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The purpose of this report is to track the increases in the utilization of ignition interlocks as a drunk driving sanction in the U.S. This is the eighth annual survey compiled by the author since 2006. Four figures in this report show the national trend and current snapshots for each state. The figures are:

1. the trend in the number of ignition interlocks installed in the US,
2. the number of interlocks currently-installed in each state,
3. the number of interlocks per capita in each state, and
4. the number of interlocks per Fatal Alcohol-Impaired-Driving Crash, FAIDC.

## Methodology

Two independent sets of sources were used to estimate the number of interlocks in each state. The fifteen U.S. Interlock distributors comprised one set. The distributors included AlcoAlert Interlock, Alcohol Countermeasure Systems, Alcohol Detection Systems, Autosense, B.E.S.T. Labs, Consumer Safety Technology, Draeger, Guardian Interlock, Instant Interlock, Interceptor Ignition Interlocks, Lifesafer Interlock, Low Cost Interlock, Monitech, Sens-O-Lock of America and Smart Start. Independent official government contacts in each of the states comprised the second source. The data were collected in July-August 2013.

All fifteen US ignition interlock distributors provided estimates for the total number of their ignition interlocks that were currently-installed in the U.S. Fourteen of the fifteen distributors also provided state-by-state estimates of their currently-installed interlocks. Independent state estimates were acquired from forty-six states and those estimates were used for those states in this report. The author was unable to identify state sources in Alaska, Indiana, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. For each of those four states, the sum of values from the fourteen distributers was increased by a percentage equal to the average U.S. market share of Smart Start, the company that did not report state data.

The columns of Appendix 1 contain the raw data and computed values used in this report.
Column 1 lists each of the states and the U.S.
Column 2 is the number of currently-installed ignition interlock devices, IID's, in each state.
Column 3 is the rank of each of the states on the number of currently-installed interlocks.
Column 4 is the population of each state.
Column 5 is the number of IID's per 10,000 population
Column 6 is the state rank on IID's per 10,000 population.
Column 7 is an estimate of the number of Fatal Alcohol-Impaired-Driving Crashes in 2013 based on a linear extrapolation of a least squares fit to the FAIDC data for 2007-2011. This is a surrogate denominator for the number of drunk drivers in each state. Column 8 is the number of IID's per FAIDC for each state and the US. Column 9 is the state rank on IID's per FAIDC.
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## Results

Figure 1 shows the trend in the total number of currently-installed interlocks in the U.S. ${ }^{1}$ The 2013 estimates are based on data supplied by 15 ignition interlock distributors and 46 independent state sources. A least-squares straight line fit to the distributor data indicates average yearly increases of about 30,000 units per year. A similar fit to the four data points from state estimates indicates a slightly greater increase per year.

Figure 1 Currently-Installed Interlocks in US vs Time


There are approximately $1,400,000$ impaired driving arrests ${ }^{2}$ each year in the U.S. Accordingly, the ratio of currently installed interlocks to persons arrested is about $22 \%$.

There are approximately $1,000,000$ impaired driving convictions each year in the U.S. So the ratio of currently installed interlocks to impaired driving convictions is about 30\%.

There is about one currently-installed interlock per thousand residents in the U.S.

There are about 41 ignition interlocks per fatal alcohol-impaired-driving crash in the U.S. (305,000 interlocks divided by 7400 fatal alcohol-impaired-driving crashes).

[^0]Figure 2 shows estimates for the number of currently-installed ignition interlocks by state. Texas, California, Arizona, and Colorado have the most with over 20,000 each. Washington, Kansas, Wisconsin, New Mexico, and Maryland have between 10,000 and 20,000. Fifteen states have between 5000 and 10,000 ; ten states have between 1000 and 5000; and the remaining sixteen states have a combined total of less than 7000 currently-installed interlocks.

## Figure 2 Currently Installed Interlocks by State

July 2013 Survey


Figure 3 shows currently-installed interlocks per capita by state. New Mexico, Kansas, Colorado, and Arizona rank highest on this measure. Sanctions have a general deterrent effect only if members of the public know about them. Therefore the number of interlocks per capita represents one relative measure of the general deterrent effect of interlocks in each state.
Figure 3 Interlocks per $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ residents by state July 2013 Survey


Figure 4 shows the estimated number of currently-installed interlocks per fatal alcohol-impaired-driving crash by state. This is one relative measure of the specific deterrent effect of interlock programs in the states. Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Kansas, and Nebraska rank highest on this measure.

Figure 4 Interlocks per Fatal Alcohol-Impaired-Driving Crash by State


Appendix 1: A summary of raw data and computed values used in figures 1-4

| State | Installed Interlocks (IID's) | Rank on IID's | Population Estimate | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { IID's Per } \\ \hline 10,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Rank on IID's Per 10,000 | FAIDC Estimate | IID's Per FAIDC | Rank on IID's Per FAIDC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 0 | 49 | 4822023 | 0.0 | 49 | 172 | 0 | 49 |
| Alaska | 1922 | 32 | 731449 | 26.3 | 5 | 14 | 139 | 6 |
| Arizona | 21468 | 3 | 6553255 | 32.8 | 4 | 111 | 193 | 1 |
| Arkansas | 3560 | 27 | 2949131 | 12.1 | 19 | 144 | 25 | 30 |
| California | 28129 | 2 | 38041430 | 7.4 | 28 | 496 | 57 | 18 |
| Colorado | 20237 | 4 | 5187582 | 39.0 | 3 | 118 | 171 | 2 |
| Connecticut | 1162 | 34 | 3590347 | 3.2 | 39 | 90 | 13 | 38 |
| Delaware | 297 | 44 | 917092 | 3.2 | 38 | 35 | 9 | 41 |
| Florida | 9379 | 12 | 19317568 | 4.9 | 33 | 490 | 19 | 36 |
| Georgia | 2080 | 31 | 9919945 | 2.1 | 41 | 173 | 12 | 39 |
| Hawaii | 1561 | 33 | 1392313 | 11.2 | 21 | 43 | 36 | 25 |
| Idaho | 876 | 36 | 1595728 | 5.5 | 30 | 41 | 22 | 35 |
| Illinois | 9521 | 10 | 12875255 | 7.4 | 27 | 164 | 58 | 16 |
| Indiana | 333 | 42 | 6537334 | 0.5 | 45 | 186 | 2 | 46 |
| Iowa | 5659 | 22 | 3074186 | 18.4 | 10 | 66 | 86 | 12 |
| Kansas | 15910 | 6 | 2885905 | 55.1 | 2 | 122 | 131 | 7 |
| Kentucky | 191 | 45 | 4380415 | 0.4 | 47 | 124 | 2 | 47 |
| Louisiana | 5440 | 23 | 4601893 | 11.8 | 20 | 124 | 44 | 22 |
| Maine | 461 | 40 | 1329192 | 3.5 | 37 | 9 | 52 | 19 |
| Maryland | 10925 | 9 | 5884563 | 18.6 | 9 | 138 | 79 | 13 |
| Massachusetts | 5890 | 21 | 6646144 | 8.9 | 25 | 84 | 70 | 14 |
| Michigan | 8197 | 15 | 9883360 | 8.3 | 26 | 187 | 44 | 21 |
| Minnesota | 7176 | 17 | 5379139 | 13.3 | 16 | 66 | 109 | 10 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 50 | 2984926 | 0.0 | 50 | 94 | 0 | 50 |
| Missouri | 7718 | 16 | 6021988 | 12.8 | 18 | 192 | 40 | 23 |
| Montana | 319 | 43 | 1005141 | 3.2 | 40 | 50 | 6 | 42 |
| Nebraska | 3973 | 26 | 1855525 | 21.4 | 8 | 31 | 127 | 8 |
| Nevada | 994 | 35 | 2758931 | 3.6 | 35 | 31 | 32 | 27 |
| New Hampshire | 537 | 39 | 1320718 | 4.1 | 34 | 25 | 22 | 34 |
| New Jersey | 8820 | 13 | 8864590 | 9.9 | 23 | 153 | 58 | 17 |
| New Mexico | 12616 | 8 | 2085538 | 60.5 | 1 | 79 | 159 | 3 |
| New York | 6870 | 19 | 19570261 | 3.5 | 36 | 275 | 25 | 29 |
| North Carolina | 9500 | 11 | 9752073 | 9.7 | 24 | 267 | 36 | 26 |
| North Dakota | 18 | 48 | 699628 | 0.3 | 48 | 52 | 0 | 48 |
| Ohio | 2407 | 30 | 11544225 | 2.1 | 42 | 258 | 9 | 40 |
| Oklahoma | 5000 | 24 | 3814820 | 13.1 | 17 | 208 | 24 | 32 |
| Oregon | 7100 | 18 | 3899353 | 18.2 | 11 | 47 | 152 | 4 |
| Pennsylvania | 6759 | 20 | 12763536 | 5.3 | 32 | 305 | 22 | 33 |
| Rhode Island | 50 | 47 | 1050292 | 0.5 | 46 | 28 | 2 | 45 |
| South Carolina | 707 | 38 | 4723723 | 1.5 | 43 | 232 | 3 | 44 |
| South Dakota | 90 | 46 | 833354 | 1.1 | 44 | 23 | 4 | 43 |
| Tennessee | 3451 | 28 | 6456243 | 5.3 | 31 | 187 | 18 | 37 |
| Texas | 39027 | 1 | 26059203 | 15.0 | 14 | 1074 | 36 | 24 |
| Utah | 4032 | 25 | 2855287 | 14.1 | 15 | 42 | 97 | 11 |
| Vermont | 404 | 41 | 626011 | 6.5 | 29 | 17 | 24 | 31 |
| Virginia | 8456 | 14 | 8185867 | 10.3 | 22 | 144 | 59 | 15 |
| Washington | 18016 | 5 | 6897012 | 26.1 | 6 | 129 | 140 | 5 |
| West Virginia | 3084 | 29 | 1855413 | 16.6 | 12 | 61 | 50 | 20 |
| Wisconsin | 13258 | 7 | 5726398 | 23.2 | 7 | 118 | 112 | 9 |
| Wyoming | 869 | 37 | 576412 | 15.1 | 13 | 34 | 26 | 28 |
| US | 304,600 |  | 313914040 | 9.7 | 24.5 | 7356 | 41 |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Before 2010 there was insufficient data from state sources for the computation of a national total and only the totals of values from distributors were plotted. For the last 4 years, there has been sufficient state data for a national estimate in addition to the estimate from distributors.
    ${ }^{2}$ The numbers of arrests and convictions are not uniformly collected in the states. Doing so is complicated by state differences in diversion programs, plea downs, police enforcement, and variations in data reporting. The numbers used for arrests and convictions are the generally accepted estimates for the U.S . The author believes that the actual number of DWI arrests per year is significantly higher than the FBI's estimate which is based on voluntary reporting by law enforcement agencies. For example, the FBI reported 11,307 DWI arrests in New Mexico in 2010 whereas the NM Citation Tracking System reported 16,563.

