



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Sara D. Anderson

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

Bill: Sub. S.B. 211 of the 128th G.A.
(LSC 128 1563-2) **Date:** February 23, 2010

Status: In Senate Judiciary Criminal Justice **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
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 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 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. As of this writing,

there is still a question as to whether the juvenile courts would pay the cost of required advanced driver training courses for indigent offenders.

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.

As of this writing, LSC fiscal staff has not been able to determine what cost, if any, there might be to a local jurisdiction if the judge elects to ask the Registrar to suspend a probationary driver's license as it relates to the offender's right to request a waiver of the suspension. More specifically, the remaining question concerns whether the juvenile courts would be responsible for paying for the advanced juvenile driver training course prescribed under the bill if a waiver of a suspension is granted and the offender is indigent and unable to pay the cost of the training course.