

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 20, 1999

LB 585

you would, for an amendment which would remove two lines in the bill, basically on page 23, lines 19 and 20. And these words say this: "The record of the revocation or suspension"..and this is referring to the suspension or revocation of the plates and registration for a repeat DWI offender..."shall become a part of the owner's record maintained by the department". It would be taking out those lines, and let me explain to you why I'm suggesting that. Following Select File and the work on the bill, it was brought to my attention that because of the way the computer systems are in the Department of Motor Vehicles, one system applying to motor vehicle driver records and another system which deals with vehicle records, it would...these two lines would cause, by interpretation, a significant amount of reprogramming of those systems so that they could talk to each other. Those systems, apparently, do not talk to each other at the present time. We had a considerable amount of discussion, and it appeared that in order for DMV to comply with those words and as they are interpreted, it would be a significant programming expense, perhaps in the neighborhood of \$200,000. There are many changes coming down the pike, in my view, in the Department of Motor Vehicles and the way we do business. As we move toward the interoperative driver's license situation, where you'd be able to get your driver's license in any county, as we move more towards a paperless process with a lot of the work in the driver's license and DMV area, I am not comfortable with spending that amount of reprogramming money at this juncture. So my suggestion is to remove these words, allow these two systems to continue to operate at the present time, one with operator records, one with vehicle records. And I would like to spend some time this summer and involve people and take more time than we were able to when the problem presented itself to try to find whether or not there is a better and more permanent solution. I feel that we can function and we can carry out the intent of LB 585 without doing this reprogramming at the present time. And so the effect of bringing the bill back, if you are willing to adopt the amendment, would be to remove those words that would require that revocation or suspension to become a part of the owner's record maintained by the DMV. Now, I hope I've explained it adequately. If we don't do this, if we decline to do this, then I've got a second amendment which I'll propose, and that would be to put the money to do this reprogramming into this bill. Now, that's been done before