

From: Adams, Marcia S.

To: Royal, Don <donroyal@scdps.net>

CC: Burgis, David <Burgis_David@scdps.state.sc.us>

Bales, Tejal <Bales_TejalJ@scdps.state.sc.us>

Date: 1/8/2002 9:40:49 AM

Subject: FW: BEA LETTER VARIANCE_FY2001 vs FY2002.xls

Attachments: BEA LETTER VARIANCE_FY2001 vs FY2002.xls

Don,

Tejal put together the attached spreadsheet showing the BEA general fund collections for FY 2001 and the collections so far for FY 2002. When you compare using only one month's data, the collections do seem to be lower. However, remember that in October and November last year DMV took responsibility for county revenue collections. We collected many county outstanding receivables beginning in October, which is the reason for the \$9.4 million in revenue collections for November, 2001. You can see that the collections level off again for December. The collections for the months January through March always seem abnormal because of the truck tags and the associated refunds. The timing for the accounting transactions are not always in the same months.

Tejal's spreadsheet shows average collections over a 12 month period last year to be \$4.2 million. So far this year, average collections are \$4.3 million. Therefore, collections are not lower when you look at the total annual collections and account for the change in county collections that occurred last fiscal year.

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

From: Bales, Tejal

Sent: Monday, January 07, 2002 3:20 PM

To: Adams, Marcia S.

Subject: BEA LETTER VARIANCE_FY2001 vs FY2002.xls