



**Minutes of Advisory Committee on
Control of Emissions from Motor Vehicles**

held on July 12, 2006 at 11:00 am

at the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection Agency
4th Floor, South Conference Room, 901 South Stewart St. Carson City, NV. 89701

These minutes are prepared in compliance with NRS 247.035. Text is in summarized rather than verbatim format. For complete contents, please refer to meeting tapes on file at the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles.

**THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED IN THE FOLLOWING
LOCATIONS ON JULY 06, 2006.**

DMV
555 Wright Way
Carson City, NV. 89711

Nevada
State Library
100 N. Stewart St.
Carson City, NV. 89701

Department of Motor
Vehicles
2701 E. Sahara
Las Vegas, NV. 89104

Clark County Department
of Air Quality
Management
500 Grand Central Pkwy
Las Vegas, NV. 89106

Department of Motor
Vehicles
305 Galletti Way
Reno, NV. 89512

Washoe County District
Health Department
1001 E. 9th St.
Reno, NV. 89512

DMV Website
www.dmvnv.com

1. Call to Order

- A. Chairman Andrew Goodrich called to order the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Control of Emissions from Motor Vehicles at 11:06 am.
- B. Committee introductions took place along with the public that was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Andy Goodrich, WC-AQMD – Chairman
Glenn Smith, DMV/CED
Lloyd Nelson, DMV/CED
Robert Tekniepe, CC-DAQEM
Sig Jaunarajs, NDEP-BAQ
Vernon Miller, Dept. Ag.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Cheng Shih, CC-DAQEM
Chet Sergent, NDEP
Connie Anderson, TMRP
Daryl James, TMRP
Dennis Ransel, CC-DAQEM
Dennis Taylor, NDOT
Jennifer Carr, NDEP
John Koswan, CC-DAQ
Leif Anderson, NDOT
Ralph Felices, DMV/CED
Roxanne Johnson, USEPA - Ex-Officio
Steven Grabski, Dept. Ag.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cleveland Dudley, NDOT
Daniel Inouye, WC-AQMD
Greg Cole, DMV/CED
Pat Mohn, NDOT
Peter Krueger, Nevada Emission Testers
Randy Tackett, NFADA
Ronald Levine, NMTA
Susie Kapahee, WC-AQMD
Thomas Lansford, DMV/CED
Troy Dillard, DMV/CED

2. Approval of the Agenda

A. The agenda was approved in the order it was prepared.

3. Approval of minutes from 04/05/06

A. Approval of the April 05, 2006 I/M Advisory Board meeting minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

4. Status Report on Alternative Fuels

A. Lloyd Nelson with the Department of Motor Vehicles explained to the Committee that he had this item removed from the agenda due to Department priorities. Lloyd has spent all of his efforts working on the Vehicle Information Database (VID), which is the Emission Programs top priority. Lloyd stated that the VID JAD sessions are near completion and this will free up some of his time. He should have an update for the Committee at the next meeting.

5. Discussion of Test (1G) and Test/Repair (2G) Station Requirements

- A. Andy Goodrich requested that the discussion of station requirements for 1G and 2G stations be placed on the agenda only as a discussion topic. Andy stated that he has heard a lot of talk about the possible introduction of Bills at the next Legislative Session for the amendment of the duties that are allowed under the two classified stations. Andy introduced Daniel Inouye, who is responsible for all of Washoe Counties I/M modeling to present Washoe Counties concerns as an Air Quality agency.
- B. Washoe County is in the process of having their I/M Program approved through EPA for the total SIP approval. Part that process is that EPA has developed a performance standard for I/M Programs and for an area to have an approved program their program must meet the equivalent. In CFR 40 part 51.352 it addresses test only and test and repair stations, along with centralized and decentralized which are equivalent. Washoe County has a decentralized hybrid program of test and test and repair stations. A certain amount of credit is received in the SIP for those test only stations. The credit is equivalent to what the basic performance standard is for an EPA program. Less credit is received for a test and repair station. The main test is centralized (Test Only) and decentralized (Test and Repair) for EPA. 100% I/M effectiveness credit is received for a centralized program and for a decentralized program EPA will basically accept a default as 50% I/M effectiveness. Washoe County is concerned that they are on the edge with what is allowed to be done at the test only stations and then the recent rumors of bills being drafted to add more services to the test only? Washoe County requested that the Industry allow them to get their SIP approved and into attainment before they start modifying the program.
- Q. Peter – Did I understand those numbers correctly? The 1G get 100% credit and the 2G gets 50% credit?
 - A. Daniel – With the mobile 6 models, there is not a lot of guidance from EPA. We are not given the exact amount of the credit that is allowed for test only and test/repair stations. What EPA has allowed is if you have a decentralized network they will allow 50% credit and that affects the overall numbers. Depending on the justifications. EPA could allow 100% credit and by default EPA will allow 50% for decentralized stations unless you are able to justify that it is more than 50% I/M effectiveness for the total program.
 - Q. Peter - Are you shooting for something greater than 50% for Washoe County?
 - A. Andy - Correct. Washoe County feels that 50% I/M effectiveness credit is very conservative and it is the default that EPA has allowed.
- C. Andy informed the Industry that if they are a hybrid mixed program or a test only station that can do more than testing then they do not qualify for the 100% credit unless the data or proof is provided that it is at least equal to EPA's standard level program as Clark County had done when they hired Parsons Engineering to come in and do an analysis. Andy stated that if the Industry wanted to amend the Washoe County program to allow test only stations to do more services he feels that it should then be up to the Industry to

come up with the proof that it is at least equal to the performance standard so that it does not jeopardize the SIP.

- D. Peter Krueger with Nevada Emission Testers stated in response to Washoe Counties concerns that he was not in the position to comment on behalf of the whole Industry only the association that he represents. Peter referred to the I/M Meeting that was held six months back when the discussion arose about the desire to do fuel injection services. Peter has been provided with Regulation Part 480 and found that it is over 25 years old. He wanted to express to the Committee that the Industry has changed a lot in the last 25 years and was curious if that regulation was even relevant anymore. This is one of the things that his association has been looking at. Peter commented on the work that he had done with Washoe County in the past and stated that his association has always been up front and will continue to do so. Peter agreed that if the goal of the industry is to expand the services provided given the new realities of motor vehicles and the public, then it should be up to the Industry to demonstrate that. However, he is not able to do anything that Washoe County and I/M Committee does not vote for.
- E. Glenn Smith with the Department of Motor Vehicles informed the Committee that the original intent of the regulation was to separate the 1G from the 2G. This was to ensure that the 2G stations received the appropriate training and equipment to repair the vehicles. This was brought about by Clark Counties enhancement program. It took the unqualified technicians out of the 2G stations. Glenn is concerned with all of the holes that are getting shot into the regulation; he feels that it was not the original intent. Test only means test only. Andy concurred with Peter, that the Regulation was created over 25 years ago and many things have changed.
- F. Andy Suggested that Sig form a sub-committee for the purpose of discussion, study and recommendations back to the I/M Committee. Peter was in favor of the sub-committee but requested that it not be exercised until he was able to meet with his association and get a sense for some of the things that have been thrown out on the table.
- **Q.** Peter - I have a question. Is a performance standards value assigned through the modeling? What contributions do these different sources hold over the make?
 - **A.** Daniel - No, it is even simpler than that. Essentially, we need a modeling program called mobile 6. Daniel invited Peter to contact him for more details.
 - **Q.** Sig – Andy, do I understand you correctly? Washoe County would prefer that nothing happen until their I/M Sip is approved? And when might that be?
 - **A.** Andy & Daniel – Yes. We are preparing the basic I/M performance standards and if everything falls into place, which it should, we will be looking at August.
- G. Peter Krueger and some of the other Representatives of the industry approached NDEP several months back to see if they would go to EPA to see if it would be acceptable to make enhancements to the 1G stations. Jennifer Carr has done that however she was not present in the meeting. Sig will have meet with Jennifer and issue a letter back to the Industry and copy the Committee on EPA's response to the issue. One of the things that

did come out of the meeting was that the Industry needed to specifically communicate with the two counties because it is really the counties opinion that matters. Sig will work to keep the Counties connected with the Industry. Andy requested that an update on the 1G and 2G station requirements remain an agenda topic for the next couple of meetings.

6. Update on NAC Regulation Amendments.

- A. The Department of Motor Vehicles had three new Regulations adopted the 1st of June. Copies of the adopted regulations were mailed out to the emission stations on June 12th. The Regulations that were adopted by the Department are LCB files:
- **R065-05 – *Revisions of certain provisions governing operation of certain test stations. Revises provisions governing bonds and deposits applicable to certain test stations. Effective September 01, 2006.***
 - **R068-05 – *Revision of certain provisions governing the control of emissions. Effective September 01, 2006.***
 - **R050-06 – *Revision of provisions governing exhaust gas analyzers that are used to perform inspections of certain motor vehicles at test stations. Effective June 01, 2006.***
- B. The Department is currently working with LCB on three more amendments to NAC. These amendments were the result of the comprehensive review session and they are still in the development phase. Workshops and Hearings should be held sometime after August. The amendments that the Department is looking at making are:
- Currently, a 2G station if they meet certain criteria are able to operate up to 120 days in a calendar year after the loss of a 2G inspector. The Department is tightening that down to 60 days.
 - If a vehicle has failed the emission test a 2G inspector must do the repairs at a 2G facility.
 - The Department is eliminating the refund for when a station turns in the outdoor metal sign.
 - The addition of the Federal Employee/Employer identification (FEIN) number to all of the business licenses.
- C. The comprehensive review session was a review of regulations that impacted the Emission Control Program. Lloyd and Troy Dillard with the DMV would like to have the review and amendments to the Regulations done on an annual basis. This last review took over 2 years to complete. The problem was not the review but the changes. The Post Regulatory changes were so encompassing there were conflicts with every single change, whether it was with a portion of the Industry or the State. Then those conflicts would hold up the whole Regulation. The Department would like to deal with the problems now instead of putting everything together in a big packet where it causes a lot of issues.
- D. The Industry inquired about the outcome of the courtesy checks. Lloyd Nelson with the DMV called EPA and was informed that when it comes to initial testing the vehicle

cannot be pre-tested. If you have a vehicle that has failed the initial test and repairs have been made, there is nothing in the CFR's that prevent that. Peter requested that Lloyd publish an article to that affect in the next Clean Air Bulletin.

7. Discuss Current Nevada Administrative Code Requirements within Chapter 445B.590. Emission Waiver Requirements for OBDII Vehicles

- A. In past I/M Advisory meetings the issue has arose of should the State of Nevada allow for an OBDII waiver. The problem is there is inconsistency within NRS and NAC, which has caused inconsistency between Clark and Washoe County. Clark County does not provide for a waiver, where Washoe County does. Glenn Smith with the DMV briefed the Committee on how the current waiver procedure works in Washoe County. If a customer fails an emission test and has repairs done by a 2G station and the repairs did not repair the problem and the vehicle fails the retest. The Department recognizes the customer's attempt and they are eligible for a waiver. Glenn feels that if the waiver were excluded from the program it would be a big discredit to the program.
- B. The CFR's is a basic guideline for the I/M Program and everything outlined in CFR's pertaining to waivers the Department adheres to, however there are no guideline specifics for OBDII vehicles.
- C. There are guidelines for waivers in the SIP.
- D. EPA recognizes that it is difficult for States to eliminate the waiver option for OBD tested vehicles. EPA recommends that States consider at least modifying waiver requirements for such vehicles. EPA does not recommend an OBD II waiver, but they cannot tell a State to not allow one. Glenn also noted that there are other States that do allow for an OBD II waiver.
- E. If you use NRS, it is required to allow for a waiver. It is written in the SIP that we will provide a waiver to any vehicle that falls within certain testing procedures or within NRS 445B.770-445B.815. Then there is NAC, which excludes OBD vehicles. The reason that NAC excludes OBD vehicles is because NAC was written before OBD and it has not been updated because of the different viewpoints on the allowance of OBD waivers.
- F. It is understood that NRS supersedes NAC and NRS 445B.825 subsection 2 is not permissive. It states, "The Commission Shall provide for a Waiver," and that includes all vehicles subject to testing, which OBD does fall. The dollar amounts for repairs also need to be adjusted for consumer pricing index and if the counties agree it could remain at the minimum as it has been set in the past.
- G. Washoe and Clark County both raised a concern on how it will affect the waiver rates and is issuing the waivers going to affect the air quality. Glenn noted that currently Clark County does not issue OBD II waivers but in Washoe County it is less than 1%.

H. Since the Regulation belongs under NDEP, Debbie Shope will work with Sig on the language Amendments. Sig will proceed with drafted the language first. Workshops and Hearings will be held after. If there are changes, they will be made and he will move forward with taking it to the SEC.

8. Update on Washoe County Smoking Vehicle Public Information Program

A. The Washoe County Smoking Vehicle Programs has been in place since 1996. Susie Kapahee with Washoe County Air Management Department (WC-AQMD) has been working with this program for the past two years. The objective of the program was advertising to individuals who were currently in the vehicles observing smoking vehicles. The avenue of advertising used to target those individuals was radio, billboards and messages sent to cell phones. Over the years those methods of advertising changed and Television was used to reach the masses involved in the program. Once all avenues of advertising were completed a maintenance mode was put into place. Based on the gross ratings points (GRP) the most effective avenue of advertisement used was radio and billboards.

➤ **Q.** Troy – Was the option of use of cell phones explored?

➤ **A.** Susie – Yes, the option was explored but AT&T wanted to charge \$132,000.00 for the first year of the program. My understanding was it was a cost factor so they chose not to use that avenue.

➤ **Q.** Glenn – Susie, as I am looking at your graph I wanted to know if the spike in phone calls were in relation to when the money was being spent on advertising? Is it possible for that advertising or campaigning to be evened out throughout the year or even directed more into the Fall?

➤ **A.** Susie – Absolutely. One of the things that we were checking on this year is doing a little more public outreach in the Spring. One of the concerns I am hearing is that people look at this program as tattling on your neighbors. What I have found is that the public did not understand what happens when they call the 686-SMOG hotline. So we spent approximately \$25,000.00 earlier this year. We had an article ran in two Reno papers from May to June that explained what happened when you called and reported a smoking vehicle.

B. Andy Goodrich with WC-AQMD expressed to the Committee how important this program is. He stated that he has received a lot of flack from County Commissioners on spending money advertising another agencies program, but if you look at the data it is money well spent. Andy stated that one of the reasons that he had this item placed on the agenda is because there has been some interest expressed by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on taking over the program and continuing the public outreach. Washoe County has no reservations with that request, however they will continue to advocate that it needs to be done. Washoe County would also suggest that Clark County gets on board with this project.

- **Q.** Sig – If there is a member of this board that reports a vehicle, does it get special attention?
 - **A.** – Glenn – It specifically states in the Policy that it has to be Law Enforcement or an employee of the DMV.
 - **A.** – Troy – The reality behind it is that it just has not hit the priority level. If a case is taken to Hearing you need to have a witness to testify and that cannot be done if the caller is anonymous. We need for the callers to be willing to step forward and do that. That would have to be done in conjunction with the advertising to the general public. The reports that are currently being taken are anonymous and the public is abusing it. We are receiving calls on the same person 20 times over and that person is issued 20 different letters in the mail and there is nothing wrong with that persons vehicle, whoever is calling just does not like him. So in order for any action to take place we need to have a confirmed sighting and a witness to testify.
- C. The DMV has already put into the FY08-09 budget \$250,000.00 for advertising the Smoking Vehicle Program on a Statewide basis. The Department does realize that Washoe County is on a maintenance program and Clark County has not advertised this program for years. The Department receives 3 times the calls out of Washoe County then they receive out of Clark County and Clark Counties population is 3 times more. Based on those statistics the initial use of the money will need to go to Clark County for advertising and getting the program started. In the past this programs advertising has been paid for out of grant funding in Washoe County. Washoe County has already put in for their grant funding this year with the smoking vehicle program listed as a maintenance project, so the Department will not take over the program this year. The Department did request that Washoe County do not put in for grant funding on this project next year. The following year the Departments PIO will handle the State publication for this program if it is approved in FY08-09 budget.
- D. Troy informed both Washoe and Clark County that the Pollution Control account came in at about \$8.1 million, which is higher than the projections that were given to the Counties when they applied for their grant requests. The Counties requests should be going to IFC in September for approval. The rough figure for the Counties 4th quarter distribution will be \$292,000.00 for Clark County and \$74,000.00 for Washoe County.

9. Overview of I/M Solutions Conference

- A. Lloyd Nelson with DMV attended the I/M Solutions Conference held in St. Louis on May 21st through the 24th. There were 13 programs with 20 Representatives present at the Conference this year. One of the handouts that were received was the I/M jurisdiction report. It contained an overview of all of the programs. Lloyd felt that this was wonderful reference material and provided a copy for the whole Committee.
- B. Jim Linder from the EPA office of Transportation of Air Quality spent the first morning with us. He is taking the lead on a lot of the mobile sources and he wanted to know what the States priorities were. He talked on “moves” mobile modeling and OBD II testability issues. Jim informed us that he was working on updating the appendix of the OBD

document that EPA put out to better identify some of the problem vehicles that are still being encountered by the States.

C. Other highlights of the conference included:

- Oregon had a real interesting module on Program Re-Engineering and Expansion. The Representative gave a presentation on how to sell an emission program to the motoring public. One of the highlights from this presentation was when a member of the public has an emission test performed they are thanked for participating in the program and helping reduce the amount of pollution in the air. Oregon also presented statistics on how many tons of times pollutants are being eliminated in the air yearly.
 - Washington is beta testing an OBD self-service lane in the centralized lane. This allows a motorist to do his or her own OBD test by using a Kiosk. This program is still not firmed up but it is in the works.
 - Oregon is working with the OBD vehicles and RF frequency. Instead of going through their centralized station a person can elect to put a monitor on their vehicle and their emissions will automatically be reported. This program will be voluntary.
 - There was also a day of focus on the maintenance part of the I/M programs. There was a speaker from Delphi present and he stated in 2009-2010 the new cars are going to have 200 actuators and sensors built into them. He felt that it would be very important for I/M programs to be aware of this and start focusing on the repair aspect. Then there were trainers present to show what was available as far as training.
- **Q.** Peter – Lloyd will you put an article together for your next Clean Air Bulletin with regards on what you heard at the I/M Solutions Conference? I feel that the Industry needs to know that things are possibly going more towards repair. This will have a huge impact in investments and career decisions.
- **A.** Lloyd – Of course.
- **Q.** Sig – Lloyd was there any reflection on the last EPA meeting? All of the States with an I/M program was asked to put together a list of their 5 top complaints with EPA due to their lack of support of the I/M programs and OBD programs. DMV and NDEP put together a list along with all of the other States and a letter was sent to EPA. In May EPA held a meeting and Dennis Ransel was the only member of the Committee that was able to attend and the States issues were addressed. Then there was a letter issued by EPA from OTAC, which is the Office of Transportation and Air Quality, and they re-committed to the importance of I/M programs. They Committed to help the States with the OBD programs and they are going to put some more money into Clearinghouse to help lift the problems experienced with OBD. They are looking at expanding the Federal Advisory Committee (FACA), which looks over the OBD program. However, I am hearing from many States that EPA’s Commitment was less than enthusiastic at the meeting than from what might have been perceived from the letter that was issued.
- **A.** Lloyd – There was some mention by the States of still not feeling that there is support from EPA. Those comments were made towards Jim Linder with EPA.

10. Update on Vehicle Information Database

- A. The DMV received approval from the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to develop the Vehicle Information Database (VID) within the State's system. The funding requested in the amount of \$296,000.00 is to buy the additional hardware that is needed in addition to what already exists to accommodate the VID. Funding was also received to support the personnel to develop and maintain/enhance the VID and an IT consultant for only the development of the VID.
- B. The Department is currently in phase one of the project. There is a team of eight individuals working on developing the VID requirements document. This document is needed in order for the programmers to start programming. The Department is currently contracted with Verizon for the VID and it is the Departments goal to be able to make the transition from Verizon by April 30th when the contract expires. However, if the Departments goal is not met, they do have the option to extend the contract with Verizon for an additional year.
- C. With the new VID there will be no \$2.06 Electronic Transfer Fees (ET fees). This fee is used in the existing contract with Verizon. The motoring public pays this fee whenever they have an emission test done and that fee is sent to Verizon. The current contract for the VID costs the motoring public 3 million dollars a year. This was how Verizon was compensated. Now the cost for the VID is going to be coming out of the Pollution Control Account. The initial cost of \$296,000.00 is for the set up of the VID. Once the VID is developed there will only be the cost for the full time position coming out of the Pollution Control Account. Even though the \$2.06 ET is going away because that service is no longer needed that does not necessarily mean a lower emission test fee. The stations are still allowed to charge to the maximum amount.
- **Statement** - Peter – I just wanted to thank Troy Dillard with the DMV even though he had to leave. The Department has been working closely with the Industry and there is a lot more to be done, but I think that this is the best thing that could of happened to us. I feel that this is a wise decision and the Industry completely backs the Department with this project and we are looking forward to the second phase of the project where the Industry will be given the management tools that we have never had before.
- **Q.** Andy – Lloyd is the decision for the ET fee final? It is going away?
- **A.** Lloyd – Yes.
- **Statement** – Andy – I think it needs to be understood that even though you do not have to buy any more hardware here, there is still IT stuff. I know how things can go with IT and you have buy stuff every two years and you have to pay for the personnel to support that. Those funds are going to be coming out of the Pollution Control Account, which indirectly affects the counties and their ability to draw that money. Just putting it out there and if that decision is final, than it is final.

- **Q.** Robert – Where are the funds coming from for the continuation of the program? Will they be coming out of the Pollution Control Account? If it is coming out of the Pollution Control Account was it approved by IFC for the duration of the program?
- **A.** Lloyd – Yes.
- **Q.** Robert – Are there any other additional funding sources for the VID than the Pollution Control Account? If not, have you asked for any other additional funding?
- **A.** Lloyd – No.

11. Update on Clark County Voluntary Vehicle Repair Program

- A. The Clark County Voluntary Vehicle Repair Program is a new program that is funded through the Pollution Control Account Excess Reserve fund. Clark County earmarked \$375,000.00 of the approved excess reserve money for repairs and \$125,000.00 for the cost associated with the administration of the program through MACTEC.
- B. The focus of the program is to target 7 zip codes located in the Central portion of Las Vegas through public outreach, media and leaving flyers with other State Agencies to distribute. Even though any resident of Clark County is able to participate in the program, it has been found through various reports that the 7 targeted areas is where the highest pollutants are located.
- C. In order for a participant to be accepted into the program there are certain criteria's that have to be met. Some of the criteria are a failed emission test, proof of income and residency. The one criterion that the program is finding to be the most difficult for the participants to meet is the income criteria, which is set at 1.8%. Once an applicant is approved and they have received their eligibility certificate the participant takes their car to an approved station where repair estimates are provided electronically to and approved by MACTEC the automotive I/M specialists. Repairs are then made along with a follow-up emission test. The vehicle is then audited and tested again at the DMV lab. Payment is then made to the repair station upon acceptance of DMV audit/test. The parameters from the auditing standpoint are pretty tight; the vehicle must be double-checked. This is to ensure the integrity of the program.
- D. The average emission repair cost is \$400.00. The program allows \$650.00 for each vehicle repair. The participant is responsible for a \$35.00 Co-pay. The Co-pay is required to establish responsibility on the participant's part. If the repair costs were to exceed the maximum allotment of \$650.00 the participant is given the option to pay the difference. Even though the average repair cost of \$400.00 would qualify the vehicle for an emission waiver, the program would like to prevent that and help get the vehicle repaired and reduce the emissions in the air.
- E. The program is still looking for an additional 1,000 vehicles that need repairs within the next 12 months. To date the program has helped 45 qualified individuals. Of the vehicles through the program so far 2/3rds of the ones that have failed were pre-OBD and 4 out of 5 are hydrocarbon.

Task:

- Update on the Clark County Vehicle Repair Program was requested to be placed on the next meetings agenda.

12. Public Comments

- A. Ron Levine with NMTA stated that 3 Legislative Sessions ago this Committee on the Control of Emissions from the Department of Motor Vehicles endorsed a BDR as a group. He was curious to know if the Committee knew of any issues that may have arose between last session and or the upcoming that may be discussed as a group. Ron notified the Committee that EPA has made two recommendations, one on idling and another on model. He questioned the Committee to see if there was an appetite to put a BDR together as a group on these recommendations. Sig stated that he was interested in talking about the number of States with idling restrictions. EPA has put together a program to collect all of the States together to see if they could come up with the framework for a model of law. The law that they are putting together is different than that of Nevada's current law. Ron proposed that the Committee work together to make Nevada's law fit the model. Andy agreed that it would be a good idea to discuss the option of making the State law fit that of model with the Committee supporting it. Sig requested that an item be placed on the next meeting agenda for the review of the model law and compare and contrast of the County laws.
- B. Sig informed the Committee that there would be a Diesel Retrofit Workshop/Boot camp from October 3rd through the 4th in Las Vegas. Western Region Air Partnership (WRAP) is sponsoring the Diesel Retrofit Workshop and it is intended to target fleet managers, off-road equipment fleets and anyone else who may be interested in putting retrofit devices on diesels to reduce emissions. The first day will be geared towards technical side and the second day will be geared towards the Air Quality Representatives.

13. Next Meeting and adjournment

- A. The next I/M Advisory Committee meeting will be scheduled tentatively for Thursday, October 05, 2006 in Las Vegas.
- B. The meeting adjourned at 1:58 pm.