
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Senator Dave Cortese, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1830	Hearing Date:	8/11/2026
Author:	Petrie-Norris		
Version:	8/5/2026 Amended		
Urgency:	Yes	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Isabelle LaSalle		

SUBJECT: Ignition interlock devices

DIGEST: This bill, beginning on January 1, 2031, requires all first-time offenders convicted of driving under the influence (DUI) to install an ignition interlock device (IID) on their vehicles, lengthens mandatory IID terms for repeat DUI offenders, establishes a new penalty structure for drug-related driving violations, and broadly reorganizes and recasts penalties and sanctions for alcohol- and drug-related driving offenses, among other changes, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

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 the Department of Motor Vehicles (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,¹ 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.
 - 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.

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

- 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 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 DMV, and pay a fee, determined by 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.)
- 13) Authorizes a court to order a 10-year license revocation if a person has been convicted of three or more DUIs or DUIs causing bodily injury, the last of which was punishable as a DUI or DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, a DUI with three or more priors, or as an alternate-felony misdemeanor because of a prior specified felony. (Veh. Code, § 23597, subd. (a).)

This bill:

- 1) Requires DMV to immediately suspend the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle when the person was driving a motor vehicle when a passenger for hire was a passenger in the vehicle when the person had a 0.04 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood.
- 2) Requires a person subject to an administrative license suspension for a DUI involving alcohol to apply for a restricted license after a 30-day license suspension.
- 3) Eliminates the course of employment exception to the IID requirement in order to obtain a restricted license for purposes of an administrative license suspension.
- 4) Establishes the following administrative license suspension timelines for a drug-only DUI:
 - a) For a first DUI, the privilege is suspended for 6 months.
 - b) For a DUI causing bodily injury, the privilege is suspended for 12 months.
 - c) For a second DUI, the privilege is suspended for 24 months.
 - d) For a second DUI causing bodily injury, the privilege is suspended for 36 months.
 - e) For a DUI with two priors, the privilege is suspended for 36 months.
 - f) For a DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, the privilege is suspended for 48 months.
 - g) For any DUI with three or more priors, the privilege is suspended for 60 months.
- 5) Requires that certain conditions are met for the driving privilege (suspended due to a drug-only DUI) to be reinstated. Requires that the person provide proof of financial responsibility to DMV, provide proof of successful completion of a licensed DUI program, as specified, and pay all reinstatement and reissue fees.

- 6) Allows a person subject to a license suspension for a drug-only DUI to apply for a restricted license if the person provides proof of financial responsibility to DMV, completes a minimum specified period of the suspension period, provides proof of enrollment or participation in a licensed DUI program, as specified, and pays all reinstatement and reissue fees.
- 7) Requires a DUI program that a person is required to be enrolled in to report any failure to participate in the program to DMV. Outlines a process to request a review of the finding that the person has failed to comply with the program requirements to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). Requires DHCS to review the submission by the person and any other relevant documents or evidence and make a determination of whether the program's determination was appropriate. Requires DHCS to notify the person and the DUI program of their finding. Requires the DUI program to reenroll the person if DHCS determines the program's determination was not appropriate and to notify DMV that the notification has been rescinded. Permits DMV to reinstate any restricted license terminated as a result of the notification.
- 8) Requires, upon a conviction for a DUI involving alcohol, the driving privilege to be suspended. Prohibits the privilege from being reinstated until the person meets specified requirements, including maintaining a restricted license (which requires the installation of an IID) for a specified period of time. Provides the following restricted license periods:
 - a) For a first DUI, restricted license for 6 months.
 - b) For a first DUI causing bodily injury, restricted license for 12 months.
 - c) For a DUI with one prior, restricted license for 24 months.
 - d) For a DUI causing bodily injury with one prior, restricted license for 36 months.
 - e) For a DUI with two priors, restricted license for 36 months.
 - f) For a DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, restricted license for 48 months.
 - g) For a DUI with three priors, restricted license for 60 months.
 - h) For a first DUI with a BAC of .20 or higher, restricted license for 10 months.

- 9) Amends the fee schedule for the reduced IID fee schedule. Provides the following:
- a) A person with an income at 125 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL) 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 accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - b) A person with an income at 126 to 225 percent of the FPL 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 accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - c) A person with an income at 226 to 325 percent of the FPL 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 accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
- 10) Allows DMV to only suspend, instead of suspend and revoke, the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle upon the receipt of an abstract of the record of a court showing that the person has been convicted of a DUI.
- 11) Repeals courts' authority to order a 10-year revocation of the driver's license of a person who has been convicted of three or more separate DUI violations.
- 12) This bill states that its provisions do not go into effect until January 1, 2031.
- 13) This bill makes other technical and conforming changes, including repealing existing provisions of law made obsolete by the provisions of this bill.
- 14) This bill contains an urgency clause.

COMMENTS:

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, "Every day, drunk drivers kill 37 people in the United States – one life every 39 minutes – and California is the epicenter of the crisis. Eight of the top ten cities with the worst DUI rates in the nation are here in California: Sacramento, Los Angeles, San Jose, Bakersfield, Fresno, San Diego, Long Beach, and Oakland. According to the NHTSA, between 2019 and 2023, drunk driving fatalities in California increased by 40%,"

far outpacing the national average of 22%. These deaths are entirely preventable. Ignition interlock devices (IIDs) are one tool to prevent individuals who have consumed alcohol from operating a vehicle, and according to the Center for Disease Control, reduce repeat DUI offenses by 70%. More than 34 states have laws requiring all individuals convicted of driving under the influence, including first-time offenders, to install an IID. Under current California law, only individuals with two-or-more DUI convictions are required to install an IID, as a condition of regaining a license. A 2016, robust national study by the University of Pennsylvania concluded that requiring ignition interlocks for all drunk-driving convictions was associated with 15% fewer alcohol-involved crash deaths. In comparison, when given the sanction of a suspended license, the study found that more than half of convicted impaired driving offenders continue to drive. In 2016, the California DMV found that ignition interlocks are 74% more effective in reducing DUI recidivism than license suspension, alone, for first-time offenders during the first six months following a conviction. In 2023 alone, IIDs prevented more than 30,500 attempts to drive drunk in California. Even with those prevented starts, California still experienced an increase in drunk driving fatalities between 2022 (31%) and 2023 (33%).”

- 2) *What’s an IID?* An ignition interlock device, or IID, is a device installed in a car that prevents the operator from driving if they have detectable levels of alcohol on their breath. It is about the size of a cell phone and wired to a vehicle’s ignition. After installation, the IID requires a breath sample before the engine can start. If the IID detects alcohol on the driver’s breath, the engine will not start. As the person drives, they will be periodically required to provide breath samples to ensure the continued absence of alcohol in their system. 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. Once installed in a vehicle, the IID must be calibrated and inspected by a certified installer at intervals not to exceed 60 days. Information about the costs and efficacy of IIDs is provided in sections six and seven of this analysis.
- 3) *DUI crash data.* According to data from UC Berkeley’s Transportation Injury Mapping System, in 2025 there were almost 162,939 total crashes in California, 18,883 of which were DUI crashes, or 11.6%. There were 19,032 fatal and serious injury crashes, of those, 4,271 or 22.4% were DUI involved. DUI crashes are more common on weekends and most often committed by drivers

ages 20-29. The vast majority of DUI crashes are alcohol-involved, as opposed to drug-involved.²

- 4) *What happens when you are arrested for DUI?* A DUI arrest triggers two separate and parallel processes: an administrative action by DMV and a criminal case in court. Shortly after arrest, DMV begins an administrative action based on receipt of a law enforcement Administrative Per Se (APS) report (0.08% BAC, zero tolerance, DUI probation violation, or chemical test refusal). Upon arrest, the person's driver's license is suspended and the driver typically receives a temporary license and has 10 days to request a DMV hearing to challenge the license suspension. If no hearing is requested, or if DMV upholds the action, a license suspension or other restriction goes into effect regardless of what happens in court. If the driver's test results showed a blood alcohol content of 0.08% or more, their license will be suspended for four months for a first offense, and a second or subsequent offense within 10 years will result in a one-year suspension.

Separately, the court process determines whether the person has committed a criminal offense and a conviction may result in penalties such as fines, probation, DUI education programs, IID requirements, or incarceration.

- 5) *Overview of current DUI penalties for first offenders.* Concurrently to the administrative license suspension upon arrest, DMV will further suspend the license of a driver *convicted* of their first DUI for 6 or 10 months, depending on whether their BAC was greater than 0.20%. Under existing law, a court may order a first-time DUI offender (not causing bodily injury), in addition to all other penalties (jail, probation, fines, license suspension, and DUI programs), to install an IID on any vehicle they operate for six to ten months. If a court finds that an IID is not appropriate for a particular person, that person may apply to 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. 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.
- 6) *Current law for repeat DUI offenders.* Under current law, DMV requires all repeat and all injury-involved DUI offenders to install an IID for a time-period ranging from one to four years, depending on the number of prior DUI

² <https://tims.berkeley.edu/tools/dui/>

convictions. Offenders who install an IID may drive anytime or anywhere, as long as the vehicle is equipped with an IID. The license suspension or revocation length is based on the number of prior convictions and severity, including whether or not another person was injured. The term lengths are as follows:

- Second offender, non-injury: two-year license suspension with a mandatory IID for one year
- Second offender with injury: three-year license revocation with mandatory IID for two years
- Third offender, non-injury: three-year license revocation with a mandatory IID for two years
- Third offender with injury: five-year license revocation with a mandatory IID for three years
- Fourth offender or higher, non-injury: four-year license revocation with a mandatory IID for three years
- Fourth offender or higher, with injury: five-year license revocation with a mandatory IID for three years

7) *Post conviction court sanctions for DUI.* Separately from licensing actions, courts impose penalties on offenders convicted of DUI including incarceration, probation, and fines. DUIs are not eligible for misdemeanor diversion. According to the *2025 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System*, “[t]he most frequent court sanction for all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2020 was probation (94.3%), while the least frequently imposed court sanction was ignition interlock (14.9%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 76.4% of the cases.”³ The report also states that, “[a]mong first DUI offenders arrested in 2020, 69.8% were sentenced to jail, compared to 94.7% of all repeat offenders.” For comprehensive county-specific data on court sanctions for DUIs, see DMV’s *Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System*.⁴

³ [Microsoft Word - 32nd DUI MIS Report](#)

⁴ [Postconviction Sanctions - California DMV](#)

- 8) *IID costs.* The monthly cost of an IID in California is approximately \$99 to \$116.⁵ Moreover, IIDs are required to be installed on every vehicle an offender operates, including vehicles to which they may have access. So, the costs of an IID would double in any household with two cars. Of course, there are other financial costs associated with a DUI conviction including penalty assessments and fees assessed on the base fine for a crime. Assuming a defendant was fined \$1,000 as the maximum fine for a criminal offense, the total payment owed would be \$4,140 due to penalty assessments. Offenders also pay increased insurance costs, the cost of a DUI treatment program, potential towing and impoundment charges, and DMV fees, among others.
- 9) *IID research mixed.* California's experience with IIDs has produced mixed findings regarding their effectiveness, particularly for first-time DUI offenders. Multiple California pilot programs and evaluations have found that while IIDs can reduce DUI recidivism during the period they are installed, those benefits often diminish over time and do not necessarily translate into improved overall traffic safety. DMV's evaluation of the 2010-2016 IID pilot program found lower rates of repeat DUI offenses among participants, but also found that drivers with IID-restricted licenses experienced higher rates of subsequent crashes than comparable offenders whose licenses remained suspended or revoked. DMV concluded that the traffic safety benefits of reduced impaired driving were "potentially marginalized" by an increased propensity for crash involvement. Similarly, earlier California studies found no statistically significant reduction in subsequent DUI convictions and characterized the overall traffic safety effects of IIDs as mixed, even when installed.

At the same time, national research has found that states requiring IIDs for all DUI offenders experience fewer alcohol-impaired drivers involved in fatal crashes than states without such requirements. As a result, the available research suggests that while IIDs may be effective at reducing impaired driving and DUI recidivism, questions remain regarding their long-term safety impacts and whether mandatory installation for all first-time offenders produces net public safety benefits. *For a more comprehensive analysis of first offender IID research, see the Assembly Public Safety Committee analysis for AB 1830 published March 23, 2026.*

- 10) *AB 1830 creates a new, statewide DUI framework in California.* California's current DUI penalty framework includes a complex tapestry of court requirements, time-limited pilot programs, administrative per se suspensions,

⁵ See e.g. Intoxalock Ignition Interlock Website, <https://www.intoxalock.com/state-requirements/california/pricing> [last visited June 23, 2026].

other DMV actions, and judicial discretion. Drug-only DUI offenders are subsumed into many of the alcohol-related driving offense penalties, such as IID requirements, which may not be appropriate for a drug-only offense. This complexity at times results in an incoherent system for both offenders and courts. Under this bill, as amended, DMV will run a permanent, statewide restricted license program which includes the new, more robust IID requirements, treatment program requirements, APS suspensions, suspensions upon conviction, and license reinstatement requirements, among others. Courts must send DMV the abstract of conviction for a DUI and, upon receipt of the abstract, DMV must inform the convicted person of the restricted license requirements they must meet, including IID installation requirements.

- 11) *IID required for first DUI.* AB 1830 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. Specifically, the bill requires DMV to order all first-time DUI offenders to install, maintain, and service an IID for a minimum of six months on every vehicle they operate. After a DUI conviction, an offender must install an IID and complete their restriction term to ever reinstate their driving privilege.

This change will likely result in a significant increase in the number of IIDs installed in California, as the vast majority of DUIs are committed by first-time offenders. According to the *2025 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System*, “[a]mong convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2020, 74.7% were first offenders and 25.2% were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 10 years), notably lower than 27.2% in 2019. The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at 37%, even though prior DUI convictions are currently retained on record, and thus counted, longer than in the past (10 years compared to 7 years in 1989).”

Supporters contend that first offender IID requirements save lives. Writing in support, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety state, “[a] common misconception is that most people who are convicted of their first drunk driving offense are social drinkers who made one mistake. However, studies show that the average first offender will have driven drunk 87 times before getting arrested. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), adult drivers admitted they drank too much and got behind the wheel approximately 127 million times in 2020, which equals over 347,000 incidents of drinking and driving each day. However, only 1 million, or approximately one percent of that 127 million, were arrested for driving under the influence

that year. Drivers with a BAC of .08 percent or higher involved in fatal crashes were three times more likely to have a prior conviction for drunk driving than drivers with no alcohol. States that have adopted IID laws for all offenders are saving lives, reducing injuries and preventing drunk driving recidivism. For example, when West Virginia adopted its IID program, recidivism was reduced by 77 percent among first time offenders.”

Opponents of first offender IID requirements argue that judicial discretion and robust IID fee waivers are essential for equitable policy. ACLU California Action writes, “AB 1830 would create a statewide program that mandates the installation of an IID for all DUI convictions, which contravenes available public safety evidence and exacerbates financial harm on low-income communities by confronting the complicated DUI problem in this state through an expansive, one-size fits all approach to DUI prevention.

“This bill removes judicial discretion and automatically imposes burdensome IID requirements on every Californian convicted of DUI, regardless of their blood alcohol content (BAC) or the presence or absence of physical harm. By mandating IID installation, AB 1830 fails to account for a wide spectrum of behavior and eliminates alternative solutions for addressing DUI convictions.”

- 12) *IID reduced fees included.* In an effort to address IID cost concerns, AB 1830 includes somewhat more generous IID fee waivers for offenders than what exists in current law. Under current law, individuals ordered to install an IID can qualify for reduced program costs based on income. Individuals receiving CalFresh benefits are also eligible to pay 50 percent of standard program costs. Manufacturers absorb the discounted portion of costs for eligible participants. All other offenders are responsible for the full cost of the IID program.

AB 1830’s new fee schedule allows people to remain in each discounted tier at higher income levels than what exists in current law. Specifically, the bill would expand eligibility for each reduced-cost tier by increasing the income thresholds by 25 percentage points of the federal poverty level. The CalFresh discount would remain unchanged. As a result, more individuals would qualify for reduced IID costs, and some participants would move into lower-cost tiers than under current law.

Of note, however, many of these offenders would not be subject to any IID installation requirement under current law. Therefore, although AB 1830 offers more generous fee waivers, ultimately, many first time DUI offenders will pay far more than they would under current law.

13) *New penalty structure for repeat DUIs.* In addition to the new first offender IID requirement, this bill significantly lengthens the mandatory IID term lengths for repeat offenders. Currently, repeat offenders must install IIDs for a specified time period based on whether they injured another person and their prior convictions, as detailed above. This bill would significantly lengthen the mandatory IID terms as follows:

- 2nd DUI offense IID term: from 1 year to 2 years (non-injury); from 2 years to 3 years (injury)
- 3rd DUI offense IID term: from 2 years to 3 years (non-injury); from 3 years to 4 years (injury)
- 4th DUI offense (or more) IID term: from 3 years to 5 years (non-injury); from 3 years to 5 years (injury)

14) *Some exempted from installing an IID.* Under current law and under this bill, offenders may qualify for an exemption from installing an IID if they are an out of state resident, have a medical condition that prevents them from being able to use an IID, or they do not own a vehicle. If they are granted an exemption, their driving privileges will remain suspended or revoked for the full length of the mandatory IID restriction term.

Additionally, an offender who drives their employer's vehicle during the scope of their employment may continue to do so without an IID. To qualify for this exemption, they must complete a Notice to Employers Ignition Interlock Restriction form and provide it to their employer, who must sign off on the form.⁶ The driver is required to keep a copy of the form in their possession or with the employer's vehicle.

15) *A new system for drug-only DUI.* Another major change in AB 1830 is the creation of a separate penalty structure for drug-only DUI offenses. Under current law, DMV suspends or revokes the license of drug-only DUI offenders for a time-period that varies by level of offense and the number of prior convictions. These time periods are aligned with the suspension requirements for alcohol-related DUIs. Some drug-only DUI offenders are eligible for a restricted license that restricts them to operating a vehicle equipped with an IID.⁷ An IID can only detect alcohol consumption, and thus may not be appropriate for a drug-only offender. As such, AB 1830 removes all IID

⁶ Notice of Employers Ignition Interlock Restriction, [DL 923, Notice to Employers Ignition Interlock Restriction](#)

⁷ [Drug- Only Offender.pdf](#)

requirements for drug-only offenders. Instead, drug-only DUI offenders will have a restricted license option that only permits driving to and from their place of employment. This drug-only DUI restricted license requires offenders to serve a specified period of time with a full and complete license suspension. They must also enroll in a DUI treatment program, provide proof of insurance, and pay court fees. Notably, a court may disallow the restricted license option at their discretion. If this happens, the license would be fully suspended for the duration of the suspension period.

- 16) *Court discretion to revoke license after three DUIs repealed.* Current law authorizes a court to order a 10-year driver's license revocation for a person convicted of a third or subsequent DUI-related offense when the latest conviction is subject to enhanced penalties for repeat offenders. Before imposing the revocation, the court must consider several factors, including the individual's level of remorse, the time elapsed since prior DUI convictions, their blood alcohol concentration at the time of the offense, participation in alcohol treatment programs, the risk they pose to traffic and public safety, and their ability to install an IID in vehicles they operate. If the court orders the revocation, DMV is required to revoke the person's driver's license for 10 years upon receiving the court's order, subject to specified exceptions. AB 1830 removes this authority, meaning a court would no longer be able to issue a 10-year license revocation. This bill shifts to long-term IID installation for repeat offenders instead of license revocations.
- 17) *AB 1830 repeals pilots, makes other conforming changes.* In addition to the first-offender IID requirement, extended IID term lengths, and drug-only DUI provisions, AB 1830 makes numerous other changes to California's DUI laws, many of which are conforming changes related to the new statewide program. The language eliminates conflicting or duplicative statutes that no longer function with a statewide permanent program, among other things. The bill also makes changes to the .04% BAC statute for rideshare drivers, moves street racing out of DUI sections, replaces license revocation authority with suspension authority only, removes court discretion on several penalties, removes reporting requirements, deletes language from previous pilot programs, and generally streamlines California's DUI statute.
- 18) *Double referral.* This bill is double referred to the Senate Public Safety Committee.

RELATED/PREVIOUS LEGISLATION:

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.

AB 71 (Lackey, 2025) – 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.*

AB 2210 (Petrie-Norris, 2024) – Would have required 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.*

SB 545 (Hill, 2019) – Would have required IIDs to be installed for a period of six months for first-time convicted DUI offenders. *The hearing for SB 545 in the Assembly Public Safety Committee was cancelled at the request of the author.*

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.

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.

SB 55 (Hill, 2013) – 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.*

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.

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.

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.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: No

POSITIONS: (Communicated to the committee before 9am on Monday, August 10, 2026.)

SUPPORT:

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety
Alcohol Justice
American College of Surgeons, Southern California Chapter
Auto Club of Southern California (AAA)
California Alcohol Policy Alliance
California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
California Professional Firefighters
Capa
City of Sunnyvale
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
Mothers Against Drunk Driving
Responsibility.org
Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment (SAFE)
Yolo County District Attorney

OPPOSITION:

ACLU California Action
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Public Defenders Association
Courage California
Debt Free Justice California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union
San Francisco Public Defender
Smart Justice California, a Project of Beyond Impact
Universidad Popular

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Writing in support, the Yolo County District Attorney’s Office states, “[t]he average drunk driver drives more than 80 times before their first arrest, according to the Centers for Disease Control, and studies show that license suspension alone is not effective. According to AAMVA, 75% of drivers continue to drive on a suspended license, contributing to repeat offenses and tragic outcomes.

“The only way to stop a drunk driver from re-offending is to install an ignition interlock on the vehicle that a person operates. The interlock device preserves public safety and allows DUI offenders to safely fulfill work and family obligations. Ignition interlocks are a safe and equitable solution. In California alone, IIDs prevented more than 30,500 attempts at drunk drivers in 2023.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Writing in opposition, Smart Justice California states, “AB 1830 removes judicial discretion and automatically imposes burdensome IID requirements on every Californian convicted of DUI, regardless of BAC or the presence or absence of physical harm. By mandating IID installation, AB 1830 fails to account for a wide spectrum of behavior and eliminates alternative solutions for addressing DUI convictions.

“Current research demonstrates that IID use and DUI penalties should be narrowly tailored based on judicial discretion. Judicial discretion to determine when to require an IID for first-time offenders is critical to ensure that this tool is appropriately used for individuals at high risk of reoffending.”

-- END --