

SP-20  
Log H-456

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

ISSUED: December 6, 1985

Forwarded to:

Governors and Legislative Leaders  
of the 50 States and Puerto Rico  
Mayor and Council Chairman  
of the District of Columbia  
(see attached list)

SAFETY RECOMMENDATION(S)

H-85-49 and -50

The tragic contribution of alcohol to violence on our highways long has been recognized. In fact, within 5 years of the first fatal motor vehicle crash in the United States, the relationship of alcohol to highway death and injury was described in a 1904 scientific journal as a developing public safety and health problem. <sup>1/</sup>

In the years that followed, State and local officials found that State laws did not deal adequately with the problem of drunk driving and that the critical information needed to measure the nature and extent of the problem did not exist. One report indicates that in 1924 it appeared "... to be the belief of traffic commissioners and other informed individuals that probably one fourth to a third of our automobile accidents (were) ... at least partly chargeable to alcohol use by drivers." <sup>2/</sup> But, as the landmark 1968 Alcohol and Highway Safety Report to Congress states, "Due to the lack of sufficiently precise data, exact estimates of the nature of the problem in the U.S. in the first third of the century ... are not possible." <sup>3/</sup>

The need for accurate and reliable information on the involvement of alcohol in highway crashes is, in fact, even more pressing today than ever before. Since 1980 there has been a virtual explosion of interest and activity nationwide concerning the drunk driving problem. Substantial commitments of financial and human resources are being made annually in every State to implement or expand drunk driving countermeasure programs. <sup>4/</sup> New laws to toughen drunk driving statutes have been enacted in most States, and Congress has passed several laws to encourage State action. National, State, and local officials are under considerable public pressure to reduce the estimated 23,500 alcohol-involved highway deaths and 650,000 alcohol-involved injuries suffered each year.

<sup>1/</sup> Editorial, The Quarterly Journal of Inebriety 26: 308-309, 1904.

<sup>2/</sup> Miles, W. R., Alcohol and Motor Vehicle Drivers, Proceedings, 13th Annual Meeting of Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., Dec. 7-8, 1933.

<sup>3/</sup> Secretary of Transportation, 1968 Alcohol and Highway Safety Report (hereinafter referred to as "1968 Report").

<sup>4/</sup> Federal highway safety grant funding (at a FY 1985 level of \$126.5 million) is allocated each year to the States to supplement State highway safety funding resources. (The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that Federal highway safety grant funds represent about 2-3 percent of total State highway safety (continued)

However, obtaining support particularly at the local level for initiating and sustaining action necessary to reduce this problem is dependent upon demonstrating that drunk driving is a serious local problem. Complete and accurate information on the involvement of drinking drivers in fatal highway crashes is essential for acquiring such support. To allocate resources for, and to evaluate the effectiveness of, drunk driving laws and programs at the State and national level, each State must know both the level of, and the annual changes in, the level of alcohol involvement in highway crashes. Such knowledge also is a critical prerequisite to the planning and implementation of effective countermeasure programs. However, a recent Safety Board review of State and national accident reporting systems indicates that this critical information may not, in fact, be available in many States.

During the 1960s and 1970s, several landmark steps were taken to improve the availability of accident data. As a result of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the Department of Transportation became the principal Federal agency in the fight against drunk driving. On June 26, 1967, the Secretary of Transportation issued the first 13 National Uniform Standards for State Highway Safety Programs. These standards established prerequisites that States must meet to receive Federal highway safety funds provided by the 1966 act. The eighth standard, "Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety," required each State to obtain quantitative tests for alcohol "on the bodies of all drivers and adult pedestrians who die within four hours of a traffic accident (and) on all surviving drivers in accidents fatal to others." <sup>5/</sup> (See appendix.) The accompanying "Highway Safety Program Manual" to Standard No. 8 emphasized that the purpose of the Standard was, in part, "to ensure that States and their communities have accurate information on the extent to which the immoderate use of alcohol is a factor in the highway crashes in their jurisdictions, to serve as a basis for resource allocations and for determining the effects of countermeasures." <sup>6/</sup>

The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances (NCUTLO), which develops the Uniform Vehicle Code (the model traffic law for the United States), also expressed the need for accurate records on the involvement of alcohol in highway crashes by adopting in 1975 a new section (10-116) of the code which requires the determination of alcohol involvement in all drivers or pedestrians involved in fatal highway accidents.

However, the most significant <sup>7/</sup> national effort to improve the collection, analysis, and use of traffic accident data began in 1975 when the National Highway Traffic Safety

expenditures each year.) Accordingly, States develop annual "Highway Safety Plans" (HSP) to allocate this funding which are supposed to reflect the relative need for programs in the various highway safety program areas (i.e., alcohol, seatbelts, emergency medical service, police traffic services, pedestrian safety, etc.). Determinations of program "need" are supposed to be based upon an empirical "Problem Identification" process that, for example, indicates the level of alcohol involvement in the States' highway crashes and the impact of the alcohol countermeasure programs in reducing these crash levels. Because, historically, countermeasure programs have achieved only small reductions in alcohol-involved crash levels, there is a concomitant need for highly accurate and precise data which can allow measurement of small changes in crash levels.

<sup>5/</sup> Program Standard 4.4.8, "Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety," authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402(a).

<sup>6/</sup> Highway Safety Program Manual No. 8, National Highway Safety Bureau, Federal Highway Administration, January 17, 1969. (emphasis added)

<sup>7/</sup> The National Highway Safety Bureau (later, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) began collecting available fatal crash data from the States in the 1960s. A National Accident Summary first was published in 1970, and from 1972-1974 the Fatality Analysis File was the repository for State accident data. Both were partial files, however, which did not include data from every State.

Administration (NHTSA) established the Fatal Accident Reporting System (FARS). FARS is a computerized file containing data on all fatal motor vehicle accidents in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia (D.C.). It is the first census of fatal crashes in the United States and is regarded as the most complete data base available on fatal accidents. Operating on an annual budget of approximately \$3 million, FARS uses more than 100 full- and part-time Federal and State employees in its operations. The reporting system enables making a State-by-State determination of whether each State has "accurate information on the extent to which immoderate use of alcohol is a factor in the (fatal) highway crashes in their jurisdictions. . . ." 8/ Using FARS data, the Safety Board has completed such an assessment and examined the current status of State alcohol-involved crash data. The Board's results indicate that considerably more than half of the States do not collect sufficient data on drivers who are fatally injured in highway accidents to allow an accurate, ongoing assessment of the extent to which alcohol is present in such accidents.

#### Testing of Fatally Injured Drivers

For the latest complete reporting year, 1983, only 13 States and the District of Columbia determined and reported blood alcohol concentration (BAC) test results on 80 percent 9/ or more of the drivers fatally injured in motor vehicle accidents in their jurisdictions. (See tables I and II.) Twenty-seven States determined and reported BACs for 50 to 79 percent of their fatally injured drivers, while 10 States reported on fewer than 50 percent. Nationally, alcohol test results are known for only 56.7 percent of all fatally injured drivers, 10/ 17.8 percentage points more than the 1975 reporting level of 38.9 percent when the FARS was established. (See table III.) The poor testing and reporting levels of many States reflected in the FARS point to one of several deficiencies in our current national and State accident data bases which limit the usefulness of these systems for measuring the level and changes in the level of alcohol-involved highway crashes.

#### Testing of Surviving Drivers in Fatal Crashes


To assess accurately the role of alcohol in highway crashes and to evaluate the impact of State and Federal countermeasures, studies of alcohol-involved fatally injured drivers alone are insufficient and potentially misleading. When a multivehicle fatal crash occurs, the driver (or drivers) responsible for causing the crash may not be fatally injured. Moreover, in single-vehicle fatal crashes, the drivers' injuries may not be fatal. The Safety Board believes that BAC data on the drivers who survive fatal crashes are needed to complement information on fatally injured drivers.

8/ Program Standard 4.4.8, op. cit.

9/ The 80 percent reporting level is considered by NHTSA's National Center for Statistics and Analysis (which operates FARS) and other experts familiar with the problems inherent in testing and reporting blood alcohol involvement in highway crashes to be a "good" reporting level and reasonably close to complete reporting. Drivers who die more than 4 hours after a crash are not tested routinely because test results would not be representative of the BAC at time of crash. California, for example, found that 3 out of 4 drivers who had not been tested died more than 4 hours after their crash. In addition, medical treatment, such as transfusions, can preclude accurate testing.

10/ In the FARS, a "known" BAC result is one that is available to the FARS analysts. As discussed later, BAC testing may be performed in a given State, but the results are not made available by a hospital or some other State agency to the State office that maintains accident records.

Table I.--Percentage fatally injured drivers tested with known BAC.\*



\* Data from NHTSA 1983 Fatal Accident Reporting System.

Table II.--Number of States where 80 percent (or more) of driver fatalities are tested and the BAC is available from FARS.

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. States*</u>	<u>States</u>
1975	6	CA, CO, DC, NH, NJ, RI
1976	5	CA, CO, NJ, OR, RI
1977	9	CA, CO, HA, NV, NH, NJ, OR, RI, WI
1978	8	CA, CO, DC, HA, NH, NJ, OR, RI
1979	9	CA, CO, DE, DC, NH, NJ, OR, RI, WI
1980	13	CA, CO, DE, DC, HA, NH, NJ, NM, OR, RI, SD, VT, WI
1981	14	CA, CO, DE, DC, HA, MD, NV, NH, NJ, OR, RI, VT, WA, WI
1982	15	CA, CO, DE, DC, HA, MD, NV, NJ, NM, OR, RI, UT, VT, WA, WI
1983	14	CA, CO, DE, DC, HA, IL, MD, NV, NJ, OR, RI, VT, WV, WI

\*including the District of Columbia

Table III.--Testing of fatally injured drivers 1975-1983 (FARS).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Percentage tested w/known results</u>	<u>Percentage tested w/unknown results</u>	<u>Percentage not tested</u>	<u>Unknown if tested</u>
1975	38.9	9.8	37.7	13.7
1976	40.8	10.2	39.6	9.3
1977	43.2	11.5	33.5	11.8
1978	42.0	12.8	33.8	11.4
1979	44.9	12.6	33.6	9.0
1980	46.6	11.0	34.7	7.7
1981	48.6	10.8	35.1	5.5
1982	54.3	10.8	29.4	5.6
1983	56.7	10.5	28.0	4.7

Despite the fact that approximately 55 percent of all drivers involved in fatal crashes survive the crash, in 1983, only two States--Delaware and Vermont--routinely tested for and reported the BAC levels of a significant portion of surviving drivers in fatal crashes. Vermont has a law requiring tests of surviving drivers, while in Delaware it is the official policy of the state medical examiner to test surviving drivers. Only three additional States--Colorado, Nebraska, and Utah--test and report BAC levels on more than half of the surviving drivers involved in fatal crashes. <sup>11/</sup> (See table IV.) Nationwide, BAC levels were determined and reported on only 16.5 percent of the surviving drivers involved in fatal crashes. (See table V.)

Table IV.--Numbers of States where 50 percent (or more) of surviving drivers (in fatal crashes) are tested and the BAC is available from FARS.

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. States</u>	<u>States</u>
1975	2	CO, DE
1976	4	CO, DE, NE, UT
1977	3	CO, DE, NE
1978	2	CO, DE
1979	3	DE, NE, VT
1980	4	DE, NE, UT, VT
1981	4	CO, DE, NE, VT
1982	5	DE, NE, SD, UT, VT
1983	5	CO, DE, NE, UT, VT

Table V.--Testing of surviving drivers involved in fatal crashes (FARS).

<u>Year</u>	<u>Percentage tested w/known results</u>	<u>Percentage tested w/unknown results</u>	<u>Percentage not tested</u>	<u>Unknown if tested</u>
1975	9.9	3.6	73.0	13.5
1976	10.4	4.6	73.2	11.8
1977	10.8	4.8	68.6	15.8
1978	10.9	5.3	69.7	14.2
1979	12.0	5.6	70.6	11.8
1980	13.8	5.4	71.1	9.8
1981	14.6	4.5	73.9	7.0
1982	16.3	5.4	71.5	6.9
1983	16.5	5.7	71.8	6.0

Note: Surviving drivers account for about 55 percent of all drivers in fatal accidents.

<sup>11/</sup> For 1983, FARS indicates Delaware tested (with known results) 90 percent of surviving drivers; Vermont--71 percent; Nebraska--60 percent; Utah--53 percent; and Colorado--51 percent.

### Testing in Injury-Producing Crashes

Epidemiological studies of injury-only accidents estimate that between 18 and 26 percent involve alcohol. <sup>12/</sup> In 1982 alone, NHTSA estimated that approximately 708,000 persons were injured in alcohol-involved highway crashes. Clearly, reductions in alcohol-involved injury-producing crashes also are an important goal of States and local alcohol countermeasure programs. <sup>13/</sup> Unfortunately, no State routinely measures alcohol involvement in injury-only crashes because existing State laws do not permit BAC testing of drivers involved in nonfatal injury-producing crashes unless they have been arrested for driving while under the influence (DWI).

National statistics on injury-producing crashes are available from NHTSA's National Accident Sampling System (NASS). Since 1979, NHTSA has investigated and placed into the NASS computer files approximately 10,000 accidents randomly selected from police-reported accidents across the United States. The reporting of alcohol data in the NASS accident files is, however, even less complete than in the FARS system, because States test so few drivers involved in injury-only crashes.

### Estimating Alcohol Involvement in Crashes

Because accurate and complete data on the presence of alcohol in all drivers involved in fatal and serious injury crashes have been largely unavailable, researchers as well as Federal, State, and local policy-making officials in many jurisdictions have been forced to estimate the extent of alcohol involvement in all fatal crashes (and, in some cases, in all types of highway crashes) from the information available on fatally injured drivers. But, as noted above, most States do not even routinely collect BAC data on all drivers killed and must estimate the overall level of alcohol involvement in all drivers who die in highway crashes. Consequently, even the national statistics published by NHTSA and others are, in fact, estimates derived from a sample of 15 so-called "good" States that test and report alcohol involvement in 80 percent or more of their driver fatalities. <sup>14/</sup>

Extrapolating alcohol involvement from driver fatalities to other crash populations (i.e., all drivers in fatal crashes or injury crashes) can, however, introduce biases which can distort the true level of alcohol involvement. <sup>15/</sup> In a recent analysis of the FARS system, Voas found that "there is no subset of FARS data which can truly be considered to be . . . randomly and completely collected. . . Drivers [in the 15 good States sample] are not a random sample of the fatally injured drivers from their States." <sup>16/</sup> Because more drivers who are involved in the types of fatal accidents known to have high alcohol involvement (i.e., nighttime, single-vehicle, rural, and those involving drivers 15-35 years

<sup>12/</sup> Fell J.C., Alcohol Involvement in Traffic Accidents. Recent Estimates from the National Center for Statistics and Analysis; Farris, R., et al., A Comparison of Alcohol Involvement in Exposed and Injured Drivers. NHTSA Report No. DOT-HS-4-00854, 1977; and Terhune, K.W., and Fell, J.C., "The Role of Alcohol, Marijuana and Other Drugs in the Accidents of Injured Drivers", Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference of the American Association for Automotive Medicine, California, 1981.

<sup>13/</sup> Injury crashes are, in fact, a statistically better measure for evaluating countermeasure program impact because their larger numbers allow small changes to be detected in States or localities that have few fatal crashes.

<sup>14/</sup> Fell, op. cit.

<sup>15/</sup> Voas, op. cit.; Zylman R., "A Critical Evaluation of the Literature on 'Alcohol Involvement' in Highway Deaths." Accident Analysis and Prevention 1984; 6(2): 163-204.

<sup>16/</sup> Voas, op. cit.

of age) tend to be tested for alcohol than those in other types of accidents (e.g., daytime, multivehicle, or urban), extrapolations not corrected for these differences tend to overestimate the number (and proportion) of alcohol-involved drivers. <sup>17/</sup>

Voas also states that "perhaps the greatest potential for overestimating the number of alcohol-related fatalities is the extrapolation from results for fatalities to the results for survivors (of fatal crashes)." The principal reason for this bias, again, appears to be an oversampling of nighttime, rural, and single-vehicle crashes. In his study of FARS data from the 15 "good" States, Voas found that 45 percent of the fatalities are from nighttime crashes, compared to 40 percent for survivors; 50 percent of fatalities are from single-vehicle accidents, compared to only 36 percent for survivors; and 60 percent of fatalities are from rural accidents, compared to 50 percent for survivors.

Estimates of the extent of alcohol involvement in injury-only crashes are even less precise than those for fatal crashes. This is because States test so few drivers involved in injury-only crashes and almost never test passengers, pedestrians, or other road users. Moreover, because police only test drivers they suspect were drinking, the BACs of those measured are less likely to be representative of the entire population of injured drivers. The net effect of these biases would tend, therefore, to underestimate the proportion of alcohol-involvement and overestimate the average BAC in injury-only crashes.

#### Importance of Accurate Records

The importance of accurate and complete records on the involvement of alcohol in highway crashes is not simply to satisfy the need to accurately define the magnitude of the drunk driving problem in a particular State or locality, or nationwide. In fact, properly drawn samples of such crash records can and have served to estimate the extent of alcohol involvement in fatal crashes. The importance of complete and accurate records and conversely the danger posed by biased and incomplete information relate most directly to the policy decisions State and local governments must make in addressing the drunk driving problem at their level.

Drunk driving is, by its nature, a local problem requiring localized solutions. The principal resources and responsibility for controlling drunk driving resides in our States, counties, and towns. Accurate and complete alcohol testing of all drivers involved in fatal highway crashes in that locality is necessary if a county or city is to be able to document the extent of its drunk driving problem, to design countermeasure programs, and to evaluate their effectiveness.

Similarly, State officials need to break down statewide data on fatal crashes to identify localities or driver groups with special problems, to target these areas or groups for special emphasis programs and, finally, to evaluate their impact. Because of the overrepresentation, for example, of drivers under age 21 in alcohol-involved fatal highway crashes, States have adopted a minimum legal drinking age of 21. In order to establish the need for and to evaluate the effect of such legislation, knowledge of the level of alcohol-involvement in fatally injured 18-, 19-, 20-, and 21-year-old drivers in the years prior and subsequent to the change in law is necessary. If fewer 18- to 20-year-old

<sup>17/</sup> Voas does indicate, however, that the sample of fatally injured drivers from the FARS 15 "good" States can provide a reasonable basis for a national estimate of the alcohol involvement in all fatally injured drivers if corrected for oversampling from nighttime and single-vehicle crashes.



drivers killed in highway crashes are tested for alcohol than older drivers, or if testing rates vary greatly from year to year, it might not be possible to evaluate the effect of the age-21 legislation. Crash records with biases simply may not reflect accurately a group's level of alcohol involvement.

The Safety Board believes that the information presented above clearly indicates that there is sufficient reason for concern about the limited effort of many States and localities to accurately measure the extent to which alcohol is involved in fatal highway crashes within their jurisdiction. Without BAC testing of all drivers involved in fatal crashes, or a better understanding of the biases and deficiencies in current State crash records systems, local, State, and Federal officials will not be able to evaluate accurately their efforts to control the drunk driving problem and to allocate resources therefore on an objective, scientific basis.

#### Deficiencies in State Alcohol Reporting Systems

The principal flaws in State systems designed to measure and report alcohol involvement in fatal crashes are the failure to test all drivers and the failure to report results of all tests that are obtained. Considering the latter category first, FARS statistics for "drivers tested with unknown results" indicate that, in a number of States, BAC tests have been performed on a substantial number of fatally injured drivers. However, the results have not been reported to the State agency responsible for collecting accident records. (See table VI.) In 13 States, tests are performed on an additional 10 percent or more of fatally injured drivers, but the results are not reported and hence "not known" by these State agencies. For three States, 30 to 50 percent of the test results are "unknown" to the agency responsible for collecting and storing accident reports.

The primary reason for the large numbers of unknown test results appears to be the lack of a formal system and/or sufficient personnel to link BAC test reports (typically sent to State health departments) with fatal accident reports collected by State police, public safety, or transportation agencies. For example, when a staff person was designated in the North Carolina Department of Public Health to coordinate the recording of toxicology results with Department of Public Safety accident analysis personnel, the percentage of fatally injured drivers tested and reported to the FARS increased from 45.04 percent (1982) to 78.74 percent (1983). Similarly, in 1982, when Alabama added a full-time FARS analyst to coordinate exchange of records between agencies, the percentage of fatally injured drivers reported tested increased from 17.5 percent to 52.0 percent. In other States, improvement in recordkeeping within agencies, better data processing equipment or procedures, as well as more staff time are needed to improve reporting levels. If administrative and manpower solutions such as these could be undertaken, currently "unknown" test results could become known, and reporting levels in five more States would immediately rise to 80 percent. (See table VI.)

However, failure to test fatally injured drivers rather than failure to report results remains by far the biggest problem in most States. Failure to test is frequently the result of a combination of factors. The most common reasons identified by the Safety Board for failures to test are:

- o no legal authority
- o lack of expertise
- o personal reluctance of those in the "testing system," i.e., police, physicians, coroners, etc.)
- o lack of resources (financial, personnel)

Table VI.--BAC testing of fatally injured drivers -1983 FARS.

DRIVER FATALITIES					
State	No. of Drivers	Percent Drivers Tested	Percent Drivers Tested	Percent Drivers Not Tested	Percent Unknown if Driver Tested
		With Known Results	With Unknown Results		
Total	24,135	56.74	10.52	28.07	4.67
Alabama	555	52.07	20.90	26.49	.54
Alaska	92	45.65	9.78	4.35	40.22
Arizona	371	61.46	5.93	21.29	11.32
Arkansas	347	10.09	17.87	54.47	17.58
California	2,487	86.45	.24	13.31	-
Colorado	365	84.66	-	15.34	-
Connecticut	266	65.41	10.15	24.44	-
Delaware	60	100.00			
District of Columbia	21	85.71	4.76	9.52	-
Florida	1,374	3.64	34.21	58.97	3.20
Georgia	756	69.58	1.46	28.97	-
Hawaii	82	89.02	-	10.98	-
Idaho	160	36.25	11.88	46.25	5.63
Illinois	884	81.22	2.71	15.50	.57
Indiana	639	51.33	13.46	31.77	3.44
Iowa	320	56.25	6.25	35.00	2.50
Kansas	264	31.82	4.92	38.26	25.00
Kentucky	455	71.21	4.18	24.40	.22
Louisiana	547	15.17	51.92	32.91	
Maine	134	58.96	2.99	35.07	2.99
Maryland	380	86.84	-	12.63	.53
Massachusetts	347	59.08	23.34	5.48	12.10
Michigan	727	58.05	1.93	39.06	.96
Minnesota	344	76.16	3.78	9.88	10.17
Mississippi	432	17.59	.46	49.77	32.18
Missouri	533	28.71	2.44	24.20	44.65
Montana	178	71.91	7.30	19.10	1.69
Nebraska	151	76.16	1.99	15.89	5.96
Nevada	133	93.23	.75	6.02	-
New Hampshire	110	63.64	14.55	21.82	-
New Jersey	464	82.33	.86	16.81	-
New Mexico	272	76.47	8.46	11.03	4.04
New York	1,002	63.37	.70	11.48	24.45
North Carolina	868	78.74	6.59	14.22	.45
North Dakota	72	6.94	26.39	66.67	-
Ohio	910	34.40	29.34	27.91	8.35
Oklahoma	511	73.19	-	26.61	.20
Oregon	329	91.49	-	8.21	.30
Pennsylvania	1,001	74.43	4.80	20.78	
Rhode Island	54	94.44	-	1.85	3.70
South Carolina	459	57.73	11.33	30.94	-
South Dakota	94	70.21	-	29.79	-
Tennessee	848	77.01	.15	22.84	-
Texas	2,175	1.93	31.77	66.30	-
Utah	141	72.34	1.42	26.24	-
Vermont	55	90.91	-	7.27	1.82
Virginia	534	79.40	3.00	17.60	-
Washington	412	78.64	1.21	18.20	1.94
West Virginia	272	82.35	1.10	16.54	-
Wisconsin	437	87.19	.92	11.44	.46
Wyoming	11	75.68	2.70	20.72	.90

Forty-one States or jurisdictions (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) have laws specifically authorizing blood alcohol tests on fatally injured drivers. (See table VII.) In some of the remaining States in which there is no specific legal authority to perform a BAC test, the result is incomplete testing and reporting. Arkansas, for example, did not have a law authorizing such tests until 1983. Before that, the lack of a law was considered to be a major barrier to complete reporting. State officials in Arkansas now expect that their reporting level will improve dramatically. The lack of a State law, however, does not appear to have been a barrier to complete reporting in all jurisdictions. The District of Columbia and Maryland, for example, do not have specific statutes requiring chemical tests in fatal crashes (as in Uniform Vehicle Code Section 10-116), but nevertheless attain high reporting levels because of the broad authority and consistent efforts of their medical examiners to investigate violent deaths of any kind.

In some States where a system of local lay coroners persists, the medical/forensic expertise may not be available at the local level to organize and manage a permanent system to obtain and analyze blood samples. Moreover, since coroners frequently serve only part-time in this capacity, they have other obligations and are not always concerned with systematically gathering accident data. In Ohio, for example, there are 88 independent, elected coroners, one in each county. Obtaining the ongoing cooperation of so many local officials has proved difficult, to the detriment of the alcohol testing program.

During the course of this inquiry, the Safety Board found that some police and medical personnel are reluctant to test and report blood alcohol information. Some police, for example, said they are reluctant to request a test for fear of causing embarrassment to families. More commonly, however, police are so occupied with other duties, such as securing the crash scene and helping the injured, that they do not make the effort to see that a blood sample is obtained. As described in a Safety Board study on repeat offender drunk drivers, <sup>18/</sup> physicians and hospital personnel often are reluctant to perform blood alcohol analyses or to release results for fear of involvement in lengthy litigation. Finally, some States and localities simply have assigned higher priorities to other needs than to establishing a complete alcohol involvement reporting system.

#### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

The Safety Board believes that efforts by the NHTSA to improve alcohol reporting by the States have been insufficient and should be increased greatly to assist States in attaining full compliance with Highway Safety Program Standard No. 8. The principal resources available to the States from the Federal government are the highway safety funds allocated to the States to collect fatal accident data (funds commonly used to hire State FARS analyst personnel) and technical assistance provided by NHTSA headquarters and regional staff.

The primary responsibility for providing technical assistance to and supervision of State data collection is assigned to 10 NHTSA staff members (one in each region) who are designated as regional FARS contract technical managers (regional CTMs). Because of the limited staffing of NHTSA regional offices, the regional CTMs (as well as the other regional staff) are responsible for other highway safety programs in addition to the individual State FARS systems in their regions. Consequently, the regional staff has been

<sup>18/</sup> Safety Study: "Deficiencies in Enforcement, Judicial and Treatment Programs Related to Repeat Offender Drunk Drivers," September 18, 1984 (NTSB/SS-84/04).

Table VII.--State law requiring BAC tests on fatally injured drivers.

State	States With Law	States Without Law	States With Law for Testing Surviving Drivers
Alabama		x	
Alaska		x	
Arizona	x		
Arkansas	x		
California	x		
Colorado	x		
Connecticut	x		
Delaware	x		*
District of Columbia	x		
Florida		x	
Georgia	x		
Hawaii	x		
Idaho	x		
Illinois	x		
Indiana	x		
Iowa		x	
Kansas		x	
Kentucky	x		
Louisiana	x		
Maine		x	
Maryland		x	
Massachusetts	x		
Michigan	x		
Minnesota	x		
Mississippi	x		
Missouri	x		
Montana		x	
Nebraska	x		
Nevada	x		
New Hampshire	x		
New Jersey	x		
New Mexico		x	
New York	x		
North Carolina	x		
North Dakota	x		
Ohio	x		
Oklahoma	x		
Oregon	x		
Pennsylvania	x		
Puerto Rico	x		
Rhode Island	x		
South Carolina	x		
South Dakota	x		
Tennessee		x	
Texas	x		
Utah	x		
Vermont	x		x
Virginia		x	
Washington	x		
West Virginia	x		
Wisconsin	x		
Wyoming	x		
Total	41	11	1

\* State has established policy for testing surviving drivers involved in a fatal crash.

limited in the time it has had available to work for improved alcohol reporting in each of their States, and such efforts to date have not received a high priority.

NHTSA should take action to ensure that the States improve the testing and reporting of all drivers involved in fatal highway crashes, and upgrade State crash records and information reporting systems. NHTSA should conduct an active program to assist States with low testing and reporting rates in conducting a thorough review of their testing and reporting systems. The Federal highway safety grant process as well as State funding should be utilized to institute the necessary remedial actions that are identified. Such an effort is consistent with NHTSA's mandate to determine the extent to which alcohol is involved in highway accidents, and is essential to meeting its responsibility to assist the States in their efforts to counter the impact of alcohol abuse on highways.

### Conclusion

The Safety Board, in pursuit of its mission to "investigate . . . the facts, conditions and circumstances and determine the cause or probable cause" of transportation accidents, long has recognized the critical importance of obtaining complete information on the level of alcohol present in all persons involved in the transportation accidents it investigates. With the current high level of public and official interest in the problem of drunk driving and the considerable amount of local, State, and Federal funds being expended to counter it, there is a critical need to determine whether programs are, in fact, reducing alcohol-involved deaths. Legislators, elected officials, and program administrators at all levels of government do not wish and cannot afford to make policy and program decisions based on incomplete or misleading information. Based on the evidence presented here, however, it appears that in many States the information required to make these decisions is both incomplete and potentially misleading.

To address the lack of accurate and complete information on the role of alcohol in highway crashes, the Safety Board urges those States without laws authorizing testing for the presence of alcohol in fatally injured drivers to enact such laws. Moreover, the Board is convinced that such authority should extend to the testing of all drivers involved in fatal crashes. Section 10-116 of the Uniform Vehicle Code (as amended) is an appropriate model for States to follow. States also should strive to determine the level of alcohol involvement in crashes involving serious injury to allow a more complete understanding of the role of alcohol in highway crashes.

Those States that now require the testing of fatally injured drivers should improve their regulations, procedures, and programs to ensure that testing for alcohol involvement is actually performed and properly reported. To this end, each State should review its support for the Fatal Accident Reporting System. The Safety Board believes that the completeness and accuracy of the Fatal Accident Reporting System is vital to understanding the nature and extent of alcohol involvement in highway crashes.


Therefore, the National Transportation Safety Board recommends that the Governors and Legislative Leaders of the 50 States and Puerto Rico and the Mayor and Council Chairman of the District of Columbia:

Initiate legislation or take the necessary administrative action to require alcohol testing of all drivers involved in fatal highway crashes. (Class II, Priority Action) (H-85-49)

Establish formal procedures to ensure that quantitative tests of the blood alcohol concentration of all drivers involved in fatal highway crashes are performed and reported to the State agency responsible for maintaining such records: (Class II, Priority Action) (H-85-50)

The National Transportation Safety Board is an independent Federal agency with the statutory responsibility ". . . to promote transportation safety by conducting independent accident investigations and by formulating safety improvement recommendations" (Public Law 93-633). The Safety Board is vitally interested in any actions taken as a result of its safety recommendations and would appreciate a response from you regarding action taken or contemplated with respect to the recommendations in this letter. Please refer to Safety Recommendations H-85-49 and -50 in your reply.

BURNETT, Chairman, GOLDMAN, Vice Chairman, and BURSLEY, Member, concurred in these recommendations.

  
By: Jim Burnett  
Chairman

APPENDIX

**HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM STANDARD 8  
ALCOHOL IN RELATION TO HIGHWAY SAFETY**

PURPOSE

To broaden the scope and number of activities directed toward reducing traffic accident loss experience arising in whole or in part from persons driving under the influence of alcohol.

STANDARD

Each state, in cooperation with its political subdivisions, shall develop and implement a program to achieve a reduction in those traffic accidents arising in whole or in part from persons driving under the influence of alcohol. The program shall provide at least that:

- I. There is a specification by the State of the following with respect to alcohol related offenses:
  - A. Chemical test procedures for determining blood-alcohol concentrations.
  - B. (1) The blood-alcohol concentrations, not higher than 0.10 percent by weight, which define the terms "intoxicated" or "under the influence of alcohol"; and  
(2) A provision making it either unlawful, or presumptive evidence of illegality, if the blood-alcohol concentration of a driver equals or exceeds the limit so established.
- II. Any person placed under arrest for operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol is deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood, breath, or urine for the purpose of determining the alcohol content of his blood.
- III. To the extent practicable, there are quantitative tests for alcohol:
  - A. On the bodies of all drivers and adult pedestrians who die within four hours of a traffic accident.
  - B. On all surviving drivers in accidents fatal to others.
- IV. There are appropriate procedures established by the State for specifying:
  - A. The qualifications of personnel who administer chemical tests used to determine blood, breath, and other body alcohol concentrations;
  - B. The methods and related details of specimen selection, collection, handling and analysis;
  - C. The reporting and tabulations of the results.
- V. The program shall be periodically evaluated by the State, and the National Highway Safety Traffic Administration shall be provided with an evaluation summary.

Honorable George C. Wallace  
Governor of Alabama  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Honorable Bill Sheffield  
Governor of Alaska  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Honorable Bruce E. Babbitt  
Governor of Arizona  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Honorable Bill Clinton, Jr.  
Governor of Arkansas  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Honorable George Deukmejian  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California 95814

Honorable Richard D. Lamm  
Governor of Colorado  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Honorable William A. O'Neill  
Governor of Connecticut  
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Honorable Michael N. Castle  
Governor of Delaware  
Dover, Delaware 19901

Honorable Robert Graham  
Governor of Florida  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Honorable Joe Frank Harris  
Governor of Georgia  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Honorable George R. Ariyoshi  
Governor of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Honorable John V. Evans  
Governor of Idaho  
Boise, Idaho 83720

Honorable James R. Thompson, Jr.  
Governor of Illinois  
Springfield, Illinois 62706



Honorable Robert Orr  
Governor of Indiana  
Indianapolis, Indiana 42604

Honorable Terry Branstad  
Governor of Iowa  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Honorable John Carlin  
Governor of Kansas  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Honorable Martha Layne Collins  
Governor of Kentucky  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Honorable Edwin Edwards  
Governor of Louisiana  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Honorable Joseph E. Brennan  
Governor of Maine  
Augusta, Maine 04330

Honorable Harry R. Hughes  
Governor of Maryland  
Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Honorable Michael S. Dukakis  
Governor of the Commonwealth  
of Massachusetts  
Boston, Massachusetts 02133

Honorable James J. Blanchard  
Governor of Michigan  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Honorable Rudy Perpich  
Governor of Minnesota  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Honorable William A. Allain  
Governor of Mississippi  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Honorable John Ashcroft  
Governor of Missouri  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Honorable Ted Schwinden  
Governor of Montana  
Helena, Montana 59620

Honorable Bob Kerry  
Governor of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Honorable Richard H. Bryan  
Governor of Nevada  
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Honorable John H. Sununu  
Governor of New Hampshire  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Honorable Thomas H. Kean  
Governor of New Jersey  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Honorable Toney Anaya  
Governor of New Mexico  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Honorable Mario M. Cuomo  
Governor of New York  
Albany, New York 12224

Honorable James G. Martin  
Governor of North Carolina  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Honorable George Sinner  
Governor of North Dakota  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Honorable Richard F. Celeste  
Governor of Ohio  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable George Nigh  
Governor of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Honorable Victor G. Atiyeh  
Governor of Oregon  
Salem, Oregon 97310

Honorable Richard L. Thornburgh  
Governor of the Commonwealth  
of Pennsylvania  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Honorable Edward D. DiPrete  
Governor of Rhode Island  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Honorable Richard W. Riley  
Governor of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Honorable William J. Janklow  
Governor of South Dakota  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Honorable Lamar Alexander  
Governor of Tennessee  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Honorable Mark White  
Governor of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78711

Honorable Norman H. Bangerter  
Governor of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Honorable Madeleine M. Kunin  
Governor of Vermont  
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Honorable Charles S. Robb  
Governor of the Commonwealth  
of Virginia  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Honorable Booth Gardner  
Governor of Washington  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr.  
Governor of West Virginia  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Honorable Anthony S. Earl  
Governor of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Honorable Ed Herschler  
Governor of Wyoming  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Honorable Juan F. Luis  
Governor of Virgin Islands  
Government House  
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas 00801

Honorable Richard J. Bordallo  
Governor of Guam  
Post Office Box 2950  
Agana, Guam 96910

Honorable Carlos Romero-Barcelo  
Governor of Puerto Rico  
La Fortaleza, San Juan 00901

Honorable A. P. Lutali  
Governor of American Samoa  
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

Honorable Marion S. Barry, Jr.  
Mayor of the District of Columbia  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Honorable Bill Baxley  
President of the Senate  
State of Alabama  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Honorable Tom Drake  
Speaker of the House  
State of Alabama  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Honorable Don Bennett  
President of the Senate  
State of Alaska  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Honorable Ben Grussendorf  
Speaker of the House  
State of Alaska  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Honorable Stan Turley  
President of the Senate  
State of Arizona  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Honorable James J. Sossaman  
Speaker of the House  
State of Arizona  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Honorable Winston Bryant  
President of the Senate  
State of Arkansas  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Honorable H. Lacey Landers  
Speaker of the House  
State of Arkansas  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Honorable Leo T. McCarthy  
President of the Senate  
State of California  
Sacramento, California 95814

Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State of California  
Sacramento, California 95814

Honorable Ted L. Strickland  
President of the Senate  
State of Colorado  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Honorable Carl B. Bledsoe  
Speaker of the House  
State of Colorado  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Honorable Joseph J. Fauliso  
President of the Senate  
State of Connecticut  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Honorable R.E. Van Norstrand  
Speaker of the House  
State of Connecticut  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Honorable S. B. Woo  
President of the Senate  
State of Delaware  
Dover, Delaware 19901

Honorable Charles L. Hebner  
Speaker of the House  
State of Delaware  
Dover, Delaware 19901

Honorable Harry A. Johnston II  
President of the Senate  
State of Florida  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Honorable James H. Thompson  
Speaker of the House  
State of Florida  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Honorable Zell B. Miller  
President of the Senate  
State of Georgia  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Honorable Thomas B. Murphy  
Speaker of the House  
State of Georgia  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Honorable Carl T. Gutierrez  
Speaker of the Legislature  
Congress Building  
Agana, Guam 96910

Honorable Richard S. H. Wong  
President of the Senate  
State of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Honorable Henry H. Peters  
Speaker of the House  
State of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Honorable David Leroy  
President of the Senate  
State of Idaho  
Boise, Idaho 83720

Honorable Tom W. Stivers  
Speaker of the House  
State of Idaho  
Boise, Idaho 83720

Honorable Philip J. Rock  
President of the Senate  
State of Illinois  
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable Michael J. Madigan  
Speaker of the House  
State of Illinois  
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable John Mutz  
President of the Senate  
State of Indiana  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Honorable J. Roberts Dailey  
Speaker of the House  
State of Indiana  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Honorable Robert T. Anderson  
President of the Senate  
State of Iowa  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Honorable Donald D. Avenson  
Speaker of the House  
State of Iowa  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Honorable Robert V. Talkington  
President of the Senate  
State of Kansas  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Honorable Mike Hayden  
Speaker of the House  
State of Kansas  
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Honorable Steven L. Beshear  
President of the Senate  
State of Kentucky  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Honorable Donald J. Blandford  
Speaker of the House  
State of Kentucky  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Honorable Samuel B. Nunez, Jr.  
President of the Senate  
State of Louisiana  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Honorable John A. Alario, Jr.  
Speaker of the House  
State of Louisiana  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Honorable Charles P. Pray  
President of the Senate  
State of Maine  
Augusta, Maine 04333

Honorable John L. Martin  
Speaker of the House  
State of Maine  
Augusta, Maine 04333

Honorable Melvin A. Steinberg  
President of the Senate  
State of Maryland  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin  
Speaker of the House  
State of Maryland  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401



Honorable William M. Bulger  
President of the Senate  
State of Massachusetts  
Boston, Massachusetts 02133 .

Honorable George Keverian  
Speaker of the House  
State of Massachusetts  
Boston, Massachusetts 02133

Honorable Martha Griffiths  
President of the Senate  
State of Michigan  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Honorable Gary M. Owen  
Speaker of the House  
State of Michigan  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Honorable Jerome M. Hughes  
President of the Senate  
State of Minnesota  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Honorable David Jennings  
Speaker of the House  
State of Minnesota  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Honorable Brad Dye  
President of the Senate  
State of Mississippi  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Honorable C. B. Newman  
Speaker of the House  
State of Mississippi  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Honorable Harriett Woods  
President of the Senate  
State of Missouri  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Honorable Bob F. Griffin  
Speaker of the House  
State of Missouri  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Honorable Bill Norman  
President of the Senate  
State of Montana  
Helena, Montana 59620

Honorable John Vincent  
Speaker of the House  
State of Montana  
Helena, Montana 59620

Honorable Donald F. McGinley  
President of the Legislature  
State of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Honorable William E. Nichol  
Speaker of the Legislature  
State of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Honorable Robert A. Cashell  
President of the Senate  
State of Nevada  
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Honorable Byron Bilyeu  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State of Nevada  
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Honorable Vesta M. Roy  
President of the Senate  
State of New Hampshire  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Honorable John B. Tucker  
Speaker of the House  
State of New Hampshire  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Honorable Carmen A. Orechio  
President of the Senate  
State of New Jersey  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Honorable Alan J. Karcher  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State of New Jersey  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Honorable Mike Runnels  
President of the Senate  
State of New Mexico  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Honorable C. Gene Samberson  
Speaker of the House  
State of New Mexico  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Honorable Warren M. Anderson  
President Pro Tempore of the Senate  
State of New York  
Albany, New York 12247

Honorable Stanley Fink  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State of New York  
Albany, New York 12248

Honorable Robert B. Jordan III  
President of the Senate  
State of North Carolina  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Honorable Liston B. Ramsey  
Speaker of the House  
State of North Carolina  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Honorable Ruth Meiers  
President of the Senate  
State of North Dakota  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Honorable Roy Hausauer  
Speaker of the House  
State of North Dakota  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

Honorable Paul E. Gillmor  
President of the Senate  
State of Ohio  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable Vernal G. Riffe, Jr.  
Speaker of the House  
State of Ohio  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Honorable Spencer T. Bernard  
President of the Senate  
State of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Honorable Jim Barker  
Speaker of the House  
State of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Honorable John Kitzhaber  
President of the Senate  
State of Oregon  
Salem, Oregon 97310

Honorable Vera Katz  
Speaker of the House  
State of Oregon  
Salem, Oregon 97310

Honorable William W. Scranton III  
President of the Senate  
State of Pennsylvania  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Honorable K. Leroy Irvis  
Speaker of the House  
State of Pennsylvania  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Honorable Miguel A. Hernandez Agosto  
President of the Senate  
The Capitol  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00904

Honorable Jose J. Alvarez  
Speaker of House  
The Capitol  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00904

Honorable Richard Licht  
President of the Senate  
State of Rhode Island  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Honorable Matthew J. Smith  
Speaker of the House  
State of Rhode Island  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Honorable Michael R. Daniel  
President of the Senate  
State of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Honorable Ramon Schwartz, Jr.  
Speaker of the House  
State of South Carolina  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Honorable Lowell C. Hansen II  
President of the Senate  
State of South Dakota  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Honorable Donald J. Ham  
Speaker of the House  
State of South Dakota  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Honorable John S. Wilder  
Speaker of the Senate  
State of Tennessee  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Honorable Ned R. McWherter  
Speaker of the House  
State of Tennessee  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Honorable William P. Hobby  
President of the Senate  
State of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78711

Honorable Gibson D. Lewis  
Speaker of the House  
State of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78711

Honorable Arnold Christensen  
President of the Senate  
State of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Honorable Robert H. Garff  
Speaker of the House  
State of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Honorable Peter P. Smith  
President of the Senate  
State of Vermont  
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Honorable Ralph Wright  
Speaker of the House  
State of Vermont  
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Honorable Derek M. Hodge  
President of the Legislature  
Capitol Building  
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801

Honorable Richard J. Davis  
President of the Senate  
State of Virginia  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Honorable A. L. Philpott  
Speaker of the House  
State of Virginia  
Richmond, Virginia 23203

Honorable John A. Cherberg  
President of the Senate  
State of Washington  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Honorable Wayne Ehlers  
Speaker of the House  
State of Washington  
Olympia, Washington 98504

Honorable Dan Tonkovich  
President of the Senate  
State of West Virginia  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Honorable Joseph P. Albright  
Speaker of the House  
State of West Virginia  
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Honorable Fred A. Risser  
President of the Senate  
State of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Honorable Thomas A. Loftus  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Honorable Gerald E. Geis  
President of the Senate  
State of Wyoming  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Honorable Jack A. Sidi  
Speaker of the House  
State of Wyoming  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Honorable David A. Clarke  
Chairman, Council of the District  
of Columbia  
1350 Pennsylvania, Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004

