



# Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Sara D. Anderson

## Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

**Bill:** Sub. S.B. 211 of the 128th G.A.      **Date:** May 26, 2010  
**Status:** As Reported by House Judiciary      **Sponsor:** Sen. Hughes

**Local Impact Statement Procedure Required:** No — Permissive

**Contents:** Permits a judge to elect to order the Registrar of Motor Vehicles not to suspend the probationary driver's license of certain juvenile repeat traffic violators

### State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND      FY 2011 – FUTURE YEARS

#### State Bureau of Motor Vehicles Fund (Fund 4W40)

Revenues	Potential negligible decrease annually
Expenditures	- 0 -

Note: The state fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. For example, FY 2011 is July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011.

- **Reinstatement revenues.** The number of cases that would affect reinstatement revenues for the Bureau of Motor Vehicles is likely to be very small, so any loss in revenues would be no more than negligible.
- **Juvenile driver improvement programs.** According to the Department of Public Safety, it is already rewriting its driver improvement programs, so this provision of the bill would not have any additional fiscal impact on its budget.

### Local Fiscal Highlights

LOCAL GOVERNMENT      FY 2010 – FUTURE YEARS

#### County Courts of Common Pleas – Juvenile Division

Revenues	- 0 -
Expenditures	Possible annual increase for courts if they pay the cost of the required training courses for indigent offenders, not likely to be more than minimal

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

- **Juvenile courts.** The primary purpose of the bill is to give juvenile judges in the counties discretion in deciding whether to ask the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to suspend the probationary driver's license of certain juvenile repeat traffic violators. The bill does not create any new cases for the juvenile courts and does not make any changes to the law regarding fines for juvenile traffic offenders. Depending on whether a juvenile court pays the cost of the advanced driver training courses for indigent offenders, there could be some increase in expenditures for that court.

Given the overall premise that a small number of cases would likely be affected, the potential increase in expenditures for any given juvenile jurisdiction would likely be no more than minimal.

---

## **Detailed Fiscal Analysis**

### **Overview**

From a fiscal perspective, the bill does the following:

- Permits a judge to elect not to suspend the probationary driver's license of certain juvenile repeat traffic violators under certain conditions; and
- Requires the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to establish standards for advanced juvenile driver improvement programs.

### **State fiscal effects**

The bill would allow a judge to elect not to suspend the probationary driver's license of certain juvenile repeat traffic offenders. The number of cases that this provision would apply to is likely to be very small. According to the Department of Public Safety, any potential revenue loss related to driver's license reinstatement fees that would not be collected by the Bureau of Motor Vehicles is likely no more than negligible. Any administrative savings or reduction in expenditures associated with processing fewer notifications pertaining to juvenile license suspensions would also be no more than negligible.

The bill requires the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to establish standards for advanced juvenile driver improvement programs. According to the Department of Public Safety, it is already rewriting its driver improvement programs, so this provision of the bill would not have any additional fiscal impact on its budget.

### **Local fiscal effects**

The primary purpose of the bill is to give juvenile judges in the counties discretion in deciding whether to ask the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to suspend the probationary driver's license of certain juvenile repeat traffic violators. The bill does not create any new cases for the juvenile courts and does not make any changes to the law regarding fines for juvenile traffic offenders.

According to the juvenile division of the Knox County Court of Common Pleas, if it grants a waiver of the suspension and orders the offender to attend the advanced juvenile driver training course prescribed under the bill, that court waives all fines and court costs so that the only cost to the offender is the cost of the class. In the case of this court, the vendor operating the class will allow an offender to work off the cost of the class if he/she cannot afford to pay for it (i.e., the offender will attend one class and then work during another class). Thus, it appears that some courts would not necessarily be

responsible for paying the cost of the advanced juvenile driver training course for indigent offenders.

If there are cases in which a juvenile court feels compelled to pay the cost of advanced juvenile driver training for an indigent offender, the potential cost to any given county would likely be very small and not likely to exceed the minimal threshold.

*SB0211HR / lb*