



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

Held on January 12, 2016 at 1:30 pm

by Videoconference **from the** Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

3rd Floor Humboldt Conference Room

901 South Stewart Street

Caron City, NV 89701

to the Clark County Development Services

Conference Room 1222

4701 W. Russell Rd.

Las Vegas, NV 89115

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
January 05, 2016**

Department of Motor
Vehicles
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

Department of Motor
Vehicles Website
www.dmv.nv.com

1. Call to Order by the Chairman

Chairman Sig Jaunarajs called the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Control of Emissions from Motor Vehicles to order at 1:32 pm.

2. Roll Call

MEMBERS:	Representing	Present	Primary	Alternate	Voting
Al Leskys	CC/DAQEM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rodney Langston	CC/DAQEM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mike Sword	CC/DAQEM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Robert Tekniepe					
Shannon Rudolph	CC/DAQEM NDOA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

William Striejewski	NDOA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

MEMBERS:	Representing	Present	Primary	Alternate	Voting
Ivie Hatt	DMV/CED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Morgan Friend	DMV/CED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Steve Mayfield	DMV/CED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Robin Roques	DMV/CED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vacant	NDOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vacant	NDOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sig Jaunarajs - Chairman	NDEP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Joseph Perreira	NDEP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Danilo Dragoni	NDEP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sarah Hills	NDEP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jeffrey Buss	U.S. EPA: Region 9	<input type="checkbox"/>		Ex Officio	
Julie Hunter	WC-AQMD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Daniel Inouye	WC -AQMD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Charlene Albee	WC-AQMD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Yann Ling Barnes	WC-AQMD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Public Introductions

INTERESTED PARTIES:

	Representing:
Glenn Smith	DMV
John Lee	DMV
Lea Cartwright	
Lou Gardella	Emission Tester Council & Jiffy Smog
Louis Lanuza	DMV
Norma Havens	USA Fleet Solutions
Rafael Arroyo	Smog Plus
Steve Yarborough	USA Fleet Solutions
Quinn Winter	Terrible Herbst

4. Public Comments.

A. Rafael Arroyo w/Smog Plus stated he is frustrated and confused because he thought that the point of the committee’s study was to update and modernize the smog program. In the sub-committee meetings time is spent on talking about classic vehicles and reducing the frequency of testing. Which is going to increase emissions. Now if all of these cars are being modernized to reduce emissions and all of the laws are going to reduce emissions eventually the technology is going to catch up with the program and make it obsolete. But for now, I just see that taking away the frequency of testing to cave into, I guess it is political pressure for something that has failed, what 10 times in a row just doesn’t make any sense. Especially when there is discussion that in 5 years the problem may return. Why would we even want to risk creating a problem? I think that we should modernize the program by making it better. Not to appease political pressure. People should stick to their guns and say look this is going to increase pollution let’s not do it. It doesn’t matter if people don’t want to go have their vehicle smog checked once a year. As long as it

keeps the vehicle maintained, it will be tested yearly. So I just think that it is two things that are just opposite. We argue about classic plates, but then we want to increase emissions.

- B. Lou Gardella w/Jiffy Smog – I just wanted to make a comment. Glenn, the caps lock key on the analyzer does make a difference for some inspectors that use special characteristics when entering a password. In-between meetings, Lou called his inspectors and they were not able to login with the caps lock on. Glenn, offered to call Lou tomorrow and troubleshoot the issue they are experiencing because the department is unable to re-create it.

5. Approval of Agenda.

- A. The Agenda was approved in the order it was prepared.

6. Approval of October 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes.

- A. The minutes were approved with the following corrections.
 - 10 A. – Change “Intern” to “Interim”
 - 11 B. (Q&A) – Change “these two committees” to “the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Chairs of the Senate and Assembly Standing Committees on Transportation”
 - 2. – The members present needs to be corrected.
 - 11. C. – Change “that’s being doing” to “that’s being done”

7. Update on the progress of the I/M Sub-Committee in response to AB-146

- A. Sig Juanarajs w/NDEP stated the members that have been assigned to the sub-committee have been making real progress. The creation of the sub-committee has allowed the members to act a little more freely in their discussions which has established a really good working group.
- B. Charlene Albee w/WC-AQMD – The sub-committee had another meeting this morning prior to this one and has been doing so on a monthly basis since its creation in August. Through the whole process we have all recognized that we must be mindful of the science. We will not be making any decisions that the data does not direct us towards. We have looked at our numbers from DMV and the modeling from Clark County. In comparison to what other programs across the country are doing we have narrowed our recommended scenario’s down to one. This scenario has a minimum impact to air quality. Based on this scenario, a teleconference was held with EPA regarding the basic State Implementation Plans (SIP’s) and the possible enactment by Legislature, we were given direction on what will need to be done. We are now down to filling in the draft outline, and getting the sections of the report written. Draft sections are due February 16th. The sub-committee has another meeting scheduled on February 23rd to start reviewing the draft. According to the timeline adopted at the beginning of the project, the March I/M sub-committee meeting will be the final review of the report. It is anticipated that we will be able to present the study to the full committee on April 12th. This has not been an easy task that was undertaken. There is a lot of emotion on both sides of the fence. As an air agency we are looking to what we need to protect. We absolutely recognize the importance of our testers, but we also have to be sensitive to DMV’s needs, as the administrators of the program. I think that we all

agree there are some decisions that this sub-committee cannot make. Those are decisions that are going to need to be made by the elected officials.

- C. Steve Yarborough w/USA Fleet Solutions requested a high level overview of what the recommendations going forward in the report look like at this point. Charlene Albee w/WC-AQMD explained the first recommendation is to:
- Extend the new car exemption from 2 years to 4 years with biennial testing for the first 8 years. The reason for the 8 years is because EPA requires vehicles that are 1995 or newer equipped with emission control devices to meet an 8 year performance warranty.
 - For the Classic Vehicle Issue, a list of recommendations will be provided for the legislatures to choose from. Those recommendations are as follows:
 - Clarify the definition of a classic vehicle.
 - Requirement of classic vehicle insurance for registration.
 - Model year cap.
 - Actual odometer reading check.
 - Impose a penalty for providing false information on the affidavit.
 - Must own a second vehicle.
 - Revert to the original language, where you are required to have an initial smog check before obtaining the classic plate.
 - Conduct random audits as a means for enforcement.

8. Informational Item(s)

- A. Ivie Hatt w/DMV – For the next meeting agenda, we need to add the issue of the waiver dollar amount. This was a recommendation of the sub-committee to have the full I/M Committee review.
- B. Charlene Albee w/DMV - One of the comments we received from the industry was to have an annual working group meeting to discuss purely industry issues. In order to accommodate that request, I would like to bring that forward to this committee to have it added to the next meeting agenda.

9. Public Comment

- A. Rafael Arroyo w/smog plus – Has anyone had an opportunity to talk with WEP about the technology they have to prevent fraud as far as clean scanning vehicles and rejecting vehicles that have monitors that do not match. When an actual emission test is being performed a station could substitute a vehicle for another one by typing in the other vehicles VIN number. Not all OBDII vehicles VIN numbers show up, however there is other information that creates an electronic signature for the vehicle that could be cross matched with the history of the vehicle causing the test reject. Erin w/WEP said this technology is available through WEP and I was wondering if this was looked into, since we are updating and modernizing. Ivie Hatt w/DMV apologized as she not aware that this was an action item. The logic that is used for emission testing is not WEP's logic. This would be something that we would need to speak with our programmers about and possibly address it at the next meeting.

- Q. Rafael Arroyo w/smog plus – I have a question about the actual way that the report is presented. Are first going to outline the program and then state that the program functions well the way it is now? However, if changes are going to be made these are our recommendations?
- A. Sig Juanarajs w/NDEP – The I/M Committee has been tasked with putting together a report of our recommendations as a committee for the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Chairs of the Senate and Assembly Standing Committees on Transportation. In some cases there may be a field of recommendations, while in other cases it might be a specific recommendation.
- Q. Rafael Arroyo w/smog plus – Right, but is the Committee going to suggest that we should decrease the frequency of tests even though the program works well today? Or, are you going to say that the program works well today, and decreasing the emission testing frequency will result in an increase of emissions? But if that is what has to be done, then this is the best way to do it?
- A. Charlene Albee w/ WC-AQMD – The final report has not been put together just yet and I don't think that, that has been written down anywhere.
- Q. Lou Gardella w/Emission Tester Council & Jiffy Smog – How do you present this to the legislatures? It is my understanding that you do not have approval from EPA and you are going to move forward with recommending option #1 for testing reductions. What is the time life of that recommendation? In other words, you are going to give the legislature a plan that is not approved by EPA and if the legislature decides to enact it, what work does the air quality people have to do? How long before you find out if this is a plan you can enact? Or, do you just go ahead and do it once it is passed by legislation? Then what happens if the EPA rejects the plan? I am a little confused because you didn't get approval from EPA but you are still going to present this. If it is enacted, how soon will the change take effect and what is the guarantee EPA will approve it?
- A. Charlene Albee w/ WC-AQMD –The Arizona legislature, did the same thing that we are looking at doing now. In the Federal Register publication, they began the process in 2001 it took the state air agency 4 months to put together the SIP submittal. The SIP submittal went to EPA for review. EPA took final action and approval in 2003.
- Q. Lou Gardella w/Emission Tester Council & Jiffy Smog – So you are relying on something that took place 14 or 15 years ago? Are you going to quantify your recommendation to legislature and tell them what you are proposing may not necessarily be acceptable to EPA?
- A. Sig Juanarajs w/NDEP – All options and ramifications will be outlined in the report. In the last section of the report, we will be identifying what will need to be done as a State in order for the recommendations to be acceptable to the EPA. This is the EPA and SIP approval process.

12. Next Meeting and Adjournment.

- A. The next I/M Advisory Committee meeting is set for Tuesday, April 19, 2016 at 1:30 pm at the same location.
- B. The meeting adjourned at 2:16 pm.