



April 7, 2025

The Honorable Chair, Senator Alan Clark

The Honorable Vice Chair, Senator Tyler Dees and Honorable Committee Members:

On behalf of our organizations, we urge your support and swift passage of House Bill 1875, by Representative Dwight Tosh and Senator Steve Crowell to add a compliance-based removal (“CBR”) requirement to the current ignition interlock law in Arkansas.

This legislation builds upon Arkansas’s successful ignition interlock law. Currently, 35 states and the District of Columbia have some form of Compliance-Based Removal law, meaning that a current ignition interlock user must prove sobriety before being allowed to discontinue use of the ignition interlock device (“IID”) and participation in the Interlock program. HB 1875 creates such a law, which is important and proven to changing behavior. Under CBR law, drivers with an Interlock installed in their vehicle must have been violation-free for the last 60 days. If not, the time on their device is extended by 60 days until they prove themselves sober to drive, exit the Interlock program, and have full driving privileges reinstated.

- [Studies](#) show that ignition interlocks reduce recidivism—[by up to 70%](#)— among first-time, repeat and high-risk offenders while they are installed.
- Research on interlocks has shown that they can effectively monitor offenders, facilitate behavioral change, and reduce recidivism rates among this population. (McCartt et. Al, 2013; Casanova Powell et. al, 2015, McGinty, 2017)
- Interlock extensions were found to decrease recidivism among all levels of offense, including high BAC and repeat populations of DWI offenders (of which 65 percent of impaired driving fatalities occur). Compliance-based removal, or interlock extensions based on compliant performance over a specific period of time, was a strong recommendation as a result of “Evaluation of State Ignition Interlock Programs: Interlock Use Analyses From 28 States” study (Casanova et. al, 2015).
- An article studying the effects of [ignition interlock laws on fatal crashes between 1982 and 2013](#) found that mandatory laws for all offenders “would have significant public health benefit” and “are more effective at reducing alcohol-involved fatal crashes than laws requiring interlocks for segments of high-risk offenders.”

This legislation will protect people on the roadways while still allowing drivers with DUIs to continue driving and fulfill family and work obligations. Laws requiring the use of IIDs by first-time and repeat offenders until there is proven compliance have been shown to reduce or prevent impaired driving. It is considered a best practice and effective countermeasure to fight DUIs. If we can be of assistance in your efforts to enact this measure, feel free to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Belew, Chairman, Arkansas Impaired Driving Prevention Task Force and Representative, MADD, Heartland Region  
[teresabelew@yahoo.com](mailto:teresabelew@yahoo.com)

David A. Kunce, Public Affairs Specialist, AAA  
kunce.david@ace.aaa.com

Catherine Chase, President, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety  
cchase@saferoads.org

Chris Swonger, CEO of the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States and Responsibility.org  
Chris.swonger@distilledspirits.org

Jerod Breit, Regional Executive Director, Mothers Against Drunk Driving  
jerod.breit@madd.org

Dr. Darrin Grondel, Director, National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving  
Darrin.grondel@responsibility.org

Lorraine Martin, CEO, National Safety Council  
radford@nsc.org

Kelly Poulsen, Vice President of Government Relations, Responsibility.org  
Kelly.Poulsen@Responsibility.org

Scott Myers, President and CEO, Students Against Destructive Decisions  
smyers@sadd.org

Debra Coffey, Board Director, Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment (SAFE)  
Debra@safedrive.org