MINUTES

`

Name:	Colorado DRIVES County Requirements Clarification and Improvement Working Group		
Meeting Date:	February 14, 2024	Organizer:	Tina Huesca
Meeting Time:	1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Location:	meet.google.com/rwn-jasj-ojh Join by phone (US) +1 208-843-1309 PIN: 955 188 413# More phone numbers

Attendance

Member	Organization	√	Member	Organization	√
Pam Nielsen Chair	Weld/Larimer County	x	Jason Salazar Co-chair	Denver/Denver County	
Beth Zilla	Prowers/Phillips County	x	Lucia Gonzalez	Otero/Adams County	x
Karissa Sanders	Douglas County	x	Kara Dehart	Vacant/Jefferson County	
Cassandra Robertson	DOR-DRIVES	x	Kevin Kihn	DOR-Vehicle Services	x
Cindi Wika	OIT				

12/13/2023 Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order
    1.1. Roll Call – Tina Huesca

2. Minutes approval
   2.1. 01/10/24 Business Meeting Minutes
      2.1.1. The working group approved the minutes

3. Equipment Request Approvals - Pam
   3.1. 202418 - San Miguel - Telluride requested a desktop PC and printer for C&R in the warehouse. Monitor cost - $150, Cabling required - $2080 = $2230.
   3.2. 202419 - Lincoln - Hugo - Moving three existing desktop PCs to a new counter and adding two new ones. PCs and some peripherals in the warehouse. Need to purchase desktop scanners and monitors - $1700 and cabling required - $2489.24 - Total of $4189.24
   3.3. 202420 - Eagle - Avon - Laptop to trade for desktop PC - in warehouse
   3.4. Budget tracking
      3.4.1. After implementing these requests, the budget review leaves $2538.39 for Equipment and Cabling to $214.70.
      3.4.2. Motion to approve by Karissa and second by Beth. Equipment requests were approved.

4. DRIVES Update Information - Kevin Kihn
   4.1. Kevin discussed the upgrade items slated to prepare for the upgrade, such as Bulk Fleet and Service Transactions. As we progress, resources will be needed to refine and test the initiatives. Those interested in testing can find information on the intranet site under the OIT portion to get involved. Contact the training group or other trainers if you have questions regarding the testing process. More testing will be needed as these are programmed. RC&I, going forward, will need to leverage the meeting times to discuss the different projects to ensure that the implementation will work for the counties and the state.

5. New Business
   5.1. Upgrade participation
      5.1.1. Bulk Fleet
      5.1.2. Service Transactions
         5.1.2.1. Claire Stewart reported that there are resources on the intranet site, including past DCGC upgrade working group meeting minutes and

presentations. The full scope of the upgrade, including the bulk fleet, has been approved by the Steering Committee. The service transaction was demoed at the conference with many great questions.

The project team and DMV leadership have decided that RC&I is the right resource for us to identify folks to be part of the refinement working groups. Steve Crandall's team will be leading, and we have the opportunity for RC&I to designate seven folks to participate in each group. Refinement will begin next week, and they anticipate running through June. Steve has put together a high-level timeline of the hours that are anticipated. Bulk Fleet for the next five months will be for approximately 184 hours, and Service Transactions will take approximately 116 hours. They want to be very clear and upfront about the expectation for participation and the time commitment that it will be. Any involvement of the entire RC&I working group will be up to Shainelle as the group leader. It was discussed that the smaller group will work to go through the requirements, and it will be scheduled if discussion needs to be addressed with the larger group.

The question regarding how RC&I will work is due to the programming stall beginning in July of this year. The upgrade will impact how we move forward. Discussion is happening with the DMV senior leaders regarding the business side and sqr governance and how it will be affected during the upgrade work.

The best way to receive an update on the process of the working groups will be the DCGC upgrade working group meeting that happens monthly on the first Thursday of each month. Those meetings are open, and anyone can listen in on them. A representative from each of the refinement groups will give an update. The date and times of those meetings are in the DRIVES bi-weekly updates, or you can reach out to Claire to be added to the invitation.

Log-in services and the KPI project will be refined starting in May.

Several individuals volunteered to be in the refinement working groups. The final list is due by the end of the week or the 16th. Some members needed to check with their management team to ensure they could commit. They were asked to email Pam and cc Claire as they had approval. More consideration will be given to others to listen to the meetings and provide input.

IDS leads will reach out to the members by the beginning of the next week once it is determined.

5.2. Status Reports to Governance
    5.2.1. Template for discussion
    5.2.2. Example for discussion
        5.2.2.1.   Pam was asked at the last governance meeting to prepare a way to report decisions made during the RC&I meetings. She created a draft of a form to be used in the future. She also shared a sample of the decisions made for Stolen Vehicles releases for refunds. The working group felt comfortable with the template. Pam will share with Governance for additional input. This will not be used for SQR processes, as notes are posted in the FCR record. The final document might be housed in the shared drive under our working group folders.

5.3. Membership Terms - End 02.28.24
    5.3.1. Denver - Jason Salazar
    5.3.2. Weld - Pam Nielsen
    5.3.3. Vacant - Kara Dehart
    5.3.4. DOR - Kevin Kihn
    5.3.5. OIT - Cindi Wika
        5.3.5.1.   The committee member list reflects that some members' term limits end on February 28, 2024. The members of the Governance Committee will either reappoint the current members or assign new members if they choose to continue the sub-committee or working group according to the by-laws. In March, the chair and co-chair must either be re-appointed or voted on new representatives.

6. Action items from the last meeting

    6.1. The title is in JTWROS, and we are removing the name - Rafael
        6.1.1.1.   Training is working on a complete resource for this topic that will cover what will be acceptable for removing a name - Updates?
            6.1.1.1.1.   Status quo at this time. We are waiting for the manual to be updated to allow the training resource to be completed. Pam asked that the draft be brought to the group for review to ensure it is clear. Individuals can be added to the stakeholder review as well. They may reach out to Rafael to be added to the group. David will be added to the stakeholder list.

    6.2. Lien perfection - dated by TPT/EVTR and then submitted to the county. What date is valid? What is their process? - Kevin & Heather
        6.2.1. Discussed in County Touchpoint meeting
            6.2.1.1.   The additional filing fee for an additional page is at the county's discretion.
                6.2.1.1.1.   The vehicle description is not on the page - a sample is needed
                6.2.1.1.2.   Also, clarification on valid stamp for date received - see notes from 01/10/24 minutes. Are EVTR vendors allowed to determine the received date, or is the system set up to post the date the payment is tendered at the county level per statute?
                    6.2.1.1.2.1. Heather was present and explained the process to the group. Typically, the dealer, if using EVTR, will gather the same documents as required at the county. They will upload the documents into the vendor system. The vendor system will then apply a lien stamp to that document. They can create a logo file that contains the vendor name, date, and time and add it electronically. Some choose to lock down the received date to be applied to the subsequent title transaction. They are not adding a physical stamp to the document. On the other hand, the vendors must keep reports of the various things received, containing the business name, the VIN, the date of the SA, the date of sale, and the applied lien date. Some agencies do both notations or only one of the two.

The lien perfection process with EVTR is the same as in the counties. They must perfect the lien within 30 days or identify an acknowledgment that they have not complied with the statutory requirements. That can also be tracked on a report.

Heather did clarify that based on 42-3-121 regarding the difference between counties and EVTR requirements related to the lien stamping process, it was completed. The AG opinion determined that the vendors may use an alternate option to the lien stamp option. There may be a chance to clear up the statutory language to clarify the option. This was determined when EVTR programs were created.

Heather will connect with the vendors to verify how they handle transactions when rejected and brought into the counties. She will then report back to the group on how they are handling it.

6.3. Record Search review related to Tow Bill of Sale searches - Kevin
    6.3.1. Kevin was asked to review the process and return the results to the working group. He reported that made the rule change but only reviewed some of the items related to forms and communication going forward that needed to be updated.
        6.3.1.1. Kevin reported that this would take a rule change for the abandoned vehicle process as we follow the statutory guidelines related to national searches. The issue is that not all vehicles or jurisdictions report to Lexis Nexis, resulting in no record found. The tow carrier followed the process, but the vehicle may have come from non-reporting agencies. If the search was completed using the information found, such as out-of-state plates on a record, More work is needed to identify the best way to address these issues. (leave on the agenda for further updates)
            6.3.1.1.1. Kevin reported that while the process is being determined, the national search will not be required if the record is returned, as there is no record in Colorado. The state may automatically run the national search when this occurs. It is still a work in progress and has yet to

be completed. This item will remain on the agenda for further information.

6.3.1.1.1.1. ==Counties reported receiving rejections and were asked to forward such information to Jim for research.==

6.3.1.2. Guidance on how many searches are required - Ex. There is no record in Colorado, but another state is listed on inspection or enclosed documents. A national search is required due to the lack of a Colorado record, but is the out-of-state search also required?

6.3.1.2.1. Jim clarified that if the national search is completed, the other state search will not be required unless that state does not send information to the national database. ==Jim has a list of states that do not send in information, which will be included in the following decision documentation.==

6.3.1.2.2. The statute does not require an out-of-state search if it is identified on the documents. Tow companies are only required by statute to complete a national search. Unfortunately, no database has all state records for searches.

6.4. The name change process review is based on the different rejections that have been processed. - Kevin and Deb

6.4.1. It was determined that proper documentation is required for a name change. A marriage license or court document is required to substantiate the name change. The owner must still sign off the title to make the change. Emily asked if there was a way to have a driver's license identified and if they also received the appropriate documents to make the driver's license change. Beth suggested that the date on the license may acknowledge the name change time frame. ==Jim will meet with Rob Baker and talk upline to see if there is a way to streamline the process and report back to the group.== The counties can see the name link to see that DL has changed names. Is there an opportunity for the state employees to see the same information? Different security settings may be a concern. The documents' presence does not prove that the name has been changed, as the DL does identify that. It only provides the approval to change their name. Social security and identification issues identify the name change. Emily clarified that security is set stricter for the agents issuing the identification.

6.5. Document the different stages of titles in the state work process - Deb
    6.5.1. Notes from past meetings were shared with Deb
        6.5.1.1.   ==Jim will follow up with Deb, and Pam will send the notes to Jim for clarification.==

6.6. SQR 23298 Error updating registration - multiple SOT rows returned - Evan
    6.6.1. Update on process
        6.6.1.1.   Evan reported that he has a list of expired vehicles that could not be updated. He will send the list out to Pam for distribution to the counties. The counties must put a hold on the record to prevent online or kiosk renewals. A SOT update will be required once the activity is completed in the office.
            6.6.1.1.1.   The process related to the owners that require refunds is for DOR to determine the correct process.
            6.6.1.1.2.   The counties reported that since the state completed the scan job to flag the records that their SOT service years need to be corrected, they can no longer process a refund since the system does not identify the county as the area that collected the original payment. This also affects the transfer of credit.
            6.6.1.1.3.   The system will not generate a renewal notice for records where holds are placed on them.

7. Ongoing Reports

    7.1. Upgrade Project Updates - Kara Dehart & Karissa Sanders
        7.1.1. The report was covered in this meeting in the previous discussions. No additional information to report.

    7.2. [Refinement Session Updates](#) - Cassandra Robertson
        7.2.1. Reviewed the information on the intranet site. February will begin the bulk fleet refinement (led by Shanielle), continuing through April, with service transactions (led by Cassandra) starting in March.
        7.2.2. April will need testers for the VS projects for Commercial Motor Carrier Safety Laws.

7.3. Development Updates - Cassandra Robertson
    7.3.1. The roadmap shows that 20385 will be completed in sprint 98, which ends on the 20th to move to UAT. SB23-012 Commercial Carrier is on the same timeline. We will start with bulk fleet and service transactions, as discussed earlier.
    7.3.2. The document can be opened under SQRs and current development sprint information, and it was explained that the descriptions have been changed to list the business areas instead of the team names (Team 1, 2, 3). The group reviewed the Sprint 98 list, which lists the SQRs. The left columns describe the dates for development, UAT, and Production Migration. An additional tab was added to the document to list the development contact sheet. This will make it easier for counties to ask the contact to volunteer to test or ask questions.
    7.3.3. Cassandra also thanked the counties for the additional testers that have come forward for more involvement.

7.4. Rules update - Stephanie Smith
    7.4.1. Chris reported that rules have been processed through:
        7.4.1.1. Rule 2 - Establishment of vehicle registration period - adopted 02/08 - effective 03/16
        7.4.1.2. Rule 26 - Physical inspection of a vehicle - adopted 01/19 - effective 03/16
        7.4.1.3. Rule 43 - Stolen Motor Vehicle - adopted 02/08 - effective 03/16
        7.4.1.4. Rule 51 - Digital License Plate - Workshop will take place on 02/26 and will be in the DRIVES update calendar
        7.4.1.5. Rule 23 - SMM registration exemption - 2nd workshop end of March and will be in the DRIVES update calendar
        7.4.1.6. 2024 rule reviews are underway and will be shown on the calendar as scheduled.

8. Open Discussion
    8.1. Livery Plates - Jim reported that they had a meeting with the PUC and are receiving complaints about the different types of plates issued by the counties. Jeremey created a job aide regarding the different types of plates that should be issued to the livery-type vehicles. Jim will forward the training guide to the group for

==YELLOW_START==review before distribution. Jim will send an email for review in the next couple of days.==YELLOW_END==

8.2. Beneficiary deeds (DR2009) - Office managers in VSS have discussed whether a new title and plate should be issued when this occurs. When an individual comes in with such documents, Jim feels that a new title and plates should be issued and the odometer. The form does not allow a place for the odometer disclosure. The counties issue a title when one is absent to have the representative complete the title with the odometer declared. Some counties follow the title manual, which states otherwise that they do not require the title and use the DR2009 for the supporting document. Counties also have the DR2173 signed for the odometer disclosure. Jim will get with Deb and return it to the RC&I next month. A question was presented about requiring a notary instead of the perjury statement. Would this require a statutory change or a required rule change? to be added to the next agenda.

8.3. David asked about how MVTC can address new legislative changes and what the best avenue to take is to have them addressed. Pam explained that the process requires a specific form to present the idea for a legislative change. The form must be submitted to Matt, the Executive Director of CCCA. He will direct the idea to the Legislative committee to determine if they agree with the proposal. The form will then be sent to the appropriate subcommittee to work through the details and give their report back to the Legislative Committee. The link to the form can be found here.

8.4. Meredith asked for clarification on the title manual update regarding the VIN inspection requirement for the Cab and Chassis units. Are Cab and Chassis units determined to be roadworthy? In the past, they were not determined to be roadworthy, and a certified VIN was required to prove that a body had been installed. Currently, it is understood that the units are roadworthy. A regular VIN inspection is required when a body is placed on the unit. The group is asking for clarification of why the VIN is required depending on multiple MSOs vs a singular MSO. This will be brought to the group at the next monthly meeting. Meredith was asked to send the highlights to Jim and cc Rafael to follow up.

8.4.1. When such decisions are made, is there county input with such discussions, and what steps must be taken? There is historical information that is useful to streamline the process.

8.4.2. There is also some confusion regarding where the auditing guide and the

manual do not match (ex., SMM when one needed a VIN inspection and one did not.)

    8.4.2.1.   Rafael confirmed that the business group updates the manual, and the training group maintains the auditing guide. Any concerns should be directed to Rafael. He wants to make sure that the document is useful.

  8.5. Persons with Disabilities brochure - It has been identified that the information on the brochure that was previously used is outdated. The DR2816 is to be used in lieu of the form. Chris discussed that he has been working with the Colorado Disability Funding Committee, and they are looking for funding for a new pamphlet and brochures for the state to distribute. The title manual also needs to be updated with valid information as well. The committee has been moved to different areas and is unstable for correct connections. Chris does have contact information if the counties need it.

9. Assignment of Action Items
  9.1. See items highlighted in yellow.

10. Next business meeting - March 13 - 1:00 - 2:50
  10.1. Next, SQR calls - Feb 21, 28, Mar 6

11. Adjourn

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1j2hdgAfb-xPqg2vGv5HqWKTo4fyrJZCX/view