TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY REGULATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MVIRAC) MEETING

OPEN MEETING VIA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL

PUBLIC PHYSICAL LOCATION
Texas Department of Motor Vehicles
4000 Jackson Avenue
Building 1
Lone Star Room
Austin, Texas 78731

Wednesday, March 6, 2024 1:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

David Blassingame, Presiding Officer Michael Bradburn, Sr., 1st Vice Chair Trey Sralla, 2nd Vice Chair Christopher Donnelly Laird Doran Thomas Durant Paul Elam Lloyd "Buddy" Ferguson Julio Gonzalez Tony Hall Russell Hayter Charles Hicks William Murphy Stephen Prather, Sr. Michael Provost Franklin Sims Scott Stark Mike Sullivan Kalien Thomas Jimmy Vitela

I N D E X

AGEN	DA IT	EM	PAGE
1.	CALL A.	TO ORDER Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum	6
2.	DISCIA.	COUSSION, BRIEFING, AND ACTION ITEMS Consider Rule Amendments to 43 TAC Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration, Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle Distribution, and Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers, Necessary to Implement House Bills 718 and 3297 (88th Texas Legislature, Regular Session), and for a Rule Review of 43 Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration (BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION ONLY)	
	В.	Recommendations of Advisory Committee on Amendments to 43 TAC Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration, Chapter 215, Moto Vehicle Distribution, and Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers Necessary to Implement House Bills 718 and 3297 (88th Texas Legislature, Regular Session), and for a Rule Review of 43 Texas Administrati Code (TAC), Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles an Registration; for Presentation to the Boar (DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM)	ve d
3.	PUBL:	IC COMMENT	none
4.	ADJO	URNMENT	109

PROCEEDING

MR. BLASSINGAME: Good afternoon. My name is
David Blassingame, and I'm pleased to open this meeting of
the Motor Vehicle Industry Regulation Advisory Committee.
For ease of reference, I will refer to this advisory
committee as MVIRAC, which is the acronym for this
committee.

It is 1:05 p.m., and I'm calling the MVIRAC meeting for March 6, 2024, to order. I want to note for the record that the notice of this meeting, containing all the items on the agenda, was filed with the Office of Secretary of State on February 7, 2024.

This meeting is being held by telephone conference call in accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 551.125. Members of the public may attend the meeting in person at 4000 Jackson Avenue, Building 1, Lonestar Conference Room, Austin, Texas, 78731. Also, members of the public may attend this meeting by clicking on the Webex link in the posted agenda for the meeting and following the instructions to attend the meeting via Webex. In addition, members of the public may attend this meeting remotely by calling the toll free number which is listed on the posted agenda for this meeting, along with access code.

I don't know how many members we have in

attendance right now, with the vast majority of them being committee members that participate remotely.

At this time, I am asking attendees to please mute your phone for the entire duration of this meeting, unless I recognize you to speak. I am asking our meeting host to make sure all participants' phones are muted, except the advisory committee 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 conference call meeting. Because this meeting is being held by 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. Please identify yourselves before speaking.

Speak clearly and slowly. Remember that there might be a slight delay due to the conference call format so please wait a little longer than usual to respond to participants. Do not speak over others; please ask the presiding officer to proceed, and be sure to get recognized before speaking.

And for members participating in the room, please remember to press the button on your microphone to unmute before speaking, then press the same button to mute again after speaking.

I would like, also, to thank our court reporter who is transcribing the meeting.

If you are not a member of this advisory committee but wish to address the advisory committee or speak on an agenda item during the meeting, please complete the speaker's sheet at the registration table prior to the agenda item being taken up by the advisory committee, or send an email to GCO_General@TxDMV.gov to register by providing the required information prior to the agenda item being taken up by the advisory committee.

Please identify the specific items you are interested in commenting on, your name and address, and whether or not 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 comments portion of the meeting. When addressing the advisory committee, please state your name and affiliation for the record.

Before we begin today, I'd like to remind all presenters and those in attendance of the rules of conduct of our advisory committee meetings. I have the authority to supervise and conduct this advisory committee meeting. This includes the authority to determine when a speaker is being disruptive. Disruptive speakers will be muted, given a warning about disruptive behavior, and then

1	removed from the meeting for any continued disruption.				
2	Advisory committee members, if you become				
3	disconnected from the call, please rejoin as soon as				
4	possible. If you encounter technical difficulties, please				
5	reach out to our technical support team,				
6	Jeff.Templeton@TxDMV.gov or Zach.Warden@TxDMV.gov.				
7	Now I'd like to have a roll call of the				
8	advisory committee members. Please respond verbally when				
9	I call your name. Please indicate if you are present.				
10	Member Bradburn?				
11	MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn present.				
12	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly?				
13	MR. DONNELLY: Member Donnelly present.				
14	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran.				
15	MR. DORAN: Member Doran present.				
16	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Durant?				
17	MR. DURANT: Member Durant present.				
18	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Elam? Member Elam?				
19	(No response.)				
20	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Ferguson?				
21	MR. FERGUSON: Member Ferguson present.				
22	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Gonzalez? Member				
23	Gonzalez?				
24	(No response.)				
25	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hall?				

1	MR. H	HALL: Member Hall present.
2	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Hayter?
3	MR. H	HAYTER: Hayter here.
4	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks?
5	MR. H	HICKS: Member Hicks present.
6	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Murphy?
7	MR. M	MURPHY: Member Murphy present.
8	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Prather? Member
9	Prather, Sr.?	
10	(No r	response.)
11	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Provost? Member
12	Provost?	
13	(No r	response.)
14	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Sims?
15	MR. S	SIMS: Member Sims here.
16	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla?
17	MR. S	SRALLA: Member Sralla on the call.
18	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Stark? Member Stark?
19	(No r	response.)
20	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan?
21	MR. S	SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan present.
22	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Thomas?
23	MS. T	THOMAS: Member Thomas present.
24	MR. B	BLASSINGAME: Member Vitela? Member
25	Vitela?	

(No response.)

MR. BLASSINGAME: All right. I am David Blassingame and I am present also. We have a quorum.

The purpose of this committee is to assist the department in obtaining feedback regarding important legislation policy-making and rulemaking. The MVIRAC provides valuable input for the department by advising on issues related to regulations of the motor vehicle industry.

Agenda item 2.A. Consider rule amendments to 43
Texas Administrative Code, TAC, Chapter 217, Vehicle
Titles and Registration; Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle
Distribution; and Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers,
necessary to implement House Bills 718 and 3297 that came
out of the 88th Legislature, Regular Session, and for a
rule review of 43 TAC Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and
Registration.

Members, I will now move on to agenda item 2.A and turn the meeting over to Annette Quintero, director of Vehicle Titles and Registration Division, for an overview of the department's implementation plans for House Bill 718 and House Bill 3297.

Members, just as a reminder, if you want to comment or ask questions, please unmute yourself and ask for the floor, then wait to be recognized before speaking.

MS. QUINTERO: Good afternoon. Thank you, Member Blassingame.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, ma'am.

MS. QUINTERO: It is my pleasure to provide an overview of our implementation plans for HB 718 and HB 3297.

The implementation of HB 718 includes the elimination of the following paper tags and permits: dealer vehicle specific, dealer agent, one-trip and 30-day permits, converter tags, and buyer's tags, to include internet down tags. To replace these paper tags and permits, the department is creating three new metal license plates: the out-of-state buyer plate, the temporary registration plate, and a dealer temporary license plate.

Plate design for the new plates is currently underway. These plates are being designed to be distinguishable and easily recognizable. We expect to have these designs finalized in the coming months.

to submit transactions. The department has developed and deployed webDEALER 101 training. It is offered both inperson and virtually on a biweekly basis. Dealers can go to our website under Upcoming Events to sign up for these trainings.

To facilitate the distribution and tracking of license plates, the department is currently seeking a technology solution and inventory management system that will make it easier for dealers and county tax assessor-collectors to order inventory. This solution should track orders, shipments, facilitate forecasting inventory needs, inventory ordering, and much more.

The department is also seeking formal integration of the vehicle transfer notification process into our webDEALER platform to be initiated when a motor vehicle is sold or transferred, to facilitate the notice of transfer required by the dealer.

The department is currently reviewing our license plate distribution model. We are reviewing three options: maintaining the distribution model we have today, shipping to the tax assessor-collectors and the tax assessor-collectors then get plates to the dealers; or a hybrid where we store plates in a distribution warehouse, we ship to the tax assessor-collectors and then to the dealers; or we ship directly from the warehouse to the dealers and the tax assessor-collectors. We're currently undergoing a cost-benefit analysis of these three models.

The department is also currently working through the implementation of HB 3297. The bill eliminates the Texas Department of Public Safety's safety

inspection program for non-commercial vehicles and creates a replacement fee for those vehicles previously required to obtain a safety only inspection. The department is required to collect a new \$7.50 replacement fee at the time of registration.

We have a bimonthly, soon to be monthly, triagency meeting with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and the Texas Department of Public Safety where we are all working hard to ensure coordination, and collaboration across agencies is at the forefront of this effort. We are also at the beginning stages of framing our internal programming enhancements to ensure that our system accurately reflects the requirements in HB 3297.

Our team has been diligently working to align our resources, engage with our stakeholders, provide widespread knowledge and understanding of the impacts of these two critical changes. We've done this by partnering with the Texas Independent Automobile Dealers Association and with county tax assessor-collectors across the state. We have reached over 400 participants providing information related to HB 718 and HB 3297. We continue to explore solutions that we feel confident will ensure a smooth and efficient implementation process for both of these highly impactful bills.

You're muted, Member Blassingame.

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: Excuse me.
2	Are there any questions for Ms. Quintero?
3	MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla.
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla, you're
5	recognized.
6	MR. SRALLA: Ms. Quintero, are there any plans
7	to strengthen the webDEALER platform? I know that we've
8	been using the webDEALER platform for quite some time and
9	sometimes we find or a lot of times we find that new
10	units are not on the platform or they're tied to new units
11	not on the platform. I have another question but I'll
12	stop with that, answer that one first, please.
13	MR. BLASSINGAME: Ms. Quintero.
14	MS. QUINTERO: Sure. I want to make sure I
15	heard that correctly. The question is related to new
16	users on the webDEALER platform?
17	MR. SRALLA: No. New units, new machines,
18	cars. I'm in the motorcycle business but sometimes when
19	we use webDEALER, the new machines like if it's a brand
20	new 2024 model, it won't be on webDEALER. It won't come
21	up.
22	So are there plans to implement a process to
23	get machines on there faster? And then straight to
24	webDEALER, I would say probably about 10 to 12 percent of
25	the time, our webDEALER is down.

MS. QUINTERO: We are having extensive 1 2 conversations internally about webDEALER and the 3 enhancements that webDEALER needs in order to support this endeavor. It is an ever-evolving conversation we have 4 5 with our Information Technology Division, and Vehicle 6 Titles and Registration is obviously a big participant in 7 that conversation. So yes, the answer to your question is 8 yes, we are working extensively to make sure that 9 webDEALER can support the work that we're doing with HB 718. 10 11 MR. SRALLA: Okay. And then another request, I 12 quess, would be to make sure that there is -- on the contingent if somebody's internet is down or if webDEALER 13 14 is down or if a unit doesn't show up, that there's an easy 15 process for a dealer to be able to implement and not hold 16 up a unit sale. 17 MS. OUINTERO: Yes. That is also a 18 conversation we are having to ensure that you have a 19 replacement ultimately for internet-down tags. 20 MR. SRALLA: Thank you very much. 21 MS. QUINTERO: Absolutely. 22 MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any other questions 23 for Ms. Quintero? 24 MR. LUNA: Member Blassingame, this is Roland 25 Luna, deputy executive director with the DMV.

1 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes.

MR. LUNA: Member Sralla, a point -- I'll go to your question about webDEALER enhancements. Part of our legislative ask was asking for technology appropriations so that we could update our current system. As you pointed out, webDEALER sustainability is a consideration for us and we want to make sure that it's stable.

We are looking at enhancements, not only internally, but we are seeking feedback from all of our stakeholder groups within the motor vehicle industry, as well as with tax assessor-collectors, to make sure as we identify enhancements that we're scoping the work and we're prioritizing the work accordingly so that we can have it completed well in advance of July 1 of 2025 when webDEALER becomes a requirement.

If there are enhancements that you've identified that are specific to your business model, please send them to the DMV. We want to hear about them. We want to hear conversations about it, and we want to make sure that we get those addressed.

Thank you.

MR. SRALLA: Specifically who would we send those to?

MR. BLASSINGAME: I'm sorry, Member Sralla, you weren't clear.

1 MR. SRALLA: Who specifically would we send 2 those to? 3 MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you. MR. LUNA: You can send those to the Vehicle 4 5 Titles and Registration Division Director Annette 6 Quintero, or you can send them to Clint Thompson, the 7 deputy director of VTR. 8 Thank you. MR. SRALLA: 9 MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there other questions for 10 Ms. Quintero? 11 (No response.) 12 MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Ms. Quintero. Now we'll turn to Monique Johnston, director of 13 14 the Motor Vehicle Division, to brief us on plate 15 allocations. 16 MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Chair Blassingame. 17 As Ms. Quintero explained, HB 718 will 18 eliminate agent and vehicle-specific tags and be replaced 19 with a new metal dealer temporary plate. The new dealer 20 plate can be used for the same purpose a dealer currently 21 uses their agent and vehicle-specific tags, such as test 22 drives, transporting vehicles to auction, loaner vehicles, 23 and transporting vehicles to be repaired or conditioned. 24 This new dealer metal plate cannot be used for personal

use, so dealers will need to retain their current dealer

25

plates in order to use those for that purpose.

Issuance and distribution of the dealer plates will be maintained and mailed by the Motor Vehicle
Division, similar to how the current dealer plates are handled. Our goal is to keep the process consistent to what our dealers are already used to with their current dealer plates, such as requesting plates with new applications, reporting current inventory of their plates, and requesting additional plates with renewal applications if needed, utilizing a plate application type process to request additional plates in between renewals, allowing dealers to provide sales documentation or other information to support business need for additional plates outside the allotted allocations.

The initial allocations allowed for a new dealer plate are higher than the current dealer plates, based on industry knowledge, how our regulated community operates, and the allowed uses of these plates. The goal with the proposed allocations was to account for business needs, while also putting in limits as part of anti-fraud efforts.

So if you have any questions about the allocations that are listed in the rule package, I'm happy to answer those for you.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any questions for

1 Ms. Johnston? 2 MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. Member 3 Blassingame, may I be recognized? MR. BLASSINGAME: You are recognized, Member 4 5 Doran. 6 MR. DORAN: I'm not sure if this is the 7 appropriate time to ask this question, but this is 8 literally the million dollar question, and I think it's 9 how long from the time a request is made by a dealer for more plates can that be approved and the plates made 10 11 available to the dealer? 12 MS. JOHNSTON: So the goal of our division is to keep it consistent with what we currently do when we're 13 14 reviewing plate application requests. We actually 15 received six additional FTEs as part of 718, and those are 16 all being allocated to our new plate section. And that 17 division will handle the requests for the new dealer 18 plates, review the documentation, and that way the 19 turnaround can be as quick as possible so those dealers 20 can have those plates. 21 And they're mailed directly from our division 22 to the dealer, like the current dealer plate. If we do 23 use a third party, it will still be with the Motor Vehicle 24 Division; we will have that inventory onsite with us.

MR. DORAN: Member Blassingame, may I follow

25

1 up?

MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, please follow up.

MR. DORAN: If you're following how it's handled today and you've got additional resources, do you have a frame of reference for what that timing looks like?

MS. JOHNSTON: Not yet. We're still going through that process and what that process will look like, and it will also kind of circle around the new inventory management system and whether those plates will be in that system and how that will connect with eLICENSING and how the exact request process will work. But we're trying to keep it as consistent as possible with the current process that we have now as to not change what the dealers are used to.

But the additional staff that will be reviewing these requests will definitely keep the processing times quick with a quick turnaround.

MR. DORAN: Member Blassingame, follow-up?

MR. BLASSINGAME: Follow up, please.

MR. DORAN: So would the department be open to -- you mentioned six FTEs -- designating a special resource to handling certain situations that might justify expediting the production of more license plates to a particular dealer? And I want to pose two scenarios to the department that we've been thinking about.

The first one is a situation where there's a natural disaster, let's say a fire in West Texas. This is a hypothetical, of course but let's say CarMax had a dealership in Amarillo, Texas, and they lost 2- or 300 vehicles due to the fire. My understanding is that the plates, because they are used vehicles, are supposed to stay with the vehicles.

The vehicles have been destroyed. Would the plates then need to be voided and then CarMax has to request from the department that they try and send more plates? And this assumes, of course, that a company like CarMax would be able to get inventory from out of state or from other dealerships over to their Amarillo location.

MS. JOHNSTON: The allocations that I was referring to is just strictly for the new metal dealer plate that would be used for test drives and taking cars to and from auction and things like that, but we can still take that into consideration with our six FTEs for that purpose. I will kick it over to Ms. Quintero to talk about the general issue plates, which I think is what you're referring to in that situation.

MR. DORAN: Sorry about that.

MS. JOHNSTON: That's okay. There's a lot of plates.

MS. QUINTERO: Mr. Doran, I want to make sure I

understand your question. It is related to the timeliness with which we would process a request to have an increase in allocated metal license plates.

MR. DORAN: Correct.

MS. QUINTERO: So I am unsure what our current timeline is. But from what I understand, those are reviewed and quickly processed, and we don't anticipate that to be any different. We do have a stipulated formula that we follow to identify what that allocation should be, and then review any requests for additional plates on a case-by-case basis.

We don't anticipate there being a delay in reviewing a request for an increase in allocation, if that's the kind of forefront of your question.

MR. DORAN: If I may respond? No, really what I'm asking about is if in special circumstances there could be an expedited process by which the department sets aside what might have been -- I'll call it a run-of-the-mill request by a dealer who says, Hey, in four weeks I think I may need more plates. To say all hands on deck, this dealer needs to get back in business quickly, let's make sure there's no cessation of operations at the dealer, and so is it possible to dedicate one of the -- however you want to do it.

MS. QUINTERO: To get that done as quick as

possible, and that happens today. When we receive requests that need special attention or need to be expedited outside of the normal process because there is a sense of urgency, that already happens today, so yes.

MR. DORAN: Good, that's good to hear.

One more follow-up on this. So another situation that I just wanted to bring to the department's attention, because this one has some financial impacts to the state. When thinking about commercial fleet sales to rental car companies, we are essentially -- I'll be very honest -- competing with other regions, other states in order to secure those sales from the rental car companies.

You know, I'll just use some examples, so
Hertz, Enterprise, I mean, they could choose to buy 2,500
vehicles from Red McCombs Toyota in San Antonio or they
could choose Jim Norton Toyota in Oklahoma. And so one of
the concerns I have is that perhaps the Texas dealer has
their set allocation of metal plates and let's just for
the sake of this hypothetical say it's 2,500 plates
annually.

They get an order that GST, or whoever the distributor or manufacturer is, has helped facilitate the negotiations with the rental car company. They're now going to get an order for 3,000 new Camrys to be delivered to Dallas-Fort Worth Airport. Right?

So the concern here would be one of the things these rental car companies are very serious about is the time in which it takes to place that vehicle into service. They are very rational business creatures, and when it comes to their decision to whether to go with our recommendation to place that order with a Texas dealership versus an out-of-state dealership, in many cases the determining factor is that timeline by which they can put that rental vehicle in service.

expedited process in place to handle that kind of situation, the state could lose tens of thousands of rental car sales which would have a meaningful impact in terms of motor vehicle sales tax. So I'm throwing that out there as a consideration and concern that we have, and also to offer up our help and assistance, whether you need to have conversations with the Governor's Office or the Comptroller if you need data to substantiate the concern that I just raised, because we want to see those sales made through Texas dealers and to see that motor vehicle sales tax remain in Texas.

So I just wanted to pose that as something that's really been top of mind for us as we've gone through the rules. And although we're a distributor, we're looking at it in terms of the impact to both the

dealers as well as the manufacturers and distributors. 1 2 MS. QUINTERO: And that makes perfect sense, 3 and I appreciate the scenario and the explanation behind 4 it. I can assure you that we will look at it and make 5 sure that there is a mechanism there that will support 6 that. 7 MR. DORAN: Thank you. 8 MR. DONNELLY: Member Blassingame, Member 9 Donnelly. 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly, you have the 11 floor. 12 MR. DONNELLY: Just a quick question as far as distribution plates -- and I can't recall but I want to 13 14 say I receive it through the mail -- will there be an 15 option to have a more expedited mail, say, when we're 16 ordering our plates, or will we have to go through the 17 U.S. Post Office? 18 MS. JOHNSTON: Are you referring to your metal 19 dealer plates or your general issue plates, or both? 20 MR. DONNELLY: Both. 21 MS. JOHNSTON: We can definitely look into that 22 option. What our current mailing is right now and if you 23 could choose to have it mailed perhaps by, you know, FedEx 24 or overnight mail or things like that, that could be an 25 option or somehow look into that so there are different

options for the dealer to choose from. I'm referring, of 1 2 course, to the metal dealer plates. 3 MR. DONNELLY: Just having the option for a 4 charge. When you say it has to go through the Post Office 5 and I'm in Conroe, Texas, that's a scary thing. 6 MS. JOHNSTON: Understood, understood. 7 MR. DONNELLY: We get all kinds of junk mail. 8 MS. JOHNSTON: But no regular mail. 9 MR. DONNELLY: The titles have to come through 10 the post office and it is concerning. 11 MS. JOHNSTON: We can definitely look into that 12 and see if we can incorporate that option in as an additional charge if dealers would prefer to do that, 13 14 sure. We can definitely look into that. Thank you for 15 the input on that. 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Member Blassingame, may I jump 17 This is Member Sullivan. in? 18 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, please. 19 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 20 In reviewing the materials over the last 21 several days, could you walk us through the approval 22 process and the denial process and the potential appeal 23 process with respect to requesting additional plates for 24 the general issue plates? The way I read it -- I could be 25

wrong, but the way I read it was that we could request

plates and the director would review the request; if the 1 2 director declined the request, there was no appeal. 3 could you walk me through the process? MS. QUINTERO: I, unfortunately, am unsure of 4 5 the process. Can I ask Mr. Thompson if he can support 6 answering this question, if you have the answer, Mr. 7 Thompson? 8 MR. THOMPSON: Presiding Officer Blassingame, 9 may I have the floor, please? 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir. 11 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. Clint Thompson, 12 deputy director of the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. 13 14 I apologize, Member Sullivan, what was the 15 question? 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir. The question was to 17 walk us through the process for requesting additional 18 plates from a dealer, and if the request is denied, what 19 the potential appeal might be? Because if I remember 20 correct, the way I read it was that a dealer could request 21 plates, it would be reviewed, and if the director denied 22 the additional plates, there was no appeal. MR. THOMPSON: The short answer is it's the 23 24 same process it is today. The language that's in existing 25 administrative code merely shifts -- obviously, metal

1 plates is the new language from the temporary tags that 2 are being requested and the responsibility from the Motor 3 Vehicle Division to the Vehicle Titles and Registration 4 Division. So it's the same process, essentially, in rule 5 for requesting those and demonstrating the need, and if 6 there's additional information that's needed, like today, 7 we can request that. If we grant something in excess of 8 or below what you requested, that does not constitute a 9 denial, but yes, if it's denied today, that is final. 10 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. And the denial being from 11 the director? 12 MR. THOMPSON: With the new rules, it's the designated director with the Vehicle Titles and 13 14 Registration Division. 15 MR. SULLIVAN: And to put faces to names in 16 this conversation, that's going to be you? 17 Operative word being "designated MR. THOMPSON: 18 director" of the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. 19 So it may be Annette, it may be myself, or it may Stefan 20 Krisch, who is the Registration Services director. 21 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. And forgive me for not 22 identifying myself, so Member Sullivan. 23 So then for now, you would have the final say, 24 so to speak, or whoever your designee would be, and

there's just no appeal. I'm not saying that we're going

25

to need an appeal process, but with 1,300-1,400 franchised 1 2 dealers across the state, I think there might be an 3 exception that would be worth considering. MS. QUINTERO: So from what I'm understanding, 4 5 the current process is when it escalates to the division 6 director, the Vehicle Titles and Registration Division 7 director, that is the appeal. 8 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Member Sullivan. Are 9 y'all comfortable with that as is? 10 MS. QUINTERO: Yes. 11 MR. SULLIVAN: All right. Thank you. 12 MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any other questions for Ms. Johnston? 13 14 MR. DURANT: Member Blassingame, Member Durant. 15 May I have the floor? 16 MR. BLASSINGAME: You have the floor. 17 MR. DURANT: I would wait on this -- and this 18 is for all staff, whoever can answer -- I would wait on this, but I just don't see it in the code section so I 19 20 wanted to ask. There were a series of different plates 21 that we're offering, some of these plates are for out-of-22 state registrations, but I do not see a mechanism herein 23 for collecting those plates back. If the staff would 24 comment. 25 MS. QUINTERO: You are correct, we do not have

1 a mechanism for collecting the plates back. The intention 2 is to design those plates in a way that they are very 3 easily distinguishable as out-of-state temporary plates. 4 And in our system they would have a 30-day lifespan, and 5 so they would show -- sorry -- 60-day lifespan, and so in 6 our system they would show invalid after that 60-day mark. 7 MR. DURANT: Thank you. 8 Member Blassingame, one more follow-up 9 question? 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir, you have the floor. 11 MR. DURANT: This is Member Durant. 12 One other concern I had is obviously the 13 temporary tags served a very vital purpose, it was very 14 obvious. If a new customer, a new vehicle owner did not 15 receive their metal plates in time, it created a signal 16 that helped y'all find dealers that were out of trust, 17 that were having issues, and you were able to rectify that 18 very quickly. It helped the TACs collect taxes. Is there 19 a method to solve that problem? 20 MS. QUINTERO: A method to help the dealers 21 collect taxes? 22 MR. DURANT: A method to police the dealers 23 that are without those temporary plates being an obvious 24 indicator.

MS. QUINTERO: Sorry. Can you restate your

25

question? I think we're confused a little bit.

MR. DURANT: I'll give you a scenario. Say I'm a dealer and I'm short on cash. And I'm not making vehicle payoffs and collecting titles but I am selling those cars and putting them on the road. I've got a very real problem.

We had a massive auto group that just went bankrupt a couple of years back that was engaged in this type of practice. And I'm sure one of the ways y'all were able to find out and catch that dealer is that you had significant complaints from customers who said that they sold me a car and I still have not received my metal plates. And those complaints helped y'all identify that dealer and helped y'all do the best you could to take care of those customers.

And without that temporary tag system that's so visible, is there a plan in place to get the same result?

MS. THOMPSON: Presiding Officer Blassingame,
may I speak? Corrie Thompson, director of the Enforcement
Division.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, Corrie Thompson, go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: So what you're referring to is dealers who fail to timely transfer title. And so with the buyer's temporary tag expiring upon the 60-day

expiration mark, law enforcement is alerted to that expired tag out there on the vehicle and so they're more apt to identify that and report that to the department for late title transfers.

Much like when a dealer comes to the tax assessor-collector's office and they note the date of the sale and they note the time period that the dealer is coming in to transfer the title, we get a lot of complaints that way as well, too, from the tax assessor-collectors. And there's a late transfer fee associated with that.

We are losing that visibility running the plate, and VTR can correct me if I'm wrong, but that should still be notated in the system that the ownership has not transferred in that time period. So, yes, law enforcement would not have that initial visibility with that expiration date on the plate, but if they were to run the plate in the system, I believe there would be some information available to them there.

MR. DURANT: Thank you very much.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any other questions for Ms. Johnston?

(No response.)

MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Ms. Johnston.

I will now hand it over to Corrie Thompson, the

director of Enforcement, to tell us about compliance issues, including new data entry requirements and storage requirements.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Presiding Officer Blassingame. Again, Corrie Thompson, director of the Enforcement Division.

As Annette and Monique have mentioned previously in their discussion, this new law is going to eliminate the paper tags that dealers currently utilize for different processes regarding their daily business operations, so we have made efforts in the past couple of years to ensure that the data in our systems is up to date. We had heard from law enforcement that ensuring that information in our records really helps them, obviously when they're on roadside stops having accurate information.

And to ensure that we continue those efforts going forward with the dealers obtaining general issue plates now, you'll be putting those plates on the vehicles with the consummation of the sale of vehicles that are to be registered in Texas. Also with that, much like today, you connect the buyer's temporary tag to the vehicle upon consummation of that sale, you'll be connecting the general issue plate as well.

When you take a vehicle in on trade, as Annette

mentioned during her initial speech, you'll also be now required to do a vehicle transfer notification. So that's going to protect that person who traded in the vehicle to you from anything that happens down the line because, again, now the plate is going to stay with that vehicle. So when taken off of the vehicle, it's going to go back into the inventory, and when that vehicle is sold later down the road, you'll reapply that but the vehicle transfer notification would have already been filed and on record with the department.

enforcement will have the most up-to-date information in our record on that particular plate. Same thing with your dealer metal plates. So the vehicle-specific tag that you would use for test drives, the agent tag that you would use taking vehicles to and from auction or to and from the mechanic, that's going to be replaced with one metal dealer plate.

So you'll see some requirements in rule that say when you go to utilize those plates for that specific purpose, you're going to make those entries into the system, with the reasoning being then, again, law enforcement can query that record and they'll note that that plate being utilized reflects properly in the system. There is also some requirements in here about maintaining

the record for issuance of that plate to that vehicle within the vehicle as well, too.

Along with those new requirements for dealers, there is also a securing of inventory requirements which I know will probably be a point of discussion during today's meeting. The current rule states that something along the lines of needing to have a secure either safe or steel cabinet that is bolted or affixed to the floor in some way so that you can house that inventory of metal plates that you have, the variety that you'll have, the ones for out-of-state buyers, the general issue plates, your dealer plates. Because you're going to want to maintain security of that, just as you're going to want to maintain security of the actual system by not allowing password sharing, maintaining who has access, removing unauthorized users when they leave the dealership, things of that nature.

And of course, with these items and these new requirements imposed upon dealers, there is sanction authority for the department for violations found for those new requirements as well.

MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, this is

Member Bradburn. Can I ask a question, please?

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, you have the floor.

MR. BRADBURN: Thank you.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Director Thompson, just a quick question. 1 2 you transition over, will the closed data portal for law 3 enforcement just switch over where it will now show the 4 metal plates being issued versus the paper tags? 5 MS. THOMPSON: Corrie Thompson with the 6 Enforcement Division. 7 Member Bradburn, that is a great question. 8 Yes, it is the goal of the department to continue the data 9 that pertains to permits for 72-hour, 144-hour permits that are issued to motor carriers in the closed data 10 11 portal, but also to try to transition all of that metal 12 plate data into the closed data portal as well, so that that can be queried by law enforcement. 13 14 MR. BRADBURN: Thank you very much. No further 15 questions. MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, this is Member 16 17 Hicks. May I be recognized? 18 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, you're 19 recognized. 20 MR. HALL: Ms. Thompson, you mentioned the demo 21 plate, the agent plate. Is that going to be at VIN level, 22 where every time we demo a vehicle, we're expected to 23 enter the information into the system for that five to 24 eight minute demo drive? Or is that something that an 25 agent is issued the plate and it's not going to be

required to be at the VIN level disclosure? 1 2 MR. THOMPSON: Corrie Thompson with the 3 Enforcement Division. So I believe that that information starts on 4 5 page 19 in your package. And so the specific language 6 says that the dealer shall maintain in the license plate 7 system a record of each license plate issued by the 8 department to that dealer, including all of the different 9 types of the dealer plates, and that the record has to 10 have the plate number, the year and make of the vehicle to 11 which that plate is affixed, the VIN of the vehicle, and 12 the name of the person in control of the vehicle. So yes, that information would have to be entered into the system 13 14 for those demos. Excellent question. 15 MR. HICKS: As a follow-up to that. 16 Member Hicks. 17 As a follow-up, on a busy day in a high volume 18 store, one sales consultant could be demoing six, eight, 19 ten people, so is the webDEALER system where we're 20 supposed to be entering this data, or is it in a more 21 secure portal for that? 22 MR. LUNA: Member Blassingame, this is Roland 23 Luna, deputy director with DMV. May I be recognized? 24 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir, you are recognized. 25 MR. LUNA: To be determined, that's the answer.

We have two different systems right now, two different tracking systems that we use to track different types of temporary tags.

To go back just a little bit on why we have this new metal plate that's replacing the agent and vehicle-specific tag, this is in response to law enforcement concerns with officer safety and public safety considerations, being able to identify the vehicle and then ultimately being able to identify the driver. And that's the purpose for that plate.

But for tracking of the plates in particular, we're still working through technology to see if it's going to be more beneficial for us to have this feature incorporated into webDEALER or to use our existing system, which is a different system that we have that is real-time. So we're still working through that to be determined, and as soon as we have that identified, we will certainly communicate that to this group.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

A final question for Ms. Thompson regarding the security of the plates that you mentioned you know that will be a topic of discussion. Many dealers do not have a bolted down steel cabinet or safe. We do, however, have safe, secure closets and other areas where we keep our plates.

1 Will there be an option to consider that as a 2 solution, or will we be restricted to modifying our 3 facilities to meet that requirement? 4 MR. THOMPSON: Corrie Thompson with the 5 Enforcement Division. 6 Again, great question. So the purpose of the 7 advisory committee meetings that we're holding to discuss 8 these rules, one already previously held with our VTRAC, 9 another one to be held next week with our Consumer Protection Advisory Committee, and this meeting, are to 10 11 get input on what you would like to see in the rule 12 language knowing your current business needs. So the department is absolutely open to hearing any ideas, and I 13 14 have thought about that as well. 15 It might be that any particular dealership has 16 a large enough inventory of plates on hand at any one 17 point in time that it might need to be a room or a closet 18 that is secured. And so we are open to additional 19 language changes to the current rule. 20 MR. HICKS: Thank you. 21 MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla. 22 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla, you're 23 recognized. 24 MR. SRALLA: Ms. Thompson, I would like to 25 suggest a lot of us already have -- due to federal laws,

we have to have secured documents areas. And I would like 1 2 for that to be in consideration to be a place to store our 3 plates. MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Member Sralla. 4 5 Corrie Thompson with the Enforcement Division. 6 We will absolutely make note of that. 7 you for the recommendation. 8 MR. SULLIVAN: Presiding Officer Blassingame, 9 Member Mike Sullivan. 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, you're 11 recognized. 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. Ms. Thompson, if more than one member has 13 14 offered an idea that is supported by other members, do you 15 want to know that now? 16 MR. THOMPSON: I would love to hear any 17 additional recommendations that you have, Member Sullivan. 18 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. 19 I agree with the previous comment that we all 20 have document secure areas that are strictly controlled, 21 keypads on the doors. Those numbers are not shared, they 22 are employee specific. And I would strongly encourage the 23 department to consider document secure areas as being 24 suitable for storage of metal plates. Also, to be

receptive to the idea of other secure areas that the

25

1	dealer is comfortable in assuming liability for placing
2	those plates in.
3	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for the
4	recommendation.
5	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.
6	MS. MORIATY: Chair Blassingame, if I may?
7	This is Laura Moriaty, general counsel.
8	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, ma'am, go ahead.
9	MS. MORIATY: I just wanted to address Member
10	Sullivan's idea that multiple folks are talking about the
11	same idea here. We're about to have a section where y'all
12	can make motions and make official recommendations to the
13	Board, so that would be the opportunity to get a vote on
14	it officially and make it an official Board recommendation
15	to do exactly what you're saying. Get something that lots
16	of folks have consensus on and put it in front of the
17	Board.
18	MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, ma'am.
19	Are there any other questions for Ms. Thompson?
20	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. May I be
21	recognized?
22	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, you're
23	recognized.
24	MR. DORAN: I do want to make sure I'm raising
25	this at the right time. I'm not going to make the motion

now, I get that, but a question I had for Ms. Thompson.

So in talking about the requirements of essentially associating the plate with a particular vehicle -- which I think you talked about being on page 19 for the dealer -- I see those same four requirements also being imposed upon the manufacturer or distributor as it relates to a manufacturer's license. And I believe this is on page 2 of 87 or page 5 in the packet, lines 4 through 7, I believe.

So a couple of thoughts on that that I wanted the agency to be aware of. As it relates to manufacturer plates, on the page before — which would be page 1 of 87. Under 215.120(b), it talks about testing prototype motor vehicles which I'm going to just interpret to be both a prototype as well as a pre-production vehicle, one that is not destined for a retail sale to a consumer but yet is still operated on a Texas public road for some purpose.

Those vehicles, in all likelihood, are not going to have a VIN number. So the requirement on the following page there, page 2 of 87, page 5 of the book, line 6, wouldn't seem appropriate in that situation.

Similarly, the way a manufacturer or distributor operates in their use of manufacturer plates.

They will apply that plate to multiple vehicles. You could have a situation where within the same week that

plate is on six different vehicles.

It was used to move a vehicle from the Toyota Center that was on display to the Houston Rodeo, and then it was used on a different vehicle for the MS-150 that weekend, et cetera, et cetera. So the idea of tying the plate to a specific vehicle and having to provide information about year, make and model of the vehicle with the license plate is kind of -- it is problematic from an operating standpoint.

Obviously, the first requirement there, making sure that the license plate number is accounted for and that the plate itself is accounted for is something that manufacturers and distributors are doing today and have safeguards and controls in place. But requirements 2 and 3 there, which would be either problematic or inapplicable in certain instances.

And then the last part of this section here, on line 7 which is number 4, talks about the name of the person in control of the vehicle to which the plate is affixed. Again, from an operational standpoint, a manufacturer or distributor may have an in-house employee that is charged with maintaining control of the plate and knowing where the plate is going, what it's being used for, what event it's associated with on the vehicle, et cetera.

But to assign that responsibility to the person in control of the vehicle would seem unworkable, and here's why. That vehicle may be operated by an intern, an activation company for ride-and-drive, a celebrity, any number of different people, and that can change sometimes within a day's time. So having to report those changes to the DMV when you think about the industry, hundreds, if not thousands, of manufacturer-plated vehicles, you would be inundated with minute changes as to who is using the vehicle that happens to have the plate that morning, that afternoon, that evening.

So when we get to the point of the meeting where we're talking about proposed motions, I have a suggestion for that that may be helpful and more workable.

So my question here -- sorry, that was the windup -- my question was what was the intent behind including these requirements on manufacturers and distributors when House Bill 718 -- which I was a part of a lot of the conversations around -- doesn't have anything conveying that the legislature's intent was to impose new requirements on manufacturers and distributors related to manufacturer plates.

MS. MORIATY: Member Blassingame, if I may?
This is Laura Moriaty, the general counsel.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, Laura, go ahead.

MS. MORIATY: So, Member Doran, the challenge about our text here is that we're reflecting both the changes that are currently proposed in front of the Board with Chapter 215 and the changes that we are currently anticipating. So the language that's underlined just in black here and isn't highlighted is actually language that was proposed in December and is coming back to the Board in April. So that's actually not in front of this committee right now, so that was not part of the 718 changes. That's preceding that as part of the 215 rule review that we are fixing to complete in April.

So we're happy to hear the feedback, but I just want to make sure that you understand that those changes are coming up in April and that we should really take that feedback to Terry and I so that we can make sure that we're incorporating any change we need to make into the stuff that's going to the Board this time. We can also look at it in the context of House Bill 718 and see if there's a new lens we need to put on it now that we're not just looking at it as a rule review, but that was where these underlined black changes came from. The only thing that's changing officially for 718, from our perspective, is the highlighted yellow language.

MR. DORAN: Thank you. Member Doran.

I appreciate the explanation and perhaps the

agency can avoid multiple manufacturers and distributors having to weigh in on that issue at the April hearing if we're able to address it at this stage. So I understand the train has left the station a little bit as it relates to formal comment on that, and obviously the advisory groups taking that specifically up, but we want to raise awareness of this issue because I would hate for the agency to hear about it after the fact. So thank you.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Anybody have questions for Ms. Thompson?

(No response.)

MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Ms. Thompson.

Now we'll turn to the specific rule amendments that will be discussed today. I'll turn it over to Deputy General Counsel Ashley Healy to lay out those rule amendments for us.

MS. HEALY: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Blassingame, members, and for the record, my name is Ashley Healy and I'm the deputy general counsel at DMV.

Today I'm presenting the draft rules to implement House Bill 718, which includes edits to the Texas Administrative Code Rule 215, 217 and 221. In addition, it was time for the regular rule review under Section 2001.039 of Chapter 217, so there's additional draft edits in 217 for this purpose.

So as Laura was saying a second ago, you saw some changes to 215 that were part of that rule review process which the agency has to do every four years for each of its rules, and those were the ones that were presented back in December and will go before the Board again in April. But we are bringing to the Board the Chapter 217 rule review, along with the 718 changes. We're bringing that to them together; we thought that would be more efficient there.

And then finally, also we are implementing
House Bill 3297, which is the bill that relates to the
elimination of certain safety inspections. So we've
included some edits for that implementation as well here.
Quite a bit going on, so I can understand exactly how it
would be confusing what the different edits and highlights
mean. The main point is that anything that is highlighted
is directly related to 718 in our opinion, and so that's
how we distinguish that.

We presented these rules to VTRAC about two weeks ago and we intend to work with this committee as well as VTRAC and CSPAC, so Vehicle Titles and Registration and Consumer Protection, to improve upon these drafts and to bring these rule packages to the DMV Board at the June Board meeting. That's when we're looking to bring them to them, so we'll continue to work

on them for the next few months and so we welcome all of your input.

I want to thank you guys all for your review of these. I know it was very voluminous. And in the interest of time, rather than go through each edit individually through these 800-page documents, we're going to go ahead and discuss the things that we feel like the stakeholders really will have some significant conversations about and things that impact you guys substantially.

So during the next agenda item, we're happy to take recommendations — the next agenda item being where you guys make your motions. We're happy to take recommendations for clerical and conforming changes, like if we just need to clean something up without having to make full motions and votes and all that stuff. If there's something that you guys see where we called it X in seven places and we called it Y in something else, you guys can just send those to us or let us know about it right here. We don't have to take motions for that kind of thing.

And your committee is seeing the first draft of these rules, the first public draft of these rules, so we know there's probably several small clerical errors that could be cleaned up, and we thank you guys for bringing

these to our attention. And as always, we welcome motions for any substantive changes.

I do want to note that we had a couple of clerical things that we did fix based on Member Hall's comments to us. We cleaned up some numbering, a spelling error or two, and we added some consistency with -- in some places we had called it general issue license plates and some places we called it buyer's license plates, but we were meaning the same thing. And so we updated that definition and added consistency throughout so that that would be less confusing for you guys.

So I'm going to jump right into the things that we thought were going to be some of the points we wanted to highlight and jump to those particular sections in the rules so you guys can have a discussion on that and provide us your recommendations.

So the first thing -- and most of these things have already been spoken about by the other ladies up here -- allocation and storage. So this is coming from Section 503.0633 of the Transportation Code, and the first part of the rule that I want to talk about is Section 215.152, Obtaining dealer-issued license plates. This is our allocation numbers for new dealers.

And so this is one of the sections that's changing, and so if you guys want to talk about this in

the next agenda item, that's one thing that we wanted to bring up to you. And Monique has already made a lot of comments about that and y'all have had some good discussion, so I'm not going to go any further into that since you guys have already had a discussion on it.

Additionally, under allocation and storage and storage requirements, that rule section is section 215.140, and currently it does say that it has to be in a safe that's bolted down. We did receive a recommendation from VTRAC to add a secured storage room or closet, so that is something that we're considering and you guys are welcome to make some more motions or recommendations during the next agenda item about what would work for you guys.

We expect that this is an area where we're going to get significant feedback from this committee because you guys are the ones having to do it, so we want to know what works for you. We're not trying to impose anything that's not going to be logistically feasible. So we want to hear you guys think that you can do that and keep them secure, and we know that you also find value in keeping them secure, so we want to hear from you guys about that.

The next thing is fees. So we do have Section 503.063(g) relating to dealer-issued license plates for

buyers. So 503.063(g) currently requires the department to set a fee of not more than \$5 for the buyer's temporary tags, which we know don't exist anymore, temporary paper tags.

So this section is amended by House Bill 718 beginning on July 1, 2025. The amended 503.063(g) requires the department prescribe a fee to be charged by the dealer to the buyer for the metal license plates that will be issued to the buyer upon purchase and they will stay with the vehicle. Buyer's temporary tags will no longer be issued.

So this fee is to be credited to the Texas DMV fund which is used to fund legislatively appropriated programs, initiatives and operations. The department is determining what dollar amount is necessary to ensure the solvency of the DMV Fund given the changes in operational requirements. And the new fee is expected to be at least \$10 and no more than \$15. So currently you'll see it reflected in the draft rules as an X because that's, again, something that's open for discussion and we want to hear feedback on.

The next thing that we thought you guys might want to talk about is data entry requirements, and you did. So in Section 215.138, these are metal dealer's license plates. This is our modernization of the

recordkeeping requirements.

We're proposing the dealer enter all the dealer standard and temporary license plate data into the license plate system which will allow toll authorities, law enforcement officials to have immediate access to specific vehicles and what license plate is being used and who is in control of those vehicles. So we're going to hopefully be able to get into a more modern system of things all being electronic and easily accessible by anyone who needs to see those rather than some of the paper records that are being kept currently.

So other related issues. Again, we mentioned that we were going to talk about 3297, so we've got some sections in 217 that address the changes that 3297 makes. So currently we have the VIN authentication for out-of-state vehicles in non-emissions counties, and so what we've put in the rule for that one is kind of a self-certification method for when somebody brings a car in from out of state and then how that is going to be authenticated for the VIN. That would previously have been authenticated through the inspection process, and so now certain vehicles would be available to have a self-inspection.

And let me pull up that language real quick. So in accordance with Transportation Code 501.030, the

verification of the vehicle identification number would be on a form prescribed by the department for the applicant to self-certify the vehicle identification number if the vehicle is not subject to 548. That's one change we made in 217 related to that bill.

Then additionally, as I said, we were also going through the rule review process for Chapter 217.

And so a couple of things that we made changes to or proposed changes to as part of the rule review process is Section 217.84, and that's the application for a non-repairable or salvage vehicle title. So this new provision is going to require that insurance companies, in addition to the information and documentation that's required to apply for a non-repairable or salvage vehicle title, that they have to disclose which major component parts must be repaired or replaced as a result of the damage to the part.

And then finally, the last thing that we wanted to highlight is Section 217.9(a)(1) and (3)(7), and this is about bonded titles. And so the statute,

Transportation Code 501.053 requires a release of all liens with bond to ensure that the creditors are not harmed by the bonded title, and a bonded title to ensure that the current owner is not harmed. So the rule currently allows them to get a bond just large enough to

cover the lien but it doesn't meet the requirements of the statute, and so this could harm secured creditors with perfected security liens who have to go sue and get payment.

And so we need to more closely align the rule with what the statute actually authorizes. But we might have some statutory challenges here, so this is something where we do have some statutory challenges that we have to work around because our authority extends to being able to pass rules which are within authority given to us by the legislature here.

Those are the things that we thought you guys might want to talk about. Obviously, anything that is contained in these rules, we could talk about and make motions on. But we wanted to highlight those specific sections and let you know which sections they were found in to give you guys kind of a head start on that.

So if anybody has any questions.

MR. SULLIVAN: Director Blassingame, Member Mike Sullivan.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, you have the floor.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Ms. Healy, when referring to the chapter numbers, et cetera, it would be helpful to me if we could

1	mention if it's in our 292-page, whatever, what blue page
2	number.
3	MS. HEALY: Of course. Everything I referred
4	to is in your documents but I can jump to that too.
5	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Presiding Officer
6	Blassingame.
7	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir.
8	MR. SULLIVAN: I just wanted to say thank you.
9	MR. BLASSINGAME: You're welcome.
10	MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, this is Member
11	Hicks. May I ask a quick question?
12	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, go ahead.
13	MR. HICKS: And this is really for staff. Is
14	it appropriate for this group to hear the suggestions that
15	came out of the first review of this inside CSPAC and any
16	other committee where dealers have already provided
17	feedback with suggested language changes, or do we need to
18	keep this an independent discussion?
19	MS. HEALY: It's a public meeting, the one that
20	just happened, and so I can let you know that we did have
21	one recommendation that was related to storage
22	requirements, and they recommended that we add a locked
23	storage room or something to that extent.
24	MR. HICKS: No other feedback from CSPAC other
25	than that?

1	MS. MORIATY: We have not met with CSPAC yet,
2	that one is next week. We met with the MVIRAC about two
3	weeks ago.
4	MR. HICKS: That's the one I'm thinking of.
5	Okay. Thank you.
6	MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any other questions
7	for Ms. Healy?
8	
	MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member
9	Bradburn with a question.
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, you have the
11	floor.
12	MR. BRADBURN: Thank you.
13	I just had one question. If I'm correct, now
14	when a dealer loses or a buyer tag gets stolen, they can
15	void it in the system but it does not show up for law
16	enforcement. The storage is going to be a hot topic for
17	all these other car dealers so I feel their pain, but when
18	metal plates do get stolen because we know criminals
19	will adapt are they going to show up in the TLETS
20	system for law enforcement when they get entered so the
21	cop driving down the street knows that plate is stolen?
22	MR. LUNA: Member Blassingame, this is Roland
23	Luna. May I be recognized?
24	MR. BLASSINGAME: You are recognized, sir.
25	MR. LUNA: Member Bradburn, the way that we

envision is, let's first talk about what is displayed in TLETS now. If there's an old motor vehicle record -- our motor vehicle records are provided to the Department of Public Safety. And as the administrator for the State of Texas, they oversee the TLETS system, the Texas Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, that Member Bradburn is referring to.

Whenever they run a registration check, law enforcement on a vehicle, if the registration is current, it will provide all of the details for that vehicle to the officer. If a plate is stolen that was traded in -- so if I buy a vehicle and it was pre-owned vehicle, there should already be a plate that's assigned to that vehicle. If that plate is stolen, we envision being able to place a remark in that motor vehicle record so that a replacement plate can be issued to that vehicle.

Member Bradburn, there's a number of logistical considerations that we have to consider and this is why we want to hear these types of scenarios from law enforcement personnel on our various advisory committees. We're happy to have further conversation about recommendations that you may have.

MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. The only thing I can see is when a vehicle is stolen, when DMV has the mark on the bottom saying it's stolen, it also populates on the

1 wanted vehicle system. And that might be a suggestion for 2 a lost plate to populate there as well, just for officer 3 safety and public safety. MR. LUNA: Yes, sir. And as we work through 4 5 operational changes and implementation, we're working very 6 closely with the Department of Public Safety. As we make 7 enhancements and changes to our system, we update the 8 motor vehicle record but we do not control the layout of 9 the information in TLETS. But as y'all make 10 recommendations, we will certainly pass those along to 11 DPS. 12 MR. BRADBURN: Thank you, sir. No further 13 questions. MS. THOMPSON: Officer Blassingame, Corrie 14 15 Thompson with the Enforcement Division. 16 MR. BLASSINGAME: Ms. Thompson, you have the 17 floor. 18 MS. THOMPSON: Yes. I wanted to follow up on 19 the question that Member Bradburn had. 20 Also, Member Bradburn, to get that stolen plate 21 information into the hands of the department, Rule 215.138 22 does currently mandate that the dealer report any lost, 23 stolen or damaged plates in the system back to the 24 department, if it's a dealer plate, within three days of

the discovering. And then if it is a buyer plate, so

25

1	those general issue plates, within 24 hours of
2	discovering, so that we'll be able to update the system.
3	MR. BRADBURN: Well, that's excellent. Thank
4	you.
5	MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any other comments?
6	MR. DORAN: Member Blassingame, this is Member
7	Doran again. A question for Ms. Moriaty.
8	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, you have the
9	floor.
10	MR. DORAN: Thank you.
11	So I just want to make sure I'm understanding
12	correctly. I was going to make three motions today on
13	underlying language in this proposed rule package. Am I
14	precluded from doing that today, or is it the desire of
15	the agency that we put those in writing and send them to
16	the agency?
17	MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general
18	counsel.
19	So we can make them today, I just want to make
20	sure we have an effective feedback loop going between you
21	and I since our deadline for this is much sooner than
22	these will actually be presented to the Board. Now, it's
23	very possible that you could also amend them in June.
24	Right?
25	Assuming that the Board adopts the proposed

changes, they would be effective, and then we could take
them back up again in June. So let's go ahead and do them
today. I just wanted to put it on your radar that that
language was currently proposed and still open if there
were easy things that we could do at adoption.

Now, it's important for me to point out that
obviously our ability to adopt something different than
what we propose is very limited. So it's very possible
that our only route to deal with the problem at this point
is to adopt what we have and then amend it in June when we
bring these amendments forward. So let's go ahead and do
it. I just wanted you to know that we may have a chance
to fix it ahead of that.

MR. DORAN: Okay. Thank you. And I think they're fairly minor, but you let me know when you want me to lay those out.

MS. MORIATY: Sure. You're about to move to the part of the show where you get to make your motion, we can just talk about it then.

MR. DORAN: Okay. I'll wait till we get to that part of the show. Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BLASSINGAME: Are there any other questions?

MR. HALL: This is Member Hall.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hall, you're

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

MR. HALL: Thank you. I have a question or a follow-up question, I guess, on the \$10 to \$15 fee. And for a little bit of context, I'm a member of the advisory committee that met a couple of weeks ago and I made a general comment about the buyer's tag fee being replaced with a new registration fee that was just mentioned at the \$10 to \$15.

It would be helpful to understand what is going into that calculation because every motor vehicle that's operated on the road today has a general issue license plate. There's not a supplemental registration fee that's attached to those, and part of this process is actually proposing to reuse general issue license plates, which would seem to be a cost savings to the state. So I'm trying to figure out what's going into the calculation that would justify essentially increasing a motor vehicle operator's registration annually -- or I say annually -- one time by that \$10 to \$15 range rather than keeping it fairly consistent.

Again, I understand that there are going to be operational costs, a new system has to built, and all that stuff, but I bring that up. And motor vehicle affordability is a big thing, certainly when somebody is paying \$60-, \$70-, \$80,000 for a car, maybe \$10 or \$15

isn't a big deal, but a lot of vehicles are significantly cheaper than that, especially used motor vehicles and those little bits of money can make a difference. I just want to kind of understand what's going into the rationale to increase the fee from \$5 to two to three times that.

MS. QUINTERO: Member Hall, this is Annette Quintero, Vehicle Titles and Registration director.

I don't have an explicit answer to your question, however, I have done quite a bit of research in the last couple of weeks related to the \$5 registration fee that we currently have, and from what I was able to uncover and kind of work backwards from -- as you can imagine, it was no easy feat -- the fee has been \$5 since very likely the beginning of the fee which I couldn't find any data beyond the year 2000. There weren't any rules related to the \$5 fee until 2007, I believe; there wasn't a statute that addressed the rule until 2007.

So while I don't have an explicit answer to your question, the only answer I do have is that that fee has not been assessed in almost likely two decades. And so as part of the overall assessment that the department is doing related to ultimately the way that we do business, but it happens to be brought to the forefront of HB 718 and the implementation of metal plates. So it is ultimately a registration fee.

1 It is not a temporary tag fee or a metal plate 2 fee, it is a registration fee. Does that help provide 3 some insight, Member Hall? MR. HALL: Yeah. Just one slight follow-up. 4 5 So that registration fee is being earmarked for the Texas 6 DMV Fund, and there was a comment made about keeping that 7 fund solvent. If the fund is already solvent and the 8 department is able to fund its operations with the 9 existing \$5 fee which is going into the DMV Fund, again, 10 I'm just trying to advocate for let's make sure that we're 11 not increasing registration fees, which consumers 12 generally look at as taxes, unnecessarily if the funds are not actually needed just for the sake of saying -- you 13 14 know, I get it, inflation has gone up a lot in 20-25 15 years. But if it's not needed to actually balance the DMV 16 Fund, let's err on the side of not raising fees for 17 consumers. 18 MR. LUNA: Member Blassingame, this is Roland 19 Luna. May I be recognized? 20 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir, Mr. Luna, you're 21 recognized. 22 MR. LUNA: Member Hall, good to hear from you. 23 Roland Luna, deputy executive director with the DMV.

look at replacing the buyer's tag fee, which is now \$5,

There are a number of considerations when we

24

25

with this amount that we're trying to determine that we need your assistance for. When we look at the buyer's tag fee that has been flat, as Annette said, for two decades, if you consider the operational considerations that we have at the agency, license plate manufacturing is one consideration, the raw materials, the manufacturing, the transportation, and then ultimately, being assigned to a tax assessor-collector and then to a dealer, there are various components that we need to consider along the way that have increased in cost and that \$5 buyer's tag fee has been flat.

And if we think about CPIs over the last two decades, I mean, let's just focus on a loaf of bread, what did a loaf of bread cost two decades ago and what does it cost today, a significant difference in price. So when we're looking at that and we're looking at the long-term projections of the DMV Fund and our solvency as an agency to make sure that we can continue to deliver first class customer service at our regional service centers, to dealers, and to the public, we have to ensure that our technology, our services and all of our operations can continue to be funded, which is why we need some help determining what that fee should be, if it's \$10 or somewhere in between the \$10 and \$15. But we know today that \$5 is inadequate, which is why we want to have

additional conversation with committees. 1 2 Thank you. 3 MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla. 4 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla, you have the 5 floor. 6 MR. SRALLA: I want to follow up on the fee 7 concern here. I agree, I don't believe that a modest 8 increase in the fee from \$5 to \$10 or to \$15, while we're 9 always careful we don't want to nickel-and-dime people to 10 death, we do agree with the solvency. But by the same 11 token, has there been any discussion with allowing the 12 dealer -- because you've used the word charge a fee, but it's not really a charge. It's more passing it on to the 13 14 collection of a fee to charge a \$5 fee or something, 15 because we have increased costs as well with additional 16 security and the things that are going to go along with 17 having plates in-house. 18 MR. BLASSINGAME: Mr. Luna, any answer? 19 MR. HALL: This is Member Hall. 20 MS. HEALY: Could you repeat your question, 21 please? I was trying to figure out the exact question. 22 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hall. 23 MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general 24 counsel. I'm going to need to go back to the statute but 25 I don't believe we have statutory authority to charge a

1	fee that the dealer can collect.
2	MR. THOMPSON: Presiding Officer Blassingame,
3	can I have the floor, please? Clint Thompson, deputy
4	director.
5	MS. HEALY: Thank you, Clint.
6	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
7	The existing statute and I believe that's
8	what Member Hall was fixing to speak to the existing
9	statute allows the dealer to charge a \$20 fee relative to
10	this.
11	MS. MORIATY: So it's set specifically by
12	statute. Is that right, Clint? We don't have rulemaking
13	authority
14	MR. THOMPSON: That's correct, and it's
15	unchanged by House Bill 718.
16	MR. HALL: This is Member Hall. That's what I
17	was going to say. The dealers can already charge an
18	optional fee up to \$20 for processing a buyer's tag, which
19	does not change, so they can charge up to \$20 for
20	processing a metal plate.
21	MR. BLASSINGAME: Does that answer the
22	question?
23	MR. SRALLA: Yes, it does. Thank you.
24	MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you.
25	Are there any other questions for Ms. Healy?

1 (No response.)

MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Ms. Healy.

Are there any public comments on item 2.A?

MS. MORIATY: Laura Moriaty, general counsel.

There are not.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Members, I will now move on to agenda item 2.B. Now that the committee has been briefed by TxDMV on the proposed amendments to Chapters 215, 217 and 221, it is time to discuss and vote on any recommendations that we as an advisory committee want to present to the TxDMV Board.

To assist the court reporter in getting an accurate record, please cite to the blue page number at the top right-hand side of your written materials and the line number located on the left-hand side of the draft amendments to Chapters 215, 217 and 221, when discussing any portion of the provisions in the written materials that TxDMV staff provided you.

Any recommendations from this advisory council should be made in the form of a motion that this advisory council votes on, unless TxDMV staff are willing to accept an informal comment. An example of a motion is: I move that this advisory committee recommend to the TxDMV Board that the proposed amendments to Section 215.120 should be modified to add a clause that says X.

1 Members, do you have any recommendations to 2 present to the TxDMV Board regarding the draft amendment 3 to Chapter 215, Motor Vehicle Distribution? 4 MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. May I be 5 recognized? 6 MR. BLASSINGAME: You have the floor, Member 7 Doran. 8 MR. DORAN: Thank you. 9 Okay. So I wanted to follow up from our discussion earlier. And to make sure we have a clean 10 11 record, I'm looking at blue page 5 of the proposed rule 12 packet. This is also identified as page 2 of 87, dealing with Chapter 215, towards the top of the page, and it is 13 14 essentially lines 5 and 6. 15 So I'm going to explain the motion and then 16 I'll make it. Right? 17 So what I'm trying to accomplish here with this 18 motion is to strike lines 5 and 6 which would require that 19 a manufacturer or distributor put into the license plate 20 system the year and make of the vehicle to which the plate 21 is affixed, as well as the VIN number. And as I discussed 22 earlier, there are operational complexities -- or frankly, 23 an operational impossibility as it relates to VIN numbers 24 not existing for certain vehicles. So with respect to

those two lines, I'm going to move to strike them, but let

25

me continue to explain the motion.

And in addition to that, on line 7, which is number (4) here, it reads currently: the name of the person in control of the vehicle to which the license plate is affixed -- that that would be information that the manufacturer or distributor would have to input into the license plate system. The proposal that I'm going to make is that the language be changed to read: the name of the person in control of the vehicle plate. And then strike the rest of the language there on line 7, again, page 5 of the packet.

So I would like to make a motion at this time to modify what is Chapter 215.120, License Plates, the proposed rule under (d)(2)(3) and (4) to be changed and modified as follows. One, striking lines 5 and 6 which are numbers (2) and (3) that currently read: the year and make of the vehicle to which the license plate is affixed, and number (3) the VIN of the vehicle. And then changing line 7, number (4) to read: the name of the person in control of the vehicle plate, period, striking the rest of that line.

That would be my motion.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BLASSINGAME: We have a motion on the floor.

Member Bradburn.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	MR. DORAN: I think we've got to get a second.
2	Right?
3	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yeah, you're right.
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan, second.
5	MR. BLASSINGAME: All right. Member Bradburn,
6	are you for or against?
7	MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn against the
8	motion.
9	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly?
10	MR. DONNELLY: Member Donnelly, for.
11	MS. MORIATY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. This is
12	Laura Moriaty, general counsel.
13	If you'd like to call for discussion, members
14	might have things they want to talk about before we vote
15	on this motion.
16	MR. BLASSINGAME: Okay.
17	MR. MURPHY: I'll call for discussion. This is
18	Murphy.
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Go ahead.
20	MR. MURPHY: I'd like to hear from people that
21	do this every day, all day long about those changes.
22	MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, this is Member
23	Hicks.
24	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, you have the
25	floor.

1	MR. HICKS: Specifically for Member Doran, this
2	is related to manufacturers, distributors and converters,
3	not to dealers, but the specific use by the manufacturers
4	or distributors. Correct?
5	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. Yes, that is
6	100 percent correct. This does not impact any operations
7	by the dealer whatsoever.
8	MR. HICKS: Thank you.
9	MR. HALL: This is Member Hall.
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hall.
11	MR. HALL: I'm going to probably direct this
12	question to Mr. Luna, since he's got prior law enforcement
13	experience.
14	If a law enforcement officer is affecting a
15	traffic stop and they run that plate and they don't know
16	if that plate is legally affixed to that vehicle because
17	there's no vehicle description to go along with it, and
18	the operator of that vehicle is also not tied to the
19	record, what type of risk does that pose to an officer
20	that's affecting that traffic stop?
21	MR. LUNA: Member Blassingame, this is Roland
22	Luna. May I respond?
23	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir, Mr. Roland.
24	MR. LUNA: So the scenario that Member Hall
25	just described would be handled as what's called a high

risk stop by law enforcement. The license plate is for one purpose. It's to identify the owner or the registrant of the vehicle and the conditions of the vehicle.

And during the legislative session we met with a number of law enforcement associations, as well as individual law enforcement agencies, both county and municipal law enforcement, to discuss what their concerns were around paper tags. And one of the prevailing themes that we heard from those groups was that they had a need to identify the vehicle.

And at the height of temporary tag fraud —
that y'all are well aware of that ultimately led to this
bill — that was one of the considerations that continued
to be pushed by law enforcement was the immediate need to
identify the vehicle. So the purpose of having the metal
plate ultimately is to identify the vehicle and the
conditions. And by having a plate on there, law
enforcement is able to query that in the TLETS system and
see the returned information so that they know how to
approach the vehicle and be able to determine whether or
not that vehicle is stolen.

MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. May I respond to that?

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, go ahead.

MR. DORAN: So today when a Toyota vehicle or a

General Motors vehicle or a Tesla vehicle is pulled over by a law enforcement officer and it has a manufacturer's plate on there, my understanding -- because trust me, there's been plenty of employees that have been pulled over -- my understanding is that what law enforcement sees is that that vehicle is owned by and registered by the manufacturer or distributor. So the officer knows as they approach the vehicle this is a company car that is owned and operated by the company. So the right question to ask is: Are you authorized to be operating the vehicle?

And in that regard, this agency provides all of the -- they provide letters that all of the associates from our company carry with them in the vehicles identifying the license plate -- this is signed by Daniel Avitia -- that says: These plates are associated with Gulf States Toyota and this associate or this employee is authorized to be operating this vehicle. So that's how that works today.

And just to clarify the question, so at no point in time are paper temporary tags ever placed on one of these vehicles that has a manufacturer plate, so it's a different situation.

Thank you.

MR. LUNA: Yes, sir.

MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1 Bradburn. 2 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, go ahead. 3 MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. The reason I'm opposing it right now is line 4 5 item 5, section (2). If you take away everything on there 6 but the license plate number, regardless of what kind of 7 plate it is, we call it ghost plate law enforcement. 8 not going to come back on anything. I believe at least it 9 should be modified -- if it's a prototype vehicle, if it's 10 an ambulance, a fire truck, whatever, it should have some 11 kind of descriptor. 12 Perfect example, not manufacturer, just this 13 weekend NYPD, they had a metal dealer plate, legitimate 14 one, not reported stolen, New York troopers do a stop and 15 it was a stolen vehicle. So I think there needs to be a 16 little more security features because I personally was at 17 the Capitol with the legislature on these, and that was 18 the intent of this bill. 19 And that's my comment. 20 MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Member Bradburn. 21 MR. DURANT: Member Blassingame? 22 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir. 23 MR. DURANT: Member Durant. 24 I'm confused here. It's a difference of

interpretation, but when I read the line "the name of the

25

1 person in control," I understand that a company can be in 2 control of the vehicle. It's not saying the name of the 3 person driving the vehicle. So I read that as if Tesla owned the vehicle, 4 5 the name of the person in control would very much be Tesla 6 or General Motors, or any manufacturer. Perhaps the staff 7 can clarify what exactly that language means. 8 MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, sir. 9 Staff? 10 MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general 11 counsel. 12 I do not have the preamble in front of me, but I believe the intent of in control was to mean the person 13 14 driving it, the operator, so that law enforcement would 15 know who they are going after. Now, you're absolutely 16 right that person does potentially mean corporate entity, 17 which I think is what Member Doran is getting at when he 18 suggests that we draw it back to the person, the entity in 19 control of the plate. 20 MR. BLASSINGAME: Did that answer your 21 question, sir? 22 MR. DURANT: Yes, sir. Thank you very much. 23 MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion before 24 we vote? 25 MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn. Can I make one

1 more comment? 2 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, you have the 3 floor. MR. BRADBURN: I would actually agree with 4 5 Member Durant on line item 7, changing that from the name 6 of the person to the entity. To me that would make sense 7 as a law enforcement officer, so I would agree with that. 8 MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion? 9 MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. So it sounds 10 like there might be a suggestion to change the motion as 11 it relates to line 4 to say: the name of the person or 12 entity in control of the vehicle to which the license 13 plate is affixed. That sounds like it might appease. 14 MS. MORIATY: Member Blassingame, this is Laura 15 Moriaty again. 16 I just wanted to clarify. It sounded to me 17 like Member Bradburn was willing to take out "in control 18 of the vehicle." I thought he was agreeing with you. 19 MR. DORAN: I think so too. 20 MS. MORIATY: Member Bradburn, are you fine 21 with his language which is currently the name of the 22 person in control of the vehicle plate, not the vehicle? 23 MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn. I was opposed

to line item 5 being taken out. That should still say in

there. On line item 7, I believe if I had it right,

24

1 Member Doran wants to change it to the manufacturer entity 2 versus the name of the person, and that I would agree 3 with. MS. MORIATY: Right. So his language for 4 5 number (4), line 7 -- his language would be: the name of 6 the person in control of the vehicle plate. 7 MR. BRADBURN: I would agree with that on that 8 line 7, yes. 9 Thank you. MS. MORIATY: 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion? 11 (No response.) 12 MR. BLASSINGAME: Do you want to change the original motion? 13 14 MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. 15 I'm still struggling with line 5 here and the 16 concern that's been raised around that. Because the 17 plate -- the whole reason for having a manufacturer plate 18 is the interchangeability of it with different vehicles so 19 that they can be quickly and easily moved legally on Texas 20 roads. So what I've discussed a few times in the meeting 21 is that operationally I'm having a hard time understanding 22 how it would be practical to have to perhaps enter into 23 the system multiple times in one day. 24 We really haven't discussed much in the meeting 25 as far as to how it would work, what hours of operation

accessibility would be, those types of things, that we would have to have potentially inputting this information.

Okay, it's noon, now the plate is on a vehicle at the rodeo. And then we're going to remove it as soon as we get it parked at the rodeo, and then we're going to put just a Toyota license plate on it. And that plate is now going to be carried by that individual who is responsible for it and it will be placed on another vehicle.

It's very difficult. So I'm trying to accommodate the concern that's been raised as it relates to line 5 there, but I don't have a good way to address that concern. Because that's really the crux of the issue there is I'm understanding the concern to be that the objection is that the manufacturer or distributor would have to input information into the license plate system about the specific vehicle that that plate happens to be affixed to.

Now, one possible -- I still don't think this is going to get where law enforcement wants to go with this -- but maybe once a year we could do that or once a quarter, but I mean, again, the frequency with which that plate is removed and applied to other vehicles that it's authorized to be applied to is pretty high, and I think it would be administratively cumbersome and burdensome to do that. So I don't know that I can really modify the motion

to address that concern, but I am open to suggestions from staff.

MR. DONNELLY: Member Blassingame, Member Donnelly.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: I'm not sure if this is an appropriate time to ask the question, but I see what Laird is saying. And from an independent standpoint it would be cumbersome keeping track of it, but I'm envisioning somebody sitting in front of a computer individually punching something in.

Is there any plan for some type of mobile app scenario would you could utilize the scan technology that would then go into that system, and we're not sitting in front of a desk? Because that's where I'm struggling is everything in the system is in front of a desk, but will there be something mobile that, say, my employees can scan the VIN, scan the plate, connect it, type in his name and done?

MS. QUINTERO: Annette Quintero, Vehicle Titles and Registration director.

I would love that, I would. I think I would be remiss to say that we are that far along in our technology track to be able to accomplish that. But it is definitely something that we would -- a model we would really like to

get to. There's a lot of efficiency gained in that space, but we're a way away from that.

MR. DONNELLY: Long way away. Got it. Thank you.

MR. HALL: This is Member Hall.

I believe this language is exactly the same for the dealer plates, so the expectation is going to be the same for dealers. And I can guarantee you that dealers that are doing test drives are going to have this problem at a level that's exponentially higher than what manufacturers are. But just my personal perspective on this is this whole bill was a result of a law enforcement officer dying because of temp tag fraud, that my personal opinion is that whatever that burden is, is not worth another law enforcement officer losing their life.

I think us finding the way to solve this problem through our internal operations, if there's a technology solution, I mean, any website is accessible from a mobile phone, whether it's mobile-friendly or not is a different conversation, but I think we've got to put law enforcement at the forefront. And for me, the biggest sticking point is not having a record of what vehicle that license plate is actually affixed to at the moment that that law enforcement officer might be effecting a traffic stop. They're getting a plate and it's going to come back

and it's going to say, yeah, okay, it belongs to Toyota but they're not sure if it's on the right Toyota vehicle, they have no description of the vehicle, to me that just increases risk.

So just from that standpoint and the purpose behind this whole bill, I think we've got to defer to ensuring an optimal outcome for our law enforcement officers that are effecting traffic stops.

MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. May I respond to that?

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, go ahead.

MR. DORAN: Thank you.

I completely agree that the premise of HB 718 was to protect law enforcement and to meet what their needs were. And throughout the process of this bill going through the legislature during the session, we, along with other stakeholders, worked very closely with the bill author, Craig Goldman, and his staff on this. And I can tell you that in my experience in working with the bill author, not one time was there ever a concern raised by law enforcement or any other stakeholder that manufacturer plates were ending up in the wrong hands, had been mishandled, that safeguards hadn't been followed, and that those plates were being used in the commission of a crime. I'm not saying that that's never happened but I'm telling

the group here that throughout the legislative process that did not come up.

So here we have a situation where, unlike the dealers who were a driving force as a reason for HB 718, we are now going further afield from what the legislative intent of this bill is and we are getting into the realm of potential scenarios versus things that have actually happened. And I think when you're talking about hypotheticals, you have to apply a different level of scrutiny and a lighter touch, honestly, when you're dealing with things that haven't been identified by law enforcement or the bill author as a reason for the bill.

So I just wanted to make that -- I just wanted to express that, so thank you.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you.

Any further discussion?

MR. SULLIVAN: Member Blassingame, Member Sullivan.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to pose a question but I don't know to who, so forgive me. In thinking of the scenario that Member Doran has laid out where there may be multiple changes throughout the day of a plate, I think my question, from a layman's perspective, is are those changes entered into a system and those are reflected in

real-time, if that makes sense.

So in other words, for instance, going back to our old safety inspection days, at midnight everything trues up. All the records are updated. So in fact, currently -- and you may know the answer to this, Member Doran -- do we know whether or not that the changes made throughout the day when the plates are changed are actually accurate anywhere? Does that make sense?

MR. DORAN: Member Doran. I don't know, Member Sullivan. I think that's a question for staff.

MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director,
Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. Presiding
Officer Blassingame, if I can have the floor, please.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BLASSINGAME: You have the floor, Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

So obviously considering that manufacturer plates are not in the system today as being entered for a vehicle, that's the whole discussion point that we've got right now. Those records are available. What we are talking about doing is creating a system, whether it's eTAG that we all use today for dealer plates, or whatever the system may be, to mirror that same process that, yes, when a vehicle is entered into that system, when a record is created, it is near real-time, which is what eTAG is

today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You issue a buyer tag, within minutes law enforcement has access to that record. The same concept would prove true with the manufacturer. And Member Hall's point, the dealer plates, that once you make those instantaneous changes for changing a vehicle for driving it for demo purposes or whatever the case may be, or changing at the rodeo, livestock show, or whatever the case is, yes, those would be updated and reflected for law enforcement near real-time.

And I also want to point out that keep in mind this is a protection. And while we have not heard from law enforcement about issues with manufacturer license plates, we have heard issues from dealers and other entities about stolen plates and plates being used on vehicles that they're not authorized for. This is a protection for manufacturers; it's a protection for dealers as well.

They actually have that record of the vehicle that it belongs to, law enforcement runs that, they recognize that it doesn't belong on that vehicle, it's a stolen plate. That's an opportunity to protect the entity that the vehicle actually has been moved from or the plate has been moved from.

> ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

Thank you.

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: Does that answer the
2	question?
3	MR. SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan. Yes, thank
4	you.
5	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. If I
6	modified my motion?
7	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, go ahead.
8	MR. DORAN: Thank you.
9	I would like to make essentially the same
10	motion and just leave out my proposed change to line 5,
11	which is number (2) the year and make of the vehicle to
12	which the license plate is affixed, so that just to
13	restate the motion, the motion would be to strike line 6
14	which identifies the VIN number of the vehicle and then to
15	make that change in line 7, number (4) to modify it to
16	read the name of the person in control of the vehicle
17	plate, period.
18	MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member
19	Bradburn. Can I have the floor?
20	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, go ahead.
21	MR. BRADBURN: Thank you.
22	Member Doran, thank you for working with me. I
23	would suggest on line 6, instead of completely removing
24	the VIN of the vehicle some of those vehicles are going

to have VINs, and if you're already updating stuff, if it

1	doesn't have a VIN, like a prototype, that would be one
2	thing. But if it has a VIN, I think it should be entered.
3	MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you.
4	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. May I be
5	recognized?
6	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran, you have the
7	floor.
8	MR. DORAN: Okay. Let's modify this one more
9	time. We will change line 6 to read: (3) the VIN of the
10	vehicle, if applicable; and.
11	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion?
12	MS. MORIATY: I'm sorry. This is Laura
13	Moriaty, general counsel.
14	We're going to need a second on that.
15	MR. SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan, second.
16	MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you, Member Sullivan.
17	We have a motion from a member and a second
18	from a member. Any further discussion?
19	MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member
20	Bradburn.
21	Can we just read back now what we're voting on,
22	please?
23	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes. Do you want to read
24	that back?
25	MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general

1	counsel. I can read it back if that will help.
2	So we're modifying line 6 to read: (3) the VIN
3	of the vehicle, if applicable; and. And then we're
4	modifying line 7 number (4) to read: the name of the
5	person in control of the vehicle plate.
6	MR. BRADBURN: Thank you very much.
7	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion?
8	(No response.)
9	MR. BLASSINGAME: I will now call for the vote.
10	Members, when I call your name, please state your name
11	and for the record whether or not you support the motion
12	or not. If you support the motion, please respond by
13	saying Support, and if you do not support the motion,
14	please respond by saying No.
15	Member Bradburn?
16	MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn, support.
17	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly?
18	MR. DONNELLY: Member Donnelly, support.
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran?
20	MR. DORAN: Member Doran, support.
21	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Durant?
22	MR. DURANT: Member Durant, support.
23	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Elam?
24	(No response.)
25	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Ferguson?

1	MR.	FERGUSON: Member Ferguson, support.
2	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Gonzalez?
3	(No	response.)
4	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Hall?
5	MR.	HALL: Member Hall, yes.
6	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Hayter?
7	MR.	HAYTER: Member Hayter, yes.
8	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks?
9	MR.	HICKS: Member Hicks, support.
10	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Murphy?
11	MR.	MURPHY: Member Murphy, support.
12	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Prather, Sr.?
13	(No	response.)
14	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Provost?
15	(No	response.)
16	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Sims?
17	MR.	SIMS: Member Sims, support.
18	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla?
19	MR.	SRALLA: Member Sralla, support.
20	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Stark? Member Stark?
21	(No	response.)
22	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan?
23	MR.	SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan, yes.
24	MR.	BLASSINGAME: Member Thomas?
25	MS.	THOMAS: Member Thomas, support.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Vitela? Member Vitela?
2	(No response.)
3	MR. BLASSINGAME: I, David Blassingame, support
4	the motion. It passes.
5	Members, do you have any recommendations to
6	present to the TxDMV Board regarding the draft amendments
7	to Chapter 217, Vehicle Titles and Registration?
8	MS. MORIATY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. This is
9	Laura Moriaty.
10	I want to make sure we're still running through
11	215, because I think at least Mr. Doran might have had
12	some other suggestions.
13	MR. DORAN: Thank you. This is Member Doran.
14	I'm not going to move forward with the second
15	motion. Thank you.
16	MR. BLASSINGAME: The advisory committee does
17	not have any formal recommendations to the department
18	requiring a vote, but has provided a great discussion and
19	information to the department to consider in drafting the
20	rules.
21	We will now move on to the draft amendments to
22	Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers.
23	MR. HICKS: Mr. Blassingame, this is Member
24	Hicks.
25	MR. BLASSINGAME: Mr. Hicks, go ahead.

1	MR. HICKS: Did we come to terms in Section 215
2	regarding the language on storage? Did we get a proper
3	language vetted through this committee?
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: We did not discuss that.
5	MR. HICKS: Okay. It's on blue page 26,
6	section (e). I'm not making this a motion yet, but I
7	certainly could, that the language was to extend that to
8	include secure document storage areas or other secured,
9	locked closet areas, whatever that might be.
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: Discussion?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Member Blassingame, Member
12	Sullivan.
13	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir, Member Sullivan.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.
15	If you'd put that in a motion, I'd be happy to
16	second it. It sounds like you read it and it certainly
17	met my expectation.
18	MR. HICKS: This is Member Hicks. I'll
19	rephrase that. Looking for a motion to amend Section
20	215 you'll have to help me staff, what section that is.
21	MR. HALL: This is Member Hall.
22	Real quick, before we make a motion, I just
23	want to point out that the VTR Advisory Committee did make
24	a motion on this and the language that was moved was to
25	include "or substantially constructed room" to that

existing definition, so that recommendation has already 1 2 gone before the Board, and the department is considering 3 that as part of that other advisory committee. I don't know that staff feels it's going to be necessary for us to 4 5 make a motion for the same thing, but if we need to do so, 6 I'm happy to make that motion. 7 But there's a couple of different sections 8 where that's in, it's not just one. I think there's two 9 or three different sections that we use that same 10 language. 11 MR. SULLIVAN: Member Blassingame, Member 12 Sullivan. 13 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, go ahead. 14 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. I'm not sure that I 15 understand or would agree to "substantially." So the 16 original discussion, I guess from Mr. Hicks, if I'm not 17 mistaken, is more in line with what I was hoping to come 18 out of the meeting today, but to add the word 19 "substantially constructed" is not something I would 20 support. 21 Thank you. 22 MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, it's Member 23 Hicks. May I be recognized? 24 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, go ahead. 25 MR. HICKS: Thank you.

1 Staff, could you share with us the specific 2 language that was offered up at the prior committee review of this so we could look at that before we settle this 3 4 down to a motion? 5 MS. MORIATY: Certainly. This is Laura 6 Moriaty, general counsel. We'll have to look it up. 7 I just want to talk about the term 8 "substantially" quickly. This current language you have 9 in front of you is actually based off the requirements for controlled substances, so it is more serious than it 10 11 probably needs to be for license plates. But in that 12 sense, "substantially" is defined, like the common usage of the word means it's heavily constructed, fortified. So 13 14 I just want to make sure we're on the same page that in 15 this usage it's meaning fortified and strongly 16 constructed. 17 There have been some folks who thought it meant 18 partially, substantially meaning somewhat, so that's not 19 the meaning. 20 If you'll give me just one moment, I will pull 21 up the language from VTRAC. 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 23 Presiding Officer Blassingame, while she looks 24 that up, may I be recognized? 25

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, you have the

1 floor.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. I can envision -- having been in many dealerships where there are secure areas with materials such as chainlink fencing or similar materials that might not appear to be "substantially constructed" but are definitely suitable and adequate for storing the plates because we're storing -- [audio cuts out].

Thank you. Now it's back on green. So now they're all back green again, forgive me.

But the substantially constructed doesn't have to be the materials that one might envision. Dealers have secure areas now that are protecting inventory of all types that I think would be suitable and not all into the "substantially constructed" definition.

Thank you.

MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla.

MR. SRALLA: I'm in agreement on that. I mean, whoever is going to decide to make the motion, "substantially" -- when you start adding terms like that, then you get into some gray areas and who's going to make a determination on what's substantial or not. I think secured document area is substantial enough for documents, according to the federal government, so I think it would be a good enough application in this application as well.

1	MS. MORIATY: Mr. Chairman, this is Laura
2	Moriaty, general counsel. I've got the language for you
3	now.
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: Do you want to read that back
5	to us, Ms. Moriaty?
6	MS. MORIATY: Absolutely. The VTRAC motion
7	was: "at least one securely locked, substantially
8	constructed, secure storage room, facility, safe or steel
9	cabinet bolted or affixed to the floor or wall in such a
10	way that the safe or cabinet cannot be removed" blah,
11	blah, blah. So they just added "secure storage room,
12	facility" to this language.
13	MR. BLASSINGAME: Does that solve the problem?
14	MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, this is Member
15	Hicks.
16	That would certainly serve I think that
17	language lines up with what we intend to offer up as a
18	modification.
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Presiding Officer Blassingame,
20	Member Mike Sullivan.
21	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan.
22	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I agree with Member Hicks
23	completely. It's suitable language for me to vote to
24	approve.
25	Thank you.

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any other discussion?
2	MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member
3	Bradburn with a question.
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn.
5	MR. BRADBURN: Are we adding to this only?
6	Because my concern is I mean, they need to find
7	different ways for their business, I understand that, but
8	some of these independent dealerships are 200 square feet
9	in size completely, give or take, so they're not going to
10	have room. They still will need some kind of locking
11	cabinet or something to lock their stuff up.
12	MR. DONNELLY: Member Blassingame, Member
13	Donnelly.
14	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly.
15	MR. DONNELLY: I am one of those dealers that
16	are very, very small. We have a safe to keep our titles
17	in and such and we would anticipate with the volume of
18	business that we do, it wouldn't be burdensome to put
19	license plates in the safe.
20	MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn. Member
21	Donnelly, that makes sense. I just don't want to see
22	independent dealers pushed into a position that they're
23	not in compliance.
24	MR. HICKS: Member Bradburn, this is Member
25	Hicks Member Blassingame, I guess I need to be

1 recognized. 2 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, you're 3 recognized. MR. HICKS: Member Bradburn, this is adding 4 5 language to that as an alternative, the dealers can have a 6 secured, locked document storage area, so the language 7 lines up with the previous committee's review. 8 offers up the alternative in lieu of some form of a locked 9 safe or secured structure affixed to the floor. 10 MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn. Thank you. 11 That makes perfect sense, I agree. 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Member Blassingame, Member 13 Sullivan. 14 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan. 15 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 16 And not trying to beat this up, but we're still 17 agreeing that it would not have to be securely fastened to 18 the floor. Is that correct? Losing track of who was speaking, but it was, I think, the person before Hicks 19 20 that said something about the prior language from the 21 other committee. 22 MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general 23 counsel. 24 If we were to track the prior language from the 25 other cabinet, the safe or steel cabinet would still need

to be attached to the floor or wall, the storage room or 1 2 facility would not, so it only modifies the second half. 3 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you very much for 4 clarifying that. Thanks. 5 MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion? 6 MR. HICKS: This is Member Hicks. I know we 7 need a motion for this. I'm just trying to figure out the 8 best way to modify or add to the language as to present an 9 alternative of having secure document storage area fit the 10 requirement of securing the plates. 11 And I'm looking at section (e) now. Can you 12 give us or show us the language how it was presented to be modified by the prior committee? 13 14 MS. MORIATY: This is Laura Moriaty, general 15 counsel. 16 So the language from the prior committee --17 first of all, keep in mind that this language occurs in 18 several places within these rules, this is just one 19 example. So when we make this motion, we should ask 20 globally to have the description of the secured facility 21 changed to match this. I just want to note that this is 22 not the only one. 23 So the language that the last committee, VTRAC, 24 looked at said, "at least one securely locked, 25 substantially constructed, secure storage room, facility,

safe or steel cabinet bolted or affixed to the floor or 1 2 wall" and continued on from there. So the only words that 3 they actually added were "secure storage room, facility." MR. HICKS: This is Member Hicks. 4 5 And I'll ask you, Ms. Moriaty, do you believe 6 that offers that as an alternative or is that in addition 7 to the requirement that needs to be affixed to the floor? 8 So your secure storage room or MS. MORIATY: 9 facility would not need to be affixed to the floor but the 10 way that VTRAC described it, those were a room or a 11 separate storehouse, so they already had a floor. They 12 were a separate structure. So yes, if you were working off of a safe or a 13 14 steel cabinet or any other form of box in your room, it 15 would need to be affixed to the wall or floor. 16 MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla. 17 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla. 18 MR. SRALLA: I'd like to go ahead and put forth 19 a motion so we can get started on this. So I move on page 20 26, Chapter 215, section (e) that my motion would be that 21 plates must be stored in a locked, secured storage room or 22 a safe or a steel cabinet that cannot be readily removed. MR. BLASSINGAME: We have a motion from the 23 24 Do we have a second? floor. 25 MS. MORIATY: Mr. Chairman, sir, if I may, can

1 I just clarify that the member would want that language 2 used in every instance where this storage security is 3 described, not just in this particular rule? 4 MR. SRALLA: That is correct. 5 MS. MORIATY: Thank you. 6 MR. HICKS: This is Member Hicks. I'd second 7 that motion. 8 MR. SULLIVAN: Presiding Officer Blassingame, 9 Member Mike Sullivan. 10 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan. 11 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. 12 Ms. Moriaty, even though the motion only had 13 some of the language mentioned in (e), we would still have 14 everything else, for instance, in dealer's possession 15 including both assigned plates for vehicles in inventory 16 and unissued buyer's license plates. Is that correct? I 17 don't want to assume that it's going to be in there. 18 MS. MORIATY: Right. Well, let's make sure 19 we're in agreement on this. I believe that the way this 20 modification has worked, the part we're looking at is it 21 would say "at least one locked, secured storage room, safe 22 or steel cabinet that cannot be readily removed, and of 23 sufficient size to store all dealer's and buyer's plates 24 in a dealer's possession, including both assigned plates

for vehicles in inventory and unissued buyer's license

1 plates." 2 I want to add the caveat that since we're doing 3 this globally, that last clause probably does not appear in all the places we're making it, so that's not an 4 5 essential part. But I agree with Member Sullivan that 6 everything after the "and of" would be intact. We're 7 really just talking about the first clause of this 8 sentence. 9 MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Ms. Moriaty. 10 MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla. 11 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla, go ahead. 12 MR. SRALLA: That was the intent of the motion, and I apologize for not being more clear on that. The 13 14 intent of the motion was to get to the "and of" and 15 everything else stay the same if it's applicable where 16 it's listed in the rule. 17 MR. SULLIVAN: Presiding Officer Blassingame, 18 Member Sullivan. 19 MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan, go ahead. 20 MR. SULLIVAN: If appropriate, I'm happy to 21 second his motion. 22 MR. BLASSINGAME: We have a motion and a second 23 on the motion. Any further discussion? 24 (No response.)

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

MR. BLASSINGAME: Hearing none, I call for a

1	vote if you support or do not support the motion.
2	Member Bradburn?
3	MR. BRADBURN: Member Bradburn, support.
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly?
5	MR. DONNELLY: Member Donnelly, support.
6	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran?
7	MR. DORAN: Member Doran, I support.
8	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Durant?
9	MR. DURANT: Member Durant, I support.
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Elam?
11	(No response.)
12	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Ferguson?
13	MR. FERGUSON: Member Ferguson, support.
14	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Gonzalez? Member
15	Gonzalez?
16	(No response.)
17	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hall?
18	MR. HALL: Member Hall voting present.
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hayter?
20	MR. HAYTER: Hayter supports the motion.
21	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks?
22	MR. HICKS: Member Hicks supports.
23	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Murphy?
24	MR. MURPHY: Member Murphy supports.
25	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Prather, Sr.?

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	(No response.)
2	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Provost?
3	(No response.)
4	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sims?
5	MR. SIMS: Member Sims, support.
6	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sralla?
7	MR. SRALLA: Member Sralla supports.
8	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Stark?
9	(No response.)
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Sullivan?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Member Sullivan, support.
12	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Thomas?
13	MS. THOMAS: Member Thomas, support.
14	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Vitela? Member
15	Vitela?
16	(No response.)
17	MR. BLASSINGAME: And I, David Blassingame, do
18	support the motion. The motion carries.
19	All right, there's 18 members that have
20	supported the motion, so the motion passes as it stands.
21	One present, by the way. One voting present.
22	Members, do you have any recommendations to
23	present to the DMV Board regarding Chapter 221, Salvage
24	Vehicle Dealers?
25	MR. DURANT: Member Blassingame, this is Member

1	Durant. May I be recognized?
2	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Durant, you have the
3	floor.
4	MR. DURANT: Same paragraph that we just
5	discussed. It just occurred to me that the assigned
6	plates for perhaps used vehicles are also going to be
7	stored in these sealed containers and I just wanted to
8	discuss the fact that while at every grocery store and
9	parking lot, license plates are going to be affixed to
10	cars, these plates are going to be in a safe. And knowing
11	my teams and the people I work with, we're going to make
12	mixups, and I wanted to see if there's any appetite to
13	discuss whether these could be stored in the glove box of
14	the car so that they would not be mixed up with the wrong
15	plate on the wrong VIN, as I've seen many times.
16	MS. HEALY: That's an item up for discussion
17	amongst you guys and you can make recommendations to
18	include things if you'd like.
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any further discussion?
20	MR. DONNELLY: Member Blassingame, Member
21	Donnelly. May I have the floor?
22	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Donnelly, say again, I
23	didn't hear you.
24	MR. DONNELLY: Sorry. I'm just asking for the
25	floor.

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: You have the floor.
2	MR. DONNELLY: So what is the current proposal
3	for a trade-in? Do the plates come off the vehicle and
4	get destroyed, or do the plates come with the vehicle? If
5	they come off the vehicle, what is the next step for them,
6	do they get sent back? Do they get destroyed?
7	MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director,
8	Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. Presiding
9	Officer Blassingame?
10	MR. BLASSINGAME: You have the floor.
11	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
12	So once this is in effect, a used vehicle that
13	has a Texas plate, that plate is now going to stay with
14	that vehicle. It gets traded in to the dealership, that
15	plate stays with the vehicle, per the rule as drafted.
16	And statutorily it's supposed to come off the vehicle, and
17	then as drafted, the rule would require that plate to be
18	put in secure area, room, safe, bolted, not bolted,
19	whatever we decide on, obviously, through the ultimate
20	adoption of the rule. But it is statutorily required to
21	be removed from the vehicle by the dealer and then storage
22	as contemplated by the rule.
23	MR. BLASSINGAME: Does that answer your
24	question?
25	MR. DONNELLY: Yes, it does. Thank you.

1	MR. BLASSINGAME: Back to Chapter 221, members,
2	do you have any recommendations to present to the DMV
3	Board regarding Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle Dealers?
4	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. Could I just
5	go back to what you were just saying about the plate
6	staying on the vehicle. So what if you have a vehicle
7	with an out-of-state plate on it, and so now it's been
8	traded in so it's a used vehicle.
9	A customer wants to come in and test drive that
10	vehicle. Is the requirement going to be that the
11	dealership has to take one of its demo plates and affix it
12	to the vehicle that has the out-of-state plate on it, or
13	can that used vehicle be operated for the test drive with
14	the Louisiana or Oklahoma plate on the vehicle?
15	MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy
16	director, Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.
17	MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, sir.
18	MR. THOMPSON: Those plates that are assigned
19	to the vehicle, whether they're Texas plates or they're
20	out-of-state plates, should be removed and only operated
21	with a plate that's in the dealer's inventory. Dealer's
22	temporary plate, whatever the case may be.
23	MR. DORAN: Thank you.
24	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any other questions about
25	that?

1	MR. HICKS: Member Blassingame, this is Member
2	Hicks.
3	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Hicks, go ahead.
4	MR. HICKS: My question may be a little off
5	topic but I still need to know the answer. Are we
6	expecting that these plates are to be screwed into the
7	back of these cars, or is there going to be a temporary
8	opportunity to put the plate on the dash in a displayed
9	form or a rear window? Or when we do these demos, are we
10	going to be expected to install the plates on the back of
11	each vehicle as that vehicle is being pulled forward to
12	demonstrate?
13	MR. BLASSINGAME: Mr. Thompson?
14	MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director,
15	Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.
16	I would have to check the rule language to see
17	exactly what it is. I know we do specify that in
18	accordance with 217.27, affixing a plate to a vehicle,
19	that is where we specify how they are to be affixed. If I
20	can get some help from general counsel on locating where
21	we talk about the
22	(Simultaneous discussion.)
23	MS. HEALY: Ashley Healy, deputy general
24	counsel. Looking it up right now.
25	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

ON THE RECORD REPORTING (512) 450-0342

1	MR. HICKS: This is Member Hicks.
2	It may not seem significant but from a customer
3	experience standpoint, it's going to be significant if
4	we're having people moving these plates around. There's
5	got to be an easy way for them to display those plates,
6	protecting law enforcement while also protecting the
7	customer experience.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for the reference.
9	Again, Clint Thompson, deputy director, Vehicle Titles and
10	Registration Division.
11	I'm on page 17 of blue text, Section 215.138,
12	line 7: "A dealer's standard personalized prestige or
13	temporary license plate should be attached to the rear in
14	accordance with 217.27." Are we talking about the
15	temporary dealer tag that's used to demo a vehicle for a
16	test drive, is that correct?
17	MR. HICKS: Member Hicks. Correct.
18	MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. So that's
19	going to be the rule that speaks to that right there. So
20	that reference to 217.27 is basically the attachment to
21	the rear of the vehicle like any other license plate.
22	MR. HICKS: Member Hicks. Thank you. Not the
23	answer I was hoping for, but thank you.
24	MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.
25	MS. THOMAS: Member Thomas. May I have the

floor? 1 2 MR. BLASSINGAME: Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. THOMAS: I just wanted to make sure that I 4 understood this. A trade-in vehicle comes in, the plates 5 are supposed to come off of that vehicle and kept in 6 storage until the vehicle is sold, then those same plates 7 go back on that vehicle. Correct? 8 MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director, 9 Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. That is correct. So if the vehicle has an 10 11 assigned -- and what we're referring to is a general issue 12 plate, it's not a specialty license plate, personalized 13 plate, something of that nature. That plate comes off of 14 the vehicle that is traded in. It goes into storage in 15 accordance with the current rules that we have drafted. 16 If it is sold to a retail purchaser, it gets 17 affixed to the vehicle for that retail purchaser. If it 18 is sold via wholesale, it travels with the vehicle to the 19 wholesale dealer, assuming we have a licensed Texas dealer 20 purchasing the vehicle. 21 MS. THOMAS: Thank you for clarifying. 22 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, ma'am. 23 MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member 24 Bradburn with a question.

MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, go ahead.

1	MR. BRADBURN: Thank you.
2	Member Bradburn to Mr. Thompson, just a
3	question. Sometimes vehicles get traded in I've
4	personally bought them that come with a really junky
5	old license plate. I personally as a citizen would not
6	want that. Would there be a way for a dealer to exchange
7	that and put a new one on and void the other one out?
8	MR. THOMPSON: Clint Thompson, deputy director,
9	Vehicle Titles and Registration Division.
10	The statute actually provides a provision for
11	the purchaser of the vehicle to opt for a replacement
12	license plate, so that is established in statute.
13	MR. BRADBURN: Thank you. I think that will
14	help the dealers out. I appreciate it.
15	MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.
16	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any other discussion or
17	questions?
18	(No response.)
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Back to Salvage Vehicle
20	Dealers, do you have any recommendations to present to the
21	TxDMV Board regarding Chapter 221, Salvage Vehicle
22	Dealers?
23	MR. BRADBURN: Member Blassingame, Member
24	Bradburn. Can I have the floor?
25	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Bradburn, you have the

1	floor.
2	MR. BRADBURN: I just want to comment. I think
3	that's a really good proposal for the salvage dealers and
4	I support it.
5	MR. BLASSINGAME: Any other comment?
6	(No response.)
7	MR. BLASSINGAME: Are there any comments from
8	the public?
9	MS. MORIATY: I was waiting for David Richards
10	to answer. I'm sorry. This is Laura Moriaty, general
11	counsel. No, there are no public comments.
12	MR. BLASSINGAME: Thank you.
13	Unless there is any further business, I would
14	like to entertain a motion to adjourn. Do I have a motion
15	from anyone to adjourn this meeting?
16	MR. DORAN: This is Member Doran. I'll make
17	that motion.
18	MR. HALL: Member Hall seconds.
19	MR. BLASSINGAME: Member Doran made the motion,
20	Member Hall seconded. All in favor?
21	(A chorus of ayes.)
22	MR. BLASSINGAME: It is now 3:22 p.m., and we
23	are adjourned.
24	(Whereupon, at 3:22 p.m., the meeting was
25	adjourned.)

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 MEETING OF: TxDMV Motor Vehicle Industry Regulation Advisory Committee 4 5 LOCATION: Austin, Texas 6 DATE: March 6, 2024 7 I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 8 numbers 1 through 109, inclusive, are the true, accurate, 9 and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the 10 11 Texas Department of Motor Vehicles. 12 DATE: March 19, 2024 13 14 15 16 17 18 /s/ Nancy H. King (Transcriber) 19 20 21 On the Record Reporting 22 7703 N. Lamar Blvd., #515 23 Austin, Texas 78752 24