

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON TRANSPORTATION

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
March 10, 1981

The Senator Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard E. Blakemore, at 2:03 p.m., Tuesday, March 10, 1981, in Room 323 of the Legislative Building, in Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exihibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Richard E. Blakemore, Chairman
Senator William Hernstadt, Vice Chairman
Senator Joe Neal
Senator Lawrence E. Jacobsen
Senator Wilbur Faiss
Senator Clifford E. McCorkle
Senator James H. Bilbray

STAFF MEMBER PRESENT:

Kelly R. Torvik, Committee Secretary -

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 41

Colonel Zadra, Nevada Highway Patrol, stated that the bill originated in the Nevada Highway Patrol. The reason for the bill is that the patrol has the authority to issue permits for amber warning light on vehicles, however; there is no provision that prohibits an individual or entity to install amber lights without such permit. He explained that construction equipment which travels on the highway that does not have a permit for the light must cover the light or install it at the construction site.

SENATE BILL NO. 228

Senator Neal explained that the bill requires that red lights on emergency vehicles be visable from all directions. He felt that since the law protects emergency vehicles that the vehicles should be required to be visable from all directions. Senator Neal explained that there are vehicles presently driving on Nevada roadways which have red lights that are not visable from all directions.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

Chairman Blakemore explained that there are emergency vehicles which have taken the light off of the top of the vehicle and placed them inside the vehicle. These lights can be seen from the rear and the front, however, these lights cannot be seen from the side. Senator Bilbray noted that it is necessary for emergency lights to be seen from the side in order to provide safety at intersections.

Mr. Robert Forbus, Manager, Mercy Ambulance in Las Vegas, testified in support of Senate Bill No. 228. He stated that there is a need for emergency lights on the sides of ambulance vehicles. Current federal codes require manufacturers to install lights on the sides of ambulance vehicles.

Senator Jacobsen asked what the cost would be to retrofit the older ambulance vehicles with lights. Mr. Forbus estimated the cost of \$100 per light.

Mr. Vince Swinney, Washoe County Undersheriff, spoke in support of the concept of the the bill; however, he opposed the wording of the bill. He stated that on page two the provision, "that there must be at least one flashing red warning light visable from all directions," could be construed to mean that there must be one light on the top of the vehicle visable from all directions. Mr. Swinney also questioned whether "plain clothes" detective vehicles could comply with the proposal if it were approved.

Colonel Zadra stated that the Nevada Highway Patrol is presently in the process of converting from the aerodynamic light bar, which is the overhead lights, to the use of a side mount light. This conversion is taking place because the patrol is also converting to smaller vehicles and the replacement cost of the aerodynamic light bars is close to three times the cost of converting the the side mount lights. He stated that the use of the aerodynamic light bars creates a fifteen percent reduction in performance of the vehicle and a ten percent reduction in fuel economy. Colonel Zadra stated that the side mount light is much brighter than the aerodynamic light. He presented the committee with photographs of the side mount lights. (These photographs are available for viewing in the Senate Committee on Transportation office).

Senator Neal asked if the side mount lights would create dangers because they are not visable from all directions. Colonel Zadra stated that most of the agencies which would employ the use of the side mount light would have policies which would require

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

that the vehicle slow down or stop in dangerous areas, such as intersections, to insure safety.

Senator Hernstadt stated that he had seen the side mount lights and they the lights were so brights that they appeared to comply with Senate Bill No. 228. Colonel Zadra said that the side mount lights are so bright that the patrol's concern is not to blind other motorists. He stated that the lights have been seen at distances up to two miles.

Chairman Blakemore asked Colonel Zadra to return on Thursday, March 12, for the committee to view the larger model vehicle which the patrol presently uses and the small vehicle which it will be converting to. Colonel Zadra stated that he would.

Senator Hernstadt asked if the patrol had considered using a dome light which sits on the top of the vehicle. Colonel Zadra stated that using the dome light requires that holes be drilled in the roof of the vehicle and therefore affects the resale value of the vehicle.

Senator Bilbray stated that because of the brightness the side mount lights may comply with the provisions of the bill. Colonel Zadra stated that the side mount lights are currently being tested to check if the lights are visable from all directions.

Colonel Zadra stated that detective vehicles will not meet the requirements of the bill. Senator Bilbray felt that detective vehicles could be exempted since mounting of lights on detective vehicles would defeat the purpose of the vehicles.

Senator Faiss asked how many vehicles are equipped with the side mount light. Colonel Zadra explained that three vehicles are equipped with the lights for testing purposes.

Senator Faiss asked if the use of the side mount light would create a savings in maintenance costs. Colonel Zadra stated that the maintenance for emergency lights is very minimal and probably would not change.

Mr. Larry Ketzenberger from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department stated that the only problem he had with the bill was the possiblity that the wording of the bill would require that one light be visable from all directions, rather than many lights causing the vehicle to be visable from all directions. He stated that motorcycles could not comply with the requirements of the bill.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

Senator Neal did not feel that the legislation would eliminate the use of motorcycles. Mr. Ketzenberger suggested that the language in Senate Bill No. 228 state that the lights be visible from ninety degrees in each direction.

SENATE BILL NO. 235

Mr. Hale Bennett, Director, Registration Division of the Department of Motor Vehicles, introduced Mr. Russ Beaver, Senior Agent in Charge of the Las Vegas operation of the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement. He also introduced Mr. Ken Alkire, Statewide Senior Agent for the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement. Mr. Bennett stated that the department supports the bill.

Mr. Alkire supplied the committee with information regarding Senate Bill No. 235. (See Exhibit C). He stated that the bill would allow the Department of Motor Vehicles to be the final authority as to whether an applicant may be licensed.

Chairman Blakemore asked if the legislation would solve the problem of merchants selling their goods from the sidewalks without an established place of business. Mr. Alkire stated that the legislation would address the problem, however, it would not solve it.

Senator McCorkle asked why a temporary enclosed building could not be used by a dealer who is licensed. Mr. Alkire stated that he has licensed temporary enclosed buildings if they have the appearance of being permanent.

Senator McCorkle pointed out that skirted mobile homes, which have the appearance of being permanent would not be provided for as places of business under this bill. Mr. Bennett stated that it was not the intent of the bill to exclude skirted mobile homes as places of business. Senator Hernstadt suggested that the bill be amended to provide for skirted mobile homes and places of business. Mr. Bennett stated that there are currently some amendments being prepared.

Chairman Blakemore asked what other problems have caused a need for the bill. Mr. Alkire explained that the bill is necessary in order to define the meaning of the term "unfit", which is used as a term to deny an applicant a license.

Chairman Blakemore stated that there are unethical procedures being practiced by dealers which this bill could prevent. One of these activities being a "chop shop", where a stolen vehicle is quickly stripped and sold as parts. The "chop shop" is a multi-billion dollar business nationally.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

Senator Neal asked if there is a remedy for the situation where a new car is involved in an accident in one jurisdiction, rebuilt to appear to be a new car and sold as a new car in another jurisdiction. Mr. Alkire explained that the entities of jurisdiction and the manufacturers cooperate to provide information and other assistance which could lead to the conviction of dealers who are involved in such practices.

Senator McCorkle felt that the listings of evidence of "unfitness" as listed on page two of the bill were not specific enough and would cause questions of interpretation which would therefore cause difficulties in enforcement. He asked how the list was developed. Mr. Alkire stated that the list was developed through discussion with individuals who had been subject to "unfit" dealers in the past and analysis of case histories. He stated that the intent of the listing is to outline the term "unfit", which is a very vague and nebulous term.

Senator Neal asked if the term "unfit" could be applied to a dealer prior to an investigation. Mr. Alkire stated that the dealer must be investigated before he can be determined "unfit". Mr. Bennett explained that it is necessary for the courts to understand what the department feels in "unfit".

Senator Hernstadt asked if a "D" license plate which is issued to dealers for the purpose of transporting new automobiles is assessed a privilege tax. Mr. Alkire stated that the vehicles which have a "D" license plate are not assessed a privilege tax because they are not for the dealer's personal use.

Senator Hernstadt asked if there was the possibility of a dealer abusing the "D" license plate in order to avoid paying a privilege tax. Mr. Alkire stated that they have found the "D" license plate being abused. He estimated that abuse of the "D" license plate is between ten and fifty percent. Chairman Blakemore pointed out that a dealer would not want to put too many miles on a new vehicle which would have a "D" plate because it would lose its retail sale value.

Chairman Blakemore asked who makes the determination which is referred to on page two, line 29 of Senate Bill No. 235. Mr. Alkire stated that a hearing officer or judge would make that decision. He stated that as an investigator for a regulatory agency he prepares the case with the cooperation of the prosecutor.

Chairman Blakemore was concerned that the bill broadens the definition of the term "unfit" to a point that it is not in the best interest of those involved.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

Mr. Daryl Capurro, Executive Director of the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association, stated that he had no objections to the intent of Senate Bill No. 235. He stated that the first seven listings of evidence of "unfitness" on page two of the bill are very specific; however, the eleventh listing is all-encompassing and could allow severe punishments for minor violations. Mr. Capurro suggested that the term "willful" be inserted in the eleventh listing in order to prevent an otherwise honest and forthright dealer from losing his license. He explained that section six of the bill would remedy the situation where a car rental agency has a Department of Motor Vehicles license for short term leasing and the sale of used cars; however, the agency fails to have a business license for the sale of used cars. He felt that the lack of a business license for the sale of used cars put the car rental agency at a competitive advantage because they do not have the additional cost of purchasing the business license. Mr. Capurro suggested that on page two, lines 43 and 44 the term "conducts business" be replaced by "maintains an established place of business" in order to make the language consistent throughout the statutes. This change would prevent businesses which are located in the city and cater to county residents from being required to purchase a county business license also.

Senator Hernstadt asked Mr. Capurro if he felt that there was a problem with the misuse of the "D" license plates or the dealer special certificate. Mr. Capurro did not feel that a problem exists. He stated that there may be misuse; however, he did not feel that the misuse was of such extent that it required a legislative remedy. Senator Bilbray suggested that the Franchised Auto Dealers Association mention that the committee is concerned about the misuse of "D" plates and the dealer special certificates in their newsletter.

Mr. Dan Fitzpatrick from Clark County felt that Senate Bill No. 235 was meritorious. He did not agree with the changes in Section Six and suggested that the committee not consider the changes. He felt that the final authority for issuance of licenses should rest with the local entities. This is because it would be a waste of time for an applicant to be approved by the numerous local entities involved and not be approved by the state.

Chairman Blakemore noted that the Department of Motor Vehicles desired the final authority because of the extensive investigation that the department holds and the possibility of the applicant not being approved by the local entity.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 363

Senator Jacobsen stated that six states have currently changed their statutes to allow county designations on their license plates. He noted that some of the county designations which are currently being used in Nevada are unrecognizable. He felt that passage of the bill would give a final solution to a problem of adding county designations as they are presently be designated. Senator Jacobsen noted that the bill would allow for stockpiling of the license plates. He stated that he would accept amendments which would allow either letter, number or a combination of the two as the actual license plate numbers. He noted that the license plates currently in use would gradually be replaced with the new plates as the older plates expired. Senator Jacobsen also noted that instead of actually embossing the county name on the license plate it would be possible to use a sticker to identify the county.

Chairman Blakemore noted that there would be a considerable amount of savings if the department discontinued the issuance of front license plates. He asked Mr. Bennett to supply the committee with an exact figure of how much money could be saved by only issuing one license plate.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was in support of the bill. He pointed out that unlike bills which have been introduced in previous sessions, Senate Bill No. 363 allows the complete spelling of the county name to be on the license plate. He explained that the use of a sticker rather than embossing the county name on the plate would allow the county name to be changed on the plate by applying another sticker. This would provide for individuals who move to another county within the state. Mr. Bennett stated that designating the county by sticker would also allow the license plates to be manufactured in bulk by the prison system and distributed to the counties at random. The stickers which designate the county would be distributed by the counties to registered owners of vehicles. Mr. Bennett showed the committee a sample license plate and a dye which is used to emboss "experimental vehicle" license plates.

Senator Faiss asked how long the proposed system could be used without requiring further revision. Mr. Bennett stated that system as proposed in the bill could supply license plates to cars, trucks, and trailers for twenty years without revision.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

Senator Hernstadt asked why license plate numbers which have been given up cannot be reissued. Mr. Bennett stated that since the license numbers are assigned to the individual reissuance of the numbers requires that the department send out a letter to the individual to inform him that if he does not respond he will lose that number.

Senator Hernstadt suggested that if the license plate number is not claimed within six months of the time that it was forfeited that it become available to new applicants for license plates. Mr. Bennett stated that such a process would be possible. Chairman Blakemore stated that it would be logical to assign a license to a vehicle rather than an individual.

Mr. Bennett suggested that the committee consider amending the bill. (See Exhibit D).

Chairman Blakemore asked if there was any objection to a committee introduction of taxicab legislation.

Senator Jacobsen moved for a committee introduction of taxicab legislation.

Senator Hernstadt seconded the motion.

The motion passed. (Senator Neal was absent for the vote).

SENATE BILL NO. 298

Chairman Blakemore stated that contrary to belief the bill was drafted as requested.

Mr. Capurro introduced Mr. Jim Lawson who represents the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association. Mr. Capurro explained that the intent of the bill is to allow non-resident manufacturers special license plates so that their vehicles which are maintained in Nevada can be properly identified. These vehicles cannot be registered as a regular vehicle because it would start the warranty term and designate the vehicle as used.

Senator Hernstadt asked how abuse of the special license plates could be avoided. Mr. Capurro explained that passage of the bill would help prevent abuse of manufacturers license plates since the enforcement agencies would have information on the vehicles readily available. Mr. Capurro pointed out that the vehicles to which a special license plate would be attached are new vehicles and the dealer intends to sell them as new vehicles; therefore, the dealer would not want excessive miles on the

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 10, 1981

vehicle. Mr. Capurro stated that the major automobile manufacturers have no problem with the bill.

Chairman Blakemore stated that he had a letter from a Mr. Thomas P. Erwin, Esq., whom he did not know, which proposes an amendment to Nevada Revised Statute 408.363 and 408.387. The amendment would clarify the time for filing of claims with the Department of Transportation for claims against highway contractors and against the surety of highway contractors. He asked Mr. Al Stone, Director, Department of Transportation to review the letter and provide his comments on the letter at the Thursday, March 12, meeting of the Senate Committee on Transportation.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


Kelly R. Torvik

APPROVED:


Senator Richard E. Blakemore
Chairman

Dated: 3/12, 1981

SENATE AGENDA

EXHIBIT A

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee on Transportation, Room 323
Day Tuesday, Date March 10, Time 2:00

A. B. No. 41--Provides for penalty for failure to obtain permit for flashing amber warning lights.

S. B. No. 228--Requires red lights on emergency vehicles to be visible from all directions.

S. B. No. 235--Makes various changes in law regulating place of business, licensing, disciplinary action of dealers in vehicles.

S. B. No. 363--Changes system of designation on license plates for passenger cars.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: 3/10/81

EXHIBIT B

PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT

NAME ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS TELEPHONE

CARL UTOIFF	NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL	885-5300
Vince Swinner	Washoe County Sheriff's Dept	785-6220
PETER ZADREIT	NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL	885-5300
Ken Kevire	DMV B2&E	925 5396
Harold Barrett	DMV Reg. Div.	825.5370
Robert [unclear]	DMV Reg Div	386-5347
Robert [unclear]	Mercy Ambulance	731-0851
Jim Austin	Mtr Veh. Mgr Assn - SACO CA	(916) 444-3767
Daryl E. Caputo	NEV. FRANCHISED AUTO DEALERS ASSN	331-6884

Legislation: SB235

Testifying: Kennard L. Alkire, Administrative Assistant
Bureau of Investigations & Enforcement
Department of Motor Vehicles

Position: Recommend Approval

1. In the past 20 months since coming to this position and through the re-organization and attempts to reorganize, several areas became a major concern. These areas of concern were not only from a licensing, regulatory and enforcement point of view, but also from one of fairness and ease of entry into the automotive market by prospective licensees.

We feel some of these problems are solved by this piece of legislation.

It allows that a short-term lessor must only maintain one of their many possible offices as an "established place of business". A short-term lessor must designate one of these locations as a principal place of business. Subsequent offices do not have to have a show room or a place to display at least one vehicle. All books and records must, however, be maintained at the principal place of business.

2. The existing statute (NRS 482.033) is ambiguous; subsection 2 alludes to "An established place of business need not be a permanent building or structure...." (emphasis added). In trying to explain to a prospective licensee the requirements of an established place of business, this area causes areas of misunderstanding. The prospective licensee immediately seizes upon the opportunity to save money and the Department's employees, in trying to carry out the provisions of NRS 482.318, explain that the structure is necessary for licensing.

Short-term lessors, by their very nature, may require more than one place of business, especially in Las Vegas and Reno, such as international airports, etc. This bill would ease the licensing requirements for this portion of the industry.

3. Nevada Revised Statute 482.352.1 (d) provides that an existing automobile dealer or rebuilder or a prospective licensee may be denied or revoked upon the grounds of "unfitness". What is "unfitness"? This, when used as a reason for denial or revocation, is inherently an area of heated contention; is the reason being used proof of unfitness or is it not?

We feel we have given a sufficient example of unfitness in this bill, understanding there are many more examples.

4. The Department of Motor Vehicles is charged in the Nevada Revised Statutes as the governmental entity responsible for licensing, regulating and enforcing the automotive industry in Nevada, as well as protecting the public interest and the public from fraud and impositions upon its citizens. NRS 482.322 as it presently reads, allows that the local licensing be the final authority in licensing after the department has completed hours of investigation and licensing procedures.

SUMMARY:

This bill will allow for:

1. A more equitable licensing of short-term lessors.
2. Eradicate ambiguous language.
3. Assist in defining "unfitness" and,
4. Allow the department to be the total licensing authority.

482.030 "Essential parts" defined. "Essential parts" means all integral parts and body parts, the removal, alteration or substitution of which will tend to conceal the identity or substantially alter the appearance of the vehicle.

[Part 1:202:1931; A 1951, 165; 1953, 280]

482.033 "Established place of business" defined.

1. "Established place of business" means a permanent enclosed building or structure owned either in fee or leased with sufficient space to display one or more vehicles which the dealer is licensed to sell, and which is devoted principally to the use of a dealer in the conduct of the business of the dealer.

2. In the case of a used vehicle dealer, trailer dealer or semitrailer dealer, an established place of business need not be a permanent building or structure but may be a vacant lot sufficiently bounded or otherwise marked definitely to indicate the boundaries thereof, but the term shall not mean or include a residence, tent, temporary stand or temporary quarters or permanent quarters occupied pursuant to a temporary arrangement. There shall be located or erected on any such lot a permanent closed building or structure large enough to accommodate the office or offices of the dealer and to provide a safe place to keep the books and other records of the business of such dealer, at which site or location the principal portion of such dealer's business shall be conducted and the books and records thereof kept and maintained. Such books and records shall be open to inspection during usual business hours by any authorized agent of the director or the State of Nevada.

(Added to NRS by 1957, 508; A 1961, 128)

482.035 "Farm tractor" defined. "Farm tractor" means every motor vehicle designed and used primarily as a farm implement for drawing plows, mowing machines and other implements of husbandry.

[Part 1:202:1931; A 1951, 165; 1953, 280]

482.037 "Fiscal year" defined. "Fiscal year" means a year commencing at 12 p.m. June 30 and ending at 12 p.m. the following June 30.

(Added to NRS by 1969, 684)

482.040 "Foreign vehicle" defined. "Foreign vehicle" means every motor vehicle, trailer or semitrailer which has been brought into this state otherwise than in the ordinary course of business by or through a manufacturer or dealer and which has not been registered in this state.

[Part 1:202:1931; A 1951, 165; 1953, 280]—(NRS A 1969, 186)

482.045 "Highway" defined. "Highway" means the entire width between the boundary lines of every way maintained by a public authority when any part of such way is open to the use of the public for purposes of vehicular traffic.

[Part 1:202:1931; A 1951, 165; 1953, 280]—(NRS A 1973, 230)

MANUFACTURERS, REBUILDERS, DISTRIBUTORS,
DEALERS, SALESMEN AND LESSORS

LICENSING

482.318 Legislative declaration. The legislature finds and declares that the distribution and sale of motor vehicles in the State of Nevada vitally affects the general economy of the state and the public interest and the public welfare, and in the exercise of its police power, it is necessary to regulate and to license motor vehicle manufacturers, distributors, new and used vehicle dealers, rebuilders, leasing companies, salesmen, and their representatives doing business in the State of Nevada in order to prevent frauds, impositions and other abuse upon its citizens.

(Added to NRS by 1965, 1471; A 1971, 1302)

482.320 Dealers, manufacturers and rebuilders: Movement, operation of new or used vehicles displaying special plates; exceptions.

1. A manufacturer, dealer or rebuilder having an established place of business in this state, and owning or controlling any new or used vehicle of a type otherwise required to be registered under the provisions of this chapter, may operate or move such vehicle if there is displayed thereon a special plate or plates issued to such manufacturer, dealer or rebuilder as provided in NRS 482.330. Such a vehicle may also be moved or operated for the purpose of towing other vehicles which are to be sold or exchanged, or stored for the purpose of sale or exchange.

2. The provisions of this section do not apply to:

(a) Work or service vehicles owned or controlled by a manufacturer, dealer or rebuilder.

(b) Vehicles leased by dealers, except vehicles rented or leased to vehicle salesmen in the course of their employment.

[Part 16:202:1931; A 1937, 330; 1951, 165; 1953, 280; 1955, 468]—
(NRS A 1957, 506; 1959, 913; 1960, 128; 1963, 103; 1965, 1473; 1971, 1303)

482.321 Registration of new vehicles by dealers, manufacturers without payment of privilege tax; transfer of registration; payment of privilege tax by purchaser.

1. Any manufacturer of or dealer in vehicles in this state qualified to receive a dealer's license is entitled to register in his name new vehicles of the make for which he is a licensed and franchised dealer upon payment of the registration and licensing fee as provided in this chapter. The dealer is not subject to the payment of privilege taxes on these registrations, and may transfer such registrations to other new vehicles without payment of such taxes.

10. Any money received by the department pursuant to subsection 6 shall be deposited with the state treasurer for credit to the motor vehicle fund.

[Part 16:202:1931; A 1937, 330; 1951, 165; 1953, 280; 1955, 468]—
(NRS A 1957, 507; 1960, 345; 1961, 80; 1963, 261; 1965, 1475; 1971, 1304; 1973, 39; 1977, 644)

New

482.347 Vehicle dealer's bond: Coverage. The vehicle dealer's bond required by NRS 482.345 covers the dealer's principal place of business and all branches operated by him if:

1. All of his places of business are located within one county; and
2. All are operated under the same name.

For any place of business located outside the county of the dealer's principal office, or any place of business operated under a different name, the dealer shall procure a separate bond.

(Added to NRS by 1979, 1024)—(Substituted in revision for part of NRS 482.322)

482.350 Certification of new vehicle dealers as franchised dealers; instruments to be provided department. A new vehicle dealer's license shall not be furnished to any dealer in new vehicles, trailers or semi-trailers unless the dealer shall first furnish the department an instrument executed by or on behalf of the manufacturer certifying that he is an authorized franchised dealer for the make or makes of vehicle concerned. New vehicle dealers shall be authorized to sell only those new vehicles for which they are certified as franchised dealers by the manufacturer.

[Part 16:202:1931; A 1937, 330; 1951, 165; 1953, 280; 1955, 468]—
(NRS A 1957, 508; 1965, 1475)

482.351 Misleading, inaccurate advertising by vehicle dealers, rebuilders prohibited; department regulations.

1. No vehicle dealer or rebuilder may intentionally publish, display or circulate any advertising which is misleading or inaccurate in any material particular or which misrepresents any of the products sold, manufactured, handled or furnished to the public.

2. The director, after hearing, may adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for making the administration of this section effective.

(Added to NRS by 1965, 1472; A 1971, 1305)

482.352 Denial, revocation of dealer's or rebuilder's license: Grounds.

1. The department may deny the issuance of or revoke a dealer's or rebuilder's license upon any of the following grounds:

(a) Failure of the applicant to have an established place of business in this state.

(b) That the applicant or licensee has been convicted of a felony in the State of Nevada or any other state, territory or nation.

482.3211 VEHICLE LICENSING, REGISTRATION

2. Vehicles so registered are subject to the payment of privilege taxes by the purchaser from the dealer at the time of their transfer to the purchaser.

3. The transferee of the vehicle is required to pay the registration fees and privilege taxes before he is entitled to a transfer of the registration and title in his name. The transferee shall apply for registration as provided in NRS 482.215.

4. This section does not apply to work or service vehicles.

(Added to NRS by 1960, 133; A 1963, 1128; 1969, 687; 1979, 1023)

482.3211 Dealers', rebuilders' permits for movement of used vehicles held for resale; form, numbering and attachment of permits.

DEMO PERMIT

1. The department shall supply to dealers and rebuilders permits for the movement of used vehicles which such dealers hold for resale. Such permits shall be in a form to be determined by the department and shall limit the use of such vehicles to movement only for the purposes of display, demonstration, maintenance, sale or exchange. A permit shall be affixed to each such vehicle in a manner and position to be determined by the department, and shall be removed and destroyed upon resale of such vehicle.

2. The permits shall be numbered in sequence and each dealer and rebuilder shall, at such times as the department may require, account to the department by number for permits in his possession, permits in use and permits destroyed.

3. Such permit shall be required for the movement of motortrucks and passenger cars only.

(Added to NRS by 1960, 134; A 1971, 1303)

482.3212 Special permits for movement of vehicles outside, inside state; fees for and expiration of permits.

1. The department shall issue to any dealer, rebuilder or individual, upon request, and upon payment of a fee of \$8.25, a special permit, in a form to be determined by the department, for movement of any vehicle for the purpose of sale outside the State of Nevada, or for movement outside the state of any vehicle purchased by a nonresident. The permit shall be affixed to the vehicle to be so moved in a manner and position to be determined by the department, and shall expire 15 days after issuance.

2. The department may issue a permit to a Nevada resident who desires to move an unregistered vehicle within the state upon the payment of a fee of \$8.25. Such permit shall be valid for 24 hours.

(Added to NRS by 1960, 134; A 1963, 105; 1965, 1474; 1971, 1554; 1973, 171)

482.322 Licensing of dealers, manufacturers and rebuilders required; investigation of applicants.

1. No person may engage in the activities of a vehicle dealer, manufacturer or rebuilder in this state, or be issued any other license or permit required by this chapter, until he has been issued a dealer's,

Suggested Amendments

March 10, 1981

Section 1, line 4: add after cars and trucks

Section 1, line 6: add after car and truck

Section 1, line 8: add after (a) a space for

Delete after county (from which the plate was issued)

Section 1, line 11: add after car or truck

Replace July 1, 1981 with on or after

January 1, 1982

Page 3, beginning on line 11, add new language:

Section 3, Chapter 482 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section which shall read as follows:

1. The director shall order the preparation of reflectorized decal strips to fit in the space on the license plates described in Section 1. The decal strips shall display the name of a county in prominent block lettering.

2. County name decals shall be available for sale in every office where motor vehicle license plates are available, upon request in person or by mail.

Section 4. NRS 482.500 is hereby amended to read as follows:

482.500

1. Except as provided in subsection 2, whenever any duplicate or substitute certificate of registration or ownership, decal or number plate is issued upon application, the following fees shall be paid:

For a certificate of registration or ownership.....	\$2.00
For every substitute number plate.....	2.00
For every duplicate number plate.....	7.50

For every decal (license plate sticker or tab).....\$1.00
For every county name decal50

2. A fee of \$2 shall be paid for a duplicate plate of a special plate issued pursuant to NRS 482.3667, 482.375, 482.376 or 482.380. A fee shall not be charged for a duplicate plate or plates issued under NRS 482.368, 482.370, 482.373 or 482.374.

3. The fee which is paid for a duplicate number plate and for each county name decal shall be deposited to the state treasurer for credit to the motor vehicle fund and allocated to the department to defray the costs of duplicating the plate and manufacturing the county name decals.

Section 4. NRS 482.273 is hereby repealed.

Section 5. This act shall become effective upon January 1, 1982.