

Date of Hearing: May 6, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

AB 1687 (Lackey) – As Amended March 26, 2026

Policy Committee:	Public Safety	Vote:	8 - 0
	Transportation		15 - 0

Urgency: No                      State Mandated Local Program: No                      Reimbursable: No

**SUMMARY:**

This bill allows the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to revoke the privilege to drive of a person who has been convicted within a 10-year period of three or more offenses commonly referred to as driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol (DUI).

Specifically, this bill authorizes DMV to revoke the privilege to drive of a person convicted of three or more of any of several specified DUI-related offenses, including three or more convictions for the same offense, within a 10-year period.

The bill allows a person whose driving privilege DMV revoked, as described above, to apply to DMV, four years from the date of the person’s last conviction, to have their driving privilege reinstated, provided the person submits to DMV an ignition interlock device (IID) “Verification of Installation” form and agrees to install and maintain the device, which is to remain on the person’s car for two years following reinstatement of the driving privilege. The bill also provides that DMV is to immediately revoke the person’s driving privilege if the person in any way tampers with the IID, and that the privilege is to remain revoked for the remaining period of the original revocation and until all reinstatement requirements are met.

The bill also requires DMV to reinstate a person’s driving privilege if the person was not convicted of one of the offenses listed above, if certain conditions are met.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

This bill creates significant new administrative and regulatory workload for the DMV, as well as the need for related information technology (IT) resources. Costs to the DMV will be significant, likely in the low millions of dollars, with costs greater during the period of initial implementation.

The DMV confirms this bill will create significant costs; however, the DMV was unable to provide the committee, by the time this analysis was prepared, with its estimate of those costs or a description of the drivers of those costs. The DMV has generally warned, in relation to any bill that the DMV concludes will require it to modify its IT systems, that it is undertaking a comprehensive modernization of its IT systems and accommodating new requirements into that modernization effort would delay overall implementation and increase costs of the upgrade considerably.

The DMV's costs, whatever they may, would likely be funded from the Motor Vehicle Account, the main funding source for both the DMV and the California Highway Patrol, which is facing insolvency. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) advises, "Until a plan is put in place to address MVA's structural deficit, we recommend the Legislature set a high bar for considering approval of any proposals that create additional MVA cost pressures and accelerate the risk of insolvency."

#### COMMENTS:

As noted in earlier analyses of this bill, the DMV reports that, from 1995 to 2021, 44,616 were killed in an alcohol- or drug-involved crashes in California; alcohol-involved crash fatalities in 2021 were the most recorded in at least a decade; and drug-involved fatalities that year were among the highest ever. (See <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv-research-reports/research-development-data-dashboards/dui-management-information-system-dashboards/dui-summary-statistics/>.)

Existing law makes it illegal to drive while under the influence of alcohol or drugs and provides for various penalties for violations, including administrative license suspensions and restrictions, fines, incarceration and obligatory installation of an IID, with the more severe sanctions generally applied to repeat offenders and offenses that resulted in harm to others.

The author contends the new penalties against repeat offenders created by this bill will better deter additional offenses and "[reduce] the likelihood of repeat offenses, [keep] high-risk drivers off the road, and [help] prevent alcohol-related injuries and fatalities, ultimately improving public safety across the state." Many law enforcement organizations agree, with some echoing the author's assertion of the bill's deterrent effect. Other, such as the California District Attorneys Association contend the bill's restrictions apply "only on those most likely to cause fatal collisions and those who have proven unreceptive to milder forms of deterrence on three separate occasions."

Others disagree. For example, ACLU California Action contends punitive measures, such as those created by this bill "only harm low- and middle-income people, while not providing any impact on alcoholism or repeated drunk driving," and that:

Many people who repeatedly drive impaired are struggling with substance use disorders. Punishing impaired driving purely through a technical legal sanction without addressing underlying health conditions will not make our roads safer. Connecting people to treatment, counseling, and support — before and after incidents — is the humane and effective path to safety. Prevention efforts give people off-ramps before a mistake becomes a tragedy.

**Analysis Prepared by:** Jay Dickenson / APPR. / (916) 319-2081