Amend section 1971.5, title 13, California Code of Regulations, to read as follows:

Note: The amendments are shown in underline to indicate additions and strikeout to indicate deletions from the existing regulatory text. Various portions of the regulations that are not modified by the proposed amendments are omitted from the text shown and indicated by “* * * *”.

§ 1971.5. Enforcement of Malfunction and Diagnostic System Requirements for 2010 and Subsequent Model-Year Heavy-Duty Engines.

(a) General.

(3) Definitions.

The definitions applicable to these rules include those set forth in Health and Safety Code section 39010 et seq. and in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1900(b) and section 1971.1(c), which are incorporated by reference herein. The following definitions are specifically applicable to section 1971.5 and take precedence over any contrary definitions.

“Nonconforming OBD System” means an OBD system on a production engine that has been determined not to comply with the emission standards as defined in requirements of Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(c). For purposes of section 1971.5, an engine class shall be considered nonconforming irrespective of whether engines in the engine class, on average, meet other applicable tailpipe or evaporative emission standards (e.g., exhaust emission standards defined in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1956.8, evaporative emission standards defined in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1976).

“OBD Emission Testing” refers to testing conducted to determine compliance with the malfunction criteria in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(e) through (g) that are based on a multiple of, or an additive to, a tailpipe emission standard or an absolute measurement from an applicable emission test cycle (e.g., 1.5 times the applicable federal test procedure (FTP) emission standards, PM standard plus 0.02 g/bhp-hr, PM level of 0.03 g/bhp-hr as measured from an applicable emission test cycle).

(b) Testing Procedures for ARB-Conducted Testing.

(3) Engine Selection for ARB-Conducted Enforcement Testing.

(C) Protocol for Procuring Engines for Test Sample Group.

(i) For OBD emission and ratio testing, the Executive Officer shall determine the appropriate manner for procuring engines. In making his or her determination, the Executive Officer shall consider the nature of the
nonconformance and the scope of the engine class. The method used shall ensure that engines are recruited from more than one source. Methods used may include obtaining lists of engine owners from specific sources (e.g., engine manufacturers, motor vehicle registration records) and soliciting participation from owners, discussing with fleet or rental operations to locate engines in the engine class, or using methods used by the manufacturer to procure engines for the manufacturer-run heavy duty diesel in-use testing program established pursuant to 70 Federal Register 34594 to procure engines consistent with the procurement process followed by the Executive Officer under Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 2137 (e.g., obtaining lists of all vehicles in the motor vehicle class within a specified geographical area, mailing postcards soliciting participation of vehicles within the specified area, selecting vehicles from those that responded to the solicitation, inspecting selected vehicles to determine whether appropriate to include in sample group, etc.). In selecting engines for OBD emission testing, the Executive Officer shall include only engines meeting the criteria set forth in section (b)(3)(D)(i) below. For OBD ratio testing, the Executive Officer shall include only engines meeting the criteria set forth in section (b)(3)(D)(ii) below.

(D) Engines to be included in a Test Sample Group.

(ii) In selecting engines to be included in a test sample group for enforcement OBD ratio testing, the Executive Officer shall include only engines that:


b. Have collected sufficient engine operation data for the monitor to be tested. For monitors required to meet the in-use monitor performance ratio and to track and report ratio data pursuant to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2), sufficient engine operation data shall mean the denominator meets the criteria set forth in sections (b)(3)(D)(ii)1. through 5. below. For monitors required to meet the in-use monitor performance ratio but not required to track and report ratio data pursuant to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2), sufficient engine operation data shall mean that engines that have a denominator that meets the criteria set forth in sections (b)(3)(D)(ii)1. through 5. below after undergoing testing as set forth in section (b)(4)(C)(ii) below. Specifically, the denominator, as defined in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(4.3), for the monitor to be tested must have a value equal to or greater than:

1. 150 for gasoline evaporative system and secondary air system monitors, and gasoline monitors utilizing a denominator incremented in accordance with Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(4.3.2)(D), (E), and (F) (e.g., cold start monitors, variable valve timing and/or control system monitors, etc.), or
2. 300 for gasoline catalyst, oxygen sensor, EGR, and all other component monitors.
3. 50 for diesel PM filter monitors, and NMHC converting catalyst monitors, PM sensor monitors, and PM sensor heater monitors and other diesel monitors using a denominator incremented in accordance with Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(4.3.2)(E), (F), (G) or (H), or
4. 150 for diesel monitors utilizing a denominator incremented in accordance with Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(4.3.2)(D), (E), or (F) (e.g., cold start monitors, comprehensive component output component monitors, etc.) and not covered in section (b)(3)(D)(ii)3. above, or
5. 300 for all other diesel monitors not covered under sections (b)(3)(D)(ii)3. and 4. above.

(6) Finding of Nonconformance after Enforcement Testing.
After conducting enforcement testing pursuant to section (b)(4) above, the Executive Officer shall make a finding of nonconformance of the OBD system in the identified engine class under the respective tests for the applicable model year(s) as follows:
(A) OBD Emission Testing.
   (i) For 2010 through 2012 model year engines:
      a. Engines certified as an OBD parent rating (i.e., the engine rating subject to the “full OBD” requirement under Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(7.1.1)), shall be considered nonconforming if the emission test results indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed 2.0 times the malfunction criteria (e.g., 5.0 times the standard if the malfunction criterion is 2.5 times the standard) on the applicable standard (i.e., FTP or SET).
   * * * *
   (ii) For 2013 through 2015 model year engines:
      a. All engines classified as OBD parent and child ratings subject to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(7.2.2) shall be considered to be nonconforming if the emission test results indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed 2.0 times the malfunction criteria (e.g., 4.0 times the standard if the malfunction criterion is 2.0 times the standard) on the applicable standard (i.e., FTP or SET).
      * * * *
   (iii) For 2016 through 2018 model year engines:
      a. PM filter monitors on engines subject to the malfunction criteria of Cal. Code Regs., title 13, sections 1971.1(e)(8.2.1)(CD) and (E) shall be considered to be nonconforming if the emission test results indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed 2.0 times the
malfunction criteria (e.g., PM emission level of 0.06 g/bhp-hr if the malfunction criterion is 0.03 g/bhp-hr) on either any of the applicable standards (i.e., FTP or SET).

b. Monitors on engines and engine ratings previously certified to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(7.2.3) for extrapolated OBD in the 2013 through 2015 model years shall be considered nonconforming if the emission test results indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed 2.0 times the malfunction criteria (e.g., 4.0 times the standard if the malfunction criterion is 2.0 times the standard) on either any of the applicable standards (i.e., FTP or SET).

c. Monitors on engines not covered under sections (b)(6)(A)(iii)a. and b. above shall be considered nonconforming if the emission test results indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed the malfunction criteria on either any of the applicable standards (i.e., FTP or SET).

(iv) For 2019 and subsequent model year engines, any engine shall be considered nonconforming if the results of the tests indicate that 50 percent or more of the engines in the test sample do not properly illuminate the MIL when emissions exceed the malfunction criteria on either any of the applicable standards (i.e., FTP or SET).

(v) The Executive Officer may not consider an OBD system nonconforming solely due to a failure or deterioration mode of a monitored component or system that could not have been reasonably foreseen to occur by the manufacturer.

(B) OBD Ratio Testing.

(i) 2013 through 2015 model year engines certified to a ratio of 0.100 in accordance with Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2.2) and PM filter filtering performance monitors (section 1971.1(e)(8.2.1)) and missing substrate monitors (section 1971.1(e)(8.2.5)) on 2016 through 2018 model year engines shall be considered nonconforming if the data collected from the engines in the test sample group indicate either that the average in-use monitor performance ratio for one or more of the monitors in the test sample group is less than 0.050 or that 66.0 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group have an in-use monitor performance ratio of less than 0.050 for the same monitor.

(ii) Except as provided above in section (b)(6)(B)(i) above, 2016 and subsequent model year engines certified to a ratio of 0.100 in accordance with Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2.2) shall be considered nonconforming if the data collected from the engines in the test sample group indicate either that the average in-use monitor performance ratio for one or more of the monitors in the test sample group is less than 0.088 or that 66.0 percent or more of the engines in the test sample group have an in-use monitor performance ratio of less than 0.100 for the same monitor.

(C) All Other OBD Testing.
(ii) Engines shall be considered nonconforming if the results of the testing indicate that at least 30 percent of the engines in the test sample group do not comply with one or more of the requirements of Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1 while the engine is running and while in the key on, engine off position such that off-board equipment designed to access the following parameters via the standards referenced in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1 for 2013 and subsequent model year engines cannot obtain valid and correct data for the following parameters:

b. The current MIL command status while the MIL is commanded off and while the MIL is commanded on in accordance with SAE J1979/J1939 and Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(h)(4.2), and in accordance with SAE J1979/J1939 and Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(2.1.2) during the MIL functional check and, if applicable Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(h)(4.1.36) during the MIL readiness status check;

(d) Remedial Action.

(3) Ordered Remedial Action-Mandatory Recall.

(A) Except as provided in sections (d)(3)(B) below, the Executive Officer shall order the recall and repair of all engines in an engine class that have been determined to be equipped with a nonconforming OBD system if enforcement testing conducted pursuant to sections (b) or (c) above or information received from the manufacturer indicates that:

(i) For major monitors required to meet the in-use performance ratio pursuant to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2) and subject to the nonconformance criteria of section (b)(6)(B)(ii) on 2016 and subsequent model year engines, the average in-use monitor performance ratio for one or more of the major monitors in the test sample group is less than or equal to 33.0 percent of the applicable required minimum ratio established in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2.2) (e.g., if the required ratio is 0.100, less than or equal to a ratio of 0.033) or 66.0 percent or more of the vehicles in the test sample group have an in-use monitor performance ratio of less than or equal to 33.0 percent of the applicable required minimum ratio established in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(3.2.2) for the same major monitor.

(ii) For major monitors required to indicate a malfunction before emissions exceed a certain emission threshold, when the engine is tested in a vehicle and operated so as to reasonably encounter all monitoring conditions disclosed in the manufacturer’s certification application, the OBD system is unable to detect and illuminate the MIL for a malfunction of a component/system monitored by the major monitor prior to emissions exceeding:
a. For 2013 through 2015 model year OBD parent and child ratings subject to the “full OBD” requirement under Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(7.2.2), three times the applicable major monitor malfunction criteria (e.g., if the malfunction criteria is 2.5 times the applicable standard, recall would be required when emissions exceed 7.5 times the applicable standard, or if the malfunction criteria is the PM standard plus 0.02 g/bhp-hr and the PM standard is 0.01 g/bhp-hr, recall would be required when emissions exceeded 0.09 g-bhp-hr).

b. For 2016 through 2018 model year engines:
   1. For engine ratings previously certified to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(d)(7.2.3) for “extrapolated OBD” in the 2013 through 2015 model years, three times the applicable major monitor malfunction criteria (e.g., if the malfunction criteria is 2.5 times the applicable standard, recall would be required when emissions exceed 7.5 times the applicable standard, or if the malfunction criteria is the PM standard plus 0.02 g/bhp-hr and the PM standard is 0.01 g/bhp-hr, recall would be required when emissions exceeded 0.09 g-bhp-hr), and
   2. For all other engine ratings, three times the malfunction criteria for PM filter monitors subject to Cal. Code Regs., title 13, sections 1971.1(e)(8.2.1)(CD) and (E) (e.g., if the malfunction criteria is the PM standard plus 0.02 g/bhp-hr and the PM standard is 0.01 g/bhp-hr, recall would be required when emissions exceeded 0.09 g-bhp-hr) and two times the malfunction criteria for all other applicable major monitors.

c. For 2019 and subsequent model year engines, two times the applicable major monitor malfunction criteria (e.g., if the malfunction criteria is 2.5 times the applicable standards, recall would be required when emissions exceed 5.0 times the applicable standards).

(iii) For misfire monitor:
   a. Gasoline misfire monitor: For 2016 and subsequent model year gasoline engines, the monitor for misfire causing catalyst damage is unable to properly detect and illuminate the MIL for misfire rates that are more than 20 percentage points greater than the misfire rates disclosed by the manufacturer in its certification application as causing catalyst damage (e.g., if the disclosed misfire rate is 12 percent, recall would be required if the misfire rate is greater than 32 percent without proper detection).
   b. Diesel misfire monitor: For 2019 and subsequent model year diesel engines, the misfire monitor is unable to properly detect and illuminate the MIL for misfire rates that are more than 10 percentage points greater than the misfire malfunction criteria specified in section Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(e)(2.2.2) (e.g., misfire rate more than 15 percent if the misfire malfunction criteria is 5 percent).

(iv) For 2016 and subsequent model year gasoline engines, when the engine is tested in a vehicle and operated so as to reasonably encounter all
monitoring conditions disclosed in the manufacturer’s certification application, the evaporative system monitor is unable to detect and illuminate the MIL for a cumulative leak or leaks in the evaporative system equivalent to that caused by an orifice with a diameter of at least 1.5 times the diameter of the required orifice in Cal. Code Regs., title 13, section 1971.1(f)(7.2.2)(B).

(v) When the engine is tested in a vehicle and operated so as to reasonably encounter all monitoring conditions disclosed in the manufacturer’s certification application, the OBD system cannot detect and illuminate the MIL for a malfunction of a component that effectively disables a major monitor and the major monitor, by being disabled, meets the criteria for recall identified in sections (d)(3)(A)(ii) or (iv) above (e.g. is unable to detect and illuminate the MIL for malfunctions that cause FTP emissions to exceed two times the malfunction criteria).

(vi) For 2013 and subsequent model year diesel engines, when the engine is tested in a vehicle and operated so as to reasonably encounter all monitoring conditions disclosed in the manufacturer’s certification application, the PM filter monitor is unable to detect and illuminate the MIL for any of the following:
   a. a missing substrate fault in accordance with title 13, CCR section 1971.1(e)(8.2.5); or
   b. a malfunction of the PM filter that causes PM emissions to be equal to or greater than the emission level of the engine, as measured from an applicable emission test cycle (i.e., FTP or SET), with the PM filter substrate completely removed.

(vi)(vii) The engine class cannot be tested so as to obtain valid test results in accordance with the criteria identified in section (b)(6)(C)(ii) due to the nonconforming OBD II system.

*     *     *     *