

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014

Bill Number: H.597 Name of Bill: Motor Vehicles; DUI

Agency/Dept: Public Safety Author of Bill Review: Lt. John Flannigan

Date of Bill Review: 1/22/14 Status of Bill: (check one):

☒ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☐ As passed by both bodies

Recommended Position:

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in # 8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*
This bill proposes to provide that a person who successfully completes a DUI Treatment Court program shall be deemed to have met the treatment and education requirements applicable to a person who is convicted of DUI.
2. **Is there a need for this bill?** *Please explain why or why not.*
DUI Treatments courts are new and it is anticipated that they will be expanding across the state in the future. This is an approach of strict treatments and regular interaction with a DUI Court system comprised of a designated DUI judge and support resources. This is not currently in statute that allows for this to qualify for treatment and education requirements under 23 VSA 1209a.
3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?**
None.
4. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?**
Minimal, less people who go through a DUI court system track will not enroll in a public or private treatment program, such as Project CRASH.
5. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*
Minimal, see #4.
6. **Other Stakeholders:**
 - 6.1 **Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?**
I believe that there would be broad support for this bill by both prosecution, defense, treatment providers and highways safety advocates.
 - 6.2 **Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?**
I don't believe there would be any opposition to this bill.
7. **Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.*
This model has had tremendous success in other parts of the country in reducing DUI recidivism. Its success is closely related to that of specific Drug Courts. This requirement will meet or exceed the requirements that have been established in the DUI Court model which emphasizes strict treatment and oversight to successfully complete the program.

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word or PDF document to laura.gray@state.vt.us

8. **Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:** *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*
None.

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document



Date: 2/11/14

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word or PDF document to laura.gray@state.vt.us