House Bill 2767

Sponsored by Representative THATCHER (Presession filed.)

SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure **as introduced.**

Directs court to require installation of ignition interlock device as condition of driving while under influence of intoxicants diversion agreement. Punishes violation of condition by maximum fine of \$720.

Directs providers of ignition interlock devices to report installation and removal of devices to court. Directs providers of ignition interlock devices to submit periodic inspection reports to court.

1 A BILL FOR AN ACT

2 Relating to ignition interlock devices; creating new provisions; and amending ORS 813.600 and 813.602.

4 Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

- **SECTION 1.** ORS 813.600 is amended to read:
- 6 813.600. (1) The Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Transportation Safety
- 7 Committee, shall establish a program for the use of ignition interlock devices by persons convicted
- 8 of driving under the influence of intoxicants and granted hardship permits under ORS 807.240 and
- by persons who have entered into a driving while under the influence of intoxicants diversion agreement.
 - (2) The department shall adopt rules that specify requirements for ignition interlock devices that may be used and shall publish a list of devices that meet the requirements. The list may include devices that:
 - (a) Do not impede the safe operation of the vehicle;
 - (b) Have the fewest opportunities to be bypassed;
 - (c) Correlate well with established measures of alcohol impairment;
 - (d) Work accurately and reliably in an unsupervised environment;
- 18 (e) Require a deep lung breath sample or other accurate measure of blood alcohol content 19 equivalence;
 - (f) Resist tampering and give evidence if tampering is attempted;
- 21 (g) Are difficult to circumvent, and require premeditation to do so;
 - (h) Minimize inconvenience to a sober user;
- 23 (i) Operate reliably over the range of automobile environments or automobile manufacturing standards;
 - (j) Are manufactured by a party who is adequately insured for product liability; and
 - (k) Have a label affixed in a prominent location warning that any person tampering with, circumventing or otherwise misusing the device is subject to civil penalty.
 - **SECTION 2.** ORS 813.602 is amended to read:
 - 813.602. (1) When a person is convicted of driving while under the influence of intoxicants in violation of ORS 813.010 or of a municipal ordinance, the Department of Transportation, in addition

NOTE: Matter in **boldfaced** type in an amended section is new; matter [*italic and bracketed*] is existing law to be omitted. New sections are in **boldfaced** type.

5

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

20

22

25

26 27

28 29

30

to any other requirement, shall require that an approved ignition interlock device be installed and used in any vehicle operated by the person:

- (a) Before the person is eligible for a hardship permit. The requirement is a condition of the hardship permit for the duration of the hardship permit.
- (b) For a first conviction, for one year after the ending date of the suspension or revocation caused by the conviction. Violation of the condition imposed under this paragraph is a Class A traffic violation.
- (c) For a second or subsequent conviction, for two years after the ending date of the suspension or revocation caused by the conviction. Violation of the condition imposed under this paragraph is a Class A traffic violation.
- (2) [If the court determines that approved ignition interlock devices are reasonably available,] The court [may] shall require as a condition of a driving while under the influence of intoxicants diversion agreement that an approved ignition interlock device be installed in any vehicle operated by the person during the period of the agreement when the person has driving privileges. In addition to any action taken under ORS 813.255, violation of the condition imposed under this subsection is a Class A traffic violation. [Courts may not exercise authority under this subsection during any period the courts have notice from the Office of Economic Analysis of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services that there are not sufficient moneys in the Intoxicated Driver Program Fund to pay the costs under subsection (4) of this section. The Office of Economic Analysis of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services may not issue any notice under this subsection if federal funds are available to pay the cost of the interlock devices for indigents and costs of analysis of the use of interlock devices].
- (3) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, if an ignition interlock system is ordered or required under subsection (1) or (2) of this section, the person so ordered or required shall pay to the provider the reasonable costs of leasing, installing and maintaining the device. A payment schedule may be established for the person by the department.
- (4) The department may waive, in whole or in part, or defer the defendant's responsibility to pay all or part of the costs under subsection (3) of this section if the defendant meets the criteria for indigence established for waiving or deferring such costs under subsection (5) of this section. If the defendant's responsibility for costs is waived, then notwithstanding ORS 813.270, the costs described in subsection (3) of this section must be paid from the Intoxicated Driver Program Fund.
- (5) The department, by rule, shall establish criteria and procedures it will use for qualification to waive or defer costs described under subsection (3) of this section for indigence. The criteria must be consistent with the standards for indigence adopted by the federal government for purposes of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- (6) At the end of the suspension or revocation resulting from the conviction, the department shall suspend the driving privileges or right to apply for driving privileges of a person who has not submitted proof to the department that an ignition interlock device has been installed or who tampers with an ignition interlock device after it has been installed. If the suspension is for failing to submit proof of installation, the suspension continues until the department receives proof that the ignition interlock device has been installed or until one year after the ending date of the suspension resulting from the first conviction or two years after the ending date of the suspension is for tampering with an ignition interlock device, the suspension continues until one year after the ending date of the suspension resulting from the first conviction or two years after the ending date of the suspension resulting from the first conviction or two years after the ending date of the suspension resulting from the first conviction or two years after the ending date of the suspension

sion	resultir	g from	a sec	cond or	sub	sequen	t con	viction.	A	person	whos	e o	driving	privileg	es or	right
to a	apply for	privileg	ges is	suspe	nded	under	this	subsect	ion	is en	titled	to	admini	strative	revie	w, as
desc	ribed in	ORS 80	9.440	of the	e acti	on.										

- (7) The department shall adopt rules permitting medical exemptions from the requirements of installation and use of an ignition interlock device under subsection (1) of this section.
- (8) When a person is required to install an ignition interlock device under subsection (2) of this section, the provider of the device shall provide to the court that ordered installation of the device:
- (a) Notices of any installation or removal of an ignition interlock device by the provider; and
- (b) Copies of periodic inspection reports monitoring the use of the device every 60 days. <u>SECTION 3.</u> The amendments to ORS 813.602 by section 2 of this 2011 Act apply to offenses that occur on or after the effective date of this 2011 Act.