## Local Mandate Fiscal Impact Estimate <br> Kentucky Legislative Research Commission <br> 2016 Regular Session

## Part I: Measure Information

Bill Request \#: $\mathbf{3 7 1}$
Bill \#: HB 10 SCS
Bill Subject/Title: Ignition Interlock.
Sponsor: Rep. Jody Richards
Unit of Government: $\qquad$ City $\qquad$ County Urban-County
$\qquad$ Charter County $\qquad$ Consolidated Local $\qquad$ Government

Office(s) Impacted:
Requirement: ___ Mandatory ___ Optional
Effect on
Powers \& Duties: $\qquad$ Adds New $\qquad$ Eliminates Existing

Part II: Purpose and Mechanics

## HB 10 GA has no Local Mandate.

The SCS for HB 10 GA removes the text of the GA and inserts language pertaining to ignition interlock.

The SCS revisits the ignition interlock statutes that underwent an omnibus revision through passage of SB 133 during the 2015 Regular Session of the Kentucky General Assembly.

Section 4 subsection (6) of the measure makes explicit that which was implicit in SB 133. The subsection states, in part, "A unit of state or local government shall not be responsible to the provider for payment or costs associated with an ignition interlock device."

Section 17 of the SCS repeals KRS 189A. 345 which provides for various ignition interlock penalties. However, Section 8 amends KRS 189A.090, through subsections (7), (8), and (9), to re-enact the penalties.

## Part III: Fiscal Explanation, Bill Provisions, and Estimated Cost

HB 10 SCS has no fiscal impact on local governments. The SCS imposes no ignition interlock associated costs on local governments. Furthermore, the measure does not change current ignition interlock penalties. (Any such change would have created a fiscal impact for jails and possibly local law enforcement.) Accordingly, the SCS has no fiscal impact on local governments.
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