

JOHN J. BARTHELMES COMMISSIONER

State of New Hampshire

DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

33 HAZEN DR. CONCORD, NH 03305 603/271-2791

July 9, 2013

Her Excellency, Governor Margaret Wood Hassan and the Honorable Council State House Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Sole Source

Requested Action

Pursuant to MOP 150, Section III, authorize the Department of Safety, Division of Motor Vehicles to pay **sole source**, for National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) annual service and support, to the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) (VC# 175767 – P001) Arlington, Virginia, in an amount not to exceed \$11,624.00 effective upon Governor and Executive Council approval for the period of October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014. Funding source: 100% Highway Funds.

Funds are available in the FY2014 and FY2015 operating budgets with the authority to adjust between fiscal years through the Budget Office if needed and justified.

02-23-23-233015-23140000 Dept. of Safety 103-502664 Contracts for Operational Services

Div of Motor Vehicles

Certificate of Title

FY2014 \$8,718.00

FY2015 \$2,906.00

Explanation

This item is **sole source** is due to AAMVA being the only association in North America dedicated to providing motor vehicle services, support, communication, access to motor vehicle networks, access to motor vehicle databases and guidance to the motor vehicle agencies and departments for the jurisdictions in the United States and Canada. Motor vehicle agencies and departments throughout North America belong to AAMVA.

AAMVA provides the State of New Hampshire electronic access to several databases including Social Security On-Line Verification (SSOLV), Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS), National Driver Register (NDR), National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) (refer to Title 49 Chapter 305 attached), and Commercial Driver License Information System (CDLIS), which is part of the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act (MCSIA). The NMVTIS tracks branded vehicles and is designed to protect consumers from fraud and unsafe vehicles and to keep stolen vehicles from being resold. NMVTIS is also a tool that assists states and law enforcement in deterring and preventing title fraud and other crimes.

Respectfully submitted,

Commissioner of Safety

TDD ACCESS: RELAY NH 1-800-735-2964



American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators

MEMO

TO: Chief Motor Vehicle Administrators

Chief Law Enforcement Administrators

FROM: Neil D. Schuster, AAMVA President & CEO

DATE: September 28, 2012

RE: Notification of NMVTIS State Fees for FY 2014

As part of our message in last year's notification regarding NMVTIS State Fees, I indicated that further Department of Justice (DOJ) grant funding was not expected beyond FY 2012. As a result, all states will begin receiving monthly invoices for NMVTIS State Fees, effective October 1, 2012.

In support of state budget planning cycles and in accordance with the NMVTIS regulations which require twelve months advance notification of NMVTIS state fees, this memo serves to inform you of NMVTIS State Fees for FY 2014, effective October 1, 2013.

The FY 2014 fees are calculated using the same model approved by DOJ for FY 2012. The model remains consistent with discussions held at our regional conferences during 2011 and meetings with the AAMVA Board of Directors. Key tenets of NMVTIS fees include:

- State fees will cover a maximum 50% of total NMVTIS operational costs.
- An equitable 51-tier structure, calculated by each state's number of registered vehicles (as reported by jurisdictions to the Federal Highway Administration) as a percentage of the total U.S. registered vehicle population, assigns each state a percentage of responsibility from the total system operating costs.
- The remaining 50% of operating costs will be covered by a combination of other sources of funding (including program income) and/or AAMVA funds.
- States in compliance with NMVTIS will receive a 50% credit of the revenue collected by AAMVA for each consumer access transaction that results in data returned for a VIN pointing to that state as the

4301 Wilson Blvd, Suite 400 • Arlington, VA 22203 • Tel 703.522.4200 • Fax 703.522.1553

www.aamva.org



American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators

current state of title. DOJ will make the determination whether a state is currently in compliance and, therefore, eligible to receive the applicable credit.

The calculations in the attached fee schedule are based on estimated costs and revenue as best predicted at the time of this notification. As the October 1, 2013 invoicing date approaches, AAMVA will refine these calculations based on updated data – which may include costs, revenue, and updated registered vehicle data as published by the Federal Highway Administration. Though these calculations may result in an adjustment to the actual dollar amount billed to each state, it will not change the model used to determine the fees.

As part of AAMVA's continuing effort to protect states and provide equitable cost sharing among parties, we continue to work with our partners to explore opportunities to generate new revenue for NMVTIS which have the potential to reduce or possibly eliminate future state user fees. AAMVA will continue to keep states informed of all developments relating to NMVTIS.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me or Patrice Aasmo (paasmo@aamva.org) at any time.

Thank you.

Attachment

4301 Wilson Blvd, Suite 400 • Arlington, VA 22203 • Tel 703.522.4200 • Fax 703.522.1553

www.aamva.org

NMVTIS 2014 State Fees

Based on \$2,500,000 cap on cost recovery via state fees

Sorted on 2010 Fee per registered vehicle

| _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 7 | n | 1 | n | מ | а | ta |

| | | 2010 Data | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| | | Registrations by State 1 | | State Fees @ 2.5M cap | |
| District of Columbia | | # of Vehicles | % | | |
| Wyoming 202,758 0.2% \$0.0189 5 Alaska 225,656 0.2% \$0.0189 5 Vermont 289,738 0.2% \$0.0189 5 North Dakota 336,420 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Montana 344,715 0.3% \$0.0189 5 South Dakota 401,5559 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 51 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 52 | Jurisdiction | Registered | Distribution | Registered | Total \$ |
| Alaska 225,656 0.2% \$0.0189 \$0 | District of Columbia | 155,701 | 0.1% | \$0.0189 | \$2,947 |
| Vermont 289,738 0.2% \$0.0189 5 North Dakota 336,420 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Montana 344,715 0.3% \$0.0189 5 South Dakota 401,559 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 5 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 52 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 52 | Wyoming | 202,758 | 0.2% | \$0.0189 | \$3,838 |
| North Dakota 336,420 0.3% \$0.0189 55 Montana 344,715 0.3% \$0.0189 55 South Dakota 401,559 0.3% \$0.0189 55 Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 55 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 55 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 55 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 55 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 51 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 51 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 52 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 52 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 52 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 53 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 53 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 53 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 54 Minnesota 1,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 54 Minnesota 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 54 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 54 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 54 Minnesota 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 55 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 55 Minnesota 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 57 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 57 | Alaska | 225,656 | 0.2% | \$0.0189 | \$4,271 |
| Montana 344,715 0.3% \$0.0189 5 South Dakota 401,559 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 51 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 52 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 52 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 52 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 52 < | Vermont | 289,738 | 0.2% | \$0.0189 | \$5,484 |
| South Dakota 401,559 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 5 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 5 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 51 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 51 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 51 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 51 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 51 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 52 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 52 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 52 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 52 <td>North Dakota</td> <td>336,420</td> <td>0.3%</td> <td>\$0.0189</td> <td>\$6,368</td> | North Dakota | 336,420 | 0.3% | \$0.0189 | \$6,368 |
| Delaware 426,890 0.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 | Montana | 344,715 | 0.3% | \$0.0189 | \$6,525 |
| Hawaii 443,104 0.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 \$5 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 \$5 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 \$5 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 | South Dakota | 401,559 | 0.3% | \$0.0189 | \$7,601 |
| Rhode Island 473,647 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3.0189 Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3.0189 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1.0222 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2.022 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2.022 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2.022 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2.022 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3.02 Kentucky 1,86 | Delaware | 426,890 | 0.3% | \$0.0189 | \$8,080 |
| Maine 512,379 0.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 \$1 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,843,4348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 | Hawaii | 443,104 | 0.3% | \$0.0189 | \$8,387 |
| Idaho 534,688 0.4% \$0.0189 \$1 New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 | Rhode Island | 473,647 | 0.4% | \$0.0189 | \$8,966 |
| New Hampshire 614,113 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189< | Maine | 512,379 | 0.4% | \$0.0189 | \$9,699 |
| Nevada 679,889 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 | Idaho | 534,688 | 0.4% | \$0.0189 | \$10,121 |
| New Mexico 686,226 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 <td>New Hampshire</td> <td>614,113</td> <td>0.5%</td> <td>\$0.0189</td> <td>\$11,624</td> | New Hampshire | 614,113 | 0.5% | \$0.0189 | \$11,624 |
| West Virginia 689,690 0.5% \$0.0189 \$1 Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$2 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 | Nevada | 679,889 | 0.5% | \$0.0189 | \$12,869 |
| Nebraska 757,354 0.6% \$0.0189 \$1 Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$4 Aliabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Misconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.018 | New Mexico | 686,226 | 0.5% | \$0.0189 | \$12,989 |
| Kansas 872,195 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 | West Virginia | 689,690 | 0.5% | \$0.0189 | \$13,055 |
| Arkansas 935,217 0.7% \$0.0189 \$1 Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,456,25 1.9% \$0 | Nebraska | 757,354 | 0.6% | \$0.0189 | \$14,336 |
| Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Misconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% <t< td=""><td>Kansas</td><td>872,195</td><td>0.7%</td><td>\$0.0189</td><td>\$16,510</td></t<> | Kansas | 872,195 | 0.7% | \$0.0189 | \$16,510 |
| Mississippi 1,131,075 0.9% \$0.0189 \$2 Utah 1,304,594 1.0% \$0.0189 \$2 Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Misconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 | Arkansas | 935,217 | 0.7% | \$0.0189 | \$17,702 |
| Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% <t< td=""><td>Mississippi</td><td>1,131,075</td><td>0.9%</td><td>\$0.0189</td><td>\$21,410</td></t<> | Mississippi | 1,131,075 | 0.9% | \$0.0189 | \$21,410 |
| Oregon 1,457,239 1.1% \$0.0189 \$2 Oklahoma 1,567,629 1.2% \$0.0189 \$2 Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% <t< td=""><td>Utah</td><td>1,304,594</td><td>1.0%</td><td>\$0.0189</td><td>\$24,694</td></t<> | Utah | 1,304,594 | 1.0% | \$0.0189 | \$24,694 |
| Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% | Oregon | | 1.1% | \$0.0189 | \$27,584 |
| Iowa 1,681,386 1.3% \$0.0189 \$3 Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% | Oklahoma | 1,567,629 | 1.2% | \$0.0189 | \$29,673 |
| Louisiana 1,854,348 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington ³ 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% | lowa | | 1.3% | \$0.0189 | \$31,827 |
| Kentucky 1,862,803 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,49,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,496,551 3.0% | Louisiana | | | | \$35,100 |
| Colorado 1,879,958 1.4% \$0.0189 \$3 Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1%< | Kentucky | | 1.4% | | \$35,261 |
| Connecticut 1,973,586 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington ³ 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia ³ 4,102,295 3.1 | Colorado | | 1.4% | \$0.0189 | \$35,585 |
| South Carolina 2,018,612 1.5% \$0.0189 \$3 Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington ³ 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia ³ 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan ³ 4,320,551 | Connecticut | | 1.5% | \$0.0189 | \$37,358 |
| Arizona 2,183,077 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | South Carolina | | 1.5% | \$0.0189 | \$38,210 |
| Alabama 2,194,004 1.7% \$0.0189 \$4 Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Arizona | | 1.7% | \$0.0189 | \$41,323 |
| Wisconsin 2,443,970 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carollina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Alabama | | 1.7% | \$0.0189 | \$41,530 |
| Minnesota 2,445,625 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Wisconsin | | 1.9% | \$0.0189 | \$46,261 |
| Missouri 2,570,428 1.9% \$0.0189 \$4 Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Minnesota | | 1.9% | \$0.0189 | \$46,293 |
| Maryland 2,576,329 2.0% \$0.0189 \$4 Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Missouri | | 1.9% | \$0.0189 | \$48,655 |
| Tennessee 2,712,117 2.1% \$0.0189 \$5 Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$8 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | | | | | \$48,767 |
| Indiana 2,960,290 2.2% \$0.0189 \$5 Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | - | | | | \$51,337 |
| Washington 3 3,080,386 2.3% \$0.0189 \$5 Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Indiana | | | | \$56,035 |
| Massachusetts 3,122,244 2.4% \$0.0189 \$5 North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | Washington 3 | | | | \$58,308 |
| North Carolina 3,249,804 2.5% \$0.0189 \$6 Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia ³ 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan ³ 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | | | | • | \$59,100 |
| Virginia 3,479,665 2.6% \$0.0189 \$6 New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | | | | | \$61,515 |
| New Jersey 3,926,249 3.0% \$0.0189 \$7 Georgia 3 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan 3 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | | | | | \$65,866 |
| Georgia ³ 4,102,295 3.1% \$0.0189 \$7 Michigan ³ 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | • | | | | \$74,319 |
| Michigan ³ 4,320,551 3.3% \$0.0189 \$8 | • | | | • | |
| - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | - | | | | \$77,651 |
| | - | | | | \$81,783 |
| | | | | | \$104,855 |
| -,,- | | | | - | \$106,720 |
| | | | | | \$107,936 |
| | | | | | \$135,792 |
| | | | | | \$148,976 |
| · | | 8,711,324 | 6.6% | \$0.0189 | \$164,894 |
| | California 3 | | 15.0% | \$0.0189 | \$374,010 |
| Total 132,074,281 100.0% \$2,50 | Total | 132,074,281 | 100.0% | | \$2,500,000 |

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration Highway Statistics 2010. State Motor Vehicle Registrations - 2010 for Automobiles
 Represents registered vehicle data provided by the state from 2008 at the request of DOJ since the federal data for these states for 2010 was determined to be an estimate

³ Represents registered vehicle data provided by the state from 2009 at the request of DOJ since the federal data for these states for 2010 was determined to be an estimate

Peter C. Hastings Commissioner

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

27 Hazen Dr., Concord, NH 03301 Fax: 603-271-1516 TDD Access: 1-800-735-2964 www.nh.gov/doit

July 30, 2013

John J. Barthelmes Commissioner Department of Safety 33 Hazen Drive Concord, NH 03305

Dear Commissioner Barthelmes:

This letter represents formal notification that the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) has approved your request for a contract with the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA), as described below and referenced as DOIT No. 2014-049.

The purpose of this contract is to pay for annual service and support in order to provide access to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS). Through NMVTIS AAMVA provides the State electronic access to several databases. The NMVTIS tracks branded vehicles and is designed to protect consumers from fraud and unsafe vehicles and to keep stolen vehicles from being resold. NMVTIS is also a tool that assists states and law enforcement in deterring and preventing title fraud and other crimes. The contract value is \$11,624, for the period from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014.

A copy of this letter should accompany the Department of Safety submission to the Governor and Executive Council for approval.

Peter C. Hastings

PCH/dcp DOS 2014-049

cc:

David Perry, Contracts Manager, DOIT, Bureau of Finance & Administration

Albert Sheldon, DOS IT Lead for DOIT