentives, any special deals, any kind of product specials or service specials. In fact, when you look at the people that could assist you, it identified at least one person that had died over a year before and a couple of members, at least two that I remember, that had been gone, had left the dealership for quite some time.

2.3

This materializes when it comes to internet leads. Internet leads is part of the advertising but it's something that Volvo finances, so leads that come in to the Volvo site of people that have an interest in buying a Volvo, Volvo will send those to the dealer.

Star received more internet leads than any other dealer in the Houston market, mainly because their AOR was so high potential, but they had by far the lowest close rate, less than 2 percent of internet leads, which was far, far, far lower than the Houston, Texas, southern or the national average. They weren't taking advantage even of the Volvo effort.

Now, maybe I'll stop there. I don't want to abuse the courtesy of the board. But one question I had, there are several statements that kind of touch, Member McRae, on advertising but not directly on your question

that were asked to Mr. Coffey that I would like maybe an 1 2 opportunity to rebut or respond to, but I won't do that 3 now because I'm not sure if that's appropriate. 4 Member McRae, I think I responded to your 5 direct question, I believe; hopefully I did. 6 MS. McRAE: You did. Thank you. 7 MR. BROWN: Yes, ma'am. MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn. 8 9 MS. WASHBURN: Yes. So I have a question based 10 on some of the answers you guys gave to some of these questions. So I heard Star is a niche player in the 11 12 market, that they're not really interested in volume the manufacturer or the distributor would like. Then I heard 1.3 14 that the amount for the facility, I heard \$16 million and 15 I heard \$18 million, so I don't know which one was right, 16 but let's call it \$16 million. So they're not interested 17 in volume yet they want to spend \$16 million to build a 18 new facility. How would you support that? 19 MR. COFFEY: Is that for me, Board Member, 20 David Coffey? 21 MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn, who is that 22 question addressed to? 2.3 MS. WASHBURN: I'm sorry. Mr. Coffey. 24 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. 25 MR. COFFEY: Thank you, Member Washburn.

would Star Motor Cars build such a large and expensive facility if it wasn't interested in selling high volumes of automobiles? Let me just say this, Volvo assigned Star Motor Cars a planning volume of 500 new vehicles per year.

2.3

A planning volume is basically what the manufacturer says your market will support. This is what you should sell, if you don't sell it, we may have words with you. Five hundred new vehicles per year is what Volvo assigned Star Motor Cars in its existing facility at its existing location. Star Motor Cars used that number on which to base the amount of money that it would or could spend on a new facility.

We put all this evidence into the record, including the fact that that 500 new vehicles per year was Volvo's number and then they come in -- you saw exhibits 9 and 10 -- and they say, hey, your location is never going to support 500 new vehicles per year. You're building too expensive a facility for a location that isn't going to sell that many vehicles.

Well, if, in fact, that's the case, Volvo, why did you assign that number to us as a planning volume?

Why did you give us reason to believe that we should use that 500 vehicles per year as our projected sales on which to base the amount of investment that we would be willing to put into that facility?

At any rate, \$16 million, it might be a little 1 2 large but that's because Volvo -- I mean Star Motor Cars 3 wanted a big service facility and it expected to grow with 4 the Volvo product. Star Motor Cars has a lot of belief in 5 the Volvo product. It has really improved over recent 6 years, and Star Motor Cars likes the product, believes 7 that it can sell a lot of it into the affluent communities 8 that surround the dealership. That's the reason why Star 9 was willing to build such a large facility and put so much 10 money into it. I hope that answers your question, ma'am. 11 MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn, do you have any 12 13 other questions? 14 MS. WASHBURN: No. 15 MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Any other board members? 16 MR. BROWN: I apologize, Mr. Chairman. This is 17 Mr. Brown. Can I comment on that last question also?

Mr. Brown. Can I comment on that last question also?

MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn, that is your prerogative. You can ask Mr. Brown any questions that you feel are necessary.

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. WASHBURN: Yeah. I would like to hear your point on that question because -- and maybe I didn't ask the question correctly -- I heard at the beginning that Star wants to be a niche player, protect the public by not selling as many cars -- hope that that is correct -- yet

wants to build a \$16 million facility, and I heard they haven't been profitable. Like how would that work, in your opinion?

2.3

MR. BROWN: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. And first, the number \$18 million, there's different numbers thrown out, \$18 million is on page 22 of the PFD or it's page 41 of the eBook that references that, that's both the facility and the land.

To answer your specific question, there was a lot of testimony on that, and the concern, and frankly, we believe the impossibility -- and so did the ALJs -- that you would never be able to support a facility of 46,000 square feet, be it \$15- or \$18 million, whatever it was, at that location, particularly with all the other problems that they have that were specifically identified. It's not just the facility, it's the staffing, it's the location, it's the advertising, it's the budgeting, it's the lack of planning.

In testimony from Mr. Seureau, being asked specifically on this point, have you -- let me start back for a second. The planning volume, that's not the number we give to Star saying you better sell this or we're going to have problems with you. That's a mistake by Mr. Coffey.

The planning volume just says what the

potential of the AOR is, and it was 500-plus of the area. The target that they were given was far smaller, and the target is based on a percentage of planning volume and a percentage of your historic performance. But regardless, they never met their targets. It was always a much lower number.

1.3

2.3

But regardless, it's really unclear whether 500 cars would support that facility, it all depends on how you manage it. And what Mr. Seureau and Mr. Al Velasco both said, there's no planned budgeting, there is no intent to change the staffing. They're going to use the same staffing to start out with to see how it went. There is no estimate of what the cost of the building maintenance would be.

You know, we're talking about multiples over the existing facility, the multiples in cost would be there too. And there is no break-even analysis: how many cars would I have to sell for what price to even support the facility.

Our conclusion was and our recommendation -talking about the business recommendation, and it's in the
record -- was that if you're going to build a new
facility, be much more conservative. This is far too big
for you to support at this location. AOR is nice but this
location and your business practice is not going to do it.

We also said by itself you're not going to fix it; you have to change your business planning and management and staffing and structure. Which, by the way, Ted Stockton also agreed with. That's the Fontana Group expert witness for Star. Needless to say, our witnesses said it too, but their witnesses said it.

1.3

2.3

So you are not going to support the facility. You'd have a very expensive facility that would be grossly underutilized, that would not make a profit, that would not support its employees or maintenance of the facility -- even the existing facility is not running at a profit -- and it would just compound the problem, not cure it. And that was the findings of the ALJs as well in their findings of fact and discussion leading up to it.

MS. WASHBURN: Thank you.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member Washburn.

Any other questions from board members? Member Graham, I cut you off before and I think you had further questions. Were they addressed or would like to continue?

MR. GRAHAM: I do have some questions. And that's okay. I'm perfectly fine with that, Mr. Chairman. I want everybody to get their questions answered. I do have some questions for Mr. Brown.

And let me just start by -- I do want to

1 respectfully correct a statement that Mr. Brown made that 2 I don't believe to be factually correct at the very 3 beginning, where you had said any one of those seven items listed in the statute can be cause for termination, and I 4 5 think it is important to note that market penetration in 6 and of itself alone cannot be cause for termination. 7 Mr. Brown, would you consider that to be an 8 accurate statement? 9 MR. BROWN: You're right. The same section 10 says that that cannot be the sole motivation for 11 termination. You're correct. And there was a finding that that was not the sole motivation. 12 13 MR. GRAHAM: I just wanted to make sure 14 everyone was clear on that. 15 Okay. So my first question regarding the CSI 16 bonus programs that were found to be in violation of the 17 statute, and I did hear your testimony that they had previously been found to not be in violation but were now 18 19 found to be in violation. Are those CSI programs still in 20 place today? 21 MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, who is that 22 question directed towards? 2.3 MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Brown. 24 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. 25 MR. BROWN: No, sir.

MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, 1 2 for the record. 3 I'd just like to mention that that would be 4 outside the record, anything that happened after the case. 5 MR. GRAHAM: You're correct. Thank you. I 6 stand corrected on that. 7 MR. BROWN: Ms. Beaver, I would stand corrected 8 by Mr. Coffey, and I won't say if Mr. Coffey disagrees 9 with me, but I don't believe that's outside the record, 10 the answer to that question. It's not in the PFD but it is in the record, and if Mr. Coffey disagrees, I won't say 11 further. 12 1.3 MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Coffey? 14 MR. COFFEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how it 15 could be in the record. We're what, two years after that 16 record was created and now the question is are those 17 CSI/SSI programs still in effect. I just don't know how 18 Mr. Brown, who I respect immensely, how he can say that 19 and it be accurate. But maybe he can explain it. 20 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Coffey. 21 Mr. Brown, at the end of the record, at the 22 time of the record, were they still in effect? 2.3 MR. GRAHAM: There you go. 24 MR. BROWN: Not the bonus part of it. In other 25 words, they're still measurements but a bonus is not based

on CSI/SSI. That ended in 2018. 1 MR. TREVIÑO: So that was in the record? 2 3 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. It was discussed as far 4 as the plan. 5 MR. TREVIÑO: That was not in the record. 6 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir. MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, does that answer 7 8 your question? 9 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. Thank you for clarifying I should have restated that a little bit better. 10 11 Mr. Brown, was there any discussion in the 12 record as to -- and I'm sure you know I have a reason for 1.3 asking this -- was there any discussion in the record as 14 to what Volvo's plan was to -- if they were successful in 15 this termination, whether or not this AOR would be 16 reassigned to other dealers or whether there would be a 17 new dealer put in this AOR? Was there any discussion in the record on that subject? 18 19 MR. BROWN: Both Sandy Seidman and also Steve 20 Klipstein, both Volvo witnesses, they made it clear they 21 had not contacted anyone. They had not reached out to any 22 They had certainly not promised it to any prospects. 2.3 other party, but their plan would be to replace the

dealer. It's considered to be a very high volume, very

24

25

attractive AOR.

MR. GRAHAM: Okay. And would it be your -- was 1 2 there any discussion as to whether or not it was -- and 3 I'm looking back to the question on and my concern about 4 the location of this dealership. I mean, clearly it's not 5 located on a major interstate, and I just simply don't 6 know how another dealership -- how a new or replaced 7 dealership could be in that area. Could you shed any 8 light to me? 9 Maybe it doesn't necessarily have to be on an 10 interstate. Clearly, Volvo did not like the proposed new location put forward by Star. Is it even plausible in 11 12 your opinion, or was there anything in the record 13 regarding the ability of this dealer or another dealer to 14 put a location anywhere that had that visibility? 15 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir, and partially in the context of the last question you asked about would the 16 17 intent be to have a new dealer if termination was approved. There is a belief that there's acreage or 18

there's dirt that's more visible from the major artery -in this case I-10.

MR. TREVIÑO: I'm sorry to interrupt you. That was in the record. Right?

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir.

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. TREVIÑO: Go ahead.

MR. BROWN: And I also agree with Mr. Coffey,

| 1 | what he stated which I think was also in the record |
|----|---|
| 2 | which I agree with that there was never any intent to |
| 3 | move by Star nor did Star look at it. They were not |
| 4 | willing to look at it nor did they ever look at it, and |
| 5 | that was also in the record. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. |
| 7 | Member Graham? |
| 8 | MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. |
| 9 | Chairman. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Any other questions from board |
| 11 | members? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. If none, Tracey, are there |
| 14 | any comments from the public? |
| 15 | MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, |
| 16 | for the record. |
| 17 | No public comments. |
| 18 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, the chair would |
| 19 | entertain a motion from the board. The chair recognizes |
| 20 | Member Gillman. |
| 21 | You're on mute, Member Gillman. You're on |
| 22 | mute, I can't hear you. |
| 23 | MS. GILLMAN: Is it open for discussion? |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: We have to have a motion first |
| 25 | and a second, then we can have discussion, so we need a |

motion first. 1 2 MR. PREWITT: Mr. Chairman? MR. TREVIÑO: 3 The chair recognizes Member Prewitt. 4 5 MR. PREWITT: I would like to make a motion. Ι 6 move that the board uphold SOAH's PFD finding that the 7 termination of Star's franchise be approved and adopt the conclusions of law 1 through 24 and findings of fact 1 8 9 through 243, as stated in the proposal for decision, with 10 the changes to findings of fact 63 and 201 as recommended by SOAH's exceptions letter of June 24, 2019. 11 MR. TREVIÑO: I have a motion from Member 12 1.3 Prewitt. Do we have a second? 14 MS. WASHBURN: Second. 15 MR. TREVIÑO: Second from Member Washburn. 16 Now we're open for discussion. Member Prewitt, 17 you made the motion so I would give the courtesy, if you'd like, to start the discussion. 18 19 MR. PREWITT: I know this has been a case of 20 long standing since 2016, and obviously it appears from reading the history of the case it goes back farther than 21 22 that in terms of it seems like the two parties have been 2.3 at odds for some time. I keep going back to what was said 24 by Mr. Coffey and putting the interests of the consumer

25

first.

And it just appears -- as I look at this dealership and I look at the facts of the case and how SOAH handled the case, I feel that they made a decision of the right type. So that's the basis of me making this motion.

MR. TREVIÑO: Any other discussion, comments? Member Gillman, I think you had wanted to speak?

MS. GILLMAN: Yes.

2.3

MR. TREVIÑO: Go right ahead.

MS. GILLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to say that I think that while, yes, I agree that the parties have been at odds for many, many years, I'm so sorry that it's come to this. But as far as serving Texans and performing the sales and service, I think that they have done that, and I don't have any testimony of customer complaints. So that's my number one.

Number two is there's been a whole lot of conversation about location and through the years it seems that even though Volvo approved the location in 1970, you're right, things do change and traffic patterns change. It's not on a major freeway anymore, but what also has changed is Google Maps, and Google Maps, when you punch it in, it is ten minutes from River Oaks and ten minutes from Tanglewood, those two neighborhoods that you

all talked about.

1.3

2.3

And so I agree, it's not on a major freeway but the good news is in 2020 you don't need that. And in fact, I live in Houston and I don't go anywhere without punching in the traffic trying to figure out the fastest way for me to get there. So it's no longer necessary to be on the freeway.

MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman, you're muted again. I don't know how that happened but you got muted.

MS. GILLMAN: Okay. So I would respectfully disagree and reject the fact that Star Motor Cars needs to relocate because anyone using a cell phone these days can find them just fine.

Next on my list is while I guess it's fine to have an opinion from a sales manager that worked for two years, the Seureau family has, in fact, put their money where their mouth is. They have bought property, built buildings, furniture, special tools, equipment, trained technicians and salespeople. That is millions of dollars in investments over the years, and I guess I value that. Mr. Velasco does not counterbalance that investment in my eyes.

My next comment is about sales and being last in sales, and the good news is that just because you're last in sales doesn't mean that you violated the law in

Texas. Somebody has got to be last. There's going to be someone, and the good news is that we don't have cases in front of us every year for every manufacturer because there's got to be somebody that's last, and so I'm happy that that does not violate our law.

1.3

2.3

But my last point is about the CSI, and I appreciate the fact that two ALJs both said that their CSI programs violate the code. And so if that is true, if that is the fact, and if upon this motion and upon our vote you agree because it is in the conclusions of law from these judges that the CSI violates the code, I think it very appropriate for Volvo to stop violating the code, modify the CSI program, or the way it's calculated.

And I think it would be very appropriate for the department, the Motor Vehicle Department, to send a violation letter, a warning letter to Volvo calling them out, if the board agrees with the ALJ in that respect.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those are all my comments.

MR. GRAHAM: You're muted, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TREVIÑO: Is that better? I was telling you, Member Washburn, that you're on mute and I'm on mute. I apologize.

The chair recognizes Member Washburn.

MS. WASHBURN: Thank you. I'd also like to

make some comments.

1.3

2.3

First I would like to say that I recognize that this case involves someone's livelihood. It's a Volvo dealer that's been around for 50 years, so we need to take this very seriously, and I'm clearly aware of the consequences of the board's decision. But I do think we need to remember our role as the board.

Under Government Code Section 2001.058, the only way a board can change a finding of fact or a conclusion of law in a PFD is: number one, if the administrative law judge did not properly apply or interpret applicable law, rules or prior administrative decisions; two, if a board decision on which the ALJ relied is incorrect or should be changed; or three, because of a technical error in a finding of fact.

So you know, we're really not here to relitigate this case. What we are charged with, though, is reviewing the conclusions of law and findings of fact to determine if the judge failed to properly interpret the applicable law in the PFD.

The law issue in this case is Occupations Code 2301.455 which lists seven factors that the board must consider, and I know we've heard about a few of these, but I'd like to kind of quickly go through all of them so that we make sure that we're really looking at everything.

So the first one is dealer sales in relationship to the market. So if you look at findings of fact 108 to 132, this found that Star has the largest market opportunity in Houston but the lowest sales. In each year from 2012 to 2017, Star had the lowest sales effectiveness in Texas and often in the nation.

1.3

2.3

So Star's consistently low sales and failure to capitalize on the opportunity of having the largest planning volume in Houston weighs as a factor in termination. And as you understand, this is not the only factor that we should consider.

So the second factor in 2301.455 is the dealer's investment and obligations. If you take a look at findings of fact 133 through 142, it states that Mr. Seureau has demonstrated a longstanding reluctance to make even modest investments in this business. Other than basic maintenance, Star has made little investment in the building over the years, so this weighs in favor of termination.

Number three, injury or benefit to the public.

And I think we talked a little bit about this with the claim of, you know, the dealership being a small -- not small, I'm sorry -- a boutique-type dealership and that this would hurt the public, so just injury or benefit to the public. So if you look at findings of fact 143 to

148, it found that terminating the franchise agreement would not harm the public.

1.3

2.3

It also noted that local potential buyers were driving further to buy a Volvo from another dealership than from Star. So the public could potentially benefit from having a dealer that could provide better service and be in a better location, so this weighs in favor of termination.

The fourth factor is the adequacy of the dealer's service facilities, equipment, parts and personnel in relation to other dealers in like markets.

If you take a look at findings of fact 149 to 157, the ALJ found in favor of termination noting that Star had not made a significant upgrade in 50 years and the dated appearance might repel customers. Star is the only Volvo dealership in Houston or anywhere else that has not had a significant update in 50 years. The CSI scores show that compared to other Volvo dealers the service department ranks far below national average in customer satisfaction.

Number five, whether warranties are honored by the dealer. Findings of fact 158 to 163 found that Star follows warranty guidelines. Star is able to provide its customers with adequate warranty service and is honoring its customers' warranties. This factor should be found in favor of Star.

Number six is compliance with the franchise.

If you look at findings of fact 164 to 194 it discussed this at length and weighs in favor of termination. So a few of the facts include: Star is the worst performing dealer in the nation in terms of sales effectiveness and penetration each year since 2012; Star has a high number of vehicles come into its market each month and is routinely outsold in its own market by other Houston Volvo dealers; Star has also resisted the efforts of Volvo to modernize the business facility and increase sales; Star failed to develop a business strategy that would help overcome its limitations in its location in a low traffic area.

1.3

2.3

Number seven, and the final, is the enforceability of the franchise agreement. Findings of fact 195 through 197 note there's nothing to prove that Volvo's franchise agreement is unreasonable. Star is not complying with some of the core requirements of the agreement. This factors in favor of termination.

So in summary, there is considerable effort -I think everybody read, I don't know how many pages it
was, I had to read it several times to have the process of
the PFD -- but there's a lot of effort to explain the
ALJs' conclusions. Six of the seven statutory good cause
factors for termination have been met, and I agree with

SOAH's ALJs' conclusion.

2.3

And I know there's been a little bit of talk about the CSI bonus program, and while the judges found that Volvo's CSI bonus program violated code in conclusions of law 19 and 20, if you take a look at page 114 of the SOAH PFD, they did find that these violations do not affect the ultimate good cause for termination.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member Washburn.

Any other comments from board members?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, sir. This is Brett -- Board Member Graham.

MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Member Graham.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And Board Member Washburn, thank you for those comments. That was well stated and I'll try not cover some of the things you've already covered.

But just as I'm kind of digesting all this, looking through my notes, you know, no question that Star is a small dealer that's kind of built this business based on being a niche dealer. They're not a high volume operation.

I know that manufacturers want dealers that will sell as much as they can, but at the end of the day,

you know, in many cases dealers get to make those decisions how they run their business and this dealer has been in operation for 50 years. Clearly they have done a pretty good job and have other dealerships. They may not be the largest, most sophisticated dealer, but that's their prerogative, and a manufacturer just simply can't dictate to a dealer how they run their business.

2.3

That being said, a relationship between a manufacturer and a dealer is a two-way street and it requires effort from both parties to end up serving the customer in the best way they can at the end of the day. Clearly this dealer did not make the financial investments that they could have and very possibly should have, and that is clearly stated all throughout the record.

And there's things that I will agree with and disagree with, that I like and I don't like, but at the end of the day the only thing that really matters is did the ALJs' decisions -- did they properly apply and interpret the law, did they rely on accurate administrative decisions and make no technical errors in findings of fact.

As I said, there's some things I don't particularly like about this case but I have not been able to identify where they misinterpreted the law, and if somebody knows better, please speak up. But that is where

| 1 | I am at on this case. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you for your comments, |
| 4 | Member Graham. |
| 5 | Are there any further comments from the board |
| 6 | members? |
| 7 | (No response.) |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: I would like to echo Member |
| 9 | Gillman's and Member Washburn's comments about that I'm |
| 10 | very sorry that this case has had to come before this |
| 11 | board, very sad state of affairs. |
| 12 | So hearing no more comments, any further |
| 13 | comments? |
| 14 | (No response.) |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: I will call for the vote. Board |
| 16 | members, when I call your name, please state your vote for |
| 17 | the record. |
| 18 | Board Member Gillman? You're on mute. Member |
| 19 | Gillman, you're on mute, still don't hear you. |
| 20 | MS. GILLMAN: I vote nay. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Nay from Member Gillman. |
| 22 | Member Graham? |
| 23 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 25 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |

| 1 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 4 | MR. SCOTT: Opposed. |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Nay. Two opposed. |
| 6 | Member Washburn? |
| 7 | MS. WASHBURN: Aye. |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: And I, Chairman Treviño, also |
| 9 | vote aye. |
| 10 | So that is one, two, three, four, five ayes, |
| 11 | two opposed. Let the record reflect that there are five |
| 12 | votes for, two votes against. The members voting aye are |
| 13 | Graham, Prewitt, Washburn, and myself and Member McRae. |
| 14 | Is that correct? Members voting against are Member |
| 15 | Gillman and Member Scott. |
| 16 | MS. GILLMAN: Correct. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: The vote is five to two, the |
| 18 | motion carries. |
| 19 | MR. PREWITT: Mr. Chairman? |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt. |
| 21 | MR. PREWITT: Could I recommend a five-minute |
| 22 | break, please? |
| 23 | MR. TREVIÑO: Certainly, Member Prewitt. Thank |
| 24 | you very much for your suggestion. We'll have a five- |
| 25 | minute break and be back in five minutes. |

| 1 | MR. BROWN: Can we be excused? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. TREVIÑO: Pardon me? |
| 3 | MR. BROWN: Can counsel be excused? |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes. Mr. Coffey, Mr. Brown, |
| 5 | thank you very much for your comments and for staying |
| 6 | within the allotted time. We appreciate your efforts. |
| 7 | Thank you. |
| 8 | (Whereupon, at 10:14 a.m., a brief recess was |
| 9 | taken.) |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: It's approximately 10:22 and the |
| 11 | board is back in session. |
| 12 | So we will move on to agenda item 6 which is |
| 13 | rule adoption, and I'll turn it over to Daniel Avitia and |
| 14 | Roland Luna, Sr. to discuss agenda item 6. |
| 15 | MS. GILLMAN: Is everyone back, Memo? |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Let me call roll. That's |
| 17 | a good question. |
| 18 | Board Member Gillman? |
| 19 | MS. GILLMAN: Present. |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: Board Member Graham? |
| 21 | MR. GRAHAM: Here. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Board Member McRae? |
| 23 | MS. McRAE: Here. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Board Member Prewitt? |
| 25 | MR. PREWITT: Here. |

MR. TREVIÑO: Board Member Scott? 1 2 MR. SCOTT: Here. MR. TREVIÑO: Board Member Washburn? 3 4 MS. WASHBURN: Here. 5 MR. TREVIÑO: And I, Chair Treviño, am still 6 here, and Member Bacarisse is not present today. So with 7 that, we have everybody present. 8 And Daniel and Roland, we'll turn it over to 9 you. 10 MR. AVITIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman and members, Ms. Brewster, good 11 morning. For the record, Daniel Avitia, deputy director, 12 13 Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. I will be co-14 presenting today with Mr. Roland Luna, the director of the 15 Motor Vehicle Division. 16 Chairman, members, today we are asking the board's permission to adopt criminal history and fitness 17 rules. This rule package is listed on your agenda as item 18 19 number 6 and details may be found on pages 313 to 365 of 20 your board books. 21 This rule package has three proposals: 22 Chapter 211 which applies to both motor vehicle 2.3 distribution and salvage vehicle dealers, and two related 24 fitness proposals, the first for 215, Motor Vehicle

Distribution, and the second for 221, Salvage Dealers.

25

This rule package implements the Sunset Advisory

Commission's recommendation 4.6 to implement criminal
history evaluation rules for the salvage industry,

consistent with Occupations Code, Chapter 53, and three
bills passed in the 86th Legislative Session to include
Senate Bill 604, House Bill 1342, and Senate Bill 1217.

2.3

We believe these rules strike a good balance between protecting the public by maintaining high fitness standards for license holders while also implementing the legislature and statutory intent to enhance opportunities for convicted persons to obtain gainful employment after completing their sentences.

In his October 8, 2019 letter, Governor Abbott requested government agencies to carefully review occupational licensing requirements, ensure rules are not overly burdensome to potential license holders or consumers. We believe this rule package implements the governor's directive.

This rule package was published for comment in the June 26, 2020 issue of the *Texas Register*. The comment period closed July 27, 2020. The department received written comments from the Lubbock County Tax Assessor-Collector, the Tax Assessor-Collectors
Association of Texas, and the Texas Automobile Dealers
Association. All comments received were addressed in the

preamble sections and rule text was clarified in response 1 to one comment. 3 If the board adopts these rules this morning, 4 staff anticipates publication in the October 16, 2020 5 issue of the Texas Register, with an effective date of 6 October 31, 2020. 7 Chairman, members, we certainly request your 8 approval to adopt this rule package. Before I conclude my 9 remarks, I'd like to certainly recognize the long term 10 hard work provided by the Office of the General Counsel, the Motor Vehicle Division, the Enforcement Division, as 11 well as to thank them for their efforts on these rules. 12 13 Members, this concludes my remarks. I'm 14 certainly happy to answer any questions you may have. MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Avitia, thank you 15 16 for the presentation. 17 Do any members have any questions for Mr. Avitia or Mr. Luna? 18 19 Member McRae. 20 MS. McRAE: I just want to clarify that it is 21 convicted in order to lose license eligibility. Correct? 22 MR. AVITIA: Member McRae, yes, ma'am. Thank 2.3 you for that question. It is conviction that would

require us to consider any license determinations as an

arrest does not imply that an individual is convicted or

24

25

| 1 | is guilty of anything at that time. |
|-----|--|
| 2 | MS. McRAE: Thank you. |
| 3 | MR. AVITIA: Yes, ma'am. |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member McRae, for that |
| 5 | question. |
| 6 | Any other questions from board members? |
| 7 | MR. GRAHAM: This is Brett. I would just add, |
| 8 | Board Member McRae, that I did get clarification on the |
| 9 | question that you just asked and there was a word that had |
| 10 | been included, I think it was "deemed," and what exactly |
| 11 | does deemed mean. Anyway, that has been struck from it so |
| 12 | that kind of just cleaned that up. And I had the same |
| 13 | question, I just wanted to share that with you. |
| 14 | Mr. Chairman, I have a motion when the board |
| 15 | will hear one. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Are there any other |
| 17 | questions from any board members? |
| 18 | (No response.) |
| 19 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, the chair would |
| 20 | entertain a motion. |
| 21 | MR. GRAHAM: I move that the board approve the |
| 22 | adoption of rules in agenda item 6, as recommended by |
| 23 | staff, including New Chapter 211.1 through 211.5 |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, hold on a second. |
| 2.5 | T apologize. |

| 1 | Tracey, are there any comments from the public |
|----|--|
| 2 | on this? |
| 3 | MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, |
| 4 | for the record. |
| 5 | No, no public comments. Thank you. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, I apologize. |
| 7 | MR. GRAHAM: No apology needed. Your job is to |
| 8 | keep us out of trouble, Mr. Chairman, so I'm down with |
| 9 | that. |
| 10 | Mr. Chairman, I will move that the board |
| 11 | approve the adoption of rules in agenda item 6, as |
| 12 | recommended by staff, including New Chapter 211.1 through |
| 13 | 211.5, amendment to Section 215.89, and repeal of Section |
| 14 | 215.88, and amendments to Sections 221.15, 221.19, 221.111 |
| 15 | and 221.112, and repeal of Sections 221.113 and 221.114. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham, thank you very |
| 17 | much for that motion. |
| 18 | Do we have a second? |
| 19 | MR. PREWITT: (No audible response.) |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Member |
| 21 | Prewitt. |
| 22 | Any discussion? |
| 23 | (No response.) |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I would call for |
| 25 | the vote. Please board members, when I call your name |

| 1 | please state your vote for the record. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I'm sorry. Member Gillman, did you have a |
| 3 | question? |
| 4 | MS. GILLMAN: No, sir. I'm anticipating you |
| 5 | calling my name. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Thank you very much for |
| 7 | anticipating. |
| 8 | Member Gillman? |
| 9 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Aye. |
| 11 | Member Graham? |
| 12 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 14 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 16 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? Member Scott? |
| 18 | Going once, going twice, Member Scott? |
| 19 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: Aye. |
| 21 | Member Washburn? |
| 22 | MS. WASHBURN: Aye. |
| 23 | MR. TREVIÑO: And I, Chairman Treviño, also |
| 24 | vote aye. |
| 25 | Let the record reflect that it's unanimous and |

the motion carries. 1 2 MR. AVITIA: Thank you, Chairman, members. 3 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Avitia and Mr. 4 Luna. 5 We will now move on. We will now hear item 7, 6 and I will turn it over to Mr. Jeremiah Kuntz. 7 Again, Mr. Kuntz, thank you very much for your 8 son's valiant efforts this morning getting the pledges 9 done. Always fantastic. 10 Mr. Kuntz, are you there with us? MR. KUNTZ: Yes. Sorry, trying to get my mute 11 button to get off there and get my video started. 12 1.3 Good morning, members. 14 Before you is agenda item number 7 relating to 15 amendments to 217.74. These amendments are relating to a 16 legislation that passed during the last legislative 17 session, Senate Bill 604, which require each county tax assessor-collector to make webDEALER available to any 18 19 licensed motor vehicle dealer requesting access. 20 rules were published for public comment and are before the 21 board for final approval. 22 We did receive public comment from multiple 2.3 commenters. The comment period closed on July 27 of 2020. 24 The department received written comments from the Bexar 25 County Tax Assessor-Collector, the Lubbock County Tax

Assessor-Collector, and the Tax Assessor-Collectors

Association of Texas. The staff did not make any
amendments to the rules based on the comments received as
we believe there may be some misunderstanding from the
commenters on the statutory requirements and those
requirements as they are related to the rules that were
adopted.

1.3

2.3

The statute requires that the webDEALER application be made available to all licensed dealers in the state. It does not give flexibility for a county tax assessor-collector to reject or not allow any licensed dealer to have access to that system based on any of the factors that were raised in the comments.

The staff's response to those comments are that if a tax assessor-collector believes that a dealer is not putting forward a proper title application, the title application itself can be rejected and not approved by the county tax assessor-collector, but access to the system must be provided in accordance with state law. And so as such, we have not made any amendments to the rules as they were proposed, and at this time I will answer any questions that the board has.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much, Mr. Kuntz.

Any questions from the board?

Member McRae.

MS. McRAE: Can you hear me?

MR. TREVIÑO: We can.

2.3

MS. McRAE: Jeremiah, this is more just for the record. The comments that were received from the tax assessor-collectors, the various ones and the association, are out of concern of fraud, waste or abuse primarily, and we currently have avenues or tools in place to address those issues.

As you stated, we can reject the application, we can report such activity to CID or go through the title fraud red flag remedy. So I just wanted to just kind of clarify that.

MR. KUNTZ: Absolutely. As you've stated, yes, there are options if there is suspected fraud, waste or abuse that is occurring, and in particular, if there are violations of a dealer in their obligations to timely submit title or any of those other kind of avenues.

You've mentioned two of the things: you could either reject the transaction back to the dealership to make corrections if it's believed to be fraudulent or not proper; you could also submit it through the red flag process which the department has rules that address how to submit through the red flag process. And in addition, if you believe that a dealer, a licensed dealer in the State of Texas is not fulfilling their statutory obligations, a

| 1 | complaint can be filed with our Enforcement Division |
|----|--|
| 2 | against that dealer for them to take administrative |
| 3 | actions as well. |
| 4 | MS. McRAE: Right. Thank you. |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member McRae, for that |
| 6 | question. |
| 7 | Any other questions from the board? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Hearing none, Tracey, any |
| 10 | comments from the public? |
| 11 | MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, |
| 12 | for the record. |
| 13 | No public comments. |
| 14 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. So any further discussion? |
| 15 | (No response.) |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I would call for a |
| 17 | motion on agenda item 7. |
| 18 | MS. McRAE: Chairman, I'd like to make a |
| 19 | motion. |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Member |
| 21 | McRae. |
| 22 | MS. McRAE: I move that the board approve the |
| 23 | adoption of rules in agenda item 7, including amendments |
| 24 | to Section 217.74, as recommended by staff. |
| 25 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much. |

| 1 | We have a motion from Member McRae. Do we have |
|----|---|
| 2 | a second? |
| 3 | MS. GILLMAN: Second. |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman, a second from |
| 5 | Member Gillman. |
| 6 | Any further discussion? |
| 7 | (No response.) |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I'd call for the |
| 9 | vote. Please, when I call your name please state your |
| 10 | vote for the record. |
| 11 | Member Gillman? |
| 12 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Aye. |
| 14 | Member Graham? |
| 15 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Aye. |
| 17 | Member McRae? |
| 18 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 19 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 20 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Another aye. |
| 22 | Member Scott? |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Aye. |
| 25 | Member Washburn? |

MS. WASHBURN: 1 Aye. 2 MR. TREVIÑO: Ave. 3 And I, Chairman Treviño, also vote aye. Let the record reflect that the vote is 4 5 unanimous, motion carries. 6 Thank you very much, Mr. Kuntz. Thank you very 7 much, Member McRae, for the motion. 8 So moving on to agenda item number 8, please 9 continue, Mr. Kuntz. 10 MR. KUNTZ: Yes. For the record again, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of the Vehicle Titles and 11 12 Registration Division. 13 Before you is agenda item number 8 which are 14 rules for final adoption. These rules are amendments to 15 215.150 through 215.158. They relate to House Bill 3760 16 from the last legislative session which addressed the 17 issuance of buyer's tags for vehicles sold by governmental 18 agencies. 19 These vehicles are generally vehicles that are 20 surplus vehicles that are being disposed of by state, federal or local entities, and in order for them to be 21 22 sold and operated off of the lot by the purchaser, this 2.3 law allows for those entities to issue a buyer's tag. 24 Like a dealer would issue a buyer's tag to a vehicle that

they've sold at no fee so that those purchasers, those

buyers can operate those vehicles to get them home or 1 wherever they're taking them. 3 These rules are for final adoption. The rules 4 were published for comment on June 26th, comment period 5 closed on July 27th. We did receive a written comment 6 from the Tax Assessor-Collectors Association, taking no 7 position on the rules. With that, I would seek your determination on 8 9 these rules. 10 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Kuntz. Any comments or questions for Mr. Kuntz at this 11 point? 12 1.3 (No response.) 14 MR. TREVIÑO: Tracey, are there any comments 15 from the public? 16 MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, 17 for the record. No public comments. And I'd also like to note 18 19 that it looks like we lost the video for Member Gillman or 20 she's having technical issues. 21 MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman, can you hear us? 22 You're on mute now so we can't hear you. You're also 2.3 muted. Your video is down and you're muted. 24 MS. GILLMAN: I can see you and I can hear you. 25 MR. TREVIÑO: All right. Well, it's our loss

| 1 | that we can't see you, but it's great that we can hear |
|----|--|
| 2 | you. |
| 3 | So at that point no comments from the public, |
| 4 | no further questions. |
| 5 | Oh, you're back. Great. Good to have you |
| 6 | back. |
| 7 | The chairman will now entertain a motion for |
| 8 | agenda item number 8. |
| 9 | MS. McRAE: Chairman, I'd like to make a |
| 10 | motion. |
| 11 | MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Member |
| 12 | McRae. |
| 13 | MS. McRAE: I move that the board approve the |
| 14 | adoption of rules in agenda item number 8, including |
| 15 | amendments to Sections 215.150 through 215.158, as |
| 16 | recommended by staff. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much, Member |
| 18 | McRae. |
| 19 | Is there a second? |
| 20 | MS. GILLMAN: Second. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman, second from |
| 22 | Member Gillman. |
| 23 | Any further discussion? |
| 24 | (No response.) |
| 25 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I would call for |

| 1 | the vote. When I call your name, please state your vote |
|----|--|
| 2 | for the record. |
| 3 | Member Gillman? |
| 4 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham? |
| 6 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 8 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 10 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 11 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 12 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn? |
| 14 | MS. WASHBURN: Aye. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: And I, Chairman Treviño, also |
| 16 | vote aye. |
| 17 | Let the record reflect that it is unanimous and |
| 18 | the motion carries. |
| 19 | At this time I would also like to mention that |
| 20 | around 11:00 a.m. Member Washburn will be dropping off, so |
| 21 | just thank you very much for participating this morning, |
| 22 | so whenever you're ready to go. Also, just be aware that |
| 23 | any committees that we establish you will probably be |
| 24 | chair of, so just be prepared for that. |
| 25 | (General laughter.) |

MS. WASHBURN: Thank you, Chairman.

1.3

2.3

MR. TREVIÑO: No worries, Member Washburn. I'm sure you have good reason. So thank you, thank you for your service.

We'll now move on and hear agenda item number 9, rule proposals, and I will turn it again over to Mr. Jeremiah Kuntz.

MR. KUNTZ: Again for the record, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.

Before you are rules for proposal that we are seeking approval from the board to publish for public comment. These rules are amendments to 217.3. These are pretty simple rules but I will explain to you why we are doing them very quickly.

During the legislative session, the 86th

Legislative Session, House Bill 3171 passed which impacted the Department of Public Safety, and it repealed a section of the Transportation Code 521.255 which required DPS to maintain a list of moped manufacturers and moped vehicles for the State of Texas and determining the proper titling and registration of these vehicles. That section of code was repealed and DPS is no longer required to maintain the list of mopeds for the State of Texas. And as such, we've had a reference in our Administrative Code to rely upon

| 1 | that list of mopeds in order to make title determinations |
|----|--|
| 2 | for these vehicles. |
| 3 | As such, we are removing that reference to the |
| 4 | list, and instead will merely rely upon Transportation |
| 5 | Code 541.201, which defines what a moped is, for our |
| 6 | determinations of titling and registration of these |
| 7 | vehicles. |
| 8 | And I would answer any questions that the board |
| 9 | may have. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you, Mr. Kuntz. |
| 11 | Any questions for Mr. Kuntz? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. |
| 14 | Tracey, any comments from the public? |
| 15 | MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, |
| 16 | for the record. |
| 17 | No public comments. |
| 18 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. So hearing no further |
| 19 | comments, the chair will now entertain a motion for agenda |
| 20 | item 9. |
| 21 | MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a |
| 22 | motion. |
| 23 | MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Member |
| 24 | Scott. |
| 25 | MR. SCOTT: I move that the board approve the |

| 1 | proposed amendments to Section 217.3 for publication in |
|----|---|
| 2 | the Texas Register for public comment. |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member Scott. |
| 4 | Do we have a second? |
| 5 | MS. WASHBURN: Second. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn. |
| 7 | Any further discussion? |
| 8 | (No response.) |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I would call for |
| 10 | the vote. When I call your name, please state your vote |
| 11 | for the record. |
| 12 | Member Gillman? |
| 13 | MS. GILLMAN: (No audible response.) |
| 14 | MR. TREVIÑO: I take that as an aye. |
| 15 | Member Graham? |
| 16 | MS. GILLMAN: Yes, aye. |
| 17 | MR. GRAHAM: (No audible response.) |
| 18 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 19 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 21 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn? |
| 25 | MS. WASHBURN: Aye. |

| 1 | MR. TREVIÑO: And I, Chairman Treviño, also |
|----|---|
| 2 | vote aye. |
| 3 | Let the record reflect that it's unanimous and |
| 4 | the vote carries. |
| 5 | MS. BEAVER: Mr. Chairman. General counsel, |
| 6 | for the record, Tracey Beaver. |
| 7 | I just wanted to clarify if Member Graham had |
| 8 | voted in favor of that. |
| 9 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: I'm sorry, Member Graham. I |
| 11 | heard somebody say it. I think I got Member Gillman and |
| 12 | you confused. I apologize, my bad which is to your |
| 13 | point earlier that my job is to keep you guys following |
| 14 | the rules. That's why you guys need to help me with this. |
| 15 | MR. GRAHAM: We can go back and watch the video |
| 16 | and see me go |
| 17 | (General talking and laughter.) |
| 18 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. We'll move on to agenda |
| 19 | item 10.A, and I'll turn it over to Committee Chair Paul |
| 20 | Scott, assisted by Caroline Love. |
| 21 | Chairman Scott. |
| 22 | MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 23 | MS. GILLMAN: Mr. Chairman, can you tell me |
| 24 | what page in the board book are we on? |
| 25 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. So a tip on the board |

book, if you go to the table of contents at the very 1 beginning, you can click on it for agenda item 10.A. 3 Sunset Implementation Status Update. 4 Is that right, Member Scott? 5 MR. SCOTT: No. This is the -- it is, yes. 6 MR. TREVIÑO: Click on that number next to it, 7 that 420, it takes you right to where we are. 8 MS. GILLMAN: Got it, 420. Thank you.

MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, ma'am.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Member Scott -- Chairman Scott, sorry for the interruption.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

Yesterday the Legislative and Public Affairs

Committee received an update from TxDMV Government and

Strategic Communications director, Caroline Love, on

several topics. She will be joining us in a moment for

some key dates and agency processes to be aware of during

the session, as well as discuss potential recommendations

to provide members of the legislature for the upcoming

season. But before she begins, I want to provide the

board with a summary of her update on a couple of items.

Sunset implementation. First, on the department's implementation efforts from last session's Sunset Advisory Commission review of TxDMV, when Sunset reviews an agency, their staff develops a report that

includes both management and statutory recommendations. The Sunset Advisory Commission then adopts the report which results in continuing legislation.

1.3

2.3

For TxDMV, that continuing legislation was

Senate Bill 604 from the 86th Legislative Session. There
were provisions to be implemented as part of that

legislation, many of which are already implemented.

These include the ability for all counties to offer webDEALER to dealers in all Texas counties. Prior to this legislation, not every county offered that service, which not only helps streamline vehicle transaction processes for dealers and counties, but also allows for such transactions to be completed remotely without in-person visits to the county offices.

Other items implemented from the legislation include the availability of TxDMV-provided fraud training required for all staff at the state and county levels performing registration or titling services. The establishment of advisory committees to provide expertise on rulemaking and other issues facing the department.

There are two significant items of interest that are still in the process of being implemented from Senate Bill 604.

First we have the alternatively-fueled vehicle study. This requires TxDMV to submit a study to the

legislature by December 1, 2020 on opportunities to assess a fee on alternatively-fueled vehicles, such as electric vehicles, that do not pay motor fuels taxes for their use on Texas roads.

1.3

2.3

This study is to be completed with information and data from several other agencies, including the Texas Department of Transportation, Texas Department of Public Safety, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, and the Public Utility Commission. TxDMV staff have regular contact with these agencies to obtain the information outlined in the bill and are on target to meet the December 1, 2020 submission deadline. This board will continue to receive updates on the status of this study.

Another legislative item included in the bill is for the board to adopt rules allowing for the use of digital license plates by commercial and government fleet vehicles. These rules were to be adopted by the end of this year and this board adopted those rules at our June 11th meeting, which then became effective in July.

While this provision is effectively implemented, further efforts continue to allow for these plates to be used. Staff has selected a vendor to provide these plates and is now in the process of developing the technological interface with the provider. Staff anticipates this interface will be available for the

provider to use by December 31, 2020.

1.3

2.3

I mentioned there were also management recommendations resulting from the Sunset review which were not part of Senate Bill 604, however, the State Auditor's Office recently reached out to receive information on the status of the department's implementation of this recommendation. Staff provided an update to the State Auditor's Office on the status of implementing management recommendations by their September 21st deadline.

Executive Director Whitney Brewster has been giving regular updates to this board on the status of implementing these recommendations and most of all the recommendations are implemented. Those that remain to be implemented include efforts that require broader technology initiatives that are underway, such as opportunities to improve enforcement data tracking.

Included in your board materials is a chart which lists each Sunset recommendation, both statutory and management recommendations, with the status of those items.

Mr. Chairman, that ends my presentation of agenda item 10.A.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Chairman Scott.

Ms. Love, would you like to comment on that or

| 1 | anything you'd like to add? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. LOVE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and |
| 3 | members of the board. |
| 4 | I thought Chairman Scott did a great job. I |
| 5 | don't have anything else to add. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Ms. Love. I thought |
| 7 | he did a great job too. |
| 8 | Any comments or questions for Chairman Scott or |
| 9 | for Ms. Love? |
| 10 | (No response.) |
| 11 | MR. TREVIÑO: Tracey, are there any comments |
| 12 | from the public? |
| 13 | MS. BEAVER: No comments from the public. |
| 14 | Thank you, Chairman. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. We'll now move to agenda |
| 16 | item 10.B. Please continue, Chairman Scott. |
| 17 | MR. SCOTT: Thank you. |
| 18 | 10.B is the driver licensing study. The |
| 19 | committee also received an update related to item 10.B, |
| 20 | the driver license study. This also relates to the Sunset |
| 21 | process in that the Texas Department of Public Safety, |
| 22 | DPS, went through Sunset review last session. |
| 23 | Their continuing legislation, Senate Bill 616, |
| 24 | stated that DPS is required to conduct a study analyzing |
| 25 | the challenges and opportunities of transferring the |

driver's license program to be delivered to the legislature by September 1, 2020. If that study was not delivered by the date of that legislation, the transfer of that program to TxDMV would become automatic as of September 1, 2021.

1.3

2.3

The study was to be completed by an independent third party and the General Appropriations Act providing DPS the authorization to use appropriated for this study further specified it was to be completed by an institution of higher education. DPS acquired the services of the University of Texas at Austin Center for Transportation Research to conduct the study, and CTR delivered the study to the legislature on August 28, 2020. CTR held several meetings with DPS and TxDMV staff while conducting the research and also looked at other states and their programs.

CTR considered three options for the future of the driver's license program, including the program remaining at DPS, a transfer of the program to TxDMV, and transitioning the program to a new stand-alone agency.

CTR's research resulted in the recommendation to establish a new stand-alone agency to administer the driver's license program. Your board materials include an executive summary of their report, found on page 428 of the board book, which includes a Likert chart that briefly

outlines the pros and cons of each scenario. 1 2 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my presentation of 3 agenda item 10.B. MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you very much, 4 5 Chairman Scott. 6 Does anybody have any questions for Chairman 7 Scott or for Ms. Love? Member Gillman. The chair recognizes Member 8 9 Gillman. 10 MS. GILLMAN: Is it appropriate or inappropriate, can I hear what Chairman Scott thinks of 11 12 the recommendation to change driver's license to a stand-13 alone agency? Does the DMV have the same opinion? After 14 reading the report, do you concur? Do you think it's a 15 good recommendation, Member Scott? MR. TREVIÑO: I think before Chairman Scott 16 17 speaks, I think the agency itself is agnostic on this question. We don't have an opinion or a position on it. I 18 19 don't think we've come out on record saying we're for or against or anything else, so I'm not sure if that's been 20 asked of us. 21 22 Whitney, is that correct? 2.3 MS. BREWSTER: Chairman Treviño, thank you for 24 bringing that up. That is absolutely correct. This is a 25 policy decision that the legislature is to make.

study was at the request of the legislature to get more 1 2 information so they could get to a sound policy 3 recommendation should they choose to bring that up this 4 session. 5 MR. TREVIÑO: Just for the record, Member 6 Scott, as a member of this board and as a citizen of 7 Texas, is always allowed his own opinion, so the board anxiously awaits to hear his opinion if he would like to 8 9 venture in that direction. 10 So Chairman Scott, I don't know if you have thoughts. 11 MR. SCOTT: I concur with what's been said. 12 13 The agency doesn't have a position. The study was not 14 done for the agency, the study was done for the 15 legislature so the study goes to the legislature. policy or a political decision from there. 16 17 So I think the next thing for us, if they

So I think the next thing for us, if they decide it is to come to DMV, then we're in a spot where we've got to do something. But at this point, the study was done for the legislature and the ball has been passed back to them.

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. GILLMAN: So does a stand-alone agency mean a private company or another government agency?

MR. SCOTT: That would be another government agency. They would have to establish the department of

| 1 | drivers's license. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. GILLMAN: Interesting. |
| 3 | MR. PREWITT: Mr. Chairman? |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: The chair recognizes Mr. Prewitt. |
| 5 | MR. PREWITT: Just a point of information. On |
| 6 | the Likert scale, I'm trying to understand how they're |
| 7 | rating DMV as average in compliance and security, culture |
| 8 | is average which I thought was interesting that they |
| 9 | would find a brand new agency having a good culture, don't |
| 10 | really understand how you get there when you don't know |
| 11 | the future and then saying that DMV was very poor in |
| 12 | disruption. |
| 13 | I totally agree it would be a disruptive event |
| 14 | for DMV but I don't like it in terms of it looks like a |
| 15 | report card on the DMV, and I want to get an |
| 16 | understanding. That's not the case, is it? |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you for those comments, |
| 18 | Member Prewitt. |
| 19 | Director Brewster or Ms. Love, would you guys |
| 20 | like to comment on that? |
| 21 | MS. BREWSTER: Go ahead, Caroline. |
| 22 | MS. LOVE: Okay. Thank you. |
| 23 | For the record, Caroline Love, director of |
| 24 | Government and Strategic Communications Division. |
| 25 | It really was more of a comparison between the |

various options. The comment about the disruption is even broader as it relates to our programs, just the other component of that being the current services that we provide and how that would take a backseat to such a large and significant initiative there. So I definitely think it's more of a comparison and not necessarily a report card of the agency in that regard.

MR. PREWITT: Thank you.

1.3

2.3

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman?

MR. TREVIÑO: Chairman Scott.

MR. SCOTT: A comment I would have on that is, I find it difficult for me to believe that given the situation of the budget and the emphasis on COVID and all the things that are going to be going on in the legislature, I don't think it's going to be reasonable to think that the legislature is going to establish a completely new and separate agency. The plan was to either keep it at DPS or move it to DMV.

There was a lot of heated political activity, people are not very happy with what's been going on at DPS, so this idea was let's get this moved someplace else. That's just how I see it. I can't see the legislature, given the current situation, establishing a completely new agency.

Now, it may well be, given the situation with

what's going on with the economy and so forth, that this 1 deal doesn't get solved and action taken on it in this 3 upcoming legislative session. It may just get kicked back 4 for a couple more years. 5 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Chairman Scott. 6 Just let the record reflect I don't see Member 7 Washburn anymore, I think she's dropped off. 8 And to Chairman Scott's point, people far 9 smarter than me have had difficulty gauging the role of 10 the legislature. But you're right, I don't see this as being a real high priority at this point going in with all 11 12 the challenges that the state faces. Great point, 13 Chairman Scott, great point. 14 Any other comments or questions? Member 15 Gillman. 16 MS. GILLMAN: I didn't see any recommendations -- I probably missed it -- for the 17 financial aspect. I see where it does talk about \$200 18 19 million in additional funds, but I didn't see in the study 20 a financial impact of moving it to a new agency or not. 21 It just seemed -- maybe this is just a briefing, what we 22 have in our book here. 2.3 MS. LOVE: Mr. Chairman, if I may? 24 MR. TREVIÑO: We'd love to hear you.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. LOVE: Thank you.

So one of the analyses that the study included 1 2 was that if the function were to transfer to the 3 Department of Motor Vehicles, it would be essentially a 4 budget wash for the state in that the funds that were 5 appropriated for that program would simply be appropriated 6 to DMV to administer the program. 7 There's a similar approach if a brand new 8 agency were to be established where, again, the funds that 9 were appropriated would go to the new agency, but they did 10 identify some additional costs for a new agency in terms 11 of setting up a new administration. And I don't recall 12 the exact figure off the top of my head but it was --1.3 MR. TREVIÑO: Twelve point seven, I think they 14 To create a new stand-alone should cost an 15 estimated additional \$12.7 million to the state for total 16 biennial cost of \$607.1-, against the \$594.4 million 17 that's already allocated. MS. LOVE: That's it. 18 19 MS. BREWSTER: And Mr. Chairman, that's on page 20 430 of your board books. 21 MR. TREVIÑO: That was a great question, Member 22 Gillman. 2.3 MS. GILLMAN: So it sounds like it's not in our 24 court, regardless.

Well, that hasn't been determined

MR. TREVIÑO:

by the legislature. 1 2 I mean their recommendation is. MS. GILLMAN: MR. TREVIÑO: Careful what you wish for. 3 4 MS. GILLMAN: Right. 5 (General laughter.) 6 MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, Whitney Brewster, 7 executive director. If I may? 8 MR. TREVIÑO: Director Brewster, yes, ma'am. 9 MS. BREWSTER: Ms. Love, would you mind sharing 10 information on the select committee on driver licensing? I think that might be helpful for the board to know more 11 about that. 12 1.3 MS. LOVE: Certainly. Thank you. 14 So at the beginning of the interim, about a 15 year ago, the speaker established a House select committee on driver license issues and renewal. And that committee 16 17 has interim charges that included looking at the study once it was submitted, but also looking at the potential 18 19 future of the program outside of the study as well. 20 As we talked about in our committee hearing 21 yesterday with the committees not meeting due to the 22 pandemic, they are instead requesting information from 2.3 agencies and stakeholders. And so they have, for those 24 interim charges, issued a request for information and

we're looking at that currently.

| 1 | Our response would be due by October 15th, and |
|----|---|
| 2 | so we're checking to see what opportunities we have to |
| 3 | provide in coordination with them to help the legislature |
| 4 | with their decision-making in the future. |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Ms. Love. |
| 6 | Member Gillman, any other questions on that |
| 7 | one? |
| 8 | MS. GILLMAN: No further questions, Mr. |
| 9 | Chairman. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member Gillman, for |
| 11 | those comments and questions. |
| 12 | Any other comments or questions for Chair |
| 13 | Scott? |
| 14 | (No response.) |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: And Tracey, I'll ask you one more |
| 16 | time on comments from the public, but do we have any more |
| 17 | comments from the public that you're aware of? Can I just |
| 18 | dispense with this question? |
| 19 | MS. BEAVER: No comments from the public for |
| 20 | agenda item 10 but there may be some during the public |
| 21 | comment period towards the end of the meeting. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. So just at the public |
| 23 | comment period I can ask you but for the rest of the |
| 24 | motions and everything else, I can just skip it. Right? |
| 25 | MS. BEAVER: Correct. |

MR. TREVIÑO: You interrupt if there is some. 1 2 MS. BEAVER: I will, yes. 3 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. 4 Okay. We'll move on to agenda item 10.C and we 5 will continue with Chair Scott. 6 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. 7 10.C, process for legislative session. As I 8 mentioned, Caroline Love will present the next two times, 9 starting with information on some key dates for the 10 upcoming legislative session, along with details on how 11 she and her team will support the board and the department 12 in the coming months during the session. At this time I'll turn it over to Caroline 1.3 14 Love, director of Government and Strategic Communications. 15 MS. LOVE: Thank you. For the record, my name is Caroline Love, and I 16 17 will go ahead and start with a small disclaimer that I'm going to present what the agency intends to follow in 18 19 terms of processes for the session as if we were headed 20 into a normal legislative session. But as we talked about 21 yesterday, the rumors abound about what the session may 22 look like, but I think the consensus is that the capacity 2.3 of this legislature will be far less than previous 24 legislative sessions.

So we may not see as many bills filed or passed

and as many meetings and hearings and those sorts of things. But certainly the top priority the legislature has is the budget and this agency will be very engaged in that process.

2.3

So with that, I'll go ahead and start with some key dates that are important to keep in mind. So November 9th is the first day that legislators can start filing bills. And that's a helpful date, we start to see trends at that point about really hot topics or things that are on their minds.

And as that bill filing starts, my team, along with general counsel, will be looking at everything filed to determine if it has an impact to DMV, and that could be operationally or fiscally. So we have our legislative tracking system that we use internally to help track those bills and get them out to our subject matter experts within the department for those types of analysis.

And after November 9th, of course, the next key date will be January 12th, which will be the first day of the 87th Legislative Session. And then 60 days after that on March 12th is when there's a bill filing deadline, so all legislation must be filed by that date. And then the sine die, the last day for the legislature to meet, is set for May 31st.

So those are some of the key dates that will be

driving a lot of the things that occur over these next several months. And throughout that time, as I mentioned, my team, along with general counsel, will be very engaged in looking at all the legislation filed, but we also work closely as well with our CFO, Linda Flores, on that budget process.

1.3

2.3

And as you all will hear in a little bit, we have submitted our Legislative Appropriations Request.

It's anticipated there will be some meetings forthcoming in the next month or two to hear from agencies about what they're requesting for budgets, and then those will lead into the legislative hearings that will occur with Senate Finance and House Appropriations and then with their subcommittees.

As the department works through this, my group will help identify when those hearings are, any related meetings, and we engage department leadership to ensure we have the proper people attending those hearings and meetings. And in addition to these efforts, we will have weekly meetings with executive leadership and subject matter experts to review legislation filed that has impacts to the department and also determine any actions or information that might be needed to provide to the legislature on those items as well.

This information will be posted as well to the

board's Sharepoint legislative site. That's a new tool 1 we'll use this time around to help ensure that the board 3 is kept up to date, and my team will also provide updates 4 on any relative hearings or floor debates that might be of 5 interest. We'll put those on that site as well, in 6 addition to all of those key dates. 7 So that is a summary of how we anticipate 8 functioning for the next several months. Of course, I'm 9 sure you can plan to see me at the next several board 10 meetings as well to provide updates, but with that, I'm 11 happy to answer any questions. 12 MR. TREVIÑO: All right. Do any of the board 13 members have questions for Chair Scott or for Caroline? 14 (No response.) 15 MR. TREVIÑO: Great presentation. Thank you 16 for those dates, it's very useful. 17 So hearing no further comments or questions and having no comments from the public, the chair would 18 19 entertain a motion for agenda item 10.D that has been 20 recommended to us by the Legislative and Public Affairs 21 Committee for approval. Is that correct? 22 MS. LOVE: I'm happy to run through those items 2.3 before adoption, but I'll hand it back over to you. 24 MR. TREVIÑO: Okay, Caroline, great.

So without further discussion, call for a

motion. Is that correct? Did you have any other comments, Caroline?

MS. LOVE: Well, I provided a summary of the recommendations to the Legislative and Public Affairs

Committee yesterday, and they were unanimously adopted, and I would be happy to give a summary of those recommendations to the full board as well.

MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Please do.

MS. LOVE: Sounds good.

So the Texas Transportation Code does task the TxDMV Board with providing recommendations to the legislature on opportunities to improve operations and streamline efficiencies. So earlier this year my team went to the divisions within the department to ask if they have identified any statutory impediments to meeting their missions in terms of their work on day-to-day activities, and we took those recommendations and talked through them internally and then sent them out for stakeholder review.

2.3

1.3

The stakeholder review provided us with some very helpful feedback and so we have some items that we are going to recommend for the board to consider for adoption today. But we also have other items that we're going to research further and maybe come back to the board in December with those.

And then once the board adopts any items, we'll take those recommendations and provide them to the relevant committees that we work with. Generally speaking, that tends to be House Transportation and Senate Transportation, but we often work with some of the other committees such as Senate Business and Commerce or the House Licensing and Administrative Procedures Committee as well. So we'll be working with those committees on any recommendations that are adopted.

1.3

2.3

And so with that, I'll go ahead and start providing a summary of those that we've had positive stakeholder feedback, and they're broken out by function within the department.

And so the first one that we have -- and this begins on page 436 of your board materials today -- we have the first related item on the mandatory tax appraiser reporting of dealers who do not file their vehicle inventories. We would like to make this reporting not mandatory in certain cases to help provide greater flexibility to tax appraisers when they're working with their dealers on their reports for inventory.

We still have the ability as an agency to run reports and follow up with dealers, and we work closely with the tax appraisers as well. We've received very positive feedback from them on this item and we'd like to

move forward with that.

1.3

2.3

There's also another item under the enforcement section that has statutory cleanup. There were two bills that passed in 2013 that amended the same section of code and so we're cleaning up some references to be sure that portion of the statute is clear.

And then moving on to motor carrier related items, we have a new one as it relates to certain outdated oversize and overweight permit requirements for bonds.

There are very small bonds associated with some oversize/overweight permits that the Texas Department of Transportation or the counties could use for damage done to their roads by these trucks.

Throughout the history of this bond requirement being in place, they've never been called upon that we know of. We have coordinated with TxDOT, as well as the counties, on this item to ensure that they were good with this requirement no longer being in statute and they support it. It does have a significant lift for agency staff to work through these so it would be helpful to no longer keep that requirement in place.

Another motor carrier item relates to motor transportation brokers who are required to file with the department currently. There are only four such motor transportation brokers that file, and keeping up with the

paperwork on that is also complicated for our staff, so we are recommending to do away with that. And we shared that with the trucking industry as well as those brokers, and they're supportive of this item.

2.3

And the next two items on the motor carrier related subject relate to a cleanup of statutes that this board has previously approved in previous sessions, but a lot of times in a session, as we know, even during a regular session, timing can be very short, and so these particular items just didn't have the time available to continue them forward. They were on calendars for consideration but didn't make it so we would like to pursue these.

They clean up some of the references to various permits, as well as references to federal statutes and rules that states should be in compliance with. There is a risk that if you don't bring state statutes into compliance that federal funds could jeopardized. Thankfully that hasn't happened, but we would like to prevent that from occurring.

And now we move on to the Motor Vehicle Crime

Prevention Authority. There are two items on this one.

Many years ago when the MVCPA function was under the Texas

Department of Transportation, their grant statistics were

reported as part of their annual Districts and Counties

Statistics Report, which is also called DISCOS, and TxDOT provided that report to legislators to help people understand where money is being allocated as it relates to transportation projects and maintenance and this was part of that report.

2.3

The MVCPA program now provides reports on the grants that are issued through various other channels.

And since they are no longer under TxDOT, we'd like to remove this requirement to help streamline processes there.

And then another item is recovery of insurance fees that may be overpaid. So currently we want to make sure the statutory authority is clear to recover those costs for the MVCPA program for any overpaid insurance costs there.

And as it relates to the Motor Vehicle

Division, we only have one item that's a cleanup. There
was an old reference to the Motor Vehicles Board so we
want to update that to the Texas Department of Motor

Vehicles Board.

And then as it relates to the Office of

Administrative Hearings, there's a recommendation that

will help streamline and clean up the Lemon Law and

warranty performance case processes. Many of the items in

this are truly a cleanup for information that's allowed

for public release if we get an open records request on these cases. But also in an instance when there is a case where the manufacturer is not on the prevailing side, currently our staff has to write a final order to require the payment of the filing fees to the manufacturer. This would just put that requirement in statute to reduce some paperwork on that side.

2.3

And then we had an internal audit that recommended there should be an opportunity for rehearing motions to be made by someone other than a chief hearings examiner, so this recommendation includes that language as well.

And then we have a couple of registration related items. One relates to the effectiveness of local option fees. Many county fees that are assessed at time of registration go into effect on January 1st, but oftentimes people who are ahead of the curve that have a registration due in January may submit their registration renewal by mail or another way in December, and this will help clarify when those fees take effect, which would be January 1 of any given year.

And another item cleans up some license plate issues. You'll hear more from Jeremiah in a moment about new license plate designs, but as you can imagine, there's always license plates that tend to be created during the

legislative sessions. There are a few that were created that never actually have been manufactured or produced.

1.3

2.3

This statute says that when a license plate is created in statute, then the sponsoring entity shall come forward with the deposit to help manufacture that plate and then that deposit is refunded when plates are issued. But there are some plates that have been in statute for more than five years and never received the deposit or been manufactured, so we would like to clean up the statute to remove those.

And then the last one I have relates to cleaning up some title statutes as it relates specifically to salvage and rebuilt vehicles. We want to make sure that it's clear that title holds cannot be placed on those vehicles during lawsuits and that those vehicles are also not eligible for title hearings or bonds.

So that is a summary of the recommendations which I mentioned were provided to the Legislative and Public Affairs Committee yesterday and adopted by that committee. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ TREVIÑO: Caroline, thank you very much for that recap.

Any questions for Chair Scott or for Caroline Love?

| 1 | (No response.) |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, Chairman Scott, |
| 3 | thank you for recommending these for board approval. |
| 4 | The chair will now entertain a motion for |
| 5 | agenda item 10.D. |
| 6 | MR. PREWITT: Mr. Chairman? |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Chair recognizes Member Prewitt. |
| 8 | MR. PREWITT: Thank you, sir. |
| 9 | I move that the board approve the following |
| 10 | recommendations of the Legislative and Public Affairs |
| 11 | Committee by adopting the proposed legislative agenda as |
| 12 | developed by the department staff, with stakeholder input |
| 13 | and involvement, direct staff to finalize and submit this |
| 14 | agenda to the legislature as directed in Transportation |
| 15 | Code Section 1001.025 for further consideration by members |
| 16 | of the legislature for bill drafting and potential filing. |
| 17 | Lastly, staff will provide the board regular updates |
| 18 | through the session the status of the approved agenda |
| 19 | items. |
| 20 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you for the motion, Member |
| 22 | Prewitt. |
| 23 | Do we have a second? |
| 24 | MS. GILLMAN: Second. |
| 25 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman. |

Any further discussion? 1 2 (No response.) MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none --3 mR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman? 4 5 MR. TREVIÑO: Chairman Scott. 6 MR. SCOTT: Before we vote I'd just like to 7 take a second and recognize Caroline for the work that she 8 did for the great presentation she made for us this 9 There's a lot of work that goes into this. morning. 10 Caroline did a good job of summarizing, but as you can imagine the work the staff has done over the 11 12 period of time to dig through all this and clean all this 13 stuff up, it's certainly not something that would be in my 14 wheelhouse to do. So I really appreciate folks that can 15 do that type of work for us, and as has been said before, 16 keep us out of trouble. And commend again Caroline and 17 the staff for their hard work on this. 18 Thank you. 19 MS. LOVE: Thank you. 20 MR. TREVIÑO: Chairman Scott, well said, well And I'll also echo that, but also I'd like to say 21 said. 22 we don't commend all staff enough for all the hard work 2.3 they do for us as a board and for the citizens of Texas.

here in this case, and thank you to all the members of the

So thank you, Caroline, for all your hard work

24

| 1 | Texas DMV staff as well. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Okay, great comments, Chairman Scott. |
| 3 | So any further comments? |
| 4 | (No response.) |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I would call for |
| 6 | the vote. Board members, when I call your name, please |
| 7 | state your vote for the record. |
| 8 | Member Gillman? |
| 9 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes. |
| 11 | Member Graham? |
| 12 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 14 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 16 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 18 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 19 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn? Oh, Member |
| 20 | Washburn is no longer present. |
| 21 | And I, Chairman Treviño, also vote aye. |
| 22 | Let the record reflect that the vote is |
| 23 | unanimous. We have a quorum, and the motion carries. |
| 24 | Thank you. |
| 25 | So next we'll hear from Mr. Kuntz on agenda |

items 11.A through 11.C regarding specialty license plates.

2.3

MR. KUNTZ: Good afternoon, members, again. For the record, Jeremiah Kuntz, director of the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.

Before you for your consideration are three license plate designs. You can find those on page 440 of your board book, and as we've done in the past, since we don't have the big board, we've got the larger digital images of those license plates.

The three license plates are all new license plates: the Zeta Phi Beta, Texas Is Home, and the Master Naturalist license plates. The Zeta Phi Beta is a license plate that is sponsored by MyPlates.

The other two license plates are actually sponsored by other state agencies, and the Texas Is Home is a new design sponsored by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. For these license plates -- and I'll talk about the Texas Master Naturalist as well -- for license plates that are sponsored by a state agency, the license plate fee is \$30.

The state agency would receive \$22 of those plate fees and the sale of this plate will go to support the Texas Realtors Housing Opportunity Foundation. The Texas Master Naturalist is a new design sponsored by the

| 1 | Texas A&M Agrolife Extension Service. Again, it is a \$30 |
|----|--|
| 2 | license plate, \$22 of which would go to the Texas A&M |
| 3 | Agrolife Extension for the Texas Master Naturalist state |
| 4 | programs and conservation initiatives for species of great |
| 5 | conservation needs. |
| 6 | So these three license plates are being brought |
| 7 | before you for your consideration, and I am happy to |
| 8 | answer any questions that you may have. |
| 9 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you for the presentation, |
| 10 | Mr. Kuntz. |
| 11 | Any questions for Mr. Kuntz? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, and there are no |
| 14 | comments from the public, the chair would entertain a |
| 15 | motion for items 11.A through 11.C. |
| 16 | MS. GILLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Gillman. |
| 18 | MS. GILLMAN: I move that the board approve |
| 19 | specialty plates under agenda items 11.A through C as |
| 20 | recommended by staff. |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Member Gillman, for |
| 22 | the motion. |
| 23 | Do we have a second? |
| 24 | MS. McRAE: I'll second. |
| 25 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae. |

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

| 1 | Any further comments or discussion? |
|----|---|
| 2 | (No response.) |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I will call for the |
| 4 | vote. Board members, when I call your name, please state |
| 5 | your vote for the record. |
| 6 | Member Gillman? |
| 7 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham? |
| 9 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 11 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 12 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 13 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 14 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 15 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Washburn is no longer with |
| 17 | us. I, Chairman Treviño, also vote aye. |
| 18 | Let the record reflect that the vote is |
| 19 | unanimous and the motion carries. |
| 20 | Okay. We will move on to agenda item 12.A. I |
| 21 | will turn it over to Linda Flores and Sergio Rey for some |
| 22 | financial updates. |
| 23 | Ms. Flores. |
| 24 | MS. FLORES: Thank you. Good morning. For the |
| 25 | record, Linda Flores. I'm the chief financial officer for |

the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. I am joined today by Sergio Rey, but with your indulgence, I will give you a brief update on where we are with our Legislative Appropriations Request.

2.3

If you recall back in August, the first week of August, we did present an appropriations request that included a baseline appropriations of \$310.8 million. And for your reference, this information begins on page 445 of your board book.

In that presentation we did not have instructions yet from the Legislative Budget Board. Those instructions were eventually received on August the 18th, with the policy letter and instructions and guidance to state agencies. And two days later on August 20th we received the adjusted general revenue baseline for the Motor Vehicle Crime Prevention Authority.

That is the only program in the department that is financed with general revenue, the rest of it is financed through the DMV Fund. Our deadline to submit our appropriations request was September 25th, and therefore, I'm providing an update as to what was actually submitted.

The good news is that the Motor Vehicle Crime

Prevention Authority actually received an increase in

appropriations. Their current appropriations are roughly

\$25.7 million for the two years; it went up to \$34.2

million.

1.3

2.3

So what we submitted last Friday includes a baseline request, including that bump for MVCPA, in the amount of \$319.3 million. Because of that increase and bump for MVCPA, we also did make three changes that all focused on Motor Vehicle Crime Prevention Authority. One was the base amount increase. The other was a new exceptional item that is shown on page 451 of your materials to expand the Motor Vehicle Crime Prevention Authority.

There was some legislation that was passed during the last legislative session that required a statutory distribution of a certain amount to MVCPA based on fee collections. On our insurance policies as motorists that fee went from \$2 to \$4 and that statute provided specific statutory distributions to various entities.

Even though they did receive an increase of approximately \$8.5 million, this did not meet that statutory distribution. So we did submit an exceptional item request in the amount of \$2.5 million that would take them up to that statutory distribution.

The final thing that we did for Motor Vehicle

Crime Prevention Authority is we did have an exceptional

item request for a fee collections unit with three FTEs

and approximately \$560,000. They removed the cost necessary to finance those three FTEs in that unit due to the increase in their baseline, but we still have to ask for the additional staff, if you will.

1.3

2.3

So bottom line, our appropriations -- the base was \$319.3 million, as I previously mentioned, we do have seven exceptional items that total \$19.5 million, so the agency's total appropriations request totals \$338.8 million.

Finally, we did continue the riders that we mentioned in August, including one that we did not, and that is a rider that directs the department to submit a DMV Fund report to the Legislative Budget Board. That is in our current bill pattern, if you will, so we are continuing that specific guidance that was provided by the legislature to the agency.

And that really concludes my presentation. Do you have any questions for me?

MR. TREVIÑO: Does anybody on the board have any questions for Ms. Flores?

(No response.)

MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I'd just like to recognize the hard work that Chairman Hansen is doing with the MVCPA. For them to get some type of increase in this climate speaks well of what they're doing with that group,

with that agency. 1 Any other comments for Ms. Flores? 3 (No response.) MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, we'll move on to 4 5 agenda item 12.B. 6 MS. FLORES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 With me today is Sergio Rey, and he will be 8 providing an update on the fourth quarter financial 9 activity for the department. 10 MR. REY: Good morning. MR. TREVIÑO: Good morning, Mr. Rey. 11 12 MR. REY: Good morning. For the record, my 13 name is Sergio Rey, assistant chief financial officer. 14 Today I have the summary for the fiscal year 15 2020 fourth quarter financial report, which for further 16 reference, I will begin on page 492 of your board 17 material. Our revenue collections for fiscal year 2020 18 19 were \$1.84 billion through the fourth quarter ending on 20 August 31, 2020. This is less than the projected \$2 billion forecasted for this year, and less compared to the 21 2019 collection of \$1.97 billion. 22 2.3 Now, in the next presentation, Mr. Brian Kline 24 will provide more details associated with the COVID 25 impacts to the department's revenue, but two main

contributors to this reduction in fiscal year 2020 are the postponement of registration revenue and related fees stemming from the pandemic and the governor's associated announcements attributing to the decline. Since this is a deferral, it is anticipated that much of this revenue will come in during fiscal year 2021 after the resumption of normal registration operations are announced.

2.3

The second item was the motor vehicle certificates of title revenue which was also impacted from this economic downturn, where we saw decreases in sales of new and used cars which resulted in decreases of 10.7 percent revenue in the category of certificates of title.

For the TxDMV Fund, which you'll see on page 495, the fund's revenue collections of \$156 million during the year was 8.9 percent less than in 2019. Now, the primary decreases specific to this fund come from the processing and handling fees and the certificates of title revenue. Now, although we did experience this decrease of revenue, the TxDMV Fund covered the \$125.8 million in expenditures that we had during the fiscal year.

Speaking of expenditures, in our summary of the department's obligations for the year, the department did have an increase of 2.6 percent in its expenditures and obligations compared to this time last year. The department incurred \$1.7 million in obligations as a

response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Now, these obligations range for equipment for telecommuting, health and safety signage, plexiglass for customer service areas, as well as personal protective equipment and cleaning services.

2.3

For capital projects budgets, the department's \$44 million in budget have various in-flight automation projects which will continue into fiscal year 2021.

During this latter part of the year, our technology replacement budget focused on ensuring staff had the technology needed in this very much different telecommuting environment.

Our headquarters maintenance project will also continue through fiscal year 2021 as it's in the process of evaluating options for major building maintenance projects, in part, one of them being the Building 5 roof.

On a final note for this summary, this department is expected to lapse \$10.2 million from its fiscal year 2020 budget, however, for this biennial budget cycle, TxDMV has the authority to transfer these budget dollars into fiscal year 2021. This will permit the department to address any unanticipated needs during this new fiscal year, including any additional responses to any COVID-19 needs.

This concludes my presentation for the fourth quarter financial report, and I'm available for any

| 1 | questions you may have. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Rey. |
| 3 | Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Rey or |
| 4 | Ms. Flores? |
| 5 | (No response.) |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Rey, I just want to be clear, |
| 7 | you did say that our TxDMV revenue was down 8.9 percent, |
| 8 | roughly \$15 million. Is that correct? |
| 9 | MR. REY: Yes, sir. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Okay. Thank you very |
| 11 | much. |
| 12 | Hearing no comments and no comments from the |
| 13 | public, we can move on to agenda item 12.C. |
| 14 | MS. FLORES: Thank you, Chairman. |
| 15 | Again for the record, Linda Flores, and with me |
| 16 | is Brian Kline. He is the team lead for the revenue |
| 17 | estimation forecasting unit. |
| 18 | As you know, we have previously provided |
| 19 | routine updates on the department's response to the |
| 20 | pandemic as well as the fiscal impacts to the State of |
| 21 | Texas. Those impacts continue. We will continue to |
| 22 | report them to both our oversight state agencies as well |
| 23 | as to the board. |
| 24 | And at this point I will turn it over to Mr. |
| 25 | Kline to provide an overview of the revenue impacts over |

the past year. 1 2 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Ms. Flores. Mr. Kline on? I don't see him, I don't see him 3 as a speaker. 4 There he is. 5 MR. KLINE: Hi there. I'm not seeing the 6 ability to do video right now. Give me one moment. 7 MR. TREVIÑO: We can hear you now, though. 8 MR. KLINE: I think I know why, I think I need 9 to plug it in. It helps if you plug the video cord in. MR. TREVIÑO: The old video cord. 10 (General laughter.) 11 12 MR. KLINE: Thank you so much, Honorable 1.3 Chairman and board members, executive director. My name 14 is Brian Kline with the Finance and Administrative 15 Services Division at TxDMV. The chief financial officer has asked me to 16 17 provide you all a brief overview of the fiscal year 2020 final numbers in terms of our projected revenues versus 18 our actual revenues for the fiscal year. This is also 19 20 similar to a monthly exercise that we've been providing to 21 the Legislative Budget Board since March or April. 22 Before I move forward, I just want to 2.3 acknowledge my teammates, Laura Fowler and Steve Sandoval, 24 for all the excellent work that they've done. It's been a

real team effort to put together these numbers and the

25

narrative that goes along with it.

1.3

2.3

This is the third time I've visited either with you all or the Finance and Audit Committee since this started back in March, and there have been a lot of fluctuations and a lot of uncertainties about the fee streams related to the economic response to the COVID virus. And I'm reminded of Yogi Berra's quote that "Prediction is difficult, especially about the future." And it's been a lot of ups and downs, but right now I don't have to predict anything because fiscal year 2020 is over and I can give you the actual numbers.

I'm going to refer mostly to page 511 of the board book which is entitled Financial Impacts of COVID-19, and you'll see in the rightmost column in the top table compared to projections the actual collections in all three funds: General Revenue, State Highway Fund, and TxDMV Fund. We're about \$157.5 million below our anticipated revenue collections at the beginning of the fiscal year. That's about a 7.9 percent drop from projections, and I'm going to add a caveat to that a little bit later in the presentation.

As you can see, the tables below break that \$157.5 million down. General Revenue Fund 1 has seen about a \$10.1 million drop. No surprise that the largest drop from projections is in the State Highway Fund because

that's what we collect the most of, and that's about a \$127.5 million drop, and TxDMV Fund 10, about a \$19.9 million drop from projections.

2.3

There's three key factors at play and those are broken down into the columns to the left of the right-hand column. First of all, the fee waivers that Ms. Flores and Mr. Rey talked about, and that you all are familiar with the governor's proclamation back in March just completely waived delinquent title transfer penalty revenue, as well as some of the temporary permit revenues during the period that his proclamation is in effect.

Even though he didn't mention the processing and handling fee, because that fee is charged on temporary permit transactions, that fee was effectively waived as well for temporary permit transactions. And these waivers are in place until 60 days after the agency announces to the public that the normal operations have resumed, and that hasn't happened yet. So of the \$157.5 million in less than projected revenue, we estimate about \$24.9 million is due to the fee waivers.

The second column that Mr. Rey talked about this concept is the postponements or the deferrals of revenue. So the governor's proclamation also allowed customers, if they choose, to defer paying for their registration renewal during the period that the waiver is

in effect as well, so this would just be a deferral of revenue. Most of the customers have actually been paying their registrations along the way but we estimate there's still some FY20 registration expirations that are still expired but have not been renewed. We anticipate that will be renewed in fiscal year 2021, so there's about a \$34.7 million deferral that we expect to come next fiscal year, so that's part of that \$157.5 million.

2.3

And finally, just the general economic impact, maybe fewer cars being sold, fewer dealer licenses, fewer motor carrier permits that are not directly related to the waivers, and that's about a \$97.9 million drop from projections caused by that.

So those are the three things that make up the \$157.5 million decrease from projections, and I mentioned earlier that that's about a 7.9 percent drop from projections, but if you take out the effect of the deferral -- which is not so much a drop within the fiscal year as it is a deferral into next fiscal year -- if you take out the effect of that revenue, the 7.9 percent drop actually becomes a 6.1 percent drop.

So that concludes my presentation. We are, of course, continuing to monitor customer activity as we go month by month by month, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you all may have.

MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Mr. Kline, for that 1 2 great presentation -- well, I won't say great 3 presentation, you did a great job. The numbers are better 4 than they were but still we'd love getting back to the 5 State of Texas. 6 Any comments or questions for Mr. Kline? 7 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman? MR. TREVIÑO: Chairman Scott. 8 9 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Kline, do you have any 10 indication, or does the agency have any indication when the 60-day deferral will be lifted and the resumption of 11 normal activity will be put in place? 12 13 MR. KLINE: May I defer, please, sir, Board 14 Member Scott, to Ms. Flores or Executive Director 15 Brewster? 16 MR. TREVIÑO: Executive Director Brewster, I 17 think, is in a position to answer that question. 18 MS. BREWSTER: Yes. Thank you for the 19 question. Thank you, Chairman Treviño, for the opportunity to respond. Great question and certainly one 20 21 we are working diligently on now. 22 We have been having discussions with a number 2.3 of the tax assessor-collectors, as well as the Governor's 24 Office and the Department of Public Safety and ones that

we might coordinate efforts once we do receive that notice

25

| 1 | from the Governor's Office that he has chosen to lift the |
|-----|--|
| 2 | waivers. Those conversations are still occurring, and |
| 3 | certainly it's a high priority for the agency. So as soon |
| 4 | as we get additional information, we will share it with |
| 5 | the board and certainly our impacted stakeholders and the |
| 6 | public. |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Chairman Scott, is that enough of |
| 8 | a non-answer for you? |
| 9 | MR. SCOTT: Exactly. Kind of what I expected |
| LO | but I thought, well, maybe there's some inside baseball |
| L1 | ears, somebody really knows but nobody has let it out yet, |
| L2 | so apparently that's not the case. |
| L3 | MS. BREWSTER: We're working on it but we don't |
| L 4 | have a definitive date at this point. |
| L 5 | MR. SCOTT: I understand, I understand. Okay. |
| L 6 | Thank you very much. |
| L7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you for the |
| L 8 | question. |
| L 9 | Any other questions for Mr. Kline? |
| 20 | (No response.) |
| 21 | MR. TREVIÑO: Mr. Kline, thank you for the |
| 22 | great presentation, and again, very serious implications |
| 23 | for the State of Texas, but the takeaway is it's better |
| 24 | than what we initially expected. Is that correct? |

MR. KLINE: It is better than what was expected

25

| 1 | because in the first month or two we definitely had a much |
|----|--|
| 2 | higher loss because there was so much uncertainty and we |
| 3 | just didn't know where we were going with this, and we |
| 4 | were a little bit conservative as well in the beginning. |
| 5 | MR. TREVIÑO: Well, thank you very much for |
| 6 | wrapping that all up. |
| 7 | Any other questions for Mr. Kline or Ms. |
| 8 | Flores? |
| 9 | (No response.) |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much. |
| 11 | We will move on to agenda item 12.D and we'll |
| 12 | turn it over to Sandra Menjivar-Suddeath. |
| 13 | MR. KLINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm so sorry. This |
| 14 | is Brian again. I think I may need to turn it over to Ms. |
| 15 | Flores to talk about the expense side of the COVID-19, if |
| 16 | I'm not mistaken. I forgot to say that before. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: No worries, no worries. |
| 18 | MR. KLINE: Thank you so much. |
| 19 | MS. FLORES: This is Linda again. I believe |
| 20 | Mr. Rey covered those expenditures, so we're good. |
| 21 | MR. KLINE: Okay. Thank you. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. Thank you very much, Mr. |
| 23 | Kline, for bringing that up, and Ms. Flores, for clearing |
| 24 | that up. |
| 25 | And now on to 12.D, Sandra Menjivar-Suddeath. |

Welcome, Ms. Menjivar-Suddeath.

2.3

MS. MENJIVAR-SUDDEATH: Thank you, board members. Good morning. For the record, Sandra Menjivar-Suddeath, Internal Audit director. I'm presenting agenda item 12.D which is just the Internal Audit Division status.

This is a briefing item only and it's on page 514 of your board books. The Internal Audit Division status for this board meeting includes an update on the progress in the Internal Audit Plan, as well as external coordination efforts.

Since the beginning of the fiscal year, the division has begun five engagements and actually has concluded one, the required annual audit activities report. That report is on page 516 of the board book. This report has to be submitted to the Governor's Office, the Legislative Budget Board, and the State Auditor's Office by November 1, 2020. We will do that after this meeting.

The information in the report is prescribed by the State Auditor's Office, and for this report the State Auditor's Office required us to include information on the engagements that we conducted in fiscal year 2020, the fiscal year 2021 Internal Audit Plan, any external audits we've had, as well as information on our peer review

process. We've included all that information in the report.

1.3

2.3

Other engagements that are still in flight, which are on page 515, include our quality assurance and improvement program. This is an annual review of the internal audit function to see how we are performing against audit standards, as well as our performance on efficiency and effectiveness. And we are in reporting and do plan on releasing that report to the Finance and Audit Committee and the board in October.

The procurement measures and advisory service and the employee relations audit has begun. They're both in planning. We do anticipate finishing those audits by January 2021.

The final item on the internal audit status is the fiscal year 2021 internal audit followup. We released the third and fourth fiscal year 2020 verified implementation status memorandum to the board earlier this week, and so now we're evaluating the first quarter audit recommendations. So those are the items for the Internal Audit Plan.

On external coordination efforts, as already discussed on the recap from the Legislative and Public Affairs Committee, the State Auditor's Office has already requested our status on the Sunset recommendations and

where we are on the management actions. We do anticipate 1 the State Auditor's Office coming in in the next couple of 3 months and actually asking for the documentation to 4 support the implementation status, and so Internal Audit 5 will coordinate those. 6 Those concludes my update and I'm open to any 7 questions. 8 MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you, Ms. Menjivar-Suddeath. 9 Does anybody have any questions? 10 (No response.) MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. Well, hearing none, I 11 quess we'll move to agenda item 13 which is executive 12 13 session. I think before we do that should we take a 14 break? Great. We'll take a five-minute break and before 15 we move into executive session -- or should we move into executive session and take the break? 16 17 Ms. Beaver, what is your suggestion on this? 18 MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, 19 for the record. 20 I'd recommend going ahead and going on break 21 first and then coming back on the record before going into 22 closed session. 2.3 MR. TREVIÑO: Sounds great. So we'll take a 24 break until high noon and then we'll come back and get 25

back in session, and then we'll move into executive

| 1 | session. |
|----|---|
| 2 | (Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., a brief recess was |
| 3 | taken.) |
| 4 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay, Tracey, are we ready to go? |
| 5 | Is everybody back? |
| 6 | MS. BEAVER: Tracey Beaver, general counsel, |
| 7 | for the record. |
| 8 | It is approximately 11:59 and I think we're |
| 9 | ready to go. |
| 10 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. If everyone is ready, I |
| 11 | think we'll reconvene and start the meeting. We've got |
| 12 | Member Gillman there, Member Prewitt I see, Member Graham |
| 13 | and McRae, we are only missing Board Member Scott. Member |
| 14 | Scott is here. We're all present so we're good to go. |
| 15 | One other note, Member Scott, your question |
| 16 | about the waivers. I have it on good authority that the |
| 17 | Governor's Office is working hard on this question but |
| 18 | they're just trying to find the right solution for the |
| 19 | citizens of Texas. It's not something that's arbitrary. |
| 20 | They're working on this. They just want to |
| 21 | chart the right path for the citizens of Texas. So I |
| 22 | wanted to comment on that. |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: Thank you. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, sir. |
| 25 | So with that, I think we're going to move into |

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

| 1 | executive session, if everyone is okay. We'll now pick up |
|----|--|
| 2 | agenda item number 13. For those of you in the audience, |
| 3 | I anticipate being in executive session for approximately |
| 4 | 30 minutes and we will reconvene in open session after |
| 5 | that. We will go into closed session under Texas |
| 6 | Government Code Section 551.071, 551.074, 551.076, and |
| 7 | 551.089. |
| 8 | Will the meeting host please move all |
| 9 | panelists, except the board members and those needing to |
| 10 | be in closed session to attendees. It is approximately |
| 11 | noon on October 1, 2020 and we're going into closed |
| 12 | session. |
| 13 | (Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the meeting was |
| 14 | recessed, to reconvene this same day, Thursday, October 1, |
| 15 | 2020, following conclusion of the executive session.) |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: It is approximately 12:21 on |
| 17 | October 1, 2020, and the Board of the Texas DMV is now |
| 18 | back in open session. |
| 19 | Will board members and panelists please turn on |
| 20 | your video and unmute your lines. I ask the meeting host |
| 21 | to move Tracey Beaver to panelist. |
| 22 | So we're good to go, Tracey? |
| 23 | MS. BEAVER: Yes, good to go. Thank you. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you. |
| 25 | We will now move on to agenda item number 14. |

So one of the things we've been talking about is the process around evaluating our executive director. And in terms of good governance, I'd like to appoint a committee charged with the review of the executive director's performance of her job description to be comprised of the chair -- and I'm going to take names off of this, but it's chair, vice chair, and then the third person would normally be the person who would be third person in line for the agency.

2.3

Member Graham has his hands full, so we've deferred to the longest serving chair on the committee which would be Member Prewitt, and Member Prewitt has graciously agreed to serve. So we are able to fill a three-person group.

This in no way eliminates the board's ability to comment on the chair's performance, and one of the things I'm going to require is that the members of the committee reach out to members to gauge their sense of it.

But just from a governance standpoint, a little bit easier process about going through it.

Although I have the authority to create board subcommittees, the board appoints the executive director of the department. I've decided to put this issue before the full board for a vote. The chair will now entertain a motion on agenda item 14.

| 1 | MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I will make a |
|----|--|
| 2 | motion. I move that the board approve the creation of the |
| 3 | Personnel Subcommittee with the members recommended by the |
| 4 | chairman during this meeting. I also move that the board |
| 5 | delegate the Personnel Subcommittee the task of evaluating |
| 6 | the performance of the executive director. |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. We've got a motion from |
| 8 | Member Graham. Do we have a second? |
| 9 | Member Gillman. |
| 10 | MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman? |
| 11 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes. |
| 12 | MR. SCOTT: I second for the plan to appoint a |
| 13 | committee to work on the executive director's performance |
| 14 | plan. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: Are you seconding? |
| 16 | MR. SCOTT: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. All right. Member |
| 18 | Gillman, you've been knocked out. I'm going with Member |
| 19 | Scott there. |
| 20 | Are there any questions or discussion on this |
| 21 | item? |
| 22 | (No response.) |
| 23 | MR. TREVIÑO: Okay. And no comments from the |
| 24 | public, so hearing none, I would call for the vote. We |
| 25 | have a motion from member Graham and a second from Member |

| 1 | Scott. Any further discussion? |
|----|--|
| 2 | (No response.) |
| 3 | MR. TREVIÑO: Hearing none, I'd call for the |
| 4 | vote. Board members, when I call your name, please state |
| 5 | your vote for the record. |
| 6 | Member Gillman? |
| 7 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: That's an aye. |
| 9 | Member Graham? |
| 10 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 11 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae? |
| 12 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 13 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? I guess that's |
| 14 | an aye. I can't hear you. |
| 15 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 16 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes. Okay. |
| 17 | Member Scott? |
| 18 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 19 | MR. TREVIÑO: And Member Washburn is no longer |
| 20 | with us, and I, Chairman Treviño, also vote aye. |
| 21 | Let the record reflect that the vote is |
| 22 | unanimous and the motion carries. |
| 23 | Okay. We will now move on to agenda item 15 |
| 24 | which is public comment. |
| 25 | Tracey, are there any comments from the public? |

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MS. BEAVER: Yes, there is a public commenter, 1 2 Gay McAllister, who is being given instructions on how to 3 raise their hand to be recognized by you, Chairman, when you're ready. MR. TREVIÑO: Okay, great. We will now hear from Ms. McAllister. Please raise your hand using the instructions provided to you, and please be mindful about

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Also, please state your name for the record and if you are representing anyone. You will have three minutes and you will be muted by the host after speaking for three minutes.

Ms. McAllister, welcome. I don't see you.

So is Ms. McAllister ready to go? And I don't want any of his time taken away until she starts talking. Are we good to go with Ms. McAllister.

> MS. McALLISTER: Hello.

eliminating any background noise.

MS. BEAVER: You may go ahead and proceed.

MS. McALLISTER: Thank you very much. This is Gay McAllister, I'm representing myself. I'd like to thank the chair and the board members and the employees who have done important work. I've been here this morning and I appreciate the time and your expertise and what you have contributed for the protection and the safety of the Texas public.

I'm speaking about Transportation Rule Chapter 218, Subchapter E, Section 218.53 that has to do with household good carrier cargo liability.

I recently moved from Dallas to Houston. I used a moving company, All My Sons, in Dallas. It was a two-part move with moving from Dallas to storage to Houston. The final step of the move I was overcharged for two trucks when one was adequate for the move from the Dallas residence to storage, and from storage in Dallas to Houston, they showed up with three trucks and one of them was almost empty. They couldn't give me an adequate breakdown of the charges. I was charged for four movers, there were only three.

But then the final insult was the reimbursement and my claim for damages. I submitted a claim for only \$2,200 which included a broken Stiffel floor lamp and completely demolished a broken antique Jenny Lind crib that couldn't be repaired, and seven pieces of crystal, four Waterford hiball glasses and three goblets, and I was offered a settlement claim of 60 cents on the pound which amounted to \$250.

I would implore the board to review this. It may not help me but this is a ridiculous charge, and I feel sure that the ladies on the board will get the sense of a reimbursement by pound for Waterford crystal is

certainly going to be inadequate. This rule, I don't know what is the origin of, and this is certainly a small issue in the important work that you do, but for those of us that hire moving vans, this reimbursement is totally inadequate.

2.3

MS. BEAVER: This is Tracey Beaver, general counsel, for the record. If I may, Chairman?

MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, please jump in here.

MS. BEAVER: I'd just like to remind the board that under the Texas Open Meetings Act the board can't comment or deliberate on a public comment that doesn't relate to an item that's posted on the agenda. This is because the public would not have been on notice that the board might discuss that subject. However, the department is able to give information about procedures that would be available to the public.

And so I would just like to note for this particular commenter that there are processes at the department in order to help folks who have these types of complaints to reach out to our Enforcement Division and file a complaint. And so if it's permissible with you, Chairman, we could definitely reach out to this particular commenter and provide this individual more information on how that process works at the department as well.

MR. TREVIÑO: I'd first like to thank Ms.

| 1 | McAllister for her comments and the challenges that she's |
|---|--|
| | |
| 2 | facing. Speaking for the board, I rarely do, but I |
| 3 | sympathize with her plight. |
| 4 | And we can ask staff to look into the matter, |
| 5 | can't we, and come back to us on this. Right? |
| 6 | MS. BEAVER: Absolutely, Chairman. |
| 7 | MR. TREVIÑO: Great. So I personally I |
| 8 | don't know about the rest of the board would like to |
| 9 | hear more about it and if you could return back with some |
| 10 | kind of assessment of how it went, and also just reach to |
| 11 | Ms. McAllister so she has some way to address her |
| 12 | grievances. |
| 13 | MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, this is Whitney |
| 14 | Brewster, executive director. |
| 15 | Yes, we would certainly be happy to reach out |
| 16 | the commenter and circle back to the board at the next |
| 17 | appropriate venue. |
| 18 | MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much. |
| 19 | Thank you very much, Ms. McAllister, for your |
| 20 | comments. |
| 21 | MS. McALLISTER: Thank you. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Tracey, are there any other |
| 23 | comments? |
| 24 | MS. BEAVER: No other public comments. Thank |
| 25 | |
| 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | hear more about it and if you could return back with som kind of assessment of how it went, and also just reach to Ms. McAllister so she has some way to address her grievances. MS. BREWSTER: Mr. Chairman, this is Whitney Brewster, executive director. Yes, we would certainly be happy to reach out the commenter and circle back to the board at the next appropriate venue. MR. TREVIÑO: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Ms. McAllister, for your comments. MS. McALLISTER: Thank you. MR. TREVIÑO: Tracey, are there any other comments? |

| 1 | MR. TREVIÑO: Then we'll now move on to Member |
|----|--|
| 2 | Prewitt's favorite next agenda item which is adjournment, |
| 3 | and if there's no further business to attend with, I would |
| 4 | entertain a motion, Member Prewitt. |
| 5 | MR. PREWITT: I would so move, Mr. Chairman. |
| 6 | MR. TREVIÑO: Second? |
| 7 | MS. McRAE: Second. |
| 8 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member McRae jumped in there. |
| 9 | Do we need a vote on this? |
| 10 | Okay. Board members, when I call your name, |
| 11 | please state your vote for the record. According to the |
| 12 | script, I've got to read it. |
| 13 | Member Gillman? |
| 14 | MS. GILLMAN: Aye. |
| 15 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Graham? |
| 16 | MR. GRAHAM: Aye. |
| 17 | MR. TREVIÑO: Yes, aye. |
| 18 | Member McRae? |
| 19 | MS. McRAE: Aye. |
| 20 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Prewitt? |
| 21 | MR. PREWITT: Aye. |
| 22 | MR. TREVIÑO: Member Scott? |
| 23 | MR. SCOTT: Aye. |
| 24 | MR. TREVIÑO: yes. And Member Washburn is no |
| 25 | longer with us, and I, Chairman Treviño, also vote aye. |

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

| 1 | And let the record reflect that the vote is |
|---|--|
| 2 | unanimous. |
| 3 | It is now approximately 12:30. We are |
| 4 | adjourned. |
| 5 | Thank you very much for everyone's diligent |
| 6 | work on this. Really appreciate everybody's efforts. |
| 7 | (Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the meeting was |
| 8 | adjourned.) |

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 MEETING OF: TxDMV Board via conference call 4 LOCATION: 5 DATE: October 1, 2020 6 I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 7 numbers 1 through 176, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording 8 9 made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the 10 Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. DATE: October 9, 2020 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 /s/ Nancy H. King (Transcriber) 18 19 20 On the Record Reporting & 21 Transcription, Inc.

22

23

7703 N. Lamar Blvd., Ste 515

Austin, Texas 78752