



Senate Fiscal Agency
P.O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

BILL ANALYSIS



Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986

Senate Bills 134 and 135 (as reported without amendment)
Sponsor: Senator Ruth Johnson (S.B. 134)
Senator Kevin Hertel (S.B. 135)
Committee: Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety

CONTENT

Senate Bill 134 would amend the Revised Judicature Act to create the Specialty Court Interlock Program, which would allow an individual assigned to a specialty court, such as a drug treatment or Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)/sobriety court, to be placed in the Program and receive a restricted license from the SOS after installing an interlock device.

Senate Bill 135 would amend the Michigan Vehicle Code to apply the current requirements for an individual assigned to a DWI/sobriety court to be issued a restricted license to an individual assigned to the Specialty Court Interlock Program. These current requirements also would apply to the revocation of a restricted license and the issuance of an unrestricted license for an individual assigned to the Specialty Court Interlock Program.

The bills are tie-barred

MCL 600.1084 & 600.1091 (S.B. 134)
257.83 & 257.304 (S.B. 135)

BRIEF RATIONALE

Annual reports evaluating Michigan's DWI/sobriety court interlock program indicate that deterring some drunk drivers from becoming repeat offenders is difficult; however, the reports also indicate that the interlock program administered by the DWI/sobriety court is effective at reducing recidivism among drunk drivers in the State.¹ This reduction improves roadway safety and reduces crashes. Given the success of using interlock ignition devices to prevent drunk driving recidivism, it has been suggested that other specialty courts focused on reducing recidivism also be allowed to use them.

Legislative Analyst: Tyler P. VanHuyse

FISCAL IMPACT

Senate Bill 134 would have a minimal impact on the State and local units of government. Any impact would be related to the expansion of the use of interlock devices in more specialty courts statewide. Any increase in the installation and use of interlock devices would not likely increase direct costs for local courts. This is primarily because the offender, or user, of the interlock device is responsible for the costs related to the purchase and maintenance of the device. Senate Bill 135 would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

Date Completed: 5-24-23

Fiscal Analyst: Joe Carrasco, Jr.
Michael Siracuse

¹ Kierkus, Christopher A, et al., *Michigan DWI/Sobriety Court Ignition Interlock Evaluation*, p. 5 & 13, 2016.