

# NORTH DAKOTA IMPAIRED DRIVING

## Newsletter

*from the desk of the* **TSRP** Kristi Pettit Venhuizen  
Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

Words matter. From infancy, we are told that words matter. What we say and how we say it can impact how we are perceived and more importantly, can impact our message. If I ask you to think of the word “blue,” some of you will think of a dark, navy uniform hue, while others may picture a serene, aqua ocean. Neither is wrong, or are both wrong? If you equate that to describing a vehicle as blue, or a suspect’s sweatshirt as blue, imagine the consequences and confusion that may result from your description. While not wrong, the information wasn’t thorough or complete and resulted in everyone having a different idea about what you were describing or explaining.

We are storytellers. Our jobs require us to share information and knowledge so that others understand and to make them see our story. We can do that by being deliberate with the words we use. For example, use plain language. Avoid police code and shorthand. Don’t say you called in a 10-55. Rather, state you called in an intoxicated driver. Avoid extra, unnecessary words. Sometimes a simple yes or no will suffice. Be concise. Make one statement at a time. Allow each statement to resonate and give the factfinder time to process what you are telling them. Give them time to create a picture in their mind – to see what you see. Avoid absolutes such as “always” and “never.” Admit what you don’t know.

These rules hold true whether writing your report or testifying in court. For example, you can write “we entered the building through the back door...” While not wrong, it might be better to describe the building, explain how you got to the back door, indicate whether the door was open or closed, and state how you opened the door. Those extra details allow the reader to picture exactly what you saw, what you did, and why you did it.

Language is also important when you interact with the public. Citizen complaints often refer to officer demeanor during a traffic stop. In general, the public is more willing to cooperate and has more trust in law enforcement when:

- They greet people and say “good evening”
- They say “please” and “thank you”
- When you refer to them as “sir” and “ma’am” or use titles like Mr. and Ms.
- When you make requests instead of demands
- When you explain what is happening (e.g., “I’m going to issue you a ticket for speeding. Here’s the deal Mr. Johnson, every year people die on this particular road from speeding so we just want to make sure everyone gets home safely.”)
- When you show empathy (e.g., “I know you are in a hurry and that this is an inconvenience for you. We will deal with this as quickly as we can and get you on your way.”)

Words have power. Use them carefully and deliberately.

## Volume 2, Issue 1

Welcome to the Quarterly North Dakota Impaired Driving Newsletter.

This resource will provide training information, drug and alcohol trends, legal updates, toxicology, and more to keep you informed.

- 2 Words Matter
- 3 Traffic Safety Partner Showcase
- 3 Upcoming Training & Events
- 4 from the Desk of the SJOL
- 5 Conversational Interrogation
- 7 Call Them Crashes
- 8 Oral Fluid Pilot Project Update

# WORDS MATTER

Trooper Tarek Chase  
DRE/SFST State Coordinator

The correct words can play an important role in administering field sobriety tests, both during the traffic stop and during a criminal trial. As a review, here are several examples of times when officers should be cognizant of their choice of words. Some word choices are suggestions while others are listed in the Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) Manual.

As it relates to alcohol consumption, I will generally ask the driver “How much” they had to drink as opposed to “If” they had something to drink. For example: “How much alcohol have you (the driver) had to drink tonight?” instead of “Have you (the driver) had anything to drink tonight?”. In most cases, we already know if the driver had been consuming alcohol (general appearance, behavior, mannerisms, movements, speech, odor, etc.) so be direct when asking questions about their alcohol consumption. It provides us, and the court, with an admission.

Before administering the SFSTs, it’s well known that we need to ask the driver about physical limitations. To start, it is recommended that we ask the driver questions about their eyes and general health conditions. As a best practice, ask the driver the following:

- “Do you have any eye or head problems?”
- “Do you wear glasses or contacts?”
- “Have you sustained any recent head injuries, resulting in a concussion or hospitalization?”

Depending on the driver’s answers, we may need to ask follow-up or clarifying questions to make sure we can continue with the field sobriety tests. Then, when determining if the driver would be physically able to perform psychophysical tests, we should avoid asking questions directed at specific body regions such as: “Do you have any back, hip, knee, or hip problems?”. The driver may have a disability not listed in the previous questions which could potentially disqualify them from performing the tests. Instead, ask a broader question, “Do you have any physical or medical disabilities that would prevent you from walking and balancing?”. In this type of question, we encourage the driver to assess their physical limitations and relieve us of attempting to list all possible medical disabilities.

During the Walk and Turn Test, there were word changes made to the instructions for the turn. The manual specifically states to instruct the driver as follows: “When you turn, keep your front (or lead) foot on the line, and turn by taking a series of small steps with the other foot.” The words plant or pivot should be avoided. Plant implies that the foot is no longer mobile. Pivot implies is spinning-type motion.

During the One Leg Stand Test, additional wording changes were made with regard to the positioning of the driver’s elevated foot. The manual states we instruct the driver to raise the leg of their choosing “and keep the bottom of their foot parallel to the ground, approximately 6 inches off of the ground.” This verbiage replaced “Pointed toe.” On a side note, another commonly missed instruction is to tell the driver to keep both legs straight. Each instruction is designed to add a certain level of difficulty to the test so to maintain the test’s sensitivity, it’s crucial we follow the guidelines in the manual.

One last note in regard to the SFSTs, make sure to use the words, “Do you understand?” when asking the driver if they understand the instructions. Try to avoid using “North Dakota nice” terms like: “Ok?”; “You got that?”; “Good?” Be direct in your question to verify the driver’s understanding of the instructions.

If, after completing the SFSTs, you determine the driver is under the influence of alcohol and the driver has consented to an on-site breath screening test after being read the North Dakota Implied Consent Advisory for an on-site breath screening test, make sure to specifically ask the driver “Do you have anything in your mouth?” It’s also a good practice to request the driver open their mouth so you can visually check.

Finally, if you’ve arrested the driver for “Driving under the influence of an alcoholic beverage” and plan to administer a chemical breath test, make sure to instruct the driver “Do not put anything in your mouth.” Generally, I instruct the driver not to put anything in their mouth after I place them in handcuffs but before leaving the scene of the traffic stop. It helps to ascertain the 20-minute wait period when administering the Intoxilyzer 8000 chemical breath test. ■





## Trooper Brian Larson • ND Highway Patrol

### Please explain your position and work history.

My current position is as a NDHP State Trooper stationed in Fargo. I started with the NDHP in 2014 and was first stationed in Williston. I worked there for about six and a half years before transferring to Fargo in 2020. I have been a traffic trooper for my full nine years with the patrol. Some of my extra duties with the patrol are a Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST) Instructor (Certified 2015), Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) (Certified 2018), DRE Instructor (Certified 2021), and have been a field training officer. I grew up in Valley City, ND, and graduated high school there. I went to NDSU in Fargo where I obtained a bachelor's degree in criminal justice with a minor in psychology. My parents still live in Valley City and I have other family members in the eastern part of the state.

### What is your favorite book or podcast?

My favorite book is the *Sword of Truth* series (fictional adventure series.) I have a few podcasts that I listen to regularly. They are the *Dan Bongino Show*, *Joe Rogan Podcast*, and *Stuff You Should Know*.

### What are the values that drive you?

Some values that drive me are work ethic and integrity. I believe in working/earning the things you get. I also strongly believe in the golden rule (i.e., treating other people the way you want to be treated.)

### What do you enjoy doing when you are not working?

I am a bit of a geek and enjoy playing video games and watching movies/tv shows when I am not working. I also like to read books. I enjoy hunting although I don't do it as much as I have in the past. Recently I am starting to travel more and am certainly enjoying that.

## Upcoming Training and Events

### [Lifesavers National Conference on Highway Safety Priorities](#)

April 2-4, 2023  
Seattle, WA

### ARIDE Class

April 27-28, 2023  
Jamestown, ND

Contact: Trp. Tarek Chase at [twchase@nd.gov](mailto:twchase@nd.gov) to register

### ARIDE Refresher

May 17, 2023  
Cass County LEC  
1612 23rd Avenue North  
Fargo, ND

Contact: Sgt. Keenan Zundel at [zundelk@casscountyny.gov](mailto:zundelk@casscountyny.gov) to register

### DRE/SFST Advisory Board Meeting

June 21, 2023 • 11:00 a.m.  
Ramada Inn, Fargo, ND

### NDSAA/DRE Joint Conference 2023

June 21-23, 2023  
Ramada Inn, Fargo, ND  
Keynote Speaker:  
Jermaine Galloway "Tall Cop"

### [IACP Impaired Driving & Traffic Safety Conference](#)

August 9-11, 2023  
Anaheim, CA

### [Governors Highway Safety Association Annual Meeting](#)

August 12-16, 2023  
New York, NY

### [IACP Annual Conference and Exposition](#)

October 14-17, 2023  
San Diego, CA

## Training Resources

TSRP Webpage • [www.ndsaa.org](http://www.ndsaa.org)

User Name: tsrp • Password: tsrp

This website was developed to provide those invested in traffic safety with a warehouse for current information, training opportunities, case law updates, related resources, interesting and relevant news articles, etc., so we can continue to focus on our goal of making North Dakota's roadways safe. Following is a list of items available.

- Impaired Driving Training Materials & Manuals
- Memo Library
- Impaired Driving Training Video Library
- SFST Training Videos
- The Two Beer Manual and latest case law updates
- Webinars



Words Matter: How the words being used when testifying can make a difference.

Prior to the last issue of this newsletter, I had written about being prepared as one of the keys to giving good testimony. Looking back, we covered writing good reports and then reviewing them before taking a witness stand. We covered talking to your prosecutor(s) and trying to develop some level of relationship and providing them with your CV or resume that lists your training and experience. Then we covered knowing your specialization and your tests. Next we covered acting like you have been there before, because you were, just a day or two before. If you haven't testified in a while or have never testified, make sure you get to the building and courtroom a day or two before so that you can get the lay of the land. Knowing what to expect can make the difference between getting flustered and leaving the courtroom knowing you have played a valuable role in the legal process. All of these things can lead to better testimony and reduce the stress level when it is time to do so.

This leads me back to the here and now and the subject of this article/opinion piece: words matter and especially how the words being used when testifying can make a difference. Let's picture the scene in our mind's eye. The State calls Officer Saferoads to the stand. You walk to the witness stand at the direction of the court and swear the sacred oath, "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." You take your seat, adjust the microphone so the court reporter doesn't get after you to speak up, and you state your name for the record. So far, so good. The next question is usually about where you work and your role there. The nerves start to subside a bit at this point. You may even start to think, this isn't so bad. You got this! Already you can see the power of the words being used. Just like "All rise," brought everyone to their feet at the start of the court session, you have been placed "under oath." That gives the connotation that you are carrying the truth on your shoulders. Being "under" the oath requires certain answers, even if we don't like those answers. For the people in the room, it brings a sense of formality, importance, and significance to what we are about to hear.

Why are we talking about this? Because words matter. Once you finally make it onto the witness stand and you have been placed under oath, being concise and straightforward with your answers (words) gives you immediate credibility with the judge and/or jury. It sends the signal that you are not afraid of the truth, that you believe the truth will come out, and that you are willing to answer tough questions without hedging your answers. The facts are the facts and trying to twist them only damages credibility, and credibility matters. Credibility matters almost as much as the actual facts, credibility is why you wear your uniform or a nice suit to court and it's why there is expert testimony.

Use simple language. Experts often make the mistake of filling their testimony with jargon that is unfamiliar to the jury or the judge. If you're testifying on horizontal gaze nystagmus, the jury's eyes might glaze over. To avoid that, rehearse your answers with friends or family outside the field to see if they can easily follow your message. Ultimately, experts who testify should see their role as an educator of the court and/or jury. 'Blowing them away' with complicated verbiage and sophisticated theories causes you to lose your audience and may even give the defense something to argue about, further confusing or losing your intended audience. Being able to use concise simple language when describing something technical is what truly makes you an expert. This straightforward approach to the words and language used when testifying builds credibility and can often carry the day.

Here's an additional example that I hope can further drive home the point. Storytelling is at the heart of words and language and whether we remember what was talked about. Think of your parents or grandparents. It's the stories they told you that held your attention and that you remember. In fact, for many of us, it's the totality of how we remember them. Stories are beloved and handed down; told and retold. Storytelling is an amazing way to create lasting memories.

Testimony is really just a more formal storytelling process, addressed to the judge and jury.

Good attorneys, and in turn good witnesses, use testimony to tell the story of what the case is about. How do you do this? I believe it is in what words you choose and how you use

them. Referring to the defendant as "the defendant" or "the subject" is common, however, using the person's name can be much more effective in placing them in the story (testimony of the case).

"The defendant is shown in the video crossing the centerline."

"Mr. Gylltee is shown in the video crossing the centerline."

While only slightly different, the person is placed into the story and remains there. It is a tactic often used by defense attorneys, especially at sentencing time to humanize their client. They don't want the court to sentence the defendant, they want the court to sentence Mr. Gylltee, who has a wife and children. He has a good job and wants to get into treatment. The same tactic can be used by the prosecution at trial when telling the story of the case to the jury. Using the defendant's surname identifies her or him. It brings them into the story as a character, making them easier to connect to things and easier to remember as being involved. Now the defendant and Mr. Gylltee are one and the same person.

Words matter. Do your best to choose the best ones. Doing so can be more of an art than a science, but then again, any art that you practice over and over will allow you to have it down to a science.

Until next time, be safe out there!

## WORDS MATTER

# How the art of conversational interrogation will improve your DWI investigations

## Most real-life police interviews contain many undesirable practices – here's how to improve them

Val Van Brocklin

Policing has evolved immensely since [Sgt. Joe Friday](#) went around in his white shirt, narrow tie, gray suit and fedora hat investigating crimes with his iconic, “Just the facts, ma’am.” But to look at DWI investigations, you wouldn’t know it.

### UNDERSTANDING THE WHY OF DWI INVESTIGATIONS



Photo/Pixabay

What’s the purpose of stopping someone suspected of DWI?

You can have all the evidence in the world, but if jurors don’t find the investigating officer credible, they will doubt the credibility of the evidence the police officer gathered.

1. To determine if they are, in fact, driving impaired.

And, if they are...

2. To gather as much legally admissible evidence of that as possible.

Accomplish this, and often the case won’t go to trial. If it does go to trial, there’s a third element of an unbeatable DWI investigation.

3. A testifying officer the jurors trust and believe. You can have all the evidence in the world, but if jurors don’t find the investigating officer credible, they will doubt the credibility of the evidence the police officer gathered.

### UNDERSTANDING THE HOW OF DWI INVESTIGATIONS

How can you best accomplish the three steps above? Conversational interrogation. That may sound like an oxymoron – but it needn’t be.

Yes, your questioning of a DWI suspect is, in the legal sense, an interrogation – a series of questions reasonably calculated to produce an incriminating response. But there’s no requirement that it not be conversational. Moreover, conversational interrogation is much more likely to produce an iron-clad DWI case.

In [Let ‘Em Talk! A Field Study of Police Questioning Practices of Suspects and Accused Persons](#), the authors summarize some core components that are fundamental to thorough and professional information-gathering interviews:

- **Ask as many open-ended questions as possible.**

Such questions can’t be answered with “yes” or “no.” Open-ended questions encourage free recall and allow for a wide range of responses. They typically start with “tell,” “explain,” or “describe.” For example, “Tell me what you’ve been doing today?” or “Other than being stopped by me, how’s your day been going?” Open questions get people to expand on information and can get a reserved person to talk.

- **Listen actively and don’t interrupt.**

A rule that encourages active listening is the 80-20 talking rule where the interviewer talks 20% of the interview time and listens 80%. When you’re talking, the DWI suspect isn’t providing information. Field studies show this rule is pervasively broken, with interviewers typically consuming most of the interview time.

- **Avoid closed yes-no questions.**

Questions like, “Do you know why I stopped you?” or “Have you been drinking?” have the potential to extract incomplete or inaccurate answers, or intimidate the interviewee. In social settings and investigations, closed questions can kill a conversation.

Despite experts agreeing on what constitutes best practices, [field studies of police interviews](#) – especially where officers have not been appropriately trained – show that most real-life police interviews contain many undesirable practices such as asking many more closed than open-ended questions.

In one of the first field studies exploring witness interviewing practices, researchers analyzed 11 video-recorded witness interviews and found that questions consisted mostly of

continued on page 6 ►

closed yes-no questions – described as being delivered in a staccato style – and only three open-ended questions were asked per interview. On average, only 10% of questions composing an interview consisted of open-ended questions.

Similarly, later research found that 73% of the questions asked by untrained investigators were closed yes-no questions, and only 2% were open-ended. This inappropriate style of questioning has been documented routinely since.

### THE ADVANTAGES OF CONVERSATIONAL INTERROGATION

Clay Abbott, a nationally recognized expert and DWI Resource Prosecutor for the Texas District and County Attorneys Association (TDCAA), contends that conversational interrogation produces:

- More cooperative suspects who will give you more information freely. **The more people talk, the more they like you.** The more they like you, the more they'll talk.
- More credibility for the police officer in court. An officer who is friendly and conversational in tone will be seen as open-minded, fair and without an agenda. Jurors will trust such an officer.

Abbott also acknowledges that officers universally perform this aspect of a DUI investigation poorly. That's why, in conjunction with the TDCAA, he helped produce a 20-minute training video titled [Effective Roadside Investigation Through Conversation](#) that includes examples of non-conversational and conversational interrogations.

### TIPS FOR A DWI ROADSIDE CONVERSATION

Rather than ask the suspect, "Do you know why I stopped you?" (close-ended), Abbott recommends – after you politely introduce yourself – to tell the person why you stopped them. This gets your probable cause on video and, by explaining your actions, you appear respectful and fair.

During a conversational roadside investigation, police officers should consider doing the following:

- While the driver is producing registration and proof of insurance, the officer asks, "Where are you coming from?" (open-ended). This divides the suspect's attention, which may well reveal impairment.
- The officer tells the suspect he smells alcohol (thereby putting it on video and getting the jury to smell it) and then asks, "What have you had to drink?" (open-ended). When the suspect says, "Two margaritas?" the officer asks, "What size?" (open-ended). When the suspect replies, "Normal size," the officer follows up with, "Anything else?"
- Additional questions relevant to a DWI conversation might include:

Where are you headed?

How long have you been driving?

How familiar are you with this vehicle?

Does the vehicle have any problems?

Tell me about any medical or other conditions that could affect your driving.

Could you please step out of the car? I just need to have you perform some tests so I can make sure you're safe to drive.

As important as whether the questioning is mostly open or closed-ended, is the **officer's tone**. It should be conversational, interested, non-judgmental and concerned.

Remember the purpose of a DWI investigation. Conversational interrogation is the best way to accomplish it – roadside and in the courtroom.

*Author's Note: Thanks to Corporal Joe Miller, of the Alaska State Troopers, for bringing this topic to my attention.*

Reprinted by permission of the author and Police1.com



## The Lighter Side

I was a brand-new attorney in practice alone, and I had a likewise inexperienced secretary fresh out of high school. The importance of proofreading the results of my dictation was highlighted one day when a reminder to a client's tenant to pay her rent or suffer eviction was transcribed as follows: "You are hereby notified that if payment is not received within five business days, I will have no choice but to commence execution proceedings."

# CALL THEM CRASHES, NOT ACCIDENTS

Kenneth Stecker, Esquire  
Michigan Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor  
Lansing, Michigan

Kinga Canike, Esquire  
Michigan Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor  
Lansing, Michigan

On average, someone is killed in a drunk driving crash every 53 minutes, and every two minutes, someone is injured because of this entirely preventable crime.<sup>1</sup> At any given point, there are potentially two million people on the roads who have had three or more drunk driving offenses.<sup>2</sup> These drunk drivers intentionally choose to drive drunk, knowing that they may seriously injure or kill another innocent driver or passenger. Newspaper headlines and articles are typically written with the following words:

“Woman who killed best friend in drunk driving accident sobs as she gets sentenced to probation.”<sup>3</sup>

“Tragedy struck last Friday evening as three people were killed in an accident on I-69 in Pike County. Initial investigation indicates that drugs played a role in the accident, in which Brian Paquette of Newport News, Virginia drove his SUV the wrong direction in both the northbound and southbound lanes of the interstate.”<sup>4</sup>

Even appellate court opinions commonly use the following language: “This case arises out of a fatal motor vehicle accident that occurred on March 20, 2017, at the intersection of Woodward Avenue and State Fair Avenue in Detroit, Michigan. At the time of the accident, defendant was allegedly driving reckless while she had cocaine in her body and lacked a valid driver’s license.”<sup>5</sup>

“A car being driven by defendant collided with a sports utility vehicle, killing three of its passengers. The accident occurred after defendant led police on a chase at speeds more than ninety miles per hour. After the accident, defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.135.”<sup>6</sup>

“Defendant’s conviction arose from his involvement in a car accident that killed one person and seriously injured another. The accident occurred when defendant, the driver of a Dodge Ram pickup truck traveling at a high rate of speed in a residential area, while under police surveillance, disregarded a red signal at an intersection and collided with a minivan that had entered the intersection on a green light.”<sup>7</sup>

How powerful is this word “accident?” The word suggests something of the unforeseen, an event that could not have been anticipated and for which no one can be blamed.<sup>8</sup> From reading the above headlines and court opinions, one can envision that these events were undesirable and unfortunate happenings, and unintentional occurrences on the part of the intoxicated drivers.

In essence, it was something that could not be predicted or avoided by the intoxicated driver; it was just something that happened. It is clear, however, that is not the case. These events are not “Acts of God,” but predictable results of specific actions. They are “crashes!” Using the word “accident” in describing these tragedies implies the resulting injuries are unavoidable and that society should merely accept these injuries, fatalities, and damage as an inescapable or inevitable part of our daily lives. This is not a novel idea. Distinguishing between “accident” and “crash” dates back to a 1997 campaign launched by the National Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).<sup>9</sup> “Changing the way we think about events, and the words we use to describe them, affects the way we behave,” wrote Pamela Tatiana Anikeeff, Ph.D., NHTSA Senior Behavioral Scientist, on August 11, 1997, describing NHTSA’s new “crashes are not accidents” campaign:

“Motor vehicle crashes and injuries are predictable, preventable events. Continued use of the word “accident” promotes the concept that these events are outside of human influence or control.”<sup>10</sup>

Since 1997, NHTSA and its employees no longer use the word “accident” in any of its materials or communications with media or other groups.<sup>11</sup> Many law enforcement agencies, including both New York and San Francisco Police Departments, abandoned use of the word “accident” recognizing it could deter the focus on traffic safety necessary to reduce death rates.<sup>12</sup> “Words have impact, words evoke images and stir emotions.”<sup>13</sup>

Additionally, in November 2019, the Michigan Department of Transportation released a video explaining the distinction between a crash and an accident.<sup>14</sup> Their website encourages

continued on page 8 ►

people to go to [www.crashnotaccident.com](http://www.crashnotaccident.com), where they can sign a pledge promising to help educate others about why “crash” is a better word than “accident.” The site includes links to share a poster on social media. The poster states:

“Before the movement to combat drunk driving, intoxicated drivers would say ‘it was an accident’ when they crashed their cars. Planes don’t have accidents. They crash. Cranes don’t have accidents. They collapse. And as a society, we expect answers and solutions. Traffic crashes are fixable problems, caused by dangerous streets and unsafe drivers. They are not accidents. Let’s stop using the word ‘accident’ today.”

Law enforcement officers and prosecutors investigating and/or prosecuting a drunk/ drugged driving crash, distracted driving crash, or a reckless driving crash should avoid using the word “accident” in police reports and during all courtroom proceedings. We all have a responsibility for road safety, and as we go forward, we need to continue to reassess our efforts to combat the threat to safety on our roads. One simple way we can make a difference is by eliminating the word “accident” and to use the appropriate word “crash.”

*Authors’ Note: For more information on this article and PAAM training programs, contact either author by e-mail at [steckerk@michigan.gov](mailto:steckerk@michigan.gov) or [canikek@michigan.gov](mailto:canikek@michigan.gov). Please*

*consult your prosecutor before adopting practices suggested by reports in this article. Discuss your practices that relate to this article with your commanding officers, police legal advisors, and the prosecuting attorney before changing your practice.*

1. <http://www.madd.org/drun-driving/about/>
2. Id.
3. New York Daily News, “Woman who killed best friend in drunk driving accident sobs as she gets sentenced to probation,” December 5, 2014.
4. <http://www.wagnerreese.com/blog/car-accident/wrong-way-driver-killsthree-on-i-69/>
5. People v. Stock, case number 340541, decided December 26, 2019 (Michigan Court of Appeals) (Unpublished).
6. People v. Gonzalez, case number 199230, decided August 11, 1998 (Michigan Court of Appeals) (Unpublished).
7. People v. Darden, case number 314562, decided June 12, 2014 (Michigan Court of Appeals) (Unpublished).
8. <https://www.michigan.gov/mdot/travel/safety/road-users/crash-not-accident>
9. <http://www.tphlink.com/injury-prevention.html>
10. “Crashes Aren’t Accidents Campaign,” by Pamela Anikeef, NHTSA Now, V. 3, No. 11, August 11, 1997.
11. <http://www.tphlink.com/injury-prevention.html>
12. <http://www.h-nlaw.com/blog/accident-best-way-describe-car-crash/>
13. Hughes, Brandon (July 2008). Word Choice Matters: Crash vs. Accident. The Alabama Prosecutor.
14. More information and the video can be found on a new webpage: [www.Michigan.gov/CrashNotAccident](http://www.Michigan.gov/CrashNotAccident)

Reprinted by permission of the authors.

## Oral Fluid Pilot Project Update



The Oral Fluid Pilot Project started in January 2022. The goal was to get 50 samples for the purposes of our feasibility study. The number of samples is determinative of getting a suitable cross-reference across all drug categories tested using the SoToxa oral fluid roadside testing device. We currently have 39 samples, 10 people who refused to participate in the project voluntarily, and 21 lab results. We currently have 31 DREs throughout the state participating in the pilot project. Keep up the good work DREs!

A shout out and bragging rights to the following officers ►►►

DRE Name	DRE Agency	Case Count
S. Rothenberger	Grand Forks County SO	8
A. Swanson	McKenzie County SO	6
J. White	Fargo PD	4
A. Rebel	Grand Forks PD	4
T. Chase	NDHP	3
T. Whinery	Dickinson PD	2
J. Noyes	Minot PD	2
A. Solar	Grand Forks PD	2
R. Haskell	West Fargo PD	2
M. Romans	NDHP	2
Z. Corbin	McKenzie County SO	2
B. Larson	NDHP	1
S. Mann	Jamestown PD	1
<b>DRE Count: 12</b>	<b>Agency Count: 9</b>	<b>Total Cases: 39</b>