

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

May 16, 2003

LB 208

from 25 years to 10 years, if all of the felonies are DUI. We have other pieces of the bill, which increase the chance of a DUI offender being charged under habitual criminal, and in the final analysis judged this unnecessary. We'll see how that works. Next one is vehicle confiscation. This was confiscation made possible at the judge's discretion after a third offense. Our intent in that was not to take away cars from anybody, but to pose a threat to anybody who was going to loan their car to a known offender. And friends, we really have to continue to figure out how to do that. We have some dangerous people out there. I'm not talking about first offense; repeat offenders who are hardheaded and aren't learning very fast, and have whatever other problems they have. One of the most dangerous acts that our public goes into is to loan these people a car. If they've got an interlock, they want to borrow the car so they can go down to the tavern and drink. It's just a very dangerous thing. We would like to find some other ways of doing that. But vehicle confiscation is a complicated thing. And rather than pursue it, we have withdrawn it. Mandatory community service requirement, we judged that it did not fit with the prison sentence. Mandatory substance abuse treatment we also removed. In the present statute, every DUI offender, do mark that, every offender is mandated to have an abuse or an alcohol assessment. And the judge can make the decision from that evidence as to whether or not the person has a problem that treatment would benefit, or whether it comes out of something else. And last on the green sheet, we have vehicle interlock, which was discussed quite a bit. One of you wanted it to be made more available. Another one of you wanted it to be made less available. Well, the DMV had a three-way conference call with the feds on this. And we quickly judged that what we . . . our best course is to leave it alone, not to change it. If we do take this out, or if we mess around with it, then we have to go to the federal requirement of vehicle immobilization for one year on repeat offenders. Now, vehicle immobilization is a difficult thing. DMV computers are not set up to handle it. It just becomes a real problem. And I personally have a problem with immobilizing every automobile with the offender's name on, which is a federal requirement. They have agreed that if we keep the interlock system in there, that that will meet that requirement. Other amendments may be coming on this. And they