Comment from Ed Wood

This is a good start. Thank you for the effort. Please keep me appraised of the results.

I'd like to see some emphasis on bad/ineffective/out-of-date practices, not just best practices. Some states rely upon urine testing for drug impairment which is obsolete. Some states permit only one test matrix - if breath is used, then blood cannot be used. Some states have implemented a 5 ng/ml THC per se level or permissible inference level. These practices should be called out as ineffective.

I'd like to see some additional quality measures, difficult though they may be. For example, don't just measure the number of DREs, but ask how effective they are. Is their testimony accepted as expert testimony in court? What is the conviction rate of drugged driving cases where a DRE is involved compared to cases where no DRE is involved?

I'm pleased to see a tab on data and the need to collect drugged driving specific data. Colorado has what I believe to be one of the most robust data collection, analysis and publication efforts of all the states. Yet I am not satisfied with it. The info is published to the judiciary committees of the state legislature and once filed, it seems to be ignored. Why not ask what changes have emerged from the analysis of data? Requests for additional analyses based upon the data that are available to Colorado have fallen on deaf ears. We need more than bureaucratic efforts to simply follow the rules, we need commitment to make a difference.

There should be some place to recognize the needs of victims of drugged driving. At the very least, victims should be suggested as one of the members of the DWI task force.

Since there is a great deal of misinformation circulating about drugged driving, I'd like to see more emphasis on research and education. I recognize that there are specific education initiatives mentioned within the tool, but I think it's important enough to merit a separate tab.