



**2005**

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA  
DUI MANAGEMENT INFORMATION  
SYSTEM**

**ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN ACCORD WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 757  
CHAPTER 450, 1989 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

**JANUARY 2005**

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER**  
Governor

**SUNNE WRIGHT MCPEAK, Secretary**  
Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

**JOAN M. BORUCKI**  
Director

© California Department of Motor Vehicles, 2005

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE January 2005	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 2005 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Helen N. Tashima and Clifford J. Helander				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) California Department of Motor Vehicles Research and Development Section P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  CAL-DMV-RSS-05-211	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  In this fourteenth annual legislatively mandated report, 2002 and 2003 DUI data from diverse sources were compiled and cross-referenced for the purpose of developing a single comprehensive DUI data reference and monitoring system. This report presents crosstabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, court sanctions, administrative actions and alcohol-involved accidents. In addition, this report provides 1-year proportions of DUI recidivism and accident rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested in each year over a time period of thirteen years. Also, the long-term recidivism curves of the cumulative proportions of DUI reoffenses are shown for all DUI offenders arrested in 1994. Analyses were conducted on the effectiveness of alcohol education programs upon the 1-year postconviction records of those convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving, and on the effectiveness of the 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education programs on the 1-year postconviction records of first offenders. The proportions of 2002 convicted first and second offenders who completed their alcohol education/treatment program requirement are also presented.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS drinking drivers, DUI tracking data system, DUI reporting system, DUI countermeasures, DUI recidivism, alcohol education and rehabilitation, driver license disqualification			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 148	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT None	

## DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1993 - 2003

	YEAR										
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Total DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	233673	208844	200754	203794	193250	190098	190286	183955	178950	179663	185973
Felony DUI arrests	8738	7567	6642	6364	5612	5379	5269	5524	5711	5915	5899
Misdemeanor DUI arrests	224935	201277	194112	197430	187638	184719	185017	178431	173239	173748	180074
DUI convictions received to date (by year of arrest) <sup>2</sup>	170142 <sup>r</sup>	152574 <sup>r</sup>	149597 <sup>r</sup>	149555 <sup>r</sup>	142004 <sup>r</sup>	143578 <sup>r</sup>	148955 <sup>r</sup>	143012 <sup>r</sup>	138625 <sup>r</sup>	136223 <sup>r</sup>	131473
Percent convicted of DUI as of September 2004	73%	73%	74%	73%	73%	76% <sup>r</sup>	78% <sup>r</sup>	78% <sup>r</sup>	77%	76% <sup>r</sup>	71%
Estimated final DUI convictions <sup>3</sup>	168964	151550	148725	147153	139626	139245	143414	139147	138766	138329	142648
Estimated final DUI conviction rate	72%	72%	73% <sup>6</sup>	72%	72%	73%	75%	76%	77%	77%	77%
Total reckless driving convictions <sup>4</sup>	27835	27374	24516	25701	25879	22851	24020	22798	23783	24590	24935
Alcohol-involved reckless	18645	18246	16329	17446	16867	15945	15514	14465	15773	15694	15735
Total mandatory susp/rev <sup>5</sup>	277447	243645	226158 <sup>r</sup>	230600 <sup>r</sup>	205462	238612	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242
Admin per se/refusal susp/rev	209006	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470
Postconviction susp/rev <sup>8</sup>	68441	59600	52462	50257 <sup>r</sup>	35951 <sup>7</sup>	63247 <sup>7</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772
Alcohol-involved fatalities	1569	1488	1343	1254	1100	1072	1170	1233	1308	1416	1445
% of total fatalities	37.7	35.3	32.2	31.6	30.0	31.0	32.8	33.1	33.3	34.2	34.2
Alcohol-involved injuries	42936	39437	36961	35654	31189	30985	29833	30971	31806	32013	31322
% of total injuries	13.6	12.5	12.1	11.9	10.9	10.7	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.2

<sup>1</sup>These totals were reported by the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, and include a small number of duplicates (1.1% in 2003).

<sup>2</sup>These data represent a DMV master file count of the number of DUI abstracts received (by year of violation), minus duplicates. These totals do not include conviction abstracts not yet received. Thus, for the most recent years, these figures will substantially underestimate the final conviction totals.

<sup>3</sup>These data include a projected number of abstracts not yet received. This number is based on an empirically derived function of the court abstract reporting rate.

<sup>4</sup>These totals were taken from the Research DUI data file and the DMV annual Suspension and Revocation reports and include late reporting of convictions from prior years.

<sup>5</sup>Since 1991, total mandatory suspension/revocation exceeds the number of DUI arrests because many offenders now receive both an APS and postconviction suspension/revocation.

<sup>6</sup>This estimated final conviction rate has been adjusted for arrest data known to be missing.

<sup>7</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

<sup>8</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements and include workload counts.

<sup>r</sup>Revised from prior reports.

## DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1993 - 2003 (continued)

	YEAR										
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS</b>	277447	243645	226158 <sup>r</sup>	230600 <sup>r</sup>	205462 <sup>2</sup>	238612 <sup>2</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	209006	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	n/a	9971	8608 <sup>r</sup>	9327 <sup>r</sup>	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949
.08 First-offender suspensions	144321	120582	116636 <sup>r</sup>	122111 <sup>r</sup>	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	57279	47429	43218 <sup>r</sup>	43922 <sup>r</sup>	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	7406	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133
Commercial driver actions	5829	5038	4743 <sup>r</sup>	4939 <sup>r</sup>	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853
Chemical test refusal actions	15662	13264	11711 <sup>r</sup>	11436 <sup>r</sup>	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399
.01 Test refusal suspensions	n/a	179	170	154	134	229	268	270	280	290	341
.08 Test refusal suspensions	8256	7022	6307 <sup>r</sup>	6299 <sup>r</sup>	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925
.08 Test refusal revocations	7406	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133
<b>TOTAL APS/REFUSAL ACTIONS</b>	209006	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>1</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	922	879	677	995	769 <sup>2</sup>	1026 <sup>2</sup>	918	741	714	896	794
First-offender suspensions	10208	8696	7266	7229	4847 <sup>2</sup>	9588 <sup>2</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521
Misdemeanor	8607	7188	5806	5753	3834 <sup>2</sup>	7497 <sup>2</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298
Felony	1601	1508	1460	1476	1013 <sup>2</sup>	2091 <sup>2</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223
Second-offender S/R actions	38849	34300	31489	30404	22945 <sup>2</sup>	40238 <sup>2</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737
Misdemeanor	38285	33794	30955	29864	22532 <sup>2</sup>	39065 <sup>2</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160
Felony	564	506	534	540	413 <sup>2</sup>	633 <sup>2</sup>	485	526	577	597	577
Third-offender revocations	12908	11193	9471	8728	5569 <sup>2</sup>	9397 <sup>2</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953
Misdemeanor	12644	10974	9261	8550	5471 <sup>2</sup>	9167 <sup>2</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758
Felony	264	219	210	178	98 <sup>2</sup>	230 <sup>2</sup>	121	148	142	175	195
Fourth-offender revocations	5554	4532	3559	2901	1821 <sup>2</sup>	2998 <sup>2</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767
<b>TOTAL POSTCONVICTION ACTIONS</b>	68441	59600	52462	50257 <sup>r</sup>	35951 <sup>2</sup>	63247 <sup>2</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772

<sup>1</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.

<sup>2</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

<sup>r</sup>Revised from prior reports.

---

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2005 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

- ▶ Alcohol-involved traffic fatalities rose by 2.0% in 2003, continuing a reversal in trend that started in 1999 after well over a decade of continuous decline.
- ▶ DUI arrests increased by 3.7% in 2003, following an increase of 0.3% in 2002, representing the first consecutive years of increases in DUI arrests in almost two decades.
- ▶ The number of persons injured in alcohol-involved crashes fell by 2.2% in 2003, following increases of 0.7% in 2002, 2.7% in 2001 and 3.8% in 2000 (which was the first such increase in 14 years).
- ▶ 14.8% of all 2002 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 14.1% in 2001, 13.5% in 2000, 12.5% in 1999, 12.8% in 1998, 12.3% in 1997, 12.6% in 1996, 12.4% in 1995, 13.2% in 1994 and 13.1% in 1993. 42.8% of these crashes involved an injury or fatality.
- ▶ The average blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on APS forms, was .162% in 2002, down slightly from the last several years, yet more than double the California illegal per se BAC limit of .08%.
- ▶ Among 2003 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (44.2%) again constituted the largest racial/ethnic group, as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999). Hispanics, however, continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population (27.5% in 2003). The ethnic distribution among DUI arrestees who are convicted fairly closely parallels the ethnic distribution of the arrestees.
- ▶ The average age of an arrested DUI offender in 2003 was 33.3 years. Less than 1% of arrested DUI offenders are juveniles (under age 18).
- ▶ Among convicted DUI offenders in 2002, 75.9% were first offenders and 24.1% were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 7 years). The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased slightly each year since 1989, when it stood at 37%.
- ▶ 10.9% of 2002 DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, the same rate as 2001 DUI arrests.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge with appreciation the many individuals who have contributed to the success of this project. In particular, we wish to acknowledge the cooperation of the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, in providing annual DUI arrest data and documentation. The contributions of Debbie McKenzie, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, in transforming mainframe computer files into readable data tables and figures, as well as her general assistance in the production of this report, are acknowledged with appreciation. We also would like to acknowledge the contributions of Patrice Rogers, Research Program Specialist II, Kevin L. Nguyen, Staff Programmer Analyst, and David J. DeYoung, Research Manager II, Alcohol/Drug Projects.

### Report Authors:

Helen N. Tashima, Research Program Specialist II, Principal Investigator and  
Clifford J. Helander, Research Manager III, Project Manager and Chief, Research &  
Development Branch.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1993-2003 .....	i
HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2005 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS .....	4
SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS .....	10
SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS .....	22
SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS .....	33
EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS .....	40
Subject Selection and Data Collection .....	40
Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures .....	43
One-Year Recidivism Rates for First and Second Offenders from 1990-2002 .....	44
One-Year Crash Rates for First and Second Offenders from 1990-2002 .....	45
Results of the Alcohol-Related Reckless Program Evaluation .....	46
Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Program Evaluation .....	47
Alcohol Program Completions for 2002 First and Second Offenders .....	48
Long-Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders .....	48
SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS .....	52
SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL .....	56
DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS .....	66
HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975 .....	67
REFERENCES .....	78
GLOSSARY .....	81

## APPENDICES

<u>NUMBER</u>		
A	ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 757 - CHAPTER 450 .....	83
B1	2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	85
B2	2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE .....	100
B3	TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT .....	109
B4	2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS .....	118

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF APPENDICES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
B5	148

DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS AND 3- AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM DRIVERS.....

## LIST OF TABLES

1	7
2	8
3a	9
3b	9
4	15
5	16
6	16
7	17
8	19
9a	20
9b	21
10	21
11	24
12	25
13	44
14a	46

DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2001-2003.....

2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST.....

2003 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY.....

2003 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY.....

2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX.....

MATCHABLE 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX.....

ADJUSTED 2002 DUI CONVICTION RATES AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY.....

TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES.....

ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2002 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY.....

2002 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS.....

2002 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21.....

2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND AVERAGE REPORTED BAC LEVEL.....

2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS.....

2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS.....

ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2002.....

THE EFFECT OF SANCTIONS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS.....



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
14b	47
FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS .....	
15	48
COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED ALCOHOL PROGRAM COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2002 .....	
16.	49
CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES OF THE 1994 DUI OFFENDERS .....	
17	54
MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1993-2003 .....	
18	55
ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES .....	
19	59
FATAL /INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	
20	59
FATAL /INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	
21	60
FATAL /INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	
22	60
FATAL /INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	
23	61
2002 CRASH-INVOLVED DUI ARRESTEES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	
24a	62
2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX .....	
24b	62
2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED) .....	
25a	63
SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES .....	
25b	63
SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2002 ALCOHOL- INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED) .....	
26a	64
2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS .....	
26b	64
2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL /INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED) .....	
27	65
2002 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES .....	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	2
2	4
3	6
4	12
5	15
6	23
7	34
8	34
9a	36
9b	37
10a	38
10b	38
10c	39
10d	39
10e	40
11	53
12	57

## INTRODUCTION

This report is the fourteenth Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System, produced in response to Assembly Bill 757 (Friedman), Chapter 450, 1989 legislative session (see Appendix A). This bill required the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to "establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted" of DUI in order to provide "accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics" to enhance "the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions." The need for such a data system had long been documented by numerous authorities, including the 1983 Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. In responding to this legislative mandate, this report combines and cross-references DUI data from diverse sources and presents them in a single reference. Data sources drawn upon include the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for crash data, Department of Justice (DOJ) for arrest data, and the DMV driver record database. Each of these reporting agencies, however, initially draw their data from diffuse primary sources such as individual law enforcement agencies (arrest and crash reports) and the courts (abstracts of conviction).


The general conceptual design of the California DUI management information system (DUI-MIS) is presented in Figure 1. The basic theme of the DUI-MIS is to track the processing of offenders through the DUI system from the point of arrest and to identify the frequency with which offenders flow through each branch of the system process (from law enforcement through adjudication to treatment and license control actions). Figure 1 also illustrates the relationship between offender flow and data collection at each point of the process. The initiating data source for the DUI-MIS is the DUI arrest report, as compiled by the DOJ Law Enforcement Information Center's Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system.

Another major objective of this report is to evaluate the effectiveness of court and administrative sanctions on convicted DUI offenders. This is accomplished by examining the postconviction recidivism records (alcohol/drug-related crashes and traffic convictions) of offenders assigned to alternative sanctions, as detailed in Section 4 on "Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness."

It should again be noted that it is not an objective of this report to make recommendations based on the data presented. Rather, the primary purpose of a reporting system such as the DUI-MIS is to provide objective data on the operating and performance characteristics of the system for others to assess in making policy decisions, formulating improvements and conducting more in-depth evaluations.

The DUI-MIS data system and report has led to numerous improvements in the California DUI system, from the identification of inappropriate dismissals in a small central valley court to major initiatives to improve the tracking and reporting of DUI cases. The success of the California DUI-MIS has also contributed to a national initiative to design a model DUI reporting system, developed under contract to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

Figure 1. DUI management information system.



## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS

The information presented below on DUI arrests is based primarily on data collected annually by the Department of Justice (DOJ), Law Enforcement Information Center, Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system. These data are the most current nonaggregated data available on DUI arrests.

Table 1: DUI Arrests by County and Annual Percentage Change from 2001-2003. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2001-2003 and the percentage change from 2002-2003 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2003 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2003 DUI arrests by felony, misdemeanor, and juvenile arrest type, by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2003 DUI Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a crosstabulates age by sex and age by race/ethnicity of 2003 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Table 3b shows the same data crosstabulated by sex and age within race/ethnicity.

Figure 2 below displays the trend in DUI arrests from 1993 to 2003.




Figure 2. DUI arrests 1993-2003.

Based on the data shown in Figure 2 and Tables 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, the following statements can be made about DUI arrests in California:

#### Statewide Parameters:

- ▶ DUI arrests increased by 3.7% in 2003, following an increase of 0.3% in 2002, the first consecutive years of increases in DUI arrests in over a decade.
- ▶ The per capita DUI arrest rate was 0.8% in 2003 (as it was in 2000-02, but down from 0.9% in 1997-99). This represents over a 50% reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
- ▶ Felony DUI arrests (involving bodily injury or death) decreased slightly (-0.3%) in 2003 after 3 consecutive years of increase, and continue to constitute a relatively small proportion (3.2%) of all DUI arrests.

#### County Variation:

- ▶ 20.7% of all 2003 California DUI arrests occurred in Los Angeles County. Four counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, and San Bernardino) had over 10,000 DUI arrests each, accounting for 43.2% of all arrests.
- ▶ The 2003 county per capita DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.3 to 5.5 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers. Nine counties again had rates of 0.7 or below. These low per capita arrest rate counties were San Francisco (0.3), Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Santa Clara and Solano (0.6), Alameda, Orange, San Mateo, and Ventura (0.7). Six counties had rates of 2.0 or higher—Alpine (5.5), Tehama (2.8), Sierra (2.5), Glenn (2.1), Colusa and Trinity (2.0).
- ▶ As in past years, many counties again showed a decline in DUI arrests in 2003. Among the larger counties, the greatest percentage declines occurred in San Francisco (-9.7%) and Santa Barbara (-9.5%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage decreases in DUI arrests occurred in Modoc (-38.8%), Alpine (-19.2%), Sutter (-18.4%) and Merced (-16.6%). Among counties showing percentage increases in DUI arrests were Tuolumne (26.3%), Kern (23.9%), Glenn (23.8%) and Sierra (22.2%).

#### Demographic Characteristics:

- ▶ The average age of a DUI arrestee in 2003 was 33.3 years. After increasing each year during the early 1990's, the average age of a DUI arrestee has declined slightly each year since 1997. Roughly half (49.4%) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters (74.1%) were age 40 or younger. Less than 1% of all DUI arrests involved juveniles (under age 18). 2.3% of all arrestees were over age 60.

- ▶ Males comprised 83.5% of all 2003 DUI arrests. The proportion of females among DUI arrestees has risen slightly each year this report has been produced, from 10.6% in 1989 to 16.5% in 2003.
- ▶ In 2003, Hispanics (44.2%) again represented the largest ethnic group among DUI arrestees as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999, when Whites were the largest group at 42.8%). Hispanics, however, continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2003 population parity of 27.5% (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also overrepresented among DUI arrestees (7.1% of arrests, 6.5% of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2003 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites (42.2% of arrests, 53.3% of the population), and "Other" (6.5% of arrests, 12.7% of the population). Figure 3 below shows the percentages of 2003 DUI arrests and (recently updated) 2003 estimated census adult population by race/ethnicity.
- ▶ Among male 2003 DUI arrestees, 48.5% were Hispanic, 38.1% were White, 7.0% were Black, and 6.4% were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, 62.8% were White, 22.4% were Hispanic, 7.8% were Black, and 7.0% were "Other." The overrepresentation of Hispanics among DUI offenders is clearly limited to males.
- ▶ In the following 7 counties, Hispanics comprised 60% or more of those arrested for DUI during 2003: Tulare (71.3%), Merced (68.5%), Fresno (68.2%), San Benito (66.5%), Imperial (66.2%), Monterey (64.0%) and Madera (60.8%). In most other counties, the majority of arrestees were White.
- ▶ The average age of a DUI arrestee varied considerably by race: Blacks were the oldest with a mean age of 35.8 years, while Hispanics were the youngest, with a mean age of 31.2 years.




Figure 3. Percentage of 2003 DUI arrests and 2003 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 1990 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS\* BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2001-2003

COUNTY	2001	2002	2003	% CHANGE 2002-2003
STATEWIDE	176490	177056	183560	3.7
ALAMEDA	5916	5542	6517	17.6
ALPINE	60	73	59	-19.2
AMADOR	233	230	216	-6.1
BUTTE	1395	1276	1448	13.5
CALAVERAS	235	299	296	-1.0
COLUSA	267	212	254	19.8
CONTRA COSTA	4899	4456	4275	-4.1
DEL NORTE	291	375	328	-12.5
EL DORADO	1123	1285	1374	6.9
FRESNO	5442	5676	5741	1.1
GLENN	320	307	380	23.8
HUMBOLDT	1349	1209	1254	3.7
IMPERIAL	1321	1157	1303	12.6
INYO	229	320	277	-13.4
KERN	4548	4501	5576	23.9
KINGS	983	931	931	0.0
LAKE	814	643	635	-1.2
LASSEN	259	263	304	15.6
LOS ANGELES	38329	38089	38015	-0.2
MADERA	913	782	835	6.8
MARIN	1455	1472	1667	13.2
MARIPOSA	97	120	139	15.8
MENDOCINO	786	748	861	15.1
MERCED	1648	1728	1442	-16.6
MODOC	81	98	60	-38.8
MONO	137	145	158	9.0
MONTEREY	3194	3360	3468	3.2
NAPA	1115	1063	1230	15.7
NEVADA	599	570	669	17.4
ORANGE	12074	12183	13742	12.8
PLACER	1708	1652	1741	5.4
PLUMAS	229	231	215	-6.9
RIVERSIDE	7858	8700	8566	-1.5
SACRAMENTO	7261	7611	8075	6.1
SAN BENITO	305	345	355	2.9
SAN BERNARDINO	10674	10184	11466	12.6
SAN DIEGO	15193	15924	16127	1.3
SAN FRANCISCO	1754	1693	1528	-9.7
SAN JOAQUIN	4364	4084	4565	11.8
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2298	2343	2247	-4.1
SAN MATEO	3500	3678	3682	0.1
SANTA BARBARA	2824	2534	2293	-9.5
SANTA CLARA	7119	6822	7014	2.8
SANTA CRUZ	1744	1859	1755	-5.6
SHASTA	1164	1244	1201	-3.5
SIERRA	42	54	66	22.2
SISKIYOU	380	369	377	2.2
SOLANO	1700	1649	1734	5.2
SONOMA	2775	2911	2764	-5.0
STANISLAUS	2230	2284	2375	4.0
SUTTER	762	716	584	-18.4
TEHAMA	847	1199	1087	-9.3
TRINITY	257	225	208	-7.6
TULARE	3169	3437	3621	5.4
TUOLUMNE	464	434	548	26.3
VENTURA	4008	3985	4047	1.6
YOLO	1082	1067	1124	5.3
YUBA	667	709	741	4.5

\*DOJ DUI arrest totals with duplicates removed and boat DUI (N = 347) removed.



TABLE 2: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL		TYPE OF ARREST						DUI ARRESTS PER 100 LICENSED DRIVERS
			FELONY		JUVENILE		MISDEMEANOR		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STATEWIDE	183560	100.0	5784	3.2	1576	0.9	176200	96.0	0.8
ALAMEDA	6517	3.6	102	1.6	48	0.7	6367	97.7	0.7
ALPINE	59	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7	58	98.3	5.5
AMADOR	216	0.1	15	6.9	2	0.9	199	92.1	0.8
BUTTE	1448	0.8	38	2.6	21	1.5	1389	95.9	1.0
CALAVERAS	296	0.2	14	4.7	5	1.7	277	93.6	0.9
COLUSA	254	0.1	8	3.1	2	0.8	244	96.1	2.0
CONTRA COSTA	4275	2.3	97	2.3	42	1.0	4136	96.7	0.6
DEL NORTE	328	0.2	8	2.4	2	0.6	318	97.0	1.9
EL DORADO	1374	0.8	72	5.2	15	1.1	1287	93.7	1.1
FRESNO	5741	3.1	198	3.4	58	1.0	5485	95.5	1.2
GLENN	380	0.2	12	3.2	6	1.6	362	95.3	2.1
HUMBOLDT	1254	0.7	24	1.9	11	0.9	1219	97.2	1.3
IMPERIAL	1303	0.7	34	2.6	14	1.1	1255	96.3	1.4
INYO	277	0.2	6	2.2	5	1.8	266	96.0	1.9
KERN	5576	3.0	130	2.3	66	1.2	5380	96.5	1.4
KINGS	931	0.5	19	2.0	9	1.0	903	97.0	1.5
LAKE	635	0.3	17	2.7	6	0.9	612	96.4	1.4
LASSEN	304	0.2	6	2.0	5	1.6	293	96.4	1.6
LOS ANGELES	38015	20.7	1540	4.1	154	0.4	36321	95.5	0.6
MADERA	835	0.5	28	3.4	1	0.1	806	96.5	1.2
MARIN	1667	0.9	22	1.3	35	2.1	1610	96.6	0.9
MARIPOSA	139	0.1	3	2.2	0	0.0	136	97.8	1.0
MENDOCINO	861	0.5	28	3.3	16	1.9	817	94.9	1.3
MERCED	1442	0.8	56	3.9	17	1.2	1369	94.9	1.1
MODOC	60	0.0	1	1.7	2	3.3	57	95.0	0.9
MONO	158	0.1	8	5.1	3	1.9	147	93.0	1.7
MONTEREY	3468	1.9	96	2.8	47	1.4	3325	95.9	1.4
NAPA	1230	0.7	38	3.1	15	1.2	1177	95.7	1.4
NEVADA	669	0.4	30	4.5	7	1.0	632	94.5	0.9
ORANGE	13742	7.5	276	2.0	69	0.5	13397	97.5	0.7
PLACER	1741	0.9	57	3.3	27	1.6	1657	95.2	0.8
PLUMAS	215	0.1	8	3.7	2	0.9	205	95.3	1.2
RIVERSIDE	8566	4.7	265	3.1	59	0.7	8242	96.2	0.8
SACRAMENTO	8075	4.4	361	4.5	73	0.9	7641	94.6	0.9
SAN BENITO	355	0.2	5	1.4	5	1.4	345	97.2	1.0
SAN BERNARDINO	11466	6.2	409	3.6	61	0.5	10996	95.9	1.0
SAN DIEGO	16127	8.8	438	2.7	164	1.0	15525	96.3	0.8
SAN FRANCISCO	1528	0.8	103	6.7	5	0.3	1420	92.9	0.3
SAN JOAQUIN	4565	2.5	114	2.5	48	1.1	4403	96.5	1.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2247	1.2	46	2.0	55	2.4	2146	95.5	1.2
SAN MATEO	3682	2.0	62	1.7	33	0.9	3587	97.4	0.7
SANTA BARBARA	2293	1.2	65	2.8	21	0.9	2207	96.2	0.8
SANTA CLARA	7014	3.8	238	3.4	59	0.8	6717	95.8	0.6
SANTA CRUZ	1755	1.0	39	2.2	18	1.0	1698	96.8	1.0
SHASTA	1201	0.7	38	3.2	14	1.2	1149	95.7	0.9
SIERRA	66	0.0	1	1.5	2	3.0	63	95.5	2.5
SISKIYOU	377	0.2	9	2.4	8	2.1	360	95.5	1.1
SOLANO	1734	0.9	55	3.2	14	0.8	1665	96.0	0.6
SONOMA	2764	1.5	80	2.9	43	1.6	2641	95.5	0.8
STANISLAUS	2375	1.3	113	4.8	28	1.2	2234	94.1	0.8
SUTTER	584	0.3	17	2.9	11	1.9	556	95.2	1.1
TEHAMA	1087	0.6	31	2.9	3	0.3	1053	96.9	2.8
TRINITY	208	0.1	3	1.4	0	0.0	205	98.6	2.0
TULARE	3621	2.0	94	2.6	62	1.7	3465	95.7	1.7
TUOLUMNE	548	0.3	11	2.0	3	0.5	534	97.4	1.3
VENTURA	4047	2.2	122	3.0	48	1.2	3877	95.8	0.7
YOLO	1124	0.6	32	2.8	21	1.9	1071	95.3	1.0
YUBA	741	0.4	42	5.7	5	0.7	694	93.7	1.9

TABLE 3a: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY\*

AGE	TOTAL		SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	183560	100.0	153325	83.5	30235	16.5	77431	42.2	81079	44.2	13094	7.1	11956	6.5
UNDER 18	1576	0.9	1272	80.7	304	19.3	873	55.4	589	37.4	46	2.9	68	4.3
18-20	14612	8.0	12286	84.1	2326	15.9	6388	43.7	6694	45.8	591	4.0	939	6.4
21-30	74332	40.5	62976	84.7	11356	15.3	26496	35.6	38129	51.3	4359	5.9	5348	7.2
31-40	45489	24.8	37861	83.2	7628	16.8	17549	38.6	21398	47.0	3760	8.3	2782	6.1
41-50	31036	16.9	25034	80.7	6002	19.3	16046	51.7	10269	33.1	2854	9.2	1867	6.0
51-60	12292	6.7	10271	83.6	2021	16.4	7317	59.5	3132	25.5	1097	8.9	746	6.1
61-70	3327	1.8	2856	85.8	471	14.2	2100	63.1	725	21.8	320	9.6	182	5.5
71 & ABOVE	896	0.5	769	85.8	127	14.2	662	73.9	143	16.0	67	7.5	24	2.7
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	33.3		33.2		33.7		35.1		31.2		35.8		32.5	

\*Tabulations for DUI arrests by age, sex, race/ethnicity and county are found in Appendix Table B1.

TABLE 3b: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

SEX	AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
				WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		183560	100.0	77431	42.2	81079	44.2	13094	7.1	11956	6.5
MALE	UNDER 18	1272	0.8	652	51.3	530	41.7	36	2.8	54	4.2
	18-20	12286	8.0	4888	39.8	6149	50.0	496	4.0	753	6.1
	21-30	62976	41.1	20221	32.1	34984	55.6	3509	5.6	4262	6.8
	31-40	37861	24.7	12865	34.0	19644	51.9	3033	8.0	2319	6.1
	41-50	25034	16.3	11809	47.2	9305	37.2	2327	9.3	1593	6.4
	51-60	10271	6.7	5743	55.9	2886	28.1	971	9.5	671	6.5
	61-70	2856	1.9	1705	59.7	684	23.9	303	10.6	164	5.7
	71 & ABOVE	769	0.5	549	71.4	133	17.3	65	8.5	22	2.9
	TOTAL	153325	100.0	58432	38.1	74315	48.5	10740	7.0	9838	6.4
FEMALE	UNDER 18	304	1.0	221	72.7	59	19.4	10	3.3	14	4.6
	18-20	2326	7.7	1500	64.5	545	23.4	95	4.1	186	8.0
	21-30	11356	37.6	6275	55.2	3145	27.7	850	7.5	1086	9.6
	31-40	7628	25.2	4684	61.4	1754	23.0	727	9.5	463	6.1
	41-50	6002	19.9	4237	70.6	964	16.1	527	8.8	274	4.6
	51-60	2021	6.7	1574	77.9	246	12.2	126	6.2	75	3.7
	61-70	471	1.6	395	83.9	41	8.7	17	3.6	18	3.8
	71 & ABOVE	127	0.4	113	89.0	10	7.9	2	1.6	2	1.6
	TOTAL	30235	100.0	18999	62.8	6764	22.4	2354	7.8	2118	7.0

## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of DUI arrests are reported directly to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on court abstracts of conviction. The following tables compile and crosstabulate these conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. In what follows, expressions like "2002 convictions" refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2002, who were subsequently convicted.

Table 4: 2002 DUI Convictions by Age and Sex. This table crosstabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and sex. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 5: Matchable 2002 DUI Convictions by Age, Race/Ethnicity, and Sex. This table displays DUI conviction information by age, race/ethnicity, and sex. "Matchable" DUI convictions are those which are traceable to a DUI arrest appearing on the MACR system. Because not all arrests could be matched to an existing record, these conviction totals underestimate the total number of actual convictions.

Table 6: Adjusted 2002 DUI Conviction Rates and Relative Likelihood of Conviction by Age and Race/Ethnicity. This table shows the relative probability of a DUI arrest leading to a DUI conviction by age and race/ethnicity. DUI conviction totals from categories in Table 5 ("matchable DUI convictions") were increased by the proportion which matchable convictions constituted of "total DUI convictions," shown in Table 7, to arrive at the adjusted DUI conviction rates. As explained above, without this adjustment DUI conviction rates would be underestimated using the conviction data from Table 5 because not all reported convictions are "matchable" to an arrest.

Table 7: Total Conviction Data for 2002 DUI Arrestees. This table portrays county and statewide DUI-related conviction data as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Corresponding court-specific data are shown in Appendix Table B3. Convictions not reported to DMV are considered nonconvictions for the purposes of this report. Actual nonconvictions include cases where the DUI arrest was not filed, not prosecuted, or resulted in a not guilty verdict. The DUI conviction rates by county were calculated by comparing the county conviction totals with DOJ arrest totals. Because not all 2002 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these conviction totals and rates will slightly underestimate the "final" figures. The DUI conviction rates shown in the "DUI Summary Statistics: 1993-2003" table at the very beginning of this report include an estimate of these late convictions, and thus are slightly higher than those shown in Tables 7 and 8. Conviction variables include felony and misdemeanor DUI convictions, alcohol- and nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions, convictions of "other" lesser offenses, and DUI convictions dismissed or found unconstitutional. DUI arrest dates from the DOJ MACR system were matched to driver record violation dates to identify nonalcohol-related reckless driving and "other" convictions. The average (mean) adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, were calculated for each county.


Table 8: Adjudication Status of 2002 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows the adjudication status (court disposition) of 2002 DUI arrests, by county. Included are the percentages of arrests which have resulted in DUI convictions (misdemeanor or felony), reckless driving convictions (alcohol-related or nonalcohol-related), convictions of "other" offenses, or no reported conviction, as of the date of writing. Again, because

not all 2002 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these rates will slightly underestimate the "final" rate for each category, excepting the category "no record of any conviction," which will be slightly reduced (approximately 1-2%) by the eventual adjudication of these few late cases.

Table 9a: 2002 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI Convictions and Table 9b: 2002 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Convicted DUI Offenders Under Age 21. Table 9a shows the frequency of reported positive BAC levels for DUI and alcohol-reckless convictions. Because of more complete reporting of BAC levels on APS reporting forms (79.8%) than on abstracts of conviction, those reports are used to calculate statewide BAC levels. Abstracts of conviction, which were used in prior evaluations, report BAC levels in only 55.4% of cases. Table 9b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21.

Table 10: 2002 DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Average Reported BAC Level. This table displays the proportions of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in seven years), and the average (mean) BAC level from APS reporting forms and abstracts of conviction, for each offense level.

Figure 4 (below) shows, for the years 1993 to 2003, the number of DUI abstracts received to date by DMV from the courts, the estimated final number of DUI convictions which will ultimately be received, and the estimated final DUI conviction rate.



Estimated final conviction rate	72%	72%	73%	72%	72%	73%	75%	76%	77%	77%	77%
---------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Note. Estimated DUI convictions - see footnote 3 to "DUI Summary Statistics: 1993-2003."

Figure 4. DUI abstracts received by DMV and DUI conviction volume and rate estimates, 1993-2003.

Based on these data, the following statements can be made:

Statewide Adjudication Parameters:

- ▶ The estimated DUI conviction rate for 2003 arrestees (77%) is the same as the prior two years, and has increased by 7% over the past decade.
- ▶ 9.9% of 2002 DUI arrests resulted in reckless driving convictions, and 18.2% of these were not correctly identified as alcohol-related on the abstracts.
- ▶ 1.9% of 2002 DUI arrests have resulted in convictions of offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, down from 2.1% last year.
- ▶ 10.9% of 2002 DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction on DMV's records, the same as for 2001 DUI arrests, and down from 19.7% in 1992. As additional cases are adjudicated and reported by the courts, this figure will decrease slightly.
- ▶ The average reported BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders in 2002, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was 0.162%, which is down slightly from the last several years, yet still more than double the illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08%.
- ▶ Average BAC levels increase as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions, from a 0.158% BAC for a first offense to a 0.189% BAC for a fourth or subsequent offense.
- ▶ Among 2002 convicted DUI offenders, 75.9% were first offenders, 19.1% were second offenders, 4.0% were third offenders, and 1.0% were on their fourth or more offense. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors in California has traditionally been seven years, although that period was just statutorily changed to 10 years by SB1694 – Torlakson, 2004.) The proportion of repeat offenders (24.1%) among all convicted DUI offenders has decreased slightly each year since 1989 (at which time 37% of all convictions were repeat offenses).
- ▶ The average (mean) adjudication time lags were 3.1 months from DUI arrest to conviction and 3.4 months from conviction to update on the DMV database, totalling over 6 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record. This total elapsed time from arrest to update is the same as last year, but almost a half month longer than in prior years.

Variation by County:

- ▶ Among the larger counties, 2002 DUI conviction rates varied from highs of 93.5% in Orange to a low of 51.9% in San Francisco. Los Angeles County, which accounted for almost a quarter of all DUI arrests in the state, had a DUI conviction rate of 74.3%.
- ▶ Among the smaller counties, 2002 DUI conviction rates varied from a high of 96.1% in Mono to a low of 42.1% in Tehama.
- ▶ The rates at which DUI arrests were plea-bargained to alcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 19.2% in Sonoma County to 0% in Marin and Ventura counties.

- ▶ The percentage of DUI arrests that were improperly adjudicated as nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 0% to 10.9%. Two counties had rates of 10% or more: San Francisco (10.9%) and Lassen (10.3%).
- ▶ The percentage of DUI arrests adjudicated as minor convictions ("other" convictions) varied from 0% to 5.1%. Del Norte, San Luis Obispo, Modoc, Los Angeles and Lassen counties had rates of 3% or more.
- ▶ In 6 counties, the proportion of arrestees not showing a conviction of any offense exceeded 30%. These counties were Tehama, Imperial, Trinity, Yuba, Imperial, and Glenn. Thirty counties had nonconviction rates of less than 10%, with ten counties at 0%.

#### Variation by Court:

- ▶ As was true for prior years, the 2002 superior court time lags were generally longer than municipal court time lags, presumably due to the type of DUI case (felony) being adjudicated.
- ▶ Municipal court time lags from arrest to conviction (for courts with more than a handful of reported convictions) varied from a high of 5.8 months in the Kingsburg court (Fresno County) to a low of 1.2 months for the Berkeley (Alameda County) court.
- ▶ Statewide, the proportion of reckless driving convictions (alcohol and nonalcohol), relative to all other dispositions resulting from DUI arrests, was a little less than 10% in 2002. Several counties adjudicated more than 20% of their DUI arrests as reckless driving convictions, including Del Norte, Mendocino, San Francisco and Stanislaus.
- ▶ Statewide, 18.2% of all DUI-related reckless driving convictions in 2002 are inappropriately designated as nonalcohol, compared to 18.0% in 2001, 17.8% in 2000, 21.1% in 1999, 19.6% in 1998 and 21% in 1997. In Lassen County, 11.4% of all 2002 DUI arrests resulted in a reckless driving conviction, with 90% of them inappropriately designated as nonalcohol.

#### Demographic Characteristics:

- ▶ The average age of a convicted DUI offender in 2002 was 33.8 years.
- ▶ 46.5% of 2002 DUI convictees were aged 30 years or younger and 73% were 40 years or younger.
- ▶ Females comprised 15.9% of all 2002 convicted DUI offenders. The proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1993.
- ▶ The racial/ethnic distribution of 2002 DUI convictions (White = 43.9%; Hispanic = 43.2%; Black = 6.8%; "Other" = 6.1%) generally paralleled that of 2002 arrests, although Whites were somewhat more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to be convicted of the offense (as shown in Figure 5 below).




Figure 5. Relative likelihood of conviction by race/ethnicity. (Adjusted conviction rate by ethnicity ÷ overall conviction rate.)

TABLE 4: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX\*

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	136794	100.0	115110	84.1	21684	15.9
UNDER 18	733	0.5	624	85.1	109	14.9
18-20	10375	7.6	8804	84.9	1571	15.1
21-30	52579	38.4	45263	86.1	7316	13.9
31-40	36209	26.5	30223	83.5	5986	16.5
41-50	24620	18.0	19848	80.6	4772	19.4
51-60	9228	6.7	7741	83.9	1487	16.1
61-70	2369	1.7	2043	86.2	326	13.8
71 & ABOVE	681	0.5	564	82.8	117	17.2
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	33.8		33.6		34.6	

\*County-specific tabulations of 2002 DUI convictions by age and sex are shown in Appendix Table B2.

TABLE 5: MATCHABLE 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX

AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)															
			WHITE				HISPANIC				BLACK				OTHER			
	MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
STATEWIDE	115013	100.0	38609	33.6	11873	10.3	45547	39.6	4092	3.6	6428	5.6	1431	1.2	5910	5.1	1123	1.0
UNDER 18	548	0.5	236	43.1	71	13.0	167	30.5	9	1.6	22	4.0	1	0.2	34	6.2	8	1.5
18-20	8617	7.5	3029	35.2	827	9.6	3605	41.8	358	4.2	219	2.5	60	0.7	420	4.9	99	1.1
21-30	44008	38.3	13007	29.6	3614	8.2	20214	45.9	1794	4.1	2047	4.7	453	1.0	2369	5.4	510	1.2
31-40	30324	26.4	9135	30.1	3172	10.5	12760	42.1	1123	3.7	1868	6.2	470	1.5	1516	5.0	280	0.9
41-50	20875	18.2	8058	38.6	2860	13.7	6276	30.1	630	3.0	1466	7.0	346	1.7	1073	5.1	166	0.8
51-60	7973	6.9	3711	46.5	988	12.4	2021	25.3	151	1.9	582	7.3	85	1.1	386	4.8	49	0.6
61-70	2063	1.8	1089	52.8	244	11.8	409	19.8	22	1.1	174	8.4	15	0.7	100	4.8	10	0.5
71 & ABOVE	605	0.5	344	56.9	97	16.0	95	15.7	5	0.8	50	8.3	1	0.2	12	2.0	1	0.2

TABLE 6: ADJUSTED 2002 DUI CONVICTION RATES<sup>1</sup> AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD<sup>2</sup> OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY

AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD
STATEWIDE	.77	1.00	.81	1.04	.75	.97	.73	.94	.75	.97
UNDER 18	.42	.54	.45	.58	.35	.45	.52	.67	.56	.73
18-20	.71	.92	.74	.96	.69	.90	.59	.76	.71	.91
21-30	.75	.97	.81	1.05	.72	.93	.73	.94	.73	.94
31-40	.79	1.02	.82	1.06	.78	1.01	.73	.94	.77	1.00
41-50	.81	1.05	.82	1.06	.82	1.07	.75	.97	.80	1.03
51-60	.82	1.06	.82	1.06	.85	1.10	.76	.99	.79	1.03
61-70	.81	1.05	.83	1.08	.81	1.04	.74	.96	.76	.98
71 & ABOVE	.81	1.05	.83	1.07	.81	1.05	.77	.99	.70	.91

<sup>1</sup>Adjusted DUI Conviction Rates = The matchable DUI conviction rate proportionally adjusted to the overall DUI conviction rate.

<sup>2</sup>Relative Likelihood =  $\frac{\text{Adjusted DUI Conviction Rate}}{\text{Overall Total DUI Conviction Rate}}$



TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	AVERAGE DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	77.3%	133110	3684	14418	3196	3351	1022	3.1	3.4
ALAMEDA	72.5%	3955	62	509	133	118	18	3.8	2.9
ALPINE	74.0%	51	3	9	2	0	0	4.1	4.1
AMADOR	94.8%	203	15	27	3	0	4	3.5	2.7
BUTTE	85.0%	1041	43	170	36	22	31	3.6	2.1
CALAVERAS	69.2%	201	6	23	13	5	4	2.5	3.1
COLUSA	73.6%	150	6	32	4	1	0	2.7	1.6
CONTRA COSTA	72.1%	3132	79	516	38	45	17	4.9	2.3
DEL NORTE	50.9%	180	11	65	29	19	5	3.2	3.4
EL DORADO	80.6%	990	46	95	25	6	10	2.7	3.4
FRESNO	63.3%	3470	123	649	60	49	18	5.1	1.5
GLENN	60.3%	179	6	13	7	8	1	2.8	2.0
HUMBOLDT	65.2%	756	32	182	51	21	1	3.3	2.6
IMPERIAL	42.3%	484	5	105	42	17	6	4.2	1.3
INYO <sup>5</sup>	75.0%	230	4	47	4	6	3	3.1	1.0
KERN	83.4%	3660	95	384	80	65	20	1.9	2.9
KINGS	80.6%	731	19	111	6	11	4	2.9	2.0
LAKE	71.7%	452	9	28	5	5	1	4.3	6.0
LASSEN	76.8%	202	0	3	27	9	1	2.9	4.0
LOS ANGELES	74.3%	27826	462	2508	923	1399	56	2.7	1.6
MADERA	62.5%	449	40	51	19	3	0	4.5	2.8
MARIN	90.4%	1316	14	0	0	35	9	3.5	3.4
MARIPOSA <sup>4</sup>	65.2%	102	1	6	5	3	0	2.7	5.5
MENDOCINO	73.4%	528	21	143	19	9	5	2.8	6.2
MERCED	66.5%	1115	34	171	23	19	5	4.7	4.2
MODOC	70.4%	69	0	6	2	4	2	2.7	2.2
MONO <sup>5</sup>	96.1%	145	2	23	3	2	0	2.2	3.4

<sup>1</sup>Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3.<sup>2</sup>This count includes misdemeanors which carried a felony disposition code. These counts do not include 4th offenses (in seven years) which are statutorily defined as felonies.<sup>3</sup>These dismissals were identified in DMV's DUI Audit and Tracking System Summary Report.<sup>4</sup>The calculation of the conviction rate was based on total arrests including federal DUI arrests of Yosemite National Park not reported in the DOJ MACR system.<sup>5</sup>The calculation of the conviction rates was based on adjustments made for Mono county convictions whose arrests were made in Inyo county.

TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES<sup>1</sup> – continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	AVERAGE DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
MONTEREY	83.9%	2766	53	303	50	32	11	1.8	4.0
NAPA	83.9%	869	23	76	20	16	6	2.8	1.5
NEVADA	85.4%	466	21	86	10	9	6	2.6	4.4
ORANGE	93.5%	11158	231	607	115	121	42	3.1	8.5
PLACER	93.8%	1498	51	92	29	18	6	3.2	3.0
PLUMAS	90.0%	202	6	31	6	0	0	2.8	4.0
RIVERSIDE	84.4%	7115	225	189	181	103	80	3.9	1.3
SACRAMENTO	72.3%	5278	223	643	34	65	9	3.2	6.4
SAN BENITO	95.4%	311	18	34	3	1	1	4.5	2.7
SAN BERNARDINO	75.0%	7304	331	555	167	268	58	4.4	0.7
SAN DIEGO	82.1%	12771	309	1650	301	254	33	2.7	4.9
SAN FRANCISCO	51.9%	857	21	159	185	21	1	3.4	1.2
SAN JOAQUIN	72.7%	2864	105	422	28	53	20	2.3	2.3
SAN LUIS OBISPO	74.8%	1707	46	365	80	112	29	2.4	4.6
SAN MATEO	76.5%	2768	46	452	19	58	6	3.3	4.0
SANTA BARBARA	88.6%	2172	74	357	59	21	9	2.1	4.1
SANTA CLARA	84.6%	5627	144	632	100	74	1	3.1	1.7
SANTA CRUZ	82.8%	1508	31	256	29	20	1	2.4	5.2
SHASTA	92.2%	1070	77	162	16	10	0	2.8	4.5
SIERRA	57.4%	30	1	10	0	0	0	4.0	1.5
SISKIYOU	78.6%	262	28	59	10	8	0	3.2	2.3
SOLANO	84.7%	1355	41	162	57	21	23	3.0	7.4
SONOMA	75.7%	2105	98	560	33	30	389	3.1	4.3
STANISLAUS	57.0%	1233	69	128	23	11	1	3.7	5.9
SUTTER	55.7%	379	20	94	14	2	2	2.4	2.9
TEHAMA	42.1%	482	23	63	8	11	5	2.7	2.4
TRINITY	45.3%	96	6	23	9	5	0	3.4	3.0
TULARE	72.2%	2390	93	88	10	27	22	3.5	4.0
TUOLUMNE	82.7%	350	9	46	10	2	5	4.6	1.3
VENTURA	86.4%	3389	55	1	1	85	25	2.9	2.8
YOLO	74.1%	741	50	159	26	7	2	3.8	3.3
YUBA	54.7%	370	18	78	4	5	15	3.3	1.9

TABLE 8: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2002 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTIONS		RECKLESS DRIVING CONVICTIONS		% OTHER CONVICTIONS	% NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION <sup>2</sup>
	% MISDEMEANOR	% FELONY	% ALCOHOL RELATED	% NONALCOHOL RELATED		
STATEWIDE	75.2	2.1	8.1	1.8	1.9	10.9
ALAMEDA	71.4	1.1	9.2	2.4	2.1	13.8
ALPINE	69.9	4.1	12.3	2.7	0.0	11.0
AMADOR	88.3	6.5	11.7	1.3	0.0	0.0*
BUTTE	81.6	3.4	13.3	2.8	1.7	0.0*
CALAVERAS	67.2	2.0	7.7	4.3	1.7	17.1
COLUSA	70.8	2.8	15.1	1.9	0.5	9.0
CONTRA COSTA	70.3	1.8	11.6	0.9	1.0	14.5
DEL NORTE	48.0	2.9	17.3	7.7	5.1	18.9
EL DORADO	77.0	3.6	7.4	1.9	0.5	9.6
FRESNO	61.1	2.2	11.4	1.1	0.9	23.3
GLENN	58.3	2.0	4.2	2.3	2.6	30.6
HUMBOLDT	62.5	2.6	15.1	4.2	1.7	13.8
IMPERIAL	41.8	0.4	9.1	3.6	1.5	43.6
INYO <sup>4</sup>	73.7	1.3	15.1	1.3	1.9	6.7
KERN	81.3	2.1	8.5	1.8	1.4	4.8
KINGS	78.5	2.0	11.9	0.6	1.2	5.7
LAKE	70.3	1.4	4.4	0.8	0.8	22.4
LASSEN	76.8	0.0	1.1	10.3	3.4	8.4
LOS ANGELES	73.1	1.2	6.6	2.4	3.7	13.1
MADERA	57.4	5.1	6.5	2.4	0.4	28.1
MARIN	89.4	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	7.3
MARIPOSA <sup>3</sup>	64.6	0.6	3.8	3.2	1.9	25.9
MENDOCINO	70.6	2.8	19.1	2.5	1.2	3.7
MERCED	64.5	2.0	9.9	1.3	1.1	21.2
MODOC	70.4	0.0	6.1	2.0	4.1	17.3
MONO <sup>4</sup>	94.8	1.3	15.0	2.0	1.3	0.0*
MONTEREY	82.3	1.6	9.0	1.5	1.0	4.6
NAPA	81.7	2.2	7.1	1.9	1.5	5.6
NEVADA	81.8	3.7	15.1	1.8	1.6	0.0*
ORANGE	91.6	1.9	5.0	0.9	1.0	0.0*
PLACER	90.7	3.1	5.6	1.8	1.1	0.0*
PLUMAS	87.4	2.6	13.4	2.6	0.0	0.0*
RIVERSIDE	81.8	2.6	2.2	2.1	1.2	10.2
SACRAMENTO	69.3	2.9	8.4	0.4	0.9	18.0
SAN BENITO	90.1	5.2	9.9	0.9	0.3	0.0*
SAN BERNARDINO	71.7	3.3	5.4	1.6	2.6	15.3
SAN DIEGO	80.2	1.9	10.4	1.9	1.6	4.0
SAN FRANCISCO	50.6	1.2	9.4	10.9	1.2	26.6
SAN JOAQUIN	70.1	2.6	10.3	0.7	1.3	15.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	72.9	2.0	15.6	3.4	4.8	1.4
SAN MATEO	75.3	1.3	12.3	0.5	1.6	9.1
SANTA BARBARA	85.7	2.9	14.1	2.3	0.8	0.0*
SANTA CLARA	82.5	2.1	9.3	1.5	1.1	3.6
SANTA CRUZ	81.1	1.7	13.8	1.6	1.1	0.8
SHASTA	86.0	6.2	13.0	1.3	0.8	0.0*
SIERRA	55.6	1.9	18.5	0.0	0.0	24.1
SISKIYOU	71.0	7.6	16.0	2.7	2.2	0.5
SOLANO	82.2	2.5	9.8	3.5	1.3	0.8
SONOMA	72.3	3.4	19.2	1.1	1.0	2.9
STANISLAUS	54.0	3.0	5.6	1.0	0.5	35.9
SUTTER	52.9	2.8	13.1	2.0	0.3	28.9
TEHAMA	40.2	1.9	5.3	0.7	0.9	51.0
TRINITY	42.7	2.7	10.2	4.0	2.2	38.2
TULARE	69.5	2.7	2.6	0.3	0.8	24.1
TUOLUMNE	80.6	2.1	10.6	2.3	0.5	3.9
VENTURA	85.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	11.4
YOLO	69.4	4.7	14.9	2.4	0.7	7.9
YUBA	52.2	2.5	11.0	0.6	0.7	33.0

<sup>1</sup>The percentages total to 100 by row (county).

<sup>2</sup>These include failure-to-appear (FTA) notices; the statewide average is 4.0%.

<sup>3</sup>The calculation of the conviction rates was based on total arrests including federal DUI arrests (Yosemite National Park) not reported in the DOJ MACR system.

<sup>4</sup>The calculation of the conviction rates was based on adjustments made for Mono county convictions whose arrests were made in Inyo county.

\*These counties had more total convictions than arrests, which could be due to arrests occurring in a different county from the county of conviction, or due to underreported arrests by arresting agencies, or underreported arrests by federal agencies (reporting not required by the DOJ MACR system).

TABLE 9a: 2002 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION  
(BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS

DUI CONVICTIONS			ALCOHOL-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS		
BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.01	87	0.1	.01	21	0.2
.02	84	0.1	.02	16	0.2
.03	66	0.1	.03	14	0.1
.04	113	0.1	.04	37	0.3
.05	425	0.4	.05	66	0.6
.06	547	0.5	.06	170	1.6
.07	754	0.7	.07	581	5.3
.08	2000	1.8	.08	2753	25.1
.09	3513	3.2	.09	3060	27.8
.10	6089	5.6	.10	1917	17.4
.11	7629	7.0	.11	877	8.0
.12	8434	7.7	.12	449	4.1
.13	8625	7.9	.13	290	2.6
.14	8415	7.7	.14	195	1.8
.15	8154	7.5	.15	130	1.2
.16	7670	7.0	.16	99	0.9
.17	7185	6.6	.17	73	0.7
.18	6640	6.1	.18	62	0.6
.19	5850	5.4	.19	54	0.5
.20	5315	4.9	.20	32	0.3
.21	4356	4.0	.21	19	0.2
.22	3575	3.3	.22	16	0.2
.23	2931	2.7	.23	15	0.1
.24	2473	2.3	.24	10	0.1
.25	1832	1.7	.25	14	0.1
.26	1456	1.3	.26	7	0.1
.27	1181	1.1	.27	6	0.1
.28	876	0.8	.28	4	0.0
.29	681	0.6	.29	1	0.0
.30	488	0.5	.31	1	0.0
.31	428	0.4	.32	2	0.0
.32	325	0.3	.35	1	0.0
.33	211	0.2			
.34	207	0.2			
.35	160	0.2			
.36	106	0.1			
.37	78	0.1			
.38	46	0.0			
.39	41	0.0			
.40	42	0.0			
.41	24	0.0			
.42	19	0.0			
.43	10	0.0			
.44	5	0.0			
.45	4	0.0			
.46	7	0.0			
.47	5	0.0			
.48	1	0.0			
.49	1	0.0			
.50+	3	0.0			
TOTAL	109167	100.0	TOTAL	10922	100.0
	MEAN BAC .162			MEAN BAC .096	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted DUI offenders, rather than the abstract of conviction for those offenders, which was the data source in the earliest reports. This change in data source was made because of the more complete BAC reporting on APS forms (79.8% of total) versus court abstracts (with only 55.4% showing BAC levels). This chart does not show 1195 zero BAC levels, which may include driving-under-the-influence of drug convictions..

TABLE 9b: 2002 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC)  
LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21

BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.01	22	0.2	.20	236	2.6
.02	22	0.2	.21	184	2.0
.03	22	0.2	.22	132	1.5
.04	50	0.6	.23	90	1.0
.05	316	3.5	.24	81	0.9
.06	383	4.2	.25	53	0.6
.07	438	4.8	.26	28	0.3
.08	373	4.1	.27	16	0.2
.09	484	5.4	.28	12	0.1
.10	663	7.3	.29	10	0.1
.11	763	8.4	.30	7	0.1
.12	814	9.0	.31	5	0.1
.13	740	8.2	.32	4	0.0
.14	725	8.0	.34	2	0.0
.15	596	6.6	.36	1	0.0
.16	536	5.9	.50+	1	0.0
.17	491	5.4			
.18	394	4.4	TOTAL	9042	100.0
.19	348	3.9		MEAN BAC .131	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for arrested DUI offenders. The proportion of BAC levels found for 2002 convicted under age 21 cases is 81.4%.

TABLE 10: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND  
AVERAGE REPORTED BAC LEVEL

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	PERCENT	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%)	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM CONVICTION ABSTRACT (%)
STATEWIDE	100.0	.162	.161
1ST DUI	75.9	.158	.159
2ND DUI	19.1	.172	.169
3RD DUI	4.0	.182	.178
4TH+ DUI	1.0	.189	.183

### SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were taken from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2002. Although counts of postconviction court license actions are included, total counts of all license actions, including DMV administrative per se (APS) license suspensions and revocations, are shown in the Administrative Actions Section. APS actions (effective July 1990) are initiated by law enforcement immediately upon arrest for DUI, and are administered independently of the criminal adjudication process. In previous reports, sanction combinations for first and second offenders were reported by county; however, they are no longer presented because various sanction combinations have been eliminated by recent legislation. This section includes the following tables:

Table 11: 2002 DUI Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions. The specific court sanctions tallied include percentages of probation, jail, alcohol treatment programs (first offender, SB 38 second offender, and 30-month third offender programs), license restriction, court suspension, and ignition interlock. Crosstabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 12: 2002 Court Sanctions by County and Offender Status. This table displays the distribution of court sanctions by county for all DUI offenders.

From the data in these and the Appendix tables, it is evident that the use of alternative sanctions continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status in 2002. For example:

#### Statewide Parameters:

- ▶ The most frequently applied court sanction among all convicted DUI offenders was probation (96.0%), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock (3.3%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 73.2% of the cases. (However, in many jurisdictions, jail is often served as community service rather than actual jail time.)

Figure 6 (below) graphically displays the statewide data from Table 11 showing the percentage representation of specific types of court-ordered sanctions among all convicted DUI offenders. Because virtually all offenders receive more than one type of sanction, the cumulative percentage adds to much more than 100%.




Figure 6. Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2002).

#### County Variation:

- ▶ The proportion of 2002 first-DUI offenders receiving a court postconviction suspension varied by county from 39.4% in Monterey County to 0% in Del Norte County.
- ▶ Use of first DUI offender alcohol programs plus license restriction varies by county from over 90% in 7 counties to 38.3% in Tehama County.

#### Court Variation:

- ▶ Statewide, there can be extreme variation by court in the use of available sanctions for DUI offenders. In Los Angeles County alone, one court (Lancaster) assigned jail to 95.9% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 652$ ), while another court (Inglewood) in the same county assigned jail to only 26.7% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 490$ ).
- ▶ In 2002, Los Angeles and San Joaquin were the only counties with active 30-month third offender treatment programs. Even within these counties, however, assignment of third offenders to this program modality was low and varied significantly by court.
- ▶ Statewide, courts required only 3.3% of all convicted DUI offenders to install the ignition interlock device in 2002. This is down from 6.3% in 1997 and 1998, primarily because new legislation shifted the mandatory interlock requirement from all repeat DUI offenders to all suspended or revoked DUI offenders caught driving while disqualified, and data on the new “mandatory” interlock assignments are not captured by the DUI-MIS report.

Variation by Offender Status:

- ▶ Less than two-thirds of 2002 first-DUI offenders were sentenced to jail, compared to over 90% of all repeat offenders.
- ▶ 88% of first DUI-offenders were assigned to alcohol treatment programs, along with 84% of second offenders, 59% of third offenders, and 35% of fourth or more DUI offenders. (By statute, however, all offenders must eventually complete specified alcohol treatment programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement.)
- ▶ 5.7% of first-DUI offenders and 11.0% of repeat-DUI offenders received court license suspensions in 2002. Since July 1990, all DUI offenders with BAC levels of 0.08% or more are also subject to a 30-day to 1-year administrative license suspension/revocation under the APS law.
- ▶ 10.9% of repeat-DUI offenders were assigned ignition interlock in 2002, compared to 8.1% in 2001, 7.5% in 2000, 13.3% in 1999 and 22.3% in 1998. In spite of the old mandatory interlock law for all repeat offenders (AB 2851 - Freidman), which took effect on July 1, 1993, judges routinely did not assign interlock to these offenders (over 75% of “mandatory” assignments were not made). This law was repealed in 1998, and a new ignition interlock law (AB 762 - Torlakson) and program was enacted and implemented July 1, 1999, which established mandatory interlock for DUI suspension/revocation violators, while providing incentives for repeat offenders to reinstate early with interlock. Judicial assignments to the new mandatory provisions have steadily risen since the law was implemented, and proportionally more DUI suspension violators are now assigned to interlock than were repeat offenders under the old “mandatory” law.

TABLE 11: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS\*

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROGRAM	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE	136794	96.0	73.2	66.4	18.0	0.2	75.5	7.0	3.3
1ST DUI	103639	96.7	66.5	84.5	2.2	0.0	80.9	5.7	0.9
2ND DUI	25976	96.1	94.2	11.2	72.9	0.2	69.9	9.4	9.9
3RD DUI	5665	61.2	93.7	4.2	52.4	2.5	21.0	16.9	16.2
4TH+ DUI	1514	65.2	92.4	2.2	31.0	2.0	7.9	17.0	8.7

\*Entries represent percentages of 2002 DUI convictees receiving each sanction by offender status. Sanctions within each offender status group (row) are not independent; therefore, row percentages always add to more than 100%. Percentages of sanctions by county and court appear in Appendix Table B4.



TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE		136794	96.0	73.2	66.4	18.0	0.2	75.5	7.0	3.3
ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3026	98.6	96.4	80.4	2.4	0.0	83.5	5.9	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	784	98.9	98.0	14.7	74.2	0.0	80.2	6.8	31.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	157	99.4	98.1	7.6	72.6	0.6	33.1	34.4	38.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	50	92.0	100.0	2.0	58.0	0.0	32.0	22.0	32.0
	TOTAL	4017	98.6	96.8	63.8	19.9	0.0	80.2	7.4	9.1
ALPINE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	40	97.5	52.5	85.0	10.0	0.0	72.5	2.5	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	100.0	84.6	15.4	61.5	15.4	76.9	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	54	98.1	61.1	68.5	22.2	3.7	74.1	1.9	0.0
AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	148	95.9	92.6	85.8	2.0	0.0	86.5	6.8	15.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	56	91.1	100.0	8.9	71.4	0.0	69.6	16.1	41.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	77.8	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	22.2	11.1	44.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
	TOTAL	218	92.2	95.0	60.6	22.9	0.0	77.5	9.2	23.4
BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	759	93.9	93.5	78.0	2.5	0.0	80.0	10.5	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	233	96.1	97.9	13.7	76.0	0.0	67.4	9.9	5.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	66	92.4	100.0	1.5	78.8	0.0	24.2	37.9	4.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	26	65.4	100.0	3.8	61.5	0.0	11.5	30.8	19.2
	TOTAL	1084	93.6	95.0	57.7	24.4	0.0	72.2	12.5	2.9
CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	147	96.6	93.9	66.0	4.1	0.0	83.0	6.1	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	97.7	100.0	9.1	77.3	0.0	38.6	0.0	15.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	100.0	80.0	6.7	66.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	13.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	207	96.6	94.2	49.3	24.2	0.0	67.6	4.3	4.3
COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	100	94.0	95.0	79.0	1.0	0.0	76.0	13.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	87.5	97.5	7.5	72.5	0.0	65.0	15.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	71.4	100.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	7.1	50.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	156	90.4	96.2	52.6	22.4	0.0	66.0	16.7	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2378	95.7	93.4	83.8	2.6	0.0	86.5	6.6	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	645	97.4	98.1	11.8	75.7	0.0	71.9	14.7	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	147	95.9	98.0	3.4	51.0	0.0	19.0	21.1	0.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	41	85.4	97.6	0.0	51.2	0.0	7.3	19.5	9.8
	TOTAL	3211	95.9	94.6	64.6	20.1	0.0	79.5	9.1	0.2
DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	141	87.9	84.4	74.5	3.5	0.0	74.5	0.0	2.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	87.5	92.5	22.5	65.0	0.0	82.5	0.0	52.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
	TOTAL	191	86.9	86.9	59.7	19.4	0.0	73.3	0.5	15.7

\*Entries represent percentages of 2002 convictees receiving each sanction by county and offender status.

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	719	97.9	97.8	91.9	1.7	0.0	89.8	1.3	1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	242	96.3	94.6	10.7	74.8	0.0	81.0	2.9	15.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	56	98.2	96.4	3.6	71.4	0.0	30.4	0.0	32.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	19	47.4	100.0	5.3	26.3	0.0	15.8	0.0	21.1
	TOTAL	1036	96.6	97.0	66.6	23.0	0.0	83.2	1.5	6.9
FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2534	94.8	93.7	84.1	2.5	0.0	79.8	2.9	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	813	94.7	96.1	12.8	73.3	0.0	80.2	1.0	8.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	187	84.5	93.6	4.3	42.2	0.0	18.2	3.7	11.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	59	61.0	98.3	1.7	11.9	0.0	5.1	0.0	3.4
	TOTAL	3593	93.7	94.3	62.5	20.8	0.0	75.5	2.5	2.8
GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	117	92.3	45.3	83.8	0.0	0.0	60.7	6.8	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	59	93.2	98.3	6.8	67.8	0.0	45.8	15.3	3.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	185	93.0	64.9	55.1	24.3	0.0	54.6	9.2	1.1
HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	579	96.5	17.3	92.1	2.6	0.0	91.7	2.6	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	161	98.1	85.1	15.5	80.7	0.0	83.2	10.6	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	91.7	94.4	2.8	88.9	0.0	41.7	47.2	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	12	66.7	91.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	8.3	50.0	0.0
	TOTAL	788	96.2	35.8	70.9	23.0	0.0	86.4	7.0	0.0
IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	391	98.2	30.4	80.8	0.5	0.3	85.9	0.5	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	80	98.8	71.3	38.8	48.8	0.0	86.3	3.8	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	82.4	23.5	52.9	0.0	70.6	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	489	98.2	39.1	71.8	10.4	0.2	85.5	1.0	0.0
INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	155	95.5	17.4	85.2	3.2	0.0	89.7	0.6	2.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	64	92.2	87.5	3.1	81.3	0.0	89.1	0.0	12.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	92.3	92.3	0.0	76.9	0.0	23.1	0.0	53.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	234	94.0	41.5	57.3	28.6	0.0	85.0	0.4	8.1
KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2767	97.1	94.1	76.7	1.0	0.2	71.3	3.6	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	755	97.1	98.1	10.1	33.1	0.3	39.6	12.2	10.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	183	89.1	96.7	6.6	10.4	0.0	13.7	25.1	13.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	50	54.0	98.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	4.0
	TOTAL	3755	96.2	95.1	58.9	8.0	0.2	61.2	6.5	3.5
KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	555	85.9	85.0	74.1	1.4	0.0	68.5	17.7	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	141	84.4	85.8	31.2	42.6	0.0	67.4	15.6	6.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	58.3	83.3	13.9	11.1	0.0	16.7	16.7	8.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	18	27.8	100.0	16.7	5.6	0.0	5.6	16.7	0.0
	TOTAL	750	82.9	85.5	61.7	9.7	0.0	64.3	17.2	2.0

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	334	95.2	26.0	77.8	2.1	0.0	88.3	0.3	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	100	95.0	85.0	13.0	72.0	0.0	70.0	1.0	4.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	91.7	79.2	12.5	37.5	0.0	33.3	4.2	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	461	94.4	42.1	59.9	19.1	0.0	80.9	0.7	1.1
LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	162	92.0	96.9	88.3	2.5	0.0	75.3	14.2	1.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	82.4	100.0	14.7	64.7	0.0	17.6	61.8	17.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	202	89.6	97.5	73.8	14.4	0.0	63.4	22.8	4.5
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22237	97.5	37.5	90.4	2.1	0.0	86.1	1.4	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4938	96.8	88.4	10.5	80.1	0.8	82.7	2.8	1.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	910	91.9	85.1	3.2	47.3	10.2	20.7	6.2	4.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	203	41.4	94.1	1.5	14.3	3.0	5.4	4.4	0.5
	TOTAL	28288	96.8	48.3	73.0	17.3	0.5	82.8	1.8	0.6
MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	363	95.3	93.9	80.2	4.1	0.3	38.0	13.8	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	89	96.6	96.6	28.1	60.7	0.0	55.1	12.4	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	96.7	100.0	13.3	40.0	0.0	26.7	16.7	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	7	85.7	71.4	0.0	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0
	TOTAL	489	95.5	94.5	65.4	17.0	0.4	40.1	13.7	0.0
MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1064	96.4	8.8	83.3	2.3	0.0	89.4	9.3	1.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	230	98.7	90.9	5.2	86.5	0.0	87.4	11.7	10.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	89.3	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	10.7	78.6	28.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	8	100.0	87.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	75.0	50.0
	TOTAL	1330	96.7	25.4	67.6	17.7	0.0	86.9	11.6	3.8
MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	59	98.3	89.8	66.1	0.0	1.7	54.2	8.5	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	85.7	91.4	8.6	37.1	5.7	37.1	5.7	11.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	TOTAL	103	94.2	90.3	40.8	18.4	3.9	44.7	7.8	4.9
MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	397	87.2	96.0	76.3	3.3	0.0	74.8	3.5	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	122	95.1	96.7	9.8	78.7	0.0	82.0	2.5	5.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	26	92.3	96.2	7.7	69.2	0.0	30.8	7.7	11.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
	TOTAL	549	88.9	96.2	57.7	23.3	0.0	73.8	3.6	2.4
MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	835	96.9	95.7	84.7	3.6	0.0	89.6	1.3	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	246	98.0	100.0	15.9	70.7	0.0	85.4	2.4	0.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	53	92.5	96.2	15.1	50.9	0.0	47.2	20.8	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	15	66.7	86.7	6.7	13.3	0.0	6.7	20.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1149	96.5	96.5	65.7	20.3	0.0	85.6	2.7	0.1

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	46	93.5	56.5	78.3	6.5	0.0	71.7	15.2	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	81.0	100.0	23.8	42.9	0.0	47.6	4.8	4.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	TOTAL	69	89.9	69.6	60.9	17.4	1.4	63.8	13.0	1.4
MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	125	88.8	60.0	85.6	1.6	0.0	80.8	1.6	1.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	100.0	100.0	12.5	81.3	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	147	88.4	65.3	74.1	12.2	0.0	78.9	1.4	3.4
MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2138	98.3	98.3	58.7	2.1	0.0	43.4	39.4	7.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	559	98.0	99.6	8.4	50.1	0.0	21.5	47.4	63.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	94	95.7	98.9	0.0	39.4	0.0	6.4	56.4	66.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	28	82.1	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	67.9	25.0
	TOTAL	2819	98.0	98.6	46.2	13.0	0.0	37.4	41.8	20.6
NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	684	98.0	93.7	86.7	1.3	0.0	90.5	1.9	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	160	96.3	100.0	12.5	80.0	0.0	94.4	0.0	10.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	95.1	100.0	2.4	80.5	0.0	82.9	0.0	31.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	57.1	0.0	14.3
	TOTAL	892	97.2	95.2	68.8	19.5	0.0	90.6	1.5	3.9
NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	362	98.6	92.8	87.3	2.8	0.0	88.1	2.2	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	91	98.9	98.9	16.5	73.6	0.0	83.5	0.0	7.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	31	100.0	100.0	9.7	64.5	0.0	41.9	6.5	3.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	487	98.4	94.5	68.6	20.1	0.0	83.8	2.1	1.8
ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8857	98.2	28.0	93.7	1.2	0.0	86.5	5.0	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2094	97.7	91.6	8.5	83.8	0.0	69.3	19.5	14.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	364	94.2	95.9	2.2	80.2	0.8	10.4	8.8	35.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	74	63.5	86.5	0.0	41.9	0.0	2.7	10.8	10.8
	TOTAL	11389	97.8	42.2	74.5	19.2	0.0	80.4	7.8	4.3
PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1149	97.7	95.6	63.2	2.3	0.1	84.2	3.0	7.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	326	96.0	97.2	12.0	70.9	0.6	83.4	0.6	53.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	68	91.2	92.6	8.8	51.5	5.9	14.7	5.9	51.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	6	16.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7
	TOTAL	1549	96.7	95.8	49.8	19.0	0.5	80.7	2.6	19.5
PLUMAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	146	96.6	97.9	84.2	9.6	0.0	91.8	2.7	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	89.4	100.0	12.8	74.5	0.0	85.1	2.1	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	84.6	92.3	23.1	53.8	0.0	69.2	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	208	93.8	98.1	63.5	27.4	0.0	88.5	2.4	0.0

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5541	97.5	80.9	87.7	1.7	0.0	84.0	4.5	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1264	95.3	96.2	12.7	77.4	0.0	64.4	7.3	4.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	385	91.7	91.4	3.6	70.4	0.0	26.5	15.8	13.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	150	72.0	94.0	2.7	54.7	0.0	14.0	18.7	9.3
	TOTAL	7340	96.3	84.4	68.6	19.4	0.0	76.2	5.8	1.9
SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3976	97.3	96.1	73.2	1.9	0.0	65.5	12.3	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1149	98.2	98.7	7.3	50.9	0.0	49.5	23.0	1.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	283	93.6	97.9	3.2	29.0	0.0	14.1	8.5	3.9
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	93	81.7	96.8	1.1	41.9	0.0	3.2	31.2	0.0
	TOTAL	5501	97.0	96.7	54.6	14.2	0.0	58.5	14.7	0.7
SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	240	94.2	90.0	64.6	1.7	0.0	61.7	25.4	2.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	67	98.5	97.0	11.9	50.7	0.0	61.2	26.9	23.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	100.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	43.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7
	TOTAL	329	95.4	92.1	49.5	12.8	0.0	58.7	24.9	8.8
SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5745	96.6	52.4	90.5	2.5	0.0	87.8	1.7	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1475	97.1	91.3	14.9	77.8	0.1	80.5	6.5	0.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	312	91.3	88.5	4.8	45.8	0.0	28.5	16.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	103	65.0	72.8	5.8	30.1	0.0	7.8	9.7	0.0
	TOTAL	7635	96.0	61.7	71.2	19.2	0.0	82.9	3.3	0.0
SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10225	95.8	47.1	85.7	3.5	0.0	82.8	4.6	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2286	95.9	90.2	13.3	71.9	0.0	68.2	6.3	1.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	474	88.8	96.0	4.6	57.8	0.0	23.2	17.5	5.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	95	71.6	92.6	9.5	23.2	0.0	10.5	5.3	0.0
	TOTAL	13080	95.4	56.7	69.5	17.5	0.0	77.6	5.4	0.5
SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	709	97.7	98.0	94.4	2.1	0.0	95.2	0.7	2.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	144	100.0	99.3	26.4	69.4	0.0	91.0	1.4	57.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	0.0	89.5	0.0	73.7	0.0	94.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0
	TOTAL	878	97.9	98.3	80.5	15.6	0.0	93.6	0.9	13.7
SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2093	98.7	96.3	88.9	1.5	0.4	77.4	7.5	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	636	98.7	97.6	8.6	81.9	1.4	80.3	8.6	16.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	181	96.1	76.8	1.1	44.8	21.0	21.5	54.1	17.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	59	72.9	67.8	1.7	18.6	32.2	0.0	40.7	11.9
	TOTAL	2969	98.0	94.8	64.6	21.7	2.5	73.1	11.3	5.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1299	92.8	94.7	86.1	1.2	0.0	79.4	1.6	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	341	95.9	99.4	5.0	83.6	0.0	76.0	0.6	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	94.5	98.9	4.4	72.5	0.0	8.8	1.1	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	22	72.7	81.8	0.0	31.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1753	93.3	95.7	65.0	21.3	0.0	74.1	1.4	0.0

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2211	96.0	96.6	88.2	1.6	0.0	77.9	0.7	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	498	95.6	99.0	9.4	82.3	0.0	30.3	3.4	31.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	90.1	100.0	1.1	81.3	0.0	3.3	3.3	26.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	14	50.0	92.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.1
	TOTAL	2814	95.5	97.1	71.0	18.6	0.0	66.7	1.3	7.0
SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1674	95.6	65.3	61.6	0.9	0.0	75.3	19.1	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	442	95.5	96.4	6.6	67.2	0.0	36.4	38.5	3.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	104	85.6	98.1	1.0	66.3	0.0	9.6	64.4	18.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	26	69.2	92.3	0.0	26.9	3.8	7.7	61.5	7.7
	TOTAL	2246	94.8	73.2	47.2	17.3	0.0	63.8	25.5	1.8
SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4361	94.5	94.2	76.1	2.5	0.0	78.0	7.7	2.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1158	84.5	98.4	7.9	67.2	0.1	66.4	7.8	15.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	209	81.8	98.1	1.9	46.4	0.5	12.0	6.7	45.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	43	65.1	100.0	0.0	34.9	0.0	0.0	9.3	18.6
	TOTAL	5771	91.8	95.2	59.1	17.3	0.1	72.7	7.7	6.5
SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1100	98.1	95.4	79.1	1.1	0.1	80.0	16.5	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	317	97.8	99.1	4.1	66.6	0.3	71.3	25.6	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	101	94.1	98.0	0.0	11.9	0.0	8.9	83.2	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	21	85.7	95.2	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	81.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1539	97.6	96.3	57.4	15.3	0.1	72.4	23.6	0.0
SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	777	94.6	94.9	89.3	1.5	0.0	83.5	6.3	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	254	95.7	98.4	18.9	73.2	0.0	83.5	2.8	15.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	89	83.1	98.9	6.7	22.5	0.0	22.5	11.2	41.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	27	51.9	96.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	18.5	14.8	40.7
	TOTAL	1147	92.9	96.0	65.2	19.5	0.0	77.2	6.1	8.1
SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	25	96.0	96.0	88.0	4.0	0.0	88.0	4.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	31	93.5	96.8	74.2	12.9	0.0	83.9	3.2	0.0
SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	211	94.3	93.8	76.8	4.3	0.0	68.2	3.3	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	56	94.6	96.4	10.7	73.2	0.0	53.6	3.6	7.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	100.0	11.8	58.8	0.0	23.5	5.9	29.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	290	92.4	94.8	58.6	20.7	0.0	61.4	3.4	3.1
SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1031	95.0	94.9	89.5	1.8	0.0	82.2	2.3	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	282	96.1	97.9	12.1	81.2	0.0	71.6	3.2	5.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	73	90.4	98.6	5.5	80.8	0.0	31.5	16.4	28.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	10	70.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	10.0
	TOTAL	1396	94.8	95.7	68.8	22.3	0.0	76.9	3.4	2.8

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1594	95.5	92.1	71.8	1.6	0.0	71.2	1.4	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	449	97.1	98.7	6.9	63.0	0.0	65.9	0.0	5.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	128	90.6	99.2	1.6	23.4	0.0	10.9	0.0	11.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	32	75.0	100.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	2203	95.3	94.0	53.5	15.4	0.0	65.6	1.0	2.3
STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	995	98.6	91.0	88.3	4.7	0.3	75.9	6.4	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	232	97.8	95.3	7.8	83.6	0.0	50.4	8.2	12.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	52	94.2	98.1	7.7	69.2	0.0	9.6	7.7	44.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	23	65.2	95.7	0.0	47.8	4.3	13.0	4.3	34.8
	TOTAL	1302	97.7	92.1	69.2	22.1	0.3	67.6	6.8	5.6
SUTTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	290	94.1	95.5	86.2	2.1	0.0	83.1	3.4	4.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	89	94.4	100.0	10.1	80.9	0.0	71.9	1.1	33.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	100.0	94.4	0.0	66.7	0.0	5.6	22.2	55.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	TOTAL	399	94.2	96.5	64.9	22.8	0.0	76.7	4.0	13.3
TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	342	91.8	96.5	38.3	2.0	0.0	66.4	9.4	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	113	84.1	99.1	3.5	68.1	0.0	65.5	13.3	3.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	46.3	97.6	2.4	41.5	0.0	19.5	4.9	9.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	9	0.0	77.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6
	TOTAL	505	84.8	96.8	26.9	20.0	0.0	61.2	9.9	3.8
TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	61	95.1	95.1	85.2	0.0	0.0	77.0	14.8	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	29	96.6	100.0	3.4	79.3	0.0	86.2	3.4	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	4	75.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	TOTAL	102	94.1	96.1	52.0	30.4	0.0	72.5	12.7	0.0
TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1836	96.0	93.1	84.0	4.2	0.0	62.1	0.7	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	474	94.7	97.0	16.2	69.6	0.0	53.0	0.8	8.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	122	95.1	100.0	12.3	67.2	0.0	23.0	4.1	15.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	51	80.4	98.0	0.0	37.3	0.0	7.8	7.8	9.8
	TOTAL	2483	95.4	94.3	65.8	20.5	0.0	57.3	1.0	3.5
TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	234	95.7	97.9	92.7	0.4	0.0	88.5	6.0	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	97	99.0	100.0	17.5	76.3	0.0	88.7	2.1	13.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	100.0	100.0	12.5	16.7	0.0	20.8	20.8	20.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
	TOTAL	359	96.7	98.6	66.0	22.3	0.0	83.0	6.1	6.1
VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2700	96.7	97.2	77.5	1.5	0.0	76.1	20.7	5.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	600	98.3	98.7	9.2	73.2	0.0	79.7	17.3	33.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	114	94.7	100.0	0.9	68.4	0.0	36.8	32.5	41.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	30	76.7	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	23.3	36.7	20.0
	TOTAL	3444	96.7	97.6	62.4	16.8	0.0	74.9	20.6	11.4

TABLE 12: 2002 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	571	96.7	92.8	84.9	1.2	0.0	80.6	5.6	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	162	94.4	96.9	26.5	58.0	0.6	79.6	3.7	9.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	92.9	100.0	16.7	50.0	0.0	28.6	16.7	16.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	16	68.8	87.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
	TOTAL	791	95.4	93.9	67.6	15.8	0.1	76.0	5.9	3.2
YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	284	95.8	95.8	86.6	0.7	0.0	75.0	0.4	2.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	79	94.9	98.7	16.5	72.2	0.0	46.8	0.0	12.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	0.0	26.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	10.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> DUI	6	66.7	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	388	95.1	96.6	66.8	17.3	0.0	64.9	0.3	4.6



---

## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

This section presents 1-year crash and DUI recidivism rates for first and second offenders over a 13-year time period, cumulative proportions of reoffenses over nine years for a single group of DUI offenders arrested in 1994, and the results of an evaluation assessing the effectiveness of alcohol education programs applied to 1) DUI offenders convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving (with a 1-year follow-up period), and 2) first DUI offenders referred to 3-month or 6-month alcohol education programs (1-year follow-up period). This section also presents the proportions of convicted 2002 first and second offenders who completed their alcohol educational or treatment program requirement. The crash and recidivism rates of first and second offenders over time, and the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for the alcohol-reckless and first offenders, are evaluated in terms of postconviction driving record as measured by: 1) total crashes and 2) DUI incidents, which include alcohol-involved crashes, major convictions (primarily DUI, but also all reckless driving [alcohol or non-alcohol] and hit-and-run), Administrative Per Se suspensions (APS for 0.08% BAC or chemical test refusal), and DUI failure-to-appear notices (FTA). For the 1994 DUI offenders, recidivism is measured by subsequent DUI convictions only, along with one comparison of DUI incidents.

Previous DUI-MIS reports included evaluations of sanction effectiveness for second offenders but these analyses were not conducted last year and will no longer be conducted because AB 762 (Torlakson, 7/1/99) not only altered the ignition interlock requirements for second offenders, but also added the application of ignition interlock to offenders who were convicted of driving with a suspended or revoked license. These changes to the DUI laws would complicate evaluations of the effectiveness of second offender sanctions, and make the results non-comparable to those of previous DUI-MIS studies. In addition, the law required a new evaluation on the effectiveness of ignition interlock devices which was recently completed at the California DMV and provides a rigorous approach to assessing the impact of ignition interlock devices.

Displayed below, in Figures 7 and 8, are unadjusted proportions of DUI recidivist incidents and crashes over time from 1990 through 2002; these proportions were derived from the sanction analyses of first and second offenders from previous DUI-MIS annual reports and are based on follow-up time periods of one year. Each year includes a unique set of first and second offenders who were arrested in the designated year. Unadjusted proportions are shown in this report because reoffense proportions for each offender group as a whole are examined rather than comparing the rates between sanction groups within each offender group. Statistical adjustments are only made when attempting to remove bias among the comparison groups.




Figure 7. Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2002).




Figure 8. Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2002).

Figures 9a and 9b, which display covariate-adjusted data as described below, show the proportion of alcohol-reckless offenders involved in crashes or DUI-incidents for the period 7/02 - 6/03 (1-year follow-up period), and 2002 first offenders who were referred to 3-month or 6-month alcohol education programs for the same 1-year subsequent period. The evaluation for the offenders with alcohol-related reckless convictions was mandated by SB 1176 (Johnson); for these offenders, this legislation requires the courts to order enrollment in an alcohol/drug education program as a condition of probation. An evaluation of the efficacy of the 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education/counseling program for first offenders was mandated by AB 1916 (Torlakson). The courts are required to refer first offenders whose BAC level is less than .20% to a 3-month program, and those with a BAC level of .20% or above, or who refuse to take a chemical test, to a 6-month program.

Figures 10a through 10e show unadjusted recidivism curves of the cumulative proportions of DUI conviction and DUI-incident reoffenses for all DUI offenders arrested in 1994.


The figures are followed by a narrative description of the evaluation design, subject selection, data collection, analytical procedures, and evaluation results.

Based on the data represented in Figures 7 and 8, the following conclusions can be drawn about first- and second-offenders from 1990 to 2002:

- ▶ The 1-year recidivism rates for all first offenders in 2002 continued to remain at the lower level of the past four years. Comparing these rates to the much higher rate of 1990, DUI reoffenses in 2002 were 36.8% lower than for 1990 for all first offenders.
- ▶ The 1-year reoffense rates for second offenders gained slightly from last year but overall the rates have leveled out in the past seven years; recidivism decreased from 1990 to 2002 by 37.1% for all second offenders.
- ▶ Overall, subsequent 1-year crash rates have declined from 1990 to 2002 by 17.5% for second offenders; although their rate was the lowest in 1996, crashes have gradually increased in recent years for all second offenders. The crash rate for first offenders has been steadily increasing since 1993 and the 2002 rate is now only 3.8% lower than the 1990 crash rate.

Based on the data portrayed in Figure 9a, the following conclusions can be made about the impact of alcohol education programs upon offenders convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving (those arrested for DUI but convicted of the reduced charge of reckless driving).


- ▶ In contrast to last year's evaluation, this year's results show that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders assigned to an alcohol education program were not significantly different, only directionally lower, than those of the nonparticipants. However, the subsequent DUI incident rates of the program participants were significantly lower than those of the nonparticipants.



**Figure 9a.** Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates of 2002-2003 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.

Figure 9b displays the 1-year crash and DUI-related incident rates for those first DUI offenders referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs. The following tentative conclusions can be made about the evaluation of length of alcohol education programs for first offenders.


- ▶ Like the last two year's evaluations, the 1-year crash rates of first offenders attending the 3-month program did not vary significantly from those attending 6-month programs. However, the subsequent DUI incident rate of the short-term program participants was again significantly lower than that of the long-term participants.



**Figure 9b.** Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates of first offender drivers (arrested in year 2002) by length of alcohol education program.

Based on the data presented in Figures 10a through 10e, which address recidivism rates for 1994 offenders over nine years, the following conclusions can be drawn about long-term recidivism rates:

- ▶ At the end of nine years, 25% of DUI offenders originally convicted in 1994 had at least one subsequent DUI conviction, and 28% incurred at least one DUI incident.
- ▶ Over nine years, recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third offenders reoffending was 35%, while 28% of second offenders and 23% of first offenders recidivated.
- ▶ Males showed a much higher cumulative proportion (26%) of reoffenses than did females (18%) over the 9-year time period.
- ▶ Long-term recidivism rates are inversely related to age, with higher reoffense rates associated with the youngest age group, and lowest rates with the oldest group.
- ▶ After five years, the proportion reoffending among the 1994 group was much lower (18%) compared to the proportion reoffending in 1984 (27%) and in 1980 (35%).



**Figure 10a.** Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction, and first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incidents (alcohol crashes, major convictions, APS suspensions and DUI FTAs).




Figure 10b. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions.




Figure 10c. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.




Figure 10d. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date).




Figure 10e. Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, and 1994 DUI drivers.

## EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS

### Subject Selection and Data Collection

Convicted DUI and alcohol-related reckless offenders were identified from monthly abstract update tapes which contain all DUI conviction data reported to DMV by the courts. In the present study, 1-year follow-up data for first and second DUI offenders were compiled from thirteen previous and current DUI-MIS evaluations. In addition, for the first time, 9-year follow-up data are presented for the convicted DUI offenders who were arrested in 1994. Follow-up data for the groups listed below were evaluated for sanction effectiveness:

- ▶ 1-year follow-up period for convicted alcohol-related reckless offenders who were arrested from July, 2002 through June, 2003.
- ▶ 1-year follow-up period for convicted first offenders who were arrested for DUI in 2002, and who were referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs.

For each year's annual DUI-MIS report, an additional year of DUI data is added to the follow-up crash and DUI reoffense data for first and second offenders and for the 1994 DUI offenders.

The conviction date for the cases involved in the prior/post analyses was considered to be the "treatment date" for defining prior and subsequent driving record data, because the penalties and sanctions for the offense are typically effective as of that date.

Except for the 1994 cases, subjects were selected based on the number of prior DUI and alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within the seven years prior to their entry DUI arrest in 2002. For this year's report, subjects selected were: 1) first-DUI offenders—drivers who had no DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within the previous seven years, 2) second-DUI offenders—drivers who had one DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction within the previous seven years, 3) alcohol-related reckless offenders with no previous DUI offenses in the past seven years, and 4) first-DUI offenders referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs. In addition, all DUI offenders arrested in 1994 were selected for the 9-year follow-up evaluation.

Although the sanction analyses were not conducted for first- and second-DUI offenders, the 1-year unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all of the previous and current evaluations were included. These previous and current analyses excluded offenders with felony convictions and chemical test refusal suspensions because their license control penalties were more severe than the misdemeanor offender groups. Also excluded were drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent time period because of late conviction dates, drivers with "X" license numbers (meaning that no California license number could be found), and drivers with out-of-state ZIP Codes. Altogether, the excluded cases represented 18.4% of the original convicted-offender file. The only exclusions made for the 1994 offenders were the out-of-state cases and drivers with "X" license numbers.

In the evaluation of the length of time of first offender programs, only first offenders who showed the 3-month and 6-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for this analysis. Unfortunately, there were many first offenders



who were referred to the alcohol education programs that did not display the specific length of time, and were not included in this evaluation (65%). Therefore, this analysis is limited to first offenders who were adjudicated by courts that were in compliance with the law. Of the total sample selected, 73% were referred to 3-month programs, while 27% were assigned to 6-month programs.

Two groups of alcohol-related reckless convictees were identified, including: 1) those who were assigned to an alcohol education program, and 2) those who were not assigned to a program. These sanctions are reported by the courts to DMV via disposition codes on the conviction abstracts. Although courts are mandated to require all alcohol-related reckless drivers to attend an alcohol education program as a condition of probation, it was found that 65% were assigned to the programs while 35% were not assigned. This discrepancy allowed us to compare subsequent crashes and DUI incidents between the two groups.

For the alcohol-related reckless drivers and first offenders attending 3-month and 6-month programs, prior driver record data were extracted for the 2 years preceding their DUI or alcohol-reckless conviction date. The prior driver record variables for these offenders are shown in Appendix Table B5, and these driver record variables were used as covariates in the analyses. The evaluation period for the postconviction driving measures starts from the conviction date, and was one year for the 2002 alcohol-related reckless drivers, the 3- and 6-month first offender program participants, and first- and second-offenders from 1990-2002, and was nine years for the 1994 offenders. A buffer period of four months was allowed between the end of the evaluation period and the data extraction date to allow for processing and reporting of the most recent data to DMV. DUI offenders who had less than the full follow-up time period (from conviction date to the buffer period) were excluded. For all of these groups, the outcome driver record measures consisted of the proportion of offenders who were involved in: 1) any crash, and 2) DUI incidents (alcohol-involved crashes, major convictions, APS/refusal suspensions, or DUI failures-to-appear). In addition, both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 9-year followup period for the 1994 group were included as outcome data in order to maintain comparability with the 1984 and 1980 cohorts from a previous evaluation (Peck, 1991).

New this year was an effort to capture the number and proportions of convicted first and second offenders (arrested in 2002) whose records indicated that they had completed the alcohol education or treatment programs. This effort was made possible by the addition of a new subrecord to each person's driving record which contains data on program enrollment and completion dates, court information relevant to the DUI conviction, and program length of time. Previous efforts were limited by the lack of organized fields of data even though part of this information was available.

#### Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures

Logistic regression analysis was used to evaluate the differences in the proportion of crash- and DUI-incident-involved drivers between: 1) alcohol reckless offenders assigned to an alcohol program and alcohol reckless drivers not assigned to a program, and 2) first offenders assigned to a 3-month alcohol program and first offenders assigned to a 6-month program. Only the first crash or DUI incident or "failure" was evaluated. This is not an important limitation with these data because the incidence of repeat failures (two or more crashes or DUI incidents) was very low over the study time window. More importantly, analysis of repeat failures would be subject to

confounding by court sanctions received in connection with the first failure incident. This type of confounding is avoided because multiple incidents were not included in this analysis.

Since it was not possible to randomly assign drivers to the various sanction groups, potential biases due to preexisting group differences were statistically controlled to the extent possible by using biographical data, prior driving record data, and ZIP Code indices (crash and traffic conviction averages for each driver's ZIP Code area as covariates; Table B5 shows significant group differences on some of these variables). While this "quasi-experimental" design is subject to a number of limitations in assessing cause-effect relationships, the attempt at statistical control of group differences removes at least part of the bias in group assignment and provides a more precise estimate of the relationship between type of sanction and subsequent record. It is likely, of course, that the groups also differ on characteristics not measured by, or reflected in, the covariates. The possibility of uncontrolled biases becomes particularly problematic if sanctions are commonly received by atypical offenders through self- or judicial-selectivity (e.g., drivers of higher socio-economic status may be more likely to receive program with restriction and less likely to receive jail than those of lower status).

There was one significant ( $p = .01$ ) interaction between the covariate license class and the alcohol program intervention in the analyses involving the alcohol-related reckless drivers. Such an interaction indicates that there is a differential effect of the program intervention upon commercial versus auto drivers on post 1-year DUI incidents. Since the proportion of auto drivers outweighs that of the commercial drivers by 97 to 3, and since the main effect of treatment program had greater magnitude than the interaction effect, conclusions about the treatment program differences were based on analyses that did not include the interactions.

No interactions were found between the covariates and the alcohol program sanction for the 3-month and 6-month program participants on either crashes or DUI reoffenses.

#### One-Year Recidivism Rates for First and Second Offenders from 1990-2002

The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident reoffense rates for both first- and second-offender sanction groups were compiled from the thirteen previous and current annual DUI-MIS evaluations and configured onto two separate graphs to display these rates over time. Figure 7 shows the proportions of first- and second-offender sanction groups, respectively, arrested between 1990 and 2002 who reoffended within one year after conviction.

Figure 7 and Table 13 show an ongoing gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first-offenders overall from 1990 to 2002; although there are slight upward trends in 1995 and 1998, these trends are followed by a leveling out of the rates over the past 4 years. The overall decline translates into a 36.8% reduction in recidivism for all first offenders compared to the rates of 1990. The decline in DUI reoffenses is steeper in the early years (1990-1994), following the enactment of APS suspensions for all DUI arrestees. As evident in Figure 7, the reoffense rates of first offenders continue to be lower than those of the second offenders; this has been consistently evident throughout all previous analyses conducted on first and second offenders.

TABLE 13: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2002

YEAR	DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED		CRASH-INVOLVED	
	FIRST-DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND-DUI OFFENDERS	FIRST-DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND-DUI OFFENDERS
1990	7.6	9.7	5.3	4.0
1991	7.1	9.5	4.7	3.6
1992	6.2	9.1	4.1	3.5
1993	5.8	8.8	4.1	3.5
1994	5.4	7.0	4.5	3.1
1995	5.8	7.0	4.6	3.0
1996	5.1	6.1	4.5	2.4
1997	5.2	6.0	4.7	2.7
1998	5.3	6.0	4.8	2.6
1999	5.0	6.1	5.0	2.8
2000	4.9	6.1	5.1	3.1
2001	4.9	5.9	5.2	3.0
2002	4.8	6.1	5.1	3.3
% DIFFERENCE 1990-2002	-36.8%	-37.1%	-3.8%	-17.5%

As noted last year, a similar overall decline is evident in the 1-year reoffense rates for the second offender group as displayed in Figure 7 and Table 13, but the rate of decline is greatest during the years from 1993 to 1996; then the rates level out for several years, followed by a slight decline in 2001 and then return to the same rate of 1996. So throughout the past 7 years, the second offender recidivism rate has basically remained the same. Table 13 shows that, from 1990 to 2002, the reoffense rates decreased 37.1% for the second offender group as a whole. Although the overall reoffense rates of second offenders are higher than those of first offenders, they came closer to the rates of first offenders in more recent years. Previous DUI-MIS reports suggested that, while many factors may be associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents for both first and second offenders, the reduction may largely be attributable to the implementation of APS suspensions in 1990. An evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS Law, in fact, documents recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders which are attributable to the law.

One-Year Crash Rates for First and Second Offenders from 1990-2002: The 1-year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders were also compiled from previous and current DUI-MIS evaluations and graphically displayed over time. Figure 8 shows the proportions of 1990-2002 first and second offenders who had crashes within one year after their conviction.

Among first offenders from 1990 through 2002, Figure 8 and Table 13 show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years and then, after 1993, there is a gradual increase in crashes. The difference between first offender crash rates between 1990 and

2002 is only -3.8%, whereas the difference for second offenders for those same years shows a much greater decline in crashes (-17.5%).

Figure 8 indicates a declining trend in the overall crash rate of second offenders up to 1996. Following the downward trend in crashes from 1990 through 1996, the crash rates gradually increase and continue on a slow upward trend, dropping slightly in 2001 and then increasing again in 2002 to a higher rate than the previous eight years. Overall, second offenders have lower crash rates than do first offenders (Table 13), and this fact has been well documented in past evaluations; it has been speculated that the lower crash rate of second offenders may be related to the longer-term (one to two years) license (restriction/suspension) actions imposed on second offenders.

#### Results of the Alcohol-Related Reckless Program Evaluation

**Total Crashes:** Figure 9a and Table 14a display the results of the fourth evaluation of the effectiveness of the alcohol education program upon drivers convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving violations. Unlike last year's findings, the results show that assignment to the alcohol education program does not have a significant effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders. However, there is a directional ( $p = .10$ ) effect, with the program participants showing a 16% lower crash rate than that of the non-participants. Comparing these rates to those of the 2002 first DUI offenders, it is evident that alcohol-related reckless drivers who are assigned and those not assigned to an alcohol program are more involved in crashes (5.56, 6.45 per 100 drivers, respectively) than are first DUI offenders (5.1). It has been suggested in the past that the lack of license suspension/restriction for the alcohol-related reckless drivers might explain the higher crash rates. Past studies have documented the effectiveness of license suspension on crash reduction.

TABLE 14a: THE EFFECT OF SANCTIONS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES)	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES)
				$\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$		$\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
7/2002-6/2003	1) No program	(2,811)	6.45		4.44	
(follow-up period = 1 year)	2) Alcohol-education program	(5,319)	5.56	16.0%	3.13	41.9%*

\* $p < .01$

**DUI Incidents:** Figure 9a and Table 14a indicate that program participants show statistically significantly fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the alcohol-education programs than the nonparticipants. The reoffense rate of the program participants is 41.9% lower than that of alcohol-reckless offenders not assigned to the programs, and is notably different from the findings of the last several years where there has been either directional or no significant differences in their reoffense rates. These results have to be viewed with some caution because random assignment to program attendance was not possible; there still remains the possibility of uncontrolled biases through self- or judicial-selectivity, even though statistical control of

group differences removed part of the biases based on available covariates.

### Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Program Evaluation

**Total Crashes:** Figure 9b and Table 14b display the results of the third evaluation of the effectiveness of the alcohol education program upon first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month versus 6-month programs. Just like the past two years, the results show that the length of time of the alcohol education program does not have a significant effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of first-time DUI offenders. The 6-month program participants have only a 2.2% lower crash rate than that of the 3-month participants. As noted earlier, the short-term APS license suspension/restriction for all first offenders might explain their lower crash rates, compared to the rates of the alcohol reckless drivers. Past studies have supported the effectiveness of license suspension on crash reduction.

TABLE 14b: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES)	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES)
				$\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$		$\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2002	1) 3-month program	(19,052)	4.98		4.29	
(follow-up period = 1 year)	2) 6-month program	(7,052)	5.09	-2.2%	6.34	-32.2%*

\*  $p = .0001$

**DUI Incidents:** In contrast to the crash findings, Figure 9b and Table 14b indicate that the 3-month program participants have significantly ( $p = .0001$ ) fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the alcohol-education programs than do the 6-month program participants. This finding is consistent with the last 2 year's evaluations of subsequent DUI incidents. The reoffense rate of the 3-month program participants is 32.3% lower than that of the 6-month participants. Again, this finding is not surprising given that those assigned to the longer term program have higher BAC levels (.20% and above), and would be more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels. Since this study only selected first offenders whose conviction abstract had information on the length of alcohol program, there are likely unknown biases that this quasi-experimental design cannot rule out. However, some statistical control of group differences removed part of the biases based on available covariates.

### Alcohol Program Completions for 2002 First and Second Offenders:

The proportions of referrals to the various DUI sanctions by the number of prior DUIs appear in Table 11. It can be seen from this table that 87% of first offenders and 84.3% of second offenders were referred to an alcohol treatment program. Table 15 shows the counts and proportions of convicted first and second offenders, arrested in 2002, who completed the requirements for attending an alcohol education or treatment program; 51,486 first offenders and 4,127 second offenders completed their alcohol

program assignment. This translates into 57.1% of referred first offenders and 18.8% of referred second offenders completing the program requirement. The underreporting of program completions for second offenders is probably related to the insufficient followup time thus far allowed for the 18-month completions. Among the offenders who completed the program, 97.3% of first offenders had attended alcohol programs that run from 3 to 6 months, while 95% of second offenders attended the 18-month alcohol program. Note that to obtain a license restriction, DUI offenders must show proof at DMV that they have enrolled in an alcohol program and also must show completion of the program to remove the restriction from their driver license.

TABLE 15: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED ALCOHOL PROGRAM COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2002

DUI OFFENDERS	TOTAL N	PROGRAM REFERRALS	PROGRAM COMPLETION	% OF REFERRALS
1 <sup>ST</sup> offenders (3 months to 6 months)	103,639	90,166 (87.0% of total)	51,486	57.1%
2nd offenders (18 months)	25,976	21,898 (84.3% of total)	4,127	18.8%

#### Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders:

Since all DUI offenders were included in the 1994 group, it was determined that long-term recidivism rates should be examined for subdivided groups within the 1994 cohort, and to see how these groups differ in their long-term recidivism rates. This approach was also taken in a previous study conducted by Peck (1991), in which the reoffense failure curves of various groups among 1980 and 1984 DUI offenders were evaluated. Failure curves are cumulative percentages over time that display the first reoffense occurring following the initial DUI conviction. These cumulative proportions are shown by yearly increments over nine years.

In looking at the 1994 offenders as a whole, it is evident from Figure 10a that at the end of nine years, 25% accumulated at least one DUI reoffense. Considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses to include all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increases to 28%. These failure curves are steepest in the earliest years following the initial conviction, and then start to flatten out in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup> years. For both measures, the steepest climb occurs in the first year following conviction. It's probable that those with more serious alcohol problems would be likely to recidivate earlier than those with lesser drinking problems. It's also possible that those less responsive to the sanctions and penalties imposed by the courts are not as deterred from recidivating over time than those who are more responsive.

One way to explore the extent of drinking severity is to examine the recidivism rates by the number of prior DUIs within seven years of the entry DUI violation. Figure 10b displays the cumulative proportions of reoffenses by first, second, and third or more DUI offenders. It is evident from this graph and from Table 16 that the recidivism failure curves increase as the number of prior offenses becomes greater. Third or more

offenders have the highest overall failure curve, and continue to maintain the higher proportions over the nine year period of time. At the end of nine years, 35% of third offenders have reoffended compared to 28% of second offenders and 23% of first offenders.

TABLE 16: CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT  
DUI REOFFENSES OF THE 1994 DUI OFFENDERS

YEAR	PERCENTAGE											
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	MALES	FEMALES	16-25	26-45	46-65	65+	1980	1984	1994
1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	6	6	5	3	5	5	4	3	11	7	5
2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	10	12	10	6	10	9	8	6	19	15	9
3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	14	17	13	9	14	13	11	8	25	20	13
4 <sup>TH</sup>	14	18	21	16	11	18	16	13	9	30	24	16
5 <sup>TH</sup>	17	21	25	19	13	20	18	15	10	35	27	18
6 <sup>TH</sup>	19	23	28	22	14	23	21	17	10	38	NA	21
7 <sup>TH</sup>	20	25	31	23	16	25	23	18	11	40	NA	22
8 <sup>TH</sup>	22	27	33	25	17	26	24	19	11	42	NA	24
9 <sup>TH</sup>	23	28	35	26	18	28	25	20	12	44	NA	25

Since the majority of DUI offenders has always been male (87% in 1994), it is relevant to inspect the recidivism rates of the 1994 offenders by gender. As evident in Figure 10c and Table 16, males show much higher cumulative proportions reoffending than females. At the end of nine years, 26% of males have reoffended as compared to 18% of females. The failure curve of females is noticeably flatter throughout the nine years as compared to the curve of males.

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed also by age. Figure 10d displays the failure curves of four age groups. It is evident that reoffense rates are inversely related to age; the failure rates are highest for the youngest group and lowest for the oldest group. Over nine years, the failure curves of the two youngest groups are quite close to each other and are much steeper than the curve of the oldest group; their failure curves are steepest during the first two years following the entry conviction. The failure curve of the 65+ group flattens out at the 5<sup>th</sup> year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality factor of the oldest group could influence the lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be imposing self-restricted driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After nine years, the youngest two groups reoffended by 28% and 25%, respectively, while 20% of the middle age group and 12% of the oldest group recidivated.

The final figure, Figure 10e, compares the 1994 recidivism curves with those of the 1980 and 1984 cohorts over a 5-year time period, while Table 16 shows the nine-year cumulative percentages for the 1980 and 1994 groups only, since data for the 1984 group were not available beyond five years. This long-term historical comparison would allow us to consider the probable influence of the major DUI laws in California over a 15-year time period. Figure 10e reveals that at the end of five years, 35% of the 1980 offenders reoffended compared to 27% of the 1984 group and 18% of the 1994 offenders. Quite dramatically, the proportion recidivating in the 1994 group (18%) dropped by half compared to those in the 1980 group (35%). Major pieces of DUI legislation were enacted in California over this time span of 15 years. The noticeably lower reoffense proportions of the 1984 group (27%) compared to the 1980 group (35%) can likely be attributed to the 1982 laws, AB 541 (Moorhead), which applied tougher sanctions on DUI offenders, and AB 7 (Hart) which established the 0.10% per se BAC illegal limit. The effectiveness of these laws was confirmed by a previous California study by Tashima and Peck (1986). Lastly, comparing the 1980 cohort with the 1994 group over nine years in Table 16 shows that 44% of the 1980 group recidivated while 25% of the 1994 group reoffended. The difference between the recidivism rates of these two groups remains quite dramatic at the end of nine years.

Continuing with Figure 10e, it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions between the 1984 group (27%) and the 1994 group (18%) is somewhat dramatic; this reduction in reoffenses is possibly attributable to the enactment of the 1990 laws, SB 1623 (Lockyer), which established APS suspensions for all offenders at the time of arrest, and SB 1150 (Lockyer) which set the illegal BAC limit to 0.08% and imposed other stringent sanctions on DUI offenders. As noted earlier, an evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS law documented recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders, and 19.5% for repeat offenders, attributable to the APS law.

In summary, the 1994 offenders have long-term reoffense rates that are higher among those with more DUI priors (within seven years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers. These are not surprising findings, and are consistent with and supported by previous studies. In comparing the reoffense rates between the 1994 group and the 1980 and 1984 offenders, it was found that the cumulative proportions of reoffenses was much lower among the 1994 offenders. The dramatically lower reoffense rates of the 1994 group could be attributed to the enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders, such as the APS suspension law of 1990.



## SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Data on DMV administrative license disqualification actions (license suspension or revocation [S/R]) taken in DUI cases are presented below. These statutorily mandated actions, which are taken in cases of alcohol-impaired driving, are initiated by the receipt of either a law enforcement APS report (.08% BAC, zero tolerance, or chemical test refusal) or court abstract of conviction. It should be noted that multiple actions can result from a single DUI incident—for example, a single DUI arrest frequently will result in both an APS suspension and a (later) mandatory postconviction suspension action. This section includes the following tables and figure:

Table 17: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1993-2003. This table shows preconviction (APS) and postconviction license disqualification totals from 1993 through 2003. The postconviction totals include juvenile suspensions, first-offender suspensions, second-offender suspensions and revocations, and third- and fourth-offender revocations.

Table 18: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measure data for fiscal years 2001/2002 through 2003/2004.

Figure 11: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1993-2003. This figure graphically portrays mandatory DUI license disqualification totals from 1993 through 2003, both preconviction and postconviction.

The following statements are based on the data shown in Tables 17-18 and Figure 11.

- ▶ During 1991, the first full calendar year of APS license suspension, the total number of DMV DUI preconviction and postconviction S/R actions increased by 60% over that for 1990. These totals declined each subsequent year through 1995, and have fluctuated up and down since 1995. After a 1.9% increase in 2000, S/R actions decreased by 3.9% in 2001, increased by 2.3% in 2002, and increased again by 2.0% in 2003.
- ▶ In 2003, 171,470 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 79% were first-offender actions and 21% were repeat-offender actions.

- ▶ In FY 03/04, APS actions increased by 8.8%, following slight decreases the previous two fiscal years (-3.2% in FY 02/03 and -1% in FY 01/02).
- ▶ Chemical test refusal actions increased 7.1% in 2003, after having declined each year since 1991. The total number of refusal actions has fallen 40% in the past decade.
- ▶ The number of mandatory postconviction license actions fell by 1.9% in 2003, following a 7.1% increase in 2002. Overall, mandatory postconviction license actions have increased by 1.9% since 1993.
- ▶ In the 14 years since APS was implemented in July 1990, almost three million (2,839,158) APS S/R actions had been taken.
- ▶ Requests for APS hearings have increased from 7.1% of all APS actions in FY 90/91 to 23.6% in 03/04. The rate at which APS S/R actions are upheld after hearing has increased the past several fiscal years, from 83.2% upheld in 01/02, to 85.4% upheld in 02/03, to 86.4% upheld in 03/04.
- ▶ During the first 10.5 years after implementation (on January 1, 1994) of the "zero tolerance" law for minors, 159,091 suspension actions have been taken.




Figure 11. Mandatory DUI license disqualification actions, 1993-2003.

TABLE 17: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1993-2003

	YEAR										
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS	277447	243645	226158 <sup>r</sup>	230600 <sup>r</sup>	205462 <sup>2</sup>	238612 <sup>2</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	209006	184045	173696 <sup>T</sup>	180343 <sup>T</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	n/a	9971	8608 <sup>T</sup>	9327 <sup>T</sup>	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949
.08 First-offender suspensions	144321	120582	116636 <sup>T</sup>	122111 <sup>T</sup>	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	57279	47429	43218 <sup>T</sup>	43922 <sup>T</sup>	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	7406	6063	5234 <sup>T</sup>	4983 <sup>T</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133
Commercial driver actions	5829	5038	4743 <sup>T</sup>	4939 <sup>T</sup>	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853
Chemical test refusal actions	15662	13264	11711 <sup>T</sup>	11436 <sup>T</sup>	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399
.01 Test refusal suspensions	n/a	179	170	154	134	229	268	270	280	290	341
.08 Test refusal suspensions	8256	7022	6307 <sup>T</sup>	6299 <sup>T</sup>	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925
.08 Test refusal revocations	7406	6063	5234 <sup>T</sup>	4983 <sup>T</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133
TOTAL APS/REFUSAL ACTIONS	209006	184045	173696 <sup>T</sup>	180343 <sup>T</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>1</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	922	879	677	995	769 <sup>2</sup>	1026 <sup>2</sup>	918	741	714	896	794
First-offender suspensions	10208	8696	7266	7229	4847 <sup>2</sup>	9588 <sup>2</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521
Misdemeanor	8607	7188	5806	5753	3834 <sup>2</sup>	7497 <sup>2</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298
Felony	1601	1508	1460	1476	1013 <sup>2</sup>	2091 <sup>2</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223
Second-offender S/R actions	38849	34300	31489	30404	22945 <sup>2</sup>	40238 <sup>2</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737
Misdemeanor	38285	33794	30955	29864	22532 <sup>2</sup>	39065 <sup>2</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160
Felony	564	506	534	540	413 <sup>2</sup>	633 <sup>2</sup>	485	526	577	597	577
Third-offender revocations	12908	11193	9471	8728	5569 <sup>2</sup>	9397 <sup>2</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953
Misdemeanor	12644	10974	9261	8550	5471 <sup>2</sup>	9167 <sup>2</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758
Felony	264	219	210	178	98 <sup>2</sup>	230 <sup>2</sup>	121	148	142	175	195
Fourth-offender revocations	5554	4532	3559	2901	1821 <sup>2</sup>	2998 <sup>2</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767
TOTAL POSTCONVICTION ACTIONS	68441	59600	52462	50257 <sup>r</sup>	35951 <sup>2</sup>	63247 <sup>2</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772

<sup>1</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements and include workload counts.

<sup>2</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

<sup>r</sup>Revised from prior reports.

TABLE 18. ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

	7/01-6/02	7/02-6/03	7/03-6/04
Total APS actions taken (including actions later set aside)	182,182	176,389	191,842
Total .08 <sup>1</sup> APS actions set aside	15,172	15,538	16,540
Total .01 <sup>2</sup> suspensions set aside	1,288	1,319	1,392
Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside)	165,722	159,532	173,910
Net total .08 APS actions	146,781	141,217	153,490
Net total .01 suspensions	18,941	18,315	20,420
<b>Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification:<sup>3</sup></b>			
Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers	161,631	155,684	170,166
Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken	4,093	3,848	3,744
Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles	15	19	15
Net APS .08 actions for drivers with no prior DUI convictions or APS actions <sup>4</sup>	110,416	106,305	116,948
4-month license suspensions	83,287	76,277	85,392
30-day suspensions plus 3-month restrictions	1,296	1,442	1,465
30-day suspensions plus 5-month COE <sup>5</sup> restrictions	16,961	20,046	20,961
First-offender chemical test refusals	5,530	5,380	6,039
CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions	3,342	3,160	3,091
Net APS .08 actions taken for drivers with prior DUI convictions	36,326	34,912	36,542
Suspensions	33,421	31,996	33,502
Revocations	2,944	2,916	3,040
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures:</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions taken (including actions later set aside)	9,356	9,234	10,100
Total .08 refusal actions set aside	579	627	661
Total .01 refusal actions set aside	23	26	28
Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside)	8,754	8,581	9,411
Net total .08 refusal actions	8,473	8,296	9,079
Net total .01 refusal actions	281	285	332
Chemical test refusal rate (excluding actions later set aside)	5.13%	5.24%	5.26%
Net .08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no prior DUIs	5,530	5,380	6,039
Net .08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with prior DUIs	2,944	2,916	3,040
<b>APS Hearings<sup>6</sup></b>			
Total .08 and .01 inperson or telephone APS hearings scheduled	40,035	43,539	45,322
Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing <sup>7</sup>	22.0%	24.7%	23.6%
.08 hearings held and/or completed	35,115	39,073	41,062
.08 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	29,222	33,386	35,476
Percentage of .08 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	83.2%	85.4%	86.4%
.01 hearings held and/or completed	3,192	3,724	4,088
.01 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	2,519	3,014	3,411
Percentage of .01 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	78.9%	80.9%	83.4%
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal hearings scheduled	2,772	3,084	3,113
.08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed	2,563	2,944	3,009
.08 APS refusal actions sustained/upheld following hearings	2,024	2,384	2,517

<sup>1</sup>.08 refers to APS actions taken subsequent to obtaining evidence of a BAC equal to or in excess of the .08% per se level or on the basis of a chemical test refusal. Such an action is taken in conjunction with a DUI arrest.

<sup>2</sup>.01 refers to APS suspensions taken against drivers under the age of 21 with BACs .01% or greater, or on the basis of a chemical test refusal, and are not necessarily taken in conjunction with a DUI arrest.

<sup>3</sup>All entries in this category exclude actions later set aside but, where possible, include actions taken on the basis of either a chemical test refusal or a BAC test result.

<sup>4</sup>Prior DUI convictions or APS actions consist of any such conviction or action where the violation occurred within seven years prior to the current violation.

<sup>5</sup>This restriction allows driving to, from, and during the course-of-employment (enacted 1/1/95).

<sup>6</sup>These figures include refusal hearings but exclude Driver Safety/Investigation hearings, subsequent APS dismissal hearings and departmental reviews.

<sup>7</sup>Both numerator and denominator include those actions later set aside as a result of the hearing.

## SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL

This section presents data on alcohol-involved crashes, as compiled and reported by the California Highway Patrol, as well as crash data which have been crosstabulated with Department of Justice DUI arrest data. Only crashes involving injury or fatality are assessed, due to incomplete reporting of property-damage-only (PDO) crashes.<sup>3</sup> Drivers identified as being under the influence of drugs other than alcohol are also included in the "alcohol-involved crash" category, but typically comprise less than 1% of the total (e.g., only 3 cases for 1994 data). This section includes the following tables:

Table 19: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2002 DUI Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity and Sobriety Code. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of sobriety for crash-involved 2002 DUI arrestees, by race/ethnicity.

Table 20: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2002 DUI Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity and Type of Arrest. This table portrays the fatal/injury crash involvement of DUI arrestees, by race/ethnicity and type of arrest (felony, juvenile, or misdemeanor).

Table 21: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2002 DUI Arrestees by Adjudication Status and Sobriety Code. This table crosstabulates crash sobriety codes (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition of the 2002 DUI arrests associated with those crashes.

Table 22: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2002 DUI Arrestees by Adjudication Status and Type of Arrest. This table displays the adjudication status of fatal and injury crash-involved 2002 DUI arrestees, by type of arrest.

Table 23: 2002 Crash-Involved DUI Arrestees With No Record of Conviction, by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows the number of crash-involved 2002 DUI arrestees without a corresponding recorded conviction, by type of DUI arrest, by county.

Tables 24a-24b: 2002 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Sex (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2002 alcohol-involved fatal and

---

<sup>3</sup>Among 2002 DUI arrests, 26,517 were associated with a reported traffic crash, with 11,354 involving an injury or fatality, and 15,163 are PDO.

injury crashes by age and sex, both total (24a) and those of subjects who were not arrested in conjunction with the crash (24b).

Tables 25a-25b: Sobriety Level by Prior DUI Convictions of 2002 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2002 alcohol-involved fatal and injury crashes by sobriety level and prior conviction status, both total (25a) and those of subjects who were not arrested in conjunction with the crash (25b).

Tables 26a-26b: 2002 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2002 alcohol-involved fatal and injury crashes by number of prior convictions, both total (26a) and for subjects who were not arrested in conjunction with the crash (26b).

Table 27: 2002 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Drivers Involved in Alcohol-Related Crashes. This table shows the mean and frequency distribution of BAC levels for drivers involved in alcohol-related crashes in 2002.

Figure 12 (below) shows the annual percentages of traffic injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 1993 to 2003. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI summary statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.




Figure 12. Percentage of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1993-2003.

---

Based on these data, the following statements can be made:

- ▶ The number of alcohol-involved traffic fatalities increased by 2.0% in 2003, following increases of 8.3% in 2002, 6.1% in 2001, 5.4% in 2000 and 9.1% in 1999, which had been the first increase in over a decade. The proportion of traffic fatalities which are alcohol-involved remained at 34.2%, after five consecutive years of increases following over a decade of decreases.
- ▶ The proportion of traffic crash injuries that are alcohol-involved declined to 10.2% from 10.4% the prior two years.
- ▶ 14.8% of all 2002 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 14.1% in 2001, 13.5% in 2000, 12.5% in 1999, 12.8% in 1998, 12.3% in 1997, 12.6% in 1996, 12.4% in 1995, 13.2% in 1994, 13.1% in 1993, and 11.1% in 1992 and 1991. 42.8% of these crashes involved an injury or fatality, down slightly from 43.8% in 2001 and 44.1% in 2000.
- ▶ In almost a quarter (21.9%) of cases where a DUI offender was arrested in connection with a fatal/injury traffic crash, there is no record of any corresponding conviction. In 86.9% of these nonconvicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers had been drinking and that their ability was impaired.
- ▶ Of all 2002 fatal/injury crash-involved DUI arrestees with no record of conviction, 22.3% had been arrested for felony DUI.
- ▶ 6.3% (11,354) of 2002 DUI arrests were associated with a fatal or injury crash. Of these fatal/injury crashes, only 32.6% (3,706) led to an arrest for felony DUI, and only 13.0% (1,476) led to a conviction of felony DUI. 78.1% of DUI arrests stemming from a fatal/injury crash resulted in a reported conviction.
- ▶ Non-arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal/injury crashes in 2002 were less likely to have a prior conviction for DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving, and had lower estimated BAC levels than did drivers who were arrested in conjunction with the crash.
- ▶ Almost three-quarters (73.0%) of arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or reckless driving conviction.

TABLE 19: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11354	100.0	5524	48.7	4350	38.3	774	6.8	706	6.2
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	10367	91.3	4959	47.8	4049	39.1	699	6.7	660	6.4
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	42	0.4	26	61.9	12	28.6	1	2.4	3	7.1
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	160	1.4	87	54.4	55	34.4	11	6.9	7	4.4
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	156	1.4	76	48.7	63	40.4	9	5.8	8	5.1
NOT REPORTED	629	5.5	376	59.8	171	27.2	54	8.6	28	4.5

\*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals.

TABLE 20: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND TYPE OF ARREST\*

TYPE OF ARREST	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11354	100.0	5524	48.7	4350	38.3	774	6.8	706	6.2
FELONY DUI	3706	32.6	1542	41.6	1623	43.8	301	8.1	240	6.5
JUVENILE DUI	157	1.4	85	54.1	64	40.8	3	1.9	5	3.2
MISDEMEANOR DUI	7491	66.0	3897	52.0	2663	35.5	470	6.3	461	6.2

\*For each type of arrest, percentages are based on row totals.



TABLE 21: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION											
			MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		NONALCOHOL- RECKLESS		OTHER CONVICTIONS		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11354	100.0	6359	56.0	1726	15.2	435	3.8	141	1.2	205	1.8	2488	21.9
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	10367	91.3	5949	57.4	1585	15.3	395	3.8	115	1.1	160	1.5	2163	20.9
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	42	0.4	20	47.6	3	7.1	2	4.8	0	0.0	4	9.5	13	31.0
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	160	1.4	64	40.0	29	18.1	4	2.5	4	2.5	9	5.6	50	31.3
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	156	1.4	80	51.3	14	9.0	10	6.4	2	1.3	9	5.8	41	26.3
NOT REPORTED	629	5.5	246	39.1	95	15.1	24	3.8	20	3.2	23	3.7	221	35.1

\*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals.

TABLE 22: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND TYPE OF ARREST\*

TYPE OF ARREST	TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION											
			MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		NONALCOHOL- RECKLESS		OTHER CONVICTIONS		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11354	100.0	6359	56.0	1726	15.2	435	3.8	141	1.2	205	1.8	2488	21.9
FELONY DUI	3706	32.6	1225	33.1	1476	39.8	79	2.1	29	0.8	70	1.9	827	22.3
JUVENILE DUI	157	1.4	52	33.1	18	11.5	0	0.0	1	0.6	2	1.3	84	53.5
MISDEMEANOR DUI	7491	66.0	5082	67.8	232	3.1	356	4.8	111	1.5	133	1.8	1577	21.1

\*For each type of arrest, percentages are based on row totals.

TABLE 23: 2002 CRASH-INVOLVED\* DUI ARRESTEES WITH NO RECORD  
OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL (100%)	TYPE OF ARREST					
		FELONY DUI		JUVENILE DUI		MISDEMEANOR DUI	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	4544	749	16.5	179	3.9	3616	79.6
ALAMEDA	215	23	10.7	6	2.8	186	86.5
AMADOR	8	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5
BUTTE	28	3	10.7	0	0.0	25	89.3
CALAVERAS	9	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
COLUSA	4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
CONTRA COSTA	114	16	14.0	10	8.8	88	77.2
DEL NORTE	6	2	33.3	0	0.0	4	66.7
EL DORADO	27	8	29.6	1	3.7	18	66.7
FRESNO	239	39	16.3	12	5.0	188	78.7
GLENN	8	1	12.5	0	0.0	7	87.5
HUMBOLDT	37	2	5.4	7	18.9	28	75.7
IMPERIAL	34	9	26.5	0	0.0	25	73.5
INYO	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
KERN	110	17	15.5	3	2.7	90	81.8
KINGS	11	1	9.1	0	0.0	10	90.9
LAKE	36	4	11.1	3	8.3	29	80.6
LASSEN	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	5	71.4
LOS ANGELES	954	139	14.6	26	2.7	789	82.7
MADERA	58	20	34.5	0	0.0	38	65.5
MARIN	38	4	10.5	0	0.0	34	89.5
MENDOCINO	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
MERCED	14	1	7.1	1	7.1	12	85.7
MODOC	54	6	11.1	7	13.0	41	75.9
MONO	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
MONTEREY	64	18	28.1	5	7.8	41	64.1
NAPA	19	4	21.1	2	10.5	13	68.4
NEVADA	11	2	18.2	0	0.0	9	81.8
ORANGE	227	28	12.3	8	3.5	191	84.1
PLACER	29	3	10.3	1	3.4	25	86.2
PLUMAS	2	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
RIVERSIDE	237	34	14.3	13	5.5	190	80.2
SACRAMENTO	213	42	19.7	6	2.8	165	77.5
SAN BENITO	7	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	28.6
SAN BERNARDINO	282	58	20.6	10	3.5	214	75.9
SAN DIEGO	336	75	22.3	19	5.7	242	72.0
SAN FRANCISCO	91	33	36.3	2	2.2	56	61.5
SAN JOAQUIN	126	9	7.1	4	3.2	113	89.7
SAN LUIS OBISPO	27	3	11.1	4	14.8	20	74.1
SAN MATEO	82	11	13.4	3	3.7	68	82.9
SANTA BARBARA	35	6	17.1	0	0.0	29	82.9
SANTA CLARA	122	29	23.8	2	1.6	91	74.6
SANTA CRUZ	29	7	24.1	0	0.0	22	75.9
SHASTA	24	1	4.2	2	8.3	21	87.5
SIERRA	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
SISKIYOU	9	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8
SOLANO	35	5	14.3	0	0.0	30	85.7
SONOMA	72	2	2.8	3	4.2	67	93.1
STANISLAUS	174	24	13.8	3	1.7	147	84.5
SUTTER	10	2	20.0	0	0.0	8	80.0
TEHAMA	6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
TRINITY	6	2	33.3	0	0.0	4	66.7
TULARE	92	19	20.7	8	8.7	65	70.7
TUOLUMNE	10	2	20.0	0	0.0	8	80.0
VENTURA	111	16	14.4	4	3.6	91	82.0
YOLO	30	6	20.0	1	3.3	23	76.7
YUBA	8	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0

\*These cases include only arrestees whose crashes showed alcohol or drug-impaired sobriety codes.

TABLE 24a: 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\* BY AGE AND SEX

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	20633	100.0	16669	80.8	3964	19.2
UNDER 18	382	1.9	291	76.2	91	23.8
18-20	2016	9.8	1639	81.3	377	18.7
21-30	7140	34.6	5905	82.7	1235	17.3
31-40	4578	22.2	3578	78.2	1000	21.8
41-50	3435	16.6	2650	77.1	785	22.9
51-59	1373	6.7	1117	81.4	256	18.6
60-69	547	2.7	465	85.0	82	15.0
70 & ABOVE	329	1.6	267	81.2	62	18.8
AGE UNKNOWN	833	4.0	757	90.9	76	9.1

\*These data are derived from the 2002 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 24b: 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED)

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8209	100.0	6616	80.6	1593	19.4
UNDER 18	208	2.5	172	82.7	36	17.3
18-20	863	10.5	705	81.7	158	18.3
21-30	2945	35.9	2439	82.8	506	17.2
31-40	1884	23.0	1476	78.3	408	21.7
41-50	1375	16.7	1069	77.7	306	22.3
51-60	559	6.8	445	79.6	114	20.4
61-70	234	2.9	199	85.0	35	15.0
71 & ABOVE	141	1.7	111	78.7	30	21.3

TABLE 25a: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\*

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18369	100.0	8156	44.4	7961	43.3	1805	9.8	364	2.0	83	0.5
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	13977	76.1	4415	31.6	7422	53.1	1713	12.3	347	2.5	80	0.6
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2969	16.2	2681	90.3	247	8.3	35	1.2	4	0.1	2	0.1
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1363	7.4	1009	74.0	284	20.8	56	4.1	13	1.0	1	0.1
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	43	0.2	37	86.0	5	11.6	1	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
NOT REPORTED	17	0.1	14	82.4	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

\*These data are derived from the California Highway Patrol's alcohol-accident files and include only those cases with available driver license numbers.

TABLE 25b: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED)

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8213	100.0	5504	67.0	2102	25.6	489	6.0	99	1.2	19	0.2
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	4029	49.1	1840	45.7	1663	41.3	424	10.5	85	2.1	17	0.4
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2927	35.6	2666	91.1	225	7.7	30	1.0	4	0.1	2	0.1
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1202	14.6	949	79.0	208	17.3	35	2.9	10	0.8	0	0.0
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	39	0.5	35	89.7	4	10.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
NOT REPORTED	16	0.2	14	87.5	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

\*These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

TABLE 26a: 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS

ACCIDENTS	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18369	100.0	8156	44.4	7961	43.3	1805	9.8	364	2.0	83	0.5
FATAL	878	4.8	641	73.0	194	22.1	33	3.8	9	1.0	1	0.1
INJURY	17491	95.2	7515	43.0	7767	44.4	1772	10.1	355	2.0	82	0.5

TABLE 26b: 2002 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED)

ACCIDENTS	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8213	100.0	5504	67.0	2102	25.6	489	6.0	99	1.2	19	0.2
FATAL	775	9.4	591	76.3	152	19.6	26	3.4	6	0.8	0	0.0
INJURY	7438	90.6	4913	66.1	1950	26.2	463	6.2	93	1.3	19	0.3

These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

TABLE 27: 2002 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS  
OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES

BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	141	1.3
.01	59	0.5
.02	78	0.7
.03	81	0.7
.04	107	1.0
.05	144	1.3
.06	202	1.8
.07	214	1.9
.08	340	3.1
.09	406	3.7
.10	489	4.4
.11	564	5.1
.12	593	5.4
.13	642	5.8
.14	639	5.8
.15	606	5.5
.16	670	6.1
.17	637	5.7
.18	608	5.5
.19	565	5.1
.20	542	4.9
.21	488	4.4
.22	395	3.6
.23	390	3.5
.24	297	2.7
.25	234	2.1
.26	174	1.6
.27	180	1.6
.28	126	1.1
.29	102	0.9
.30	73	0.7
.31	70	0.6
.32	54	0.5
.33	43	0.4
.34	38	0.3
.35	19	0.2
.36	15	0.1
.37	11	0.1
.38	11	0.1
.39	8	0.1
.40	10	0.1
.41	12	0.1
.42	2	0.0
.43	3	0.0
.45	1	0.0
.46	1	0.0
.47	1	0.0
.48	1	0.0
.49	1	0.0
.54	1	0.0
TOTAL	10947	100.0
	MEAN BAC .163	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted alcohol-crash drivers (56.5% of the records showed BAC levels).

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

### DUI Arrest Data:

Arrest data are reported to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Law Enforcement Information Center, by individual law enforcement agencies throughout the state. As such, these data are subject to reporting errors such as incorrect names, birthdates or arrest dates. Nonreporting of arrest data due to error or omission can also occur; for example, in 1995 the Oakland Police Department reported no DUI arrests, after reporting 960 such arrests in 1994. In addition, when data are entered into DOJ's Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system, only the highest-order offense is included. Therefore, in cases where a DUI arrest is made in conjunction with, for example, an auto theft arrest, that DUI arrest will not be included in the database. This results in a slight but systematic underreporting of the number of DUI arrests annually.

### DUI Conviction Data:

Abstracts of conviction for DUI and other traffic-related offenses are reported to the DMV by courts throughout the state. As abstracts are received (either hard copy, magnetic tape or through direct electronic access from the courts) they are entered onto the DMV driver record database. Abstracts without an identifying driver license number are run through the automated name index (ANI) system in order to match the abstract with an existing driver record; in cases where no such match can be made, an "X"-numbered record is created to store the abstract. The total number of DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV from the courts is tallied monthly and annually. Since this workload total includes abstracts which amend, correct or dismiss prior abstracts of conviction, it tends to overestimate the actual number of convictions which have occurred. Conviction data are also subject to reporting and nonreporting errors similar to those for DUI arrests. For example, the 1993 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System documented the fact that thousands of DUI convictions appearing in court records do not appear on the DMV driver record database.

### Alcohol-Involved Crash Data:

Crash data are reported to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) by local law enforcement agencies and district offices of the CHP. As such, these data are subject to reporting and nonreporting errors similar to those occurring in both DUI arrest and conviction data. While most local law enforcement agencies will investigate and file reports on crashes involving injury or death, the investigation and reporting of property-damage-only crashes varies widely by local jurisdiction. Data are entered onto CHP's Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) and published in annual reports.

## HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975

SB 1694 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, increases the time period from seven to ten years during which arrests and/or convictions of DUI will be counted as prior offenses for enhanced penalties (includes DUI convictions of persons under age 21). This new law also requires the court to order a person convicted of a prior DUI to complete an alcohol/drug problem assessment program, even though that prior conviction occurred more than ten years ago, and authorizes the court to order the person to complete a repeat offender treatment program. Finally, it expands court-

---

ordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all convicted persons of a repeat DUI offense within ten years of a prior offense.

- SB 1696 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, requires the alcohol treatment program providers to send proof of enrollment in or proof of completion of the programs directly to DMV Headquarters and prohibits the DMV from receiving the certificates from program participants.
- SB 1697 (Torlakson), effective 9/20/2005, assigns sole responsibility for imposing driver license actions for DUI arrests and convictions to DMV, and removes this responsibility from the courts. It also ensures that all persons convicted of a DUI will receive a license restriction, suspension or revocation of the driving privilege.
- SB 408 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2004, prohibits the DMV (for cases showing a "critical need to drive") from issuing a restricted drivers license to minors convicted of DUI with a BAC of 0.01% or greater if the minor has other zero tolerance or DUI convictions within seven years of the current violation.
- AB 1078 (Jackson), effective 1/1/2002, removes the 10-year limit on certain vehicular manslaughter convictions, resulting in the permanent retention of these violations on the driver's record. These convictions would be considered by the court as "priors" for enhancing penalties upon subsequent conviction for DUI.
- AB 803 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2001, requires the court to order a person who is at least 18 years of age who is convicted of a first violation of DUI with 0.05% or more, by weight, of alcohol to attend the educational component of a licensed DUI program; upon a second or subsequent conviction, the court is required to order the person, in addition to other penalties, to attend a 30-hour DUI program. If the person's license is suspended, the DMV cannot reinstate the driving privilege until the person provides proof of having completed the program as specified.
- AB 1650 (Assembly Transportation Committee), effective 1/1/2000, is a committee bill intended to deal with transportation issues more efficiently by clarifying and making technical changes. This bill authorizes the DMV to impose a driver license suspension on those convicted of DUI in a water vessel involving injury; this remedies an oversight in existing law which provides for sanctions against drivers convicted of DUI in a water vessel without injury than for those with injury.
- AB 762 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/99, extends the suspension period for a second-DUI offender from 18 months to two years, but allows the second offender to serve 12 months of the license suspension period, followed by a restricted license with continued enrollment in a treatment program and installation of an ignition interlock device; requires persons convicted of driving with a suspended or revoked license, where that suspension or revocation was based on prior DUI convictions, to install the ignition interlock device for a period not to exceed three years or until the driving privilege is reinstated, and requires DMV to study and report on the effectiveness of these devices. Judges are also encouraged to order installation of an ignition interlock device for first-time DUI offenders if there are aggravating factors such as high blood alcohol readings (0.20% or above), chemical test refusal, numerous traffic violations, or injury crashes. This law requires that upon a first DUI conviction, if a court grants probation, 1) the person's driving privilege shall be suspended for six months by the DMV, in addition to other penalties, or 2) the



person may operate a motor vehicle restricted for 90 days, to and from work and alcohol treatment program, if the person establishes proof of financial responsibility and complies with other penalties and fees.

- SB 24 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/99, cleans up AB 762, AB 1916, and SB 1186. This law requires the DMV to revoke for one year the driving privilege of any ignition interlock device-restricted driver who is convicted of driving a vehicle not equipped with an ignition interlock device (IID) under authority section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under section 23246(g)] if notified by an installation facility that the driver attempted to bypass, tamper with or remove the device, or has three or more times failed to comply with calibration or servicing requirements of the device; amends certain sections to specify that completion of a program equals enrollment, participation, and completion subsequent to the date of the current violation.
- SB 1186 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/99, reorganizes specified provisions relating to DUI-related statutes by amending, repealing, and/or renumbering the DUI-related sections without making substantive changes to the statutes.
- SB 1176 (Johnson), effective 1/1/99, requires that, upon a conviction of an alcohol-related reckless driving charge, the courts order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. This bill also requires an evaluation by the DMV of the effectiveness of the program and a discussion of the findings in its annual report to the Legislature.
- SB 1890 (Hurt), effective 1/1/99, deletes the choice of the urine test from the options for chemical tests relating to operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, unless both the blood and breath tests are unavailable or where there is a condition that warrants the use of the urine test.
- AB 1916 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/99, provides that the court shall, as a condition of probation, refer a first offender whose BAC level is less than 0.20%, by weight, to participate for at least three months (minimum 30 hours) or longer to a licensed education/counseling program; if the BAC level is equal to 0.20% or more, by weight, or the person refused to take a chemical test, the court shall order the person to participate for at least six months or longer in a program consisting of 45 hours of education/counseling activities; requires the DMV to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the efficacy of the increased drug and alcohol intervention programs; requires repeat offenders who have twice failed the programs to participate in a county alcohol and drug problem assessment program, and requires each county, beginning 1/1/2000, to prepare, or contract to be prepared, an alcohol and drug assessment report on each person ordered by the court to participate in an alcohol and drug assessment program.
- AB 130 (Battin), effective 1/1/98, requires that any person guilty of a felony or misdemeanor DUI within 10 years of a prior felony offense be designated as a habitual traffic offender for a 3-year period and have their driver license revoked for four years.

- SB 1177 (Johnson), effective 1/1/98, requires that anyone convicted of a second or subsequent DUI within seven years of a separate DUI, alcohol-related reckless driving, or DUI with bodily injury violation, is ordered to enroll in, participate and complete a DUI treatment program, subject to the latest violation, as a condition of probation. The person is not to be given credit for any treatment program activities prior to the date of the current violation.
- AB 1985 (Speier), effective 1/1/97, cited as "Courtney's Law"; provides that a person convicted of gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated and who has one or more prior convictions of vehicular manslaughter or multiple prior DUI convictions shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a term of 15 years to life. Also, any person fleeing the scene of a crime after committing specified vehicle offenses which resulted in death, serious injury, or great bodily injury is subject to an additional 5-year prison enhancement.
- SB 1579 (Leonard), effective 1/1/97, permits DMV to suspend a driver license on a first FTA for DUI, and establishes an enhanced audit and tracking system to compare DUI arrests with subsequent actions.
- SB 833 (Kopp), effective 1/1/96, permits peace officers to seize and cause the removal of a vehicle, without arresting the driver, when the vehicle was being operated by a person whose driving privilege was suspended or revoked or who had never been issued a license; requires an impounding agency to send a notice by certified, return receipt requested mail, to the legal owner of a vehicle that is impounded, and specifies under what conditions an impounded vehicle may be released to the legal owner.
- AB 321 (Connolly), effective 1/1/95, allows juveniles cited for driving under the influence, with a BAC of 0.05% or more, by weight (Section 23140), to be charged with vehicular manslaughter (Penal Code (PC) 192) or gross vehicular manslaughter (PC 191.5) if they violate these vehicular manslaughter laws.
- SB 1295 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/95, requires every person convicted of a first DUI offense to submit proof of completion of a treatment program within a time period set by the department; requires the department to suspend the driving privilege for noncompliance, prohibits reinstatement until proof of completion is received by the department; enhances the required administrative driving privilege revocation for a minor who refuses to take or fails to complete a preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test, to two years revocation for the second offense in seven years and three years revocation for the third and subsequent offenses; applies the CVC section 23140 to drivers under age 21 (previously under age 18), making it unlawful to drive with a 0.05% BAC level or greater.
- SB 1758 (Kopp), effective 1/1/95, permits a noncommercial driver, 21 years of age or older, who was arrested for a first APS DUI offense, who took a chemical test, and enrolled in an alcohol treatment program, to also obtain a restricted driver license, valid for driving to and from and during the course of that person's employment, after serving 30 days of the suspension period. The total time period for suspension/restriction shall be six months, rather than four months. Suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers who drive are subject to having their vehicles towed and impounded for 30 days. If the driver is the registered owner of

the vehicle and has a prior conviction for driving while unlicensed or suspended/revoked, the vehicle is subject to forfeiture to local authorities.

AB 2639 (Friedman), effective 9/30/94, repeals the statutes which authorized discretionary IID orders (23235), although part of the repealed statutes were incorporated into the sections establishing mandatory orders (section 23246 et seq.). Previously, the discretionary IID orders applied to all DUI offenders, but now they apply only to first-DUI offenders. For third and subsequent offenders, the statutes are amended to clarify that the court must require proof of installation of the device before issuing an order granting a restricted license. Some of the exemptions to the IID orders were revised.

SB 126 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/94, amends CVC 23161 to provide that if the court orders a 90-day restriction for a first offender, the restriction shall begin on the date of the reinstatement of the person's privilege to drive following the 4-month administrative suspension; as part of the sentencing of repeat-DUI offenders, 23161 requires an ignition interlock device to remain on the vehicle for one to three years after restoration of the driving privilege; specifies that the person cannot operate a motor vehicle when the driving privilege is suspended or revoked even if the vehicle is equipped with an ignition interlock device; requires second offenders who have been suspended for 18 months to provide proof of financial responsibility and proof of successful completion of an alcohol or drug program in order to reinstate their license privilege, includes violation of 23140 for administrative suspension for minors driving with 0.05% BAC or greater.

SB 689 (Kopp), effective 1/1/94, prohibits a person under 21 years of age from driving with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, as measured by a PAS test; violators receive a 1-year license suspension. A person under the age of 21 who refuses the PAS test will be suspended for one year.

AB 2851 (Friedman), effective 7/1/93, requires anyone convicted of a second DUI within seven years of a prior conviction to install an IID on all their vehicles. The device must be maintained for a period of one to three years. Proof of installation must be provided to the court or probation officer within 30 days of conviction. If proof is not provided, the DMV will revoke the license for one year. Exceptions to installing a device are for medical problems, use of vehicle in emergencies, and driving the employer's vehicle during employment.

AB 3580 (Farr), effective 7/1/93, changes the effective date of APS suspension from 45 to 30 days after the notice is given.

SB 1600 (Bergeson), effective 9/26/92, provides that DMV is required to suspend or revoke the licenses of those who drop out of an alcohol treatment program a second time.

AB 37 (Katz), effective 1/1/92, combines elements of the formal and informal review hearing into a single hearing for those who were suspended under the APS laws, and provides that DMV need not stay a suspension or revocation pending review, if the hearing followed suspension or revocation for refusing a chemical test for alcohol or for driving with a BAC of 0.08 % or more.

- SB 185 (Thompson), effective 1/1/92, amends Section 14602 to authorize the court to order the motor vehicle impounded for up to six months for a first conviction, and up to 12 months for a second or subsequent conviction of any of the following offenses: driving with a suspended or revoked license, violation of 2800.2 or .3 (evading a peace officer in a reckless manner, causing injury or death), within seven years of a violation of 23103, 23152, 23153, or PCs 191.5 or 192(c).
- AB 2040 (Farr), effective 9/28/90, repeals previous statutes authorizing the installation of ignition interlock devices in DUI cases. This urgency statute authorizes the installation of such devices in all DUI cases, permits the court to grant subjects revoked for 3 or more DUI-related violations a restricted license after 24 months of the revocation have passed. The restricted license is conditioned on satisfactory completion of 18 months of an alcohol treatment program, submission of proof of financial responsibility, and agreement to have an ignition interlock device installed in their vehicles. Courts are authorized to reduce the minimum DUI fine to allow the person to pay the costs of the device.
- SB 1150 (Lockyer), effective 7/26/90, provides clean-up legislation for APS; lowers the BAC level from .10 to .08, requires proof of financial responsibility to reinstate from any APS suspension or revocation action, increases sanctions for implied consent refusals (1-year license suspension for no priors or APS actions, 2-year license revocation for one prior or APS action, and 3-year revocation for two or more prior DUI offenses or APS actions), and authorizes suspension or revocation actions taken under 13353 and 13353.2 CVC to be considered as priors.
- SB 1623 (Lockyer), effective 7/1/90, establishes authority for a peace officer to serve a notice of suspension or revocation (administrative per se or APS) personally on a person arrested for a DUI offense, to take possession of the driver license for forwarding to the department, and to issue a 45-day temporary operating permit; provides for an administrative review of the order, for an administrative hearing, and for a judicial review of the hearing, and provides for a fee, not to exceed \$100, to be assessed upon the return of the driver license.
- AB 757 (Friedman), effective 1/1/90, requires the DMV to establish and maintain a DUI data and recidivism tracking system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI. Annual reports are to be made to the Legislature.
- SB 310 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90, authorizes the courts to sell the vehicles of those registered owners who are found in violation of PCs 191.5 or 192 (C3), CVC 23152 which occurred within seven years of two or more convictions of 23152 or 23153, or a violation of 23153 which occurred within seven years of one or more convictions of 23152 or 23153 or the cited PC sections.
- SB 408 (Leonard), effective 1/1/90, modifies AB 7 (Hart) to establish a BAC level of .08% or higher as per se evidence of impaired driving.
- SB 1119 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90 for vessel provisions and 1/1/92 for commercial driver provisions, prohibits the operation of a commercial vehicle by a person with a BAC of .04% or above; requires a commercial vehicle driver to be ordered out of service for 24 hours if found with a BAC at or above .01%, but less than .04%; establishes separate penalties for refusing to take or complete a chemical test based

on the type of vehicle involved. Under this bill, a conviction of operating a vessel while under the influence of alcohol or drugs would also be treated as a DUI prior for driver license sanctions.

- SB 1344 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90, requires statewide implementation of 12-week (30-hour) first-offender alcohol education and counseling programs, and requires state licensing of such programs. This bill also adds 6 months of monitoring and follow-up to second offender programs, resulting in 18-month programs. It requires that DMV evaluate program effects on recidivism and report the findings to the Legislature.
- SB 1902 (Davis), effective 1/1/90, prohibits DMV from issuing or renewing a driver license unless the applicant agrees in writing to comply with a blood, breath, or urine test. This bill also designates drivers convicted of a third or subsequent DUI within seven years as "habitual traffic offenders."
- AB 3134 (Harris), effective 1/1/89, allows the 4th DUI within seven years to be charged as a felony or misdemeanor. The term of imprisonment to state prison or county jail is not less than 180 days and not more than one year. Allows for second offenders to attend either a one year or 30-month treatment program.
- AB 3563 (Killea), effective 1/1/89, authorizes the court to order DMV to suspend, revoke, or delay the driving privilege of a minor failing to show proof of completion of a court-ordered alcohol education program when convicted of CVC 23140.
- SB 1300 (Campbell), effective 1/1/89, amends CVC 13202.5 to allow courts to suspend the license of a person under the age of 21 (changed from age 18) for one year, or delay the driving privilege of those 13 years or older, upon conviction of various alcohol and drug offenses, including open container violations.
- SB 1964 (Robbins), effective 1/1/89, requires all first-DUI offenders to file proof of insurance when applying for a restricted license or for reinstatement of the driving privilege following a period of license suspension.
- SB 885 (Royce), effective 1/1/88, requires that a person who was granted probation for a second DUI offense must show proof of financial responsibility in order to be eligible for the 1-year restricted license.
- SB 1365 (Seymour), effective 1/1/88, establishes a 30-month alcohol treatment program as an alternative to the 12-month program for third and subsequent DUI offenders, in counties where such a program exists. In these cases, imprisonment in the county jail shall be imposed for at least 30 days, but not more than one year, in lieu of the 120-day minimum jail term.
- AB 2558 (Duffy), effective 1/1/87, provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable in the state prison for 4, 6, or 10 years. Former PC 192(c3) was deleted and incorporated into 191.5(a).
- AB 2831 (Killea), effective 1/1/87, makes it unlawful for a minor to drive with a BAC of .05% or more (CVC 23140). A conviction of this violation requires completion of an alcohol education program or alcohol-related community service program.

- SB 2206 (Watson), effective 1/1/87, authorizes a county to develop and administer an alcohol and drug problem-assessment program, which could include a pre-sentence alcohol and drug problem-assessment report for persons convicted under CVC 23152 or 23153, and referral to treatment program with follow-up tracking.
- SB 2344 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/87, extends the sentencing period for prior DUIs from five to seven years, and specifies a 3- to 5-year probation term for a DUI conviction.
- SB 3939 (Farr), effective 1/1/87, authorizes courts to order the installation of IID for repeat offenders in four counties, and establishes a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of the devices.
- SB 925 (Seymour), effective 7/1/86, extends the period of license suspension for second-misdemeanor offenders from one year to 18 months, and also requires that offenders with three or more DUI convictions show proof of treatment completion in order to have their licenses reinstated.
- AB 144 (Naylor), effective 9/29/85, requires the court to take into consideration in a DUI case a blood alcohol concentration of 0.20 percent or above, or a refusal to take a chemical test, as special factors in the enhancing of penalties for sentencing or to impose additional terms and conditions of probation.
- SB 1441 (Petris), effective 1/1/85, requires a 3-year license revocation for persons with two or more DUI or alcohol-related reckless convictions within five years of refusing a chemical test.
- SB 1522 (Alquist), effective 1/1/85, retains existing law for first offenders, which authorizes courts to impound a vehicle at the registered owner's expense for up to 30 days if the driver was convicted of DUI pursuant to CVC 23152 or 23153. The same time period for impoundment is required for second offenses within five years. For third and subsequent offenses, the vehicle can be impounded at the registered owner's expense for up to 90 days. Exceptions to the required impoundment arise "where the interests of justice would best be served by not ordering impoundment." Another limitation is that no vehicle driven by a class 3 or 4 licensee is subject to impoundment if another person has a community property interest in the vehicle, and it is the only vehicle available to the driver's family.
- AB 624 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/84, requires a 1-year license revocation for minors (up to age 18) for a DUI conviction (Sections 23152, 23153 CVC).
- SB 1601 (Sieroty), effective 7/1/82, modifies AB 541 provisions by requiring that SB 38 participants establish proof of insurance in order to remove the license restriction at the end of six months. In addition, SB 38 participants who dropped out of the program are given two more opportunities to reenroll, instead of receiving an immediate license suspension. Program providers are also required to report dropouts directly to DMV.
- AB 7 (Hart), effective 1/1/82, makes it a misdemeanor under CVC 23152(b) to drive a vehicle with a BAC level of .10% or higher. Drivers with lower BAC levels (.05 - .09%) can be convicted of DUI when sufficient behavioral evidence of impairment is apparent.

AB 541 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/82, establishes that under CVC 23152(a), driving under the influence of an alcoholic beverage or drugs or their combined influence is a misdemeanor, while felony charges are filed under CVC 23153, and alcohol-related reckless charges are filed under CVC 23103.5. A conviction under 23103.5 constitutes a prior for a second offense (but not for third offenses). The penalties imposed are a 90-day license restriction (work- and treatment-related driving only) and referral to an alcohol education program for most first offenders; a 1-year license restriction for second offenders who enroll in an approved 12-month alcohol treatment (SB 38) program. First offenders not placed on probation receive a 6-month license suspension. Second offenders not assigned to an alcohol program are suspended for one year. A minimum jail term of 48 hours is mandatory for all repeat offenders, and a minimum fine of \$390 is assessed for all DUI offenses. Offenders with three or more DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving convictions receive a 3-year license revocation along with a jail term and fine, and a small proportion are referred to a 12-month SB 38 program. Enrollment in the program cannot be substituted for license revocation. The period defining prior DUIs changes from seven to five years. Convictions of a DUI offense with bodily injury or fatality, when prosecuted as a felony, continue to result in more severe penalties (such as longer license actions and jail terms) than the misdemeanor offenses. The only change in the 1982 law for felony second offenders is that those participating in the SB 38 program will receive a license suspension for one year and a license restriction for two years.

SB 38 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/78, extends the pilot 12-month alcohol treatment program for repeat offenders statewide.

SB 330 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/76, permits repeat DUI offenders in four counties to participate in a 12-month pilot alcohol treatment program in lieu of the usual 12-month suspension or 3-year revocation.

## REFERENCES

- Automobile Club of Southern California, California Highway Patrol, California State Automobile Association, & Department of Motor Vehicles. (2003). *Digest of Traffic Legislation*. Sacramento: Authors.
- California Department of Motor Vehicles. (1984-87). *An evaluation of the California drunk driving countermeasure system. Volumes 1-8*. Sacramento: Author.
- California Highway Patrol. (2002). *2002 annual report of fatal and injury motor vehicle traffic collisions*. Sacramento: Author.
- DeYoung, D. J. (1997). *An evaluation of the specific deterrent effect of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked and unlicensed drivers in California* (Report No. 171). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- DeYoung, D. J., Peck, R. C., & Helander, C. J. (1999). Estimating the exposure and fatal crash rates of suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers in California. *Crash Analysis & Prevention*, 29(1), 17-23.
- Helander, C. J. (1989). *Development of a California DUI management information system*. Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. (1995, September). DUI legislation 1982-1995. *The 1995 Judicial DUI Seminar*. Presented by the Committee on Drinking Drivers of the Municipal Court Judges Association and the

- Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. Oxnard, California.
- Peck, R. C. (1991). The general and specific deterrent effects of DUI sanctions: A review of California's experience. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving*, 7(1), 13-42.
- Peck, R. C. (1993, January). *California DMV's driving under the influence R&D program: Some recent findings and activities*. Paper presented at the 72<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Session 86A. Washington DC.
- Rogers, P. N. (1997). *The specific deterrent impact of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws. Volume 2 of an evaluation of the effectiveness of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws* (Report No. 167). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2004). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 206). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2003). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 198). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2002). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 191). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2001). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 188). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2000). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 185). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1999). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 179). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1998). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 169). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1997). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 165). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1996). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 159). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1995). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 145). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1994). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 143). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., Marowitz, L. A., DeYoung, D. J., & Helander, C. J. (1993). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 138). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1992). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 134). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.



## GLOSSARY

### ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE (APS)

Administrative per se ("on-the-spot") license suspension or revocation occurs immediately pursuant to lawful arrest of a person driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08% or more, or one who refuses a chemical test. Upon arrest, the driver's license is immediately confiscated by the law enforcement officer and an order of suspension or revocation served. The driver is issued a temporary license and allowed due process through administrative review. In July 1990, California became the 28th state to implement APS. In January 1994, California enacted a "zero tolerance" statute which requires the administrative suspension of any driver under age 21 with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, or who refuses to be tested.

### ALCOHOL-INVOLVED CRASH

Alcohol-involved crashes are those in which the investigating law enforcement officer indicates on the crash report that the driver "had been drinking (HBD)." Crashes involving drivers who are determined to be under the influence of drugs other than alcohol (typically less than 1% of all crashes) are also included in the alcohol-involved crash category.

### ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

Commonly called a "wet" reckless, alcohol-related reckless driving refers to an arrest/conviction incident which originated as a DUI arrest. DUI arrests involving drugs which are reduced to reckless driving are also referred to as alcohol-involved or "wet" reckless driving. "Wet" reckless convictions count as priors for the purposes of enhanced penalties upon subsequent conviction of DUI.

### ALPHA

Alpha is the investigator's acceptable risk or probability level of making a Type 1 error (generally chosen to be small—e.g., 1% or .01, 5% or .05). There is always some risk of a Type 1 error, so alpha cannot be zero. Alpha is also called the significance level, because it is the criterion for claiming statistical significance.

### BAC

Blood alcohol concentration, or BAC, is a measure of the percent, by weight, of alcohol in a person's blood. Statutorily, BAC is based upon grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or per 210 liters of breath.

### CONVICTION

Conviction of an offense, as used in this report, refers to the receipt by DMV of a court abstract of conviction. In a small proportion of cases, an offender may be convicted of an offense but that conviction is not reported to DMV. Such cases would functionally be treated by DMV as though the offender had not been convicted.

---

Because convictions can be amended, corrected, dismissed or simply not reported at all, the conviction totals reported herein are dynamic and subject to change.

### COVARIATE

A variable used to statistically adjust the results of an analysis for differences (on that variable) existing among subjects prior to the comparison of treatment effects.

### DUI

DUI is an acronym for "driving under the influence" of alcohol and/or drugs, a violation of Sections 23152 or 23153 of the California Vehicle Code.

### LOGISTIC REGRESSION

Logistic regression analysis is a statistical procedure evaluating the linear relationship between various factors and the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an outcome event. In this study, the procedure was used to explain the relationship between the various sanctions and the proportion of DUI offenders who incurred crashes and/or DUI incidents.

### MAJOR CONVICTION

Major convictions include primarily DUI convictions, but also reckless driving and hit-and-run convictions.

### *p*

*p* stands for probability. For example, if  $p < .05$ , the probability is less than 5 chances in 100 that the difference you found is by chance alone.

### QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

Quasi-experimental designs refer to analyses where the comparison groups are not equivalent on characteristics other than the treatment conditions because random assignment was not used. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results because of possible confounding of group bias with treatment effects. Covariates are used to statistically reduce group differences prior to the comparison of treatment effects.

### SIGNIFICANT (STATISTICALLY)

If the result of a statistical test is significant, this means that the difference found is very unlikely by chance alone. How unlikely is determined by alpha.

## APPENDIX A

Assembly Bill No. 757

### CHAPTER 450

An act to add Section 1821 to the Vehicle Code, relating to driving offenses.

(Approved by Governor September 14, 1989. Filed with  
Secretary of State September 15, 1989.)

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 757, Friedman. Driving offenses: intervention programs: evaluation.

Under existing law, the Department of Motor Vehicles maintains records of driver's offenses reported by the courts. Including violations of the prohibitions against driving while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage, any drug, or both, driving with an excessive blood-alcohol concentration, or driving while addicted to any drug.

This bill would, additionally, require the department to establish and maintain a data and monitoring system, as specified, to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of those violations relating to alcohol and drugs, and to report thereon annually to the Legislature.

The bill would declare legislative findings.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares as follows:

(a) Drivers under the influence of drugs or alcohol continue to present a grave danger to the citizens of this state.

(b) The Legislature has taken stern action to deter this crime and punish its offenders and has provided a range of sanctions available to the courts to use at their discretion.

(c) No system exists to monitor and evaluate the efficacy of these measures or to determine the achievement of the Legislature's goals.

(d) This lack of accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics hampers the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions.

(e) It is essential that the Legislature acquire this information, from available resources, as soon as practicable, and that this information be updated and transmitted annually to the Legislature.

SEC. 2. Section 1821 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read:

1821: The department shall establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The system may include a recidivism tracking system. The recidivism tracking system may include, but not be limited to, jail sentencing, license restriction, license suspension. Level I (first offender) and II (multiple offender) alcohol and drug education and treatment program assignment, alcohol and drug education treatment program readmission and dropout rates, adjudicating court, length of jail term, actual jail or alternative sentence served, type of treatment

program assigned, actual program compliance status, subsequent accidents related to driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and subsequent convictions of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The department shall submit an annual report of its evaluations to the Legislature. The evaluations shall include a ranking of the relative efficacy of criminal penalties, other sanctions, and intervention programs and the various combinations thereof.



## APPENDIX B

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		183560	153325	83.5	30235	16.5	77431	42.2	81079	44.2	13094	7.1	11956	6.5
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	48	41	85.4	7	14.6	22	45.8	15	31.3	5	10.4	6	12.5
	18-20	456	397	87.1	59	12.9	182	39.9	161	35.3	64	14.0	49	10.7
	21-30	2514	2139	85.1	375	14.9	693	27.6	1042	41.4	447	17.8	332	13.2
	31-40	1758	1468	83.5	290	16.5	588	33.4	609	34.6	375	21.3	186	10.6
	41-50	1103	905	82.0	198	18.0	485	44.0	235	21.3	268	24.3	115	10.4
	51-60	481	411	85.4	70	14.6	251	52.2	71	14.8	124	25.8	35	7.3
	61-70	117	106	90.6	11	9.4	56	47.9	11	9.4	36	30.8	14	12.0
	71 & ABOVE	40	36	90.0	4	10.0	25	62.5	3	7.5	10	25.0	2	5.0
	TOTAL	6517	5503	84.4	1014	15.6	2302	35.3	2147	32.9	1329	20.4	739	11.3
ALPINE	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	14	14	100.0	0	0.0	11	78.6	1	7.1	0	0.0	2	14.3
	31-40	10	10	100.0	0	0.0	7	70.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	2	20.0
	41-50	23	17	73.9	6	26.1	21	91.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.7
	51-60	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	59	53	89.8	6	10.2	48	81.4	5	8.5	0	0.0	6	10.2
AMADOR	UNDER 18	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	8	72.7	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	9.1
	21-30	47	41	87.2	6	12.8	33	70.2	11	23.4	0	0.0	3	6.4
	31-40	49	40	81.6	9	18.4	41	83.7	7	14.3	0	0.0	1	2.0
	41-50	54	43	79.6	11	20.4	48	88.9	4	7.4	1	1.9	1	1.9
	51-60	40	32	80.0	8	20.0	37	92.5	0	0.0	1	2.5	2	5.0
	61-70	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	9	81.8	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	9.1
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	216	177	81.9	39	18.1	180	83.3	25	11.6	2	0.9	9	4.2
BUTTE	UNDER 18	21	13	61.9	8	38.1	18	85.7	2	9.5	0	0.0	1	4.8
	18-20	212	179	84.4	33	15.6	171	80.7	30	14.2	5	2.4	6	2.8
	21-30	569	463	81.4	106	18.6	417	73.3	109	19.2	21	3.7	22	3.9
	31-40	263	204	77.6	59	22.4	205	77.9	38	14.4	12	4.6	8	3.0
	41-50	243	177	72.8	66	27.2	195	80.2	21	8.6	15	6.2	12	4.9
	51-60	104	87	83.7	17	16.3	96	92.3	5	4.8	2	1.9	1	1.0
	61-70	28	25	89.3	3	10.7	25	89.3	3	10.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1448	1155	79.8	293	20.2	1134	78.3	209	14.4	55	3.8	50	3.5

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	18	16	88.9	2	11.1	14	77.8	3	16.7	0	0.0	1	5.6
	21-30	73	65	89.0	8	11.0	59	80.8	13	17.8	0	0.0	1	1.4
	31-40	71	43	60.6	28	39.4	64	90.1	7	9.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	77	55	71.4	22	28.6	70	90.9	5	6.5	0	0.0	2	2.6
	51-60	39	31	79.5	8	20.5	35	89.7	1	2.6	2	5.1	1	2.6
	61-70	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	296	227	76.7	69	23.3	260	87.8	29	9.8	2	0.7	5	1.7	
COLUSA	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	22	22	100.0	0	0.0	5	22.7	17	77.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	91	82	90.1	9	9.9	30	33.0	56	61.5	2	2.2	3	3.3
	31-40	50	39	78.0	11	22.0	28	56.0	20	40.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
	41-50	52	42	80.8	10	19.2	31	59.6	19	36.5	1	1.9	1	1.9
	51-60	28	25	89.3	3	10.7	18	64.3	7	25.0	2	7.1	1	3.6
	61-70	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	4	57.1	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	254	221	87.0	33	13.0	118	46.5	123	48.4	6	2.4	7	2.8	
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	42	35	83.3	7	16.7	28	66.7	7	16.7	2	4.8	5	11.9
	18-20	325	264	81.2	61	18.8	169	52.0	104	32.0	20	6.2	32	9.8
	21-30	1673	1370	81.9	303	18.1	706	42.2	632	37.8	160	9.6	175	10.5
	31-40	1049	811	77.3	238	22.7	457	43.6	323	30.8	166	15.8	103	9.8
	41-50	793	609	76.8	184	23.2	457	57.6	162	20.4	116	14.6	58	7.3
	51-60	297	245	82.5	52	17.5	183	61.6	41	13.8	49	16.5	24	8.1
	61-70	71	61	85.9	10	14.1	52	73.2	8	11.3	9	12.7	2	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	25	20	80.0	5	20.0	19	76.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	2	8.0
TOTAL	4275	3415	79.9	860	20.1	2071	48.4	1279	29.9	524	12.3	401	9.4	
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	21	18	85.7	3	14.3	14	66.7	5	23.8	0	0.0	2	9.5
	21-30	74	61	82.4	13	17.6	53	71.6	13	17.6	1	1.4	7	9.5
	31-40	92	67	72.8	25	27.2	83	90.2	4	4.3	0	0.0	5	5.4
	41-50	75	52	69.3	23	30.7	65	86.7	3	4.0	1	1.3	6	8.0
	51-60	45	37	82.2	8	17.8	39	86.7	1	2.2	0	0.0	5	11.1
	61-70	15	9	60.0	6	40.0	14	93.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
TOTAL	328	250	76.2	78	23.8	273	83.2	26	7.9	2	0.6	27	8.2	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	15	15	100.0	0	0.0	14	93.3	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	102	80	78.4	22	21.6	88	86.3	11	10.8	1	1.0	2	2.0
	21-30	423	370	87.5	53	12.5	322	76.1	84	19.9	4	0.9	13	3.1
	31-40	332	254	76.5	78	23.5	288	86.7	35	10.5	1	0.3	8	2.4
	41-50	345	253	73.3	92	26.7	319	92.5	19	5.5	2	0.6	5	1.4
	51-60	116	91	78.4	25	21.6	110	94.8	5	4.3	0	0.0	1	0.9
	61-70	25	23	92.0	2	8.0	21	84.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
	71 & ABOVE	16	9	56.3	7	43.8	15	93.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3
TOTAL	1374	1095	79.7	279	20.3	1177	85.7	158	11.5	8	0.6	31	2.3	
FRESNO	UNDER 18	58	51	87.9	7	12.1	16	27.6	38	65.5	1	1.7	3	5.2
	18-20	533	500	93.8	33	6.2	117	22.0	383	71.9	8	1.5	25	4.7
	21-30	2476	2206	89.1	270	10.9	467	18.9	1819	73.5	89	3.6	101	4.1
	31-40	1394	1199	86.0	195	14.0	331	23.7	956	68.6	50	3.6	57	4.1
	41-50	864	733	84.8	131	15.2	272	31.5	512	59.3	50	5.8	30	3.5
	51-60	323	295	91.3	28	8.7	125	38.7	168	52.0	15	4.6	15	4.6
	61-70	66	60	90.9	6	9.1	30	45.5	31	47.0	3	4.5	2	3.0
	71 & ABOVE	27	26	96.3	1	3.7	15	55.6	9	33.3	3	11.1	0	0.0
TOTAL	5741	5070	88.3	671	11.7	1373	23.9	3916	68.2	219	3.8	233	4.1	
GLENN	UNDER 18	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	1	16.7
	18-20	33	30	90.9	3	9.1	21	63.6	10	30.3	0	0.0	2	6.1
	21-30	136	125	91.9	11	8.1	49	36.0	73	53.7	4	2.9	10	7.4
	31-40	92	75	81.5	17	18.5	42	45.7	46	50.0	2	2.2	2	2.2
	41-50	59	47	79.7	12	20.3	34	57.6	23	39.0	2	3.4	0	0.0
	51-60	40	28	70.0	12	30.0	33	82.5	5	12.5	1	2.5	1	2.5
	61-70	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	8	80.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	380	320	84.2	60	15.8	194	51.1	161	42.4	9	2.4	16	4.2	
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	10	90.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1
	18-20	118	82	69.5	36	30.5	87	73.7	7	5.9	2	1.7	22	18.6
	21-30	477	380	79.7	97	20.3	368	77.1	46	9.6	15	3.1	48	10.1
	31-40	242	167	69.0	75	31.0	203	83.9	22	9.1	2	0.8	15	6.2
	41-50	252	177	70.2	75	29.8	203	80.6	22	8.7	4	1.6	23	9.1
	51-60	114	92	80.7	22	19.3	106	93.0	2	1.8	0	0.0	6	5.3
	61-70	31	26	83.9	5	16.1	28	90.3	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	6.5
	71 & ABOVE	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	8	88.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
TOTAL	1254	938	74.8	316	25.2	1013	80.8	99	7.9	24	1.9	118	9.4	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	14	8	57.1	6	42.9	5	35.7	9	64.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	105	95	90.5	10	9.5	30	28.6	67	63.8	3	2.9	5	4.8
	21-30	446	383	85.9	63	14.1	123	27.6	296	66.4	9	2.0	18	4.0
	31-40	313	275	87.9	38	12.1	65	20.8	225	71.9	4	1.3	19	6.1
	41-50	261	229	87.7	32	12.3	79	30.3	171	65.5	5	1.9	6	2.3
	51-60	112	103	92.0	9	8.0	39	34.8	69	61.6	1	0.9	3	2.7
	61-70	44	40	90.9	4	9.1	19	43.2	20	45.5	3	6.8	2	4.5
	71 & ABOVE	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1303	1139	87.4	164	12.6	363	27.9	862	66.2	25	1.9	53	4.1	
INYO	UNDER 18	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
	18-20	23	20	87.0	3	13.0	12	52.2	3	13.0	0	0.0	8	34.8
	21-30	63	51	81.0	12	19.0	39	61.9	13	20.6	0	0.0	11	17.5
	31-40	57	45	78.9	12	21.1	39	68.4	8	14.0	1	1.8	9	15.8
	41-50	73	54	74.0	19	26.0	51	69.9	12	16.4	0	0.0	10	13.7
	51-60	41	39	95.1	2	4.9	28	68.3	3	7.3	1	2.4	9	22.0
	61-70	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	12	85.7	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	277	225	81.2	52	18.8	186	67.1	40	14.4	2	0.7	49	17.7	
KERN	UNDER 18	66	60	90.9	6	9.1	34	51.5	32	48.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	494	428	86.6	66	13.4	216	43.7	257	52.0	16	3.2	5	1.0
	21-30	2196	1910	87.0	286	13.0	718	32.7	1350	61.5	104	4.7	24	1.1
	31-40	1351	1141	84.5	210	15.5	524	38.8	733	54.3	73	5.4	21	1.6
	41-50	988	807	81.7	181	18.3	491	49.7	402	40.7	68	6.9	27	2.7
	51-60	345	292	84.6	53	15.4	198	57.4	113	32.8	21	6.1	13	3.8
	61-70	108	93	86.1	15	13.9	73	67.6	28	25.9	6	5.6	1	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	28	27	96.4	1	3.6	24	85.7	3	10.7	1	3.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	5576	4758	85.3	818	14.7	2278	40.9	2918	52.3	289	5.2	91	1.6	
KINGS	UNDER 18	9	6	66.7	3	33.3	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1	0	0.0
	18-20	87	79	90.8	8	9.2	21	24.1	57	65.5	4	4.6	5	5.7
	21-30	415	366	88.2	49	11.8	118	28.4	267	64.3	19	4.6	11	2.7
	31-40	205	172	83.9	33	16.1	58	28.3	127	62.0	11	5.4	9	4.4
	41-50	148	117	79.1	31	20.9	57	38.5	71	48.0	10	6.8	10	6.8
	51-60	45	38	84.4	7	15.6	17	37.8	22	48.9	3	6.7	3	6.7
	61-70	15	14	93.3	1	6.7	9	60.0	5	33.3	1	6.7	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	931	799	85.8	132	14.2	287	30.8	557	59.8	49	5.3	38	4.1	



TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LAKE	UNDER 18	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	4	66.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7
	18-20	44	37	84.1	7	15.9	30	68.2	12	27.3	1	2.3	1	2.3
	21-30	174	149	85.6	25	14.4	119	68.4	49	28.2	0	0.0	6	3.4
	31-40	131	95	72.5	36	27.5	102	77.9	19	14.5	5	3.8	5	3.8
	41-50	155	113	72.9	42	27.1	135	87.1	12	7.7	2	1.3	6	3.9
	51-60	92	72	78.3	20	21.7	81	88.0	4	4.3	4	4.3	3	3.3
	61-70	24	20	83.3	4	16.7	21	87.5	1	4.2	1	4.2	1	4.2
	71 & ABOVE	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	635	498	78.4	137	21.6	500	78.7	99	15.6	13	2.0	23	3.6	
LASSEN	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	33	23	69.7	10	30.3	26	78.8	2	6.1	1	3.0	4	12.1
	21-30	71	64	90.1	7	9.9	56	78.9	13	18.3	2	2.8	0	0.0
	31-40	65	50	76.9	15	23.1	58	89.2	3	4.6	1	1.5	3	4.6
	41-50	74	58	78.4	16	21.6	70	94.6	3	4.1	1	1.4	0	0.0
	51-60	41	37	90.2	4	9.8	39	95.1	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0
	61-70	15	12	80.0	3	20.0	14	93.3	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	304	248	81.6	56	18.4	266	87.5	25	8.2	6	2.0	7	2.3
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	154	126	81.8	28	18.2	67	43.5	71	46.1	9	5.8	7	4.5
	18-20	2141	1783	83.3	358	16.7	604	28.2	1267	59.2	109	5.1	161	7.5
	21-30	15718	13136	83.6	2582	16.4	3452	22.0	9723	61.9	1144	7.3	1399	8.9
	31-40	10677	9234	86.5	1443	13.5	2306	21.6	6452	60.4	1178	11.0	741	6.9
	41-50	6272	5337	85.1	935	14.9	1792	28.6	3041	48.5	947	15.1	492	7.8
	51-60	2301	2009	87.3	292	12.7	811	35.2	917	39.9	372	16.2	201	8.7
	61-70	628	566	90.1	62	9.9	248	39.5	191	30.4	144	22.9	45	7.2
	71 & ABOVE	124	103	83.1	21	16.9	64	51.6	32	25.8	21	16.9	7	5.6
TOTAL	38015	32294	85.0	5721	15.0	9344	24.6	21694	57.1	3924	10.3	3053	8.0	
MADERA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	66	64	97.0	2	3.0	16	24.2	48	72.7	2	3.0	0	0.0
	21-30	335	313	93.4	22	6.6	66	19.7	253	75.5	6	1.8	10	3.0
	31-40	213	186	87.3	27	12.7	76	35.7	126	59.2	5	2.3	6	2.8
	41-50	145	115	79.3	30	20.7	75	51.7	63	43.4	3	2.1	4	2.8
	51-60	59	52	88.1	7	11.9	44	74.6	12	20.3	0	0.0	3	5.1
	61-70	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	6	50.0	6	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
TOTAL	835	745	89.2	90	10.8	287	34.4	508	60.8	16	1.9	24	2.9	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIN	UNDER 18	35	26	74.3	9	25.7	31	88.6	1	2.9	0	0.0	3	8.6
	18-20	100	78	78.0	22	22.0	66	66.0	27	27.0	2	2.0	5	5.0
	21-30	568	476	83.8	92	16.2	290	51.1	205	36.1	32	5.6	41	7.2
	31-40	411	309	75.2	102	24.8	279	67.9	91	22.1	22	5.4	19	4.6
	41-50	315	234	74.3	81	25.7	249	79.0	33	10.5	18	5.7	15	4.8
	51-60	188	133	70.7	55	29.3	169	89.9	7	3.7	4	2.1	8	4.3
	61-70	42	32	76.2	10	23.8	38	90.5	1	2.4	2	4.8	1	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	1667	1295	77.7	372	22.3	1129	67.7	365	21.9	81	4.9	92	5.5	
MARIPOSA	18-20	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3
	21-30	27	25	92.6	2	7.4	21	77.8	5	18.5	0	0.0	1	3.7
	31-40	40	32	80.0	8	20.0	36	90.0	3	7.5	0	0.0	1	2.5
	41-50	47	37	78.7	10	21.3	46	97.9	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	16	11	68.8	5	31.3	14	87.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5
	61-70	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	139	112	80.6	27	19.4	123	88.5	10	7.2	0	0.0	6	4.3
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	16	12	75.0	4	25.0	10	62.5	5	31.3	0	0.0	1	6.3
	18-20	77	60	77.9	17	22.1	50	64.9	21	27.3	0	0.0	6	7.8
	21-30	252	220	87.3	32	12.7	142	56.3	87	34.5	3	1.2	20	7.9
	31-40	217	164	75.6	53	24.4	147	67.7	49	22.6	6	2.8	15	6.9
	41-50	189	136	72.0	53	28.0	154	81.5	21	11.1	4	2.1	10	5.3
	51-60	86	64	74.4	22	25.6	69	80.2	9	10.5	0	0.0	8	9.3
	61-70	22	16	72.7	6	27.3	16	72.7	3	13.6	0	0.0	3	13.6
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	861	674	78.3	187	21.7	590	68.5	195	22.6	13	1.5	63	7.3
MERCED	UNDER 18	17	16	94.1	1	5.9	6	35.3	10	58.8	1	5.9	0	0.0
	18-20	141	128	90.8	13	9.2	38	27.0	100	70.9	1	0.7	2	1.4
	21-30	585	548	93.7	37	6.3	114	19.5	442	75.6	11	1.9	18	3.1
	31-40	343	317	92.4	26	7.6	66	19.2	252	73.5	14	4.1	11	3.2
	41-50	243	201	82.7	42	17.3	84	34.6	137	56.4	14	5.8	8	3.3
	51-60	75	66	88.0	9	12.0	34	45.3	32	42.7	9	12.0	0	0.0
	61-70	35	34	97.1	1	2.9	20	57.1	14	40.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1442	1313	91.1	129	8.9	364	25.2	988	68.5	51	3.5	39	2.7

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MODOC	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	12	9	75.0	3	25.0	9	75.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	2	16.7
	31-40	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	19	86.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6
	51-60	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	1	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	60	48	80.0	12	20.0	54	90.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	5	8.3
MONO	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	19	15	78.9	4	21.1	16	84.2	3	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	44	39	88.6	5	11.4	32	72.7	11	25.0	1	2.3	0	0.0
	31-40	43	36	83.7	7	16.3	31	72.1	10	23.3	1	2.3	1	2.3
	41-50	29	28	96.6	1	3.4	26	89.7	1	3.4	1	3.4	1	3.4
	51-60	16	14	87.5	2	12.5	13	81.3	2	12.5	0	0.0	1	6.3
	61-70	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	158	138	87.3	20	12.7	125	79.1	27	17.1	3	1.9	3	1.9
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	47	43	91.5	4	8.5	17	36.2	29	61.7	1	2.1	0	0.0
	18-20	329	285	86.6	44	13.4	73	22.2	245	74.5	5	1.5	6	1.8
	21-30	1575	1394	88.5	181	11.5	345	21.9	1152	73.1	28	1.8	50	3.2
	31-40	774	669	86.4	105	13.6	209	27.0	508	65.6	35	4.5	22	2.8
	41-50	462	382	82.7	80	17.3	223	48.3	194	42.0	30	6.5	15	3.2
	51-60	213	181	85.0	32	15.0	123	57.7	78	36.6	7	3.3	5	2.3
	61-70	45	36	80.0	9	20.0	34	75.6	7	15.6	3	6.7	1	2.2
	71 & ABOVE	23	20	87.0	3	13.0	15	65.2	7	30.4	1	4.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3468	3010	86.8	458	13.2	1039	30.0	2220	64.0	110	3.2	99	2.9
NAPA	UNDER 18	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	10	66.7	5	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	121	102	84.3	19	15.7	56	46.3	57	47.1	1	0.8	7	5.8
	21-30	463	389	84.0	74	16.0	221	47.7	224	48.4	10	2.2	8	1.7
	31-40	282	226	80.1	56	19.9	178	63.1	88	31.2	7	2.5	9	3.2
	41-50	212	148	69.8	64	30.2	164	77.4	36	17.0	6	2.8	6	2.8
	51-60	108	82	75.9	26	24.1	87	80.6	17	15.7	1	0.9	3	2.8
	61-70	25	17	68.0	8	32.0	19	76.0	4	16.0	1	4.0	1	4.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1230	980	79.7	250	20.3	739	60.1	431	35.0	26	2.1	34	2.8

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	60	48	80.0	12	20.0	50	83.3	9	15.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
	21-30	205	171	83.4	34	16.6	177	86.3	24	11.7	0	0.0	4	2.0
	31-40	142	116	81.7	26	18.3	124	87.3	14	9.9	2	1.4	2	1.4
	41-50	176	132	75.0	44	25.0	157	89.2	12	6.8	3	1.7	4	2.3
	51-60	62	48	77.4	14	22.6	61	98.4	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
	61-70	14	9	64.3	5	35.7	14	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	669	531	79.4	138	20.6	592	88.5	59	8.8	8	1.2	10	1.5	
ORANGE	UNDER 18	69	55	79.7	14	20.3	45	65.2	13	18.8	0	0.0	11	15.9
	18-20	981	788	80.3	193	19.7	525	53.5	358	36.5	16	1.6	82	8.4
	21-30	5735	4831	84.2	904	15.8	2414	42.1	2631	45.9	138	2.4	552	9.6
	31-40	3621	2977	82.2	644	17.8	1702	47.0	1542	42.6	102	2.8	275	7.6
	41-50	2207	1735	78.6	472	21.4	1329	60.2	621	28.1	73	3.3	184	8.3
	51-60	866	694	80.1	172	19.9	586	67.7	194	22.4	18	2.1	68	7.9
	61-70	210	179	85.2	31	14.8	150	71.4	42	20.0	4	1.9	14	6.7
	71 & ABOVE	53	45	84.9	8	15.1	39	73.6	12	22.6	1	1.9	1	1.9
TOTAL	13742	11304	82.3	2438	17.7	6790	49.4	5413	39.4	352	2.6	1187	8.6	
PLACER	UNDER 18	27	17	63.0	10	37.0	19	70.4	5	18.5	1	3.7	2	7.4
	18-20	138	102	73.9	36	26.1	114	82.6	19	13.8	1	0.7	4	2.9
	21-30	640	510	79.7	130	20.3	461	72.0	149	23.3	13	2.0	17	2.7
	31-40	417	318	76.3	99	23.7	323	77.5	66	15.8	11	2.6	17	4.1
	41-50	350	264	75.4	86	24.6	303	86.6	25	7.1	15	4.3	7	2.0
	51-60	127	104	81.9	23	18.1	115	90.6	9	7.1	1	0.8	2	1.6
	61-70	38	31	81.6	7	18.4	35	92.1	3	7.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1741	1348	77.4	393	22.6	1374	78.9	276	15.9	42	2.4	49	2.8	
PLUMAS	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	22	17	77.3	5	22.7	21	95.5	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0
	21-30	46	32	69.6	14	30.4	38	82.6	7	15.2	1	2.2	0	0.0
	31-40	47	36	76.6	11	23.4	44	93.6	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.3
	41-50	55	43	78.2	12	21.8	52	94.5	2	3.6	1	1.8	0	0.0
	51-60	32	26	81.3	6	18.8	28	87.5	0	0.0	3	9.4	1	3.1
	61-70	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	215	166	77.2	49	22.8	194	90.2	11	5.1	7	3.3	3	1.4	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	59	55	93.2	4	6.8	25	42.4	32	54.2	2	3.4	0	0.0
	18-20	752	637	84.7	115	15.3	298	39.6	405	53.9	29	3.9	20	2.7
	21-30	3363	2948	87.7	415	12.3	1037	30.8	2067	61.5	152	4.5	107	3.2
	31-40	2075	1755	84.6	320	15.4	720	34.7	1145	55.2	143	6.9	67	3.2
	41-50	1444	1165	80.7	279	19.3	740	51.2	551	38.2	105	7.3	48	3.3
	51-60	610	515	84.4	95	15.6	370	60.7	176	28.9	44	7.2	20	3.3
	61-70	206	180	87.4	26	12.6	135	65.5	59	28.6	6	2.9	6	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	57	48	84.2	9	15.8	46	80.7	8	14.0	1	1.8	2	3.5
TOTAL	8566	7303	85.3	1263	14.7	3371	39.4	4443	51.9	482	5.6	270	3.2	
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	73	57	78.1	16	21.9	46	63.0	19	26.0	4	5.5	4	5.5
	18-20	730	585	80.1	145	19.9	323	44.2	247	33.8	79	10.8	81	11.1
	21-30	3384	2699	79.8	685	20.2	1503	44.4	1068	31.6	468	13.8	345	10.2
	31-40	1925	1511	78.5	414	21.5	905	47.0	509	26.4	368	19.1	143	7.4
	41-50	1314	1011	76.9	303	23.1	750	57.1	209	15.9	263	20.0	92	7.0
	51-60	488	397	81.4	91	18.6	287	58.8	66	13.5	101	20.7	34	7.0
	61-70	122	104	85.2	18	14.8	74	60.7	16	13.1	16	13.1	16	13.1
	71 & ABOVE	39	36	92.3	3	7.7	29	74.4	6	15.4	4	10.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	8075	6400	79.3	1675	20.7	3917	48.5	2140	26.5	1303	16.1	715	8.9	
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	32	29	90.6	3	9.4	12	37.5	20	62.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	135	123	91.1	12	8.9	30	22.2	103	76.3	0	0.0	2	1.5
	31-40	85	75	88.2	10	11.8	21	24.7	60	70.6	2	2.4	2	2.4
	41-50	66	56	84.8	10	15.2	27	40.9	34	51.5	0	0.0	5	7.6
	51-60	23	21	91.3	2	8.7	10	43.5	13	56.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	4	57.1	3	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	355	317	89.3	38	10.7	108	30.4	236	66.5	2	0.6	9	2.5	
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	61	54	88.5	7	11.5	28	45.9	29	47.5	2	3.3	2	3.3
	18-20	927	782	84.4	145	15.6	382	41.2	459	49.5	47	5.1	39	4.2
	21-30	4644	3986	85.8	658	14.2	1560	33.6	2639	56.8	289	6.2	156	3.4
	31-40	2869	2399	83.6	470	16.4	954	33.3	1520	53.0	298	10.4	97	3.4
	41-50	1962	1624	82.8	338	17.2	921	46.9	779	39.7	206	10.5	56	2.9
	51-60	753	662	87.9	91	12.1	404	53.7	238	31.6	82	10.9	29	3.9
	61-70	183	159	86.9	24	13.1	123	67.2	39	21.3	18	9.8	3	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	67	64	95.5	3	4.5	40	59.7	16	23.9	8	11.9	3	4.5
TOTAL	11466	9730	84.9	1736	15.1	4412	38.5	5719	49.9	950	8.3	385	3.4	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	164	125	76.2	39	23.8	101	61.6	51	31.1	6	3.7	6	3.7
	18-20	1536	1247	81.2	289	18.8	806	52.5	566	36.8	65	4.2	99	6.4
	21-30	7104	5893	83.0	1211	17.0	3534	49.7	2614	36.8	494	7.0	462	6.5
	31-40	3618	2970	82.1	648	17.9	1693	46.8	1467	40.5	290	8.0	168	4.6
	41-50	2435	1954	80.2	481	19.8	1399	57.5	722	29.7	198	8.1	116	4.8
	51-60	937	773	82.5	164	17.5	614	65.5	212	22.6	63	6.7	48	5.1
	61-70	255	215	84.3	40	15.7	172	67.5	55	21.6	14	5.5	14	5.5
	71 & ABOVE	78	64	82.1	14	17.9	66	84.6	9	11.5	3	3.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	16127	13241	82.1	2886	17.9	8385	52.0	5696	35.3	1133	7.0	913	5.7	
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
	18-20	65	53	81.5	12	18.5	29	44.6	9	13.8	8	12.3	19	29.2
	21-30	667	520	78.0	147	22.0	301	45.1	107	16.0	76	11.4	183	27.4
	31-40	432	365	84.5	67	15.5	216	50.0	71	16.4	62	14.4	83	19.2
	41-50	227	196	86.3	31	13.7	125	55.1	23	10.1	38	16.7	41	18.1
	51-60	96	74	77.1	22	22.9	64	66.7	4	4.2	13	13.5	15	15.6
	61-70	32	24	75.0	8	25.0	19	59.4	1	3.1	8	25.0	4	12.5
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1528	1240	81.2	288	18.8	757	49.5	218	14.3	207	13.5	346	22.6	
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	48	37	77.1	11	22.9	23	47.9	22	45.8	2	4.2	1	2.1
	18-20	426	386	90.6	40	9.4	131	30.8	236	55.4	21	4.9	38	8.9
	21-30	1826	1636	89.6	190	10.4	431	23.6	1207	66.1	96	5.3	92	5.0
	31-40	1086	914	84.2	172	15.8	374	34.4	553	50.9	106	9.8	53	4.9
	41-50	769	628	81.7	141	18.3	309	40.2	316	41.1	91	11.8	53	6.9
	51-60	295	249	84.4	46	15.6	149	50.5	94	31.9	32	10.8	20	6.8
	61-70	87	78	89.7	9	10.3	49	56.3	24	27.6	9	10.3	5	5.7
	71 & ABOVE	28	25	89.3	3	10.7	15	53.6	10	35.7	3	10.7	0	0.0
TOTAL	4565	3953	86.6	612	13.4	1481	32.4	2462	53.9	360	7.9	262	5.7	
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	55	46	83.6	9	16.4	41	74.5	13	23.6	0	0.0	1	1.8
	18-20	264	214	81.1	50	18.9	188	71.2	67	25.4	3	1.1	6	2.3
	21-30	905	771	85.2	134	14.8	564	62.3	306	33.8	17	1.9	18	2.0
	31-40	427	353	82.7	74	17.3	256	60.0	144	33.7	16	3.7	11	2.6
	41-50	356	267	75.0	89	25.0	285	80.1	55	15.4	9	2.5	7	2.0
	51-60	183	132	72.1	51	27.9	153	83.6	24	13.1	3	1.6	3	1.6
	61-70	40	31	77.5	9	22.5	33	82.5	4	10.0	2	5.0	1	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	16	94.1	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	2247	1827	81.3	420	18.7	1536	68.4	614	27.3	50	2.2	47	2.1	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	33	24	72.7	9	27.3	26	78.8	5	15.2	2	6.1	0	0.0
	18-20	255	207	81.2	48	18.8	84	32.9	120	47.1	11	4.3	40	15.7
	21-30	1475	1184	80.3	291	19.7	484	32.8	658	44.6	64	4.3	269	18.2
	31-40	900	737	81.9	163	18.1	354	39.3	327	36.3	46	5.1	173	19.2
	41-50	650	507	78.0	143	22.0	375	57.7	148	22.8	44	6.8	83	12.8
	51-60	285	237	83.2	48	16.8	189	66.3	52	18.2	16	5.6	28	9.8
	61-70	72	58	80.6	14	19.4	44	61.1	9	12.5	7	9.7	12	16.7
	71 & ABOVE	12	8	66.7	4	33.3	9	75.0	1	8.3	1	8.3	1	8.3
TOTAL	3682	2962	80.4	720	19.6	1565	42.5	1320	35.9	191	5.2	606	16.5	
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	21	15	71.4	6	28.6	10	47.6	11	52.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	142	117	82.4	25	17.6	89	62.7	46	32.4	3	2.1	4	2.8
	21-30	1079	841	77.9	238	22.1	565	52.4	422	39.1	29	2.7	63	5.8
	31-40	474	367	77.4	107	22.6	260	54.9	185	39.0	14	3.0	15	3.2
	41-50	376	287	76.3	89	23.7	259	68.9	95	25.3	13	3.5	9	2.4
	51-60	150	116	77.3	34	22.7	111	74.0	37	24.7	0	0.0	2	1.3
	61-70	41	30	73.2	11	26.8	31	75.6	8	19.5	1	2.4	1	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	10	9	90.0	1	10.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	2293	1782	77.7	511	22.3	1331	58.0	808	35.2	60	2.6	94	4.1	
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	59	46	78.0	13	22.0	30	50.8	25	42.4	1	1.7	3	5.1
	18-20	522	443	84.9	79	15.1	161	30.8	279	53.4	16	3.1	66	12.6
	21-30	3000	2566	85.5	434	14.5	724	24.1	1725	57.5	143	4.8	408	13.6
	31-40	1724	1451	84.2	273	15.8	537	31.1	860	49.9	97	5.6	230	13.3
	41-50	1160	951	82.0	209	18.0	545	47.0	414	35.7	52	4.5	149	12.8
	51-60	397	326	82.1	71	17.9	195	49.1	126	31.7	20	5.0	56	14.1
	61-70	120	99	82.5	21	17.5	71	59.2	33	27.5	6	5.0	10	8.3
	71 & ABOVE	32	28	87.5	4	12.5	28	87.5	3	9.4	1	3.1	0	0.0
TOTAL	7014	5910	84.3	1104	15.7	2291	32.7	3465	49.4	336	4.8	922	13.1	
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	18	12	66.7	6	33.3	8	44.4	9	50.0	0	0.0	1	5.6
	18-20	178	149	83.7	29	16.3	100	56.2	66	37.1	6	3.4	6	3.4
	21-30	692	548	79.2	144	20.8	385	55.6	265	38.3	15	2.2	27	3.9
	31-40	373	296	79.4	77	20.6	224	60.1	137	36.7	4	1.1	8	2.1
	41-50	335	266	79.4	69	20.6	249	74.3	62	18.5	10	3.0	14	4.2
	51-60	133	97	72.9	36	27.1	107	80.5	19	14.3	4	3.0	3	2.3
	61-70	19	17	89.5	2	10.5	16	84.2	3	15.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1755	1392	79.3	363	20.7	1096	62.5	561	32.0	39	2.2	59	3.4	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SHASTA	UNDER 18	14	8	57.1	6	42.9	12	85.7	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	7.1
	18-20	91	72	79.1	19	20.9	78	85.7	2	2.2	3	3.3	8	8.8
	21-30	407	334	82.1	73	17.9	338	83.0	40	9.8	7	1.7	22	5.4
	31-40	267	189	70.8	78	29.2	227	85.0	22	8.2	6	2.2	12	4.5
	41-50	268	200	74.6	68	25.4	232	86.6	17	6.3	9	3.4	10	3.7
	51-60	108	85	78.7	23	21.3	101	93.5	4	3.7	0	0.0	3	2.8
	61-70	34	24	70.6	10	29.4	32	94.1	0	0.0	1	2.9	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1201	922	76.8	279	23.2	1032	85.9	86	7.2	26	2.2	57	4.7	
SIERRA	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	10	9	90.0	1	10.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	17	15	88.2	2	11.8	15	88.2	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	19	17	89.5	2	10.5	18	94.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3
	51-60	11	7	63.6	4	36.4	10	90.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1
	TOTAL	66	55	83.3	11	16.7	62	93.9	2	3.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	23	19	82.6	4	17.4	18	78.3	4	17.4	0	0.0	1	4.3
	21-30	93	80	86.0	13	14.0	66	71.0	17	18.3	2	2.2	8	8.6
	31-40	89	74	83.1	15	16.9	71	79.8	12	13.5	4	4.5	2	2.2
	41-50	101	73	72.3	28	27.7	91	90.1	6	5.9	1	1.0	3	3.0
	51-60	46	45	97.8	1	2.2	41	89.1	4	8.7	1	2.2	0	0.0
	61-70	12	9	75.0	3	25.0	12	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
TOTAL	377	310	82.2	67	17.8	311	82.5	43	11.4	8	2.1	15	4.0	
SOLANO	UNDER 18	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	10	71.4	4	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	149	126	84.6	23	15.4	65	43.6	57	38.3	16	10.7	11	7.4
	21-30	578	508	87.9	70	12.1	219	37.9	226	39.1	86	14.9	47	8.1
	31-40	445	362	81.3	83	18.7	181	40.7	123	27.6	111	24.9	30	6.7
	41-50	325	251	77.2	74	22.8	173	53.2	58	17.8	71	21.8	23	7.1
	51-60	160	125	78.1	35	21.9	86	53.8	12	7.5	47	29.4	15	9.4
	61-70	46	40	87.0	6	13.0	33	71.7	3	6.5	7	15.2	3	6.5
	71 & ABOVE	17	14	82.4	3	17.6	15	88.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	0	0.0
TOTAL	1734	1439	83.0	295	17.0	782	45.1	484	27.9	339	19.6	129	7.4	



TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SONOMA	UNDER 18	43	30	69.8	13	30.2	27	62.8	10	23.3	4	9.3	2	4.7
	18-20	287	251	87.5	36	12.5	161	56.1	111	38.7	6	2.1	9	3.1
	21-30	1103	957	86.8	146	13.2	527	47.8	508	46.1	32	2.9	36	3.3
	31-40	587	494	84.2	93	15.8	329	56.0	222	37.8	13	2.2	23	3.9
	41-50	445	336	75.5	109	24.5	335	75.3	81	18.2	13	2.9	16	3.6
	51-60	238	195	81.9	43	18.1	196	82.4	20	8.4	8	3.4	14	5.9
	61-70	42	29	69.0	13	31.0	38	90.5	2	4.8	0	0.0	2	4.8
	71 & ABOVE	19	13	68.4	6	31.6	18	94.7	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2764	2305	83.4	459	16.6	1631	59.0	954	34.5	77	2.8	102	3.7
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	28	23	82.1	5	17.9	11	39.3	17	60.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	269	229	85.1	40	14.9	110	40.9	141	52.4	3	1.1	15	5.6
	21-30	1026	903	88.0	123	12.0	343	33.4	621	60.5	24	2.3	38	3.7
	31-40	529	432	81.7	97	18.3	225	42.5	250	47.3	31	5.9	23	4.3
	41-50	332	262	78.9	70	21.1	181	54.5	121	36.4	16	4.8	14	4.2
	51-60	144	124	86.1	20	13.9	82	56.9	50	34.7	7	4.9	5	3.5
	61-70	40	36	90.0	4	10.0	23	57.5	11	27.5	4	10.0	2	5.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	5	71.4	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2375	2015	84.8	360	15.2	980	41.3	1211	51.0	87	3.7	97	4.1
SUTTER	UNDER 18	11	11	100.0	0	0.0	6	54.5	5	45.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	65	55	84.6	10	15.4	36	55.4	27	41.5	0	0.0	2	3.1
	21-30	238	214	89.9	24	10.1	114	47.9	101	42.4	8	3.4	15	6.3
	31-40	118	97	82.2	21	17.8	61	51.7	45	38.1	1	0.8	11	9.3
	41-50	96	78	81.3	18	18.8	56	58.3	21	21.9	5	5.2	14	14.6
	51-60	41	36	87.8	5	12.2	28	68.3	7	17.1	0	0.0	6	14.6
	61-70	15	15	100.0	0	0.0	12	80.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	2	13.3
	TOTAL	584	506	86.6	78	13.4	313	53.6	207	35.4	14	2.4	50	8.6
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
	18-20	82	76	92.7	6	7.3	60	73.2	22	26.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	345	298	86.4	47	13.6	220	63.8	112	32.5	2	0.6	11	3.2
	31-40	286	212	74.1	74	25.9	220	76.9	62	21.7	3	1.0	1	0.3
	41-50	222	176	79.3	46	20.7	186	83.8	32	14.4	1	0.5	3	1.4
	51-60	91	81	89.0	10	11.0	83	91.2	5	5.5	1	1.1	2	2.2
	61-70	48	45	93.8	3	6.3	42	87.5	4	8.3	1	2.1	1	2.1
	TOTAL	1087	899	82.7	188	17.3	823	75.7	237	21.8	8	0.7	19	1.7

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TRINITY	18-20	20	20	100.0	0	0.0	19	95.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
	21-30	57	47	82.5	10	17.5	48	84.2	5	8.8	0	0.0	4	7.0
	31-40	42	34	81.0	8	19.0	39	92.9	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4
	41-50	49	36	73.5	13	26.5	44	89.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.2
	51-60	28	19	67.9	9	32.1	28	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	208	168	80.8	40	19.2	190	91.3	6	2.9	1	0.5	11	5.3
TULARE	UNDER 18	62	57	91.9	5	8.1	17	27.4	43	69.4	0	0.0	2	3.2
	18-20	327	297	90.8	30	9.2	69	21.1	255	78.0	1	0.3	2	0.6
	21-30	1544	1373	88.9	171	11.1	288	18.7	1199	77.7	32	2.1	25	1.6
	31-40	913	774	84.8	139	15.2	223	24.4	651	71.3	19	2.1	20	2.2
	41-50	528	455	86.2	73	13.8	189	35.8	314	59.5	13	2.5	12	2.3
	51-60	166	149	89.8	17	10.2	75	45.2	83	50.0	3	1.8	5	3.0
	61-70	74	67	90.5	7	9.5	35	47.3	34	45.9	2	2.7	3	4.1
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	3621	3179	87.8	442	12.2	902	24.9	2580	71.3	70	1.9	69	1.9	
TUOLUMNE	UNDER 18	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	38	28	73.7	10	26.3	35	92.1	2	5.3	0	0.0	1	2.6
	21-30	147	122	83.0	25	17.0	142	96.6	4	2.7	0	0.0	1	0.7
	31-40	123	92	74.8	31	25.2	119	96.7	3	2.4	0	0.0	1	0.8
	41-50	143	106	74.1	37	25.9	139	97.2	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7
	51-60	67	54	80.6	13	19.4	65	97.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	1	1.5
	61-70	22	15	68.2	7	31.8	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	548	423	77.2	125	22.8	529	96.5	12	2.2	2	0.4	5	0.9	
VENTURA	UNDER 18	48	37	77.1	11	22.9	29	60.4	19	39.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	362	310	85.6	52	14.4	170	47.0	179	49.4	6	1.7	7	1.9
	21-30	1625	1421	87.4	204	12.6	580	35.7	964	59.3	37	2.3	44	2.7
	31-40	925	773	83.6	152	16.4	399	43.1	476	51.5	27	2.9	23	2.5
	41-50	752	591	78.6	161	21.4	454	60.4	258	34.3	22	2.9	18	2.4
	51-60	257	199	77.4	58	22.6	176	68.5	67	26.1	5	1.9	9	3.5
	61-70	62	51	82.3	11	17.7	41	66.1	17	27.4	2	3.2	2	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	16	10	62.5	6	37.5	15	93.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3
TOTAL	4047	3392	83.8	655	16.2	1864	46.1	1980	48.9	99	2.4	104	2.6	

TABLE B1: 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	21	18	85.7	3	14.3	8	38.1	12	57.1	1	4.8	0	0.0
	18-20	143	123	86.0	20	14.0	72	50.3	58	40.6	3	2.1	10	7.0
	21-30	489	435	89.0	54	11.0	192	39.3	245	50.1	14	2.9	38	7.8
	31-40	232	194	83.6	38	16.4	107	46.1	113	48.7	5	2.2	7	3.0
	41-50	143	122	85.3	21	14.7	85	59.4	45	31.5	6	4.2	7	4.9
	51-60	63	54	85.7	9	14.3	43	68.3	18	28.6	0	0.0	2	3.2
	61-70	26	23	88.5	3	11.5	19	73.1	6	23.1	1	3.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1124	975	86.7	149	13.3	532	47.3	498	44.3	30	2.7	64	5.7
YUBA	UNDER 18	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	77	67	87.0	10	13.0	38	49.4	29	37.7	1	1.3	9	11.7
	21-30	259	228	88.0	31	12.0	128	49.4	105	40.5	8	3.1	18	6.9
	31-40	167	144	86.2	23	13.8	105	62.9	54	32.3	5	3.0	3	1.8
	41-50	156	120	76.9	36	23.1	123	78.8	24	15.4	5	3.2	4	2.6
	51-60	56	48	85.7	8	14.3	48	85.7	4	7.1	4	7.1	0	0.0
	61-70	17	16	94.1	1	5.9	14	82.4	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	741	631	85.2	110	14.8	463	62.5	221	29.8	23	3.1	34	4.6

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		136794	100.0	115110	84.1	21684	15.9
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	14	0.3	13	0.4	1	0.2
	18-20	241	6.0	193	5.8	48	7.3
	21-30	1454	36.2	1262	37.6	192	29.0
	31-40	1100	27.4	916	27.3	184	27.8
	41-50	812	20.2	643	19.2	169	25.6
	51-60	303	7.5	249	7.4	54	8.2
	61-70	72	1.8	62	1.8	10	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	21	0.5	18	0.5	3	0.5
	TOTAL	4017	100.0	3356	100.0	661	100.0
ALPINE	21-30	18	33.3	18	35.3	0	0.0
	31-40	17	31.5	15	29.4	2	66.7
	41-50	12	22.2	11	21.6	1	33.3
	51-60	6	11.1	6	11.8	0	0.0
	61-70	1	1.9	1	2.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	54	100.0	51	100.0	3	100.0
AMADOR	18-20	18	8.3	16	9.6	2	3.9
	21-30	56	25.7	47	28.1	9	17.6
	31-40	48	22.0	37	22.2	11	21.6
	41-50	58	26.6	40	24.0	18	35.3
	51-60	34	15.6	23	13.8	11	21.6
	61-70	4	1.8	4	2.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	218	100.0	167	100.0	51	100.0
BUTTE	UNDER 18	11	1.0	10	1.1	1	0.5
	18-20	116	10.7	95	10.9	21	9.8
	21-30	401	37.0	331	38.0	70	32.7
	31-40	248	22.9	197	22.6	51	23.8
	41-50	201	18.5	153	17.6	48	22.4
	51-60	82	7.6	64	7.4	18	8.4
	61-70	19	1.8	14	1.6	5	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.6	6	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1084	100.0	870	100.0	214	100.0
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	2	1.0	0	0.0	2	5.3
	18-20	13	6.3	12	7.1	1	2.6
	21-30	45	21.7	38	22.5	7	18.4
	31-40	46	22.2	33	19.5	13	34.2
	41-50	54	26.1	47	27.8	7	18.4
	51-60	33	15.9	28	16.6	5	13.2
	61-70	10	4.8	8	4.7	2	5.3
	71 & ABOVE	4	1.9	3	1.8	1	2.6
	TOTAL	207	100.0	169	100.0	38	100.0
COLUSA	UNDER 18	1	0.6	1	0.7	0	0.0
	18-20	19	12.2	18	12.7	1	7.1
	21-30	53	34.0	50	35.2	3	21.4
	31-40	41	26.3	36	25.4	5	35.7
	41-50	28	17.9	24	16.9	4	28.6
	51-60	9	5.8	8	5.6	1	7.1
	61-70	3	1.9	3	2.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.3	2	1.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	156	100.0	142	100.0	14	100.0
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	24	0.7	18	0.7	6	1.0
	18-20	283	8.8	240	9.1	43	7.4
	21-30	1144	35.6	992	37.8	152	26.0
	31-40	809	25.2	639	24.3	170	29.1
	41-50	648	20.2	490	18.7	158	27.1
	51-60	223	6.9	181	6.9	42	7.2
	61-70	62	1.9	56	2.1	6	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	18	0.6	11	0.4	7	1.2
	TOTAL	3211	100.0	2627	100.0	584	100.0

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
DEL NORTE	18-20	12	6.3	10	6.4	2	5.9
	21-30	53	27.7	47	29.9	6	17.6
	31-40	44	23.0	35	22.3	9	26.5
	41-50	55	28.8	38	24.2	17	50.0
	51-60	19	9.9	19	12.1	0	0.0
	61-70	6	3.1	6	3.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.0	2	1.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	191	100.0	157	100.0	34	100.0
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	5	0.5	2	0.2	3	1.7
	18-20	74	7.1	64	7.5	10	5.5
	21-30	301	29.1	262	30.6	39	21.5
	31-40	247	23.8	194	22.7	53	29.3
	41-50	282	27.2	233	27.3	49	27.1
	51-60	102	9.8	81	9.5	21	11.6
	61-70	19	1.8	15	1.8	4	2.2
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.6	4	0.5	2	1.1
	TOTAL	1036	100.0	855	100.0	181	100.0
FRESNO	UNDER 18	19	0.5	17	0.6	2	0.4
	18-20	294	8.2	258	8.3	36	7.2
	21-30	1430	39.8	1270	41.1	160	31.8
	31-40	906	25.2	746	24.1	160	31.8
	41-50	636	17.7	527	17.1	109	21.7
	51-60	232	6.5	210	6.8	22	4.4
	61-70	55	1.5	47	1.5	8	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	21	0.6	15	0.5	6	1.2
	TOTAL	3593	100.0	3090	100.0	503	100.0
GLENN	UNDER 18	4	2.2	4	2.6	0	0.0
	18-20	18	9.7	17	11.0	1	3.2
	21-30	57	30.8	50	32.5	7	22.6
	31-40	62	33.5	44	28.6	18	58.1
	41-50	25	13.5	22	14.3	3	9.7
	51-60	14	7.6	13	8.4	1	3.2
	61-70	5	2.7	4	2.6	1	3.2
	TOTAL	185	100.0	154	100.0	31	100.0
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	2	0.3	2	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	80	10.2	67	10.9	13	7.6
	21-30	342	43.4	272	44.1	70	40.9
	31-40	157	19.9	123	19.9	34	19.9
	41-50	132	16.8	94	15.2	38	22.2
	51-60	56	7.1	44	7.1	12	7.0
	61-70	12	1.5	10	1.6	2	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.9	5	0.8	2	1.2
	TOTAL	788	100.0	617	100.0	171	100.0
IMPERIAL	18-20	31	6.3	27	6.2	4	7.7
	21-30	175	35.8	159	36.4	16	30.8
	31-40	130	26.6	114	26.1	16	30.8
	41-50	97	19.8	85	19.5	12	23.1
	51-60	37	7.6	33	7.6	4	7.7
	61-70	14	2.9	14	3.2	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.0	5	1.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	489	100.0	437	100.0	52	100.0
INYO	UNDER 18	1	0.4	1	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	9	3.8	9	4.6	0	0.0
	21-30	55	23.5	50	25.6	5	12.8
	31-40	69	29.5	54	27.7	15	38.5
	41-50	51	21.8	44	22.6	7	17.9
	51-60	32	13.7	27	13.8	5	12.8
	61-70	7	3.0	3	1.5	4	10.3
	71 & ABOVE	10	4.3	7	3.6	3	7.7
	TOTAL	234	100.0	195	100.0	39	100.0

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
KERN	UNDER 18	50	1.3	43	1.3	7	1.3
	18-20	333	8.9	283	8.9	50	9.0
	21-30	1393	37.1	1222	38.2	171	30.6
	31-40	992	26.4	831	26.0	161	28.9
	41-50	653	17.4	533	16.7	120	21.5
	51-60	226	6.0	192	6.0	34	6.1
	61-70	82	2.2	71	2.2	11	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	26	0.7	22	0.7	4	0.7
	TOTAL	3755	100.0	3197	100.0	558	100.0
KINGS	UNDER 18	10	1.3	8	1.2	2	1.9
	18-20	93	12.4	84	13.0	9	8.7
	21-30	302	40.3	266	41.2	36	34.6
	31-40	177	23.6	145	22.4	32	30.8
	41-50	122	16.3	101	15.6	21	20.2
	51-60	34	4.5	30	4.6	4	3.8
	61-70	7	0.9	7	1.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.7	5	0.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	750	100.0	646	100.0	104	100.0
LAKE	UNDER 18	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	28	6.1	24	6.9	4	3.5
	21-30	133	28.9	110	31.7	23	20.2
	31-40	119	25.8	87	25.1	32	28.1
	41-50	115	24.9	76	21.9	39	34.2
	51-60	42	9.1	30	8.6	12	10.5
	61-70	12	2.6	9	2.6	3	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	11	2.4	10	2.9	1	0.9
	TOTAL	461	100.0	347	100.0	114	100.0
LASSEN	UNDER 18	1	0.5	1	0.6	0	0.0
	18-20	9	4.5	7	4.5	2	4.3
	21-30	55	27.2	45	29.0	10	21.3
	31-40	57	28.2	40	25.8	17	36.2
	41-50	61	30.2	46	29.7	15	31.9
	51-60	14	6.9	13	8.4	1	2.1
	61-70	5	2.5	3	1.9	2	4.3
	71 & ABOVE	5	2.5	3	1.9	2	4.3
	TOTAL	202	100.0	155	100.0	47	100.0
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	37	0.1	34	0.1	3	0.1
	18-20	1552	5.5	1322	5.4	230	5.8
	21-30	11001	38.9	9405	38.7	1596	40.2
	31-40	8381	29.6	7299	30.0	1082	27.3
	41-50	4959	17.5	4195	17.3	764	19.2
	51-60	1773	6.3	1526	6.3	247	6.2
	61-70	466	1.6	430	1.8	36	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	119	0.4	107	0.4	12	0.3
	TOTAL	28288	100.0	24318	100.0	3970	100.0
MADERA	UNDER 18	3	0.6	3	0.7	0	0.0
	18-20	40	8.2	36	8.1	4	9.1
	21-30	188	38.4	180	40.4	8	18.2
	31-40	137	28.0	128	28.8	9	20.5
	41-50	82	16.8	64	14.4	18	40.9
	51-60	27	5.5	25	5.6	2	4.5
	61-70	11	2.2	8	1.8	3	6.8
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	489	100.0	445	100.0	44	100.0
MARIN	UNDER 18	11	0.8	9	0.9	2	0.6
	18-20	95	7.1	85	8.4	10	3.2
	21-30	409	30.8	322	31.7	87	27.6
	31-40	362	27.2	267	26.3	95	30.2
	41-50	294	22.1	209	20.6	85	27.0
	51-60	126	9.5	97	9.6	29	9.2
	61-70	27	2.0	22	2.2	5	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.5	4	0.4	2	0.6
	TOTAL	1330	100.0	1015	100.0	315	100.0

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIPOSA	18-20	4	3.9	4	4.8	0	0.0
	21-30	36	35.0	29	34.9	7	35.0
	31-40	24	23.3	21	25.3	3	15.0
	41-50	28	27.2	22	26.5	6	30.0
	51-60	7	6.8	3	3.6	4	20.0
	61-70	3	2.9	3	3.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	103	100.0	83	100.0	20	100.0
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	4	0.7	4	0.9	0	0.0
	18-20	58	10.6	50	11.2	8	7.9
	21-30	170	31.0	147	32.8	23	22.8
	31-40	128	23.3	99	22.1	29	28.7
	41-50	121	22.0	93	20.8	28	27.7
	51-60	49	8.9	39	8.7	10	9.9
	61-70	16	2.9	14	3.1	2	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.5	2	0.4	1	1.0
TOTAL	549	100.0	448	100.0	101	100.0	
MERCED	18-20	102	8.9	95	9.3	7	5.7
	21-30	438	38.1	398	38.8	40	32.5
	31-40	312	27.2	273	26.6	39	31.7
	41-50	176	15.3	150	14.6	26	21.1
	51-60	89	7.7	81	7.9	8	6.5
	61-70	23	2.0	20	1.9	3	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	9	0.8	9	0.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1149	100.0	1026	100.0	123	100.0
MODOC	UNDER 18	1	1.4	1	1.8	0	0.0
	18-20	2	2.9	2	3.6	0	0.0
	21-30	21	30.4	16	29.1	5	35.7
	31-40	17	24.6	13	23.6	4	28.6
	41-50	15	21.7	13	23.6	2	14.3
	51-60	10	14.5	9	16.4	1	7.1
	61-70	2	2.9	1	1.8	1	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	7.1
TOTAL	69	100.0	55	100.0	14	100.0	
MONO	UNDER 18	3	2.0	3	2.3	0	0.0
	18-20	9	6.1	8	6.1	1	6.7
	21-30	48	32.7	43	32.6	5	33.3
	31-40	30	20.4	26	19.7	4	26.7
	41-50	31	21.1	28	21.2	3	20.0
	51-60	22	15.0	20	15.2	2	13.3
	61-70	2	1.4	2	1.5	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.4	2	1.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	147	100.0	132	100.0	15	100.0	
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	13	0.5	9	0.4	4	1.2
	18-20	274	9.7	252	10.1	22	6.8
	21-30	1259	44.7	1141	45.7	118	36.3
	31-40	645	22.9	562	22.5	83	25.5
	41-50	415	14.7	344	13.8	71	21.8
	51-60	168	6.0	144	5.8	24	7.4
	61-70	33	1.2	30	1.2	3	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	12	0.4	12	0.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	2819	100.0	2494	100.0	325	100.0	
NAPA	UNDER 18	8	0.9	8	1.1	0	0.0
	18-20	93	10.4	79	10.5	14	9.8
	21-30	295	33.1	265	35.4	30	21.0
	31-40	228	25.6	190	25.4	38	26.6
	41-50	173	19.4	127	17.0	46	32.2
	51-60	73	8.2	61	8.1	12	8.4
	61-70	17	1.9	16	2.1	1	0.7
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.6	3	0.4	2	1.4
TOTAL	892	100.0	749	100.0	143	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	9	1.8	9	2.2	0	0.0
	18-20	27	5.5	24	6.0	3	3.5
	21-30	126	25.9	108	26.9	18	20.9
	31-40	131	26.9	102	25.4	29	33.7
	41-50	122	25.1	92	22.9	30	34.9
	51-60	59	12.1	54	13.5	5	5.8
	61-70	9	1.8	8	2.0	1	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.8	4	1.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	487	100.0	401	100.0	86	100.0	
ORANGE	UNDER 18	46	0.4	36	0.4	10	0.5
	18-20	767	6.7	623	6.6	144	7.4
	21-30	4394	38.6	3718	39.4	676	34.7
	31-40	3148	27.6	2640	28.0	508	26.1
	41-50	2030	17.8	1597	16.9	433	22.2
	51-60	784	6.9	651	6.9	133	6.8
	61-70	184	1.6	150	1.6	34	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	36	0.3	26	0.3	10	0.5
TOTAL	11389	100.0	9441	100.0	1948	100.0	
PLACER	UNDER 18	20	1.3	14	1.1	6	2.0
	18-20	128	8.3	100	8.0	28	9.2
	21-30	556	35.9	469	37.7	87	28.4
	31-40	369	23.8	281	22.6	88	28.8
	41-50	338	21.8	265	21.3	73	23.9
	51-60	102	6.6	85	6.8	17	5.6
	61-70	31	2.0	24	1.9	7	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.3	5	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	1549	100.0	1243	100.0	306	100.0	
PLUMAS	18-20	9	4.3	8	4.5	1	3.1
	21-30	46	22.1	40	22.7	6	18.8
	31-40	57	27.4	47	26.7	10	31.3
	41-50	62	29.8	52	29.5	10	31.3
	51-60	27	13.0	22	12.5	5	15.6
	61-70	6	2.9	6	3.4	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.5	1	0.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	208	100.0	176	100.0	32	100.0
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	33	0.4	28	0.4	5	0.5
	18-20	638	8.7	538	8.6	100	9.1
	21-30	2755	37.5	2411	38.6	344	31.4
	31-40	1885	25.7	1590	25.5	295	26.9
	41-50	1296	17.7	1060	17.0	236	21.5
	51-60	532	7.2	449	7.2	83	7.6
	61-70	157	2.1	132	2.1	25	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	44	0.6	35	0.6	9	0.8
TOTAL	7340	100.0	6243	100.0	1097	100.0	
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	40	0.7	35	0.8	5	0.4
	18-20	366	6.7	297	6.8	69	6.1
	21-30	2221	40.4	1815	41.5	406	36.0
	31-40	1436	26.1	1112	25.4	324	28.7
	41-50	988	18.0	744	17.0	244	21.7
	51-60	326	5.9	271	6.2	55	4.9
	61-70	100	1.8	78	1.8	22	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	24	0.4	22	0.5	2	0.2
TOTAL	5501	100.0	4374	100.0	1127	100.0	
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	6	1.8	6	2.1	0	0.0
	18-20	39	11.9	35	12.2	4	9.5
	21-30	108	32.8	101	35.2	7	16.7
	31-40	86	26.1	69	24.0	17	40.5
	41-50	53	16.1	43	15.0	10	23.8
	51-60	32	9.7	28	9.8	4	9.5
	61-70	5	1.5	5	1.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	329	100.0	287	100.0	42	100.0



TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	1	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	541	7.1	466	7.2	75	6.7
	21-30	2875	37.7	2495	38.3	380	34.0
	31-40	2065	27.0	1746	26.8	319	28.5
	41-50	1417	18.6	1168	17.9	249	22.3
	51-60	546	7.2	474	7.3	72	6.4
	61-70	145	1.9	129	2.0	16	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	45	0.6	37	0.6	8	0.7
	TOTAL	7635	100.0	6516	100.0	1119	100.0
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	78	0.6	68	0.6	10	0.5
	18-20	1124	8.6	917	8.4	207	9.6
	21-30	5548	42.4	4758	43.6	790	36.6
	31-40	3249	24.8	2674	24.5	575	26.6
	41-50	2100	16.1	1694	15.5	406	18.8
	51-60	765	5.8	629	5.8	136	6.3
	61-70	168	1.3	141	1.3	27	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	48	0.4	40	0.4	8	0.4
	TOTAL	13080	100.0	10921	100.0	2159	100.0
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	46	5.2	38	5.0	8	6.6
	21-30	344	39.2	282	37.3	62	51.2
	31-40	258	29.4	233	30.8	25	20.7
	41-50	152	17.3	137	18.1	15	12.4
	51-60	66	7.5	55	7.3	11	9.1
	61-70	8	0.9	8	1.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.3	3	0.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	878	100.0	757	100.0	121	100.0
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	27	0.9	26	1.0	1	0.2
	18-20	252	8.5	227	8.9	25	5.9
	21-30	1080	36.4	955	37.5	125	29.5
	31-40	811	27.3	671	26.4	140	33.0
	41-50	516	17.4	419	16.5	97	22.9
	51-60	199	6.7	174	6.8	25	5.9
	61-70	62	2.1	57	2.2	5	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	22	0.7	16	0.6	6	1.4
	TOTAL	2969	100.0	2545	100.0	424	100.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	19	1.1	15	1.1	4	1.2
	18-20	210	12.0	176	12.3	34	10.4
	21-30	697	39.8	570	40.0	127	38.8
	31-40	370	21.1	296	20.8	74	22.6
	41-50	304	17.3	247	17.3	57	17.4
	51-60	112	6.4	87	6.1	25	7.6
	61-70	32	1.8	26	1.8	6	1.8
	71 & ABOVE	9	0.5	9	0.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1753	100.0	1426	100.0	327	100.0
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	12	0.4	9	0.4	3	0.6
	18-20	206	7.3	170	7.3	36	7.6
	21-30	1043	37.1	909	38.9	134	28.2
	31-40	745	26.5	617	26.4	128	26.9
	41-50	521	18.5	417	17.8	104	21.8
	51-60	214	7.6	165	7.1	49	10.3
	61-70	61	2.2	46	2.0	15	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	12	0.4	5	0.2	7	1.5
	TOTAL	2814	100.0	2338	100.0	476	100.0
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	16	0.7	16	0.9	0	0.0
	18-20	204	9.1	161	8.9	43	9.9
	21-30	942	41.9	787	43.4	155	35.8
	31-40	518	23.1	414	22.8	104	24.0
	41-50	389	17.3	296	16.3	93	21.5
	51-60	134	6.0	105	5.8	29	6.7
	61-70	27	1.2	20	1.1	7	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	16	0.7	14	0.8	2	0.5
	TOTAL	2246	100.0	1813	100.0	433	100.0

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	40	0.7	35	0.7	5	0.6
	18-20	406	7.0	350	7.1	56	6.5
	21-30	2394	41.5	2099	42.8	295	34.1
	31-40	1522	26.4	1266	25.8	256	29.6
	41-50	964	16.7	781	15.9	183	21.2
	51-60	344	6.0	287	5.8	57	6.6
	61-70	84	1.5	74	1.5	10	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	17	0.3	15	0.3	2	0.2
TOTAL	5771	100.0	4907	100.0	864	100.0	
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	17	1.1	13	1.0	4	1.4
	18-20	122	7.9	97	7.8	25	8.7
	21-30	582	37.8	492	39.3	90	31.3
	31-40	369	24.0	305	24.4	64	22.2
	41-50	306	19.9	239	19.1	67	23.3
	51-60	115	7.5	84	6.7	31	10.8
	61-70	25	1.6	19	1.5	6	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.2	2	0.2	1	0.3
TOTAL	1539	100.0	1251	100.0	288	100.0	
SHASTA	UNDER 18	24	2.1	16	1.8	8	3.1
	18-20	97	8.5	87	9.8	10	3.8
	21-30	361	31.5	291	32.9	70	26.7
	31-40	280	24.4	206	23.3	74	28.2
	41-50	261	22.8	188	21.2	73	27.9
	51-60	93	8.1	70	7.9	23	8.8
	61-70	24	2.1	20	2.3	4	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.6	7	0.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	1147	100.0	885	100.0	262	100.0	
SIERRA	18-20	1	3.2	1	3.6	0	0.0
	21-30	7	22.6	6	21.4	1	33.3
	31-40	8	25.8	8	28.6	0	0.0
	41-50	7	22.6	6	21.4	1	33.3
	51-60	6	19.4	5	17.9	1	33.3
	61-70	1	3.2	1	3.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	3.2	1	3.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	31	100.0	28	100.0	3	100.0
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	2	0.7	2	0.9	0	0.0
	18-20	15	5.2	13	5.6	2	3.6
	21-30	76	26.2	62	26.5	14	25.0
	31-40	82	28.3	66	28.2	16	28.6
	41-50	81	27.9	62	26.5	19	33.9
	51-60	27	9.3	23	9.8	4	7.1
	61-70	3	1.0	3	1.3	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	1.4	3	1.3	1	1.8
TOTAL	290	100.0	234	100.0	56	100.0	
SOLANO	UNDER 18	16	1.1	14	1.2	2	1.0
	18-20	141	10.1	121	10.2	20	9.7
	21-30	489	35.0	423	35.6	66	31.9
	31-40	333	23.9	280	23.5	53	25.6
	41-50	254	18.2	205	17.2	49	23.7
	51-60	121	8.7	107	9.0	14	6.8
	61-70	37	2.7	34	2.9	3	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.4	5	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	1396	100.0	1189	100.0	207	100.0	
SONOMA	UNDER 18	34	1.5	28	1.5	6	1.5
	18-20	221	10.0	190	10.5	31	7.8
	21-30	858	38.9	732	40.5	126	31.9
	31-40	496	22.5	401	22.2	95	24.1
	41-50	359	16.3	275	15.2	84	21.3
	51-60	174	7.9	136	7.5	38	9.6
	61-70	43	2.0	34	1.9	9	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	18	0.8	12	0.7	6	1.5
TOTAL	2203	100.0	1808	100.0	395	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	18	1.4	17	1.5	1	0.5
	18-20	128	9.8	114	10.4	14	6.9
	21-30	521	40.0	466	42.4	55	27.1
	31-40	309	23.7	240	21.8	69	34.0
	41-50	223	17.1	171	15.6	52	25.6
	51-60	77	5.9	67	6.1	10	4.9
	61-70	18	1.4	17	1.5	1	0.5
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.6	7	0.6	1	0.5
TOTAL	1302	100.0	1099	100.0	203	100.0	
SUTTER	UNDER 18	5	1.3	3	0.8	2	4.5
	18-20	34	8.5	32	9.0	2	4.5
	21-30	162	40.6	149	42.0	13	29.5
	31-40	91	22.8	83	23.4	8	18.2
	41-50	69	17.3	53	14.9	16	36.4
	51-60	27	6.8	25	7.0	2	4.5
	61-70	9	2.3	9	2.5	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	2.3
TOTAL	399	100.0	355	100.0	44	100.0	
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	6	1.2	6	1.4	0	0.0
	18-20	38	7.5	33	7.9	5	5.8
	21-30	152	30.1	132	31.5	20	23.3
	31-40	125	24.8	100	23.9	25	29.1
	41-50	128	25.3	98	23.4	30	34.9
	51-60	34	6.7	30	7.2	4	4.7
	61-70	16	3.2	15	3.6	1	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	6	1.2	5	1.2	1	1.2
TOTAL	505	100.0	419	100.0	86	100.0	
TRINITY	UNDER 18	2	2.0	1	1.2	1	5.6
	18-20	6	5.9	5	6.0	1	5.6
	21-30	22	21.6	18	21.4	4	22.2
	31-40	19	18.6	14	16.7	5	27.8
	41-50	32	31.4	27	32.1	5	27.8
	51-60	16	15.7	15	17.9	1	5.6
	61-70	3	2.9	3	3.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2.0	1	1.2	1	5.6
TOTAL	102	100.0	84	100.0	18	100.0	
TULARE	UNDER 18	11	0.4	11	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	286	11.5	264	12.0	22	7.6
	21-30	1029	41.4	923	42.1	106	36.7
	31-40	623	25.1	536	24.4	87	30.1
	41-50	378	15.2	321	14.6	57	19.7
	51-60	124	5.0	110	5.0	14	4.8
	61-70	26	1.0	24	1.1	2	0.7
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.2	5	0.2	1	0.3
TOTAL	2483	100.0	2194	100.0	289	100.0	
TUOLUMNE	18-20	28	7.8	27	9.6	1	1.3
	21-30	109	30.4	88	31.3	21	26.9
	31-40	88	24.5	67	23.8	21	26.9
	41-50	85	23.7	57	20.3	28	35.9
	51-60	34	9.5	29	10.3	5	6.4
	61-70	13	3.6	11	3.9	2	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.6	2	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	359	100.0	281	100.0	78	100.0
VENTURA	UNDER 18	10	0.3	8	0.3	2	0.4
	18-20	260	7.5	212	7.4	48	8.4
	21-30	1355	39.3	1170	40.7	185	32.5
	31-40	906	26.3	750	26.1	156	27.4
	41-50	630	18.3	498	17.3	132	23.2
	51-60	213	6.2	176	6.1	37	6.5
	61-70	52	1.5	44	1.5	8	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	18	0.5	16	0.6	2	0.4
TOTAL	3444	100.0	2874	100.0	570	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2002 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	13	1.6	12	1.7	1	1.1
	18-20	94	11.9	85	12.1	9	10.0
	21-30	274	34.6	251	35.8	23	25.6
	31-40	187	23.6	160	22.8	27	30.0
	41-50	146	18.5	126	18.0	20	22.2
	51-60	56	7.1	50	7.1	6	6.7
	61-70	14	1.8	11	1.6	3	3.3
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.9	6	0.9	1	1.1
	TOTAL	791	100.0	701	100.0	90	100.0
YUBA	UNDER 18	2	0.5	2	0.6	0	0.0
	18-20	41	10.6	36	11.1	5	7.7
	21-30	121	31.2	106	32.8	15	23.1
	31-40	110	28.4	85	26.3	25	38.5
	41-50	73	18.8	58	18.0	15	23.1
	51-60	27	7.0	22	6.8	5	7.7
	61-70	11	2.8	11	3.4	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.8	3	0.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	388	100.0	323	100.0	65	100.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	77.3%		133110	3684	14418	3196	3351	1022	3.1	3.4
ALAMEDA	72.5%	SUP OAKLAND	25	19	0	0	4	0	5.2	4.0
		SUP HAYWARD	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	21.7
		JUV SAN LEANDRO	18	2	1	0	0	0	3.2	2.7
		ALAMEDA	152	1	23	8	6	3	1.8	1.8
		BERKELEY	45	1	6	2	4	0	1.2	3.0
		FREMONT	637	13	110	21	15	0	4.1	3.2
		PLEASANTON	843	5	139	28	31	0	4.0	1.8
		OAKLAND	1219	15	176	60	31	14	3.6	2.9
		HAYWARD	1015	6	54	14	27	1	4.2	3.7
TOTAL	3955	62	509	133	118	18	---	---		
ALPINE	74.0%	SUP MARKLEVILLE	51	3	9	2	0	0	4.1	4.1
		TOTAL	51	3	9	2	0	0	---	---
AMADOR	94.8%	SUP JACKSON	0	0	0	0	0	1	---	---
		JACKSON	203	15	27	3	0	3	3.5	2.7
		TOTAL	203	15	27	3	0	4	---	---
BUTTE	85.0%	SUP OROVILLE	105	25	23	3	6	6	8.3	4.2
		JUV OROVILLE	14	1	2	0	1	0	3.3	2.0
		CHICO	630	1	116	13	4	19	2.5	1.4
		GRIDLEY	0	0	1	0	0	0	---	---
		OROVILLE	292	16	28	20	9	5	4.0	2.8
		SUP PARADISE	0	0	0	0	2	1	---	---
		TOTAL	1041	43	170	36	22	31	---	---
CALAVERAS	69.2%	SUP CALAVERAS	199	6	23	13	5	0	2.5	3.1
		JUV CALAVERAS	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	2.0
		SAN ANDREAS MUN	0	0	0	0	0	4	---	---
		TOTAL	201	6	23	13	5	4	---	---
COLUSA	73.6	SUP COLUSA	0	4	0	0	0	0	9.8	0.1
		JUV COLUSA	2	0	0	0	0	0	3.0	6.9
		COLUSA	148	2	32	4	1	0	2.5	1.6
		TOTAL	150	6	32	4	1	0	---	---
CONTRA COSTA	72.1%	SUP CONTRA COSTA	31	65	2	0	1	0	7.7	3.8
		JUV CONTRA COSTA	38	3	6	0	0	0	4.5	3.1
		CONCORD	771	2	115	9	9	7	4.5	2.6
		RICHMOND	719	3	124	11	14	4	4.7	1.8
		PITTSBURG	826	4	127	7	16	5	5.1	1.8
		WALNUT CREEK	747	2	142	11	5	1	4.8	2.9
		TOTAL	3132	79	516	38	45	17	---	---
DEL NORTE	50.9%	SUP DEL NORTE	177	11	61	29	19	0	3.2	3.5
		CRESCENT CITY	3	0	4	0	0	5	1.6	0.1
		TOTAL	180	11	65	29	19	5	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
EL DORADO	80.6%	SUP EL DORADO	6	1	1	0	0	0	10.0	4.4
		SUPJUV PLACERVLE	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.5	5.5
		CAMERON PARK	5	0	0	0	0	0	0.7	7.3
		SO LAKE TAHOE	366	14	38	14	0	3	2.4	3.2
		PLACERVILLE	612	30	56	11	6	7	2.8	3.5
		TOTAL	990	46	95	25	6	10	---	---
FRESNO	63.3%	SUP FRESNO	19	8	0	0	0	1	6.4	3.5
		JUV FRESNO	26	1	2	3	1	0	6.7	3.7
		FRESNO	2061	93	395	39	30	7	5.3	1.5
		CLOVIS	288	0	76	6	1	2	5.3	1.5
		COALINGA	108	2	32	2	4	1	4.4	2.2
		FIREBAUGH	202	3	25	3	4	1	3.8	0.6
		FOWLER	207	2	31	2	2	1	5.0	1.1
		KERMAN	51	5	10	0	1	0	5.7	0.5
		KINGSBURG	61	2	20	1	0	0	5.8	1.0
		PARLIER	0	0	0	0	0	1	---	---
		REEDLEY	174	5	25	1	1	1	4.1	1.3
		SANGER	91	0	17	1	1	0	3.5	1.9
		SELMA	181	2	15	2	4	3	4.9	2.1
US CT FRESNO	1	0	1	0	0	0	11.0	3.3		
		TOTAL	3470	123	649	60	49	18	---	---
GLENN	60.3%	SUP WILLOWS	174	6	13	7	8	0	2.7	1.9
		JUV GLENN	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.8	5.2
		WILLOWS MUNI	0	0	0	0	0	1	---	---
		TOTAL	179	6	13	7	8	1	---	---
HUMBOLDT	65.2%	SUPJUV HUMBOLDT	754	32	181	51	21	1	3.3	2.6
		JUV HUMBOLDT	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.1	1.2
		GARBRVLE SUPMUN	1	0	1	0	0	0	1.6	1.4
		TOTAL	756	32	182	51	21	1	---	---
IMPERIAL	42.3%	SUP IMPERIAL	0	1	0	0	0	0	16.2	1.0
		BRAWLEY	141	1	17	3	3	0	4.8	0.9
		CALEXICO	183	0	45	30	9	3	3.9	0.9
		EL CENTRO	159	3	43	9	5	3	4.1	2.1
		CALIPATRIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	0.9
		TOTAL	484	5	105	42	17	6	---	---
INYO	75.0%	SUP INYO	2	3	1	0	0	0	8.0	4.2
		JUV INYO	1	0	2	0	1	0	3.1	2.8
		BISHOP	227	1	44	4	5	3	3.0	1.0
		TOTAL	230	4	47	4	6	3	---	---
KERN	83.4%	SUP KERN	20	15	0	0	0	0	2.8	3.0
		JUV KERN	59	0	1	0	0	0	2.7	2.1
		ARVIN LAMONT	310	13	34	7	7	1	2.2	4.0
		BAKERSFIELD	2014	30	211	18	23	7	1.9	2.8

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
KERN (cont.)		DELANO	290	14	24	0	1	2	2.0	3.3
		LAKE ISABELLA	113	1	6	2	2	0	1.9	1.2
		TAFT	190	5	10	6	4	1	1.9	3.1
		SHAFTER	267	11	39	2	10	2	1.7	3.1
		MOJAVE	237	4	33	41	13	0	1.7	3.3
		RIDGECREST	160	2	26	4	5	7	1.9	2.0
		TOTAL	3660	95	384	80	65	20	---	---
KINGS	80.6%	SUP KINGS	26	12	0	0	1	2	2.5	1.9
		JUV HANFORD	14	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	0.3
		HANFORD	584	6	102	6	9	2	2.8	2.1
		AVENAL	46	0	4	0	1	0	3.1	1.1
		CORCORAN	61	1	4	0	0	0	3.7	2.0
		LEMOORE	0	0	1	0	0	0	---	---
		TOTAL	731	19	111	6	11	4	---	---
LAKE	71.7%	SUP LAKE	296	6	24	5	3	1	4.2	5.7
		CLEARLAKE	155	3	4	0	2	0	4.4	6.8
		LAKEPORT	1	0	0	0	0	0	12.2	1.5
		TOTAL	452	9	28	5	5	1	---	---
LASSEN	76.8%	JUV LASSEN	1	0	0	0	1	0	3.2	1.1
		SUSANVILLE	200	0	3	27	7	1	2.9	4.0
		USMAG SUSANVL	1	0	0	0	1	0	7.4	1.5
		TOTAL	202	0	3	27	9	1	---	---
LOS ANGELES	74.3%	SUP LA	125	48	0	0	2	0	4.9	1.1
		SUP POMONA	73	34	2	0	1	0	4.3	0.6
		SUP LANCASTER	29	8	0	0	0	0	2.6	0.6
		SUP VAN NUYS	71	23	0	1	0	0	4.6	1.1
		SUP PASADENA	17	4	0	0	0	0	5.0	0.5
		SUP VAN NUYS	26	15	0	0	0	1	5.7	0.7
		SUP LONG BEACH	34	11	0	0	1	0	4.5	1.4
		SUP COMPTON	10	7	0	0	0	0	5.3	0.5
		SUP NORWALK	53	24	0	0	2	0	4.2	1.0
		SUP TORRANCE	44	16	0	0	0	0	5.3	1.2
		SUP SANTA MONCA	32	12	0	0	0	0	4.5	0.9
		JUV LA	4	0	3	1	3	0	2.2	2.8
		LA JUV CENTRAL	26	4	1	0	0	0	4.8	3.9
		LA MUNI	1038	6	73	25	31	0	3.1	1.2
		ALHAMBRA	582	6	55	24	11	1	3.7	1.8
		LANCASTER	650	2	84	12	23	0	2.7	1.7
		BEVERLY HILLS	203	1	37	16	9	0	3.8	1.0
		BURBANK	289	5	41	6	4	0	2.0	1.2
		WEST COVINA	1790	8	71	32	47	0	3.0	1.2
		SUP CHATSWORTH	1038	14	94	41	56	0	1.6	3.5
COMPTON	1221	18	48	118	30	1	4.1	1.3		

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
LOS ANGELES (cont.)		DOWNEY	811	4	36	11	13	0	3.6	1.2
		EAST LA	913	7	116	134	21	12	3.9	1.1
		EL MONTE	743	4	48	7	14	2	2.8	1.0
		GLENDALE	556	3	43	7	17	0	3.9	2.0
		INGLEWOOD	485	5	36	27	19	8	3.6	1.6
		LONG BEACH	1066	23	90	71	22	6	2.4	3.3
		LA METRO	5713	15	536	35	673	3	1.7	2.1
		BELLFLOWER	366	5	18	6	11	5	3.2	1.3
		VALENCIA	803	9	128	16	11	0	2.4	1.6
		PASADENA	851	1	185	81	28	1	3.3	1.0
		MALIBU	293	6	61	17	10	0	4.1	1.0
		POMONA	968	6	30	23	25	12	3.0	1.2
		HUNTINGTON PARK	902	18	20	2	13	1	2.3	1.2
		MONROVIA	244	4	18	6	10	0	3.6	1.2
		SANTA MONICA	209	0	54	13	7	0	3.2	1.1
		TORRANCE	1212	6	269	59	45	3	3.1	1.2
		REDONDO BEACH	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	6.3
		SOUTH GATE	224	5	6	5	3	0	2.7	0.9
		WHITTIER	634	15	55	7	15	1	3.1	2.1
		HOLLYWOOD	244	0	15	2	27	0	1.8	1.2
		SAN FERNANDO	653	4	49	20	27	0	1.9	2.3
		SAN PEDRO	334	2	26	2	31	0	2.0	1.5
		VAN NUYS	2241	54	157	96	136	0	1.9	1.0
		LOS ANGELES	2	0	0	0	1	0	2.2	0.0
		AVALON	2	0	1	0	0	0	4.2	8.1
		FED TORRENCE	1	0	0	0	0	0	---	---
	US DIST CT LA	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.6	0.3	
	TOTAL	27826	462	2508	923	1399	56	---	---	
MADERA	62.5%	SUP MADERA	33	28	5	2	0	0	2.3	3.0
		JUV MADERA	3	0	0	0	0	0	3.2	4.9
		CHOWCHILLA	326	2	29	15	2	0	4.6	2.6
		BORDEN	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.2	16.8
		MADERA	5	7	0	0	0	0	14.7	4.5
		BASS LAKE	81	3	17	2	1	0	3.9	3.3
		TOTAL	449	40	51	19	3	0	---	---
MARIN	90.4%	SAN RAFAEL	1316	14	0	0	35	9	3.5	3.4
		TOTAL	1316	14	0	0	35	9	---	---
MARIPOSA	65.2%	MARIPOSA	79	1	6	5	3	0	2.7	4.2
		USMAG YOSEMITE	23	0	0	0	0	0	2.6	9.8
		TOTAL	102	1	6	5	3	0	---	---
MENDOCINO	73.4%	SUP UKIAH	6	4	1	1	1	0	5.5	7.4
		JUV UKIAH	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.1	0.8
		WILLITS	113	6	36	6	0	0	2.8	5.4



TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
MENDOCINO (cont.)		UKIAH	254	7	81	9	5	5	2.6	6.9
		BOONVILLE	10	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	6.4
		PT. ARENA	12	0	5	0	0	0	4.7	4.7
		LEGGETT	36	0	12	3	0	0	3.3	5.5
		COVELO	10	0	1	0	0	0	3.4	5.0
		FORT BRAGG	86	4	7	0	2	0	2.5	6.1
		TOTAL	528	21	143	19	9	5	---	---
MERCED	66.5%	SUP MERCED	36	15	1	0	1	0	4.5	3.6
		JUV MERCED	3	0	0	0	3	0	10.8	2.1
		MERCED	782	12	122	18	10	2	4.7	4.2
		LOS BANOS	293	7	48	5	5	3	4.6	4.3
		GUSTINE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	1.3
		TOTAL	1115	34	171	23	19	5	---	---
MODOC	70.4%	SUP ALTURAS	69	0	6	2	4	0	2.7	2.2
		ALTURAS MUNI	0	0	0	0	0	2	---	---
		TOTAL	69	0	6	2	4	2	---	---
MONO	96.1%	JUV MONO	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	5.5
		BRIDGEPORT	20	0	2	2	0	0	2.7	2.2
		MAMMOTH LAKES	124	2	21	1	2	0	2.2	3.6
		TOTAL	145	2	23	3	2	0	---	---
MONTEREY	83.9%	SUP MONTEREY	68	37	2	0	2	0	3.4	4.0
		JUV SALINAS	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.4	4.1
		MARINA MUNI	15	0	0	0	11	2	3.4	2.0
		SALINAS	2221	13	264	47	13	9	1.7	4.4
		KING CITY	450	2	37	3	6	0	1.7	2.1
		TOTAL	2766	53	303	50	32	11	---	---
NAPA	83.9%	NAPA SUP	862	22	76	20	16	0	2.8	1.5
		NAPA MUNI	7	1	0	0	0	6	4.9	0.3
		TOTAL	869	23	76	20	16	6	---	---
NEVADA	85.4%	NEVADA CITY SUP	5	12	0	0	0	0	7.2	1.8
		NEVADA CITY JUV	8	0	0	0	1	0	3.4	6.2
		TRUCKEE JUV	1	0	0	0	0	0	14.0	0.1
		NEVADA CITY MUN	232	4	30	7	6	4	2.4	5.1
		TRUCKEE MUNI	220	5	56	3	2	2	2.2	3.8
		TOTAL	466	21	86	10	9	6	---	---
ORANGE	93.5%	SUP SANTA ANA	61	20	0	0	1	0	2.6	1.9
		JUV ORANGE	64	2	3	0	3	0	4.5	2.3
		FULLERTON	2922	56	135	31	27	8	2.9	9.1
		WESTMINSTER	2508	46	132	10	31	12	3.0	8.1
		LAGUNA HILLS	899	24	42	10	3	0	3.8	8.3
		LAGUNA NIGUEL	0	0	0	0	0	13	---	---
		NEWPORT BEACH	2799	34	218	55	30	4	2.8	9.0
		SANTA ANA MUNI	1905	49	77	9	26	5	3.4	7.8
		TOTAL	11158	231	607	115	121	42	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
PLACER	93.8%	SUP AUBURN	1282	47	58	29	13	0	3.3	3.2
		JUV AUBURN	21	0	0	0	1	0	3.2	2.3
		JUV TAHOE VISTA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.9	8.4
		AUBURN SUPMUN	1	0	0	0	0	5	1.1	1.6
		ROSEVILLE SUPMUN	1	0	0	0	1	0	---	---
		ROSEVILLE MUNI	0	0	0	0	0	1	---	---
		SUP TAHOE CITY	31	1	8	0	0	0	4.5	0.2
		TAHOE CITY	160	3	26	0	3	0	2.4	2.1
TOTAL	1498	51	92	29	18	6	---	---		
PLUMAS	90.0%	PORTOLA	4	0	0	0	0	0	8.1	2.6
		QUINCY	198	6	31	6	0	0	2.7	4.0
		TOTAL	202	6	31	6	0	0	---	---
RIVERSIDE	84.4%	SUP RIVERSIDE	366	91	1	1	9	31	4.3	3.3
		SUP INDIO	177	30	44	2	1	24	5.6	3.3
		JUV RIVERSIDE	5	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	2.2
		JUV INDIO	6	0	0	0	0	0	3.4	1.8
		CORONA	262	2	5	3	2	9	2.9	2.0
		HEMET MUNI	545	8	8	1	8	6	2.6	1.5
		BANNING	400	4	3	10	8	1	4.3	1.0
		INDIO CONSOLID	1407	19	56	83	32	1	3.6	0.9
		MORENO VLY RIV	2385	46	14	32	24	0	4.1	0.9
		BLYTHE SUPMUN	112	1	17	3	3	4	2.2	1.1
		PERRIS CNSOLID	1445	24	41	46	12	4	4.3	1.3
		TEMCULA CONSOL	3	0	0	0	3	0	2.9	0.2
		ELSINORE CONSOL	2	0	0	0	1	0	1.6	1.3
TOTAL	7115	225	189	181	103	80	---	---		
SACRAMENTO	72.3%	SUP SACRAMENTO	109	136	3	1	5	0	4.8	5.2
		JUV SACTO TRF	49	0	3	0	0	0	3.7	2.2
		SACRAMENTO	5048	86	629	32	59	9	3.1	6.5
		ELK GROVE	39	0	6	1	0	0	1.9	1.9
		GALT	25	1	1	0	1	0	1.8	3.6
		WALNUT GROVE	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.1	3.9
		SACTO US MAG	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	7.3
		TOTAL	5278	223	643	34	65	9	---	---
SAN BENITO	95.4%	SUP SAN BENITO	302	17	34	3	1	1	4.5	2.7
		JUV HOLLISTER	7	1	0	0	0	0	3.8	4.1
		HOLLISTER	2	0	0	0	0	0	3.3	6.9
		TOTAL	311	18	34	3	1	1	---	---
SAN BERNARDINO	75.0%	SAN BERN SUP MUN	10	42	0	0	0	10	7.2	1.9
		SUP R CUCAMNGA	30	42	1	0	1	3	3.8	2.3
		VICTRVLE SUPMUN	12	40	0	0	0	0	6.9	3.1
		BARSTOW SUPMUN	408	30	67	26	12	1	4.9	2.2
		JOSHUA TREE	0	0	0	0	0	5	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)		JUV TF SAN BERN	2	0	0	0	0	0	---	---
		SUP JUV SAN BERN	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.8	7.8
		R CUCMNGA SPMUN	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.7	1.9
		SUPJUV VICTORVLE	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	13.6
		CHINO SUPMUN	371	14	10	2	6	0	3.7	0.8
		REDLANDS SUPMUN	381	29	33	13	7	2	3.9	0.6
		SAN BERN SUP	1391	16	117	26	90	5	4.6	1.0
		FONTANA SUPMUN	858	60	28	12	18	7	4.6	0.8
		VICTRVLE SUPMUN	1019	10	89	26	58	2	5.1	0.6
		RANCHO CUCMNGA	2128	20	89	23	36	7	4.2	0.4
		BARSTOW SUPMUN	0	0	0	0	0	4	---	---
		BGBEAR LK SUPMUN	144	6	13	3	8	0	3.0	0.8
		TWNPEAKS SUPMUN	157	6	24	6	6	6	3.6	0.9
		NEEDLES SUPMUN	115	2	38	18	12	5	4.1	1.3
	JOSHTRIE SUPMUN	275	14	46	12	14	1	3.9	1.5	
	TOTAL	7304	331	555	167	268	58	---	---	
SAN DIEGO	82.1%	SUP SAN DIEGO	144	61	0	1	0	2	5.1	5.7
		SUP VISTA	134	92	1	0	1	1	3.2	3.9
		SUP CHULA VISTA	57	4	3	0	0	0	3.4	4.1
		SUP EL CAJON	20	1	0	0	0	0	2.4	4.3
		JUV SAN DIEGO	93	2	1	1	2	0	4.2	1.4
		EL CAJON	2291	68	196	56	29	13	2.7	5.2
		VISTA	3461	48	739	120	23	8	2.4	4.3
		SAN MARCOS	25	0	0	0	4	3	3.1	3.4
		SAN DIEGO MUNI	4676	7	504	76	171	4	3.0	5.1
		CHULA VISTA	1866	26	203	47	24	2	2.6	5.5
		NATIONAL CITY	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.7	0.8
		US CT SAN DIEGO	3	0	3	0	0	0	6.2	1.4
		TOTAL	12771	309	1650	301	254	33	---	---
SAN FRANCISCO	51.9%	SUP SAN FRAN	0	1	0	0	1	0	13.7	0.9
		JUV SAN FRAN	1	0	0	0	1	0	7.2	1.0
		SAN FRANCISCO	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.0	0.2
		SAN FRAN MUN	854	20	159	185	19	1	3.4	1.2
		US DIST CT SF	1	0	0	0	0	0	8.0	2.9
		TOTAL	857	21	159	185	21	1	---	---
SAN JOAQUIN	72.7%	JUV FRENCH CAMP	37	6	0	0	1	2	5.3	2.8
		LODI	590	18	116	6	14	0	1.9	1.6
		MANTECA	446	10	67	0	4	0	2.3	1.2
		TRACY	375	8	54	14	6	0	2.3	2.3
		STOCKTON SUPMUN	1416	63	185	8	28	18	2.3	2.8
		TOTAL	2864	105	422	28	53	20	---	---
SAN LUIS OBISPO	74.8%	S L OBSPO SUPMN	1707	46	365	80	112	20	2.4	4.6
		PASO RBLES SUPMUN	0	0	0	0	0	9	---	---
		TOTAL	1707	46	365	80	112	29	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN MATEO	76.5%	RDWDCTY SUPMUN	45	13	1	1	6	0	6.8	1.8
		SNMATEO SUPMUN	15	0	0	0	2	5	3.3	2.6
		SO SF SUPMUN	1448	21	219	8	28	0	3.3	3.7
		REDWOOD CITY	1260	12	232	10	22	1	3.2	4.5
		TOTAL	2768	46	452	19	58	6	---	---
SANTA BARBARA	88.6%	JUV SANTA BARB	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.6	3.7
		JUV LOMPOC	11	1	1	0	1	0	2.7	1.6
		SANTA BARBARA	1175	28	302	45	16	5	2.5	3.8
		SANTA MARIA	635	31	23	10	2	4	1.6	4.3
		LOMPOC	349	14	31	4	2	0	1.9	4.6
		TOTAL	2172	74	357	59	21	9	---	---
SANTA CLARA	84.6%	SUP SANTA CLARA	138	66	1	0	5	0	5.2	2.9
		JUV SANTA CLARA	46	4	2	2	3	0	3.7	3.2
		LOS GATOS	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.1	1.5
		PALO ALTO MUN	585	3	84	4	8	0	3.4	1.3
		SAN JOSE	3859	53	438	79	40	1	2.9	2.0
		TRAF SAN JOSE	6	0	0	0	3	0	2.0	1.5
		SANTA CLARA MUN	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	1.6
		SUNNYVALE	359	6	36	13	1	0	2.8	0.7
		GILROY	632	12	71	2	14	0	3.3	0.6
		TOTAL	5627	144	632	100	74	1	---	---
SANTA CRUZ	82.8%	SUP SANTA CRUZ	20	5	2	0	0	1	6.2	1.7
		JUV SANTA CRUZ	18	0	1	0	0	0	3.0	1.1
		SANTA CRUZ	1074	23	215	26	12	0	2.5	5.3
		WATSONVILLE	396	3	38	3	8	0	2.0	5.3
		TOTAL	1508	31	256	29	20	1	---	---
SHASTA	92.2%	JUV SHASTA	29	2	1	0	1	0	3.2	2.2
		BURNEY	38	0	5	3	1	0	2.5	4.1
		REDDING	1003	75	156	13	8	0	2.8	4.6
		TOTAL	1070	77	162	16	10	0	---	---
SIERRA	57.4%	DOWNIEVILLE	30	1	10	0	0	0	4.0	1.5
		TOTAL	30	1	10	0	0	0	---	---
SISKIYOU	78.6%	SUP SISKIYOU	4	2	5	1	0	0	2.5	3.0
		JUV YREKA	0	0	1	0	0	0	---	---
		WEED	119	1	20	3	7	0	3.4	1.9
		YREKA JUD DIST	139	25	33	6	1	0	3.1	2.6
		TOTAL	262	28	59	10	8	0	---	---
SOLANO	84.7%	SUP SOLANO	39	21	1	0	1	0	4.5	6.3
		JUV SOLANO	21	0	1	0	0	0	4.6	3.1
		FAIRFIELD	909	16	144	9	10	8	2.7	6.2
		BENICIA	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.6	1.8
		VALLEJO BENICIA	380	4	16	47	10	15	3.1	10.6
		TOTAL	1355	41	162	57	21	23	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2002 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS <sup>1</sup>	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SONOMA	75.7%	SUP SONOMA	7	45	1	0	1	0	5.8	3.4
		JUV SONOMA	35	2	7	2	0	0	2.5	2.4
		SANTA ROSA	2062	51	552	31	29	389	3.0	4.3
		SONOMA	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.9	1.5
		TOTAL	2105	98	560	33	30	389	---	---
STANISLAUS	57.0	SUP STANISLAUS	1208	68	125	23	9	1	3.7	5.9
		JUV STANISLAUS	21	1	2	0	0	0	3.4	4.0
		MODESTO	3	0	0	0	1	0	1.7	5.9
		TURLOCK	1	0	1	0	1	0	4.1	3.3
		TOTAL	1233	69	128	23	11	1	---	---
SUTTER	55.7%	YUBA CTY SUPMUN	379	20	94	14	2	2	2.2	3.0
		TOTAL	379	20	94	14	2	2	---	---
TEHAMA	42.1%	SUP TEHAMA	17	17	3	0	0	0	5.5	1.1
		JUV TEHAMA	6	1	0	0	0	0	2.1	0.2
		CORNING	180	0	23	6	6	0	2.7	3.4
		RED BLUFF	279	5	37	2	5	5	2.4	1.9
		TOTAL	482	23	63	8	11	5	---	---
TRINITY	45.3%	SUP TRINITY	95	6	23	9	5	0	3.4	2.9
		JUV TRINITY	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.6	11.3
		TOTAL	96	6	23	9	5	0	---	---
TULARE	72.2%	SUP TULARE	21	11	0	0	0	1	5.2	2.3
		JUV TULARE	11	2	0	0	0	0	4.0	1.9
		DINUBA MUNI	305	11	13	1	4	2	3.6	4.6
		LINDSY EXETER	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.9	1.0
		PORTERVILLE	699	18	13	2	13	3	3.4	3.2
		TULARE	468	21	26	0	6	1	3.2	4.5
		VISALIA	885	30	36	7	4	15	3.5	4.3
		TOTAL	2390	93	88	10	27	22	---	---
TUOLUMNE	82.7%	TUOLUMNE SUP	348	9	46	10	2	0	4.6	1.3
		SUP SONORA	2	0	0	0	0	5	4.3	4.3
		TOTAL	350	9	46	10	2	5	---	---
VENTURA	86.4%	SUP VENTURA	32	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	14.4
		JUV VENTURA	7	0	1	0	0	0	0.8	3.6
		VENTURA	3350	55	0	1	85	25	2.9	2.7
		TOTAL	3389	55	1	1	85	25	---	---
YOLO	74.1%	WOODLND SUPMUN	739	50	159	26	7	2	3.8	3.3
		DAVIS	2	0	0	0	0	0	2.7	10.0
		TOTAL	741	50	159	26	7	2	---	---
YUBA	54.7%	SUP YUBA	4	14	0	0	0	0	6.2	3.0
		JUV YUBA	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.6	10.5
		MARYSVILLE	363	4	78	4	5	15	3.2	1.8
		TC BEALE AFB	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.8	2.1
		TOTAL	370	18	78	4	5	15	---	---

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE			136794	96.0	73.2	66.4	18.0	0.2	75.5	7.0	3.3
ALAMEDA	SUP OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	63.2	100.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	21.1	10.5	5.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	66.7	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	80.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	44	70.5	97.7	4.5	9.1	0.0	11.4	11.4	2.3
	SUP HAYWARD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV SAN LEANDRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	85.0	5.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	70.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	85.0	5.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	70.0	0.0
	ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	126	100.0	98.4	74.6	2.4	0.0	98.4	1.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	24	100.0	100.0	16.7	75.0	0.0	95.8	4.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	153	100.0	98.7	64.1	14.4	0.0	96.1	2.6	0.0
	BERKELEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	41	100.0	100.0	90.2	0.0	0.0	82.9	4.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	46	100.0	100.0	80.4	8.7	0.0	78.3	4.3	0.0
	FREMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	479	98.5	94.8	78.3	2.3	0.0	68.1	0.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	130	100.0	100.0	10.0	83.8	0.0	60.0	0.8	4.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	100.0	100.0	0.0	88.2	0.0	26.5	2.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	650	98.9	96.2	59.7	24.0	0.0	63.5	0.8	0.9
	PLEASANTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	648	99.1	98.0	82.4	1.9	0.0	92.6	3.5	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	172	100.0	99.4	17.4	76.2	0.0	94.2	2.9	7.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	100.0	100.0	4.3	87.0	0.0	21.7	47.8	13.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
		TOTAL	848	99.3	98.3	66.6	19.8	0.0	90.8	4.7	2.4
	OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	938	99.0	98.3	81.2	2.3	0.0	88.9	6.9	2.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		239	98.7	99.2	14.2	71.1	0.0	77.4	14.6	61.9	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		47	100.0	95.7	12.8	55.3	2.1	40.4	40.4	57.4	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		10	100.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	
TOTAL		1234	99.0	98.4	65.0	18.2	0.1	84.5	9.9	16.1	
HAYWARD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	754	98.9	95.5	81.8	3.4	0.0	80.0	8.9	2.4	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	205	98.5	94.1	16.6	73.2	0.0	86.8	5.4	39.5	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	49	98.0	98.0	10.2	73.5	0.0	38.8	44.9	61.2	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	92.3	100.0	7.7	69.2	0.0	61.5	30.8	76.9	
	TOTAL	1021	98.7	95.4	64.3	21.6	0.0	79.1	10.2	13.6	
ALPINE	SUP MARKLEEVLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	40	97.5	52.5	85.0	10.0	0.0	72.5	2.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	100.0	84.6	15.4	61.5	15.4	76.9	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	54	98.1	61.1	68.5	22.2	3.7	74.1	1.9	0.0

\*Entries represent percentages of 2002 DUI convictees receiving each sanction by county, court, and offender status.

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
AMADOR	JACKSON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	148	95.9	92.6	85.8	2.0	0.0	86.5	6.8	15.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	56	91.1	100.0	8.9	71.4	0.0	69.6	16.1	41.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	77.8	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	22.2	11.1	44.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
		TOTAL	218	92.2	95.0	60.6	22.9	0.0	77.5	9.2	23.4
BUTTE	SUP OROVLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	67	89.6	94.0	83.6	0.0	0.0	68.7	7.5	10.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	91.4	94.3	20.0	62.9	0.0	45.7	20.0	17.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	78.6	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	21.4	28.6	7.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	71.4	100.0	7.1	64.3	0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6
		TOTAL	130	86.9	95.4	49.2	31.5	0.0	51.5	16.9	13.8
	JUV OROVLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	13	76.9	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	15	73.3	13.3	26.7	6.7	0.0	6.7	60.0	0.0
	CHICO MUNI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	469	95.5	94.7	79.1	1.9	0.0	82.3	12.6	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	122	97.5	98.4	14.8	77.0	0.0	83.6	9.8	0.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	97.2	100.0	0.0	86.1	0.0	33.3	52.8	2.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	631	95.7	95.7	61.6	21.6	0.0	79.2	14.6	0.5
	OROVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	210	92.8	96.6	76.9	4.8	0.0	83.7	3.4	1.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	74	97.3	98.6	9.6	80.8	0.0	52.1	5.5	5.5
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		16	93.8	100.0	6.3	68.8	0.0	6.3	12.5	6.3	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		8	62.5	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
TOTAL		305	93.1	97.4	55.1	27.9	0.0	70.2	4.3	3.0	
CALAVERAS	SUP CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	145	96.6	95.2	66.2	4.1	0.0	84.1	4.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	97.7	100.0	9.1	77.3	0.0	38.6	0.0	15.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	100.0	80.0	6.7	66.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	13.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	205	96.6	95.1	49.3	24.4	0.0	68.3	3.4	4.4
COLUSA	SUP COLUSA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
	COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	98	93.9	96.9	80.6	1.0	0.0	76.5	12.2	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		38	86.8	100.0	7.9	73.7	0.0	68.4	15.8	0.0	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		14	71.4	100.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	7.1	50.0	0.0	
TOTAL		150	90.0	98.0	54.7	21.3	0.0	68.0	16.7	0.0	
CONTRA COSTA	SUP CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	34	82.4	85.3	29.4	5.9	0.0	38.2	11.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	57.1	100.0	4.8	19.0	0.0	4.8	28.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	78.6	92.9	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	77.8	96.3	0.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0
		TOTAL	96	75.0	92.7	11.5	19.8	0.0	14.6	12.5	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
CONTRA COSTA (cont.)	JUV CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	39	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	41.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	41	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	39.0	0.0
	CONCORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	578	97.8	95.0	82.9	1.6	0.0	83.2	11.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	158	100.0	98.7	6.3	76.6	0.0	84.8	9.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	100.0	97.2	2.8	19.4	0.0	13.9	8.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	773	98.3	95.9	63.4	17.9	0.0	80.3	11.3	0.0
	RICHMOND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	543	99.3	95.4	89.1	4.2	0.0	91.0	5.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	147	98.6	98.0	17.0	74.1	0.0	70.7	19.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	100.0	100.0	0.0	86.2	0.0	10.3	13.8	3.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	722	99.2	96.1	70.5	22.0	0.0	83.4	8.3	0.1	
	PITTSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	596	95.1	96.1	89.4	2.7	0.0	90.8	3.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	178	98.3	97.8	16.3	79.8	0.0	93.3	2.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	47	95.7	100.0	6.4	63.8	0.0	40.4	38.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	11.1	66.7	44.4
	TOTAL	830	95.9	96.7	68.1	23.5	0.0	87.6	5.9	0.5	
	WALNUT CREEK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	588	97.4	93.7	82.7	2.2	0.0	89.8	3.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	139	99.3	99.3	7.9	80.6	0.0	42.4	28.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	95.2	95.2	4.8	47.6	0.0	4.8	28.6	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	749	97.7	94.8	66.5	18.2	0.0	78.5	8.9	0.0
	DEL NORTE	SUP DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	139	87.8	84.2	74.1	3.6	0.0	74.1	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			39	87.2	92.3	23.1	64.1	0.0	82.1	0.0	51.3
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
TOTAL		188	86.7	86.7	59.6	19.1	0.0	72.9	0.5	15.4	
CRESCENT CITY		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3
EL DORADO	SUP EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	42.9	14.3
	JUV SUP PLACERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	
CAMERON PARK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	5	100.0	100.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	



TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
CONTRA COSTA (cont.)	JUV CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	39	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	41.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	41	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	39.0	0.0	
	CONCORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	578	97.8	95.0	82.9	1.6	0.0	83.2	11.9	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	158	100.0	98.7	6.3	76.6	0.0	84.8	9.5	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	100.0	97.2	2.8	19.4	0.0	13.9	8.3	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	773	98.3	95.9	63.4	17.9	0.0	80.3	11.3	0.0	
		RICHMOND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	543	99.3	95.4	89.1	4.2	0.0	91.0	5.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	147	98.6	98.0	17.0	74.1	0.0	70.7	19.7	0.0		
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	100.0	100.0	0.0	86.2	0.0	10.3	13.8	3.4		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	722	99.2	96.1	70.5	22.0	0.0	83.4	8.3	0.1		
	PITTSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	596	95.1	96.1	89.4	2.7	0.0	90.8	3.4	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	178	98.3	97.8	16.3	79.8	0.0	93.3	2.8	0.0		
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	47	95.7	100.0	6.4	63.8	0.0	40.4	38.3	0.0		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	11.1	66.7	44.4		
	TOTAL	830	95.9	96.7	68.1	23.5	0.0	87.6	5.9	0.5		
	WALNUT CREEK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	588	97.4	93.7	82.7	2.2	0.0	89.8	3.6	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	139	99.3	99.3	7.9	80.6	0.0	42.4	28.8	0.0		
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	95.2	95.2	4.8	47.6	0.0	4.8	28.6	0.0		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	749	97.7	94.8	66.5	18.2	0.0	78.5	8.9	0.0		
	DEL NORTE	SUP DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	139	87.8	84.2	74.1	3.6	0.0	74.1	0.0	2.2
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	39	87.2	92.3	23.1	64.1	0.0	82.1	0.0	51.3
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7
			4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
TOTAL			188	86.7	86.7	59.6	19.1	0.0	72.9	0.5	15.4	
CRESCENT CITY		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	
EL DORADO		SUP EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL		7	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	42.9	14.3	
	JUV SUP PLACERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0		
	CAMERON PARK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		5	100.0	100.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0		

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
EL DORADO (cont.)	SO LAKE TAHOE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	290	96.2	97.9	92.8	1.4	0.0	90.0	0.7	3.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	66	93.9	95.5	7.6	77.3	0.0	68.2	0.0	42.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	94.1	0.0	94.1	0.0	11.8	0.0	52.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	100.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	57.1
		TOTAL	380	95.5	97.4	72.4	19.5	0.0	81.6	0.5	13.7
	PLACERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	423	99.3	98.1	91.5	1.9	0.0	90.1	1.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	170	99.4	96.5	12.4	75.3	0.0	87.6	3.5	5.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	97.3	100.0	5.4	64.9	0.0	40.5	0.0	24.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	33.3	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	642	98.0	97.8	63.9	25.2	0.0	85.0	1.7	3.0
FRESNO	SUP FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	50.0	100.0	28.6	7.1	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	33.3	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	60.0	80.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	27	48.1	92.6	18.5	7.4	0.0	18.5	0.0	0.0
	JUV FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	27	100.0	0.0	29.6	0.0	0.0	7.4	74.1	0.0
		TOTAL	27	100.0	0.0	29.6	0.0	0.0	7.4	74.1	0.0
	FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1495	94.4	94.2	84.3	2.2	0.0	82.9	1.1	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	510	94.3	95.5	13.5	72.2	0.0	80.6	0.4	7.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	111	84.7	93.7	5.4	40.5	0.0	18.9	3.6	17.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	38	60.5	97.4	0.0	13.2	0.0	5.3	0.0	2.6
		TOTAL	2154	93.3	94.6	62.0	20.9	0.0	77.7	1.0	2.8
	CLOVIS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	207	95.7	92.3	85.5	4.8	0.0	87.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	69	98.6	95.7	11.6	81.2	0.0	92.8	0.0	21.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	81.8	100.0	0.0	72.7	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	288	95.5	93.4	64.2	25.7	0.0	85.8	0.0	5.6
	COALINGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	76	97.4	94.7	89.5	2.6	0.0	59.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	92.9	96.4	10.7	78.6	0.0	75.0	3.6	14.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	83.3	83.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	110	95.5	94.5	64.5	23.6	0.0	60.0	0.9	3.6
	FIREBAUGH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	152	96.7	98.7	78.3	2.0	0.0	75.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	94.3	94.3	8.6	62.9	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	100.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	85.7	100.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	205	96.1	98.0	60.0	13.2	0.0	67.3	0.0	0.0
	FOWLER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	141	97.9	96.5	92.2	2.8	0.0	90.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	97.7	100.0	13.6	81.8	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		15	80.0	100.0	0.0	53.3	0.0	13.3	0.0	6.7	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		9	55.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	
TOTAL		209	94.7	97.6	65.1	23.0	0.0	81.3	0.0	1.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO (cont.)	KERMAN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	41	95.1	100.0	87.8	4.9	0.0	80.5	4.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	12	100.0	100.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	56	96.4	100.0	69.6	21.4	0.0	78.6	3.6	0.0
	KINGSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	42	100.0	97.6	90.5	2.4	0.0	85.7	2.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	93.3	100.0	13.3	80.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	6.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7
		TOTAL	63	96.8	98.4	63.5	25.4	0.0	77.8	1.6	3.2
	REEDLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	129	96.1	96.1	89.9	0.8	0.0	56.6	24.0	3.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	97.5	5.0	75.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	15.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	88.9	11.1	66.7	0.0	22.2	22.2	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	179	96.6	96.1	66.5	20.7	0.0	55.9	21.2	6.1	
	SANGER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	73	95.9	97.3	84.9	5.5	0.0	83.6	4.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	17.6	76.5	0.0	88.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	91	96.7	97.8	71.4	18.7	0.0	83.5	4.4	0.0
	SELMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	136	91.9	91.9	83.1	2.2	0.0	78.7	0.7	1.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	37	91.9	97.3	13.5	75.7	0.0	86.5	0.0	2.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	66.7	77.8	0.0	44.4	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	183	90.7	92.3	64.5	19.7	0.0	77.0	0.5	1.6		
USCT FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
GLENN	SUP WILLOWS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	112	95.5	47.3	87.5	0.0	0.0	63.4	7.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	59	93.2	98.3	6.8	67.8	0.0	45.8	15.3	3.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	180	95.0	66.7	56.7	25.0	0.0	56.1	9.4	1.1	
JUV GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	5	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
HUMBOLDT	SUP JUV HUMBLT EUREKA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	577	96.5	17.2	92.0	2.6	0.0	91.7	2.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	161	98.1	85.1	15.5	80.7	0.0	83.2	10.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	91.7	94.4	2.8	88.9	0.0	41.7	47.2	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	66.7	91.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	8.3	50.0	0.0
	TOTAL	786	96.2	35.8	70.9	23.0	0.0	86.4	7.0	0.0	
JUV HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0		
GARBERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
IMPERIAL	SUP IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
IMPERIAL (cont.)	BRAWLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	107	98.1	52.3	87.9	0.9	0.0	88.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	100.0	92.6	37.0	55.6	0.0	85.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	100.0	85.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	142	98.6	62.0	73.2	16.9	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0
	CALEXICO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	150	98.0	26.7	71.3	0.7	0.0	79.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	96.4	57.1	39.3	42.9	0.0	85.7	10.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	80.0	80.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	183	97.3	32.8	65.6	7.7	0.0	79.8	1.6	0.0
	ELCENTRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	132	98.5	15.9	85.6	0.0	0.8	90.9	1.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	100.0	64.0	40.0	48.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	80.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	162	98.8	25.3	77.2	8.0	0.6	89.5	1.2	0.0
	CALIPATRIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
INYO	SUP INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	40.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	BISHOP	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	151	96.0	15.9	85.4	3.3	0.0	92.1	0.7	2.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	62	95.2	88.7	3.2	83.9	0.0	91.9	0.0	12.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	92.3	92.3	0.0	76.9	0.0	23.1	0.0	53.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	228	95.2	40.8	57.5	29.4	0.0	87.3	0.4	8.3
KERN	SUP KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22	50.0	77.3	36.4	0.0	9.1	9.1	4.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	35	40.0	85.7	22.9	2.9	5.7	5.7	2.9	0.0
	JUV KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	58	98.3	0.0	67.2	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	59	98.3	0.0	67.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
	ARVIN LAMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	222	97.3	97.7	77.0	1.8	0.0	52.7	16.2	1.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	64	96.9	96.9	7.8	40.6	0.0	29.7	42.2	9.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	89.3	96.4	3.6	17.9	0.0	7.1	64.3	10.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	33.3	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	323	94.7	97.2	54.8	10.8	0.0	42.7	25.1	3.7
	BAKERSFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1513	97.4	97.2	76.1	0.2	0.1	81.7	0.7	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	416	96.6	99.3	13.7	16.1	0.0	37.7	11.3	10.8
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		94	91.5	97.9	9.6	1.1	0.0	17.0	17.0	16.0	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		21	57.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	4.8	
TOTAL		2044	96.6	97.7	59.6	3.5	0.1	68.9	3.8	3.5	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
KERN (cont.)	DELANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	220	98.2	84.1	83.6	2.3	0.0	52.7	2.3	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	58	96.6	94.8	10.3	60.3	0.0	41.4	3.4	10.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	100.0	89.5	10.5	36.8	0.0	26.3	26.3	26.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3
		TOTAL	304	97.0	86.8	63.2	16.1	0.0	47.7	4.3	4.3
	LAKE ISABELLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	76	100.0	98.7	85.5	0.0	0.0	85.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	100.0	100.0	3.7	40.7	0.0	44.4	3.7	3.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	114	99.1	99.1	57.9	9.6	0.0	67.5	0.9	0.9
	TAFT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	152	97.4	94.7	70.4	3.9	0.7	63.8	25.0	5.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	95.0	2.5	82.5	5.0	42.5	25.0	45.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	195	97.4	94.9	55.4	20.5	1.5	58.5	25.1	13.8
	SHAFTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	206	99.0	98.1	89.8	2.9	0.0	62.1	4.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	59	100.0	96.6	5.1	81.4	0.0	62.7	8.5	8.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	81.8	100.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	63.6	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	278	98.6	97.8	67.6	21.2	0.0	59.4	7.9	1.8
	MOJAVE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	177	96.6	97.7	75.1	0.6	0.0	73.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	98.0	98.0	2.0	31.4	0.0	35.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		241	95.9	97.5	55.6	7.1	0.0	61.8	0.0	0.0	
RIDGECREST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	121	95.0	98.3	64.5	1.7	0.0	66.9	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	100.0	100.0	2.9	41.2	0.0	44.1	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	162	96.3	98.8	48.8	10.5	0.0	59.9	0.0	0.6	
KINGS	SUP KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	19.0	90.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	9.1	100.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	38	13.2	94.7	5.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV HANFORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	HANFORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	438	90.4	86.5	78.8	1.4	0.0	73.1	15.3	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	117	88.9	86.3	30.8	47.0	0.0	72.6	14.5	7.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	65.5	82.8	17.2	10.3	0.0	17.2	20.7	10.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	590	88.6	86.4	65.9	10.8	0.0	69.7	15.8	2.4

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
KINGS (cont.)	AVENAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	35	97.1	94.3	80.0	5.7	0.0	71.4	25.7	2.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	77.8	66.7	44.4	22.2	0.0	66.7	11.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	46	93.5	87.0	69.6	10.9	0.0	69.6	21.7	2.2
	CORCORAN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	47	89.4	87.2	76.6	0.0	0.0	74.5	17.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	61.5	92.3	30.8	23.1	0.0	30.8	30.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	62	80.6	88.7	64.5	4.8	0.0	62.9	19.4	0.0
	LAKE	SUP LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	217	94.0	32.7	76.0	1.4	0.0	90.8	0.5
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			67	97.0	89.6	9.0	79.1	0.0	89.6	1.5	4.5
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			16	93.8	81.3	6.3	25.0	0.0	31.3	6.3	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	302	94.0	48.3	57.0	19.9	0.0	86.8	1.0	1.3
CLEARLAKE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	116	97.4	12.9	81.9	2.6	0.0	83.6	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	90.9	75.8	21.2	57.6	0.0	30.3	0.0	3.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	75.0	25.0	62.5	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	158	94.9	29.7	65.8	17.1	0.0	69.6	0.0	0.6
LAKEPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
LASSEN	JUV LASSEN	1STDUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	SUSANVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	161	92.5	97.5	88.8	2.5	0.0	75.8	13.7	1.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	81.8	100.0	12.1	66.7	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	200	90.0	98.0	74.0	14.5	0.0	64.0	22.5	4.5
	USMAG	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUSANVILLE	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LOS ANGELES	SUP LA CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	103	66.0	81.6	26.2	3.9	1.0	26.2	10.7
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			33	54.5	87.9	6.1	12.1	3.0	18.2	6.1	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			12	41.7	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			25	24.0	100.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	173	56.1	86.7	16.8	5.8	1.2	19.1	8.1	0.0
SUP POMONA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	52	53.8	86.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	1.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	35.7	100.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	7.1	3.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	18	16.7	100.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
		TOTAL	107	38.3	93.5	12.1	7.5	0.0	9.3	3.7	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	SUP LANCASTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	60.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	5.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	60.0	80.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	37	43.2	83.8	18.9	0.0	0.0	18.9	2.7	0.0
	SUP VAN NUYS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	79	50.6	78.5	22.8	0.0	0.0	10.1	7.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	29.4	94.1	2.9	8.8	0.0	11.8	14.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	135	39.3	85.9	14.1	2.2	0.0	8.9	8.1	0.0
	SUP PASADENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	50.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	8.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	42.9	81.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	4.8	0.0
	SUP LONG BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	62.1	69.0	20.7	0.0	0.0	27.6	3.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	14.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	45	46.7	75.6	13.3	2.2	0.0	22.2	2.2	0.0
	SUP COMPTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	44.4	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	17	82.4	100.0	29.4	0.0	0.0	11.8	5.9	0.0
	SUP NORWALK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	39	79.5	82.1	43.6	2.6	0.0	48.7	2.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	75.0	93.8	6.3	37.5	0.0	43.8	6.3	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	50.0	90.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	16.7	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	77	64.9	88.3	23.4	15.6	0.0	37.7	2.6	0.0
	SUP TORRANCE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	33	60.6	84.8	33.3	0.0	0.0	27.3	6.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	12	41.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		4	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		11	27.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		60	51.7	91.7	18.3	3.3	0.0	18.3	3.3	0.0	
SUP SANTA MONICA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	80.0	75.0	40.0	0.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	57.1	85.7	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	57.1	100.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	14.3	0.0	
	TOTAL	44	65.9	86.4	20.5	6.8	2.3	13.6	18.2	0.0	
JUV LA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	LA JUV CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	30	100.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
		TOTAL	30	100.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
	LA MUNI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	814	98.9	31.0	94.2	2.2	0.0	84.8	0.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	204	99.5	87.3	13.7	80.4	1.0	79.9	0.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	91.3	78.3	0.0	43.5	8.7	17.4	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1044	98.7	43.2	76.1	18.4	0.4	82.1	0.2	0.0
	ALHAMBRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	470	96.6	58.1	88.3	1.1	0.0	82.1	0.6	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	102	95.1	98.0	5.9	83.3	0.0	80.4	0.0	2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	76.9	92.3	0.0	30.8	7.7	15.4	0.0	15.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	588	95.4	66.0	71.6	16.0	0.2	79.9	0.5	1.0
	LANCASTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	524	95.8	96.6	91.2	3.2	0.0	82.3	2.3	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	101	98.0	95.0	8.9	74.3	1.0	51.5	15.8	25.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	96.3	81.5	0.0	48.1	11.1	11.1	3.7	40.7
		TOTAL	652	96.2	95.7	74.7	16.1	0.6	74.5	4.4	6.4
	BEVERLY HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	170	100.0	21.2	97.6	1.8	0.0	97.1	0.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	100.0	85.7	14.3	82.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	83.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	83.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	204	100.0	31.9	83.8	14.7	0.5	97.1	0.5	0.0
	BURBANK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	246	98.4	35.4	91.5	2.0	0.0	92.3	0.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	95.0	7.5	85.0	2.5	85.0	7.5	2.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	100.0	71.4	28.6	14.3	14.3	28.6	28.6	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	294	98.6	44.6	78.2	13.6	0.7	89.5	2.4	0.3	
	WEST COVINA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1430	98.2	36.9	94.1	1.5	0.0	92.9	1.3	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	323	98.8	89.8	11.1	84.2	0.3	92.6	0.6	3.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	97.8	91.1	2.2	55.6	8.9	11.1	4.4	11.1
		TOTAL	1798	98.3	47.8	76.9	17.7	0.3	90.8	1.3	1.4
	SUP CHATSWORTH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	819	99.3	47.5	91.3	4.0	0.0	87.2	4.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	184	99.5	94.0	7.6	88.0	0.0	72.8	12.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	44	100.0	84.1	2.3	47.7	15.9	4.5	15.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		1052	99.3	57.1	72.5	20.5	1.0	80.8	6.1	0.0	
COMPTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	922	97.6	79.9	91.1	1.8	0.0	91.1	0.4	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	248	98.0	91.1	15.7	77.4	0.0	90.7	2.4	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	52	94.2	80.8	3.8	59.6	13.5	53.8	0.0	1.9	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	17	70.6	88.2	0.0	23.5	5.9	5.9	11.8	0.0	
	TOTAL	1239	97.2	82.3	71.1	19.7	0.6	88.3	1.0	0.1	
DOWNEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	651	97.7	41.9	90.2	1.2	0.0	89.2	1.1	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	141	98.6	90.1	10.6	79.4	2.1	80.9	2.8	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	95.5	81.8	4.5	54.5	4.5	31.8	9.1	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	815	97.8	51.4	74.0	16.3	0.5	86.1	1.7	0.0	



TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	EAST LA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	734	96.2	18.9	89.6	1.8	0.0	91.7	1.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	162	96.9	86.4	11.1	78.4	1.2	88.9	3.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	95.7	73.9	8.7	47.8	26.1	17.4	21.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	920	96.3	32.3	73.7	16.5	0.9	89.3	1.8	0.0
	EL MONTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	578	96.5	21.1	91.7	1.7	0.0	90.5	2.1	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	145	97.2	72.4	9.7	83.4	0.7	86.2	4.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	100.0	95.8	4.2	83.3	0.0	25.0	4.2	0.0
		TOTAL	747	96.8	33.5	73.0	20.2	0.1	87.6	2.5	0.3
	GLENDALE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	441	98.0	16.6	92.1	0.7	0.0	91.4	1.8	2.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	101	97.0	88.1	16.8	76.2	0.0	64.4	11.9	8.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	92.9	85.7	0.0	71.4	7.1	21.4	21.4	14.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	559	97.5	31.7	75.7	16.1	0.2	84.3	4.3	4.3
	INGLEWOOD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	366	97.0	16.1	90.4	1.1	0.0	88.5	0.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	103	96.1	59.2	28.2	57.3	0.0	86.4	1.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	47.1	11.8	35.3	23.5	52.9	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	490	96.3	26.7	73.9	14.5	0.8	86.5	1.0	0.0
	LONG BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	855	97.7	27.6	82.8	1.1	0.0	83.3	0.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	192	99.0	69.8	12.5	71.9	0.0	77.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	40	100.0	80.0	2.5	27.5	10.0	15.0	2.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1089	97.9	37.0	67.3	14.5	0.4	79.5	0.3	0.0
	LA METRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4630	98.6	45.6	93.2	2.9	0.0	86.5	0.4	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	925	99.6	95.4	7.4	89.0	0.1	89.9	0.9	2.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	166	97.6	95.8	2.4	59.6	3.0	19.9	1.8	10.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	85.7	100.0	14.3	71.4	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3
		TOTAL	5728	98.7	55.2	76.6	18.5	0.1	85.0	0.5	0.9
	BELLFLOWER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	290	99.3	11.0	92.1	0.3	0.0	86.6	8.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	63	100.0	84.1	12.7	82.5	1.6	88.9	3.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	100.0	94.4	5.6	27.8	5.6	22.2	27.8	0.0
		TOTAL	371	99.5	27.5	74.4	15.6	0.5	83.8	8.4	0.0
	VALENCIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	626	96.8	33.9	90.3	1.6	0.2	85.0	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	155	98.7	94.2	6.5	89.0	0.6	91.0	0.0	1.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	96.3	81.5	0.0	59.3	18.5	29.6	3.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	812	96.9	47.2	70.8	20.3	1.0	83.9	0.5	0.2
	PASADENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	686	98.4	20.8	90.4	0.9	0.1	94.5	1.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	144	100.0	90.3	7.6	85.4	0.7	93.1	0.7	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		20	90.0	85.0	0.0	40.0	15.0	25.0	5.0	0.0	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
TOTAL		852	98.5	34.3	74.1	16.1	0.6	92.4	1.4	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	MALIBU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	224	98.2	10.3	93.3	1.3	0.0	95.1	0.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	61	98.4	82.0	11.5	78.7	4.9	90.2	0.0	3.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	91.7	50.0	8.3	8.3	33.3	16.7	8.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	299	97.7	26.8	72.6	17.4	2.3	90.3	0.7	0.7
	POMONA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	779	98.3	23.7	92.4	2.4	0.0	89.1	0.3	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	164	95.7	70.7	20.1	72.0	0.0	88.4	1.2	2.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	89.3	71.4	10.7	46.4	7.1	32.1	3.6	10.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	974	97.5	33.2	77.6	15.5	0.2	87.2	0.5	0.8
	HUNTINGTON PARK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	746	98.8	27.3	90.8	3.4	0.3	92.0	1.5	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	149	98.7	84.6	11.4	82.6	2.0	89.3	1.3	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	91.7	95.8	8.3	62.5	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	920	98.6	38.5	75.7	17.7	0.5	90.3	1.4	0.1
	MONROVIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	189	98.9	13.2	93.7	0.0	0.0	91.5	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	50	96.0	82.0	16.0	74.0	0.0	84.0	2.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	16.7	50.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	248	97.6	29.8	75.0	16.1	0.0	86.7	1.6	0.0
	SANTA MONICA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	159	98.7	13.2	91.2	1.9	0.0	91.8	3.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	100.0	85.3	5.9	73.5	5.9	79.4	2.9	2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	100.0	75.0	6.3	50.0	18.8	31.3	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	209	99.0	29.7	70.8	17.2	2.4	85.2	4.8	0.5
		TORRANCE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	959	98.6	20.2	95.6	0.8	0.0	89.4	1.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		205	97.1	81.5	13.2	80.0	0.5	85.9	0.5	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		45	95.6	68.9	0.0	37.8	24.4	17.8	6.7	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		9	88.9	88.9	11.1	55.6	11.1	22.2	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL		1218	98.2	32.8	77.6	15.9	1.1	85.6	1.1	0.0
	REDONDO BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	SOUTHGATE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	191	99.5	33.5	90.6	5.2	0.0	92.1	2.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	97.0	69.7	18.2	75.8	0.0	93.9	6.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	229	99.1	38.9	78.2	15.7	1.3	90.4	2.6	0.0
		WHITTIER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	525	96.4	17.3	88.4	1.0	0.0	88.0	5.3
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	110		98.2	92.7	7.3	84.5	1.8	89.1	4.5	0.9	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14		100.0	71.4	7.1	7.1	21.4	7.1	14.3	0.0	
TOTAL	649		96.8	31.3	72.9	15.3	0.8	86.4	5.4	0.2	
HOLLYWOOD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI		208	99.5	22.1	89.9	1.9	0.0	90.4	1.4	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	100.0	93.9	12.1	87.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	66.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	244	99.6	32.4	78.3	14.3	0.4	90.6	1.2	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	SAN FERNANDO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	494	98.2	45.5	88.3	4.0	0.6	85.6	1.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	135	95.6	94.1	9.6	82.2	0.7	77.0	5.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	26	100.0	92.3	0.0	69.2	7.7	15.4	3.8	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	657	97.6	57.5	68.3	22.8	0.9	80.8	2.3	0.0
	SAN PEDRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	252	98.4	38.1	88.9	1.6	0.0	81.7	1.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	68	94.1	92.6	7.4	82.4	1.5	75.0	4.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	100.0	73.3	6.7	60.0	13.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	336	97.6	50.9	68.5	20.8	0.9	77.4	2.1	0.0
	VAN NUYS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1825	99.1	34.2	93.2	2.8	0.1	76.1	1.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	389	98.5	93.1	6.9	83.8	2.3	76.6	2.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	69	92.8	91.3	0.0	39.1	8.7	4.3	8.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	41.7	100.0	8.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
		TOTAL	2295	98.5	46.3	75.3	17.7	0.7	73.6	2.2	0.0
	LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	AVALON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
TORRANCE FED	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
MADERA	SUP MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	42	95.2	83.3	64.3	2.4	2.4	16.7	42.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	11.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	61	91.8	86.9	50.8	11.5	3.3	19.7	32.8	0.0
	JUV MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0
	CHOWCHILLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	253	96.4	97.2	83.8	5.1	0.0	37.9	5.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	52	100.0	98.1	28.8	71.2	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	100.0	100.0	10.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	20.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	328	97.3	97.3	69.8	18.6	0.0	43.0	5.5	0.0
	BORDEN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	50.0	87.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	66.7	91.7	41.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	25.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK		
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
MADERA (cont.)	BASSLAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	57	96.5	89.5	82.5	1.8	0.0	56.1	24.6	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	24	95.8	95.8	25.0	58.3	0.0	29.2	41.7	0.0		
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0		
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	84	96.4	91.7	64.3	17.9	0.0	47.6	28.6	0.0		
MARIN	SAN RAFAEL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1064	96.4	8.8	83.3	2.3	0.0	89.4	9.3	1.2		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	230	98.7	90.9	5.2	86.5	0.0	87.4	11.7	10.9		
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	89.3	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	10.7	78.6	28.6		
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	100.0	87.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	75.0	50.0		
		TOTAL	1330	96.7	25.4	67.6	17.7	0.0	86.9	11.6	3.8		
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	47	97.9	87.2	78.7	0.0	2.1	63.8	10.6	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	24	91.7	91.7	12.5	54.2	8.3	54.2	8.3	16.7		
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5		
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	80	96.3	88.8	50.0	23.7	5.0	55.0	10.0	6.3		
	USMG YOSEMITE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	100.0	100.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	11	72.7	90.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	23	87.0	95.7	8.7	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0		
		MENDOCINO	UKIAH CONSLD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0
				4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
TOTAL	10			30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	0.0		
	JUV UKIAH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	WILLITS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	81	93.8	96.3	88.9	1.2	0.0	84.0	1.2	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	37	91.9	91.9	8.1	73.0	0.0	78.4	2.7	2.7		
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		
		TOTAL	119	93.3	95.0	63.0	23.5	0.0	81.5	1.7	1.7		
			UKIAH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	188	81.9	97.9	67.6	4.8	0.0	69.1	2.1	0.5
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	53			94.3	98.1	7.5	84.9	0.0	79.2	1.9	7.5		
3RDDUI	20			95.0	95.0	10.0	70.0	0.0	35.0	10.0	15.0		
TOTAL	261			85.4	97.7	51.0	26.1	0.0	68.6	2.7	3.1		
	BOONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	88.9	88.9	77.8	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	10	90.0	90.0	70.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0		
	PT. ARENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3		
		TOTAL	12	100.0	100.0	75.0	16.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	8.3		
	LEGGETT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	26	88.5	100.0	80.8	0.0	0.0	73.1	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0		
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	36	91.7	100.0	58.3	27.8	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0		

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MENDOCINO (cont.)	COVELO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	71.4	14.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	80.0	100.0	50.0	10.0	0.0	60.0	10.0	0.0
	FORT BRAGG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	68	100.0	95.6	91.2	1.5	0.0	88.2	2.9	1.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19	100.0	100.0	21.1	73.7	0.0	89.5	5.3	5.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	90	98.9	96.7	73.3	17.8	0.0	85.6	3.3	2.2
	MERCED	SUP MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	30	76.7	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	3.3
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			10	70.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			8	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL			51	68.6	94.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	2.0	0.0
JUV MERCED		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MERCED		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	564	97.7	95.7	86.5	4.6	0.0	92.6	1.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	187	99.5	100.0	16.0	74.3	0.0	88.8	3.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	100.0	97.3	13.5	56.8	0.0	54.1	24.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	794	98.1	96.6	66.0	23.6	0.0	89.3	3.3	0.0
LOS BANOS		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	237	98.7	97.5	92.0	1.7	0.0	94.1	0.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	49	98.0	100.0	18.4	71.4	0.0	89.8	0.0	2.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	84.6	92.3	23.1	46.2	0.0	38.5	15.4	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	300	98.0	97.7	76.7	15.3	0.0	90.7	1.3	0.3
GUSTINE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
MODOC		SUP MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	46	93.5	56.5	78.3	6.5	0.0	71.7	15.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		21	81.0	100.0	23.8	42.9	0.0	47.6	4.8	4.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	TOTAL		69	89.9	69.6	60.9	17.4	1.4	63.8	13.0	1.4
MONO	JUV MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	BRIDGEPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	16	100.0	68.8	93.8	0.0	0.0	93.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	100.0	75.0	75.0	20.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0
	MAMMOTH LAKES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	108	88.0	59.3	85.2	1.9	0.0	79.6	0.9	1.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	15.4	76.9	0.0	84.6	0.0	15.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		126	87.3	64.3	74.6	11.1	0.0	77.8	0.8	4.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MONTEREY	SUP MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	58	84.5	100.0	36.2	12.1	0.0	10.3	60.3	13.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	23	87.0	100.0	4.3	47.8	0.0	13.0	56.5	39.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	73.7	100.0	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	63.2	10.5
		TOTAL	105	82.9	100.0	21.0	21.9	0.0	8.6	60.0	20.0
	JUV SALINAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	13	84.6	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	15.4	0.0
		TOTAL	13	84.6	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	15.4	0.0
	MARINA MUNI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	28.6	57.1	7.1	7.1	0.0	14.3	7.1	14.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	15	33.3	60.0	6.7	13.3	0.0	20.0	6.7	20.0
	SALINAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1722	99.2	98.8	59.0	2.0	0.0	45.9	38.3	6.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	436	98.2	99.5	8.7	53.0	0.0	23.2	44.3	62.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	69	95.7	98.6	0.0	46.4	0.0	5.8	47.8	66.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	71.4	57.1
		TOTAL	2234	98.9	99.0	47.2	13.4	0.0	40.1	39.8	19.1
	KING CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	331	99.4	98.8	65.3	0.6	0.0	38.4	43.8	12.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	99	100.0	100.0	8.1	37.4	0.0	15.2	59.6	73.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	100.0	100.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	10.0	85.0	70.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.0
		TOTAL	452	99.6	99.1	49.6	9.3	0.0	31.9	49.3	28.8
NAPA	NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	684	98.0	93.7	86.7	1.3	0.0	90.5	1.9	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	160	96.3	100.0	12.5	80.0	0.0	94.4	0.0	10.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	95.1	100.0	2.4	80.5	0.0	82.9	0.0	31.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	57.1	0.0	14.3
		TOTAL	892	97.2	95.2	68.8	19.5	0.0	90.6	1.5	3.9
NEVADA	NEVADA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	189	98.4	88.4	82.0	1.6	0.0	81.0	3.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	55	100.0	100.0	12.7	74.5	0.0	76.4	0.0	12.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	0.0	52.9	0.0	17.6	0.0	5.9
		TOTAL	261	98.9	91.6	62.1	20.3	0.0	75.9	2.7	3.1
	TRUCKEE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TRUCKEE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	172	98.8	97.7	93.0	4.1	0.0	95.9	0.6	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	36	97.2	97.2	22.2	72.2	0.0	94.4	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	100.0	21.4	78.6	0.0	71.4	14.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		225	97.8	97.8	76.0	20.0	0.0	92.9	1.3	0.4	
ORANGE	SUP SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	31	71.0	90.3	38.7	6.5	0.0	35.5	12.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	60.0	96.0	4.0	52.0	4.0	16.0	32.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	43.8	93.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
		TOTAL	81	61.7	93.8	16.0	29.6	1.2	18.5	17.3	0.0
	JUV ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	65	96.9	21.5	80.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	52.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	66	97.0	22.7	78.8	0.0	0.0	12.1	53.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ORANGE (cont.)	FULLERTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2300	98.8	32.2	94.5	1.6	0.0	86.7	5.1	1.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	574	98.8	92.9	10.1	84.1	0.0	67.1	20.7	23.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	100.0	94.5	2.2	85.7	1.1	9.9	11.0	39.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	84.6	76.9	0.0	69.2	0.0	15.4	15.4	15.4
		TOTAL	2978	98.8	46.0	75.0	20.4	0.0	80.2	8.3	6.6
	WESTMINSTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1972	99.0	14.0	93.9	1.1	0.0	92.2	1.8	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	492	98.2	90.0	7.7	82.7	0.0	82.3	5.3	16.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	82	93.9	96.3	3.7	75.6	1.2	15.9	2.4	43.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	75.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
		TOTAL	2554	98.6	31.6	74.1	19.3	0.0	87.6	2.5	5.2
	LAGUNA HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	728	97.9	17.6	94.4	0.5	0.0	85.3	9.3	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	164	98.2	85.4	6.7	84.1	0.0	65.2	20.7	12.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	93.3	96.7	0.0	83.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	26.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	923	97.7	32.3	75.6	18.1	0.0	79.0	11.1	3.3
	NEWPORT BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2237	99.1	32.4	94.4	0.8	0.0	91.5	5.5	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	491	98.4	93.3	6.7	85.5	0.0	56.2	40.5	2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	86	96.5	95.3	2.3	84.9	1.2	9.3	22.1	12.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	73.7	94.7	0.0	47.4	0.0	0.0	15.8	15.8
		TOTAL	2833	98.7	45.3	75.8	18.4	0.0	82.2	12.1	1.1
	SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1524	95.9	37.1	92.5	1.4	0.1	76.5	4.0	0.8
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		347	96.8	92.2	10.7	84.4	0.0	79.0	6.3	13.5	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		66	87.9	97.0	1.5	74.2	0.0	10.6	0.0	56.1	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		17	52.9	70.6	0.0	41.2	0.0	0.0	5.9	11.8	
TOTAL		1954	95.4	49.2	74.1	19.0	0.1	74.1	4.3	5.0	
PLACER	SUP AUBURN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	964	97.9	98.1	62.2	2.5	0.1	85.1	1.2	9.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	296	95.6	97.0	11.5	70.6	0.7	82.1	0.7	58.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	63	90.5	92.1	9.5	47.6	6.3	11.1	6.3	55.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	16.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7
		TOTAL	1329	96.7	97.6	48.2	19.9	0.5	80.5	1.4	22.6
	JUV AUBURN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	95.2	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	90.5	0.0
		TOTAL	21	95.2	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	90.5	0.0
	JUV TAHOE VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	AUBURN MUNI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	ROSEVILLE SUP	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUP TAHOE CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	23	100.0	100.0	95.7	4.3	0.0	95.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	22.2	66.7	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		32	100.0	100.0	75.0	21.9	0.0	93.8	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
PLACER (cont.)	TAHOE CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	137	97.1	93.4	68.6	1.5	0.0	90.5	1.5	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	14.3	76.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	4.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	163	97.5	94.5	59.5	14.1	0.0	90.8	1.2	0.6	
PLUMAS	PORTOLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	QUINCY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	143	96.5	97.9	84.6	9.1	0.0	91.6	2.8	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	89.4	100.0	12.8	74.5	0.0	85.1	2.1	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	83.3	91.7	25.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	204	93.6	98.0	63.7	27.0	0.0	88.2	2.5	0.0	
	RIVERSIDE	SUP RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	283	81.6	85.9	65.7	2.1	0.0	43.1	8.5	2.5
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	97	71.1	97.9	20.6	45.4	0.0	38.1	6.2	5.2
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			30	66.7	90.0	0.0	46.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			47	59.6	95.7	0.0	53.2	0.0	6.4	2.1	2.1	
TOTAL			457	76.1	89.7	45.1	19.5	0.0	36.8	6.8	4.2	
SUP INDIO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	52	86.5	80.8	55.8	17.3	0.0	50.0	13.5	9.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	56	87.5	89.3	5.4	69.6	0.0	67.9	3.6	44.6	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	69	92.8	72.5	2.9	59.4	0.0	47.8	5.8	58.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	30	73.3	90.0	3.3	36.7	0.0	10.0	13.3	43.3	
		TOTAL	207	87.0	81.6	16.9	48.3	0.0	48.3	8.2	40.1	
JUV RIVERSIDE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	5	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	
JUV INDIO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	
CORONA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	216	100.0	98.6	98.6	1.4	0.0	93.5	3.2	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	97.5	15.0	80.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	2.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	100.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	
		TOTAL	264	100.0	98.5	83.3	15.9	0.0	84.5	9.5	0.8	
HEMET		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	420	97.9	95.7	94.0	1.7	0.0	85.5	4.5	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	110	97.3	98.2	16.4	77.3	0.0	79.1	2.7	5.5	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	90.0	100.0	10.0	80.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	553	97.5	96.4	75.0	20.1	0.0	82.1	4.0	1.1		
BANNING	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	299	98.7	65.6	96.0	1.7	0.0	88.6	6.0	0.7		
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	84	97.6	97.6	16.7	81.0	0.0	75.0	10.7	4.8		
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	0.0	94.7	0.0	21.1	0.0	0.0		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	404	98.0	73.8	74.8	22.5	0.0	82.4	6.7	1.5		



TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
RIVERSIDE (cont.)	INDIO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1187	98.5	67.0	94.3	0.8	0.0	95.8	1.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DDUI	152	96.7	88.2	19.7	73.0	0.0	86.2	4.6	3.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	59	93.2	86.4	1.7	57.6	0.0	39.0	23.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	28	100.0	92.9	0.0	71.4	0.0	21.4	67.9	0.0
		TOTAL	1426	98.1	70.5	80.6	12.2	0.0	91.0	4.3	0.4
	MORENO VALLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1879	98.3	81.2	83.8	1.6	0.0	85.5	6.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	422	98.1	97.4	10.4	81.3	0.0	81.5	5.0	1.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	109	93.6	97.2	6.4	72.5	0.0	19.3	28.4	1.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> +DUI	21	57.1	100.0	4.8	47.6	0.0	14.3	19.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2431	97.7	84.9	66.9	19.0	0.0	81.2	7.2	0.3
	BLYTHE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	87	100.0	26.4	95.4	0.0	0.0	85.1	11.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	17	100.0	76.5	11.8	70.6	0.0	47.1	58.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0
		TOTAL	113	99.1	39.8	75.2	15.9	0.0	75.2	21.2	0.0
	PERRIS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1102	98.6	94.5	88.0	2.3	0.0	78.0	1.4	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	286	97.9	99.3	8.4	85.3	0.0	30.1	6.3	3.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	62	96.8	100.0	1.6	90.3	0.0	8.1	9.7	6.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	73.7	94.7	5.3	68.4	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1469	98.1	95.6	67.8	23.0	0.0	64.9	2.7	1.0
	TEMECULA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ELSINORE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SACRAMENTO	SUP SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	96	79.2	96.9	37.5	15.6	0.0	0.0	44.8	2.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	56	76.8	92.9	3.6	46.4	0.0	7.1	33.9	5.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	52.9	97.1	2.9	29.4	0.0	0.0	20.6	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	59	78.0	96.6	0.0	50.8	0.0	0.0	42.4	0.0
		TOTAL	245	74.7	95.9	15.9	33.1	0.0	1.6	38.4	2.0
	JUV SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	49	100.0	93.9	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.3	0.0
		TOTAL	49	100.0	93.9	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.3	0.0
	SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3777	97.8	96.2	75.0	1.5	0.0	67.8	11.0	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1074	99.3	99.0	7.0	51.3	0.0	51.3	22.6	1.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	249	99.2	98.0	3.2	28.9	0.0	16.1	6.8	4.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	34	88.2	97.1	2.9	26.5	0.0	8.8	11.8	0.0
		TOTAL	5134	98.1	96.9	56.8	13.4	0.0	61.4	13.2	0.7
	ELK GROVE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	30	90.0	90.0	80.0	3.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	44.4	44.4	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0
		TOTAL	39	92.3	92.3	71.8	12.8	0.0	84.6	2.6	0.0
	GALT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	94.7	89.5	68.4	5.3	0.0	94.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	26	96.2	92.3	61.5	19.2	0.0	92.3	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SACRAMENTO (cont.)	WALNUT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		GROVE	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	6	100.0	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	
	SACTO USMAG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SAN BENITO	SUP SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	230	97.8	93.0	67.4	1.7	0.0	64.3	22.6	2.2	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	67	98.5	97.0	11.9	50.7	0.0	61.2	26.9	23.9	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	100.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	43.8	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	
		TOTAL	319	98.1	94.4	51.1	13.2	0.0	60.5	22.9	9.1	
	JUV HOLLISTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	HOLLISTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
	SAN BERNARDINO	SUP MUN SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	27	66.7	63.0	44.4	14.8	0.0	18.5	3.7	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	70.0	70.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> +D UI			12	50.0	50.0	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL			52	63.5	61.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	11.5	3.8	0.0	
SUP RANCHO CUCAMONGA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	46	50.0	58.7	21.7	6.5	0.0	10.9	6.5	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	62.5	87.5	0.0	62.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	25.0	50.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	72	45.8	58.3	16.7	11.1	0.0	9.7	5.6	0.0	
SUP VICTORVILLE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	23	73.9	87.0	21.7	17.4	0.0	13.0	4.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	85.7	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	62.5	68.8	0.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	52	67.3	75.0	11.5	21.2	0.0	5.8	1.9	0.0	
SUP MUN BARSTOW		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	318	95.0	62.9	84.6	4.1	0.0	87.1	4.4	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	95	95.8	90.5	17.9	76.8	0.0	77.9	15.8	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	91.7	95.8	0.0	70.8	0.0	29.2	29.2	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	438	94.7	70.8	65.3	23.5	0.0	81.7	8.4	0.0	
SUP MUN JOSHUATREE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	60.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	16	50.0	50.0	31.3	12.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	
JUV SAN BERNADINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
SUP JUV SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)	SUP MUN RNCHO CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUP JUV VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUP MUN CHINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	301	97.0	32.2	90.7	4.0	0.0	89.0	1.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	70	100.0	87.1	8.6	88.6	0.0	91.4	1.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	100.0	91.7	8.3	58.3	0.0	50.0	33.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	385	97.4	44.2	72.7	21.0	0.0	87.8	2.6	0.0
	SUP MUN REDLANDS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	311	97.7	57.9	93.2	1.3	0.0	89.7	3.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	76	94.7	84.2	11.8	81.6	0.0	85.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	72.2	0.0	38.9	22.2	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	410	96.6	64.6	72.9	19.5	0.0	85.9	3.7	0.0
	SUP MUN SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1056	97.4	73.3	91.8	2.9	0.0	84.4	1.6	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	279	98.9	91.8	15.8	77.1	0.0	64.5	18.6	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	56	96.4	91.1	5.4	32.1	0.0	14.3	7.1	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	93.8	93.8	6.3	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0
		TOTAL	1407	97.7	77.9	72.3	19.3	0.0	76.8	5.3	0.1
	SUP MUN FONTANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	665	97.1	56.8	90.8	2.7	0.0	85.3	0.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	198	95.5	90.9	16.2	69.7	0.0	75.3	3.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	83.3	95.2	0.0	45.2	0.0	23.8	19.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	53.8	69.2	0.0	15.4	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	918	95.5	66.1	69.3	19.3	0.0	79.2	1.9	0.0
	SUP MUN VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	796	96.9	43.1	93.1	2.5	0.0	90.8	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	184	98.4	92.9	14.7	81.5	0.0	91.3	0.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	43	90.7	90.7	11.6	60.5	0.0	53.5	20.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	100.0	83.3	16.7	66.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1029	96.9	54.2	75.2	19.4	0.0	89.1	1.4	0.0
	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1661	98.1	42.0	95.2	1.2	0.0	94.3	0.8	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	402	97.8	93.3	14.4	81.6	0.0	93.0	0.5	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	76	100.0	88.2	3.9	31.6	0.0	25.0	11.8	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	88.9	100.0	11.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	
	TOTAL	2148	98.0	53.4	76.5	17.4	0.0	91.3	1.3	0.0	
BIG BEARLAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	111	100.0	58.6	97.3	1.8	0.0	99.1	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	36	100.0	94.4	13.9	86.1	0.0	86.1	8.3	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	150	100.0	68.0	75.3	24.0	0.0	94.0	2.0	0.0	
TWINPEAKS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	118	98.3	40.7	94.1	3.4	0.0	95.8	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	94.1	91.2	8.8	82.4	0.0	79.4	5.9	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	83.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	
	TOTAL	163	96.9	54.6	70.6	25.2	0.0	87.1	4.9	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)	NEEDLES SUPMU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	99	98.0	56.6	51.5	3.0	1.0	63.6	24.2	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	14	100.0	71.4	35.7	42.9	7.1	42.9	42.9	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	117	98.3	59.0	48.7	8.5	1.7	59.8	25.6	0.0	
	JOSHUA TREE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	198	93.4	53.5	85.4	3.0	0.0	85.4	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	62	96.8	95.2	21.0	72.6	0.0	74.2	8.1	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	81.8	0.0	63.6	0.0	45.5	27.3	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	273	94.5	64.5	66.7	22.0	0.0	80.6	2.9	0.0	
	SAN DIEGO	SUP SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	128	70.3	92.2	31.3	3.1	0.0	13.3	1.6	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	65.9	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	31.3	93.8	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			17	52.9	100.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	205	64.9	94.6	20.0	8.3	0.0	11.2	1.0	0.0	
SUP VISTA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	133	79.7	97.0	33.8	6.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	49	67.3	95.9	2.0	28.6	0.0	16.3	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	44.4	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	26	61.5	100.0	3.8	19.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	226	72.1	97.3	20.8	13.3	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0	
SUP CHULA VISTA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	44	63.6	88.6	18.2	2.3	0.0	20.5	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	77.8	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	61	65.6	90.2	14.8	1.6	0.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	
SUP EL CAJON		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	81.8	90.9	9.1	18.2	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	21	66.7	95.2	4.8	9.5	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	
JUV SAN DIEGO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	94	3.2	2.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	95	3.2	2.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	
EL CAJON		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1726	96.6	15.3	85.9	2.5	0.0	83.9	3.5	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	502	94.8	86.3	11.8	67.9	0.0	76.5	2.8	0.2	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	109	84.4	93.6	4.6	35.8	0.0	18.3	4.6	1.8		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	72.7	81.8	18.2	18.2	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	2359	95.4	34.6	65.7	18.1	0.0	78.8	3.4	0.1		
VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2645	98.2	17.4	87.9	4.8	0.1	84.5	6.4	0.3		
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	704	98.7	88.6	10.1	78.1	0.1	71.2	13.9	2.7		
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	153	96.1	98.7	2.0	73.2	0.0	24.8	24.2	3.3		
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	85.7	85.7	14.3	71.4	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0		
	TOTAL	3509	98.2	35.4	68.4	22.6	0.1	79.1	8.7	0.9		
SAN MARCOS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	25	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	48.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	25	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	48.0	0.0		

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN DIEGO (cont.)	SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3839	98.2	94.6	91.8	3.5	0.1	90.8	3.3	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	706	98.0	99.2	17.7	77.8	0.0	62.9	2.7	1.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	133	96.2	98.5	6.8	80.5	0.0	28.6	21.8	12.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	80.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4683	98.1	95.4	78.2	17.0	0.0	84.7	3.7	0.7
	CHULA VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1576	97.1	10.0	84.5	2.1	0.0	79.9	6.2	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	266	97.0	75.6	17.3	67.3	0.0	80.5	4.9	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	40	97.5	82.5	12.5	27.5	0.0	25.0	30.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	100.0	90.0	10.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1892	97.1	21.1	73.2	12.0	0.0	78.4	6.6	0.1
	NATIONAL CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	USCT SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN FRANCISCO	SUP SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	JUV SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	706	98.2	98.4	94.8	2.1	0.0	95.6	0.4	2.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	144	100.0	99.3	26.4	69.4	0.0	91.0	1.4	57.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	77.8	0.0	94.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0
		TOTAL	874	98.3	98.6	80.9	15.6	0.0	94.1	0.7	13.6
US DISTCT SF	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SAN JOAQUIN	FRENCH CAMP	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	43	100.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.6	20.9	0.0
		TOTAL	43	100.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.6	20.9	0.0
	LODI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	458	98.9	97.8	85.6	1.3	0.2	77.9	16.2	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	103	95.1	99.0	10.7	68.9	0.0	74.8	17.5	5.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	40	95.0	97.5	0.0	10.0	2.5	7.5	90.0	7.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0
		TOTAL	608	97.5	98.0	66.3	13.5	0.3	71.9	21.7	2.0
	MANTECA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	311	98.7	96.5	91.6	2.6	0.3	91.0	1.9	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	102	99.0	99.0	9.8	82.4	1.0	93.1	3.9	51.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	97.1	79.4	0.0	73.5	17.6	35.3	29.4	44.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	66.7	88.9	0.0	44.4	11.1	0.0	55.6	33.3
		TOTAL	456	98.0	95.6	64.7	26.5	2.0	85.5	5.5	16.2
	TRACY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	271	98.2	98.9	91.1	1.1	0.0	79.0	7.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	88	100.0	98.9	15.9	80.7	1.1	78.4	4.5	31.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	95.0	95.0	0.0	65.0	0.0	25.0	40.0	25.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
		TOTAL	383	98.2	98.7	68.1	23.2	0.3	75.2	8.9	9.1

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN JOAQUIN (cont.)	STOCKTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1009	98.7	97.4	92.8	1.4	0.7	75.2	4.9	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	343	99.4	96.5	5.8	86.0	2.0	78.7	8.5	5.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	87	96.6	62.1	2.3	44.8	35.6	21.8	50.6	9.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	39	76.9	53.8	2.6	10.3	46.2	0.0	33.3	5.1
		TOTAL	1478	98.2	94.0	64.9	23.8	4.3	70.9	9.1	2.0
	SUP STOCKTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1299	92.8	94.7	86.1	1.2	0.0	79.4	1.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	341	95.9	99.4	5.0	83.6	0.0	76.0	0.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	94.5	98.9	4.4	72.5	0.0	8.8	1.1	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	72.7	81.8	0.0	31.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1753	93.3	95.7	65.0	21.3	0.0	74.1	1.4	0.0
SAN MATEO	SUP REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	69.0	96.6	31.0	10.3	0.0	17.2	3.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	40.0	100.0	0.0	26.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	37.5	100.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	58	53.4	98.3	15.5	13.8	0.0	10.3	1.7	0.0
	SUP SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	53.3	0.0
		TOTAL	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	53.3	0.0
	SO SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1186	97.8	97.0	92.7	1.5	0.0	80.2	0.0	1.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	242	97.1	99.2	8.7	84.3	0.0	31.4	1.2	49.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	94.6	100.0	0.0	86.5	0.0	2.7	0.0	35.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1469	97.5	97.3	76.2	17.4	0.0	70.0	0.3	10.0
	REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	981	94.6	97.7	85.8	1.4	0.0	78.0	0.6	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	241	97.5	98.8	10.8	83.8	0.0	30.7	5.8	14.9
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		48	93.8	100.0	2.1	87.5	0.0	4.2	6.3	22.9	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	
TOTAL		1272	95.1	98.0	68.3	20.4	0.0	66.1	1.8	4.0	
SANTA BARBARA	JV SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
	SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	948	95.4	65.4	69.7	0.5	0.0	83.4	12.9	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	200	95.0	96.5	5.5	71.5	0.0	43.5	11.5	6.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	48	89.6	95.8	0.0	70.8	0.0	20.8	47.9	27.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	85.7	0.0	28.6	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6
	TOTAL	1203	94.9	71.9	55.9	15.3	0.1	74.0	14.1	2.7	
	SANTA MARIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	453	96.7	58.1	46.6	1.3	0.0	59.6	32.7	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		163	95.7	95.1	9.8	54.0	0.0	30.7	58.3	1.2	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		37	75.7	100.0	0.0	48.6	0.0	0.0	70.3	10.8	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		13	84.6	92.3	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	84.6	0.0	
TOTAL		666	95.0	70.1	34.1	17.3	0.0	48.0	42.0	0.9	

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SANTA BARBARA (cont.)	LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	259	96.5	81.1	61.4	1.5	0.0	77.2	18.1	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	79	96.2	98.7	2.5	83.5	0.0	30.4	65.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	5.3	89.5	0.0	0.0	94.7	10.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	363	95.3	86.2	44.6	24.5	0.0	61.7	33.1	0.8
SANTA CLARA	SUP SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	109	71.6	95.4	43.1	9.2	0.0	17.4	5.5	0.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	58.3	97.9	4.2	39.6	0.0	14.6	2.1	2.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	64.7	100.0	0.0	52.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	30	53.3	100.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	204	65.2	97.1	24.0	23.0	0.0	12.7	3.4	2.0
	JUV SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	48	100.0	45.8	85.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	83.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	50	100.0	48.0	86.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	82.0	0.0
	LOS GATOS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PALO ALTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	473	98.1	91.1	89.4	2.5	0.0	84.4	9.9	2.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	96	95.8	97.9	7.3	84.4	1.0	76.0	8.3	14.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	100.0	94.7	5.3	68.4	5.3	15.8	5.3	68.4
		TOTAL	588	97.8	92.3	73.3	18.0	0.3	80.8	9.5	6.3
	SAN JOSE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2963	93.5	94.7	71.5	2.1	0.0	81.3	6.9	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	807	80.9	98.1	7.3	64.1	0.0	67.8	8.6	14.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	132	75.8	98.5	1.5	48.5	0.0	12.9	9.8	45.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
		TOTAL	3912	90.3	95.6	55.7	16.5	0.0	76.0	7.4	6.3
	SAN JOSE TRAFFIC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL		6	83.3	83.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	16.7	
SANTA CLARA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
SUNNYVALE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	291	99.3	97.3	90.4	4.1	0.7	92.1	3.8	0.3	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	68	100.0	100.0	8.8	85.3	0.0	88.2	2.9	23.5	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	TOTAL	365	99.5	97.8	73.7	19.7	0.5	89.9	3.6	5.2	
GILROY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	471	98.5	97.2	90.0	2.8	0.0	63.9	5.9	3.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	136	99.3	99.3	11.8	75.7	0.0	59.6	6.6	25.7	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	35	100.0	100.0	2.9	25.7	0.0	11.4	0.0	48.6	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	
	TOTAL	644	98.8	97.8	68.5	19.4	0.0	59.9	5.7	10.4	
SANTA CRUZ	SUP SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	88.9	77.8	33.3	0.0	0.0	22.2	33.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	28.6	57.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	25	72.0	88.0	12.0	12.0	0.0	16.0	40.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SANTA CRUZ (cont.)	JUV SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	38.9	55.6	0.0	
		TOTAL	18	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	38.9	55.6	0.0	
	SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	786	98.0	96.3	84.2	0.8	0.1	85.8	10.6	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	232	97.0	98.7	4.7	72.0	0.4	77.2	19.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	64	96.9	98.4	0.0	15.6	0.0	10.9	82.8	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	93.3	93.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	1097	97.6	96.9	61.3	16.7	0.2	78.4	17.7	0.0	
	WATSONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	287	98.6	99.3	68.3	2.1	0.0	68.6	29.6	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	78	100.0	100.0	2.6	53.8	0.0	57.7	42.3	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	32	100.0	100.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	6.3	90.6	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	399	99.0	99.5	49.6	12.5	0.0	61.2	37.3	0.0	
	SHASTA	JUV SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	31	29.0	19.4	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.7	0.0
			TOTAL	31	29.0	19.4	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.7	0.0
BURNEY		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	23	100.0	82.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	14	100.0	78.6	28.6	64.3	0.0	85.7	7.1	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	38	100.0	81.6	71.1	23.7	0.0	92.1	2.6	2.6	
REDDING		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	723	97.2	98.5	92.0	1.7	0.0	86.6	3.9	0.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	240	95.4	99.6	18.3	73.8	0.0	83.3	2.5	16.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	88	83.0	98.9	6.8	22.7	0.0	22.7	11.4	40.9	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	51.9	96.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	18.5	14.8	40.7	
		TOTAL	1078	94.5	98.7	66.3	19.9	0.0	78.9	4.5	8.5	
SIERRA		DOWNIEVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	25	96.0	96.0	88.0	4.0	0.0	88.0	4.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL		31	93.5	96.8	74.2	12.9	0.0	83.9	3.2	0.0	
SISKIYOU	SUP SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	6	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	
	WEED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	87	98.9	97.7	82.8	4.6	0.0	74.7	4.6	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	26	100.0	92.3	11.5	73.1	0.0	57.7	0.0	7.7	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	14.3	14.3	57.1	
		TOTAL	120	99.2	96.7	64.2	21.7	0.0	67.5	4.2	5.0	
	YREKA JU DIST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	121	93.4	93.4	74.4	4.1	0.0	65.3	1.7	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	96.4	100.0	10.7	78.6	0.0	53.6	7.1	7.1	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	164	90.9	95.1	56.7	20.7	0.0	59.1	2.4	1.8	



TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SOLANO	SUP SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	32	81.3	100.0	65.6	9.4	0.0	18.8	12.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19	63.2	100.0	0.0	57.9	0.0	26.3	5.3	15.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
		TOTAL	60	76.7	100.0	35.0	36.7	0.0	20.0	10.0	8.3
	JUV SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	100.0	0.0	10.5	5.3	0.0	15.8	57.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	100.0	0.0	9.5	4.8	0.0	14.3	61.9	0.0
	FAIRFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	686	94.0	96.8	89.8	1.6	0.0	82.7	1.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	189	98.4	98.4	9.0	87.3	0.0	72.5	2.1	5.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	47	89.4	100.0	2.1	83.0	0.0	12.8	23.4	42.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	925	94.5	97.3	68.5	23.4	0.0	76.8	2.5	3.7
	BENICIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	83.3	83.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
		TOTAL	6	83.3	83.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
	VALLEJO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	288	98.6	96.2	97.2	1.4	0.0	92.4	0.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	72	98.6	98.6	23.6	73.6	0.0	83.3	2.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	90.9	95.5	13.6	72.7	0.0	77.3	4.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	384	98.2	96.6	78.1	19.0	0.0	89.3	1.3	0.0
SONOMA	SUP SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	26	69.2	92.3	30.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	7.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	100.0	87.5	12.5	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	12.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	33.3	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	52	71.2	94.2	17.3	5.8	0.0	17.3	0.0	7.7
	JUV SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	37	27.0	10.8	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.4	0.0
		TOTAL	37	27.0	10.8	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.4	0.0
	SANTA ROSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1530	97.6	94.1	73.8	1.7	0.0	73.9	0.2	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	441	97.1	98.9	6.8	63.7	0.0	66.2	0.0	5.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	122	93.4	99.2	1.6	23.8	0.0	10.7	0.0	11.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	20	75.0	100.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2113	97.1	95.4	54.9	15.9	0.0	68.0	0.1	2.2
	SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	STANISLAUS	SUP STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	969	99.0	92.7	88.8	4.9	0.3	77.6	6.3
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			232	97.8	95.3	7.8	83.6	0.0	50.4	8.2	12.1
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			52	94.2	98.1	7.7	69.2	0.0	9.6	7.7	44.2
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			23	65.2	95.7	0.0	47.8	4.3	13.0	4.3	34.8
TOTAL			1276	98.0	93.4	69.1	22.6	0.3	68.7	6.7	5.7
JUV STANISLAUS		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22	90.9	22.7	77.3	0.0	0.0	4.5	13.6	0.0
		TOTAL	22	90.9	22.7	77.3	0.0	0.0	4.5	13.6	0.0
MODESTO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STANISLAUS (cont.)	TURLOCK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
SUTTER	YUBA SUP MUN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	13	92.3	100.0	84.6	0.0	0.0	23.1	15.4	7.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	90.5	100.0	52.4	23.8	0.0	14.3	23.8	9.5
	YUBA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	277	94.2	95.3	86.3	2.2	0.0	85.9	2.9	4.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	85	95.3	100.0	10.6	81.2	0.0	75.3	1.2	34.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	100.0	93.3	0.0	73.3	0.0	6.7	13.3	66.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	378	94.4	96.3	65.6	22.8	0.0	80.2	2.9	13.5
TEHAMA	SUP TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	25.0	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	11	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	18.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7
		TOTAL	34	20.6	97.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	44.1	32.4
	JUV TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	CORNING	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	135	98.5	96.3	93.3	2.2	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	100.0	100.0	10.7	89.3	0.0	60.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	47.1	100.0	5.9	41.2	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9
		TOTAL	180	93.9	97.2	72.2	19.4	0.0	55.0	0.0	0.6
	RED BLUFF	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	190	91.1	96.8	2.1	2.1	0.0	76.8	10.0	1.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	72	87.5	98.6	1.4	69.4	0.0	79.2	8.3	2.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	47.4	94.7	0.0	47.4	0.0	31.6	10.5	10.5
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	
TOTAL		284	86.3	96.5	1.8	22.2	0.0	73.6	9.9	2.5	
TRINITY	SUP TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	96.7	95.0	86.7	0.0	0.0	78.3	13.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	29	96.6	100.0	3.4	79.3	0.0	86.2	3.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	101	95.0	96.0	52.5	30.7	0.0	73.3	11.9	0.0
	JUV TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	TULARE	SUP TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	38.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			6	66.7	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			4	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			4	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL			32	40.6	96.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
JUV TULARE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	13	92.3	0.0	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
		TOTAL	13	92.3	0.0	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
TULARE (cont.)	DINUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	239	96.2	97.5	85.4	3.3	0.0	88.7	0.0	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	59	100.0	96.6	16.9	71.2	0.0	88.1	0.0	3.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	55.6	0.0	11.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	88.9	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	316	96.8	97.5	67.7	18.7	0.0	85.8	0.0	1.6
	LINDSAY-EXETER	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	PORTERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	520	97.5	96.0	80.2	5.6	0.0	41.5	0.4	2.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	143	93.7	98.6	17.5	63.6	0.0	23.8	0.0	9.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	97.6	100.0	22.0	63.4	0.0	7.3	2.4	22.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	100.0	100.0	0.0	61.5	0.0	7.7	7.7	15.4
		TOTAL	717	97.1	96.8	62.9	21.5	0.0	35.4	0.6	5.3
	TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	361	98.1	83.9	86.7	6.1	0.0	39.6	2.2	1.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	95	97.9	94.7	9.5	85.3	0.0	32.6	3.2	18.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	95.7	100.0	4.3	87.0	0.0	13.0	13.0	21.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	20.0
		TOTAL	489	98.0	87.1	66.1	26.0	0.0	36.2	3.5	6.5
	VISALIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	685	95.0	95.9	87.9	2.6	0.0	83.1	0.3	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	170	92.9	97.6	19.4	67.6	0.0	77.6	0.6	2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	97.8	100.0	11.1	66.7	0.0	37.8	2.2	8.9
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		15	60.0	93.3	0.0	26.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	6.7	
TOTAL		915	94.2	96.4	69.9	18.3	0.0	78.6	0.4	1.2	
TUOLUMNE	SUP SONORA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	234	95.7	97.9	92.7	0.4	0.0	88.5	6.0	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	97	99.0	100.0	17.5	76.3	0.0	88.7	2.1	13.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	100.0	100.0	12.5	16.7	0.0	20.8	20.8	20.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
		TOTAL	359	96.7	98.6	66.0	22.3	0.0	83.0	6.1	6.1
VENTURA	SUP VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	90.5	0.0	0.0	90.5	4.8	14.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	88.9	0.0	66.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	32	96.9	100.0	59.4	31.3	0.0	90.6	3.1	34.4
	JUV VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	VENTURA MUNI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2672	96.6	97.2	77.6	1.5	0.0	76.2	20.8	5.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	591	98.5	98.6	9.3	72.9	0.0	79.5	17.6	33.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	112	94.6	100.0	0.9	67.9	0.0	35.7	33.0	40.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	30	76.7	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	23.3	36.7	20.0
TOTAL	3405	96.7	97.6	62.5	16.7	0.0	74.9	20.8	11.2		
YOLO	WOODLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	569	96.7	92.8	84.9	1.2	0.0	80.8	5.4	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	162	94.4	96.9	26.5	58.0	0.6	79.6	3.7	9.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	92.9	100.0	16.7	50.0	0.0	28.6	16.7	16.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	68.8	87.5	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
		TOTAL	789	95.4	93.9	67.6	15.8	0.1	76.2	5.8	3.2

TABLE B4: 2002 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
YOLO	DAVIS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
YUBA	SUP YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	55.6	100.0	44.4	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	18	50.0	100.0	22.2	5.6	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
	JUV YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	MARYSVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	272	97.1	96.3	88.6	0.7	0.0	77.2	0.4	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	74	98.6	98.6	17.6	75.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	13.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	94.4	100.0	0.0	27.8	0.0	11.1	0.0	11.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	367	97.3	97.0	69.2	18.0	0.0	67.8	0.3	4.9
	BEALE AFB	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B5: DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS AND 3- AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM DRIVERS

YEAR GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT FEMALE	MEAN AGE	PERCENT COMMERCIAL DRIVERS	MONTHS IN STUDY	2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS PER 100 DRIVERS				ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES**			
						TOTAL ACCIDENTS	ALCOHOL ACCIDENTS	MAJOR CONVICTIONS	MINOR CONVICTIONS	TOTAL ACCIDENTS	INJURY ACCIDENTS	MAJOR VIOLATIONS	MOVING VIOLATIONS
<u>7/02-6/03</u>													
No program	2,811	20.8	33.2	3.3	16.6	2.7	0.9	.20	9.2	1.63	.40	.43	1.99
Alcohol education program	5,319	22.7	33.0	3.1	16.8	2.9	1.0	.10	9.1	1.67	.40	.38	2.00
Statistical significance test		$X^2 = 3.5$	$F = .55$	$X^2 = .17$	$F = 7.7^*$	$F = 2.16$	$F = .95$	$F = 4.40^*$	$F = .03$	$F = 37.7^*$	$F = 23.5^*$	$F = 158.9^*$	$F = .92$
<u>2002</u>													
3-month program	14,820	22.2	34.2	2.8	21.4	3.3	1.5	.10	8.0	1.66	.40	.41	1.96
6-month program	5,535	21.5	37.3	3.0	21.4	4.2	2.5	.20	5.7	1.67	.40	.42	1.99
Statistical significance test		$X^2 = 1.4$	$F = 342.9^*$	$X^2 = 1.10$	$F = .04$	$F = 111.0^*$	$F = 359.8^*$	$F = 2.32$	$F = 191.7^*$	$F = 14.5^*$	$F = 15.8^*$	$F = 21.9^*$	$F = 16.2^*$