



IGNITION INTERLOCK REPORT

National Center for State Courts



IGNITION INTERLOCK REPORT

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) is providing this resource to judges, court administrators, and policymakers with support from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). This report reviews the latest research on ignition interlock programs and how they are used from a national perspective (2013-2017). The appendix contains a detailed chart of each state's ignition interlock program and a comprehensive resource list. It is intended to be a single resource that judges, court administrators, and policymakers can use to implement or improve an interlock program. The resource is also useful in preparing for presentations and in gaining a more well-rounded picture of ignition interlock use across the country. What follows is a summary of the latest research on ignition interlocks.

NHTSA RESOURCES

NHTSA has released several resources discussing ignition interlocks over the past five years. The resources can be grouped into two broad categories: instruction on how to establish an effective state ignition interlock program and research on the effectiveness of ignition interlocks in reducing alcohol-impaired driving.





Resources on Establishing Effective State Interlock Programs

RESOURCE

Interlock Data Utilization (2017)

WHAT IS IT?

A meta-study regarding the use of data collected by interlocks installed in nine states (Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, New Mexico, Texas, and Washington). The study looks at how states use ignition interlock data to administer their interlock programs, particularly in treating the offender and determining whether he or she is ready to have the interlock removed.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The report contains an interlock-data-use profile for each of the nine states in the study. After an overview of the general effectiveness of interlocks, the bulk of the report discusses variations in the way that interlock data are reported highlighting issues with interlock data, such as automation of data delivery, sharing of data, compatibility differences, access to data, and evaluation issues, and then makes recommendations on how to best handle those problems.

Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices (2015)

An overview of many different subsets of traffic law and the most effective ways to curb dangerous behavior in each. This resource's section on ignition interlocks summarizes the technology and points the reader to leading research in the field, then discusses the effectiveness of interlocks. It concludes that while interlocks have been shown to be effective while they are installed, there is little data to suggest that they are effective once uninstalled.

The resource discusses problems with implementing an interlock program, such as compliance with interlock orders, judges being unwilling to use new technology, and service issues in rural areas. The publication also cites research saying that the average cost of having an interlock installed is \$65-\$90/month, in addition to \$100-\$250 of startup costs. Note, however, that the research cited is from 2010 and costs have likely changed some.



RESOURCE

Ignition Interlocks—What You Need to Know: A Toolkit for Program Administrators, Policymakers, and Stakeholders (2014)

WHAT IS IT?

An in-depth treatment of the workings of ignition interlocks, the research surrounding interlocks, and the process of setting up a state-run ignition interlock system. The resource is not a cover-to-cover read, but rather a reference guide to use as needed while establishing an ignition interlock program. The research overview suggests that interlocks are effective while installed, but that alcohol-impaired-driving rates return to pre-interlock levels once the interlocks are removed. It also suggests that interlocks are somewhat frequently tampered with or just not installed altogether. The main body of the resource closes with a discussion of program costs and potential sources of revenue, along with a discussion of how to handle indigent participants.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The guide sets forth steps to designing an effective interlock program, including considering program goals, identifying stakeholders, developing administrative protocol, selecting a vendor, and monitoring and reporting. After the end of the main body of the resource, there are multiple appendices with additional resources on interlock laws and programs, including frequently asked questions, a table of interlock laws, talking points, checklists, and sample forms.

Model Guideline for State Ignition Interlock Programs (2013)

This resource focuses on the actual legislative components that should be included during the creation of a state ignition interlock program. The guide includes concrete overarching legislative goals followed by recommended actions for specific parts of interlock programs.

There are recommendations for educational strategies, program administration, technical compliance, vendor selection, interlock data management, and driver licensing. The guideline ends with a resource list.



Research on Ignition Interlock Effectiveness

RESOURCE

The Feasibility of Voluntary Ignition Interlocks as a Prevention Strategy for Young Drivers (2017)

WHAT IS IT?

An examination of the potential effectiveness of a voluntary program that would facilitate interlock installation in the cars of teenage drivers to dissuade risky driving behaviors in young drivers, particularly in teens. The study included discussions with interlock manufacturers, insurance companies, community groups, parents, and young drivers, along with an examination of interlock data from young drivers.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

Reactions to the proposal were largely negative, ranging from the parties wanting more information about the program to a general sense that the program would be unpopular, cost-prohibitive, overly intrusive, or all of the above.

Examination of the Feasibility of Alcohol Interlocks for Motorcycles (2017)

An examination of how an interlock program might work for motorcycles. The study collected information from interlock companies, government authorities, and DUI offenders and analyzed interlock data about motorcyclists. Two main areas of concern arose in the study. The first concerns were technical in nature, namely, whether it is feasible to design an interlock that fits a motorcycle and protects its components from weather. However, the larger concern is that most state interlock standards require rolling retests, which would present a large safety hazard while a motorcycle is in motion.

The report found no technical barriers to using interlocks on motorcycles. The report did not come to a conclusion on how to solve the problem of rolling retests.



RESOURCE

Evaluation of State Ignition Interlock Programs: Interlock Use Analyses from 28 States, 2006-2011 (2015)

WHAT IS IT?

This study used data from just over half of all states over a five-year period to identify key features of interlock programs and determine how states can increase interlock use. Eight interlock program keys were identified, spread across three program aspects: program design (requirements and penalties), program management (monitoring, uniformity, coordination, and education), and program support (resources and data). Each state's programs were then analyzed qualitatively, relative to program changes, and relative to the strength of their key features.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The data showed strong correlations between interlock use and DWI arrests and fatalities. When the key program features were analyzed individually, the data showed strong correlations between requirements and interlock use rates, as well as between monitoring frameworks and interlock use rates. There were moderate correlations between coordination, uniformity, and penalties and interlock use rates, and low-to-insignificant correlations between education, resources, and data and interlock use. The study concluded that states with requirements that cover more types of offenders (particularly first-time offenders) saw increased interlock use rates. It also recommended that states wanting to increase the rate of interlock use should design programs with strong requirements, incentives, and penalties, and then support them with strong program management.



RESOURCE

DWI Recidivism in the United States: An Examination of State-Level Driver Data and the Effect of Look-Back Periods on Recidivism Prevalence (2014)

WHAT IS IT?

An update to a 1995 NHTSA estimate that 31% of those arrested for DUI and 31.5% convicted of DUI would reoffend. The study also analyzed look-back periods for DUI offenses for different states.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The report discusses how these new recidivism estimates help state and local officials measure the impacts of specific deterrent strategies, such as ignition interlocks. The new estimate found by this study is that 25% of those arrested, 29.5% of those convicted, and 34% of DUI offenders whose license was suspended will reoffend. When analyzing the look-back periods of states, this study's data suggested that states with longer look-back periods had higher recidivism rates than states with shorter periods.

Case Studies of Ignition Interlock Programs (2012)

Case studies of ignition interlock programs from six states (Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Mexico, New York, and Oklahoma). This report is primarily designed to provide information on the different types of interlock programs, not evaluate the effectiveness of one model over another or the overall impact of the use of ignition interlocks. The study's findings are grouped into five main categories: legislation, funding, program administration, program issues, and evaluation.

The report's section on interlock program administration is particularly detailed, especially given the need to explain the differences between court-run programs, hybrid programs, and administratively run programs. The report also has several appendices at the end with different forms, frameworks, letters, and charts that provide more detail regarding individual facets of each state's interlock program.



NON-NHTSA RESOURCES

Nationwide Research from the U.S.

RESOURCE

TIRF 2016 Annual Ignition Interlock Survey, TIRF (2017)

WHAT IS IT?

A large, data-rich survey with significant amounts of comparative data, analyzing the state of traffic crashes and arrests and interlock laws in the United States in 2016 and changes in crashes, arrests, interlock laws, and interlock use from 2014 to 2016. The report is issued every year and allows comparisons between jurisdictions and identifies trends in interlock program participation. It aggregates data from both states and interlock manufacturers and shows increasing interlock use nationally.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The report thoroughly breaks down, with both raw data and collective visuals, data on interlock use for each state from year to year. The report has several appendices, ranging from an overview of the interlock laws in each state to the data requested from states and manufacturers regarding interlock installation and use.

“Mandating Treatment Based on Interlock Performance: Evidence for Effectiveness,”
*Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research (2016)**

The article details the findings of a study regarding the effectiveness of linking mandatory alcohol-use-disorder (AUD) treatment to the number of violations an interlock user accumulates. The study analyzed two groups of DUI offenders: one group of 640 multiple DUI offenders who received mandated treatment for AUD, and one group of 806 offenders who were not required to go through AUD treatment.

The study showed that the group that received treatment had a 32% lower recidivism rate as compared with the non-treatment group, which the authors of the study estimated saved 41 rearrests, 13 crashes, and 9 injuries. The study concluded that there was strong evidentiary support for a program of mandatory AUD treatment based on the number of interlock device lockouts or violations an offender accumulates.



RESOURCE

“Impact of State Ignition Interlock Laws on Alcohol-Involved Crash Deaths in the United States,” *American Journal of Public Health* (2016)*

WHAT IS IT?

This article analyzed NHTSA crash data from 1999 to 2013 and compared alcohol-involved crash deaths between states with and without interlock requirements.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The study found that requiring ignition interlocks for all impaired-driving convictions led to 15% fewer alcohol-involved crash deaths. The authors urged the continued expansion of interlock programs, and innovation in the use of interlocks, to reduce drunk-driving crash fatalities.

“Modeling the Injury Prevention Impact of Mandatory Alcohol Ignition Interlock Installation in All New US Vehicles,” *American Journal of Public Health* (2015)*

In this article, five professors from the University of Michigan estimated the injury-prevention impact and cost savings associated with interlock installation in all new U.S. vehicles. The study’s lead researcher, an emergency-room physician, noted that current ignition interlocks are imposed only after drunk drivers are caught by police and fail to catch those individuals who are driving without a license to avoid having the devices installed in the first place. The researchers first identified fatal and nonfatal injuries associated with drunk driving crashes from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System data sets (2006-2010). They then derived the estimated impact of universal interlock installation using an estimate of the proportion of alcohol-related crashes that were preventable in vehicles less than one year old. They repeated this analysis for each subsequent year, assuming a 15-year implementation. They then applied existing crash-induced injury cost metrics to approximate economic savings and used a sensitivity analysis to examine results with varying device effectiveness.

The professors concluded that if ignition interlocks were installed in all new U.S. vehicles, 85% of crash fatalities and 84 to 88% of nonfatal injuries attributed to drunk driving would be prevented. They estimated \$342 billion in savings in injury-related costs and that savings would overtake costs after approximately three years of such a program. This study could be useful to policy makers interested in cost-benefit data for ignition interlocks.



RESOURCE

Ignition Interlock Institutes: Promoting the Use of Interlocks and Improvements to Interlock Programs, MADD (2013)

WHAT IS IT?

With the cooperation of NHTSA, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) developed a program of education and advocacy for the increased use of ignition interlocks that they presented at eight “institutes” across the country. Those institutes brought together key players from more than 30 states and gave state teams the opportunity to identify the unique challenges they face in their states with regard to ignition interlock programs and to offer ideas for improvement.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

MADD's report discusses the common barriers to implementing interlock programs and potential solutions to those problems. It would be useful to any group of stakeholders interested in working together to improve their ignition interlock programs, locally or state-wide.

State-Specific Resources

Maryland's Ignition Interlock Program: Status Report, Maryland Department of Transportation (2017)

A report from the Maryland Department of Transportation detailing the implementation of “Noah’s Law,” a mandatory interlock program for all DWI offenders. Under the new law, any driver who fails a BAC test must install an interlock on their vehicle for a minimum of 6 months. The law also significantly increases driver license suspension periods for chemical test failures and refusals. Enhanced penalties apply to drivers under 21, drivers who have a previously imposed alcohol restriction, drivers with a commercial license/vehicle, and those with previous DWI convictions. Under the new law, a participant can only successfully complete the program if there were no violations in the final three consecutive months of the participation period.

With the passage of “Noah’s Law” in 2016, Maryland became the 30th state to make ignition interlock mandatory for all offenders. MADD considers Noah’s Law a “model ignition interlock law for the nation.”



RESOURCE

Minnesota Ignition Interlock Program Evaluation—Final Report, Minnesota Department of Public Safety (2016)

WHAT IS IT?

The Minnesota Department of Public Safety released this report tracking the success of Minnesota's interlock program and compared it to other programs across the country. The report found that participants in Minnesota's program were less than half as likely to reoffend after the program had ended than those who did not participate in Minnesota's program.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The report made several recommendations, including making the program mandatory for all DWI offenders and increasing the role of treatment. The report suggests that due to the non-mandatory nature of the program, the groups with the highest recidivism rates are the same as those with the lowest participation rates: females, drivers aged 21-24 and aged 25-34, and drivers in urban counties.

Michigan's DWI/Sobriety Court Ignition Interlock Evaluation, Christopher A. Kierkus, PhD, and Brian R. Johnson, PhD (2016)

Michigan's report provides the state government with analysis and documentation of its interlock program implementation. The report showed that approximately 97% of drivers ordered to install interlocks on their vehicles have complied with those orders. The report showed that interlock installation was inversely correlated with levels of education and employment status. The study found that in DWI courts, approximately three times more clients without an interlock failed their programs than clients who had an interlock installed. The study also found that interlock program participants had the lowest rate of recidivism after one, two, three, and four years of follow up.

The report is particularly useful for judges or lawmakers interested in how interlock programs are utilized by DWI courts because this report was commissioned by the Michigan Association of Treatment Court Professionals, in cooperation with the State Court Administrative Office, and is therefore written from the perspective of court professionals and not DMV officials.



RESOURCE

Evaluation of the Washington State Ignition Interlock Pilot Program 2009: 2012 Recidivism Report, Washington Traffic Safety Commission (2014)

WHAT IS IT?

The Washington Traffic Safety Commission released this report tracking compliance with the state's ignition interlock program. The report found increased levels of installation compliance, but also found a high rate of non-compliant behavior among drivers after installation of the interlock. The report found that interlocks decreased the rate of recidivism in second-time and subsequent offenders, but not first-time offenders. The report noted that a significant minority of drivers persisted in not complying with ignition interlock requirements and recommended these drivers should receive intensive alcohol monitoring and alcohol abuse treatment and stricter legislative requirements for removal of the interlock device.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

Washington made ignition interlock mandatory for all offenders in 2009 and modified its laws in 2011 and 2012 to require compliance-based removal. This report tracks the results of these laws and is useful to policy makers looking to make similar legal reforms.

“Administrative Reinstatement Interlock Programs: Florida, a 10-Year Study,”
*Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research (2013)**

This report was an update to an earlier publication evaluating the state of Florida's ignition interlock program. The authors analyzed ten years of driver and interlock program records and found, in keeping with the findings of other studies, that interlocks were effective at reducing recidivism rates of drivers while the devices were installed on their vehicles.

The study also found that Florida's interlock program is generally successful at requiring offenders to keep an interlock installed for at least six months to qualify for eventual license reinstatement. However, the study also found that approximately half of all offenders who completed their mandatory license-revocation periods either did not or could not qualify for license reinstatement because of other ancillary requirements to reinstate their licenses.



RESOURCE

Ignition Interlock Program FAQ Report, Vermont Department of Motor Vehicles (2017)

WHAT IS IT?

Vermont's DMV created this FAQ for the public explaining what ignition interlock devices are, who is eligible for one, how they work, the cost of interlock devices, and what actions are considered violations of an interlock use agreement.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

This is a useful resource for any state attempting to create a similar education component to help the public understand its ignition interlock program.

International Resources

Alcohol Interlocks and Drink Driving Rehabilitation in the European Union: Best Practice and Guidelines for Member States, European Transport Safety Council (2016)

The EU's European Transport Safety Council published a report on interlock in three main parts. The first part summarizes road-safety measures and alcohol consumption in Europe and how the two interact. The second part of the report offers case studies from 5 EU countries, four of whom had implemented interlock programs at the time of publication, with an interlock program in the fifth country pending. The final section offers a set of practical guidelines to member states wishing to establish an interlock program of their own, focusing on legislation, technology, rehabilitation, costs, enforcement, and evaluation of drivers.

Many of these EU guidelines are similar to guidelines offered in reports in the U.S. The report advocates implementation of a strong, closely managed interlock program in other EU member states. The report discusses how to deal with the costs of ignition interlocks and how to reduce those costs to increase participation, an issue also faced by American courts.



RESOURCE

Managing Risk and Behaviour Change: Proceedings of the 14th International Alcohol Interlock Symposium, TIRF (2015)

WHAT IS IT?

A summary of the most notable developments in the field of ignition interlocks. Subjects included the following: new research, integration of supervision and treatment, technology, international developments, future research, and trends.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The symposium report concluded that low- and middle-income countries are about to make a significant entry into the ignition interlock world. It also noted that much of the research has shifted from trying to demonstrate the effectiveness of interlock programs to improving existing interlock programs, since the effectiveness of interlocks to deter impaired driving has been solidly established. Finally, it noted that future developments in interlock technology will likely center on information security and privacy concerns.

*Nova Scotia Alcohol Ignition Interlock Program: Outcome Evaluation, TIRF (2015)**

This study evaluated Nova Scotia's ignition interlock program, which began in 2008. Specifically, the study attempted to find any potential improvements for the program, determine whether the program helped reduce impaired driving, and evaluate participation rates in the program.

The study found that interlocks helped reduce the recidivism rate of DUI offenders in Nova Scotia, and continued to do so, albeit less effectively, after the devices were removed. The study found no statistically significant reduction in the number of crashes due to mandated use of ignition interlocks. The report concluded that the presence of an interlock program was preferable to the absence of an interlock program because of the reduced recidivism rate and data that suggested, though not at a statistically significant level, that interlocks may also prevent some traffic crashes.



RESOURCE

Technical Development and Deployment of Alcohol Interlocks in Road Safety Policy, European Parliament Directorate-General for Internal Policies (2015)

WHAT IS IT?

This EU Transport and Tourism study was prepared to inform parliamentary debate on the advisability of ignition interlock programs. The report discusses the various methods of use currently established in EU member states. The report analyzes the cost-benefit from installing interlocks on all new commercial vehicles, or on certain categories of vehicles according to their use, or on specific target groups of users.

WHY IS THIS INTERESTING?

The study recommends, based on cost-benefit data, that EU member states make ignition interlock mandatory for certain categories of users (e.g. reoccurring offenders) and as a preventative measure in specific categories of commercial vehicles (e.g. those that transport passengers or dangerous goods). This study could be useful to policy makers interested in cost-benefit data for ignition interlocks.

Effectiveness and impact of Alcohol Interlock-Controlled Driving Rights, Finnish Transport Safety Agency (2013)

The report looked at Finnish traffic crash data, as well as public survey data, regarding interlocks. The study, like many others, found that when installed, ignition interlocks caused a moderate reduction in the recidivism rate of drivers who had previously been convicted of driving while intoxicated.

The study also found that approximately 1/3 of drivers planned to keep the interlock device installed in their cars after their government-mandated period of installation had ended. Many surveyed said that the requirements of the program were difficult to determine, and many also said that using an interlock device in public was cause for some measure of embarrassment. The study concluded with recommendations for the Finnish interlock program, varying from ways to improve interlock performance to oversight and public education.



Ignition interlock laws change frequently. The information below is current as of January 1, 2018. More recent changes may be available from the [National Conference of State Legislatures](#) or [Mothers Against Drunk Driving](#).

State/ Jurisdiction	Administered by Courts or Admin. Agency?	Available After Which Offense?	Required for All 1st Offenses?	Required at any time?	After Which Offense Required?	Installation Length for 1st Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 2nd Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 3rd Offense (Months)	Applicable Statute(s)
Alabama	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	2nd	6	24	36	Ala. §§32-5A-191; 32-5A-191.4
Alaska	Courts	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6	12	18	AS §28.35.030(b), (n)
Arizona	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	12	12	A.R.S. §28-3319
Arkansas	Administrative Agency	1st	No	No	n/a	6			A.C.A. §§5-65-104; 5-65-118
California	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	Special*		24		Cal. Veh. Code §23575(a), (f)(1); §13352(a)
Colorado	Administrative Agency	1st	No	Yes	2nd		24		C.R.S.A. §42-2-126; §42-2-132.5
Connecticut	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	36		C.G.S.A. §§14-36(g); 14-111(k)(2); 14-227j
Delaware	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	16	21	21 Del.C. §4177
District of Columbia	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6	12	24	D.C. Code §50-2201.05a
Florida	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6	12	24	F.S.A. §322.2715
Georgia	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd		12		OGCA §§40-5-58; 40-5-63; 42-8-111; 42-8-112
Hawaii	Courts	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	18	24	HRS § 291E-61
Idaho	Courts	2nd	No	Yes	2nd	0	12		I.C. §§18-8004A(2), (3); 18-8004C(2)(e); 18-8005(4)(f), (6)(e); 18-8008
Illinois	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st		60	60	625 ILCS 5/6-206.1; 625 ILCS 5/6-205; 625 ILCS 5/6-206
Indiana	Courts	1st	No	No	n/a				IC §9-30-5-10
Iowa	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st				I.C.A. §§321J.4(1); 321J.17
Kansas	Administrative Agency	1st	No	Yes	2nd		12	24	K.S.A. §§8-1014
Kentucky	Courts	1st	No	No	n/a	6	12	30	KRS §§189A.010; 189A.340
Louisiana	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	2nd		6		La. R.S. §§14:98(K); 32:414
Maine	Administrative Agency	1st	No	No	n/a	5	24	36	29-A M.R.S.A. §2508



State/ Jurisdiction	Administered by Courts or Admin. Agency?	Available After Which Offense?	Required for All 1st Offenses?	Required at any time?	After Which Offense Required?	Installation Length for 1st Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 2nd Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 3rd Offense (Months)	Applicable Statute(s)
Maryland	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6	12	36	MD Code, Transportation §§16-404.1; 21-902
Massachusetts	Administrative Agency	2nd	No	Yes	2nd	0	24		M.G.L.A. 90 §24 ½
Michigan	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12			M.C.L.A. §257.322(6), (7), (8), (9); §257.319(8)(h)
Minnesota	Hybrid	1st	No	No	n/a				M.S.A. §§169A.55; 169A.275, subd. 7
Mississippi	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd				Miss. Code Ann. §§63-11-30; 63-11-31
Missouri	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	2nd	6	6		V.A.M.S. § 302.440
Montana	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	2nd				MCA §§61-8-442; 61-8-731
Nebraska	Courts	1st	Yes	Yes	1st				Neb.Rev.St. §§60-6,197.03; 60-6,211.05
Nevada	Courts	1st	No	Yes	3rd	3		12	N.R.S. §484C.460; 484C.400
New Hampshire	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd		12		N.H. Rev. Stat. §265-A:36
New Jersey	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd	6	12		N.J.S.A. §§39:4-50(a); 39:4-50.17
New Mexico	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	24	36	NMSA §66-8-102
New York	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6			NY Veh & Traf §§1193, 1198
North Carolina	Administrative Agency	1st	No	Yes	Special*				N.C.G.S. §20-179.3; §20-17.8
North Dakota	Hybrid	1st	No	No	n/a				NDCC §39-06.1-11
Ohio	Courts	1st	No	No	n/a				O.R.C. §4510.13
Oklahoma**	Hybrid	1st	No	Yes	Special*				47 Okl.St. Ann. §754.1; §11-902
Oregon	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	24	24	O.R.S. §813.602
Pennsylvania	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st				75 Pa.C.S.A. §3805** (effective Aug. 25, 2017)
Rhode Island	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd	3	6	12	RI ST §§31-27-2(d); 31-27-2.8
South Carolina	Administrative Agency	1st	No	Yes	2nd				SC Code 1976 §56-5-2941
South Dakota	Courts	1st	No	No	n/a				SDCL §32-23-4.9
Tennessee	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd		6		T.C.A. §§55-10-409; 55-10-417



State/ Jurisdiction	Administered by Courts or Admin. Agency?	Available After Which Offense?	Required for All 1st Offenses?	Required at any time?	After Which Offense Required?	Installation Length for 1st Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 2nd Offense (Months)	Installation Length for 3rd Offense (Months)	Applicable Statute(s)
Texas	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd		12		V.T.C.A., Penal Code §49.09(h)
Utah	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd				U.C.A. 1953 §41-6a-518
Vermont	Administrative Agency	1st	No	No	n/a				23 VSA §§1205(m); 1213
Virginia	Courts	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6			Va. Code Ann. §§18.2-270.1; 18.2-271; 46.2-391
Washington	Hybrid	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	12	60	120	RCWA §46.20.720
West Virginia	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	4	24	24	W. Va. Code §17C-5A-3a
Wisconsin	Courts	1st	No	Yes	2nd		12		W.S.A. §§343.301(1)(g), (2m); 343.305(10m)
Wyoming	Administrative Agency	1st	Yes	Yes	1st	6	12	24	W.S. 1977 §31-5-233(f)

**Special" offense could include refusal of breath test, higher BAC threshold, driving on a suspended license, etc.

**Oklahoma had a new law, but it was struck down by the state's supreme court.



Ignition Interlock Resource List

Beck KH, Rauch WJ, Baker EA, Williams AF. Effects of ignition interlock license restrictions on drivers with multiple alcohol offenses: a randomized trial in Maryland. *Am J Pub Health*. 1999; 89(11): 1696–1700.

Beirness, D. J., PhD. (2007). *Ignition Interlock Program Standards for Canada*. Retrieved November 30, 2017, from http://www.ccmta.ca/images/publications/pdf/Interlock_program_standards_FINAL_REPORT.pdf

Beirness, D.J., Marquess, P.M., Voas, R.B., and Tippetts, S. “Evaluation of the Alberta Ignition Interlock Program: Preliminary Results.” Ottawa, Canada: Traffic Injury Research Foundation. Bethesda, Maryland: Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Beirness, D. J., Marques, P. R., Voas, R. B., & Tippetts, A. S. (2003). The Impact of Mandatory Versus Voluntary Participation in the Alberta Ignition Interlock Program. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 4(3), 195-198. doi:10.1080/15389580309876

Carter, P. M., Flannagan, C. A., Bingham, C. R., Cunningham, R. M., & Rupp, J. D. (2015). Modeling the Injury Prevention Impact of Mandatory Alcohol Ignition Interlock Installation in All New US Vehicles. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(5), 1028-1035. doi:10.2105/ajph.2014.302445

CDC, NHTSA, & GHSA. *Increasing Alcohol: Ignition Interlock Use Successful Practices for States* (Rep. No. CS255777-B). Retrieved November 30, 2017, from CDC website: https://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/pdf/impaired_driving/ignition-interlock_successful_practices_for_states-a.pdf

Coben, Jeffrey H., and Larkin, Gregory L. “Effectiveness of Interlock Devices in Reducing Recidivism.” *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 1999; 16(15): 81-87.

Compton, Richard P., and Hedlund, James. “Reducing Impaired-Driving Recidivism Using Advanced Vehicle-Based Alcohol Detection Systems: A Report to Congress.” (Report No. DOT HS 810 876) Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (Dec. 12, 2007).

DeYoung, D. J., Tashima, H. N., & Masten, S. V. (2004). *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Ignition Interlock in California* (Rep. No. CAL-DMV-RSS-04-210). Retrieved from [https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/wcm/connect/039b00f2-2a50-4e12-9a90-b06230fab4be/210-Ignition Interlock Rpt.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CONVERT_TO=url&CACHEID=039b00f2-2a50-4e12-9a90-b06230fab4be](https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/wcm/connect/039b00f2-2a50-4e12-9a90-b06230fab4be/210-Ignition%20Interlock%20Rpt.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CONVERT_TO=url&CACHEID=039b00f2-2a50-4e12-9a90-b06230fab4be)

Elder RW, Voas R, Beirness D, et al. Effectiveness of ignition interlocks for preventing alcohol-impaired driving and alcohol-related crashes: A Community Guide systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2011; 40(3): 362–376.

Fiedler, K., Brittle, C., & Stafford, S. (2012, April). Case Studies of Ignition Interlock Programs. (Report No. DOT HS 811 594). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Goodwin, A., Thomas, L., Kirley, B., Hall, W., O'Brien, N., & Hill, K. (2015, November). Countermeasures that work: A highway safety countermeasure guide for State highway safety offices, Eighth edition. (Report No. DOT HS 812 202). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.



- Greenway Transportation Planning, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., & TIRF USA. Minnesota Ignition Interlock Program Evaluation. Retrieved from <https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ots/reports-statistics/Documents/mn-iid-eval.pdf>
- Houwing, S. (2016, December). *Alcohol interlocks and drink driving rehabilitation in the EU – Best Practices and Guidelines for Member States*. Retrieved from http://etsc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016_12_alcohol_interlock_guidelines_final.pdf
- Jones, Barnie. “The Effectiveness of Oregon’s Ignition-interlock program.” Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs, and Traffic Safety, Cologne, Germany, September 28-October 2, 1992.
- Kaufman, Elinore J., Wiebe, Douglas J., “Impact of State Ignition Interlock Laws on Alcohol-Involved Crash Deaths in the United States”, *American Journal of Public Health* 106, no. 5 (May 1, 2016): pp. 865-871.
- Kelley-Baker, T., Taylor, E., Berning, A., Yao, J., Lauer, L., & Watson, D. (2017, June). The feasibility of voluntary ignition interlocks as a prevention strategy for young drivers. (Report No. DOT HS 812 425). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Kierkus, C. A., PhD, & Johnson, B. R., PhD. (2015). *Michigan DWI/Sobriety Court Ignition Interlock Evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/admin/op/problem-solving-courts/Drug/Documents/Ignition%20Interlock%20Device%20Report%20-%20revised.pdf>
- Lahousse JA, Fildes BN. Cost-benefit analysis of an alcohol ignition interlock for installation in all newly registered vehicles. *Traffic Inj Prev*. 2009;10(6):528–537.
- Marques, P. R., & McKnight, A. S. (2017, June). Examination of the feasibility of alcohol interlocks for motorcycles (Report No DOT HS 812 423). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Marques, P. R., Tippetts, A. S., Voas, R. B., & Beirness, D. J. (2001), Predicting repeat DUI offenses with the alcohol interlock recorder. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. Vol. 33, Issue 5: 609-19.
- Marques, P. & Voas, R. (2010, March). Key Features for Ignition Interlock Programs (Report No. DOT HS 811 262). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Marques PR, Voas RB, Roth R, AS T. Evaluation of the New Mexico Ignition Interlock Program (Report No. DOT HS 811 410). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2009.
- Marquess, Paul, Hansson, Therese, et al. “Detection of Phosphatidylethanol (PEth) in the Blood of Drivers in an Alcohol Ignition Interlock Program.” *Traffic Inj. Prev*. 12(2): 136-141 (Apr. 2011).
- Martino, A., Sitran, A., & Rosa, C. (2014, March). *Technical Development and Deployment of Alcohol Interlocks in Road Safety Policy*. Retrieved from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2014/513993/IPOL-TRAN_ET\(2014\)513993_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2014/513993/IPOL-TRAN_ET(2014)513993_EN.pdf)



- Maryland Department of Transportation. (2017, February). *Maryland's Ignition Interlock Program: Status Report*. Retrieved from http://www.mva.maryland.gov/_resources/docs/InterlockReportFINAL_2017.pdf
- Mayer, R. (2014, February). Ignition interlocks – *What You Need To Know: A toolkit for program administrators, policymakers, and stakeholders*. 2nd Edition. (Report No. DOT HS 811 883). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Mcginty, E. E., Tung, G., Shulman-Laniel, J., Hardy, R., Rutkow, L., Frattaroli, S., & Vernick, J. S. (2017). Ignition Interlock Laws: Effects on Fatal Motor Vehicle Crashes, 1982–2013. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 52(4), 417-423. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.10.043
- Mothers Against Drunk Driving. (2013, July). Ignition interlock institutes: Promoting the use of interlocks and improvements to interlock programs. (Report No. DOT HS 811 815). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Evaluation of state ignition interlock programs: interlock use analyses from 28 states, 2006-2011. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Transportation, 2015 Report No.: DOT HS 812 145.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2013, December). *Model Guideline for State Ignition Interlock Programs*. (Report No. DOT HS 811 859). Washington, DC: Author.
- Powell, T. D. C., Vanlaar, W. G., & Robertson, R. D. (2017, May). *2016 Annual Ignition Interlock Survey: United States*. Retrieved from <http://tirf.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/TIRF-USA-Annual-Interlock-SurveyReport-19.pdf>
- Rauch, William J., Ahlin, Eileen M., et al. "Effects of administrative ignition interlock license restrictions on drivers with multiple alcohol offenses." *J. Experimental Criminology* (2011) 7:127-148.
- Robertson, Robyn D., and Vanlaar, Ward G.M. "Managing Risk and Behaviour Change: Proceedings of the 14th International Alcohol Interlock Symposium." Ottawa, Ontario: Traffic Injury Research Foundation. (Aug. 2015).
- Roth, R., Voas, R., & Marques, P. (2007). Interlocks for First Offenders: Effective? *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 8(4), 346-352. doi:10.1080/15389580701598559
- Taylor, E., Voas, R., Marques, P, McKnight, S. & Atkins, R. (2017, August). Interlock data utilization (Report No. DOT HS 812 445). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Tippetts, A. Scott, and Robert B. Voas. "The effectiveness of the West Virginia interlock program." *Journal of Traffic Medicine* 26 (1998): 19-24.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2014, June). *TRAFFIC SAFETY: Alcohol Ignition Interlocks Are Effective While Installed; Less Is Known about How to Increase Installation Rates* (Rep. No. GAO-14-559). Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/assets/670/664281.pdf>



Vanlaar, Ward, Hing, Marisela, and Robertson, Robyn. "Nova Scotia Alcohol Ignition Interlock Program: Outcome Evaluation." Ottawa, Ontario: Traffic Injury Research Foundation. (Apr. 2015).

"VASAP Ignition Interlock Agreement." The Commission on Virginia Alcohol Safety Action Program. (June 2015).

Vehmas, A., & Löytty, M. (2013, June). *Effectiveness and impact of alcohol interlock-controlled driving rights*. Retrieved from https://www.trafi.fi/filebank/a/1364296057/07ec5f80fc5103a8c0f05b84e2ff89ab/11854-TraFi_Publications_6-2013.pdf

Vermont Department of Motor Vehicles. (2017). *Ignition Interlock Program FAQ*. Retrieved from <http://dmv.vermont.gov/sites/dmv/files/documents/VL-086%20RDL%20and%20IID%20FAQs.pdf>

Voas, Robert B., Anthony S. Tippetts, and Milton Grosz. "Administrative Reinstatement Interlock Programs: Florida, A 10-Year Study." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 37(7) (2013): 1243-1251.

Voas, R. B., Tippetts, A. S., Bergen, G., Grosz, M. and Marques, P. (2016), Mandating Treatment Based on Interlock Performance: Evidence for Effectiveness. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*, 40: 1953–1960.

Warren-Kigenyi N, Coleman H. Research Note: DWI recidivism in the United States: an examination of state-level driver data and the effect of lookback periods on recidivism prevalence. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2014 Report No.: DOT HS 811 911.

Washington Traffic Safety Commission. (2014). *Evaluation of the Washington State Ignition Interlock Pilot Program 2009: 2012 Recidivism Report as Submitted to the Legislature Per RCW 46.20.745(5)* (Rep.). Retrieved from http://wtsc.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ignition-interlock-pilot-program-evaluation_2012.pdf

Willis, C., Lybrand, S., & Bellamy, N. (2004). Alcohol ignition interlock programmes for reducing drink driving recidivism. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. doi:10.1002/14651858.cd004168.pub2



National Center for State Courts | 300 Newport Avenue | Williamsburg, VA 23185