## IFTA CAC MEETING – 6/5/2008

Participants: Garry Hinkley, Lonette Turner, Debbie Meise, Jason DeGraf, Bill Kron, Gary Frohlick, Scott Greenawalt, Pat Platt, Randy Boone, Scott Miller, Colleen Weed, Christopher Nelson, Debbie Stuart

Last conference call -4/24/2008

Funds Netting Ballot – Regarding the comments made on the first comment period for FTPBP #1-2008, Scott G. brought up Rollie Marr's (IL) comments about the problems they have had in the past regarding funds netting. Lonette will call Rollie and address his complaints. Right now the ballot has a proposed effective date of 'Upon Passage'. This is of concern to several jurisdictions that need to update and test their systems. It was agreed to change the proposed effective date to July 1, 2009. Should the ballot pass, it would toward the end of the year. The passage under Intent that states 'The intent of this ballot is to allow seven more days to process returns;' should be changed to 'seven more days to fund the obligation' or wording to that effect. Debbie M. will make the changes and present the revised ballot to the Board. It looks like NY has misinterpreted the ballot, in their comments. Lonette will look at the calendar reference NE (3) comment. The language may need to be changed to address this issue. It would probably be helpful if the draft calendar were attached to the ballot for the second comment period, slated for September. There will be a 45 day comment period. Lonette will make an outline of what should be addressed at the ABM presentation. Gary F., Pat, and Bill will take a piece and then make it a complete presentation, leaving the ballot for last. This should clear up jurisdiction concerns.

<u>Fund Netting – Penny Test</u> – Lonette and Debbie M. attended a meeting with the bank yesterday (6/4/2008) to learn about ACH. The bank process is very user friendly. As long as the funds are in the bank by closing time (6:00 PM Pacific Time) funds will be credited the next day. Lonette and Debbie need to go to the Fund Transfer training and then we will be ready to do the Penny Test. Overall it has been a good process and training is great. We should be ready for the penny test in a couple of weeks. If the Penny Test works, we should be able to do July transmittals and funding.

<u>Funds Netting Rules</u> – There were only a couple of issues regarding the rules. There are some typos that need to be corrected. Scott G: In 2.1.5 it says that late transmittals to the Clearinghouse will be held until the next month. Lonette: Yes, they would be posted with the next month's transmittal data. 3.1.6 addresses this issue.

<u>Information Gathering</u> – Jason would like to see some data concerning when jurisdictions are receiving payments from other jurisdictions for incoming and outgoing transmittals. This way, jurisdictions can see in black and white, when they are receiving payments now as opposed to receiving them within seven days.

<u>ITAC</u> – Scott M. provided an update from the ITAC Minutes. Minutes have been forwarded to CAC members. The Revoked DB use is slow. There are only a few members using the DB. There will be a pitch made at the ABM. ITAC is looking into a Task Force to work together to get a system available to roadside enforcement, whether it be the Clearinghouse, NLETS, SAFER, etc. Tim Adams (PRISM) will be conducting a survey of the IRP community for input. It is mostly just ideas at this point. Garry H. asked about the Service Providers Upload. He thinks it is a great idea. How is the EDI going to work? Scott M. stated that this has not been discussed yet. Garry H. suggested that the ITAC should be encouraged to go forward with the Service Provider Upload.

<u>Utah Issue</u> – UT is a member of POLK and is considering or will be considering a new IFTA system. UT currently supplies intrastate licensees to the Clearinghouse, both demographic and transmittal data. Can they continue to do so in the future? They currently send their intrastate data with a UF code. Garry H. suggested they not do this further stating that "We have tried so hard to get the data clean and correct, and UF is not a fuel type". If UT is allowed to do this then other jurisdictions will want to; then we run into needing bigger servers, higher costs, etc. Let UT know that their new vendor will not be able to send intrastate data to the Clearinghouse. Jurisdictions need to follow the definitions of what is allowed to upload.

<u>Surcharges</u> – ACS has updated their surcharge issue, but the total due is not adding up correctly, but it does not occur every time. The line detail does not equal the total due. Some are off by several thousand dollars. This is not happening to just the surcharge states. Jason has found that this is happening with IL and CO data. IL does not know what is happening and cannot find the problem. Jurisdictions are supplying summary totals (which are used for funds netting). The Summary Totals do not equal the Total Due. Jason will pick a period, go through all transmittals and create a report to compare Summary Total to Total Due. There are still several jurisdictions that need to address the surcharge issue.

<u>Policing</u> – The Clearinghouse needs to be policed. We need to look for things that are not right, so that we can keep on top of it. Perhaps reports could be generated for fuel types that do not match, etc. Think about what is important, that should be policed.

Next conference call scheduled for August 7, 2008 @ 11:00 AM eastern time.