

Date of Hearing: March 24, 2026

Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 1830 (Petrie-Norris) – As Introduced February 11, 2026

SUMMARY: Requires, rather than authorizes, a court to order an ignition interlock device (IID) for a first-time driving under the influence (DUI) conviction that does not cause bodily injury, and makes permanent certain provisions of the IID pilot program currently in place. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires, rather than authorizes, a court to order a person convicted of a DUI involving alcohol with no priors¹ that did not cause bodily injury to another person, to install a functioning, certified IID on any vehicle that person operates, and prohibit that person from operating a vehicle unless it is equipped with an IID, for a period not to exceed six months from the date of conviction.
- 2) Makes permanent certain provisions of the IID pilot program currently in place, extended last year by AB 366 (Petrie-Norris), Chapter 689, Statutes of 2025, which requires courts, until January 1, 2033, to order the installation of IIDs for alcohol-involved repeat DUI and DUIs causing bodily injury to another person, as follows:
 - a) For a period of one year for a person convicted of a DUI with one prior, or a first-time DUI causing bodily injury to another person.
 - b) For a period of two years for a person convicted of a DUI with two priors, or a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with one prior.
 - c) For a period of three years for a person convicted of a DUI with three or more priors, a DUI within 10 years of specified impaired driving felonies, a DUI with a prior conviction for felony intoxicated vehicular manslaughter or intoxicated manslaughter while operating a vessel, as specified, a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with two or more priors, or a DUI causing bodily injury that proximately caused great bodily injury (GBI) to another, and the offense occurred within 10 years of two or more priors.
 - d) For a period of four years for a person convicted of a DUI causing bodily injury with one prior punishable as a specified impaired driving felony.
- 3) Specifies that every manufacturer certified by the DMV to provide IIDs must adopt a fee schedule that provides for the payment of the costs of the IID, the administration of the

¹ For purposes of IID installation requirements, a “prior” means a separate conviction for a DUI, DUI causing bodily injury, wet reckless offense, intoxicated vehicular manslaughter, intoxicated vehicular manslaughter involving a vessel, and specified impaired driving offenses involving a vessel, as specified, that occurred within 10 years of the current violation. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(3).)

program, installation of the device, service, maintenance, and recalibration of the device, and any other costs associated with the device by persons subject to this chapter in amounts commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level, as defined, as follows:

- a) A person with an income at 125 percent of the federal poverty level or below is responsible for 10 percent of the costs associated with the IID, and the IID provider is responsible for absorbing the cost of the IID that is not paid by the person.
 - b) A person with an income at 126 to 225 percent, inclusive, of the federal poverty level is responsible for 25 percent of the costs associated with the IID, and the IID provider is responsible for absorbing the cost of the IID that is not paid by the person.
 - c) A person with an income at 226 to 325 percent, inclusive, of the federal poverty level is responsible for 50 percent of the costs associated with the IID, and the IID provider is responsible for absorbing the cost of the IID that is not paid by the person.
 - d) A person who is receiving CalFresh benefits and who provides proof of those benefits to the manufacturer or manufacturer's agent or authorized installer is responsible for 50 percent of the costs associated with the IID, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - e) A person with an income at 326 to 425 percent, inclusive, of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification, as specified, is responsible for 90 percent of the costs associated with the IID, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - f) Makes all other persons responsible for 100 percent of the costs associated with the IID.
 - g) Makes the manufacturer responsible for the percentage of costs that the person ordered to install an IID is not responsible for, as specified.
 - h) Requires the IID provider to verify the income of the person ordered to install an IID to determine the costs associated with the IID by verifying any of the following documents from the person:
 - i) The previous year's state or federal income tax return.
 - ii) The previous three months of weekly or monthly income statements.
 - iii) Employment Development Department verification of unemployment benefits.
 - i) Provides that at any point during which an IID is installed and in use, an individual shall be permitted to apply for reduced costs and shall be credited for any previously paid costs that were in excess of the above fee schedule, as specified. An individual shall also be permitted to apply for reduced costs based on a change in income.
- 4) Requires an IID provider to post conspicuously on its internet website and contracts the fee schedule information established above, and before an individual executes a contract for an

IID, the provider shall also give verbal notification of the fee schedule and how to apply for reduced costs.

- 5) Requires installation service and repair providers to post conspicuously in their place of business and verbally inform a person of the fee schedule information established above, prior to installation and servicing of the device.
- 6) Specifies that the requirement that an individual who is required to install an IID must arrange for each vehicle with an IID to be serviced by an installer every 60 days is subject to the fee schedule described above.
- 7) Requires a copy of the above fee schedule information to also be provided to an individual, together with the court order requiring the installation of an IID.
- 8) Requires the DMV to publish and share such fee schedule information, as follows:
 - a) The DMV must post the fee schedule information described above on its website.
 - b) The DMV must include the fee schedule information described above in any mailed notice of revocation or suspension that notifies an individual of the requirement to install an IID.
- 9) Requires the DMV to annually report to the Legislature the following information:
 - a) The number of DUI offenders with no priors, as specified, who were required to have an IID installed as a result of the IID program, who killed or injured anyone in a crash while they were operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol.
 - b) The number of DUI offenders with no priors, as specified, who were required to have an IID installed as a result of the IID program, who killed or injured anyone in a crash while they were operating a vehicle and were not under the influence of alcohol.
 - c) The number of DUI offenders with no priors, as specified, who were required to have an IID installed as a result of the IID program, who were convicted of specified offenses including a “wet reckless” offense, a DUI where the person is under 21 years of age, a DUI, a DUI causing bodily injury, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated without gross negligence, or intoxicated vehicular manslaughter while operating a vessel with gross negligence, during the term in which the person was required to have the IID installed.
- 10) Removes previously implemented provisions of law authorizing the DMV to undertake a study and report its findings to the Legislature by January 1, 2013, regarding the overall effectiveness of the use of IIDs in reducing the recidivism rate of first-time DUI offenders, as specified, and requiring the DMV to report data pertaining to IIDs to California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) by March 1, 2024, and requiring CalSTA to submit a report to the Legislature pertaining to the effectiveness of IIDs by January 1, 2025.
- 11) Makes technical and conforming changes.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug, to drive a vehicle. (Veh. Code, § 23152 subds. (a), (f), & (g).)
- 2) Makes it unlawful for any person, while having 0.08 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood to drive a vehicle. (Veh. Code, § 23512, subd. (b).)
- 3) Requires a person convicted of driving when their license is suspended or revoked because that person has either one, two, or three or more priors, as specified, to install an IID in all vehicles operated by that person for one, two, or three years, respectively. (Veh. Code, § 23573, subd. (j).)
- 4) Provides that IID installation requirements generally apply to all vehicles an offender operates, including vehicles not owned by that person. (Veh. Code, § 13353.6, subd. (g)(2) & (3); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A)(i).)
- 5) Establishes an ignition interlock device pilot program until January 1, 2033, as follows:
 - a) Authorizes a court to order a person convicted of their first DUI offense (involving alcohol) to install a functioning, certified IID on any vehicle that the person operates and prohibit that person from operating a motor vehicle for up to six months unless that vehicle is equipped with a functioning, certified IID. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A)(i).)
 - b) Provides that for a person convicted of a first-time DUI (involving alcohol) offense, only one of the following may occur:
 - i) The court may order installation of an IID, as specified above; or
 - ii) The person may apply to DMV for a restricted license (permitting limited driving to and from their work and their DUI program) upon proof of enrollment in a DUI program, proof of financial responsibility, and payment of fees. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A) & (B); 13352.4.).
 - c) Requires a court, until January 1, 2033, to order the installation of an IID for repeat DUI offenders and DUIs causing bodily injury to another person,² as follows:
 - i) For a period of one year for a person convicted of a DUI with one prior, or a first-time DUI causing bodily injury to another person.
 - ii) For a period of two years for a person convicted of a DUI with two priors, or a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with one prior.

² This only applies to DUIs involving alcohol or both alcohol and drugs. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A) & (B).)

- iii) For a period of three years for a person convicted of a DUI with three or more priors, a DUI within 10 years of specified impaired driving felonies, a DUI with a prior conviction for felony intoxicated vehicular manslaughter or intoxicated manslaughter while operating a vessel, as specified, a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with two or more priors, or a DUI causing bodily injury that proximately caused great bodily injury (GBI) to another, and the offense occurred within 10 years of two or more priors.
- iv) For a period of four years for a person convicted of a DUI causing bodily injury with one prior punishable as a specified impaired driving felony. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (h); 13352; 13352.4; 13353.3; 13353.6; & 13353.75.)
- d) Requires the DMV, if a court orders the installation of an IID, to place a restriction on the person's license stating the driver is restricted to only driving vehicles equipped with an IID for the applicable term. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subds. (e), (h)(1)(A)(i), 23575).
- e) Requires a person subject to an IID to arrange for each vehicle they operate to be equipped with a functioning, certified IID by a certified provider, provide proof of installation to the DMV, and pay a fee, determined by the DMV, sufficient to cover the costs of administering the pilot program. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (d).)
- f) Requires IID manufacturers to adopt a fee schedule under which the manufacturer will absorb a varying amount of an offender's cost for the IID based on the offender's income, relative to the federal poverty level, as follows.
 - i) A person with an income at 100 percent of the federal poverty level or below and who provides income verification is responsible for 10 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs associated with non-compliance.
 - ii) A person with an income at 101 to 200 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification is responsible for 25 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs associated with non-compliance.
 - iii) A person with an income at 201 to 300 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification is responsible for 50 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs associated with non-compliance.
 - iv) A person who is receiving CalFresh benefits and who provides proof of those benefits to the manufacturer or manufacturer's agent or authorized installer is responsible for 50 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs associated with non-compliance.
 - v) A person with an income at 301 to 400 percent of the federal poverty level and who provides income verification is responsible for 90 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs associated with non-compliance. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (k).)

- g) Provides that the above IID pilot program shall sunset on January 1, 2033. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (r).)
- 6) Specifies that upon the expiration of the above pilot program, and beginning January 1, 2033, a court may order a person convicted of their first DUI offense involving drugs or alcohol, or a DUI offense involving bodily injury, to install an IID on any vehicle that the person operates for up to three years from the date of conviction. The court shall give heightened consideration to ordering an IID for a first offense violator: 1) with 0.15 percent blood alcohol content (BAC); 2) with two or more prior moving traffic violations; or 3) persons who refused a chemical test at arrest. (Veh. Code, § 23575, subd. (a)(1).)
- 7) Requires a person ordered to install an IID to arrange for each vehicle with an IID to be serviced by the installer at least once every 60 days in order for the installer to recalibrate and monitor the operation of the device. (Veh. Code, §§ 23573, subd. (e)(1); 23575.3, subd. (f)(1).)
- 8) Makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by up to six months in county jail, a \$5,000 fine, or both, for a person subject to an IID installation order to:
- a) Willfully fail to install an IID during the applicable time period;
 - b) Operate a vehicle not equipped with an IID;
 - c) Knowingly lend or rent a vehicle to a person known to have their driving privileges restricted, unless the vehicle is equipped with an IID;
 - d) Blow into, or request or solicit another person to blow into, an IID or start a motor vehicle equipped with an IID for the purpose of providing the person with a restricted license with an operable motor vehicle;
 - e) Remove, bypass, or tamper with an IID. (Veh. Code, §§ 23573, subd. (i), 23247, subds. (a)-(g).)
- 9) Permits a person required to operate a motor vehicle in the course and scope of employment, where the vehicle is owned by the employer, to operate that vehicle without an IID if the employer has been notified by the person that the person's driving privilege has been restricted. (Veh. Code, § 23576, sub. (a).)
- 10) Requires the license suspension of a person with a medical problem that prevents breathing with sufficient force to activate an IID. (Veh. Code §§ 23575, subd. (h), 23575.3, subd. (i).)
- 11) Punishes a DUI with no priors as follows:
- a) As a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for four days to six months in county jail (two days must be continuous), or if given probation, possibly two days to six months in jail.
 - b) With a fine of \$390 to \$1,000, plus penalty assessments.

- c) By an order to install a functioning, certified IID on any vehicle that person operates for up to six months (if offense involved alcohol), at the court's discretion.
- d) By a six-month license suspension or a 10-month suspension if probation is given and a 9-month DUI program is ordered; and
- e) In counties with approved programs, completion of a three-month (30-hour) DUI program, or a nine-month (60-hour) program if the person's BAC was .20% or more, or they refused to take a chemical test, if given probation. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, subd. (a)(1); 13352.1, subd. (a); 23536, subs. (a) & (c); 23538, subs. (a) & (b); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A)(i).)

12) Provides that a person convicted of their first DUI offense may be issued a restricted license upon proof of enrollment in a DUI program, proof of financial responsibility, and payment of fees, unless a court has ordered the installation of an IID or a court has disallowed a restricted license. (Veh. Code, § 13352.4.)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

1) **Author's Statement:** None submitted

2) **What is an IID?:** IID technology has been around since the 1960s and has been authorized for use in California since the 1980s.³ California regulations define an IID as “a device designed to allow a vehicle ignition switch to start the engine when the breath alcohol concentration test result is below the alcohol set point, while locking the ignition when the breath test results is at or above the alcohol setpoint.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 13, § 125.00, subd. (a).) In practice, “[a]n IID is about the size of a cell phone and wired to your vehicle's ignition. After installation, the IID requires you to provide a breath sample before the engine will start. If the IID detects alcohol on your breath, the engine will not start.”⁴

Notably, persons subject to an IID are subject to multiple re-test requirements while driving. The first re-test must occur at a random interval ranging from five to 15 minutes after passing the first test, while subsequent re-tests must occur at random intervals ranging from 15 to 45 minutes from the prior test. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 13, § 125.02, subd. (a)(1).)

3) **Effect of this Bill:** Under existing law, a court may order a first-time DUI offender (not causing bodily injury), in addition to all other penalties (jail, fines, license suspension, and DUI programs), to install an IID on any vehicle they operate for up to six months. If a court finds that an IID is not appropriate for a particular person, that person may apply to the DMV for a restricted driver's license upon proof of enrollment in a DUI program, proof of financial responsibility, and payment of fees, unless a restricted license is disallowed. (Veh. Code, §

³ DMV, *An Evaluation of the Implementation of Ignition Interlock in California* (May 2002) p. ii, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/an-evaluation-of-the-implementation-of-ignition-interlock-in-california/>

⁴ DMV, *Ignition Interlock Devices* (accessed February 26, 2025), available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/educational-materials/fast-facts/ignition-interlock-devices-ffdl-31/>

23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A).) Courts are required to order an IID for almost all other DUI offenders, including: 1) a first-time DUI that causes bodily injury; 2) repeat DUI offenders; and 3) a person convicted of driving with a revoked or suspended license due to a prior DUI conviction. (Veh. Code, §§ 23575.3, subd. (h), 13352, 13352.4, 13353.3, 13353.6, 13353.75.)

Most notably, this bill removes the discretion of courts to make an individualized determination of whether a person convicted of a first-time DUI that did not cause bodily injury should be ordered to install an IID, by *requiring courts to order all first-time DUI offenders to install, maintain, and service an IID* for up to six months on every vehicle they operate. Courts would be required to order an IID regardless of fact-specific circumstances, such as the person's BAC level at the time of the offense, whether the offender is a new driver who shares a vehicle with their parents, or whether that person can afford to comply with that order. This bill also makes permanent certain provisions of the current pilot program, which requires courts to order the installation of IIDs for repeat DUI offenders and first-time DUIs causing bodily injury.

This bill modifies the required manufacturer fee schedule that establishes the payment of the costs of the IID in amounts commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level. Specifically, it provides that IID costs include the administration of the program, installation of the device, service, maintenance, and recalibration of the device, and any other costs associated with the device, expands the portion of costs that must be covered by IID providers, and lessens the proportion of costs that must be paid by individuals within specified poverty ranges. It also clarifies that the requirement that an individual subject to an IID order must arrange for each vehicle with an IID to be serviced by an installer every 60 days, as well as the requirement that the individual pay a fee, determined by the DMV that is sufficient to cover the costs of administering the IID program, is subject to this fee schedule. Further, it requires the DMV to publish such fee schedule information on its website, and requires the DMV to include such fee schedule information in any mailed notice of revocation or suspension that notifies an individual of the requirement to install an IID.

Lastly, this bill requires the DMV to collect and annually report to the Legislature the following information: 1) the number of first time DUI offenders required to install an IID under this bill, who killed or injured anyone in a crash while they were operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol; 2) the number of first time DUI offenders required to install an IID under this bill, who killed or injured anyone in a crash while they were operating a vehicle and were not under the influence of alcohol; and 3) the number of first time DUI offenders required to install an IID under this bill, who were convicted of specified offenses during the term in which the person was required to have the IID installed, including a DUI, a DUI causing bodily injury, a "wet reckless" offense, as well as specified vehicular manslaughter and other impaired driving convictions.

The impact of this bill will be significant. First-time DUI convictions comprise approximately 40% of all misdemeanor convictions in a given year,⁵ and misdemeanor DUIs

⁵ Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code, Annual Report and Recommendations (Dec. 2024), available at: https://clrc.ca.gov/CRPC/Pub/Reports/CRPC_AR2024.pdf. See also Judicial Council of California, 2021 Court Statistics Report, Tables 9a & 9c (212,291 misdemeanor guilty pleas in traffic and non-traffic cases occurred in Fiscal Year 2019–20); DUI MIS Report, 25, Table 5b (in 2019, there were 83,512 misdemeanor DUI convictions and 12,552 alcohol- or mdrug-involved reckless driving convictions).

make up the vast majority of DUIs, comprising 95.6% of the 95,957 total DUI arrests in 2020.⁶ First-time DUI convictions represent the vast majority of DUI convictions, comprising 72.5% of the 93,926 DUI convictions in 2018 and 72.8% of the 88,043 DUI convictions in 2019.⁷ As such, this bill may require tens of thousands of first-time misdemeanor DUI offenders to install IIDs on their vehicles.

- 4) **Eliminates Judicial Discretion for IID Installation for First-Time DUI Offenders:** This bill would remove judicial discretion to order an IID for first-time DUI offenders, discretion that has been preserved for decades despite repeated efforts to remove it.

Multiple legal and statutory bases give courts discretion to impose IIDs for first-time DUI offenses not causing bodily injury. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3.) IIDs are mandated for almost all other DUI offenders. Under the current pilot program, a court has the option to order an IID for a first-time DUI offender. A court can also impose an IID as a condition of probation, which is commonly given to first-time DUI offenders; courts have broad discretion to fashion and impose additional probation conditions that are particularized to the defendant. (*People v. Smith* (2007) 152 Cal.App.4th 1245, 1249.) A valid condition must be reasonably related to the offense and aimed at deterring misconduct in the future. (*People v. Carbajal* (1995) 10 Cal.4th 1114, 1121.)

Judicial discretion permits courts to tailor the sentence in the appropriate manner to the facts of the crime, the person's history, and the person's current circumstances. As stated by the California Supreme Court, "Society receives maximum protection when the penalty, treatment or disposition of the offender is tailored to the individual case." (*People v. Williams* (1970) 30 Cal.3d 470, 482 [citation and internal quotation marks omitted].) "Only the trial judge has the knowledge, ability and tools at hand to properly individualize the treatment of the offender." (*Ibid.*)

Judicial discretion may be particularly important for first-time misdemeanor DUI offenses. First, misdemeanor DUIs encompass a broad range of circumstances and behavior, including, for example, a minor who miscalculated the size of a single drink, has the bare minimum .08% BAC, and is pulled over for a non-moving offense, showing no signs of impairment, and who has no history of alcohol abuse or poor judgment. Alternatively, this could apply to a person who has been binge drinking, has a BAC significantly over the limit, and whose judgment and motor skills are extensively impaired. This bill would require the installation of an IID in both cases. Moreover, given that courts must already order IIDs for repeat DUI offenders and DUIs causing bodily injury, this bill proposes to treat first-time DUIs not involving injury similarly to serial DUI offenders, as well as DUI offenders involving crashes and injury.

Second, judicial discretion is uniquely important as applied to first-time DUI offenses since an IID burdens persons other than the offender. IIDs are required to be installed on every

⁶ DMV, *2022 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (2023), DUI Summary Statistics, available at: <https://qr.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2023/09/2022-DUI-MIS-Report.pdf>.

⁷ DMV, *2021 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (2022), p. iv, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2022/09/2021-Annual-Report-of-the-California-DUI-Management-Information-System-1.pdf>; Department of Motor Vehicles, *2022 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (2023), p. iv, available at: <https://qr.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2023/09/2022-DUI-MIS-Report.pdf>.

vehicle an offender operates, including vehicles to which they may have access but do not own. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (o)(2).) As such, a court might find that the imposition of an IID is not the best remedy where a single car is shared between family members and requiring an IID on that car will burden persons who have engaged in no wrongdoing. This concern may be most applicable to parents of young drivers, given that younger drivers are overrepresented in DUI arrests.⁸ For example, a DUI conviction given to a new and financially dependent driver who was using their parents' car would require their parents to install IIDs on every vehicle their child operates, as well as incur the financial burden associated with installing and routinely servicing the IIDs on behalf of their child.

Third, courts can already order IIDs for first-time DUI offenders where a judge deems an IID an appropriate remedy. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A)(i).) Accordingly, the need to mandate IID installation for every first-time DUI offender is somewhat unclear.

- 5) **California's IID Pilot Programs and Associated Statistical Studies:** Since 1989, there have been at least ten legislative efforts to make IIDs mandatory statewide for first-time DUI offenders. None have been successful, in part due to the many concerns identified in this analysis.⁹ During that time, the Legislature has enacted four pilot programs creating various IID installation requirements, and commissioned five statistical studies analyzing the effectiveness of IIDs in California. These reports have generated many recommendations and findings on how to maximize the use of IIDs as a DUI countermeasure and reduce the harms associated with drunk driving.

The first pilot program was enacted in 1986 and established a four-county pilot program authorizing judges to order DUI offenders to install IIDs as a condition of probation.¹⁰ The associated study found “there was no statistically significant difference in the subsequent DUI conviction rate between DUI offenders who installed IIDs and DUI offenders who did not.”¹¹ *The second pilot program* was enacted in 1998 and authorized the use of IIDs for first-time offenders for up to three years, especially when aggravating factors such as a high BAC are present, and required IIDs for repeat offenders and drivers convicted of driving on a DUI suspended license.¹² The findings of the pilot program study were mixed. It found that IIDs can be effective in reducing DUI recidivism, particularly when they are actually installed. However, it emphasized that IIDs are “not the ‘silver bullet’ that will solve the DUI problem” and are not effective “in all situations or for all offenders.”¹³ Importantly, while the report found that IIDs can reduce DUI recidivism, it also found that IIDs are “linked with an increase in crash risk” and as such “the overall traffic safety effect of IIDs are mixed, even when installed.”¹⁴ As applied to first-time DUI offenders, the study explicitly discouraged the

⁸ DMV, *2022 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System*, 2023, available at: <https://qr.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2023/09/2022-DUI-MIS-Report.pdf>.

⁹ Among others, these include AB 762 (Torlakson), Chapter 756, Statutes of 1998 (amended into pilot program), SB 1361 (Correa) of the 2007-2008 Legislative Session (amended to change restricted license rules and later vetoed), SB 1046 (Hill), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2016 (amended into pilot program), SB 434 (Hill) of the 2019-2020 Legislative Session, and most recently, AB 211 (Petrie-Norris) of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session.

¹⁰ California Department of Motor Vehicles, *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Ignition Interlock in California* (Sept. 2005), p. 4, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/an-evaluation-of-the-effectiveness-of-ignition-interlock-in-california/>

¹¹ *Id.* at p. 2.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Id.* at p. 61-62.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

use of IIDs for first-time DUI offenders, asserting that “use of the devices should not be emphasized, even for those first offenders with high BACs at the time of arrest.”¹⁵

The third pilot program was created by AB 91, Chapter 217, Statutes of 2009, which required first-time and repeat DUI offenders, in four counties, to install IIDs in order to obtain a restricted driver’s license, from 2010-2016. This is the only pilot program that mandated IIDs for first-time DUI offenders, and accordingly is the most informative for the purposes of analyzing this bill.

The DMV conducted two studies evaluating this pilot program. The first was a general deterrent study that found the program “was not associated with a reduction in the number of first-time and repeat DUI convictions in pilot counties” and as such, “no evidence was found that the pilot program has a general deterrence effect”¹⁶ The second study was a specific deterrent study, which found that pilot participants, including first-time offenders, had lower DUI recidivism rates than other DUI offenders.¹⁷ However, these lower rates significantly diminished over time, particularly for first-time offenders.¹⁸ Second, it found that obtaining an IID-restricted license was associated with a substantial increase in subsequent crashes compared to DUI offenders whose licenses remained suspended or revoked.¹⁹ Of significance, this higher crash risk for first and second-time DUI offenders increased over time relative to those with a suspended license.²⁰ As a result, the DMV found that the benefits of IIDs “are *potentially marginalized by the greater safety toll of an increased propensity for traffic crash involvement.*”²¹ Based on these findings, the DMV made several recommendations, none of which included mandating IIDs for first-time offenders.

The fourth pilot program was created by SB 1046 (Hill), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2016, which is largely the program that is currently in place. This pilot program refrained from mandating IIDs for first-time offenders, and instead gave courts discretion to determine if an IID is appropriate for a first-time DUI conviction, while requiring courts to order IIDs for specified repeat DUI offenders and DUIs causing bodily injury.

CalSTA submitted its assessment of the current pilot program last year. The report’s findings were partially consistent with the prior pilot programs, although CalSTA emphasized that the overlap between the pilot program and the pandemic made it difficult to effectively assess the pilot program data.²² Specifically, it found that installing an IID within two years of arrests reduces recidivism rates, whether measured by future DUI arrests, crashes, or crashes involving injury.²³ Although it noted that alcohol related crashes, injuries, and fatalities increased in the post-SB 1046 period relative to the pre-SB 1046 period, in part due to

¹⁵ *Id.* at p. 64.

¹⁶ California Department of Motor Vehicles, *General Deterrent Evaluation of the Ignition Interlock Pilot Program in California* (Jan. 2015), Report Documentation Page, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/general-deterrent-evaluation-of-the-ignition-interlock-pilot-program-in-california/>

¹⁷ California Department of Motor Vehicles, *Specific Deterrent Evaluation of the Ignition Interlock Pilot Program in California* (June 17, 2016), at xiv, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2021/12/s5-251.pdf>

¹⁸ *Id.* at xiv-xv.

¹⁹ *Id.* at xv.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.* (emphasis added).

²² CalSTA, *An Evaluation of an Expansion of the Use of Ignition Interlock Devices through California Senate Bill 1046* (Dec. 31, 2024), available at: https://calsta.ca.gov/-/media/calsta-media/documents/ignition_interlock_evaluation-11-a11y.pdf

²³ *Id.* at p. 31.

changes in alcohol-related fatalities during the pandemic.²⁴ Contrary to prior reports, it found that the effects of installing an IID on future DUI arrests is greatest for people arrested for the first time.²⁵ Given the data issues created by the pandemic, in its transmittal to the Legislature, CalSTA's recommendations focused on the need for additional data pertaining to post-pandemic driving trends and behaviors, further evaluation of safety outcomes while an IID is installed, and the continuing effects of DUI recidivism once an IID is removed.²⁶

In sum, none of the findings and recommendations from the four IID pilot programs include mandating IIDs for first-time offenders. Rather, while these studies have found that IIDs can reduce DUI recidivism, they have emphasized that IIDs may have limited effectiveness for first-time offenders and are associated with increases in subsequent crashes compared to DUI offenders with suspended or revoked licenses. As such, the studies have either explicitly discouraged the use of IIDs for first-time DUI offenders or emphasized the need for additional research regarding subsequent crash involvement.

The mandate in this bill may contradict the recommendations made by these previous reports.

- 6) **Unintended Consequences:** IIDs can be effective at reducing DUI recidivism for certain offenders.²⁷ However, this benefit is offset by certain public safety harms. Specifically, mandating IIDs after a DUI conviction, rather than utilizing other DUI countermeasures such as license suspension or revocation, may result in hundreds of subsequent crashes. A California pilot program study that mandated IIDs for first-time DUI offenders found that obtaining an IID-restricted license was associated with substantial increases in subsequent crashes, including fatal/injury crashes, compared to DUI offenders whose licenses remained suspended or revoked.²⁸ This increased crash risk associated with an IID was present for all DUI offenders, including both first-time and repeat offenders.²⁹ The higher crash risk for first- and second-time DUI offenders increased over time relative to those with a suspended license, and “a substantial proportion of these crashes are those involving injuries and/or fatalities.”³⁰

The DMV predicted that if the pilot program were implemented more broadly, it may result in an increase of potentially hundreds of crashes. Consistent with an earlier study, the DMV found that although the “pilot program is associated with an increase in crash risk among DUI offenders who complied with...program requirements and obtained an IID-restricted license when compared to drivers with a suspended or revoked license, the traffic safety benefits of this program are potentially marginalized by the greater safety toll of an increased propensity for traffic crash involvement.”³¹ This is not an isolated finding. The DMV study of the 1998 pilot program also found that while IIDs can reduce DUI recidivism, they are

²⁴ *Id.* at pp. 31, 60.

²⁵ *Id.* at p. 31.

²⁶ CalSTA, *SB 1046 Transmittal Letter* (March 19, 2024), available at: https://calsta.ca.gov/-/media/calsta-media/documents/sb_1046_transmittal_3_21_2025-a11y.pdf

²⁷ *Ibid.*; Elder et. al., *Effectiveness of ignition interlocks for pre-venting alcohol-impaired driving and alcohol-related crashes, a community guide systemic review*, *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* (40)(4): 362-376, at p.1, available at: <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/31167>

²⁸ California Department of Motor Vehicles, *Specific Deterrent Evaluation of the Ignition Interlock Pilot Program in California* (June 17, 2016), at xv, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2021/12/s5-251.pdf>.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

“linked with an increase in crash risk” and as such, the overall traffic safety effect of IIDs is mixed, even when installed.”³² Further, a study of an IID program in Oregon also found that “IIDs were associated with an increase in crashes.”³³

These findings are supported by independent reports that IIDs have caused numerous accidents, including many deaths, while a person subject to an IID is attempting to complete a required “retest” (i.e., blow into the breathalyzer while driving). A person with an IID is repeatedly required to retest while driving to ensure the continued absence of alcohol in their system. Failure to re-test may result in alarms or other notifications. For example, “[i]f the driver fails or doesn’t comply, the car goes into panic mode: Its headlights flash and its horn honks until the driver turns off the engine.”³⁴ A 2019 *New York Times* review of accident reports and lawsuits associated with IIDs found that this re-test requirement contributed to many crashes, including fatal accidents. According to *The New York Times*:

A review by The New York Times of accident reports and lawsuits turned up dozens of examples of collisions in which the devices played a role. A Pennsylvania driver trying to complete a test blew so hard that he blacked out and crashed into a tree, nearly severing his left hand. Another in rural New Hampshire struck a telephone pole. And in California, a man attempting a rolling retest on a busy highway crossed the dividing line and hit another car, badly injuring a woman and killing her husband....

One driver told local police that he had reached for his beeping interlock, missed a curve in the road and “woke up to someone saying he had been in an accident.” Two drivers rear-ended stopped cars during rolling retests. A fourth driver hit a sheriff’s vehicle. A fifth veered off the road and into a field, where he hit a calf.³⁵

The concern that IID re-testing may contribute to distracted driving has similarly been echoed by federal regulators.³⁶ According to *The New York Times*:

When regulatory warnings about rolling tests have come up, Interlock companies have pushed back.

In 2006, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the federal regulator in charge of setting vehicle safety equipment standards, began revising its 14-year-old guidelines for how interlock devices should work. A 2010 draft of the document said the agency “does not intend” that users perform rolling retests and said they should be performed while stopped on the side of the road.

The interlock industry and others objected, arguing that rolling retests were safe and that, in any case, it was impractical to expect drivers to pull over...

³² *Ibid.*

³³ DMV, *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Ignition Interlock in California* (Sept. 2005), p. 62, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/an-evaluation-of-the-effectiveness-of-ignition-interlock-in-california/>. See also Jones, B. (1992). *The effectiveness of Oregon’s ignition interlock program*. Salem, OR: Motor Vehicle Division.

³⁴ St. Cowley et al., *The Unforeseen Dangers of a Device that Curbs Drunk Driving*, N.Y. Times (Nov. 10, 2021), available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/23/business/drunken-driving-interlock-crash.html>.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Federal Register; Model Specifications for Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Devices (BAIIDs) (May 8, 2013), at p. 26852, available at: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2013/05/08/2013-10940/model-specifications-for-breath-alcohol-ignition-interlock-devices-baiids>

The regulator backed down. In its final guidance, published in 2013, it wrote that it was “very concerned about distracted driving” but would not specify how retests should be conducted. The agency also said that was “more appropriately a function for states and local jurisdictions.”³⁷

Indeed, both Legislature-commissioned studies and independent reporting have suggested that the public safety impacts of mandating IIDs for first-time offenders are mixed. Given the availability of DUI countermeasures that do not create additional public safety harms, judicial discretion to determine which countermeasure is most appropriate appears justified.

Supporters of this bill cite an Insurance Institute for Highway Safety study that analyzed IIDs in other states, which is partially inconsistent with the above studies.³⁸ That study found that mandating IIDs for every DUI offender was associated with 16% fewer drivers with at least a .08% BAC involved in fatal crashes compared to no law.³⁹ However, that study specifically excluded California from its analysis.⁴⁰ Further, the Insurance Institute's findings resulted from comparing state laws mandating IIDs for all offenders with laws that did not mandate IIDs for any specific class of offender.⁴¹ However, California requires IIDs for almost all DUI offenders other than first-time offenders, and as such is unlike the comparison group in the Insurance Institute study.

- 7) **First-Time DUI Offenders Have Low One-Year Recidivism Rates:** First-time DUI offenders generally have low DUI recidivism rates. The one-year re-offense rate for first-time DUI offenders arrested in 2018 and 2019 was 3.7% and 4%, respectively.⁴² Moreover, first-time offenders reoffend at lower rates than repeat offenders.⁴³ Given that first-time DUI offenders are highly unlikely to re-offend within one year, and that an IID issued to first-time offenders cannot exceed six months, the public safety benefits of this bill may be minimal.
- 8) **Penalties in Addition to the Cost of an IID:** A person convicted of their first DUI is subject to a wide range of sanctions, irrespective of whether they are ordered to install an IID. If a person is given probation, which is typical for a first-time DUI, they face two days to six months in jail, a fine of \$390 to \$1,000, plus penalty assessments, up to a 10-month license suspension, and up to a 9-month DUI treatment program in order to get relicensed. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, subd. (a)(1), 13352.1, subd. (a), 23536, subds. (a) & (c), 23538, subds. (a) & (b).) Additionally, in order to reinstate their license after a DUI conviction, that person must acquire additional insurance in the form of an SR-22 insurance certificate.⁴⁴

³⁷ St. Cowley et al., *supra*.

³⁸ Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, *State alcohol ignition interlock laws and fatal crashes* (March 2018), available at: <https://interlockciim.org/wp-content/uploads/IIHSIIDstudy0318.pdf>

³⁹ *Id.* at p. 2

⁴⁰ *Id.* at p. 5.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² DMV, *2022 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (2023), DUI Summary Statistics, available at: <https://qr.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2023/09/2022-DUI-MIS-Report.pdf>; Department of Motor Vehicles, *2021 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (2022), p. iv, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2022/09/2021-Annual-Report-of-the-California-DUI-Management-Information-System-1.pdf>

⁴³ DMV, *General Deterrent Evaluation of the Ignition Interlock Pilot Program in California* (Jan. 2015), p. viii, available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/general-deterrent-evaluation-of-the-ignition-interlock-pilot-program-in-california/>

⁴⁴ DMV, *DUI First Offenders* (June 2020), available at:

https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/uploads/2020/06/1st_Offender_Alcohol_Non-Injury.pdf

Failure to comply with an IID mandate can lead to a variety of misdemeanor charges, punishable by up to six months in county jail, a \$5,000 fine, and a one-year license suspension from the conviction date. Misdemeanor conduct includes: 1) willful failure to install an IID when required to do so; 2) operating a vehicle not equipped with an IID when required to install an IID; 3) knowingly lending or renting a vehicle not equipped to an IID to a person known to have their driving license restricted; 4) requesting another person to blow into an IID to provide a restricted person with an operable vehicle; 5) blowing into an IID for the purpose of providing a restricted person with an operable vehicle; and 6) removing, bypassing, or tampering with an IID. (Veh. Code §§ 23247, subs. (a)-(g), 23573, subd. (i).)

Notably, the financial costs of a first-time DUI are considerably higher than the base fine. For example, a base fine of \$390 would be subject to the following additional fees and assessments:

- Penal Code section 1464 state penalty on fines: \$390 (\$10 for every \$10)
- Penal Code section 1465.7 state surcharge: \$78 (20% surcharge)
- Penal Code section 1465.8 court operation assessment: \$40 (\$40 fee per criminal offense)
- Government Code section 70372 court construction penalty: \$195 (\$5 for every \$10)
- Government Code section 70373 assessment: \$35 (\$35 for each infraction)
- Government Code section 76000 penalty: \$273 (\$7 for every \$10)
- Government Code section 76000.5 EMS penalty: \$78 (\$2 for every \$10)
- Government Code section 76104.6 DNA fund penalty: \$39 (\$1 for every \$10)
- Government Code section 76104.7 additional DNA fund penalty: \$156 (\$4 for every \$10)

As such, after additional fees and assessments, the minimum fine for a first-time DUI could end up costing \$1,674. This amount does not include the cost of the required DUI program, lasting either three or nine months, depending on the person's blood alcohol level. (Veh. Code, § 23538, subd. (b).) A 3-month DUI program generally costs between \$500 and \$900, while a 9-month program can cost upwards of \$1,500. Most programs charge for missed activities, transfers, and late payments.⁴⁵ A DUI program participant may receive a program fee reduction after a financial assessment.⁴⁶ For a restricted license with an IID, there are additional DMV fees associated with reissuing the license.⁴⁷

In addition to the base fine and the cost of a DUI program, this bill would impose additional costs on a person convicted of their first DUI. First, such a person would have to pay a fee "sufficient to cover the costs of administration of [the IID program]." (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (d).) Second, a first-time DUI offender may be subject to a variety of different costs pertaining to installing, servicing, and maintaining the IID, subject to a fee schedule commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (k)(1).)

⁴⁵ HCS, *Driving Under the Influence Program Fees* (accessed March 5, 2025), available at: <https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/individuals/Pages/DUI-Program-Fees.aspx>

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ DMV, *Statewide Ignition Interlock Device Pilot Program* (accessed April 17, 2025), available at: <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/driving-under-the-influence/statewide-ignition-interlock-device-pilot-program/>

The poverty scale provisions of this bill may alleviate some of the financial burden on individuals required to install an IID. However, in practice, people may still fail to install an IID when required or fail to service their IID as frequently as required, purely because they cannot afford to. If someone is unable to afford an IID and is pulled over, they will likely be found to have violated their probation and will be subject to potential jail time as well as additional costs. Given that misdemeanor first-time DUI convictions are one of the most common crimes in California, the existence of numerous misdemeanors associated with IID non-compliance, and the cost-burden associated with an IID, this bill can reasonably be expected to increase the criminal penalties associated with IID non-compliance. Such additional costs, criminal penalties, and potential license suspensions carry employment and housing consequences, and may contribute to the affordability and unhoused persons crisis in this state.⁴⁸

- 9) **California’s IID Pilot Program Was Just Extended Until 2033.** The IID pilot program currently in place was initially established by SB 1046 (Hill), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2016. The pilot program was set to expire on January 1, 2026. However, last year, AB 366 (Petrie-Norris), Chapter 689, Statutes of 2025, extended the pilot program until January 1, 2033. Given that the program was just extended and the most recent CalSTA’s report cited a need for data and further evaluation, the urgency to make the current pilot program permanent and mandate IIDs for all first-time offenders is unclear.

- 10) **Argument in Support:** According to *Mothers Against Drunk Driving*, AB 1830 “would improve the drunk driving law by making California the 35th state to require ignition interlocks for all first-time convicted drunk drivers for six months. California’s current law is limited to repeat offenders and first time offenders who cause an injury crash.

“Drunk driving remains a problem in California. Since 2019, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), drunk driving deaths in California have increased 40%, resulting in 1,355 preventable deaths in 2023.

“Research demonstrates that laws like AB 1830 save 253 lives each year. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, laws like AB 1830 reduce drunk driving deaths by 26%. Utilizing this information, AAA and MADD estimates that AB 1830 will save 253 lives each year.¹

“What is an ignition interlock? An ignition interlock is a device about the size of a smartphone that is wired into the ignition system of a vehicle. If an interlock detects a blood alcohol content above .02, the vehicle will not start.

“There are over 425,000 reasons why MADD urges you to support this lifesaving proposal. Interlocks are already working to stop drunk driving in California, but the law is not reaching every eligible drunk driver. Over the past 18 years, interlocks have prevented 425,999 attempts to drive drunk in California. Can you imagine how many more attempts to drive drunk will be stopped by enacting an all-offender interlock law with AB 1830?

⁴⁸ Cuellar and Perez, *An Update on Homelessness in California*, PPIC (March 21, 2024), available at: <https://www.ppic.org/blog/an-update-on-homelessness-in-california/>

“Interlocks are more effective than license suspension. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), ignition interlocks reduce repeat drunk driving offenses by 67%. An ignition interlock is more effective than license suspension alone, because up to 75% of convicted drunk drivers continue to drive on a suspended license.”

11) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *California Public Defenders Association*,

“AB 1830 Eliminates Judicial Discretion

“AB 1830 removes the ability of judges to exercise reasoned judgment in individual DUI cases. Under current law, courts retain limited discretion to tailor penalties based on the specific facts before them. AB 1830 replaces that discretion with a rigid mandate requiring IIDs for every first-time DUI offender

“Judicial discretion exists because cases differ. Courts are often best positioned to determine whether an IID meaningfully advances public safety or whether another sanction—such as license restrictions, alcohol education programs, or probation conditions—would be more effective.

“AB 1830 eliminates that flexibility and replaces it with a one-size-fits-all penalty, requiring the same sanction regardless of individual circumstances.

“California Has Already Tested This Policy

“California has previously studied whether mandatory IID requirements should apply to first-time offenders. In 2009, the Legislature declined to impose a statewide mandate due to limited supporting evidence. Instead, **AB 91 created a pilot program in four counties** requiring IIDs for first-time DUI offenders and directed the Department of Motor Vehicles to evaluate the results before considering broader expansion.

“Two subsequent DMV studies evaluated the program. The **2014 DMV report** concluded the pilot program **did not reduce either first-time or repeat DUI convictions** and found no evidence of a broader deterrent effect. A **2016 follow-up report** again found **mixed traffic safety results** and recommended additional study rather than statewide expansion.

“Despite these findings, the Legislature later expanded IID availability statewide through SB 1046 (2016) while preserving judicial discretion. Under the current framework, courts may order an IID for first-time offenders when appropriate. If an IID is not ordered, the driver must obtain a restricted license allowing travel only to work, DUI programs, and necessary job-related driving. This approach preserves accountability while allowing courts to determine when IID installation is actually warranted.

“AB 1830 Disregards the Evidence

“The available evidence does not support eliminating judicial discretion.

“The **2016 DMV evaluation** found that while IID installation appeared to reduce DUI convictions during the first six months after installation, that effect **disappeared within two**

years. More concerning, the study observed **higher crash rates among IID participants** compared with the control group:

- Crash rates were roughly equal during the first 300 days
- **58% higher between 300 and 730 days**
- **116% higher after 730 days**

“Based on these findings, the report’s authors did not recommend expanding mandatory IID requirements statewide and characterized the results as producing “mixed traffic safety outcomes.” The report also emphasized that license suspensions and revocations remain the most effective deterrents. It cautioned that layering excessive financial and administrative penalties can reduce compliance. When sanctions become too costly or difficult to meet, some drivers disengage from the legal system entirely—undermining, rather than strengthening, deterrence.

“In conclusion, AB 1830 replaces a balanced, evidence-informed system with a rigid mandate. Courts already possess the authority to order ignition interlock devices when they determine the device will improve public safety. Eliminating that discretion does little to enhance safety while imposing substantial costs on drivers—particularly those with limited financial means—and creating a guaranteed market expansion for private IID vendors. California should maintain the current approach, which allows courts to require IIDs when appropriate while preserving the flexibility needed to craft sanctions that are both effective and achievable.”

12) **Related Legislation:** AB 1546 (Schultz) increases the punishment for a DUI with two priors from a misdemeanor to a wobbler and increases the punishment for a DUI with four or more priors from a wobbler to a straight felony, and increases the IID installation period for a DUI with four or more priors from three years to four years, among other changes. AB 1546 is pending a hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

13) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) AB 366 (Petrie-Norris), Chapter 689, Statutes of 2025, extended the sunset of the IID pilot program currently in place, from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2033.
- b) AB 71 (Lackey) of the 2025-2026 Legislative Session would have extended the sunset date of the IID pilot program from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2033, and required CalSTA to report to the Legislature on the outcomes of the pilot program by July 1, 2031. AB 71 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- c) AB 2210 (Petrie-Norris) of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session would have required the DMV to operate a five-county pilot project for the installation of an IID in the vehicle of a first-time DUI offender. AB 211 was held in Assembly Appropriations.
- d) SB 545 (Hill) of the 2019-2020 Legislative Session would have required IIDs to be installed for a period of six months for first-time convicted DUI offenders. The hearing SB 545 in the Assembly Public Safety Committee was cancelled at the request of the author.

- e) SB 1046 (Hill), Chapter 783, Statutes of 2016, extended the IID pilot program in certain counties and required installation of IIDs for specified DUI offenses.
- f) SB 61 (Hill), Chapter 350, Statutes of 2015, extended the IID pilot project in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties until July 1, 2017.
- g) SB 55 (Hill), of the Legislative Session of 2013-2014, would have required, as a condition of being issued a restricted driver's license, being reissued a driver's license, or having the privilege to operate a motor vehicle reinstated for a 2nd or subsequent conviction for a DUI offense, installation for a specified period of time an ignition interlock device on all vehicles a person owns or operates. SB 55 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- h) SB 598 (Huff), Chapter 193, Statutes of 2009, allowed an individual convicted of more than one DUI within a 10-year period to get a restricted driver's license upon installation of an IID, enrolling in DUI class, and meeting other specified criteria.
- i) AB 91 (Feuer), Chapter 217, Statutes of 2009, established a pilot program in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties, administered by DMV to require the installation of IIDs on the vehicles of all persons convicted of a DUI, as specified.
- j) SB 1388 (Torlakson), Chapter 404, Statutes of 2008, required that a person immediately install a certified IID on all vehicles he or she owns or operates for a period of one to three years when he or she has been convicted of violating specified provisions relating to DUI and driving a motor vehicle when his or her license has been suspended or revoked as a result of a DUI-related conviction.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment (SAFE) (Sponsor)

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety

Alcohol Justice

Arcadia Police Officers' Association

Automobile Club of Southern California

Brea Police Association

Burbank Police Officers' Association

California Association of Highway Patrolmen

California Association of School Police Chiefs

California Coalition of School Safety Professionals

California Narcotic Officers' Association

California Police Chiefs Association

California Professional Firefighters

California Reserve Peace Officers Association

California State Sheriffs' Association

City of Pico Rivera
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Costa Mesa; City of
County of Orange, Through its Office of the District Attorney/public Administrator
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Irvine; City of
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Mothers Against Drunk Driving
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peopleforbikes
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Streets for All
2 Private Individuals

Opposition

ACLU California Action
California Public Defenders Association
Debt Free Justice California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union

Analysis Prepared by: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744