

From: Doerring, Lora Lee
To: Osmer, Jr., Thomas M. <Osmer_ThomasM@scdps.state.sc.us>
Bales, Tejal <Bales_TejalJ@scdps.state.sc.us>
CC: McWhorter, Laurence S. <McWhorter_LaurenceS@scdps.state.sc.us>
Matthews, Eugene H. <Matthews_EugeneH@scdps.state.sc.us>
Pappas, Carol S. <Pappas_CarolS@scdps.state.sc.us>
Burgis, David <Burgis_David@scdps.state.sc.us>
Adams, Marcia S. <Adams_MarciaS@scdps.state.sc.us>
Wengrow, Henry R. <Wengrow_HenryR@scdps.state.sc.us>
Date: 2/22/2001 8:31:01 AM
Subject: FW: AGENCY FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE FOR FY 99 BILL NO

Looks like we're in agreement then with the BEA's interpretation.

-----Original Message-----

From: Wengrow, Henry R.
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 5:03 PM
To: Osmer, Jr., Thomas M.; Doerring, Lora Lee
Cc: Bales, Tejal; Caldwell, John H.; Matthews, Eugene H.; McWhorter, Laurence S.; Pappas, Carol S.; Burgis, David; Adams, Marcia S.
Subject: RE: AGENCY FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE FOR FY 99 BILL NO

The 2001 appropriation act contains a proviso in Part 1B which says: notwithstanding any provision of Title 56 of the 1976 Code relating to the disposition of revenues, all revenues derived under Title 56 credited to the Department of Public Safety must be credited to the General Fund of the State, except for fees {data sets and video cameras and alcohol restricted licenses.]

Part II Section 98 amends 56-3-910 reserves certain fees for the Infrastructure Bank, sends all the other fees on a 20/80 split to DOT/General Fund and has what appears to be meaningless language which allows fees and penalties that are to be credited to a different account by law to still be credited to those accounts.

In essence they take away in part 1b what they gave in part II. So DPS gets nothing from DMV except revenue derived from the sale of information.

If this makes sense to any of you, then explain it to me.

Henry Ray

-----Original Message-----

From: Osmer, Jr., Thomas M.
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 4:37 PM
To: Doerring, Lora Lee
Cc: Bales, Tejal; Caldwell, John H.; Matthews, Eugene H.; McWhorter, Laurence S.; Wengrow, Henry R.; Pappas, Carol S.; Burgis, David; Adams, Marcia S.
Subject: RE: AGENCY FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE FOR FY 99 BILL NO

The BEA received their information from us on January 22, 2001. I gave Henry the law concerning this bill and he gave his interpretation of it. That was before Tejal and John Caldwell informed me of the Proviso 36.7. Henry is now looking at that proviso. So, as for as a reply to the SBO, they have been informed that we are waiting for complete interpretation of all laws and provisos concerning special fees for special tags.

-----Original Message-----

From: Doerring, Lora Lee
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Osmer, Jr., Thomas M.
Cc: Bales, Tejal; Caldwell, John H.; Matthews, Eugene H.; McWhorter, Laurence S.; Wengrow, Henry R.; Pappas, Carol S.
Subject: RE: AGENCY FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE FOR FY 99 BILL NO

Tom -- see attached. The BEA in the attached fiscal report disagrees with Henry's interpretation.

<< File: H3085 -- du plate bill.doc >>

-----Original Message-----

From: Osmer, Jr., Thomas M.
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2001 2:26 PM

To: Bales, Tejal; Caldwell, John H.
Cc: Doerring, Lora Lee; Matthews, Eugene; McWhorter, Laurence; Pappas, Carol; Royal, Don R.
Subject: AGENCY FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE FOR FY 99 BILL NO

Tejal,

This is in response to the e-mail from Henry Wengrow about the ducks unlimited bill. Read this addition at the bottom and let me know your response by e-mail.

<< File: #3085 Ducks Unlimited ammended version.doc >>