

CAC Monthly Meeting | Thursday, August 22, 2019 | 11:00 AM (E.S.T.)
(Clearinghouse Advisory Committee)

Attendance:

Chris Keil	Melvina Allen	Jennifer Blumhagen
Rodney Richard – Board Liaison	Heidi Durbin	Monica Halstead – IFTA, Inc.
Craig – Board Liaison	Monique Williams	Jason DeGraf - IFTA, Inc.
Ron Hester	Bettina Naylor	Tom King - IFTA, Inc.
	Kalyn Gomez	

Minutes:

Minutes from the 7/18/19 meeting. Changes: Heidi – under quality control – Knoles for Trent, no W. Kalyn - under new business – “waiting on” not “of NV”. No other changes. Motion to approve by Jennifer Blum. Seconded by Kalyn.

IFTA, Inc. Board Update:

Rodney provided the board report. He was not in attendance but was briefed afterwards. The board met briefly after the ABM. They talked about areas to approve ABM. They talked about bylaws and that the board needs to come up with better guidelines for the bylaws. They want to send out changes to bylaws, but that will need more discussion. Overall, they felt the ABM had good discussions and gave the board a direction to go in.

CAC Membership:

Tim Green no longer with us as he went back to his previous job. During the ABM, Chris gave the CAC update and solicited for new members from the North East & Canadian jurisdictions. Debbie received reached out from Steve Adamak from MA. He will send his packet to the board for approval. Another person from MD approached Chris as well. Chris will reach out to MD. If we get both seats from the Northeast filled, we still have a vacancy in Canada. Monica stated Bernie Mar from NS seemed interested in the work the CAC does. She suggested we reach out to NS to see if they have anyone who is interested in helping. If this does not pan out, we must consider opening the seat to all jurisdictions.

Funds Netting:

Jason stated there were no major issues – U.S. Funds were \$6,606,115.10. Canadian funds were \$197,404.11

Best Practices:

Chris stated we’re in a holding mode. We’re waiting on board approval. The BPG was advertised at ABM. Jason stated he needs to do an update to the transmittal. He requested the original document (which Bettina has in Word format). Bettina will send the document to Jason. MT has issues receiving document so he will need to get it back to Bettina in a roundabout manner. Jason has added some upgrades to the Transmittal site and a chart maker. Jason will make the updates over the next few weeks but will have it ready well prior to the board meeting so the CAC can look at and approve without having an additional meeting.

IFTA Ballot:

There was no big conversation at ABM regarding the ballot.

Clearinghouse Access Agreement:

Chris wanted to know if the Clearinghouse Access Agreement is being worked on. Ron stated that he is working with Monica and they have not started. Monica stated QC needs a few items changed so they can fully participate things. Let QC join, then if we need a full redo – then we can do it after QC to join. Monica and Ron will catch up next week.

Other Items:

Chris talked about the FMCSA attempting to convert to IFTA status codes. The changes go into effect September 22nd. She stated there is an ITD call today regarding this.

Quality Control – There was not much to discuss. The CAC needs to look at the strategic plan. We know we have items to consider such as active accounts, mpg's etc. The CAC came up frequently at the ABM and they will have a few action items to look at for the next year. Monica stated that while the CAC is charged with a great deal of action items from the ABM we will be partnering with other committees and IFTA team for a lot. The CAC will not have to complete all items on our own.

LEC Survey - Monica stated the LEC will be conducting a survey and has asked to run it by the CAC. They want to know what would make demographics more useful for law enforcement. They don't have issues to propose but want to have the data be more useful. We don't want to have a bulky survey but want it just to start the info gathering process. They are asking the CAC to tweak questions and add / collaborate on the survey.

POWER POINT PRESENTATION

Monica stated jurisdictions are sending in data with issues. IFTA, Inc. has lot of data that we can use in different ways, but jurisdictions are not using it effectively. IFTA, Inc. does not want to tailor reports to individual jurisdictions but want to help jurisdictions use the information better. Most of the information in the study is how jurisdictions used data to increase service. The study did not include Canada. The report shows how jurisdictions can use 3rd party data to improve their decision-making processes. IFTA does not analyze the data, however, IFTA makes sure it's valid and to share information.

Regarding data validation, this is what CAC needs to work through. We need to decide what we want to validate on and what do we do if the validation fails? Do we want to reject the file or not?

Chris stated that she will be presenting at the Managers & Law Enforcement workshop on IRP Data Quality. At the end of the day, she will be presenting on the CAC data quality.

It was stated that when changing systems, it is vital that the data going to the Clearinghouse is always validated. Sometimes it's your jurisdictions fault when data is not going up correctly. On jurisdiction was sending demographics information in the transmittal format. They had 40,000 lines of incorrect data they worked through themselves. Is this information we shouldn't have accepted based on a validation? What would have been a better outcome?

Regarding tax rate increases: Some jurisdictions didn't use IFTA data for analysis and IFTA, Inc. wanted to know what was going on. They are tasking the CAC to help look at this. We know the data is not bad, but the jurisdiction was still not able to reconcile what they wanted to see. Other jurisdictions may want to do this in the future. This may be a task to assign to someone. Chris stated this was a great

education tool. When a tax rate changes, sometimes carriers decide to go to neighboring jurisdiction and do business there, so they don't have to pay higher fuel taxes. Sometimes legislators believe tax increase will increase revenue, then it doesn't happen, it's usually because carriers decide to travel differently. Carriers communicate!

Most general public don't understand IFTA and we want to make the Clearinghouse a tool for more people to get data that is useful to them in the position they work in.

Regarding the dashboard: Monica stated she's not quite sure what to do with a dashboard on IFTA, Inc that's feasible. Are we able to show a jurisdictions status is for IFTA activity? She doesn't know how much programming or upkeep it will take but is thinking about what this could look like. All other items are being worked on.

Regarding training – the CAC will probably be primarily responsible for training. We want to reach staff of all different levels. We will be using surveys to get the answers. The policy maker may or may not be the one answering the surveys.

___END POWER POINT___

Chris asked, "What's next?". With all the information we just received, do we need to have another meeting? Do all these items fall under Quality Control sub-committee? How is it that we want to attack these as the CAC? Our next few meetings will be to set up an action plan and start goal setting. Chris stated we would get more direction from our board liaisons and forge ahead.

Monica stated this was a good time to gather notes, take this information, the BPG and Data Validation and see what needs to be done. Separate this at a higher level and then drill down. We should parse out to accomplish small things. In the near future we should consider doing a survey about all this. Monique stated any feedback we get can drive question we ask

Chris asked if all these fits under Quality Control sub-committee. Heidi stated that this has 2 distinct sections. One part of it is data quality. There are other parts to this and since the BPG is done, some people are freed up for another project. Some of this will be developing reports, communication portal and other similar information platforms. It would include working with Tom, Jason and the rest of the IFTA Team. This depends on what we want it to look like, etc. Reports and data usage are different than data quality.

Action Items to consider:

- 1) Questions regarding LEC survey
- 2) Survey on data quality / communication of data on the next CAC call. Any thoughts, jot them down
- 3) Who takes lead on Quality Control Sub-committee?

Motion to close – Bettina - 2nd – Ron