

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 8, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Mark A. Manendo at 8:14 a.m. on Wednesday, May 8, 2013, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair
Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Vice Chair
Senator Pat Spearman
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator Donald G. Gustavson

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18
Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Counsel
Jennie F. Bear, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dan Musgrove, Barrett-Jackson Auction Company LLC
Erin McMullen, Copart, Inc.
Megan Salcido, City of Reno
Andrew J. MacKay, Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority, Department of
Business and Industry
Emily Sermak, Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee, Carson City Republican
Central Committee

Senate Committee on Transportation
May 8, 2013
Page 2

Robert Sack, Director, Environmental Health Services Division, Washoe County
Health District

Chair Manendo:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 176.

ASSEMBLY BILL 176 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the emissions testing of certain consigned vehicles. (BDR 40-964)

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo (Assembly District No. 18):

Assembly Bill 176 involves provisions for emissions testing of consigned vehicles. Currently, the law requires sellers or long-term lessors of used vehicles to provide evidence to buyers or long-term lessees that the vehicles comply with emissions testing. The bill exempts consignees from this requirement for vehicles sold at consignment auctions if consignees inform buyers that they are responsible for testing the vehicles purchased. Consignees also must post notices of this requirement at auction sites.

Dan Musgrove (Barrett-Jackson Auction Company LLC):

Barrett-Jackson is one of the world's largest collector-car auction companies. The company began in Scottsdale, Arizona, in 1971. Five years ago, the company opened an office in Nevada. It announced on the Speed channel in January that it is partnering with Washoe County and the City of Reno to produce the 2013 Hot August Nights event, including a classic car auction. The company is committed to Nevada. More than 60,000 people attended the most recent auction in Las Vegas. Ninety-two percent of them were from out of state. The auction generated \$26 million. According to the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, the auction brought in more than \$38 million in nongaming and gaming revenue, and 41,000 room nights were booked.

Chair Manendo:

Where was the auction held?

Mr. Musgrove:

It was at the Mandalay Bay Resort and Casino. The Las Vegas auction is held in October each year. In Reno, the auction will be held in August during the event.

Chair Manendo:

Do car buyers pay sales tax in these transactions?

Mr. Musgrove:

Yes. For every vehicle purchased by a Nevada resident, auction officials collect Nevada sales tax. Last year, more than \$171,000 in Nevada sales tax was collected at the Las Vegas auction. During the 5 years Barrett-Jackson has held auctions in Nevada, more than \$700,000 in sales tax revenue has been generated.

When the company came to Nevada, it learned that there is no provision in State law regarding consignment auctions. The auction sells classic vehicles, which generally do not need to be tested for emissions to become registered. In Arizona and California, Barrett-Jackson representatives have worked with staff at the state departments of motor vehicles to exempt vehicles sold at consignment auctions. The responsibility is on the buyers to follow whatever laws exist in the states where they register their purchased vehicles.

We have worked with the air quality officials in Washoe and Clark Counties and the Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. They agreed to our proposal. Additionally, we have worked with staff at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to work out details of the legislation and the auction certification process. The first page of the bill reflects the work we did with the DMV; it includes the definition of consignment auction, the responsibilities of consignment auctions and necessary certifications. The most critical part of the bill for us is found on pages 3 and 4. It states the auctioneer does not have to test the vehicles for emissions and that this will be the responsibility of the buyers. We are to inform the buyers through the required paperwork and by posting signs at auction sites explaining the emission testing requirements.

While this bill was being discussed in the Assembly Committee on Transportation, a representative from an Internet auction company testified. We worked with the DMV to ensure these types of auctions are also covered in the bill. The DMV officials wanted to allow anyone buying a vehicle through an Internet auction the opportunity to inspect the vehicle. This concern arose after fraudulent auctioneers tried to sell dummy vehicles through the Internet. In some cases, buyers purchased vehicles that did not exist or that did not appear as advertised. This provision was included in A.B. 176. We all want the buyers to have a good experience with Barrett-Jackson and online auctions.

I attended the Scottsdale auction in January. It was very exciting. The original Batmobile was sold for \$4.2 million. The average vehicle at our auctions sells for \$20,000 to \$25,000. We have a large variety of vehicles at auction. The Speed channel televises the auctions live 5 nights per week, which brings exposure for Las Vegas and, soon, for Reno. It is a positive endeavor for Nevada.

Senator Spearman:

On average, what is Nevada's tax revenue from these auctions?

Mr. Musgrove:

The State receives about \$125,000 per year from Nevadans who buy vehicles at auction.

Senator Gustavson:

This amount is for the Las Vegas area only. The amount will be larger once the new auction in Washoe County is in place.

Mr. Musgrove:

Yes. While we are not sure yet who will attend the Reno auction, one of our biggest markets is the San Francisco Bay area. People there are excited to come to Reno for the auction. More tax revenue beyond sales tax will be generated for the region because the auction will spark tourism. Mayor Robert Cashell of Reno was in Scottsdale for the live announcement on the Speed channel that Barrett-Jackson is bringing its experience to Reno this year.

Senator Gustavson:

The Hot August Nights event has always included an auction. Because of Barrett-Jackson's reputation of being the largest and best auctioneers of classic cars, more interest will be generated. I am looking forward to it.

Senator Hardy:

With the Internet sales, will sales tax be based in the state of residence of the buyer or of the Internet site's registration? Are all cars in the Internet auction inspected, or available for inspection, before being sold?

Mr. Musgrove:

Barrett-Jackson does not sell on the Internet. We allow bidding via the Internet, however. Our auctions are live with all the vehicles onsite, available to be inspected. We collect the taxes at the time of the sale.

Erin McMullen (Copart, Inc.):

I do not know the answer to Senator Hardy's question about sales tax on Internet sales, but I will find out and provide the information to the Committee members. Copart is an Internet auction company and supports A.B. 176.

Megan Salcido (City of Reno):

The City of Reno supports A.B. 176. We are excited about the partnership with Barrett-Jackson and the upcoming Hot August Nights event.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

This bill is a good step for Nevada to continue to be a State that is friendly toward business.

Chair Manendo:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 176 and open the hearing on A.B. 198.

ASSEMBLY BILL 198: Revises provisions governing taxicabs in certain counties.
(BDR 58-86)

Assemblyman John Ellison (Assembly District No. 33):

Assembly Bill 198 repeals provisions of existing law that requires a vehicle acquired in a county other than Clark County to be new or to have not more than 30,000 miles on its odometer when it is acquired for use as a taxicab and to be removed from operation as a taxicab after a certain period of use.

The small taxicab companies in my district are unable to comply with NRS 706.88345, added by Senate Bill (S.B.) No. 320 of the 76th Session. These small companies are in Elko, Winnemucca and Wendover. We need to pass A.B. 198 to help these companies stay viable. The small taxicab companies inspect their vehicles and comply with all the other requirements, as do larger operators.

Andrew J. MacKay (Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority, Department of Business and Industry):

Last session, S.B. No. 320 of the 76th Session had taken what was in regulation and moved it into statute, specifically age requirements relative to the maximum age that a vehicle could be put in service as a taxicab as well as maximum time periods. That was in regulation, specifically *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 706.3745. An unintended consequence resulted from that bill. Previously, rural carriers were exempt from these specific mileage requirements. Assembly Bill 198 resets the requirements for rural taxi operators to what they were before the effective date of last Session's bill.

The question about what will happen in Washoe County was raised during the hearing on A.B. 198 in the Assembly Committee on Transportation. The bill will not affect carriers in Washoe County because they fall within the current regulation. Assembly Bill 198 resurrects a rural exemption that existed prior to the 76th Legislative Session. The Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA), Department of Business and Industry, supports A.B. 198.

The small operators from Elko, Winnemucca and Wendover expressed concerns for their viability when the law changed. They operate on thin margins. Due to the effective date of that law, these operators have been able to remain in business. They are worried about the near future if A.B. 198 is not passed.

The NTA is not concerned about safety factors because all of the rural taxis are inspected daily, before being driven and after returning to the yard. They also are subject to the comprehensive annual vehicle inspection.

Chair Manendo:

I am not familiar with the taxi yards in Elko. Do they have enough staff to conduct the required daily vehicle inspections?

Mr. MacKay:

Yes. They have no choice but to employ the necessary staff because the inspections are mandated by law. The NTA inspects all carriers over which it has authority. Part of the comprehensive annual vehicle inspection is reviewing the daily and annual vehicle inspection reports for compliance.

Chair Manendo:

Has this been an issue for some time?

Assemblyman Ellison:

No. The age of these vehicles was not an issue until the passage of S.B. No. 320 of the 76th Session. That is when the operators realized the cars they had already purchased would fall under the new law and would not be legal for use. They usually buy used police cars and refurbish them.

In Elko, most of the people using these cabs during the day are seniors and others with mobility needs. Taxis became particularly important for these people after the North Eastern Area Transit bus service stopped operating. During the evening, people who are out on the town have been the major users of the taxis. The other communities in my district have experienced the same trends. The small companies run good operations with clean, reliable cars.

Senator Hardy:

What unintended consequences will we have in Washoe County if A.B. 198 is passed?

Mr. MacKay:

I am fully confident that there will not be any unintended consequences because the bill resets the requirements to what they were before October 2011. Operators in Washoe County were under these restrictions prior to that date.

Senator Hardy:

Why did we need the bill in 2011?

Mr. MacKay:

A certain taxicab carrier requested to deviate beyond the maximum mileage requirement. The NTA granted that request and sought to start the permanent rule-making process to address the issue. At that time, State administrative agencies were subject to a freeze by executive order on adopting and promulgating regulations. I do not want to delve too deeply into the details now.

Senator Hardy:

You answered my question.

Senator Spearman:

Did this unintended consequence occur to anyone in 2011? If so, what was said about it? If not, why did this not come to the fore?

Mr. MacKay:

The bill was amended significantly from its original form, and the rural exemption was not included until late in the process. I admit that I should have caught the matter. I was focusing on other provisions such as the one that gave the NTA a better mechanism to collect fines. The NTA informed all the carriers affected between the time the Governor signed the bill and the effective date, which was October 1, 2011, to inform them of the new situation. Any vehicles purchased before the effective date were grandfathered in for compliance. The small taxi companies have been able to manage for a few years with the vehicles they have, but they contacted Assemblyman John Ellison for help. At that point, work began on drafting A.B. 198.

Regarding why Washoe County is not exempted, the answer involves an injunction against the NTA filed by a northern Nevada carrier. This carrier attempted to put vehicles into service that did not comport with the statute. We said the company could not do this, and we were sued. The judge issued an injunction against the NTA from enforcing the statute because of the location of the statute within chapter 706 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The NTA left this regulation on the books when it conducted a comprehensive review because we knew legislative action was going to be taken. Since we did not know how the situation would be resolved, we decided to leave the statute in place to avoid any downtime for taxicabs operating in Washoe County in the future. This is a long answer to your question, Senator Spearman, but it clarifies why we are here.

Senator Spearman:

If we eliminate the requirement of 30,000 miles, what will be the new amount, or will unlimited miles be allowed?

Mr. MacKay:

I will have to think about that.

Senator Spearman:

The purpose of my question is that most of the passengers are seniors and people who are challenged in various ways and do not have transportation. If there is not a mileage cap, we could have vehicles in service that are not roadworthy, putting part of our most vulnerable populations at risk.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The cabs are well maintained. The problem is the small companies cannot purchase new vehicles as easily as companies in Clark County that have much more business. The cabs are in good shape. Good people operate them. We hear stories from the seniors about helpfulness of the drivers, even carrying their groceries inside for them.

Senator Spearman:

I do not doubt the veracity of any of your statements. I believe what you are saying actually happens. My concern is, at some time, every vehicle comes to the point where it is no longer roadworthy. If we exempt rural operators from the 30,000-mile limit, what is the cap? I think there has to be a cap regardless of how good the mechanics are, how good the cars were when they were purchased or how many bags of groceries drivers carried. My concern remains. We should have uniformity if we remove the 30,000-mile limit.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I agree.

Mr. MacKay:

If the 30,000-mile requirement were eliminated under A.B. 198, taxicab operators could put vehicles into service such as used police cars that have 60,000 to 70,000 miles. The problem is there would be a serious unintended consequence if the statute remained in place. The NTA would be able to use NAC regulations in Washoe County, as we were enjoined from using the statute in the district court decision. If the current statute remains in effect, I request that it be moved to the part of the NRS dealing with the Nevada Transportation Authority rather than the Taxicab Authority. I disagree with the decision of the district court judge because the statute is clear. It covers the counties in which the Taxicab Authority does not have jurisdiction. That involves all the counties under the jurisdiction of the NTA. This is why we are here today.

Senator Spearman:

If my mother were still here in one of these taxicabs and a rear-end collision with an explosion killed everyone in the cab, a smart lawyer first would determine the mileage of that cab. Based upon that, the lawyer would ask if it had been prudent to keep the cab in service. We need to cap the mileage at some amount because every vehicle has a point at which it is unsafe without a complete overhaul. At what number of miles is it ill advised to continue

operating the cabs? My concern is for the safety of the most vulnerable people in our population. If such an accident happened, attorneys might sue the NTA. However, they might look to the Legislature because we are responsible for legislation to keep our communities safe. I need this mileage cap to be decided.

Mr. MacKay:

Assuming A.B. 198 is signed by the Governor, the current regulation applies only to Washoe County. The regulation involves minimum mileage requirements and maximum age requirements for putting vehicles into service. Such requirements do not exist for rural Nevada, and they did not exist prior to this Session. The NTA will do what the Legislature mandates it to do. If the Legislature wants to pass a maximum time for taxicabs to be in service, we will uphold that. The reason time, instead of the age of a cab, is the requirement is that it is extremely difficult to track mileage for all cabs. We know, based on our database, that at 5 years a certain vehicle needs to be removed from service. I respectfully defer to the Legislature to determine a maximum amount of time a vehicle can be in service. The NTA will enforce provisions accordingly in Nye, Elko and Humboldt Counties and in the other rural counties.

Senator Atkinson:

I am getting confused by the whole discussion. I have seen some cars operate very well after a few hundred thousand miles. At this time, I am not comfortable assessing a mileage cap for a vehicle's viability. A car's performance depends on how it is maintained. We may need to spend more time discussing the situation in the rural areas. The NTA does a good job of ensuring inspections of the vehicles in service. Perhaps the answer is to inspect vehicles more often after they have reached a certain number of miles.

Mr. MacKay:

You are correct about inspections. I think members of the Assembly Committee on Transportation had an impression that these vehicles are not inspected. The annual vehicle inspections are comprehensive. Each vehicle is examined from bumper to bumper, from roof to frame. They are put up on racks for thorough examinations. The NTA prides itself on its work with carriers and has no tolerance for failed vehicles remaining in service. Federal law delineates that federally certified inspectors conduct the required annual inspections. Any vehicles failing are removed from service immediately, regardless of the number of miles on their odometers. They are not allowed back in service until proof is given that the necessary repairs have been made. If the Legislature wants to

implement a biennial inspection process for taxicabs in rural Nevada older than a certain age, the NTA will do it.

Senator Spearman:

I am not saying that some vehicles with 100,000 or 200,000 miles on their odometers are not roadworthy. If our statute has a 30,000-mile cap and we are seeking an exemption to that statute, at what level do we place a higher cap? If there is no need for the 30,000-mile limit, we should remove this statute from the books. My point is we have a 30,000-mile cap for some operators, but not for others. Should we even have a mileage cap? I am not disputing the fact that the rural areas have qualified mechanics and comprehensive daily inspections. What, if any, is an appropriate mileage amount for parity with those who remain under the 30,000-mile limitation by statute?

Mr. MacKay:

I do not know. Historically, the rural exemption comes down to economics. The owner of Winnemucca Cab, for instance, is a phenomenal operator and great businessman. He does not have the financial means, however, to buy more vehicles compared to larger companies in Reno and Las Vegas.

A maximum mileage cap of 70,000 to 75,000 miles is close to the mileage on the used cars that some rural operators buy for their fleets. I have no empirical data at this time. I honestly do not know.

Senator Spearman:

I can accept an "I don't know." This is something that needs to be on the record. Any business plan includes considerations for the unexpected. We need to consider this aspect of vehicle operation.

Assemblyman Ellison:

For many years, there was no mileage or age limitation. The rural companies have operated excellent service. Now that the law has changed, the situation has thrown them into the whole mix of operators in Nevada. Whatever the NTA and the Legislature decide, they will comply. However, I guarantee that without passage of A.B. 198, these small businesses will not be operating this time next year. They cannot comply with existing law.

Senator Hardy:

Can we accomplish change through the regulatory process rather than through legislation? The administrative freeze is no longer in effect.

Mr. MacKay:

You are correct about the freeze having been lifted. We can go through the regulatory process. I have always said it is better to have policies in statute than in regulation. Some of my colleagues have told me that we would have avoided this perceived mess if the regulation had stayed in place. If it is the appetite of this body to set a maximum age requirement for taxicabs in rural counties, similar to Washoe and Clark Counties, the NTA will act accordingly. We will request input from the carriers and the insurance companies in an open process.

Senator Hardy:

Does the NTA have to be told to implement regulations, or does it have the ability to implement regulations without the Legislature passing laws that tell the NTA to implement regulations?

Mr. MacKay:

No. The enabling statute is chapter 233B of the NRS for the Nevada Transportation Authority. We can enter into rule making anytime we want, within reason. To start the rule-making process, we must have a good reason. If the Legislature wants a rule in the administrative code but not in statute, we have a good reason to do it.

Senator Hardy:

You have heard that a reason and an appetite exist, but I do not think you need a statute to tell you to do your job.

Mr. MacKay:

I agree.

Senator Hardy:

Thank you.

Chair Manendo:

I have been reviewing S.B. No. 320 of the 76th Session and the committee minutes related to it.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I ask for consideration to pass a bill that puts the provisions back to the way they were before. If more regulations or inspections are added, we do not have a problem with that. We just want to try to keep these taxicabs running in good service.

Senator Spearman:

Assemblyman Ellison, I understand that and am sympathetic to the worries of small businesses. Please do not hear my questions as unsympathetic, against business or wanting to see them go out of business. Mr. MacKay mentioned insurance companies. The insurers will look at the risk of exposure for each vehicle at some point in its lifetime. We live in a litigious society. Insurance companies will consider age, mileage and a combination of factors. Eventually, they will determine they cannot insure certain vehicles. If the cars are driven further, they will not be insured. Something catastrophic due to lack of parameters will bankrupt and ruin the brands of the companies. This is not to mention lives lost or health consequences to passengers and drivers resulting from catastrophe. I hope my questions are thought provoking. They are intended to say we ought to explore these areas. If anything were to happen, the first question asked will be, "What would a reasonable and prudent person have done under similar circumstances?" This is usually how judges and attorneys begin when considering fault in accident cases. I am sympathetic.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Thank you.

Emily Sermak (Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee):

I am a former school bus driver and area supervisor from California. There, school buses are limited to 7 years for 24-passenger vehicles and 20 years for 79-passenger vehicles. The limits have nothing to do with mileage, as some buses have short daily runs while others have long daily runs. The buses will have different mileage amounts after 7 years. The reason for this is fine line fractures in the metal. The fractures are related to age, not mileage. The 1997 limousine in California that recently caught on fire reportedly had a fracture somewhere at its bottom. Age has a lot to do with the length of service. Does this make any sense?

Senator Atkinson:

To me, it has to be a combination of age and mileage. It is not just age. You can have a 20-year-old vehicle, like a classic Camaro. Someone else can have the same model, but it is in worse shape because it has more road mileage. My cousin has a classic car that is never driven. It is in mint condition.

Ms. Sermak:

It is probably in a garage, too, which makes a difference.

Senator Atkinson:

I believe mileage plays a big part in a vehicle's condition.

Ms. Sermak:

I am not disputing that fact. I am saying that age also has a lot to do with it.

Senator Atkinson:

I agree. Age plus miles equal problems.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Senator Atkinson is correct. I flew a 1960 Cessna 182. An airplane undergoes quite a bit of stress. That airplane is inspected yearly. I have a 1965 GT Cobra Mustang that has about 150,000 miles on its frame. It is in immaculate condition. Recently, I bought a 2002 Thunderbird with 80,000 miles. We had it inspected thoroughly, and it is in immaculate condition. I drive it back and forth from my district to Carson City. It is not just the age of the vehicle that matters.

Chair Manendo:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 198 and open the hearing on A.B. 379.

ASSEMBLY BILL 379 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the disposal of abandoned recreational vehicles. (BDR 43-593)

Assemblyman John Ellison (Assembly District No. 33):

People can take a truck or a van to a landfill for disposal under current law, but we have a problem with abandoned motor homes. The cities and crushing companies will not take them. We have been asked to propose a new law to regulate the disposal of abandoned recreational vehicles (RV). Specifically, A.B. 379 allows an owner or occupant of private property who discovers an

abandoned RV on that property to dispose of the abandoned RV properly and legally.

The bill requires the owner or occupant of the property to take steps to locate the RV's owner and notify the person that he or she has 60 days to remove the vehicle. If the RV is not removed within 60 days, the property owner or occupant of the property can apply for a letter of abandonment from the DMV. Issuance of this letter will divest any other person of any interest in the abandoned RV and will allow the property owner or occupant of the property to dispose of the RV.

In addition, a landfill will be required to accept an RV for disposal if two conditions are met. First, the person disposing of the RV must provide the title to the vehicle indicating that he or she is the owner or provide a letter of abandonment from the DMV. Second, acceptance of the RV for disposal must not violate any applicable federal or State law concerning the operation of the landfill.

Draining fluids before crushing the vehicles is just one of the steps in the process. Landfill workers must empty any garbage inside the RVs as well as the cabinets, wood and other components. These vehicles have been out in the elements for years and can be quite messy. With this provision in A.B. 379, cities and other entities can process the vehicles in compliance with existing landfill laws.

The property owner or occupant of the property must advertise in newspapers, preferably with photos of the abandoned RV, attempting to find the owner. If no one comes to retrieve the vehicle, the property owner or occupant of the property can apply for a lost title and dispose of the RV. There are not a lot of these vehicles out there, but they are out there causing problems. Many are dumped in mobile home parks. The vehicles are not worth anything. Some have blown engines or collapsed roofs. We are trying to dispose of these vehicles properly.

Senator Gustavson:

What is the current practice? You said most landfills do not accept these vehicles so people park them out there and let them go. I can understand why landfills do not want to take the RVs because of the expense involved. Are there any landfills that will take these vehicles?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Former Assemblyman John C. Carpenter has one on his property that he cannot dispose of. People are happy to pay to process the RVs properly—fluid draining, title processing and removal transportation. However, most of the vehicles have had their identification numbers scratched off before being dumped. Cities have been stuck with paying to process abandoned RVs. People at a mobile home park in Carlin where several RVs were abandoned tried to take them to the recycling center for crushing. The center would not take them. Neither would the City of Elko. Assembly Bill 379 will help everyone take care of these abandoned vehicles.

Robert Sack (Director, Environmental Health Services Division, Washoe County Health District):

We support A.B. 379. We have run into the same problems with abandoned RVs in Washoe County. The main issue is titling. For a person to be able to get rid of one of these things on his or her property, it requires a title to the vehicle. In Washoe County, we do not have the problem of disposal because the metal in the vehicles is sold for parts or recycled. Disposing of the nonmetallic elements can be done easily in our county. To have the legal authority, through a title, to actually remove the vehicles is our problem.

Senate Committee on Transportation
May 8, 2013
Page 17

Chair Manendo:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 379. Having no other business on today's agenda, I will adjourn our meeting at 9:17 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jennie F. Bear,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	2		Attendance Roster