

**I-95 Corridor Coalition, CVO Working Group  
Credentialing TRC Meeting  
Minutes  
February 12, 1998  
Boston, Massachusetts**

The focus of the meeting was to provide an update on the FOT project status, discuss regional issues and initiatives and share information. This was the first update and meeting since the initial FOT work plan approval in November 1997.

**1. Credentialing FOT Update**

Each state verbally reported on the status of their Credentialing FOT. Since the last meeting where states presented their work plans, the majority of the states have begun the initial planning stages of their projects.

**Discussion Points**

Summarized by A.W. Quillian, each state had similar project themes:

- Focus on IRP
- As states involve carriers, their expectations are building
- Limited resources (staff and funds) and contracting problems
- Planning is critical
- Progress is slow
- Other entities need to be involved for success (federal agencies, Associations, etc.)

**Delaware - Tricia Faust, DMV**

Delaware hired a consultant to assist them with their FOT, which will focus primarily on IRP. To date, Delaware has completed Task 1, Inventory of Existing Systems, and held a kick-off meeting with Delaware carriers. A second meeting with the carriers to explain ITS and the FOTs is planned. In regard to barriers and needs, Delaware expressed a need for outreach to educate the carriers and a barrier with the IRS's 2290 Form requirement (basically the inability to submit an electronic form). Delaware has completed a survey, which will assist in determining the carriers that can participate.

**Massachusetts - David Lewis, RMV**

Massachusetts has not started their FOT although many other initiatives have been advanced, such as the IRP redevelopment system. Massachusetts will base their FOT on the experience they have gained from placing the automobile dealers on-line and their passenger vehicle services, which have included credit cards and electronic funds transfer. Massachusetts mentioned three potential barriers: (1)

Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV) staff turnover is high, requiring constant training, (2) automobile dealers need training, and (3) the IRS requirements for the 2290 (Massachusetts could permit renewal over the internet, if only the 2290 could be submitted electronically to the IRS).

**New Jersey** - Lee Feldman, DMV

New Jersey conducted an informal survey of their largest carriers, 15-18 in total, to determine if they use computers. New Jersey is still resolving internal contracting issues, has not been able to access funds even for travel, and consequently has not started the bulk of the project. New Jersey wants to work with the other FOT 8 states with project planning. Carriers have indicated that they will support the FOT, because they are tired of sending runners and would like to have the flexibility of self-issuance.

**New York** - Guido Quattrocchi, Department of Tax and Finance

New York is in the process of assembling their project team. Presently, they need two agencies to identify staff to work on the project. Once that is done, New York is ready to start.

**Pennsylvania** - Tom Zamboni, DOT

Pennsylvania DOT will offer initial application and renewal for IRP. This project is in its preliminary stages. To date, Pennsylvania has visited both CVISN states (Maryland and Virginia); began defining the parameters of the project; identified the equipment needs and made plans to survey carriers. Barriers include the reprioritization of information systems needs within the Department, which translates into extremely limited information systems support for the FOT. In addition, Pennsylvania does not have in-house software for the project.

## **2. Demonstrations/Presentations**

### **Keep Truckin' Along:** Massachusetts' internal electronic management of International Registration Plan

This new system streamlines current functions at the RMV and would permit remote location entry. The basis for developing this system was to:

- Allow for future flexibility, such as internet
- Eliminate duplication of effort when maintaining ALARS
- Incorporate carrier-maintained data

In developing the system, Massachusetts found that there was limited to no documentation on IRP. The project began in 1996 and has included six people full-time since July 1997, which at

times was increased to nine people. In developing the system, the project examined business processes and data requirements.

### **Discussion Points**

- In considering the internet for IRP interaction, Massachusetts could not place their existing system maintained by a contractor on the internet.
- Visual basic was the programming

### **Lessons Learned from a CVISN State on Credentialing, Virginia**

A.W. Quillian presented the main concept of CVISN for credentialing. This included the three distinct participants, who each have their own needs: state agencies (these typically include DMV and DOT); enforcement at the roadside; and carriers.

### **Discussion Points**

- Roadside enforcement does not differentiate between inter- and intrastate carriers
- CVIEW, the link between state credentialing agencies and roadside enforcement, is still under development. Intrastate carriers are not considered in the existing design.
- Concerns on how CVISN would address third-party providers
- IRS 2290 requirement places significant limitations on implementing electronic credentialing
- Standardized roadside enforcement information would permit officers, who are not specialized in motor carriers, to enforce trucks. In the past, officers may have let trucks with potential violations pass.

### **Massachusetts' Web Site and Internet Transactions**

Larry McConnell, Information Systems Director for Massachusetts RMV, presented aspects involved in web site development staff and time requirements, institutional arrangements, private provider agreements, and service provided over the internet.

### **3. FOT 8 Evaluations**

Nick Owens and Mark Flak, Transcore, discussed how the evaluations will support states' needs, use existing studies to support baseline information and minimize total collection effort, and use an evaluation criteria which will include the state's FOT work plan as a baseline.

### **4. Credentialing Visioning Session**

The Credentialing Visioning Session would have been better titled the "the reality session." During the session, three proposals were considered and the states discussed their needs.

## Proposals

**Fee Table** - The proposal would standardize the calculation of fees so that each state would no longer be responsible for deciphering and then calculating other state's complex fees for IRP. In order to participate in this project, each state would be required to submit their fees in a set program: visual basic, cobalt, or C++. The administration of the fee table has yet to be determined, and this pilot test could potentially include all of the five states participating in FOT 8 and any other state that expressed interest. Meeting participants expressed interest in the proposal.

### Next Steps

- Massachusetts will create a draft proposal for the electronic fee table
- Proposal will be forwarded to I-95 Corridor Coalition member states to comment
- After reviewing the proposal, Corridor states will decide, if they are interested in pursuing this issue. Agreement could mean a joint letter of intent or interest.

**Regional IRP** - LGS Group, Inc. proposed initiating a regional IRP. At the meeting, the participants were not interested in pursuing this proposal.

### Next Step

- No action will be taken.

**IRS Requirements for 2290** - States prepared to issue electronic credentials are stopped by the IRS 2290 requirements. The IRS has indicated that the development time to automate the 2290 will be another 2.5 years. Meeting participants shared their attempts to work with the IRS that were to no avail. The meeting participants thought a joint letter, or issue paper presented to FHWA, would assist in raising the issue and potentially affect a solution.

### Next Steps

- Summarize issue and previous attempts to resolve the issue (including coordinating with AAMVA's and RSIS' efforts) in a draft letter. This letter will represent the I-95 Corridor Coalition member agencies' views on the necessity of automating the 2290 and IRS function.
- Determine the process and timeline to receive the endorsement of the I-95 Executive and Steering Committees on the draft 2290 letter.

**Shared FOT and Electronic Credentialing Goals and Tasks** - During the meeting, a couple of states expressed concern about the progress made on the FOTs and that the states participating should work together to plan and share the work. The leadership requested that states interested in a joint project planning session and discussion about shared technology should submit a letter, either to the leadership or to Castle Rock on their interest.

## **Next Step**

- Interested states should send a letter indicating their interest and goals of a joint project planning session to the TRC Leadership or Castle Rock.