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Motorist Modernization Advisory Board Monthly Meeting

April 12, 2016
Kirkman Building, Training Room B130
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Invitees
Deb Roby
Ed Broyles
Steven Fielder
Carl Forney
April Edwards
Beth Allman
Linda Fugate

Representing
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
DHSMV
Florida Clerk Courts & Comptrollers
Florida Tax Collectors

Agenda Outline

• Roll Call
• Welcome
• Review and Approval of Last Meeting Minutes
• Stakeholder Outreach Update
• Policy and Decisions Review
• MM Phase I Program Update
  o Status Update and Financial Review
  o IV&V Update
  o Change Request Review
  o Requirements Validation Update
• Communications Update
  o Organizational Change Management
• Q&A
• Adjourn
MOTORIST MODERNIZATION ADVISORY BOARD

Monthly Meeting Minutes
Kirkman Building Conference Room B-130
March 31, 2016
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

- The meeting was called to order at 1:08 pm. Terrence Samuel began the meeting with the Welcome and Introductions. He proceeded with roll call for the Board Members.

  Advisory Board Members present included:
  - Deb Roby (via telephone)
  - Ed Broyles
  - Steven Fielder
  - Carl Forney
  - April Edwards
  - Beth Allman
  - Linda Fugate (via telephone)

- Other DHSMV members present included: Terrence Samuel, Kristin Green, Wendy Ling, Jessica Espinoza, Judy Johnson, Cathy Thomas, Laura Freeman, Janis Timmons, Kathlene Crowe, Scott Tomaszewski, Samadhi Jones, RaeLynn DeParsqual, and Aundrea Andrades.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE LAST MEETING MINUTES

- Ms. Green reviewed the meeting minutes from February 9, 2016. A motion to approve was unanimously accepted by the members.

OMM/DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOCUS GROUP UPDATE

- Ms. Espinoza: There were several meetings with the Department of State focus group to discuss changes in both the online voter registration and motorist modernization and how they would impact each other. Among those changes is one that would require a party affiliation selection on all portable applications regardless of the status they are selecting. Users will be allowed to proceed with the application process without having to provide complete previous address. The customer’s address information will be pre-filled from the driver record to prevent retyping. Questions will be aligned to match to current paper application. The motor voter oath and personal information acknowledgement will be given through the signature pad so that the customer can review, before they agree to submit the motor voter. A disclaimer will be added to payment and motor voter application receipts so that we can remind the customer to keep his receipts in the event that they don’t receive their motor voter card. The possibility of receiving the current motor voter status from
DOS was discussed so that we can see whether the customer already has a Florida voter registration or not. A decision is still pending. The signoff document was reviewed which lists all of the changes and a place for DOS to sign indicating that they approve of these changes. Our next scheduled meeting is on April 4, 2016 with the technical team and that’s when we will getting a signoff document from DOS from the changes that were requested and agreed upon.

- Mr. Samuel: There was a meeting with Terry Rhodes this morning. She asked if the customer could choose their party every time. Currently, due to some set up differences in some of the offices, the customer would use the signature pad to verify they have the right party. But they want us to look into having the customer select the party every time. I believe there are some differences in how several of the offices were set. Ms. Rhodes has asked us to look into other options that we could possibly provide.

BUREAU OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (BAR) UPDATE

- OMM has met several times with the Bureau of Administrative Review to discuss requirements for BAR functionality in the MyDMV Portal and DL Issuance. The planned functionality to review the screen mockups for Portal and DL was discussed. The BAR has provided information to assist in process in retiring the Gobi interface such as reporting, scheduling, and data input requirements. Our next scheduled meeting with them is this afternoon.

RENEWAL DATA FOCUS GROUP

- Mr. Samuel: Yesterday, several of the team members and I went out Orlando to meet with the renewal vendors. We had a great meeting with them and then afterwards, a tax collector IT coalition meeting was held. These are all of the vendors that receive data on behalf of the tax collectors and send out the printed renewal notices.

- Ms. Johnson: Upcoming enhancements in the new renewal system was discussed in this meeting. Some of the information that we received was based on a survey that was distributed to the tax collectors over a year ago and another survey that was distributed to the vendors a couple of weeks ago. One of the requests that we received was about stops. Currently in the file right now we tell them to stop but they don’t know who the customer needs to contact, so in the new file, we are providing those details for them. New registration types would be included in the file. Some of the items that won’t be included are confidential and fictitious records. The new process in how we currently push the data to them in the new system they were actually coming to us to retrieve that data. Mr. Hutchinson provided a high-level overview of what the new architecture will be like. We would be using web services. We plan to have a follow-up meeting with the technical staff from some of the offices to discuss the technical aspects. One of the exercises that we will do with the focus group is reevaluation the no fee scenarios. There was a request for kiosks in the offices for simple renewals and etc.

- Mr. Samuel: From the survey, we were rated poorly on a couple of items; changing vendors and IP address changes. The matter of changing vendors was already addressed because they now have the authority to change vendors themselves.
POLICY AND DECISIONS REVIEW

Ms. Thomas:
- CDL05 and CDL10 were related to each other. At the Executive Steering Committee meeting on March 24, 2016, both items were addressed and closed.
  - CDL05: Will the department stop issuing CLP’s and CDL’s to "Non-Domiciled" drivers?
    - Update - The department will continue to issue CDLs and CLPs to "Non-Domicile" drivers.
  - CDL10: Should CLPs and CDLs for foreign drivers be printed with the verbiage "Non-Domiciled"?
    - Update - The department will continue to print "Temporary" on the card.

Ms. Johnson:
- POR06: Eligibility for DL Renewal and Replacement Issuance. On the application that was submitted to them, one of the fields was the MOU signatory which has to be GS15 or higher.
  - Terry Rhodes and Diana Vaughn decided that Terrence Samuel would be listed as the MOU signatory. This update would be made to the application and resubmitted to the Department of Defense (DOD).
  - Mr. Roby’s team are scheduled to meet with the DOD at the end of April.
  - OMM will touch base with Mr. Roby’s team members prior to their meeting with DOD.
- POR24: Transcripts.
  - We are still waiting to discuss this item with legal.
- POR26: Scanned documents
  - The issue was providing customers access to the scanned documents through Portal. It was decided that we would not provide access through Portal. The functionality can be offered in DL Issuance and treated like a public records request.
  - OMM will discuss this further with Carl Forney and decide on the correct fee to charge for public record request.

Ms. Espinoza:
- DL01: Allow examiners to print Hazmat extension letter locally.
  - The letter would be issued without temporary permit.
- DL05: The Motor Voter application should allow users to enter a partial address in the previous address field.
  - This item will not be closed until it is signed-off by DOS.
- DL23: DHSMV should have access to the Motor Voter data so that we know what updates truly need to take place. Currently, we only have the customer’s word to go by and they are sometimes mistaken about their current voter registration status. Perhaps a standalone online voter registration system could be used outside of the DL issuance system.
  - Only allow users to see current voter status during a transaction and add Voter Party selected on the application receipt and cashier receipt. Pending more information from the Department of State.
- DL24: The Supervisor of Election would like for DHSMV to add the county location and contact information to the Motor Voter receipt.
  - Create this in a way that the Supervisor of Election can make updates whenever needed.
• DL25: Should the DL system display Time and Date in Standard or Military time?
  o The decision was to display all times in the DL issuance system as standard time.
• DL26: Will the department purchase hardware to scan/read checks to validate the check during the cashiering process?
  o Research cost for hardware and service to purchase for state offices.
  o OMM will meet with Carl Forney to discuss further.
• DL27: Should the department continue to collect Race/Ethnicity as one field? Also, should the current list of Race/Ethnicity be updated to align with any other agencies? (Census, DOS, etc.)
  o Break this field so that there are two separate questions and send the information to the signature pad.
  o OMM will research if DOS follows the Census list for Race and Ethnicity.

Ms. Johnson:
• REN01: Will we allow school bus drivers to renew CDL by convenience method?
  o Receive a complete file, weekly, from the Department of Education of their employees. This file would be used for verification.
• REN04: The TC focus group would like to add a link to "By Mail" the will navigate the customer to the mailing address of the county associated with the registration.
  o This item will be discussed with the Renewal Focus Group meeting (3/30/2016) for their feedback.
• REN05: This item was added to the legal opinion document.

Ms. Thomas:
• FR01: Currently the letters have a name and signature on them. It has been brought to our attention by Natasha that Terry Rhodes has requested the signatures be removed from certain letters recently. Should all the letters (Sanction, correspondence, etc.) have the name and signatures removed or just certain letters?
  o A decision was made to keep the Bureau Chief's signatures on the letters and modernize the signature collection process.

Ms. Freeman:
• MMO1: When the teams reviewed the conversions for the new restriction requirements, we realized that there are several restrictions that fit under the Restriction "C" category. If the customer has more than one restriction that qualifies as a "C" will we only display one "C" restriction on the face of the license and display multiple descriptions on the back?
  o Determine if the restrictions can be rerouted to an unused letter or number. The ESC also recommends using 2 digit FL specific codes. (10, 11, 12, etc.)
  o Check the statistics to determine what restrictions are no longer required.

MM PHASE I PROGRAM UPDATE

Status Update and Financial Review
• Ms. Timmons: We are on track with the contract services spending. Through the end of February, we have approved an additional four deliverables. In March an additional six deliverables was approved. We are in the process of setting up the orders for computers and software in relation to the development phase that will be starting in July.
Status Update and Financial Review

- Ms. Green provided an IV&V update. We finalized the February monthly assessment report last week and presented it to the ESC. According to that assessment report, we are still in the green status. There were no new deficiencies identified. We are proactively work with IV&V to make sure that as we move into the development phase of the project and they start looking at some of those gray deficiency areas that were on the cube, that we are proactively positioned to resolve any issues that might show that were in a favorable position. We have been talking to Gary Didio about when they might begin evaluating those areas. We have been working with IV&V to structure the deliverables for the development phase. They provided us with suggestions that will be included in the current support services vendor contract as deliverables.

Online Insurance Verification

- Ms. Green provided an update on the online insurance verification. We have been doing a lot of research with other states on line insurance verification. Diana Vaughn tasked us with putting together a work group and doing an assessment of that process. Components of the assessment include: evaluating the current environment, assess our state on how we currently process things, consolidating the research from other states, and etc. In addition to our trip to Alabama and Louisiana, we had conference calls with California and New York. We reached out to Texas and Idaho and have had some initial contact with them but we are still waiting for more information. We will be providing scenarios that we can provide to leadership in terms of whether or not we would like to proceed with the current path, do full online insurance verification or a hybrid solution.
- We have targeted to present a draft of this report to the ESC by the next ESC meeting in April. Participants in the work group include Laura Freeman, Cathy Thomas, Chad Hutchinson, Suzie Carey, Carl Forney, a few members from the legislative team Pat Porter and others.

Requirements Validation Update

Financial Responsibility
- Ms. Thomas provided an update on Financial Responsibility.
  - We are currently doing self-insurance and reports.

Citation Processing/CDLIS
- Ms. Thomas provided an update on Citation Processing/CDLIS.
  - We have a few items to wrap up with citation processing. We are about 3-5 days behind. We are waiting to receive a few legal opinions and then citation processing will be finished.
  - We currently started on CDLIS.

DL Issuance
- Ms. Espinoza provided an update on DL Issuance.
  - We are a couple of days behind. Most of it has to do with clearance stories. But we are trending in the right direction to getting those stories completed. Our submission date is due on May 25, 2016.
MyDMV Portal and Renewal
- Ms. Johnson provided an update on Renewal Notification.
  - We are currently working on system notification. There are four stories in that particular functional area. The team is on schedule.
  - MyDMV Portal
    - We are currently working on the BAR hardship hearing request functionality. There are 29 stories and the team is on schedule.

Motorist Maintenance
- Ms. Freeman provided an update on Motorist Maintenance.
  - We are about three and one-half weeks behind due to a very aggressive schedule. We plan to catch up using the seven weeks of slack in the schedule before the deliverables omission.

ADJOURNED
- The meeting came to a close and was officially adjourned at approximately 2:03 p.m.
- The next Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

**Note: Handouts at this meeting included:**

*Consolidated in a booklet format:*

- MM Advisory Board Agenda: 1 page
- MM Advisory Board Monthly Meeting Minutes 02/09/16: 6 pages
- Change Request 10 Phase I: 9 pages
- Change Request 11 Phase I: 3 pages
- Communications Update: 3 pages
- Notes Section: 4 pages

*Additional handouts include:*

- MM Phase I Decisions (updated): 12 pages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POR24</td>
<td>1/12/2016</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Currently if a transcript request is received in the mail for a driver license record and the driver license record is not found, the customer does not receive a refund unless the amount sent is greater than $10.00 or the customer requests a refund for the amount exceeding the $2.00 not found fee. The MIX process currently charges $2.00 for all not found record request. The portal team is requesting that we do not charge the $2.00 fee for &quot;Other Driver License Request&quot; when the driver license / social security number entered is not found. We will however charge this fee for Bulk driver license record request.</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>2/9/2016 Update</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Allow the customer the option to purchase the &quot;Not Found&quot; record for $2.00. The report will contain the information entered by the customer. If the customer decides not to purchase the record, the &quot;Not found&quot; transaction will not be added to the shopping cart. (No fees will be charged)</td>
<td>01/28/16 Update</td>
<td>AI - Add to legal opinion document and review statute. 02/15/16 Update - AI - Peter will meet with Judy to discuss further.</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR26</td>
<td>2/18/2016</td>
<td>Scanned Documents</td>
<td>During the ESC meeting held on 2/18/16, A request was made to allow Portal customers the ability to view documents that were scanned in a field office. Members from the Portal &amp; DL issuance teams have concerns about this request because sometimes documents are scanned and attached to the wrong customer record. Allowing this functionality in the Portal could give customers the ability to see the passport, SSN and other documents which do not belong to them.</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>02/25/16 Update - ESC Decision - Scanned document will not be provided in the MyDMV Portal system. AI - ESC would like to know how many have been processed and whether or not this service can be provided via Motorist Maint. Or DL Issuance 03/24/16 Update - It was determined that this functionality can be offered in DL issuance and treated like a public records request. AI - Discuss this further with Carl Forney and look for correct fee to charge for public record request.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO5</td>
<td>6/10/2015</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>The Motor Voter application should allow users to enter a partial address in the previous address field. Original Request: The system should allow partial previous addresses to be entered. Even a previous city, state or county will help.</td>
<td>Recommendation made</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Recommendation: Planned - Street address will be optional but previous State will be required.</td>
<td>Diana/Terry will verify that DOS signs off on this. AI - Add to the DOS Open Item list and have DOS sign off on this. (Next meeting: 12/03) 12/03 Update - DOS Agrees with recommendation. A Department of State - Focus Group document has been produced to track decisions. 01/28/16 Update - ESC agrees with recommendation. AI - Obtain DOS sign off on this decision and close item. 03/24/16 Update - Pending sign-off.</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL23</td>
<td>1/11/2016</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>DHSMV should have access to the Motor Voter data so that we know what updates truly need to take place. Currently, we only have the customer’s word to go by and they are sometimes mistaken about their current voter registration status. Perhaps a standalone online voter registration system could be used outside of the DL issuance system.</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>02/12/16 Advisory Board Update - The Advisory Board would like to wait until we have a legal opinion from both DOS and DHSMV before making a recommendation. AI - Add this item to the Legal Opinion Document. 02/31/16 Advisory Board Update - AI - Discuss the possibility of creating an audit report for applications submitted to DOS.</td>
<td>02/28/16 Update - Pending DOS and DHSMV legal opinion. 02/25/16 Update - AI - Peter will reach out to DOS to discuss this further. AI - Follow-up with DOS during the next scheduled Focus Group meeting. (03/25/16) 03/24/16 Update - Suggestion: Only allow users to see current voter status during a transaction and add Voter Party selected on the application receipt and cashier receipt. AI - Pending more information from the Department of State.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>Function Area</td>
<td>Requested Functionality</td>
<td>Bureau Chief Suggestion/ Approval by Name(s)</td>
<td>Advisory Board Status</td>
<td>Recommendation Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>ESC Close Date</td>
<td>ESC Comments</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL26</td>
<td>3/21/2016</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Will the department purchase hardware to scan/read checks to validate the check during the cashiering process?</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>02/31/16 Advisory Board Update - AI: Research how many checks are accepted as payment statewide (1yr of data)</td>
<td>03/24/16 Update - Research cost for hardware and service to purchase for state offices. AI: Get with Carl Forney to discuss further.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL27</td>
<td>3/23/2016</td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Should the department continue to collect Race/Ethnicity as one field? Also, should the current list of races/ethnicities be updated to align with any other agencies? (Census, DOS, etc...)</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>03/24/16 Update - Break this field so that there are two separate questions and send the information to the signature pad. AI: Research if DOS follows the Census list for Race and Ethnicity.</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN04</td>
<td>2/10/2016</td>
<td>MV Email/Renewal Notices</td>
<td>The TC focus group would like to add a link to “By Mail” the will navigate the customer to the mailing address of the county associated with the registration.</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>07/25/16 Update - Notify the TC focus group of the options and the impact of this request as it pertains to high-speed processing. AI: Discuss this with the Renewal Focus Group meeting (3/30/2016).</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN05</td>
<td>2/10/2016</td>
<td>Bad Check Stop</td>
<td>Currently, FRVIS does not prevent the issuance or renewal of a Parking Permit when the customer has a Bad Check stop against him because there is no fee charged for a Parking Permit. I was told that a free transaction in the Driver License application (like having the Veteran’s status added or 100% Poverty ID card) is not allowed if the customer has a Bad Check stop against him. In ORION, we will want to be consistent. Should a customer with a Bad Check stop be prevented from being issued a parking permit or renewing a current parking permit until that BC stop has been cleared?</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>Section 320.181(1), Florida Statutes, provides for the department to withhold the registration of any motor vehicle or mobile home the owner or co-owner of which failed to register under the provisions of law for any previous period or periods for which it appears registration should have been made in this state until the tax for such period or periods is paid. The department may cancel any vehicle or vessel registration, driver license, identification card, or fuel-use tax decal if the owner or co-owner pays for any vehicle or vessel registration, driver license, identification card, or fuel tax decal, administrative, delinquency, or reinstatement fee or pays any tax liability, penalty, or interest is paid by a dishonored check. AI: Are placards considered vehicle registrations? If not, then placards are not mentioned in the statute and could possibly be exempt.</td>
<td>02/25/16 Update - This item will be added to the Legal Opinion Document Should the parking permit expire beyond the expiration date of the certification?</td>
<td>Require additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA01</td>
<td>3/3/2016</td>
<td>Restrictions</td>
<td>When the teams reviewed the conversions for the new restriction requirements, we realized that there are several restrictions that fit under the Restriction “C” category. If the customer has more than one restriction that qualifies as a “C” we will only display one “C” restriction on the face of the license and display multiple descriptions on the back? (Reference Restriction Attachment)</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td>03/31/16 Advisory Board Update - AI: Remember to account for indicators from bills that passed this year. (Lifetime Fishing/Hunting, Hearing Impaired, etc...)</td>
<td>02/24/16 Update - Determine if the restrictions can be rerouted to an unused letter or number. The ESC also recommends using 2 digit FL specific codes. (10, 11, 12, etc...) AI: Check stats to determine what restrictions are no longer needed.</td>
<td>New Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

**Advisory Board Status**
- **New Item** - New item has been added to the decision log for recommendation
- **Recommendation Made** - Advisory board has made a recommendation to the ESC
- **Update** - Additional information has been updated for review
- **Requires additional information** - Advisory board requires additional stats or information to make a recommendation

**Executive Steering Committee Status**
- **New Item** - New item has been added to the decision log for review
- **Open** - No decision has been made after initial review
- **Close** - Decision has been made
- **Update** - Additional information has been updated for review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>Function Area</th>
<th>Requested Functionality</th>
<th>Bureau Chief Suggestion/Approval by Name(s)</th>
<th>Advisory Board Status</th>
<th>Recommendation Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>ESC Close Date</th>
<th>ESC Comments</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Require additional information* - ESC requires additional stats or information to make a decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Add Date</th>
<th>ESC Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESC01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>During the requirements gathering phase of this project tax collector personnel expressed an interest in including the email address in the renewal file. Will the email address be included in the renewal file?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>12/22/2015</td>
<td>AI - Research legal requirements. 12/22 Update - AI - Boyd, Robert, Steve and Peter will follow-up to discuss this. (Tentative: Week of Jan 4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC05</td>
<td></td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>The request to use the customer’s email address provided during the DL transaction was raised. Both Tax Collector and DL Offices already collect this information and the Tax Collector would like to use the email address to send out renewal notices/reminder to customer’s in their counties.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>12/22/2015</td>
<td>AI - This issue is tied to ESC01 and requires decision based on the legal opinion. AI - Judy will check if email address is on the high speed file. 12/22 Update - The email is not in the file. AI - Boyd, Robert, Steve and Peter will follow-up to discuss this. (Tentative: Week of Jan 4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL01</td>
<td></td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>Allow examiners to print Hazmat extension letter locally. Original Request: System should be able to print hazmat temporary letter instead of calling help desk.</td>
<td>Planned - Extensions may be printed as replacements with “HazMat until MM/DD/YYYY” on the card. CDLIS Help Desk Recommendation: 1. Designate 2-3 Hazmat certified users per office (more hazmat specific training). 2. Add prompts to ensure successful submission/payment and a checkbox for Veterans who are entitled to a no-fee Hazmat endorsement.</td>
<td>Need more information</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Will there be a fee or no fee? AI - Do we have legal authority to extend Hazmat? 1. Issuance reason: a) Application/Examiner Error (inaccurate prints, veteran no fee issues, etc...) b) Delayed processing time at TSA 2. Process: CDL Help Desk generates letters manually on as need basis. Staff uses the CDL driver’s data to draft letters that are specific to the driver’s case. 3. Average: 15-20 Hazmat extension letters are issued per week. 4. Other States: Pending more information 12/22 Update -ESC Q: How many days is the permit issued for? A: Permits (Hazmat Extensions) are issued for 90 days. Stat Request: How often are drivers denied by TSA after a permit has been issued? Stat Update: Less than 1% 01/28/16 Update - AI - Provide copy of the Hazmat Extension letter. 02/24/16 Update - Copy of letter provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL23</td>
<td></td>
<td>DL Issuance</td>
<td>DHS should have access to the Motor Voter data so that we know what updates truly need to take place. Currently, we only have the customer’s word to go by and they are sometimes mistaken about their current voter registration status. Perhaps a standalone online voter registration system could be used outside of the DL issuance system.</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>12/3/2015</td>
<td>Q: Are there any legal limitations to the information we can or cannot receive from the department of state regarding voter status? 02/26/16 Update - AI - Peter will reach out to the Department of State to discuss this further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL08</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Is there a statutory or FMCSA requirement for mail notification? If we send out an electronic notification, are we still required to send a letter by mail as well?</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR24</td>
<td>MyDMV Portal</td>
<td>Currently if a transcript request is received in the mail for a driver license record and the driver license record is not found, the customer does not receive a refund unless the amount sent is greater than $10.00 or the customer requests a refund for the amount exceeding the $2.00 not found fee. The MIX process currently charges $2.00 for all not found record request. The portal team is requesting that we do not charge the $2.00 fee for &quot;Other Driver License Request&quot; when the driver license / social security number entered is not found. We will however charge this fee for Bulk driver license record request.</td>
<td>Advisory Recommendation: Allow the customer the option to purchase the &quot;Not Found&quot; record for $2.00. The report will contain the information entered by the customer. If the customer decides to not purchase the record, the &quot;Not Found&quot; transaction will not be added to the shopping cart. (No fees will be charged)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1/28/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGL01</td>
<td>MyDMV Portal</td>
<td>Would there need to be a change in public record exemption rule to allow the department to send text messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2/18/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN05</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Currently, FRVIS does not prevent the issuance or renewal of a Parking Permit when the customer has a Bad Check stop against him because there is no fee charged for a Parking Permit. It was told that a free transaction in the Driver License application (like having the Veteran’s status added or 100% Poverty ID card) is not allowed if the customer has a Bad Check stop against him. In ORION, we will want to be consistent. Should a customer with a Bad Check stop be prevented from being issued a parking permit or renewing a current parking permit until that BC stop has been cleared?</td>
<td>Section 320.18(1), Florida Statutes, provides for the department to withhold the registration of any motor vehicle or mobile home the owner or co-owner of which failed to register under the provisions of law for any previous period or periods for which it appears registration should have been made in this state until the tax for such period or periods is paid. The department may cancel any vehicle or vessel registration, driver license, identification card, or fuel-use tax decal if the owner or co-owner pays for any vehicle or vessel registration, driver license, identification card, or fuel use tax decal, administrative, delinquency, or reinstatement fee or pays any tax liability, penalty, or interest is paid by a dishonored check. TW: Are placards considered vehicle registrations? If not, then placards are not mentioned in the statute and could possibly be exempt.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2/25/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGLO2</td>
<td>Citation Processing</td>
<td>Currently, the department does not add dispositions codes 431 - Reckless Driving or 457 - DUI reduced to Reckless Driving when a customer has a learner’s license and is under the age of 18. The CP team would like to update the rule to include the 2 disposition codes. Does the department have the authority to extend the Learner’s License time period, if any of the two codes mentioned above are added?</td>
<td>The team recommends changing this process to the following: Extends the Learner License expire date for drivers aged 15-17 when dispositions for moving violations are added to the driver record, adds a correspondence code and generates a letter to the customer, and checks to see if a disposition occurred during the 12 month violation free period but was not reported until after the driver obtained a “Class E” license.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3/23/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Add Date</td>
<td>ESC Status</td>
<td>Close Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGL03</td>
<td>Citation Processing</td>
<td>The team has been working on business rules for allowing or not allowing school election to comply with clearance requirements. Currently the department allows CDL holders to provide proof of compliance/school election for CDL holders even though, the statutes states that it is only allowed for non-commercial drivers. The team would like a legal opinion on the matter so that the business rules may be finalized.</td>
<td>Currently, the statute states the following: 318.14(10)(a) Any person who does not hold a commercial driver license or commercial learner’s permit and who is cited while driving a noncommercial motor vehicle for an offense listed under this subsection may, in lieu of payment of fine or court appearance, elect to enter a plea of nolo contendere and provide proof of compliance to the clerk of the court, designated official, or authorized operator of a traffic violations bureau. In such case, adjudication shall be withheld; however, a person may not make an election under this subsection if the person has made an election under this subsection in the preceding 12 months. A person may not make more than three elections under this subsection. This subsection applies to the following offenses:</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3/23/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/24/16 Update - AI - Find email and send to Peter, Diana and Terry. 03/28/2016 Update - Cathy Thomas sent the email to the ESC members for their review from Maureen Johnson. 04/05/2016 Update - Per Steve Hurm, the law does not permit CDL, CLP and drivers cited while driving CMV's to take advantage of the election provided by subsection (10) in Section 318.14. Our Citation Processing business rules will be updated to follow the statute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Change Management Update

**Deliverable #22–Training and Performance Support Strategy** submitted February 11

- Scope of Phase I ORION training audiences
- Assessing the demographics of the identified audiences
- Suggested Training Delivery Methods and High Level Curriculum Ideas
- Training Deployment Considerations
- Evaluating Training Effectiveness
- Pre-Deployment, Point of Deployment, and Post-Deployment Suggestions
The OCM team issued a training needs assessment questionnaire to understand key demographics (including understanding the groups’ size, geographic dispersion, and current legacy system use of each audience)

Worked closely with the Learning and Development Office (LDO) to understand existing intake, design, and delivery processes; OMM and LDO will continue coordination throughout this initiative

Approximately 5,300 users will need training (with largest contingent being the Tax Collector and Credentialing Services staff)

Majority of users are “high impact users” meaning that they will be high frequency ORION users and will use ORION daily for transactional / data entry purposes

Recommend a variety of training delivery methods for these high impact users, including E-Learning, Classroom Training, Hands-On Practice (using a “Sandbox” environment), “Delta” training to understand changes between Training Completion and Go-Live, Job Aids, and Field Office-Level Coaching
Sample “High Impacted” User Learning Experience

**FOR DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motorist Modernization Phase 1 Overview (E-Learning)</th>
<th>System and Process Training (by audience) (E-Learning / Virtual / Classroom)</th>
<th>Practice period (“Sandbox”)</th>
<th>Delta Training * (Virtual)</th>
<th>Post Go-Live Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Supporting activities/material**

- Training Material Deployment and Maintenance (E-Learning, Virtual, Classroom, Hands-On, Job Aids)

- Training Environment Deployment and Maintenance (Environment Code and Data Refreshes, Environment Testing, Staging Scenarios and Data)

- Practice / Self-Study in “Sandbox” environment

- Communicate “Go-Live” Support: Command Center, FAQs, Resource e-mail, Customer Service Hotline, Website, etc.

- Job Aids

- 1 on 1 Coaching

**Measurements**

- Training tracking and feedback surveys

- Engagement & Change Readiness Assessments (including Level 2 and 3 evaluations as appropriate)

**On-going communications**

- Execute activities in accordance with OCM Communications Plan

* Delta Training refers to sessions to understand key functionality that may have changed since Classroom Training (e.g., due to testing, fixes, new functionality, etc.)
OCM / Communications Update

◆ Department of State – Motor Voter / Online Voter Registration

❖ March 25 – focus group meeting: introduced decision acceptance document; next meeting is May 9

❖ April 4 – supervisors of elections meeting: discussed special addresses

❖ April 25 (tentative) – technical subgroup meeting

◆ Florida Police Chiefs Association & Florida Sheriffs Association

❖ March 16 – distributed focus group invitations

◆ Bureau of Administrative Reviews

❖ March 3, 10, 17 and 31 – requirements meetings conducted

◆ Bureau Chiefs – last meeting held March 18; next meeting is April 22