



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

60 State Street, Wethersfield, CT 06161

<http://ct.gov/dmv>



Testimony of Department of Motor Vehicles

Acting Commissioner Judeen Wrinn

Transportation Committee Public Hearing

February 27, 2019

SB 925 AN ACT CONCERNING AN ADVANCED OPERATOR'S RETRAINING PROGRAM

Good morning Senator Leone, Representative Lemar and the members of the Transportation Committee. Thank you for providing the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) the opportunity to testify on SB 925. The DMV is not opposed to the concept but we have many concerns with the bill as written.

This proposal seeks to establish an advanced operator's retraining program. Currently operators that are subject to the retraining program must remain free from any additional moving violations or suspension violations found in Section 14-111g of the Connecticut General Statutes for 36 consecutive months after completing the Operator Retraining Program. If any additional violations occur within such 36-month period from the completion of the class, the DMV suspends the operator's license for 30 days (for one such conviction), 60 days (for second conviction) and for 90 days (for a third or subsequent conviction).

The proposed language outlining the advanced retraining program is unclear as written. It appears that the advanced training is a requirement for those violators who receive moving violations or suspension violations within the 36-month period, regardless of whether they have committed a first, second, or third offense. By the third offense, the operator has already taken the advanced program on two prior occasions. Driver retraining programs that simply allow habitual offenders to take instruction over and over again may not prove to be as effective as license sanctions.

The proposal also raises some concerns regarding the advanced program curriculum. Because of the in-depth psychological components of the classroom instruction, our current vendors may not be qualified to provide such instruction. Therefore, DMV would either be required to bid for program providers or rely on the bill proponent as the sole provider of this program. In addition, it is unlikely DMV will be able to implement this program within the timeframe contemplated in this proposal, especially because of the requirement to promulgate regulations.

The DMV agrees in concept that problem drivers should receive additional sanctioning and instruction, however, we would like the opportunity to provide more input to assist in the administration of such a program. Thank you for considering DMV's testimony opposing SB 925 as currently written.