IFTA CAC MEETING -2/19/2009

Participants: Garry Hinkley, Debbie Meise, Jason DeGraf, Bill Kron, Pat Platt, Scott Miller, Scott Greenwalt, Gary Frohlick, Debbie Stuart, Chis Nelson

Randy Boone and Lonette Turner did not participate.

Last conference call – January 22, 2009.

JANUARY MINUTES – January CAC minutes were approved with no changes.

<u>BOARD MEEETING</u> – Scott Greenawalt gave a synopsis of the ITFA Inc. Board Meeting held in January. <u>Points of interest:</u> Ballot 1 passed. Funds netting has been sent to the Board for review. Financially IFTA, Inc. is solid, but investments have taken a hit.

Combined IFTA & IRP Compliance/Peer Reviews. This would require a ballot to change the review timeline to five years for IFTA reviews and IRP will change to regional reviews to coincide with IFTA reviews. IRP is looking at their Audit Manual and Procedures. IFTA wishes to do the same. Maybe both can work together to get Federal funding to get it up and going.

It is up to the jurisdictions if they want a combined review. The combined review may cut down on the amount of reviewers. The Clearinghouse may be able to help with the combined review. The IRP Clearinghouse is not good for statistical analysis. It is not as handy for reports as the IFTA Clearinghouse is. The five year review cycle may cause some heartache for jurisdictions who feel they are being shorted and want a review, but it should not be a problem on the whole. Jurisdictions can always go to the DRC if they want to.

<u>ITAC</u> - Scott Miller provided an update on the meeting. GPS devices for data collection are on the agenda. The Board has asked the ITAC to gather information on GPS devices reference what the practical capabilities are, the data they are providing and whether they are tamper proof. They may relieve truckers from manual recordkeeping. Most states are still requiring odometer reading to be kept.

APC - The Clearinghouse is on the agenda for the Law Enforcement & Managers Workshop. Plans are to have a breakout session regarding the Clearinghouse. They need someone to take the lead on presenting the breakout session. Bill is willing to help. Pat may be able to go to the meeting, but not sure at this time. Pat and Bill will put something together for the breakout session. Jason will need to help set something up. The Workshop will bee held in Durham, NC this year, hoping to draw attendees from the Northeast. Jurisdictions doing funds netting will be required to do the penny test. Jason is creating a webinar to show what the screens are and what is needed to do funds netting. It is not possible to conduct a webinar from the meeting, but may be able to do screenshots and a conference call. The webinar could be taped and played back for the breakout session. The APC has been advertising the meeting to try and gain more attendees. The Law Enforcement & Managers Workshop is still in the planning stages at this time.

NEXT ABM - Lonette is planning on addressing funds netting and the access agreement.

<u>FUNDS NETTING</u> - Jason has started running the net of all jurisdictions in the Clearinghouse. It has been out there for a couple of weeks now. He will do it every month.

<u>NLETS</u> – Nothing new to report. Scott M. will find out how many states are passing IFTA information to their CVIEW.

<u>UNCOLLECTIBLES</u> - Needs to be a reason code, because it is not a return type. Jason has been turning jurisdictions away from using the financial lines that the RPC uses for adjustments. The financial adjustment lines may have to be opened up for other jurisdictions to use. Gary F. sees no need to change the way things are today. As long as the information is there, there is no need to change. Idaho wanted to see a U code for uncollectibles. Table to next month and talk about then. Debbie M. wants to take a closer look.

<u>IDAHO – INPUT FOR DRAFT CLEARINGHOUSE AGREEMENT</u> – Idaho would like to add wording to penalize jurisdictions who miss the late funds due date for three consecutive months or a total of four months within the 12 month membership period. The process of taking jurisdictions out of the Clearinghouse and putting them back in will be messy. Jurisdictions may not want to rejoin the Clearinghouse. Jurisdictions would lose out on demographic data among other things from those jurisdictions denied access. There should be some penalty, perhaps allow them in but not to send data and give read only view. There will be an initial adjustment but it shouldn't be long before everyone is on board. We need to see how it works before we try to do something about it. Garry will respond in his Board Report that the Committee does not support this change.

CANADIAN JURISDICTIONS — Canadian jurisdictions are shifting toward the acceptance of the Clearinghouse. BC and AB have the same stance as in the past. AB is having problems with the privacy of information and is having system issues. BC needs a new IFTA system, so it will be two to three years out before they take part. MB is implementing a new system to include the Clearinghouse. ON is developing a new system and still has some concerns regarding money. They still have a problem with Ballot 1 and may want to adjust the language in the future. Perhaps they will join by the end of the year. NS had put forth an RFP for a new system, perhaps ACS for their IFTA and IRP processing system, and then the Clearinghouse will be a go for them. PE is building an in house system and plan to join in fiscal year 2009-2010. NL is interested and will pursue at some point. QC Andre is retiring and the incoming Commissioner seems interested in pursuing. SK implemented a new numbering system for transmittals in January 2009.

<u>REMAINING US JURISDICTIONS</u> – OK is having a problem with their vendor. IRP will be first and then IFTA and will probably not join until late 2010 or 2011. SC has no plans on joining the Clearinghouse. They are having budget issues and no Federal Funding available to them.

<u>CAC MEMBERSHIP</u> – During the next few months the CAC will be developing new tasks which will require sub-committees and will need to start recruiting new members. Ideas for new members include: provide two members from each vendor group or; go by regions or; one from

each system and each region. The CAC should probably be moved to a standing committee. The Board is the body to address this issue.

Next conference call will be March 19, 2009 at 11:00 a.m. EDT