

From: London, Sarah [Sarah.London@vermont.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Coriell, Scott; Allen, Susan
CC: Springer, Darren
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

Yeah – Chris is saying it is rare chance to have woman from prior press conference and new person (new American) in one room. He is not on until 3 or 3:30pm today, so would be later in the day. Bill isn't final in that committee, but as of this am, looks like most of our stuff is definitely in play, including some new stuff... Basically:

- Make clear SA, Defender General, etc can dismiss pre-1990 charges that were crimes, nothing owed
- Statewide Driver Restoration for tickets prior to a TBD date, pay \$25 a pop
- Eliminate suspensions for underage tobacco and bomb threats
- Recall driving privileges for underage alcohol and marijuana if they fail to complete diversion, and reduce suspension/recall (unclear there is any difference) to 30 days for first offense, 60 days for second
- Eliminate suspensions for failure to pay a fine
- Improve/ increase awareness of the 30x30 payment plan options that already exists
- [NO MAKING TRAFFIC TICKET FINES BASED ON ABILITY TO PAY]
- **Committee is considering adopting recommendation of state's attorneys re texting while driving violations: go from 5 to 10 points (automatic suspension) & increase points for all handheld violations in work zones, etc**

From: Coriell, Scott
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 9:25 AM
To: London, Sarah ; Allen, Susan
Cc: Springer, Darren
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

Kind of does. We'd be talking about doing something today?

From: London, Sarah
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 9:16 AM
To: Allen, Susan <Susan.Allen@vermont.gov>; Coriell, Scott <Scott.Coriell@vermont.gov>
Cc: Springer, Darren <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

Now looks like they ARE going to remove suspensions for underage tobacco and bomb threats and "recall" licenses for underage alcohol and pot for a certain period of time. Not sure if this changes any interest on the press front, but FYI.

From: Allen, Susan
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 10:20 AM
To: Coriell, Scott <Scott.Coriell@vermont.gov>; London, Sarah <Sarah.London@vermont.gov>

Cc: Springer, Darren <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

If I understand Sarah's comments this morning correctly, I agree with Scott. Sounds like they will vote out a good first step bill, and maybe we can strengthen it in the Senate ...

From: Coriell, Scott
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 10:18 AM
To: London, Sarah <Sarah.London@vermont.gov>; Allen, Susan <Susan.Allen@vermont.gov>
Cc: Springer, Darren <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

We're gonna lose on the vote right? My sense is that we let them do what they're going to do and react to the news when it happens. We don't want the Governor out there calling for a change in the law only to have House Judiciary poo poo it later in the week.

From: London, Sarah
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 10:05 AM
To: Allen, Susan <Susan.Allen@vermont.gov>; Coriell, Scott <Scott.Coriell@vermont.gov>
Cc: Springer, Darren <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Subject: FW: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

Chris Curtis is trying to bring below witness or two to House Judiciary tomorrow (Tuesday). He is wondering if we want to try to do a DLS press event tomorrow while these witnesses are together (assuming he gets them both). I assume GPS will be in Burlington at press event, so we're not able to do this? Or just let me know. It looks like goal may be to vote something out on Wednesday.

From: Christopher Curtis [<mailto:CCurtis@vtlegalaid.org>]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 9:42 AM
To: London, Sarah <Sarah.London@vermont.gov>
Subject: FW: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

FYI... I finally managed to reach Helana Gardner. She is checking to see if she can come to the statehouse tomorrow. Do you want to check with Maxine to see if she has any objection to some media work while they are there? Do you want to talk to Scott and/or Sue about this? It may be difficult to get them back at the same time.

CC

From: Christopher Curtis
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 9:40 AM
To: 'Maxine'
Subject: RE: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

I have two witnesses I would like to bring to your committee with me. Helana Martin is a young woman who received a tobacco violation at 13. Her parents thought it would teach her a lesson to not pay the fines. As a consequence she still does not have her license today (at 27). I also have a "new

American"/refugee, Zia Gbau, from Colchester who received a ticket for a broken taillight, couldn't afford the fine and ended up with his license suspended. He wants to go back to work, but not having a license is making it difficult.

I know that Mr. Gbau is available tomorrow. Ms. Gardner is checking to see if she can make arrangements.

Please let me know if it is OK to bring them.

From: Maxine [<mailto:maxjg@gmavt.net>]

Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 8:43 AM

To: Christopher Curtis

Cc: Jeannie Lowell; Helena Gardner; Maxine Grad; London, Sarah; Chip Conquest; Willem Jewett

Subject: Testimony on DLS needed/where we are

Here is a summary of where we are:

First, we are looking to clear the slate of suspended licenses that were based on traffic tickets that predate 1990 and were burned/lost in the fire. The Defender General's Office, State's Attorneys and AG's office are coming up with an MOU or similar action to dismiss the cases. I would like to reflect this in session law or legislative history somehow.

We are trying to implement a state-wide driver restoration program—one time, in statute to get “caught up” and create geographical justice for those who didn't live in the counties that had restoration days or couldn't attend.

Finally, moving forward: We are trying to find a balance between getting people's licenses back to them while still finding a way to collect at least some of the outstanding fines. Testimony shows that there is vast underuse of 30 x 30 and other collection methods, including advising drivers at the time of ticketing—roadside. There is belief that if these programs are in place, people would pay something over time.

We are getting a lot of pushback on the potential revenue losses due to going to suspensions for moving violations only and the decrease in suspensions, waiving the reinstatement fee and an indigent fee. Many folks oppose the reduced fee. Data is very inconsistent or nonexistent. We heard that DVM fees are up for review this year and perhaps the Administration can work with the money committees to redistribute and recoup the lost revenue with fees.

Maxine Grad, Chair
House Judiciary Committee
House of Representatives
Montpelier, VT 05633
maxjg@gmavt.net

