

Testimony for Public Hearing
Members of the Judiciary Committee
March 17, 2014

Robin Cullen
125 Peters Lane
Rockfall, CT 06481

SB 465 An Act Concerning Ignition Interlock Devices

Good Afternoon. My name is Robin Cullen. I am a former employee, current volunteer, and board member at Mothers Against Drunk Driving in Connecticut. I appreciate the opportunity to submit testimony today and thank you for holding this Judiciary Public Hearing. I fervently hope this legislation is passed. It will maximize the use of ignition interlock devices to save lives until that day comes when all motor vehicles coming off assembly lines are equipped with a Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety.

I have come before this committee today to endorse interlock **Senate Bill 465**, An Act Concerning Installation, Use and Enforcement Regarding Ignition Interlock Devices.

- An average drunk driver has driven drunk 80 times before his/her first arrest.
- 50 to 75 percent of convicted drunk drivers continue to drive on a suspended license.
- Installation of ignition interlocks reduces re-arrest rates by a median of 67%. *

Repeat offenders are responsible for approximately 30% of the drunk driving arrests, crashes, deaths, and injuries. Repeat offenders kill thousands and injure tens of thousands each year. Traveling our roadways, driving among us, are 2 million repeat offenders, people with three or more drunk driving offenses.

During my employment as Victim Impact Panel Coordinator for MADD countless offenders spoke out in favor of being required to install an IID. Many stated they felt safer from themselves, that before the IID they had little actual help with changing their behavior of drinking and driving. Many asked if they could keep the IID beyond the mandated term to continue to monitor themselves, but without penalty if they were found by the device to be impaired, stating they would simply not be able drive.

According to The Effectiveness of Ignition Interlocks for Preventing Alcohol-Impaired Driving and Alcohol-Related Crashes, A Community Guide Systematic Review, "Typically, interlock programs have been targeted to repeat and high BAC offenders. However, first time DWI offenders more closely resemble repeat offenders than they do non-offenders, and the results of this review suggest that interlocks are as effective with first time DWI offenders as they are with repeat offenders. Thus, it would likely be a major boost to overall public safety to require first-time DWI offenders to participate in an interlock program. Making participation in such programs mandatory instead of at the discretion of judges, offenders, or both would also help to maximize interlock use." 1. The IID is not a punishment. It is an intervention. It is proactive. It is immediately effective. Requiring IID's saves lives.

I support strengthening the current IID law to maximize the use of life saving IID's. Thank you.