



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

Held on April 15, 2008 at 10:00 am
At the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection,
4th Floor Conference Room, 901 S. 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 APRIL 09, 2008.**

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 th St. Reno, NV. 89512	DMV Website www.dmvnv.com	

1. Call to Order & Introductions

- A. Chairman Sig Jaunaraajs 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
- Daniel Inouye, WC-AQMD
- Dennis Ransel, CC-DAQEM
- Dennis Taylor, NDOT
- Glenn Smith, DMV/CED
- John Pietrzycki, DMV/CED
- Lloyd Nelson, DMV/CED
- Rebecca Cripe, NDEP-BAQP
- Robert Tekniepe, Ph.D., CC-DAQEM
- Roxanne Johnson, USEPA – Ex-Officio – Teleconferenced
- Sig Jaunaraajs, NDEP-BAQP - Chairman
- Steven Grabski, NDOA

MEMBERS ABSENT:

John Koswan, CC-DAQEM
Leif Anderson, NDOT
Michael Elges, NDEP-BAQP
Ralph Felices, DMV/CED
Randy White, CC-DAQEM
VACANT, TMRP
VACANT, TMRP
Vernon Miller, NDOA

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Brian Keraly, Smog Busters – Nevada Emission Tester Council – Teleconferenced
Corky Elliott, Terrible Herbst – Teleconferenced
David Reed, Jones West Ford
Debbie Shope, DMV/CED
Hal Greene, DMV/CED – Teleconferenced
Mike Prince, Terrible Herbst – Teleconferenced
Peter Krueger, Nevada Emissions Tester Council
Russ Lucas, Jiffy Smog – Teleconferenced
Thomas Lansford, DMV/CED
Troy Dillard, DMV/CED
Steven Bauder, DMV/CED
Steven Yarborough, Fleet Solutions

2. Approval of Agenda Order

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

3. Approval of Minutes from 02/12/08.

A. The Chairman opened up the February 12, 2008 meeting minutes for discussion, comment and approval. The Committee approved the minutes without any changes.

4. Reject Certificate Issue

- A. At the last I/M Committee Meeting the Industry brought forward an issue with reject certificates causing some motorists confusion and perhaps the FACT sheet that was created by the DMV that prints out with each rejected test is not as effective as the DMV had intended, and is the rejected test really necessary.
- B. Lloyd Nelson with the DMV met with one of the station owners in Reno right after the last meeting because of his concerns. There were several suggestions made along with requested revisions to the already existing FACT sheet. Management Analyst, Steven Bauder with the DMV Emissions Program was asked to research other alternatives to clear up this issue. Steven researched other States websites to find out how these States are explaining to customers, “How to handle their rejected vehicles.” Tennessee, Virginia

and Washington provided some really good outreach information that is being taken into consideration. Another review of the EPA technical guidance document was done as part of this research process to ensure nothing was missed with regards to rejected vehicles. In reviewing that document it states in the Performing Onboard Diagnostic System Checks as Part of a Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program Guidance Document from EPA, on Page 8 it specifically states that the vehicle must be *rejected* if:

- More unset readiness codes found than allowed based on model year (MY) and/or
- DLC cannot be located or is inaccessible.

Then again on page 14 it reads, In all cases, it is important to emphasize that lack of readiness is a special status particular to OBD systems and that the vehicle is not necessarily producing excess emissions. Instead, the vehicle's emissions status is officially "Unknown," due to a failure to meet certain monitoring conditions prior to the inspection. In order to minimize confusion, EPA recommends that states provide a written statement about OBD and readiness status to motorists who are rejected based upon an excessive number of unset readiness codes. Such a statement should make the following key points:

- 1) A vehicle rejected as "not ready" is not necessarily "dirty."
- 2) "Not ready" just means the vehicle's computer has not had an opportunity to fully evaluate the vehicle's performance.
- 3) Many circumstances can lead to a vehicle being "not ready," including recent vehicle repairs and/or battery replacement.
- 4) In most cases, a week's worth of continued vehicle operation under normal operating conditions will be sufficient to make a "not ready" vehicle "ready."
- 5) In a very limited number of cases (less than 1%), a "not ready" vehicle may need to be taken to a repair facility, where the readiness codes can be set based upon vehicle-specific, manufacturer guidance.

- C. The DMV's findings after the research conducted was that a rejected test is necessary. The DMV will update the FACT sheet and make it more informative to motorists along with some outreach information. Any other suggestions made by the Board and/or Industry are also welcomed.

❖ **Suggestions made by the Committee and the Industry:**

- Use plain language.
 - Let the motorist know right away that their vehicle may not be dirty.
 - Explanation on either a handout/poster of each type of test result.
 - Notification on either a handout/poster of what test fee's stations may charge.
- **Q.** Andy – The DMV is not counting those rejects as failures right? When the reporting is done, is it now in three different categories so it will not affect the failure rate?
- **A.** Lloyd – Exactly. On the new reports there will be another column for the rejects.

- D. The Industry would like to be able to enter the price of the test after the technician knows the results, whether it is a pass, fail or reject. Currently, the stations pricing structure for tests are based on the outcome of the smog test. Since a reject test result has been added the analyzer does not allow for the technician to enter a fee after the result of the test

appears, which means the stations are losing out on a lot of their labor fees. Lloyd Nelson with the DMV had already brought this request before the programmers on the VID and they responded this was not a good idea because the request would require them to redesign the system to accommodate that change. There would also be an additional cost to the State for this request because in order to enter a fee after the test there would be 3 calls instead of the 2 calls it makes right now. Lloyd will however request from the programmers a time and cost estimate to the agency for this change to system and bring forward that information for discussion and review.

- **Q.** Brian Keraly – If a vehicle has a rejected emission test, is the DMV giving the customers 10 day moving permits to drive the vehicles until the monitors reset and then they are able to retest the vehicle?
- **A.** Lloyd – I believe that they are just like with the failed emission test, but I will double check and email you that information.

5. Light Duty Diesel Vehicle Weight Increase

- A. A few meetings ago Glenn Smith with the DMV brought before the Committee for consideration a change within NRS which will increase the gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) on light duty diesel vehicles. The proposal is to raise the maximum GVWR from 10,000 up to 14,000. The Committee requested that the DMV provide the actual affected number of diesel vehicles there are in both the North and South and bring that information back before the Committee.
- B. Glenn Smith informed the Committee that there are currently 6,657 vehicles with a GVWR between 10,001 and 14,000 pounds. Additional research found that the stations that have the Mustang dyno's will be able to test these diesel vehicles up to 14,000 pounds if the Committee decided to proceed with a NRS change. The testing process will be painful the first year until the Department is able to establish and post a list of stations that are able to handle the testing of these vehicles.
 - **Q.** Andy – Before we move forward with changing the rule and I am obviously in support of capturing those vehicles that seem to be moving out of the program because of their increased GVWR, I think first if we are going to change anything, I would like to see us move more to an OBD system for those vehicles. If what you are saying Glenn is that those newer vehicles have a higher GVWR, and since those newer vehicles are also equipped OBDII equipment, couldn't we just move them right into an OBDII program?
 - **A.** Troy – We don't know the answer to that Andy. We are not sure if those vehicles can or cannot be checked with OBDII because the same monitoring system that is used for gasoline is not used for diesel. We will need to request a new monitor and a new testing function that is diesel specific, along with determining the standards. This would not be an overnight project. We will have to design a whole new VID for the diesel just like the gas. This does not mean that the diesel cannot be tested on the same machine, it just means that there is a whole different set of parameters that need to be looked at.

- **Q.** Sig – I would also have to add that diesel is not a Federal requirement, its only State and I don't know of any other States that that are doing this, so we would not have any support from EPA. This would be all new territory for us. Is this something that you really want to take on?
 - **A.** Andy - Maybe not, I might just be getting ahead. It just seemed to me if the manufacturers are placing OBD equipment on LDD vehicles than that direction must be coming from somewhere, and I assumed that would have been from EPA. Then the natural evolution would be that LDD vehicles are going OBDII eventually. So we need to consider, would it be wise for us to have our private sectors invest in dynamometers if the direction is to go OBDII testing soon, or perhaps that is not a change that will happen for another decade or so down the road? It is just something to consider.
- C. The GVWR is a Nevada Revised Statute. This change would require a bill draft that would have to go in front of the Legislature. The Committee approved the motion to endorse moving the light duty diesel weight range up to 14,000 pounds. The Committee will seek legislative sponsorship for the bill draft.

6. Testing Light Duty Diesel Vehicles Using OBDII Procedure

- A. LCB File R105-07 was initiated to amend the dynamometer load ratings for testing by increasing the current load rating. Discussion pertaining to the amendment then evolved into the addition of OBD related visual inspection requirements. The Department held a workshop back in February and received feedback from the industry. The Industry had concerns with both the dynamometer load and the expansion to a visual inspection of OBD related items. The Department held an internal meeting after the Workshop to review the industries concerns and found that this regulation has evolved into a much bigger amendment than originally planned. If the Department continues to pursue this regulation change, it will also have to be heard in front of the Environmental Commission due to recent statute changes within NRS 445B.785. Lloyd Nelson with the Department of Motor Vehicles is requesting guidance from the Committee as to if the DMV should continue to pursue this regulation amendment. The Committee is in favor of the amendment to regulation.
- B. Glenn Smith with the DMV proposed that since the OBD function in the diesel vehicle works similar to the gas as far as the MIL light, perhaps we could continue to test with the dynamometers. Then on the OBD vehicles that have been mandated to be OBD compliant which appears to be 2008 and newer, have a visual inspection for the particulate traps and MIL since those units will be mandated.
- **Q.** Andy – Glenn, is it possible now for a new diesel truck with the OBDII on it to pass the dynamometer test with a check engine light?
 - **A.** Glenn – Yes it could. You could also have one that failed the opacity test but still pass the OBD test because with the dynamometer all you are checking is the density of the smoke coming out of the tail pipe along with signs of tampering.
- C. The Committee brought forth a proposal of adding into current regulations a full VID for OBD testing of LDD vehicles. Troy informed the Committee that there currently is a

funding issue with this proposal. In order for the Department to build a diesel OBD VID, a cost analysis would have to be drafted and the request would need to be taken in front of the legislature for approval. In the interim the Committee would like to further discuss and give future consideration to bringing forward the OBD testing of LDD vehicles starting with 2008 vehicles.

7. Update on New Ozone Standards Announced by EPA on Wednesday 03/12 and its Impact on the I/M Program

- A. In the past the focus in Las Vegas Valley was on CO and PM₁₀. The I/M program was initiated as a CO control measure. This has led to a great deal of success in reducing the carbon monoxide emissions. During recent modeling updates, Clark County found that the numbers in the population that is received from the Regional Transportation Commission were dramatically increasing and they were unable to move all of the controls in their modeling updates and still demonstrate attainment of the CO standard.
- B. Ozone in Clark County was designated in attainment of standards. In 1997 they were then determined in non-attainment. In 2004, EPA was sued by a number of agencies for the 1997 ozone standard which was 80 PPB with a rounding mechanism to 84. As a result in December of 2006 the implementation rule that was reclassified as a basic non-attainment area was thrown out by the court. EPA now has to re-determine the rule and classify Clark County. This means that currently Clark County is in non-attainment of current Ozone standards and they have no guidance to submit a plan for attainment or maintenance. Clark County has been advised that EPA should have a new rule by the end of the year which would classify Clark County and give guidance for submitting a plan.
- C. Clark County feels that they are able to meet the 80 PPB standard with their current I/M Program, but the new rule that was recently determined by EPA on the 12th of March made effective in May is to lower standards to 75 PPB with no rounding regimen. Clark County has 1 site in Mesquite out of their 13 monitors that does not exceed the 75 PPB standards. The County feels that there are some serious problems with Ozone and it is critical that the I/M program remains stringent.
 - **Q.** Peter – Dennis, Do I understand correctly, and Clark County would not be in favor of further relaxation on vehicles?
 - **A.** Dennis – No.
 - **Q.** Peter – Do you capture or will your modeling capture data that would indicate that the current 2 year exemption is justified?
 - **A.** Dennis – Yes, however our perspective on that is we are not meeting the standards and to remove any of the stringencies of this program, for example allow a 4 year exemption as opposed to the 2 year, would be allowing an increase in emissions. Clark County will advise against anything that would reduce the stringencies in the program.
- D. Clark County has also been able to demonstrate that California's emissions do impact the Las Vegas Valley. California has to change their SIP language with EPA to indicate what their emission impact has been in the past on other States just off of the border.

E. The central focus for Clark County is going to be the I/M program in terms of Ozone reduction. Clark County's plans to review anything that may benefit emissions reduction and additional controls will be added to the program to help aid in meeting the new standard.

➤ **Q.** Robert – With the new standards for ozone, or proposed standards for ozone, is there areas within the State that are not within the air quality district that might be impacted by these new standards? To give an example Pahrump, because of the transport issue. Obviously we are going to get hit pretty hard in Clark County and I would assume that right over the Spring Mountain range that would probably also be effected.

➤ **A.** Sig – The Counties that fall under the program are Washoe and Clark. I am not sure if other areas are affected because based on population we are not required to monitor them.

➤ **Q.** Robert – I was informed that last year Pahrump was not in attainment for PM₁₀. If there is no monitoring is that area, where did that information come from?

➤ **A.** Sig – They are not officially in non-attainment for PM₁₀; however it was going that way. NDEP had entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Nye County Commission and EPA to aggressively move forward with control measures to avoid going down the non-attainment road. There are 5 or 6 PM monitors set up in Nye County. We do not have any ozone monitors there.

F. Washoe County brought up the fact that there are a lot of people living in Pahrump who commute to Las Vegas for work. It might prove beneficial to have these vehicles emission checked. Additionally, EPA is purposing a monitoring rule that will address some of the monitoring requirements with the new program standard. The new monitoring requirements should be coming out in June of this year. This may address some of those additional monitoring questions in the areas that are not currently being monitored for ozone.

G. Roxanne Johnson with USEPA stated that the Committee had the most current information available. Roxanne feels that it is too early to say much with regards to what will happen with the new ozone standard and for new classification, but it is a good idea to have this item on the agenda to discuss how tough things are going to be for Las Vegas. Roxanne informed the Committee that EPA released recently 50 million dollars under the energy policy act to clean up diesel engines nation wide. Region 9 received close to 5.1 million and that funding is available to apply for.

H. Roxanne Johnson with USEPA notified Washoe County that the Legal Administration signed the notice for the county re-designation and it is going to the Federal Register office today for publication.

8. Discussion of Known/Potential BDR's (2009 Legislature) that may Impact the I/M Program.

- A. This item has been placed on the agenda by the Chairman because it is the time of year that BDR's start to take shape. Sig opened this topic to the members of the Committee who would like to discuss any BDR's related to the I/M Program.
- B. Clark County has a BDR they would like to share with the Committee but it does not affect the I/M Program. The BDR that is being proposed is to transfer the authority from the Legislature over to the local air quality district to increase the registration fees on an annual basis up to \$6.00 on registered vehicles. This would establish a funding mechanism for the Greenhouse Gas Abatement programs. The County is not specifically asking for any sort of increase in fees from the Legislature, they are asking for the Legislature to transfer authority to assess a fee up to \$6.00 per vehicle on an annual basis to fund the program.

9. Clark County Excess Reserve Grant Request

- A. 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 \$600,546.00 for fiscal year 2009. 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 PM₁₀ Re-designation Request/Maintenance Plan.
 - ◆ Preparation and Submittal of the CO Re-designation Request/Maintenance Plan.
 - ◆ Potential Development of an Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP).
 - ◆ Continuance of Public Outreach, Information and Voluntary Participatory Programs promoting Clean Air Initiatives.
- B. The Committee moved all in favor of Clark County's application for excess reserve funds from the Pollution Control account in the amount of \$600,546.00.

10. Washoe County Excess Reserve Grant Request

- 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 \$170,000.00 for fiscal year 2009. 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.
 - ◆ Fund public outreach activities; including smoking vehicle, idling reduction, and air quality events.
 - ◆ Contract for Technical Assistance in Field and Office Projects.
 - ◆ Assess and Implement Greenhouse Gas Reduction Activities.
- B. The Committee moved all in favor of Washoe County's application for excess reserve funds from the Pollution Control account in the amount of \$170,000.00.

- C. Robert Tekniepe with Clark County wanted to comment specifically to Andy Goodrich in Washoe County with regards to the Greenhouse Gas Abatement issue. Robert informed the Committee that Andy is an active participant on the Governors Committee for Climate Change which addresses specifically the reduction of Greenhouse Gas. Robert wanted to inform the Committee that Clark County is now actively involved in this area also and wanted to let Andy know that he admires him personally for his leadership in this area of reduction. Sig requested that Andy update the Committee on the recommendations that this board finalizes and how it might affect fuels, I/M or transportation issues.

11. Summary of DMV Excess Reserve Audit and Discussion of Possible Changes to NAC as a Result of the Audit

- A. Recently the Internal Controls Section within the Department of Motor Vehicles performed an audit on DMV, Washoe County and Clark County in relation to the excess reserve grant funding reporting process. The results of that audit have been received by DMV, Washoe and Clark County. The overall outcome was good, however there were some recommendations made by the Auditors to aid in simplifying the process. Some of those recommendations discussed were:

- Submission of more comprehensive reports by the Counties including receipts with the cover report.
- Counties provide a quarterly update at the I/M Committee meeting on progress of work programs.
- DMV perform a more thorough review of the reports that are received by the Counties.
- DMV must ensure the reports are received in a timely basis.
- If there is return of funds, then the DMV should follow up and make sure the funds are received back in a timely basis.
- DMV Administrative Services Division was tasked with developing a method to ensure the Counties funding is released in a timely manner.
- DMV should provide financial updates at the I/M Advisory meeting, operational review.

An annual audit of the excess reserve grant funds, reporting process will be done by the DMV Internal Controls Section.

- B. Steven Bauder the Management Analysis with the Emission Control Program at the DMV has been tasked with the reviewing and tracking of excess reserve grant requests and reports. If the counties have any concerns he is available to assist.
- C. There was additional talk about changing regulations. Some of the regulations requested to be changed was the quarterly requirement of submission of the excess reserve report to a semi-annual reporting requirement. Additionally, there currently are three different funding mechanisms available to the counties. There is:
- (2) d, funding which has no reporting period.
 - Dedicated funding with an annual report to the Legislative Body.
 - Excess Reserve Grant funding with a quarterly report to DMV.

These are funds received all from the same funding source, however the mechanism used for approval of release is different. It is uncertain why there are two different bodies it reports to while one has no reporting requirement at all. This regulation should be cleaned up. It was suggested by Troy Dillard the Chief of the Compliance Enforcement Division, Emission Control Program that instead of the Committee filtering through the regulations issue by issue, that Washoe County, Clark County, NDEP and DMV meet and discuss the regulation changes they would like to have the DMV draft and bring it back before the Committee for review, discussion and direction. A meeting will be set possibly before the next I/M Committee meeting.

- D. A recommendation made by the Auditors was to have the counties provide a quarterly update at the I/M Committee meetings on the progress of their work programs. An issue they saw was that the Committee reviews the initial application requests and makes a recommendation to DMV and NDEP for approval or denial, but they never hear of the progress of what they supported. The counties stated that they would be interested in seeing reporting on the pollution control account from the State agencies. Troy advised the counties that they are able to review that account as part of the State budget. The expenditures are what are going out to the other State agencies. In order to review what those funds are used for, a request would have to be made to them.
- E. Last year there was an increase in the pollution control account of 3.65% over the previous year. The projected amounts for FY08 and FY09 were for 4% continued growth. The legislatively approved average for FY07 was \$652,990.00 per month. The monthly average was 7.07%, so it was \$50,000.00 a month more. That resulted in \$600,000.00 or more than the legislatively approved, which is the budget funding that turns into excess reserve. This year the account is bringing in 1.1% more than it did last year, which is 3% less than what it was projected at. The legislatively approved average for this year is \$739,000.00 per month. The actual amount we are seeing is \$711,000.00 per month. That means we are looking at a \$400,000.00 shortfall in the appropriated amount. This is going to have an impact on what is available for excess reserve the following year.
- **Q.** Andy – Troy the expense side that you are reporting, is that all the pay outs in category D? Does DMV, NDEP and the AG all first come out and then the dedicated?
 - **A.** Troy – Yes, it is budget account 4722 which is the pollution control accounts primary budget. This shows all of the DMV expenses broken out. It also shows the appropriations that go to the other State agencies and to the Counties.
 - **Q.** Robert – Andy are you looking for a year over year increase or decrease in funding to the various State agencies by the pollution control account to see what the increases are or if the amount you requested is stable?
 - **A.** Andy – Yes, basically that is it. We have seen it in the past where state programs for whatever reason need additional augmentation of their budget and so they increase their request out of the pollution control funds
 - ❖ **Suggestion from Dennis** – I think that it is important that we are aware of what the State agencies are requesting from this account because it is going to impact us.
 - ❖ **Response from Troy** - The budget requests itself are confidential until the Governor publishes the State budget.

12. Summary of Proposed Changes to the I/M Program with Regards to EPA Discussion on Vehicles Operated on Federal Installations.

A. This agenda item was withdrawn.

13. Public Comment

A. Steve Yarborough with Fleet Solutions informed the Committee that they were taking out a full page ad in the Reno Gazette Journal this Thursday, April 17, 2008, congratulating the 30 plus fleets that have been using the Fleet Solutions tracking software. Through recent calculations fuel consumption over the next year has been reduced by 264 gallons, which reduces approximately 5 million pounds of emission will be reduced by these 590 vehicles over the next year.

➤ **Q.** Sig – Steve, we know you have some pretty big fleets running your system. Are all of their vehicles on this or just test group?

➤ **A.** Steve – Some are, there is Truckee Meadows and City of Reno-Public Works. The City of Sparks, Washoe-Animal Control Services and Water Resources are now getting involved. We also have a lot of private fleets and we expect to continue to grow over the next year.

B. The DMV is looking to have a pilot program on an active monitoring study within the Emission Control program. The DMV is expecting to have the request for proposal (RFP) ready any day and once that is received the DMV will be able to accept bids and that will give the DMV an idea of cost for the program. The Committee will have full knowledge of what the total amount will be before it is requested from IFC.

C. Mike Prince with Terrible Herbst requested an update on any other additional analyzer vendors coming into Nevada to do business. Lloyd Nelson with the DMV notified Mike that there have been discussions with some competing companies but no one has submitted a unit for certification.

➤ **Q.** Mike – Are you saying there is no interest from the industry out there?

➤ **A.** Lloyd – There is interest, but they are still evaluating Nevada to see if it would be possible for them to bring a unit in.

➤ **Q.** Mike – How about with the OBDII only, was there any interest with that?

➤ **A.** Lloyd – There is one unit currently being evaluated in Reno.

➤ **Q.** Brian – Who is the Manufacturer on that?

➤ **A.** Troy – Worldwide.

➤ **Q.** Mike – There was discussion a while back on the possibility of having an outside company service the analyzers that are no longer covered under a warranty. What was the outcome of that?

➤ **A.** Lloyd – That could never happen because the units are so proprietary. It is next to impossible to get inside of the units because of the access code. This was part of the

BAR 97 specifications. To have a third party come in and repair the unit would be very difficult.

- **Q.** Russ – Lloyd, sometime ago you asked us to submit some ideas for new management report off the web portal. I sent some input on that from at least 3 different operators and was wondering if there has been any progress on what new reports we may be able to look forward to?
- **A.** Lloyd – We made a few mockups and I sent those out to your counterpart here in Reno last week and I thought I copied you too. I will resend them.

14. Next Meeting and Adjournment

- A. The next I/M Advisory Committee meeting will be set for July 15, 2008 in Reno. Andy will reserve the meeting location.
- B. The meeting adjourned at 12:25 pm.