

**Regulatory Analysis**  
LSA Document #24-389**I. Description of Rule**

**a. History and Background of the Rule** – Since 2000, the Indiana Department of Revenue's Motor Carrier Division has operated the State's one stop shop for all commercial motor carrier needs. As part of this service to Hoosiers, the Department of Revenue has entered into several agreements in furtherance of its purpose. The State of Indiana is signatory to the International Registration Plan (IRP).

As background, the IRP was initially developed in the 1960s and early 1970s by representatives of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, with important input from representatives of the interstate motor carrier and truck rental and leasing industries. The IRP was conceived as a means of replacing the system of registration reciprocity which then prevailed, and which was rapidly becoming inadequate to meet the needs of expanding interstate and international commerce. With the related International Fuel Tax Agreement, the IRP is unique in that it is an interjurisdictional agreement administered and managed by the states and provinces that are its members without any significant federal involvement.

The IRP is a registration reciprocity agreement among states of the United States and provinces of Canada providing for payment of license fees on the basis of total distance operated in all jurisdictions. The unique feature of the IRP is that, even though license fees are paid to the various jurisdictions in which fleet vehicles are operated, only one license plate and one cab card is issued for each fleet vehicle when registered under the IRP. A fleet vehicle is known as an apportionable vehicle and such vehicle, so far as registration is concerned, may be operated both interjurisdictionally and intra-jurisdictionally.

The amount of the fees for a "trip permit" and a "hunter's permit" were established in 1987 by the Indiana Reciprocity Commission (a multi-member group that, amongst other things, entered into multi-state agreements), which permitted the BMV to charge a \$15 fee and a \$10 fee (respectively) for those permits. Responsibility in statute for these fees was transferred to the BMV in 1990 and then DOR in 1997. The amount of the fees has stayed the same since 1987.

These two permits are offered by all the states surrounding Indiana and the rates are all commensurate and have not increased in more than a decade.

**b. Scope of the Rule –**

The proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required.

**c. Statement of Need –**

The proposed rule is required under HEA 1623-2023 and [IC 4-22-2-19.6](#) to set forth the amount and the circumstances in which the fee for Trip permits and Hunter's permits is required.

**d. Statutory Authority for the Proposed Rule: [IC 6-8.1-3-3](#)****e. Fees, Fines, and Civil Penalties –**

The proposed rule neither increases nor decreases fees. The proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required, which have not changed since 1987.

**II. Fiscal Impact Analysis****a. Anticipated Effective Date of the Rule: January 1, 2025****b. Estimated Fiscal Impact on State and Local Government –**

The entire rule is new. There are no proposed additions, deletions, or amendments. The proposed rule does not

impact expenditures and revenues of State agencies or local government.

**c. Sources of Expenditures or Revenues Affected by the Rule –**

The entire rule is new. There are no proposed additions, deletions, or amendments. The proposed rule does not impact expenditures and revenues.

**III. Impacted Parties**

This will impact approximately twelve thousand one hundred and sixty-eight (12,168) motor carriers who are in Indiana temporarily in addition approximately five hundred (500) who are seeking loads and require temporary permits.

**IV. Changes in Proposed Rule**

The proposed rule does not change any agency practice. The proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required, which have not changed since 1987.

**V. Benefit Analysis**

**a. Estimate of Primary and Direct Benefits of the Rule –**

This rule provides guidance on the circumstances under which Trip permits and Hunter's permits are required. This rule gives certainty on both the applicability and non-applicability of these permits.

**b. Estimate of Secondary or Indirect Benefits of the Rule -**

There are no expected secondary or indirect benefits.

**c. Estimate of Any Cost Savings to Regulated Industries –**

This will provide minimal cost savings to potential permittees. Any expected savings would be from increased compliance, either from not acquiring unnecessary permits or a reduction of fines and penalties from failure to acquire a required permit.

**VI. Cost Analysis**

**a. Estimate of Compliance Costs for Regulated Entities –**

There is not any material expected compliance costs for regulated entities resulting from the proposed rule. The proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required, which have not changed since 1987. Any costs are already incurred or potentially incurred by the regulated entities.

**b. Estimate of Administrative Expenses Imposed by the Rules –**

There are no expected administrative costs for the Department of Revenue resulting from this proposed rule. The proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required, which have not changed since 1987. Any administrative costs necessary for these permits are already incurred by the Department.

**c. The fees, fines, and civil penalties analysis required by [IC 4-22-2-19.6](#) –**

The fees in this proposed rule are fees that have already been established. No portion of this proposed rule is seeking to impose a new or additional fee.

**d. If the implementation costs of the proposed rule are expected to exceed the threshold set in [IC 4-22-2-22.7\(c\)\(6\)](#) –**

The fees in this proposed rule are fees that have already been established. No portion of this fee is seeking to impose a new or additional fee. The combined implementation and compliance costs of the proposed rule are not

expected to exceed the threshold set in [IC 4-22-2-22.7\(c\)\(6\)](#).

**VII. Sources of Information:** None

**VIII. Regulatory Analysis –**

There are no additional costs or revenues associated with this proposed rule because the proposed rule puts into Administrative Code the amount of the permit fees as well as provide the circumstances in which these permit fees are required, which have not changed since 1987. This proposed rule is necessary for compliance with [IC 4-22-2-19.6](#), so the benefits outweigh the costs.

**IX. Contact Information of Staff to Answer Substantive Questions –**

Jeff Raney, Senior Counsel, Tax Policy, Indiana Department of Revenue, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, 317-232-7630, [jraney@dor.in.gov](mailto:jraney@dor.in.gov).

*Notice of First Public Comment Period with Proposed Rule:* [20241016-IR-045240389FNA](#)

*Notice of Determination Received:* September 23, 2024

*Posted: 10/16/2024 by Legislative Services Agency*

An [html](#) version of this document.