

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Coulter  
Vice Chairman Fielding  
Assemblyman Bedrosian  
Assemblyman Polish  
Assemblyman Rhoads  
Assemblyman Price  
Assemblyman Prengaman  
Assemblyman Bergevin

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Dini (excused)

---

Chairman Coulter brought this meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. and heard the following bills:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 36:

Assemblyman Bob Rusk, testified on this bill, distributing to each member of the committee a copy of same. This copy is attached hereto and entered as Exhibit "A". He explained that this resolution spells out that the Fish and Wildlife Service continue their experiments on behalf of the Indians that have a fish experiment going at the end of the Truckee River, at Pyramid Lake. The problems, he explained, for the cities of Reno and Sparks is that the flow of water increasing to 7,000 acre feet per day right out of Stampede Reservoir and Boca which is, in one month under this program, one year supply of water goes down the Truckee to cool the Truckee River sufficiently for their spawning program to work more effectively. Therefore, this simply asks the Fish and Wildlife Service to consider the fact that the lip at Tahoe is just one foot over that dam and in normal years it is just seven feet above that lip. So, he explained, the control & the water that is available is extremely limited.

SENATE BILL 458:

Mr. Joseph E. Manos, Nevada Department of Energy, testified on this bill. He distributed a table of Estimated Energy Savings from Bannin Gas Pilot Lights which is attached hereto and entered as Exhibit "B". He noted that these energy savings could be realized within the very first year. He gave detailed explanation to the committee as to the figures contained in the exhibit. In layman's terms, he stated that with the average home in Nevada using about 1,000 therms per year, you are coming out to about 800 homes that could be totally heated with the amount of energy that would be saved off of this bill. He noted that this is a federal conservative figure. Actually, Mr. Manos said, you

could probably double that figure, coming out with 1600 homes. Mr. Manos stated that presently with the curtailment of natural gas and the limiting of its use, he feels its time is needed. He noted that this SB 458 is based on a bill that comes from Natural Gas Appliance Association and if you compute the amount of energy saved in dollars, it would come out to about \$250,000 that the citizens of Nevada are saving. Mr. Manos stated that the appliances are on the market and they are not that much more expensive than the appliances which are now on the market, perhaps \$10 or \$15 difference. This bill only pertains to new devices that are purchased in the State of Nevada. The way this bill is written, it gives a six-month period of time for those distributors of appliances to get rid of their stock. Upon questioning from Chairman Coulter, Mr. Manos explained the definition of a retro-fit. It is a device that will be put onto your furnace that would get rid of the standing pilot light and let you have the same benefits. He advised the committee that the cost of the entire retro-fit on your home would be \$45.00 and that would pay for itself in less than a year. There was further discussion amongst the committee and Mr. Manos on the details of this retro-fit.

SENATE BILL 503:

Mr. Joseph E. Manos, Department of Energy, State of Nevada, advised the committee that he was before the committee merely to answer any questions they might have on SB 503. He noted that the only bit of new legislation is section four. He stated that this was prompted by the fact that the Federal Department of Energy and the Office of the President are reacting so quickly and are coming up with so many different programs that this State Department of Energy was funded to perform a specific task, i.e., develop a state energy conservation plan and enforce same. He explained that the only salaries that have come out of the State Fund are the directors and the secretaries; all else has come out of the Federal Government. Mr. Manos further explained that the Federal Government comes up with alot of different programs, they send them to the Governor's Office and they in turn send them to their department and make an analysis and return them. Technically, he explained, they are not allowed to do that. This bill doesn't require any money to come out of the State budget, but it authorizes them to spend some time on other things other than what they were originally asked to do.

SENATE BILL 543:

Mr. Dick Serdoz, Air Quality Officer for the State of Nevada and also employed by the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection, testified on this bill. He explained that it is to delay the implementation of the annual inspection that was scheduled for implementation July, 1979. This came out of a Senate Committee after hearings were held on the general statutes, as opposed to the bill itself.

Mr. Serdoz stated that some information coming forth from one of those hearings was that the bill, if implemented now, will cost the residents of Nevada approximately, \$6,000,000 for the annual inspection and maintenance that is required, if the program goes into effect. The emission reduction will be about 30%. For that six million dollars, they will save approximately four and one-half million dollars in gasoline savings alone and an overall cost to the residents of about one and one-half million dollars per year. To implement a 5% reduction in emission, as opposed to the 30%, it would cost about 2 1/2 million dollars in the City of Las Vegas to implement a bus program that would get them approximately a 5% reduction in emissions. He detailed the major air pollution problem in Clark and Washoe Counties for the committee. With this program being implemented, the state would get about 30% reduction. They would only get the other 20% if they delay action on attaining the standards until 1987. He stated that if it is the wish of the Legislature to delay the action of '81, the community that did the planning on the original plan for attaining these standards will have to go back and reevaluate the plan to find out where they can get additional reductions. Cost-effectively, he stated, this is the best program. Mr. Serdoz stated that he is here to ask the committee not to pass this bill out. He stated that by the program that they have, they are getting a better reduction of emissions than any other program in any other state. In answer to some question when he testified before the Senate, Mr. Serdoz stated that since 1974 through 1977 the average vehicle has improved their gas mileage from 13 miles per gallon in 1974 to about 20 miles per gallon in 1977 and the target for all vehicles by 1982 is 28 miles per gallon on gasoline. Mr. Serdoz noted a report which came out of the Department of Motor Vehicles on the inspection/maintenance program showing the actual reductions and all costs. A copy of this report is attached hereto and entered as Exhibit "C". He then answered numerous questions that the committee had.

Mr. John Ciardella, Department of Motor Vehicles and Mr. Ken Boyer, in charge of the Reno Program for the State, testified on this bill. Mr. Ciardella stated that they do echo Mr. Serdoz' comments, however, he stated that if you read the bill very carefully that if the counties elect to go ahead with the program they still can do so. He stated that the program initially was scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1979. He said that right now if they were to get the go-ahead from the Legislature, he doesn't feel they would get enough public information out to get public acceptance of the program. Their other concern is if the counties elect to go ahead with the program one problem that they did not anticipate is a lack of service stations to cover it due to this present gasoline crunch. He mentioned that service stations in Las Vegas are pumping their gas and leaving. Presently this is not the case in Washoe; they will go ahead in Washoe and do the repair work. He feels that the program has been successful; they have worked very closely with the Environmental Commission.

Mr. Ciardella stated that if the bill passes and the counties cannot justify the need, then two years later the Legislature will look at the program again and go ahead with it at that time. They do support this bill; he noted that the inspection/maintenance program did prove to have good results as people were getting better gas mileage.

Mr. Darrell Capurro, Executive Director of the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association, testified on this bill noting that he was neither in favor nor in opposition to this bill. He gave a short history of this program starting as a pilot program in Clark County a few years ago, graduating to a program in both Clark and Washoe Counties whereby the inspection certifications are required on vehicles being registered for the first time and on change of registration. He mentioned that he doesn't think anyone could have foreseen this present energy crunch. Mr. Capurro stated that he believes this program has been effective in two ways, i.e., in reducing emissions and the fact that fuel economy has been improved. He emphasized the aforementioned problem that is presently happening in Las Vegas and that is the service stations shutting down after they have pumped their gas. The independent garages and the service stations are handling the bulk of the vehicles that would come under an annual inspection program. He noted that you are talking about going from 7,000 inspections per month to 28,000 in Clark County. He mentioned that the fuel that is in greatest demand and the least supply is the unleaded fuel. Mr. Capurro detailed the problems that this would cause the catalytic converter. He believes that the date should be moved forward to July 1, 1981.

Mr. Jim Hanna, acting executive secretary of the Environmental Commission, testified on this bill stating that the enabling legislation that first started this program last Session required a report by the Environmental Commission to this Legislature concerning the program. He stated that they submitted that report in February of 1979 to the Legislative Counsel Bureau and he reemphasized certain details therein.

Ms. Peggy Twete, representing the League of Women Voters in Nevada, testified on this bill. She stated that the League is in favor of having a motor vehicle emission's program. Ms. Twete stated that if it is possible that the counties can take this problem up, that would be fine with them as long as there is some program established in the large counties.

Upon hearing all of the above testimony on SB 543, the committee decided to read the minutes from three hearings that the Senate held on emission control before coming to a final determination.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

SENATE BILL 458 - Mr. Bedrosian moved for a DO PASS, the motion was seconded by Mr. Bergevin. The motion carried with Mr. Polish and Mr. Fielding voting "no". Mr. Price and Mr. Dini were absent

from this vote.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 36 - Mr. Rhoads moved for a DO PASS, Mr. Fielding seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Price and Mr. Bedrosian voting "no". Mr. Dini was absent.

SENATE BILL 503 - Mr. Bergevin moved for a DO PASS, Mr. Rhoads seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Mr. Fielding and Mr. Dini absent from voting. (Also, Mr. Daykin gave a brief explanation on this bill.)

SENATE BILL 520:

Mr. Frank Daykin of the Legislative Counsel Bureau explained that this goes back to a change which was made in 1975 in the salary generally allowed to members of boards and commissions. For some reason, this board was missed in the drafting of that bill, but it had on it a "shotgun clause" which said that the Legislative Counsel was preparing the supplement to change any section not amended by that bill. They didn't catch it in 1975 either. This bill will merely carry out the 1975 intent and ratify the payments that were made.

SENATE BILL 521:

Mr. Frank Daykin of the Legislative Counsel Bureau explained that this bill goes back even further than that of SB 520. In 1969, the Legislature divided what had been agricultural district number six into six and thirteen, adding a new district. However, it did not at the same time make any change in the statute relating to the Nevada Fair of Mineral Industries at Ely and therefore, that statute still refers to District No. 6 in which Ely was then located instead of District No. 13 which is now White Pine County. So, this merely needs to be modernized in order to reflect the truth of the geography.

SENATE BILL 520 - Mr. Rhoads moved for a DO PASS, Mr. Polish seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Mr. Fielding and Mr. Dini absent from voting.

SENATE BILL 521 - Mr. Polish moved for a DO PASS, Mr. Bedrosian seconded the motion. Mr. Fielding and Mr. Dini were absent from voting.

There being no further business to consider, Chairman Coulter adjourned this meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Anne M. Peirce*

Anne M. Peirce,  
Assembly Attache



from Bob Rusk  
5-11-79

SUMMARY--Urges United States Fish and Wildlife Service to abandon certain projects which use large amounts of water from Truckee River. (BDR 2167)

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION--Urging the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to abandon certain projects which use large amounts of water from Truckee River.

WHEREAS, The population of the Truckee Meadows area which includes the cities of Reno and Sparks and nearby communities is rapidly growing; and

WHEREAS, This increase in population means a greater demand for water; and

WHEREAS, There is a limited water supply in the area; and

WHEREAS, The area has not recovered from a drought in 1976 and 1977; and

WHEREAS, The limited amount of available water is, therefore, a precious resource which should not be wasted in any way; and

WHEREAS, The United States Fish and Wildlife Service is engaged in programs which use 1,200 acre-feet of water a day to cool the Truckee River and to aid the Lahontan cutthroat trout and cui-ui suckers in Pyramid Lake to spawn; and

WHEREAS, The success of those programs is, at best, questionable; and

WHEREAS, The water used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is being taken from the same reservoirs which provide water to the people of the Truckee Meadows area; and

WHEREAS, While the legislature of this state recognizes the environmental importance of the federal projects, it nonetheless feels that the people should be given priority to the water; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE ASSEMBLY AND SENATE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, JOINTLY, That the legislature hereby urges the United States Fish

1.

EXHIBIT A

and Wildlife Service to abandon their projects which reduce the available water supply from the Truckee River until such a time as there is adequate water in the reservoirs to provide for the needs of the people; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution shall become effective upon passage and approval.



Table VII-1

ESTIMATE OF ENERGY SAVINGS FROM BANNING GAS PILOT LIGHTS

Appliance	Number of Units		Replacement Rate (%/year)	Additions and Replacement <sup>†</sup> 1980	Gas Used/ Pilot <sup>§</sup> (Btu/yr)	Gas Saved <sup>**</sup> in 1980 (Btu)
	1970 <sup>x</sup>	1980 <sup>F</sup>				
Furnaces	76,915	96,915	3.3%	4,538	6 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	.03 x 10 <sup>12</sup>
Water heaters	53,847	67,847	10.0	6,785	5 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	.03 x 10 <sup>12</sup>
Cooking ranges	58,699	73,960	10.0	7,396	3 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	.02 x 10 <sup>12</sup>
Clothes dryers	4,136	5,211	10.0	521	3 x 10 <sup>6</sup>	.002 x 10 <sup>12</sup>
Total						.08 x 10 <sup>12</sup>

\* U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, "1970 Census of Housing, Housing Characteristics for States, Cities, and Counties," Vol. I, Part 30-Nevada (1972).

† Growth rate in Federal Energy Administration, "Baseline Forecasts of 1980 Energy Consumption for State Energy Conservation Programs" (December 6, 1976).

‡ Number of additions = 0.1 of 1970 to 1980 increase; number of replacements = replacement rate x 1970 number of units.

§ American Gas Association data, adjusted; clothes dryers assumed to be only 50% equipped with constant pilot lights.

\*\* (Additions + replacements) x gas-used/pilot.

STATE OF NEVADA  
 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
 REGISTRATION DIVISION  
 EMISSION CONTROL SECTION

STATE  
 WIDE

ALL VEHICLES

EMISSION CONTROL STATISTICS

VEHICLES THRU 1967	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N				
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	
6,451 VEHICLES	552	453	403	339	404	308	306	275	148	145	97	64	
* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.23	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				1.00				

VEHICLES 1968 - 1969	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N				
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	
7,420 VEHICLES	389	392	288	259	250	245	196	192	139	147	92	67	
* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.24	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				1.22				

VEHICLES 1970 - 1974	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N				
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	
24,627 VEHICLES	283	328	192	196	160	196	125	137	103	132	67	59	
* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.63	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				1.32				

VEHICLES 1975 THROUGH	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N				
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	
17,543 VEHICLES	167	174	96	98	113	96	69	59	54	78	27	31	
* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				14.53	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.51				

VEHICLES ALL YEARS	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N				
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	
58,047 VEHICLES	301	308	206	193	202	188	144	141	99	120	62	52	
* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.79	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				1.02				

NOTE: AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION INCLUDES \$2.00 CERTIFICATE FEE

EXHIBIT C  
226

STATE OF NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
REGISTRATION DIVISION  
EMISSION CONTROL SECTION

ALL VEHICLES

STATE  
WIDE

EMISSION CONTROL STATISTICS

VEHICLES THRU 1967	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****	
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.
6,476 VEHICLES	429	351	314	281	375	294	280	254	54	57	34	27
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.20	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.54		

VEHICLES 1968 - 1969	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****	
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.
4,692 VEHICLES	255	258	188	188	230	226	177	173	25	32	11	15
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.23	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.57		

VEHICLES 1970 - 1974	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****	
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.
15,901 VEHICLES	174	199	118	132	159	178	109	122	15	21	9	10
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.65	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.54		

VEHICLES 1975 ONWARD	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****	
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.
13,751 VEHICLES	108	92	64	55	99	81	60	50	9	11	4	5
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				14.58	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.21		

VEHICLES ALL YEARS	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****		**** IDLE ****		**** 2250 ****	
	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.	H.C.	C.O.
40,820 VEHICLES	201	194	139	136	181	169	127	124	20	25	12	12
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.84	AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$				.43		

NOTE: AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION INCLUDES \$2.00 CERTIFICATE FEE

EXHIBIT C-227

STATE OF NEVADA  
 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
 REGISTRATION DIVISION  
 EMISSION CONTROL SECTION

CLARK COUNTY

ALL VEHICLES

EMISSION CONTROL STATISTICS

VEHICLES THRU 1967	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
4,411 VEHICLES	430	354	312	276	384	308	283	251	46	46	29	25
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.30				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .55			

VEHICLES 1968 - 1969	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
3,334 VEHICLES	255	258	185	184	237	236	175	172	18	22	10	12
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.30				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .46			

VEHICLES 1970 - 1974	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
11,453 VEHICLES	177	201	118	127	167	186	111	118	10	15	7	9
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.71				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .41			

VEHICLES 1975 ONWARD	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
9,865 VEHICLES	111	95	65	54	105	87	63	50	6	8	2	4
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				14.77				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .19			

VEHICLES ALL YEARS	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** IDLE **** C.O.	**** 2250 **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
29,063 VEHICLES	202	194	137	131	187	177	128	121	15	17	9	10
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.96				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .36			

NOTE: AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION INCLUDES \$2.00 CERTIFICATE FEE

EXHIBIT C 228

STATE OF NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES  
REGISTRATION DIVISION  
EMISSION CONTROL SECTION

WASHOE  
COUNTY

ALL VEHICLES

EMISSION CONTROL STATISTICS

VEHICLES THRU 1967	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
2,061 VEHICLES	428	347	319	292	355	265	273	259	73	82	46	33
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				12.98				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .52			

VEHICLES 1968 - 1969	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
1,356 VEHICLES	253	257	195	198	215	203	181	176	38	54	14	22
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.07				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .85			

VEHICLES 1970 - 1974	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
4,443 VEHICLES	164	196	119	146	139	159	106	132	25	37	13	14
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.49				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .86			

VEHICLES 1975 ONWARD	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
3,883 VEHICLES	99	87	61	59	82	66	52	49	17	21	9	10
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				14.11				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .25			

VEHICLES ALL YEARS	***** B E F O R E *****				***** A F T E R *****				A V E R A G E R E D U C T I O N			
	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.	**** IDLE **** H.C.	**** 2250 **** C.O.
11,743 VEHICLES	199	194	144	149	167	152	126	132	32	42	18	17
	* AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION \$				13.56				AVERAGE COST OF REPAIRS \$ .60			

NOTE: AVERAGE COST OF INSPECTION INCLUDES \$2.00 CERTIFICATE FEE

622  
1191110