



Between the Lines

Mark Your Calendars

National Distracted Driving Awareness Month
Alcohol Awareness Month
April 2014

Lifesavers National Conference on Highway Safety Priorities
Nashville, TN
April 27–29, 2014

National TSRP Training
Denver, CO
July 15–16, 2014

NAPC Summer Meeting
Denver, CO, July 16–18, 2014

IACP–DRE Section 20th Annual Training Conference on Drugs, Alcohol and Impaired Driving
Phoenix, AZ
July 28–30, 2014

2013 GHSA Annual Meeting Highway Safety & Technology: Safely Navigating the Road Ahead
San Diego, CA
August 25–28, 2014

Upcoming NDAA Courses
for a listing of all upcoming NDAA courses, please go to:
www.ndaa.org

Technical and Practical Aspects of Ignition Interlocks

Ken Denton

Association of Ignition Interlock Program Administrators

When an individual is convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol, the prosecutor may request and the judge may order an ignition interlock device (IID) installed on the individual's vehicle. Interlocks have been readily available since the 1990s but more recently gained popularity because of their effectiveness in preventing recidivism. All states have ignition interlock laws in some form and 39 states mandate devices be installed on vehicles where the operators were convicted of various impaired driving laws.¹ To better understand interlock devices and how to utilize them, the Association of Ignition Interlock Program Administrators (AIIPA) (www.aiipa.org) provides links to information and programs in all 50 states.

What is AIIPA?

AIIPA is a non-profit organization whose membership is comprised of interlock program personnel, probation personnel, highway safety professionals, and other stakeholders. The mission of AIIPA is to provide leadership to the ignition interlock device community by promoting best practices, enhance program management, and provide technical assistance to improve traffic safety by reducing impaired driving.

The Association's primary purposes are to assist in the implementation and revision of IID

programs; developing best practices; identifying legislative and policy needs at the national, state and local levels; identifying and promoting research issues relating to IIDs; and developing and promoting IID training programs. In the Association's short history, much has already been accomplished. AIIPA has a dedicated (volunteer) board of directors that recently developed a standardized glossary of terms for ignition interlocks and a best practices guide for use by interlock oversight programs, among other resources.

Because each state implements its own laws regarding utilization of ignition interlock, one of the toughest aspects of interlock program management is jurisdictional reciprocity.

- What happens when someone is required to have an interlock in one state; however, moves or lives in another state?
- How is this information shared by jurisdictions?
- Does the individual have to adhere to the regulations of the jurisdiction ordering the interlock or the jurisdiction in which he or she resides?
- What if a manufacturer is approved by one state but not in the other state?

All of the above scenarios are questions that are faced by program administrators, probation agencies, prosecutors, courts, and licensing agencies on a regular basis. With the develop-

ment of a best practices guide and a standardized glossary of terms, the goal is to eventually see these implemented by all jurisdictions creating a more uniform reporting standard. With more uniform reporting, some of the reciprocity issues faced by programs will eventually become more manageable. Until uniform legislation and reporting requirements make issues more manageable, questions or concerns should be directed to the local prosecutor, a Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor, or the jurisdiction's program administrator.

AIIPA maintains a website (www.aiipa.org) that hosts information relating to interlock programs. The website contains research studies and publications, news related to ignition interlocks, NHTSA model specifications, conference information, state ignition interlock laws and program rules, and for members, contact information for other program administrators. Since laws vary from state to state, including sometimes variation within a state, the traffic safety professional should access the state ignition interlock program site to aid him or her with answers to key issues that arise. Links to state programs can be found on AIIPA's website. The website is continuously being updated with new information.

Various issues may arise when utilizing an ignition interlock device but rapidly evolving technology can be used to address many of these issues. Several jurisdictions now require camera devices in the vehicle to ensure the driver is not having someone else provide the sample. Global Positioning Systems (GPS) are also available in many instruments, pinpointing the coordinates of a device whenever a sample is required. Some jurisdictions require real time reporting, alerting law enforcement when someone has provided a sample and alcohol has been detected. With these growing technology trends, it should become easier to manage these requirements and the individuals who must abide by them. However, as each new technology becomes available, so does the responsibility of jurisdictions to determine whether the technology is reliable, and how it should be utilized.

While the use of interlock technology can be effective, the law must also support its use. For example, in one particular case the entity overseeing the program received information from the manufacturer that an individual provided a failed breath sample to the IID installed on his vehicle. Within minutes, a second sample was provided to the same IID that was free of alcohol. That information (with photographs) was then provided to police who saw that the subject providing the alcohol-free (second) sample was seated in the passenger seat of the vehicle. In that jurisdiction, it is a gross misdemeanor for anyone to circumvent the device. The case seemed clear enough. The evidence included alcohol on the driver's breath as demonstrated by the first breath sample, a passenger circumvented the device by providing the second alcohol-free sample, and photographic evidence of the crime being committed. The technology worked as intended however the problem was that there was no way to prove where the violation had occurred.

Without a police or probation officer witnessing the crime, no charges could be filed and the driver could not be held accountable. Had the individual been in probationary status, perhaps the evidence could have been used differently. The solution is to seek legislation that would allow GPS to be utilized to identify the location of the violation and require GPS tracking on all interlock devices.

Whether or not GPS is the answer is yet to be seen, but the current law and administrative rules in the above jurisdiction need to be addressed. By sharing this information, other jurisdictions may be able to address this issue before a case is presented or someone is injured. For further information regarding jurisdictional issues on circumventing device cases and the latest discussions surrounding potential solutions, visit www.aiipa.org.

Ignition interlock devices do save lives. We have all seen the data available about the senseless deaths that have occurred as a result of someone making the choice of driving under the influence. As traffic safety professionals we have a responsibility to those we serve to ensure safe, reliable, and accurate interlock devices and program protocols are utilized. By working together, keeping up with legislation, administrative rules, technology, and program trends, we can continue to decrease the deaths that occur at an average rate of every 51 minutes nationwide. AIIPA strongly urges your involvement and suggestions.

What's next for AIIPA?

On May 18-21, 2014, AIIPA will hold its Second Annual AIIPA Conference and Ignition Interlock Training Institute in Baltimore, MD.

AIIPA is currently soliciting members and stakeholders for speaker and/or presenter recommendations. To make a recommendation an email may be sent to AIIPA@AIIPA.org.

About the Author:

Sergeant Ken Denton is a 23 year veteran of the Washington State Patrol. He currently manages the state patrol's ignition interlock program and evidential breath alcohol testing program. He serves as the current vice president on the board of directors for the Association of Ignition Interlock Program Administrators. He can be reached by email at Ken.Denton@wsp.wa.gov.

1 The various impaired driving laws and the number of states requiring ignition interlock include, eighteen states for any impaired driving, four states for high BAC, nine states for repeat offenders, and eight states for high BAC and repeat offenders. "Drunk Driving Laws." State Laws & Funding. Governors Highway Safety Association, 14 Jan. 2014. < http://www.ghsa.org/html/stateinfo/laws/impaired_laws.html >



Between the Lines is published by the National District Attorneys Association's National Traffic Law Center.

Items may be reprinted if properly attributed. Please provide copies of any reprints to the National Traffic Law Center. For questions or other inquiries, contact the National Traffic Law Center at 703.549.9222 or trafficemail@ndaa.org.

Traffic Prosecutors May See Increase In Commercial Motor Vehicle Cases

An annual safety campaign intended to reduce the more than 4,000 deaths and 100,000 injuries involving CMV crashes that occur annually in the United States may mean prosecutors see increases in traffic citations from October of 2013.¹ Each year during one week in October, the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) conducts a safety campaign, “Operation Safe Drive”.² CVSA is an international not-for-profit organization comprised of industry representatives, law enforcement agencies and motor carrier safety officials.³ The “Operation Safe Driver” campaign first launched in 2007, aims to increase enforcement efforts on drivers operating in an unsafe manner in or around commercial vehicles.⁴ This year’s campaign was conducted from October 20 to October 26, 2013 and involved 6,174 law enforcement officials at 1,868 locations across the United States and Canada.⁵ A total of 29,048 traffic enforcement contacts were made during the 2013 event showing an increase from the 20,398 contacts made in 2012.⁶ Not all contacts resulted in a ticket for the motorists with officers writing warnings as well as citations.⁷ The most common citations

were for speeding, safety belt violations or failure to obey traffic control devices.⁸ A comparison of 2013 and 2012 data reflects a decreased citation rate for speeding and seatbelt usage violations by both CMV and non-CMV drivers.⁹

-
- 1 Enforcement Output Triples During CVSA Operation Safe Driver Mobilization Week, <http://www.prweb.com/releases/prweb11470235.htm> (last visited Feb. 6, 2014).
 - 2 Id.
 - 3 Id.
 - 4 Id.
 - 5 Id.
 - 6 Id.
 - 7 Id.
 - 8 Id.
 - 9 Id.



The National Traffic Law Center is a program of the National District Attorneys Association. This document was prepared under Cooperative Agreement Number DTNH22-13-H-00434 from the U. S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Grant Number CD119910NDAAOP from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the Department of Transportation or the National District Attorneys Association.

Contact Us

National Traffic Law Center

National District

Attorneys Association

99 Canal Center Plaza

Suite 330

Alexandria, VA 22314

703.549.9222

Joanne E. Thomka

Program Director
703.519.1645
jthomka@ndaa.org

Duane M. Kokesch

Senior Attorney
703.519.1641
dkokesch@ndaa.org

Kristen K. Shea

Senior Attorney
703.519.1644
kshea@ndaa.org

Grace Broughton

Staff Attorney
703.519.1682
gbroughton@ndaa.org

Brittney D. Wilson

Program Assistant, Paralegal
703.519.1695
bwilson@ndaa.org