



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

held on April 05, 2007 at 10:00 am

at the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection Agency  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, South Conference, 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 MARCH 28, 2007.**

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. 9 <sup>th</sup> St. Reno, NV. 89512	DMV Website <a href="http://www.dmvnv.com">www.dmvnv.com</a>	

**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 10:03 am.
- B. Committee introductions took place along with the public that was present.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Connie Anderson, TMRP  
Daryl James, TMRP  
Jennifer Carr, NDEP  
John Koswan, CC-DAQEM  
Leif Anderson, NDOT  
Steven Grabski, Nevada Dept. Ag.

**INTERESTED PARTIES:**

Adele Malone, NDEP  
Dylan Shaver, NPM/CSA  
Emily Boysen, Fleet Solutions/Network Car  
Peter Krueger – NPM/CSA  
Ralph Felices, DMV/CED  
Randy White, CC-DAQEM  
Roxanne Johnson, USEPA – Ex-Officio (*Teleconferenced*)  
Steve Yarborough, Fleet Solutions  
Troy Dillard, DMV/CED

**2. Approval of the Agenda Order**

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

**3. Approval of minutes from 01/18/07.**

A. Minutes of January 18, 2007 were approved without any changes.

**4. OBDII Remote Emission Testing - Presentation**

A. Lloyd Nelson with the Department of Motor Vehicles introduced Steve Yarborough a distributor of the Network Car Unit. The Network Car unit is an OBDII continuous monitoring unit. Currently, other States are using continuous monitoring of OBDII as part of their I/M pilot programs and it is found that it holds a lot of merit. With consideration of the issues within the Nevada fleets, Lloyd felt that Networkcar Unit might is a topic of interest for the Committee to consider for the future of I/M and extended an invitation to Steve Yarborough to present an overview of Networkcar.

B. Representatives Steve Yarborough and Emily Boysen of Networkcar were present and gave the Committee a presentation on the Networkcar Unit. The company Networkcar is based out of San Diego, California. They have the patent on the GPS tracking device called Networkfleet. The device Networkfleet actually plugs into the on-board diagnostic board of the vehicle. This device monitors in real time the diagnostics of the emissions and the trouble codes data of the vehicle and then uploads the information. The information uploaded by this device is the same diagnostic information that is captured

during an emission test at an I/M emissions station. The uploaded information is then transmitted over a wireless network system, continuously monitoring the emissions of the vehicle. This device meets the EPA and Bar guidelines for I/M based emissions test. There is no cost to the State for implementation of this program or technology; it is funded by the vehicle owners and it may be used for emission credit trading.

- C. California piloted this program in two different formats, with the State of California's, Air Resource Board and the Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR). The State of California put into place a voluntary bi-ennial exemption program for the fleets that voluntarily equip their vehicles with this device. Currently, there are 2,765 vehicles voluntarily enrolled and equipped with the Networkfleet device. The BAR program that was piloted consisted of Nox reductions. It was targeted at the high mileage groups and was initially funded by a government grant. This program is no longer in effect.
- D. In the State of California, vehicles equipped with the On Board Monitoring Communications device are exempt from the bi-ennial smog program, provided the following conditions are met. (1) They sign an agreement with the communications provider. This is Network Fleet in San Diego. (2) Every vehicle equipped with the device remains informed by all on board. The reports collected by network fleet, are then transmitted to the State every 30 days. The results of the test are uploaded and any vehicle that has a malfunctioning light must be repaired within 45 days.
- E. The advantages this program provides to the industry and the clean air agencies include:
- **Increase in Driver Productivity:**
    - *Fleet Operators are able to:* Manage vehicles, anywhere and anytime
    - Locate closest vehicle to a new job
    - Verify vehicle stops and customer visits
    - Dispatch using fleet map and driving directions
  - **Reduce in Operating Costs:**
    - Eliminate after hours vehicle usage
    - Identify underutilized vehicles
    - Reduce vehicle idle time
    - Get MPG statistics
  - **Increase Safety and Security**
    - Get notified of vehicles exceeding speed limits
    - View speed history
    - Nationwide stolen vehicle recovery
    - Full roadside assistance package
  - **Simplified Vehicle Maintenance**
    - Get notified of problems ahead of time
    - Decrease downtime with maintenance reminders
    - Integrates with fleet management software
    - Remote smog checks programs which promotes clean air

- **Q. Lloyd** – Do you know if this is being used as part of evaluating the OBD II system effectiveness of a high mileage vehicle?
- **A. Emily** – I am not certain if the Federal Government is looking at this program. I know that California is obviously involved with it. We do have involvement with the Federal Government in a few different avenues. The heavy trucks obtain an emission status as well. So we are involved with the heavy truck and in trying to get this information to the Federal Government.
- **A. Steve** – Due to the additional features of the system like the tracking of productivity, State and City fleets are looking at using this unit within their fleets.
  
- **Q. Dennis R.** – What is the cost for one of these units?
- **A. Steve** – The retail price for one unit is \$525.00 along with an additional \$34.00 a month tracking fee.
  
- **Q. Ralph** – Aside from the emissions portion, are there any other benefits to it? Insurance benefits?
- **A. Steve** – Yes! The fleet in the handout I passed out called me last week very excited. They received a \$12,000.00 credit on their liability insurance because the fleet was able to prove to the insurance company a reduction in their vehicle speeds.
  
- **Q. Dennis R.** – Would you also be able to track the idle time of an engine?
- **A. Steve** – Yes! In the return investment calculator that is one of the demonstrations. By reducing idle time with the cost of fuel today, we have shown some great advances.
  
- **Q. Ralph** – How many objections are being received due to some obvious privacy issues?
- **A. Steve** – From the fleet operator/owner standpoint they are not tracking the individual, they are tracking their assets. If you have a lawn business or a carpet cleaning business, you have 30 to 50 thousand dollars invested in your trucks with equipment and tools. You have a right to know where that vehicle is and if it is being used for what you have designated it for. This stops not only unnecessary driving which again reduces emissions, but it really changes driver behavior. There is a snap shot in the report that shows what percent of time the vehicle is idling and speed percentages. Additionally, this program is voluntary.
  
- **Q. Troy** – After you install your module, how often is it reporting data on the vehicle?
- **A. Steve** – Every 2 minutes.
  
- **Q. Troy** – What is being reported to the State of California, BAR and is it coming from Networkcar?
- **A. Emily** – We are reporting a 45 day average and as long as the fleet remains within the program for emissions then they will never have to get a smog check. If a vehicle falls out of the program, Networkcar will send the fleet owner a letter, giving them 30 days to

correct the failing vehicle. If they do not fix the vehicle within that timeframe the DMV is notified that they are no longer in the program.

- **Q. Troy** – Under this test program is Networkcar actually monitoring whether the vehicle is repaired within the 45 day period as opposed to BAR?
- **A. Emily** – Yes, we receive the data and remove the non-compliant vehicle from the list that reports to BAR. That vehicle is then sent back into the program. Networkcar does everything. The communication is between Networkcar and the DMV.
  
- **Q. Troy** – What happens if they do not pay their bill?
- **A. Steve** – They get turned off, and they have to go and have their fleets emission tested.
  
- **Q. Troy** – What standards are being used for non-compliant vehicles?
- **A. Emily** – We use California’s Requirements.
  
- **Q. Glenn** – So you could tailor this to Nevada’s standards as well?
- **A. Steve & Emily** – Right.
  
- **Q. Glenn** – The information that you send to California, does it report directly to their VID, the Vehicle Information Database, or is it a hard copy that you send and they have to manually input?
- **A. Emily** – No, it is all sent electronically to their VID.
  
- **Q. Glenn** – Who does the programming for this device? How do you know that it is plugged into a particular vehicle?
- **A. Steve** – The Reseller does. The Reseller will go out and install the unit. Record the VIN and set up their webpage. I think that where you are going with that is if there is a possibility to manipulate the system through hooking this to another car? There probably is. It is probably no different then somebody trying to do a cold pipe.
  
- **Q. Glenn** – So how does it identify with that vehicle?
- **A. Emily** – The fleet manager is not going to be able to pull out one device and plug it into another vehicle without us knowing it. The odometer will be different, the year, make and model. There is probably a chance of potential fraud in this case, but it would be tough to do.
  
- **Q. Peter** – You know when we previously talked about doing a study on the fuel injection servicing, this might be a way to evaluate those fuel injection servicing techniques that our guys would like to do? This is just something that I would like for Dennis, Andy and the Committee to think about. This might be an answer to our I/M service statutes down the road? I would like to talk to Steve and maybe we can come up with a protocol that would use this technology and see what we can come up with?
- **Q. Dennis R.** – Is this something that could be implemented with our current system? If a fleet wanted to do this now, could it be done?
- **A. Troy** – I think that it would take at least some Regulatory change. I don’t know about Statute we would have to look at it. I can tell you that this is certainly on my list of wants

to look at for fleet purposes. As technology changes, it is my belief that the place to test it is in the fleet environment to determine if it is good or not.

- **Q. Glenn** – How does the State of California still collect their Annual Fee from these tests?
  - **A. Emily** – I think that it might be part of the registration. If it is separate in Nevada we can work with that. The intention is not to eliminate something that is necessary for your program. We could definitely build your own program around this.
  - **Q. Randy** – Steve, you mentioned credits? How is that working in California? Is it a mobile credit or a Federal credit or is it a local credit?
  - **A. Steve** – I am not familiar with how the programs are set up with the SIP credits. I just heard that in different conversations that they have received additional credits for this program. We will look into it, but I think that it is at the Federal level.
  - **Q. Sig** – Are there other States that have adopted this program?
  - **A. Emily** – Not yet. We are currently piloting with Maryland and New Jersey.
  - **Q. Peter** – Would it be possible for DMV to evaluate the Statute? As we all know time is of the essence here and if there is a Statute change that is needed then we are running out of time.
  - **A. Troy** – I would agree. We will look at the Statute. I believe that this falls under Regulations.
  - **Q. Randy** – What is the network downtime like? How often is it up and how often is it not? Are there any technical errors along those lines?
  - **A. Emily** – Upgrades are done 10 minutes at a time, once a quarter. The box/device however, is a store and forward device, if it is ever out of coverage the box stores the data up to 30 days. So you are never losing the data, you just may not have real time diagnostics for that small period of time.
  - **Q. Troy** – Steven, is the GPS tracking through GPS, or is it through the cell towers?
  - **A. Steve** – The GPS is tracking through satellite constantly. It records into the box and then it uploads the data every two minutes.
- F. The Department will review NRS and NAC to see if there is a prohibition restricting this type of program. If there is a prohibition then Regulatory process will have to move forward to expand the ability of using this unit as a viable, test project. Once a determination is made further exploration will be done to determine the potential to test within a government fleet.

## 5. Updating of Nevada Mobile Sources SIP

- A. An update is needed to the Nevada Mobile Sources SIP. Currently, the mobile source SIP contains portions that are really old while other portions are really new. The State has one Implementation Plan that is comprised of many small SIP's, and the I/M SIP's are

composed of the over all Nevada SIP. Adele Malone a planner with Air Quality works with the State Implementation Plans and presented an overview to the Committee of what has been approved in each of the non-attainment areas.

- In 1975/76, Nevada submitted Mobile Equipment Regulations out of the Air Quality Regulations to EPA. This was called the Mobile Equipment SIP. Statute was submitted along with it.
- In 1978, Nevada submitted an update. The update was to fulfill the new requirements imposed by amendments to the Clean Air Act. This submission of the new regulations and Statute became the Mobile Equipment SIP.
- In 1990, the Amendments of the Clean Air Act required Nevada to revise it's I/M Program. I/M Programs were required within non-attainment areas for certain criteria pollutants.
- The Mobile Equipment SIP was updated as required the submittal to EPA was named, I/M SIP. There was a change in it which made the SIP's different for Truckee and Clark County.
  - Truckee Meadows was required to develop a basic I/M program.
  - Clark County because of their non-attainment status was required to develop a low enhanced I/M Program.
- Submission was made in 1994 and 1996; however the old Mobile Equipment SIP is still in effect.
- Between 1994, 1996 and 2004 there was no EPA action on the submittals. Although, the Counties were following the programs that were submitted, it is neither federally approved nor enforceable.
- In effect today is the old mobile equipment SIP from 1978 which was approved in 1980/81 by EPA. Then in 2004 as part of the approval of Clark County's CO revision, the I/M SIP that was submitted in 1996 was approved. In order for EPA to approve the 1996 I/M SIP for Clark County or the Las Vegas Valley, submission of updated Regulations and Statute had to be made. The Statutes effective in 2001 and the February 2002 classification of Regulations were submitted. This is what is in effect in Clark County today. It is the belief that the NAC's and NRS's that were approved by EPA in 2004 supersede anything in the Mobile Equipment SIP which was from 1998. That determination is based on ongoing conversations that have been ongoing with EPA's legal council.
- Truckee Meadows SIP was submitted in 1994. EPA is working on it as part of the CO re-designation request that Washoe County has in with EPA.

Recently, EPA has requested NDEP to submit an update to the NAC's and the NRS's in support of the 1994, Truckee Meadow's I/M SIP. NDEP is currently putting that package together for submission to EPA; however the status at the moment is that:

- Truckee Meadows is being held to the approved 1978 Equipment SIP.
- Clark County is being held to the 1996 partially updated I/M SIP. The NAC's and the NRS's were updated but the SIP contains more than NAC's and NRS, and that is the part that was not updated.

Once Washoe County has their SIP approved, EPA is allowing the option of submitting the NAC and NRS updates to be incorporated by reference into the Clark County SIP.

B. The I/M SIP's apply in 2 counties in Nevada because of what is required by the Clean Air Act for non-attainment areas. The Counties, NDEP and this Committee needs to decide if it is necessary to go through the old 1994/96 I/M SIP's and see what else needs to be updated besides the NRS's and the NAC's. Additionally Adele Malone has requested contacts in each of the Counties for this requested update work

- **Q. Andy** – Adele, you said that you received a request to update the NAC's and NRS's for the Truckee Meadows CO SIP because of the emission request. I am curious of timing. Do you think that you would wait until the end of this legislative session in the case that there are any additional changes, or are you just going to go ahead and submit?
- **A. Adele** – I was going to go ahead and submit them as soon as possible; however I would ask your opinion on that? I was assuming that you would like to see some action on your CO SIP.
- **A. Andy** – I would. This is all very confusing, and you did a great job explaining it. I think that Randy w/Clark County, Adele with NDEP and I with Washoe County need to sit down and really go over this so we all have a better understanding.
- **Response from Sig w/NDEP** – Absolutely, it goes without saying that close coordination between the Counties, DMV and NDEP is what is needed to make this work.
  
- **Q. Andy** – Adele, the updating by reference to me seems a little weird. Are we doing this because once it is done, then the process becomes automatic?
- **A. Adele** – No, we are not updating by reference. The NAC's and the NRS's that we are going to submit for Truckee Meadows CO request may be incorporated by reference into the Clark County 1996 I/M SIP. Currently, Clark County has a 2002 version of the NAC's. Anytime afterward, we will have to go through a submittal process to revise the SIP. There is no automatic route.
  
- **Q. Roxanne** – Adele, you did a fine job explaining the complication between these 2 SIP's and addressing how outdated the Truckee Meadows SIP is. What is the plan for the old 1980 I/M SIP that we had approved? Were you saying that you planned to submit the NAC's and NRS's as soon as possible so that the Truckee Meadows SIP would be complete?
- **A. Adele** – Yes Roxanne. If you would like, I can send you some of the emails that I had kept between Jeff in your Legal Department and myself. I had asked him questions on what was happening with the Mobile Equipment SIP, and he informed me that it would be superceded in its entirety when the regulations were submitted.
  
- **Q. Roxanne** – Right, and is that all that we are currently waiting on?
- **A. Adele** – Yes.

## 6. Update on the Pollution Control Fund

- A. The pollution control fund continues to grow at a rate of 6% which is 2% over last year.
- **Q. Andy** – Troy, would we be able to expect a true-up in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter?

- A. Troy – If the account continues to grow at the 6%, which is 2% above the projected growth.

## **7. Discussion and Hearing of Excess Reserves for Washoe and Clark County**

- A. Washoe County District Health Department, Air Quality Management Division submitted an application for Grant Funds from the Pollution Control Fund – Excess Reserve in the amount of \$305,000.00 for fiscal year 2008. The requested funds will provide support for the following air quality projects:
  - ◆ Purchase ambient air quality monitoring equipment.
  - ◆ Provide resources for air quality training/travel.
  - ◆ Implement woodstove rebate program.
  - ◆ Fund public outreach activities; including smoking vehicle, idling reduction, and air quality events.
  - ◆ Implement diesel emission reduction projects.
  - ◆ Assist in the acquisition of a wood chipper/shredder, reducing open burning.
- B. Sig Jaunaraajs with NDEP stated it is a statutory requirement that the grant funds requested are used for improvement of air quality, which in his opinion he felt was met by Washoe County’s application. The Committee moved all in favor of Washoe County’s application for excess reserve funds from the Pollution Control account in the amount of \$305,000.00.
- C. Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management submitted an application for Grant Funds from the Pollution Control Fund – Excess Reserve in the amount of \$925,000.00 for fiscal year 2008. The requested funds will provide support for the following air quality projects:
  - ◆ Development and maintenance of a perpetual emissions inventory for criteria and hazardous pollutants.
  - ◆ Development of a PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan
  - ◆ Preparation of the CO Maintenance Plan.
  - ◆ Development of an Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP).
  - ◆ Continuance of Public Outreach, Information and Voluntary Participatory Programs promoting Clean Air Initiatives.
- D. Sig Jaunaraajs with NDEP stated once again that its statutory requirement for requested grant funds to be used for improvement of air quality, which in his opinion he felt was met by Clark County’s application. The Committee moved all in favor of Clark County’s application for excess reserve funds from the Pollution Control account in the amount of \$925,000.00.

## **8. Public Comment**

- A. Peter Krueger with NPM/CSA addressed one of Clark County’s clean air projects as outlined in their application. During Roberts overview it was stated that Clark County is looking at a gas can exchange component as part of their public outreach lawn equipment

exchange program in the fall of next year. Peter stated they do not work; the fuel does not come out. He requested that each member of the committee be required to use one first. Peter explained that the vent is in the nozzle, and you have to hold a portion of the nozzle. Steve Yarborough concurred with Peter. Steve was reselling these gas cans through his stations about 4 months ago and the public's response was not good. Steve received constant complaints on the gas cans because they do not work. He sent what he could back to the manufacturers. Sig with NDEP stated that the Federal EPA has proposed a rule making for mobile source air toxics, which is mainly for the reduction of benzene. Part of that rule making is to make these mobile fuel storage containers tighter so they don't emit. There will be improvement to those gas cans. When Clark County starts on this project they informed the public that they will research what is available and test them first.

- B. Glenn Smith with DMV would like for the Counties to consider placing some effort, time and resources within their clean air projects towards enforcement within the Local, Metro, City, County and State Law Enforcement Agencies for vehicles that evade the program. This could be as simple as just approaching the various traffic law enforcement agencies Statewide and actively encourage officers to enforce NRS 484.611.
- C. This Session Assembly Bill 173 sponsored by Assemblymen Hogan was introduced. The intent of this bill is to strengthen the idling restrictions for certain heavy duty motor vehicles. The Nevada Division of Environmental Protection made a commitment to the Assemblymen that this Committee will work with the Nevada Motor Transport on a Regulation change to bring Nevada's current idling restrictions in conformance with the national model idling law that was drafted by EPA. Sig requested that this item be placed as an ongoing agenda topic.
- D. Clark County's business office is responsible for the invoicing and reporting of grant funds. The office has been researching the reporting process with regards to the Federal EPA grant funds report. The office found that it is an acceptable practice to report or expense off indirect costs and there is a formula provided by the Federal Government for use. Clark County is additionally required to provide a quarterly report on the dedicated grants and an annual report on the excess reserve grants received from the pollution control account to the State as provided in NAC 445B. The County requested that they be able to use that same practice they found acceptable by the Federal Government when reporting to the State. The Department (DMV) explained that they only act as a funnel; the evaluation of the report and expenditures is done by LCB. The Department recommended that Clark County contact LCB for direction on appropriateness of that practice. Robert with Clark County stated he would contact LCB for that information and requested that this item be placed on the agenda for the next I/M Committee meeting.
- E. Vince Mow contacted the Department and offered to give a presentation to the Committee on Remote OBD. Lloyd Nelson requested that he placed on the next meetings agenda if there is interest from this Committee on following up on the continuous monitoring program. The Committee is interested in following up, and requested that Lloyd extend an invitation.

## **9. Next Meeting and Adjournment**

- A. The next I/M Advisory Committee meeting will be set for July 12<sup>th</sup>, in Reno. Sig Jaunarajs with NDEP will reserve a meeting location.
- B. The meeting adjourned at 11:40 pm.