



Alcohol Interlocks for First Offenders:

A Case Study on Implementation

Robyn Robertson

Erin Holmes

Alcohol Interlock Symposium

Melbourne, Australia

Oct. 28th, 2009



Overview

- > **Evolution of interlock programs and emerging trend**
- > **Project description and method**
- > **Key findings**
- > **Future directions**



Background

- > **Interlock programs have developed across North America, the EU and Australia.**
- > **Historically programs have been mandatory for repeat offenders; voluntary for first offenders.**
- > **Participation rates have been low.**
- > **Implementation has been challenging and more work is needed in this area to identify best practices.**



Background

- > More recently there has been a growing trend towards the use of interlocks for first offenders as a mandatory sanction.
- > Twelve U.S. states have introduced first offender laws for interlocks (AK, AR, AZ, CA pilots, CO, HI, IL, LA, NE, NM, UT, WA).
- > Interlocks as a mandatory sanction for first offenders has been raised as an issue during the re-authorization of the U.S. Federal Highway Bill.



Background

- > **TIRF was contracted by the Century Council to examine the process of implementing the first offender interlock program in IL.**
- > **Case study approach in order to better understand the translation from legislative to operational – what is needed to execute.**
- > **Goal is to provide guidance to other jurisdictions considering similar implementation.**



Method

- > Review relevant materials and documentation related to implementation.
- > Develop detailed summary of process and timelines.
- > Interview key informants to gather information about experiences, challenges, achievements, outcomes.
- > Delphi panel to review findings.
- > Review by other first offender jurisdictions to compare processes, augment knowledge.
- > Develop guidelines.



Committees

- > **The implementation effort was organized and led by six committees whose goal was to identify and execute needed modifications to key aspects of the program:**
 - » Revise the administrative rules to reflect the new legislation;
 - » Develop new forms and letters;
 - » Program changes into the IL SOS driver record and interlock program database;
 - » Deliver agency/staff training and education;
 - » Raise public awareness; and,
 - » Create new program fees and indigent funding.



Committee to revise administrative rules

- > Eight people were on the committee.**
- > Focus was to revise and enhance the existing administrative rules for first offenders and to make modifications to the new law.**
- > Work lasted for nine months from October 2007 to July 2008 when the rules were filed.**
- > Additional work was ongoing until December 2008 when the rules were passed.**



Committee to revise administrative rules

- > **Main task was to translate legislation into revised administrative rules for the interlock program.**
- > **The committee made a number of strategic decisions relating to:**
 - » creation of definitions for violations of the program requirements for first offenders;
 - » determining length of monitoring period; and,
 - » identifying the consequences for violations.
- > **Secondary task was to identify inconsistencies and errors in the text of the law and propose revisions.**



Committee to develop new forms, letters

- > **Eleven people on the committee (core group of 5).**
- > **Purpose to revise existing forms, anticipate and develop new forms and letters to accommodate first offenders in the alcohol interlock program.**
- > **The goals of this committee were threefold:**
 - » to change existing forms to reflect program changes and to develop additional forms for the new program;
 - » to develop new letter responses to specific actions; and,
 - » to plan the flow of information through the program to account for the new changes.
- > **Committee met bi-monthly for a year beginning in June 2007. Most forms were completed by July 30th, 2008 although work continued into January 2009.**



Committee to develop new forms, letters

- > **Task was to identify all existing SOS forms that needed to be created, changed/updated due to the new law:**
 - » Forms for program participation (e.g., MDDP application for BAIID program);
 - » Letters to the offender to communicate information about the program (e.g., offender requirements letter); and,
 - » Notices (e.g., notice of statutory summary suspension).

- > **More than 30 new documents created.**



Committee to program databases

- > Fifteen people were on this committee.
- > Focus to develop and implement necessary changes to the SOS driver records system; change functions associated with the BAIID computer program to accommodate first offenders.
- > The goals of this committee were twofold:
 - » to ensure that the new BAIID computer program was able to handle the multiple requirements associated with the interlock program; and,
 - » to ensure that the existing Driver Records program was upgraded/updated to manage the new requirements resulting from the interlock program.
- > Work on the committee lasted from September 2007 to July 1st, 2008 (when the new BAIID/AH system was completed).



Committee to program databases

- > **Committee divided into two separate groups with different tasks.**
- > **First subcommittee managed the changes needed to the driver record computer program.**
 - » Most of the tasks of the first subcommittee had to do with bringing the driving record program up to par with the new law.
- > **Second subcommittee managed the writing of the new BAID computer program (that would review the interlock data and generate the appropriate letters and forms) and enabling it to interface with the driver record program.**
- > **Need to interface with vendor data systems; provide access.**



Committee on training and education

- > **Nine people were on the committee.**
- > **Focus was to educate relevant agencies about changes to BAID program and its implications for each agency.**
- > **The goals were twofold:**
 - » to provide initial training to agency staff regarding new forms, the application of new offenses and penalties, changes to the processing of offenders and new staff responsibilities; and,
 - » to provide information about alcohol interlock technology.
- > **Work lasted 18 months from June 2007 to December 2008. It took a 3-person committee approximately 6 months to plan and organize a statewide symposium.**



Committee on training and education

- > **Committee responsible for following activities:**
 - » To create a statewide symposium to deliver education and training to a broad range of practitioners and to generate interest in the program.
 - » To deliver general education and training about changes to the BAID program and the implications of these changes for different agencies.
 - » To create educational materials that are geared towards each of the professional groups (e.g., police, prosecutors, judges, treatment, etc.).
 - » To respond to inquiries from agencies about the program.
 - » To provide agencies with new forms and templates in support of the program.



Committee on awareness and education

- > **Nine people on committee (core group of 5).**
- > **Focus to develop and deliver educational initiatives/materials to the public about changes to BAID program, new eligibility requirements, and new consequences of an impaired driving conviction.**
 - » Achieved through the use of press events, media interviews, and meetings with community and advocacy organizations.
- > **Work lasted for 18 months from June 2007 to December 2008. All publications were completed by October 2008.**



Committee on awareness and education

- > **Delivered using comprehensive strategy:**
 - » Town Hall meeting - held in July 2008 to provide information and solicit input.
 - » Multiple press conferences (involving SOS, MADD, and law enforcement) and press releases.
 - » SOS publications (e.g., The Sober Truth, DUI Fact Book, Rules of the Road, and the website).
 - » News ads/brochures about the BAIID program.
 - » A new section was added to the SOS website to explain the BAIID program (<http://www.cyberdriveillinois.com>).
 - » Law enforcement symposium.
 - » IDOT also provided publicity for the new BAIID program in late 2008 to raise awareness about its launch.



Committee on fees, indigent funding

- > **Seven people were on the committee.**
- > **Focus to anticipate and prepare for the financial impact of new BAID program.**
 - » While there was not any indigent funding under the existing interlock program for repeat offenders, it was proposed for the first offender program.
- > **The committee met approximately ten times over two years. Decision-making was completed by June 16th, 2008.**



Committee on fees, indigent funding

- > **Committee was required to set up two separate funds for the indigent program; one fund to receive monies and one fund to pay out monies.**
- > **They were also responsible for:**
 - » Assessing financial impact of the new BAIID program.
 - » Assisting with initial budget planning for the BAIID program.
 - » Meeting with A/R and purchasing to determine if it was preferable to use a contract with vendors or to write the requirements into the administrative rules.



Implementation resources

- > **More than 40 people involved over a 2 year period.**
- > **Percentage of staff time allocated to program implementation:**
 - » BAIID Program Manager – 90%
 - » Legal Advisor – 20%
 - » Manager of DUI Section for Drivers Services – 15%
 - » Contractual Programmer – 25%
 - » Creative Director – 1%
 - » Policy and Program Analyst – 15%
 - » Alcohol Program Coordinator at IDOT – 40%
 - » Budget Analyst – 1%
 - » TSRP – several hours per week for 9 months
- > **SOS BAIID program staff grew from 3 to 7.**
- > **Additional hires – 2 programmers and 6 staffers to respond to questions and deliver training.**



Financial resources

- > HSO provided \$25,000 grant to support the costs of the interlock symposium.
- > HSO also provided \$300,000 in Federal highway dollars to support additional staff for the SOS, to support staff travel to deliver training and education across the State.
 - » 66% of the grant from IDOT went toward paying staff salaries and social security.
- > The salary costs associated with the amount of time spent by individual staff members at SOS.



Outcomes

- > **Overall, implementation went very well.**
 - » The SOS was fully supportive of the new program and provided appropriate resources and timelines.
 - » There was a strong feeling of teamwork, coordination, and communication across agencies.
 - » Roles and responsibilities were clearly delineated.
 - » There have been little or no technical issues associated with the new program at present.

- > **More time should have been spent on the wording and content of the legislation.**
 - » This would have streamlined efforts to develop the administrative rules.



Conclusions

- > **The implementation of first offender interlock programs requires:**
 - » leadership
 - » planning and preparation
 - » teamwork
 - » staff allocations
 - » financial allocations

- > **Legislation must be backed up by execution strategies at an operational level if they are to achieve their intended goal.**



Conclusions

- > **At a legislative/policy level there is support for mandatory first offender interlock program.**
- > **There is some resistance among practitioners.**
- > **What is at the heart of this issue and can the problem be resolved?**



Staying informed

www.tirf.ca

