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### Alabama – Daily Registration Data Upload Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Alabama Department of Revenue - Motor Vehicle Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Jay Starling, Registration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov">jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(334) 242-9078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

An issue was identified with the timeliness in which vehicle registration data was available to law enforcement. Vehicle registration data was submitted each month to the Alabama Department of Revenue (ADOR) by the sixty-seven (67) Alabama county license plate issuing officials. The monthly registration data was edited, compiled and uploaded by ADOR to the Alabama Vehicle Information System (ALVIS). The data was saved to a magnetic tape by the ALVIS vendor and shipped to the agency responsible for maintaining the law enforcement database. Overall, the process was taking an average of sixty (60) days.

This project provides the motor vehicle registration data to law enforcement on a daily basis by creating an upload process to allow registration data to be uploaded by county license plate issuing officials using an automated secure ftp upload process. The project also created a new process to receive the data, edit for quality and completeness, provided error reports to county license plate issuing officials and upload the data to the state’s law enforcement motor vehicle data repository each night. This was a significant accomplishment since Alabama law prohibits centralized registration and county license plate issuing officials are responsible for registering vehicles based in their county; therefore, each county maintains its own registration system.

An additional benefit of this project is the impact it has on the IRP ad valorem validation process that is necessary for International Registration Plan (IRP) registration. The existing validation process required the registrant to provide the ad valorem tax receipt to the IRP office before an IRP registration could be issued. The IRP vehicle ad valorem tax records are included in the registration data provided by the county license plate issuing officials and are now electronically verified. The electronic verification of ad valorem taxes eliminates the need for the Motor Carrier Services unit employees to examine and image ad valorem tax receipts, as well as reducing or eliminating the need for carriers to submit the receipts.

### Implementation Timeframe

Ten (10) months

### Resources Required

Federal grant.

### Lessons Learned

The project was implemented through a cooperative effort with county license plate issuing officials, county IT representatives and the University of Alabama Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS). The county license plate issuing officials and their IT representatives participated in the design of the upload process. Ten (10) different systems are currently
utilized by the county license plate issuing officials, so the project was prototyped with a county representing each of the different IT systems. The pilot involved establishing a successful upload process first with the pilot county, and then with the remaining counties who utilize the same system. The process was repeated until all 67 counties were submitting motor vehicle registration data on a daily basis.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

In September 2010, all sixty-seven (67) Alabama counties began uploading their registration data on a daily basis.

**Comments**

CAPS is a unit of the University of Alabama Computer Science Department whose mission is to create innovative solutions through IT research and cutting-edge software development in order to enhance the public safety and security of the State of Alabama. Because CAPS is part of a public university, it has access to the latest cutting edge equipment, software and talent to provide the ultimate state-of-the-art solutions. CAPS works with sister agencies, such as the Department of Public Safety and the Criminal Justice Information Center, so CAPS was able to coordinate the work more efficiently.
# Alabama – Utilizing State Universities to Develop and Maintain State IT Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Alabama Department of Revenue - Motor Vehicle Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines:</td>
<td>Registration and Title Law Enforcement Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Jay Starling, Registration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov">jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(334) 242-9078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Best Practice

In October 2010, the Alabama Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle Division executed a memorandum of Understanding with the University of Alabama Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS) to host and maintain the State's title and registration systems. In February 2011, the title and registration systems were successfully migrated to a state-owned hosting facility.

## Implementation Timeframe

Five (5) months

## Resources Required

CAPS is a non-profit organization, so the resources required are based on the actual cost of resources provided by the university (i.e. hardware, software, hosting, backup, developers, helpdesk, project manager, etc.).

## Lessons Learned

As its name implies, CAPS works closely with sister agencies, such as the Department of Public Safety and Criminal Justice Information Center, so CAPS can coordinate the sharing of title and registration data more efficiently.

## Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

The project was compared to other projects performed by system vendors.

## Comments

CAPS is a unit of the University of Alabama Computer Science Department whose mission is to create innovative solutions through IT research and cutting-edge software development in order to enhance the public safety and security of the State of Alabama. Because CAPS is part of a public university, it has access to the latest cutting edge equipment, software and talent to provide the ultimate state-of-the-art solutions.
## Arizona – ENVOY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: ADOT Motor Vehicle Division</th>
<th>Contact Name: Jackie Allgood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:jallgood@azdot.gov">jallgood@azdot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: (602) 712-7384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

The ADOT Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) has implemented an e-mail response system titled ENVOY, which provides the opportunity for customers to email inquiries to the Division using a link on the MVD website. This is an alternative online option for customer inquiries. Responses are typically answered within a 24 hour timeframe. Customers select a desired inquiry category from a drop-down menu, which allows the Division to route specific subject matters to the appropriate area for an expeditious response. This is conducted on a secured and encrypted system, thereby utilizing a safe and secure methodology.

### Implementation Timeframe

March 2009

### Resources Required

Partnering with internal and external work groups to initiate programming, software applications, and training for staff and inmates.

### Lessons Learned

Significant benefit to customers and reduces field office traffic.

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

The Division receives approximately 2,500 inquires on a weekly basis. Customer satisfaction rate is high.
# Florida – Modified Dealer License Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Ed Broyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:EdBroyles@flhsmv.gov">EdBroyles@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(850) 617-3171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Discipline:</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Best Practice

Automobile dealers are licensed by our agency annually. Many times there is a need to make a change to the license prior to the renewal period. To make changes the applicant was required to complete the six-page original application for a simple change. To expedite the process we have created a one page modification application to respond to simple changes that take place during the licensure period. This simplifies the process for the applicant and expedites the processing time.

## Implementation Timeframe

30 days

## Resources Required

Staff time to redesign the application

## Lessons Learned

Always consider if you are requesting more information than is required to process a transaction. Value your customer's time, needs and effort.

## Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Customer appreciates the shorter form. We have a success rate of 95% with the shorter form compared to a 75% rate when the customer had to complete the six page form. We have improved our service by 20% with this change.
Florida – Electronic Crash Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Discipline:</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Maureen Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maureenjohnson@flhsmv.gov">maureenjohnson@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>850-617-2586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice:**

Submission of ELECTRONIC CRASH REPORTS (Long Form):
The Department continues to encourage law enforcement agencies to submit crash reports electronically. With the change to the new Florida Traffic Crash Report effective January 1, 2011, law enforcement agencies submitting crash reports electronically increased from 12 to 75. Currently there are approximately 30 other agencies in the testing phase. Electronic submission allows edits that improve data accuracy while substantially improving timelessness and reducing costs. Crash data becomes more reliable and useful to Department stakeholders, such as local and statewide law enforcement, traffic and roadway engineering, and for local and statewide parties developing safety initiatives.

**Implementation Timeframe**

TBD

**Resources Required**

IT support

**Lessons Learned**

Efficiencies

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

N/A
Florida – Migration of Databases to SharePoint

**Agency:** Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles  
**Related Discipline:** Customer Service  
**Contact Name:** Ed Broyles  
**E mail:** EdBroyles@flhsmv.gov  
**Phone number:** (850) 617-3171

**Description of Best Practice**

Databases were migrated to one secured shared site with option to view or view and edit based on assigned roles. These databases are available to designated Department staff statewide. Typically these databases would capture information regarding the actions taken against the industries regulated by the Department. The database allows regular updates and also tracks changes and identification of the person making the changes. The database also generates reports that are required to study the trends and changes in the motor vehicle industry.

**Implementation Timeframe**

30 days

**Resources Required**

Staff from Information Systems helped develop the database, staff tested the database and staff worked input the current open cases to the new file.

**Lessons Learned**

Utilize the existing technology and skills to develop a database that would not only capture information on cases but also serve as a tool to run reports for research and analysis.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Provides instant accessibility, tracking of information and follow ups, saves on time.
Florida – Records Retention

| **Agency:** Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles | **Contact Name:** Maureen Johnson |
| **Related Discipline:** Driver Licensing & Control Registration and Title | **E mail:** maureenjohnson@flhsmv.gov |
| | **Phone number:** 850-617-2586 |

**Description of Best Practice**

Florida law requires records be maintained through the Department of State to ensure all appropriate records are properly retained and disposed. It is a best practice for agencies to annually review and evaluate all records. Agencies should be checking to make sure all appropriate documents are on the retention schedule with the appropriate time for destruction. A continually maintained records management program is a best practice that helps an organization be more efficient:

- Which places the organization in a posture to easily facilitate transparency and accountability,
- by the orderly and efficient flow of information enables the organization to perform its functions successfully and efficiently;
- by eliminating unnecessary duplication of records;
- in retaining only those records it really needs for functional purposes and disposing of unnecessary or obsolete information.

**Implementation Timeframe**

Annual exercise

**Resources Required**

Operational staff

**Lessons Learned**

See bulleted items above.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

N/A
Florida – Motorist Services Consolidation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency</strong>: Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
<th><strong>Contact Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related Discipline</strong>: Driver Licensing &amp; Control Registration &amp; Title Customer Service</td>
<td>Name: Stacy Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:stacyjarias@flhsmv.gov">stacyjarias@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 850-617-2681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice** - updated 8/3/11

The organizational and operational plan to merge the Division of Driver License and Division of Motor Vehicles into the Division of Motorist Services can definitely be considered a "Best Practice". Any state organization having both motor vehicle and driver functions that serve the same customers and have similar functions can be considered to be combined to capitalize on operational efficiencies, which will result in significant cost savings and further enhance customer service. It is recommended a feasibility study be conducted to determine risks and benefits. If the study forecasts favorable results, a merger could pay high dividends in consolidating like functions, reducing staff, streamlining operations and reducing supervisory capacity.

**Implementation Timeframe**

2/15/2011

**Resources Required**

Business, Legal and IT resources

**Lessons Learned**

Streamlined operations, aligned similar tasks and functions and generated significant financial savings.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

N/A
### Description of Best Practice

The Department discovered a number of opportunities to improve the way information is managed and distributed within the various business units and with external partners. Executive Leadership established a team to review the Department’s data exchange practices in order to ensure that appropriate security and accountability exists. The purpose of the Data Exchange Project is to identify all data exchanges occurring between the various business units within the Department and data exchanges occurring with external partners/third parties. Specifically, this project identifies the characteristics of the data, any associated revenues, whether or not a valid MOU exists, and ways to improve the data exchange process. Teams were created to perform the evaluation and analyses of the information being exchanged. These teams consist of representatives from the various business units and IT Department. A new information tracking system is being written to contain all data exchange information, specifically data contracts (MOU), revenue and data privileges.

### Implementation Timeframe

Fiscal Year 2010-2011

### Resources Required

Business, Legal and IT resources

### Lessons Learned

Security and Accountability lessons were learned
### Florida – Frequently Asked Questions for Motor Vehicle Dealers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Discipline:</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Ed Broyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:EdBroyles@flhsmv.gov">EdBroyles@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(850) 617-3171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description of Best Practice

Licensed dealers and prospective dealer applicants can access the Department’s website and get instant answers to their questions regarding the licensing procedures. This is also immensely helpful to the staff of the Department, Tax Collector’s Offices and other state agencies.

#### Implementation Timeframe

90 days

#### Resources Required

Staff research to compile questions and answers that are frequently asked by dealers.

#### Lessons Learned

Think ahead of the needs of dealers and prospective applicants in order to serve them better and move towards technology and progress.

#### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Save on telephone calls and e-mails. Save on valuable staff time and labor that was applied to other areas.
## Georgia – Contact Center Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Revenue</td>
<td>Andrea Smith-Calloway</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrea.Smith-Calloway@DOR.GA.gov">Andrea.Smith-Calloway@DOR.GA.gov</a></td>
<td>404-968-3690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discipline:** Customer Service

**Description of Best Practice**

On Tuesday October 12, 2010, Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue presented the Governor’s Customer Service Awards for 2010. The award for Contact Center Excellence was given to the Georgia Department of Revenue’s Motor Vehicle Citizens Help Desk Contact Center! For 12 consecutive months, the Motor Vehicle Department (MVD) improved their call center performance. Using a model developed by the Governor’s Office of Customer Service, and establishing a task force team of the Director, Human Resources, Call Center management and front-line staff, MVD methodically focused on the people, processes and technology to maximize productivity. The end result was faster service, with less people, while serving more citizens. Motor Vehicle’s Call Center is a leading example of Team Georgia and demonstrating their commitment to Georgian’s by being: COURTEOUS, HELPFUL, ACCESSIBLE, RESPONSIVE and KNOWLEDGEABLE.
Indiana – Central Fulfillment

**Agency:** Bureau of Motor Vehicles  
**Contact Name:** Angela Ballard  
**Discipline:** Registration & Title  
**E mail:** anballard@bmv.IN.gov  
**Phone number:** 317-233-1947

### Description of Best Practice

All vehicle registrations, plates, stickers and watercraft registrations/decals are processed and mailed from a central location to enhance the security and efficiency of registration transactions. Customers will no longer receive these items in the license branch. Processing centrally eliminates the need for inventory management and results in zero excess inventory. Plates are produced on demand (after a transaction is completed), and there is no unused plate inventory in the branches at the end of a plate cycle to be wasted. Central fulfillment also removes the need for the customer to visit a license branch and encourages the use of alternative processing methods (on-line, by mail, by phone) and this reduces branch traffic and longer wait times. The process is also more secure because plate stock is not on hand at the license branch that could be lost or stolen.

### Implementation Timeframe

Started 01/01/2011.

### Lessons Learned

Provide better communication to the public well in advance of the project initiative and be prepared for some backlash in regard to the additional funds required for mailing all plates and registrations (which is less than money saved on inventory).

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

The first two and half months of Central Fulfillment have shown a successful decline in registration renewals processed in a branch. From 01/01/2010 to 03/20/2010: 52% of registration renewals were processed in a license branch and 43% were processed by internet/mail. From 01/01/2011 to 03/20/2011: 30% of registration renewals have been processed in a license branch and 65% have been processed by internet/mail/phone.

**Agency:** Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, License Offices Bureau

**Discipline:** Customer Service

**Contact Name:** Keith Bohl

**Email:** Keith.Bohl@dor.mo.gov

**Phone number:** (573) 526-5123

---

**Description of Best Practice**

All DMVs strive to ensure the best possible customer service to its motor vehicle and driver license customers. To help determine if the Department of Revenue was meeting its customers’ expectations, it:

- Developed a new customer comment card for its walk-in customers to determine how the Central Office staff measure up to their expectations and what can be done to improve customer service;
- Began randomly mailing 250 comment cards each week (postage prepaid) with vehicle titles to solicit customer information;
- Developed a new customer comment card for the license offices to help them determine if the service they provide meets their customers’ expectations;
- Developed an online customer satisfaction survey that’s customized based on customer type for customers who wish to reply via the Internet; and
- Developed a user-friendly, online reporting system so the Motor Vehicle Bureau, Driver License Bureau, and license offices may enter their comment card results online instead of having to manually draft a summary customer satisfaction report each month. The bureaus/license offices are able to print reports (Report Cards) for their offices based on data parameters they enter.

---

**Implementation Timeframe**

October 2009 – September 2010

---

**Resources Required**

Business Users, Testers, Information Technology Programmers

---

**Lessons Learned**

- To get accurate statistics, it’s important to track the number of responses received for each question/rating as some customers don’t provide responses for all the sections of the comment card; and
- Discuss the order in which the ratings appear on the survey (met expectations, exceeded expectations, and did not meet expectations) with users up front and reach a consensus before proceeding.

---

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

- Mailed comment cards to license offices in January 2010
- Online survey went live on March 12, 2010
- Online reporting system went live on September 10, 2010

---

**Comments**

To view the survey, visit our website at: [https://sa.dor.mo.gov/survey1/](https://sa.dor.mo.gov/survey1/)
Missouri – Competitive Bid Process for Awarding License Offices

**Agency:** Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, License Offices Bureau  
**Disciplines:** Driver Licensing & Control  
Registration & Title  

**Contact Name:** Cathy Herigon  
**Email:** Cathy.Herigon@dor.mo.gov  
**Phone number:** (573) 751-3871

**Description of Best Practice**

One of the Department of Revenue’s challenges in 2009 was implementing the new competitive bid process for awarding all 183 license offices throughout the state without any additional staff.

The Division completed many tasks to make this competitive bidding process a success including:

- Creating a schedule to issue six RFPs each week.
- Creating evaluation tools, evaluation summary templates and instructions, and held weekly team leader meetings to ensure uniformity in bid reviews.
- Creating an RFP Evaluation Process Checklist to ensure all steps of the process were transparent and completed in the prescribed order.
- Coordinating release of license office RFP award notification with Office of Administration-Purchasing, the Department’s Public Information Officer, and internal staff.

As of June 17, 2010, all 183 license offices have been awarded through the competitive bid process. Of the 183 awarded offices at that time:

- 101 were awarded to incumbent agents; and
- 82 were awarded to new agents.

Fifty-five of the offices were awarded to not-for-profit or civic organizations.

Under the RFP process, bidders can pledge a return of some portion of their profits to the state. Pledged amounts as of September 15, 2010 were:

- FY-09 - $17,555  
- FY-10 - $722,628  
- FY-11 - $1,038,704

**Implementation Timeframe**

January 2009 – June 2010

**Resources Required**

Department RFP Team Leaders, Department RFP Team Members, Department Public Information Officer, Department Management, General Counsel’s Office, Information Technology Staff, and Office of Administration-Purchasing Buyers

**Lessons Learned**

- The RFP should be extremely “user-friendly” and simple for potential offerors to understand and complete;
- Eliminate any possibility for “guess work” on the part of the potential offerors (consider the use of a fillable form);
• Also eliminate “guess work” on the part of the evaluators when reviewing proposals, to assist in ensuring contract compliance after award;
• Develop evaluation tools and guidelines to ensure consistency amongst all evaluators;
• Document all decisions regarding standards for RFP response evaluations and keep the information updated;
• "Test" the RFP before issuing with someone unfamiliar with the process to ensure understanding;
• Expect the majority of proposals received to not include all the necessary documents and information and allow time to obtain them from the offerors;
• One RFP does not fit all – different requirements for different size offices;
• A member of the General Counsel's office should review all winning proposals prior to award; and
• When determining the number of participants necessary to complete the project, consider areas outside your own department (i.e., ensuring the Office of Administration had enough staff to process the proposals, the highway patrol had enough staff to process background checks, the General Counsel's Office has staff to review winning proposals, etc.).

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

All 183 license offices were awarded through the competitive bid process.
Missouri – Discontinued Outsourcing Imaging

| Agency: Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, Motor Vehicle Bureau & Driver License Bureau | Contact Name: Brad Brester |
| Discipline: Information Technology | Email: Brad.Brester@dor.mo.gov |
| | Phone number: (573) 526-3656 |

**Description of Best Practice**

The Department of Revenue developed an internal workflow application to image convictions, issuance, and reinstatement documents for the Driver License Bureau and to image Title and Registration Intranet Processing System (TRIPS) shipments and notice of sale documents for the Motor Vehicle Bureau instead of outsourcing the work to a vendor. The Department realized a savings of $750,000.

**Implementation Timeframe**

February 2009 – May 2009

**Resources Required**

Project Lead, Vendor, Business Users, Testers, Information Technology Staff

**Lessons Learned**

None

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

All scanned functions were moved in-house from the vendor on May 26, 2009
**Missouri – Eliminated Microfilming in Motor Vehicle Bureau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency</strong></th>
<th>Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, Motor Vehicle Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Registration &amp; Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name</strong></td>
<td>Casey Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E mail</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov">Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number</strong></td>
<td>(573) 751-1030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

The Motor Vehicle Bureau eliminated microfilming and converted to a full-scanning operation on May 28, 2010. (The MVB previously only scanned Title and Registration Intranet Processing System (TRIPS) title transactions and Notice of Sale documents.) In addition to eliminating microfilm for motor vehicle documents, the bureau also began imaging dealer licensing documentation. Maintenance on the microfilmers was discontinued and these units were replaced by two new scanners. Programming was completed by internal and contracted IT staff to ensure document bar codes were in place and applicable work flows created to meet the project completion date.

The Department eliminated microfilming for approximately 388,000 – 792,000 documents annually. These documents are now scanned in-house for easier retrieval access for employees (at their desk top). The scanning operation allows for images to be available within seconds from the scanning retrieval software; versus having to have dedicated staff manually pull required documents from microfilm.

As the document retrieval resources become available, they will be attritioned to other processing areas to assist with backlogs due to budget cuts.

**Implementation Timeframe**

December 2009 – May 2010

**Resources Required**

Project Lead, Business Subject Matter Experts, Testers, Information Technology staff, contracted staff

**Lessons Learned**

None

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Go live date was May 28, 2010
# Missouri – On-Line Notice of Lien (NOL) System Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency</strong></th>
<th>Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, Motor Vehicle Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name</strong></td>
<td>Casey Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov">Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number</strong></td>
<td>(573) 751-1030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Best Practice

The on-line NOL system was modified to include owner and lien holder information contained in the Notice of Sale System and the Motor Vehicle Bureau reject file. The on-line NOL system is used by entities prior to applying for a repossession, abandoned vehicle or mechanic lien title in order to determine current ownership and/or identify any other entity which may have a valid security interest in a vehicle. These enhancements provide additional consumer protection by ensuring all current owners and entities holding a security interest receive appropriate notification from someone attempting to obtain a new certificate of title under the repossession, abandoned vehicle, or mechanic lien title process.

The enhancements reduced the Department’s employee resources required to process rejects and respond to telephone and written inquiries related to the notification process provided by the on-line NOL system. As these resources become available, they are attritioned to other processing areas to assist with backlogs due to budget cuts.

## Implementation Timeframe

July 2009 – October 2009

## Resources Required

Project lead, Business users, Testers, Information Technology Staff

## Lessons Learned

None

## Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Changes were implemented/deployed on October 13, 2009
### Missouri – New Boat Registration Renewal Notice and Boat Registration Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division, Motor Vehicle Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Casey Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov">Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(573) 751-1030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

Boat owners received a new boat and vessel registration renewal notice in 2009. The new folded and secured postcard format is more convenient for customers and resulted in a savings of $14,800.

The Department also began printing the marine registration (pocket card) on the Title and Registration Intranet Processing (TRIPS) receipt versus creating a separate form and mailing to the customer. This resulted in $42,600 in savings.

### Implementation Timeframe

February 2009 – March 2009

### Resources Required

Project Lead, Business Users, Testers, Information Technology Staff, Department Forms Group

### Lessons Learned

None

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

2009 Marine Renewal Notices were issued with the new postcard format
The pocket card started printing on the TRIPS receipt in April 2009.
Missouri – Confidentiality Webinar Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue, Administration Division</th>
<th>Contact Name: Lynn Bexten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Lynn.Bexten@dor.mo.gov">Lynn.Bexten@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: (573) 751-7429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

The Department of Revenue developed a confidentiality webinar for all employees to view. This webinar was a short 15-minute presentation that reminds staff about the importance of maintaining confidentiality and ways to prevent the unauthorized release of information. The Department also created a laptop security webinar for those assigned a laptop on the importance of using a laptop lock, and securing the laptop when traveling.

In addition, the Department has recorded approximately 30 other training courses as webinars. These can be made available at any time to staff without a traditional class being scheduled. License Office personnel throughout the state can view these upon request without the cost associated with traveling to attend a live training session.

**Implementation Timeframe**

November 2009 – January 2010

**Resources Required**

Project Lead, Business Users, Information Technology Staff, Department Training Staff

**Lessons Learned**

Customers need to have speakers to listen to webinars and the latest version of flash player to view the webinar.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

All Department of Revenue employees viewed the confidentiality webinar by February 15, 2010
Missouri – Military Reference Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue, Administration Division</th>
<th>Contact Name: Lynn Bexten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Lynn.Bexten@dor.mo.gov">Lynn.Bexten@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: (573) 751-7429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Best Practice

The Department of Revenue created a Military Reference Guide that provides information to military personnel about tax, motor vehicle, and driver license requirements. The Department also designated a “military liaison” to assist military personnel with questions about Missouri’s requirements in these areas. A link to the guide can be found at: http://dor.mo.gov/military/

In addition to the printed material, representatives from the Department provided presentations to military personnel during yellow ribbon events throughout the state.

Implementation Timeframe

September 2009 – January 2010

Resources Required

Project lead; Subject Matter Experts from the Driver License Bureau, Motor Vehicle Bureau and Taxation Division; Department Forms Group

Lessons Learned

It is important to make sure the subject matter experts are involved in the content.

Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

The guide was posted to the Internet on January 22, 2010
## Montana – ARIDE Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Montana Highway Patrol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Colonel Michael Tooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mitooley@mt.gov">mitooley@mt.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>406-444-3780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

The Montana Highway Patrol started its Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) program in May 2006 sending 3 officers to Phoenix Arizona for two weeks of training. This DRE program has since grown to 20 trained officers with scheduled training in spring 2011 to bring this DRE force to 40 officers. Currently the MHP has four trained DRE’s who gained instructor certification from the Los Angeles Police Department. The MHP also started the ambitious task of training its entire force in Advanced Roadside Impairment Detection (ARIDE). ARIDE is a bridge between Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) and DRE. ARIDE training for MHP started October 2009 and will be finished summer 2011. The MHP will be the first state patrol force in the nation with all of its officers trained in ARIDE. The MHP also employed a Traffic Safety Resource Officer in April 2009 to assist with the SFST, ARIDE and DRE training not only for the MHP but for law enforcement statewide. A large percentage of this training was paid for by a grant from the Montana Department of Transportation, Highway Traffic Safety Office.

### Implementation Timeframe

Summer 2009 to Summer 2011

### Resources Required

DRE Instructors, class room etc......

### Lessons Learned

Was found that troopers were lacking at maintaining proficiency with SFST’s.

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Our DUI Alcohol and DUI Drug arrest’s have increased significantly. DUI Drug arrests have doubled this past year.

### Comments

ARIDE Training has been given to local prosecutors with extremely favorable results. ARIDE Training also includes a legal update.
# New Hampshire – Automated Driver License Testing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong> Division of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th><strong>Contact Name:</strong> Jeff Oberdank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline:</strong> Driver Licensing &amp; Control</td>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> <a href="mailto:Jeffrey.A.Oberdank@dos.nh.gov">Jeffrey.A.Oberdank@dos.nh.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong> 603-227-4203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Best Practice

Converted from paper testing format to an automated touchscreen testing program.

## Implementation Timeframe

120 days from contract signing to implementation.

## Resources Required

Hardware and software personnel as well as program managers from the vendor and division of motor vehicles. Open lines of communication between the vendor and DMV with mandatory weekly meetings to discuss and solve issues.

## Lessons Learned

Embrace technology! After getting over the initial shock of changing the way we have conducted business for decades, the front line personnel have fallen in love with the new system. Having to learn new technologies was the most difficult part. The key to the transition was initial training with lots of follow up support to gain the comfort level needed to succeed.

## Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

After the initial training, administrators would monitor the system for anomalies and lend support as needed. With in 30-45 days of roll out, support was needed very infrequently. To date, we are 1 year into the new system without any major issues to report.

## Comments

Automated testing has proven to be a valuable tool on many fronts. The amount of time we spend with an applicant has been reduced by 50% while adding accuracy. We also have the ability to retrieve reports on just about everything associated with knowledge testing.
New Jersey – Cross-Training of Commercial Bus & School Bus Inspectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Customer Service Vehicle Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Tom Bednarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.bednarz@dot.state.nj.us">tom.bednarz@dot.state.nj.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>1.609.292.6644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

The Motor Vehicle Commission’s Inspection Services Division has merged the Commercial Bus Inspections Unit with the School Bus Inspection Unit, forming one single Bus Inspection Program. This new program was necessary due to the many vacancies in both inspection units that ultimately created staffing shortages and backlogs for our customers. Merging the two bus inspection units allows the MVC to complete the mandated commercial bus and school bus inspections with more flexibility of existing human resources because the inspections can now be performed by all Safety Specialist position titles within the MVC.

**Implementation Timeframe**

12 months

**Resources Required**

MVC Human Resource Division, Local State Unions, NJ Civil Service Commission, and MVC Inspection Services Division

**Lessons Learned**

Benefits of this type of program should be documented in predefined and agreed upon performance measures.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Improve the average number of inspections performed per employee each month
## New Jersey – Project Governance Model

**Agency:** Motor Vehicle Commission (MVC)  
**Contact Name:** Robert Porreca  
**Discipline:** Customer Service  
**E mail:** Robert.porreca@dot.state.nj.us  
**Phone number:** 1.609.341.5791

### Description of Best Practice

The Motor Vehicle Commission established a Project Governance Model to manage the implementation of all key initiatives. The model features a multi-discipline project team outside of the MVC’s organizational chart that helps to facilitate a more efficient and effective project implementation. The goal of the model was to establish clear lines of communication, organize the decision-making process and allow state agency partners to work cohesively throughout the various stages of a project. With a clear line of authority for decision making, the model helps to reduce much of the proverbial “red tape” that afflicts many government projects.

### Implementation Timeframe

Various

### Resources Required

Governor's Office, Treasury, Office of Information Technology, MVC, and various stakeholders

### Lessons Learned

Given the initial success of the Governance Model, the MVC has used it to implement the state’s new Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance contract. The model was also used when developing an RFP for the MVC’s Enhanced Digital Driver Licenses and will be continued as our Enhanced Digital Driver License (EDDL) program progresses. Similar successful outcomes were realized while utilizing the model for our Motor Vehicle Automated Transaction System (MATRX) project, Driver and Road Test Scoring System (DARTTS) project, Sports Plates project, and fee adjustment project.

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Faster project implementation time, fewer project risks, and more projects implemented within or under budget.
# New Jersey – Broader Position Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Robin Liebeskind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robin.liebeskind@dot.state.nj.us">Robin.liebeskind@dot.state.nj.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>1.609.777.2829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

Specific Motor Vehicle Commission employee position titles, such as Customer Service Representative, Support Service Representative, and Exam Technician titles, had been combined to be broadened into a new MVC Technician position title. The change allows for improved employee career growth within the Commission, and increased management’s flexibility to utilize employees where and when they are needed most.

**Implementation Timeframe**

2 years

**Resources Required**

MVC Human Resource Division, Local State Unions, NJ Civil Service Commission, and MVC Agency Services Division

**Lessons Learned**

This was a difficult initiative to implement based on competing interests of the various stakeholders. The net effect, however, was worth the effort and is now viewed positively by all parties involved.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Average transaction costs per man minute have shown a decline
Pennsylvania – Consistent Approach to Processing non-U.S. Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>PennDOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Janet Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline:</strong></td>
<td>Driver Licensing &amp; Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdolan@state.pa.us">jdolan@state.pa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>(717) 787-4701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

Implemented a systematic approach to handling non US citizens by creating a Liaison Office to coordinate information, knowledge, and resources to support handling the complexities of immigration cases, legal presence issues, and product eligibility. Partnerships were developed with outside entities vested in immigration issues such as American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), PA Universities, and PA Refugee Resettlement coordinators. Communication avenues were put in place for knowledge sharing and analysis of issues. Procedures and processes were defined, documented, and tied back to the operational functions of all parties involved through resource information and training of internal staff. All efforts were focused on consistent and systematic processing of non US citizens by developing knowledge and subject matter expertise to ensure our services are understood and accessible by non US citizens residing in Pennsylvania.

**Implementation Timeframe**

July 09 - July 10

**Resources Required**

Liaison Office, external partners, management for decision-making and process implementation

**Lessons Learned**

There is no one place to go to understand the complexities of immigration challenges and issues at a high-level. It requires a facilitated, coordinated approach with various outside entities- then a focused approach on Department-wide impacts and operational processing. It is also not easily defined, documented and understood at all levels throughout DMV organizations. A top-down approach to training was needed to develop subject matter expertise in managers as a support network for counter staff doing daily processing.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Our partners have provided us with positive feedback on the program.

**Comments**

Immigration information is so complex it requires continual monitoring, reviews, and impact assessments as on-going changes occur at the federal level.
Pennsylvania – Mandatory Electronic Lien and Titling (ELT) Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>E mail</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PennDOT</td>
<td>Andy Cleaver</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aceaver@state.pa.us">aceaver@state.pa.us</a></td>
<td>(717) 787-2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

On July 10, 2008, PennDOT implemented a Mandatory ELT Program, ending a voluntary ELT Program, which had been in place for nearly ten years. The Mandatory ELT Program was phased in over a two-year period, beginning with the enactment of legislation on July 10, 2006. The legislation requires all lienholders, with the exception of individuals and lienholders not normally engaged in the business of financing vehicles, to participate in PennDOT’s ELT Program. Participating lienholders must contract with a third party ELT Service Provider in order to establish a connection with PennDOT and facilitate the sending and receiving of electronic vehicle records and lien maintenance information. Currently there are five ELT Service Providers contracted with PennDOT. The issuance of an electronic title allows lienholders to maintain their title records in Pennsylvania electronically. A paper title is not produced until the lienholder performs an electronic transaction to release its lien. PennDOT then prints the title and mails it the next business day to either the vehicle owner, or a dealership or insurance company, depending on who paid off the loan and which electronic transaction was performed by the lienholder.

Lienholders may also convert an ELT to a paper title if there is a legitimate business need, such as a repossession or to forward a paper title to an owner who has moved out of state. Pennsylvania still requires a paper title to assign ownership of a vehicle; however, because a paper title is not produced until it is actually needed, the processes of vehicle record and lien maintenance are much more efficient and cost effective. Common changes or corrections to vehicle records do not require a paper title to be returned to or issued by PennDOT, further enhancing efficiency of the ELT system.

**Implementation Timeframe**

Mandatory ELT was implemented between July 10, 2006, and July 10, 2008.

**Resources Required**

ELT records are issued based on a lienholder table on PennDOT's existing mainframe, and ELT data is sent and received in FTP file transfers nightly. Oversight of the ELT Program was absorbed by existing PennDOT staff, and includes a help desk email account, lienholder enrollment, lienholder account maintenance, service provider contract maintenance and various auditing and compliance monitoring functions.

**Lessons Learned**

1. Partners and stakeholders MUST BE INVOLVED in the planning of implementation.
2. Lienholders, vehicle dealers, and vehicle owners have been generally accepting of the ELT Program requirements.
3. Implementation must be coordinated with agencies that have direct contact with existing records of lienholders (lenders).
4. Each audience (lienholders, vehicle dealers, PennDOT application processing staff, ELT service providers) must have its own specific, detailed document which provides ELT processing rules and procedures.
5. Make available as much information as possible through official DMV website.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Prior to July, 2006, less than 40 percent of Pennsylvania titles with liens were issued as ELT, when participation in the ELT program was voluntary. Currently, PennDOT maintains a monthly average of 95 percent ELT. Currently 3,700 lienholders are participating in Pennsylvania's ELT Program.

**Comments**

Planning and partnering are the keys to implementation success. Auditing and communication have been the keys to making needed changes and improvements. When crafting contracts PennDOT was able to require Service Providers to deal directly with the lienholders in all major ELT Program areas, allowing PennDOT to commit fewer resources, concentrating on discrepancy resolution and auditing.
## Pennsylvania – e-SAFETY Vehicle Safety Inspection Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>PennDOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Vehicle Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Kristen Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:krsinger@state.pa.us">krsinger@state.pa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>717-787-2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

Privately-owned garages that participate in Pennsylvania’s vehicle safety inspection program can electronically enter and transmit vehicle safety inspection data via a web-based application (e-SAFETY). This system replaces the current paper forms used by stations to record and store safety inspection information. e-SAFETY provides stations with online access to vehicle history reports, inspector/station performance reports, inspection sticker usage reports and the ability to track outstanding incomplete records. Customer data is secured electronically, and data collected is also used by the Department to conduct "pre-audits" as a means to streamline on-site audits and reduce interruptions to stations. e-SAFETY data is used to advise stations of their pass/fail rate in relation to other participating stations as well as to track vehicle performance trends. Participating stations receive monthly electronic messages containing helpful tips and program enhancements and have access to a toll-free Station Operator Hotline. Additional enhancements to improve functionality for inspections stations are developed based on feedback from users.

### Implementation Timeframe

A pilot was conducted from May to August 2007 and included 3rd party vendors providing software solutions to transmit data to the e-SAFETY application. The e-SAFETY program was fully implemented in December 2007.

### Resources Required

This web-based system was designed by Pennsylvania's program management contractor (Verizon Business) in consultation with PennDOT staff. Participanting stations need a computer with internet access and a printer.

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

Secure data collection and storage; ability to analyze data to identify vehicle and program trends.

### Comments

While the e-SAFETY system is rich with data, the Department is working on the best method to analyze and use the data for information that can be shared back with the industry and used for improvement.
## Texas – DL Business Intelligence Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Texas Department of Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Driver Licensing &amp; Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Paul Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.watkins@txdps.state.tx.us">paul.watkins@txdps.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>512-424-5413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

DL contracted with Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, to do a business analysis of the driver license operation. This study is designed to tell the Department where our offices should be located, what size they should be, and the staffing required based on population density and the population growth projected over the next ten years. It will also show the service area, by zip code, of the customers who get served in each office area.

### Implementation Timeframe

Study complete end of April 2011.

### Resources Required

IT database, Texas State University

### Lessons Learned

In process

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

In process
## Texas – Driver License Uniforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Texas Department of Public Safety</th>
<th>Contact Names: Lori Melchor / Ron Coleman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:lori.melcher@txdps.state.tx.us">lori.melcher@txdps.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ron.coleman@txdps.state.tx.us">ron.coleman@txdps.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: (512) 424 7652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

Provided uniform polo and long sleeve button up shirts with the driver license logo imbroidered.

### Implementation Timeframe

12 months

### Resources Required

funding for purchase of shirts

### Lessons Learned

Identify a company who can process a high volume of shirts

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

pending

### Comments

still currently in process
**Texas – Web Content Coordinator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Texas Department of Public Safety</th>
<th>Contact Name: Melissa Heald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline:</strong> Customer Service</td>
<td><strong>E mail:</strong> <a href="mailto:melissa.heald@txdps.state.tx.us">melissa.heald@txdps.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong> 512-424-7270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

In January 2011, we hired an Electronic Media Specialist to focus on web communication. We now have a single point-of-contact for all website updates relating to driver license. If an employee has a request for a change or update to the website, they contact the Electronic Media Specialist, and she writes or edits the update, ensuring that our web content is consistent and easy to read. She coordinates any necessary research and follow-up as well.

**Implementation Timeframe**

Currently implemented

**Resources Required**

one FTE

**Lessons Learned**

We’ve found that with having one person review all content, we are able to make sure that our website has a consistent tone and is more user-friendly.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

pending

**Comments**

The Electronic Media Specialist has been helpful in maintaining and updating our web context.
**Virginia – Mobile Customer Service Centers – DMV 2 Go**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name: Ashley Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Ashley.Hall@dmv.virginia.gov">Ashley.Hall@dmv.virginia.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 804-367-6540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

DMV 2 Go, Virginia DMV's "new" mobile customer service center, hit the road in January 2011. DMV 2 Go is a refurbished 32-foot RV that serves as a DMV "office on wheels". This unit utilizes wireless technology to process all DMV transactions including driver’s licenses, identification cards, handicapped parking permits, driver transcripts, vehicle registrations and titles, special plates and address changes. Additionally, DMV 2 Go is equipped with the Virginia State Government Internet Portal which provides customers with information about other state services.

In the past, Virginia DMV utilized several mobile units to provide services throughout Virginia. These units were very popular at a variety of sites including large businesses, naval bases, army bases, shipyards, and colleges and universities. Now that Virginia DMV has re instituted this successful service offering, we are scheduled to provide onsite services across the state throughout 2011. We are currently contacting businesses to form public/private partnerships to expand the services to areas with large employment bases. DMV 2 Go will be a valuable marketing tool for business development entities in Virginia to attract new businesses to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Implementation of a second mobile unit, a refurbished 40-foot Bluebird bus, is targeted for July 2011.

**Implementation Timeframe**

The project was initiated in August 2010 and the unit "hit the road" in January 2011.

**Resources Required**

Three Virginia DMV employees staff this “office on wheels”.

**Lessons Learned**

The unit was refurbished and successfully implemented in a very short period of time. We will continue to monitor its performance.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

This unit was implemented very recently and has been well-received by the public. We will continue to monitor and evaluate its success.

**Comments**

The unit is handicapped accessible, has two customer service terminals as well as two DMV Knowledge Automated Testing Systems (KATS). The unit was constructed using as many "green" features as possible including LED lights powered by solar panels and flooring made from recycled materials.
### Virginia – On-Line PIN Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Charles Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Customer Service Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Charles.Sheldon@dmv.virginia.gov">Charles.Sheldon@dmv.virginia.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>804-367-2869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description of Best Practice

Virginia DMV requires customers to obtain a Personal Identification Number (PIN) to securely conduct certain DMV transactions online or over the phone. Virginia DMV recently upgraded our PIN process to allow customers to initiate and manage their PIN completely online. Previously, customers could request a PIN online, however, to ensure security of customer information, DMV required that the PIN be mailed to customers via USPS. It typically took three to five days for customers to receive their PINs via postal mail which prevented customers from completing their transactions immediately.

The new process allows customers to set up a PIN immediately online. Customers access our secure website and are asked to enter their customer number and date of birth. They are asked five security questions derived directly from their DMV record. Then customers are asked to establish a series of challenge questions selected from several categories so they can manage their Forgot PIN process. Additionally, customers are asked to verify their address and offered to participate in DMV’s eNotification service.

This new process offers customers added convenience, providing them with instantaneous access to complete their online transactions. This process saves DMV money by reducing the paper, production and postage costs associated with the PIN letters and by promoting online services which are less costly and more efficient to administer than other service options.

##### Implementation Timeframe

This new service was implemented in August 2010.

##### Resources Required

This project required involvement from DMV customer service, driver, vehicle, law enforcement and information technology staff. The new process uses our existing mainframe and web infrastructure to generate record-based security questions, record-based challenge questions, and to present the service online to customers.

##### Lessons Learned

- Virginia DMV worked with our IT security, law enforcement, and business and customer service staff to build a secure, yet customer-friendly, process for providing record-based security questions that only the customer should be able to handle. This involved limited (for security purposes) internal usability testing.

- For those customers who may have difficulty with the online record-based questions, Virginia DMV also established a procedure for customers to be initially verified either in person or by telephone by customer service staff. Once validated through a series of questions either in person or by telephone, these customers are issued a temporary PIN that allows them to continue the online process at the next step.

##### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

From implementation in August 2010 through March 21, 2011, we have issued 471,001 PINs to customers. This represents a cost avoidance of $254,341 as we no longer produce and mail paper PIN letters to customers who obtain their PIN online. This service is still relatively new, and the volume of PINs issued appears to be higher than originally anticipated. We are continuing to monitor customer adoption rates and the impact on customer behavior and overall usage of web-based DMV services (e.g. driver license/registration renewals, transcript purchases, account updates).

##### Comments

We recommend keeping the process as simple as possible for customers. During development, it is important to ensure proper oversight of all aspects by information security personnel and to follow web security best practices.
# Virginia – eNotifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name: Charles Sheldon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline: Customer Service Information Technology</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Charles.Sheldon@dmv.virginia.gov">Charles.Sheldon@dmv.virginia.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 804-367-2869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Best Practice

Virginia DMV created a new process for customers to sign up to receive email, text, or phone notifications for DMV services. Customers may sign up online, in a customer service center, or by talking with an agent in our call center. We began offering eNotifications for individual customers for vehicle registration renewals in August 2010. We are planning for implementation of driver license renewal eNotifications with Fall 2011 renewals.

eNotifications offer added convenience for customers, enabling them to choose their preferred methods to receive communications from DMV. eNotifications also result in cost savings for our agency because we produce and mail fewer paper renewal notices. For each paper renewal notice that we now send electronically, we save $0.59 in postage, paper and printing costs.

## Implementation Timeframe

eNotification service for vehicle registration renewals was implemented in August 2010.

## Resources Required

This project involved Virginia DMV customer service, driver, vehicle and information technology staff. The process uses our existing IT infrastructure for delivery of smtp email, SMS texts, and our PBX for autodialing and processing of voice messages.

## Lessons Learned

It was critical for us to develop a comprehensive customer acceptance policy to ensure compliance with Virginia privacy statutes and policies. It was also important to ensure this policy was broad enough to allow for changes or additions to the eNotification services we may offer in the future. Within our process, customers opt-in to receive eNotifications for all services Virginia DMV deems to offer as opposed to allowing customers to select individual services. This provides greater flexibility for Virginia DMV offerings while avoiding a potentially complex service management process for both customers and the agency.

By tying the eNotification opt-in process to our PIN logon process, we have observed higher customer adoption rates and earlier cost savings than we would have expected to see if we had offered eNotification opt-in as a stand alone process that was marketed separately.

Prior to the expiration date of a customer’s credential, customers receive eNotifications at multiple intervals if they have not yet renewed their credential or taken the requested action. This practice is customer-friendly and provides customers with several reminders to promote awareness of the DMV requirements they must fulfill.

It is important to verify individual SMS distribution rules with all affected Telecomm carriers as practices and results vary considerably.
We also recommend allowing customers to receive eNotifications via multiple channels (text/email/phone) simultaneously to account for additional delivery reliability issues when distributing through private third party networks (ISP, Telecomms, etc.)

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

From implementation in August 2010 through March 21, 2011, 346,530 customers have signed up to receive eNotifications by email, phone and text. This represents a cost avoidance of $204,453 as we no longer produce and mail paper renewal notices to customers who opt-in for eNotifications. These eNotification services are still relatively new, however, the results for customer adoption are higher than originally anticipated. We are still studying the impact of this process on customer behavior and overall usage of DMV web-based services (e.g. driver license/registration renewals, transcript purchases, account updates).
**Virginia – Print-on-Demand Temporary Tags**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name: Michael Menefee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline:</strong> Registration &amp; Title</td>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> <a href="mailto:michael.menefee@dmv.virginia.gov">michael.menefee@dmv.virginia.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong> (804) 367-8973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Best Practice**

Through a private-public partnership, Print-On-Demand (PoD) technology was developed and provided as an enhanced service to licensed dealers. Through the use of PoD, licensed dealers are able to print 30-day temporary tags "on demand" through the convenience of their own equipment. This eliminates the need for dealers to visit Virginia DMV's Customer Services Centers to purchase the traditional cardboard temporary tags or for dealers to store these tags.

PoD is also a benefit for law enforcement officials and Virginia DMV. PoD provides law enforcement officials with instant access to up-to-date vehicle owner information during traffic stops (which was not available with the traditional cardboard tags) and deters fraud. PoD also eliminates the need for Virginia DMV to produce, inventory and distribute the cardboard tags, thereby reducing agency costs.

Currently, under the private-public partnership, three vendors offer PoD to licensed dealers and a fourth vendor is expected to be added in the near future.

**Implementation Timeframe**

PoD began operations in December 2009, when the technology was deployed to the first group of dealers. In April of 2010, Virginia DMV notified affected stakeholders we were requiring all licensed dealers who issue 30-day temporary tags to sign-up with a PoD vendor no later than May 1, 2011. Ultimately, all licensed dealers will issue temporary tags printed "on demand" from their own equipment in lieu of the traditional cardboard temporary tags.

**Resources Required**

During development, PoD required the resource knowledge of stakeholders; our Motor Vehicle Dealer Board; and Virginia DMV’s communications, financial management, information technology, law enforcement, procurement and vehicle services staff.

**Lessons Learned**

In order to address the possibility of a connectivity outage between DMV and an approved PoD vendor, DMV is enhancing PoD through the development of a “pre-assigned” capability. This newest capability will enable licensed dealers to print 30-day temporary tags "on demand" even if connectivity is disrupted between DMV and a PoD vendor.

**Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)**

Since PoD began operations, more than 875 dealers have been installed with the technology. In addition, these particular dealers have printed over 120,000 30-day temporary tags “on-demand” from their own equipment.
## Washington – Automated License Plate Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>Washington State Patrol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplines:</strong></td>
<td>Law Enforcement, Motor Carrier Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Captain Darrin Grondel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E mail:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:darrin.grondel@wsp.wa.gov">darrin.grondel@wsp.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>360-596-3801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Best Practice

Washington State has been proactive in the design, development, and deployment of technologies to enable more targeted inspections of commercial vehicles to keep traffic moving and minimize disruptions in travel and commerce. The technologies also play an important role in improving safety on the state’s roadways.

Throughout June of 2010, the Washington State Patrol (WSP) and Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Expanded Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Project teamed up to deploy an Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) system. The ALPR has leveled the playing field for the automated sorting of commercial vehicles both with and without transponders on the primary roadways.

### Implementation Timeframe

Development and testing took approximately one year before the ALPR was fully deployed at eleven CVISN equipped scale sites.

### Resources Required

The ALPR system uses SpikeHDTM integrated ALPR system from PIPS Technology coupled with software developed in-house it is fully integrated into the existing WSDOT CVISN system.

### Lessons Learned

Acquiring license plate data and developing the software to identify 11 different jurisdictions demanded a close working relationship with PIPS Technology software developers. Washington State is the only state having the ability to identify 11 jurisdictions screening on the CMVs on the mainline.

### Benchmarking / Success Measurement(s)

The ALPR system gives Washington the opportunity to provide more targeted inspections by checking all commercial vehicles automatically against a commercial vehicle database as they approach the weigh station. The system then provides WSP Officers with all available vehicle information. Using this system to make more intelligent decisions about which vehicles warrant a more targeted inspection, Washington is able to more quickly assess the commercial traffic flowing through checkpoints to minimize delays for vehicles with good safety and maintenance histories.

The ALPR is able to correctly identify 11 different jurisdictions.

The ALPR has also been instrumental in the officer’s ability to identify Hours of Service violations and remove fatigued drivers off Washington’s roadways. Using the ALPR to verify scale crossings, officers have dramatically increased enforcement of False Record of duty status. As an example, Washington’s Bow Hill Port of Entry, near the Canadian border, reports for all of February 2011 officers identified a total of 24 log book violations. Between March 4 - 16 officers have identified 61 drivers who have made false hours of service entries in their log book. This is a 154% increase for hours of service violations.
## Alabama – Motor Vehicle Title, Registration and Insurance Portal (MVTRIP)

| **Agency** | Alabama Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle Division |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name</strong></td>
<td>Jay Starling, Registration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov">jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number</strong></td>
<td>(334) 242-9078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

The Motor Vehicle Title, Registration and Insurance Portal (MVTRIP) allows motor vehicle administrators to access vehicle title, registration and insurance systems over the internet using a single userid and password. This project also creates a repository for in-depth analysis and queries for motor vehicle administrators.

### Comments:

The portal was developed by the University of Alabama Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS). CAPS is a unit of the University of Alabama Computer Science Department whose mission is to create innovative solutions through IT research and cutting-edge software development in order to enhance the public safety and security of the State of Alabama. Because CAPS is part of a public university, it has access to the latest cutting edge equipment, software and talent to provide the ultimate state-of-the-art solutions. CAPS has developed some of the most advanced law enforcement support software systems that exist, including Alabama Communications and Operations Portal (Alacop), Electronic Citations Generation and Processing System (eCite), and Electronic Crash Reporting System (eCrash).
## Alabama – Motor Vehicle Division iPhone Application

| Agency: | Alabama Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle Division | Contact Name: | Jay Starling, Registration Manager |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov">jay.starling@revenue.alabama.gov</a></td>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(334) 242-9078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

In January 2011, the Motor Vehicle Division launched its free iPhone application. This application allows vehicle owners to search and order personalized plates messages on the license plate of their choice. The application also has a search feature that can be used to locate county licensing officials’ offices and even provides maps and driving instructions to the officials’ offices. Additionally, the application features a “frequently asked questions” menu addressing motor vehicle registration, title, International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA), International Registration Plan (IRP), and mandatory liability insurance areas, as well as an index of related motor vehicle forms. The iPhone application provides users access to the same motor vehicle information that is available on the department’s Web site.

The major benefit of the new, free application is that individuals who may not have access to a computer can now use their iPhones, iPod Touch, or iPads to contact the department’s Motor Vehicle Division via email.

### Comments:

The Center for Advanced Public Safety (CAPS) at the University of Alabama created the application for the ADOR For more information about Alabama DMV visit http://itunes.apple.com/en/app/alabama-dmv/id399424940.it. CAPS is a unit of the University of Alabama Computer Science Department whose mission is to create innovative solutions through IT research and cutting-edge software development in order to enhance the public safety and security of the State of Alabama. Because CAPS is part of a public university, it has access to the latest cutting edge equipment, software and talent to provide the ultimate state-of-the-art solutions.
## Florida – Communications – Alerts - Newsletters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name: Stan Kirkland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:stan.kirkland@flhsmv.gov">stan.kirkland@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number: 850-617-2902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

The Department continues to place an emphasis on effective communications to its members and stakeholders. In doing so, the Department has developed an Alert System and an Intersection Newsletter. The alert system is a simple but effective tool utilized as needed to inform members of members being promoted into new positions, deaths of members or their immediate family, new procedures or other general information. This quick and simple means of distributing information is a valuable yet simple way to keep members informed of events and situations that occur.

The Department has recently combined four different newsletters into one newsletter called the "Intersection". This newsletter is aimed at agency members, Tax Collector staff and third party providers who contract services with the Department. The Newsletter utilizes articles to communicate a wide variety of information. Information such as events the Department or members participated in or upcoming events, member awards, milestones, and a wide variety of informative articles for the readers enjoyment.

In both cases, the Alert System and the Intersection Newsletter are excellent tools used to keep members and vendors informed.
Florida – Expansion of Issuance to Agents

Agency: Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles

Contact Name: Stan Kirkland

Email: stankirkland@flhsmv.gov

Phone number: 850-617-2902

Description of Project or Legislation:

The Florida Legislature enacted a provision to require all State run driver license offices to be phased into existing county Tax Collector Offices statewide (excluding Dade, Brevard and Volusia counties) by 2015. This will facilitate "One Stop Shopping" by allowing customers to visit one office to conduct both driver and vehicle services (driver license issuance and title/registration issuance). The Department will save approximately $20 million dollars once implemented. The savings is derived by reducing staff and eliminating leases. This is a win-win situation as tax payers will experience significant financial savings as well as enhanced customer service.
Description of Project or Legislation:

Law enforcement agencies have special cars equipped to read license plates and match those plate numbers against a list of tag numbers of suspended/revoked drivers. The software automatically sets off an alert when one is detected. Some agencies using this technology are reporting anywhere from a 100% to 500% increase in stops of suspended/revoked drivers. And all report that being able to make these stops has also lead to increased arrests for persons with outstanding warrants, including drug offenses. FL HSMV participates in enhancing the effectiveness this license plate reader software by providing tag numbers suspended/revoked drivers to the law enforcement agencies on a regular basis.

Comments:

Florida Department of Law Enforcement coordinates the distribution of the files provided by FL HSMV. Additionally, FDLE provides tags of stolen cars and wanted felons, in addition to the files provided by HSMV.
Florida – Outsourcing Paper Crash Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name: Maureen Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:maureenjohnson@flhsmv.gov">maureenjohnson@flhsmv.gov</a></td>
<td>Phone number: 850-617-2586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Outsourcing of PAPER CRASH REPORTS:
The Department will terminate their contract with PRIDE to code paper crash reports on 6/30/2011, saving the Department an estimated yearly cost of $275,000. An Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) will be posted by 3/11/2011, to obtain offers from qualified firms to transfer data from paper crash reports to an electronic format. The Department is seeking a no-cost contract to fully utilize technology and more efficiently increase public access to crash records. The contract will require the vendor to code and scan traffic crash reports into a database and offer them for sale to the public via the Internet. A daily transfer of the crash reports entered and a log of the crash reports sold, along with the fees will also be required. The Department currently sells bulk crash data to the public though an email and check received process. The vendor may sell this bulk crash data to the public through the Internet thus enhancing customer service. The vendor will provide an analytical tool on its website for the public, law enforcement personnel and the Department to request on demand queries for specific crash data elements by month and county. The final request of the vendor is to tabulate and analyze all crash reports and compile and publish statistical information gathered from the long form crash reports submitted by state and local law enforcement agencies in the annual Traffic Crash Statistics Report as required by statute. The implementation date of this project is 7/1/2011.
## Georgia – Intrastate Motor Carrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>Department of Revenue</th>
<th><strong>Contact Name:</strong> Andrea Smith-Calloway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov">Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>404-968-3690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

Georgia Intrastate Motor Carrier is required for Georgia motor carriers (anyone providing motor vehicle transportation for compensation) who operate motor vehicles between points within the state of Georgia (intrastate). This is effective for 2011.

### Comments:

Available for web registration at www.cvisn.dor.ga.gov/Welcome/GIMC
**Georgia – Trip Permits On-Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue Motor Vehicle Division</th>
<th>Contact Name: Andrea Smith-Calloway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov">Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 404-968-3690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

The Georgia Department of Revenue sought to make Trip Permits available directly to their Motor Carrier customers and ensure proper review is taken in regard to the safety of vehicles traveling into the jurisdiction through compliance with SAFER/PRISM.

You may now purchase the following TRIP PERMITS on the Georgia Trucking Portal:

An IRP Trip Permit is required when a vehicle needs to travel through Georgia and the vehicle meets the criteria for apportioned registration under International Registration Plan (IRP), but does not have an apportioned registration for Georgia. Valid for 72 hours at $30 a permit.

A Motor Fuel Use Tax Permit is required when a qualified vehicle needs to travel through Georgia and the vehicle meets the criteria for International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) but either has not received or does not have IFTA credentials. Valid for 10 days at $16 a permit.

A Hunter’s Trip Permit is required when a vehicle needs to travel in order to find work within the state of Georgia. This permit is for unladen vehicles only. Valid for 7 days for $30 a permit.
Georgia – Trucking Portal

| **Agency:** | Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle Division |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Andrea Smith-Calloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov">Andrea.Smith-Calloway@dor.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>404-968-3690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

The Georgia Trucking Portal is designed to offer our motor carrier customers a one-stop shopping experience. Our Home Page offers information to assist motor carriers in conducting their motor carrier business with the State of Georgia. The motor carrier customer can access the applications required to obtain credentials (UCR-Unified Carrier Registration, GIMC-Georgia Intrastate Motor Carrier, IRP-International Registration Plan, IFTA-International Fuel Tax Act, OS/OW-Oversize/Overweight Permits, IRP/IFTA/Hunters Permits) from a single location.

**Comments:**

www.cvisn.dor.ga.gov
| **Agency:** Secretary of State Vehicle Services | **Contact Name:** Mary Riseling |
| **Email:** MRiseling@ilsos.net | **Phone number:** 217-524-1166 |

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Illinois has introduced Chicago Blackhawks, Chicago Cubs, Chicago White Sox, Chicago Bulls and Chicago Bears Specialty License Plates.

**Comments:**

Negotiations with the individual sports teams and the respective oversight authority (i.e., National Hockey League, National Baseball League, etc.) were held regarding the use of the franchise name and symbols. The Chicago Blackhawks, who won the Stanley Cup in 2010, has become one of the top three selling license plates in Illinois. The money raised from and of these specialty plates is deposited into the Illinois Common School Fund.
# Illinois – Driver Education Electronic Application

| Agency: | Secretary of State  
| Driver Services |
| Contact Name: | Deborah Fleck |
| Email: | dfleck@ilsos.net |
| Phone number: | 217-782-2952 |

## Description of Project or Legislation:

This project establishes a secure private area on the Illinois Secretary of State website for access by all participating Illinois public high schools' driver education departments. This new system provides on-line access for the electronic input of students' information, the creating of a driving record, and the printing, at the school, of a customized bar-coded instruction permit application. This bar-coded application, when scanned at the local DMV, will populate all applicable screens thus significantly reducing keystrokes required by the DMV employee, decreasing production time and ultimately producing a more accurate and error free document.

## Comments:

Phase II of this process will be to discontinue the driver education instructors administering paper written tests to each student and allow these tests to be administered electronically, via the secured website, in the classroom utilizing this same system.
Illinois – Emergency Contact Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Secretary of State Vehicle Services</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
<th>Mary Riseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MRiseling@ilsos.net">MRiseling@ilsos.net</a></td>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>217-524-1166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Project or Legislation:

In 2009, the IL Secretary of State established the Emergency Contact Database (ECD) due to the passage of legislation. Any Illinois resident with a DL or ID may electronically supply contact information for up to two persons to be notified by law enforcement in the case of a medical emergency or traffic crash. Law enforcement accesses the emergency contact information through the Illinois State Police LEADS program. In January 2011, the ECD will expand to allow for a person to register any type of special medical need or disability.

Comments:

Because we only provide for electronic registration on the ECD, our start up and expansion costs have been kept to a minimum. We promote the program through facility signs and information on the vehicle registration renewal. We have targeted specific populations for registration including the trucking industry and motorcycle riders. We have also utilized law enforcement to push the program at their community events. Because the senior citizen population are the least likely to have a computer in their home, we have partnered with AARP and the Illinois Department on Aging to assist in promoting the program.
### Illinois – No Fee Identification Cards for the Homeless

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact Name:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Email:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone number:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State Vehicle Services</td>
<td>Mary Riseling</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MRiseling@ilsos.net">MRiseling@ilsos.net</a></td>
<td>217-524-1166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

In 2010, the Illinois Secretary of State’s office established a no-fee identification card for homeless residents due to the passage of legislation.

**Comments:**

Homeless persons must meet all of the same identification requirements as that of a non-homeless person EXCEPT for residence. In place of proof of residence, the person must present a Homeless Status Certification form that has been executed and notarized by the homeless shelter or agency where the homeless person is receiving services. The address of the homeless shelter or agency becomes the address used on the face of the DL or ID Card. We are working with the shelters and agencies to combat any fraud situations and the SOS has the ability to refuse service from a shelter or agency that does not follow the rules with regard to the Homeless Status Certification form.
### Illinois – Procurement and Ethics Reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Terri Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:TCoombes@ilsos.net">TCoombes@ilsos.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>217-782-0115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

Legislation that mandates strict reporting of any contact with business associations that may provide services or are providing services to the Illinois Secretary of State’s Office.

### Comments:

In 2010, legislation was passed that places strict reporting requirements on state employees and business associations doing business or wanting to do business in Illinois. This legislation mandates that any communication between a state employee and an outside business association promoting a product, wishing to do business (outside the regular bid process) or currently doing business with the agency where the state employee is employed must be reported. Both the business and the state employee are required to report any communication. Communication includes telephone calls, e-mails, other written correspondence or person to person conversations between the state employee and the business association.
### Indiana – Central Processing – Transferring Transactions Out of the Branches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Bureau of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Angela Ballard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anballard@bmv.IN.gov">anballard@bmv.IN.gov</a></td>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>317-233-1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Transferring transactions out of the branch to the Central Office. Company titles and registrations, Salvage titles, new MVIN applications, and Municipal titles and registrations are all processed through the Central Office. The goal is to reduce customer traffic in the branches and to take the more complicated transactions out of the branches. Both allow for shorter wait times and more efficient processing.
## Indiana – Phone Registration Renewal System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>Angela Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:anballard@bmv.IN.gov">anballard@bmv.IN.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 317-233-1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Customers have the option to process their registration renewals by phone. We previously allowed for renewal by internet or mail. The new option provides customers with another alternative to visiting a license branch. This helps to reduce wait times and customer traffic in the branches allowing for more efficient service.
**Minnesota - Driver’s License DWI Administrative Sanctions Initiative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Agency:</em></th>
<th>Minnesota Department of Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Contact Name:</em></td>
<td>Patricia McCormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Email:</em></td>
<td><a href="mailto:patricia.mccormack@state.mn.us">patricia.mccormack@state.mn.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phone number:</em></td>
<td>(651) 201-7580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

In the spring of 2008, the Department of Public Safety (DPS) launched the *Minnesota Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions (DLAS) Initiative* to examine and improve Minnesota’s system of sanctions associated with impaired (drunk) driving. The purpose of the initiative was to:

- Describe a system of driver’s license administrative sanctions and incentives and supporting strategies that can most effectively be used to reduce impaired driving fatalities and injuries, and increase the number of people driving legally and responsibly.

See appendix A for full report on Minnesota’s Driver License DWI Administrative Sanctions Initiative.
# Missouri – New Driver License Contract Awarded

| Agency: | Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
Driver License Bureau |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Norma Hensiek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Norma.Hensiek@dor.mo.gov">Norma.Hensiek@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(573) 526-2555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

On October 4, 2010, the Missouri Department of Revenue issued a new driver license contract to L-1 Secure Credentialing, Inc. The Department will be converting its current over-the-counter licensing process to a central issuance process. The Missouri project team (business and IT) has been assigned and will soon be meeting with the vendor to discuss implementation of the new driver licensing process, equipment, and card design.

**Comments:**

Discussions still need to take place with the vendor, but the Department hopes to begin a phased-in rollout in November 2011 to all 183 license offices throughout the state.
Missouri – House Bill 62 – Texting While Driving

**Agency:** Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
Driver License Bureau

**Contact Name:** Tracy Robertson

**Email:** Tracy.Robertson@dor.mo.gov

**Phone number:** (573) 526-2555

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

This legislation was implemented August 28, 2009. It prohibits drivers 21 and younger from sending, reading, or writing a text or electronic message by means of a hand-held electronic wireless communication device while operating a motor vehicle on the highways of Missouri. This is a two-point assessable violation that is added to the driver’s record. Since implementation and through September 2, 2010, the Driver License Bureau has received 39 texting while driving convictions.

**Comments:**

Legislation was introduced in the 2010 General Assembly session to remove the age limit; however, the legislators did not pass the bill.
## Missouri – Senate Bills 930 & 947 – Ignition Interlock Requirements

| **Agency:** | Department of Revenue  
|             | Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
|             | Driver License Bureau | **Contact Name:** | Tracy Robertson |
|             |                      | **Email:** | Tracy.Robertson@dor.mo.gov |
|             |                      | **Phone number:** | (573) 526-2555 |

### Description of Project or Legislation:

This legislation was implemented on July 1, 2009. Any person suspended, revoked, or denied for a second or subsequent alcohol-related offense is required to install an Ignition Interlock Device (IID) on all vehicles operated, prior to being issued a Restricted Driving Privilege (RDP), a Limited Driving Privilege (LDP), or reinstatement. The device must be installed for the duration of the RDP or LDP and/or for six months from the reinstatement date.

The court may order the installation of an IID on a first alcohol offense, but is required to order the device on any second or subsequent alcohol offense. The court must require the device to be installed for a minimum of six months from the date of reinstatement, but may require installation for a time period longer than six months.

The IID must be:
- Certified by the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT);
- Installed on all vehicles operated; and
- Serviced/calibrated by the manufacturer/installer every month during the required installation period.

Proof of installation is reported electronically to the Driver License Bureau by the manufacturer. The bureau also receives electronic notification when a person fails to have a device serviced monthly or when the device is “de-installed” (removed).

This law was retroactive for any applicable actions that had not been reinstated prior to the implementation date. On the date the law was implemented, a system sweep was conducted and 194,226 ignition interlock indicators were set at that time. During FY10, 20,288 additional indicators were set.

### Comments

Additional ignition interlock information may be found at: [http://dor.mo.gov/drivers/ldp.php#iid](http://dor.mo.gov/drivers/ldp.php#iid)
**Missouri – Enhanced Security Vehicle Registration Tabs**

| Agency: | Department of Revenue  
|         | Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
|         | Motor Vehicle Bureau |  
| Contact Name: | Casey Garber |  
| Email: | Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov |  
| Phone number: | (573) 751-1030 |  

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

The Department of Revenue is producing “enhanced security tabs” aimed at stopping tab theft from motor vehicles. The enhanced security tab on demand makes license plate tab theft more difficult due to the printing of the unique vehicle license plate number directly on the tab at the time of registration. The new format enables law enforcement to quickly and easily detect whether the tab on the vehicle belongs with the license plate. In addition to reducing tab theft, the enhanced security tabs on demand provide more efficient license office operations with less tab inventory tracking/reconciliation by the Central Office and the license office staff.

The Department conducted an Enhanced Security Vehicle Registration Tabs pilot program from August 21, 2009 through May 31, 2010, issuing 154,955 tabs. Under a new RFP, a three-year contract was awarded on May 10, 2010. The new contractor implemented enhanced security tabs in the Central Office and four St. Louis offices on June 7, 2010. St. Louis offices were targeted because tab theft crime is more common in this area of the state.

On October 4, 2010 the Department expanded the issuance of Enhanced Security Vehicle Registration Tabs to five Kansas City area license offices.

In addition to those offices already issuing Enhanced Security Vehicle Registration Tabs, four Springfield area license offices are scheduled to implement the program on November 1, 2010.

**Comments:**

Additional enhanced security tab information may be found at: [http://dor.mo.gov/motorv/enhancedtabs/](http://dor.mo.gov/motorv/enhancedtabs/)
Missouri – On-Line Vehicle Plate Renewal Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Department of Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Casey Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov">Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(573) 751-1030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Project or Legislation:

The Department of Revenue redesigned the Missouri Online Registration Exchange (MORE) vehicle plate renewals, renaming the system “plates.mo.gov.” It may be accessed directly at [http://plates.mo.gov](http://plates.mo.gov). Improvements include an updated appearance, quicker navigation, and fewer steps for customers to follow.

Key improvements:

- This new system can be used up to the last day that a vehicle registration expires. Previously, customers were advised that if they were within ten days of their vehicle registration expiring they should visit a local license office to renew their license plates.
- Generates a temporary vehicle registration receipt that is valid for up to 30 days, or upon receipt of plates or tabs in the mail. Law enforcement will honor the receipt.
- The Department’s public telephone system now has recorded messages encouraging customer to utilize the online system.
- The customers are now provided enhanced security tabs that display their unique license plate number.
- Transactions for all terrain vehicles, trailers, and past due registrations with the $5 penalty assessed are now allowed to be processed online.

Comments:

Before these improvements were made, less then 1% of our customers were using the online process. We are now seeing more than a 6% system usage.
**Missouri – National Motor Vehicle Title Information System**

| **Agency:** | Department of Revenue  
|             | Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
|             | Motor Vehicle Bureau | **Contact Name:** Karen Dudenhoeffer |
| **Email:**  | [Karen.Dudenhoeffer@dor.mo.gov](mailto:Karen.Dudenhoeffer@dor.mo.gov) | **Phone number:** (573) 751-8749 |

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

On August 30, 2010, Missouri went live with NMVTIS for online, real-time title inquiries and nightly batch updates. Department staff began working on the business requirements and holding bi-weekly conference calls with AAMVA staff in November 2009. Staff worked diligently to clean up its records prior to the initial load to eliminate as many errors as possible. Due to these efforts, the following results were realized, which equates to a .07% error rate:

**Brand File:**
- 1,629,015 files uploaded
- 141 errors

**VIN File:**
- 12,699,070 files uploaded
- 10,541 errors

**Comments:**

The Department prepared a press release and sent letters its title service agencies notifying them that Missouri would now be using the new federal database for inquiries before issuing titles. Notification was also posted on the web at: [http://dor.mo.gov/motorv/nmvtis/](http://dor.mo.gov/motorv/nmvtis/)
# Missouri – House Bill 683 – Motor Vehicle Safety Inspection Changes

| **Agency:** | Department of Revenue  
|  | Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
|  | Motor Vehicle Bureau | **Contact Name:** | Casey Garber |
|  |  | **Email:** | Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov |
|  |  | **Phone number:** | (573) 751-1030 |

## Description of Project or Legislation:

Effective January 1, 2010, motor vehicles in Missouri are now exempt from the safety inspection requirement for the first five years following the model year of manufacture. This is true regardless of whether or not a change of ownership occurs during this timeframe. Example: a 2006 vehicle is exempt from the safety inspection in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

An estimated 65,000 vehicles are exempt from having to get safety inspections in 2010 because of the enactment of this new law. Safety inspections of school buses and interstate commercial vehicles were not affected by the new law.

## Comments:

Additional information regarding the motor vehicle safety inspection exemption may be found at: [http://dor.mo.gov/motory/help.php](http://dor.mo.gov/motory/help.php)
Missouri – Senate Bill 630 – Conveyance of a Manufactured Home to Real Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name: Steve Ahlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Steve.Ahlers@dor.mo.gov">Steve.Ahlers@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number: (573) 751-8749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Senate Bill 630 modifies various provisions pertaining to manufactured homes and allows for the conveyance of manufactured homes from personal property to real property. To convert a manufactured home into real property from personal property, the manufactured home must be permanently affixed to a permanent foundation, an affidavit of affixation must be recorded with the recorder of deeds, and various documents must be filed with the Department of Revenue. After the manufactured home becomes deemed real property, it is subject to all the requirements applicable to real property, rather than the provisions regulating manufactured homes as personal property.

To convert a manufactured home from real property back into personal property, an affidavit of severance must be filed with the recorder of deeds attesting that the home has been removed from its permanent foundation and application for title with supporting documents filed with the Department. The legislation includes provisions governing how severances and affixations impact security interests or liens on the manufactured home.

This legislation is effective March 1, 2011.
Missouri - House Bill 1692 – Outboard Motor Titles to Display “Model Year-New” and “Year Manufactured”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue</th>
<th>Contact Name: Steve Ahlers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Steve.Ahlers@dor.mo.gov">Steve.Ahlers@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number: (573) 751-8749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

This legislation requires that a certificate of title for an outboard motor list the year the motor was manufactured as “Year Manufactured” and the year the dealer received the new outboard motor from the manufacturer as “Model Year-New.”

Currently, dealers receive outboard motors from the manufacturer that may have been manufactured a year or more before the date of sale. This causes the consumer to question the price of the outboard motor as the motor appears old when in fact it is new and has never been titled. In addition, some banks are reluctant to loan 100% of the value of a unit that was built in a previous year and not sold until several years later.

This legislation is effective January 1, 2011.
# Missouri - House Bills 1695, 1742 & 1674
## Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) Law Changes

| **Agency:** | Department of Revenue  
| Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
| Driver’s License Bureau | **Contact Name:** Gayla Mangels |
| **Email:** Gayla.Mangels@dor.mo.gov | **Phone number:** (573) 526-2555 |

### Description of Project or Legislation:

House Bill 1695, effective August 28, 2010, changes the laws regarding repeat alcohol offenders and drivers with high blood-alcohol levels, including the laws that affect a person’s driving privilege. Among other changes, the new law:

- Creates a centralized reporting database to track all driving-while-impaired offenses, from arrest to disposition;
- Prevents municipal courts from hearing an intoxication-related case if the offender has two or more “intoxicated-related” offenses, or two or more “alcohol-related” offenses;
- Establishes DWI courts to facilitate treatment for repeat offenders and drivers with high blood-alcohol levels;
- Establishes criteria for qualifying participants and graduates of a DWI court program to obtain a court-ordered limited driving privilege; and
- Prohibits a first alcohol-related driving offense from being expunged from a person’s record if the person has another alcohol-related contact on record, or another alcohol-related action pending.

### Comments:

To review the most frequently asked questions about how this law affects a person’s driving privilege, visit our website at: [http://dor.mo.gov/faq/drivers/dwi.php](http://dor.mo.gov/faq/drivers/dwi.php)
# Missouri – Dangerous Driver Alert

| **Agency** | Department of Revenue  
|            | Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
|            | Drivers License Bureau | **Contact Name**: Brad Brester |
| **Email**: | Brad.Brester@dor.mo.gov | **Phone number**: (573) 526-3656 |

## Description of Project or Legislation:

The Department is researching the possibility of creating a web application that would allow the public to enter certain information into a database programmed to display the driving status of individuals who have lost their driving privilege. It is perceived that the public nature of this information would discourage suspended and revoked drivers from driving.

## Comments:

Implementation is yet to be determined.
Missouri – Driver Privacy Protection Act (DPPA) Compliance Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Department of Revenue</th>
<th>Contact Name: Casey Garber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov">Casey.Garber@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number: (573) 751-1030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

From December 2009 through April 2010, the Department of Revenue provided fictitious records to bulk motor vehicle record purchasers to determine if personal information contained in the files were used for any solicitation purposes. This action resulted in receipt of a “Warranty – Final Coverage Notice.” After further investigation, it was determined the solicitation was conducted by one of the Department’s record purchasers. The Department immediately terminated the purchaser’s access to any further bulk record information as it violated its agreement by exceeding the permitted use of personal information.

The Department plans to periodically provide fictitious records to its customers as an audit avenue to ensure the purchasers of the bulk records are protecting the personal information of Missouri’s record holders and strictly following the federal DPPA.
Missouri – Recertification of Driver Privacy Protection Act (DPPA)  
Security Access Codes

| Agency: | Department of Revenue  
Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Division  
Motor Vehicle Bureau | Contact Name: | Karen Dudenhoeffer |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Karen.Dudenhoeffer@dor.mo.gov">Karen.Dudenhoeffer@dor.mo.gov</a></td>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(573) 751-8749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Missouri law requires the Department of Revenue to disclose any information regarding drivers and motor vehicle owners that is permitted to be disclosed under the federal DPPA. The Department requires persons who request such information to apply for a DPPA security access code. We have recently undertaken recertification of all current access code holders to ensure that they still qualify under the law to receive the information.

The Department is mailing letters monthly to different batches of current access code holders, requiring them to reapply for access. If a recipient does not respond within a specified timeframe, access is automatically inactivated. We should be finished with the recertification process by the end of 2010, and going forward, those who wish to continue receiving records containing personal information will be required to recertify with the Department on an annual basis.

**Comments:**

Calendar Year 2010 (January – August) results thus far:  
- Letters mailed – 7,254  
- Recertifications approved – 2,186  
- Codes cancelled – 3,657
# New Jersey – Driver and Road Test Scoring System (DARTSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>New Jersey Motor Vehicle Commission</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
<th>Mike Cox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.cox@dot.state.nj.us">michael.cox@dot.state.nj.us</a></td>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>1.609.633.9379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

This project modernized the MVC's existing Automated Driver License Testing (ADLT) system with a web-based solution that provides greater flexibility, security and improved efficiency in delivery of the law and knowledge test, as well as the skill portion, of all motor vehicle testing. The new system utilizes new networked PCs with centralized access to allow for improved management of the law and knowledge tests. The testing process was developed to include a number of security measures that assist in preventing cheating, including reanimated tests unique to each applicant. We also expect to use this system to expand the service capability of DARTSS to allow law and knowledge testing, which is administered by commercial and secondary schools, to be conducted online.

**Comments:**

It is our intent to improve customer service and security of the driver license testing program while utilizing a fewer number of human resources available.
Ontario – Seven Day Vehicle Impoundment Program for Suspended and Impaired Driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Ontario Ministry of Transportation</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
<th>Fazelah Ali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fazelah.ali@ontario.ca">fazelah.ali@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>416-235-4711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

Ontario implemented three new seven-day vehicle impoundment programs on December 1, 2010 for:

1. Drivers caught driving with a driver’s licence that is under a specific Highway Traffic Act (HTA) suspension(s) including default of family support, but not including suspensions for defaulted fines or medical conditions. A seven-day vehicle impoundment would apply to HTA suspensions such as:
   - failure to complete remedial measures;
   - warn range suspensions;
   - novice violations;
   - demerit point accumulations; and
   - careless driving

   NOTE: An alternative program exempts drivers of commercial vehicles from a seven-day impoundment if they have an eligible HTA licence suspension that has been in effect for less than 100 days.

2. Drivers required to have a vehicle ignition interlock device who are caught driving without such a device; and,

3. All drivers caught with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) over 0.08 or who fail/refuse to comply with a demand to provide a breath sample made by a police officer under the Criminal Code of Canada (CCC).

**Comments:**

The creation of the new seven-day vehicle impoundments is designed to further reduce incidents of driving while suspended/impaired and promote compliance with the law. This is expected to contribute to improved driver behaviour and safer roads.
Ontario - Inquiry Services System / Access Enforcement Solutions (ISS/AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
<th>Phone number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>Whitney Webster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Whitney.Webster@ontario.ca">Whitney.Webster@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>(416) 235-4146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

ISS/AES is an Intranet based application that provides Ontario Police Services and Ontario Government Ministries/Agencies with customized on-line, real-time access to the Ministry of Transportations driver, vehicle and/or carrier databases in accordance with Ontario privacy laws governing collection, use and disclosure of personal information. Ontario Police Services also have the ability to electronically "view" the digital driver licence photo through the Inquiry Services System as part of a pilot project that commenced in 2006.

MTO continues to leverage ISS by incorporating "Access Enforcement Solutions (AES)" or enforcement reporting tools including electronic Provincial Offence Notice production (ePON), electronic commercial vehicle impoundment reports (CVIP), electronic commercial vehicle inspection reports (eCVIR) and electronic suspension/impoundment reports for drinking driving offenses.

**Comments:**

ISS/AES resides on the Government of Ontario "Intranet" and access is restricted to Ontario Police Services and Ontario based Ministries/Agencies clients with an enforcement mandate.

All eligible clients enter into a contractual agreement that prescribes use restrictions, mandatory user training/attestation, audit/oversight prerequisites and compliance declarations.

MTO pre-defines "Security Profiles" that includes a combination of driver, vehicle and/or carrier database inquiry and reporting privileges customized for each client.

A "local administrator" designated by the client is responsible for managing their user access on-site.

All users are authenticated, have a unique ID/password and all transactions are logged to support performance management, quality assurance and audit/investigation activities.
## Ontario – Suspension and Impoundment Management System (SIMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Ontario Ministry of Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Judy Taggart, Manager, Driver Improvement Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Judy.Taggart@ontario.ca">Judy.Taggart@ontario.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(416) 235-4791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

SIMS is an on-line web-based application that updates the Ministry of Transportation (MTO)’s driver/vehicle licensing system in real-time. It provides police with the ability to electronically enter information and issue a notice of suspension/impoundment for drinking and driving offenses.

### Comments:

SIMS has been designed to capture all of the information required to report and issue administrative driver licence suspensions under the Highway Traffic Act. It interacts directly with MTO’s driver & vehicle databases to provide the most recent information to the officer, automatically populate forms, and update driving records. Once recorded, suspensions are visible to every enforcement and licensing agency across the province.

Since December 1, 2008, SIMS has been used to report:

1. 90-day Administrative Driver’s Licence Suspensions (immediate roadside driver licence suspension for a blood alcohol content (BAC) over 0.08.)

2. 7-day driver licence suspension and vehicle impoundment for racing/stunt/contest.

3. 3, 7, 30-day driver licence suspensions for 0.05-0.08 BAC

4. On-line suspension and impoundment cancellation

5. On-line vehicle impoundment reporting for driving while suspended for a Criminal Code conviction
**Pennsylvania – Motorcycle Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation</th>
<th>Contact Name: Scott Shenk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:rshenk@state.pa.us">rshenk@state.pa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone number: 717-783-5958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

A recently completed motorcycle safety study conducted by PennDOT revealed that the factors most closely linked to the outcome of a crash (the severity of injury or the occurrence of a fatality) are under the direct control of motorcycle operators. In particular, the biggest negative impacts on motorcycle crash outcomes were: driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI), speeding, and not being properly licensed. Therefore a comprehensive campaign to promote personal responsibly among riders was needed.

The comprehensive campaign draws on the strong sense of community within the motorcycling community, and focuses on the freedom of the ride while reminding them that if they crash a motorcycle their freedom may be lost. The campaign utilizes several forms of media including radio, and the internet (www.livefreeridealive.com).

At this new Web site motorcyclists can:
- See statistics on motorcycle crashes
- Learn about the leading causes of motorcycle crashes
- See where in Pennsylvania motorcycle crashes have occurred
- Discover tips about proper motorcycle gear and equipment
- Take a pledge to not become a crash statistic
- Read (and submit) comments from other motorcycle riders
- See a documentary profiling actual Pennsylvania riders who have been affected by a motorcycle crash

**Comments:**

The motorcycle safety report as well as some of the campaign materials are available at ftp://dot.state.pa.us/SA motorcycle safety Username: motorcycle Password: safety.
**Pennsylvania – Improved Cash Flow Procedure – Check 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency: Pennsylvania Department of Transportation</th>
<th>Contact Name: Steve Tomassini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:stomassini@state.pa.us">stomassini@state.pa.us</a></td>
<td>Phone number: 717-787-2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

The implementation of Check 21 in January 2011 began the electronic depositing of checks instead of delivering paper checks to the bank. Implementation of electronic depositing of checks will deposit money in the bank faster, and gain interest on the deposit earlier. Because of the successful implementation, after PennDOT recoups its costs in the first three years of operation, PennDOT will gain over $100,000 annually in reduced labor costs. And, realize increased interest revenue by the quicker depositing of funds.
### Texas – Temporary Visitor Transaction Consolidation Pilot Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Texas Department of Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Rosendo Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosendo.martinez@txdps.state.tx.us">rosendo.martinez@txdps.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>(512) 424 2767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

In an effort to better serve Texas, the Driver License Division of the Texas Department of Public Safety will implement a pilot project for temporary visitor transactions at select driver license offices. The pilot project will consolidate temporary visitor transactions at select offices in two of nine regions. Within each selected office, a designated customer service counter will process temporary visitor transactions.

### Comments:

implementation pending
## Utah - E-Impounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Utah Division of Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Allen Sudweeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asudweeks@utah.gov">asudweeks@utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>801-297-7753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

Utah is in the process of implementing a new online impound reporting system that will allow law enforcement agencies and impound yards to directly record impounds on the motor vehicle computer system, reducing the DMV's associated workload.

### Comments:

The new system will provide an online interface for law enforcement agencies and impound yards to report impounded vehicles to the DMV, instead of sending paperwork to the DMV and having DMV staff manually enter all the impound records. The project began in September, 2010, is set to be implemented by the end of June 2011, and is expected to save the DMV at least 30 manhours per week.
# Utah – “On the Spot” Renewal Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Utah Division of Motor Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>Allen Sudweeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asudweeks@utah.gov">asudweeks@utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>801-297-7753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Project or Legislation:

The On the Spot program allows private safety and emissions inspection stations limited remote access to the motor vehicle system to perform registration renewals for their customers. Participants in the program receive advertising materials to display and are allowed to assess a convenience fee to their customers at their discretion, thus creating competition with other stations and a form of incentive for station participation. The program reduces the workload on DMV offices and the customer wait time found therein.

## Comments:

Online training is utilized to ensure that station employees understand the important aspects of the program, vastly reducing DMV's involvement and therefore the DMV's cost to operate the program. Stations order decal inventory as needed, and are held responsible for the decals by way of a bond. The DMV monitors decal usage and station activity to ensure accuracy and compliance. The convenience fee assessed by the station is not monitored or dictated by the DMV. 450 private businesses are participating in the program, accounting for 20% of the total registration renewal transactions completed during fiscal year 2010.
# Utah – Renewal Express

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong> Utah Division of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th><strong>Contact Name:</strong> Allen Sudweeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> <a href="mailto:asudweeks@utah.gov">asudweeks@utah.gov</a></td>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong> 801-297-7753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of Project or Legislation:

The RenewalExpress program is the DMV’s online registration renewal system made available to the general public with no additional fees for use of the system. This program is available 24 hrs a day, seven days a week.

## Comments:

Vehicle owners are sent a post card size renewal reminder notice that contains a PIN to be used on the system. Upon payment, vehicle owners are able to print a temporary permit to carry in the vehicle until the decal and official registration are mailed to them. Our contracted partner, Utah Interactive, Inc, is largely responsible for maintaining the system. No convenience fees or other surcharges are assessed above the normal required vehicle registration fees. This program reduces the workload on DMV offices, and accounts for approximately 29% of our annual total registration renewal transactions.
### Virginia – CSI Systems Redesign Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles</th>
<th><strong>Contact Name:</strong></th>
<th>Tully Welborn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tully.Welborn@dmv.virginia.gov">Tully.Welborn@dmv.virginia.gov</a></td>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>804-367-8069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Project or Legislation:**

The DMV CSI Systems Redesign project focuses on the fragmented processing of DMV’s core lines of business of credentialing and information provisioning. The purpose of the CSI effort is to transform these fragmented and outdated systems into a solution that is responsive to the ever-changing needs relating to internal security, homeland security, legislative mandates, and customer relationship management.

The CSI Solution must be flexible, scalable, and support future growth as a result of Commonwealth and DMV initiatives and mandates (such as those related to legislative actions, executive orders, Government Reform, etc.), and Federal mandates.

As we move forward with this endeavor, DMV has a unique opportunity to revolutionize the agency’s approach to fulfilling its mission, carrying out core functions, and delivering service. DMV intends to fully integrate processing while incorporating and leveraging the full functionality and benefits of proposed technology solutions.

**Comments**

The proposed CSI Solution is a fully integrated, enterprise Oracle solution that resides on a server infrastructure which implements state-of-the-art Customer Relationship Management (CRM) capabilities from the leader in CRM software. The CSI Solution is built using components that truly enable a 360-degree view of the customer and facilitate self service functions and contains a true SOA backplane that would support service-oriented integration for years to come. The proposed solution supports consistent service delivery processes across all lines of business so business functions are no longer in separate silos.

Siebel CRM is proposed as the core and complimented by additional proven COTS products that would integrate out-of-the-box so that the solution remains flexible, scalable, and supports future growth. Oracle Policy Automation for business rules management, Oracle E-Business Suite R12 (EBS) for financial management and Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition to support performance management. The infrastructure uses Oracle SOA Suite to provide the SOA backplane components. All of the products are proven to work together and Oracle will continue to invest in the development of these products so that DMV will be able to evolve with changing technology. Three best-of-breed products are included to provide specific DMV functionality, Adobe LiveCycle for forms and correspondence, CORE iPayment for cash drawer management and Solutions Thru Software to provide unique scheduling requirements. These three products will be integrated using the SOA Suite tools and pre-built connectors so that they can be replaced over time with minimal impact to the overall solution.
## Washington – Automated License Plate Recognition System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency:</strong></th>
<th>Washington State Patrol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Captain Darrin Grondel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:darrin.grondel@wsp.wa.gov">darrin.grondel@wsp.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone number:</strong></td>
<td>360-596-3801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of Project or Legislation:

Washington State has been proactive in the design, development, and deployment of technologies to enable more targeted inspections of commercial vehicles to keep traffic moving and minimize disruptions in travel and commerce. The technologies also play an important role in improving safety on the state’s roadways.

Throughout August of 2009, the Washington State Patrol (WSP) and Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Expanded Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Project teamed up to deploy an Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) system. The ALPR has leveled the playing field for the automated sorting of commercial vehicles both with and without transponders on the primary roadways. Washington has the ability to screen 11 jurisdictions using the ALPR on the mainline.

The ALPR system gives Washington the opportunity to provide more targeted inspections by checking all commercial vehicles automatically against a commercial vehicle database as they approach the weigh station. The system then provides WSP Officers with all available vehicle and registration information. Using this system to make more intelligent decisions about which vehicles warrant a more targeted inspection, Washington is able to more quickly assess the commercial traffic flowing through checkpoints to minimize delays for vehicles with good safety and maintenance histories. The ALPR system uses SpikeHDTM integrated ALPR system from PIPS Technology coupled with software developed in-house it is fully integrated into the existing WSDOT CVISN system.

The ALPR has also been instrumental in the officer’s ability to identify Hours of Service violations and remove fatigued drivers off Washington’s roadways. Using the ALPR to verify scale crossings, officers have dramatically increased enforcement of False Record of duty status. As an example, Washington’s Bow Hill Port of Entry, near the Canadian border, reports for all of February 2011 officers identified a total of 24 log book violations. Between March 4 - 16 officers have identified 61 drivers who have made false hours of service entries in their log book. This is a 154% increase for hours of service violations.

### Comments:

The ALPR provides the officer with a validation method for vehicle credentialing (registration, VIN, USDOT #). In addition it assists with identifying carriers who have out-of-service orders, and those who have tried to switch to another carrier to avoid the OOS order.
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Summary Report
This document summarizes the results of Minnesota’s Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative and is prepared for policy makers, agencies, and other stakeholders in Minnesota and other states. The initiative resulted in many changes to Minnesota’s impaired driving administrative sanctions, including the implementation of a permanent ignition interlock program.

For terminology and definitions, see Appendix A.

For more information on Minnesota’s current statewide Ignition Interlock (II) Pilot Program, including a 2010 report to the legislature about the 2009-2010 statewide II Pilot Program, see http://www.dps.state.mn.us/ots/Laws_Legislation/Ignition_Interlock.asp.
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Executive Summary

In the spring of 2008, the Department of Public Safety (DPS) launched the Minnesota Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions (DLAS) Initiative to examine and improve Minnesota’s system of sanctions associated with impaired (drunk) driving. The purpose of the initiative was to:

Describe a system of driver’s license administrative sanctions and incentives and supporting strategies that can most effectively be used to reduce impaired driving fatalities and injuries, and increase the number of people driving legally and responsibly.

DPS involved nearly 70 people in the project, with representation from the courts, law enforcement, human services, private sector treatment programs, several DPS divisions (Office of Traffic Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services, Commissioner’s Office, and State Patrol), state and county probation, the Minnesota Driving While Impaired (DWI) Task Force, and other stakeholders (e.g., MADD and Minnesotans for Safe Driving). DPS and its partners implemented a comprehensive nine-step process for system review and recommendation development. Project process and structure were as important as the final recommendations for achieving policy changes and implementation. The process nurtured “buy-in” from stakeholders who later supported the policy change.

After discussion and analysis, the project team identified four key areas for further research and recommendation development:

- Strategies for effectively assessing chemical health issues and appropriate recommendations for treatment
- Countermeasures for addressing impaired drivers who had their licenses revoked after one or two DWI offenses
- Countermeasures for impaired drivers who had their license cancelled due to multiple DWIs and were required to meet rehabilitation requirements
- Strategies related to individuals who drive illegally after having their driver’s licenses revoked or cancelled

Teams met between October 2008 and December 2009 to review findings about the system and lay the groundwork for research-based recommendations. Project members developed six major recommendations:

1. Lower the alcohol concentration level that triggers enhanced DLAS
2. Lengthen the revocation time for first and second time DWI offenders
3. Update sanctions for people who are “cancelled inimical to public safety” (three offenses in 10 years or four in a lifetime)
4. Provide effective chemical health screens and assessments
5. Focus enhanced consequence on people who continue to drive after their driving privileges have been withdrawn due to risky driving behavior
6. Determine effective programs that achieve long-term behavior changes by the use of cognitive-based education and statewide intensive supervision programs (ISP) and DWI Court Programs
The initiative was very successful in identifying changes to the DLAS that could more effectively reduce alcohol-related fatalities and increase legal driving. Many of the recommendations were included in the Governor’s Initiative that passed into law May 18, 2010. The bill had support from a wide-range of stakeholders due to the inclusiveness of the committee structure, resulting in groups testifying for the bill that would not normally support stronger DWI Sanctions.

Throughout the process DPS identified factors that contributed to success. These include:

- Be inclusive - identify all stakeholders and make sure to include them in the process
- Educate all stakeholders on the current system; many of them only know their slice of the system
- Provide administrative support for documentation and meeting facilitation
- Allow time to research state’s data along with national best practices; inform stakeholders on research results
- Recommendations must be data driven – this is critical
- Be deliberate in prioritizing those areas where compromise is not possible, and those areas where flexibility is possible

The Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative provides a roadmap for future impaired driving traffic safety initiatives and identifies key strategies that can reduce alcohol-related deaths and increase legal driving. Consideration should be given to implementing additional recommendations in the future.
I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Initiative

In the spring of 2008, the Department of Public Safety (DPS) launched the Minnesota Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative to examine and improve Minnesota’s system of sanctions associated with impaired (drunk) driving. DPS research and experience had identified several key issues and trends, but a more holistic and in-depth assessment was needed to determine system-wide priorities and improvements.

The driver’s license administrative sanctions “system” was and is a compilation of complex laws, policies, procedures, agencies, and interests associated with implementing administrative sanctions after an individual is arrested for impaired driving. The reach of this system extends beyond the DPS Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) and Driver and Vehicles Services (DVS) to include law enforcement, the courts, probation, treatment, and other stakeholders. The system had changed over time, but a comprehensive review had not been conducted in nearly 30 years.

The purpose of the DLAS Initiative was to:

Describe a system of driver’s license administrative sanctions and incentives and supporting strategies that can most effectively be used to reduce impaired driving fatalities and injuries, and increase the number of people driving legally and responsibly.

The project was initiated by DPS and conducted with other internal and external agencies, interests and work groups, resulting in research-based recommendations. Many recommendations were enacted into law in early 2010 while others still need implementation.

Purpose of This Report

This report describes the Driver’s License Administration Sanctions Initiative process, findings, recommendations and outcomes. The process and structure of the project was as important as the final recommendations. Without the process and structure, the recommendations would not have had the level of success in achieving policy changes.

Results of the project:

- The process Minnesota used to conduct the review and develop recommendations was comprehensive and successful. Despite divergent perspectives and interests, the many groups involved reached a consensus in understanding, researching and prioritizing recommended administrative sanction changes.

- The project’s key findings provided a critical base of information for staff, work groups, and advisory teams to develop a holistic view of the sanctions system and its component parts. Findings often challenged the assumptions each stakeholder brought to the table and led to new insights about needed change.

- The final six recommendations were evidence-based. They were developed and supported at a level sufficient to result in many of the recommendations being enacted into law in their proposed form or close to it.
• The resulting legislation will become effective on July 1, 2011 and includes major policy changes such as implementation of a statewide ignition interlock (II) program.

• Key recommendations that were not included in the law are important to consider in future proposed changes. Much has been accomplished through this initiative and related efforts, but more work remains to be done.

Use of Terms
In understanding the work and recommendations of this initiative, it is helpful to know the three commonly used terms below. For more information on terminology, see Appendix A.

**DWI incident** is an alcohol-related offense associated with an implied consent incident and/or a DWI conviction. A person may have an implied consent incident on their driving record with no associated DWI conviction or a DWI conviction with no associated implied consent revocation. Either situation is considered a DWI incident. A DWI conviction and implied consent revocation arising from the same behavioral incident are only counted as one incident.

**Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions (DLAS)** refers to the administrative sanctions imposed on drivers by the Department of Public Safety (the driver licensing authority) for violating their privilege to drive by engaging in driving behavior that risks the public’s safety. Specific administrative sanctions that were reviewed were those imposed on a driver who is arrested for driving a vehicle with an alcohol concentration level of 0.08 or above or refusing to take a test to determine their alcohol concentration level. These are referred to as “administrative” sanctions to distinguish them from criminal penalties imposed by the courts. For the purposes of this initiative, administrative sanctions were reviewed only in terms of their relevance to impaired driving and violations of driving after withdrawal of driving privileges due to an impaired driving incident. Administrative sanctions imposed on drivers for other reasons, such as multiple moving violations or driving after withdrawal of a suspension for unpaid fines, were not reviewed by this committee.

**The DLAS system** refers to the compilation of people, agencies, policies, laws, rules, procedures and interests involved with DLAS for impaired driving. The word “system” is used loosely to refer to the interconnectedness of all these individuals and groups involved in setting, administering, enforcing and experiencing the effects of driver’s license administrative sanctions.
II. PROCESS

Impetus for the DLAS Initiative

In the years preceding the DLAS Initiative launch, DPS was increasingly aware that a holistic review of the DLAS system was needed. The complex set of policies, rules, agencies and stakeholder groups had evolved over 20-30 years, and changes were often implemented without thoughtful consideration of how different elements worked with or against each other. A holistic review of the system was a new way of looking at the issues. DPS’s interest was primarily focused on its own administrative sanctions, yet it was clear that those sanctions interacted with issues in the courts, law enforcement, corrections, treatment and non-driving sanctions.

Even as the state experienced decreasing numbers of alcohol-related traffic crashes leading to death and injury, the impact of those crashes on individuals and families as well as public budgets was devastating. In 2007, for example, 164 people were killed in alcohol-related crashes and 3,252 were injured. In addition, the percentage of traffic fatalities that were alcohol-related held steady at 30 to 40 percent over many years, and associated costs amounted to more than $261 million (DPS, 2007).

Examining the issues from a more systematic approach is also consistent with Minnesota’s “Toward Zero Deaths” (TZD) Initiative. TZD was (and is) working to “create a culture for which traffic fatalities and serious injuries are no longer acceptable through the integrated application of education, engineering, enforcement, and emergency medical and trauma services. These efforts are driven by data, best practices and research.”

In addition, DPS was finding that offenders in DWI court had difficulty complying with court requirements under the current sanctions system. The removal of a license after a DWI could hamper one’s ability to get to work, treatment, AA groups, therapy and court appearances—the very things associated with compliance, responsibility and sobriety. The issue could be especially problematic in rural areas where transportation alternatives were lacking. Based on the number of “Driving after Withdrawal” violations issued, many people continue to drive illegally after their license had been revoked or cancelled. Often these individuals are also driving without insurance. Illegal driving is not just a Minnesota problem. Nationally it is estimated that at least 70 percent of people continue driving even after their license has been revoked or cancelled (Griffin II and De La Zerda 2000).

DPS research was also showing high recidivism rates among DWI offenders. In 2007, for example, nearly half of Minnesotans whose licenses were canceled as “inimical to public safety” re-offended within ten years of completing the chemical dependency treatment required for license reinstatement (DPS, 2007).

A systemic review was also necessitated by research showing the benefits of ignition interlock (II) programs and Minnesota’s increased use of this tool. In 2007, DPS began a two-year pilot II program in one rural and one metropolitan county, as required by statute. Ignition interlock was viewed by

---

1 Toward Zero Deaths (TZD) is a Minnesota partnership led by the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Health, in cooperation with County Engineers, and the Center for Transportation Studies at the University of Minnesota (www.minnesotatzd.org, 2010).

2 An ignition interlock system is a breath-testing system installed on a motor vehicle that prevents the vehicle from operating when a certain level of blood alcohol is detected. For more information on Minnesota’s program, see http://www.dps.state.mn.us/ots/Laws_Legislation/Ignition_Interceptor.asp.
many as a way to help insure public safety while allowing an individual to drive legally. The 2007-2009 pilot project targeted individuals living in Beltrami and Hennepin Counties with two or more DWI offenses. DPS sought to integrate its knowledge and experience about II from the pilot program and other states into the state’s sanctions system. For Minnesota to gain public safety benefits from the use of II, the DLAS needed to be changed.

Other DLAS system components were signaling their readiness to examine the DLAS. The DPS Driver and Vehicle Services (DVS) for instance, was seeking to update its policies and procedures to take advantage of new technology and research. Courts and probation agencies were also seeking ways to more effectively deal with large numbers of DWI and illegal driving cases.

**Process Overview**

DPS and its project partners developed a comprehensive process for developing recommendations. Careful planning and execution were needed to assure the development of practical, effective, and widely supported recommendations. Table 1 (next page) presents a summary of the process and knowledge gained. Each step is further described below.

**Process Steps**

1. **The DPS Commissioner authorized the project and assigned OTS to lead the charge.** The Office of Traffic Safety proposed a project to conduct a thorough review of DLAS sanctions to the Commissioner of Public Safety. The proposal was supported by the need to review current policies and procedures and expand the use of new technologies. The Commissioner’s office approved the project. Early support of the Commissioner’s office built credibility, added high-level expertise, facilitated legislative efforts, and generally helped assure a positive outcome.

2. **DPS created a core project team with extensive expertise and broad DLAS system representation.** Members included OTS, DVS, Probation, Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor, which enabled the team to address the large number of issues involved in the DLAS system. The range of issues studied included the administration of DLAS; traffic safety policy, impaired driving research, and programs; II pilot programs and research; chemical dependency assessments and treatment; DLAS interdependencies with criminal penalties for DWI convictions; causes of illegal driving and consequences; and enforcement of the laws. The project team was the driving force of the DLAS Initiative. Extensive expertise and broad representation allowed the team to refine work group ideas and strategies into an integrated set of recommendations.
3. DPS contracted two consultants from Management Analysis & Development (MAD) to assist with project design, management, and facilitation, and to provide research support. MAD is the state government’s in-house consulting group at the Department of Minnesota Management and Budget. Their involvement freed-up members to fully engage in discussion and focus on developing the content of the recommendations. The MAD consultants also provided a high-level perspective external to the system to those enmeshed in the system, and promoted effective meeting processes.

4. Using a broad scope, the Project Team identified interrelated elements of the DLAS system, as depicted in Figure 1. The DPS is the state’s licensing authority and imposes impaired driving administrative sanctions. However, there is no real defined or coherent “system” that administers, provides, monitors, creates and enforces the sanctions and penalties affiliated with impaired driving. The boundaries can be unclear; perspectives can be highly divergent; and policy, research, and trends are constantly changing. Moreover, the elements of this system are highly visible and often controversial, reflecting life and death issues and a need to balance public safety with concerns about justice, due process, personal freedom and costs. By outlining system elements, the team outlined the project scope and paved the way for the identification of issues and people to include in project teams, see Figure 1.
5. The Project Team developed clear goals, articulated key strategies and business structures, and identified resources and system improvement by outlining the elements of an ideal DLAS system (Figure 2). The team identified system success measures, emphasizing the need for evidence-based recommendations that led to effective, measurable results, where program benefits exceeded costs. Clarity in goals and strategies was a prerequisite to launch the project and facilitated an understanding of the task at hand and its priorities. Four key strategies were identified early on so that efforts were focused on priority areas. The team created a project charter to define rules, roles, structure and expectations. (See Appendix B for Project Charter).

![Figure 2: Minnesota Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions: Elements of an Ideal System](image)

Overarching Goal & Project Purpose
- Overarching Goal: To reduce impaired-driving fatalities and injuries, and increase the number of people driving legally and responsibly.
- Project Purpose: To describe a system of driver’s license sanctions and incentives, and supporting strategies, that can most effectively achieve the overarching goal.

Success Measures
- Evidence-based
- Further reduce impaired-driving fatalities and injuries;
- Further increase the number of people driving legally and responsibly;
- Provide effective, measurable results; and
- Benefits of the program should exceed costs

A. Effective Assessments
B. Revocation and Reinstatement: Maintain good sanctions (quick and certain) and evaluate how they are used
C. Cancellation and Rehabilitation: Updated rehab system to more effectively verify sobriety
D. DAR/DAS/DAC
   Tools, Best Practices and Innovations
   - Ignition interlock
   - Court monitoring
   - Others
     - Withdrawal of driving privileges (time periods)
     - License plate impoundment
     - Vehicle forfeiture
     - Reinstatement fee
     - Effective consequences for DAR/DAS
     - Diversion program on DAR charges — consistency among counties

Note: DAR/DAS/DAC are acronyms for “Driving After” a license has been Revoked, Suspended, or Cancelled.
Key strategies identified for further research and recommendation development were:

a. **Strategies for effectively assessing chemical health issues and appropriate recommendations for treatment.** Focusing on effective assessments and appropriate treatment assured that the research and recommendations would address the root cause of impaired driving and recidivism.

b. **Countermeasures for addressing impaired drivers who had their licenses revoked after one or two DWI offenses.** These individuals make up the majority of people who receive DWIs and are involved in an alcohol-related fatal crash. Approximately 40 percent of all first-time DWI offenders will re-offend and 80 percent of drinking drivers involved in an alcohol-related fatal crash have either one or no prior DWI (DPS, 2007). By concentrating on administrative license revocation and reinstatement, the working group addressed a large proportion of the alcohol-related fatalities.

c. **Countermeasures for impaired drivers who had their licenses cancelled due to multiple DWIs and were required to meet rehabilitation requirements before they could apply for a new license.** This category of impaired drivers includes the most serious offenders in terms of level of alcohol in their bloodstream and/or number of previous offenses. These individuals have their licenses cancelled because they are considered “inimical to public safety” and they must complete certain requirements related to rehabilitation (chemical dependency treatment, etc) in order to have their licenses restored. While these offenders do not comprise the greatest percentage of drinking drivers involved in a fatal crash, they do cause the greatest burden on the criminal justice system.

d. **Strategies related to individuals who drive illegally after having their driver’s license revoked or cancelled.** Unfortunately, as noted, the vast majority of individuals who have their license revoked or cancelled continue to drive illegally. The problem is clearly pervasive and needed to be further addressed to improve system outcomes.

6. **DPS expanded the project structure to include a Policy Group, a Technical Advisory Panel (TAP), and four work groups (see Figure 3).** The use of six different teams (plus a core project team and two outside consultants) that consisted of nearly 70 members somewhat complicated project administration. However, this structure was critical to the project’s success by developing support and drawing expertise of individuals representing different levels, (e.g., from Commissioner to field staff), agencies, viewpoints and concerns. The purpose of each team is described below:

- **The Policy Group provided project oversight, established policy and promoted change, and was comprised of the highest-level policy makers concerned with DWI sanctions issues in their respective organizations. Members had the ability to assess the broad implications of the policy recommendations and the authority to approve the recommendations. They also helped to move the recommendations toward implementation.**

- **Members of the TAP were stakeholders with interest and knowledge that extended over all working groups. They reviewed work group proposals with an awareness of overlapping issues across the four topic areas, and provided feedback to work groups and the Project Team.**

- **The work groups reviewed research on current laws, policies and practices, identified key issues, and proposed draft recommendations for the Project Team. The work groups consisted**

---

3 For a definition, see Appendix A.
The four topics of the work groups were the four strategies described in step 6 and depicted in Figure 3.

- The Project Team executed core tasks, set direction, and refined recommendations to present to the Policy Group. This group was comprised of work group co-chairs. They met frequently to coordinate and prepare for TAP meetings and to shape work group proposals into the recommendations presented and later approved by the Policy Group (See Figure 4).

The full-system approach was essential to the project’s success because it accounted for how system elements affect each other. For example, when the group mapped process steps from arrest, to sanctions, to license reinstatement, it confirmed that DLAS are effective in reducing recidivism and providing for public safety; however, sanctions for withdrawing an offender’s driving privileges also negatively affects their ability to attend treatment, hold a job, and participate in other activities needed to return to safe and legal driving. Knowing this helped shape the proposal to provide II sooner rather than later after a brief period of “hard revocation” (no driving permitted at all). A holistic view also improved coordination among those assisting offenders in resuming legal driving. Throughout the project, research was a crucial factor in forming recommendations. An analysis of crash and arrest data, for instance, showed that DLAS must focus on first-time DWI offenders in addition to repeat offenders, if they are to be effective in reducing alcohol-related fatalities.

**Figure 3: Minnesota Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative Committee Structure**

- **Policy Group**
  - Provide overall project oversight
  - Establish policy
  - Promote change (if determined)

- **Project Team**
  - Execute core project tasks
  - Set project direction
  - Develop recommendations to present to Policy Group

- **Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)**
  - Review work group proposals with an awareness of overlapping issues across the four topic areas
  - Provide feedback to work groups and project team

- **Work Groups**
  - Review research on current laws, policies and practices
  - Identify key issues
  - Present options to TAP

- **Effective Assessments**
- **Revocation and Reinstatement**
- **Cancellation and Rehabilitation**
- **Driving After Withdrawal**
Representation on project groups included the courts (Judges, State Court Administration, prosecutor and defense attorneys), law enforcement, human services (state department, treatment providers and chemical health assessors), private sector programs, DPS (OTS, DVS, Commissioner’s Office, State Patrol and legislative liaison), probation (state and county probation), and other stakeholders (e.g., MADD and Minnesotan’ for Safe Driving) and the MN DWI Task Force. See Appendix C for list of participants by each of the project teams.

7. **DPS hosted a project kick-off meeting involving all participants.** An all-inclusive kick-off meeting facilitated the process of developing a common understanding of the system, strategies, and current challenges. When participants formed work groups at the kick-off meeting, it signaled the move from planning to recommendation development. Leaders described why and how the project was being done and provided preliminary data. The day also included a presentation from a national expert on behavior change and impaired driving countermeasures. Work groups met for the first time and were able to identify real-life challenges in working with offenders and the current system. At the other end of the spectrum, policy makers identified their expectations from the initiative.

8. **The Project Team, work groups, TAP and Policy Group met between October 2008 and December 2009 to research, draft, recommend, refine and/or approve recommendations.** (See overview in Figure 4). Members researched, analyzed and discussed facts, best practices, problems, trends and issues associated with each of the four major work group/strategies, considering a range of questions and issues, such as:

- What does the research say about each of these key strategy/work topic areas? How does this research confirm or challenge our assumptions?
- How do different elements of the system work with and against each other?
- In terms of number of offenses, recidivism, alcohol concentration (AC), and other variables, what is the likelihood of being involved in a fatal or serious injury crash?
- How do II programs and other new technologies and best practices fit within the current and future DLAS system?
- If the project is focused on the administrative side of sanctions, what do we need to be concerned about on the criminal justice side?

One lesson learned in the team meetings was that developing a shared understanding of the sanctions system takes time. Participants needed to understand basic information about each piece of the system to develop proposals for change. The groups were comprised of experts in their particular section of the system, but few understood the entire system. A common understanding was facilitated by developing and reviewing process maps describing, “what is” as a first step toward identifying “what could be.” Process map development and review allowed participants to ask questions and clarify misunderstandings.
Figure 4: DLAS Initiative Group Meetings Timeline

Representatives of stakeholder groups met to offer feedback on proposals and direction to work groups. Meetings included:
- **December**: Review of guiding principles and initial work group reports
- **February**: Review and discussion of sanctions processes
- **April**: Review of initial proposals on lowering blood alcohol level, requiring ignition interlock, revising B card policy, updating treatment requirements, intensive supervision and DWI courts, assessments, and the effect of “driving after” fees

Top decision-makers from agencies involved in sanctions met to review the initial package of recommendations prepared by the Project Team.

Participants of all groups attended all-day event to introduce and launch the project.

Multidisciplinary work groups met monthly to identify issues and opportunities to improve sanctions in four areas:
- Assessments
- Revocation and reinstatement
- Cancellation and rehabilitation
- Driving after withdrawal

Chairs of work groups, now acting as the Project Team, met to refine proposals to present to Policy Group.

The Project Team prepared and presented recommendations to the Policy Group at monthly meetings. Following each meeting, the Project Team reviewed Policy Group feedback and refined proposals for reconsideration the next month.

The TAP stakeholder group reviewed revised proposals, and offered advice for successful implementation.

All project participants met to hear final recommendations sent forward by the Policy Group. Project leaders also presented ignition interlock legislation proposed by Gov. Pawlenty, and heard a presentation by Illinois BAIID Division Administrator Susan McKinney.

---

- **Representative Meetings**
  - **TAP meetings**
    - December 2008, February, and April 2009
  - **Project Team meetings**
    - May 5, June 10, June 23
  - **Monthly Policy Group meetings**
    - July 15, August 17, September 21, October 19, November 16, December 14
  - **Wrap up meeting**
    - with Policy Group, TAP and work groups Jan. 25, 2010
9. The project and policy teams finalized work group proposals. Section IV of the report identifies recommendations that were to be considered for implementation. DPS selected key recommendations and submitted them to the Governor’s office. These recommendations became part of a Governor’s initiative, with major legislation signed into law in May 2010. The full Policy Group approved the set of recommendations, although there was not 100% agreement for every recommendation. The final project report identifies recommendations that remain to be considered for implementation (see section VI of this report).
## Table 1: Overview of Process Steps (April 2008 - May 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Knowledge Gained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The DPS Commissioner authorized the project and assigned OTS to lead the charge.</td>
<td>OTS presented strong reasons to conduct the review. Early support of the Commissioner’s office built project credibility and provided a critical liaison with the Governor’s office and legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DPS created a core project team with deep expertise and broad DLAS system representation.</td>
<td>The project team was the driving force of the DLAS Initiative; dedication to the project, extensive expertise and broad representation allowed the team to refine work group ideas and strategies into an integrated set of recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DPS hired consultants to assist with project design, facilitation and research.</td>
<td>The use of consultants allowed members to focus on content. Consultants facilitated and documented meetings and provided the high-level perspective of individuals not involved in the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The project team identified interrelated elements of the driver’s license sanctions “system.”</td>
<td>Since a systems-perspective had not been used before, one of the first steps was to outline what was included in the DLAS system; this was critical in defining scope and identifying others to include on the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Project Team developed clear goals, focus, and scope, including four key strategies that later became work group topics.</td>
<td>The group developed clarity by outlining the elements of an ideal DLAS system; this was requisite to launching the project and facilitated an understanding of the task at hand and its priorities. The key strategies were identified early on so that efforts were focused on priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DPS expanded the project structure to include a Policy Group, Technical Advisory Panel (TAP), and four work groups.</td>
<td>While the structure of this initiative complicated project administration, it was also crucial to assure the project’s success by developing support and drawing expertise from individuals at different levels, agencies, viewpoints and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DPS hosted a project launch meeting involving all participants and including work group and team meetings.</td>
<td>An all-inclusive kick-off meeting facilitated the process of developing a common understanding of the system, strategies, and current challenges. When participants formed work groups at the launch meeting, it signaled the move from planning to recommendation development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Project Team, working groups, TAP and Policy Group met for 12-18 months to research, draft, recommend, refine and/or approve recommendations.</td>
<td>The involvement of individuals across levels, agencies and interests fostered the development of integrated strategies and approved recommendations. The project allowed time for teams to understand each system component, review data and process maps, draft proposals, conduct follow-up research, and build consensus. Recommendations were developed by the working groups, presented for comment to the TAP and finalized by the Policy Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The teams finalized recommendations and DPS submitted them to the Governor’s office; a subset was enacted into law.</td>
<td>Many of the recommendations became part of a Governor’s initiative, with legislation effective in July 2011. This final report identifies recommendations that remain to be implemented for future improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. GENDERAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The DLAS Initiative relied on research from DPS’s driver license data base, crash data, and other state and national sources. Topics of investigation included trends, best practices, outcomes and current practices associated with sanctions, expected or documented impacts on serious and fatal crashes, and the effect of variables such as AC levels, number of previous DWI offenses, and rates of recidivism. The research provided an understanding of promising strategies and identified DWI offenders who are at a higher risk for recidivating. This guided the groups toward avenues for improvement and provided the basis for recommendations.

This General Findings section provides highlights of the project’s research, including:

- Snapshots of Minnesota’s system and impaired driving statistics;
- The context for change; and
- Change principles developed by the Project Team and reviewed by the TAP.

In the next section, data and findings related to each of the Initiative’s major recommendations are presented. Appendix E contains expansions of several of the tables discussed in the body of the report.

The DLAS Initiative relied on research from a large variety of sources, including: DPS (Driver License Database and Crash System), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Pacific Institute of Research and Evaluation, National Drug Court Institute, Traffic Injury Research Foundation, University of Minnesota, and the State Court Administrators Office Evaluation Unit.
Snapshot of the Sanctions System and Impaired Driving

Basic Arrest, Crash and Ignition Interlock Data
Each year nationally, nearly 14,000 people die in an alcohol-related crash, costing society over $100 billion dollars (NPSR, 1993). In Minnesota, over one-third of traffic fatalities are alcohol-related and over 30,000 people are arrested for DWI. Other basic facts associated with an alcohol-related crash and DWI arrests are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Basic Arrest, Crash, and Ignition Interlock Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Crash Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421 people died in traffic crashes in Minnesota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 (34 percent) of those deaths resulted from crashes classified as alcohol-related. This was an all-time low. Still, alcohol related crashes accounted for more than one-third of all traffic deaths, which is typical each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,592 people sustained injuries in alcohol-related crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 percent of traffic fatalities in the 25-29 year-old age group were alcohol-related.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 DWI Arrest Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32,756 motorists were arrested for DWI (an average of 90 per day). More than half a million Minnesotans with driver’s license records have a DWI. This represents one of seven drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 percent of these violators had at least one prior DWI on record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One in 13 of the total DWIs were issued to drivers less than 21 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly half of the people arrested for DWI are between the ages of 20-29.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ignition Interlock and Other Major Traffic Safety Law Changes
- Ignition interlock is one of many significant traffic safety laws passed in recent years. Other major laws include felony DWI (2001); 0.08 legal alcohol-concentration limit (2004, effective 2005); stronger teen graduated driver’s licensing laws (2008); booster seat law (2008) and a primary seat belt law (2009) (Governor’s Office, 2010).

- Results from the first year of Minnesota’s Statewide Ignition Interlock Pilot Program showed that 1,129 individuals enrolled, and 97% continued to participate in the program. Two participants reoffended by circumventing the device and were subsequently arrested for DWI (DPS, 2010).

If a source is not identified above, it is DPS’s 2009 Minnesota Impaired Driving Facts and 2009 Minnesota Motor Vehicle Crash Facts.
Fatal Crashes by Prior DWI
Minnesota data from 2005-2007 show that the majority (60 percent) of drinking drivers who were involved in fatal crashes did not have a previous DWI on their driving record at the time of the crash. Driving records also indicate that 45 percent (85 out of 188) of the drinking drivers who had a prior DWI offense had one prior DWI. Therefore, nearly 80 percent of drinking drivers involved in a fatal crash had one or no prior DWI offense (see Table 3).

Table 3: Minnesota Drunk Drivers in Fatal Crashes by Number of Prior DWIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No prior offenses</th>
<th>1 prior offense</th>
<th>2 prior offenses</th>
<th>3 prior offenses</th>
<th>4 prior offenses</th>
<th>5 or more prior offenses</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Total drivers with at least one prior DWI offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90 (55%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>73 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>98 (66%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>51 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100 (61%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>64 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288 (60%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>188 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPS, 2009c

Fatal Crashes and DWI Arrests
Between 2005 and 2007, 476 drinking drivers were involved in a fatal crash. Of these 288 (60%) had no prior offense, 29 (6%) had a prior offense within the previous 12 months. The first 12 months after a DWI arrest is the highest 12 month period for drinking drivers with a previous DWI to be involved in a fatal crash (see Table 4).

Table 4: Drunk Drivers by Fatal Crashes and Most Recent DWI Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No prior DWI offense</th>
<th>0-12 months</th>
<th>13 to 24 months</th>
<th>25 to 48 months (two years)</th>
<th>49 months of more (over 4 years)</th>
<th>Total drinking drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288 (60%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>20 (4%)</td>
<td>32 (7%)</td>
<td>107 (22%)</td>
<td>476 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPS, 2009c. See more extensive data in Table 2 in Appendix E.
Recidivism Rates
Repeat offenders are a problem in Minnesota and other states. Projected 2007 recidivism rates in Minnesota, based on historical data (DPS, 2009), show that:

- Forty percent of drivers that are arrested for impaired driving for the first time will recidivate.
- Fifty percent of repeat DWI offenders (two or more) will recidivate. This percentage remains relatively constant for rate of recidivism.
- Fifty percent of individuals who recidivate do so within four years, and approximately 90 percent do so within 10 years.
- By far the largest gain attainable in reducing the number of people rearrested for impaired driving is by reducing the number of first time DWI offenders who incur a second offense. (See Table 3 in Appendix E for more recidivism data).

Alcohol Concentration Rates
Repeat DWI offenders are more likely to have an alcohol concentration of 0.15 or above (45% first time DWI offenders, 59% repeat DWI offenders).

Table 5: Alcohol Concentration Test Results of Drivers Who Incurred an Impaired Driving Incident: 2005 – 2007 (DPS, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Concentration Level</th>
<th>0.08-0.09</th>
<th>0.10-0.14</th>
<th>0.15-0.19</th>
<th>0.20-0.24</th>
<th>0.25-0.29</th>
<th>0.30-0.34</th>
<th>0.35 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Time DWI Offenders</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>28,103</td>
<td>20,374</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat DWI Offenders</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>12,153</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DWI Offenders</td>
<td>9,162</td>
<td>40,272</td>
<td>32,527</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPS, 2009c.

AC data also shows that:

- First-time DWI offenders with an AC level of 0.15 to 0.19 will re-offend at nearly the same rate as an offender with an AC level of 0.20 or above.
- Those arrested for a repeat DWI offense are twice as likely to refuse to take a test to determine alcohol concentration at the time of arrest.
- A person’s likelihood of being in a fatal crash significantly increases at a 0.15 AC level and the most common alcohol concentration level of a drinking driver involved in a fatal crash is 0.20.
- As a person’s alcohol concentration level increases, the more likely the person will be involved in a fatal crash (see Table 8 and Figure 1 in Appendix E for more information).

National Research
The DLAS Initiative project teams examined information from National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Pacific Institute for Research and Education (PIRE), Traffic Injury Research Foundation (TIRF) and other national research organizations regarding the effectiveness of various types of sanctions being used throughout the United States. The NHTSA’s summary of Countermeasures That Work - a 301-page document that indicates the most effective, evidence-based strategies for implementing sanctions to reduce impaired driving - lists the following as among the most effective strategies for states to pursue.

- Administrative license revocation or suspension
- High blood alcohol content sanctions
- BAC test refusal penalties, lower BAC limits for repeat offenders
- Ignition interlocks
- Vehicle sanctions including license plate impoundment (with Minnesota cited as a state using plate impoundment to reduce recidivism)
- Graduated driver licensing
- Saturation patrols
- DWI courts
- DWI offender monitoring
- Alcohol problem assessment and treatment
- Alcohol screening and brief interventions

All of these strategies are in some degree being used in Minnesota. It is often the implementation of these strategies that indicates the level of success in achieving the goal of reduced alcohol-related fatalities. NHTSA’s Update of Vehicle Sanction Law and Their Applications (NHTSA, 2008) in addition to personal contact with states that have successful programs provided the team with insight on how other states are using vehicle sanctions to achieve greater success.

Public and Private Costs
Everyone involved in alcohol-related fatalities, severe injuries and DWI arrest (victims, families, offenders, the state, local agencies, the criminal justice system, and many others) pays a high cost. According to NHTSA, alcohol-related fatalities cost more than $100 billion annually, including $51 billion in monetary costs and $63 billion in quality-of-life losses. In Minnesota alone, the cost of alcohol-related crashes, fatalities, and injuries was more than $261 million, according to the 2007 edition of Minnesota Impaired Driving Facts (DPS, 2007a). Any reduction in DWIs is expected to result in substantial savings to individuals, agencies, the court system, and taxpayers.

Context for Change
After reviewing extensive data, members of the DLAS Initiative come to the following conclusions. These conclusions served to focus the group’s efforts and provided the foundation for development of the recommendations specified in this document.

The current system is complex and not well understood
In Minnesota, the criminal justice system and the civil system administered by the DPS addresses DWI offenders in different ways and for different reasons; DPS is concerned about maintaining the public’s safety on the roadway and the criminal justice system punishes people for violating the law. Each
system has undergone changes and adjustments over the years, resulting in a complex array of policies, laws, processes, requirements and fees. With this level of complexity, DWI offenders often do not understand the system, and even the people who work within it sometimes lack information about how to help offenders comply with administrative sanctions.

**A focus on first- and second-time DWI offenders presents the greatest opportunity for reducing alcohol-related fatalities and increasing legal driving**

In 2007, first-time DWI offenders accounted for the greatest number of DWI violations (61 percent). First- and second-time offenders accounted for 83 percent of the 38,669 drivers cited with DWIs (Table 6). They also account for 82 percent of the total number of offenders who recidivate. Further, nearly 80 percent of drinking drivers involved in a fatal crash had one or no prior DWI offense.

**Table 6: Drivers with DWIs by Number of Offenses (2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenses</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>23,653</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>6,527</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38,669</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPS, 2009c

Of first-time DWI offenders who are known to incur an additional offense, 17 percent reoffend within 12 months. This increases to slightly over 30 percent in 24 months, and by 48 months half of these people will have incurred their second offense.

**Many offenders have repeat DWIs**

Approximately, 40 percent of all first-time DWI offenders re-offend. The likelihood of reoffending increases with each new offense. For example, by the time they reach their 5th offense, 63% will reoffend. Almost all (90%) of offenders who recidivate, do so within 10 years of their previous arrest.

**An AC of 0.15 or more among first-time DWI offenders is associated with higher recidivism and increased fatalities and injuries**

More than a third (36%) of first-time offenders with an AC of 0.15-0.19 incurred a second DWI offense within ten years. This recidivism rate is essentially equal to that of first-time offenders with an AC of 0.20, indicating that 0.15 AC may be a more appropriate threshold indicator of recidivism (see Appendix E, Table 7). Moreover, the number of people who die in an alcohol-related crash significantly increases at a 0.15 AC level and there is a minimal increase at a 0.20 AC level compared to a 0.15 AC level, suggesting that a person with a 0.15 AC is almost as likely to be in an alcohol-related fatal crash as a person with a 0.20 AC (see Appendix E, Table 8).

**Assessments and treatment are not as effective as they could be**

Minnesota statute section 169A.70 requires that all DWI offenders have a chemical use assessment determining the presence of alcohol abuse or dependency. However, the process is sometimes undermined by inconsistencies in assessment tools being used around the state, and the wide range of qualifications of people administering those assessments. Due to the large number of DWI offenders, some judicial districts have already begun using shorter, less comprehensive “screens” in place of the
full assessment, which has contributed to the use of a wide variety of screening and assessment tools around the state.

Once offenders have been assessed and found chemically dependent, it is critical to ensure that they receive adequate treatment. The current DPS driver’s license reinstatement requirement of 48 hours of treatment is outdated, contradicts best practice and current treatment provider licensing requirements for development of a clinically appropriate treatment plan. It also does not meet the needs of most offenders who require individualized treatment and support to stay sober.

**Offenders who fail to reinstate and who drive illegally after a DWI are of significant concern**

Nearly three-quarters of DWI offenders continue to drive after their licenses are revoked. Some offenders may drive illegally after their revocation period has ended because they have not met the requirements for driver’s license reinstatement. A lack of strong criminal consequences for “driving after revocation” offenses further exacerbates the problem of illegal driving. In short, once the driver’s license is revoked, the offender has nothing else to lose.

**Minnesota can make better use of best practices and new technologies**

Nationwide, a number of initiatives and tools for reducing alcohol-related fatalities have been developed and proven effective. Minnesota has embraced many of these initiatives and tools (e.g. administrative license revocation and plate impoundment); however, significant gains in reducing fatalities may be achieved by greater use of the following:

- **Ignition interlock** - Most states have an ignition interlock program in which devices are placed in a DWI offender’s vehicle to measure their AC level prior to starting their vehicle. If alcohol is detected at a designated set point, the vehicle will not start. Several studies show that interlocks are an effective method for preventing alcohol-impaired driving while they are installed. In one study, interlocks cut DWI recidivism at least in half and at times up to 90 percent, compared to similar offenders without interlocks (Beirness and Marques, 2004).

- **Intensive Supervision and DWI Courts** - Many states use intensive supervision and DWI courts to deal with high-risk DWI offenders. These options provide a higher degree of interaction between corrections, judicial professionals and the DWI offender. Strong supervision programs have shown promising results in reducing recidivism. A Michigan study demonstrated that traditional probation offenders were 19 times more likely to be arrested for DWI than a DWI Court participant (NPC Research, 2008). However, these options do not consistently exist throughout Minnesota.

- **Cognitive-based skills education** - Cognitive-based education teaches DWI offenders to recognize and change patterns of behavior that lead to drinking and driving. Minnesota has limited experience with this approach, but for the last four years, Washington County has required all second-time DWI offenders to take a cognitive-based education course called *Driving With Care*. Over 90 percent of offenders entering the program have completed it, and of this group only 7.2 percent have recidivated.
Change Principles

Based on research and extensive discussion, the Project Team and work groups established five change principles to guide their work. These were:

1. **Sanctions must be evidence-based.** Sanctions should be based on research that demonstrates measurable effectiveness. Proposed changes need to be realistic for today, and should consider incentives that encourage compliance.

2. **Public safety is the primary goal.** Sanctions should reduce impaired and other illegal driving by discouraging drinking and driving, and supporting behavior that keeps offenders law-abiding. The most serious sanctions should be reserved for people with higher risk levels of re-offense. Cost was not a driver of recommendations, as more effective policies may both save lives and reduce public expenditures.

   The proposed sanctions are balanced to be swift, certain, and severe in deterring dangerous behavior across the state, and at the same time allow offenders to engage in positive activities in their communities (e.g., maintaining employment and attending chemical dependency treatment sessions) that can contribute to long-term safe and legal driving. Ignition interlock is one new tool that balances these goals; it is designed to improve roadway safety and also provide the ability for a person to function in society.

3. **Sanctions must represent statewide policy and be coordinated across systems.** The sanctions must be designed for application across urban, suburban and rural areas. Also, the administrative sanctions and criminal justice systems share the common objectives of reducing impaired-driving injuries and fatalities, and increasing the number of people driving legally. To this end, the two systems should avoid working at cross-purposes by using effective two-way communication and coordinating their approach.

   Moreover, the sanctions must be coordinated with the chemical dependency treatment system, so that all of the possible consequences of DWI arrest (loss of driving privileges, court appearance, chemical health assessment, treatment, probation, etc.) work together to reduce the likelihood of re-offense.

4. **The process must be simplified and practical, and result in legal driving.** Administrative sanctions impose uniform, consistent and cost-effective consequences to maintain public safety. To increase the sanctions’ effectiveness, every step must be easy to understand and uniformly consistent throughout the state system.

   The recommendations are designed to simplify the driver’s license sanction process and improve communication to drivers about consequences of driving while impaired. The current process is complicated, and drivers often do not understand the sanctions imposed on them or the process to reinstate their driving privileges.

   A core element of practicality is a system that recognizes the fiscal responsibilities of offenders and their ability to pay in order to be reinstated. The recommendations address the reality that many people drive illegally because they do not have the ability to pay.

5. **Treatment approaches should be flexible to meet offenders’ needs.** Current sanctions include one-size-fits-all rehabilitation requirements that do not always promote the success of efforts to reduce traffic-related deaths and injuries. The team’s underlying values in this area included:
Chemical dependency is a disease. Sobriety is a critical element in reducing recidivism among chemically dependent DWI offenders. DWI sanctions should not impede offenders’ ability to receive appropriate treatment.

Early, appropriate, valid assessments help DWI offenders to receive appropriate interventions. Increased accuracy and consistency of assessments will lead to appropriate and effective education and treatment, and thereby decrease repeat DWI offenses.

Matching individual offenders with appropriate treatment and education programs will improve outcomes. High-quality treatment and effective education, such as cognitive-based skills training, are most effective when appropriately matched to the offender’s situation.

Quality control is vital for a consistent statewide approach. Many different professionals using a wide variety of screening and assessment tools are involved in addressing impaired driving in Minnesota. It is important to create consistency and maintain quality control over the programs and services provided.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND RELATED FINDINGS

Summary of Recommendations Approved by the Policy Group

The Policy Group approved six recommendations for changes to the DLAS system, listed below. Detailed descriptions of each recommendation are found on page 24.

1. **Reduce the alcohol concentration level that triggers enhanced DLAS from 0.20 to 0.15**

2. **Lengthen the revocation time for first- and second-time DWI offenders**
   - First-time DWI offenders with an AC level under 0.15
     - Six-month revocation period
     - 15-day hard revocation (period of no driving privileges)
     - Full driving privileges allowed with the installation of an ignition interlock device for the remainder of the 6 months
     - Eliminate option to obtain a limited license
   - First-time DWI Offenders with an alcohol concentration level of 0.15 and above
     - One-year revocation period
     - 15-day hard revocation
     - Full driving privileges allowed with the installation of an ignition interlock device for the remainder of the one year
     - Eliminate option to obtain a limited license
     - Impound license plates; issue regular license plates if an ignition interlock device is installed
   - First-time test refusals
     - First-time DWI offenders who refuse to take a test to determine their AC level should be sanctioned the same as those with an AC of 0.15 or above
   - Second-time DWI offenders (all second-time offenders receive the same sanction)
     - Two-year revocation period
     - 30-day hard revocation
     - Full driving privileges allowed with the installation of an ignition interlock device for the remainder of the two years
     - Eliminate option to obtain a limited license
     - Impound license plates; issue regular license plates if ignition interlock device is installed

3. **Update sanctions for people that are cancelled as “inimical to public safety” (three offenses in 10 years or four in a lifetime)**
   - Revocation periods
     - Third offense in 10 years or fourth on record – 3 years
     - Fourth offense in 10 years – 4 years
     - Fifth offense – 5 years
   - 30-day hard revocation
   - Limited license for one year allowing for completion of a set level of chemical health recovery
   - Full driving privileges allowed with the installation of an ignition interlock device for the remainder of the revocation period
• Period of abstinence followed by a period of “not a drop” while driving a motor vehicle
• Removal of restrictions after 10 years of compliance with all DLAS
• Restrictions placed on the driving record, not on the driver’s license card

4. **Provide effective chemical health screens and assessments**
   • Allow counties the option to use a chemical health screen, in place of an assessment, on first-time DWI offenders that are arrested with an AC level under 0.15
     – Mandate training for people who administer the screen
     – Screening tool used must be approved by a state designated authority
   • Provide quality assurance to ensure that screens are administered correctly and appropriately
   • Require the use of the Rule 25 assessment tool statewide
   • Develop and maintain lists of court-appointed screeners and assessors

5. **Focus enhanced consequence on people who continue to drive after their driving privileges have been withdrawn due to risky driving behavior**
   • Change the definitions of when a license is suspended and/or revoked
     – Suspension = loss of license for financial or other non-driving violations
     – Revocation/cancellation = loss of license for demonstrating risky driving behavior
   • Consequences for “driving after revocation” or “driving after cancellation” offenses
     – First two violations
       ▪ Payable offense
       ▪ Additional loss of driving privileges
       ▪ Required to meet with a DPS Driver Evaluator
     – Third violation
       ▪ No longer a payable offense /mandatory court appearance
       ▪ Additional loss of driving privileges
   • Consequence for “driving after suspension” offense
     – All violations
       ▪ Payable offense
       ▪ No additional loss of driving privileges

6. **Determine effective programs that achieve long-term behavior change and assure statewide access**
   • Create a multi-agency committee that would:
     – Research existing county programs
     – Determine how the Department of Public Safety could work with probation services and the Department of Human Services to assure that identified DWI offenders consistently receive appropriate long-term behavior-change services
     – Determine how a screen or assessment might be used to identify which people would be best served by cognitive-based education
Recommendation 1
Reduce the alcohol concentration level that triggers enhanced DLAS from 0.20 to 0.15

Current Sanctions Overview
Current law imposes enhanced sanctions on first- and second-time DWI offenders with an AC at or above 0.20, which was twice the *per se* AC level for impairment (0.10) at the time the law was enacted in 1998. In 2005, the *per se* limit for impairment was reduced to 0.08 and no changes occurred that would reduce the AC level of enhanced sanctions.

Description of Recommendation
Reduce the AC threshold that triggers enhanced DLAS for first-time DWI offenders from 0.20 to 0.15 AC, and apply enhanced sanctions to all repeat DWI offenders.

Support for Change
Fatality statistics demonstrate a strong relationship between AC levels at 0.15 or above and alcohol-related fatalities
- In Minnesota, more than 63 percent drivers who were involved in fatal crashes and tested positively for alcohol had AC levels of 0.15 or above (DPS) (see Figure 5).
- Drivers with AC levels of 0.15 or above are 200 times more likely to be in a fatal crash than non-drinking drivers (TIRF, 2008).

First-time offenders with AC levels 0.15 and above are more likely to commit a second offense
- DWI offenders with 0.15-0.19 AC level will re-offend at essentially the same rate as offenders with AC levels of 0.20 and higher (Figure 6).
- DWI offenders arrested at 0.10 - 0.14 are less likely to recidivate, indicating that 0.15 AC is a more appropriate threshold for enhanced sanctions.

Source: DPS, 2009c for Fig 5 and Fig 6 (DPS 2007)

Of the 40 states that have established enhanced DLAS for high AC levels, half use 0.15 as the threshold; Minnesota is one of four remaining states that use 0.20 as the threshold.


**Recommendation 2**

**Lengthen the revocation time for first- and second-time DWI offenders**

**Current Sanctions Overview**

The current DLAS impose different revocation periods for first- and second-time DWI offenders based on number of offenses, alcohol concentration (AC) level, and test refusal. The revocation periods are short, sanctions are complicated, and they do not encourage the use of ignition interlock, an effective tool for reducing recidivism. Further, limited license that allow DWI offenders to work, attend school and treatment, are difficult to administer by the DPS. They do not always address changes in work hours and may result in illegal driving.

**Description of Recommendation**

Lengthen the revocation time for first- and second-time DWI offenders and provide the option of full driving privileges restored with the agreement that the offender is restricted to driving only a vehicle with an ignition interlock installed. Provide for a short period of no driving privileges (15-30 days) and eliminate the option of a limited license. Failed attempts to start the vehicle due to alcohol use in the last three months of the required restricted license time-period will result in a longer period of the ignition interlock restricted license. License plates are impounded at the time of arrest and license plates are only issued upon installation of an ignition interlock device (see Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Current and proposed sanctions for first and second-time offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-time offender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Change
Data indicates that providing more serious sanctions for first- and second-time offenders, and promoting ignition interlock use, will have an impact on reducing alcohol-related fatalities and severe injuries, reducing DWI recidivism, and increasing legal driving.

Strengthened DLAS can help reduce repeat offenses. Research indicates that swift and certain sanctions act as a general deterrent, preventing some drivers who might consider drinking and driving from doing so. They also act as a specific deterrent in preventing repeat offenses. A summary of 12 evaluations concluded that administrative sanctions reduced alcohol-related crashes by 13 percent (Wagenaar, Zobek, Williams, & Hingson, 2000).

A focus on first- and second-time offenders can make a significant difference in the number of people that will re-offend.

- In Minnesota, first- and second-time offenders accounted for 84 percent of all drivers with DWIs (DPS, 2007b).
- First-time DWI offenders who are re-arrested account for over 50 percent of the total number of repeat DWI offenders (DPS, 2007b).
• Of the population of first-time DWI offenders who are known to re-offend, approximately 20 percent do so within 12 months of their previous DWI arrest and one-third will re-offend within 24 months (DPS, 2007 arrest data).
Addressing first- and second-time DWI offenders will also have the most significant effect on reducing alcohol-related fatalities. Of all drinking drivers in Minnesota involved in a fatal crash 60 percent had no previous DWI. Of the 40 percent who had a previous DWI, 75 percent had one or two DWIs (DPS, 2009b).

The proposed recommendation eliminates a longer revocation for those that refuse a test and treats those people similar to a person with an alcohol concentration level at 0.15 and above. The current DLAS imposes a longer revocation period for test refusal. This has been in place since 1961 when Minnesota first enacted an implied consent law to revoke the driver’s license of drivers who refuse to submit to chemical testing. The intent was to compel the offender’s cooperation with chemical testing and reduce the refusal rate. The longer revocation period remained in place after Minnesota enacted the nation’s first administrative license revocation law for test failure. However, Minnesota has since enacted a statute that makes refusal to submit to chemical testing a criminal offense, a more serious crime than Driving While Impaired. Data shows that the criminal refusal law has effectively lowered the refusal rate. In 2008, Minnesota’s refusal rate was 12%, which is approximately half of what it was in 1991 and significantly lower than the national average (DPS 2009a). Furthermore, the criminal refusal statute makes the refusal rate less concerning because drivers are prosecuted for refusing the test and the refusal conviction is treated as an impaired driving conviction under Minnesota law. The DLAS is unnecessarily complicated by providing a third revocation period for the 12% of offenders who refuse testing and there is no benefit to continuation of the longer revocation period for test refusal. States without strong criminal refusal statutes may wish to maintain more severe administrative license sanctions for test refusal.

**Ignition Interlock Support**

Research confirms the effectiveness of ignition interlock in reducing recidivism and therefore encouraging first-and second-time DWI offenders to install an II device will result in a reduction of impaired and illegal driving.

- Four studies, each with a unique population, different measures of recidivism, and varying evaluation periods, have concluded that II is effective in reducing recidivism among first-time offenders (EMT Group 1990; Morse and Elliot 1992; Tippets and Voas 1998; Voas et al. 1999).

- A Canadian study compared first offenders with II to a control group of reinstated and non-interlocked drivers and found an 89% reduction in recidivism when comparing first offenders with II to reinstated drivers (Voas et al. 1999).

- More than 10 evaluations of II applications have reported reductions in recidivism ranging from 35 – 90% (Voas and Marques 2003; Vezina 2002; Tippetts and Voas 1997; Coben and Larkin 1999) with an average reduction of 64% (Willis et al. 2005).

- Positive tests for alcohol use reported by an II device, is a predictor of increased risk for re-offense and should be used to determine the time-period that the offender is required to drive a vehicle with it installed. This recommendation would require the offender to continue to drive a vehicle with an II installed until they have no failed test due to alcohol use in the last three months of their ignition interlock use.

- A high rate of failed tests due to alcohol consumption from the II data recording device, particularly in excess of .02%, is predictive of the likelihood of recidivism (Marques et al. 2003; Beirness and Marques 2004).
Ignition interlock allows offenders to resume driving earlier while also ensuring public safety. The recommendation offers those who install an II device full driving privileges, compared to the current restrictions of limited or no driving privileges, and as a result will increase legal driving.

More states are implementing II programs. In 2009, 21 states required II use for first-time offenders; twelve states required II on all first-time offenders and nine required it on first-time offenders with an AC level of 0.15 and above.
Recommendation 3

Update sanctions for people who are cancelled as “inimical to public safety” (three offenses in 10 years or four in a lifetime)

Current Sanctions Overview
Minnesota has not reviewed sanctions imposed on drivers that are cancelled as “inimical to public safety” for over 30 years. Due to their demonstration of risky driving behavior, offenders are required to experience lengthy time periods of no driving privileges. Since many of these offenders need to drive to maintain employment, attend AA, treatment, court and other requirements of their rehabilitation, a lengthy cancellation period encourages illegal driving; an estimated 70 percent of people continue to drive despite not having driving privileges. Further, in the last 30 years, treatment professionals have developed a much greater understanding of chemical dependency and expectations from a person that is going through the recovery process.

Description of Recommendation
The proposed sanctions for these drivers incorporate the following information, while maintaining a focus on reducing alcohol-related driving fatalities and severe injuries and increasing legal driving.

Considerations acknowledged by this recommendation
- “Cancelled” drivers have repeatedly demonstrated risky driving behavior, which compromises public safety.
- People in chemical health recovery often need to drive to be productive citizens.
- Chemical dependency is a medical condition that can be managed through a lifetime process of recovery, and the process of recovery may include relapses.
- Incentives are important for acknowledging success in recovery.

In the proposed system, the cancellation period would range from three to five years, depending upon the number of offenses (see Tables 8 and 9). After a 30-day hard revocation, a person could return to driving with a limited II license that would allow them to drive to work, attend treatment, court and other requirements. They would also enter a monitoring period including abstinence and not-a-drop alcohol restrictions. Full, unrestricted driving privileges would be obtained after 10 years of no alcohol or drug violations.
### Table 8: Current and Proposed Sanctions for “Cancelled” Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed (see Table 9 for additional information)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Time-periods of cancellation of driving privileges – no driving privileges allowed  
  – 3 offense in 10 years or 4 on record - 1 year  
  – Additional arrest or indication of alcohol use with previous completion of rehabilitation - 3 years  
  – Additional arrest or indication of alcohol use with two previous completions of rehabilitations – 6 years | • Time-periods of revocation/cancellation (option of a limited license with the use of ignition interlock after 30 days)  
  – 3 offenses in 10 years or 4 on record – 3 years  
  – 4 offenses in 10 years – 4 years  
  – 5 offenses – 5 years |
| **Conditions of Reinstatement**                                        |                                                  |
| • 1, 3 or 6 years demonstration of no alcohol or controlled substance usage  
  – Completion of treatment  
  – Verified by 5 letters and AA attendance  |                                                  |
| • Life-long restriction of no alcohol or controlled substance usage     |                                                  |
| **Driver License Restrictions**                                        |                                                  |
| • Lifetime restriction prohibiting the use of alcohol (B Card), whether behind the wheel or outside of a vehicle | • Elimination of abstinence restriction on the driver’s license card  
  • Elimination of the lifetime abstinence restriction  
  **Driver License Restrictions**  
  • Elimination of abstinence restriction on the driver’s license card  
  • Elimination of the lifetime abstinence restriction  
  **Conditions of Reinstatement**  
  • After one-year of a limited license and completion of treatment, full driving privileges are restored with an ignition interlock restriction  
  • Ignition interlock restriction may be removed after 3, 4 or 5 years of demonstrated abstinence verified by reports from the ignition interlock device (Time may be extended if alcohol use is detected)  
  • Combination of abstinence and “not a drop behind the wheel” restrictions during the 10 year monitoring period  
  • Consequences that allow for continued restricted driving if relapse occurs (see detailed sanction periods and consequences for relapse in Table 11 below)  
  • Reports of alcohol or drug usage must be substantiated by a blood, breath, or urine test, or refusal of a chemical test  
  **Driver License Restrictions**  
  • Elimination of abstinence restriction on the driver’s license card  
  • Elimination of the lifetime abstinence restriction  
  **Conditions of Reinstatement**  
  • After one-year of a limited license and completion of treatment, full driving privileges are restored with an ignition interlock restriction  
  • Ignition interlock restriction may be removed after 3, 4 or 5 years of demonstrated abstinence verified by reports from the ignition interlock device (Time may be extended if alcohol use is detected)  
  • Combination of abstinence and “not a drop behind the wheel” restrictions during the 10 year monitoring period  
  • Consequences that allow for continued restricted driving if relapse occurs (see detailed sanction periods and consequences for relapse in Table 11 below)  
  • Reports of alcohol or drug usage must be substantiated by a blood, breath, or urine test, or refusal of a chemical test  
  **Driver License Restrictions**  
  • Elimination of abstinence restriction on the driver’s license card  
  • Elimination of the lifetime abstinence restriction  
Table 9: Sanctions and Restriction for Drivers “Inimical to Public Safety”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Offenses</th>
<th>Cancellation period (requiring abstinence and fulfillment of treatment requirements)</th>
<th>Regular driver’s license reinstatement with “Not a Drop behind the wheel” restriction</th>
<th>Full driver’s license reinstatement, no restriction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 within 10 years or 4th on record</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>1 year (limited license)</td>
<td>Additional 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 within 10 years</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>1 year (limited license)</td>
<td>Additional 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more on record</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>1 year (limited license)</td>
<td>Additional 4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed consequences for violations of abstinence and “not a drop behind the wheel” restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents not involving driving</th>
<th>Incidents involving driving</th>
<th>During “not a drop behind the wheel” period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any documented use of alcohol = one additional year of ignition interlock (these additional years are not cumulative)</td>
<td>Any documented use of alcohol behind the wheel returns to beginning of cancellation/1/abstinence period</td>
<td>Any documented use of alcohol involving driving = one additional year of ignition interlock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Change

- The proposed 3, 4 and 5-year abstinence periods correspond to the evidence that 45 percent of those cancelled drivers that recidivate do so within three years, and that 70 percent of those who recidivate do so within five years (DPS, 2009c).

- The requirement for 10 years with no alcohol violations is based on the evidence that 90 percent of drivers with cancelled licenses who recidivate do so within 10 years (DPS, 2009c).

- The abstinence sanctions would help to assure public safety by supporting a regimen of strategies for managing chemical addiction, thus focusing on the underlying reason individuals are designated as “inimical to public safety.” The “not a drop behind the wheel” provision is designed to balance public safety needs with individuals’ needs and responsibilities.

- Removing the current lifetime abstinence restriction provides an incentive for people in recovery and acknowledges their success.

- The DPS recognizes chemical dependency is a medical condition, and the department has a history of cancelling licenses based on medical conditions, such as epilepsy and diabetes, which may have an impact on public safety.

- The limited license is intended to restrict driving during the first year of cancellation and until the offender has completed treatment, when the risk of relapse is considered to be the greatest.

- The sanctions recognize the possibility of relapse, and allow for continued driving while individuals participate in treatment and recovery.

Recommendation 4

Provide effective chemical health screens and assessments

Current Sanctions Overview

Minnesota Statutes, section 169A.70 requires everyone to have a chemical health assessment if they are convicted of any violation resulting from a DWI arrest. The statute references rules adopted by the Commissioner of the Department of Human Services (DHS) under section 254A.03. Prior to 2008, many different assessment tools were compliant with the rule criteria. As of July 1, 2008, the criteria was updated to specify a single statewide assessment tool for use by counties, tribes, and state contracted managed health care plans. While this assessment tool is required for all public pay individuals, or for those requesting a Rule 25 assessment per MS section 256M.70, the tool is of significant length, and may not be required for all offenders. About 50% of offenders currently are required to have a full Rule 25 assessment.

Description of Recommendation

Policies and processes for screening and assessing offenders for alcohol dependency should be improved in order to improve the delivery of recovery resources to individual offenders’ unique chemical dependency needs.

This recommendation includes three sub-proposals:

---

4subdivision 3 (Minnesota Rules, parts 9530.6600 to 9530.6655 - Rule 25).
1. **Allow screening to appropriately determine need for a full assessment.** Allow counties the option to use an approved screen for first-time DWI offenders who test under 0.15 AC who are not public pay or who have not requested assessment per MS section 256M.70. Full assessments would be given to first-time offenders with 0.15 AC and higher, those who refuse the alcohol test, repeat offenders, those whose screen indicates a need for a full assessment, and those who are public pay or request assessment per MS, section 256M.70. DHS would provide a valid screening tool and variances could be granted for tools that meet the same standards. Requirements of a screening program would include:

- Mandated training for people who administer the screen.
- Provide quality assurance to ensure that screens are administered correctly and appropriately.

Approved screening tools used as an alternative to a state-approved screen would have to be:

- Score-able
- Validated to predict need for services
- Address mental health and chemical dependency
- Low-cost

2. **Require chemical health assessments** to be completed according to Minnesota Rules 9530.6600-9530.6655 statewide, and revise MS 169A.70 to require a single assessment tool and to incorporate the tool into a coherent assessment process.

3. **Develop and maintain lists of court-appointed screeners and assessors** who meet the requirements of MS 169A. Persons administering the screen would either meet the same requirements as would assessors, or be a Human Services professional. Lists of approved assessors and screeners would be created at the local level and maintained at the state level.

**Support for Change**

Appropriate use of a screening tool on first-time DWI offenders with an AC level of below 0.15 would provide:

- More efficient use of resources, by filtering who gets a full assessment.
- More appropriate referrals.
- Earlier intervention, in accordance with “best practices”, for people with substance use disorders.

The law requires that everyone convicted of DWI or a lesser charge must have a chemical health assessment according to Minnesota Rules 9530.6600 to 9530.6655. Currently, some counties inappropriately use a screen instead of an assessment as a filter to determine who gets an assessment. Providing clear direction as to when an allowable screen may be used and when the full assessment is required would provide consistency in service in identifying treatment and education needs of DWI offenders which is not present in the current process of using multiple screens and assessments throughout the state.

Use of a screen might not save resources in all circumstances. Some probation officers will choose to “sit down” and use a more complete interview process with offenders regardless of screen availability. Cost depends on the volume and the way the county structures the work. For DWI offenders with an AC of 0.15 or less, who are not public pay and do not request assessment per MS 256M.70, counties
would be allowed to choose whether to use a screen or conduct an assessment according to Minnesota Rules 9530.6600-9530.6655.

As part of this recommendation, DHS would regularly train practitioners on the use of the assessment in response to concern that in the current system some practitioners lack sufficient skills to accurately administer the assessment.

Chemical health assessors must meet criteria established in Rule 9530.6615. These assessors would also be qualified to administer the screening tool, but practitioners authorized to administer the screening tool would not necessarily be authorized to administer the assessment.

**Recommendation 5**

Focus enhanced consequence on people who continue to drive after their driving privileges have been withdrawn due to risky driving behavior

**Current Sanctions Overview**

Minnesota has three levels of driver’s license withdrawal (DAW): suspension, revocation, and cancellation, with increasingly severe consequences for each consecutive level. Each level involves a consequence for poor driving behavior. However, the majority of suspended licenses are a result of outstanding financial payments (e.g. unpaid fine or failure to pay child support). In 2009, in an effort to manage increasing caseloads with diminishing resources, Minnesota’s district courts stopped requiring court appearances for DAW cases. These offenses are treated like petty misdemeanor offenses with a payable fine. An unintended consequence of this change was that the riskiest driving-after-withdrawal violators were treated the same way as non-driving-related violators.

**Description of Recommendation**

The current complicated set of driver’s license suspensions, revocations and cancellations should be redefined so that suspensions are reserved for non-driving-related offenses, and revocations and cancellations are reserved for offenders demonstrating risky driving behavior. Persons with one or two “driving after revocation (DAR)” or “driving after cancellation (DAC)” violations would be required to meet with a Driver Evaluator at the DPS Driver and Vehicle Services. The Driver Evaluator would counsel the offender on the steps required to obtain a legal license and assure compliance with licensing requirements. If the offender incurs a third or more DAR or DAC, a mandatory court appearance would be imposed (see Table 10)
Table 10: Sanctions for Driving After Suspension, Revocation or Cancellation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Offense</th>
<th>Second Offense</th>
<th>Third or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAS</strong></td>
<td>• Payable</td>
<td>• Payable</td>
<td>• Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No additional loss of driving privileges</td>
<td>• No additional loss of driving privileges</td>
<td>• No additional loss of driving privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAR / DAC</strong></td>
<td>• Payable</td>
<td>• Payable</td>
<td>• Mandatory court appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional loss of driving privileges</td>
<td>• Additional loss of driving privileges</td>
<td>• Additional loss of driving privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required meeting with a Driver Evaluator</td>
<td>• Required meeting with a Driver Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed definitions of license suspension and revocation
- Suspension = loss of license for financial or other non-driving violations
- Revocation/cancellation = loss of license for demonstrating risky driving behavior

The recommendation would require additional Driver Evaluators to conduct the hearings with DAW violators. Additional staff could be funded by a slight increase ($10.00 to $20.00) of the $30.00 reinstatement fee for non-alcohol driver license revocations.

**Support for Change**
DAW data from 2007 indicates:
- Only 9% of license suspensions were for moving violations; therefore, the majority of license suspensions are already for financial reasons and changing the definition of license suspension will have minimal impact.
- Over half the time (54%), the reason for driving privilege withdrawal is for non-driving violations; 104,155 of all 193,181 withdrawals were suspensions for non-driving violations, such as unpaid fines and unpaid child support.
- By focusing only on those drivers that “drive after revocation/cancellation” it eliminates over half of the people that lose their driving privileges and allows the limited resources available time to focus on those drivers that put others at risk on the roadway.
- Driving after withdrawal violators continue to violate and are often not held accountable for their actions. Some of these violators are confused on the steps needed to reinstate their license and would benefit from a meeting with a Driver Evaluator that can explain the reinstatement requirements. The 15,539 repeat DAW violations were incurred by 10,990 drivers; half of repeat DAW drivers will re-offend and 35% of all DAW violations are incurred by people with three or more violations.

Source: DPC, 2009c
**Recommendation 6**

Determine effective programs that achieve long-term behavior change and assure statewide access

**Current Sanctions Overview**

Current sanctions try to encourage long-term DWI behavior changes by requiring some repeat offenders to complete chemical dependency treatment, participate in a support group, and provide five letters attesting to the offender’s abstinence. In addition, some counties provide special services such as DWI courts and intensive supervision programs, which are known to be effective where they are available. However, these measures are not provided statewide.

**Description of Recommendation**

Achieving long-term DWI behavior change requires cooperation among multiple agencies concerned with reducing DWIs. This recommendation would create a multi-agency committee to:

- Further research what each county is doing to address long-term behavior change of DWI offenders, including cognitive-based education, DWI courts, and intensive supervision programs.

- Determine how an assessment or screen could be used to identify which people would be best served by cognitive-based education.

- Determine how the Department of Public Safety could work jointly with the three-tier delivery system of probation services and the Department of Human Services to assure that identified DWI offenders consistently receive appropriate long-term behavior-change services.

**Support for Change**

New approaches are needed to help address long-term behavior change, such as cognitive-based education, DWI courts and intensive supervision programs. A study on DWI Courts demonstrated that traditional probation offenders were 19 times more likely to be arrested for DWI than a DWI Court participant (NPC Research, 2008). Currently, Minnesota has 10 DWI Courts and several other Hybrid (DWI and Drug) Courts; however, supervision is not consistent throughout the state. Another promising tool being used increasingly to address behavior change is cognitive-based education. The Driving with Care program, for example, is being used in several Minnesota counties.

Additional research is needed on the effectiveness of these programs and a plan for statewide implementation. This recommendation would create a committee of knowledgeable professionals working with DWI offenders to develop and implement the new approaches described above.

Committee members would include:

- Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers (MACPO);
- MN Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC);
- MN Department of Corrections;
- MN Department of Human Services; and
- MN Department of Public Safety.
V. FINAL OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

On May 18, 2010, Governor Tim Pawlenty signed a major piece of legislation calling for strong DWI sanctions and requiring the use of ignition interlocks. The legislation is effective July 1, 2011. Many of the recommendations of the DLAS Initiative were included in the Governor’s initiative. The outcome of each recommendation from the DLAS Initiative is shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Proposed DLAS Initiative System Changes and Legislative Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Recommendation</th>
<th>Legislative Outcome (2010 legislation effective on July 1, 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the AC level that triggers enhanced administrative sanctions from 0.20 to 0.15.</td>
<td>The AC level that triggers enhanced administrative sanctions was reduced from 0.20 to 0.16 (instead of 0.15 as recommended).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify DLAS by eliminating the use of enhanced administrative sanctions for repeat offenders.</td>
<td>The tiered system of enhancing sanctions for high AC levels of second-time offenders remained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthen revocation periods for DWI offenders and provide the option of full driving privileges with the restriction of driving only a vehicle with II installed.</td>
<td>Revocations were lengthened for all DWI offenders except first-time offenders with an AC level less than 0.16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for a short period of no driving privileges (hard revocation).</td>
<td>A short period of no driving privileges was eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the use of a limited license.</td>
<td>The use of limited licenses was eliminated with the exception of first-time DWI offenders with an AC level of less than 0.16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update administrative sanctions for people that are cancelled as “inimical to public safety” (three offenses in 10 years or four in a lifetime).</td>
<td>Legislation was passed that updated many of the proposed recommendations into law and provided the ability to write into rule other recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide effective chemical health</td>
<td>These recommendations were not included in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Summarized; see Section IV for full proposals.
### Proposed Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Legislative Outcome (2010 legislation effective on July 1, 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>screens and assessments.</td>
<td>the 2010 legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus enhanced consequence on those that continue to drive after their driving privileges were withdrawn due to risky driving behavior.</td>
<td>These recommendations were not included in the 2010 legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine effective programs that achieve long-term behavior change and assure statewide access.</td>
<td>No action has been taken at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusion

The **DLAS Initiative** was very successful in identifying administrative sanctions that could more effectively reduce alcohol-related fatalities and increase legal driving. Many of the recommendations were included in the Governor’s Initiative that passed into law May 18, 2010. The bill had support from a wide-range of stakeholders due to the inclusiveness of the committee structure, resulting in groups testifying for the bill that would not normally support stronger DWI Sanctions. The bill passed into law with only one opposing vote in both the Senate and the House.

Not all recommendations were included in the Governor’s Initiative. The recommendations that were included will have significant impact on the driver licensing division and time is needed to enact such significant changes.

Through the process, DPS identified key factors that contributed to project success. These included:

- Be inclusive - identify all stakeholders and make sure to include them in the process.
- Educate all stakeholders on the current system; many of them only know their slice of the system.
- Provide administrative support for documentation and meeting facilitation.
- Allow time to research state’s data along with national best practices; inform stakeholders on research results.
- Recommendations must be data driven – this is critical.
- Be deliberate in prioritizing those areas where compromise is not possible, and those areas where flexibility is possible.

The **Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative** provides a roadmap for future impaired driving traffic safety initiatives and identifies key strategies that can reduce alcohol-related deaths and increase legal driving. These recommendations were developed by a dedicated group of impaired driving stakeholders and consideration should be given to implementing additional recommendations in the future.
Appendix A: Sanctions Terminology and Definitions

AC (alcohol concentration) – Is defined by statute as: the number of grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood; the number of grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath; or the number of grams of alcohol per 67 milliliters of urine.

Cancelled as inimical to public safety – If the Commissioner of Public Safety has good cause to believe that the operation of a motor vehicle on the highways by a person would be inimical to public safety or welfare, the Commissioner has the authority to cancel driving privileges. A person is defined as inimical to public safety for three or more impaired driving arrests in ten years or four impaired driving arrests in a lifetime.

DWI incident – An alcohol-related offense associated with an implied consent incident and/or a DWI conviction. A person may have an implied consent incident on their driving record with no associated DWI conviction or a DWI conviction with no associated implied consent revocation. Either situation is considered a DWI incident. A DWI conviction and implied consent revocation arising from the same behavioral incident are only counted as one DWI incident.

Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions (DLAS) refers to the administrative sanctions imposed on drivers by the Department of Public Safety (the driver licensing authority) for violating their privilege to drive by putting others drivers at risk on the roadway. Specific administrative sanctions that were reviewed were those imposed on a driver that is arrested for driving a vehicle with an alcohol concentration level of 0.08 or above or refusing to take a test to determine their alcohol concentration level. These are referred to as “administrative” sanctions to distinguish them from criminal penalties which are imposed by the courts. For the purposes of this initiative, administrative sanctions were reviewed only in terms of their relevance to impaired driving and legal/responsible driving after withdrawal of driving privileges due to an DWI incident.

The DLAS System refers to the compilation of people, agencies, policies, laws, rules, procedures and interests involved with DLAS for impaired driving. The word “system” is used loosely to refer to the interconnectedness of all these individuals and groups involved in setting, administering, enforcing and experiencing the effects of driver’s license administrative sanctions.

Hard revocation – Revocation of driving privileges for which a DWI offender is not eligible for any type of driving privileges.

Ignition interlock device – A breath alcohol analyzer that is connected to a motor vehicle ignition. In order to start the motor vehicle engine, a driver must blow an alveolar breath sample into the analyzer which measures the alcohol concentration. If the alcohol concentration exceeds the startup set point on the interlock device, the motor vehicle engine will not start.

Implied Consent – A driver’s consent to drug or alcohol testing that is implied by the driver’s actions in applying for a driver’s license.
**Implied Consent Incident** - An incident whereas a driver, when requested by law enforcement, withdraws implied consent and refuses to submit to a drug or alcohol test. The term is commonly used to include chemical test failures (i.e. drivers who test above the *per se* limit for alcohol) and chemical test refusals.

**Limited license** – A restricted license issued to a person while their driving privileges are under revocation or suspension. It provides the ability for a person to drive to work, school, and support programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA).

**Per Se** - Latin phrase used in English to mean "in itself". Meaning that driving a vehicle with an alcohol concentration level of 0.08 and above is in itself enough cause for administrative sanctions to be imposed.

**Recidivism** – An act of a person re-offending for an offense of driving while impaired.

**Revocation** – Loss of driving privileges. To reinstate a driver license after a license revocation, a person must take a driving test, pay a reinstatement fee and apply for a new license, in addition to comply with any other imposed requirements

**Suspension** – Loss of driving privileges. To reinstate a driver license after a license suspension, a person must pay a reinstatement fee, in addition to comply with any other imposed requirements.
Appendix B: Project Charter

MN Driver’s License Administrative Sanctions Initiative
Project charter

Project Overview
The Office of Traffic Safety seeks the input and advice of professionals on ways to enhance the driver’s license administrative sanctions system so that the number of fatalities and severe injuries resulting from alcohol-related traffic crashes in Minnesota is further reduced and the number of people driving legally and responsibly increases. The project will produce recommendations to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety on ways to enhance the driver’s license administrative sanction system to measurably and cost-effectively reduce alcohol-related fatalities and severe injuries, and increase legal and responsible driving.

Background
On average, 35% of traffic fatalities in Minnesota are alcohol-related. The most effective countermeasure known to reduce alcohol-related fatalities is a driving-while-impaired arrest. Driver’s license sanctions are imposed on drivers when arrested for impaired driving. While driver’s license sanctions have been effective in decreasing alcohol-related fatalities and severe injuries, several challenges exist:

- National research indicates that 70% of drivers that are revoked or cancelled drive illegally. In Minnesota, approximately 36,000 charges are filed each year for driving after withdrawal. Besides driving illegally, many of these people are driving uninsured.
- Recidivism after rehabilitation: 87% of people that are cancelled as inimical to public safety for a second or subsequent time are cancelled within 10 years of completing rehabilitation requirements for license reinstatement.

The driver’s license sanctions for driving while impaired have not been reviewed for 20 – 30 years, during which time national innovations and improved practices have been developed. Emerging research and improved technologies known to reduce impaired driving offer new opportunities that may improve the results of Minnesota’s system of administrative sanctions.

Program Organizational Structure
The following groups serve the following roles to support the project:

Work groups – Four work groups will review research on current laws, policies and practices, identify key issues, and develop options and present them to TAP.

Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) – Work group representatives and other stakeholders will review work group proposals with an awareness of overlapping issues across the four topic areas and provide feedback to work groups and project team.

Project Team – Staff of DPS, courts, and county attorneys will execute core project tasks, set project direction, and develop recommendations to present to the Policy Group.
Policy Group – Key leaders in organizations involved with driver’s license administrative sanctions will provide overall project oversight, establish policy, and promote change, if needed.

Project Timeline
Phase 1 (June – September 2008): Identification of priority issues
Phase 2 (October 2008 – September 2009): Issue analysis and development of recommendations
Phase 3: Implementation

Expectations of members
• Members will strive to attend each meeting. If unable to attend, members should contact the key contact person for that meeting.
• If members miss meetings, they should review materials from the missed meeting and talk to a member who was present, in order to keep up with the rest of the group when they return.
• Nonmembers are welcome to attend meetings. While only members will participate in decision-making, nonmembers will be able to contribute input during meetings and by submitting written comments and questions.

Operating guidelines
• Unity of purpose: Though participants come from diverse organizations, they share responsibility for the group’s success.
• Atmosphere of respect: Each group member acknowledges the value of other members and gives genuine consideration to others’ ideas. Each has an equal opportunity to influence the group’s thinking.

Consensus
• We define consensus as when the whole group consents, or can live with the decision (70 per cent comfortable/100 per cent willing to support). Each decision will have some members more comfortable on the matter than others. Consensus will reflect a decision that everyone can live with, after thorough discussion and exchange of ideas.
• Documents produced by the group will reflect not only the consensus, but will include minority viewpoints in a less formal way than minority reports.

Communications outside this group
• We will strive to communicate externally in ways that support the work of this group.
• At the end of each meeting, we will plan for needed communications with colleagues and others before the next meeting.
• We will not report the remarks of other members without permission.
• Meeting summaries are in “draft” status until they are approved at the next meeting.
• We will let committee staff know of media contacts or concerns.
• We will work to characterize decisions accurately.
• We will share information with our organizations, recognizing our responsibility to communicate in a manner that does not create barriers to future cooperation.
• We acknowledge a possibility of discord between this group’s decisions and an organization’s objectives. Group members agree not to criticize the decisions of the group but are free to identify the discord.

For more information, please contact Project Manager Jean Ryan, Impaired Driving Program Coordinator with the Office of Traffic Safety at 651-201-7074; or via e-mail at Jean.M.Ryan@state.mn.us.
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# Appendix D: Current and proposed sanctions

## Appendix D, Table 1: Current Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; offense below 0.20</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; offense 0.20 and above</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; offense, refused test</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; offense below 0.20 or test refusal</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; offense 0.20 and above or test refusal</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; offense in 10 yrs below 0.20 (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cancellation)</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; offense in 10 yrs 0.20 and above or test refusal (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cancellation)</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; offense (2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; cancellation)</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; offense (3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; cancellation)</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; or more offenses (add’l cancellations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard revocation</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>many variables</td>
<td>many variables</td>
<td>many variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>90 days (30 days if plead guilty to DWI)</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>1 year (30 days if plead guilty to DWI)</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>many variables</td>
<td>many variables</td>
<td>many variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 1 yr abstinence or 2 yrs w/o treatment</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 1 yr abstinence or 2 yrs w/o treatment</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum 3 yrs of abstinence or 4 yrs w/o treatment</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 6 yrs abstinence or 7 yrs w/o treatment</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 6 yrs abstinence or 7 yrs w/o treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impound all offender's plates</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Forfeiture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Paper License</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Alcohol Use Restriction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
<td>Yes, life time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sanctions Reference**
  - 1<sup>st</sup> offense below 0.20
  - 1<sup>st</sup> offense 0.20 and above
  - 1<sup>st</sup> offense, refused test
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> offense below 0.20 or test refusal
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> offense 0.20 and above or test refusal
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> offense in 10 yrs below 0.20 (1<sup>st</sup> cancellation)
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> offense in 10 yrs 0.20 and above or test refusal (1<sup>st</sup> cancellation)
  - 4<sup>th</sup> offense (2<sup>nd</sup> cancellation)
  - 5<sup>th</sup> offense (3<sup>rd</sup> cancellation)
  - 6<sup>th</sup> or more offenses (add’l cancellations)

- **Variables Reference**
  - Many variables
  - N/A

**Notes:**
- Impound all offender's plates
- Vehicle Forfeiture
- Limited Paper License
- No Alcohol Use Restriction
### Appendix D, Table 2: Proposed Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>1st offense</th>
<th>2nd offense in 10 yrs including test refusal</th>
<th>3rd offense in 10 yrs, 4th in a lifetime (1st cancellation)</th>
<th>5th and 6th offenses (2nd and 3rd cancellations)</th>
<th>More than 6 offenses (add'l cancellations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard revocation</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation or Ignition Interlock (II)</td>
<td>1 year or full driving privileges under II</td>
<td>2 years or full driving privileges under II</td>
<td>3 years or limited driving privileges for 1st year and 2 years full driving privileges under II</td>
<td>4 years or limited driving privileges for 1st year and 3 years full driving privileges under II</td>
<td>5 years or limited driving privileges for 1st year and 4 years full driving privileges under II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 3 years abstinence (if II detected drinking incident, II time starts over)</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 4 years abstinence (if II detected drinking incident, II time starts over)</td>
<td>Cancelled a minimum of 5 years abstinence (if II detected drinking incident, II time starts over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impoundment of all offender’s plates</td>
<td>Yes, until II</td>
<td>Yes, until II</td>
<td>Yes, until II</td>
<td>Yes, until II</td>
<td>Yes, until II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Paper License (e.g., days of wk, hrs)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (partial period)</td>
<td>Yes (partial period)</td>
<td>Yes (partial period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Abstinence and “Not a drop” Requirements | No | No | Yes, 10 years  
- Three years abstinence, 7 years “not a drop”  
- Alcohol-use violations add time to existing sanctions | Yes, 10 years.  
- Four years abstinence, 6 years “not a drop”  
- Alcohol-use violations add time to existing sanctions | Yes, 10 years.  
- Five years abstinence, five years “not a drop”  
- Alcohol-use violations add time to existing sanctions |
| Offender Assessment & Completion of Requirements | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

---

6 Abstinence requires no alcohol consumption, whether or not one is driving. “Not a drop” restrictions prohibit a driver from having any alcohol in his/her bloodstream when driving.
Appendix E: Selected Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety Impaired Driving Statistics

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No prior offenses</th>
<th>1 prior offenses</th>
<th>2 prior offenses</th>
<th>3 prior offenses</th>
<th>4 prior offenses</th>
<th>5 or more prior offenses</th>
<th>Total drivers with a prior DWI offense involved in a fatal crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings
- Table 1 indicates the number of DWI offenses on the driving record of drinking drivers prior to being involved in a fatal crash.
- The majority (60%) of drinking drivers did not have any DWI on their driving record at the time of the fatal crash.
- Driving records indicate that 45 percent (85 out of 190) of the drinking drivers who had a prior DWI offense only had one prior.
Key Findings

- Table 2 above indicates the number of drinking drivers involved in a fatal crash and the number of months between the date of the previous DWI arrest and the occurrence of the fatal crash.
- Over a three year period, 29 drinking drivers were involved in a fatal crash within 12 months of a DWI arrest.
Table 3  Projected 2007 recidivism rate based on historical data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; to 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Offense</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; to 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Offense</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; to 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Recidivating</td>
<td>Percentage of Offenders who are Known to incur an Additional Offense</td>
<td>Cumulative Recidivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>5,249</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6,105</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>6,839</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>28.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>7,396</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>31.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>7,879</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>33.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>8,276</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>34.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>36.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>37.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>9,156</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>9,393</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>39.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>9,579</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>9,804</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Recidivating</td>
<td>13,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in 2007 Cohort</td>
<td>23,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>4th to 5th Offense</th>
<th>5th to 6th Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Recidivating</td>
<td>Percentage of Offenders who are Known to incur an Additional Offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Not Recidivating</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings:

- Appendix B, Table 3 indicates the number of people arrested for impaired driving based on the number of offenses at the time of arrest and recidivism rate of those people. Based on historical recidivism rate data, the table also indicates the percentage of people that will recidivate at set time periods.

- Fifty percent of those that will recidivate do so within four years and approximately 90% do so within 10 years. This is true at all degrees of recidivism.

- Forty percent of drivers that are arrested for impaired driving for the first time will recidivate.

- After the second offense, 50% of offenders will recidivate. This percentage remains relatively constant for rate of recidivism.

- By far the largest gain attainable in reducing the number of people re-arrested for impaired driving is by reducing the number of first time DWI offenders who incur a second offense.
Alcohol Concentration Test Results of Drivers Who Incurred an Impaired Driving Incident: 2005 – 2007

Table 4: BAC Level and Number of Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Concentration Level</th>
<th>0.08-0.09</th>
<th>0.10-0.14</th>
<th>0.15-0.19</th>
<th>0.20-0.24</th>
<th>0.25-0.29</th>
<th>0.30-0.34</th>
<th>0.35+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Time DWI Offenders</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>28,103</td>
<td>20,374</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat DWI Offenders</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>12,153</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DWI Offenders</td>
<td>9,162</td>
<td>40,272</td>
<td>32,527</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings

- Appendix B, Table 4a indicates the number of first time DWI offenders, repeat DWI offenders and total DWI offenders at set alcohol concentration levels.
- Half of people arrested have an alcohol concentration level of 0.15 or above. Repeat DWI offenders are more likely to have an alcohol concentration of 0.15 or above (45% first time DWI offenders 59% repeat DWI offenders).
Table 5: Repeat Offenders Have Higher BAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average AC level</th>
<th>Total tested</th>
<th>Test refusals</th>
<th>Total incidents</th>
<th>Average yearly DWI offenders 0.15 AC or above</th>
<th>Percent of DWI offenders 0.15 AC or above</th>
<th>Average yearly DWI offenders 0.20 AC or above</th>
<th>Percent of DWI offenders 0.20 of above</th>
<th>Percent of DWI offenders who refused to test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time DWI offenders</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>63,696</td>
<td>8,461</td>
<td>72,157</td>
<td>9,631</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat DWI offenders</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>35,481</td>
<td>9,984</td>
<td>45,465</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DWI offenders</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>99,177</td>
<td>18,445</td>
<td>117,622</td>
<td>16,561</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5,719</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings
- Appendix C, Table 4b indicates the number and percentage of all first time DWI offenders and repeat DWI offenders who are arrested at 0.15 or above and 0.20 and above over a three year time period. It also indicates the number of offenders who refused to take a test.
- Those arrested for a repeat DWI offense are twice as likely to have an alcohol concentration level of 0.20 or above than those arrested for the first time.
- Those arrested for a repeat DWI offense are twice as likely to refuse to take a test to determine alcohol concentration at the time of arrest.
Table 6. Alcohol concentration (AC) level of first-time DWI offenders who incurred a second offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC Level</th>
<th>0.01 – 0.07</th>
<th>0.08-0.09</th>
<th>0.10-0.14</th>
<th>0.15-0.19</th>
<th>0.20-0.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total First-time offenders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,201</td>
<td>5,152</td>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recidivating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of first-time DWI offenders who recidivated with stated AC level on first offense</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Percentage of first-time DWI offenders who recidivated in 1998

---

7 Based on first-time DWI offenders in 1998 that incurred a second offense (does not include all test results).
Table 8. Alcohol concentration level of drivers killed in a fatal crash 2003 – 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Concentration Level</th>
<th>Number of Killed Drivers in a Fatal Crash</th>
<th>Number of all Drivers in a Fatal Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Drivers in Fatal Crashes Where BAC Level is Known

Key Findings

- Figure 1 is a ten year look at first time DWI offenders in 1998 that incurred a second offense and the alcohol concentration level of the offender at the time of the first offense. In 1998 the per se alcohol concentration level for impaired driving was 0.10, therefore there were very few people arrested at the 0.01 to 0.09 AC level.
- The largest increase of AC levels that were over the per se alcohol concentration level was 0.15-0.19.
- There is very little difference in recidivism rates for first-time DWI offenders with BAC of 0.15 to 0.19 or with BAC levels of over 0.20.
- Table 6 is the alcohol concentration level of killed drivers and all drivers involved in a fatal crash that were positive for alcohol use.
- The most common alcohol concentration level of a drinking driver involved in a fatal crash is 0.20.

As a person’s alcohol concentration level increases, the more likely the person will be involved in a fatal crash.
## Driving after Withdrawal Data

### Table 9: 2007 Withdrawal Suspension Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Suspension Withdrawal</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court ordered withdrawal (unpaid fines, fail to appear, civil judgments, child support, court ordered)</td>
<td>104,155</td>
<td>104,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non moving violation suspensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple moving violations</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No driver license or endorsements</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Under 21 alcohol consumption</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total suspensions for moving violations</strong></td>
<td>11,256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all suspension</strong></td>
<td>115,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation Withdrawals</td>
<td>58,911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation Withdrawals</td>
<td>18,859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all revocation and cancellation</strong></td>
<td>77,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total moving violation withdrawals</strong></td>
<td>89,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total all withdrawals</strong></td>
<td>193,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Findings**
- 9% of suspensions are for moving violations.
- 46% of all withdrawals are for moving violations.

### Table 10: 2008 Driving after Withdrawal Violation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Level</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>11,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 1st and 2nd</strong></td>
<td>17,776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3 or more</strong></td>
<td>9,518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Findings**
- The 15,539 repeat DAW violations were incurred by 10,990 drivers, one third of violations are the same violator.
Thirty five percent of all driving after withdrawal are 3 or more violations.
GOVERNOR PAWLENTY SIGNS LEGISLATION FOR STRONGER DWI SANCTIONS; REQUIRES USE OF IGNITION INTERLOCKS -- May 18, 2010

Saint Paul – Governor Tim Pawlenty today signed legislation to strengthen sanctions against DWI offenders and require certain offenders to use ignition interlock devices. The legislation becomes effective July 1, 2011, and aims to enhance road safety to prevent alcohol-related crashes which account for one-third of all Minnesota traffic deaths annually. The legislation gives DWI offenders a chance to regain driving privileges by ensuring safe and legal driving through the use of interlocks.

Interlock devices are installed in a vehicle and require a driver to provide a breath sample in order for the vehicle to start. The vehicle will not start if the device detects an alcohol-concentration level of 0.02 or above after the driver blows into its tube. Interlocks require rolling re-tests after the initial test, and have features to deter others from starting the vehicle for the intended user.

“This legislation demonstrates Minnesota is serious about preventing impaired driving and the tragedies that result from the deadly decision to get behind the wheel after drinking too much,” Governor Pawlenty said. “Stronger sanctions and employing smarter tools such as interlock devices are necessary to step up the fight against this illegal and dangerous behavior. With this law, if you don’t breathe, you don’t leave.”

Highlights of the legislation include:

• DWI offenders with a 0.16 and above alcohol-concentration level will be required to have ignition interlock devices installed on any vehicle they drive.

• DWI offenders with a 0.16 and above alcohol-concentration level that choose not to use ignition interlocks will not have driving privileges ranging from one year to six years — depending on offense level. Offenders with three or more DWIs in a 10-year period will be required to use interlocks.

• Interlock users will regain full driving privileges immediately after the offense, ensuring they are driving with a valid license and not a threat on the roadway.

• Interlocks will be used to monitor chronic DWI offenders (three or more DWIs in 10 year period) to verify chemical use.

In the United States, 46 states have implemented interlock requirements for DWI offenders. Research from the leading ignition interlock institution, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, reports interlocks can reduce repeat DWI offenses by 45 percent to 90 percent.

Minnesota Department of Public Safety (DPS) Commissioner Michael Campion says the increased sanctions and use of interlocks will help to deter motorists from driving impaired, and therefore reduce alcohol-related fatalities.

“Minnesota cannot continue to allow these preventable deaths and injuries on our roads due to drinking and driving,” says Campion. “This law is about saving lives, keeping motorists safe, and sending a message to motorists that impaired driving is a serious crime with serious consequences.”
Campion says the benefits of the new legislation will include safer roads and reduced costs through the use of ignition interlock on high-risk drivers. He adds the law creates a method for all offenders to obtain a valid driver's license to address the epidemic of DWI offenders driving without a valid license. Campion says the use of interlocks also encourages behavior modification and rehabilitation, and diminishes the probability and possibility of repeat DWI.

"Minnesota has made progress in limiting alcohol-related traffic deaths in recent years," says Campion, citing enhanced, targeted enforcement and education outreach efforts. "To continue this trend, it's important that legislators and the governor took action to embrace interlock technology to prevent impaired driving crimes."

The interlock legislation is one of many traffic safety legislative pieces in recent years — felony DWI (2004); 0.08 legal alcohol-concentration limit (2005); ban on cell phone use for new teen drivers (2006); stronger teen graduated driver’s licensing laws (2008); ban on texting, emailing and web access (2008); primary seat belt law (2009); and booster seat law requirement for children (2009).

A current Minnesota ignition interlock pilot program began in July 2009 and more than 1,000 DWI offenders have enrolled to regain their driver's licenses sooner and are legally driving with interlocks.
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