

## **IFTA CAC MEETING 03/20/2009**

Participants: Lonette Turner, Jason DeGraf , Pat Platt , Scott Miller, Scott Greenawalt, Gary Frohlick, Randy Boone Debbie Stuart, Chris Nelson, Nikki Bachelder

Randy Boone, Debbie Meise and Bill Kron did not participate. Garry Hinkley entered near the end of the call.

Last conference call – February 19, 2009.

February Minutes –Second paragraph down (under Board Meeting) changed hand to handy. Minutes were approved with the one change.

ITAC – Scott M. said there was not a conference call this month.

Clearinghouse Access Agreement Comments – Idaho suggested having a code for uncollectibles. This code could be U or UC. A recommendation will need to be made to the Board, change the code table, and issue the new code. This may cause a problem for jurisdictions that do a reconciliation of distance vs. fuel. We may have a too narrow description of uncollectible. Partial payments may have been made on these. P1060 talks about including details on transmittals that are uncollectible. If a refund of money is done with an adjustment, the detail shows the reversal of the money. Many jurisdictions have systems that won't allow detailing distance/fuel without showing monies. The whole transaction would need to be reversed. This may get messy. If the uncollectible field is used, it will need to show if the money is netted and be included in the summary totals. If it's in the summary, it will be netted, but will want the detail. Will need to know the fuel type, etc. If there is a payment plan, trying to figure out partial miles and fuel would become too difficult. Maybe jurisdictions should not include uncollectibles in calculations. Will have the tax payer ID, period and type with the uncollectibles. Maybe the group is over thinking this. As long as the uncollectible is listed as uncollectible, the figures will be in the funds netting and the detail won't reconcile with it. Maybe use the adjustment fields on the left in RPC? Could list amount, reason, tax payer ID and if it was a credit or debit, stating it will not be in summary totals. Does this cause a problem for those jurisdictions not currently doing that? No one knows if the RPC will have difficulties. Maine uses the line item detail as a reversal now. PN is RPC funding only and does everything else in house. Deb S. will find out from Meg what the impact of this may be or what the best solution to this for the RPC is.

Idaho would like to have received verification as to what was uploaded. The jurisdictions are responsible for viewing and verifying the upload and what is in the upload. Maybe there should be something in the user manual telling jurisdictions verify information prior to funds netting date and instructions how to do so. It would be intensive for Jason to do a summary with total due and add up the line details. Maybe he can do a 1 page report with the total due. Maybe that can be emailed but Jason will have to think about this before deciding what to do. Maybe Jason can do an automated canned email telling the jurisdiction yes, upload is ok, or no, its not....that is pretty much

being done today. If can send an email, it will let the jurisdictions know when the upload was done and when it is out there. Jurisdictions need to remember that it is their data and their responsibility and we should not be babysitting.

Standard naming for each transmittal – have the funds netting period in name. There could be confusion depending on what time in the month the data comes in.

Access Agreement – need to start on a formal amendment and need to go over if there should be any changes. Garry H. thinks the RPC will be in favor in using a UC code in the details. Deb S. will find out and then we will make the decision. P1060 could be added to 6.1 or 6.2. 2.20 includes a definition of summary totals but might be good to include it in the uncollectible section since it talks about transmittals. We don't really know exactly what problem we are addressing. Lonette will send out a marked and a non-marked version of the agreement.

Arizona – Garry H. will call them, as their comments lead us to believe they do not get the concept.

Everyone was pleased with the number of “no comments”. That must mean that the jurisdictions understand the agreement.

Colorado – said it's a big deal to transmit files. This is a technical issue and they do not know how to automate. They currently are out of compliance. To be within compliance, the jurisdiction has to upload every 10 days. There has been an issue with Colorado for a long time. Lonette doesn't remember anything in the agreement that says there has to be daily uploads, but she will double check.

New York – Asks if a jurisdiction has read-only, does that mean that jurisdiction can not upload anything? Yes- that is what it means. So nothing would be sent to Oklahoma. They would need to go out and look on the Clearinghouse. This means that CH jurisdictions would not send paper transmittals to non CH jurisdictions.

New York does not want a limit on the number of late payments that can be made. This is not possible, as we do not have a way to carry them over to the next month if late.

The prorate screen is different every time it is accessed. If money is sent, it will be sent out no matter when in the month it was received. If money is sent in after the 2<sup>nd</sup> funding and distribution, then it will be sent back and the jurisdiction will have to mail out checks for what they owe. Contrary to NY's comments, this should not create 2 sets of books. If a jurisdiction ends up sending checks, it does not affect the clearinghouse. NY may not quite understand.

We cannot compare IFTA clearinghouse to the IRP clearinghouse as they are very different.

The IFTA, Inc. Attorney is looking at the final access agreement and will table the rest for the next call. Lonette will ask for approval to start the formal amendment on the access agreement.

Next month, the implementation plate and the time leading up to January 1<sup>st</sup> will be discussed. Education will be a big piece. There are not a lot of system changes. There will be internal process changes. Lonette will resend the test plan. Everyone will review the plan and make comments and suggestions. Gary F. will be going on vacation and will send Lonette his comments before doing so.

Next Meeting – The next conference call is scheduled to take place on April 16, 2009 at 11:00 a.m. EDT