

FOR VOTE BY JANUARY 15, 2018



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #01-2017**

Sponsor

Jurisdictions of Alabama, Maine, Virginia and Wisconsin

Date Submitted

December 13, 2016

Proposed Effective Date

January 1, 2018

Manual Sections to be Amended (January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Articles of Agreement R625 DISPLAY OF DECALS

Subject

Display of decals for short-term motor vehicle rentals.

History/Digest

Section R625 of the IFTA Articles of Agreement requires IFTA vehicle identification decals to be placed on the exterior portion of both sides of the cab of a qualified vehicle. Recognizing the unique nature of operations for certain types of operators, the Agreement provides an exception to this requirement for transporters, manufacturers, dealers, or driveaway operations. In these cases the decals are not required to be permanently affixed, but rather are allowed to be temporarily displayed in a visible manner on both sides of the cab.

A utility contractor asked the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles to seek an amendment to the Agreement to extend the decal display exception to rental equipment. As a utility contractor the company rents equipment from time to time as a result of equipment failures or peak demand.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to allow carriers using a qualified motor vehicle under a short-term motor vehicle rental of 29 days or less whereby the lessee has assumed responsibility for reporting and paying the fuel use tax pursuant to Section R510 of the IFTA Articles of Agreement to temporarily display the IFTA decals rather than permanently affix them to the vehicle.

The proposed change would provide carriers using rental equipment greater flexibility and in some cases lower costs in managing the requirement to display IFTA decals on qualifying motor vehicles. The change could also reduce the number of circumstances in which a lessee fails to remove its IFTA decals from rental equipment upon termination of the rental, potentially jeopardizing law enforcement efforts.

The ballot also corrects a misspelling that exists within Section R625.

1 **Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition**

2

3 **ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT**

4

5 ***R625 DISPLAY OF DECALS**

6

7 Each licensee shall be issued a minimum of two vehicle identification decals for each qualified vehicle in
8 its fleet. The decals must be placed on the exterior portion of both sides of the cab. In the case of
9 transporters, manufacturers, dealers, or ~~driveaway~~ driveaway operations, or in the case of a short-term
10 motor vehicle rental of 29 days or less whereby the lessee has assumed responsibility for reporting and
11 paying the fuel use tax pursuant to R510, the decals need not be permanently affixed, but may be
12 temporarily displayed in a visible manner on both sides of the cab.

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

FTPBP #1-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Support: 31
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 2

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

CONNECTICUT

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

INDIANA

Support

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MICHIGAN

Undecided

Currently, we utilize and encourage our carriers to obtain a *Temporary Decal Permit (R650)*, which adequately addresses this issue. The temporary decal permit is vehicle specific and provides a document trail for audit. We are not necessarily opposed to the ballot at this time, but would like to evaluate it's necessity.

MINNESOTA

Support

Minnesota is supportive of the ballot proposal and the effective date.

MISSISSIPPI

Support

FTPBP #1-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

MONTANA

Support

Support if ballot #2 passes requiring serialized decals.

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

By not affixing the decal to the vehicle, there is concern carriers could move unaffixed decals between vehicles and not properly report. It may be more difficult to track vehicles and mileage that should be reported.

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PENNSYLVANIA

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

Stakeholders

Support

FTPBP #1-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

6-2-2017 ATA Robert Pitcher

This seems like common sense, but only given that IFTA requires decals at all. Decals no longer make any sense.

TENNESSEE
Support

UTAH
Support

VERMONT
Support

VIRGINIA
Support

WASHINGTON
Support

WEST VIRGINIA
Support

WISCONSIN
Support

FTPBP #1-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

Support: 16
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 2

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

IDAHO

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

KANSAS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Oppose

Maryland is not in favor of temporarily affixing a decal for any purpose. It is the responsibility of the licensee to maintain control of their credentials, and it's their option to either license and abide by the rules and regulations, or obtain a trip permit for their affected operations.

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

see prior comment

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Undecided

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

See previous comments.

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

FTPBP #1-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

ONTARIO

Support

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

SOUTH DAKOTA

Support

UTAH

Support

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 1-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA	1			1
ARIZONA	1		1	
ARKANSAS	1		1	
BRITISH COLUMBIA	1		1	
CALIFORNIA		1		1
COLORADO	1		1	
CONNECTICUT	1		1	
DELAWARE		1		1
FLORIDA	1		1	
GEORGIA	1		1	
IDAHO	1		1	
ILLINOIS	1		1	
INDIANA	1		1	
IOWA	1		1	
KANSAS	1		1	
KENTUCKY	1		1	
LOUISIANA	1		1	
MAINE	1		1	
MANITOBA	1		1	
MARYLAND		1		1
MASSACHUSETTS	1		1	
MICHIGAN		1		1
MINNESOTA	1		1	
MISSISSIPPI	1		1	
MISSOURI	1		1	
MONTANA	1		1	
NEBRASKA		1	1	
NEVADA	1		1	
NEW BRUNSWICK	1		1	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		1	
NEW JERSEY - INELIGIBLE				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK		1		1
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA		1		1
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO				
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON				
PENNSYLVANIA	1			1
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1			1
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 1-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
TENNESSEE				
TEXAS	1		1	
UTAH	1		1	
VERMONT	1		1	
VIRGINIA	1		1	
WASHINGTON	1		1	
WEST VIRGINIA	1		1	
WISCONSIN	1		1	
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	46	7	44	9

Bold font and shading indicate that the jurisdiction did not vote.

Failure to vote for the ballot language counts as a "No" vote.

Failure to vote for the alternative effective date counts as a "No" vote.

Number of "YES" votes necessary to pass: 44

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **46**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **7**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **4**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **44**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **9**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **4**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent: The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to allow carriers using a qualified motor vehicle under a short-term motor vehicle rental of 29 days or less whereby the lessee has assumed responsibility for reporting and paying the fuel use tax pursuant to Section R510 of the IFTA Articles of Agreement to temporarily display the IFTA decals rather than permanently affix them to the vehicle.

The proposed change would provide carriers using rental equipment greater flexibility and in some cases lower costs in managing the requirement to display IFTA decals on qualifying motor vehicles. The change could also reduce the number of circumstances in which a lessee fails to remove its IFTA decals from rental equipment upon termination of the rental, potentially jeopardizing law enforcement efforts.

FOR VOTE BY JANUARY 15, 2018



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #02-2017**

Sponsors

IFTA Law Enforcement Committee
IFTA Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

April 13, 2017

Proposed Effective Date

January 1, 2019

Manual Sections to be Amended

IFTA Articles of Agreement *R2110 IFTA, INC. Clearinghouse

Subject

An amendment to the IFTA Articles of Agreement to: Require jurisdictions to record and upload serialized IFTA decals issued to carriers.

History/Digest

Currently IFTA jurisdictions are not required to keep track of their decals.

In trying to keep up with technology of today, the IFTA community is moving toward electronic credentialing. Our goal is to make the carriers serialized decal numbers available for enforcement personnel and ensure that the data being received by enforcement is accurate. The IFTA LEC wants to accomplish this before we move toward pursuing an electronic IFTA credential.

In order to accommodate IFTA enforcement we would like all jurisdictions participating in the IFTA Clearinghouse to include the serialized decal numbers specific to a carrier in their uploads. P320 in the IFTA Procedures Manual currently requires decals to be serialized. We understand that the decals are not required to be vehicle specific but all serialized decals should be assigned to a specific carrier. Jurisdictions should record and update the decal numbers specific to an IFTA licensee. Then when a QMV (qualified motor vehicle) is stopped, enforcement can

confirm the decal matches the licensed carrier. This would be a tool used to combat/deter/detect fraudulent decals by confirming the decal is actually valid and associated to the licensed carrier.

Electronic credentialing is being encouraged and pressured by industry, and some jurisdictions, the LEC is merely preparing to accept the technology.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require that jurisdictions track and upload serialized decal numbers issued to carriers.

This would be done by adding “serialized decal numbers” to Licensee demographic data in Section R2110.200 of the IFTA Articles of Agreement.

FAILED

Underlining indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

***R2110 IFTA, INC. CLEARINGHOUSE**

There is established the IFTA, Inc. Clearinghouse (hereafter referred to as the “clearinghouse”) which is responsible for the maintenance and administration of licensee demographic and transmittal data transmitted by participating members. The clearinghouse is also responsible for providing a mechanism for the exchange of Interjurisdictional Audit Reports. The participating members may electronically view and retrieve the clearinghouse data.

- .100** “Participating members” are those jurisdictions that have entered into an agreement with IFTA, Inc. to access the clearinghouse and that have submitted licensee demographic or transmittal data to the clearinghouse.
- .200** Licensee demographic data includes licensee name, address, IFTA license number, license status, serialized decal numbers and other information identified in the IFTA, Inc. Clearinghouse Access Agreement.

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

FTPBP #2-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Support: 18
Oppose: 7
Undecided: 8

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Undecided

Alberta generally supports the ballot but has concerns. We have agents requesting decals to be distributed to their various client licensees as listed by the agents. While Alberta keeps track of serialized decals and can update the serialized decal information for those decals Alberta issued directly to licensees, we do not have information on which specific serialized decals are distributed by the agents to the specific licensees. Since Alberta cannot update the serialized decal information for decals distributed through these agents, there continues to be a need to call Alberta for verification of decal information for those cases. We are, therefore, wondering about the value of the proposed ballot.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

Already doing.

CONNECTICUT

Support

Connecticut is in support of this ballot. While IFTA is expressly *not* vehicle specific, nothing prevents jurisdictions from maintaining information on what serial numbers have been issued to specific carriers. By providing this information as part of the Clearinghouse demographics, law enforcement can readily identify what decal numbers a carrier has in their possession. This will make things easier for law enforcement to identify the misuse of decals. Once IFTA goes to full electronic credentialing we will in fact be vehicle specific; until such time this is a good measure to undertake to assist law enforcement.

ILLINOIS

Oppose

Oppose as written. One very important component that must be required with this ballot language is the decal year must be identified with the serial number. It is possible that decal number IL123456 is valid for two different companies at the same time: carrier ABC could have decal IL123456 issued for 2017, while carrier DEF could have decal IL123456 issued to them for 2018: both decals (could be) valid from December through the end of the grace period. A roadside search of "serial number" could provide a false hit if that decal serial number is not tied to a specific year.

FTPBP #2-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

INDIANA

Oppose

Indiana does not support this ballot as it does not provide a complete solution. If passed this ballot would require programming changes, continual updates, and still would not verify that the credential is valid through this change alone.

To expend resources to comply with this ballot when we are on the doorstep of a very different future verification process that would also require allocation of scarce resources is inefficient.

As an alternative, Indiana supports the concept of electronic records as a safe, accurate, inclusive, economical, and effective validation of credentials.

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Undecided

While Maine currently serializes its decals, we see limited value in requiring jurisdictions to send their serial numbers to the CH. This option exists today for many jurisdictions wishing to avail themselves of the service. Making this a requirement at this late date would seem superfluous.

MANITOBA

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

Minnesota is supportive of the ballot proposal and the effective date.

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEVADA

Support

Nevada supports this ballot as we already serialize our decals. That said, what does this ballot really accomplish? It will require costly changes for system programming and a new field in the clearinghouse.

Decals and copies of licenses in the cab are little more than a false sense of security for law enforcement and have been for years. A decal (serialized or not) on the cab of the truck does not ensure that vehicle is being reported for IFTA. The license is only a piece of paper that states the "company" the vehicle belongs to licensed for IFTA. It doesn't mean the returns were received, all the vehicles were reported on

FTPBP #2-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

the return, or the information on the return is even accurate. Only real time information which may also be available through ASPEN, NLETS, SAFER, PRISM, CVIEW, etc., will tell you if the company is still active and in good standing with IFTA.

Perhaps rather than trying to fit the electronic credentials into a box that is rapidly becoming obsolete, it is time to think outside the box and find long term solutions that will fit the changing transportation industry, i.e. in 2035 when driversless vehicles are the norm. It's time to consider piloting a few states to go totally electronic, no paper license and no decals, or perhaps build an app through IFTA that will provide realtime status of the company for roadside enforcement to view if it provides greater value to the officer coming directly from IFTA.

NEW BRUNSWICK

Undecided

We support the idea of including the decal numbers, however we will need to investigate the capability of our IT system to provide this information.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Undecided

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

There is concern with the system changes needed and costs associated with those changes.

NOVA SCOTIA

Undecided

We are unclear about operational and IT implications.

ONTARIO

Support

PENNSYLVANIA

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Undecided

We would need to confirm with our IT department that the information we already have in our system could easily be reported on.

QUEBEC

Oppose

Even if Quebec is not part of the clearinghouse, we think this proposal will require a significant system development and it will be costly.

FTPBP #2-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

RHODE ISLAND

Support

RI currently already does this

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

Stakeholders

Oppose

6-2-2017 ATA Robert Pitcher

Although more thorough and timely sharing of IFTA licensees' demographic data by the states and provinces is necessary, the sharing of serialized decal numbers is not, and would be bound to cause problems for compliant carriers.

TENNESSEE

Support

UTAH

Oppose

We feel it's not worth the effort to have our system changed, and decals serialized, if decals are going to be obsolete in the next few years. .

VERMONT

Support

VIRGINIA

Undecided

Virginia already does this voluntarily, but to require it of all jurisdictions seems at odds with the long-term goal of moving to electronic credentials. We look forward to the discussion of this ballot.

WASHINGTON

Oppose

This proposal would require a significant system development. We have IFTA accounts without IRP and IRP accounts with foreign jurisdiction IFTA. An IFTA account without vehicle information would be difficult to track decals by vehicle.

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

FTPBP #2-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

WISCONSIN

Oppose

Wisconsin does not support. We currently maintain serial numbers internally but do not feel the juice is worth the squeeze. Reprogramming our system to upload serialized decal numbers to the clearinghouse would require funding and energy that we feel would be better spent elsewhere (electronic records). If decals were going to be around for another decade or longer, I would fully support vehicle specific decals. That being said, I believe the decal's days are numbered.

Wisconsin is supportive of allocating resources to electronic records concept and level 8 (moving) roadside inspections.

FTPBP #2-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

Support: 13
Oppose: 2
Undecided: 4

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

IDAHO

Undecided

ILLINOIS

Undecided

I was leaning towards supporting this ballot, but now as I think about this more, I'm wondering if the decal's "status" would then become necessary if serialized decals are to become tracked. For example, if a company is revoked, his license and decals are no longer valid: he must reinstate his account and get a new license and decals. Under his original (now revoked) license, he ordered 80 decals. Under his reinstated license he only ordered 20 decals to save money. 60 trucks in his fleet still run the "revoked" decals, while 20 run with the newly assigned decals -- they all look the same after all. OR-- he orders 80 new decals with his reinstatement (like he did on his original), but doesn't see the need to remove the revoked decals off of 80 trucks only to replace them with the "new" decals having different serial numbers -- they look the same, and it's November after all. Either way, with this ballot the Clearinghouse will show ALL of the decals issued to the carrier for the year whether they are currently valid or not. Do we really even care that some of the decals are technically no longer good?? They were all issued to that company, after all.

Leasing companies are another story -- some notify us when a driver has been terminated. They no longer want their decal associated with that driver's truck. Should that particular decal serial number now have a status of "invalid" so it can be accurately be reflected in the Clearinghouse? Again do we really care?

If we do care, that's more programming costs that could make this ballot less palatable to those jurisdictions already citing programming costs as a concern.

KANSAS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MISSISSIPPI

Support

FTPBP #2-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

MONTANA

Support

see prior comment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

See previous comments.

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

Will require system change by our 3rd party service provider.

ONTARIO

Support

QUEBEC

Oppose

Quebec has to take in consideration the cost, operational and systematic, associated to this change.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

IFTA, Inc put the money and time a couple of years ago to add this to the clearinghouse. It makes sense for an enforcement reasons for the date to be submitted. If this ballot does not pass, then I think it would make sense to maybe looking at removing this option from the clearinghouse to save money for IFTA, Inc. if no one is going to use it.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

SOUTH DAKOTA

Undecided

UTAH

Oppose

We feel it's not worth the effort to have our system changed, and decals serialized, if decals are going to be obsolete in the next few years.

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 2-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA	1		1	
ARIZONA	1			1
ARKANSAS	1		1	
BRITISH COLUMBIA	1		1	
CALIFORNIA	1		1	
COLORADO	1		1	
CONNECTICUT	1		1	
DELAWARE		1		1
FLORIDA				
GEORGIA	1		1	
IDAHO		1		1
ILLINOIS	1		1	
INDIANA		1		1
IOWA	1		1	
KANSAS	1		1	
KENTUCKY	1		1	
LOUISIANA		1		1
MAINE		1		1
MANITOBA	1		1	
MARYLAND	1		1	
MASSACHUSETTS		1		1
MICHIGAN		1		1
MINNESOTA	1		1	
MISSISSIPPI	1		1	
MISSOURI	1		1	
MONTANA	1		1	
NEBRASKA		1	1	
NEVADA	1			1
NEW BRUNSWICK	1		1	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		1	
NEW JERSEY - INELIGIBLE				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK		1		1
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA		1		1
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO				
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON		1		1
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC		1		1
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 2-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA		1		1
TENNESSEE				
TEXAS		1		1
UTAH		1		1
VERMONT	1		1	
VIRGINIA		1	1	
WASHINGTON		1		1
WEST VIRGINIA	1		1	
WISCONSIN		1		1
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	35	18	35	18

Bold font and shading indicate that the jurisdiction did not vote.

Failure to vote for the ballot language counts as a "No" vote.

Failure to vote for the alternative effective date counts as a "No" vote.

Number of "YES" votes necessary to pass: 44

Effective Date: Failed

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **35**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **18**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **4**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: FAILED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **35**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **18**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **4**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: FAILED

Ballot Intent: The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require that jurisdictions track and upload serialized decal numbers issued to carriers.

This would be done by adding "serialized decal numbers" to Licensee demographic data in Section R2110.200 of the IFTA Articles of Agreement.

FOR VOTE BY NOVEMBER 6, 2017
FAILED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF VOTES



IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
STFBP #03-2017

Sponsor

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

April 12, 2017

Proposed Effective Date

Upon Passage

Manual Sections to be Amended (January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised) IFTA

Procedures Manual

*P1030 U.S. and Canadian Funds Transfers

Subject

A change in the reference to be used if a conversion from Canadian to U.S. dollars is required for the transmittal reports.

History/Digest

Currently, if a conversion is required from Canadian to U.S. dollars for transmittal purposes, the procedures state that it shall be done using the Bank of Canada noon day spot rate quoted at 12:00 PM Eastern Time. The Bank of Canada has traditionally published two daily foreign exchange rates, one of which was a noon day rate. However, effective May 1, 2017, there will only be one foreign exchange rate published by 4:30 PM Eastern Time each business day.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Procedures Manual to align with the Bank of Canada's new procedure in publishing exchange rates once each business day by 4:30 PM Eastern Time. With the elimination of the published noon day rate, to allow for timely Canadian jurisdictional transmittals, if a conversion takes place before 4:30 PM Eastern Time the prior day's rate will be used. A fund conversion at 4:30 PM Eastern Time or after will be converted using the current day's rate.

Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition

***P1030 U.S. AND CANADIAN FUNDS TRANSFERS**

.200 Transmittals from Canada

Transmittal reports submitted by a Canadian jurisdiction to a U.S. jurisdiction will be in either U.S. customary measures and U.S. dollars, or International customary measures and Canadian dollars. All funds transmitted by Canadian jurisdictions to U.S. jurisdictions will be in U.S. dollars.

If a conversion is required from Canadian to U.S. dollars it shall be done using the Bank Of Canada ~~noon~~ day spot rate quoted at 12:00 PM Eastern Time ~~exchange rate that was posted by 4:30 PM Eastern Time.~~
A fund conversion prior to ~~12:00~~ 4:30 PM Eastern Time will be converted using the prior day's ~~spot~~ spot rate and a fund conversion at ~~12:00~~ 4:30 PM Eastern Time or after will be converted using the current day's ~~spot~~ spot rate. The amount to be converted into U.S. dollars will be net the cost of converting.

[SECTIONS P1030.100 and P1030.300 REMAIN UNCHANGED]

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

FTPBP #3-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Support: 33
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 0

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

CONNECTICUT

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

INDIANA

Support

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

Minnesota is supportive of the ballot proposal and the effective date.

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

FTPBP #3-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PENNSYLVANIA

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

TENNESSEE

Support

UTAH

Support

VERMONT

Support

VIRGINIA

Support

FTPBP #3-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

WASHINGTON
Support

WEST VIRGINIA
Support

WISCONSIN
Support

STPBP #3-2017
Second Comment Period Ending September 26, 2017

Support: 27
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 0

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

GEORGIA

Support

IDAHO

Support

IOWA

Support

KANSAS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NEW JERSEY

Support

STPBP #3-2017
Second Comment Period Ending September 26, 2017

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

OKLAHOMA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

UTAH

Support

VIRGINIA

Support

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

**IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 3-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA	1		1	
ARIZONA				
ARKANSAS				
BRITISH COLUMBIA				
CALIFORNIA				
COLORADO				
CONNECTICUT	1		1	
DELAWARE				
FLORIDA				
GEORGIA				
IDAHO	1		1	
ILLINOIS	1		1	
INDIANA				
IOWA	1		1	
KANSAS	1		1	
KENTUCKY				
LOUISIANA				
MAINE	1		1	
MANITOBA	1		1	
MARYLAND	1		1	
MASSACHUSETTS				
MICHIGAN				
MINNESOTA				
MISSISSIPPI				
MISSOURI				
MONTANA	1		1	
NEBRASKA				
NEVADA	1		1	
NEW BRUNSWICK	1		1	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		1	
NEW JERSEY - INELIGIBLE				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND				
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA				
OHIO				
OKLAHOMA				
ONTARIO				
OREGON				
PENNSYLVANIA				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND				
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	

**IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 3-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SASKATCHEWAN				
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
TENNESSEE				
TEXAS				
UTAH				
VERMONT				
VIRGINIA				
WASHINGTON				
WEST VIRGINIA				
WISCONSIN				
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	22	0	22	0

Bold font and shading indicate that the jurisdiction did not vote.

Failure to vote for the ballot language counts as a "No" vote.

Failure to vote for the alternative effective date counts as a "No" vote.

Number of "YES" votes necessary to pass: 44

Effective Date: Failed due to insufficient number of votes

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **22**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **0**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **35**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: FAILED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **22**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **0**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **35**

NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**

RESULT: FAILED

Ballot Intent: The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Procedures Manual to align with the Bank of Canada's new procedure in publishing exchange rates once each business day by 4:30 PM Eastern Time. With the elimination of the published noon day rate, to allow for timely Canadian jurisdictional transmittals, if a conversion takes place before 4:30 PM Eastern Time the prior day's rate will be used. A fund conversion at 4:30 PM Eastern Time or after will be converted using the current day's rate.

FOR VOTE BY NOVEMBER 6, 2017
FAILED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF VOTES



IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
STFBP #04-2017

Sponsor

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

March 10, 2017

Proposed Effective Date

Upon Passage

Manual Sections to be Amended (January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Articles of Agreement *R2120 Required Exchange Of Licensee Demographic And Transmittal Data And Interjurisdictional Audit Reports

Subject

A requirement to upload full demographics data on a daily basis for each business day.

History/Digest

The IFTA, Inc. Clearinghouse currently provides a mechanism into which participating jurisdictions may upload licensee demographic data and inter-jurisdictional audit reports when requested by another jurisdiction. Participating jurisdictions may then login to the Clearinghouse and view the licensee demographic data and inter-jurisdictional audit reports.

Jurisdictions are electronically notified when such reports have been uploaded to the Clearinghouse.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to clarify that the upload done on a daily basis for each business day is an upload of the full demographic data.

Membership would benefit from this procedure change by allowing all jurisdictions access to the latest status of accounts when licensing new accounts and would give roadside enforcement more accurate data to utilize when enforcing IFTA. By distributing the licensee demographic data and inter-jurisdictional audit reports to participating jurisdictions via the IFTA, Inc. Clearinghouse, this will ensure jurisdictional compliance according to the applicable provisions of the IFTA Audit Manual.

This change would require the full demographic data to be uploaded to the Clearinghouse each business day for accuracy and timely information.

Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition

***R2120 REQUIRED EXCHANGE OF LICENSEE DEMOGRAPHIC AND TRANSMITTAL DATA AND INTERJURISDICTIONAL AUDIT REPORTS**

.100 Licensee Demographic Data

When the exchange of licensee demographic data is required of the participating members by the IFTA Articles of Agreement and the IFTA Procedures Manual, such requirements shall be deemed satisfied by the successful and timely transmission of the full demographic data to the clearinghouse each business day.

IFTA, Inc. shall be responsible for providing the data from the participating members to all other member jurisdictions.

[SECTIONS R2120.200 and R2120.300 REMAIN UNCHANGED]

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

•

FTPBP #4-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Support: 31
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 2

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

Already doing.

CONNECTICUT

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

INDIANA

Support

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Support

this is the best way to ensure timely and accurate CH demographic data.

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

Minnesota already provides a full, daily data transmittal to the Clearinghouse and is in favor of this ballot proposal as brings parity to the data provided by each jurisdiction but would prefer to have a reasonable effective date included in the ballot proposal.

FTPBP #4-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PENNSYLVANIA

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Undecided

Quebec is not part of the clearinghouse. This proposal will require a significant system development.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

RI currently already does this

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

TENNESSEE

Support

FTPBP #4-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

UTAH

Support

Utah already sends daily full demographic data to the Clearinghouse.

VERMONT

Support

VIRGINIA

Support

WASHINGTON

Undecided

Washington uploads demographic data daily for accounts that have an update or status change. Would this meet the standards for this ballot? If so, we would support. If not, we would have to evaluate the required changes to our system before deciding to support or oppose.

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

WV already does this

WISCONSIN

Support

Wisconsin already does this.

STPBP #4-2017
Second Comment Period Ending September 26, 2017

Support: 27
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 0

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

GEORGIA

Support

IDAHO

Support

IOWA

Support

KANSAS

Support

Kansas already practices this procedure.

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

STPBP #4-2017
Second Comment Period Ending September 26, 2017

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NEW JERSEY

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

OKLAHOMA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Support

Quebec is not part of the Clearinghouse but we support the ballot.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

UTAH

Support

Utah already sends daily full demographic data to the Clearinghouse.

VIRGINIA

Support

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

WV already does this

**IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 4-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA	1		1	
ARIZONA				
ARKANSAS				
BRITISH COLUMBIA				
CALIFORNIA				
COLORADO				
CONNECTICUT	1		1	
DELAWARE				
FLORIDA				
GEORGIA				
IDAHO	1		1	
ILLINOIS	1		1	
INDIANA				
IOWA	1		1	
KANSAS	1		1	
KENTUCKY				
LOUISIANA				
MAINE	1		1	
MANITOBA	1		1	
MARYLAND	1		1	
MASSACHUSETTS				
MICHIGAN				
MINNESOTA				
MISSISSIPPI				
MISSOURI				
MONTANA	1		1	
NEBRASKA				
NEVADA	1		1	
NEW BRUNSWICK	1		1	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		1	
NEW JERSEY - INELIGIBLE				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND				
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA				
OHIO				
OKLAHOMA				
ONTARIO				
OREGON				
PENNSYLVANIA				
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND				
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	

**IFTA SHORT TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 4-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SASKATCHEWAN				
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
TENNESSEE				
TEXAS				
UTAH				
VERMONT				
VIRGINIA				
WASHINGTON				
WEST VIRGINIA				
WISCONSIN				
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	22	0	22	0

Bold font and shading indicate that the jurisdiction did not vote.

Failure to vote for the ballot language counts as a "No" vote.

Failure to vote for the alternative effective date counts as a "No" vote.

Number of "YES" votes necessary to pass: 44

Effective Date: Failed due to insufficient number of votes

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **22**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **0**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **35**
 NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**
RESULT: FAILED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **22**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **0**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **35**
 NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**
RESULT: FAILED

Ballot Intent: The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to clarify that the upload done on a daily basis for each business day is an upload of the full demographic data.

Membership would benefit from this procedure change by allowing all jurisdictions access to the latest status of accounts when licensing new accounts and would give roadside enforcement more accurate data to utilize when enforcing IFTA. By distributing the licensee demographic data and inter-jurisdictional audit reports to participating jurisdictions via the IFTA, Inc. Clearinghouse, this will ensure jurisdictional compliance according to the applicable provisions of the IFTA Audit Manual.

This change would require the full demographic data to be uploaded to the Clearinghouse each business day for accuracy and timely information.

FOR VOTE BY JANUARY 15, 2018



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #05-2017**

Sponsors

Jurisdictions of Alabama, Maine, Virginia and Wisconsin

Date Submitted

April 12, 2017

Proposed Effective Date

January 1, 2019

Agreement Articles to be Amended

IFTA Articles of Agreement Section R620 and Section R650

Subject

An amendment to the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require jurisdictions to accept electronic images of IFTA licenses (Section R620) and temporary decals (Section R650) in place of paper, at the option of the licensee.

History/Digest

The intent of this ballot is to allow the use of electronic images of licenses, at the option of the licensee.

1. Current practices. Historically, base jurisdictions have issued licenses in paper form. The Agreement also allows a base jurisdiction to issue a license by electronic means. Many jurisdictions now also issue pdf licenses.
2. Pilot project. The seven-jurisdiction 2016-2017 Motor Carrier Electronic Credentials Pilot Project (working with the IFTA Electronic Credentials Working Group), has tested electronic images in pdf format roadside. The testing has been for IFTA licenses, IRP cab cards and other credentials.

In the pilot, some of the electronic images have been made from electronic files issued by the base jurisdiction, while others have been scanned images of licenses originally issued in paper form.

Although the number of carriers participating has been low, the response of participating licensees and law enforcement has been highly positive. The technology is relatively easily

understood, is reliable, and saves time roadside. Discussion of some concerns follows:

- a. Confirming the validity of the electronic image. Electronic images can be altered, as can paper images. Where law enforcement questions the validity of an electronic image, the officer would need to use the same verification procedures as for paper.
 - b. Reliability of radio and telephone communications in some geographic areas. In general, reliability will be addressed by having a pdf stored and available in the electronic device, and not rely on internet connectivity at the time of a roadside stop.
 - c. Ability of law enforcement to receive the pdf in the patrol car without taking the electronic device from the truck driver. This can be addressed to a degree by the driver e-mailing the pdf to law enforcement. This would not be possible on a real-time basis in those geographic areas where cellphone service is not available.
 - d. Reading of barcodes on IFTA licenses of IFTA licensees, if any jurisdictions apply barcodes to IFTA licenses. Barcoded licenses provide a convenience for law enforcement, and any technology reducing the duration of a roadside stop aids safety. Discussion of some concerns follows:
 - i. Readability of barcodes on the pdf images on the electronic device. Where the image is sharp, barcodes can be read from the screens of electronic devices.
 - ii. Inserting barcode data into pertinent law enforcement computer programs. The same as for paper barcodes, this sometimes requires a couple steps, such as reading a program specific IFTA QR code or barcode to activate the correct app or program.
 - iii. Scanning of the barcodes from the electronic device, without taking the device to the patrol car. Where a barcode reader is not wireless, this can be addressed to a degree by e-mailing of the pdf, where cellphone service is available.
3. Effective date. January 2019. This will allow jurisdictions one full calendar year – 2018 to obtain any needed changes to statute or regulations.
4. Intent/Summary. The intent of this ballot is to amend the Agreement to allow licensees and base jurisdictions flexibility in issuing and presenting the IFTA license. The ballot adds language clarifying that base jurisdictions may issue licenses in paper or as an electronic image.

The ballot adds language requiring jurisdictions to accept a paper original, legible paper copy or legible electronic image of the license, at the option of the licensee, regardless of the method by which the license was initially issued by the base jurisdiction.

1 **Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition**

2

3 ***R620 POSSESSION OF LICENSE**

4

5 Each licensee shall be issued one IFTA license ~~or cab card~~ in paper or as an electronic image. The
6 licensee is required to make legible paper copies or electronic images of the license ~~so that one and a~~
7 copy shall be carried in each vehicle. Member jurisdictions must accept paper originals, paper copies, or
8 electronic images of IFTA licenses, whichever is presented by the licensee and regardless of the method
9 by which the license was initially issued by the base jurisdiction. A vehicle will not be considered to be
10 operating under this Agreement unless there is a copy of the license in the vehicle, or an electronic image
11 is made available at the time it is requested.

12

13

14 ***R650 TEMPORARY DECAL PERMITS**

15

16 The base jurisdiction may provide for the issuance of a 30-day IFTA temporary decal permit valid for all
17 member jurisdictions to a licensee in good standing to carry in lieu of displaying the annual decals. The
18 base jurisdiction may charge an administrative fee to the licensee to cover the cost of issuance.
19 Temporary decal permits must be vehicle specific and show the expiration date. The temporary decal
20 permit need not be displayed but shall be carried in the vehicle- in paper or as an electronic image.

21

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

FTPBP #5-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Support: 19
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 11

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Undecided

We understand that electronic services is the way of the future. However, we would like to hear how some of the concerns as noted through the pilot project are to be dealt with first. Alberta also agrees with the concerns as noted by Ontario.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

CONNECTICUT

Support

Connecticut is in support of this ballot. Since electronic credentialing is where IFTA is moving as a membership, this ballot is a critical step toward that goal.

ILLINOIS

Undecided

INDIANA

Support

Indiana supports this ballot as it moves away from requiring paper when we exist in an electronic world. However, the presentation of a paper or electronic image of a license does not verify the status of a credential as additional acts must be taken by roadside enforcement.

Imagine roadside enforcement already knowing the status of an IFTA license prior to pulling a truck over. It is possible and it is time.

KANSAS

Undecided

Without the full endorsement from LE, Kansas cannot support the ballot as this time. We have similar concerns as Alabama, Ontario and Washington.

This section of the ballot may need more clarification.

As noted in the History/Digest of the ballot: ***The response of licensees and LE has been highly positive.*** In my opinion, this is misleading, LE from Kansas has vocalized concerns that were not acknowledged. It is my understanding that very few carriers participated and only 1 carrier of relevant fleet size participated in the study and no inspection reports were "turned in".

We too would like the Law Enforcement Committee to voice their concerns.

FTPBP #5-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

MAINE
Support

The IFTA license, whether paper or on a device, is merely a convenience to provide basic information. In order to truly verify a licensee's status, a check must be made against a database such as SAFER (via a CVIEW) or the CH.

MICHIGAN
Undecided

Michigan is not opposed to electronic credentials and recognizes it will inevitably be accepted. Even as a participant of the pilot program, we recognize the potential. Our concern is that the language of the ballot states jurisdictions *must* accept electronic images of the IFTA license if that is the format provided by the licensee. This language has no regard to the jurisdictional statutes or the jurisdictions law enforcement policy. Since the effective date is allowing time for statutory and regulation changes, what are the consequences of jurisdictions who do not implement a change of accepting an electronic image of an IFTA license?

MINNESOTA
Support

Minnesota is very supportive of the ballot proposal and the January 2020 effective date but would prefer to have a definition included that the electronic image shall be in unalterable format.

MISSISSIPPI
Support

MONTANA
Oppose

NEVADA
Support

Nevada fully supports the use of electronic credentials. Whether in paper format or electronic, the only real way to know if a vehicle is on the road legally is to confirm the company information through another means such as NLETS, ASPEN, SAFER, CVIEW, etc. Reliance on a decal and paper cab card, or an electronic image of a cab card, does not ensure the company operating the vehicle is properly registered and licensed at the time of the stop.

NEW BRUNSWICK
Support

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Support

NORTH CAROLINA
Undecided

If this ballot passes, we may have to make statutory changes.

FTPBP #5-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

NOVA SCOTIA

Undecided

We agree with Ontario's comments.

ONTARIO

Undecided

*While there may be value in allowing either format in licensing, it seems fundamentally skewed for that decision to be controlled by an individual licensee. By all means introduce the flexibility **at the discretion of each jurisdiction** but continue with the requirement to also carry a paper copy of the license. Despite the best of intentions there may be situations where electronic information is simply not accessible (e.g. service provider limitations, dropped signal, defective device, etc.) Jurisdictions must be permitted to continue with roadside inspection activities and enforcement by demanding proof of an IFTA license in these circumstances.*

It would be beneficial to add language and establish a process for an evidence trail that may be necessary in the event that fraudulent electronic documents are discovered. Additionally the ballot does not speak to the control, handling or potential jurisdictional liability of any device presented by the licensee.

PENNSYLVANIA

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Undecided

We agree with Ontario's comments.

QUEBEC

Undecided

As per our Law Enforcement agents, it is always the responsibility of the carrier to prove he has a valid license. If electronic information is not accessible then the driver needs to carry a paper copy of the licence.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Undecided

FTPBP #5-2017
First Comment Period Ending June 7, 2017

Stakeholders

Support

6-2-2017 ATA Robert Pitcher

We support the concept very strongly, but the effective date should be moved up at least a year, to no later than January 2019!

TENNESSEE

Support

UTAH

Support

VERMONT

Support

VIRGINIA

Support

WASHINGTON

Undecided

Washington would like to have the Law Enforcement Committee to review and explain their enforcement concerns (if any). We are concerned with a "picture" or other electronic documents. We are interested in hearing from other jurisdictions regarding any concerns that this is at the taxpayer's discretion and not more defined by the ballot language.

WISCONSIN

Support

FTPBP #5-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

Support: 11
Oppose: 2
Undecided: 6

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Undecided

Still have concerns about the size, clarity of images, and the process to make this work. Also agree with Quebec's comments.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

IDAHO

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

KANSAS

Undecided

Still have concerns regarding size requirements of the license which could lead to issues with Officer safety. See prior comments as well.

MANITOBA

Undecided

Agree with Quebec's comments.

MARYLAND

Support

MISSISSIPPI

Support

MONTANA

Oppose

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

See previous comments.

FTPBP #5-2017
Second Comment Period Ending October 30, 2017

NOVA SCOTIA

Undecided

Agree with Quebec

ONTARIO

Oppose

Ontario continues to oppose the ballot as it fails to address the concerns previously raised in terms of access, security, handling, etc.

QUEBEC

Undecided

A simple modification or suggestion: The electronic image must be downloaded/stored on the electronic device to present in circumstances where wireless networks are down or not working. We recommend having the license electronic and in paper. After all, it is the responsibility of the carrier to prove it.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SOUTH CAROLINA

Support

SOUTH DAKOTA

Support

Pending legislative changes to accept electronic images.

UTAH

Support

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 5-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA		1		1
ARIZONA	1		1	
ARKANSAS	1		1	
BRITISH COLUMBIA	1		1	
CALIFORNIA		1		1
COLORADO	1		1	
CONNECTICUT	1		1	
DELAWARE	1		1	
FLORIDA	1		1	
GEORGIA	1		1	
IDAHO	1		1	
ILLINOIS	1		1	
INDIANA	1		1	
IOWA	1		1	
KANSAS		1		1
KENTUCKY	1		1	
LOUISIANA	1		1	
MAINE	1		1	
MANITOBA	1		1	
MARYLAND	1		1	
MASSACHUSETTS	1		1	
MICHIGAN	1		1	
MINNESOTA	1		1	
MISSISSIPPI	1		1	
MISSOURI	1		1	
MONTANA		1		1
NEBRASKA	1		1	
NEVADA	1			1
NEW BRUNSWICK	1		1	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1		1	
NEW JERSEY - INELIGIBLE				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA		1		1
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA		1		1
OHIO				
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO		1		1
OREGON	1		1	
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1			1
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 5-2017
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
TENNESSEE				
TEXAS	1		1	
UTAH	1		1	
VERMONT	1		1	
VIRGINIA	1		1	
WASHINGTON		1		1
WEST VIRGINIA	1		1	
WISCONSIN	1		1	
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	46	8	44	10

Bold font and shading indicate that the jurisdiction did not vote.

Failure to vote for the ballot language counts as a "No" vote.

Failure to vote for the alternative effective date counts as a "No" vote.

Number of "YES" votes necessary to pass: 44

Effective Date: January 1, 2019

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **46**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **8**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **3**
 NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**
RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES RECEIVED: **44**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES RECEIVED: **10**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT RECEIVED: **3**
 NUMBER OF INELIGIBLE JURISDICTIONS: **1**
RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent: The intent of this ballot is to amend the Agreement to allow licensees and base jurisdictions flexibility in issuing and presenting the IFTA license. The ballot adds language clarifying that base jurisdictions may issue licenses in paper or as an electronic image.