

ASSEMBLY THIRD READING  
AB 1687 (Lackey)  
As Amended March 26, 2026  
Majority vote

## SUMMARY

Authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to revoke a person's driver's license for eight years if they are convicted of three or more specified impaired driving offenses within a ten-year period.

### Major Provisions

- 1) Authorizes the DMV to immediately revoke the privilege of a person to drive a motor vehicle upon receipt of a duly certified abstract of the record of a court showing that the person has been convicted of three or more of the following violations, or a combination of three or more of these violations, where each of the three or more violations occurred within a 10-year period:
  - a) Driving under the influence (DUI)<sup>1</sup> with two priors.<sup>2</sup>
  - b) A DUI with three or more priors.
  - c) A DUI causing bodily injury with two or more priors.
  - d) A DUI or DUI causing bodily injury within 10 years of the following felonies: a DUI with three or more priors, a DUI causing bodily injury, or gross vehicular manslaughter.
  - e) A DUI or DUI causing bodily injury with a prior conviction for felony intoxicated vehicular manslaughter or intoxicated vehicular manslaughter while operating a vessel.
  - f) A DUI causing bodily injury, where the violation proximately causes great bodily injury (GBI) to another person, and the offense occurred within 10 years of two or more priors.
  - g) Gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated.
  - h) Vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, without gross negligence, within seven years of two or more priors.
  - i) Intoxicated vehicular manslaughter while operating a vessel and with gross negligence, as specified.
- 2) Specifies that if the DMV revokes the privileges of a person to drive a motor vehicle pursuant to the above, the DMV shall not reinstate the privilege revoked until the expiration

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this analysis, a "DUI" refers to a DUI punishable under Vehicle Code section 23152 that does not cause bodily injury. A DUI causing bodily injury is punished separately under Vehicle Code section 23153.

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this analysis and unless otherwise specified, a "prior" means a separate DUI conviction under Vehicle Code sections 23152 (DUI), 23153 (DUI causing bodily injury), or a "wet reckless" conviction under 23103.5 (plea to reckless driving in satisfaction of an original DUI charge) that occurred within 10 years of the current violation.

of eight years after the date of revocation and until the person whose privilege was revoked gives proof of financial responsibility, as defined, except as specified below.

- 3) Authorizes, four years from the date of the last conviction of an offense specified above, a person whose license was revoked pursuant to the above to apply to the DMV to have their privilege to operate a motor vehicle reinstated, subject to the condition that the person submits an ignition interlock device (IID) "Verification of Installation" form and agrees to install and maintain an IID, as specified.
- 4) Requires the IID to remain on the person's motor vehicle for two years following the reinstatement of the person's driving privilege pursuant to this bill.
- 5) Requires the DMV to reinstate the person's license pursuant to the above, if the person satisfies all of the following conditions:
  - a) The person was not convicted of any drug- or alcohol-related offenses under state law, during the driver's license revocation period.
  - b) The person successfully completed a specified licensed DUI program, following the date of the last conviction of an offense specified above, if such a program is required.
  - c) The person was not convicted of violating specified prohibitions against driving a vehicle on a suspended or revoked license, including driving on a suspended or revoked license because of a DUI conviction, during the revocation period.
- 6) Requires the DMV to immediately terminate the restriction issued pursuant to the above and immediately revoke the privilege to operate a motor vehicle of a person who attempts to remove, bypass, or tamper with the IID, who has the device removed prior to the termination date of the restriction, or who fails three or more times to comply with any requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the ignition interlock device, and specifies that the privilege shall remain revoked for the remaining period of the original revocation and until all reinstatement requirements are met.

## COMMENTS

### According to the Author

"As a CHP officer, I have stood on the side of the road with families who have just lost loved ones to drunk drivers. Those scenes will never leave me. We owe it to those families to hold repeat offenders accountable. AB 1687 will help by increasing the revocation period for a third DUI conviction from three years to eight years. This stronger deterrent reduces the likelihood of repeat offenses, keeps high-risk drivers off the road, and helps prevent alcohol-related injuries and fatalities, ultimately improving public safety across the state."

### Arguments in Support

According to the *Peace Officers' Research Association of California (PORAC)*, "AB 1687 strengthens penalties for repeat DUI offenders by requiring the Department of Motor Vehicles to immediately revoke the driver's license of individuals with three or more DUI-related

convictions. The bill also prohibits reinstatement of the license for at least eight years following the revocation, ensuring longer-term removal of dangerous drivers from California roadways.

"PORAC supports AB 1687 because it increases accountability for repeat impaired drivers and helps keep dangerous offenders off the road. Stronger license revocation provisions enhance public safety and support the work of peace officers who respond to DUI incidents and work to prevent serious injuries and fatalities on California's roadways."

### **Arguments in Opposition**

According to the *California Public Defenders Association*, AB 1687 "would require the Department of Motor Vehicles ("DMV") to immediately revoke the driving privilege of a person upon a showing that the person has 3 or more convictions for, among other things, driving while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage and prohibit the DMV from reinstating their driving privileges until 8 years after the date of revocation.

"Suspending a driver's license for DUI offenses often imposes severe and disproportionate economic consequences, particularly for low-income individuals who depend on driving to maintain employment. For many workers—especially those in rural areas or in occupations such as delivery, construction, and sales—the loss of a license effectively means the loss of a job. Studies in some jurisdictions show that more than 40% of individuals lose employment after a license suspension. Rather than promoting stability or accountability, license suspensions frequently trigger a cycle of poverty by cutting off access to work while fines, fees, and program costs continue to accumulate.

"These policies also create a debt trap. Individuals must often pay hundreds or thousands of dollars in fines, reinstatement fees, and mandatory programs—costs that can range from \$400 to more than \$3,000—before they can legally drive again. Without the ability to drive to work, many cannot earn the income necessary to repay these obligations. As a result, some individuals drive out of necessity, exposing themselves to additional criminal penalties and further compounding their financial hardship.

"License suspensions also disproportionately impact rural, low-income and minority communities, which are less likely to have access to reliable public transportation and less able to afford costly rehabilitation requirements. Research further suggests that suspensions imposed for financial reasons—such as unpaid fines or fees—do not increase repayment rates. Instead, they make repayment less likely by preventing individuals from working.

"Additionally, research has identified troubling racial disparities in DUI license suspension practices. The study "Trends and disparities in alcohol-DWI license suspensions by suspension duration, North Carolina, 2007–2016," by Bhavna Singichetti and colleagues (September 20, 2024), found evidence of disparities in suspension duration across race, ethnicity, and sex, and noted that structural factors such as residential segregation may contribute to unequal outcomes. This study can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0310270> [<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0310270>].

"Suspending a driver's license for DUI offenses often produces severe economic consequences without improving public safety. Instead, CPDA supports more balanced alternatives that protect public safety without pushing individuals into economic hardship, including allowing restricted licenses for employment and eliminating debt-based license suspensions, which promote accountability while allowing individuals to remain employed and support their families."

**FISCAL COMMENTS**

According to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations, "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."

**VOTES****ASM PUBLIC SAFETY: 8-0-1**

**YES:** Schultz, Alanis, Mark González, Harabedian, Lackey, Nguyen, Ramos, Sharp-Collins  
**ABS, ABST OR NV:** Haney

**ASM TRANSPORTATION: 15-0-1**

**YES:** Wilson, Davies, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Carrillo, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, Lackey, Macedo, Papan, Ransom, Rogers, Sharp-Collins  
**ABS, ABST OR NV:** Ávila Farías

**ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0**

**YES:** Wicks, Hoover, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

**UPDATED**

VERSION: March 26, 2026

CONSULTANT: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744

FN: 0002807