

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #01-2015**

Sponsor

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

March 23, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

Upon Passage

Manual Sections to be Amended

(January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Procedures Manual

Section P1050

Subject

The annual notification of the number of transmittals sent – read only jurisdictions.

History/Digest

This section of the Procedures Manual is intended to require only “read only” Clearinghouse member jurisdictions to number their transmittals. Additionally, Clearinghouse member jurisdictions would also notify all “read only” Clearinghouse members of the number of transmittals that have been sent that calendar year.

Currently many jurisdictions that are members of the Clearinghouse are sending this information to both Clearinghouse member jurisdictions and “read only” Clearinghouse member jurisdictions.

Technologies have improved and all jurisdictions have access to the clearinghouse, therefore there is a need to amend this section to reflect only the processes that are still required. This will help to reduce paperwork, time and confusion.

For jurisdictions that already use the Clearinghouse for transmittals, the number of transmittals sent for the year are available from the Clearinghouse. “Read only” Clearinghouse member jurisdictions have access to view the clearinghouse information. For this reason it is no longer necessary to require Clearinghouse

member jurisdictions to notify “read only” Clearinghouse member jurisdictions.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Procedures Manual to remove the requirement for Clearinghouse members to notify all “read only” Clearinghouse members of the number of transmittals that have been sent that calendar year.

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

2
3 ***P1050 NUMBERING OF MONTHLY TRANSMITTALS**

4
5 The base jurisdiction is responsible for consecutively numbering each set of transmittals to each
6 jurisdiction for each calendar year. At the end of each calendar year, each read only non-Clearinghouse
7 member jurisdiction shall notify other jurisdictions of the number of transmittals that have been sent that
8 calendar year. ~~At the end of each calendar year, Clearinghouse members shall notify all non-~~
9 ~~Clearinghouse members of the number of transmittals that have been sent that calendar year.~~

10

<p style="text-align: center;">NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD</p>
--

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 1-2015
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	1		1	
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO	1		1	
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON	1		1	
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 1-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
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	56	0	56	0

Bold font in the voting total columns 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: March 25, 2016**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **56**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **56**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Procedures Manual to remove the requirement for Clearinghouse members to notify all "read only" Clearinghouse members of the number of transmittals that have been sent that calendar year.

FTPBP #1-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 26
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 0

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

ARKANSAS

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

CONNECTICUT

Support

This ballot makes sense as the number of transmittals sent and received for full participants is easily determined from the Clearinghouse entries.

ILLINOIS

Support

IOWA

Support

Iowa supports this ballot as proposed by the APC. Iowa is represented on the APC.

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Support

Maine supports the ballot, but we also concur with MO's and NE's comments.

MANITOBA

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

FTPBP #1-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

MINNESOTA

Support

MN has no issues with the proposal language change. This will eliminate an annual task and will be one less compliance item for the clearinghouse participants. An option for consideration is to strike the requirement; reason is the receiving jurisdictions should be monitoring receipt of transmittals and funds from the non-clearinghouse member jurisdictions on a monthly basis. Reconciling a year later is often too late. For jurisdictional accountability the non-receipt of monthly funds needs to be identified each month rather than once a year.

MISSOURI

Support

Missouri suggests removing all language for the number of transmittals sent. If jurisdictions have "read-only" access they should be verifying the monthly carrier transactions and AP/AR amounts. Clearinghouse members should not have to send any "paper" information to non-clearinghouse members when "read-only" access provides the details/information needed.

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Support

Nebraska supports this ballot but has some underlying concerns with including Clearinghouse requirements into the governing documents. If/when all jurisdictions are full participating Clearinghouse members, this section will need to be amended again.

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

Ensures streamlined practices.

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

FTPBP #1-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

WASHINGTON

Support

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

FTPBP #1-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 26
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 0

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

OKLAHOMA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

With most jurisdictions now being full members of the Clearinghouse, the need to share transactional details between themselves has becoming outdated. It is only logical to remove the blanket provision and limit the requirement to those jurisdictions restricted to "read only" Clearinghouse access.

OREGON

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

FTPBP #1-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

QUEBEC

Support

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

VERMONT

Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #2-2015**

Sponsor:

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted:

March 23, 2015

Proposed Effective Date:

Upon passage

Manual Sections to be Amended

(January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Procedures Manual

P1100 Base Jurisdictions Reporting
P1110 Annual Reporting

Subject:

Annual Report Requirement

History/Digest:

The purpose of this ballot is to remove any confusion regarding the information that is being uploaded regarding the number of IFTA accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked. Some jurisdictions are counting each time an IFTA account is cancelled, suspended or revoked throughout the calendar year; this may include the same account multiple times if warranted. Whereas some jurisdictions only count the total sum of IFTA accounts that were cancelled, suspended or revoked during the entire year.

Rewording the language "during the year" in the Procedures Manual, Section P1110.300.005 will alleviate the confusion of duplicating accounts that have been revoked, cancelled or suspended in the same calendar year and they would only be counted once.

By removing the requirement in the Procedures Manual, Section P1110.300.010 - Number of accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked - it will alleviate confusion of duplicating accounts in the total number of accounts noted in Section P1110.300.005.

Also, this ballot would add an addition to the annual report which would have members identify the IFTA processing system (in-house or provider/vendor name) utilized by their jurisdiction. This information is currently posted on the IFTA Inc. website and updated annually. Including it in the annual report would simplify gathering the information and provide current information on an annual basis to all jurisdictions.

Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to remove the confusing verbiage related to the reporting of the number of accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked so all jurisdictions are reporting the same data. Jurisdictions should report the total number of accounts at the end of the year that are revoked, suspended, or cancelled at the time the data is collected. This would be a snap-shot of collective data at the specific date in time. It would also add the requirement to provide the type of IFTA processing system (in-house or provider/vendor name) that is being utilized by each jurisdiction. .

Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

P1100 BASE JURISDICTION REPORTING

***P1110 ANNUAL REPORTING**

[ALL OTHER SECTIONS UNDER P1110 REMAIN UNCHANGED]

.300 Required Information

Content of the annual report to member jurisdictions shall include:

- .005 Number of total IFTA accounts (this includes new accounts, active accounts and accounts that were suspended, revoked or canceled as of ~~on~~ December 31st of each year during the year), which shall consist of all licensees that are issued an IFTA license and decals for a licensing year excluding licensees who were issued credentials in error and returned those credentials to the base jurisdiction;
- ~~.010~~ ~~Number of accounts cancelled and suspended /revoked;~~ ;
- ~~.015~~ .010 Number of accounts audited;
- ~~.020~~ .015 Number of accounts audited with assessment;
- ~~.025~~ .020 Number of new licensees which shall consist of all new accounts licensed, but does not include licensees renewed or reinstated, for the registration year being reported or previously registered in another member jurisdiction; and
- ~~.030~~ .025 Number of sets of decals issued;
- ~~.035~~ .030 Price per set of decals; and
- ~~.040~~ .035 Application fee amounts, including license fees, reinstatement fees, and other fees.
- .040 Name of the IFTA processing system (in-house or provider/vendor name) utilized by each jurisdiction.

REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

- Changes were made to all three paragraphs in the History/Digest section to clarify what was intended to be accomplished with this ballot.
- The intent was also updated for clarification.
- P1110.300.005 was edited to read “as of” December 31st of each year

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 2-2015
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	1		1	
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA		1		1
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO		1	1	
OKLAHOMA		1		1
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON		1		1
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND		1		1
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 2-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
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	49	7	51	5

Bold font in the voting total columns 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: March 25, 2016**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **49**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **7**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **51**
 NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **5**
 NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to remove the confusing verbiage related to the reporting of the number of accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked so all jurisdictions are reporting the same data. Jurisdictions should report the total number of accounts at the end of the year that are revoked, suspended, or cancelled at the time the data is collected. This would be a snap-shot of collective data at the specific date in time. It would also add the requirement to provide the type of IFTA processing system (in-house or provider/vendor name) that is being utilized by each jurisdiction.

FTPBP #2-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 15
Oppose: 8
Undecided: 3

ALABAMA

Oppose

The language in the ballot is confusing. A jurisdiction would report the total number of accounts, but would not report any information regarding how many accounts were suspended, revoked, or canceled. This can be useful information. If the intent of the ballot is to ensure that an account that has been suspended multiple times during a license year is counted as "1" suspension, the ballot does not accomplish this goal. Why not simply state how these account changes should be tallied?

Is the intent to report the status of an account as of December 31 of each year or count the number of occurrences of suspensions, cancellations, and revocations? Once this has been determined, the ballot language should be written to address the issue.

The "History" section refers to removing language from the Articles of Agreement, but the amendments to the ballot are in the Procedures Manual.

ALBERTA

Undecided

Alberta finds the ballot to be quite confusing. As pointed out by various other jurisdictions that are undecided or oppose the ballot, we think that if jurisdictions find the information on the number of accounts cancelled and suspended / revoked to be useful, then we should work to clarify how those should be reported consistently among jurisdictions, rather than just removing the requirement from the annual report. Alberta does not have concern about providing the information about the processing system but wonders about the usefulnesses of the information.

ARKANSAS

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

BC has always wondered about the accuracy and value in reporting the number of accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked accounts during the year (e.g., double and perhaps triple counting individual carriers who are suspended and/or revoked multiple times within a calendar year).

CONNECTICUT

Support

We agree that reporting the number of cancelled, suspended, or revoked accounts for the preceding calendar year is confusing and has resulted in unnecessary duplications. We further agree with those who have questioned the value of this data if it is not accurate. We do not know what specific value disclosing the type or vendor used for administering the IFTA program brings, but the mandating of this type of disclosure does not affect any process nor does it result in additional work or cost to be borne by the member.

FTPBP #2-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

ILLINOIS

Support

IOWA

Support

Iowa supports this ballot as proposed by the APC. Iowa is represented on the APC.

KANSAS

Support

MAINE

Undecided

The requirement is confusing only because jurisdictions count cancellations, suspensions, and revocations differently. What's really needed is better instructions on how to report this information. The real question is "is this information useful to the community?" In the present form, probably not.

MANITOBA

Support

Manitoba agrees with Saskatchewan's comments. We have no issue with providing the name of our IFTA processing system as we feel this is useful information to have.

MICHIGAN

Oppose

The proposed language does not resolve problem.

MINNESOTA

Oppose

The proposal references removing language "during the year", however that language does not appear in P1110. MN feels that the number of cancelled, suspended, and revoked licensees is useful information if there was a consistent practice in reporting (either a snapshot in time at the end of the licensee year or cumulative throughout the year). Rather than require the IFTA processing system data as a part of the annual report, MN would rather see this information captured outside of the annual report requirement. We question the value of mandating the jurisdictional type of processing system as a data element to the annual report.

MISSOURI

Support

MONTANA

Support

FTPBP #2-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

NEBRASKA

Oppose

The History/Digest section is confusing - it references the Articles of Agreement, yet this proposal impacts the Procedures Manual and if talks about removing language "during the year" that doesn't appear in the section to begin with. So for a ballot that is intended to remove confusion - it has just created more! The purpose of the annual report is to provide jurisdiction snapshot information to the reader, therefore, the number of cancelled/suspended/revoked accounts reported by a jurisdiction relative to their active accounts might be interesting information. If the membership feels that processing system information is important, we would not be opposed to capturing that in the annual report.

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Oppose

We would echo Michigan's comments.

NORTH CAROLINA

Oppose

NC agrees with Quebec in regard that removing the suspended, canceled and revoked accounts doesn't have anything to do with the system (in-house or vendor). What is the purpose of adding what type of system is utilized? Clarifying how to report suspended, canceled or revoked accounts to be consistent would be more appropriate.

NOVA SCOTIA

Undecided

ONTARIO

Support

Ontario supports the concept but agree there may be need to further clarify language.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Oppose

We agree with Nebraska's comments.

QUEBEC

Oppose

Quebec doesn't see the relation between not reporting the number of accounts cancelled, suspended or revoked with the IFTA processing system. Is it going to be different treatment when Jurisdiction is using in-house instead of a provider?

FTPBP #2-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

Saskatchewan supports the idea behind this ballot but the wording could be clearer in section .005 to require not just the total number of accounts but the number of each account status.

WASHINGTON

Support

WEST VIRGINIA

Support

FTPBP #2-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 10
Oppose: 2
Undecided: 4

ALBERTA
Undecided

It seems that P1110.300.005 asks for the total IFTA accounts which includes new accounts, active accounts and accounts that were suspended, revoked and cancelled. Since, it will still be useful to obtain separately the information of the number of accounts cancelled and suspended/ revoked, should P1110.300.010 be retained?

BRITISH COLUMBIA
Support

ILLINOIS
Support

MANITOBA
Support

MARYLAND
Support

NEVADA
Support

NEW BRUNSWICK
Support

NORTH CAROLINA
Oppose

NOVA SCOTIA
Undecided

ONTARIO
Support

Sharing information related to account cancellations has limited value in the context of jurisdictional reporting and since the definition of these terms is not consistent throughout the membership, this likely creates confusion when referenced.

ON is neutral as to whether there is value in replacing the field with jurisdictional vendor details but agree with removing the requirement to record account cancellations, suspensions, revocations when completing an Annual Report.

OREGON
Undecided

FTPBP #2-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Oppose

QUEBEC

Undecided

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

VERMONT

Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #03-2015**

Sponsor

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

March 23, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

July 1, 2017

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 include a requirement to upload full demographic information on a daily basis for each business day.

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 make it a requirement for this information to be uploaded to the Clearinghouse each business day for accuracy and timely information.

1 Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition

2

3

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

6

7

.100 Licensee Demographic Data

8

9

10

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 data to the clearinghouse each business day.

11

12

13

14

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

15

16

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

17

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 3-2015
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				
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	1		1	
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO		1		1
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON		1		1
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 3-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
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	49	6	48	7

Bold font in the voting total columns 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, 2017**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **49**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **6**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **48**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to include a requirement to upload full demographic information on a daily basis for each business day. 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 make it a requirement for this information to be uploaded to the Clearinghouse each business day for accuracy and timely information.

FTPBP #3-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 19
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 6

ALABAMA
Support

Alabama currently submits demographic data, on a daily, basis to the Clearinghouse.

ALBERTA
Undecided

We agree with New Brunswick.

ARKANSAS
Support

Arkansas agrees with Michigan's comment.

BRITISH COLUMBIA
Support

BC supports the concept but shares the concerns expressed by others. BC currently updates at 11:00pm each business day (i.e., not weekends or statutory holidays).

For future consideration - With the 3 to 4-1/2 hour time difference between coasts perhaps we should be more specific regarding uploads (e.g., between 10PM – 2AM). This would ensure we all have consistent/unchanging demographic data during the day/times when most compliance activities occur.

CONNECTICUT
Undecided

As opined by others, the direct language of the proposal is too restrictive and does not account for possible conditions (e.g. weekends, holidays, system or agency shutdowns, weather or other disasters) which may prohibit a nightly refresh from occurring. We strongly recommend that the sponsors amend the proposal to account for such events which would prohibit a nightly refresh from taking place.

ILLINOIS
Support

IOWA
Support

Iowa supports this ballot as proposed by the APC. Iowa is represented on the APC.

FTPBP #3-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

KANSAS

Support

Kansas has recently implemented this practice of nightly uploads.

MAINE

Support

Maine supports the requirement that CH demographic changes be uploaded once every 24 hours. Nearly every CH jurisdiction is in compliance with this proposal. NE's comments should be taken into consideration.

MANITOBA

Support

Manitoba agrees with New Brunswick's comments.

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

Minnesota is currently transmitting the licensee demographic data on a nightly basis. The proposed language may be too restrictive by mandating on a "nightly" basis, Minnesota recommends replacing nightly with "daily" or "24 hour". Also, business days should be clarified to eliminate the requirement on weekends and holidays.

MISSOURI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Support

Curious why the term "nightly" basis was used rather than on a "daily" basis. Does that mean you would have to upload your information at night?! What about 5am or 6am?

Nebraska does however want to point out that this ballot, along with ballot #1 is troubling because it proposes Clearinghouse requirements in the governing documents. Every time your requirements change - you have to pass a ballot.

NEVADA

Support

FTPBP #3-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

NEW BRUNSWICK

Undecided

New Brunswick already performs this practice daily, however this practice is not performed on the weekends as there are no changes to report. We would support the ballot if it was weekdays only and not holidays.

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NC supports this ballot but "nightly" needs to be defined better.

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

Agree with New Brunswick's and Quebec's comments

ONTARIO

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Oppose

Nightly uploading would place a burden on the jurisdiction which would outweigh the benefit.

QUEBEC

Undecided

We agree with New Brunswick.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

Saskatchewan supports this ballot. The term nightly needs to be defined. We currently upload a file every work day morning.

WASHINGTON

Undecided

WEST VIRGINIA

Undecided

FTPBP #3-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 16
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 1

ALBERTA

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

OHIO

Oppose

I believe this ballot is well-intentioned; however the same result can be obtained without the jurisdictions providing full demographic data daily. To clarify, the other agencies that use IFTA data normally request a one-time data load of all demographic data, then require the states to provide the changes (delta) as they occur. The reason why this is significant is the fact that providing a full data dump daily consumes an extreme amount of space in a short period of time. Especially, when some of the larger IFTA jurisdictions have over 9,000 active accounts. It makes more sense to pass the delta values rather than a complete daily dump of all demographic information.

ONTARIO

Support

FTPBP #3-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Without specific standards establishing the timeliness of licensee data, it is challenging to expect jurisdictions to rely on the Clearinghouse for such information. Consequently it falls back to direct jurisdictional contact to obtain data confirmation resulting in additional time and effort for all parties.

OREGON
Undecided

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
Support

QUEBEC
Support

RHODE ISLAND
Support

SASKATCHEWAN
Support

STAKEHOLDERS

ATA Robert Pitcher
IAC Sandy Johnson, Chair

Both the ATA and the IAC supports the requirement that a jurisdiction refresh its demographic data daily. If IFTA data is to support real enforcement efforts, it must be accurate and timely.

VERMONT
Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP 4-2015**

Sponsor

Agreement Procedures Committee

Date Submitted

March 23, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

Upon Passage

Manual Sections to be Amended

(January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Articles of Agreement

R400 Cancellation, Revocation and Suspension

*R410 License Cancellation

*R420 License Suspension and Revocation

*R430 License Reinstatement

Subject

Cancellation, Revocation, Suspension and Reinstatement Reports

History/Digest

Currently in accordance of the IFTA Articles of Agreement Section R410.300, all IFTA jurisdictions are required to notify all member jurisdictions on a quarterly basis of all canceled accounts. Per Section R420.300 and R430.300 all IFTA jurisdictions are required to notify all member jurisdictions within 10 days of all suspended, revoked and reinstated accounts.

The purpose of this ballot is to remove the member jurisdictional requirement since the information is electronically uploaded to the Clearinghouse and require specifically the Read Only Clearinghouse member jurisdictions to notify the other member jurisdictions of any Cancellation, Revocation, Suspension or Reinstatement as per the Articles of Agreement section R400.

Intent

The requirement to send Cancellation, Revocation, Suspension and Reinstatement reports shall only be a requirement for those read only Clearinghouse member jurisdiction.

IFTA Full Track Final Ballot Proposal

#04-2015

March 23, 2015

Page 1 of 2

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

2
3 **R400 CANCELLATION, REVOCATION, AND SUSPENSION**

4
5 ***R410 LICENSE CANCELLATION**

6
7 **.100** A base jurisdiction may, at the request of a licensee or on its own initiative, cancel a
8 license if the licensee has complied with all applicable provisions of this Agreement,
9 including the satisfaction of all motor fuel use tax obligations for the license period. The
10 base jurisdiction shall instruct its licensees that, upon cancellation, the original IFTA
11 license, all license copies, and all decals shall be destroyed.

12
13 **.200** Licenses shall be canceled in accordance with the administrative procedure laws of the
14 base jurisdiction.

15
16 **.300** The read only Clearinghouse member ~~base jurisdictions~~ shall notify all Clearinghouse
17 member jurisdictions quarterly of all canceled accounts.

18
19 ***R420 LICENSE SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION**

20
21 **.100** Failure to comply with all applicable provisions of this Agreement shall be grounds for
22 suspension or revocation of the license issued under this Agreement.

23
24 **.200** Licenses shall be suspended or revoked in accordance with the administrative procedure
25 laws of the base jurisdiction.

26
27 **.300** The read only Clearinghouse member ~~base jurisdictions~~ shall notify all Clearinghouse
28 member jurisdictions within 10 days of all suspensions and revocations.

29
30 ***R430 LICENSE REINSTATEMENT**

31
32 **.100** A former licensee whose license has been revoked may have that license reinstated.
33 Before a license may be reinstated, the base jurisdiction may require a reinstatement fee
34 in accordance with the existing jurisdictional laws.

35
36 **.200** The base jurisdiction may also require the reinstated licensee to post a fuel tax bond in an
37 amount sufficient to satisfy any potential liability to all member jurisdictions.

38
39 **.300** The read only Clearinghouse member ~~base jurisdictions~~ shall notify all Clearinghouse
40 member jurisdictions within 10 days of all reinstatements.

41

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 4-2015
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				
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	1		1	
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO	1		1	
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON	1		1	
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 4-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
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	55	0	55	0

Bold font in the voting total columns 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: Upon Passage - March 25, 2016**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **55**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **55**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The requirement to send Cancellation, Revocation, Suspension and Reinstatement reports shall only be a requirement for those read only Clearinghouse member jurisdiction.

FTPBP #4-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 24
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 2

ALABAMA

Support

ALBERTA

Support

We generally support the idea and agree with Quebec that the language can be clarified for the notification to be provided by read only Clearinghouse members to all member jurisdictions.

ARKANSAS

Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

CONNECTICUT

Support

We agree. This proposal removes a redundant and unnecessary task from fully participating members of the IFTA Clearinghouse yet retains a requirement for those that do not.

ILLINOIS

Support

IOWA

Support

Iowa supports this ballot as proposed by the APC. Iowa is represented on the APC.

KANSAS

Support

Agree with Missouri's comments.

MAINE

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

FTPBP #4-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

MISSOURI

Support

Missouri agrees with the changes to the language but suggests we develop a way for non-clearinghouse members to enter the information into the demographic file so that all carrier information is retrievable by the demographic file search functions for members and law enforcement.

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Support

Another ballot that will have to change when all jurisdictions are full participating Clearinghouse members.

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

Ensures streamlined practices.

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Undecided

The language should be: to send the reports to Clearinghouse member ***and read only*** Jurisdictions.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

WASHINGTON

Support

FTPBP #4-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

WEST VIRGINIA
Undecided

FTPBP #4-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 15
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 2

ALBERTA

Undecided

Alberta supports the ballot. However, we are just wondering whether the requirement should be for the read only Clearinghouse member to notify all member jurisdictions (and not just the Clearinghouse member jurisdictions) on their cancelled, revoked and suspended accounts.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

With status reports being available through the Clearinghouse, there is no need for base jurisdictions to share directly with other members. It is reasonable therefore to limit the requirement specifically to those members unable to input data into the Clearinghouse (read-only jurisdictions).

OREGON

Support

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

FTPBP #4-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

QUEBEC

Undecided

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

VERMONT

Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
#05-2015**

Sponsor

IFTA, Inc. Board of Trustees

Date Submitted

April 10, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

July 1, 2017

Manual Sections to be Amended

(January 1996 Version, Effective July 1, 1998, as revised)

IFTA Procedures Manual

P1300 UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

Subject

To establish a standard unit measure for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) reporting and transmittal purposes between IFTA members.

History/Digest

For accurate reporting and transmittal purposes between IFTA jurisdictions, members must use consistent units of measure and be able to instruct carriers how to convert between measures (e.g., gallons to liters).

In the United States two different methodologies exist to convert LNG from weight measures to volume measures for sales purposes:

- Straight weight - Where 1 gallon weighs 3.5 pounds
- Energy equivalent weight - Where 1 Diesel Gallon Equivalent (DGE) weighs 6.06 pounds

In the United States, many retail stations want to use DGEs so the public can compare the costs of using LNG with diesel. Also in the United States the responsibility for administering measurement requirements has been delegated to the State level. To maintain uniformity, an organization called the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM), establishes model law on a consensus basis. Individual States then choose whether to adopt the model law in whole or in part. The NCWM has not yet obtained

a consensus but currently, twenty-four states have adopted the definition that a DGE of LNG weighs 6.06 pounds, and *similar legislation is pending in one other state* (1).

(1) Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming, Source: Brett Barry, Public Policy and Regulatory Advisor, Clean Energy Fuels Corp. (June 2015).

Additionally, in July 2015 the U.S. enacted House of Representatives bill H.R. 3236 as Public Law 114-41. That law establishes DGE as the federal unit of tax for LNG used as a motor fuel. The bill also establishes for U.S. federal motor fuel tax purposes an energy equivalent conversion factor of a gallon of diesel with respect to LNG of 6.06 lbs. The effective date is January 1, 2016.

In Canada, the Federal government determines the units of measure and is strongly opposed to energy equivalents. As a result, all provinces will be required to sell LNG in mass units of measure, specifically kilograms. However, there is nothing limiting provinces, or their IFTA carriers from converting purchases in kilograms to diesel liter equivalents for IFTA tax reporting purposes.

This ballot is necessary, like IFTA Ballot #03-2013 for compressed natural gas (CNG), to ensure consistent tax reporting and distribution of taxes between IFTA jurisdictions. Currently the three units of measures are used for sales of LNG; twenty-four jurisdictions are selling LNG in gallons (3.5 lb per G), twenty-four jurisdictions selling LNG in DGEs (6.06 lb per 1 DGE), and ten jurisdictions selling as mass (kilograms). Other IFTA standards already exist to ensure consistent reporting and distribution of taxes between IFTA members including distances (miles/kilometers), volumes (gallons/liters), and currency (US/CD). The tax rates and the units of measure a jurisdiction chooses for LNG are their responsibility. However, it is critical that IFTA has a standard LNG measure for reporting and transmittal purposes.

The IFTA Board of Trustees and Dual Fuel Working Group believe for LNG the standard will become DGE for all US jurisdictions, especially with the recent enactment of U.S. Public Law 114-41.

In the case of Canadian jurisdictions, which sell LNG in a weight measure, the proposed amendment will require a conversion of mass to energy equivalents. However, the system programming required to convert to energy equivalents for IFTA reporting and transmittal purposes is easier than what is already required for currency conversion.

The Attorneys' Section Steering Committee (ASSC) has reviewed the ballot, agrees it provides a consistent method of tax reporting and distribution of taxes between IFTA jurisdictions, and has not identified any concerns regarding its impact on a jurisdiction's sovereignty regarding the setting of tax rates.

Intent

To establish a standard unit measure for LNG reporting and transmittal purposes between IFTA members.

Interlining Indicates Deletion; Underlining Indicates Addition

1 **P1300 UNITS OF MEASUREMENT**

2
3 **P1320 MEASURES FOR LIQUIFIED NATURAL GAS**

4
5 For reporting tax rates, and audit results and for transmittals between IFTA jurisdictions, liquefied natural
6 gas shall be in diesel energy equivalent measures using the following conversion factors:

7
8 .100 a diesel gallon equivalent in U.S. jurisdictions weighs 6.06 pounds, and

9
10 .200 a diesel liter equivalent in Canadian jurisdictions weighs 0.73 kilograms.

11

Please Note: Ballot 3-2013 removed Procedures Manual, Section P1320 effective July 1, 2015. The following is the language that was removed:

For reporting fuels that cannot be measured in liters or gallons (e.g., compressed natural gas), the licensee shall report the fuel in the units of measurement employed by the jurisdiction in which the fuel was used.

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 5-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
ALABAMA	1		1	
ALBERTA				
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	1		1	
NEW YORK		1		1
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO	1		1	
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1		1	
OREGON		1		1
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 5-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
TEXAS	1		1	
UTAH	1		1	
VERMONT	1		1	
VIRGINIA	1		1	
WASHINGTON		1		1
<i>WEST VIRGINIA</i>				
WISCONSIN	1		1	
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	50	4	50	4

Bold font in the voting total columns 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, 2017**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **50**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **4**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **4**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **50**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **4**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **4**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

To establish a standard unit measure for LNG reporting and transmittal purposes between IFTA members.

FTPBP #5-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 20
Oppose: 5
Undecided: 2

ALABAMA
Support

ALBERTA
Oppose

We agree with New Brunswick. We also do not have concerns using standard conversion factors. However, the reporting of LNG in energy equivalent measures adds confusion to reporting and transmittal when all other types of fuel are reported in dollar per gallon, or dollar per litre.

ARKANSAS
Support

Attorneys Section Steering Committee
Support

TO: IFTA JURISDICTION COMMISSIONERS
FROM: EDWARD G. BEAUDETTE, CHAIRMAN IFTA ATTORNEY SECTION STEERING COMMITTEE
RE: COMMENTS ON ADOPTING BALLOT STBF #2014-05

The IFTA Attorneys Section Steering Committee has been asked to make a formal comment on the adoption of STBF#2014-05 concerning the institution of a standard conversion factor for fuels that are not susceptible to measurement in gallons or liters.

The need for this ballot as described in the proposal is to address the fact that the Canadian Province jurisdictions are under a legislative requirement that doesn't allow measurement referencing energy equivalency units. This has the effect of allowing jurisdictions to use different units or means of measurement that can create inconsistencies in reporting usages across jurisdictions.

It appears that the proposed ballot would serve the function of allowing a consistent reporting of the non-standard measurement of certain fuels such as LNG amongst all the jurisdiction while allowing each jurisdiction to comply with their individual laws or rules.

This ballot addresses two issues which are of general concern to the Attorney Section. Those are the deference of the Agreement to the sovereignty of the individual jurisdictions while maintaining a consistency within IFTA that allows for clear and accurate reporting amongst the jurisdictions that can be understood and applied in a uniform manner that does not contradict the laws of an individual jurisdiction.

While there appears to have been some concern over the details of the conversion factor that is better left to the auditors and accountants to resolve, from a legal perspective, a consistent means of reporting which allows for individual jurisdictions to remain in full compliance with their governing statutes and rules is optimal for addressing these issues in the future. It is always better to have everyone working from the same set of standards. It will eliminate questions and issues related to interpretation in cases where the subject is central to the resolution.

FTPBP #5-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

It also appears that this ballot failed on its first time through because of a lack of voting rather than significant problems with the concept.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

There are three different units of measures being used for sales of LNG (i.e., straight gallons, diesel gallon equivalents and kilograms). Without LNG conversion factors and a common reporting methodology it is impossible to ensure consistent tax reporting and distribution of taxes between IFTA jurisdictions.

CONNECTICUT

Oppose

While Connecticut respects the position of the sponsors and the comments of the Attorneys' Section Steering Committee, we are concerned that passage of this ballot would result in this jurisdiction holding taxpayers not required to be licensed under IFTA to different standards from those who are IFTA licensees. Accordingly, we are opposed to this ballot.

ILLINOIS

Support

IOWA

Support

This is already in Iowa code 452A.2 (21.b).

KANSAS

Support

This is currently in the Kansas statutes.

MAINE

Support

MANITOBA

Undecided

MARYLAND

Support

MICHIGAN

Support

MINNESOTA

Support

MISSOURI

Support

FTPBP #5-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Oppose

We agree with the concept of uniformity, however we believe it will add a layer of complexity for our carriers and is contrary to the method established by the Canadian Federal Government.

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

We agree this will at least provide consistency in the methodology used. The differences with the Canadian Federal government is not going to change so it is better to go to a common approach.

ONTARIO

Undecided

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Oppose

Quebec has same reasons as New Brunswick.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

WASHINGTON

Oppose

Washington cannot support this ballot until we have a state standard established.

FTPBP #5-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 11
Oppose: 4
Undecided: 1

ALBERTA

Oppose

We support the use of standard conversion factors. However, we continue to have concerns in reporting LNG using energy equivalent measures when all other types of fuel are reported in dollar per gallon, or dollar per litre.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

There are three different units of measures being used for sales of LNG (i.e., straight gallons, diesel gallon equivalents and kilograms). Without LNG conversion factors and a common reporting methodology it is impossible to ensure consistent tax reporting and distribution of taxes between IFTA jurisdictions.

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Undecided

MARYLAND

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Oppose

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

LNG as a fuel source is no longer theoretical and without a standard measurement, product reporting will be inconsistent and tax inaccurately apportioned. We understand the concerns in appearing to overstep jurisdictional sovereignty but also recognize this proposed measurement is specifically for the purpose of transmitting a proportional tax value within the confines of IFTA reporting.

OREGON

Oppose

FTPBP #5-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Oppose

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

STAKEHOLDERS

ATA Robert Pitcher
Strongly supports this ballot.

This proposal represents unfinished business for IFTA in the area of reporting the use of natural gas. Two years ago, the IFTA membership adopted a standard conversion factor for reporting compressed natural gas (CNG). Although the use of CNG in qualified motor vehicles across jurisdictional lines is not yet common, it is increasing rapidly, and it was clear to the membership that a uniform conversion factor for CNG - which cannot be measured in liquid gallons or liters, since it is not a liquid – was necessary if fuel use tax was to be successfully imposed. An energy equivalent standard was chosen for IFTA because that's the way CNG is commonly sold for highway use. IFTA's CNG standard does not affect any jurisdiction's tax rate; it is required solely for IFTA reporting, not for other purposes.

The standard for liquefied natural gas (LNG) proposed by this ballot is similar in concept. The use of LNG across state and provincial lines is also at a low level, but increasing rapidly and, like CNG, although for different reasons, LNG cannot be measured directly in gallons or liters – it's too cold for volumetric meters to work. Instead, LNG must be measured by weight (mass). Once again, an energy equivalent conversion standard is proposed for LNG, as it was for CNG, because that's how LNG for highway use is being sold. And, once again, the adoption of the proposed standard for LNG will not affect any jurisdiction's tax rate or its ability to change that rate – it is only for IFTA reporting purposes.

It should be noted that about half of the states, as well as the U.S. federal government, have adopted for their taxation of LNG the proposal contained in this ballot proposal.

VERMONT

Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #6-2015**

Sponsor

IFTA Program Compliance Review Committee

Date Submitted

April 10, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

Upon passage

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

IFTA Articles of Agreement R1555 Compliance Matters

Subject

Disputes initiated by the Program Compliance Review Committee from findings of non-compliance in program compliance reviews.

History/Digest

When ballot #1-2009 passed it amended the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require the PCRC to recommend to the membership that a dispute be initiated against a member jurisdiction that: 1) has been found non-compliant on the subject articles of the governing documents following completion of the Program Compliance Review Process, including a follow-up and/or reassessment; and 2) has been issued a Final Determination Finding of Non-Compliance by the PCRC. Membership approved disputable items in R1555 to be R970, R1210, R1230, R1260, R1270, P1040, A310, A320, and A690.

Subsequently, the Program Compliance Review Committee was charged by the IFTA, Inc. Board of Trustees to complete a comprehensive review of the compliance review processes. The goal was to determine if the review process should be modified to better serve the membership in today's environment.

A sub-committee meeting of the Program Compliance Review Committee met in Chandler, AZ to discuss the charge by the IFTA Board of Directors. One point of discussion was to determine if the scope of the language in R1555 was adequate or needed to be expanded or narrowed based on the charge by the Board to the committee.

The sub-committee concluded that adding one section to R1555 would help to better meet IFTA, Inc.'s Mission Statement and Goals Adding R1310 LICENSEE AUDITS, would allow the PCR's to monitor one of the core beliefs of IFTA audits; auditing on behalf of all member jurisdictions and the audits completed determine if a carrier is compliant with not only the base jurisdiction's tax reporting requirement, but for all jurisdictions operated in.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require the PCRC to recommend to the membership that a dispute be initiated against a member jurisdiction that has been found non-compliant on the subject of Licensee Audits by not auditing on behalf of all member jurisdictions.

In addition to this this ballot, the PCRC will present to membership for approval an updated and streamlined Program Compliance Review Guide where reviews would focus on those specific sections found in R1555 that the membership felt were disputable. Each of the Sections outlined in the proposed R1555 are measurable and are currently reviewed by the PCR teams.

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

2
3 **ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT**

4
5 **R1500 MEMBERSHIP**

6
7 ***[SECTIONS R1505 THROUGH R1550 REMAIN UNCHANGED]***

8
9 **R1555 COMPLIANCE MATTERS**

10
11 **.100 Dispute Resolution Process**

12
13 Disputes concerning issues of compliance with the International Fuel Tax
14 Agreement may be resolved pursuant to the IFTA Dispute Resolution Process.
15 The IFTA Dispute Resolution Process may be utilized to resolve only:

16
17 .005 Compliance disputes between member jurisdictions;

18
19 .010 Compliance disputes between member jurisdictions and IFTA licensees
20 in those matters where no administrative remedy to the IFTA licensee is
21 available within the member jurisdiction involved in the dispute.

22 Compliance disputes subject to this section shall not include disputes
23 between member jurisdictions and IFTA licensees over matters of
24 substantive jurisdiction law, including but not limited to, laws governing
25 the imposition, assessment, and collection of jurisdiction motor fuel use
26 taxes collected pursuant to the International Fuel Tax Agreement; and

27
28 .015 Compliance matters where (i) the Program Compliance Review Process,
29 including follow-up and/or reassessment, has been completed; (ii) a Final
30 Determination Finding of Non-Compliance has been issued by the
31 Program Compliance Review Committee related to Sections, R970,
32 R1210, R1230, R1260, R1270, R1310, P1040, A310, A320, or A690;
33 and (iii) a recommendation for initiation of a dispute from the Program
34 Compliance Review Committee has been approved by the member
35 jurisdictions as defined in Article R1555.300.

36
37 **.200 Submission of a Final Determination Finding of Non-Compliance to the**
38 **Membership**

39
40 A Final Determination Finding of Non-Compliance issued by the Program
41 Compliance Review Committee related to Sections, R970, R1210, R1230,
42 R1260, R1270, R1310, P1040, A310, A320, or A690 shall be submitted to the
43 membership to determine whether a dispute will be initiated.

44
45
46 ***[SUB-SECTIONS .300 AND .400 REMAIN UNCHANGED]***

47

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 6-2015
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	1		1	
NEW YORK		1		1
NEWFOUNDLAND	1		1	
NORTH CAROLINA	1		1	
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO	1		1	
OKLAHOMA		1		1
ONTARIO				
OREGON		1		1
PENNSYLVANIA		1		1
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1		1	
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 6-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
TEXAS	1		1	
UTAH		1		1
VERMONT	1		1	
VIRGINIA	1		1	
WASHINGTON	1		1	
<i>WEST VIRGINIA</i>				
WISCONSIN	1		1	
WYOMING	1		1	
TOTALS	44	10	44	10

Bold font in the voting total columns 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: Upon Passage - March 25, 2016**

LANGUAGE:

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

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **10**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

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

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **10**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **3**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Articles of Agreement to require the PCRC to recommend to the membership that a dispute be initiated against a member jurisdiction that has been found non-compliant on the subject of Licensee Audits by not auditing on behalf of all member jurisdictions.

FTPBP #6-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 15
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 10

ALABAMA
Support

ALBERTA
Undecided

We agree with Nebraska and Kansas.

ARKANSAS
Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA
Support

CONNECTICUT
Support

The subject article (R1310) is a core provision of cooperative administration through this Agreement. A jurisdiction that does not audit on behalf of its fellow members should be held accountable if it (the non-compliant jurisdiction) fails to bring itself into compliance. Member jurisdictions rely on base jurisdictions to protect their revenue stream through compliance programs including audits. Failure to do so undermines the purpose of the Agreement.

ILLINOIS
Support

IOWA
Support

Appears to further clarify audits.

KANSAS
Undecided

In addition to Nebraska's comments. The ballot is too 'open' ended and criteria needs to be established, regarding what would be considered as 'not auditing on behalf of all jurisdictions'. To what severity, would it take, before a dispute is initiated?

MAINE
Support

MANITOBA
Undecided

FTPBP #6-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

MICHIGAN

Undecided

MINNESOTA

Undecided

This is a very subjective issue due to the fact that the governing documents do not define what is meant by the statement "audit on behalf of all jurisdictions" In addition, this change may be premature based on the pending outcome of the 2014 Proposed ballot #3.

MISSOURI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Undecided

Nebraska is undecided but leaning more towards opposition than support. There was concern when the original ballot #1-2009 was passed (the ballot that outlined the process for the PCRC to recommend to the membership that a dispute for non-compliance be brought) that the IFTA community needed to be prudent when affording a committee the same privileges as a jurisdiction when it came to disputes. Those arguments still ring true today. If you haven't done so, I recommend reading the history/digest associated with ballot#1-2009.

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Undecided

We would echo Nebraska's comments.

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Undecided

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

FTPBP #6-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

QUEBEC

Undecided

Quebec needs more clarification.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

WASHINGTON

Support

WEST VIRGINIA

Oppose

FTPBP #6-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 8
Oppose: 1
Undecided: 6

ALBERTA

Undecided

Alberta has the same comments as Ontario.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Undecided

MARYLAND

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Undecided

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Undecided

It's hard to ascertain from the ballot narrative exactly why there is a need to add this particular provision to the numerous options presently available to the PCRC for this purpose. ON echoes the comment previously posted by KS and question what exactly is meant by "not auditing on behalf of all member jurisdictions."

OREGON

Oppose

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Undecided

RHODE ISLAND

Support

FTPBP #6-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

SASKATCHEWAN
Support

VERMONT
Support

FOR VOTE BY MARCH 24, 2016



**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL
FTFBP #7-2015**

Sponsor

IFTA Program Compliance Review Committee

Date Submitted

April 10, 2015

Proposed Effective Date

July 1, 2016

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

Audit Manual A600 THE AUDIT PROCESS

Subject

Requiring an interest charged thru date on the Licensee Audit Report and Interjurisdictional Audit Report

History/Digest

The Program Compliance Review Committee (Committee) is responsible for the oversight of the program compliance reviews that occur on a five-year cycle. The Program Compliance Review Team (Team) reviews all aspects of a Jurisdiction's IFTA Program and reports to the Committee its finding and non-compliance issues. During the review and any subsequent follow up or reassessment, one area has been noted by the Team and Committee that has deficiencies and could use strengthening to create better compliance. On multiple reviews the Team or Committee has needed to request additional information on the interest date on the audit as in many cases, the audit file, audit report, and interjurisdictional audit report all fail to show the interest date.

IFTA Articles of Agreement, R1230.300.010, required interest to be calculated on the "cumulative net balance owed to a jurisdiction until paid". Without an interest date present it becomes difficult for the Team or Committee to determine if a jurisdiction is calculating interest properly on audits.

Intent

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Audit Manual to require jurisdictions to include the Interest Charged Thru Date on the Audit Reports and Interjurisdictional Audit Reports they generate on the

completion of their audits. This proposed change will benefit the Licensee, Affected Jurisdictions, Team and Committee by providing better information on the reports.

The interest charged thru date would need to be recorded in these reports to be compliant but the location of where in the report the date is would be the responsibility of the jurisdictions. It could be placed into the narrative portion of the audit report or any supporting schedules generated.

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

2
3 **AUDIT MANUAL**

4
5 **A600 THE AUDIT PROCESS**

6
7 ***[SECTIONS A610 THROUGH A650 REMAIN UNCHANGED]***

8
9 ***A660 AUDIT REPORTS**

10
11 **.100 Licensee Audit Report**

12 A complete report documenting the audit must be prepared by the auditor and
13 shall contain, but not be limited to, the following information:

14
15 .005 Name and address of licensee;

16
17 .010 Account number;

18
19 .015 Audit period;

20
21 .020 Types of records audited;

22
23 .025 Description of audit techniques employed;

24
25 .030 Net distance adjustment;

26
27 .035 Net tax paid fuel purchases adjustment;

28
29 .040 MPG/KPL as reported;

30
31 .045 MPG/KPL as result of audit;

32
33 .050 Net fuel tax adjustment per jurisdiction;

34
35 .055 Remarks and recommendations; ~~and~~

36
37 .060 Signature of auditor or reviewing jurisdictional official and date, and

38
39 .070 Date through which interest has been computed.

40
41 **.200 Interjurisdictional Audit Report**

42
43 The base jurisdiction shall prepare an Interjurisdictional Audit Report utilizing a
44 layout similar to the example report forms contained in appendix A, and shall
45 contain, but not be limited to, the following information:

46
47 .005 name of base jurisdiction;

48
49 .010 name and address of licensee;

50
51 .015 Federal Employer Identification Number or equivalent;

52
53 .020 reported tax by jurisdiction;

55 .025 audited tax by jurisdiction;
56
57 .030 penalty;
58
59 .035 interest by jurisdiction; ~~and~~
60
61 .040 total by jurisdiction, and
62
63 .045 Date through which interest has been computed.
64

65 ***[SECTIONS A670 THROUGH A690 REMAIN UNCHANGED]***

NO REVISIONS FOLLOWING THE SECOND COMMENT PERIOD

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 7-2015
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	1		1	
NEW YORK	1		1	
NEWFOUNDLAND		1		1
NORTH CAROLINA	1			1
NORTH DAKOTA	1		1	
NOVA SCOTIA	1		1	
OHIO	1		1	
OKLAHOMA	1		1	
ONTARIO	1			1
OREGON	1		1	
PENNSYLVANIA	1		1	
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	1		1	
QUEBEC	1			1
RHODE ISLAND	1		1	
SASKATCHEWAN	1		1	

**IFTA FULL TRACK FINAL BALLOT PROPOSAL 7-2015
VOTING RESULTS**

JURISDICTION	LANGUAGE		EFFECTIVE DATE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOUTH CAROLINA	1		1	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1		1	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>				
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	55	1	47	9

Bold font in the voting total columns 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, 2016**

LANGUAGE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **55**

NUMBER OF "NO" VOTES: **1**

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVE DATE:

NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES: **47**

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

NUMBER OF VOTES NOT CAST: **2**

RESULT: PASSED

Ballot Intent:

The intent of this ballot is to amend the IFTA Audit Manual to require jurisdictions to include the Interest Charged Thru Date on the Audit Reports and Interjurisdictional Audit Reports they generate on the completion of their audits. This proposed change will benefit the Licensee, Affected Jurisdictions, Team and Committee by providing better information on the reports.

The interest charged thru date would need to be recorded in these reports to be compliant but the location of where in the report the date is would be the responsibility of the jurisdictions. It could be placed into the narrative portion of the audit report or any supporting schedules generated.

FTPBP #7-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

Support: 21
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 5

ALABAMA
Support

ALBERTA
Undecided

Alberta is undecided but tends more to oppose. Our interest calculation and reassessment processing is handled by an area other than the Audit branch. Information about the interest calculation is clearly provided on the notice of reassessment issued. It seems an unnecessary step to go back and have the information in the audit report when the information is provided in an official notice already.

ARKANSAS
Support

BRITISH COLUMBIA
Support

CONNECTICUT
Undecided

Connecticut already meets the criteria outlined in this proposal. However, we strongly recommend that the Proposed Effective Date be changed from July 1, 2016 to January 1, 2017. By doing so, we would not have two different standards within the same year subject to a Program Compliance Review.

ILLINOIS
Support

IOWA
Support

Appears to further clarify audits.

KANSAS
Support

MAINE
Support

MANITOBA
Support

MICHIGAN
Support

FTPBP #7-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

MINNESOTA

Undecided

The interest thru date is not static when the funds are transmitted using A690.600 Option 1, or if the audit is appealed. To clarify the proposal should address the situations in which the audit interest thru date changes. Consideration needs to be given as to system programming requirements.

MISSOURI

Support

MONTANA

Support

NEBRASKA

Support

NEVADA

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Support

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Undecided

Ontario supports the concept but would have to ensure there are no system limitations.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Undecided

Quebec needs a system development to respect this ballot.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

WASHINGTON

Support

FTPBP #7-2015
First Comment Period Ending June 8, 2015

WEST VIRGINIA
Support

FTPBP #7-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

Support: 12
Oppose: 0
Undecided: 3

ALBERTA

Undecided

Alberta continues to be undecided about the ballot and tends more to oppose. Our interest calculation and reassessment processing is handled by an area other than the Audit Branch. Information about the interest calculation is clearly provided on the notice of reassessment issued. It seems an unnecessary step to go back and have the information put on the audit report when the information is provided clearly in an official notice already.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Support

ILLINOIS

Support

MANITOBA

Support

MARYLAND

Support

NEW BRUNSWICK

Support

NORTH CAROLINA

Undecided

Should the proposed effective date be changed to 1/1/17 (per CT 1st comment period) about not having two different standards within the same year subject to a PCR?

NOVA SCOTIA

Support

ONTARIO

Support

There is merit in helping to clarify the method used for interest calculations arising from licensee audits. Although our jurisdiction is currently unable to include a "thru date" in ON audit reports, we will shortly be migrating to another platform allowing for this additional field.

We also support the QC comment in amending the effective date to the start of the calendar year.

OREGON

Support

FTPBP #7-2015
Second Comment Period Ending November 30, 2015

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Support

QUEBEC

Undecided

Need to change the proposed effective date from July 1st, 2016 to Jan.1st, 2017.

RHODE ISLAND

Support

SASKATCHEWAN

Support

VERMONT

Support