Fiscal Estimate - 2017 Session						
I Original Dpdated	Corrected Sup	plemental				
LRB Number 17-1368/1	Introduction Number AB	-0098				
<b>Description</b> court orders regarding the installation of an ignition interlock device and providing a criminal penalty						
Fiscal Effect						
Appropriations Reve	ease Existing enues Increase Costs - I rease Existing to absorb within a enues IVes Decrease Costs					
Indeterminate   5. Types of Local     Indeterminate   3. Increase Revenue     Permissive Mandatory   Permissive Mandatory     Decrease Costs   4. Decrease Revenue     Permissive Mandatory   Permissive Mandatory     Permissive Mandatory   Permissive Mandatory     Decrease Costs   4. Decrease Revenue     Permissive Mandatory   Permissive Mandatory     Decrease Revenue   Others     Decrease Costs   Decrease Revenue     Decrease Costs   D						
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations						
GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS 20.395(5)(cq)						
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date				
DOT/ Robert Combs (608) 266-1449	Jennifer Peters (608) 267-6979 2/13/2017					

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOT 2/13/2017

LRB Number	17-1368/1	Introduction Number	AB-0098	Estimate Type	Original	
Description						
court orders regarding the installation of an ignition interlock device and providing a criminal penalty						

## Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Currently when a court orders an ignition interlock device restriction, that restriction is applied upon issuance of the violator's driver license for a minimum of 1 year. Courts currently have the option to immediately order IID installations on the vehicles belonging to the violator, but not on that individual's driver license. If a driver has been revoked due to OWI, has not reinstated his or her driver's license, has a pending IID restriction waiting for that reinstatement, and is caught driving, he or she would be convicted of operating after revocation. However, the driver would not be convicted of violating the IID restriction on their license.

This bill would require the IID restriction ordered by the court to begin on the date of the order, rather than upon license issuance. The requirement that the restriction last no less than one year after issuance of the license is left in place, resulting in potentially longer IID restriction durations.

Currently a violator who removes, disconnects, tampers with or otherwise circumvents the operation of an IID can have his or her IID restriction extended by 6 months for each violation.

This bill allows a judge to specify a deadline for the installation of an IID in the violator's vehicle. Additionally, this bill adds "fails to install by deadline" to the existing list of justifications for 6 month extensions.

DMV uses automated driver license systems to process court orders, to relay information to law enforcement, and to aid its customers online with status checks and application processes. All of these services would need to be updated to allow for this new restriction.

If there is a violation of a court ordered deadline for IID installation, the department assumes that there would be another ticket written by law enforcement, per request from the court who issued the deadline, to carry a 6 month extension of the IID restriction through the DMV licensing system. The court chooses these deadlines, so it is assumed that the deadlines would not conflict with sentencing, suspensions, revocations, or other factors that would make it impossible for the individual to comply with the order.

Changes to existing department IT systems would be needed to meet the requirements of this bill. The cost of these changes would be approximately \$155,740.

## **Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

None.

## Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2017 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

🛛 Original	Updated		Supplemental		
LRB Number	17-1368/1	Introduction Num	ber <b>AB-0098</b>		
<b>Description</b> court orders regarding the installation of an ignition interlock device and providing a criminal penalty					
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):					
Changes to existing IT systems would be needed to meet the requirements of this bill. The cost of these changes would be approximately \$155,740.					
II. Annualized Cos	ts:	Annualized Fisc	al Impact on funds from:		
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs		
A. State Costs by	Category				
State Operations	- Salaries and Fringes	\$	\$0		
(FTE Position Ch	anges)		(-0.0 FTE)		
State Operations	- Other Costs		0		
Local Assistance			0		
Aids to Individual	s or Organizations		0		
TOTAL State (	Costs by Category	\$	\$0		
B. State Costs by	Source of Funds				
GPR			0		
FED			0		
PRO/PRS			0		
SEG/SEG-S			0		
	s - Complete this only w ( increase, decrease in l	hen proposal will increase c license fee, ets.)	or decrease state		
		Increased Rev	Decreased Rev		
GPR Taxes		\$	\$0		
GPR Earned			0		
FED			0		
PRO/PRS			0		
SEG/SEG-S			0		
TOTAL State I		\$	\$0		
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT					
		<u>State</u>	Local		
NET CHANGE IN C		\$0	\$		
NET CHANGE IN F	REVENUE	\$0	\$		
Agency/Prepared By Authorized Signature Date					
DOT/ Robert Comb	-	Jennifer Peters (608) 267-69	79 2/13/2017		