

From: Earley, Jr., Jimmy E.
To: Adams, Marcia S <Marcia.Adams@SCDMV.net>
Date: 4/7/2008 11:57:19 AM
Subject: FW: Questions re IFTA/placards

FYI

From: Earley, Jr., Jimmy E.
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 10:36 AM
To: 'jschilz@gov.sc.gov'
Cc: Lake, Steven
Subject: Questions re IFTA/placards

Jeff,

DOT sent a letter to members of the General Assembly asking for money to help offset the funds they are required to send to SCDMV to administer the IFTA program. They also stated that if funds could not be directed to DOT, that they would prefer to manage the program themselves.

Each year, DOT transfers the following to SCDMV:

- Approximately \$1,000,000 to administer the program
- Approximately \$5,000,000 to pay other states the fuel taxes that we owe based on all of the participating state's gas taxes and the IFTA program formula for tax distribution.

Marcia and Steven Lake pulled all the facts and figures for the program and met with Representative Annette Young and a DOT employee – their legislative liaison I think.

They explained that the vast majority of the \$1 million that we receive from DOT to administer the program is used to audit the program (trucking companies and their records of fuel purchases and consumption). These audits are required and must be conducted no matter who manages the program.

Only \$80 – \$90 thousand of the \$1 million is used by DMV to cover our administrative costs.

The \$5 million must be paid to other states no matter who manages the program. Our low fuel tax is one reason our state owes this money – if a trucking company buys fuel in SC and pays our tax rate then drives a significant number of miles in NC, then NC can recoup dollars from the IFTA program for wear and tear on their roads. The amount they receive is based in part on their (higher) gas tax.

Marcia and Steven provided alternatives for funding of the administrative costs, such as surcharges to be paid by the trucking companies or increasing other fees (plates/registrations). These options have been exercised in other states.

Rep Young, however, informed the group that she did not want to make any changes at this time.

Regarding the photos on the placards, we have not pursued this due to our inability to print a photo on the placard cardstock. We would have to invest in another type of printer that could handle that for us.

Also, we have talked at length about how an officer would use the photo to better enforce handicap parking laws. The only opportunity an officer would have to use the photo is when the driver and passengers are present to park the car or leave the parking space.

The photo on a placard in an empty car is of no value. Some may even feel that it is a security issue.

We can envision scenarios when a driver is transporting a handicap passenger who may be in a doctor's office/hospital/etc. when the driver parks or retrieves the car.

For these reasons we have not pursued a plan to put the photo on the placard.

Hope this helps – let me know if you have any questions.