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This year’s 2008 Roadmap to State Highway Safety Laws represents Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety’s fifth annual review of state progress in adopting 15 key traffic safety laws requiring seat belt, motorcycle helmet and booster seat use, as well effective teen driving and impaired driving restrictions. There are individual successes to celebrate in 2007, but when viewed from a national, historical and safety perspective there are still too many states that lack essential, lifesaving laws and too few states making significant progress.

The latest fatality projections for 2006 show 42,642 people died in motor vehicle crashes that year. Unfortunately, more than half of those killed were unrestrained, the number of fatalities involving teen drivers remained unchanged at 8,000 deaths, there was no drop in alcohol-related fatalities and motorcycle rider deaths continue to climb dramatically for the ninth consecutive year to a record 4,810 fatalities. Motor vehicle crashes continue as the leading cause of death for children and adults ages 4 to 34.

For elected officials, government leaders and policymakers, there are no acceptable excuses for delaying and dithering. We know that the proven public health solution to preventing motor vehicle crashes, saving lives and reducing serious injuries is the enactment of strong and cost-effective traffic safety laws. These laws need to be enacted and enforced, and the motoring public needs to be educated about their benefits and responsibilities. The traffic safety law is the central foundation of this public health approach. Without enactment of these basic laws, significant progress is impossible.

The theme of this year’s report is navigating state actions on traffic safety laws in state legislatures. Since Advocates published its first Annual Roadmap Report to Highway Safety Laws in 2004 there have been more than 128,000 deaths and over 8 million injuries caused by motor vehicle crashes at an enormous economic and personal loss to families. This death and morbidity toll has been accompanied by insufficient progress in state capitals. Essentially, we are stuck in neutral. Now is the time for action and accountability. This report is the navigational tool for every state to advance traffic safety. If all states would adopt these lifesaving laws we would see a much-improved fatality report in future years.

The Journey to Safer Driving is Far From Over

24 States need primary enforcement seat belt laws * 30 states need an all-rider motorcycle helmet use law * 12 states still need a booster seat law and 32 need to protect up to age 8 * 49 states do not have completely optimal GDL programs for new teen drivers * and many states are missing critical impaired driving laws.

Judith Lee Stone, President
January 2008
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KEY THINGS TO KNOW ABOUT THIS REPORT

• Changes from Last Year’s Report:
  o Added “Ignition Interlock Devices” to list of laws
  o Includes expanded fact sheets on Ignition Interlock Devices
  o Combined evaluation of Mandatory BAC Testing – Surviving and Killed

• The report is divided into four issue sections:
  ✓ Adult Occupant Protection
    ▪ Primary Enforcement Seat Belts
    ▪ All-Rider Motorcycle Helmets
  ✓ Child Passenger Safety
    ▪ Booster Seats
  ✓ Teen Driving
    ▪ 6-Month Holding Period
    ▪ 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving
    ▪ Nighttime Restriction
    ▪ Passenger Restriction
    ▪ Cell Phone Restriction
  ✓ Impaired Driving
    ▪ Child Endangerment
    ▪ High BAC
    ▪ Mandatory BAC Testing – Drivers Killed and Surviving
    ▪ Open Container
    ▪ Repeat Offender
    ▪ Sobriety Checkpoints
    ▪ Ignition Interlocks for First-Time DUI Offenders

• In Advocates’ judgment, the 15 laws that are listed in four sections are extremely important for states to have, although they do not comprise the entire list of effective public policy interventions states may take to reduce motor vehicle deaths and injuries. Explanations for each law are provided in the respective sections throughout the report.

• States are rated only on whether they have a certain law, not on how they enforce their laws or educate their citizens, or on the number of statewide fatalities. A definition of each law, as defined by Advocates for purposes of this report, can be found on the next page.

• Each section has a state law chart in alphabetical order, with each state’s rating. Overall state ratings fall into three groupings based on the number of laws in each section:
  ✓ Green: Good—State is significantly advanced toward adopting all of Advocates’ recommended optimal laws;
  ✓ Yellow: Caution—State needs improvement because of numerous gaps in Advocates’ recommended laws; and
  ✓ Red: Danger—State falls dangerously behind in adoption of Advocates’ recommended laws.
DEFINITIONS OF 15 LIFESAVING LAWS

Based on government and private research, crash data and states’ experience, Advocates has determined the following traffic safety laws to be priorities in reducing motor vehicle deaths and injuries. States were given full credit for having a particular law only if their legislation meets the optimal provisions as described below. Half credit was given to states with booster seat and teen driving laws that have some version of the criteria, but fall short of optimal.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law – Allows law enforcement officers to stop and ticket someone when they see a violation of the seat belt law. No other violation need occur first to take action.

All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law – Requires all motorcycle riders, regardless of age, to wear a U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) certified helmet or face a fine.

CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY

Booster Seat Law – Requires children between the ages of four and eight to be placed in a child restraint system (booster seat) that is certified to meet U.S. DOT safety standards. States were given only half credit if their booster seat law does not cover up to age 8.

TEEN DRIVING

Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) systems allow teenagers to learn to drive under lower risk conditions and consist of a learner's stage, an intermediate stage and an unrestricted driving stage. The learner's stage requires a teenage driver to complete a minimum amount of adult supervised driving before application for a full license. The intermediate stage restricts teens from driving in high-risk situations for a specified period of time after receiving a full license.

Learner’s Stage: Six Month Holding Period Provision – A beginning teen driver must be supervised by an adult licensed driver at all times. If the learner remains citation-free for six months, he or she may progress to the intermediate stage. States have not been given credit if there is a reduction in the holding period for drivers who take a drivers’ education course.

Learner’s Stage: 30-50 Hours of Supervised Driving Provision – A beginning teen driver must receive at least 30-50 hours of behind-the-wheel training with an adult licensed driver. States have not been given credit if there is a reduction in the required hours of supervised driving for drivers who take a drivers’ education course.

Intermediate Stage: Nighttime Driving Restriction Provision – Unsupervised driving should be prohibited from at least 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. Half credit is awarded for nighttime restrictions that do not fully meet Advocates’ optimal criteria.
Intermediate Stage: Passenger Restriction Provision – This provision limits the number of teenage passengers who ride with a teen driving without adult supervision. The optimal limit is no more than one non-familial teenage passenger. Half credit is awarded for passenger restrictions that do not fully meet Advocates’ optimal criteria.

Cell Phone Restriction – This restriction prohibits all use of cellular devices (both handheld and hands-free) by beginning teen drivers, except in the case of emergency. States are only given credit if the provision lasts for the entire duration of the GDL program (both learner’s and intermediate stages).

**IMPAIRED DRIVING**

Child Endangerment - This law creates a separate offense or enhances an existing penalty for an impaired driving offender who endangers a minor.

High-BAC – This law creates a separate, more severe offense or enhances the existing penalties for impaired drivers that are found to have a Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) well over the maximum legal BAC level (.15 percent).

Mandatory BAC Testing for Drivers Killed or Surviving Drivers – These statutes require any driver who was killed or who survived a car crash, or is involved in a crash that causes serious injury, to have his or her BAC tested.

Open Container– This law prohibits open containers of alcohol in the passenger area of a motor vehicle. To comply with federal requirements in TEA-21 (Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century), the law must: prohibit both possession and consumption of any open alcoholic beverage container; apply to the entire passenger area of any motor vehicle; apply to all vehicle occupants except for passengers of buses, taxi cabs, limousines or persons in the living quarters of motor homes; apply to vehicles on the shoulder of public highways; and require primary enforcement of the law. State laws are counted in this report only if they are in compliance with the federal law.

Repeat Offender– This law applies to drivers with previous impaired driving convictions. The state law must comply with federal requirements in TEA-21 which requires: a minimum one-year license suspension; mandatory motor vehicle impoundment or installation of an ignition interlock system; mandatory alcohol assessment; and the establishment of an increasing mandatory minimum sentence for repeat offenders depending on subsequent offenses. State laws are counted in this report only if they are in compliance with the federal law.

Sobriety Checkpoints– This statute gives law enforcement officials authority to set up checkpoints for evaluation and signs of alcohol or drug impairment in drivers. Advocates defines a sobriety checkpoint program as one authorized by law and implemented by the state.

Ignition Interlock Devices (IID) – This law mandates the installation of ignition interlock devices on the vehicles of drunk driving offenders. Advocates has given full credit only to those states that require the use of ignition interlock devices for all offenders (first-time and repeat offenders), and half-credit for other IID laws.
URGENT ACTION NEEDED TO IMPROVE ROAD SAFETY

THE PROBLEM

Driving an automobile is an American way of life. Every day, 90% of Americans drive to work, to school, to medical appointments, to shopping malls. With nearly 4 million miles of roadway, Americans are afforded a significant degree of mobility. Yet this increased mobility offered by our nation’s highway system comes with an enormous price – 6.2 million crashes annually resulting in over 42,000 fatalities, 2.5 million injuries, at a cost to society of more than $230 billion. Every day 119 people are killed on America’s highways, while roughly 7,400 are injured. Unfortunately, proven legislative solutions in the form of highway safety laws languish in state legislatures.

KEY FACTS ABOUT THIS LEADING PUBLIC HEALTH EPIDEMIC:

- 42,642 people were killed in motor vehicle crashes in 2006. Automobile crashes remain the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 4 and 34.

- Over 2.5 million people were injured in motor vehicle crashes in 2006.

- In 2006, more than half (55%) of passenger vehicle occupants killed were unrestrained, unchanged from 2005.

- 6,984 fatal crashes involving young drivers occurred in 2006, resulting in 7,975 deaths.

- Motorcycle deaths increased for the ninth year in a row. A total of 4,810 motorcyclists died in 2006, a 127% increase from 1997, and a 5% increase from just the year before (2005). Only 20 states have all-rider helmet laws and among them, 15 attempted repeal in 2007.

- 1,270 children and youth, ages eight to 15, were killed in motor vehicle crashes in 2006.

- 459 children age 0-3 were killed in 2006.

- In 2007, only 12 states passed one or more of Advocates’ key laws. The volume of highway safety laws introduced in state legislatures increased slightly in 2007, as did the number of laws.

- The 6 million motor vehicle crashes in 2006 cost an estimated $230 billion annually in property and productivity losses, medical and emergency bills and other related costs. This adds up to a “crash tax” of $792 on every American, every year.

(Sources: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Fatal Analysis Reporting System, 2007; Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety)
PROGRESS IS SLOW AND SLOWING

Annual fatalities have hovered at or above 40,000 for more than 15 years. While many new and innovative highway safety laws have been enacted during that time, several considered to be fundamental to highway safety are missing. One example is primary enforcement of seat belt laws.

New York enacted the nation’s first primary enforcement seat belt law in 1984. In the more than 20 years since that time, only 25 other states and DC have followed suit. Even with federal incentive grants available in 2007, only one state, Maine, took advantage by adopting a primary enforcement law.

New York was also the first state to enact a motorcycle helmet law that covers all riders, in 1967. In the 40 years since, only 19 other states and the District of Columbia have such laws in place. In fact, in 2007 there were attempts in 15 states to repeal their existing all-rider motorcycle helmet laws. No state passed a new helmet law in 2007.

Advocates has chosen to highlight states’ progress in enacting 15 basic highway safety laws. The basis for choosing these 15 particular laws was derived from government and private research, crash data and states’ experience. Only 25 new laws recommended by Advocates were passed in 2007 among all 50 states and the District of Columbia, down from previous years. An additional 324 new laws need to be adopted for all 50 states to comply with Advocates’ recommendations.

- 24 states still need a primary enforcement seat belt law;
- 30 states still need an all-rider motorcycle helmet law;
- 12 states still need a booster seat law; 20 need an optimal booster seat law;
- 49 states do not protect new teen drivers with Advocates’ optimal GDL program;
- Many states are missing critical impaired driving laws.
THE SOLUTION

Just as we inoculate against polio and other diseases, public policy vaccines in the form of effective laws are immediately available, providing proven solutions and strategies, backed by research and ready to be implemented. In fact, many states and communities already employ these ideas and programs, realizing important reductions in deaths and injuries on their roadways. Unfortunately, as this report will demonstrate, when viewed as a whole, state traffic safety laws have gaping holes in need of repair.

Even at a glance, the maps and charts included in this report show that most American families live in states that could do much more to ensure their safety in neighborhoods and on roadways.

In contrast, every person flying on every airplane, in every state, is subject to nationally uniform safety laws and regulations set by the federal government.

This uniformity in air travel has been the foundation for achieving an exemplary aviation safety record in the United States. Were this the case for motor vehicle travel, and nearly every state had the same essential and effective traffic safety laws, thousands of deaths and many more injuries could be prevented.

ADVOCATES KEY HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS PASSED IN 2007

**Primary Enforcement of Seat Belts:** Maine

**Booster Seat Law** (children under 8): Oregon, Virginia

**Graduated Driver Licensing:** Arizona (supervised, nighttime, passenger), California (cell phone), Idaho (holding, passenger), Illinois (passenger, holding), Nebraska (holding, passenger, nighttime, supervised, cell phone), Nevada (passenger), Ohio (passenger, nighttime), Oregon (cell phone), Virginia (cell phone), West Virginia (cell phone)

**Impaired Driving:** Arizona (ignition interlock), Illinois (ignition interlock), and Louisiana (ignition interlock)

**All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Laws:** No state implemented an all-rider law in 2007, however there were 15 unsuccessful attempts to repeal existing laws.

“The adoption of highway safety laws is among the most effective public health interventions we can make to save lives and protect society”

Georges Benjamin, M.D., FACP, Executive Director, of American Public Health Association, and Board Member
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety
PUBLIC SUPPORT VERSUS POLITICAL INACTION

According to a 2000 motor vehicle occupant survey conducted by NHTSA, 81 percent of Americans favored mandatory helmet use laws for motorcyclists.

According to a 2003 survey conducted by NHTSA, 64 percent of the population supports primary enforcement of seat belts.

According to a 2004 survey conducted by AAA, 73 percent of Americans think that public officials should do more to improve the safety of drivers between the ages of 15 to 19.

In 2004, an Advocates Lou Harris Poll showed that 84 percent of Americans support Booster Seat laws.
In addition to the emotional toll, motor vehicle crashes impose a significant financial burden on society. According to NHTSA, the cost of motor vehicle crashes exceeds $230 billion annually. The costs to society are dramatic. Motor vehicle crashes:

- cost each American an average of $792 annually;
- result in a total of $81 billion annually in lost productivity;
- create approximately $32.6 billion in medical expenses;
- result in $52 billion in property damage; and
- impose upon each critically injured crash survivor approximately $1.1 million in crash-related costs over his or her lifetime.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Laws

All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Laws

State has both a primary enforcement seat belt law and an all-rider motorcycle helmet law

State has either a primary enforcement seat belt law or an all-rider motorcycle helmet law

State has neither a primary enforcement seat belt law nor an all-rider motorcycle helmet law
PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT SEAT BELT LAWS

Seat belt use is the single most effective action a driver or passenger can take to reduce deaths in motor vehicle crashes. However, the United States ranks among the lowest in the developed world for seat belt usage. In 2006, 55% of passenger vehicle occupants killed in traffic crashes were not wearing seat belts. The national use rate is currently 81%.

All states except New Hampshire have seat belt use laws, but only 26 states (AK, AL, CA, CT, DE, GA, HI, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MS, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OK, OR, SC, TN, TX, WA) and the District of Columbia allow primary enforcement of their belt laws. In states with primary enforcement, law officers may ticket a non-belt user when they see a violation of the seat belt law. With secondary enforcement laws, officers may issue a citation only after stopping the vehicle for another traffic infraction.

In states with primary enforcement laws, belt use rates are higher. A study conducted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety found that when states strengthen their laws from secondary enforcement to primary, driver death rates decline by an estimated seven percent. Use levels are typically 10 to 15 percentage points higher than in secondary enforcement states. Drivers are more likely to buckle up because the perception is that they’re going to be ticketed if they don’t.

Needless deaths and injuries that result from non-use of seat belts cost society an estimated $26 billion annually in medical care, lost productivity and other injury-related costs.

A 2004 Lou Harris Poll found that four out of five Americans believe that seat belt use should be enforced like any other traffic violation. Unfortunately, 24 state legislatures have failed to act to upgrade their belt laws to primary enforcement, making it legal for police to do so.

### EFFECTS OF STRENGTHENING BELT LAWS

*Lives that could have been saved since 1996 in secondary states if belt laws had been primary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Passenger vehicle driver deaths 1996-2003</th>
<th>Lives that could have been saved 1996-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>10,889</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6,309</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,390</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States listed are all those with secondary belt use laws.

Source: NHTSA
TOP REASONS WHY EVERY STATE SHOULD PASS A PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT SEAT BELT LAW

1. LIVES SAVED – In the U.S., motor vehicle crashes claim one fatality every 13 minutes and one injury every 10 seconds. Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death and injury for all Americans ages 4 through 34. In 2006, 42,642 Americans were killed and 2.5 million were injured, at a cost of $230 billion. In 2006, seat belts prevented 15,700 fatalities, 350,000 severe injuries and $67 billion in economic costs associated with traffic injuries and deaths.

2. MONEY SAVED -- Needless deaths and injuries that result from non-use of seat belts cost society an estimated $26 billion annually in medical care, lost productivity and other injury related costs. Unbelted crash victims have medical bills 50% higher than belted victims — society bears 74% of the cost through increased insurance premiums, taxes, and health care costs.

3. SEAT BELT USE WILL INCREASE – States that have passed a primary enforcement law have seen dramatic increases in belt use rates. The safety belt use rate in Illinois rose from 74 percent in 2002 to 80 percent in 2003, after passage of a primary law. When Oklahoma upgraded its belt law to primary enforcement in 1997, the use rate increased from 48 percent in 1996 to 68 percent in 2001.

4. PROTECTING CHILDREN IS PARAMOUNT -- Six out of ten children who died in passenger vehicle crashes were unbelted. Children riding with unbelted adults are much less likely to be buckled up. When Louisiana adopted its primary enforcement law, child restraint use jumped from 45 to 82%, even though the state's child passenger safety law did not change.

5. PERSONAL CHOICE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS – “A primary enforcement seat belt law is no more intrusive of an individual’s freedom than any other law. As with other laws, for example building and fire codes, it is the legitimate responsibility of government to provide for the protection of its citizens.” (NHTSA, 2006) The U.S. Supreme Court noted in 1972 “…from the moment of injury, society picks the person up off the highway; delivers him to a municipal hospital and municipal doctors; provides him with unemployment compensation if, after recovery, he cannot replace his lost job; and, if the injury causes disability, may assume the responsibility for his and his family’s continued subsistence.”

6. CONCERNS ABOUT HARRASSMENT – According to NHTSA’s 2003 Motor Vehicle Occupant Safety Survey, 67 percent of African-Americans and 74 percent of Hispanics supported primary enforcement of seat belt laws. Numerous before-and-after studies in Michigan, Maryland, Oklahoma, and other states that have passed primary enforcement laws show no increase in citation overrepresentation with minorities. However, the potential for harassment is an ongoing concern that is not limited to, nor created by, primary seat belt laws.

7. FEDERAL INCENTIVE GRANTS ARE AVAILABLE – Passage of federal legislation in 2005 created an incentive program for states that enact a primary enforcement law. Almost $500 million in grant funds is available in fiscal years (FY) 2006-2009 under this program.
ALL-RIDER MOTORCYCLE HELMET LAWS

In 2006, 4,810 motorcycle riders were killed, a 5% increase from 2005 and a 127% increase since 1997. This is the ninth year in a row motorcycle fatalities have increased and the highest number of deaths since 1986. Studies from NHTSA show that fatality rates are exceeding increases in vehicle miles traveled and motorcycle registrations. Motorcycles make up less than 2% of all registered vehicles and only 0.4% of all vehicle miles traveled, but motorcyclists account for almost 11% of total traffic fatalities. A 2004 Lou Harris Poll showed that eight of ten people believe their state should have an all-rider helmet law. Despite this fact, in 2007, 15 states attempted to repeal their all-rider helmet law, while virtually no state is working toward adopting a new one.

Helmet use is the most effective measure to protect motorcyclists in a crash. In 2007, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended that all states adopt an all-rider helmet law. In states with all-rider helmet laws, use is nearly 100%. While helmets will not prevent crashes from occurring, they have a significant, positive impact on preventing head and brain injuries during crashes. Critics of helmet laws cite motorcycle education programs as the answer, but research studies from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and others show no evidence that motorcycle rider training reduces crash risk.

According to NHTSA, almost 50 percent of motorcycle crash victims have no private health insurance, so their medical bills are often paid by taxpayers. As states have repealed their helmet laws, helmet use has declined from 71 percent to 58 percent nationally, with deaths and traumatic brain injuries on the rise. In 1992, California’s all-rider law went into effect resulting in a 40 percent drop in its Medicaid costs and total hospital charges for treatment of motorcycle riders.

According to NHTSA, an estimated $13.2 billion was saved from 1984 to 1999 because of motorcycle helmet use. An additional $11.1 billion could have been saved if all motorcyclists had worn helmets.

Today, only 20 states and DC require all motorcycle riders to wear a helmet. 27 states have laws that cover only some riders (i.e., up to age 18 or 21). These age-specific laws are nearly impossible for police officers to enforce and result in much lower helmet use. Three states (IL, IA and NH) have no motorcycle helmet use law. About two-thirds (65%) of the fatally injured motorcycle riders were not wearing a helmet in states without all-rider helmet laws compared to 14% in states with them. In 2004, Louisiana reinstated its all-rider helmet law after seeing a 100 percent increase in motorcycle fatalities and a 50 percent drop in helmet usage since repealing its all-rider law in 1999.
TOP REASONS WHY EVERY STATE SHOULD PASS AN ALL-RIDER MOTORCYCLE HELMET LAW

HELMET LAWS SAVE LIVES
Death rates from head injuries are twice as high among motorcyclists in states without all-rider helmet laws. Motorcycle helmets are 37 percent effective in preventing motorcyclist deaths and 67 percent effective in preventing brain injuries.

HELMET LAWS INCREASE USE
Studies show that helmet use approaches 100% in states with all-rider motorcycle helmet laws. In states without all-rider laws, helmet use was 53% in 2002 and only 46% in 2005. Age-specific helmet laws are virtually impossible to enforce and there is no evidence that these laws reduce deaths and injuries.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY
Un-helmeted riders have higher health care costs as a result of their crash injuries and nearly half lack private insurance. The financial burden for treatment and care of uninsured motorcycle crash victims is placed on the government and taxpayers. In 2005, Maryland estimated that a repeal of its all-rider helmet law would increase Medicaid expenditures by $1.2 million in the first year and annually up to $1.5 million thereafter.

FATALITIES AND INJURIES ARE CLIMBING
In 2006, 4,810 motorcycle riders died in crashes. Motorcycle fatalities are at their highest level in 20 years, and now account for over 10% of all annual fatalities, even though motorcycles make up less than 2% of all registered vehicles and only 0.4% of all vehicle miles traveled.

THE PUBLIC OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORTS HELMET LAWS
According to a motor vehicle occupant survey conducted by NHTSA, 81 percent reported that they favored mandatory helmet use laws for motorcyclists. A 2004 Lou Harris poll commissioned by Advocates yielded the same results.

ALTERNATIVES ARE COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE
There is no scientific evidence that motorcycle rider training reduces crash risk and is an adequate substitute for an all-rider helmet law. A review conducted in 1996 by the Traffic Injury Research Foundation concluded that there is "no compelling evidence that rider training is associated with reductions in collisions." The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also supports these claims. If elimination of risk exposure is not possible, then risk management, in the form of a universal helmet law, is the next best option.

HELMETS DO NOT INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF SPINAL INJURY OR CRASH
Critics of helmet laws often cite a highly disputed study by J.P. Goldstein indicating the added weight of helmets cause neck and spinal injuries during crashes. More than a dozen peer-reviewed medical studies have refuted this claim. A study reported in the Annals of Emergency Medicine in 1994 analyzed 1,153 motorcycle crashes in four states and determined that helmets reduce head injuries without an increased occurrence of spinal injuries in motorcycle trauma. Studies also show that helmets do not restrict vision, interfere with hearing, or cause heat discomfort.

(Sources: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration(NHTSA), Fatal Analysis Reporting System, 2003; Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety)
ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Laws and
All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Laws

Number of new Adult Occupant Protection laws since January 2007: One Primary Enforcement, NO All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law</th>
<th>All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law</th>
<th>Adult Occupant Protection Law Rating</th>
<th>Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law</th>
<th>All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law</th>
<th>Adult Occupant Protection Law Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● = Optimal law

Green symbol = Good

Yellow symbol = Caution

Red symbol = Danger

One state adopted a primary enforcement seat belt law in 2007:
- Maine

Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law -- gives police authority to stop a motorist simply for not using a seat belt. No other traffic citation need be issued first in order to write such a ticket.

24 states do not have primary enforcement seat belt laws.

No state adopted an all-rider motorcycle helmet law.

All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law -- protects all riders from death or serious injury by requiring helmet use. No credit was given to states with any exceptions in their helmet laws.

30 states do not have all-rider helmet laws.

17 states have neither law. (AZ, AR, CO, FL, ID, KS, MN, MT, NH, ND, OH, PA, RI, SD, UT, WI and WY).

13 states and DC have both laws (AL, CA, DC, GA, LA, MD, MI, MS, NJ, NY, NC, OR, TN and WA).
CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY

Booster Seat Laws

- **Green** State has an optimal booster seat law
- **Light Green** State has booster seat law, but does not meet Advocates optimal provisions
- **Red** State does not have a booster seat law

ADVOCATES FOR HIGHWAY AND AUTO SAFETY
**BOOSTER SEAT LAWS FOR CHILDREN AGES 4 – 8**

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death and injury for all children over the age of three. In 2006, 444 children ages 4 through 7 died and nearly 50,000 children were injured in motor vehicle crashes. Almost half of those children who died in 2006 were not appropriately restrained. According to Partners for Child Passenger Safety, a project of Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia and State Farm Insurance, booster seats can substantially reduce the risk of death and injury to children through age 7, yet, as of 2003 only 19% of children in this age group are using them. Most of the children in that age group are at increased risk of injury or death due to inappropriate restraint in adult seat belts or lack of any restraint at all. A 2004 Harris poll found that 84% of Americans support all states having booster seat laws protecting children ages 4 to 8.

Booster seats are intended to provide a platform that lifts the child up off the vehicle seat in order to improve the fit of the adult seat belt. An improper fit of an adult belt can cause the lap belt to ride up over the stomach and the shoulder belt to cut across the neck, potentially exposing the child to serious abdominal and/or neck injury. If the shoulder strap portion of the lap/shoulder belt is uncomfortable, children will likely place it behind their backs, defeating any safety benefits of the system. When children are properly restrained in a child safety seat, booster, or seat belt, as appropriate for their age and size, their chance of being killed or seriously injured in a car crash is greatly reduced.

To date, 38 states and DC have enacted booster seat laws. Only 18 of those states and DC have laws that provide protection for children up to age 8, as recommended by Advocates, NHTSA, and other child advocacy organizations. Twenty states with booster seat laws cover children only up to age five, six or seven, or their laws are not subject to primary enforcement. Twelve states have no booster seat law at all. In this report, Advocates gives only half credit to those states whose laws do not cover children up to age eight. Ironically, nearly every state (48) and DC have laws requiring children to wear life jackets while boating to protect them from the third leading cause of preventable death—drowning.

Critics of comprehensive booster seat laws cite financial burdens of purchasing booster seats as a barrier to enacting such laws. In 2005, an incentive program was passed by Congress in the SAFETEA-LU Act to provide funds to states that pass booster seat laws for the purpose of purchasing booster seats to be given to low-income families.
**BOOSTER SEAT LAWS FOR CHILDREN AGES 4 – 8**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booster Seat Law</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Booster Seat Law</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● = Optimal law  ○ = Law does not satisfy Advocates’ recommendations (half credit)

---

Two states adopted booster seat laws in 2007:

- *Oregon and Virginia adopted the recommended optimal law*

18 states and DC have an optimal booster seat law.

20 states have a booster seat law that does not cover all children up to age 8.

12 states have yet to adopt any booster seat law.

6-Month Holding Period
30-50 Hours Supervised Driving
Nighttime Driving Restriction
Passenger Restriction
Cell Phone Use Restriction

State has all five optimal provisions of Advocates’ recommended graduated driver licensing (GDL) program
State has made progress by enacting laws in most of the component areas of GDL
State has less than two of the optimal provisions of GDL program
TEEN DRIVING

Motor vehicle crashes are the number one killer of American teenagers.

Teen drivers are far more likely than other drivers to be involved in fatal crashes because they lack driving experience and tend to take greater risks due to their immaturity. According to NHTSA, young drivers (16 to 20 years old) were involved in approximately 1.6 million, or 26 percent of all automobile crashes (6 million) in 2006. Additionally, 7,975 people were killed in crashes involving young drivers. Of that number, 3,406 of those killed (43 percent) were young drivers.

Graduated driver licensing (GDL) programs introduce teens to the driving experience gradually by phasing in full driving privileges over time and in lower risk settings, and have been effective in reducing teen driver crash deaths. In this report, Advocates has defined what it considers to be the optimal GDL program, making specific recommendations for each of the five components of GDL.

Advocates supports the recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board that cell phone use by novice teen drivers is an unnecessary distraction and contributes to motor vehicle crashes. Research also confirms that the cognitive effects of talking on a cell phone can decrease situational awareness and slow reaction times. Cell phones are becoming an increasing part of our everyday lives. In 2006, the Virginia Tech Transportation Institute and NHTSA released the results of a 100-car naturalistic driving study, in which the behavior of the drivers (many of them young) of 100 vehicles was tracked for more than one year using video and sensor devices. Researchers determined that nearly 80 percent of crashes and 65 percent of near-crashes involved some form of driver inattention within 3 seconds before the event; the most common distraction was the use of cell phones.

The public also supports GDL programs for teen drivers. According to a 2004 survey conducted by American Automobile Association, 73 percent of Americans think that public officials should do more to improve the safety of drivers between the ages of 15 to 19. On the following page, the five major provisions of Advocates’ optimal GDL program are explained. In this report, each provision is counted as its own law. To date, only Delaware has all five optimal provisions recommended by Advocates, although Illinois is missing only a nighttime restriction on weekends that begins at 10 pm, rather than 11 pm.
TEEN DRIVING: Advocates’ Optimal Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) Program

LEARNER’S STAGE

1. Six (6)-Month Holding Period
Advocates’ optimal learner’s stage graduated driver licensing (GDL) program includes a 6-month holding period during which an adult licensed driver must supervise a new driver at all times. If the new driver remains citation-free for 6 months, he or she may progress to the intermediate stage. States are not credited if their 6-month holding period law allows a reduced holding period for those who take a drivers’ education course, but half credit is given for a holding period less than six months.

6 states do not have an optimal six-month holding period.

2. 30-50 Hours of Supervised Driving
Advocates’ optimal learner’s stage GDL program requires a new driver to complete 30-50 hours of behind-the-wheel training with an adult licensed driver. Advocates has not given credit to States if their law requiring 30-50 hours of supervised driving includes a reduction in the required hours of supervised driving for those who take a drivers’ education course, but half credit is given for supervised driving less than 30-50 hours.

16 states do not have an optimal 30-50 hours of supervised driving requirement.

INTERMEDIATE STAGE

3. Nighttime Restriction
Advocates’ optimal intermediate stage GDL program restricts teen driving at night. Under this program, unsupervised driving is prohibited from at least 10:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. Half credit is awarded for nighttime restrictions that do not fully meet Advocates’ optimal criteria.

42 states and DC do not have an optimal nighttime restriction.

4. Passenger Restriction
A passenger restriction law under the intermediate stage of Advocates’ optimal GDL program limits the number of teenage passengers that may accompany a teen driver without adult supervision to one non-familial teenager. Half credit is awarded for passenger restrictions that do not fully meet Advocates’ optimal criteria.

15 states do not have an optimal passenger restriction.

5. Cell Phone Restriction
A cell phone restriction law under Advocates’ optimal GDL program limits all cell phone use (including hands-free devices) for the duration of the GDL program (both learner’s and intermediate stage), except in the case of an emergency. No credit is given for cell phone restrictions that allow hands-free devices or that are effective for less than the entire duration of the GDL program.

34 states and DC do not have an optimal cell phone restriction for teen drivers.
KEY FACTS REGARDING TEEN DRIVERS

- In 2006, 7,975 people were killed in crashes involving young drivers ages 16-20. (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2007)

- Comprehensive graduated driver licensing programs are associated with reductions of approximately 20% in 16-year-old drivers’ fatal crash involvement rates. (Chen/Baker/Li, Graduated driver licensing programs and fatal crashes of 16-year-old drivers: A national evaluation, Pediatrics, July 2006.)

- 3,406 young drivers ages 16-20 were killed in 2006. (NHTSA, 2007)

- States with nighttime driving restrictions show crash reductions of up to 60 percent during restricted hours. (NHTSA, Traffic Safety Facts, 2006)

- Late night driving increases crash risk among young drivers for a variety of reasons: the driving task is more difficult in darkness; many newly licensed drivers will have had less driving practice at night than during the day; fatigue – thought to be a problem for teenagers at all times of the day – may be more of a factor at night; and recreational driving that is considered to be high risk, sometimes involving alcohol use, is more likely to take place at night. (Williams, A.F., “Teenage Drivers: Patterns of risk”, Journal of Safety Research 2003; 34:5-15)

- Fatal crash rates are higher at all times of the day for 16-year-olds than for older drivers, but in any given mile driven, teens are twice as likely to crash at night (9pm to 6am) as during the day. Forty-two percent of young teens’ nighttime crashes occur before midnight. (IIHS, Fatality Facts 2005: Teenagers)

- The percent of fatal crashes involving 16 year-olds carrying 3 or more passengers was reduced in half between 1996 and 2005. Researchers suggest this is attributable to the success of graduated drivers licensing laws. (Ferguson et al., Progress in teenage crash risk during the last decade. Journal of Safety Research 2007)

- Based on estimated miles traveled annually, teen drivers ages 16 to 19 have a fatality rate four times the rate of drivers ages 25 to 69. Sixteen-year-old drivers have a crash rate three times more than 17-year-olds, 5 times greater than 18-year-olds, and two times that of 85-year-olds. (NHTSA, 2001)

- Drivers are less likely to use restraints when they have been drinking. In 2004, 62 percent of the young drivers who were killed in crashes were unrestrained. (NHTSA, 2005)

- Twenty-two percent (22%) of young drivers killed in fatal crashes in 2004 were intoxicated. (NHTSA, 2005)

- In California, the alcohol-related crash rate of 16-year-olds dropped 16 percent in the first year after the GDL law took effect and 13 percent in the second year when compared with the crash rate of 16-year-olds before the law was in place. (Automobile Club of Southern California, 2002)
KEY FACTS REGARDING TEEN DRIVERS (cont’d)

• In 2001, the estimated economic cost of police-reported crashes involving drivers between 15 and 20 years old was $42.3 billion. (NHTSA, 2002)

• Evaluations of GDL programs comparing rates before and after GDL implementation in individual states have reported reductions in crash rates of novice drivers that ranged from 11% to 32%. (Chen et al., 2006)

• Researchers examined GDL systems implemented in 1997 in Michigan and North Carolina, which were considered among the country’s most comprehensive programs. Comparing 1999 with 1996 data, crashes involving 16-year-old drivers decreased by 25% in Michigan and 27% in North Carolina. (Journal of the American Medical Association, 2001)

• A comparison between Oregon, a state with a strong intermediate GDL stage that includes nighttime and passenger restrictions, and Ontario, Canada, a province with a less restrictive intermediate stage, shows that per-driver crash rates among 16-year-old drivers are nearly 50% less in Oregon. (Mayhew, D., “Reducing the Crash Risk for Young Drivers”, June 2006)

• In California, teenage passenger deaths and injuries resulting from crashes involving 16-year-old drivers declined by 40 percent statewide from 1998 through 2000, the first three years of the program. In addition, the number of at-fault collisions involving 16-year-old drivers decreased by 24 percent. (Automobile Club of Southern California, 2001)

• Programs that included a mandatory waiting period, 30 hours of supervised driving, and passenger and nighttime restrictions were associated with reductions of 16-21 percent in fatal-crash involvement rates of 16-year-old drivers. (NHTSA, 2006)
TEEN DRIVING: *Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) Program*

Number of New Laws Adopted Since January 2007: Four nighttime restrictions; two 30-50 hours supervised driving provisions; three 6-month holding period provisions; six passenger restriction provisions; five cell phone restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>6-Month Holding Period</th>
<th>30-50 Hrs. Supervised Driving</th>
<th>Nighttime Restriction</th>
<th>Passenger Restriction</th>
<th>Cell Phone Restriction</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ● = Optimal law  ○ = Law does not satisfy Advocates’ recommendations (half credit)
- ● = Good  ○ = Caution  ● = Danger

One state has all five provisions of Advocates’ optimal GDL program.

9 states have only one of the optimal provisions.

9 states have two of five optimal provisions.

19 states and DC have three of five optimal provisions.

12 states have four of five optimal provisions.

**Holding Period** - one state has no holding period; 44 states and DC have optimal provisions.

**Supervised Driving** - 10 states have none; 34 and DC have optimal.

**Nighttime Restriction** - five states have none; eight have optimal.

**Passenger Restriction** - 11 states have none; 35 and DC have optimal.

**Cell Phone Restriction** - 16 states have optimal restrictions.
IMPAIRED DRIVING
Child Endangerment
High BAC
Mandatory BAC Test for Drivers Who Survive Fatal Crashes
Mandatory BAC Test for Drivers Killed in Fatal Crashes
Open Container
Repeat Offender
Sobriety Checkpoints
Ignition Interlocks

State has at least 6 out of 7 impaired driving laws
State has 4 or 5 of 7 impaired driving laws
State has 1-3 out of 7 impaired driving laws
IMPAIRED DRIVING: Key Laws Help Stem The Tide

In 2006, 41 percent of all fatal crashes were alcohol-related. Clearly, more needs to be done to reduce the number of impaired drivers on our roadways.

Impaired driving laws target a range of behavioral issues associated with alcohol consumption and operation of a motor vehicle on public roads.

Federal leadership in critical areas, such as impaired driving, has resulted in the rapid adoption of life-saving laws in states across the country. As a result of federal laws enacted with strong sanctions, all 50 states have adopted .08 percent blood alcohol concentration (BAC), a national 21 minimum drinking age and zero tolerance BAC laws for youth.

87 percent of Americans feel that more attention should be given to drunk driving.

Lou Harris Poll, May 2004

The chart on page 37 shows which states have open container and repeat offender laws that meet federal requirements, and which states lag behind.

Additionally, documented successes in reducing drunk driving have resulted from the enactment of high BAC laws; laws requiring mandatory BAC testing for those drivers either killed or those who survive a crash in which deaths occur; laws requiring sobriety checkpoints; laws penalizing impaired drivers who have one or more children in the car; and laws requiring ignition interlock devices for convicted drunk drivers.

Seven laws that Advocates considers crucial to reducing impaired driving are:

- Child Endangerment
- High BAC
- Mandatory BAC Test – Killed; and
  Mandatory BAC Test – Surviving
  (considered as one law, for evaluation purposes)
- Open Container
- Repeat Offender
- Sobriety Checkpoints
- Ignition Interlocks

In the chart, states have been rated as:

- “Good” for having at least six of the seven laws necessary for reducing drunk driving.
- “Caution” for having four or five of the optimal laws.
- “Danger” for having fewer than four of these lifesaving laws.
CHILD ENDANGERMENT LAWS

In 2006, 2,173 children ages 14 and younger were killed in motor vehicle crashes. Approximately 22 percent of these fatalities occurred in crashes involving alcohol. A national telephone survey, sponsored by NHTSA in 1999, estimated that between 46 and 102 million drunk-driving trips are made each year with children under the age of 15 in the vehicle.

Child endangerment laws either create a separate offense or enhance existing Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)/Driving Under the Influence (DUI) penalties for someone who drives under the influence of alcohol or drugs with a minor child in the vehicle. These drivers create a hazardous situation for themselves and for others on the road and they put a child – who rarely has a choice in who gets behind the wheel – in potential serious danger.

While many states have existing child endangerment laws to address child abuse, many state laws are not clearly defined when it comes to impaired driving. Prosecution of child endangerment cases also requires the state to prove intent and overcome the defense that the act was unintentional. This additional burden in child endangerment cases frequently causes the cases to be dismissed during pre-trial negotiations. For this reason, driving while impaired with a child in the vehicle is rarely charged as child abuse. By creating a separate offense for driving impaired with a child in the vehicle, enforcement of the law is improved and public awareness is heightened.

Currently, 39 states have enacted child endangerment laws that increase penalties for people who drive while impaired with children in their vehicles. Eleven (11) states and DC need to enact these laws.

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) studied crashes involving impaired drivers and found that in over 5,000 child passenger deaths, more than 60 percent of the children who were killed were riding in the car driven by the impaired driver. Impaired drivers who transported a child who died in a crash were more likely to have had a prior license suspension or had been previously convicted for driving while intoxicated. These problem drivers continue to take risks with their own lives, as well as with a child’s.

Additionally, the CDC study found that only 18 percent of children who were killed in a crash while riding in the impaired driver’s vehicle were properly restrained. In comparison, nearly 31 percent of children killed in a crash while riding with a non-impaired driver were properly restrained.

Child endangerment laws are put in place to encourage people to consider the consequences before they get behind the wheel while impaired with a child in their vehicle.

When adequately defined and properly enforced, child endangerment laws act as strong deterrents that protect children.
HIGH BAC LAWS

According to NHTSA, the median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) for drivers involved in a fatal crash is .16 percent. This far exceeds the limit set by federal law at .08 percent, and statistics indicate that drivers with such high BACs are an even greater danger on the road.

The National Hardcore Drunk Driver Project estimates that one percent of drivers on a normal weekend night are driving with a BAC of .15 percent or more. Shockingly, these “super drunk” drivers account for nearly 60 percent of all fatal crashes during this period. In fact, 59 percent of the alcohol-related deaths in 2006 were caused by a driver with a .15 percent BAC or higher.

A high BAC statute provides for stiffer penalties for drivers convicted of a Driving While Impaired (DWI)/Driving Under the Influence (DUI) offense when their BAC exceeds a certain threshold. For example, conviction under a high BAC law could result in longer, more intense compulsory alcohol education or treatment, stronger driver penalties – jail, license revocation or fines, or stronger vehicle sanctions – license plate impoundment or ignition interlock.

High BAC laws have proven to reduce repeat offenses. A study of enhanced sanctions for high BAC drivers in Minnesota found that offenders who received enhanced sanctions as a result of their high BAC had lower rates of recidivism than those who had slightly lower BACs and did not receive enhanced sanctions.

Most states have enacted some form of a high BAC law. Advocates regards an optimal high BAC law to be one that sets the threshold at .15 percent BAC or lower. High BAC laws are an important deterrent, especially for drivers likely to repeat an impaired driving offense. Currently, 38 states and DC have high BAC laws in place. Twelve states have not enacted these important, lifesaving statutes, and no state enacted a High BAC law in 2007.
MANDATORY BAC TEST LAWS
For Drivers Killed in Fatal Crashes and
For Drivers Who Survive Fatal Crashes

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA) Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) contains data on all reported fatal crashes that occur in the United States each year. This data helps formulate public policy and initiate legislative reform of traffic safety laws.

Unfortunately, data on deaths in crashes involving an impaired driver are incomplete because state laws have different requirements for testing drivers involved in crashes in which a fatality occurs. According to NHTSA’s latest data, only 24,389 (42 percent) of the drivers who were involved in a fatal crash in 2001 had blood alcohol concentration (BAC) test results reported in FARS. In Texas, which only requires testing of surviving drivers involved in a fatal crash, only 1,175 (23 percent) of the 5,138 drivers involved in fatal crashes in 2001 had their BACs reported to FARS. These statistics are far too low, and state laws are far too inconsistent on this subject to ensure accurate reporting.

There are generally two provisions of law that are needed for accurate and full reporting to FARS on impaired driving and crash fatalities: mandatory BAC testing for drivers who are killed in a fatal crash, and mandatory BAC testing for drivers who survive a crash in which there is a fatality. These laws require the collection of important data that can serve to increase awareness of drunk driving issues by improving the integrity of the data that are collected. They ensure a high level of testing, increase the likelihood of prosecution of impaired driving offenders, decrease the use of hospitals as “safe havens” for offenders to avoid prosecution, and increase the deterrent to drink and drive by making detection increasingly likely. All of these benefits allow officials to determine the best policies and strategies to reduce impaired driving.

In this report, Advocates reviews both of these laws. Currently, 37 states require drivers who are killed in a fatal crash to be tested for the presence of alcohol. Thirteen (13) states and DC do not have a law. Thirty-nine (39) states and DC require that surviving drivers of a crash involving a death have their BACs tested. Eleven (11) states have no such provision. In total, 29 states require that both killed and surviving drivers be tested, and three states (RI, TN and VA) do not require BAC testing in either instance. No state adopted either of these laws in 2007.
OPEN CONTAINER LAWS

Drinking and driving is dangerous, deadly and destructive, and impaired driving deaths are not going down. There is a stalemate in combating the problem and a stalemate in state legislation. Studies have shown that open container laws are effective at deterring heavy drinkers from getting behind the wheel. States have also shown a significant decrease in hit-and-run crashes after adopting open container laws.

Previous federal legislation included a program designed to encourage states to adopt laws that ban the presence of open containers of any kind of alcoholic beverage in the entire passenger area of a motor vehicle. To comply with the provisions set forth in TEA-21, the state’s open container law must:

- Prohibit both possession of any open alcoholic beverage container and consumption of any alcoholic beverage in a motor vehicle;
- Cover the entire passenger area of any motor vehicle, including unlocked glove compartments, etc.;
- Apply to all alcoholic beverages including beer, wine, and spirits;
- Apply to all vehicle occupants except for passengers of buses, taxi cabs, limousines or persons in the living quarters of motor homes;
- Apply to vehicles on the shoulder of public highways; and
- Require primary enforcement of the law.

On the impaired driving chart in this report, Advocates gives credit only to states with an open container law that is in compliance with the provision in TEA-21. Currently, 40 states and DC are in compliance with the TEA-21 provisions. No state adopted a federally compliant open container law in 2007.

Ten states do not comply with the federal statute. In an effort to encourage states to comply with the federal law, those states that are non-compliant have 3 percent of their annual federal transportation funds diverted to highway safety programs that fund alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures and law enforcement activities. This federal requirement is known as “redirection.”
**REPEAT OFFENDER LAWS**

One third of those arrested or convicted of an impaired driving offense each year are repeat offenders. Repeat offenders are also increasingly likely to be driving with a higher blood alcohol concentration (BAC) and are 40 percent more likely to be involved in a fatal crash.

Repeat offender laws apply to impaired drivers with previous impaired driving convictions. They generally include stiffer penalties for individuals that are convicted of an impaired driving offense for the second, third, or fourth time. Stiffer penalties are an important deterrent to a repeat impaired driving offense.

TEA-21 included a provision that requires states to enact repeat offender laws that include the following:

- A minimum one year license suspension for repeat intoxication;
- All motor vehicles of the offender be impounded for a specified period or require the installation of an ignition interlock system;
- Mandatory assessment of alcohol abuse and referral to treatment; and,
- Establishment of a mandatory minimum sentence for repeat offenders of at least five days of imprisonment or 30 days of community service for the second offense, and at least ten days of imprisonment or 60 days of community service for the third or subsequent offense.

States that are non-compliant have 3 percent of their annual federal transportation funds diverted to highway safety programs that fund alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures and law enforcement activities. This federal requirement is known as “redirection.”

Only those states that fully comply with all provisions of the federal law are listed as in compliance in this report. To date, 38 states and DC get credit for having this law. Twelve (12) states are not in compliance with the federal repeat offender language. **No state adopted a federally compliant repeat offender law in 2007.**
SOBRIETY CHECKPOINT LAWS

According to NHTSA, in the United States, only one arrest is made for every 772 impaired driving trips. To improve upon this startling statistic, most states have authorized the use of sobriety checkpoints, which are traffic stops where law enforcement officers systematically select drivers to assess their level of alcohol impairment. Law enforcement officers use sobriety checkpoints as a highly visible tool for deterring impaired driving. The publicity garnered coupled with the visibility of sobriety checkpoints increase the perceived risk of arrest within the communities for which they are conducted.

Checkpoints have a predetermined set of rules as to whom an officer may stop in order to identify impairment. Publicized, frequent and long-term checkpoints create a convincing threat for drivers not to get behind the wheel impaired. This tool has proven to deter drunk or drugged people from driving under the influence and has removed impaired drivers from the roads.

According to NHTSA, studies indicate that large-scale sobriety checkpoint programs alone can reduce alcohol-related crashes by 20 percent.

In this report, Advocates has given credit to states that have enacted laws with guidelines for enforcement officials to run sobriety checkpoints throughout the state. To date, 39 states and DC have laws on their books that authorize them to run checkpoints. Of those, only 12 states and DC conduct sobriety checkpoints twice a month.

Sobriety checkpoints reduce impaired driving, lower the incidence of fatal crashes and garner a great deal of support from the public. A 2004 Lou Harris poll shows strong public support—80 percent—for police checkpoints to spot drunk drivers. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), sobriety checkpoints at 23 locations across the nation resulted in an average decline of fatal crashes by 22 percent.

Advocates encourages all states that have laws allowing for sobriety checkpoints to make them a key part of their efforts to reduce impaired driving, and urges those 11 states without these laws to enact them. No state adopted a sobriety checkpoint law in 2007.
IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICES: A PRIMER

A breath alcohol ignition interlock device (IID) is a mechanism similar to a breathalyzer which is linked to a vehicle’s ignition system. Its purpose is to deter an individual who has a certain level of alcohol in the bloodstream from driving the vehicle. Before the vehicle can be started, the driver must breathe into the device. If the analyzed result is over a programmed blood alcohol concentration, commonly .02% or .04%, the vehicle will not start. At random times after the engine has been started, the IID will require another breath sample. This will prevent a friend or relative from breathing into the device to bypass the system, enabling the intoxicated person to get behind the wheel and drive away. If the breath sample isn't provided, or the sample exceeds the ignition interlock's preset blood alcohol level, the device will log the event, warn the driver and then start up an alarm (e.g., lights flashing, horn honking, etc.) until the ignition is turned off.

Most states now permit judges to order the installation of an IID as a condition of probation; especially for repeat offenders. However, states are beginning to recognize the value in having IID’s installed for drunk driving offenders, even first time offenders.

Statistics show that the overwhelming majority of people arrested for drunk driving have driven drunk more than 50 times before their first arrest. Two-thirds of those whose licenses are suspended for DUI drive anyway. Interlocks are proven to be up to 90 percent effective while on the vehicle, yet it is estimated that only one in eight convicted drunk drivers each year are currently subject to the device, and most of those are repeat offenders.

In November of 2006, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) announced a national campaign advocating mandatory IID installation for all first offenders. An effort to combat the more than 17,000 annual deaths each year related to drunk driving, the campaign’s goal is to apply new technology and tougher laws to deter drunk driving.

The recent push for this new technology is promising, therefore, Advocates has chosen to join in MADD’s efforts and begin evaluating whether states have adequate requirements for the use of ignition interlock devices.
IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICES (cont’d)

While 46 states allow the use of ignition interlock devices, it is estimated that only one convicted drunk driver in eight is required to use the device each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Use for First Conviction</th>
<th>Required Use for Repeat and High BAC Offenders (2+)</th>
<th>Ignition Interlock Law Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advocates has chosen to evaluate states, based not just on whether they allow ignition interlocks, but whether they require the use of these lifesaving systems.

A common misconception is that most people who are convicted of their first drunk driving offense are social drinkers, who made a one-time mistake. However, studies have shown that the average first offender will have driven drunk 87 times before getting caught.

For this reason, Advocates has also chosen to evaluate whether states’ ignition interlock laws apply to both first-time offenders, and repeat and high BAC offenders.

Currently, only four states (AZ, IL, LA, NM) require the installation of ignition interlock devices for first-time offenders. These state laws offer the most effective means for denying drunk drivers the opportunity to get behind the wheel. Advocates has given full credit to these states.

Equally important are laws that address the “super-drunk” driver (those drivers who are caught driving with a BAC level twice the legal limit or more), and repeat offenders. Advocates has given half credit to those states that require the installation of IIDs for repeat and high BAC offenders.
# IMPAIRED DRIVING LAWS

Number of new laws since January 2007: NO Open Container; NO child endangerment; NO high BAC; NO BAC Testing; NO open container; NO repeat offender; NO sobriety checkpoint laws were passed in 2007; and ten ignition interlocks, three of which were first offense laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● = Optimal law  ○ = Half credit given because law does not fully satisfy Advocates’ recommendations
STATES’ OVERALL RATING BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER OF LAWS, PLUS OCCUPANT PROTECTION LAWS

On the following page, Advocates has given an overall rating to the states based on the number of laws each state has that are recommended in this report. Full credit was given only when the law met Advocates’ optimal law recommendations; half credit was given for booster seat and teen driving laws that partially met Advocates’ recommendations.

The overall rating takes into consideration whether or not a state has a strong occupant protection rating. No state without a primary enforcement seat belt law is eligible for a Green rating, no matter how many other laws they have. The weighting of occupant protection laws is to highlight the significance of these laws in saving lives and reducing injuries.

NOTE: As discussed on page 4, there are changes in how impaired driving laws are graded in this year’s report. Ignition interlock laws have been added to the list, and two mandatory BAC testing laws are merged into one, with half credit given for each law. Because ignition interlock laws are introduced for the first time, in order not to penalize states by changing the baseline, this year only, no state’s overall rating will drop because they do not have ignition interlock or BAC laws. Hawaii and Kentucky; therefore, will maintain their “green” rating this year, although their overall number decreased.

[PLEASE REFER TO PAGE 5 FOR DEFINITIONS OF 15 LIFESAVING LAWS]

Ratings Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Number of Laws</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>11 to 15, with primary enforcement law, or nine, including both primary enforcement and all-rider helmet laws</td>
<td>State is significantly advanced toward adoption of all Advocates’ recommended optimal laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Six to ten, with primary enforcement law, or seven to 13, without primary enforcement law</td>
<td>State is advancing but has numerous gaps in its highway safety laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Less than seven, without primary enforcement law</td>
<td>State falls dangerously behind in adoption of key laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● = Optimal law  ○ = Half credit given because law does not satisfy Advocates’ recommendations
## Overall Rating Based on Number of Safety Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number With Optimal Law</th>
<th>26+ DC</th>
<th>20+ DC</th>
<th>18+ DC</th>
<th>44+ DC</th>
<th>34+ DC</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>35+ DC</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>38+ DC</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>39+ DC</th>
<th>39+ DC</th>
<th>39+ DC</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Missing Optimal Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42+ DC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34+ DC</td>
<td>11+ DC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21+ DC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46+ DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● = Optimal law  ○ = Half credit given because law does not satisfy Advocates’ recommendations
Overall Rating Of States Based On Number Of Safety Laws

11 to 15, with primary enforcement law, or nine, including both primary enforcement and all-rider motorcycle helmet laws

Six to 10, with primary enforcement law, or seven to 13, without primary enforcement law

Less than seven, without primary enforcement law
STATES AT A GLANCE

Each state and DC are graphically represented in alphabetical order with the following information:

• A listing of the 15 key life-saving laws that the state does not have based on the laws defined on page 5 and discussed in this report.

• The number of people killed in each state for the year 2006, as reported in the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

• The annual economic cost of motor vehicle crashes to the state, as reported by *The Economic Impact of Motor Vehicle Crashes 2000* (NHTSA) report.

• The state’s background color represents its overall rating based on the rating chart on page 39 of this report.

States are credited with having laws only if their laws meet Advocates’ optimal criteria.

• **Only 17 states** (Alabama, California, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington) and DC received a “Green” rating, showing significant advancement toward adopting all of Advocates’ recommended optimal laws.

• **30 states** (Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) received a “Yellow” rating, showing advancement but with numerous gaps still in their highway safety laws.

• **3 states** (Arkansas, South Dakota, and Wyoming) received a “Red” rating, indicating dangerous lack of key laws.
ALABAMA

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN ALABAMA:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Ignition Interlock Law

2006 Fatalities: 1,208
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $2.79 Billion

ALASKA

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN ALASKA:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Open Container Law
- Repeat Offender Law
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

2006 Fatalities: 74
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $475 Million

ARIZONA

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN ARIZONA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive

2006 Fatalities: 1,288
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.27 Billion
ARKANSAS

2006 Fatalities: 665
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.97 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN ARKANSAS:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

CALIFORNIA

2006 Fatalities: 4,236
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $20.66 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN CALIFORNIA:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Repeat Offender Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

COLORADO

2006 Fatalities: 535
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.28 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN COLORADO:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
CONNECTICUT

2006 Fatalities: 301
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.60 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN CONNECTICUT:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

DELAWARE

2006 Fatalities: 148
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $706 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN DELAWARE:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

2006 Fatalities: 37
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $732 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN WASHINGTON DC:
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Ignition Interlock Law
FLORIDA

2006 Fatalities: 3,374
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $14.40 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN FLORIDA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

GEORGIA

2006 Fatalities: 1,693
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $7.85 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN GEORGIA:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

HAWAII

2006 Fatalities: 161
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crash: $655 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN HAWAII:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
IDaho

2006 Fatalities: 267
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $856 Million

Highway Safety Laws Needed in Idaho:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

Illinois

2006 Fatalities: 1,254
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $8.98 Billion

Highway Safety Laws Needed in Illinois:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision (weekends)

Indiana

2006 Fatalities: 899
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.35 Billion

Highway Safety Laws Needed in Indiana:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Ignition Interlock Law
IOWA

2006 Fatalities: 439

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $2.11 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN IOWA:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

KANSAS

2006 Fatalities: 468

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.88 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN KANSAS:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

KENTUCKY

2006 Fatalities: 913

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.11 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN KENTUCKY:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
LOUISIANA

2006 Fatalities: 982
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.00 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN LOUISIANA:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Open Container Law
- Repeat Offender Law

MAINE

2006 Fatalities: 188
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $912 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MAINE:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

MARYLAND

2006 Fatalities: 651
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.24 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MARYLAND:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
MASSACHUSETTS

2006 Fatalities: 430
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $6.28 Billion

HIGHERWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MASSACHUSETTS:
Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
Ignition Interlock Law

MICHIGAN

2006 Fatalities: 1,085
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $8.07 Billion

HIGHERWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MICHIGAN:
Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
High BAC Law
Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
Sobriety Checkpoints Law
Ignition Interlock Law

MINNESOTA

2006 Fatalities: 494
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.07 Billion

HIGHERWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MINNESOTA:
Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
Repeat Offender Law
Sobriety Checkpoints Law
Ignition Interlock Law
MISSISSIPPI

2006 Fatalities: 911
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $2.11 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MISSISSIPPI:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL – 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- High BAC Law
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

MISSOURI

2006 Fatalities: 1,096
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.74 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MISSOURI:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

MONTANA

2006 Fatalities: 263
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $621 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN MONTANA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
NEBRASKA

2006 Fatalities: 269
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.63 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEBRASKA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

NEVADA

2006 Fatalities: 432
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.84 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEVADA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

NEW HAMPSHIRE

2006 Fatalities: 127
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.01 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEW HAMPSHIRE:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
NEW JERSEY

2006 Fatalities: 772
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $9.34 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEW JERSEY:
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

NEW MEXICO

2006 Fatalities: 484
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.41 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEW MEXICO:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Repeat Offender Law

NEW YORK

2006 Fatalities: 1,456
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $19.49 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NEW YORK:
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL – 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL – 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
NORTH CAROLINA

2006 Fatalities: 1,559

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $8.27 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NORTH CAROLINA:
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Ignition Interlock Law

NORTH DAKOTA

2006 Fatalities: 111

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $290 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN NORTH DAKOTA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

OHIO

2006 Fatalities: 1,238

Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $11.09 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN OHIO:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive Repeat Offender Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
OKLAHOMA

2006 Fatalities: 765
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $2.59 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN OKLAHOMA:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Ignition Interlock Law

OREGON

2006 Fatalities: 477
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.95 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN OREGON:
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
- Repeat Offender Law
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

PENNSYLVANIA

2006 Fatalities: 1,525
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $8.17 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN PENNSYLVANIA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
RHODE ISLAND

2006 Fatalities: 81
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $767 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN RHODE ISLAND:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
- Repeat Offender Law
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

SOUTH CAROLINA

2006 Fatalities: 1,037
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.34 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN SOUTH CAROLINA:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law

SOUTH DAKOTA

2006 Fatalities: 191
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $498 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN SOUTH DAKOTA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- Repeat Offender Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
TENNESSEE

2006 Fatalities: 1,287
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $4.63 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN TENNESSEE:
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

TEXAS

2006 Fatalities: 3,475
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $19.76 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN TEXAS:
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

UTAH

2006 Fatalities: 287
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.59 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN UTAH:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- Booster Seat Law Up To Age 8
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Ignition Interlock Law
VERMONT

2006 Fatalities: 87
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $221 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN VERMONT:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Repeat Offender Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

VIRGINIA

2006 Fatalities: 963
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $5.20 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN VIRGINIA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Mandatory BAC Test Law – Drivers Who Survive
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

WASHINGTON

2006 Fatalities: 630
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $5.31 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN WASHINGTON:
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law
WEST VIRGINIA

2006 Fatalities: 410
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $1.27 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN WEST VIRGINIA:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- GDL - 30-50 Hours Supervised Driving Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL - Passenger Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
- Open Container Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

WISCONSIN

2006 Fatalities: 724
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $3.76 Billion

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN WISCONSIN:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Who Survive
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law

WYOMING

2006 Fatalities: 195
Annual Economic Cost Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes: $424 Million

HIGHWAY SAFETY LAWS NEEDED IN WYOMING:
- Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law
- All-Rider Motorcycle Helmet Law
- GDL - 6-Month Holding Period Provision
- GDL - Nighttime Restriction Provision
- GDL – Cell Phone Restriction Provision
- Child Endangerment Law
- High BAC Law
- Mandatory BAC Test Law - Drivers Killed
- Open Container Law
- Repeat Offender Law
- Sobriety Checkpoints Law
- Ignition Interlock Law