

**From:** Devlin, Lotte  
**To:** Parks, Beth S <Beth.Parks@SCDMV.net>  
Adams, Marcia S <Marcia.Adams@SCDMV.net>  
**CC:** Valenta, Val <Val.Valenta@scdmv.net>  
**Date:** 3/8/2006 3:45:29 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Rick Brundrett's Questions

---

here's my crack at the responses where I can make them.

Lotte Devlin  
Policy and Planning Administrator  
SC Department of Motor Vehicles  
Office: 803.896.4879  
Mobile: 803.609.4852  
Fax: 803.896.9979  
P.O. Box 1498  
Blythewood, SC 29016

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

**From:** Parks, Beth S  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 08, 2006 3:07 PM  
**To:** Devlin, Lotte; Adams, Marcia S  
**Cc:** Valenta, Val  
**Subject:** Rick Brundrett's Questions

Rick wants to do a follow up story this week. He said he didn't know we were notifying law enforcement and that we should have told him. He said he thought no one was contacting them and that's why Judge Kittrell volunteered to contact them. Basically, he's worried about the editorial that will go out on Saturday. I need to leave early this afternoon so I told him it would probably be tomorrow before we got back to him. Here's what he wants to know now:

1) When did DMV start contacting law enforcement?

We began notifying them 2/10/06 in for those cases where we had enough information to do so. **On 2/23/06, we started notifying all of them. [Devlin, Lotte]** I wouldn't give any other date than the 2/10 date.... if he specifically asks when we started notifying all of them we can say so, but it could just open up more questions. His question was when did we START contacting LE.

2) How many officers have we contacted?

Mike said we had notified 427 so far.

3) What types of cases are we notifying officers about? **[Devlin, Lotte]** Since we started notifying law enforcement, we're notifying them whenever we receive notice from the ALC of a hearing. Legal, Please verify. Regular hearings? Appeals? Only the ones that were dismissed?

4) How many appeals have we filed to date and do we have any hearing dates **[Devlin, Lotte]** for those appeals? **[Devlin, Lotte]** Need some additional information here.

He didn't ask the following questions, but I think we should be prepared to answer them. I'm just trying to anticipate some of his questions.

5) Why did DMV wait so long to contact law enforcement? **[Devlin, Lotte]** At first we didn't know law enforcement wasn't being notified. We assumed that the ALC staff would notify them, just as they had done when they were with DMV. When we discovered that law enforcement wasn't being notified, we filed numerous legal motions and appeals to allow cases to be reheard or continued so that law enforcement could be present. When ALC did not respond to our motions, DMV began notifying officers of hearing dates. **[Devlin, Lotte]** this is a direct quote from our oped.

6) Where do things stand now between us and ALC?

**[Devlin, Lotte]** We haven't received any notification from ALC that they are notifying law enforcement.  
**[Devlin, Lotte]** We continue to try to work with them to resolve any outstanding issues.

7) We said the ALC didn't respond to our motions. We should be prepared to discuss what the motions were about and if we know why they didn't respond to us. **[Devlin, Lotte]** The short version: we wanted to allow officers to testify, so used different motions, depending on whether the hearing had already been held or not. We don't know why they did not respond to some of our motions. The Long Version: MV filed a motion for reconsideration for cases that had been dismissed because the officer failed to appear for the hearing. When we received no response to these motions for reconsideration, we appealed those cases in which we could determine that the officer was not notified. Also, DMV filed Motions for Continuance in those cases in which the hearing had not yet been held, to allow DMV to notify the officer. To date, the ALC has denied 129 of these motions for continuance.

**Beth Parks**  
**SCDMV Communications**  
**(803) 896-8198**