

**Summary from 2016 V.G. Young Institute School for County Tax Assessor-Collectors**  
**San Marcos, TX**  
**November 14-16, 2016**

Topic	Issues	Response
<b>Questions Across Events and Points of Contact</b>		
Processing & Handling Fee (P&H)	Are dealer deputies entitled to retain \$1 of the P&H fee or is it permissive?	A processing and handling fee in the amount of \$4.75 shall be collected with each registration transaction processed by the department, the county tax assessor-collector, or a deputy appointed by the county tax assessor-collector ( <b>Section 217.183</b> ). The deputy may retain \$1 of the P&H fee. It is possible that the county could direct the deputy not to retain the \$1, but the way the Rule is worded, the county cannot retain the \$1. The county can retain \$1.30 from the P&H by rule. If the amount is collected and not retained by the deputy, the extra \$1 would go to the department. <i>(Response provided by David Duncan, OGC)</i>
	If a fleet company is using webSUB (limited service deputy), does the fleet company have to remit \$1 out of the P&H fee or is that up to the contract between the fleet company and the county?	The rules are worded identically for the limited service and dealer deputy types (“A limited service/dealer deputy may retain \$1 from the processing and handling fee established by <b>§217.183</b> ”). If a limited service deputy has been authorized under <b>217.164(a)</b> (“A county tax assessor-collector, with the approval of the commissioners court of the county, may deputize a person to act as a limited service deputy”) they are a limited service deputy and all of the fees and rules apply. There is some allowance for the counties to impose “reasonable obligations or requirements” or limit their service to customers, members, employees, etc. ( <b>217.164(c) and (d)</b> ), but not to change how they collect or apply the \$1 fee as the department reads it. <i>(Response provided by David Duncan, OGC)</i>
Dealer Deputy Program	What are bonding requirements when dealer has an inventory of plates and stickers?	Dealer must post a bond payable to the county tax assessor-collector in an amount between \$100,000 and \$5,000,000 ( <b>TAC 43, Pt.10, Ch. 217, Subch. H, Rule §217.167</b> ).

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
<b>Questions / Issues / Discussion from</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V. G. Young Motor Vehicles Roundtable Breakout Sessions</li> <li>• V. G. Young TAC Liaison Session</li> <li>• V. G. Young Individual Inquiries</li> <li>• TAC Town Halls</li> </ul>		
<b>General Comments</b>	<b>Comments from V.G. Young Breakout Session</b>	<b>Motor Vehicles Discussion County Population Over 500,000</b>
	<p>What changes do you anticipate when the new dealer deputy program starts?</p>	<p>Counties are not clear or prepared for deputy dealer transactions yet; will discuss further with the department; There is a need for the offices to re-group and anticipate unanswered questions that will result. <i>(Dallas County)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Discussions on handling start of program are pending; concerns especially with dealers having inventory. <i>(Travis County)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Contacted dealers to obtain input. Look at SIT for vehicle inventory / used car. Car Max has 7-10 runners per day; huge company so the program may be a help for them. <i>(Harris County)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>If you try to refuse the dealer will complain – always verify with neighboring counties. <i>(Dallas County)</i></p> <p>=====</p>
	<p>Has your office been contacted by dealers interested in participating?</p>	<p>There are 150 dealers not going on webDEALER. <i>(Dallas County)</i></p>
	<p>Has your office developed plans for the new program?</p>	<p>Deputy Quality Control Unit. <i>(Bexar County)</i></p>
	<p>How does your office handle overages / shortages? NOTE: <i>This question recently generated a lot of activity on the TACA list serve.</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Has your office adopted a policy?</p> <p>=====</p> <p>If employees are required to pay for shortages, what is the collection process?</p>	<p>Supervisors try to find shortage if over \$10; if less than \$10, not researched. <i>(Travis County)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Handled as a disciplinary matter; not dependent on amount. <i>(Tarrant County)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Deputies are responsible to pay back shortages; all sign an agreement acknowledging their responsibility for their</p>

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
<p>General Comments from V.G. Young Breakout Session (continued)</p>	<p>===== How does the office handle the overages?</p>	<p>cash drawer; any overages are looked for. <i>(Denton County)</i> ===== Deputies subject to disciplinary action and pay back amount over \$5. <i>(Bexar County)</i> ===== Maintain variance sheet and all considered errors are signed by manager and deputy; if over \$20, auditor is notified. Subject to termination if frequent occurrence. <i>(Williamson County)</i> ===== Employee responsible for checks and cash. <i>(Dallas County)</i> ===== Title is not rejected if error is clerks; the deputy will pay the shortage. <i>(Denton County)</i> ===== Zero tolerance for overages and shortages. <i>(Bexar County)</i></p>
<p>webDEALER</p>		
	<p>In what ways has webDEALER impacted your office? =====</p>	<p>The application has created an excessive amount of work for the office. <i>(Bexar County)</i> ===== Deputies still multitask; none are exclusively assigned to webDEALER; Extensive work. <i>(Tarrant County)</i></p>
	<p>How many vehicle registration renewal transactions per employee are processed by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mail</li> <li>• In Person</li> <li>• Online</li> </ul> <p>===== How has the office streamlined these processes?</p>	<p>Online – 200,000; In Person 300,000. <i>(Tarrant County)</i>  ===== In Person – high volume; no figure. <i>(Bexar County)</i></p>
	<p>Comment: Out of state vehicles are not automatically issued a plate; must process as a replacement and charge \$7</p>	<p>It appears the transaction may have been processed incorrectly. The replacement fee is charged for either a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• replacement license plate</li> <li>• replacement registration sticker</li> <li>• or both</li> </ul>

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS  
AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
webDEALER (continued)	===== Out of state vehicles previously registered with a previous record did not issue a new plate. A \$7.50 replacement fee was charged. ===== Only the department has authority to issue no charge replacements?	===== The department does not have the authority to issue no charge replacements.
	Will webDEALER be made mandatory or will the TAC have the choice? <i>(from TAC Liaison Session)</i>	eTAG is being rolled into webDEALER. At present it is completely separate, so soon all dealers will be in webDEALER. For those who are not authorized to do title work, they will only be doing temporary tags in webDEALER. Integration is in progress.
	Problems with homemade trailers and owner who wants to increase above 4000 lbs. but cannot provide purchase documents.	The owner can raise the weight over 4000 lbs., but a bill of sale is needed.
	County offices want the ability to research websites for empty weight through RTS; but in RTS the sites are blocked. This requires using another computer to look up empty weight information. <i>(from Breakout Session – County Population 125,000 – 500,000)</i>	The department is evaluating the possibility of RTS populating the vehicle weight by decoding the VIN. Until such time this functionality is made available two websites have been enabled in RTS to facilitate county lookup of vehicle empty weights. <b>RTB #010-16</b> was published October 27, 2016 and has information on this issue.
	Informed that regional office cannot assign a VIN without a court order	Lease vehicle purchase depends on how the contract reads based on how the time is written. ===== Conditional sale is more likely to be purchased. ===== Sales tax is collected.
	Salvage Vehicles <i>(from Breakout Session – County Population 125,000 - 500,000)</i>	If owner rebuilt vehicle, does not pay tax If dealer rebuilt vehicle, tax is due. ===== Communication to more Salvage dealers from the department about obtaining a blue

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS  
AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
webDEALER (continued)		title before the vehicle can be sold to the public.
Transactions		
	Move inspection verification at the front so clerk does not have to go through the transaction / can the system be changed to allow clerk to go into a specific transaction after completing several without having to start over? <i>(issue also addressed in Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000 as well as during the TAC Liaison Session)</i>	Placing the inspection verification screen in the process flow as the first prompt after entering the vehicle information could result in some customers being told they need to provide a Vehicle Inspection Report (VIR) when a VIR is not needed. In addition, moving the inspection verification to the front would require the RTS event flow be re-worked, resulting in a major undertaking that would require significant county input.
	When online or for an internet renewal, is it possible to update owner address and renewal recipient address at the same time? <i>(issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population 125,000 – 500,000)</i>	Only the renewal recipient address may be updated online.
	How will county offices be able to check online renewals? <i>(issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000)</i>	Online renewal transactions can be reviewed in RTS in the Registration Only event under Internet Renewal and Search. Online renewals will appear on the RTS closeout reports for Workstation 99 and on Transaction Processing Engine daily reports. Counties can also view the sticker tracking tool at <a href="http://www.txdmv.gov/track">www.txdmv.gov/track</a> .
	Address close out procedures for Workstation 99, 10/28/16 – 8.7 release notes <i>(Issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000 as well as during the TAC Liaison Session and individual inquiries)</i>	No county action is required to close out Workstation 99. RTS will automatically close out Centralized Fulfillment online renewals on Workstation 99.
	The TACs are beginning to see the P&H fee show up on a new report. The P&H fee is combining with the county renewals and the TAC offices want to itemize the department vs county transactions. The fee and county wide reports match but the reports do not match the amount going to the bank. The payment report and the net revenue match	County staff with questions pertaining to report balancing issues are referred to the <b>RTS Release Notes for 8.7.0 – page 6</b> for information on how the fee and compensation report equals the payment report. The payment and compensation will balance if they are added together. As detailed in the Release Notes, the new Countywide Compensation Report has been added and changes have been made to the Countywide Payment Type Report, Payment

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
Transactions (continued)	each other and match the amount going to the bank, but they do not match the fee and county wide reports. <i>(Issue raised at TAC Liaison Session as well as at the Nueces County TAC Town Hall in October 2016 and by individual inquiries)</i>	Report and other closeout reports. These reports can be run to show the source of money breakdown between the fees collected for cash drawer and non-cash drawer transactions. TxDMV has created a new virtual workstation (Workstation 99) for each county in order to balance transactions processed through centralized fulfillment. TxDMV closes out this workstation automatically. However, the county will need to run the Transaction Reconciliation and Funds reports for Workstation 99 from the county's batch server.
	The Countywide Fee Report – internet transaction shows \$2.00 Lavaca County <i>(from Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000)</i>	The department response noted that based on the question, it is unclear what account item code is associated with the \$2.00 amount; directed question to the department Service Desk and provide specific report information. Service Desk followed up individually with the county.
	Is it possible to increase space in RTS to enter an entire customer name so the record will match the IDs provided rather than shorten names? <i>(Issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population 125,000 – 500,000)</i>	The space constraint in RTS correspond to the space constraints on the title. The size of the title would have to be increased and programming undertaken in RTS to enable this change.
	Can additional fees be put back in accounting so that the county office can add or delete fees for incorrect inspections? <i>(from TAC Liaison Session)</i>	The system was recently updated to remove this functionality since RTS is programmed to 'ping' the DPS inspections data, which provides the most current inspection information, including proper fees.
	Comment on even trade transactions <i>(from Breakout Session – Count Population less than 40,000)</i>	Platform about even trade transactions must be done at the same time – comptroller.
	Will a report of no fee replacements be available? The report was previously available in COGNOS but is now "grayed out" <i>(Issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000 as well as at TAC Liaison session)</i>	The department is working to make this report available through RSCs. The report shows only 254 counties; to isolate by county requires new programming. In addition, employee no-fee transactions are on the report and all COGNOS-enabled users should not have this information. RSC managers can run the report and provide director to the TAC.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS  
AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
Transactions (continued)	Is it possible to provide access to microfilm to the county offices instead of going through the RSC? <i>(from TAC Liaison Session)</i>	This is a security issue; there is DPPA secure information contained in the data and any person who has access to the microfilm can obtain every piece of information contained in the record (currently in excess of 65 million records), including signatures. There is exposure for misuse of the information. If the microfilm access is opened up to the 3000 employees throughout the state, then all would have to be monitored. <i>(Response provided by VTR)</i>
	Credit Card Disputes	Tarrant County sends constable to attempt collection; but does not have county copy as proof of sale.
		<b>Comments from Breakout Session-Motor Vehicles Discussion</b> <b>County Population 125,000 – 500,000</b>
Online Renewals	Montgomery County TAC Town Hall in October: attendees asked if customers could be notified via email to contact the county when an online transaction is rejected so the county office will not have to query the look up tool.	This will be considered as part of a future enhancement.
	Why are 'radio buttons' for walk in and mail in renewals still appearing? <i>(from TAC Liaison session); NOTE: also raised during the Montgomery County TAC Town Hall in October; since the button now shows 'greyed out', the issue from the Montgomery County Town Hall is addressed.</i>	The purpose is to allow the county to refine reporting. There is no longer any difference between mail in or walk in. If the default was for walk in, the reporting would generate zero mail in; the report can serve as documentation to justify annual staffing levels to the Commissioners Court.
Dealer Issues	Counties experience dealers with fraudulent license numbers.	The department is requesting a \$1.9 million exceptional item during the 85 <sup>th</sup> Legislature to fund investigative unit.
	Can a dealer use a white POA / Dealer uses a POA with all transactions. Dealer can use white POA if vehicle is older than 10 years. <i>(Issue addressed in Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000)</i>	A dealership can use a limited power of attorney (POA) only when the motor vehicle is not subject to federal law on odometer disclosure. A motor vehicle is subject to odometer disclosure when it is self-propelled, less than 10 years old, and has a gross vehicle weight of 16,000 lbs. or less. If the motor vehicle is subject to federal odometer law, a secure power of attorney <b>(Form VTR-271-A)</b> must be used, but only when the title is lost or held by a lienholder.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS  
AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
Dealer Issues (continued)		Further information regarding the use of powers of attorney can be found in Chapter 11 of the Title Manual.
		<b>Comments from Breakout Session-Motor Vehicles Discussion</b> <b>County Population less than 40,000</b>
Off-Highway Vehicles	Comment on 4-wheelers and farm use.	Recreational off-highway (ROVs) vehicles are defined as a motor vehicle equipped with a seat or seats for the use of the rider (and a passenger), designed to propel itself with four or more tires in contact with the ground, designed by the manufacturer for off-highway use, and not designed by the manufacturer primarily for farming or lawn care. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) are defined in the same manner except ATVs are not more than 50 inches in width, may only have 3 or more wheels, and accommodate a rider and one passenger. There is no titling exemption for ROVs or ATVs not designed primarily for farm use of lawn care. ROVs and ATVs must be titled, but are not eligible for registration. <b>RTB #11-16</b> advised of the elimination of the <i>Recreational Off-Highway or All-Terrain Vehicle Use for Farming or Lawn-Care (Form VTR-329)</i> which facilitated a titling exemption for ROVs and ATVs being used for farming or lawn care, but not manufactured for such purpose.
Temporary Permits	Comment on placement of temporary tags.	30-Day and One Trip temporary permits should be displayed in the rear windshield of the vehicle. If the vehicle does not have a rear windshield, the temporary permit should be attached on or carried in the vehicle. 144 and 72-hour temporary permits should be carried in the pulling unit. This is required by <b>Transportation Code 502.095(f)</b> . <i>(f) A registration receipt shall be carried in the vehicle at all times during the period in which it is valid. The temporary tag must contain all pertinent information required by this section and must be displayed in the rear window of the vehicle so that the tag is clearly visible and legible when viewed from the rear of the vehicle. If the vehicle does not have a rear window, the temporary tag must be attached on or carried in the vehicle to allow ready inspection. The registration</i>

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
Temporary Permits (continued)		<i>receipt must be carried in the vehicle at all times during the period in which it is valid.</i>
Token Trailers	The Department proposal for token trailers from 5 to 7 year plate to a lifetime plate was reviewed by Tarrant County. <i>(from Breakout Session – County Population over 500,000 and during TAC Liaison Session)</i>	Tarrant County suggested that large counties need to review as the proposal may have a detrimental effect on their revenue. El Paso County’s position is that the department is trying to satisfy the trucking industry; should ask for Road and Bridge early; need to address moving forward.
	What is the reason for the decline in token trailer transactions? <i>(from TAC Liaison Session)</i>	This is in response to other states; for example, Maine. A token trailer plate is valid in any state. The plate is attached to a trailer. These trailers are throughout the United States and can be plated in any state. States who charge a flat fee are getting the majority of the transactions. Texas is now working to get competitive with other states who offer lifetime plates because the token trailer registration rate in Texas continues to decline. The carriers want a lifetime plate because under the current statute, they have to locate the trailer and ship the sticker to ‘catch-up’ with the trailer.
	Do all other states require trailer inspections like in Texas?	There is a federal safety inspection through the International Registration Program that a motor carrier trailer must comply with. The federal inspection is the minimum; states can require additional inspection requirements.
Kiosks	Provide an update to the counties on the Kiosk project <i>(from TAC Liaison Session as well as from the Breakout Session – County Population less than 40,000)</i>	The department is currently in the information gathering/data assimilation phase of this pilot project. An RFP will be issued. Initially, 10 kiosks will be placed in high-volume, indoor locations. Target is approximately 850 monthly transactions; small/rural counties unlikely to benefit from the project. The proposed breakdown for kiosk compensation is yet to be decided. There is an allowance in statute at this time with a requirement to obtain permission from the Commissioners Court and

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
Kiosks (continued)		clarification from the county office(s) regarding maintenance procedures.
TAC Town Hall	<p>Will drafts of the Performance Quality Recognition Program (PQRP) be sent to the group? <i>(Issue raised at Montgomery County TAC Town Hall in October 2016)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Attendee brought an issue up regarding a recent RTS message they received. “No ITMDF” came up on RTS screen for a 30-day permit transaction. Another attendee asked if it was like a mainframe-down issue b/c on occasion there are messages for that.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>Regarding NMVTIS – TAC said they developed a database they can download from a COGNOS report to track NMVTIS rejections. The email portion is not working (mail from COGNOS to send report so that it can be added to database). They have called the Help Desk.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>TAC reported that COGNOS ‘sleeps’ on Tuesdays preventing running of reports when needed. <i>(from Potter County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>There is a concern the system defaulting to a county will not be accurate. IVTRS will default the county of residence on the vehicle record. The user will be presented with a confirmation “Is this the correct county” If the user selects ‘no’ a county dropdown will be presented for selection of</p>	<p>J. Kuntz/VTR assured the group the department would make sure they have access. A communication will be sent to all TACs once the final product is complete, likely by the beginning of February.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>This unique issue is currently being investigated.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>E. Obermier said this was not configured when COGNOS initially rolled out; multiple reasons include not all counties have email addresses; COGNOS has the ability to automatically email reports, but the problem is we are not one single organization. Following the explanation, the TAC stated that she used to be able to email it to herself to download it. E. Obermier said this is a separate issue. TAC volunteered to follow up separately.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>Tuesdays is the busiest reporting day, and an index was added recently to help the COGNOS run faster.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>Due to a recent addition IVTRS now prompts the user to confirm the county after the user selects it.</p>

Topic	Issues	Response
TAC Town Hall (continued)	<p>the correct county of residence. <i>(from Potter County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i> =====</p> <p>Aug. 31 was the last day Hansford Co. got an online renewal. People can't get past the home screen in some instances or they get somewhat through the process but can't complete it. Yet, when they come into the TAC office, RTS allows the transaction to process without issue. <i>(from Potter County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i> =====</p> <p>Question was raised about Panhandle representation in the TAC recognition working group. <i>(from Potter County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>Attendee asked if the customer will be able to see why an online transaction was rejected. <i>(from Potter County TACA Town Hall October 2016)</i></p>	<p>=====</p> <p>The unique issue has been addressed directly with the county.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>A list of all working group members was provided to TACA for distribution. Performance Quality Recognition Program Working Group members identified by the Tax Assessor-Collectors Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ro'Vin Garrett</li> <li>• Teri Garvey</li> <li>• Cristyn Hallmark</li> <li>• Robin Harper</li> <li>• Deborah Hunt</li> <li>• Ronnie Keister</li> <li>• Kevin Kieschnick (replaced Ronnie Keister)</li> <li>• Tammy McRae</li> <li>• Becky Robles</li> <li>• Becky Watson Fant</li> </ul> <p>=====</p> <p>The sticker tracking tool will not provide information about declined transactions by the county. The customer will receive an email if an online transaction is declined by the county, as was done before. The decline email provides a generic message informing the online customer the transaction has been declined and to contact the county. This is the same email message that has always been sent for decline transactions.</p>

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
TAC Town Hall (continued)	<p>=====</p> <p>Attendee commented that the webinars go too fast and sometimes talk too soft.</p> <p>Webinar materials should be distributed in advance to allow TACs to review them before the session. <i>(from Nueces County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i></p> <p>=====</p> <p>PC Refresh</p> <p>When using the same workstation for transactions, TACs have to configure each time, issue with a switch for the printer</p> <p>Regarding the toggle switches <i>(from Nueces County TAC Town Hall October 2016)</i></p>	<p>=====</p> <p>Management requested presenters speak more slowly.</p> <p>The presentation materials are not always finalized when the webinar announcement/invitation is sent. Development of the presentation materials is dependent on getting final screen mockups, reports, etc., from IT and sometimes it is last minute due to changes found in user acceptance testing. The department's goal is to get the invitation sent as soon as possible to provide counties ample time to register for the webinar. Every effort will continue to be made to have the presentation materials posted on the TAC Hub prior to the first scheduled webinar.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>The department (IT Services) communicated the exact dimensions of the printers that will be shipped to the counties</p> <p>The department (IT Services) communicated the three toggle switches that are confirmed to work.</p>
General Issues	<p>Handling by a county of the destruction of expired plates.</p>	<p>A county office currently recycles returned plates and obtains a nominal amount of money each year and allocates these funds to the office petty cash account. Statute is silent regarding this practice.</p> <p>The department's general counsel stated the department's position is that so long as the plates are rendered unusable and are not being made available for fraudulent purposes, this is a proper disposal of the</p>

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (TXDMV) Q&A SUMMARY FROM 2016 TAC TOWN HALLS  
AND V.G. YOUNG INSTITUTE SCHOOL FOR COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTORS

Topic	Issues	Response
General Issues (continued)		plates, consistent with <b>DMV rule 217.53(b)</b> . That rule details, pursuant to <b>Transportation Code Section 504.901</b> , the options for license plates that have been removed from a vehicle. <b>Texas Admin. Code Section 217.53(b)(2)</b> , regarding disposition of removed license plates, provides that the plates may be “disposed of in a manner that renders the license plates unusable or that ensures the license plates will not be available for fraudulent use on a motor vehicle[.]” As for the funds obtained from the recycling business, what the county does with any revenue from properly disposed plates is outside of the department’s authority to dictate. The department recommends the TAC to consult with the county attorney and/or the chief financial officer of the county office for further guidance.
	Will the department consider providing comments cards for the county offices to provide to customers?	The RSCs are in the process of creating a revised comment card to solicit customer feedback and will consider adding a field for county comment.
	Will the department make credit card payments available through computer instead of via machine?	Other credit card payment options/vendors will be explored for the best fit for the requesting county.
	Can an iPhone application be developed for customers to access department functions such as the website, special plate requests and comments?	This suggestion is currently under further research.
	Counties report that calls to the help desk result in being placed on hold or inability to provide answers to questions; what is the recourse if inquiries are not satisfactorily handled?	If the question is a basic report issue, ask to escalate and speak to the manager on duty.
Follow Up	When is a new distribution code list coming? <i>(from TAC Liaison Meeting)</i>	In initial draft has been completed and is under review for accuracy and inclusion of all applicable codes, should be finalized by end of January 2017 and distributed.