

# Vehicle/Watercraft Titling Study

## Fiscal Impact of Substitute Senate Bill 59 of the 124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

February 14, 2003

# Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.....1**
  
- II. Fiscal Impact .....3**
  - A. Net Revenue Resulting from Sub. S.B. 59 by County.....4**
  - B. Relative Gains and Losses in County Revenues.....7**
  - C. Case Studies ..... 11**
  - D. Poundage Fees..... 14**
  - E. Certificate of Title Administration Fund Balances ..... 16**
  
- III. Customer Service .....19**

## Appendices

- A. Text of Section 4 of Sub. S.B. 59..... 20**
- B. LSC Survey Instrument ..... 21**
- C. Tuscarawas County Customer Service Survey..... 26**
- D. County Responses – Problems Associated with  
Sub. S.B. 59 Implementation..... 32**
- E. County Responses – Operational Changes ..... 40**

## LSC Contacts:

	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E-Mail</u>
Sean Fouts, Budget Analyst	614-728-4811	sfouts@lsc.state.oh.us
Don Eckhart, Division Chief	614-644-7786	deckhart@lsc.state.oh.us

## I. Introduction

Substitute Senate Bill 59 of the 124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly made various changes to the titling process for motor vehicles and watercraft. One of the major changes was to allow cross-county titling. Before the act, a person was required to apply for a certificate of title with the clerk of courts in his or her county of residence. Substitute Senate Bill 59 changed that requirement to allow a person to title his or her motor vehicle or watercraft in any of Ohio's 88 counties.

Section 4 of Sub. S.B. 59 requires the Legislative Service Commission to conduct a study of the fiscal impact of the act, as well as its impact on customer service. (See Appendix A.) This study focuses on the changes experienced by county clerks of courts since March 2002, the month that cross-county titling took effect.

Senate Bill 59 made no changes which would affect the total number of titles issued in Ohio. Instead, the fiscal impact would be felt by the shifting of titling revenue among counties. For example, when a person buys a motor vehicle from a car dealership, the dealership processes the titling of the car. It would be expected that since Sub. S.B. 59, dealerships would discontinue traveling throughout the state to title motor vehicles and instead title in the county that is most convenient for them. Also, vehicle sales between individuals could result in some titling in a county other than the residence of the buyer. Such changes in behavior would result in decreased titling revenue for the county of residence and increased titling revenue for the county where the car is actually titled.

In 2002, 5,041,944 motor vehicles and 84,707 watercraft received new titles in the state of Ohio. In addition, 637,170 motor vehicles and watercraft received either duplicate or replacement titles. A consumer is charged \$5 for a title. The \$5 fee is distributed as follows:

- \$2 goes to the Automated Title Processing Fund
- 25 cents goes to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles Fund
- 25 cents goes to the Department of Taxation
- 4 cents goes to the Motor Vehicle Dealers Board
- 21 cents goes to the General Revenue Fund
- \$2.25 goes to the appropriate county clerk of courts

The clerk also gets to keep the \$5 charged for a memorandum of title plus any late fees.

For a period of three years, the act requires the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to reimburse counties for losses associated with Sub. S.B. 59. In the first year, reimbursement is to occur at a 100% rate, in the second year at a 75% rate, and in the



third year at a 50% rate. The money for these reimbursements comes from the Automated Title Processing Fund.

Due to the current 100% reimbursement and the relative short time since the act's effective date, it is difficult to draw substantive conclusions about the act's ultimate fiscal impact. However, some analysis is possible and provided in the following pages of this report. Section II of the report examines the actual net gains and losses counties have experienced to date due to Sub. S.B. 59, the relative net results of Sub. S.B. 59 as compared to a county's total titling revenue, the impact of poundage changes in the act, and the impact the act may be having on Certificate of Title Administration Funds. Section III of the report examines customer satisfaction as it relates to Sub. S.B. 59.



## II. Fiscal Impact

Since cross-county titling has been in effect for less than one year, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the operational impact of the fiscal changes resulting from Sub. S.B. 59. Moreover, since the effective date of the act, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has reimbursed counties at 100%. Thus, we know which counties have lost titling revenue and which counties have gained titling revenue due to cross county titling since the change took effect. Since the counties losing revenue have been reimbursed at 100%, we cannot know for sure how the revenue losses will affect their operations. However, we can analyze the data and identify some possibilities.

First, this section presents the actual losses and gains per county in 2002, resulting from Sub. S.B. 59. This information is provided by the Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS). As the department responsible for reimbursing counties experiencing revenue losses, ODPS has recorded where titling is actually occurring today, and where that titling would have been required to occur, because of residency, pre-Sub. S.B. 59.

Second, this section examines these revenue losses and gains relative to each county's actual total titling revenues. If a large metropolitan county loses a few thousand dollars of titling revenue in nine months' time, the relative effect would be less than if a small county loses the same amount of titling revenue in the same amount of time. This section displays relative losses and gains for all 64 counties that responded to the survey.

Third, this section examines any changes that counties have experienced in the amount of poundage<sup>1</sup> they are able to retain. Before the act, counties were permitted to keep 1.0% of the taxes collected. Under the act, counties are now permitted to keep 1.01% of the taxes collected.

Fourth, this section shows the changes in counties' Certificate of Title Administration Fund balances from year to year.

---

<sup>1</sup> Poundage is the portion of the sales tax that counties may keep on the sale of motor vehicles and watercraft.

## A. Net Revenue Resulting from Sub. S.B. 59, by County

Table 1 is provided by the Ohio Department of Public Safety. It shows the net revenue gains and losses resulting from Sub. S.B. 59 county-by-county, most of which is attributable to cross county titling.

**Table 1: Statewide Net Revenue Totals, April – December, 2002**

County name	April Net Revenue	May Net Revenue	June Net Revenue	July Net Revenue	August Net Revenue	September Net	October Net Revenue	November Net	December Net	Total Net Revenue
ADAMS	\$60	(\$477)	(\$804)	(\$485)	(\$298)	(\$517)	(\$210)	(\$751)	(\$37)	(\$3,521)
ALLEN	\$649	\$33	\$1,238	\$1,441	\$790	\$1,094	\$2,280	\$963	\$1,780	\$10,266
ASHLAND	(\$2,645)	(\$2,526)	(\$2,549)	(\$2,905)	(\$3,659)	(\$2,622)	(\$1,794)	(\$1,780)	(\$1,546)	(\$22,025)
ASHTABULA	(\$2,353)	(\$2,457)	(\$2,734)	(\$1,943)	(\$3,483)	(\$1,449)	(\$1,968)	(\$1,813)	(\$974)	(\$19,173)
ATHENS	\$90	(\$56)	(\$242)	\$160	(\$327)	\$177	(\$401)	\$113	\$344	(\$142)
AUGLAIZE	(\$246)	(\$291)	(\$1,602)	(\$1,078)	(\$710)	(\$786)	(\$679)	(\$388)	(\$652)	(\$6,431)
BELMONT	\$1,446	\$1,065	\$1,156	\$1,272	(\$11)	\$651	\$282	\$156	(\$47)	\$5,969
BROWN	(\$4,179)	(\$4,166)	\$4,604	(\$4,416)	\$636	(\$3,448)	(\$16,897)	(\$3,632)	(\$2,728)	(\$34,226)
BUTLER	\$6,545	\$7,358	\$4,164	\$7,113	\$5,966	\$5,777	\$4,945	\$5,863	\$4,877	\$52,607
CARROLL	(\$1,002)	(\$1,511)	(\$883)	(\$1,070)	(\$966)	(\$775)	(\$1,272)	(\$1,164)	(\$1,130)	(\$9,772)
CHAMPAIGN	(\$1,598)	(\$1,281)	(\$1,929)	(\$1,841)	(\$1,702)	(\$1,229)	(\$1,833)	(\$1,070)	(\$747)	(\$13,228)
CLARK	\$22	(\$1,160)	\$1	\$1,571	\$296	\$702	\$2,056	\$125	\$1,571	\$5,183
CLERMONT	\$4,584	\$3,280	\$5,338	\$7,178	\$6,258	\$4,441	\$4,944	\$4,394	\$3,006	\$43,422
CLINTON	(\$1,484)	(\$1,767)	(\$1,299)	(\$1,854)	(\$1,890)	(\$1,337)	(\$1,709)	(\$899)	(\$1,213)	(\$13,451)
COLUMBIANA	(\$3,218)	(\$3,042)	(\$3,396)	(\$3,008)	(\$3,566)	(\$3,349)	(\$3,584)	(\$3,255)	(\$2,570)	(\$28,988)
COSHOCTON	(\$1,296)	(\$769)	(\$953)	(\$1,234)	(\$1,288)	(\$595)	(\$697)	(\$448)	(\$631)	(\$7,912)
CRAWFORD	(\$2,439)	(\$1,770)	(\$2,068)	(\$2,161)	(\$2,173)	(\$1,276)	(\$1,489)	(\$1,061)	(\$246)	(\$14,682)
CUYAHOGA	(\$18,814)	(\$25,134)	(\$25,608)	(\$22,081)	(\$18,539)	(\$15,286)	(\$18,542)	(\$15,982)	(\$14,724)	(\$174,709)
DARKE	(\$1,013)	(\$1,597)	(\$1,169)	(\$629)	(\$934)	(\$560)	(\$723)	(\$1,079)	(\$467)	(\$8,170)
DEFIANCE	\$469	\$966	\$262	\$184	(\$2)	\$133	\$338	\$197	\$890	\$3,435
DELAWARE	(\$5,371)	(\$3,477)	(\$5,000)	(\$5,848)	(\$7,740)	(\$6,812)	(\$7,381)	(\$6,838)	(\$7,931)	(\$56,397)
ERIE	(\$1,735)	(\$1,891)	(\$913)	(\$1,585)	(\$2,277)	(\$2,113)	(\$2,346)	(\$1,524)	(\$1,519)	(\$15,902)
FAIRFIELD	\$10,919	\$19,369	\$15,752	\$22,260	\$21,494	\$23,899	\$24,207	\$17,672	\$15,589	\$171,160
FAYETTE	\$384	(\$22)	(\$197)	(\$36)	(\$50)	\$114	\$243	(\$337)	(\$102)	(\$4)
FRANKLIN	\$16,838	\$6,228	\$5,927	\$6,480	\$9,175	\$1,462	\$2,069	\$10,258	\$10,223	\$68,659
FULTON	(\$550)	(\$838)	(\$48)	\$30	(\$630)	(\$864)	(\$517)	(\$656)	(\$755)	(\$4,828)
GALLIA	\$925	\$876	\$1,157	\$850	\$827	\$884	\$277	\$951	\$760	\$7,506
GEAUGA	(\$151)	(\$64)	(\$3,391)	(\$3,448)	(\$4,790)	(\$2,396)	\$1,948	\$682	\$883	(\$10,725)
GREENE	\$3,071	\$3,306	\$2,297	\$6,228	\$6,430	\$6,719	\$7,696	\$4,760	\$5,943	\$46,450
GUERNSEY	(\$1,796)	(\$1,421)	(\$1,196)	(\$1,252)	(\$1,088)	(\$1,363)	(\$1,731)	(\$1,344)	(\$1,348)	(\$12,538)
HAMILTON	(\$4,502)	(\$5,492)	(\$4,578)	(\$6,371)	(\$8,263)	(\$4,083)	(\$6,245)	(\$4,625)	(\$2,303)	(\$46,461)
HANCOCK	\$2,134	\$1,775	\$1,737	\$2,272	\$1,689	\$2,155	\$2,258	\$1,762	\$1,987	\$17,769
HARDIN	(\$1,035)	(\$945)	(\$1,204)	(\$1,672)	(\$1,279)	(\$771)	(\$976)	(\$876)	(\$917)	(\$9,674)
HARRISON	(\$1,345)	(\$1,492)	(\$1,405)	(\$1,564)	(\$1,788)	(\$1,669)	(\$1,663)	(\$1,887)	(\$1,710)	(\$14,521)
HENRY	\$79	(\$301)	(\$17)	(\$574)	(\$505)	(\$119)	(\$503)	(\$169)	(\$386)	(\$2,495)
HIGHLAND	(\$1,056)	(\$650)	(\$689)	(\$449)	(\$1,091)	(\$1,209)	(\$1,137)	(\$366)	(\$548)	(\$7,195)
HOCKING	(\$1,650)	(\$1,705)	(\$1,752)	(\$2,227)	(\$2,125)	(\$2,097)	(\$2,378)	(\$1,447)	(\$1,517)	(\$16,896)
HOLMES	(\$171)	(\$321)	(\$396)	(\$955)	(\$687)	(\$475)	(\$552)	(\$452)	(\$709)	(\$4,715)
HURON	(\$1,951)	(\$386)	(\$807)	(\$1,683)	(\$1,178)	(\$574)	(\$410)	(\$147)	(\$359)	(\$7,494)
JACKSON	(\$263)	(\$302)	(\$419)	(\$442)	(\$537)	(\$287)	(\$274)	\$296	(\$81)	(\$2,307)
JEFFERSON	(\$1,282)	(\$1,113)	(\$1,159)	(\$1,516)	(\$927)	(\$421)	(\$326)	\$402	\$480	(\$5,861)
KNOX	(\$294)	\$92	\$346	\$930	(\$643)	(\$117)	\$8	\$8	\$101	\$431
LAKE	\$5,880	\$6,792	\$9,309	\$11,272	\$11,865	\$10,592	\$6,809	\$6,749	\$5,509	\$74,777
LAWRENCE	\$2,290	\$662	\$712	\$1,508	\$774	\$970	\$590	\$1,296	\$1,639	\$10,442
LICKING	\$2,934	\$1,950	\$1,763	\$1,913	\$1,313	\$6,422	\$4,974	(\$70)	\$2,169	\$23,367
LOGAN	(\$1,029)	(\$780)	(\$1,055)	(\$1,051)	(\$1,692)	(\$1,180)	(\$1,997)	(\$1,586)	(\$1,190)	(\$11,559)
LORAIN	\$3,333	\$2,310	\$4,226	\$3,695	\$3,324	\$2,405	\$1,420	\$178	\$2,073	\$22,965
LUCAS	\$4,935	\$3,424	\$3,829	\$6,926	\$5,226	\$5,537	\$3,400	\$1,250	\$4,144	\$38,670
MADISON	(\$2,083)	(\$1,251)	(\$215)	(\$691)	(\$250)	(\$1,231)	(\$423)	\$538	\$556	(\$5,050)
MAHONING	\$5,832	\$4,895	\$5,654	\$4,787	\$5,348	\$5,020	\$6,018	\$5,257	\$3,321	\$46,131
MARION	\$333	\$125	\$661	\$218	\$563	\$422	(\$445)	\$149	\$238	\$2,265

County name	April Net Revenue	May Net Revenue	June Net Revenue	July Net Revenue	August Net Revenue	September Net Revenue	October Net Revenue	November Net Revenue	December Net Revenue	Total Net Revenue
MEDINA	\$13,949	\$17,053	\$13,267	\$15,139	\$14,637	\$13,855	\$13,362	\$14,018	\$12,716	\$127,995
MEIGS	(\$1,690)	(\$1,634)	(\$1,614)	(\$1,884)	(\$1,628)	(\$1,491)	(\$1,533)	(\$1,534)	(\$1,095)	(\$14,103)
MERCER	\$1,297	\$1,491	\$1,374	\$1,724	\$1,576	\$1,078	\$1,109	\$744	\$1,122	\$11,515
MIAMI	(\$1,263)	(\$1,228)	(\$1,204)	(\$1,589)	(\$1,539)	(\$2,042)	(\$3,104)	(\$1,832)	(\$1,662)	(\$15,462)
MONROE	(\$855)	(\$933)	(\$935)	(\$952)	(\$1,141)	(\$957)	(\$980)	(\$692)	(\$378)	(\$7,823)
MONTGOMERY	\$1,170	\$1,177	(\$423)	(\$2,471)	(\$508)	(\$2,345)	(\$3,362)	(\$995)	(\$1,795)	(\$9,552)
MORGAN	(\$815)	(\$880)	(\$880)	(\$1,121)	(\$1,088)	(\$1,016)	(\$1,000)	(\$855)	(\$745)	(\$8,399)
MORROW	(\$1,874)	(\$3,162)	(\$2,594)	(\$2,958)	(\$3,360)	(\$2,814)	(\$3,490)	(\$2,376)	(\$2,403)	(\$25,029)
MUSKINGUM	\$536	(\$397)	(\$371)	(\$688)	(\$1,211)	\$236	\$209	\$104	\$336	(\$1,247)
NOBLE	(\$143)	(\$192)	(\$550)	(\$35)	(\$479)	\$30	(\$162)	(\$258)	\$24	(\$1,766)
OTTAWA	(\$1,238)	(\$1,464)	(\$1,439)	(\$1,201)	(\$1,217)	(\$1,602)	(\$2,697)	(\$2,301)	(\$2,502)	(\$15,660)
PAULDING	(\$820)	(\$710)	(\$499)	(\$672)	(\$354)	(\$40)	(\$595)	(\$368)	(\$43)	(\$4,099)
PERRY	(\$2,335)	(\$2,401)	(\$2,643)	(\$2,796)	(\$2,397)	(\$2,252)	(\$2,190)	(\$2,244)	(\$2,123)	(\$21,379)
PICKAWAY	(\$1,898)	(\$855)	(\$722)	(\$283)	(\$2,023)	(\$2,371)	(\$2,449)	(\$1,978)	(\$1,207)	(\$13,785)
PIKE	(\$667)	(\$392)	(\$348)	(\$458)	(\$323)	(\$70)	(\$435)	(\$290)	(\$281)	(\$3,263)
PORTAGE	\$2,792	\$4,639	\$4,401	\$5,177	\$6,369	\$5,915	\$5,267	\$3,560	\$1,463	\$39,584
PREBLE	(\$1,735)	(\$1,454)	(\$772)	(\$1,241)	(\$1,066)	(\$794)	(\$1,765)	(\$1,077)	(\$1,500)	(\$11,403)
PUTNAM	(\$880)	(\$710)	(\$1,033)	(\$1,280)	(\$1,697)	(\$1,243)	(\$1,395)	(\$1,507)	(\$1,516)	(\$11,260)
RICHLAND	\$3,320	\$1,739	\$2,058	\$1,728	\$2,172	\$1,249	\$863	\$430	\$1,022	\$14,579
ROSS	(\$2,714)	(\$3,287)	(\$3,979)	(\$3,697)	(\$4,231)	(\$3,008)	(\$3,301)	(\$3,037)	(\$2,254)	(\$29,506)
SANDUSKY	\$283	\$1,533	\$1,265	\$1,161	\$406	\$907	\$1,619	\$591	\$1,225	\$8,988
SCIOTO	(\$1,253)	(\$1,288)	(\$1,429)	(\$1,984)	(\$2,315)	(\$1,675)	(\$2,034)	(\$1,866)	(\$2,021)	(\$15,865)
SENECA	(\$2,513)	(\$2,651)	(\$2,474)	(\$2,714)	(\$2,739)	(\$2,511)	(\$2,729)	(\$2,021)	(\$2,475)	(\$22,827)
SHELBY	(\$346)	(\$808)	(\$917)	(\$292)	(\$1,027)	(\$55)	(\$670)	(\$424)	(\$1,209)	(\$5,747)
STARK	\$5,234	\$3,033	\$3,603	\$4,659	\$4,232	\$3,641	\$4,283	\$3,546	\$4,682	\$36,912
SUMMIT	\$9,653	\$10,692	\$9,864	\$12,782	\$10,786	\$9,063	\$7,817	\$5,875	\$9,578	\$86,109
TRUMBULL	(\$7,700)	(\$7,737)	(\$6,726)	(\$7,220)	(\$8,586)	(\$7,865)	(\$10,485)	(\$7,864)	(\$5,194)	(\$69,377)
TUSCARAWAS	\$376	\$707	(\$50)	\$1,147	\$201	\$1,306	\$725	\$537	\$632	\$5,582
UNION	(\$1,206)	(\$1,150)	(\$1,016)	(\$1,422)	(\$1,250)	(\$288)	(\$654)	(\$533)	(\$1,195)	(\$8,712)
VAN WERT	\$345	\$310	\$592	\$901	\$658	\$692	\$26	\$363	\$445	\$4,332
VINTON	(\$234)	(\$274)	(\$488)	(\$422)	(\$697)	(\$329)	(\$652)	(\$472)	(\$251)	(\$3,816)
WARREN	\$4,306	\$4,118	\$3,814	\$6,028	\$6,963	\$8,376	\$8,404	\$5,795	\$7,048	\$54,852
WASHINGTON	\$644	\$643	\$787	\$1,219	\$794	\$791	\$492	\$802	\$114	\$6,285
WAYNE	(\$2,351)	(\$2,193)	(\$2,142)	(\$2,606)	(\$2,926)	(\$2,654)	(\$3,065)	(\$2,896)	(\$2,417)	(\$23,250)
WILLIAMS	(\$180)	(\$323)	(\$182)	(\$431)	\$41	(\$259)	(\$874)	(\$220)	(\$397)	(\$2,824)
WOOD	\$513	\$745	(\$1,508)	(\$1,531)	(\$482)	\$128	\$65	\$1,154	\$6	(\$910)
WYANDOT	(\$363)	(\$808)	(\$831)	(\$403)	(\$666)	(\$502)	(\$882)	(\$564)	(\$763)	(\$5,780)
<b>Total Net Revenue</b>										\$104,314
<b>Total Losses</b>	<b>(\$101,621)</b>	<b>(\$107,378)</b>	<b>(\$107,439)</b>	<b>(\$118,407)</b>	<b>(\$122,028)</b>	<b>(\$99,187)</b>	<b>(\$131,600)</b>	<b>(\$93,847)</b>	<b>(\$84,509)</b>	<b>(\$943,888)</b>

The table shows that 58 of Ohio's 88 counties have experienced net revenue losses due to Sub. S.B. 59, totaling \$943,888,<sup>2</sup> all of which has been reimbursed to these counties by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles from the Automated Title Processing Fund. That averages \$16,273.93 per county that lost titling revenue due to Sub. S.B. 59. Losses ranged from a very low \$3.50 for Fayette County to \$174,709.35 for Cuyahoga County. The 30 counties that gained revenue due to Sub. S.B. 59 gained a total of \$1,048,201.76. That is an average of \$34,940.06. These gains ranged from a high of \$171,160 in the case of Fairfield County to a low of \$431 in the case of Knox County.

<sup>2</sup> The Department of Public Safety accounts for total losses as \$966,014. This is the actual amount that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles was required to reimburse. This is because they must reimburse on a monthly basis. Montgomery County will serve as a good example. In April and May, Montgomery County gained revenue. For the period of June through December, Montgomery County lost revenue each month and the Registrar was required to reimburse Montgomery County each month at 100%. In calculating total loss net revenue, the Department of Public Safety does not take into account April and May. It includes only what it actually paid to Montgomery County in the form of reimbursement. However, this study considers a county's net lost revenue for the period of April-December and therefore takes into account months of gained revenue also.

These numbers show that roughly one-third of Ohio's counties are gaining titling revenue due to cross county titling while roughly two-thirds of Ohio's counties are losing titling revenue. However, they do not show the relative impact of these gains and losses on counties of different size. This is examined in the following section.



## B. Relative Gains and Losses in County Revenues

This section shows the relative impact of Sub. S.B. 59 gains and losses on a county-by-county basis. In order to do this, LSC sent out a questionnaire to all 88 of Ohio's county clerks of courts. (See Appendix B). Among other things, the clerks were asked to report to LSC their total titling revenue for the last few years. Sixty-four counties responded to our questionnaire.<sup>3</sup> If a county does not appear in any of the following charts, it is either because they did not respond or the information given was unusable by the Legislative Service Commission.

The following tables show the net loss or gain due to Sub. S.B. 59 in the year 2002 (from Table 1) as a percentage of the total titling revenue on a county-by-county basis. This gives a picture of the relative impact that a loss or gain has on a particular county. Table 2.1 presents counties with populations over 250,000. Table 2.2 presents counties with populations between 50,000 and 250,000. Table 2.3 presents counties with populations under 50,000.

**Table 2.1: Titling Revenue for Large Counties  
(Population Over 250,000)**

County	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	S.B. 59 Gain or Loss	Gain or Loss as a Percent of 2002 Revenue
Cuyahoga	\$3,811,861	\$3,893,129	\$4,005,893	\$4,092,535	\$3,804,451	(\$174,709.35)	-4.59%
Franklin	3,631,468	3,929,850	4,390,783	4,234,666	4,403,108	\$68,659.46	1.56%
Lorain	923,065	952,548	938,539	1,000,047	1,040,258	\$22,965.15	2.21%
Lucas	1,389,477	1,475,174	1,491,077	1,541,860	1,614,929	\$38,670.15	2.40%
Mahoning	838,917	860,520	901,000	937,744	1,021,402	\$46,131.25	4.52%
Stark	643,784	940,089	978,627	999,410	1,047,771	\$36,912.45	3.53%
Summit	1,750,914	1,760,437	1,783,283	1,849,709	1,963,325	\$86,108.55	4.39%
<b>TOTALS</b>					\$14,895,244	\$124,737.66	0.88%
<b>Gainers</b>					\$11,090,793	\$299,447	2.70%

Table 2.1 shows the relative impact of Sub. S.B. 59 gains and losses on large counties. Of the counties completing the LSC survey, Cuyahoga is the only large county to have lost revenue due to Sub. S.B. 59. (Hamilton and Montgomery counties also lost revenue, but did not return surveys to LSC.) With Cuyahoga County included in the analysis, large counties experienced a relatively small gain of revenue due to Sub. S.B. 59. The gain constitutes 0.88% of total revenue. However, if

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that LSC sent out a second questionnaire after it was realized that the first survey instrument was incomplete. Eight counties responded to the first questionnaire but not the second. LSC understands the inconvenience of sending two separate questionnaires. The eight counties are Allen, Harrison, Jefferson, Knox, Lawrence, Perry, Sandusky, and Wayne.

Cuyahoga is removed from the analysis, large counties experienced a revenue gain that is 2.70% of their total titling revenue.

**Table 2.2: Titling Revenue for Medium-Sized Counties  
(Population between 50,000 and 250,000)**

County	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	S.B. 59 Gain or Loss	Gain or Loss as a Percent of 2002 Revenue
Ashland	\$78,708	\$105,235	\$130,334	\$133,166	\$110,999	(\$22,024.85)	-19.85%
Ashtabula	289,460	290,070	312,061	306,925	280,439	(\$19,172.50)	-6.80%
Athens	194,350	206,490	223,345	210,381	211,422	(\$142.00)	-0.07%
Columbiana	406,079	397,780	404,541	425,392	440,189	(\$28,987.50)	-6.59%
Darke	191,795	197,846	193,555	203,787	200,715	(\$8,170.05)	-4.07%
Delaware	205,710	274,087	364,090	420,939	305,062	(\$56,397.00)	-18.49%
Erie	276,110	279,695	283,084	290,573	309,996	(\$15,902.40)	-5.13%
Fairfield	387,035	422,835	441,021	454,744	666,106	\$171,159.50	25.70%
Geauga	263,648	263,042	276,313	298,420	306,543	(\$10,725.35)	-3.50%
Greene	312,159	409,428	470,080	519,752	540,000	\$46,449.50	8.60%
Hancock	253,375	251,632	255,029	271,929	278,311	\$17,768.75	6.38%
Hardin	122,851	126,018	130,582	121,949	122,015	(\$9,673.75)	-7.93%
Huron	226,286	231,602	231,497	244,638	194,094	(\$7,494.45)	-3.86%
Lake	692,273	706,283	780,653	775,073	811,531	\$74,776.58	9.21%
Licking	396,421	413,780	427,191	451,237	488,547	\$23,367.30	4.78%
Marion	246,640	250,781	254,670	268,266	270,004	\$2,264.55	0.84%
Medina	229,297	314,709	418,172	454,770	596,218	\$127,994.80	21.47%
Miami	362,629	363,198	362,533	372,335	367,725	(\$15,462.09)	-4.20%
Muskingum	251,392	261,804	255,383	264,336	278,176	(\$1,247.00)	-0.45%
Pickaway	188,357	194,155	197,308	200,277	186,752	(\$13,784.50)	-7.38%
Portage	151,380	156,038	156,256	155,839	161,292	\$39,583.50	24.54%
Richland	206,701	302,704	395,014	396,981	426,675	\$14,579.01	3.42%
Ross	280,799	293,180	318,772	325,957	265,104	(\$29,506.00)	-11.13%
Scioto	49,272	72,150	110,124	113,986	110,115	(\$15,864.50)	-14.41%
Seneca	191,682	192,398	185,206	199,434	168,821	(\$22,826.50)	-13.52%
Tuscarawas	347,040	389,138	395,430	404,463	411,571	\$5,581.50	1.36%
Warren	534,176	570,841	586,005	675,759	761,175	\$54,852.25	7.21%
Washington	210,397	219,601	222,887	229,591	239,860	\$6,284.50	2.63%
Wood	390,133	388,985	386,162	404,986	397,167	(\$909.75)	-0.23%
<b>TOTALS</b>					9,906,624	\$306,371.55	3.10%
<b>Gainers</b>					5,651,290	\$584,661.74	10.35%
<b>Losers</b>					4,255,334	(\$278,290.19)	-6.54%

Of the 29 medium-sized counties that are included in our study, 17 lost titling revenues due to Sub. S.B. 59. Five of these counties lost revenue that, as a percentage of total revenue is higher than 10%. However, the 12 counties that gained revenue

did so at high rates, causing a total net gain in revenue for medium-sized counties, equaling 3.10% of the total titling revenue. Three counties gained revenue that is higher than 20% of total titling revenue.

Counties that gained revenue averaged a gain that equaled 10.35% of total revenue, while counties that lost, averaged a loss that equaled 6.54% of total revenue.

**Table 2.3: Titling Revenue for Small Counties  
(Population under 50,000)**

County	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	S.B. 59 Gain Loss	Gain or Loss as a Percent of 2002 Revenue
Adams	\$107,633	\$109,604	\$108,475	\$107,187	\$104,177	(\$3,520.75)	-3.38%
Auglaize	163,313	169,464	212,835	168,172	167,352	(\$6,430.75)	-3.84%
Carroll			85,214	87,424	77,785	(\$9,771.70)	-12.57%
Champaign	153,729	154,751	154,901	162,656	155,629	(\$13,228.00)	-8.50%
Crawford	174,867	178,643	184,236	181,705	175,453	(\$14,682.15)	-8.37%
Defiance	105,464	125,274	158,947	168,940	179,131	\$3,434.75	1.92%
Fayette	88,131	94,339	92,001	90,208	94,457	(\$3.50)	0.00%
Fulton	107,797	106,465	105,844	113,491	112,258	(\$4,828.25)	-4.30%
Gallia		114,395	116,686	119,222	130,604	\$7,505.50	5.70%
Guernsey		116,688	117,036	121,154	110,064	(\$12,537.75)	-11.39%
Hardin	122,851	126,018	130,582	121,949	122,015	(\$9,673.75)	-7.93%
Henry	118,654	116,246	108,509	117,421	119,936	(\$2,494.50)	-2.08%
Hocking	49,689	65,988	92,279	93,024	72,345	(\$16,896.25)	-23.36%
Holmes	65,325	84,319	106,378	105,059	98,732	(\$4,714.75)	-4.78%
Logan	78,634	110,450	138,252	141,937	135,413	(\$11,558.75)	-8.54%
Madison		137,930	139,679	211,431	195,000	(\$5,049.64)	-2.59%
Meigs	114,620	117,265	117,509	117,670	104,570	(\$14,102.50)	-13.49%
Mercer	60,707	88,420	103,653	106,074	119,807	\$11,514.50	9.61%
Monroe	56,642	56,552	59,292	64,356	55,605	(\$7,822.50)	-14.07%
Morgan	59,734	63,055	62,498	66,628	51,109	(\$8,399.25)	-16.43%
Ottawa	167,089	176,232	178,189	185,413	180,862	(\$15,659.60)	-8.66%
Preble	168,325	173,329	177,000	184,739	177,000	(\$11,403.00)	-6.44%
Putnam	126,865	130,760	129,490	129,186	127,181	(\$11,260.00)	-8.85%
Shelby	167,242	176,633	181,642	182,031	184,688	(\$5,746.83)	-3.11%
Union	96,506	124,463	166,162	181,494	168,235	(\$8,712.07)	-5.18%
Van Wert	41,473	52,943	66,474	66,287	74,197	\$4,331.75	5.84%
Vinton	63,540	65,486	65,436	66,954	63,887	(\$3,816.00)	-5.97%
Wyandot	78,932	78,630	82,817	83,940	83,130	(\$5,779.75)	-6.95%
<b>TOTALS</b>					3,440,622	(\$181,305.49)	-5.27%
<b>Gainers</b>					503,739	\$26,786.50	5.32%
<b>Losers</b>					2,936,883	(\$208,091.99)	-7.09%

Of the 28 small counties included in the study, only four gained revenue due to cross county titling. The average loss of all 28 small counties was 5.27% of their total titling revenue. Six counties lost revenues that are more than 10% of their total titling revenue. Evaluating only the counties that lost revenues, their total loss averages 7.09% of their total titling revenue. Of the counties that gained, their total gain averaged 5.32% of their total titling revenue.

An analysis of Tables 2.1 through 2.3 together shows that small counties are the biggest relative losers of cross-county titling revenue. A higher percentage of small counties have lost revenue due to cross county titling than have large and medium counties. Further, small counties' losses are larger, relatively speaking, than medium and large counties. However, medium counties that have lost revenues have done so at similar relative rates as small counties.

The big relative revenue gainers are the 12 medium counties that gained revenue at a rate that averages 10.35% of total titling revenue. Three suburban counties (Fairfield, Medina, and Portage) were especially large revenue gainers. Fairfield County's gain was 25.70%, Medina County's gain was 21.47%, and Portage County's gain was 24.54%.



## C. Case Studies

This section comprises a more in-depth analysis of eight counties, the three counties that experienced the biggest proportional gain in titling revenue (as compared to total titling revenue) and the three counties that experienced the largest loss in titling revenue (as compared to total titling revenue). It also includes the largest county to lose revenue and the county with the least amount of titling revenue. This section is not meant to be an exhaustive study of all the possible circumstances facing titling departments due to cross county titling. Appendices D and E provide all county responses to questions concerning problems and operational changes caused by Sub. S.B. 59.

### **Three Counties with Largest Proportional Revenue Gains**

*Fairfield County* has gained more revenue due to cross county titling than any other county, a total of \$171,159.50 in 2002. As a percentage, this is 25.7% of total titling revenue for the year. Due to this increase in revenue, Fairfield has hired two additional staff persons at their Pickerington office and purchased additional equipment. In 2001, Fairfield County spent \$340,183 to fund its titling program. In 2002, expenditures increased by 20.5% to \$409,938, and Fairfield County reports that it expects spending in 2003 to increase to \$562,000, a 37.1% increase over 2002.

*Medina County* has also gained a large amount of revenue due to cross county titling, a total of \$127,994.80 in the year 2002. As a percentage, this equals 21.47% of total titling revenue for Medina County. Despite this increase in titling revenue, Medina County actually spent less money on titling in 2002 than in 2001. (This is mainly due to the retirement of three people in 2001, causing Medina County to pay accumulated sick leave and vacation leave). But Medina County has made significant changes to its titling operation due to the increased business brought by cross county titling. The Clerk of Courts has hired one additional person and plans to move the main office to a larger facility. Medina County has also made some procedural changes at branch offices, due to the increased workload from out-of-county dealers.

*Portage County* gained \$39,583.50 in 2002 due to cross county titling, equaling 24.54% of total titling revenue. Portage County has reported experiencing some problems with dealers identifying the incorrect county of buyer and computing the tax amount improperly. But operations stay largely the same otherwise. The Clerk of Courts has hired an additional full-time employee due to the additional titling activity, but has not had to open a new office, remaining at one.

### **Three Counties with Largest Proportional Revenue Losses**

*Hocking County* lost more revenue relative to its total titling revenue stream than any other county. In 2002, Hocking County lost \$16,896.25 in titling revenue to other counties. The amount of total titling revenue received by Hocking County in 2002 was \$72,345.25. Hocking County has made no changes yet, due to the 100% reimbursement. However, changes will be necessary. For the last year, expenditures have been approximately \$85,000. That is \$12,500 more than titling revenue received. Hocking County has only one non-leased titling office and two titling employees. (One additional employee from the legal department fills in at the titling department if an employee goes on vacation or is sick.) The Hocking County Clerk of Courts indicates that when reimbursement rates drop to 50%, she will most likely decide to close the titling office one day a week in order to save money.

*Ashland County* lost \$22,024.85 to cross county titling in 2002. Unlike Hocking County, Ashland County is still bringing in more titling revenue than it is spending on titling department expenses. In 2002, Ashland County spent \$106,431.09 to operate its titling department, while bringing in \$110,999.35 in titling revenue. Ashland County operates only one titling office and has six titling employees. One employee will be leaving the titling department in the near future and the Clerk intends on not replacing her due to the drop in titling business.

*Delaware County* lost \$56,397.00 to cross county titling in 2002. As a percentage, this is 18.5% of total estimated titling revenue of \$305,062.71. This is still well above expenditures. In 2002, Delaware County spent \$186,745 to operate the titling department. The county operates one office with five employees. Because they are losing titling revenue to Franklin County, the clerk is in the process of opening a new titling office in southern Delaware County, in order to regain some of this titling business.

### **Largest County Losing Revenue and Smallest County Losing Revenue**

*Cuyahoga County* is Ohio's largest county with 1,393,978 people. In 2002, Cuyahoga reported total titling revenue as \$3,804,451. The county lost \$174,709.35 in titling revenue due to cross county titling. The title office reported total expenditures in 2002 as \$3,545,008, a 3.71% decrease from the previous year. The Cuyahoga County Clerk of Courts indicates a reduction of titling office staff from 102 to 95 due in part to revenue losses. Cuyahoga County has five titling locations, four of which are located in leased space. Hours of operations were modified at some of these locations in order to accommodate workflow changes caused by cross county titling.

*Morgan County* brought in the least amount of titling revenue in 2002 of any county to answer our survey. In 2002, titling revenues totaled \$51,109.21. This is a 23.3% drop from the previous year's titling revenues of \$66,627.63. The loss from cross county titling is \$8,399.25. Morgan County operates one office with two titling employees, in addition to the Clerk herself. Costs of operations in 2002 were \$69,170.67. Morgan County indicates that when reimbursement is discontinued, the county will reduce or eliminate staff, as well closing down the office one or two days per week.



## D. Poundage Fees

Sub. S.B. 59 increased the amount of poundage fees<sup>4</sup> that a county may keep from 1.0% of sales taxes on vehicles and watercraft to 1.01% (otherwise, state and local permissive sales and use taxes were not affected by Sub. S.B. 59). Poundage fees continue to belong to the county of the purchaser's residence. LSC asked counties to provide poundage fee data for the last three years, including 2002. The counties in our study, shown in the table below, lost an average of 2.8% of poundage revenue from 2001 to 2002. However, this loss is due to vehicle sales, not Sub. S.B. 59.

The increase in the poundage fee by one one-hundredth of one percent in Sub. S.B. 59 had little effect on poundage fees collected. The amount of money spent on automobiles and watercraft in a given year has the largest impact. For example, if Cuyahoga County had received 1.01% poundage in 2001, instead of 1.0%, their poundage fee revenue would have increased by \$13,107. Logan County would have received \$563 in additional revenue, under the same scenario.

**Table 3: Poundage Fees**

County	2000	2001	2002	% Change
Adams	27,459	29,032	26,519	-8.6%
Allen	93,062	93,171	108,445	16.4%
Ashland	53,576	59,717	44,310	-25.8%
Ashtabula	103,099	106,247	77,675	-26.9%
Athens	47,253	47,599	42,157	-11.4%
Auglaize	49,483	50,385	53,706	6.6%
Belmont	70,994	76,782	82,276	7.2%
Carroll	30,384	31,923	29,001	-9.2%
Champaign	40,342	43,472	41,545	-4.4%
Columbiana	84,311	104,527	97,276	-6.9%
Crawford	48,084	48,352	39,000	-19.3%
Cuyahoga	1,225,064	1,310,719	1,304,376	-0.5%
Darke	53,300	59,017	51,107	-13.4%
Defiance	41,410	44,610	51,252	14.9%
Delaware	138,959	161,731	99,459	-38.5%
Erie	86,747	92,889	86,362	-7.0%
Fairfield	127,068	136,322	130,697	-4.1%
Fayette	28,934	29,234	31,869	9.0%
Franklin	998,030	1,083,078	1,038,410	-4.1%
Gallia	30,905	33,014	35,522	7.6%

<sup>4</sup> Poundage is the portion of the sales tax that counties may keep on the sale of motor vehicles and watercraft.

County	2000	2001	2002	% Change
Geauga	99,801	114,201	102,917	-9.9%
Greene	142,395	165,317	184,551	11.6%
Guernsey	37,931	41,784	46,389	11.0%
Hancock	68,725	75,546	80,768	6.9%
Hardin	29,224	29,100	17,596	-39.5%
Henry	29,187	33,340	36,111	8.3%
Huron	63,836	68,168	71,033	4.2%
Knox	54,504	58,447	57,962	-0.8%
Lake	223,542	252,861	189,372	-25.1%
Licking	583,399	619,199	665,063	7.4%
Logan	54,216	56,275	24,160	-57.1%
Lorain	266,115	287,798	322,442	12.0%
Lucas	379,872	407,725	327,147	-19.8%
Madison		38,000	44,000	15.8%
Mahoning	214,592	243,299	225,400	-7.4%
Marion	58,907	63,695	62,871	-1.3%
Medina	163,137	185,327	197,404	6.5%
Meigs	22,845	23,925	21,598	-9.7%
Mercer	41,682	43,696	45,322	3.7%
Miami		109,857	112,328	2.2%
Monroe	15,074	17,622	10,149	-42.4%
Morgan	14,461	15,886	10,691	-32.7%
Muskingum	87,405	92,318	89,620	-2.9%
Ottawa	57,778	60,798	65,748	8.1%
Pickaway	50,452	55,829	40,251	-27.9%
Portage	527,954	555,757	603,500	8.6%
Preble	177,000	184,739	146,955	-20.5%
Putnam	38,058	41,700	27,768	-33.4%
Richland	129,473	137,733	143,836	4.4%
Ross	78,134	79,831	59,237	-25.8%
Scioto	66,470	76,100	60,813	-20.0%
Seneca	52,712	58,407	59,933	2.6%
Shelby	49,976	52,901	55,082	4.1%
Stark	326,908	346,252	374,915	8.3%
Summit	487,234	524,888	534,307	1.8%
Tuscarawas	86,500	91,500	91,798	0.3%
Union	46,043	51,347	41,976	-18.3%
Van Wert	72,045	71,548	80,039	11.9%
Vinton	13,723	13,467	6,920	-48.6%
Warren	180,511	220,942	234,222	6.0%
Washington	70,476	73,991	69,058	-6.7%
Wood	113,797	120,587	125,238	3.9%
Wyandot	24,764	25,710	21,841	-15.0%
<b>TOTALS</b>		9,529,234	9,259,295	-2.8%



## **E. Certificate of Title Administration Fund Balances**

The two charts that follow show changes in the balances of county Certificate of Title Administration (CTA) funds. The act requires these balances to be included in the study. While the balances in these funds provide some indication of the financial health of the titling operation, there are other significant factors which have a bearing on each county's situation. Many counties transfer money from their CTA funds to their General Revenue Fund. Various other expenses not related to cross county titling could also account for dramatic changes in CTA fund balances.

The first table provides CTA fund balances for counties that segregate CTA funds from other county funds. The second table provides CTA fund balances for counties that regularly take money from their CTA fund for other purposes.



**Table 4.1: CTA Fund Balance – (Counties with separate funds)**

<b>County</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001-2002 % Change</b>
Adams	54,579	77,965	117,623	90,376	80,756	-11%
Allen	2,120,652	1,919,476	2,075,404	287,267	374,649	30%
Athens	134,260	171,488	206,253	152,076	176,345	16%
Auglaize	247,107	333,075	414,455	293,964	314,761	7%
Belmont			344,773	364,687	392,000	7%
Columbiana	47,482	154,224	133,919	286,669	186,000	-35%
Cuyahoga	1,395,528	973,640	887,763	162,191	291,831	80%
Darke	141,080	221,565	104,758	153,514	217,923	42%
Franklin	4,309,190	5,008,350	3,336,514	3,249,324	3,499,731	8%
Gallia	73,691	96,091	31,734	21,949	34,280	56%
Guernsey	188,127	220,864	224,184	225,553	216,520	-4%
Hardin	312,965	404,332	484,899	193,686	209,214	8%
Henry	71,234	58,758	44,668	47,252	62,083	31%
Lake	528,838	622,255	700,000	202,515	239,673	18%
Licking	296,294	564,364	583,399	619,198	677,855	9%
Logan	39,970	109,688	175,582	215,052	242,669	13%
Lucas	1,338,157	1,201,724	1,224,511	1,336,765	1,345,110	1%
Mahoning	399,179	419,310	445,771	508,726	494,302	-3%
Medina	91,740	164,685	255,481	293,308	489,675	67%
Meigs	20,819	20,599	16,635	29,933	42,354	41%
Mercer	73,905	75,587	84,560	58,386	97,946	68%
Miami	510,124	588,366	589,878	586,443	571,363	-3%
Monroe	17,315	19,651	25,339	28,436	31,534	11%
Morgan	41,146	42,425	41,603	43,417	39,804	-8%
Muskingum	453,082	651,233	806,491	308,078	464,078	51%
Putnam	108,401	148,237	188,218	224,261	249,303	11%
Tuscarawas	200,014	322,939	474,275	602,797	681,005	13%
Union	79,477	57,016	67,617	103,596	113,145	9%
Warren	202,685	263,038	312,041	425,172	582,762	37%
Wood	164,748	207,908	262,321	327,560	380,000	16%
Wyandot	100,434	114,373	148,341	161,203	179,793	12%

**Table 4.2: CTA Fund Balance – (Counties that do not separate funds)**

<b>County</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001-2002 % Change</b>
Ashland			39,786	28,740	138,231	381%
Ashtabula	102,000	39,323	159,187	89,270	157,376	76%
Carroll	45,657	41,764	73,055	90,077	101,959	13%
Champaign	217	15,418	24,861	42,585	74,792	76%
Crawford	174,867	178,643	184,236	181,705	187,000	3%
Defiance	100,277	106,359	115,082	98,594	65,865	-33%
Delaware	247,189	307,096	511,277	759,111	896,000	18%
Erie	341,961	451,147	556,793	167,201	294,705	76%
Fairfield	916,843	1,036,170	903,507	1,012,497	1,249,056	23%
Fayette	36,406	68,892	49,842	69,639	101,514	46%
Geauga	137,137	56,855	71,561	117,226	154,595	32%
Greene	491,867	450,385	472,940	499,021	580,480	16%
Hancock	471,303	594,730	317,655	266,499	379,402	42%
Hocking	126,691	175,027	57,923	96,438	96,991	1%
Holmes	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Huron	158,158	189,700	142,467	147,475	96,283	-35%
Lorain	222,806	243,406	287,509	302,351	189,041	-37%
Marion	203,768	220,001	240,438	259,395	261,222	1%
Pickaway	112,382	113,636	187,230	218,012	284,649	31%
Portage	251,456	287,254	249,745	221,993	283,101	28%
Preble	0	0	0	54,760	76,500	40%
Richland	192,604	214,287	476,875	622,045	190,190	-69%
Ross	34,221	52,560	55,444	60,543	95,180	57%
Scioto	325,448	83,667	30,585	121,291	259,962	114%
Seneca	125,743	87,367	87,290	104,917	88,145	-16%
Shelby	245,430	281,998	318,549	356,141	387,579	9%
Stark	1,159,044	866,245	741,355	982,761	689,117	-30%
Summit	1,007,580	924,935	1,151,350	1,044,203	1,081,406	4%
Van Wert	99,060	113,957	122,338	119,282	122,762	3%
Vinton	19,769	26,023	18,695	10,362	5,630	-46%
Washington	27,743	51,088	45,522	50,310	50,336	0%

### **III. Customer Service**

Comprehensive information on the effects of S.B. 59 on customer service is not readily available. Due to practical constraints such as the unavailability of baseline data, or more specifically, the unavailability of a statistically meaningful number of customers to survey, the Legislative Service Commission was unable to measure customer reaction to the changes implemented by Sub. S.B. 59. Neither has the Bureau of Motor Vehicles done such a study. Only one county that responded to the LSC survey performed a customer service survey of its own. Tuscarawas County's survey results are included in Appendix C.

Through consultation with the Ohio Clerks of Courts Association, a few observations can be made. It would be expected that car dealerships would generally be satisfied with the advent of cross county titling. The Tuscarawas County survey provides information that would validate this. Of 41 dealers responding, none were dissatisfied with this change. In fact, 34 were highly satisfied, two were very satisfied and five were satisfied. Prior to cross county titling, car dealerships had to travel to the county of the purchaser's residence in order to title the purchaser's new automobile or boat. Obviously, this took time and cost money. Now, the dealership can title a vehicle in the county where it is located or any county it prefers.

Ohioans not purchasing a car through a dealership can now choose the county where they will title their car. Presumably a consumer will choose the county most convenient to him or her. As with dealerships, the Tuscarawas survey provides information that coincides with expected consumer satisfaction. Of 27 casual consumers to respond to this question, 14 were highly satisfied, one very satisfied, and 12 satisfied.

In consultation with the clerks, one potential customer service problem was discussed. Many clerks have rules that disallow dealerships from coming into the clerk's office for titles during lunch hours. This is so that casual consumers, who usually conduct their business during their lunch hours, don't have to wait in long lines. Once counties begin competing for the business of big dealerships, it is possible that they might relax this rule, causing inconvenience for the casual consumer. However, there are no studies to show this is actually happening and is only provided as an illustration of a potential problem.

## **Appendix A: Text of Section 4 of Sub. S.B. 59 of the 124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly**

**Section 4.** (A) The Legislative Service Commission shall conduct a study of both of the following:

(1) The effect of this act on customer service in the issuance of certificates of title;

(2) The fiscal impact of this act, including, but not limited to, its impact on the collection of state and local permissive sales and use taxes and on balances in county certificate of title administration funds;

(B) The Commission, in conducting the study, may seek the assistance of state agencies, political subdivisions, and organizations such as the County Commissioners Association of Ohio, the Ohio Clerk of Courts Association, and the Ohio Automobile Dealers Association;

(C) The Commission shall complete the study not later than February 15, 2003.



## Appendix B: Copy of LSC Questionnaire

### LSC Questionnaire

1. Please provide the year-end balances in your county's Certificate of Title Administration Fund for the following years:

**1998:** \_\_\_\_\_

**1999:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2000:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2001:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2002 (indicate if actual or estimate):** \_\_\_\_\_

2. Please provide monthly balances in your county's Certificate of Title Administration Fund for the following months:

**January 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**February 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**March 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**April 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**May 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**June 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**July 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**August 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**September 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**October 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**November 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**December 2002 (indicate if actual or estimate):** \_\_\_\_\_



3. Please provide title revenues received by your county for the following years:

**1998:** \_\_\_\_\_

**1999:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2000:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2001:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2002 (indicate if actual or estimate):** \_\_\_\_\_

4. Please provide title revenues received by your county for the following months:

**January 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**February 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**March 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**April 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**May 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**June 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**July 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**August 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**September 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**October 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**November 2002:** \_\_\_\_\_

**December 2002 (indicate if actual or estimate):** \_\_\_\_\_





7. a) How many persons does your office employ, excluding the clerk of courts? \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) How many employees in your office perform titling work? \_\_\_\_\_  
 c) Of these employees, how many exclusively perform titling work? \_\_\_\_\_  
 d) How many employees perform both titling and legal work? \_\_\_\_\_  
 e) Please provide your expenditures for the following years:

	<b>Personnel Costs (Including Fringe Benefits)</b>	<b><u>Other Costs</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
<b>1998</b>			
<b>1999</b>			
<b>2000</b>			
<b>2001</b>			
<b>2002*</b>			

\*Indicate if actual expenditures or an estimate.

8. a) How many titling locations does your county have available for the public? \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) How many of these offices are currently leased? \_\_\_\_\_  
 c) If you have leased offices, please provide the information requested in the following chart for each leased office:

	<b>Annual Rental Costs of Lease</b>	<b>Other Costs Related to Operation of Leased Space (e.g. utilities, insurance, etc.)</b>	<b>Ending Date of the Lease</b>
Lease #1			
Lease #2			
Lease #3			
Lease #4			
Lease #5			

9. Has your county experienced any problems associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 59 that have affected revenues collected into or distributed from your county's Certificate of Title Administration Fund?

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



10. Has your county conducted any surveys aimed at determining customer satisfaction post Senate Bill 59? \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, please provide that information.)

11. Please provide the amount of poundage fees retained by your county, annually, for calendar years 2000 and 2001. In addition, please provide the amount of poundage fees retained, monthly, for January 2002 through October 2002.

**2000:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2001:** \_\_\_\_\_

**2002 (indicate if actual or estimate):** \_\_\_\_\_

12. To date, has your office made any operational changes due to the enactment of Senate Bill 59? If so, please explain.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. Please provide the name and phone number of the person in your office who we should contact if we have questions about the answers provided.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_



## Appendix C: Tuscarawas County Customer Service Survey



**Tuscarawas County Clerk of Courts**  
**Rockne W. Clarke, Clerk of Courts**  
 125 E. High Ave., Room 230  
 P. O. Box 628, New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663-0628  
 (330)364-8811 - Fax (330)343-4682

<p><b>Jury Services</b> Room 230 (330) 364-8818</p>	<p><b>Legal Division</b> Room 230 (330)365-3243</p>	<p><b>Motor Vehicle Title Division</b> Room 125 (330) 365-3227</p>	<p><b>Uhrichsville Branch Title Division</b> 224 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. (740) 922-6804</p>	<p><b>Passport Division</b> 410 Lewis Ave., New Philadelphia (330)364-3197</p>
---	---	--	---	--

  

### SB 59 Casual Consumer Survey

30 Responses Received

2002 brought us Sub. S.B. 59, which began implementation in March of 2002. One of the provisions of Sub. S. B 59 was that an evaluation be completed to determine the satisfaction level with the other provisions of Sub. S. B. 59. This evaluation is to be completed and a report made to the legislature early next year. To aid in the evaluation, we ask that you complete the following survey. We know that some of the provisions of SB 59 have not been implemented by the State of Ohio to date but we would like your opinion on your possible use of these provisions.

We thank you for your input and THANK YOU for allowing us the opportunity to serve you.

1. Sub. S. B. 59 contains a provision that allows any clerk of courts to do a lien cancellation instead of only the clerk of courts that noted the lien. How do you view this change?  
 15-Highly Satisfied    1-Very Satisfied    9-Satisfied    0-Unsatisfied    4-Do not use
2. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?  
 13-Highly Satisfied    1-Very Satisfied    8-Satisfied    0-Unsatisfied    6-Do not use
3. Another provision of Sub. S. B.59 is that Lien Notations can be made by any clerk of courts, not just the clerk of courts from the owner's county of residence. How do you view this change?  
 13-Highly Satisfied    3-Very Satisfied    6-Satisfied    0-Unsatisfied    5-Do not use
4. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?  
 11-Highly Satisfied    3-Very Satisfied    9-Satisfied    0-Unsatisfied    7-Do not use  
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Another provision of Sub. S. B. 59 was to allow any clerk of courts to issue a Certificate of Title, not just the clerk of courts from the owner's county of residence. How to you view this change?  
 14-Highly Satisfied    1-Very Satisfied    12-Satisfied    0-Unsatisfied    2-Do not use

6. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?

16-Highly Satisfied 1-Very Satisfied 11-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 2-Do not use

7. Motor vehicle dealers many apply to become a limited authority deputy registrar(LADR). This would allow the LADR dealers to transfer existing license plates from vehicles traded-in to the motor vehicle purchased as long as the name(s) on both transactions are the same. It would also allow dealers to apply to the BMV for new license plates for you when they sell you a motor vehicle. The Bureau of Motor vehicle would mail your actual licenses plates directly to you. If you were to purchase a motor vehicle from a dealer, how likely would you be to use these service.

17-Highly Likely 1-Very Likely 6-Likely 3-Unlikely 3-Will not use

Comments received: Things are working, why change?  
Dealers should not do license plates, their crooks!

8. The law also allows for a pilot program for clerks of courts to become limited authority deputy registrars and provide the same services as dealers in conjunction with issuing a certificate of title. It would also allow clerks of courts to do out of state VIN inspections. How likely would you be to use these services through a Clerk of Courts?

15-Highly Likely 4-Very Likely 5-Likely 3-Unlikely 3-Will not use

9. The law allows for clerks of courts in counties with a population of less than 40,000 to perform all the services of a deputy registrar. This bring all titling, registration and drivers license issuance under one umbrella. Would you support legislation that would allow any clerk of courts to perform these services instead of only clerks of courts in counties with a population of less than 40,000?

14-Highly Supportive 12-Supportive 2-Will not Support 2-Will not use

10. Sub. S. B. 59 made current title information available through an open public web site. Individual owners' names are blocked from view because of the Federal Drivers Protection Act; however, brands and other information are available to view. How satisfied are you with this access?

10-Highly Satisfied 1-Very Satisfied 7-Satisfied 6-Unsatisfied 5-Do not use

Comments Received: It's no bodies business what I paid for a car and if I have a loan!  
Does not need to be on the web.

11. SB 59 will allow the issuance of electronic certificates of titles in lieu of a physical Certificate of Title. The fee for electronic Certificates of Title would be the same as physical certificates. How likely would you be to request an electronic Certificate of Title?

13-Highly Likely 0-Very Likely 8-Likely 3-Unlikely 5-Will not use

12. When a motor vehicles, outboard motors and/or watercrafts are being used as collateral for a loan, SB 59 will allows financial institutions and dealers to obtain an electronic certificate of title for you. When the loan is paid off, they can electronically release their security interest in the motor vehicle, outboard motor and/or watercraft. If you want a physical certificate of title issued, you will need to apply and pay for the issuance of a physical Certificate of Title at that time from any clerk of courts. How satisfied are you with this provision?

13-Highly Satisfied 1-Very Satisfied 10-Satisfied 1-Unsatisfied 4-Do not use

Comments Received: Why can't the bank get the title issued for me when the loan is paid off?

13. How satisfied were you with the services you were rendered by to the clerk of courts' title office?

18-Highly Satisfied 2-Very Satisfied 10-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 0-Do not use

Comments Received: Very Good Service

Easy to Deal With

Employee was very courteous

Clerk very pleasant-Thanks

Highly Satisfied

14. Please let us know what type of business brought you to the title office today.

1-Mobile Home Purchase

2-Lost Title/Get a Duplicate Title

1-Change Florida Title to Ohio

1- Bought a car from out of state

1- Cancel a lien

14-Transfer a title

## Dealer and Bank Survey Results

41 Responses Received

To aid in the evaluation, we ask that you complete the following survey and return it to us in the self addressed envelope. We know that some of the provisions of SB 59 have not been implemented to date but we would like your opinion on your possible use of these provisions.

We thank you for your input and again, THANK YOU for allowing us to serve you during 2002.

1. Sub. S. B. 59 contains a provision to allow any clerk of courts to do a lien cancellation instead of only the Clerk that noted the lien. How do you view this change?

23-Highly Satisfied 1-Very Satisfied 9-Satisfied 1-Unsatisfied 7-Do not use

Comments received: Sounds like a great Idea

All clerks should be trained to cancel liens.

2. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?

26-Highly Satisfied 5-Very Satisfied 5-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 5-Do not use

Comments received: This office offers the highest customer service I've ever seen, staff always helpful and pleasant.

We really appreciate your office keeping us in the know.

3. Another provision of Sub. S. B.59 is that Lien Notations can be made by any clerk of courts, not just the clerk from the owners county of residence. How do you view this change?

29-Highly Satisfied 1-Very Satisfied 6-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 5-Do not use

Comments: As a bank, we really like cross county.

4. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?

26-Highly Satisfied 4-Very Satisfied 6-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 4-Do not use

Comments: Really satisfied with the work you are doing

5. Another phase of Sub. S. B. 59 was to allow any clerk of courts to issue a Certificate of Title, not just the clerk from the owner's county of residence. How to you view this change?

34-Highly Satisfied 2-Very Satisfied 5-Satisfied 0-Unsatisfied 0-Do not use

Comments Received: Best thing to ever happen to titling.

So much easier for dealers

When Tuscarawas County gave us a hard time and refused to do a transfer, we were able to go to Stark County and get it done.

Great Move!!



6. How do you view Tuscarawas County's effort in implementing this change?

31-Highly Satisfied 6-Very Satisfied 3-Satisfied 1-Unsatisfied 0-Do not use

Comments: Your office refused to issue a repossession title for us because we discharged the lien, so we took it to another county and had a title issued.

Employees go the extra mile in providing service  
Highly satisfied with service, employees always cheerful  
Best customer service around

7. Sub. S. B. 59 allows dealers to apply to become electronic dealers. When implemented, electronic dealers will be able to electronically submit title applications to any Clerk of Courts. How likely are you to use this provision?

9-Highly Likely 4-Real Likely 6-Likely 11-Unlikely 10-Will not use

Comments:

8. Banks and other financial institutions will also be able to submit lien notations and cancellations electronically. No physical title will be printed but an electronic title will be issued showing lien notations and an electronic receipt provided. How likely are you to use this provision?

11-Highly Likely 6-Real Likely 7-Likely 9-Unlikely 8-Will not use

Comments: Why would I not want proof that a title with my lien is printed? Why change?

9. If a private third party provider provided you with the equipment and software necessary for either #7 or #8 above in exchange for a \$5 to \$10 fee per transaction, how likely would you be to do electronic transactions?

7-Highly Likely 8-Very Likely 12-Likely 9-Unlikely 5-Will not use

Comments Received: Why not a free web enabled application like registrations?

Need to know more information

Why would I want to pay \$5 to \$10 more for a title?

10. Electronic dealers will be allowed to do electronic assignments & re-assignments on vehicles traded in to them. No physical title would be printed however, the ATPS system would reflect the owner's name in the data base. There would still be a \$5 fee for each assignment or reassignment. How likely are you to become an electronic dealer and use this provision?

6-Highly Likely 7-Very Likely 7-Likely 11-Unlikely 8-Will not use

Comments:



11. Dealers may apply to become a limited authority deputy registrar. This would allow dealers to transfer existing license plates from vehicles traded-in to a newly sold vehicle as long as the names on both transactions are the same. It would also allow dealers to apply to the BMV for new plates for their customers. The dealer would electronically report these to the BMV. Dealers would be able to charge the same fee as deputy registrars for this service and retain that writing fee. Plate fees would have to be maintained in an account that enables the BMV to access their fees on a daily basis. How likely are you to apply to become a limited authority deputy registrar?

6-Highly Likely      1-Very Likely      3-Likely      12-Unlikely      13-Will not use  
Comments: Dealers should stay out of state services  
Why change things, system working.

12. The law also allows clerks of courts to become limited authority deputy registrars and provide the same services. How likely would you be to use this service through a Clerk of Courts?

8-Highly Likely      7-Very Likely      13-Likely      7-Unlikely      5-Will not use  
Comments: Would be more convenient

13. Sub. S. B. 59 made current title information available through an open public web site. Individual owners' names are blocked from view because of the Federal Drivers Protection Act; however, brands and other information are available to view. How satisfied are you with this access?

6-Highly Satisfied      5-Very Satisfied      12-Satisfied      0-Unsatisfied      14-Do not use  
Comments: This is very helpful  
No knowledge of this site  
Unaware of this  
Hard to use  
Haven't seen yet

## **Appendix D: County Responses – Problems Associated with Sub. S.B. 59 Implementation**

Following are survey responses from county clerks of courts to the question, “Has your county experienced any problems associated with the implementation of Senate Bill 59 that have affected revenues collected into or distributed from your county’s Certificate of Title Administration Fund?” (Only counties that responded to the question are included).

### **Adams County**

*No Problems Except a Loss of \$2792.25 in 6 Months Time*

### **Ashland County**

*No.*

### **Ashtabula County**

*None as of this date but have concerns when our Title Department doesn’t receive reimbursements will we be able to retain the same number of employees.*

### **Athens County**

*Yes – A slight decrease.*

### **Auglaize County**

*Because of SB59, we continually face the “staffing” issue. How many Deputy Clerks should remain in the office on any given day. We are never sure when we will be busy or when we will be “just waiting” for business. Recently we had a day when we processed only 38 Titles! How do I justify paying the minimum staff persons to process only 38 Titles! The Title Department is NOT located with the Clerk of Courts Legal Offices. If they were, I could move persons around more easily, but that is not possible as we operate the Title Department from a One-Stop Shop Location. Therefore, we are either overstaffed and “WAIT” or we are understaffed when we get a rush of business. We did NOT have this situation/problem/concern before SB59 went into effect. We are finding that dealers are “Clerk” shopping – looking for the office that can serve them immediately. No matter what the Clerk does we are caught in the middle trying to serve our customers including Dealers who DEMAND immediate service!!!*

### **Belmont County**

*No.*

### **Carroll County**

*Carroll County is on line to lose \$12,000.00 since SB 59.*



**Champaign County**

*Not as long as we are reimbursed.*

**Clark County**

*Problem determining workload – Employees are not busy one day and swamped the next.*

*Branch office borders Montgomery & Miami – Champaign counties. Before Senate Bill 59 had two employees – I have assigned another one & half employees to the branch office. New Carlisle, Ohio.*

**Columbiana County**

*We are losing too much money due to liens and memos. These are our customers, and because we are not located near the large banks our revenue has gone down. The 100% reimbursement is almost over and will drop to 75% and lien money still is not going to the county where the customer resides. We have had customers complain that their title was titled in wrong county, which means we lost poundage. When that title goes back for a new lien the residing county will be wrong, so we will lose again.*

**Crawford County**

*Yes – Loss of revenue.*

**Cuyahoga County**

*Implementation of SB 59 has impacted our ability to plan for or predict appropriate customer service needs and levels. Continued revenue loss may have a negative effect on customer service levels. A reduction of services would cause additional losses.*

**Darke County**

*Yes – Loss of poundage – not to mention County sales tax – when the county of residence is incorrectly stated on the title.*

**Defiance County**

*Minimal.*

**Delaware County**

*Actual problems, no.....but we, of course, are losing revenues to Franklin County due to cross county titling; however, we are in the process of opening a satellite office in southern Delaware County.*

**Erie County**

*No specific problems to report – general concerns with revenues collected.*

**Fairfield County**

*We have received additional revenue as a result of Senate Bill 59.*



**Fayette County**

*Not at this point in time. However I feel it will in the not too near future.*

**Franklin County**

*SB59 became effective during a very uncertain economic period. It is difficult to distinguish whether fluctuations that we are experiencing are attributable to regional economic conditions or due to lost business to outside counties. Although Franklin County has had positive revenue growth, we continue to lose local business and gain business from surrounding counties. These monthly variances spike and level off without prediction and make it difficult to track whether or not SB59 would be the sole revenue fluctuations.*

**Fulton County**

*Not at this point. It certainly will in the future if no changes are made after 3 years with no reimbursement.*

**Gallia County**

*No.*

**Geauga County**

*No. Not at this time, but if we continue to lose revenue in the next few years, my cushion in the CTA fund will dwindle and I will run out of funds within the next few years.*

**Greene County**

*Nothing that has affected revenues. On a few occasions when a dealer has been denied a title issued (due to lack of proper documentation, etc) they will state they will take their business to another county because "they'll do it." However, most dealers come back the next business day with the correct paperwork.*

**Guernsey County**

*One deputy clerk transferred from title to legal due to lack of work in title office. This lady is a very valuable employee so I am trying to work her back into the general fund/legal budget to be able to keep her in my employ.*

*Yes – Our revenues (before reimbursement) have been down every month since the beginning of cross-county titling. Accordingly, the work we have to do in our office has decreased also. Although the dollar amounts may not appear to be very large, they are significant to a county our size. We have already had to downsize staff in our title department due to this decline in business. As a smaller rural county, many of our citizens travel to the larger surrounding cities (such as Zanesville/Muskingum County) to purchase their automobiles and, of course, those dealers are having those deals processed in the dealer's county of business instead of the customer's county of residence.*



**Hancock County**

*No.*

**Hardin County**

*Other than an average loss of \$1000.00 per month.....No.*

**Henry County**

*In order to not deplete the Certificate of Title Administration Fund, we reduced the staff by putting one of the staff at 1/2 time for six months of 2001 and then after 3 months of 2002 the position was eliminated completely. We are located in a building very near the courthouse and would really like help with the purchasing of this building, since the county has taken real estate notes for its purchase.*

**Hocking County**

*No problems, but we will certainly be affected when we do not receive this reimbursement.*

**Holmes County**

*We have been re-imbursed this year 100% however next year only 75% and the next year 2004 50% and nothing after that. The loss to the county general fund is a big loss to small counties. Which we tried to impress [...] and the legislators, they however chose to think they knew so much better, when in fact they did not understand at all. To fix something that is not broke seems to be these legislators thing. I find this especially disheartening when I know they do not understand but are insistent on going ahead and hurting the counties they represent.*

**Huron County**

*We have seen some dealer go to other counties with their work that would have been ours in the past.*

*Banks are now using larger city Title offices rather than local ones.*

**Lake County**

*Our revenues have increased due as a result of cross county titling. We have no way of knowing if it will change if e titling goes into effect. There is less certainty of what our title revenues will be and our workload.*

**Licking County**

*No.*

**Logan County**

*No.*



**Lorain County**

*No.*

**Lucas County**

*No.*

**Mahoning County**

*No.*

**Marion County**

*No.*

**Medina County**

*Since we are one of the minority counties that have increased in net revenue, we have not experienced any problems in the area of collected revenues.*

**Mercer County**

*No.*

**Miami County**

*None that I am aware of.*

**Monroe County**

*No customers – No business – No money.*

**Morgan County**

*Morgan County has not experienced any problems in the state reimbursements. They have been done in a timely manner. There is a great concern in our county that after the state reimbursements have stopped how our title office will survive. SB 59 will greatly impact the operation of our department due to the reduced revenue.*

**Ottawa County**

*Because Ottawa County is long & narrow, our 23,406 over age 18 west end residents have easier access to Lucas & Wood County auto dealers. The figures below show that watercraft title work has increased a lot.*

<i>Titles Processed</i>	<i>Motor Vehicles –12 months</i>	<i>Motor Vehicles – 10 months</i>	<i>Watercraft – 12 months</i>	<i>Watercraft – 10 months</i>
<i>1999</i>	<i>18,520</i>	<i>16,176</i>	<i>1,952</i>	<i>1,887</i>
<i>2000</i>	<i>18,664</i>	<i>15,966</i>	<i>1,917</i>	<i>1,794</i>
<i>2001</i>	<i>19,573</i>	<i>16,467</i>	<i>1,832</i>	<i>1,683</i>
<i>2002</i>		<i>14,288</i>		<i>2,647</i>



**Pickaway County**

*No.*

**Portage County**

*Dealers set forth incorrect County of seller. All counties do not have the same amt of tax. Thus tax amount will be incorrectly computed. Clerk thus has to collect more money or refund money.*

**Preble County**

*Not at the current rate of reimbursement.*

**Putnam County**

*No.*

**Richland County**

*No.*

**Ross County**

*We have not experienced any problems with collection and distribution.*

*Implementation of SB59 has resulted in lost revenue and therefore, reduced hours and # of employees.*

**Scioto County**

*No.*

**Seneca County**

- *The bookkeeping was & still is a nightmare. What used to take a few hours – now takes DAYS*
- *Our county has lost A lot of business & work*
- *Most people buy out of county, therefore the title work is done in other counties*
- *We don't have any LARGE Banks here that bring in liens.*
- *In 2001 we issued 30750 Titles Jan-Nov. 2002 we've issued 23383 titles Jan-Nov. We are DOWN 7367 titles*

**Shelby County**

*No.*

**Stark County**

*No.*

**Summit County**

*No.*



### **Tuscarawas County**

*No – It has benefited us income wise. However I have one out of county dealer that has given me a large amount of work. In fact I get more from them than from any other dealer. If they decide to take their work elsewhere, I would experience a \$1500 to \$2000 monthly loss. This dealer presently drives about 35 miles one way to deliver the work.*

### **Union County**

*There needs to be report that shows the amount that you need to pay into the County. The worksheets are very time consuming and are somewhat confusing. My Title Supervisor was told the tax report was always correct and pay that amount. In fact, when I had problems trying to balance one of the months- it turned out that I had overpaid the taxes not the County. You leave the Clerks hanging out there when it comes to the State Auditors. We are not going by the reports but working a sheet to come out to what we say the County gets. I am getting ready to be audited and am not looking forward to explaining this to the auditors.*

### **Van Wert County**

*None as of date.*

### **Vinton County**

*On July 1<sup>st</sup> – I became Deputy Registrar – which caused myself and my girls a tremendous amount of extra work and responsibility. For which, as an elected official I cannot receive a pay increase in term and without legislation passed I had to hire additional employees to get through the last 6 months. Our Title Business has fallen off and without the deputy registrar office I would be forced to lay-off employees and close the one stop shop. Increases in utilities, rent etc. still have to be paid and office must be kept with staff. Our office hours have increased to the same as the Deputy Registrar's Office to promote customer service.*

### **Warren County**

*No problems in implementing S.B. 59 that negatively affected our revenues.*

### **Washington County**

*The office is now open on Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. to encourage of keep the business down here in Washington County here (in Washington County).*

### **Wood County**

*To date Wood County has lost \$916.00 to cross-county titling. Our losses right now are buffered by two large dealerships having dealerships in Lucas and Wood counties, but doing the majority of their titles in Wood County. This could change at any time. Bank business (liens and memorandums) from the large banks has totally gone away. These are transactions that provide the best fees for the least amount of work. Ford Motor Credit has chosen Wood County to cancel all of their liens for the whole state. There is*



*not any compensation for doing this large task. Cross-county titling makes staffing levels hard to predict which can affect revenue.*

**Wyandot County**

*At the current time, since there is a balance in the CTA Fund, we are not experiencing any funding problems yet. However, with the implementation of SB 59, this survey shows it is just a matter of time before the fund will be depleted and no longer support the operation of the title office. Especially once we are no longer receiving reimbursement from the State fund.*



## Appendix E: County Responses – Operational Changes

Following are survey responses from county clerks of courts to the question, “To date, has your office made any operational changes due to the enactment of Senate Bill 59? If so, please explain.” (Only counties that responded to the question are included).

### **Adams County**

*No.*

### **Ashland County**

*I will have an employee leaving in my title dept. and will probably not replace her due to the fact that we aren't as busy now.*

### **Ashtabula County**

*No Changes in Staff or Operations have been made.*

### **Athens County**

*No.*

### **Auglaize County**

*With the exception of moving one Deputy Clerk approximately three (3) days per week to the Legal Office and paying her salary for those days from the General Fund (thereby creating an impact on the County General Fund), we have made no other changes.*

### **Belmont County**

*No.*

### **Carroll County**

*Not at this time.*

### **Champaign County**

*No.*

### **Clark County**

*See Question #9. [Note: Answer to Question #9 can be found in Appendix D].*

*Legislature needs to address users fees (Title Fee increases) and not put the burden on the taxpayers.*

### **Columbiana County**

*No.*



**Crawford County**

*No.*

**Cuyahoga County**

*Hours of operation were modified at some branches to better accommodate changing workflow.*

*Staff reduced from 102 to 95.*

*Decreased workload allowed for an increase in “dealer waits.”*

**Darke County**

*No.*

**Defiance County**

*Using 1 title employee in both legal and title capacity. With first obligation to title dept. Majority of time spent in title.*

**Delaware County**

*In the spring of 2003, plans are in the works to open a satellite office towards the south end of Delaware County.*

**Erie County**

*No.*

**Fairfield County**

*We had to hire additional personnel. We also had to install additional equipment as a direct result of Senate Bill 59.*

**Fayette County**

*None.*

**Franklin County**

*Due to the increase of title requests, in April we instituted a policy change which allowed us to control the workflow of our branch locations. We limited dealers to a maximum of three title transfers at our front service counters. Titles transactions in excess of three are placed into our workflow processed off of our services counters. We also began transferring work from the branch location to our main title operation to assist in processing time and turn around. This work is returned to the branch locations for dealer pick up within hours. We currently use a third party vendor for some limited title processing. We have alerted local dealerships that this service is available and as a result patronage of this service has increased dramatically.*

**Fulton County**

*As of 1-13-03 dropped 1 employee.*



**Gallia County**

*No.*

**Geauga County**

*One employee resigned 12-26-02. I will not replace her this time. If operations improve, I will hire another employee to replace her. I am considering moving passport processing from the legal office to the title office for 2003 to increase revenue.*

**Greene County**

*One employee has been moved to a branch office to assist with increased workload. One employee has been reassigned from part-time to full-time due to increased workload.*

**Guernsey County**

*See answer to question 9. [Note: Answer to Question #9 can be found in Appendix D].*

**Hancock County**

*None.*

**Hardin County**

*No; however, a Reduction in staff and/or hours may be required as SB59 Reimbursement diminishes & simultaneously costs of living such as utilities, supplies, insurance, & personnel costs Rise.*

**Henry County**

*The staff was reduced by one full time person to try to avoid depleting the existing funds.*

**Holmes County**

*Extended hours to open at 8:00 A.M. instead of 8:30 A.M. to more closely mirror the license bureau hours situated right beside the title office which is under our County Auditor. These two offices open at 8:00 A.M. The County offices do not open until 8:30. My title office is open on Monday nights until 6:30 P.M. and 4:30 P.M. the other days. The license bureau is open on Saturdays, however I do not have the staff to open on Saturday too. The County does not have the funds for me to hire more staff at this time because of the state budget cuts and loss of additional revenue in our title fund from cross-county title HB 59.*

**Huron County**

*No changes made.*

**Lake County**

*We have added one staff member to our branch office to handle the additional work.*



**Licking County**

*None as of this date. Two employees retiring end of January. Hiring one employee.*

**Logan County**

*None.*

**Lorain County**

*No.*

**Lucas County**

*No.*

**Madison County**

*No.*

**Mahoning County**

*No.*

**Marion County**

*No.*

**Medina County**

*We hired additional personnel (1) in June for our main office. We are moving our main office to a larger facility to accommodate the need for increased filing supply storage, and anticipated hiring of an additional clerk.*

*Also procedures of our branch offices changed due to the increased title work they perform for out-of-county dealers.*

**Meigs County**

*No.*

**Mercer County**

*No.*

**Morgan County**

*Since 1998, Morgan County's certificate of title expenses and revenue collections have remained very compatible. The title department was able to support itself. With economic slow downs, however, my general fund budget has been trimmed again by 6.8% and some title revenue has been used to help with legal department expenses.*

*When the state reimbursements are reduced to 75% and 50% respectfully, and eventually eliminated, our office staff will also be reduced or eliminated, also.*



*The purpose of SB59 was to benefit the citizens of Ohio so we could better serve them. When my title office is forced to close for one or more days per week due to SB59 and the lack of operational funds, this is not benefiting the citizens of Ohio, especially the citizens of Morgan County.*

*I urge legislation to continue 100% reimbursement to the counties that have suffered such percentage losses and are facing layoffs and closing their facilities.*

**Muskingum County**

*Fortunately, we have not had to implement any significant changes.*

**Ottawa County**

*No specific changes due to SB 59. However, the Title Dept began processing Passport applications instead of the legal office.*

**Pickaway County**

*No.*

**Portage County**

*Hired one employee full time.*

**Preble County**

*Not at this time, however one employee has been put on notice of possible lay-off at 50% reimbursement level. This is to give her the opportunity to seek other employment without having to make a rush judgment decision.*

**Putnam County**

*No.*

**Richland County**

- 1. Increased the number of titles a dealer can wait on.*
- 2. Extended office hours on Monday.*
- 3. Hiring another person for our branch office.*

**Ross County**

*Decreased hours – now closed on Saturday. Now have less employees, could not “man” Saturdays due to cost.*

**Scioto County**

*No.*

**Seneca County**

*-Seneca County has lost A lot of business to the surrounding counties. Revenue & amount of work is way down. We used to get a box of mail – Since SB59 we get 1-6 pieces of mail.*

*-The Bookkeeping has become a nightmare.*

*-Our office personnel had to take a “cut” in hours. From 35 to 30 hrs pd per week. We have had to watch expenditures.*

**Shelby County**

*No.*

**Stark County**

*No major changes.*

**Summit County**

*The only change we have made is to be open to the public on Saturdays from 9:00am to 12:45pm.*

**Tuscarawas County**

*Being that we have experienced a small increase in work in 2002 we have been able to do so without any changes in staffing levels.*

*However, we have done some operations changes, added equipment & remodeled space to meet need for LADR and electronic titling.*

**Union County**

*Yes. I do not have enough business for four fulltime people but I need the fourth person for emergencies, vacations, lunch hours, etc. I am having the fourth person work in Legal part time so there will be no lay offs. Even at that, it is hard to keep 3 people busy. We receive very little mail. The only thing that keeps my Title office busy all week is the legal work that they are able to do for me.*

**Van Wert County**

*No changes have been made to date due to Senate Bill 59.*

**Vinton County**

*See #9 [Note: Answer to Question #9 can be found in Appendix D]. Our office hours were increased to the same as the deputy registrar office in July – When I became Deputy registrar to provide customer service and give them additional opportunity to come in.*

**Warren County**

*No.*



**Washington County**

*The title office now is open on Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. I am going to hire one and a half staff employees to learn title work in order to accommodate.*

**Wood County**

*No, so far our revenue has been nearly the same as previous years.*

**Wyandot County**

*The operational changes that I have made are because of the severe drop in the workload. I have installed more computers with access to the system in the legal department. Since all employees have some training in the legal dept., they have been given legal work to do in order to keep them busy instead of just sitting there with nothing to do. The Title office is open during the lunch hour so there is no way to reduce the staff due to loss of work.*