

# Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

## 127<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Ohio

Ohio Legislative Service Commission  
77 South High Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Columbus, OH 43215-6136 ✦ Phone: (614) 466-3615  
✦ Internet Web Site: <http://www.lsc.state.oh.us/>

BILL: **S.B. 17** DATE: **March 21, 2007**  
STATUS: **As Introduced** SPONSOR: **Sen. Grendell**  
LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: **Yes**  
CONTENTS: **OVI prohibitions and penalties**

### State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND	FY 2007*	FY 2008	FUTURE YEARS
<b>Law Enforcement Reimbursement Fund (Fund 83R)</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	Gain of uncertain magnitude	Gain of uncertain magnitude
Expenditures	- 0 -	Increase, commensurate with available revenue	Increase, commensurate with available revenue

Note: The state fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. For example, FY 2007 is July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007.

\* For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, it is assumed that any of the bill's state fiscal effects would occur sometime after FY 2007.

- **Law Enforcement Reimbursement Fund (Fund 83R)**. When a court issues an immobilization order, and the paperwork is properly filed with the BMV, the BMV returns a \$100 immobilization fee, an amount that is disbursed from the state's Law Enforcement Reimbursement Fund (Fund 83R). As a result of the bill, it is likely that additional vehicles will be immobilized and generate additional related revenues that would be deposited to the credit of Fund 83R and subsequently redistributed to the appropriate local jurisdiction. As of this writing, the magnitude of those revenues and related redistributed moneys are uncertain.

### Local Fiscal Highlights

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 2007 – FUTURE YEARS
<b>Counties, Municipalities, and Townships</b>	
Revenues and Expenditures	Factors increasing and decreasing revenues and expenditures, with net fiscal effect on any given local government uncertain

Note: For most local governments, the fiscal year is the calendar year. The school district fiscal year is July 1 through June 30.

- **Local government revenues and expenditures**. As of this writing, LSC fiscal staff has not had the opportunity to complete all of the research necessary to provide estimates of the net impact of all the bill's provisions on local revenues and expenditures.



---

## ***Detailed Fiscal Analysis***

### **Overview**

For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, the bill most notably:

- Revises the sentencing provisions for an offender who is convicted of a state OVI and who, within six years of the offense, previously has been convicted of one or more state OVI offenses.
- Revises the vehicle immobilization and forfeiture provisions that apply to a person who is convicted of a violation of a municipal OVI ordinance and who, within the preceding six years, has been convicted of one or more state OVI offenses.
- Specifies that, if a court grants bail to a person who is alleged to have committed a state OVI and who would be sentenced as a repeat offender if convicted of that offense, the court as a condition of bail must: (1) prohibit the person from consuming any beer or intoxicating liquor, and (2) require the person to wear a monitor that provides continuous alcohol monitoring that is remote until the case is properly adjudicated.
- Removes from the prohibition that constitutes the offense of wrongful entrustment of a motor vehicle the current element that requires that the person who permits the motor vehicle to be driven by another must know or have reasonable cause to believe that: (1) the other person does not have a valid license or operating privilege, (2) the other person's license or operating privilege is under suspension, (3) the other person's driving the vehicle would violate Chapter 4509. of the Revised Code, or (4) the other person's driving the vehicle would be an OVI offense.

### **Repeat OVI offenders**

According to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles within the Department of Public Safety, in calendar year 2006, there were 58,098 OVI convictions in Ohio. Of this total number of convictions, about 54,452 involved offenders that had at least one prior OVI conviction within the previous six years. Based on this preliminary data for just one year, the bill will affect the disposition of a large number of OVI cases annually.

### **OVI sentencing revisions**

For individuals convicted of a state OVI or equivalent municipal offense and who, within six years of the offense, had previously been convicted of either one or more state OVI offenses, the bill would revise the existing sentencing provisions as described below.

### **Driver's intervention program**

In addition to any jail term or house arrest that may be imposed under current law, the court must require the offender to attend a driver's intervention program. Current law authorizes, but does not require, a court to impose attendance at such a program as part of the sentence. As of this writing, LSC fiscal staff has not had the opportunity to complete the research necessary to determine the extent to which judges currently sentence offenders to such programs, as well as the costs associated with establishing new programs if necessary.

### **Immobilization and impoundment**

The vehicle involved in the offense, if registered to the offender, as well as all other motor vehicles registered to the offender, shall be immobilized for one year and the license plates will be impounded for one year. Current law allows for only 90 days. This provision of the bill would increase the number of license plates that would be impounded in any given year, which would generate an increase in revenues collected by local jurisdictions from the state Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) to cover the cost of impounding the plate.

The bill would also result in a larger number of vehicles being immobilized and stored for a one-year period, as compared to current law. When a vehicle is immobilized as a result of an OVI conviction, the owner pays the BMV a \$100 immobilization fee, which is deposited in the state treasury to the credit of the Law Enforcement Reimbursement Fund (Fund 83R). The BMV then disburses that fee back to the appropriate local law enforcement entity to reimburse that jurisdiction for the costs it incurs in immobilizing the vehicle.

The storage fees charged to the vehicle owner are approximately \$10 per day, which means a one-year immobilization would cost the offender approximately \$3,650 per vehicle. This should generate additional revenue for some local jurisdictions, however it could also create additional expenses. The larger storage fees would compound the problems of collecting what is owed, particularly from the more indigent offenders as well as from owners whose vehicle is worth less than the storage fees. If their owners essentially abandon a large number of immobilized vehicles, local jurisdictions would not likely collect any storage fees and would incur costs to dispose of the vehicles. Additionally, certain counties and/or municipalities may have to build or otherwise create more storage space for immobilized vehicles, which may involve a substantial expenditure for new construction or renovations.

As of this writing, LSC has not had the opportunity to complete the research necessary to determine the extent to which judges currently impose immobilization of vehicles and the impoundment of license plates, as well as the net effect of the increased accumulation of fee revenue against the potential increased costs stemming from the additional nine months of immobilization.

### **Continuous monitoring**

The bill also requires offenders, as well as those alleged to have committed an OVI-related offense and granted bail, to wear a device providing remote continuous monitoring, and further states

the offender must pay all costs associated with the monitoring process. The bill is silent as to the issue of who pays these costs if the offender is indigent and cannot pay. To the extent that the financial responsibility for the monitoring may ultimately rest with the courts, local expenditures would increase. Again, the research to fully determine these costs is not yet complete.

### **Alcohol and drug addiction treatment**

For those offenders who, within six years of the current OVI offense, have two or more prior OVI convictions, in addition to the above-mentioned sanctions, the bill also expands the existing alcohol and drug addiction program sanctions to require the operator of the program to determine and assess the degree of the offender's alcohol dependency and treat the offender accordingly. As of this writing, LSC has not had the opportunity to complete the research necessary to determine the extent to which judges currently require OVI offenders with multiple priors to receive such alcohol and drug addiction programming, and whether there is currently enough of such programming to accommodate potentially more offenders as a result of this bill. We need to determine the potential cost of such additional programming as well as the jurisdiction that would pay these costs.

### **Wrongful entrustment of a motor vehicle**

Lastly, the bill removes from the prohibition that constitutes the offense of wrongful entrustment of a motor vehicle the current element that requires that the person who permits the motor vehicle to be driven by another must know or have reasonable cause to believe that: (1) the other person does not have a valid license or operating privilege, (2) the other person's license or operating privilege is under suspension, (3) the other person's driving the vehicle would violate Chapter 4509. of the Revised Code, or (4) the other person's driving the vehicle would be an OVI offense. The effect of this provision would likely be some reduction in the number of cases filed for wrongful entrustment. As of this writing, LSC has not had the opportunity to complete the research necessary to determine the approximate number of cases involving wrongful entrustment and specifically how the reduction in such cases would impact state and local expenditures.

*LSC fiscal staff: Joseph Rogers, Senior Budget Analyst*

*SB0017IN.doc/lb*