NEVADA COMMITTEE ON TESTING FOR INTOXICATION

DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING

June 25, 2018 – 10:00 AM

Telephone Conference Between

Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Forensic Laboratory Library,
Basement Floor;
911 Parr Blvd. Reno, NV

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Forensic Laboratory
5605 W. Badura Ave., Suite 120B
Las Vegas, NV

Ms. Victoria Hauan, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. After the roll call, a quorum was present.

Members present:

Kerri Heward, Director, Washoe County Sheriff's Office-Forensic Science Division
Dr. William Anderson, Toxicologist III, NMS Labs
Victoria Hauan, Committee Chair, DPS, Impaired Driving Program Manager
Eric Bauman, Clark County D.A., Vehicular Crimes Unit

The following individuals were also in attendance:

Nathan Hastings, Attorney General's Office
Toby Taylor, Smart Start
Darby Lanz, Las Vegas Metro Forensics Lab
Marlissa Collins, Las Vegas Forensic Lab
David Astles, Criminalist, Forensic Science Division, Forensic Analyst of Alcohol
Karyl Brown, Supervising Criminalist, Toxicology
Ken Denton, Guardian and Life Saver Interlock
Amy Davey, Office of Traffic Safety
Abe Vergas, Alcohol Countermeasure Systems
Michael Stypa
Kevin Honea
Tom Stewart

2. Public Comment

None

3. Approval of May 17, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Heward moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Modification of the Evidentiary Operators Application for Certification

Ms. Lanz stated there have been issues with officers and their ability to put first name and last name in the same order more than once. So, they want to split the names into two places where it just says first name and last name. There is also a question about the inclusion of the POST information. Until the regulations go through where it is proposed to remove references to POST, can the reference to POST be removed from the application form at this point, or is that something that's going to have to come at a later time?

Mr. Hastings said the Committee was "between a rock and a hard place" and they had to choose one of two things: 1. choose to leave it on the form in which case the form is inaccurate but in theory, more compliant with the regulation or 2. make the form accurate to what's actually happening, which would be openly acknowledging non-compliance with the regulation at this time. Either way, they would be not compliant with the regulation. Mr. Hasting said it is a policy decision for the Committee as to which is the lesser evil.

Ms. Heward suggested making the name changes now, but make all of the changes removing POST at one time when the other regulations go through.

Mr. Astles said the proper name of POST is Peace Officer Standards and Training, not Peace Officer Standards and Testing as currently listed.

Ms. Heward moved to change the form where it says "name" to last name and first name, and under certification of training, where it currently says "Peace Officer Standards and Testing" POST, to change that to Peace Officer Standards and Training, POST. Mr. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Approval of the Ignition Interlock Breath Test Devices Tested by FAA David Astles

Mr. Astles shared the results of his evaluation of two devices, the ALCOLOCK LR and the ALCOLOCK GR. He analyzed two handsets from each of two models that were submitted for evaluation. The handsets were not tested in vehicles, but tested using test display boards that were provided by Alcohol Countermeasures Systems.

The anti-circumvention features of the devices were deactivated for testing; therefore, there was no assessment of those features. And because the test display boards were provided by the manufacturer, there's no way of knowing if the handsets function exactly the same way as they would in a vehicle. The devices were tested for response to alcohol only.

The set point of the devices was 0.02 grams per 210 liters. Mr. Astles made solutions that were very slightly below and very slightly above, and tested them under different conditions, ambient temperature, after 90 days, and after leaving them in an oven overnight at 150 degrees and leaving them in a zero-degree Fahrenheit freezer for a minimum of seven hours. So, at ambient temperature, the devices all either correctly allowed a start 20 of 20 times or correctly locked out 20 of 20 times. (With the exception of one of the two handsets in the LR and one in the GR, which locked out 19 of 20 times.)

After being in the freezer, the LRs correctly locked out 19 of 20 times, correctly allowed starts 20 of 20 times. They correctly locked out 20 of 20 times for the GR. Mr. Astles had to terminate the testing on one of the GR handsets after 12 samples because of some technical issues with the setup, but it correctly locked out 12 out of 12 times. The devices don't seem to allow deliberate or accidental circumvention due to chilling,

Mr. Astles noticed an anomaly in the GR when it went to the oven. The GR locked out while the handsets were warmed, but then correctly allowed starts when they cooled. The issue with the GR would be an inconvenience for a user, but would not cause somebody who had who had been drinking to be able to start the vehicle.

Mr. Astles' conclusion was that the devices showed very good accuracy and a very low rate of inappropriate starts or lockouts, using solution concentrations as close to the set point as possible. From a basic alcohol detection standpoint, they seem to function accurately and properly.

Ms. Lanz asked if the devices show the concentration numerically, or showed yellow, red, green lights? Mr. Astles said the display only shows startup or lockout and has little musical tones and warning notes for a lockout.

Mr. Stypa expressed concern about the blistering heat in Las Vegas and what that might do to devices. He thinks it could be a safety issue for individuals if they are unable to start their car. Mr. Vergas replied that the handset is a removable handset with an HDMI connection. It is recommended that the handset be removed when the driver leaves the car. If the temperature gets too hot, the device will not allow you to take that test, because it knows that any tests that are coming outside that temperature range could certainly affect the graph that you're getting from the alcohol sensor.

Chair Hauan reminded everyone that previous devices tested for approval by the Committee were tested at 122 degrees Fahrenheit. So, this was tested at an even higher temperature than some of the other devices that they have approved.

Ms. Heward moved to approve the ignition interlock breath testing devices. Mr. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Working Session to Initiate the Process Required to Change the NAC Regulation and Submit a Draft to LCB

Chair Hauan provided some background on Nevada's SB259. When SB259 passed out of the Senate Transportation Committee, it attained appropriate language that would have allowed Nevada to qualify for additional NHTSA incentive funding. When this piece of legislation went to the assembly side, it was changed dramatically. So, it did give duties and responsibilities to DPS that had not previously been in their wheelhouse or their responsibility. It also added some additional exemptions to provide judicial discretion for financial hardship.

SB259 does accomplish some best practices for ignition interlocks. It requires that the courts shall order all first offense DUIs to have the ignition interlock. Considering that there were over 11,000 DUI arrests and 84% of those were first DUI arrests, this should have a deterrent effect in regard to DUIs in Nevada. It is a minimum six months for the first offense. Ignition interlock is required for one year if they fail to submit to evidentiary testing. It provides reduced pricing for those that are truly indigent or truly on financial hardship, such as the SNAP or federal assistance programs. Someone that's arrested for DUI may install an ignition interlock voluntarily presentencing. So, that enables them to drive legally with an actual driver's license with an ignition interlock restriction, of course, and it also has a compliance-based removal so that violations within the last four months of the interlock period may result in an extended period of installation of the ignition interlock.

Mr. Astles added that when the issue came up to amend the regulations as a consequence of the change to the interlock laws, he and his colleagues discussed the idea of making a few other kind of housekeeping changes to

the regulations. He asked the Committee Members whether they wanted to discuss the proposals for changes, and Chair Hauan and Ms. Heward encouraged him to go ahead. The proposed changes are as follows:

- **NAC 484C.020, Forensic Analyst of Alcohol Certification, Clause 2C.** Change “course” to “program of training.” There is no official course, but there is a program of training for FAAs, Forensic Analysts of Alcohol.

  Ms. Lanz inquired about the 3 day course offered by the manufacturer. The manufacturer teaches specifics of the internal mechanisms and material that is not relevant to officers. The same course is eluded to in the recertification, because if you don't have the testimony experience, you have to go back on the recertification again with a basic course like described in subsection 2. Mr. Astles said the practice in the North was to send everybody to the CMI course.

  Ms. Lanz said they shouldn’t be certifying people as Forensic Analysts of Alcohol if they have not taken the course from the manufacturer. Mr. Astles said they need to make a distinction between training somebody as a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol and training them as a technician on an interlock device. Mr. Astles said he thought a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol is a more generic kind of training than the specifics of training on a given instrument. The course that CMI offers is more constrained to their device, whereas the requirements of training of a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol are broader than just that. Ms. Lanz responded that that's why it's one of the parts of becoming a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol.

  Mr. Anderson had a question. When training to become an FAA, don’t candidates receive a lot of other training at one of the labs besides the CMI course? Mr. Astles confirmed. In the Washoe County lab, they have a specific training plan with training objectives, training assessments, and signoffs before somebody can get signed off as a Criminalist. It’s a very formalized program with Certification as the Forensic Analyst of Alcohol and attending the CMI course only a part of that bigger picture. The training standards to do case work are much higher than the requirements to become a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol.

  Ms. Lanz brought up part D, which talks about demonstrating competence, and you can't be competent until you've been trained. It basically comes back to clarifying whether part C is the manufacturer's training or something else.

  Mr. Anderson said he didn’t want to put themselves in a box, but supported language that would clarify that you’ve got to go through this formal training program of which this manufacturer training is one part.

Chair Hauan suggested that the NAC 484C.020 conversation be tabled for a future meeting so they could get additional comments from either Terri or Kim Murga.

- **NAC 484C.030, No. 2C, Proof of Acceptance As an Expert**

  Mr. Astles stated the proposal was to either strike 2C completely or amend it somehow to reflect the fact that they have no control over the court system. Recertification as a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol should only depend on things within their control.

  Ms. Lanz said she was fine with the strikeout of C, the proof of acceptance, if they would just add in some clarification like “you must be responsible before the maintenance and repair of an instrument that is in the field, evidentiary instrument.” Part of being an FAA should be showing that you have continued activity that includes dealing with subpoenas and teaching operator courses.

  Mr. Astles said the previous Clause B would still require that they attend at least two seminars or training programs. So, that would not go away. Could they put in language about in the verification of continued activity, something like “to include performing breath alcohol casework and training of operators?”

  Ms. Lanz had some reservations. She didn’t want an FAA there who does nothing but attend seminars and teach. Ms. Heward said what Ms. Lanz was proposing was good best practice, but awfully prescriptive when you dictate that much in the NAC. Ms. Lanz said she was willing to accept other ideas, but she didn’t want to leave it so vague that they have FAAs that aren't officially in the field.

  Chair Hauan said they shouldn’t put too much detail into the regulations; if they are too specific, they would run the risk of painting themselves into a box. Could they add a phrase that says “guidelines as approved by the Committee” meaning any time at a Committee Meeting, they could change that criteria instead of going through the regulatory process?

  Chair Hauan suggested they move on because any changes that they want incorporated into this could be done even after they get language back from LCB. Ms. Lanz recommended not taking out part C until they have something to put in its place. The Chair reminded everyone they can't change this regulation until it goes to workshop and a hearing.

  Mr. Anderson said in all deference to Ms. Lanz’ concerns, he didn’t see the tie-in to leaving C in or taking it out. They're two separate issues, and

the Committee is already on record as thinking it's not necessary because of the difficulty in the four separate courts. Striking C was their intention. If they want to put in some other criteria, that's up for discussion, but he didn't see that it had any relationship to taking C in or out. The Chair and Ms. Heward agreed.

Ms. Lanz said she disagreed because if you're testifying in court, that shows you are on instrumentation and you are actually maintaining and repairing instruments and able to testify to them. That also validates your continued activity in the field. If they take out the testimony portion, that takes out the being responsible for instrumentation portion, because you don't receive subpoenas if you're not responsible for instrumentation.

Ms. Heward asked if they were proposing to maintain language that they have absolutely no control over? Ms. Lanz replied that part of the language she wanted to put in is the potential to receive court subpoenas, because if you're on an evidential instrument, you have the potential to receive them. That doesn't mean whether or not you go to court. Just the fact that you are receiving them is keeping you active.

Mr. Astles said he understood they would have opportunities to explore this a little bit more during the rule-making process, and leaving that strikeout in keeps that as an area open for discussion. They will have an opportunity to revise final language before it's all said and done.

Mr. Anderson said he thought they should strike C. If they want to address Ms. Lanz' concerns, that's with D or what will become C. They can put anything they want, because it's still up to evaluation of the activity that has to be submitted and judged upon by the Department for renewal of that certificate. Ms. Lanz said she still didn't want this to go forward with having C taken out without clarification on everything else.

Mr. Hasting explained the rule-making process. A proposed striking or deletion of language in a draft that the Committee might or would submit to the LCB does not mean that in the rule-making process that that language must end up being stricken from the ultimate product of the regulation that's going to be adopted. So, submitting it to LCB as a draft with a strikethrough isn't a pronouncement of what will take place.

The Chair reminded everyone that this item had already been discussed and it was proposed to change. Any of the other things that happen before the new section starts can be brought up at a workshop or talked about at a future meeting.

Definitions for New Section
Chair Hauan started with Ignition Interlock Device Requirements. She said they examined over 20 different states' regulations as well as the Traffic Injury Research Foundation's suggestions for how to develop regulations and what your program should do.

- **NAC 484C.160 1C**

Mr. Astles said his perspective was as a Forensic Analyst of Alcohol. What these regulations are attempting to do is to say if a device meets NHTSA model standards and the manufacturer has proof of that from an appropriately accredited lab, that that would be sufficient to include a device on the state-approved list. It would take them out of the business of evaluating devices for which they're not really very well equipped to do. It would streamline approval and ensure that only top quality devices get approved in the state.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that on page 9 of 14 at the bottom, under number 4, it does still empower the Committee to request from the manufacturer a device to be installed and compliance tested.

Ms. Heward read a comment from David in regard to the International Organization for Standardization, ISO 17025 certified testing laboratory. He suggested they use language like "by a laboratory accredited, by an organization that is a signatory to the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation, ILAC, multilateral recognition arrangement which complies with current ISO 17025 standards." The laboratory scope of accreditation must include the type of testing necessary to verify compliance with NHTSA model specifications.

Mr. Hastings had some suggestions to make their discussion open meeting law compliant in terms of taking action on a potential action item. Since this was listed on the Agenda as an action item, there needs to be a motion. The Committee could motion every single time under this Agenda item or just at the end of the Agenda item, they could do one motion that includes all the language that was noted during the working session in Agenda Item No. 6. The Chair opted for the latter.

Ms. Lanz had some questions about NAC 484C.160. Under C1 where it says "proof within five years that it meets NHTSA standards." When they reapprove these devices every two years, do they have to go through this process again? Do they have to resubmit ISO approval from this other laboratory? Are they to be reanalyzed every five years and resubmitted to them every two? How does that math and that timing all pan out?
Ms. Heward said she understood that the time frames are coming out of the ISO standard. The requirement of the ISO standard by the ILAC

compliant organization who's going to be doing these checks is they have to reaccredit on a five-year basis. Ms. Lanz said that's not how it's reflected in the proposed language, because it says proof current within five years that the device meet or exceed NHTSA specs. That's the device, not ISO lab.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the current “within five years” is a recommendation from the US Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration outlined in their model guidelines for state ignition interlock programs that's cited as a reference on page 14. That does require that the device be resubmitted to an ISO 17025 lab at least once every five years to make sure the device remains in compliance with the model specifications.

Mr. Denton requested the removal of the word “design” from the part that says “manufacturer is responsible for the design, construction, and production of ignition interlock devices.” He would prefer they stick to the straight definition of “manufacturer” from the AAMVA document or district definition in the AIIPA document, which just defines “manufacturer” as someone who manufactures or builds the device.

- **NAC 484C.170 Calibration**

Mr. Astles stated this section bears some editing. The new article 2 needs to be streamlined substantially, pared down to something straightforward to say exactly how often they need to calibrate, what the tolerances are to be expected, et cetera. The Chair said that language would need to come from the FAAs’ suggestions and expertise and Mr. Astles said he and his colleagues could provide that language. Mr. Hastings stated they could come up with additional language to clarify this section in the way Mr. Astles just described and bring that to the workshop.

There was a lengthy and technical conversation about dry gas concentrations. Topics included equivalent measures, solution standards, altitude adjustments, and merits of using different alcohol concentrations.

Following that, there was another technical exchange regarding NAC 484C.170, 2A. It was suggested that the range be lowered from .03 to .02 because if the devices are designed to lock out at .02, a good practice would be to test it as close to that as one could reasonably manage.

Mr. Denton said he wouldn't recommend going down to a .02. It would be okay for lab testing to check the device to make sure it locks out at a .02 and above, but to do an everyday calibration and/or adjustment on that device it would be a mistake and maybe cause some issues down the line. Mr. Astles said he didn’t think it would hurt to lower the range since it’s allowing the manufacturer to test anywhere in that range. Mr. Anderson

said changing the range wouldn't have any practical impact unless you specifically say it has to be at .02.

- **Standards and Procedures for Service Centers**

Chair Hauan stated the new law gives them the opportunity to set the standards and procedures. Both standards and procedures are following best practices from other states, from NHTSA guidelines, AAMVA's guidelines, and AIIPA's guidelines. There were no comments on this item.

- **Orientation for Program Participants**

Mr. Anderson said the DMV questioned if Item 2 (to provide proof of installation certificate to the participant) was necessary? The Chair said the process was still being worked out. It's a new system and they're starting from scratch. They still need input from the judges and from DMV. They're doing what they can do, what they can afford to do, and hopefully, some changes and improvements will be made in the future.

Mr. Taylor informed the Committee that most manufacturers can send proof of installation via email or however the State wants to receive that information. Chair Hauan said they were all for transmitting electronically.

- **Device Monitoring Requirements**

Ms. Lanz asked for clarification on Part 1. Is this requiring them to get inspected every 30 days and then calibrated every 90? And does if have to be exactly 30 or 90 days?

Chair Hauan said the language on that monitoring piece is that it has to be every 30 days because there is the compliance-based removal piece of the law that requires the downloading of data from the device. The technician at the time of that service appointment inspects the device, ensures that there hasn't been any tampering, and that it's operating properly. They'll do the calibration and download all the data that is then sent to the manufacturer's servers.

Ms. Lanz said 30 day checks is fine, but if you're expecting them to calibrate it every 30 days, then they shouldn't have the contradictory language farther up of every 90 days.

Mr. Taylor stated that for the sake of compliance-based reporting, all their devices have a feature called an "early recall." In the event of a violation, it forces the client to come back to the service provider within a prescribed amount of time, typically, five or seven days, and the reason for that is so that they don't go on for an extended period of time without the State being made aware of the violation. And that also allows the manufacturer then to calibrate in accordance with the 90-day requirement as stated

earlier in the rule. There is some AIIPA standardized language that could be incorporated that is around early recall and the process for that.

Mr. Taylor suggested striking the 30-day language. They could leave the service and calibration as previously outlined, every 90 days, but then add language under the standards and specifications section or in the device monitoring requirements section. In the event of a violation that's listed in statute or elsewhere in this document, the device would go into an early recall that would force the client to come back within five or seven days of the violation. The language in advance of having the accuracy of the device verified once every 90 days would be sufficient. Just replace that language on page 12 of 14 under the new section that the device would require an early recall and then outline under what circumstances the early recall would be put into effect, what should be done by the service center in the event of an early recall, and then what the reporting requirements are with respect to reporting to the State the event that forced the device into early recall.

Chair Hauan wondered about monthly monitoring reports to the DUI courts. She didn't want anything in their language that would prevent those courts from getting the information that they need to run their programs. Mr. Astles thought they could craft language that would allow for that kind of more regular monitoring if a sentencing court wanted it and then also would allow for early recalls. It would just give more information to the courts.

Mr. Taylor raised a point for the Committee's consideration. Under Section F, repair work, the manufacturers believe that all repair work to the device should be done by the device manufacturer versus being done in the field at a service center level. And if that is the case, then F would need to be eliminated from the proposal.

- **NAC 484C.180**

Mr. Taylor said the language in the section refers to the provider, and the provider may not have the information when a device comes back to the manufacturing facility. So, the manufacturer could certainly make notification. All the provider would know was that the device was malfunctioning, was taken out of service.

Mr. Stipa asked if there was any schedule for the Committee to do an evaluation of devices currently approved? If not grandfathering devices in, what was the thought moving forward as far as regulations in place? Mr. Astles had another question. Since these regulations change how devices get added to the list, how is the new post-October 1st list going to be created of permitted devices? As of October 1st, are they going to allow

existing devices a grace period or are they going to say everybody's got to meet the new requirements October 1st?

Chair Hauan asked the Committee their thoughts. An unidentified speaker recommended a “reasonable” grace period for current devices to meet the new specs. The Chair said she liked that idea and believes they could see an influx of new companies coming in if they could grandfather the existing companies in for down the road to certify that they met all of these qualifications. She thinks it would ease up the workload. Ms. Lanz said if they set it at two years, that would put them right at the same recycle, re-approval two years of the Committee. She suggested a one year grace period.

Mr. Taylor stated that the companies that already have NHTSA certification could gather the required information and send it tomorrow. Those that don’t are likely not going to get it done in a year, because they're just not turning them out that fast. Mr. Vergas thought that although the interlock side of testing was substantial, companies could usually secure that within six months.

Ms. Heward had a question of the manufacturers. If it is a lengthy process to have the testing completed, was there some sort of a documentation that could be provided when they submit for it, and could they perhaps require the documentation that it's been submitted for testing? Mr. Denton stated they could supply an affidavit from the lab stating that a device had been submitted for testing.

The Chair asked if there was any more discussion for NAC 484C.180. Ms. Lanz remarked that the language was going back to using the word “form.” She suggested they should change it so it says something about “shall keep this information however, whether it be electronic or on a piece of paper. Mr. Astles agreed, saying they should probably avoid the terminology “form.”

Mr. Astles had another item relating to NAC 484C.180 as it relates to getting information from the manufacturer about a device that's installed with a client. He asked isn’t this a DPS concern as opposed to the Committee's concern? Wouldn't DPS want to be the one to say how they get it?

Mr. Hastings said the scope within the bill of the language says that the Committee on Intoxication shall adopt regulations to prescribe the, and then listing these different categories of things that the regulations need to accomplish. Mr. Hastings thought the piece about reporting on calibration or maintenance or reparation of devices is something that has to be in the regulations. The Committee should create the language in the regulation

as opposed to leaving it to DPS. For instance in paragraph 1 they could say “the manufacturer shall enter at or near the time of the activity the following information prescribed by the Committee” and just strike that three-word phrase “on a form.”

Ms. Heward asked if these regulations are prescribed by the Committee, why did they have to say they are prescribed by the Committee? Couldn't they just end it at the following information, and then all of the information that is expected follows that? Mr. Hastings thought that was a good point.

Ms. Lanz stated that number 5 on 180 doesn’t fit. It’s the line about all repairs should be performed by the device manufacturer. But even if the section was removed because information might be addressed other places, they definitely needed to keep the number 5 information somewhere.

Mr. Astles said they could eliminate 484C.180, because that is one of the Legacy sections in the regulations. The Committee discussed where number 5 could go, and they decided it was best to put in the repairs section. Then items #1-4 could be eliminated. The directive "device repairs to be performed by the device manufacturer” will be moved to the device requirements.

Ms. Collins said the manufacturers would like guidelines from the Committee. They need a checklist of exactly what they’re looking for and what the Committee wants them to look for when they’re evaluating information. Mr. Taylor said a notarized affidavit from an ISO 17025 lab that the device meets or exceeded the NHTSA model guidelines is available. That’s the guarantee that the device has been tested against the NHTSA model specs by the lab and that it met or exceeded the relevant model specifications.

Mr. Taylor had some comments about NRS 484C.480.1D, posting of fee schedules and the formula for calculating indigent fee waiver amounts. He isn’t sure they’ll be able to have the exact indigent fee amount for every indigent client to put on the chart of fees. The Chair responded that the intent of the chart of fees was just so that someone knows if they have a lockout, it's going to cost them this much money.

Chair Hauan moved to approve the draft incorporating the suggestions that the Committee discussed today to submit to LCB to begin the rule-making process. Ms. Heward seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

7. **Discussion and Possible Action for Future Meetings, Workshops, and Potential Dates**
   Chair Hauan said the Committee wouldn't be able to set up a workshop date until they know when the language will get back from LCB. Mr. Hastings clarified the process that's correct under the rule making process: that the changes that were part of the motion for Agenda Item 6 would go in the draft to LCB so that they could then move forward and set up the workshop and that additional things that needed to be worked on, but that weren't ready for today would be prepared and brought to that workshop to be discussed in the workshop.

8. **Public Comment**
   Mr. Taylor thanked the Committee for their hard work and commitment to developing a quality ignition interlock program. He said the manufacturers supported their efforts 100%.

9. **Adjournment**
   Ms. Heward moved for adjournment. Mr. Anderson seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 1:01 PM.