

Evaluation of State Ignition Interlock Programs: Interlock Use Analyses from 28 States

Tara Casanova-Powell
James Hedlund
Julie Tison

Preusser Research Group, Inc.
7100 Main Street
Trumbull, CT 06611

Sponsored by: GHSA, NHTSA and CDC

Life savers Conference 2014
Ignition Interlock Technology: An Update for States Workshop
April 27 - 29 at the Gaylord Oprland in Nashville, Tennessee

1. All findings are preliminary and may be subject to change pending review.

(2)

Introduction

- ▲ Interlocks are highly effective in reducing alcohol-impaired driving while they are installed.
- ▲ Increasing the number of DWI offenders who install interlocks is an effective and straightforward strategy to reduce impaired driving.
- ▲ Effectiveness can't be fully realized until they are used more at a population level.

(3)

Objectives

- ▲ How can we increase the number of interlocks in use in the U.S.?
- ▲ How can states increase interlock use among DWI offenders who are required or eligible to install one?
- ▲ How do we measure interlock use?
- ▲ What changes to interlock programs have been associated with increased interlock use?
- ▲ What program features are associated with higher interlock use?

[4]

Methods

- ▲ Twenty-eight states with more than 2,000 interlocks in use in 2010 were contacted and participated in the study.
- ▲ Interlock data and program data were requested through discussions with state interlock program staff and managers.

[5]

Methods

- ▲ Program features for each state were summarized, assessed and tabulated.
- ▲ Interlock use counts from these states for 2006 to 2011 were compared with their interlock program changes to evaluate whether program changes were associated with increases in interlock use.

[6]

Methods-Key Features

- ▲ Eight potential keys to higher interlock use were identified.
- ▲ Program Design:
 - ▶ Requirements
 - ▶ Penalties
- ▲ Program Management
 - ▶ Monitoring
 - ▶ Uniformity
 - ▶ Coordination
 - ▶ Education
- ▲ Program Support
 - ▶ Resources
 - ▶ Data

(7)

Methods- Key Features

- ▲ Each state's performance was assessed on each key.
- ▲ A 5-point performance scale:
 - ▶ Strong performance scored 5.
 - ▶ Weak performance scored 1.
- ▲ The scores reflected each program's operations throughout 2011 and do not account for law or program improvements during or subsequent to 2011.

(8)

Methods

- ▲ Various ways to measure interlock in-use rates
 - ▶ Interlocks in use per population.
 - ▶ Interlocks in use per impaired driving (DWI) arrest
 - ▶ Interlocks in use per impaired driving fatality.
- ▲ These three interlock in-use rates were calculated for all 28 states for the years 2006-2011 and compared across the 28 states.
- ▲ State performance on the eight program keys was compared using correlation analysis with state performance on the three interlock in-use rates for 2011 to assess which keys may be related to higher interlock use.

(9)

Results-Interlocks in-use, 2006-2011

State	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% change from 2006 to 2011
Arizona	3,654	7,700	6,849	15,397	18,300	17,026	366%
Arkansas	1,250	1,897	1,366	1,704	5,880	3,952	219%
California	4,876	5,904	5,954	7,545	8,733	15,180	211%
Colorado	2,755	5,267	6,104	8,775	17,056	17,461	534%
Florida*	5,434	5,950	6,738*	7,791	8,514	8,976	65%
Georgia	1,612	1,938	1,919	1,995	2,182	2,308	43%
Illinois	2,731	2,676	3,387	6,500	11,000	9,974	265%
Iowa	4,049	5,000	4,618	5,225	5,342	5,491	36%
Kansas	420	739	861	1,919	3,500	6,379	1419%
Louisiana	1,613	2,111	3,085	4,124	4,806	5,337	231%
Maryland	4,006	4,905	5,966	6,400	9,600	9,000	125%
Massachusetts	223	952	2,186	2,488	4,601	4,872	2085%
Michigan	4,000	4,825	3,994	4,038	4,974	5,249	31%
Missouri	1,852	3,020	2,743	4,649	4,693	6,179	234%
Nebraska	286	500	1,030	1,136	1,800	3,100	984%
New Mexico	6,311	7,437	8,955	8,625	12,064	13,500	114%
New York	702	1,544	1,276	1,762	2,500	5,000	612%
North Carolina	6,034	7,685	8,003	8,303	8,500	8,761	45%
Ohio	2,260	3,105	2,580	2,974	4,217	6,741	198%
Oklahoma	1,709	2,200	1,722	1,635	6,000	4,500	163%
Oregon	2,012	2,302	2,570	2,957	3,499	3,715	85%
Pennsylvania	2,875	4,854	4,336	5,122	5,722	6,331	120%
Texas	8,582	17,000	14,935	17,025	31,190	33,064	285%
Utah	1,111	1,186	1,311	1,497	1,950	2,550	130%
Virginia	3,593	4,306	4,253	4,641	4,200	3,841	7%
Washington	8,833	9,792	9,997	14,974	14,117	20,000	126%
West Virginia	701	1,252	1,095	1,503	2,112	2,686	283%
Wisconsin	832	998	967	945	1,195	7,824	840%

(10)

Red Blue Purple Yellow Orange Green

Interlock Use Change Results

- ▲ Required interlocks for first offenders: interlock use increased in all three states.
- ▲ Required interlocks for repeat or high-BAC offenders: interlock use increased in three of four states.
- ▲ Required interlocks for hardship license: interlock use increased in two of three states.
- ▲ Interlock to reduce or eliminate license suspension period: interlock use increased in five of six states.
- ▲ Management and other changes: interlock use increased in seven states.

(11)

Results: Correlations of Interlock Program Key Ratings with Interlock In-Use Rates, 2011

Rate per:	Requirements	Monitoring	Coordination	Uniformity	Penalties	Education	Resource	Data
Population	0.63	0.56	0.55	0.52	0.47	0.38	0.41	0.12
DWI Arrests	0.51	0.39	0.36	0.38	0.31	0.19	0.17	0.02
DWI Fatalities	0.64	0.56	0.50	0.45	0.47	0.37	0.28	0.12
Range	0.51-0.64	0.39-0.56	0.36-0.55	0.38-0.52	0.31-0.47	0.19-0.38	0.17-0.41	0.02-0.12

(12)

Conclusions

- ▲ The strongest relation to high interlock use-requirements or incentives (Program Design) especially for first offenders, followed by strong monitoring (Program Management).
- ▲ Strong Program Design alone does not guarantee high interlock use: some states with acceptable or higher program design ratings have low interlock use.
- ▲ Strong Program Management alone does not guarantee high interlock use; some states with acceptable or lower Design and Management ratings have achieved relatively high interlock use.

[13]

Contact Information

Tara Casanova Powell
Preusser Research Group
7100 Main Street, Trumbull, CT 06518
Phone: 203-459-8700 ext. 109
tara@preussergroup.com

[14]
