



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 20-118

For business meeting on: September 25, 2020

Title

Criminal Procedure: Ignition Interlock Forms

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

Revise forms ID-100, ID-110, ID-120, ID-130, ID-140, ID-150

Effective Date

January 1, 2021

Date of Report

September 25, 2020

Recommended by

Criminal Law Advisory Committee
Hon. J. Richard Couzens, Chair

Contact

Sarah Fleischer-Ihn, 415-865-7702
Sarah.Fleischer-Ihn@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Criminal Law Advisory Committee recommends revising the criminal forms implementing ignition interlock device requirements to conform to statutory changes on reporting, compliance, and monitoring requirements; increase clarity and usability; and make nonsubstantive technical changes.

Background

In 1993, the Judicial Council adopted six forms to assist courts with ordering and monitoring the use of ignition interlock devices (“IID”) in criminal cases. The forms were based on Vehicle Code sections 23575 and 23576. The forms were last amended over 10 years ago and do not reflect statutory changes made by Assembly Bill 762 (Stats. 1998, ch. 756), Senate Bill 485 (Stats. 2001, ch. 473), and Senate Bill 1046 (Stats. 2016, ch. 783). The proposed amendments to the forms reflect the changes in each of these revisions to the statutes.

Historically, Vehicle Code section 23575 outlined the court’s role in ordering and monitoring ignition interlock devices, making it optional for the court to order IIDs for persons convicted of

driving under the influence¹ and mandatory for those convicted of driving on a suspended or revoked license.² Senate Bill 1046 (Stats. 2016, ch. 783), established a statewide pilot program from January 1, 2019 to January 1, 2026, and added a separate code section mandating installation of IIDs for persons convicted of driving under the influence.³

The proposed changes to the IID forms comply with the current version of section 23575 with respect to suspended/revoked license referrals, but do not address the pilot program for driving under the influence referrals. Given the limited role of the courts in the pilot program, there is no separate proposed Judicial Council form.

Recommendation

The Criminal Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2021, renumber and revise six forms, identified below, addressing ignition interlock devices ordered in criminal cases. The proposed changes would revise the forms to conform to the requirements and language of Vehicle Code sections 23575 and 23576 and increase clarity and usability. The proposed changes would also make nonsubstantive technical changes to all six forms, including adding a field for defendant's email address and fax number, and adding "State" to the address fields.

1. *Order to Install Ignition Interlock Device* (form ID-100)

- Renumber as **CR-221**;
- State that the defendant may return a copy of the Department of Motor Vehicle's installation verification form in lieu of the Judicial Council's installation verification form, in order to streamline the process;
- Conform to updated statutory language in Vehicle Code section 23576 by referencing motor vehicles and replacing "wholly" with "all;"
- Delete the advisement that failure to comply with any court order is a violation of the order, as unnecessarily broad;
- Delete the advisement that failure to maintain current license and registration on any vehicle owned by the defendant is a violation of the order, since it is duplicative of language on page 1; and

¹ Veh. Code, §§ 23152, 23153.

² Veh. Code, § 14601.2.

³ Section 23575 was amended, effective January 1, 2019, to January 1, 2026, deleting the subdivision applying to driving under the influence but maintaining the subdivision on driving on a suspended or revoked license. The bill added a separate code section, Veh. Code, § 23575.3. Under this statute, courts are required to notify persons convicted of driving under the influence of the requirement to install an IID, but the Department of Motor Vehicles largely monitors installation and maintenance. Under SB 1046, the former version of section 23575 would go back into effect on January 1, 2026. This would again make IID installation for driving under the influence optional and revert monitoring duties back to the court.

- Conform to the requirements of Vehicle Code section 23575 through the following:
 - Delete the requirement for installation to occur no later than 30 days from the date of conviction;
 - Delete the advisement that the order is violated if defendant fails to return a completed copy of the verification form to the court or probation within the time limit specified in the order;
 - Delete the advisement that the order is violated if defendant defaults on any payment plan arranged with the installer or ordered by the court, absent a showing in court of good cause;
 - Delete the statement on affirmative defenses to specified violations if the defendant can show that a vehicle was leased, rented, or borrowed for emergency use when no other feasible alternative was available, or for a bona fide business purpose when away from defendant's regular place of business;
 - Delete the "Your Rights" section addressing medical exemptions and the ability to petition the court to review whether continued restrictions are necessary if driving privileges are restored; and
 - Reflect updated statutory language on recalibration and monitoring requirements.

2. *Ignition Interlock Installation Verification* (form ID-110)

- Renumber as **CR-222**;
- Delete the statement that the declaration by the installer is under penalty of perjury, as the statute does not require a sworn statement;
- Delete the requirement for the original form to be sent to the court, and add a line directing the defendant to return a completed and signed form to the court; and
- Delete the line stating "Distribution: Court, Manufacturer or Manufacturer's Agent, Defendant, Probation Department," as the distribution requirement appears unnecessary and is not required by statute.

3. *Ignition Interlock Calibration Verification and Tamper Report* (form ID-120)

- Renumber as **CR-223**;
- Convert this form to address only calibration verification, and move the tamper report provisions to *Ignition Interlock Noncompliance Report* (form ID-130/proposed form CR-224);
- Delete the statement that the declaration by installer is under penalty of perjury, as the statute does not require a sworn statement;
- Update the notice section to the defendant regarding missed appointments and payments to better reflect existing practice; and
- Delete the line stating "Distribution: Court, Manufacturer or Manufacturer's Agent, Defendant, Probation Department," as the distribution requirement appears unnecessary and is not required by statute.

4. *Ignition Interlock Noncompliance Report* (form ID-130)

- Renumber as **CR-224**;
- Include the tamper report provisions currently in form ID-120;
- Include a statement for the installer to indicate that the defendant failed to comply with a requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the device on three or more occasions, as required by Vehicle Code section 23575;
- Include a statement for the installer to indicate signs of removal, attempt to bypass, attempt to remove, or tampering as required by Vehicle Code section 23575; and
- Delete the statement that the declaration by installer is under penalty of perjury, as the statute does not require a sworn statement.

5. *Ignition Interlock Removal and Modification to Probation Order* (form ID-140)

- Renumber as **CR-225**.

Notice to Employers of Ignition Interlock Restriction (form ID-150)

- Renumber as **CR-226**;
- Conform to Vehicle Code section 23576(a) by specifying that the ignition interlock device be functioning and certified; and
- Conform to Vehicle Code section 23576(b) by adding a provision that a motor vehicle owned by a business entity that is all or partly owned or controlled by the defendant is not a motor vehicle owned by the employer subject to the exemption in Vehicle Code section 23576 (item #4 on proposed form CR-226).

The revised forms are attached at pages 7–13.

Relevant Previous Council Action

In 1993, the Judicial Council adopted six forms to assist courts with ordering and monitoring ignition interlock devices (“IID”) in criminal cases, based on Vehicle Code sections 23575 and 23576. The forms were last amended over 10 years ago and do not reflect changes to both statutes.

Analysis/Rationale

The recommended changes to the IID forms comply with the current versions of Vehicle Code sections 23575 and 23576.

The forms are currently identified as “ID” forms.⁴ The Rules Committee previously recommended shifting the forms to the criminal category, identified with the “CR” designation, which is reflected in the recommended changes.

Policy implications

The revisions are recommended so that the IID forms reflect existing statutory provisions. No further policy implications were discussed by the committee.

Comments

This proposal circulated for comment from April 10 through June 9, 2020, and received comments from two superior courts and a local bar association. Two commenters agreed with the proposal. The Superior Court of Orange County agreed with the proposal if modified, suggesting a nonsubstantive technical change to *Ignition Interlock Noncompliance Report* (form ID-130/CR-224) to avoid confusion in identifying the vehicles involved. The committee agreed with this suggestion, which is reflected in proposed form CR-224 on page 11. The committee’s specific responses to each comment are available in the attached comments chart at pages 14–16.

Three of the original forms had required the installer to sign a declaration under penalty of perjury—a requirement which the committee recommends removing because it is not required by Vehicle Code section 23575. There was concern that the absence of a sworn statement could limit the court’s ability to fulfill its statutory monitoring requirement, as the court would have limited recourse for a falsified document. Therefore, the proposal that circulated replaced the declaration with a statement of truth and correctness, and specifically sought public comment on the issue. The proposal received no comments expressly objecting to the change and one expressly agreeing with it.

Alternatives considered

The committee conducted an informal survey of courts to determine usage of the forms. Several courts responded that they used the forms, so the committee decided to move forward with the proposed changes.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

Expected costs are limited to training, possible case management system updates, and the production of new forms. No other implementation requirements or operational impacts are expected.

Attachments and Links

1. Forms CR-221, CR-222, CR-223, CR-224, CR-225, and CR-226, at pages 7–13
2. Chart of comments, at pages 14–16

⁴ E.g., forms ID-100 and ID-110.

3. Link A: Vehicle Code section 23575,
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=23575.&lawCode=VEH
4. Link B: Vehicle Code section 23576,
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=23576.&lawCode=VEH

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME:		FOR COURT USE ONLY DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council
NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:		
ORDER TO INSTALL IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE		CASE NUMBER:

Under Vehicle Code section 23575, **the court orders:** a functioning, **certified** Ignition Interlock Device installed on the following vehicles operated by defendant:

Make Model Year Color License Plate No. and/or VIN

a.
b.
c.

1. Installation of an ignition interlock device on a vehicle does not allow defendant to drive without a valid driver's license.
2. Installation must be no later than **(date)**:
3. Defendant must present this form to the installer at the time of installation.
4. Defendant must return completed *Ignition Interlock Installation Verification* (form **CR-222**) or the Department of Motor Vehicles *Verification of Installation—Ignition Interlock* (DL 920) to the court no later than **(date)**:
5. Defendant must take vehicles to the installer **to recalibrate or monitor the device:**
☐ **once every** 60 days ☐ other *(specify frequency)*: _____ following the date of installation.
6. Without a court order, the devices may not be removed prior to *(specify a date no later than three years from the date of conviction)*:
7. Defendant's employer requires defendant to drive a **motor** vehicle owned by the employer within the course and scope of defendant's employment. Defendant must provide the employer with the *Notice to Employers of Ignition Interlock Restriction* (form **CR-226**) no later than *(specify date)*: _____. Defendant must keep a copy of the *Notice to Employers of Ignition Interlock Restriction* in defendant's possession or keep the original or a copy in the employer's vehicle.
8. Defendant must maintain current insurance and registration on all vehicles owned.
9. Other *(specify)*:

Date: _____

I acknowledge receipt of this order.



(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DEFENDANT)

(DEFENDANT'S SIGNATURE)

Date: _____

JUDICIAL OFFICER OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Page 1 of 2

ORDER TO INSTALL IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE

CASE NUMBER:

What is a violation of this order?

1. Failure to have ignition interlock devices installed **as ordered**.
2. Failure to **show proof of installation** to the court within the time limit specified in this order.
3. Failure to comply three or more times with any requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the ignition interlock devices.
4. If defendant has a valid driver's license, driving any vehicle without an ignition interlock device except for employer-owned vehicles required to be operated within the course and scope of employment. A motor vehicle owned by a business entity that is **all** or partly owned or controlled by defendant is not a motor vehicle owned by an employer subject to the exemption.

What will happen if you violate this order?

Under Vehicle Code section 23575, if a defendant fails to comply with this court order the court must notify the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Violation of the following is a misdemeanor and can be punished by imprisonment in the county jail and/or a fine:

1. Failure to notify any person who rents, leases, or loans a motor vehicle to defendant of the restriction imposed by this order.
2. Requesting or soliciting any person to blow into an ignition interlock device or to start a motor vehicle equipped with the device for the purpose of providing defendant with an operable motor vehicle.
3. **Operating a vehicle not equipped with a functioning ignition interlock device.**
4. **Removing, bypassing, or tampering with an ignition interlock device.**

Defendant: Call the ignition interlock device installer and arrange for the installation of the device(s). The court will provide you with a list of manufacturers certified by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Contact a certified manufacturer to locate an installer.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME:	FOR COURT USE ONLY <div style="text-align: center;"> DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council </div>
NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: E-MAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:	
DATE OF COURT ORDER:	
IGNITION INTERLOCK INSTALLATION VERIFICATION	

1. Manufacturer:
2. Facility Location (*address*):
3. Vehicles:

	<u>Make</u>	<u>Model</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>License Plate No.</u>	<u>VIN:</u>
a.						
b.						
c.						
4. Serial nos. of units:	a.		b.		c.	
5. Odometer reading:	a.		b.		c.	
6. Date of installation:	a.		b.		c.	
7. Date of next monitor check:	a.		b.		c.	

I declare that the information provided is true and correct.

Date: _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF INSTALLER)



(SIGNATURE OF INSTALLER)

Defendant: return a completed and signed form to the court.

For installer use only:

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME:	FOR COURT USE ONLY <div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 10px; display: inline-block; text-align: center;"> DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council </div>
NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:	CASE NUMBER:
DATE OF COURT ORDER:	
IGNITION INTERLOCK CALIBRATION VERIFICATION	

1. Defendant's name: _____
2. Installer's name: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____
 Telephone no.: _____
3. Vehicles:

	<u>Make</u>	<u>Model</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Color</u>	<u>License Plate No.</u>	<u>VIN:</u>
a.						
b.						
c.						
4. Installation date: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____
5. Odometer reading: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____
6. Calibration setting: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____
7. Unit serial no.: a. _____ b. _____ c. _____
8. Program to end (date): _____
9. ☐ The system is in calibration ☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.
10. ☐ The system has been inspected and is functioning properly. ☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.
11. Payment of \$ _____ + sales tax \$ _____ Total collected \$ _____ paid by
 - a. ☐ Credit card
 - b. ☐ Money order/cashier's check/certified check
 - c. ☐ Cash/personal check

I declare that the information provided is true and correct.

Date: _____



(SIGNATURE OF INSTALLER)

DEFENDANT: Your next monitoring check is (date): _____. If you have not had your system serviced within a few days after a missed monitoring check, the system will shut down and you will be unable to start your car. It will be your responsibility to have your car towed to the calibration location. You may also owe a missed appointment fee.

Your next payment of \$ _____ is due at the above monitoring check. Payment must be made in full before service is performed. If payment is not made, the system may shut down and you may not be able to start your car. This will result in a service call that will be your responsibility. You may be required to make an additional payment for late payments.

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this form.

Date: _____



(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME:	DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council
NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:	
IGNITION INTERLOCK NONCOMPLIANCE REPORT	CASE NUMBER:

1. **Vehicles:**MakeModelYearColorLicense Plate No.
and/or VIN

a.

b.

c.

2. ☐ The defendant failed to comply with a requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the ignition interlock device installed in the vehicle indicated below on three or more occasions:

VehiclesDateDescribe Noncompliance☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.

3. ☐ The ignition interlock device installed in the vehicle indicated below showed evidence of:

VehiclesDateRemovalAttempt to bypassAttempt to removeTampering☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.☐ a. ☐ b. ☐ c.☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

4. I declare that the information provided is true and correct.

Date: _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF FACILITY MONITOR)

Name of facility monitor (*specify*):Name of facility (*specify*):Address of facility (*specify*):Telephone number of facility (*specify*):

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME:		FOR COURT USE ONLY DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council
NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:		
IGNITION INTERLOCK REMOVAL AND MODIFICATION TO PROBATION ORDER		CASE NUMBER:

1. ☐ **Order to change vehicles.** The above-named defendant has approval of the court to change the ignition interlock device (system serial number: _____) to another vehicle.

a. Remove from vehicle:

Make Model Year Color License Plate No. and/or VIN

b. Reinstall in vehicle:

Make Model Year Color License Plate No. and/or VIN

2. ☐ **Order for additional installation.** The above-named defendant must install an ignition interlock device on the vehicle designated below by (date): _____

Make Model Year Color License Plate No. and/or VIN

3. ☐ **Order to remove device.**

☐ Additional orders:

Date: _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

I acknowledge receipt of this order.

▶ _____
(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT)

Date: _____

JUDICIAL OFFICER OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME: NAME OF DEFENDANT: STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE: TELEPHONE NO.: FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: DRIVER'S LICENSE NO.:	FOR COURT USE ONLY <div style="text-align: center;"> DRAFT Not approved by the Judicial Council </div>
NOTICE TO EMPLOYERS OF IGNITION INTERLOCK RESTRICTION	CASE NUMBER:

INSTRUCTIONS TO DEFENDANT

You are required to provide this notice to any employer who owns a vehicle that you operate in the course and scope of your employment with that employer. You are also required to keep this notice in your possession or with your employer's vehicle.

NOTICE TO EMPLOYER

1. This is to inform the employers of the above named defendant that the defendant is required by court order to have installed, on all vehicles that the defendant owns or operates, an ignition interlock device pursuant to Vehicle Code section 23575 et seq.
2. This court order is effective *(date)*: _____ and will expire *(date)*: _____
3. Note: Vehicle Code section 23576 provides:
 "[I]f a person is required to operate a motor vehicle in the course and scope of his or her employment and if the vehicle is owned by the employer, the person may operate that vehicle without installation of a **functioning, certified** approved ignition interlock device if the employer has been notified by the person that the person's driving privilege has been restricted ... and if the person has proof of that notification in his or her possession, or if the notice, or a facsimile copy thereof, is with the vehicle."
4. **A motor vehicle owned by a business entity that is all or partly owned or controlled by the defendant is not a motor vehicle owned by the employer subject to the exemption in Vehicle Code section 23576.**
5. This notice satisfies the requirements of Vehicle Code section 23576.

SPR20-13

Ignition Interlock Forms (Revise forms ID-100, ID-110, ID-120, ID-130, ID-140, ID-150)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Orange County Bar Association by Scott B. Garner, President	A	<p><i>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</i></p> <p>Yes. The proposed updated forms appropriately conform to the requirements set forth in Vehicle Code sections 23575 and 23576 with the exception of the “under penalty of perjury” declaration by the installer.</p> <p><i>Is it sufficient for an IID installer to declare that information provided is true and correct, rather than under penalty of perjury? Does this limit the court’s ability to properly monitor the IID installation and maintenance as required by statute?</i></p> <p>The court should not require the declaration under the penalty of perjury by the installer as the legislature did not provide for such declaration by section 23575. True and correct affirmation is sufficient. The court’s ability to properly monitor the IID installation and maintenance as required by statute will not be hampered by a true and correct affirmation. On the other hand, evidentiary issues related to proof of noncompliance or tampering based solely upon the proposed calibration verification or noncompliance report court forms may arise in a hearing for a violation of probation or a new criminal prosecution.</p>	<p>No response required.</p> <p>The committee appreciates this input.</p>
2.	Superior Court of Orange County	AM	<p><i>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</i></p>	

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated

SPR20-13

Ignition Interlock Forms (Revise forms ID-100, ID-110, ID-120, ID-130, ID-140, ID-150)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response																				
			<p>Yes, the recommended modifications to the forms appropriately address the purpose. The proposed changes accommodate the use of the form during and after the pilot program has concluded, however, step 2 of the Ignition Interlock Noncompliance Report is not clear. The use of letters to both list the vehicles and identify which vehicle was being referenced is confusing Perhaps modifying as follows may alleviate some confusion:</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The defendant failed to comply with a requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the ignition interlock device installed in the vehicle indicated below on three or more occasions.</p> <table><thead><tr><th colspan="3">Vehicle</th><th>Date</th><th>Describe Noncompliance</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> a.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> b.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> c.</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> a.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> b.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> c.</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> a.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> b.</td><td><input type="checkbox"/> c.</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p><i>Is it sufficient for an IID installer to declare that information provided is true and correct, rather than under penalty of perjury? Does this limit the court’s ability to properly monitor the IID installation and maintenance as required by statute?</i></p> <p>The phrase “under penalty of perjury” was removed because the statute does not provide for this as a requirement. This appears to be a legal question as to enforceability of the standards and practices of an installer.</p> <p><i>Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so, please quantify.</i></p> <p>The proposal will not impact the court. Non-substantive changes were made to the form and not the process.</p>	Vehicle			Date	Describe Noncompliance	<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.			<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.			<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.			<p>The committee agrees with this suggestion and has modified the proposal to recommend making this change to item 2 on <i>Ignition Interlock Noncompliance Report</i>, form ID-130/CR-224, as well as to item 3 on the same form, for consistency and to further alleviate confusion.</p> <p>No response required.</p> <p>No response required.</p>
Vehicle			Date	Describe Noncompliance																				
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.																						
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.																						
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	<input type="checkbox"/> b.	<input type="checkbox"/> c.																						

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree; NI = Not indicated

Ignition Interlock Forms (Revise forms ID-100, ID-110, ID-120, ID-130, ID-140, ID-150)

	Commenter	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p><i>What would the implementation requirements be for courts—for example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems?</i></p> <p>Minimal training would be required to inform staff of the non-substantive modifications made to the form.</p> <p><i>Would three months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation?</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><i>How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?</i></p> <p>As these forms have been in use previously, and the changes are non-substantive, the impact would be minimal.</p>	<p>No response required</p> <p>No response required.</p> <p>No response required.</p>
3.	Superior Court of San Diego County by Mike Roddy, Executive Officer	A	No specific comment	No response required.

16