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DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1996-2006

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| DUI Arrest Rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers) | 995 | 933 | 908 | 896 | 847 | 803 | 783 | 809 | 792 | 786 | 849 |
| Total DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 201765 | 191164 | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 |
| Felony DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 6313 | 5568 | 5330 | 5242 | 5476 | 5647 | 5859 | 5856 | 5646 | 5962 | 6191 |
| Misdemeanor DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 195452 | 185596 | 182997 | 183281 | 175860 | 170843 | 171197 | 177704 | 175311 | 174326 | 191057 |
| DUI convictions received to date (by year of arrest) ${ }^{2}$ | 149770 | 142372 | 144081 | 149703 | 144342 | 140446 | 139814 | 144453 | 143188 | 140879 | 148066 |
| Percent convicted of DUI as of Sept. $2007^{2}$ | 74\% | 75\% | 77\% | 79\% | 80\% | 80\% | 79\% | 79\% | 79\% | 78\% | 75\% |
| Alcohol-involved reckless driving convictions ${ }^{2}$ | 17446 | 16867 | 15945 | 15514 | 14465 | 15773 | 15694 | 15735 | 14801 | 14452 | 14517 |
| Percent convicted of alcohol reckless as of Sept. $2007^{2}$ | 8.6\% | 8.8\% | 8.5\% | 8.2\% | 8.0\% | 8.9\% | 8.9\% | 8.6\% | 8.2\% | 8.0\% | 7.4\% |
| Alcohol-involved fatalities ${ }^{3}$ | 1254 | 1100 | 1072 | 1170 | 1233 | 1308 | 1416 | 1445 | 1462 | 1574 | 1597 |
| \% of total fatalities | 31.6 | 30.0 | 31.0 | 32.8 | 33.1 | 33.3 | 34.2 | 34.2 | 35.7 | 36.6 | 38.1 |
| Alcohol-involved injuries ${ }^{3}$ | 35654 | 31189 | 30985 | 29833 | 30971 | 31806 | 32013 | 31322 | 31538 | 30810 | 31099 |
| \% of total injuries | 11.9 | 10.9 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 11.2 |
| Drug-involved fatalities ${ }^{4}$ | 264 | 253 | 266 | 290 | 428 | 509 | 639 | 784 | 799 | 880 | 859 |
| \% of total fatalities | 6.6 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 11.5 | 13.0 | 15.6 | 18.6 | 19.5 | 20.4 | 20.5 |
| Drug-involved injuries ${ }^{4}$ | 1606 | 1682 | 1549 | 1774 | 1917 | 2106 | 2373 | 2580 | 2646 | 2722 | 2421 |
| \% of total injuries | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

${ }^{1}$ These totals do not include duplicate cases as originally reported in the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, MACR data, and as of 2006 the counts for all the years reflect this change.
${ }^{2}$ These data represent a DMV master file count of the number of DUI abstracts (data received from the courts), by year of violation, minus duplicates. Each year, the DUI conviction totals are updated to include the amended and new abstracts for current and previous years. These additions are also reflected in changes for the percent convicted. These totals do not include conviction abstracts not yet received. Thus, for the most recent years, these figures will underestimate the final conviction totals.
${ }^{3}$ These figures include overlap with drugs. That is, drugs are also involved in some of these cases.
${ }^{4}$ These figures include overlap with alcohol. That is, alcohol is also involved in some of these cases. Beginning with the 2007 DUI-MIS report, reporting of drug-involved fatalities is included.
DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1996-2006 (continued)

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS | $230600^{\text {r }}$ | $205462^{1}$ | $238612^{1}$ | 236141 | 240597 | 231217 | 236603 | 241242 | 239580 | 247568 | $339796^{3}$ |
| PRECONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Per Se (APS) Actions | $180343^{\text {r }}$ | 169511 | 175365 | 179332 | 172606 | 164840 | 165505 | 171470 | 171828 | 168569 | 185481 |
| . 01 Zero tolerance suspensions | 9327 r | 11517 | 15640 | 17775 | 18185 | 18549 | 19129 | 19949 | 19967 | 19374 | 22044 |
| . 08 First-offender suspensions | $122111^{\text {r }}$ | 114247 | 116827 | 119621 | 114997 | 109695 | 109888 | 114975 | 116022 | 107466 | 118468 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender suspensions | $43922^{\text {r }}$ | 39636 | 39024 | 38487 | 36147 | 33517 | 33580 | 33413 | 32903 | 38097 | 41420 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender revocations | $4983{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 4111 | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 |
| Commercial driver actions | 4939 r | 4496 | 4609 | 4471 | 4139 | 4013 | 3936 | 3853 | 3801 | 3525 | 2974 |
| Chemical test refusal actions | $11436{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 10110 | 9935 | 9435 | 9433 | 8841 | 8772 | 9399 | 9353 | 9599 | 9315 |
| . 01 Test refusal suspensions | 154 | 134 | 229 | 268 | 270 | 280 | 290 | 341 | 326 | 364 | 419 |
| . 08 Test refusal suspensions | 6299 r | 5865 | 5832 | 5718 | 5886 | 5482 | 5547 | 5925 | 6091 | 5603 | 5347 |
| . 08 Test refusal revocations | $4983{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 4111 | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 |
| POSTCONVICTION ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juvenile DUI suspensions | 995 | 7691 | $1026{ }^{1}$ | 918 | 741 | 714 | 896 | 794 | 838 | 737 | 941 |
| First-offender suspensions | 7229 | $4847{ }^{1}$ | $9588{ }^{1}$ | 15072 | 29924 | 31097 | 32716 | 32521 | 31012 | 39078 | $110525^{3}$ |
| Misdemeanor | 5753 | $3834{ }^{1}$ | 74971 | 13401 | 28118 | 29188 | 30563 | 30298 | 28799 | 36808 | $108227^{3}$ |
| Felony | 1476 | $1013{ }^{1}$ | $2091{ }^{1}$ | 1671 | 1806 | 1909 | 2153 | 2223 | 2213 | 2270 | 2298 |
| Second-offender S/R actions | 30404 | $22945{ }^{1}$ | $40238{ }^{1}$ | 31940 | 29097 | 26911 | 29345 | 28737 | 28400 | 30294 | 32680 |
| Misdemeanor | 29864 | $22532{ }^{1}$ | $39065^{1}$ | 31455 | 28571 | 26334 | 28748 | 28160 | 27847 | 29699 | 32046 |
| Felony | 540 | $413{ }^{1}$ | 6331 | 485 | 526 | 577 | 597 | 577 | 553 | 595 | 634 |
| Third-offender revocations | 8728 | 55691 | 93971 | 6573 | 6163 | 5727 | 6171 | 5953 | 5581 | 6720 | 7649 |
| Misdemeanor | 8550 | $5471{ }^{1}$ | $9167^{1}$ | 6452 | 6015 | 5585 | 5996 | 5758 | 5429 | 6537 | 7424 |
| Felony | 178 | $98{ }^{1}$ | 2301 | 121 | 148 | 142 | 175 | 195 | 152 | 183 | 225 |
| Fourth-offender revocations | 2901 | $1821{ }^{1}$ | $2998{ }^{1}$ | 2306 | 2066 | 1928 | 1970 | 1767 | 1921 | 2170 | 2520 |
| TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS | 50257r | $35951{ }^{1}$ | $63247^{1}$ | 56809 | 67991 | 66377 | 71098 | 69772 | 67752 | 789993 | $154315^{3}$ |

${ }^{1}$ The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.
${ }^{2}$ These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.
${ }^{3}$ This count has increased as a result of the law change, effective $09 / 20 / 2005$, which assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUI and removed this responsibility from the courts.
${ }^{r}$ Revised from prior reports.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2008 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

- Alcohol-involved traffic fatalities rose by $1.5 \%$ in 2006 , continuing the rising trend that started in 1999 after well over a decade of continuous decline (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- Drug-involved fatalities show a slight decline in the midst of a growing trend in the past decade, increasing by 225\%, from 264 in 1996 to 859 in 2006 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- The number of persons injured in alcohol-involved crashes increased slightly by $0.9 \%$ in 2006, following decrease of $2.3 \%$ in 2005 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- DUI arrests increased by $9.4 \%$ in 2006, following decreases by $0.4 \%$ in 2005 and by $1.4 \%$ in 2004, after increases of $3.7 \%$ in 2003 and $0.3 \%$ in 2002 (see Table 1).
- The DUI arrest rate rose by $8.0 \%$ in 2006 . The rate has remained fairly stable over the last five years. The 2006 rate represents a $14.7 \%$ reduction from the arrest rate in 1996 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- $15.8 \%$ of all 2005 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to $14.8 \%$ in $2004.6 .6 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly higher than $6.2 \%$ in 2004 (see Table 19).
- Among 2006 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (45.8\%) again constituted the largest racial/ethnic group, as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999). Hispanics continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population (35.4\% in 2006). This is shown in Figure 3.
- The median (midpoint) age of an arrested DUI offender in 2006 was 30 years. Less than $1 \%$ of arrested DUI offenders were juveniles (under age 18). This is shown in Table 3a.
- Among convicted DUI offenders in 2005, $72.9 \%$ were first offenders and $27.1 \%$ were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous ten years). This
is shown in Table 10. The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at $37 \%$. However the increase in the proportion of repeat offenders in 2005 could be attributed to the change in the counting period for priors from seven to ten years.
- The median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on APS forms, was $0.15 \%$ in 2005, same as last year, yet almost double the California illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08\% (see Table 9a).
- $10.3 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, decreased from $11.2 \%$ of the 2004 DUI arrests (see Table 8).
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## INTRODUCTION

This report is the seventeenth 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, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, 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. In the earlier years of this report, these evaluations were accomplished by examining the postconviction recidivism records (alcohol/drug-related crashes and traffic convictions) of offenders assigned to alternative sanctions within offender group. In recent years as the sanctions became increasingly homogenous within each offender group, the evaluations (as mandated by law) became focused on available sanctions in selected groups. These evaluations are 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).

## SECTION 1:

## DUI ARRESTS

## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS

The information presented below on DUI arrests is based primarily on data collected annually by the Department of Justice (DOJ), Criminal Justice Statistics 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 2004-2006. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2004-2006 and the percentage change from 2005-2006 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2006 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2006 DUI arrests by felony, juvenile, and misdemeanor arrest type, by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2006 DUI Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a cross tabulates age by sex and age by race/ethnicity of 2006 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Also, Table 3a shows the average (Mean) age for 2006 arrestees. In addition to the mean, the median (midpoint) was reported to minimize the influence of data values that are not equally distributed. Table $3 b$ shows the same data cross tabulated by sex and age within race/ethnicity.

Table 3c: DUI Arrests Under Age 21, 1996-2006. Table 3c shows a breakdown of DUI arrests under 21, by age, from 1996 to 2006. It also shows a proportion of DUI arrests under 21 in the total number of DUI arrests for the state over the same time period.

Figure 2 (below) displays the trend in DUI arrests from 1996 to 2006.


Figure 2. DUI arrests 1996-2006.

Based on the data shown in Figure 2 and previously listed tables, the following statements can be made about DUI arrests in California:

## Statewide Parameters:

- DUI arrests increased by $9.4 \%$ in 2006, following a decrease of $0.4 \%$ in 2005 , and a decrease of $1.4 \%$ in 2004 (see Table 1).
- Table 2 shows that DUI arrest rate per 100 licensed drivers was 0.8 in 2006 (as it was in 2000-2005, but down from 0.9 in 1997-1999). This represents a $56 \%$ reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
- The percentage of DUI arrests that were felonies (involving bodily injury or death) decreased slightly from $3.3 \%$ in 2005 to $3.1 \%$ in 2006; felony DUI arrests continue to constitute a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).


## County Variation:

- $20.0 \%$ of all 2006 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 $43.5 \%$ of all arrests (see Table 2).
- The 2006 county DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.3 to 2.9 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers (the statewide average rate is 0.8 ). Seven counties had rates of 0.7 or below.

These low arrest rate counties were San Francisco (0.3), Contra Costa (0.6), Santa Clara (0.6), Alameda, Los Angeles, San Mateo and Solano (0.7). Five counties had rates of 2.0 or higher - Sierra (2.9), Glenn (2.8), Inyo (2.3), Alpine and Colusa (2.0). This is shown in Table 2.

- While DUI arrests have been declining in past years, DUI arrests in 2006 increased in most counties. Among the larger counties, the greatest percentage increase occurred in Ventura ( $25.5 \%$ ), Fresno ( $22.5 \%$ ) and Orange (17.9\%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage increases in DUI arrests occurred in Inyo (53.2\%), Mendocino and Shasta ( $43.2 \%$ ), Modoc ( $36.1 \%$ ), Kings (30.7\%) and Placer (28.2\%). Counties showing large percentage declines in DUI arrests were the smaller counties of Alpine (-18.5\%), Del Norte (-16.8\%) and Glen (-13.1\%). This is shown in Table 1.


## Demographic Characteristics:

- The median age of a DUI arrestee in 2006 was 30 years. Slightly more than half $(52.7 \%)$ of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and three-quarters ( $75.0 \%$ ) were age 40 or younger. Less than $1 \%$ of all DUI arrests involved juveniles (under age 18). $2.1 \%$ of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).
- Among all DUI arrestees, the proportion of DUI arrests under age 18 has remained relatively stable in the past 10 years (varying between $0.8 \%$ and $0.9 \%$ ); however, the proportion of DUI arrests under age 21 increased from $7.5 \%$ in 1996 to $9.4 \%$ in 2006 ( $25.3 \%$ increase). This is shown in Table 3c.
- Males comprised $81.9 \%$ of all 2006 DUI arrests (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrestees has risen slightly each year this report has been produced, from $10.6 \%$ in 1989 to $18.1 \%$ in 2006.
- In 2006, Hispanics (45.8\%) 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 continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2006 population parity of $35.4 \%$ (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also slightly overrepresented among DUI arrestees ( $7.0 \%$ of arrests, $6.0 \%$ of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2006 population parity. These
underrepresented groups were Whites ( $40.4 \%$ of arrests, $43.9 \%$ of the population), and "Other" ( $6.9 \%$ of arrests, $14.7 \%$ of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.
- Among male 2006 DUI arrestees, $50.4 \%$ were Hispanic, $36.1 \%$ were White, $6.8 \%$ were Black, and $6.6 \%$ were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, 59.5\% were White, $24.8 \%$ were Hispanic, $7.7 \%$ were Black, and $8.0 \%$ were "Other." The overrepresentation of Hispanics among DUI offenders is clearly limited to males (see Table 3b).
- In some counties where the population of Hispanics is high, the DUI arrest rate is also higher. For example, in the following eight counties, Hispanics comprised $60 \%$ or more of those arrested for DUI during 2006: Tulare (76.3\%), Madera (69.7\%), Imperial (67.8\%), Fresno (67.4\%), Monterey (66.0\%), Merced (65.6\%), San Benito ( $64.6 \%$ ), and Kings ( $60.8 \%$ ). However, in most other counties, the majority of arrestees were White (see Appendix Table B1).
- The median age of a DUI arrestee varied considerably by race: Blacks were the oldest with a median age of 34.0 years, while Hispanics were the youngest, with a median age of 28.0 years (see Table 3a).


Figure 3 . Percentage of 2006 DUI arrests and 2006 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS* BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2004-2006

| COUNTY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | \% CHANGE 2005-2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATEWIDE | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 | 9.4 |
| ALAMEDA | 6454 | 7241 | 7253 | 0.2 |
| ALPINE | 40 | 27 | 22 | -18.5 |
| AMADOR | 319 | 310 | 352 | 13.5 |
| BUTTE | 1395 | 1432 | 1647 | 15.0 |
| CALAVERAS | 375 | 313 | 319 | 1.9 |
| COLUSA | 267 | 294 | 268 | -8.8 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 3845 | 3494 | 4004 | 14.6 |
| DEL NORTE | 378 | 327 | 272 | -16.8 |
| EL DORADO | 1358 | 1370 | 1411 | 3.0 |
| FRESNO | 6064 | 6388 | 7826 | 22.5 |
| GLENN | 449 | 589 | 512 | -13.1 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1279 | 1240 | 1164 | -6.1 |
| IMPERIAL | 1215 | 1181 | 1371 | 16.1 |
| INYO | 259 | 218 | 334 | 53.2 |
| KERN | 5541 | 5105 | 5232 | 2.5 |
| KINGS | 935 | 992 | 1297 | 30.7 |
| LAKE | 601 | 476 | 535 | 12.4 |
| LASSEN** | 171** | 244 | 262 | 7.4 |
| LOS ANGELES | 36705 | 38329 | 39518 | 3.1 |
| MADERA | 1001 | 1016 | 1104 | 8.7 |
| MARIN | 1533 | 1557 | 1583 | 1.7 |
| MARIPOSA | 135 | 130 | 161 | 23.8 |
| MENDOCINO | 778 | 759 | 1087 | 43.2 |
| MERCED | 1495 | 1753 | 1988 | 13.4 |
| MODOC | 60 | 72 | 98 | 36.1 |
| MONO | 130 | 125 | 149 | 19.2 |
| MONTEREY | 3584 | 2973 | 3052 | 2.7 |
| NAPA | 1099 | 981 | 1056 | 7.6 |
| NEVADA | 789 | 664 | 758 | 14.2 |
| ORANGE | 13492 | 13586 | 16012 | 17.9 |
| PLACER | 1805 | 1834 | 2351 | 28.2 |
| PLUMAS | 269 | 221 | 262 | 18.6 |
| RIVERSIDE | 8533 | 8754 | 9896 | 13.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 7193 | 7172 | 7818 | 9.0 |
| SAN BENITO | 357 | 377 | 396 | 5.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 10695 | 10810 | 12233 | 13.2 |
| SAN DIEGO | 17129 | 16467 | 18101 | 9.9 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 1648 | 1363 | 1336 | -2.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 4219 | 3955 | 4436 | 12.2 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 2321 | 2267 | 2549 | 12.4 |
| SAN MATEO | 3501 | 3310 | 3542 | 7.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 2770 | 2518 | 2665 | 5.8 |
| SANTA CLARA | 7000 | 6619 | 6697 | 1.2 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1697 | 1605 | 1739 | 8.3 |
| SHASTA | 1042 | 891 | 1276 | 43.2 |
| SIERRA | 69 | 83 | 80 | -3.6 |
| SISKIYOU | 396 | 365 | 447 | 22.5 |
| SOLANO | 1660 | 1746 | 1916 | 9.7 |
| SONOMA | 2907 | 2985 | 3384 | 13.4 |
| STANISLAUS | 2575 | 2660 | 2846 | 7.0 |
| SUTTER | 530 | 473 | 584 | 23.5 |
| TEHAMA | 592 | 718 | 748 | 4.2 |
| TRINITY | 182 | 169 | 190 | 12.4 |
| TULARE | 3446 | 3315 | 3476 | 4.9 |
| TUOLUMNE | 551 | 453 | 463 | 2.2 |
| VENTURA | 4370 | 4139 | 5196 | 25.5 |
| YOLO | 1146 | 1273 | 1293 | 1.6 |
| YUBA | 608 | 560 | 681 | 21.6 |

*DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI $(N=332)$ removed.
**The count for 2004 was incomplete.

TABLE 2: 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

| COUNTY | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF ARREST |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI ARRESTS PER } \\ 100 \text { LICENSED } \\ \text { DRIVERS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FELONY |  | JUVENILE |  | MISDEMEANOR |  |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |  |
| STATEWIDE | 197248 | 100.0 | 6109 | 3.1 | 1697 | 0.9 | 189442 | 96.0 | 0.8 |
| ALAMEDA | 7253 | 3.7 | 96 | 1.3 | 41 | 0.6 | 7116 | 98.1 | 0.7 |
| ALPINE | 22 | 0.0 | 3 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 19 | 86.4 | 2.0 |
| AMADOR | 352 | 0.2 | 5 | 1.4 | 1 | 0.3 | 346 | 98.3 | 1.2 |
| BUTTE | 1647 | 0.8 | 50 | 3.0 | 21 | 1.3 | 1576 | 95.7 | 1.1 |
| CALAVERAS | 319 | 0.2 | 10 | 3.1 | 4 | 1.3 | 305 | 95.6 | 0.9 |
| COLUSA | 268 | 0.1 | 8 | 3.0 | 8 | 3.0 | 252 | 94.0 | 2.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 4004 | 2.0 | 114 | 2.8 | 53 | 1.3 | 3837 | 95.8 | 0.6 |
| DEL NORTE | 272 | 0.1 | 6 | 2.2 | 4 | 1.5 | 262 | 96.3 | 1.5 |
| EL DORADO | 1411 | 0.7 | 56 | 4.0 | 18 | 1.3 | 1337 | 94.8 | 1.0 |
| FRESNO | 7826 | 4.0 | 200 | 2.6 | 74 | 0.9 | 7552 | 96.5 | 1.6 |
| GLENN | 512 | 0.3 | 16 | 3.1 | 2 | 0.4 | 494 | 96.5 | 2.8 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1164 | 0.6 | 40 | 3.4 | 13 | 1.1 | 1111 | 95.4 | 1.2 |
| IMPERIAL | 1371 | 0.7 | 30 | 2.2 | 13 | 0.9 | 1328 | 96.9 | 1.4 |
| INYO | 334 | 0.2 | 16 | 4.8 | 3 | 0.9 | 315 | 94.3 | 2.3 |
| KERN | 5232 | 2.7 | 181 | 3.5 | 45 | 0.9 | 5006 | 95.7 | 1.2 |
| KINGS | 1297 | 0.7 | 39 | 3.0 | 18 | 1.4 | 1240 | 95.6 | 1.9 |
| LAKE | 535 | 0.3 | 22 | 4.1 | 11 | 2.1 | 502 | 93.8 | 1.2 |
| LASSEN | 262 | 0.1 | 6 | 2.3 | 1 | 0.4 | 255 | 97.3 | 1.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | 39518 | 20.0 | 1674 | 4.2 | 169 | 0.4 | 37675 | 95.3 | 0.7 |
| MADERA | 1104 | 0.6 | 47 | 4.3 | 13 | 1.2 | 1044 | 94.6 | 1.5 |
| MARIN | 1583 | 0.8 | 35 | 2.2 | 21 | 1.3 | 1527 | 96.5 | 0.9 |
| MARIPOSA | 161 | 0.1 | 5 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 156 | 96.9 | 1.1 |
| MENDOCINO | 1087 | 0.6 | 19 | 1.7 | 14 | 1.3 | 1054 | 97.0 | 1.7 |
| MERCED | 1988 | 1.0 | 42 | 2.1 | 16 | 0.8 | 1930 | 97.1 | 1.5 |
| MODOC | 98 | 0.0 | 4 | 4.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 94 | 95.9 | 1.5 |
| MONO | 149 | 0.1 | 6 | 4.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 140 | 94.0 | 1.6 |
| MONTEREY | 3052 | 1.5 | 64 | 2.1 | 34 | 1.1 | 2954 | 96.8 | 1.3 |
| NAPA | 1056 | 0.5 | 36 | 3.4 | 9 | 0.9 | 1011 | 95.7 | 1.2 |
| NEVADA | 758 | 0.4 | 32 | 4.2 | 6 | 0.8 | 720 | 95.0 | 0.9 |
| ORANGE | 16012 | 8.1 | 281 | 1.8 | 93 | 0.6 | 15638 | 97.7 | 0.8 |
| PLACER | 2351 | 1.2 | 47 | 2.0 | 31 | 1.3 | 2273 | 96.7 | 1.0 |
| PLUMAS | 262 | 0.1 | 10 | 3.8 | 3 | 1.1 | 249 | 95.0 | 1.5 |
| RIVERSIDE | 9896 | 5.0 | 253 | 2.6 | 99 | 1.0 | 9544 | 96.4 | 0.8 |
| SACRAMENTO | 7818 | 4.0 | 375 | 4.8 | 73 | 0.9 | 7370 | 94.3 | 0.9 |
| SAN BENITO | 396 | 0.2 | 12 | 3.0 | 2 | 0.5 | 382 | 96.5 | 1.1 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 12233 | 6.2 | 435 | 3.6 | 90 | 0.7 | 11708 | 95.7 | 1.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | 18101 | 9.2 | 463 | 2.6 | 154 | 0.9 | 17484 | 96.6 | 0.9 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 1336 | 0.7 | 72 | 5.4 | 2 | 0.1 | 1262 | 94.5 | 0.3 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 4436 | 2.2 | 116 | 2.6 | 47 | 1.1 | 4273 | 96.3 | 1.1 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 2549 | 1.3 | 51 | 2.0 | 43 | 1.7 | 2455 | 96.3 | 1.4 |
| SAN MATEO | 3542 | 1.8 | 67 | 1.9 | 32 | 0.9 | 3443 | 97.2 | 0.7 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 2665 | 1.4 | 93 | 3.5 | 24 | 0.9 | 2548 | 95.6 | 1.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | 6697 | 3.4 | 255 | 3.8 | 80 | 1.2 | 6362 | 95.0 | 0.6 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1739 | 0.9 | 39 | 2.2 | 25 | 1.4 | 1675 | 96.3 | 1.0 |
| SHASTA | 1276 | 0.6 | 43 | 3.4 | 15 | 1.2 | 1218 | 95.5 | 1.0 |
| SIERRA | 80 | 0.0 | 7 | 8.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 73 | 91.3 | 2.9 |
| SISKIYOU | 447 | 0.2 | 14 | 3.1 | 8 | 1.8 | 425 | 95.1 | 1.2 |
| SOLANO | 1916 | 1.0 | 55 | 2.9 | 24 | 1.3 | 1837 | 95.9 | 0.7 |
| SONOMA | 3384 | 1.7 | 77 | 2.3 | 49 | 1.4 | 3258 | 96.3 | 1.0 |
| STANISLAUS | 2846 | 1.4 | 85 | 3.0 | 38 | 1.3 | 2723 | 95.7 | 0.9 |
| SUTTER | 584 | 0.3 | 16 | 2.7 | 7 | 1.2 | 561 | 96.1 | 1.0 |
| TEHAMA | 748 | 0.4 | 27 | 3.6 | 5 | 0.7 | 716 | 95.7 | 1.9 |
| TRINITY | 190 | 0.1 | 9 | 4.7 | 4 | 2.1 | 177 | 93.2 | 1.7 |
| TULARE | 3476 | 1.8 | 108 | 3.1 | 48 | 1.4 | 3320 | 95.5 | 1.6 |
| TUOLUMNE | 463 | 0.2 | 13 | 2.8 | 7 | 1.5 | 443 | 95.7 | 1.1 |
| VENTURA | 5196 | 2.6 | 156 | 3.0 | 53 | 1.0 | 4987 | 96.0 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | 1293 | 0.7 | 37 | 2.9 | 22 | 1.7 | 1234 | 95.4 | 1.1 |
| YUBA | 681 | 0.3 | 31 | 4.6 | 4 | 0.6 | 646 | 94.9 | 1.6 |

TABLE 3a: 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY*


TABLE 3b: 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| SEX | AGE | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 197248 | 100.0 | 79644 | 40.4 | 90296 | 45.8 | 13734 | 7.0 | 13574 | 6.9 |
| MALE | UNDER 18 | 1333 | 0.8 | 613 | 46.0 | 611 | 45.8 | 36 | 2.7 | 73 | 5.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 13782 | 8.5 | 5181 | 37.6 | 7285 | 52.9 | 551 | 4.0 | 765 | 5.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 70286 | 43.5 | 22226 | 31.6 | 39082 | 55.6 | 3972 | 5.7 | 5006 | 7.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 36562 | 22.6 | 11074 | 30.3 | 20254 | 55.4 | 2852 | 7.8 | 2382 | 6.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 24912 | 15.4 | 11163 | 44.8 | 9980 | 40.1 | 2242 | 9.0 | 1527 | 6.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 11202 | 6.9 | 5957 | 53.2 | 3447 | 30.8 | 1044 | 9.3 | 754 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 2836 | 1.8 | 1730 | 61.0 | 665 | 23.4 | 253 | 8.9 | 188 | 6.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 668 | 0.4 | 464 | 69.5 | 125 | 18.7 | 52 | 7.8 | 27 | 4.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 161581 | 100.0 | 58408 | 36.1 | 81449 | 50.4 | 11002 | 6.8 | 10722 | 6.6 |
| FEMALE | UNDER 18 | 364 | 1.0 | 259 | 71.2 | 76 | 20.9 | 8 | 2.2 | 21 | 5.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 3055 | 8.6 | 1826 | 59.8 | 858 | 28.1 | 118 | 3.9 | 253 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 15051 | 42.2 | 8047 | 53.5 | 4422 | 29.4 | 1043 | 6.9 | 1539 | 10.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 7463 | 20.9 | 4145 | 55.5 | 2003 | 26.8 | 751 | 10.1 | 564 | 7.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 6701 | 18.8 | 4626 | 69.0 | 1148 | 17.1 | 583 | 8.7 | 344 | 5.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 2429 | 6.8 | 1833 | 75.5 | 293 | 12.1 | 197 | 8.1 | 106 | 4.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 482 | 1.4 | 398 | 82.6 | 35 | 7.3 | 29 | 6.0 | 20 | 4.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 122 | 0.3 | 102 | 83.6 | 12 | 9.8 | 3 | 2.5 | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 35667 | 100.0 | 21236 | 59.5 | 8847 | 24.8 | 2732 | 7.7 | 2852 | 8.0 |

TABLE 3c: DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 1996-2006

| AGE |  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL <br> (ALL AGES) | $N$ | 201765 | 191164 | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 |
| UNDER 18 | $N$ | 1814 | 1709 | 1761 | 1741 | 1527 | 1645 | 1557 | 1576 | 1488 | 1436 | 1697 |
|  | \% | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| 18-20 | $N$ | 13357 | 12267 | 13093 | 13875 | 14145 | 14075 | 14410 | 14612 | 14672 | 14617 | 16837 |
|  | \% | 6.6 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.5 |
| UNDER 21 | $N$ | 15171 | 13976 | 14854 | 15616 | 15672 | 15720 | 15967 | 16188 | 16160 | 16053 | 18534 |
|  | \% | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 9.4 |

## SECTION 2:

CONVICTIONS

## 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. Although the DUI arrest data reported earlier are based on arrests that occurred in 2006, the DUI conviction data are based on convictions of DUI offenders arrested in 2005, in order to allow sufficient time for courts to report convictions to DMV. The following tables compile and cross tabulate these conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. Beginning with last year's report, the median was calculated and reported to describe certain characteristics of the conviction data, in addition to the mean, to minimize the influence of data values that are not symmetrically distributed. In what follows, expressions like "2005 convictions" refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2005, who were subsequently convicted in that year.

Table 4: 2005 DUI Convictions by Age and Sex. This table cross tabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and sex. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 5: Matchable 2005 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 2005 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 2005 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 2005 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: 1996-2006" 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 median 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 2005 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows the adjudication status (court disposition) of 2005 DUI arrests, by county. Included are the percentages of arrests which 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 2005 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these rates will slightly underestimate the "final" rate for each category, except for 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: 2005 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI Convictions and Table 9b: 2005 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 the forms on which APS actions are reported more completely report BAC levels ( $82.0 \%$ ) than do abstracts of conviction, APS forms are used to calculate statewide BAC levels. Table 9b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21.

Table 10: 2005 DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Reported BAC Level. This table displays the proportions of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in ten years as defined by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective $1 / 1 / 2005$ ), with the average (mean) and median BAC level from APS reporting forms and abstracts of conviction, for each offense level.

Figure 4 (below) shows, for the years 1996 to 2006, the number of DUI abstracts of conviction received to date by DMV from the courts, and conviction rates based on the data received as of September 2007.


Note: For arrests occurring from 1996 to 2005, 5.3\% of California drivers had one-or-more DUI conviction on their record in 2005.

Figure 4. DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV and conviction rates, 19962006.

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

- $78.1 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of DUI offenses (see Table 7).
- As of January 1, 2005, DUI convictions remain on the driving record for ten years. Therefore, based on the DUI conviction data, over ten years (1996-2005), 5.3\% of California drivers have one or more DUI conviction on their record.
- $9.6 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrests resulted in reckless driving convictions, and $16.7 \%$ ( $1.6 \% / 9.6 \%$ ) of these were nonalcohol-related reckless violations (see Table 8).
- $1.9 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, which is the same as last year (see Table 8).
- $10.3 \%$ of 2005 DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction on DMV's records, down slightly from $11.2 \%$ in 2004 , and down from $16.3 \%$ in 1995 . As additional cases are adjudicated and reported by the courts, this figure will decrease slightly (see Table 8).
- The average reported BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders in 2005, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was $0.16 \%$ (median BAC level was $0.15 \%$ ), which is down slightly from the last several years, yet still more than double the illegal per se BAC limit of $0.08 \%$ (see Table 9a).
- Average and median BAC levels increase as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions. Average BAC level increases from a $0.16 \%$ BAC for a first offense to a $0.19 \%$ BAC for a fourth or subsequent offense (when the median is reported, BAC level increases from $0.15 \%$ BAC for a first offense to a $0.18 \%$ BAC for a fourth or subsequent offense). This is shown in Table 10.
- Among 2005 convicted DUI offenders, $72.9 \%$ were first offenders, $20.1 \%$ were second offenders, $5.3 \%$ were third offenders, and $1.7 \%$ were on their fourth or more offense. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors in California has traditionally been 7 years, although that period was just changed to 10 years by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective $1 / 1 / 2005$ ) The proportion of all convicted DUI offenders that are repeat offenders ( $27.1 \%$ ), shown in Table 10 , has increased since the counting period for priors has changed from seven to ten years.
- The median adjudication time lags were 73 days from DUI arrest to conviction and 13 days from conviction to update on the DMV database, totaling a little less than 3 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record. This total elapsed time from arrest to update appears substantially shorter than in previous years, because, as of last year, elapsed time for 2005 data reported here was calculated using the median instead of the mean (see Table 7).


## Variation by County:

- Among the larger counties, 2005 DUI conviction rates varied from highs of $89.8 \%$ in Orange to a low of $69.6 \%$ in Alameda. Los Angeles County, which accounted for over 20 percent of all DUI arrests in the state, had a DUI conviction rate of $74.3 \%$ (see Table 7).
- Among the smaller counties, 2005 DUI conviction rates varied from a high of $98.4 \%$ in Mono to a low of $33.7 \%$ in Sierra (see Table 7).
- The rates at which DUI arrests were plea-bargained to alcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from $25.9 \%$ in Alpine County to $0 \%$ in Ventura County (see Table 8).
- The percentage of DUI arrests that were improperly adjudicated as nonalcoholrelated reckless driving convictions varied from 0\% (Sierra and Ventura) to $11.4 \%$ (San Francisco). This is shown in Table 8.
- The percentage of DUI arrests adjudicated as minor convictions ("other" convictions) varied from 0\% to $4.7 \%$. Alpine, Del Norte, Los Angeles, Marin, San Luis Obispo, and Trinity counties had rates of $3 \%$ or more (see Table 8 ).
- In six counties, the proportion of arrestees not showing a conviction of any offense exceeded $30 \%$. These counties were Del Norte, Imperial, Mariposa, Sierra, Tehama, and Trinity. Twenty one counties had nonconviction rates of less than $10 \%$, ( 10 counties did not have available conviction data). This is shown in Table 8.


## Variation by Court:

- Court time lags from arrest to conviction (for courts with more than 200 reported convictions) varied from a high of 192 days in the Lake court (Lake County) to a low of 24 days for the Salinas (Monterey County) court (see Table B3 in Appendix).
- Statewide, the proportion of DUI arrests resulting in reckless driving convictions (alcohol- and nonalcohol-related) was $9.6 \%$ in 2005. Four counties (Alpine, Del Norte, Inyo and San Francisco) adjudicated more than $20 \%$ of their DUI arrests as reckless driving convictions (see Table 8).
- Statewide, $16.7 \%$ ( $1.6 \% / 9.6 \%$ ) of all DUI-related reckless driving convictions in 2005 are inappropriately designated as nonalcohol, slightly down from $17.2 \%$ in 2004, and $17.7 \%$ in 2003 (see Table 8).


## Demographic Characteristics:

- The median age of a convicted DUI offender in 2005 was 31.0 years (see Table 4 ).
- $49.6 \%$ of 2005 DUI convictees were 30 years of age or younger and $73.4 \%$ were 40 years or younger (see Table 4).
- Females comprised $17.4 \%$ of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2005 (see Table 4). The proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994.
- The racial/ethnic distribution of 2005 DUI convictions (White $=42.9 \%$; Hispanic $=$ $43.9 \%$; Black $=6.6 \%$; "Other" $=6.5 \%$ ) generally paralleled that of 2005 arrests, although Whites were somewhat more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to be convicted of the offense (as shown in Figure 5 and Table 6 below).


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

TABLE 4: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX*

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 140879 | 100.0 | 116340 | 82.6 | 24539 | 17.4 |
| UNDER 18 | 579 | 0.4 | 484 | 83.6 | 95 | 16.4 |
| 18-20 | 9957 | 7.1 | 8219 | 82.5 | 1738 | 17.5 |
| 21-30 | 59368 | 42.1 | 49459 | 83.3 | 9909 | 16.7 |
| 31-40 | 33460 | 23.8 | 28014 | 83.7 | 5446 | 16.3 |
| 41-50 | 24339 | 17.3 | 19144 | 78.7 | 5195 | 21.3 |
| 51-60 | 10076 | 7.2 | 8365 | 83.0 | 1711 | 17.0 |
| 61-70 | 2490 | 1.8 | 2142 | 86.0 | 348 | 14.0 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 610 | 0.4 | 513 | 84.1 | 97 | 15.9 |
| MEAN AGE (YEARS) | 33.5 |  | 33.4 |  | 33.9 |  |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 31.0 |  | 31.0 |  | 31.0 |  |

[^0]TABLE 5: MATCHABLE 2005 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 |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 119482 | 100.0 | 37873 | 31.7 | 13373 | 11.2 | 47534 | 39.8 | 4947 | 4.1 | 6353 | 5.3 | 1608 | 1.3 | 6268 | 5.2 | 1526 | 1.3 |
| UNDER 18 | 513 | 0.4 | 219 | 42.7 | 67 | 13.1 | 171 | 33.3 | 10 | 1.9 | 12 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 23 | 4.5 | 11 | 2.1 |
| 18-20 | 9248 | 7.7 | 3005 | 32.5 | 1055 | 11.4 | 3895 | 42.1 | 419 | 4.5 | 260 | 2.8 | 72 | 0.8 | 415 | 4.5 | 127 | 1.4 |
| 21-30 | 50106 | 41.9 | 14347 | 28.6 | 4955 | 9.9 | 21996 | 43.9 | 2419 | 4.8 | 2206 | 4.4 | 569 | 1.1 | 2772 | 5.5 | 842 | 1.7 |
| 31-40 | 27779 | 23.2 | 7573 | 27.3 | 2782 | 10.0 | 12374 | 44.5 | 1140 | 4.1 | 1662 | 6.0 | 452 | 1.6 | 1490 | 5.4 | 306 | 1.1 |
| 41-50 | 20574 | 17.2 | 7411 | 36.0 | 3060 | 14.9 | 6382 | 31.0 | 770 | 3.7 | 1399 | 6.8 | 379 | 1.8 | 981 | 4.8 | 192 | 0.9 |
| 51-60 | 8588 | 7.2 | 3896 | 45.4 | 1140 | 13.3 | 2195 | 25.6 | 147 | 1.7 | 595 | 6.9 | 113 | 1.3 | 463 | 5.4 | 39 | 0.5 |
| 61-70 | 2154 | 1.8 | 1110 | 51.5 | 242 | 11.2 | 448 | 20.8 | 36 | 1.7 | 193 | 9.0 | 16 | 0.7 | 103 | 4.8 | 6 | 0.3 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 520 | 0.4 | 312 | 60.0 | 72 | 13.8 | 73 | 14.0 | 6 | 1.2 | 26 | 5.0 | 7 | 1.3 | 21 | 4.0 | 3 | 0.6 |

*Not all convictions are matchable to an existing record, so these counts underestimate the total number of convictions.

TABLE 6: ADJUSTED 2005 DUI CONVICTION RATES ${ }^{1}$ AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD ${ }^{2}$ OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| AGE | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  | ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE | RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD | ADJUSTED <br> CONVICTION <br> RATE | RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD | $\qquad$ | RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD | $\qquad$ | RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD | ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE | RELATIVE <br> LIKELIHOOD |
| STATEWIDE | 0.78 | 1.00 | 0.82 | 1.05 | 0.75 | 0.96 | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.98 |
| UNDER 18 | 0.42 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.58 | 0.38 | 0.49 | 0.39 | 0.50 | 0.42 | 0.53 |
| 18-20 | 0.75 | 0.96 | 0.79 | 1.01 | 0.72 | 0.92 | 0.66 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.92 |
| 21-30 | 0.77 | 0.99 | 0.84 | 1.08 | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.72 | 0.93 | 0.76 | 0.97 |
| 31-40 | 0.79 | 1.01 | 0.83 | 1.06 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.96 | 0.78 | 1.00 |
| 41-50 | 0.81 | 1.04 | 0.83 | 1.06 | 0.81 | 1.04 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.80 | 1.02 |
| 51-60 | 0.81 | 1.04 | 0.81 | 1.04 | 0.86 | 1.10 | 0.73 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 1.03 |
| 61-70 | 0.82 | 1.05 | 0.81 | 1.03 | 0.87 | 1.12 | 0.85 | 1.08 | 0.77 | 0.99 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 0.76 | 0.98 | 0.77 | 0.99 | 0.79 | 1.01 | 0.61 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.98 |

${ }^{1}$ Adjusted DUI Conviction Rates $=$ The matchable DUI conviction rate proportionally adjusted to the overall DUI conviction rate.
${ }^{2}$ Relative Likelihood $=$ Adjusted DUI Conviction Rate/Overall Total DUI Conviction Rate.
TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES ${ }^{1}$

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FELONYDUI $^{2}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NONALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSED } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ${ }^{4}$ DUI ADJUDICATIONTIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { VIOLATION } \\ \text { TO CONVICTION } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION } \\ & \text { TO DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| STATEWIDE | 78.1 | 136591 | 4288 | 14452 | 2890 | 3488 | 1253 | 73.0 | 13.0 |
| ALAMEDA | 69.6 | 4973 | 64 | 690 | 103 | 137 | 97 | 95.0 | 11.0 |
| ALPINE | 63.0 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 42.0 | 17.0 |
| AMADOR | 86.5 | 261 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 76.0 | 14.0 |
| butte | 75.5 | 1036 | 45 | 205 | 65 | 26 | 98 | 72.0 | 19.0 |
| CALAVERAS | 65.5 | 191 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 48.0 | 14.0 |
| colusa | 66.7 | 192 | 4 | 48 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 63.0 | 7.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 91.2 | 3076 | 112 | 437 | 11 | 48 | 64 | 118.0 | 14.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 40.4 | 125 | 7 | 73 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 59.0 | 33.0 |
| El DORADO | 79.6 | 1047 | 44 | 168 | 29 | 10 | 9 | 77.0 | 16.0 |
| FRESNO | 70.2 | 4376 | 110 | 454 | 57 | 51 | 12 | 112.0 | 40.0 |
| GLENN | 63.7 | 369 | 6 | 65 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 42.0 | 15.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 54.4 | 642 | 32 | 223 | 24 | 28 | 3 | 79.0 | 21.0 |
| IMPERIAL | 52.9 | 609 | 16 | 27 | 124 | 8 | 28 | 192.0 | 63.0 |
| INYO | 75.2 | 156 | 8 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 71.0 | 9.0 |
| KERN | 79.6 | 3975 | 91 | 497 | 104 | 63 | 60 | 34.0 | 19.0 |
| KINGS | 74.6 | 718 | 22 | 62 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 82.0 | 0.0 |
| LAKE | 76.5 | 349 | 15 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 5 | 202.0 | 51.0 |
| LASSEN | 84.0 | 203 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 122.0 | 17.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | 74.3 | 28056 | 437 | 2798 | 600 | 1493 | 63 | 66.0 | 14.0 |
| MADERA | 64.5 | 629 | 26 | 86 | 25 | 8 | 18 | 170.0 | 20.0 |
| MARIN | 83.6 | 1279 | 22 | 1 | 5 | 61 | 0 | 68.0 | 23.0 |
| MARIPOSA ${ }^{5}$ | 52.3 | 100 | 3 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 69.0 | 32.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 73.8 | 525 | 35 | 121 | 28 | 2 | 3 | 43.0 | 78.0 |
| MERCED | 65.8 | 1121 | 33 | 164 | 14 | 18 | 23 | 90.0 | 57.0 |
| MODOC | 72.2 | 49 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 60.0 | 13.0 |
| MONO | 98.4 | 123 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 49.0 | 17.0 |
| MONTEREY | 86.3 | 2508 | 57 | 185 | 56 | 35 | 27 | 30.0 | 43.0 |

[^1]TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{2} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NONALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSED } 3 \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ${ }^{4}$ DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| NAPA | 85.8 | 811 | 31 | 89 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 54.0 | 3.0 |
| NEVADA | 84.8 | 542 | 21 | 104 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 56.0 | 72.0 |
| ORANGE | 89.8 | 11821 | 375 | 645 | 61 | 149 | 52 | 85.0 | 2.0 |
| PLACER | 95.9 | 1688 | 70 | 111 | 33 | 9 | 12 | 74.0 | 10.0 |
| PLUMAS | 76.5 | 166 | 3 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 60.0 | 17.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 82.2 | 6943 | 253 | 65 | 189 | 96 | 27 | 73.0 | 3.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 74.7 | 5137 | 219 | 717 | 21 | 95 | 12 | 52.0 | 29.0 |
| SAN BENITO | 95.5 | 344 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 136.0 | 27.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 78.7 | 8098 | 408 | 294 | 240 | 269 | 157 | 94.0 | 8.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | 82.4 | 13100 | 461 | 1667 | 277 | 143 | 79 | 73.0 | 10.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 62.4 | 803 | 48 | 199 | 155 | 40 | 47 | 82.0 | 6.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 74.4 | 2826 | 116 | 353 | 44 | 50 | 10 | 44.0 | 7.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 76.0 | 1648 | 74 | 354 | 37 | 107 | 15 | 45.0 | 27.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 75.5 | 2458 | 42 | 477 | 17 | 64 | 37 | 121.0 | 16.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 89.0 | 2118 | 122 | 270 | 83 | 40 | 6 | 48.0 | 14.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | 83.0 | 5293 | 202 | 676 | 138 | 82 | 3 | 73.0 | 5.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 82.3 | 1299 | 22 | 151 | 20 | 18 | 1 | 61.0 | 34.0 |
| SHASTA | 97.6 | 792 | 78 | 79 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 65.0 | 6.0 |
| SIERRA | 33.7 | 25 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105.0 | 30.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 74.5 | 255 | 17 | 66 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 66.0 | 17.0 |
| SOLANO | 87.5 | 1488 | 39 | 233 | 35 | 17 | 30 | 81.0 | 18.0 |
| SONOMA | 79.5 | 2247 | 125 | 552 | 32 | 24 | 79 | 58.0 | 22.0 |
| STANISLAUS | 62.9 | 1610 | 63 | 232 | 40 | 25 | 14 | 64.0 | 52.0 |
| SUTTER | 75.9 | 337 | 22 | 85 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 63.0 | 17.0 |
| TEHAMA | 57.4 | 396 | 16 | 67 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 57.0 | 20.0 |
| TRINITY | 36.1 | 58 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 71.0 | 35.0 |
| TULARE | 75.4 | 2420 | 78 | 41 | 39 | 67 | 17 | 51.0 | 39.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 86.3 | 370 | 21 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 60.0 | 6.0 |
| VENTURA | 87.6 | 3553 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 3 | 62.0 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | 74.8 | 914 | 38 | 198 | 18 | 5 | 4 | 108.0 | 23.0 |
| YUBA | 61.1 | 327 | 15 | 77 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 69.0 | 36.0 |

TABLE 8: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2005 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY ${ }^{1}$

| COUNTY | DUICONVICTIONS |  | RECKLESS DRIVINGCONVICTIONS |  | \% OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% NO RECORD } \\ & \text { OF ANY } \\ & \text { CONVICTION }{ }^{2} \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MISDEMEANOR | \% FELONY | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% ALCOHOL } \\ & \text { RELATED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% NONALCOHOL } \\ & \text { RELATED } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| STATEWIDE | 75.8 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 10.3 |
| ALAMEDA | 68.7 | 0.9 | 9.5 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 17.6 |
| ALPINE | 59.3 | 3.7 | 25.9 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| AMADOR | 84.2 | 2.3 | 11.3 | 2.3 | 1.3 | N/A |
| BUTTE | 72.3 | 3.1 | 14.3 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
| CALAVERAS | 61.0 | 4.5 | 11.8 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 20.4 |
| COLUSA | 65.3 | 1.4 | 16.3 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 13.6 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 88.0 | 3.2 | 12.5 | 0.3 | 1.4 | N/A |
| DEL NORTE | 38.2 | 2.1 | 22.3 | 0.6 | 3.7 | 33.0 |
| EL DORADO | 76.4 | 3.2 | 12.3 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 5.3 |
| FRESNO | 68.5 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 21.0 |
| GLENN | 62.6 | 1.0 | 11.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 20.2 |
| HUMBOLDT | 51.8 | 2.6 | 18.0 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 23.5 |
| IMPERIAL | 51.6 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 10.5 | 0.7 | 33.6 |
| INYO | 71.6 | 3.7 | 21.6 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| KERN | 77.9 | 1.8 | 9.7 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 7.3 |
| KINGS | 72.4 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 15.7 |
| LAKE | 73.3 | 3.2 | 6.3 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 13.0 |
| LASSEN | 83.2 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 2.9 | 4.5 |
| LOS ANGELES | 73.2 | 1.1 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 12.9 |
| MADERA | 61.9 | 2.6 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 23.8 |
| MARIN | 82.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 12.1 |
| MARIPOSA ${ }^{3}$ | 50.8 | 1.5 | 8.1 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 32.5 |
| MENDOCINO | 69.2 | 4.6 | 15.9 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 6.3 |
| MERCED | 63.9 | 1.9 | 9.4 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 23.0 |
| MODOC | 68.1 | 4.2 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 13.9 |
| MONO | 98.4 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 2.4 | 0.8 | N/A |
| MONTEREY | 84.4 | 1.9 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 4.4 |
| NAPA | 82.7 | 3.2 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 3.3 |
| NEVADA | 81.6 | 3.2 | 15.7 | 1.4 | 1.1 | N/A |
| ORANGE | 87.0 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 3.9 |
| PLACER | 92.0 | 3.8 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 0.5 | N/A |
| PLUMAS | 75.1 | 1.4 | 13.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 8.1 |
| RIVERSIDE | 79.3 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 13.8 |
| SACRAMENTO | 71.6 | 3.1 | 10.0 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 13.7 |
| SAN BENITO | 91.2 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 1.3 | N/A |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 74.9 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 13.9 |
| SAN DIEGO | 79.6 | 2.8 | 10.1 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 5.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 58.9 | 3.5 | 14.6 | 11.4 | 2.9 | 8.7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 71.5 | 2.9 | 8.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 14.3 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 72.7 | 3.3 | 15.6 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 2.1 |
| SAN MATEO | 74.3 | 1.3 | 14.4 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 7.6 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 84.1 | 4.8 | 10.7 | 3.3 | 1.6 | N/A |
| SANTA CLARA | 80.0 | 3.1 | 10.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 3.4 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 80.9 | 1.4 | 9.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 5.9 |
| SHASTA | 88.9 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 0.3 | 1.3 | N/A |
| SIERRA | 30.1 | 3.6 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49.4 |
| SISKIYOU | 69.9 | 4.7 | 18.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 6.0 |
| SOLANO | 85.2 | 2.2 | 13.3 | 2.0 | 1.0 | N/A |
| SONOMA | 75.3 | 4.2 | 18.5 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| STANISLAUS | 60.5 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 25.9 |
| SUTTER | 71.2 | 4.7 | 18.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.2 |
| TEHAMA | 55.2 | 2.2 | 9.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 32.0 |
| TRINITY | 34.3 | 1.8 | 8.3 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 47.9 |
| TULARE | 73.0 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 20.2 |
| TUOLUMNE | 81.7 | 4.6 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | N/A |
| VENTURA | 85.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 10.8 |
| YOLO | 71.8 | 3.0 | 15.6 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 7.9 |
| YUBA | 58.4 | 2.7 | 13.8 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 22.9 |

${ }^{1}$ The percentages total to 100 by row (county).
${ }^{2}$ These include failure-to-appear (FTA) notices; the statewide average is $4.4 \%$.
${ }^{3}$ 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.
N/A - 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: 2005 REPORTED* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS

| DUI CONVICTIONS |  |  | ALCOHOL-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAC LEVEL | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| . 00 | 1726 | 1.5 | . 00 | 303 | 2.6 |
| . 01 | 90 | 0.1 | . 01 | 14 | 0.1 |
| . 02 | 70 | 0.1 | . 02 | 15 | 0.1 |
| . 03 | 74 | 0.1 | . 03 | 19 | 0.2 |
| . 04 | 69 | 0.1 | . 04 | 38 | 0.3 |
| . 05 | 172 | 0.2 | . 05 | 85 | 0.7 |
| . 06 | 222 | 0.2 | . 06 | 209 | 1.8 |
| . 07 | 539 | 0.5 | . 07 | 663 | 5.8 |
| . 08 | 2177 | 1.9 | . 08 | 2764 | 24.0 |
| . 09 | 3832 | 3.3 | . 09 | 3190 | 27.7 |
| . 10 | 6554 | 5.7 | . 10 | 1877 | 16.3 |
| . 11 | 8419 | 7.3 | . 11 | 843 | 7.3 |
| . 12 | 8822 | 7.6 | . 12 | 434 | 3.8 |
| . 13 | 9027 | 7.8 | . 13 | 267 | 2.3 |
| . 14 | 8897 | 7.7 | . 14 | 199 | 1.7 |
| . 15 | 8604 | 7.4 | . 15 | 126 | 1.1 |
| . 16 | 8253 | 7.1 | . 16 | 111 | 1.0 |
| . 17 | 7598 | 6.6 | . 17 | 89 | 0.8 |
| . 18 | 6949 | 6.0 | . 18 | 65 | 0.6 |
| . 19 | 6099 | 5.3 | . 19 | 62 | 0.5 |
| . 20 | 5257 | 4.6 | . 20 | 30 | 0.3 |
| . 21 | 4485 | 3.9 | . 21 | 21 | 0.2 |
| . 22 | 3596 | 3.1 | . 22 | 18 | 0.2 |
| . 23 | 2984 | 2.6 | . 23 | 21 | 0.2 |
| . 24 | 2404 | 2.1 | . 24 | 10 | 0.1 |
| . 25 | 1967 | 1.7 | . 25 | 10 | 0.1 |
| . 26 | 1504 | 1.3 | . 26 | 6 | 0.1 |
| . 27 | 1168 | 1.0 | . 27 | 4 | 0.0 |
| . 28 | 937 | 0.8 | . 28 | 4 | 0.0 |
| . 29 | 745 | 0.6 | . 29 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 30 | 572 | 0.5 | . 30 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 31 | 410 | 0.4 | . 31 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 32 | 327 | 0.3 | . 32 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 33 | 230 | 0.2 | . 33 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 34 | 197 | 0.2 | . 39 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 35 | 148 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 36 | 123 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 37 | 87 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 38 | 46 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 39 | 62 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 40 | 47 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 41 | 23 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 42 | 15 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 43 | 14 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 44 | 9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 45 | 9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 46 | 8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 47 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 48 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 49 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 50 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 51 | 3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 60 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | --------- | ------ | TOTAL | 11507 | ------- |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IEAN** BAC . } 16 \\ & \text { DIAN** BAC . } 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KEAN** BAC } .10 \\ & \text { EDIAN** BAC . } 09 \end{aligned}$ |  |

*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form, which replaced the abstract of conviction used in earlier reports. This change in data source was
made because of the more complete BAC reporting on APS forms ( $82.0 \%$ of total).
**The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 9b: 2005 REPORTED* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21

| BAC LEVEL | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | 182 | 2.1 | . 21 | 196 | 2.3 |
| . 01 | 27 | 0.3 | . 22 | 141 | 1.6 |
| . 02 | 19 | 0.2 | . 23 | 117 | 1.4 |
| . 03 | 9 | 0.1 | . 24 | 66 | 0.8 |
| . 04 | 20 | 0.2 | . 25 | 47 | 0.5 |
| . 05 | 53 | 0.6 | . 26 | 35 | 0.4 |
| . 06 | 83 | 1.0 | . 27 | 22 | 0.3 |
| . 07 | 152 | 1.8 | . 28 | 17 | 0.2 |
| . 08 | 305 | 3.5 | . 29 | 8 | 0.1 |
| . 09 | 493 | 5.7 | . 30 | 6 | 0.1 |
| . 10 | 655 | 7.6 | . 31 | 4 | 0.1 |
| . 11 | 842 | 9.8 | . 33 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 12 | 801 | 9.3 | . 34 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 13 | 744 | 8.6 | . 36 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 14 | 701 | 8.1 | . 37 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 15 | 644 | 7.5 | . 43 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 16 | 575 | 6.7 |  |  |  |
| . 17 | 540 | 6.3 |  | --------- | ------- |
| . 18 | 464 | 5.4 | TOTAL | 8627 | 100.0 |
| . 19 | 381 | 4.4 | MEAN** BAC . 14 |  |  |
| . 20 | 270 | 3.1 | MEDIAN** BAC . 14 |  |  |

*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for arrested DUI offenders. The percentage of BAC levels found on these forms for 2005 convicted under age 21 cases is $81.9 \%$.
**The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 10: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND REPORTED BAC LEVEL

| DUI OFFENDER <br> STATUS | PERCENT | AVERAGE BAC LEVEL <br> FROM APS REPORTING <br> FORM (\%) | MEDIAN BAC LEVEL <br> FROM APS REPORTING <br> FORM (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATEWIDE | 100.0 | .16 | .15 |
| 1 $^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 72.9 | .16 | .15 |
| $2^{\text {ND DUI }}$ | 20.1 | .17 | .16 |
| $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 5.3 | .18 | .18 |
| $4^{\mathrm{TH}+}$ DUI | 1.7 | .19 | .18 |

## SECTION 3:

## POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

## SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were obtained from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2005. 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. As of September 20, 2005, SB 1697 (Torlakson) gave DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions on DUI offenders; therefore, courts no longer have the authority to impose license actions on DUI offenders. This procedural change results in a declining count of court license restrictions and suspensions. This section includes the following tables:

Table 11: 2005 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, 18-month, and 30-month alcohol programs), license restriction, court suspension, and ignition interlock. Cross tabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 12: 2005 DUI 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 tables and those in Appendix B4, it is evident that the use of alternative sanctions continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status in 2005. For example:

## Statewide Parameters:

- The court sanction most frequently applied to all convicted DUI offenders was probation ( $96.6 \%$ ), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock ( $4.3 \%$ ). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in $74.6 \%$ of the cases. (However, in many jurisdictions, jail is often served as community service rather than actual jail time.) This is shown in Table 11.

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 $100 \%$.

*As of $09 / 20 / 2005$, license restriction and suspension sanctions are no longer imposed by courts, but by DMV only.

Figure 6. Percentage of representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2005).

## County Variation:

- The proportion of first-DUI offenders arrested in 2005 who received a court postconviction suspension varied by county, from $37.2 \%$ in Monterey County, to $0 \%$ in Sierra County (see Table 12).
- The use of first DUI offender alcohol programs for the first-DUI offenders varies by county, from over $90 \%$ in 15 counties to $10.2 \%$ in Santa Barbara County (see Table 12).


## Court Variation:

- Statewide, courts vary significantly in how they use available sanctions for DUI offenders. In Los Angeles County alone, one court (Lancaster) assigned jail to 95.5\%
of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n=1,130$ ), while another court (Malibu) in the same county assigned jail to only $19.4 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders $(n=247)$. This is shown in Table B4 in the Appendix.
- In 2005, $0.2 \%$ DUI offenders were referred to $30-$ month alcohol treatment program. Assignment of DUI offenders (mostly third-or-more) to 30-month programs was low, and varied significantly by court (see Table B4 in the Appendix).
- Statewide, courts required only $4.3 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders to install an ignition interlock device in 2005. This is down from $6.3 \%$ in 1997 and 1998, primarily because legislation in 1999 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" suspended or revoked interlock assignments are not captured by the DUI-MIS report.

Variation by Offender Status:

- About $75 \%$ of first-DUI offenders arrested in 2005 were sentenced to jail, compared to over $90 \%$ of all repeat offenders (see Table 11).
- $87.2 \%$ of first-DUI offenders were assigned by courts to alcohol treatment programs, along with $83.9 \%$ of second offenders, $65.2 \%$ of third offenders, and $34.8 \%$ of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. This is shown in Table 11. (By statute, however, all offenders must eventually complete specified alcohol treatment programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement).
- $5.5 \%$ of first-DUI offenders and $7.7 \%$ of repeat-DUI offenders received court postconviction license suspensions in 2005 (see Table 11). Court license actions are declining as a result of the law change described above. Under the APS law (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, or two to three year revocation.
- $13.3 \%$ of repeat-DUI offenders were assigned ignition interlock in 2005, compared to $14.0 \%$ in $2004,12.9 \%$ in $2003,10.9 \%$ in $2002,8.1 \%$ 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, that 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: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS*

| $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {sT }}$ <br> OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROGRAM | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 140879 | 96.6 | 74.6 | 65.0 | 19.3 | 0.2 | 51.2 | 6.1 | 4.3 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 102702 | 97.8 | 67.5 | 84.7 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 5.5 | 0.9 |
| REPEAT DUI | 38177 | 93.3 | 93.6 | 11.8 | 64.7 | 0.6 | 38.6 | 7.7 | 13.3 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 28207 | 96.6 | 93.3 | 14.2 | 69.6 | 0.1 | 47.2 | 6.6 | 11.8 |
| 3 RD DUI | 7439 | 91.9 | 94.2 | 5.5 | 57.5 | 2.2 | 17.3 | 11.9 | 19.8 |
| $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 2531 | 60.9 | 94.7 | 2.6 | 31.1 | 1.1 | 6.1 | 7.9 | 10.9 |

[^2]TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS*

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | $\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{N}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROBATION } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG <br> $\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{l} 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array} \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LICENSE <br> RESTRICTION <br> $\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITIONINTERLOCK$\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STATEWIDE |  | 140879 | 96.6 | 74.6 | 65.0 | 19.3 | 0.2 | 51.2 | 6.1 | 4.3 |
| ALAMEDA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3695 | 99.2 | 98.1 | 83.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 54.6 | 7.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1006 | 99.4 | 97.9 | 18.4 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 52.7 | 8.0 | 18.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 251 | 98.4 | 95.6 | 5.2 | 50.2 | 0.8 | 27.5 | 30.3 | 27.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 85 | 90.6 | 100.0 | 4.7 | 41.2 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 14.1 | 15.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 5037 | 99.1 | 98.0 | 65.4 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 52.2 | 8.4 | 6.0 |
| ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 12 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 | 82.4 | 52.9 | 35.3 | 5.9 | 64.7 | 11.8 | 23.5 |
| AMADOR | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 177 | 98.3 | 93.8 | 72.3 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 49.2 | 10.2 | 5.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 61 | 96.7 | 98.4 | 6.6 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 42.6 | 14.8 | 44.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD D DUI }}$ | 21 | 76.2 | 85.7 | 9.5 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 47.6 | 66.7 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 9 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 22.2 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 268 | 94.0 | 94.4 | 50.0 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 43.3 | 14.6 | 20.1 |
| BUTTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 715 | 95.9 | 93.6 | 88.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 11.5 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 254 | 94.9 | 97.6 | 19.3 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 5.9 | 4.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 86 | 84.9 | 86.0 | 9.3 | 65.1 | 3.5 | 43.0 | 15.1 | 20.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 26 | 65.4 | 96.2 | 7.7 | 42.3 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 34.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1081 | 94.1 | 94.0 | 63.8 | 25.1 | 0.3 | 56.6 | 10.4 | 5.1 |
| CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 139 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 82.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 5.8 | 4.3 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 41 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 12.2 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 4.9 | 17.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 15 | 86.7 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 66.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 26.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 205 | 93.7 | 97.1 | 58.5 | 23.4 | 0.5 | 37.1 | 5.9 | 8.8 |
| COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 125 | 93.6 | 96.8 | 77.6 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 57.6 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 55 | 94.5 | 98.2 | 18.2 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 11 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 196 | 90.8 | 96.9 | 55.6 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 55.1 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2243 | 97.5 | 95.1 | 90.2 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 56.8 | 7.0 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 686 | 98.5 | 97.5 | 16.5 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 50.4 | 6.7 | 0.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 178 | 94.9 | 97.8 | 3.4 | 59.6 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 10.1 | 2.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 81 | 77.8 | 97.5 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 11.1 | 4.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 3188 | 97.1 | 95.8 | 67.2 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 51.6 | 7.2 | 0.4 |

[^3]TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \end{array}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| DEL NORTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 92 | 91.3 | 92.4 | 89.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 59.8 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 25 | 84.0 | 96.0 | 16.0 | 64.0 | 4.0 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+\mathrm{DUI}$ | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 132 | 86.4 | 92.4 | 65.2 | 15.2 | 2.3 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 14.4 |
| EL DORADO | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 749 | 98.4 | 97.7 | 89.3 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 3.3 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 238 | 97.9 | 97.1 | 21.4 | 70.6 | 0.0 | 46.6 | 3.4 | 4.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 73 | 90.4 | 93.2 | 6.8 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 4.1 | 15.1 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 31 | 71.0 | 77.4 | 6.5 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 12.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 1091 | 97.0 | 96.7 | 66.6 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 49.4 | 3.3 | 2.5 |
| FRESNO | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3028 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 85.4 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 53.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1030 | 92.7 | 97.1 | 14.8 | 71.8 | 0.0 | 50.1 | 0.8 | 7.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 324 | 90.4 | 96.3 | 4.3 | 65.7 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 1.9 | 13.6 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 104 | 57.7 | 93.3 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 4486 | 93.8 | 96.5 | 61.4 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 48.8 | 1.0 | 3.7 |
| GLENN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 245 | 95.5 | 69.4 | 73.9 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 27.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 84 | 94.0 | 92.9 | 22.6 | 48.8 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 14.3 | 3.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 34 | 79.4 | 100.0 | 11.8 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 8.8 | 2.9 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 12 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 375 | 92.8 | 78.4 | 54.4 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 5.9 | 1.1 |
| HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 453 | 97.1 | 20.8 | 91.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 75.1 | 2.9 | 3.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 165 | 98.2 | 86.1 | 18.2 | 70.9 | 0.0 | 69.1 | 4.8 | 47.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 41 | 95.1 | 87.8 | 7.3 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 43.9 | 9.8 | 53.7 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 26.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 13.3 | 46.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 674 | 97.2 | 42.6 | 66.9 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 70.5 | 4.0 | 18.2 |
| IMPERIAL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 491 | 98.4 | 13.8 | 73.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 64.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 114 | 94.7 | 50.0 | 34.2 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 56.1 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 15 | 93.3 | 73.3 | 26.7 | 46.7 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 625 | 97.6 | 22.6 | 64.8 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 62.4 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
| INYO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 107 | 98.1 | 18.7 | 92.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.0 | 1.9 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 42 | 97.6 | 88.1 | 19.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 76.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 9 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 33.3 | 55.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 164 | 96.3 | 38.4 | 65.2 | 19.5 | 0.6 | 57.3 | 3.0 | 6.1 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {1sT }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH <br> PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KERN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2832 | 96.2 | 96.6 | 74.5 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 46.6 | 3.8 | 0.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 902 | 96.2 | 98.0 | 11.5 | 24.8 | 0.1 | 23.2 | 6.0 | 5.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 240 | 91.7 | 99.2 | 7.1 | 16.2 | 0.4 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 5.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 92 | 54.3 | 97.8 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 12.0 | 3.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 4066 | 95.0 | 97.1 | 54.9 | 7.2 | 0.1 | 38.2 | 4.8 | 2.0 |
| KINGS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 493 | 89.9 | 95.7 | 76.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 42.0 | 19.3 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 171 | 87.1 | 98.8 | 39.8 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 30.4 | 16.4 | 4.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 52 | 86.5 | 98.1 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 17.3 | 5.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 24 | 29.2 | 95.8 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 740 | 87.0 | 96.6 | 61.6 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 36.2 | 18.0 | 2.0 |
| LAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 235 | 93.6 | 35.3 | 79.1 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 51.9 | 2.6 | 0.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 96 | 92.7 | 81.3 | 15.6 | 56.3 | 4.2 | 22.9 | 7.3 | 12.5 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 27 | 85.2 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 29.6 | 18.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 6 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 16.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 364 | 92.3 | 53.0 | 55.2 | 22.0 | 1.1 | 40.4 | 6.3 | 5.2 |
| LASSEN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 140 | 95.0 | 96.4 | 80.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 8.6 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 50 | 88.0 | 96.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 36.4 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 205 | 92.7 | 95.1 | 62.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 35.1 | 7.8 | 1.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 21552 | 98.0 | 38.6 | 89.6 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 58.5 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 5338 | 97.1 | 86.8 | 14.9 | 75.0 | 0.5 | 53.9 | 2.8 | 1.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 1251 | 91.6 | 82.9 | 6.2 | 53.5 | 11.6 | 17.9 | 4.5 | 4.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 352 | 46.6 | 92.3 | 4.0 | 17.9 | 5.4 | 7.7 | 3.7 | 1.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 28493 | 96.9 | 50.2 | 70.9 | 19.0 | 0.7 | 55.2 | 1.8 | 0.6 |
| MADERA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 428 | 93.5 | 95.3 | 82.9 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 32.0 | 12.4 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 151 | 94.7 | 98.0 | 21.9 | 64.2 | 0.0 | 33.8 | 14.6 | 2.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 55 | 81.8 | 94.5 | 3.6 | 61.8 | 1.8 | 16.4 | 9.1 | 3.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 21 | 52.4 | 81.0 | 4.8 | 33.3 | 4.8 | 19.0 | 23.8 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 655 | 91.5 | 95.4 | 59.7 | 23.4 | 0.5 | 30.7 | 13.0 | 0.9 |
| MARIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1003 | 99.2 | 10.3 | 91.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 7.6 | 0.6 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 231 | 100.0 | 86.6 | 9.5 | 83.5 | 0.0 | 79.2 | 4.8 | 6.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 55 | 98.2 | 92.7 | 5.5 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 54.5 | 30.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 12 | 75.0 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1301 | 99.1 | 28.1 | 72.7 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 9.3 | 3.2 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| MARIPOSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 56 | 100.0 | 96.4 | 83.9 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 89.3 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 37 | 100.0 | 67.6 | 32.4 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 75.7 | 2.7 | 5.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 9 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 22.2 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 103 | 100.0 | 84.5 | 59.2 | 18.4 | 1.0 | 81.6 | 1.9 | 5.8 |
| MENDOCINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 363 | 94.2 | 95.0 | 81.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 55.6 | 2.8 | 1.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 145 | 95.2 | 97.9 | 20.0 | 61.4 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 0.0 | 20.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 37 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 10.8 | 64.9 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 5.4 | 37.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 53.3 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 46.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 26.7 | 13.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 560 | 93.6 | 96.1 | 58.9 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 49.8 | 2.9 | 8.9 |
| MERCED | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 820 | 96.8 | 95.2 | 89.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 62.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 236 | 99.2 | 98.7 | 18.2 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 61.4 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 78 | 89.7 | 94.9 | 15.4 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 16.7 | 1.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 85.0 | 95.0 | 5.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1154 | 96.6 | 95.9 | 68.5 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 3.5 | 0.1 |
| MODOC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 34 | 100.0 | 55.9 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 41.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 14 | 100.0 | 92.9 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 52 | 100.0 | 67.3 | 34.6 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 36.5 | 1.9 | 5.8 |
| MONO | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 78 | 98.7 | 64.1 | 91.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 36 | 100.0 | 94.4 | 8.3 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 123 | 97.6 | 75.6 | 60.2 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 53.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1885 | 99.3 | 98.4 | 60.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 37.2 | 9.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 514 | 98.1 | 99.2 | 12.5 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 26.5 | 70.8 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 112 | 96.4 | 99.1 | 2.7 | 48.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 56.3 | 83.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 54 | 72.2 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 48.1 | 46.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 2565 | 98.3 | 98.5 | 46.8 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 36.1 | 25.8 |
| NAPA | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 612 | 98.2 | 93.1 | 93.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 85.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 172 | 97.7 | 99.4 | 12.2 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 1.2 | 64.5 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 45 | 91.1 | 100.0 | 4.4 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 73.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 13 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 842 | 96.8 | 94.9 | 70.7 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 80.9 | 2.3 | 19.5 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {15T }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| NEVADA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 415 | 99.3 | 94.7 | 89.9 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 108 | 95.4 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 39.8 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.7 | 53.6 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 3.6 | 42.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 12 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 563 | 98.4 | 96.1 | 69.3 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 55.8 | 0.5 | 6.0 |
| ORANGE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 9207 | 99.1 | 27.9 | 92.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 8.0 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2332 | 98.2 | 90.4 | 10.5 | 78.5 | 0.0 | 43.5 | 10.9 | 18.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 527 | 94.5 | 96.6 | 2.8 | 79.9 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 9.9 | 35.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 130 | 60.0 | 99.2 | 1.5 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 16.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 12196 | 98.3 | 43.6 | 71.9 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 49.1 | 8.6 | 5.9 |
| PLACER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1307 | 99.0 | 97.2 | 12.5 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 5.1 | 2.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 326 | 93.9 | 98.8 | 3.1 | 74.8 | 0.0 | 39.3 | 10.1 | 29.4 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 91 | 82.4 | 97.8 | 2.2 | 67.0 | 1.1 | 8.8 | 4.4 | 64.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 34 | 44.1 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 2.9 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 26.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1758 | 96.1 | 97.4 | 10.0 | 19.3 | 0.1 | 42.0 | 5.9 | 11.3 |
| PLUMAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 113 | 98.2 | 99.1 | 89.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 64.6 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 38 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 68.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 169 | 97.0 | 99.4 | 65.7 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 5385 | 97.5 | 91.1 | 92.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 59.9 | 3.3 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1322 | 95.6 | 96.8 | 18.8 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 4.5 | 1.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 353 | 91.8 | 97.7 | 9.6 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 20.7 | 10.8 | 6.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 136 | 55.9 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 49.3 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 7.4 | 2.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 7196 | 96.1 | 92.6 | 72.8 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 54.4 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3671 | 98.6 | 98.0 | 89.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 12.4 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1164 | 97.9 | 99.2 | 8.5 | 71.3 | 0.0 | 41.9 | 13.7 | 4.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 373 | 93.6 | 98.4 | 1.3 | 44.8 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 5.4 | 7.8 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 148 | 76.4 | 99.3 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 5356 | 97.4 | 98.4 | 63.1 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 12.0 | 1.7 |
| SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 239 | 97.1 | 90.4 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.3 | 31.8 | 3.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 82 | 96.3 | 95.1 | 13.4 | 43.9 | 0.0 | 31.7 | 26.8 | 18.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 29 | 93.1 | 100.0 | 3.4 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 3.4 | 48.3 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 30.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 360 | 94.7 | 92.5 | 45.3 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 36.1 | 27.5 | 10.6 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN <br> BERNARDINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 6261 | 97.3 | 54.3 | 90.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 76.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1654 | 95.8 | 87.5 | 19.0 | 70.0 | 0.1 | 68.4 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 422 | 91.7 | 94.1 | 7.6 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 9.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 169 | 60.9 | 75.7 | 4.7 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 5.3 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 8506 | 96.0 | 63.1 | 70.6 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 71.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 10243 | 96.9 | 45.2 | 86.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 5.3 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2585 | 96.1 | 88.8 | 11.8 | 73.1 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 4.7 | 4.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 573 | 90.1 | 93.4 | 5.1 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 12.0 | 13.4 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 160 | 54.4 | 98.1 | 3.8 | 34.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 11.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 13561 | 96.0 | 56.2 | 68.1 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 5.4 | 1.7 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 674 | 98.5 | 99.0 | 94.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 0.1 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 140 | 99.3 | 98.6 | 24.3 | 70.7 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 49.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 30 | 96.7 | 93.3 | 3.3 | 86.7 | 3.3 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 76.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 851 | 98.6 | 98.6 | 79.2 | 16.7 | 0.2 | 55.8 | 0.1 | 13.3 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1969 | 99.0 | 95.4 | 89.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 50.4 | 3.5 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 646 | 98.1 | 99.2 | 11.9 | 79.9 | 0.2 | 46.0 | 3.6 | 16.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 234 | 96.6 | 98.3 | 3.0 | 79.9 | 0.4 | 14.5 | 26.5 | 22.2 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 93 | 75.3 | 94.6 | 1.1 | 54.8 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 23.7 | 20.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 2942 | 97.9 | 96.5 | 62.5 | 28.5 | 0.1 | 45.2 | 6.0 | 6.6 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1199 | 98.8 | 96.6 | 92.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 361 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 13.0 | 79.5 | 0.0 | 50.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 112 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 9.8 | 74.1 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 50 | 72.0 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1722 | 97.7 | 97.1 | 67.6 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 49.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| SAN MATEO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1875 | 98.3 | 94.7 | 91.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 70.5 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 465 | 96.1 | 98.9 | 10.5 | 81.1 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.4 | 20.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 135 | 92.6 | 100.0 | 5.2 | 77.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 17.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 25 | 88.0 | 100.0 | 4.0 | 56.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2500 | 97.5 | 95.8 | 70.5 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 0.8 | 5.3 |
| SANTA <br> BARBARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1611 | 97.9 | 68.5 | 10.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 57.9 | 11.2 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 451 | 96.2 | 94.5 | 0.7 | 71.2 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 42.6 | 6.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 140 | 87.9 | 98.6 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 52.9 | 11.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 38 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 5.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 2240 | 96.1 | 76.2 | 7.5 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 20.4 | 2.1 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SANTA CLARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 4029 | 99.0 | 97.0 | 88.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 56.8 | 5.6 | 2.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1091 | 97.0 | 99.4 | 14.0 | 75.3 | 0.2 | 48.6 | 3.4 | 27.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 281 | 91.1 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 52.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 1.8 | 54.4 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 94 | 56.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 39.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 14.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 5495 | 97.5 | 97.7 | 67.5 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 51.9 | 4.9 | 9.9 |
| SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 914 | 99.0 | 95.6 | 73.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 49.2 | 22.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 298 | 98.3 | 98.3 | 8.4 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 40.9 | 27.5 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 90 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 1.1 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 77.8 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 19 | 73.7 | 94.7 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 31.6 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1321 | 98.1 | 96.5 | 52.5 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 43.8 | 27.3 | 0.0 |
| SHASTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 532 | 96.8 | 99.1 | 90.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 57.5 | 9.4 | 2.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 235 | 93.2 | 99.1 | 14.5 | 73.6 | 0.0 | 59.1 | 5.1 | 67.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 65 | 90.8 | 98.5 | 4.6 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 26.2 | 81.5 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 38 | 21.1 | 97.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 7.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 870 | 92.1 | 99.0 | 59.7 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 52.0 | 10.0 | 26.3 |
| SIERRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 72.7 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 28 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 32.1 | 50.0 | 3.6 | 39.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 180 | 97.8 | 98.3 | 75.6 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 65 | 96.9 | 98.5 | 24.6 | 69.2 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 4.6 | 23.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 22 | 95.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 54.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 272 | 96.0 | 98.5 | 55.9 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 26.5 | 4.4 | 12.5 |
| SOLANO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1044 | 98.1 | 97.7 | 92.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 333 | 94.6 | 99.7 | 16.8 | 73.9 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 0.0 | 6.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 107 | 86.0 | 98.1 | 8.4 | 67.3 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 43 | 67.4 | 97.7 | 7.0 | 48.8 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1527 | 95.6 | 98.2 | 67.5 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 56.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| SONOMA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1608 | 96.8 | 89.4 | 71.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 43.9 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 515 | 94.2 | 98.3 | 9.5 | 48.3 | 0.0 | 36.9 | 0.2 | 6.4 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 180 | 87.8 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 69 | 56.5 | 97.1 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 2372 | 94.4 | 92.4 | 50.5 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 38.4 | 0.8 | 3.3 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STANISLAUS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1224 | 98.8 | 97.5 | 84.9 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 3.8 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 311 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 18.0 | 68.8 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 97 | 97.9 | 99.0 | 9.3 | 71.1 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 2.1 | 16.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 41 | 68.3 | 100.0 | 4.9 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1673 | 97.8 | 98.0 | 66.1 | 21.4 | 0.1 | 27.1 | 3.7 | 3.0 |
| SUTTER | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 241 | 97.1 | 93.8 | 90.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 61.4 | 0.8 | 2.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 74 | 95.9 | 98.6 | 14.9 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 55.4 | 1.4 | 21.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 31 | 93.5 | 96.8 | 12.9 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 12.9 | 41.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 84.6 | 7.7 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 30.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 359 | 96.1 | 94.7 | 65.5 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 2.2 | 10.9 |
| TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 241 | 93.4 | 98.3 | 83.8 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 73.9 | 5.8 | 2.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 119 | 89.1 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 68.9 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 6.7 | 9.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 33 | 63.6 | 97.0 | 0.0 | 57.6 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 12.1 | 24.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 19 | 31.6 | 100.0 | 10.5 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 31.6 | 0.0 | 36.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 412 | 86.9 | 98.8 | 53.6 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 61.4 | 6.3 | 7.8 |
| TRINITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 40 | 65.0 | 90.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 17 | 94.1 | 88.2 | 11.8 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 61 | 73.8 | 88.5 | 42.6 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1740 | 94.1 | 87.2 | 79.4 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 35.1 | 3.5 | 2.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 554 | 92.4 | 95.8 | 15.3 | 62.8 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 9.9 | 12.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 136 | 92.6 | 94.1 | 4.4 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 17.6 | 33.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 68 | 67.6 | 94.1 | 1.5 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 19.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 2498 | 93.0 | 89.7 | 59.0 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 5.7 | 6.9 |
| TUOLUMNE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 257 | 92.6 | 95.7 | 82.9 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 2.7 | 0.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 91 | 93.4 | 98.9 | 13.2 | 73.6 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 32 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 6.3 | 21.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 391 | 92.3 | 96.9 | 57.8 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 52.4 | 2.6 | 2.0 |
| VENTURA | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2768 | 99.1 | 90.4 | 75.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 48.0 | 19.4 | 5.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 640 | 98.6 | 96.6 | 11.4 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 13.6 | 67.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 165 | 94.5 | 94.5 | 4.2 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 79.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 51 | 72.5 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 43.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 27.5 | 64.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 3624 | 98.5 | 91.8 | 59.6 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 18.4 | 20.9 |

TABLE 12: 2005 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| YOLO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 667 | 97.3 | 95.1 | 86.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 2.7 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 208 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 27.9 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 63.9 | 1.4 | 46.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 55 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 18.2 | 50.9 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 22 | 59.1 | 95.5 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 13.6 | 9.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 952 | 96.5 | 96.2 | 67.1 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 58.7 | 3.6 | 13.9 |
| YUBA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 235 | 96.2 | 89.4 | 83.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 76 | 93.4 | 92.1 | 14.5 | 67.1 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 3.9 | 14.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 26 | 88.5 | 92.3 | 3.8 | 50.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 19.2 |
|  | $4{ }^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 342 | 94.7 | 90.4 | 61.1 | 21.6 | 0.3 | 40.1 | 1.8 | 5.0 |

## SECTION 4:

## POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

This section presents reoffense and crash rates of DUI offenders over various time periods, as well as the methodology and results of evaluations assessing the effectiveness of alcohol education programs applied to drivers convicted for the first time of an alcohol-related offense.

The first part of the section examines descriptive indicators, such as DUI recidivism and crash rates, for different groups of DUI offenders within different periods of time:

1) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders from 1990-2005, 2) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for 2005 first and second DUI offenders, 3) proportions of alcohol program referrals for 2005 first and second DUI offenders, and 4) long term recidivism rates of the 1994 DUI offenders.

The second part of the section contains the results of several sanction analyses evaluating the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for two groups of DUI offenders: 1) drivers convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving, and 2) first DUI offenders, who attended 3-month or 6-month alcohol education programs.

Also in the second part of the section, and like last year, are two additional subanalyses: 1) an evaluation of 6-month alcohol education programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ versus first DUI offenders with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ or above, and 2) an evaluation of the relative effectiveness of 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above.

The following are highlights of the findings:

- The 1-year recidivism rates for all first offenders in 2005 continued to remain at the lower level of the past seven years. The DUI reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 2005 was $38.2 \%$ lower than the reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 1990 (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).
- While the 1-year reoffense rate for second offenders has leveled out for the past 10 years, these rates are substantially lower than the rates during the early 1990s; recidivism decreased from $9.7 \%$ in 1990 to $5.6 \%$ in 2005, a $42.3 \%$ relative decrease for all second offenders (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).
- Overall, subsequent 1-year crash rates among second offenders have declined from $4.0 \%$ in 1990 to $3.0 \%$ in 2005, a $25.0 \%$ relative decrease; although their rate was the
lowest in 1996, crashes have continued to gradually increase in recent years for all second offenders. The crash rate for first offenders steadily increased from 1993 to 2001, and has decreased since then. The 2005 rate remains $9.4 \%$ lower than the 1990 crash rate (see Figure 8 and Table 13a).
- Of those arrested in $2005,85.1 \%$ of first offenders were referred to an alcohol education program, while $70.1 \%$ of second offenders were referred to the 18 -month treatment program (see Table 14).
- At the end of 12 years, $28 \%$ of DUI offenders originally convicted in 1994 had at least one subsequent DUI conviction, and $32 \%$ incurred at least one DUI incident (see Figure 9a).
- Over 12 years, recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third offenders reoffending was $39 \%$, while $32 \%$ of second offenders and $25 \%$ of first offenders reoffended (see Figure 9 b ).
- Males showed a much higher cumulative proportion (29\%) of reoffenses than did females ( $21 \%$ ) over the 12 -year time period (see Figure 9c).
- 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 (see Figure 9d).
- After 5 years, the proportion of DUI offenders reoffending in the 1994 group was much lower ( $18 \%$ ) compared to the proportion reoffending in the 1984 group ( $27 \%$ ) and in the 1980 group ( $35 \%$ ). The 2000 group of DUI offenders had the lowest proportion of reoffenses (17\%). This is shown in Figure 9e.
- Similar to the last three years' evaluations, this year's results continue to show that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders assigned to an alcohol education program did not vary significantly from those of the nonparticipants. In contrast to the previous two years' evaluations, the subsequent DUI incident rates of the program participants were not significantly lower than those of the nonparticipants (see Table 16a).
- Similar to the last four years' evaluations, the 1-year crash rates of first offenders attending the 3-month program were not significantly higher than those attending 6month programs. However, as consistently evident in previous evaluations, the
subsequent DUI incident rate of the short-term program participants was again significantly $(p<.0001)$ lower than that of the long-term participants (see Table 16b).
- Among first DUI offenders assigned to 6-month alcohol treatment programs, crash rates of the offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above were higher than the crash rates of those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$, but this result, while close, did not reach statistical significance ( $p=.055$ ). Previous analyses also did not show significant crash differences between the two groups. However, DUI offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above had significantly ( $p<.004$ ) more DUI incidents ( $30.5 \%$ ) than those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ (see Table 16c). This finding was evident in the past two year's evaluations.
- Consistent with the past two years' results, the length of time of alcohol treatment program (3-month vs. 6-month) had no effect on crash rates and DUI incidents for first DUI offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above (see Table 16d).

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. Except for the 1994 cases, subjects were selected based on the number of prior DUI and alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within ten years (instead of seven years due to a law change effective January 1, 2005) prior to their entry DUI arrest in 2005. 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 ten years, 2) second-DUI offenders drivers who had one DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction within the previous ten years, 3) alcohol-related reckless offenders with no previous DUI offenses in the past ten 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 12-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders over time, and the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for persons convicted of an alcohol-reckless or first DUI offense, are evaluated in terms of postconviction driving record, as measured by: 1) total crashes and 2) DUI incidents, which include alcohol-involved crashes, DUI convictions, 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, along with one comparison of DUI incidents.

Although the sanction analyses are not conducted for first- and second-DUI offenders as in previous years, the 1-year unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all of the previous and current evaluations were included. In order to maintain comparability to the previous subject selection criteria, certain types of offenders had to be excluded. These previous and current analyses excluded offenders with felony convictions and chemical test refusal suspensions because their license control penalties were different from the misdemeanor offender groups. Drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent time period (because of late conviction dates) were also excluded, as were 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 about $25.5 \%$ 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.

## DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES

One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders from 1990-2005
The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident reoffense rates for both first- and second-offender sanction groups were compiled from the 16 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 2005 who reoffended within one year after conviction.


Figure 7. Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2005).

This figure and Table 13a show an ongoing gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first-offenders overall from 1990 to 2005; although there is a slight upward trend from 1996 to 1998, this trend is followed by an overall decline of the rates over the past 7 years. The overall decline translates into a $38.2 \%$ 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 is 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 13a: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2005

| YEAR | DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED |  | CRASH-INVOLVED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FIRST-DUI <br> OFFENDERS | SECOND-DUI <br> OFFENDERS | FIRST-DUI <br> OFFENDERS | SECOND-DUI <br> 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 |
| 2003 | 4.7 | 6.5 | 4.8 | 3.2 |
| 2004 | 4.5 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 3.1 |
| 2005 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 3.0 |
| \% DIFFERENCE | $-38.2 \%$ | $-42.3 \%$ | $-9.4 \%$ | $-25.0 \%$ |
| $1990-2005$ |  |  |  |  |

As noted in the past 2 years, a similar overall decline is evident in the 1-year reoffense rates for the second offender group as displayed in Figure 7 and Table 13a. The rate of decline is greatest during the years from 1993 to 1996, with a leveling out for several
years, followed by a slight decline in 2001; from 2001 to 2003 there is a modest increase, followed by a decline in 2004 and 2005. Table 13a shows that, from 1990 to 2005, the reoffense rates decreased $42.3 \%$ for the second offender group as a whole. The overall reoffense rates of second offenders remain higher than those of first offenders. 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 attributed to the implementation of APS suspensions in 1990. An evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS Law documents recidivism reductions of up to $21.1 \%$ for first offenders, and $19.5 \%$ for repeat offenders, attributable to the law.

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 1990-2005 first and second offenders who had crashes within one year after their conviction.


Figure 8. Percentages of first-and second-DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2005).

Among first offenders from 1990 through 2005, Figure 8 and Table 13a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by an ongoing increase after 1993, and slight decline after 2002. The relative difference between first offender crash rates between 1990 and 2005 is the same as last year's, $-9.4 \%$, whereas the relative difference for second offenders for those same years, which is slightly greater than last year, shows a much greater decline in crash involvement of $-25.0 \%$.

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, increasing again in 2002, and decreasing slightly through 2005. Overall, second offenders have lower crash rates than do first offenders (Table 13a), 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.

One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2005
For the third year, the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism and crash rates, by county, are reported for both first and second DUI offenders.

Table 13b displays the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism rates of offenders arrested in 2005. As shown in this table, among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent DUI incident within one year varied from $6.7 \%$ in San Joaquin County to $3.6 \%$ in Orange County. Among the smaller counties, Butte, Modoc, and Shasta had DUI recidivism rates at or above $8.5 \%$, while Alpine, Sierra, and Trinity had zero DUI recidivism rates. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, Fresno County had again the highest rate, with $8.4 \%$ of second offenders having a subsequent DUI incident within one year whereas Orange County's second offenders had the lowest rate of $4.0 \%$ for subsequent DUI incidents. Among the smaller counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from $12.5 \%$ (Mendocino and Modoc) to 0.0\% (Alpine, Lake, Lassen, San Benito, Sierra, and Trinity).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2005 are displayed in Table 13c. Among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent crash within one year varied from $5.7 \%$ in Santa Clara County to $3.8 \%$ in San Diego County. Among the smaller counties, Tehama had a crash rate of $7.9 \%$, while Alpine, Sierra, and Trinity had a $0.0 \%$ crash rate. In contrast to DUI recidivism rates, second offenders have generally lower crash rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, the rate at which second offenders have a subsequent crash within one year varied from $4.6 \%$ (San Joaquin) to $2.0 \%$ (Orange and San Mateo). Among the smaller counties, one county had a crash rate above 16.7\% (Del Norte), and nine counties had $0.0 \%$ crash rates (Alpine, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, San Benito, Sierra, Trinity, and Yuba).

TABLE 13b. 2005 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

| COUNTY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 3342 | 4.7 | 1118 | 5.6 |
| ALAMEDA | 126 | 4.9 | 40 | 6.0 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 5 | 3.7 | 2 | 4.0 |
| BUTTE | 54 | 8.8 | 15 | 6.9 |
| CALAVERAS | 8 | 7.0 | 3 | 8.6 |
| COLUSA | 4 | 4.3 | 2 | 5.1 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 78 | 4.9 | 24 | 5.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 3 | 5.0 | 2 | 11.1 |
| EL DORADO | 24 | 4.5 | 7 | 4.0 |
| FRESNO | 140 | 6.6 | 57 | 8.4 |
| GLENN | 10 | 6.4 | 5 | 7.7 |
| HUMBOLDT | 15 | 4.1 | 5 | 3.9 |
| IMPERIAL | 15 | 4.6 | 1 | 1.3 |
| INYO | 5 | 6.0 | 3 | 8.3 |
| KERN | 100 | 5.4 | 33 | 5.4 |
| KINGS | 16 | 4.9 | 8 | 6.3 |
| LAKE | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| LASSEN | 2 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | 576 | 3.9 | 199 | 5.1 |
| MADERA | 8 | 4.1 | 5 | 7.0 |
| MARIN | 28 | 3.9 | 7 | 4.3 |
| MARIPOSA | 4 | 6.9 | 3 | 12.5 |
| MENDOCINO | 20 | 7.3 | 5 | 4.9 |
| MERCED | 37 | 6.8 | 6 | 3.7 |
| MODOC | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 12.5 |
| MONO | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 3.6 |
| MONTEREY | 45 | 4.8 | 22 | 6.6 |
| NAPA | 17 | 4.6 | 8 | 5.9 |
| NEVADA | 19 | 5.9 | 2 | 2.1 |
| ORANGE | 240 | 3.6 | 65 | 4.0 |
| PLACER | 56 | 5.6 | 9 | 3.6 |
| PLUMAS | 7 | 7.9 | 1 | 3.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 174 | 4.5 | 60 | 6.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 162 | 6.0 | 61 | 6.9 |
| SAN BENITO | 10 | 6.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 237 | 5.3 | 77 | 6.5 |
| SAN DIEGO | 297 | 4.2 | 98 | 5.3 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 27 | 5.6 | 3 | 3.1 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 92 | 6.7 | 32 | 7.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 57 | 6.3 | 17 | 6.1 |
| SAN MATEO | 39 | 2.9 | 10 | 3.3 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 38 | 3.6 | 21 | 6.9 |
| SANTA CLARA | 107 | 3.9 | 30 | 4.1 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 33 | 4.8 | 15 | 7.0 |
| SHASTA | 36 | 8.5 | 13 | 7.1 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 6 | 5.3 | 4 | 8.3 |
| SOLANO | 38 | 5.1 | 19 | 7.9 |
| SONOMA | 60 | 5.6 | 17 | 5.4 |
| STANISLAUS | 55 | 6.1 | 15 | 6.4 |
| SUTTER | 12 | 7.4 | 5 | 11.6 |
| TEHAMA | 7 | 3.7 | 8 | 8.2 |
| TRINITY | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | 61 | 5.5 | 30 | 8.1 |
| TUOLUMNE | 11 | 5.0 | 6 | 7.9 |
| VENTURA | 71 | 4.0 | 24 | 5.6 |
| YOLO | 33 | 7.3 | 10 | 6.8 |
| YUBA | 11 | 6.5 | 2 | 3.8 |

TABLE 13c. 20051 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

| COUNTY | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 3450 | 4.8 | 596 | 3.0 |
| ALAMEDA | 120 | 4.6 | 19 | 2.8 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 10 | 7.5 | 3 | 6.0 |
| BUTTE | 27 | 4.4 | 9 | 4.1 |
| CALAVERAS | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 2.9 |
| COLUSA | 2 | 2.2 | 2 | 5.1 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 76 | 4.7 | 11 | 2.3 |
| DEL NORTE | 2 | 3.3 | 3 | 16.7 |
| EL DORADO | 29 | 5.4 | 5 | 2.8 |
| FRESNO | 77 | 3.6 | 19 | 2.8 |
| GLENN | 8 | 5.1 | 2 | 3.1 |
| HUMBOLDT | 11 | 3.0 | 5 | 3.9 |
| IMPERIAL | 6 | 1.8 | 1 | 1.3 |
| INYO | 2 | 2.4 | 1 | 2.8 |
| KERN | 70 | 3.8 | 15 | 2.4 |
| KINGS | 16 | 4.9 | 1 | 0.8 |
| LAKE | 5 | 3.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| LASSEN | 4 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | 803 | 5.4 | 139 | 3.6 |
| MADERA | 4 | 2.1 | 2 | 2.8 |
| MARIN | 27 | 3.8 | 3 | 1.8 |
| MARIPOSA | 3 | 5.2 | 1 | 4.2 |
| MENDOCINO | 13 | 4.7 | 1 | 1.0 |
| MERCED | 24 | 4.4 | 5 | 3.1 |
| MODOC | 1 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONO | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | 38 | 4.1 | 7 | 2.1 |
| NAPA | 19 | 5.1 | 2 | 1.5 |
| NEVADA | 4 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.1 |
| ORANGE | 333 | 5.0 | 33 | 2.0 |
| PLACER | 51 | 5.1 | 9 | 3.6 |
| PLUMAS | 4 | 4.5 | 1 | 3.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 219 | 5.6 | 27 | 2.7 |
| SACRAMENTO | 139 | 5.2 | 29 | 3.3 |
| SAN BENITO | 6 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 243 | 5.5 | 48 | 4.1 |
| SAN DIEGO | 272 | 3.8 | 43 | 2.3 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 32 | 6.7 | 2 | 2.1 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 60 | 4.3 | 21 | 4.6 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 68 | 5.0 | 6 | 2.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 39 | 3.7 | 9 | 2.9 |
| SANTA CLARA | 156 | 5.7 | 23 | 3.1 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 29 | 4.2 | 11 | 5.1 |
| SHASTA | 33 | 7.7 | 7 | 3.8 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 3 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.1 |
| SOLANO | 28 | 3.7 | 8 | 3.3 |
| SONOMA | 49 | 4.6 | 10 | 3.2 |
| STANISLAUS | 52 | 5.7 | 10 | 4.3 |
| SUTTER | 6 | 3.7 | 1 | 2.3 |
| TEHAMA | 15 | 7.9 | 5 | 5.2 |
| TRINITY | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | 48 | 4.4 | 6 | 1.6 |
| TUOLUMNE | 12 | 5.5 | 2 | 2.6 |
| VENTURA | 80 | 4.5 | 12 | 2.8 |
| YOLO | 25 | 5.5 | 3 | 2.0 |
| YUBA | 4 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 |

## The Proportions of Alcohol Education Program Referrals for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2005

For this current report, the intention was to make an effort to capture the number and proportions of convicted first and second offenders whose records indicated that they had completed an alcohol education/treatment program; the past two years' reports include a table showing the proportions of program referrals and completions for these offenders. This effort became possible by the recent addition of a subrecord to each person's driving record that 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. However, this year, it was not possible to obtain the program completion data due to a programming change to expand the subrecord, and additional changes to Research's own program to capture this subrecord were not made in time to support this effort.

Data are available on the proportions of referrals to the various DUI programs for first and second offenders, and these are shown in Table 14. It can be seen from this table that $85.1 \%$ of first offenders and $70.1 \%$ of second offenders were referred to an alcohol treatment program. First offenders attend alcohol treatment programs that range from 3 to 9 months, depending upon their BAC levels at the time of their arrest. Almost all second offenders attend an 18-month alcohol treatment program, and are allowed to apply for a restricted license after completing one year of license suspension, and showing evidence that they installed an ignition interlock device. To obtain a license restriction, DUI offenders need to have enrolled in an alcohol program and show proof of auto insurance; later, in order to remove the restriction from their driver license, they must have completed the program and continue to maintain proof of insurance.

TABLE 14: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED ALCOHOL PROGRAM REFERRALS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2005

| DUI OFFENDERS | TOTAL $N$ | PROGRAM REFERRALS |  | PROGRAM COMPLETION* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDERS } \\ & \text { (3 MOS. TO } 9 \text { MOS.) } \end{aligned}$ | 102,702 | 87,425 | 85.1\% | Unavailable |  |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDERS <br> ( 18 MOS.) | 28,207 | 19,765 | 70.1\% | Unavailable |  |

*Due to a modification of the Drinking Drivers Program Subrecord, information on program enrollment and completion were not immediately available in time for this report.

## Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders

Since all DUI offenders were included in the 1994 group, it was possible to observe and compare the long-term recidivism rates 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 that occurs after the initial DUI conviction. Both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 12-year follow-up 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).

Table 15 shows cumulative percentages of the first DUI reoffenses for the 1994 offenders, as well as 9- and 12-year cumulative percentages for the 1980 and 1994 groups and 5-year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group (dates were not available beyond 5 years).

TABLE 15: CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES FOR 1994 DUI OFFENDERS

| YEAR | PERCENTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2}^{\mathrm{ND}} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 3RD } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | MALES | FEMALES | 16-25 | 26-45 | 46-65 | 65+ | 1980 | 1984 | 1994 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 5 |
| $2^{N D}$ | 8 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 19 | 15 | 9 |
| 3 RD | 12 | 14 | 17 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 25 | 20 | 13 |
| $4^{\text {TH }}$ | 14 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 11 | 18 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 30 | 24 | 16 |
| $5^{\text {TH }}$ | 17 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 13 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 10 | 35 | 27 | 18 |
| $6^{\text {TH }}$ | 19 | 23 | 28 | 22 | 14 | 23 | 21 | 17 | 10 | 38 | NA | 21 |
| $7^{\text {TH }}$ | 20 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 16 | 25 | 23 | 18 | 11 | 40 | NA | 22 |
| $8^{\text {TH }}$ | 22 | 27 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 26 | 24 | 19 | 11 | 42 | NA | 24 |
| 9TH | 23 | 28 | 35 | 26 | 18 | 28 | 25 | 20 | 12 | 44 | NA | 25 |
| $10^{\text {TH }}$ | 24 | 30 | 36 | 27 | 19 | 29 | 27 | 21 | 12 | NA | NA | 26 |
| $11^{\text {TH }}$ | 25 | 31 | 38 | 28 | 20 | 30 | 28 | 22 | 12 | NA | NA | 27 |
| $12^{\text {TH }}$ | 25 | 32 | 39 | 29 | 21 | 31 | 28 | 22 | 12 | NA | NA | 28 |

In addition to Table 15, Figures 9a through 9e, display recidivism rates for 1994 offenders over 12 years.


Figure 9a. 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 9a shows that, for 1994 offenders as a whole, at the end of 12 years $28 \%$ accumulated at least one DUI reoffense. Considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses to include all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increased to $32 \%$. These failure curves are steepest in the earliest years following the initial conviction, and then start to flatten out but are still rising slightly in the $7^{\text {th }}$ through $12^{\text {th }}$ years. For both measures, the steepest climb occurs in the first year following conviction. Based on Figure 9b, third or more DUI offenders did recidivate to a greater extent than first or second offenders in the first year following their conviction.

One way to explore the extent of drinking severity is to examine the recidivism rates by the number of prior DUIs within seven years (time frame for counting priors of 1994 offenders) of the entry DUI violation. Figure 9b displays the cumulative proportions of reoffenses by first, second, and third-or-more DUI offenders.


Figure 9b. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions.

It is evident from this graph and from Table 15 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 twelve year time period. At the end of 12 years, $39 \%$ of third-or-more offenders have reoffended compared to $32 \%$ of second offenders and $25 \%$ of first offenders.

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 9c and Table 15, males show much higher cumulative proportions reoffending than females. At the end of 12 years, $29 \%$ of males have reoffended as compared to $21 \%$ of females. The failure curve of females is noticeably lower and increases at a slower pace throughout the 12 years as compared to the curve of males. In the final 4 years, the proportion of both males and females recidivating is only one percent per year.


Figure 9c. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed also by age. Figure 9d 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 twelve 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; the failure curves of the youngest groups are steepest during the first two years following the entry conviction. The failure curve of the $65+$ group flattens out at the $5^{\text {th }}$ 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 restricting their driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 12 years, the youngest two groups reoffended by $31 \%$ and $28 \%$, respectively, while $22 \%$ of the middle age group, for which mortality may also be a factor, and $12 \%$ of the oldest group recidivated.


Figure 9d. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date).

The final figure, Figure 9e, compares the 1994 recidivism curves with those of the 1980, 1984, and 2000 cohorts over a 5-year time period.


Figure $9 e$. Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2000 DUI drivers.

Last year, the reoffense rates of the 2000 cohort over the 5-year time period were added along with the cumulative percentages of the 1980, 1984 and 1994 groups (Figure 9e and Table 15). It is possible to view this long-term historical comparison with consideration of the probable influence of major DUI laws in California over a 20-year time period.

Figure 9e reveals that at the end of five years, $35 \%$ of the 1980 offenders reoffended compared to $27 \%$ of the 1984 group, $18 \%$ of the 1994 offenders and $17 \%$ of the 2000 group. Quite dramatically, the proportion recidivating in the 1994 and 2000 groups ( $18 \%, 17 \%$ ) 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 20 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). Table 15, which compares the 1980 cohort with the 1994 group over nine years, 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. There was only a one percent increase in recidivism for the 1994 group in the last year of 12 years.

Continuing with Figure 9 e , it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions between the 1984 group ( $27 \%$ ) and the 1994 group ( $18 \%$ ) is substantial; 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, both attributable to the APS law. Figure 9e also shows that the level of reoffenses is very similar for both the 1994 and 2000 cohorts. At each of the five years, the reoffenses of the 2000 offenders were only $1 \%$ lower than that of the 1994 group.

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 youngeraged drivers. These are not surprising findings, and are consistent with and supported by previous studies. In comparing the reoffense rates between the 1994 and 2000 groups with the 1980 and 1984 offenders, it was found that the cumulative proportions of reoffenses was much lower among the 1994 and 2000 offenders. The dramatically
lower reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2000 groups could be attributed to the enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders in the past two decades, including the APS suspension law of 1990.

## ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR THE ALCOHOLRELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS

Subject Selection and Follow-up Data: The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for offenders convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving, or of a first DUI offense, was established by legislation. 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). In 2004, the courts were required to refer first offenders whose BAC level is less than $0.20 \%$ to a 3-month program, and those with a BAC level of $0.20 \%$ or above, or who refuse to take a chemical test, to a 6 -month program. Effective 2005, AB 1353 (Liu) increased the duration of alcohol treatment programs from 6 to 9 months for first DUI offenders on probation whose BAC level is $0.20 \%$ or greater or who refuse to take a chemical test.

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 $39 \%$ of such offenders were not assigned. This discrepancy allowed a comparison of subsequent crashes and DUI incidents between the two groups.

In evaluating the traffic safety impact of length of time of first offender programs, only first offenders that showed the 3-month and 6-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for this analysis. Although, in 2005, the courts were to prescribe 9-month alcohol treatment programs for first offenders whose BAC levels were above $0.20 \%$, it was decided not to investigate the impact of the 9 -month treatment programs at this time because the number of those assigned was still quite
low ( $N=2020$ ). The effectiveness of this longer-term program will be evaluated in next year's DUI-MIS report.

Unfortunately, the records of $49 \%$ of first offenders who were referred to the alcohol education programs did not display the specific length of time. These individuals were not included in this evaluation, and this analysis is limited to first offenders who were adjudicated by courts that were in compliance with the law. Of the total sample selected, $77 \%$ were referred to 3-month programs, while $23 \%$ were assigned to 6 -month programs. Subjects for the initial analyses consisted of first offenders assigned to a 3-month alcohol program versus first offenders assigned to a 6-month program. To further explore the possible effects of BAC levels, two additional subanalyses included 1) first offenders assigned to a 6-month alcohol program with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ versus those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above, and 2) first offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above assigned to a 3-month alcohol program versus first offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above assigned to a 6-month alcohol program.

The conviction date for 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. The evaluation period for the postconviction driving measures starts from the conviction date, and was 1) 1-year following conviction for alcohol-related reckless offenders who were arrested from July, 2005 through June, 2006. 2) 1-year following conviction for first DUI convictees who were arrested in 2005, and who were referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs.

A buffer period of 4 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 one-year 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). 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.

Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures: 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, such as crash and traffic conviction averages for each driver's ZIP Code area (Appendix Table B5). While this "quasi-experimental" design is subject to a number of limitations in assessing causeeffect 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 possible, 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 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).

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 since some of these driver record variables were significantly different between the two groups, they were used as covariates in the analyses to remove these differences.

Following the extraction of covariates, simple correlations were computed between demographic and prior driving variables and the outcome measures, number of days to first subsequent crash and number of days to first subsequent DUI incident. The demographic and 2-year prior driving variables that had statistically significant correlations with the outcome measures were identified and selected as potential variables. For each analysis, logistic regression was used to test for potential interactions between the covariates and treatment/comparison groups. In analyses where there are significant interactions, the levels of the covariate and treatment groups are plotted on a graph to determine if there are differential effects of alcohol treatment on the covariate levels. The interaction term is then typically included in the final logistic regression analyses.

For the alcohol-reckless drivers, significant interactions were not found between the covariates and the alcohol program sanction on either crashes or DUI reoffenses.

Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol-Reckless Driving
Figure 10a and Table 16a display the results of the seventh evaluation of the effectiveness of the alcohol education program on drivers convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving violations.


Figure 10a. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2005-2006 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.

Total Crashes: Like the past two year's findings, the results show that assignment to the alcohol education program does not have a significant effect on 1-year subsequent crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders. Comparing these rates to those of the 2005 first DUI offenders, it is evident that alcohol-related reckless drivers who are assigned and those not assigned to an alcohol program are slightly more involved in crashes (4.95 and 5.07 per 100 drivers, respectively, see Table 16a) than are first DUI offenders (4.8 per 100 drivers; see Table 13a). However, these crash rates of the 2005 alcohol-reckless drivers are the lowest of all of the previous evaluations of alcohol-reckless drivers. For previous evaluations going back from 2004 to 2002, 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless drivers with no program were $5.13,5.44$, and 6.45 , respectively, while the crash rates for those involved in the alcohol education program were $5.24,5.82$, and 5.56 . These drivers who were arrested with a BAC level of $0.08 \%$ and above would have incurred an APS license suspension/restriction prior to their conviction. Table 9a shows that about $88 \%$ of the alcohol-reckless drivers had BAC levels of $0.08 \%$ and above.

TABLE 16a: THE EFFECT OF ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}\right.$ | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENTAGE } \\ & \text { EFFECT } \\ & \text { (DIFFERENCE IN } \\ & \text { FAILURE RATES) } \\ & \frac{\text { GRP } 1-\text { GRP } 2}{\text { GRP } 2} \times 100 \end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENTINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\xrightarrow[\text { GRP 1-GRP } 2]{ } \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/2005-6/2006 | 1) No program | $(2,474)$ | 4.95 |  | 3.35 |  |
| (FOLLOW-UP <br> PERIOD = 1 YEAR) | 2) Alcohol-education program | $(4,570)$ | 5.07 | -2.4\% | 3.01 | 11.3\% |

DUI Incidents: Figure 10a and Table 16a indicate that program participants do not show significantly fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the alcohol-education programs relative to the nonparticipants. The reoffense rate of the alcohol-reckless offenders not assigned to the programs is $11.3 \%$ higher than the reoffense rate of the program participants, but this difference is not large enough to be significant. 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 Evaluation of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Programs for First DUI Offenders
Total Crashes: Figure 10b and Table 16b display the results of the sixth evaluation of the effectiveness of the alcohol education program on first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month versus 6-month programs. Differing from last year but like the previous four years, the results show that the length of time of the alcohol education program does not have an effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of first-time DUI offenders. The 3-month program participants have a $6.5 \%$ higher crash rate than that of the 6 -month participants, but this difference is not significantly large enough to conclude that the 6 -month program was more effective in reducing crashes than 3-month program.


Figure 10b. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2005) by length of alcohol education program.

TABLE 16b: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | \||c|cter SAMPLE | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text { GRP } 1-G R P 2}{\text { GRP } 2} \times 100$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { NUMBER OF } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { INCIDENT- } \\ \text { INVOLVED, } \\ \text { PER 100 } \\ \text { DRIVERS } \end{array}$ | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) GRP 1-GRP $2 \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2005 \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | 1) 3-month program <br> 2) 6-month program | $\begin{aligned} & (22,059) \\ & (6,471) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.57 \\ & 4.29 \end{aligned}$ | $6.5 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.79 \\ & 5.44 \end{aligned}$ | -30.3\%* |

$* p=<.0001$

DUI Incidents: Similar to the last five year's results, Figure 10b and Table 16b indicate that, among first DUI offenders, 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 five years' evaluations of subsequent DUI incidents. The reoffense rate of the 3-month program participants is $30.3 \%$ 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 ( $0.20 \%$ and above), and would be more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels.

In order to determine whether BAC level was a major factor in the outcome of the previous analysis, two further subanalyses were conducted to investigate this possibility. Among first offenders assigned to the 6-month program, 30\% actually had BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ and $70 \%$ had BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above. This difference in BAC levels allowed for conducting additional analyses comparing the outcome measures between those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ and those with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above. A second subanalysis was conducted comparing 3-month versus 6-month alcohol treatment program effects for those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above. There were a sufficient number of drivers who had BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above who were assigned to the 3-month program to allow for this second comparison. The results of these additional subanalyses are described below.

Results of the Evaluation of the 6-Month Alcohol Education Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels Below $0.20 \%$ Versus $0.20 \%$ and Above
Total Crashes and DUI Incidents: Table 16c shows the results of the effects of the 6-month alcohol treatment program on crashes and DUI incidents for two groups: 1) those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ and 2) those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above. As evident in Table 16c, differences in crash rates between the two groups approached directional significance ( $p=.055$ ) but this finding should be viewed with caution because its tentative significance level could indicate that the difference in crash rates is due to chance alone; also the three previous similar evaluations did not show significant differences between the two groups on crashes. First offenders with the lower BAC levels had $23.4 \%$ fewer crashes than their counterparts with higher BAC levels. A possible explanation for this finding may be related to pre-existing crash expectancies related to differences in BAC levels.

# TABLE 16c: FIRST OFFENDER 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS BELOW $0.20 \%$ VERSUS $0.20 \%$ AND ABOVE 

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}\right.$ | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text { GRP 1-GRP } 2}{\text { GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 | NUMBER OF DUI <br> INCIDENTINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PERCENTAGE } \\ & \text { EFFECT } \\ & \text { (DIFFERENCE IN } \\ & \text { FAILURE RATES) } \\ & \frac{\text { GRP } 1-\text { GRP } 2}{\text { GRP } 2} \times 100 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2005 \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | 1) BAC below $0.20 \%$ <br> 2) BAC $0.20 \%$ and above | $(1,865)$ <br> $(4,367)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.37 \\ & 4.40 \end{aligned}$ | -23.4\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4.04 \\ & 5.81 \end{aligned}$ | 30.5\%* |

${ }^{*} p=.004$

However, significant differences were apparent between these two groups on DUI incidents, substantiating the fact that those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above had more DUI incidents in the one-year following their conviction than drivers with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$. These drivers with lower BAC levels had $30.5 \%$ fewer DUI incidents than did those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above. The results of this analysis confirm the earlier suggestion that those with higher BAC levels are more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels, regardless of the length of time of alcohol treatment program. Thus, it may not be that the 6 -month programs are less effective than the 3-month programs, but rather that the 6-month programs have a higher proportion of offenders with high arrest BAC levels, who are more likely to recidivate.

Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Programs for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels of $0.20 \%$ and Above

Total Crashes and DUI Incidents: As shown in Table 16d, and consistent with the past two year's results, the length of time of alcohol treatment program for first DUI offenders had no effect on those with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above on both outcome measures, 1-year subsequent crashes and DUI incidents. Although the crash and DUI incident rates for those attending the 3-month program are slightly higher than for those attending the 6-month program, these differences were not significant, even with a difference of $17.6 \%$ on subsequent crashes. Thus, with BAC level held constant, the findings of this analysis indicate that the extended 6-month alcohol treatment program has no beneficial effect relative to the 3-month alcohol treatment program, on first offenders with high BAC levels on both subsequent 1-year crashes and DUI incidents. While the results of the previous analysis left unclear the relationship between
recidivism and length of program or BAC level, the findings from this analysis more clearly indicate that extending the program length for first offenders with high BAC levels does not reduce subsequent 1-year crashes or DUI incidents.

TABLE 16d: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS 0.20\% AND ABOVE

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP <br> (BAC LEVELS 0.20\% <br> AND ABOVE) | $\begin{array}{\|\|l\|l} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF <br> CRASH- <br> INVOLVED, <br> PER 100 <br> DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) GRP 1-GRP $2 \times 100$ GRP 2 | NUMBER OF DUI <br> INCIDENTINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP 1-GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2005 \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | 1) 3-month program <br> 2) 6-month program | $\begin{aligned} & (1,349) \\ & (4,367) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.01 \\ & 4.26 \end{aligned}$ | $17.6 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.74 \\ & 5.63 \end{aligned}$ | 1.8\% |

The effectiveness of increasing the duration of time for alcohol education/treatment programs has not been supported in the literature. DeYoung examined the effectiveness of lengthening SB 38 alcohol treatment programs from 12 to 18 months for second offenders and found no evidence that the additional 6 months contributed to reducing DUI recidivism (DeYoung, 1995). A final limitation of these analyses should be noted. Since this study only included first offenders whose conviction abstract had information on the length of alcohol program, there may be additional unknown biases that this quasi-experimental design cannot rule out. However, some statistical control of group differences removed at least part of the biases based on available covariates.

## SECTION 5:

## ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

## 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 ( $0.08 \%$ 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.

The total count of postconviction suspension/revocation actions has dramatically increased as a result of a law change (SB 1697), effective September 20, 2005, which assigned to DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions for all DUI offenders and removed this responsibility from the courts.

This section includes the following tables:

Table 17: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1996-2006. This table shows preconviction (APS) and postconviction license disqualification totals from 1996 through 2006. The postconviction totals include juvenile suspensions, first-offender suspensions, second-offender suspensions and revocations, and third- and fourthoffender revocations.

Table 18: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measure data for fiscal years 2004/2005 through 2006/2007.

The following statements are based on the data shown in the previously listed tables.

- The total number of DMV DUI preconviction and postconviction $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{R}$ actions increased by $47.4 \%$ over that for 1996 (see Table 17). These totals have inflated as of September 2005 due to the law change noted above.
- In 2006, 185,481 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, $76 \%$ were firstoffender actions (including actions for zero tolerance) and $24 \%$ were repeatoffender actions (see Table 17).
- In FY 2006/2007, total APS actions increased by 5.8\% from FY 2005/2006, following a $6.7 \%$ increase in the previous fiscal year (see Table 18).
- The number of chemical test refusal actions decreased by $3.0 \%$ in 2006, after increasing by $2.6 \%$ in 2005 . The total number of refusal actions has fallen $18.5 \%$ in the past decade (see Table 17).
- Requests for APS hearings have decreased from $28.2 \%$ of all APS actions in FY $2004 / 2005$ to $24.8 \%$ in $2006 / 2007$. The rate at which APS S/R actions are upheld after hearing has increased during the past several fiscal years, from $86.7 \%$ upheld in 2004 / 2005 , to $89.8 \%$ upheld in 2005/2006, and in 2006/2007 (see Table18).
- During the first 13.5 years after implementation (on January 1, 1994) of the "zero tolerance" law for minors, 210,035 suspension actions have been taken.
TABLE 17: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1996-2006

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS | $230600^{\text {r }}$ | $205462{ }^{1}$ | $238612^{1}$ | 236141 | 240597 | 231217 | 236603 | 241242 | 239580 | 247568 | $339796^{3}$ |
| PRECONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Per Se (APS) Actions | $180343{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 169511 | 175365 | 179332 | 172606 | 164840 | 165505 | 171470 | 171828 | 168569 | 185481 |
| . 01 Zero tolerance suspensions | $9327^{\text {r }}$ | 11517 | 15640 | 17775 | 18185 | 18549 | 19129 | 19949 | 19967 | 19374 | 22044 |
| . 08 First-offender suspensions | $122111^{\text {r }}$ | 114247 | 116827 | 119621 | 114997 | 109695 | 109888 | 114975 | 116022 | 107466 | 118468 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender suspensions | $43922^{\text {r }}$ | 39636 | 39024 | 38487 | 36147 | 33517 | 33580 | 33413 | 32903 | 38097 | 41420 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender revocations | $4983{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 4111 | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 |
| Commercial driver actions | 4939 r | 4496 | 4609 | 4471 | 4139 | 4013 | 3936 | 3853 | 3801 | 3525 | 2974 |
| Chemical test refusal actions | $11436{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 10110 | 9935 | 9435 | 9433 | 8841 | 8772 | 9399 | 9353 | 9599 | 9315 |
| . 01 Test refusal suspensions | 154 | 134 | 229 | 268 | 270 | 280 | 290 | 341 | 326 | 364 | 419 |
| . 08 Test refusal suspensions | 6299 r | 5865 | 5832 | 5718 | 5886 | 5482 | 5547 | 5925 | 6091 | 5603 | 5347 |
| . 08 Test refusal revocations | $4983{ }^{\text {r }}$ | 4111 | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 |
| POSTCONVICTION ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juvenile DUI suspensions | 995 | 7691 | $1026{ }^{1}$ | 918 | 741 | 714 | 896 | 794 | 838 | 737 | 941 |
| First-offender suspensions | 7229 | $4847{ }^{1}$ | $9588{ }^{1}$ | 15072 | 29924 | 31097 | 32716 | 32521 | 31012 | 39078 | $110525^{3}$ |
| Misdemeanor | 5753 | $3834{ }^{1}$ | 74971 | 13401 | 28118 | 29188 | 30563 | 30298 | 28799 | 36808 | $108227^{3}$ |
| Felony | 1476 | $1013{ }^{1}$ | $2091{ }^{1}$ | 1671 | 1806 | 1909 | 2153 | 2223 | 2213 | 2270 | 2298 |
| Second-offender S/R actions | 30404 | $22945{ }^{1}$ | $40238{ }^{1}$ | 31940 | 29097 | 26911 | 29345 | 28737 | 28400 | 30294 | 32680 |
| Misdemeanor | 29864 | $22532{ }^{1}$ | $39065^{1}$ | 31455 | 28571 | 26334 | 28748 | 28160 | 27847 | 29699 | 32046 |
| Felony | 540 | $413{ }^{1}$ | 6331 | 485 | 526 | 577 | 597 | 577 | 553 | 595 | 634 |
| Third-offender revocations | 8728 | 55691 | 93971 | 6573 | 6163 | 5727 | 6171 | 5953 | 5581 | 6720 | 7649 |
| Misdemeanor | 8550 | $5471{ }^{1}$ | $9167{ }^{1}$ | 6452 | 6015 | 5585 | 5996 | 5758 | 5429 | 6537 | 7424 |
| Felony | 178 | $98^{1}$ | 2301 | 121 | 148 | 142 | 175 | 195 | 152 | 183 | 225 |
| Fourth-offender revocations | 2901 | $1821{ }^{1}$ | $2998{ }^{1}$ | 2306 | 2066 | 1928 | 1970 | 1767 | 1921 | 2170 | 2520 |
| TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS | 50257r | $35951{ }^{1}$ | 632471 | 56809 | 67991 | 66377 | 71098 | 69772 | 67752 | 789993 | $154315^{3}$ |

[^4]${ }^{2}$ These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.
${ }^{3}$ This count has increased as a result of the law change, effective $09 / 20 / 2005$, which assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUI and removed this responsibility from the courts.

## TABLE 18. ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

|  | 7/04-6/05 | 7/05-6/06 | 7/06-6/07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total APS actions taken (including actions later set aside) | 184,324 | 196,691 | 208,106 |
| Total $.08^{1}$ APS actions set aside | 16,761 | 16,763 | 17,721 |
| Total . $01^{2}$ suspensions set aside | 1,349 | 1,369 | 1,415 |
| Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside) | 166,214 | 178,559 | 188,970 |
| Net total . 08 APS actions | 147,196 | 157,602 | 166,544 |
| Net total . 01 suspensions | 19,018 | 20,957 | 22,426 |
| Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification: ${ }^{\mathbf{3}}$ |  |  |  |
| Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers | 162,473 | 175,458 | 186,251 |
| Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken | 3,741 | 3,101 | 2,719 |
| Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles | 15 | 12 | 4 |
| Net APS . 08 actions for drivers with no prior DUI convictions or APS actions ${ }^{4}$ | 109,174 | 113,707 | 121,138 |
| 4-month license suspensions | 83,908 | 84,983 | 85,599 |
| 30-day suspensions plus 3-month restrictions | 896 | 56 | 0 |
| 30-day suspensions plus 5-month $\mathrm{COE}^{5}$ restrictions | 15,705 | 20,798 | 27,596 |
| First-offender chemical test refusals | 5,761 | 5,509 | 5,622 |
| CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions | 2,904 | 2,361 | 2,321 |
| Net APS . 08 actions taken for drivers with prior DUI convictions | 38,022 | 43,895 | 45,406 |
| Suspensions | 34,769 | 40,284 | 41,904 |
| Revocations | 3,253 | 3,611 | 3,502 |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures: |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 APS refusal actions taken (including actions later set aside) | 10,015 | 10,140 | 10,151 |
| Total .08 refusal actions set aside | 614 | 505 | 568 |
| Total .01 refusal actions set aside | 24 | 28 | 31 |
| Net total .08 and . 01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside) | 9,377 | 9,607 | 9,552 |
| Net total .08 refusal actions | 9,018 | 9,222 | 9,159 |
| Net total .01 refusal actions | 359 | 385 | 382 |
| Chemical test refusal rate (excluding actions later set aside) | 5.43\% | 5.16\% | 4.88\% |
| Net .08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no prior DUIs | 5,761 | 5,509 | 5,622 |
| Net .08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with prior DUIs | 3,253 | 3,611 | 3,502 |
| APS Hearings ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 inperson or telephone APS hearings scheduled | 52,023 | 49,856 | 51,677 |
| Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing ${ }^{7}$ | 28.2\% | 25.3\% | 24.8\% |
| . 08 hearings held and/or completed | 47,139 | 45,098 | 47,093 |
| . 08 actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 40,847 | 40,511 | 42,281 |
| Percentage of .08 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 86.7\% | 89.8\% | 89.8\% |
| . 01 hearings held and/or completed | 4,556 | 4,532 | 4,766 |
| . 01 actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 3,830 | 4,010 | 4,194 |
| Percentage of . 01 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 84.1\% | 88.5\% | 88.0\% |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings |  |  |  |
| Total . 08 and .01 APS refusal hearings scheduled | 3,610 | 3,308 | 3,209 |
| . 08 APS refusal hearings held and/ or completed | 3,488 | 3,196 | 3,075 |
| . 08 APS refusal actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 2,963 | 2,758 | 2,665 |

${ }^{1} .08$ 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.
${ }^{2} .01$ 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.
${ }^{3}$ 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.
${ }^{4}$ Prior DUI convictions or APS actions consist of any such conviction or action where the violation occurred within ten years (seven years before $1 / 1 / 05$ ) prior to the current violation.
${ }^{5}$ This restriction allows driving to, from, and during the course-of-employment (enacted $1 / 1 / 95$ ).
${ }^{6}$ These figures include refusal hearings but exclude Driver Safety/Investigation hearings, subsequent APS dismissal hearings and departmental reviews.
${ }^{7}$ Both numerator and denominator include those actions later set aside as a result of the hearing.

## SECTION 6:

## CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL

## SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL

This section presents data on alcohol-involved crashes, as compiled and reported by the California Highway Patrol. Only crashes involving injury or fatality are assessed, due to incomplete reporting of property-damage-only (PDO) crashes ${ }^{1}$. Drivers identified as being under the influence of drugs other than alcohol are also included in the "alcoholinvolved crash" category, but typically comprise less than $1 \%$ of the total. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 19: DUI Arrests Associated with Reported Crashes, 1995-2005. This table shows the number of DUI arrests and percentage of DUI arrests associated with reported crashes from 1995-2005.

Table 20: 2005 Had Been Drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Race/Ethnicity and Sobriety Code. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of sobriety and race/ethnicity for 2005 HBD drivers involved in crashes.

Table 21: 2005 Had Been Drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Adjudication Status and Sobriety Code. This table cross tabulates crash sobriety codes (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition for 2005 DUI convictions associated with those crashes.

Table 22: 2005 Had Been Drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes With No Record of Conviction, by County and Sobriety Level. This table shows the number of HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes without a corresponding conviction, by sobriety level, by county.

Table 23: 2005 Had Been Drinking Drivers Under Age 21 Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes, 1995-2005. This table shows the total number of HBD drivers under age 21 in California. It also shows their percentage of the total count of HBD drivers in the state, over the same time period.

[^5]Tables 24a-24b: 2005 Had Been Drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Sex (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2005 HBD drivers in fatal and injury crashes by age and sex, both total (24a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (24b).

Table 24c: 2005 Had Been Drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Type of Crash. New this year is a table that cross tabulates type of crash by age group for HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes.

Tables 25a-25b: Sobriety Level by Prior DUI Convictions for 2005 Had Been Drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2005 HBD drivers involved in fatal and injury crashes by sobriety level and prior conviction status, both total (25a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (25b).

Tables 26a-26b: 2005 Had Been Drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2005 HBD drivers involved in fatal and injury crashes by number of prior convictions, both total (26a) and for drivers who were not arrested or convicted in conjunction with the crash (26b).

Table 27: 2005 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Drivers Involved in Alcohol-Related Crashes. This table shows the mean, the median and frequency distribution of BAC levels for HBD drivers involved in alcohol-related crashes in 2005.

Figure 11 (below) shows the annual percentages of traffic injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 1996 to 2006. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI summary statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.


Figure 11. Percentage of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1996-2006.

Figure 12 (below) shows the alcohol and drug involved fatalities from 1996 to 2006. It also shows a breakdown of the number of fatalities when only alcohol was known to be involved, when only drugs were involved, or when both alcohol and drugs were involved in the fatality.


Figure 12. Alcohol and drug involved total fatalities, 1996-2006.

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

- The number of alcohol-involved traffic fatalities increased by $1.5 \%$ in 2006, following increases of $7.7 \%$ in $2005,1.2 \%$ in $2004,2.0 \%$ in $2003,8.3 \%$ 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 (see DUI Summary Statistics). The proportion of traffic fatalities which are alcohol-involved increased to $38.1 \%$, the third consecutive year of increases, after two years of being stable at $34.2 \%$ (see Figure 11).
- Drug-involved fatalities show a noticeable growing trend in the past decade, increasing by $225 \%$, from 264 in 1996 to 859 in 2006. However, in the last year, the number of drug-involved fatalities decreased by $2.4 \%$. Also, the greatest proportion of fatalities remains alcohol related (see Figure 12).
- $11.2 \%$ of traffic crash injuries in 2006 were alcohol-involved, slightly higher than $10.5 \%$ in 2005 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- The proportion of HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes under age of 21 increased from $9.3 \%$ in 1995 to 11.0\% in 2005 ( $18.3 \%$ increase, see Table 23).
- $15.8 \%$ of all 2005 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to $14.8 \%$ in 2004. $6.6 \%$ of DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly higher than $6.2 \%$ in 2004 (see Table19).
- In $42.9 \%$ 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 $53.8 \%$ of these nonconvicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers had been drinking and that their ability was impaired (see Table 21).
- Non-arrested or non-convicted drivers in alcohol-involved fatal/injury crashes in 2005 were less likely to have a prior conviction within ten years for DUI or alcoholrelated reckless driving than did drivers who were arrested in conjunction with the crash (see Tables 25a and 25b).
- About two-thirds ( $67.5 \%$ ) of arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 26a).
- Among 2005 HBD drivers in fatal/injury crashes, 32.4\% were involved in crashes with fixed objects, while $55.1 \%$ were involved in multiple vehicle crashes. With increasing age, the proportion of HBD drivers in fixed object crashes declined, while the proportion of HBD drivers in multiple vehicle crashes increased (see Table 24c).

TABLE 19: DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 1995-2005

|  | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TOTAL DUI ARRESTS | 198982 | 201765 | 191164 | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 |
| PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS | $12.5 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |
| ASSOCIATED WITH <br> CRASHES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS <br> ASSOCIATED WITH <br> CRASHES INVOLVING <br> INJURIES/FATALITIES | $6.0 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ |

TABLE 20: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE*

| SOBRIETY CODE | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  | UNKNOWN |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TOTAL | 20818 | 100.0 | 8882 | 42.7 | 8041 | 38.6 | 1519 | 7.3 | 1121 | 5.4 | 1255 | 6.0 |
| HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 15881 | 76.3 | 6887 | 43.4 | 6535 | 41.1 | 1102 | 6.9 | 823 | 5.2 | 534 | 3.4 |
| HBD-NOT KNOWN IF <br> IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 2012 | 9.7 | 614 | 30.5 | 591 | 29.4 | 137 | 6.8 | 79 | 3.9 | 591 | 29.4 |
| HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2925 | 14.0 | 1381 | 47.2 | 915 | 31.3 | 280 | 9.6 | 219 | 7.5 | 130 | 4.4 |

*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2005 California Highway Patrol data files.

TABLE 21: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY
CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE*

| SOBRIETY CODE | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF CONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISDEMEANOR } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | ALCOHOLRECKLESS |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YOUTH } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTIONS |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% |
| TOTAL | 18230 | 100.0 | 7875 | 43.2 | 1979 | 10.9 | 480 | 2.6 | 77 | 0.4 | 7819 | 42.9 |
| HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC . $08 \%$ \& ABOVE) | 14399 | 79.0 | 7728 | 53.7 | 1929 | 13.4 | 473 | 3.3 | 61 | 0.4 | 4208 | 29.2 |
| HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 1133 | 6.2 | 121 | 10.7 | 39 | 3.4 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.3 | 968 | 85.4 |
| HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2661 | 14.6 | 21 | 0.8 | 7 | 0.3 | 5 | 0.2 | 13 | 0.5 | 2615 | 98.3 |
| HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 20 | 0.1 | 5 | 25.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 65.0 |
| NOT REPORTED | 17 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 11.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 88.2 |

*For each sobriety code, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2005 California Highway Patrol data files, and include only cases where the drivers license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 22: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND SOBRIETY LEVEL

| COUNTY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | SOBRIETY LEVEL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) |  | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) |  | HBD-NOT IMPAIREL (BAC .01\%-.049\%) |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 7790 | 4214 | 54.1 | 957 | 12.3 | 2619 | 33.6 |
| ALAMEDA | 296 | 170 | 57.4 | 26 | 8.8 | 100 | 33.8 |
| AMADOR | 20 | 10 | 50.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 7 | 35.0 |
| BUTTE | 52 | 27 | 51.9 | 8 | 15.4 | 17 | 32.7 |
| CALAVARAS | 24 | 11 | 45.8 | 2 | 8.3 | 11 | 45.8 |
| COLUSA | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 142 | 74 | 52.1 | 21 | 14.8 | 47 | 33.1 |
| DEL NORTE | 6 | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 4 | 66.7 |
| EL DORADO | 48 | 26 | 54.2 | 6 | 12.5 | 16 | 33.3 |
| FRESNO | 242 | 174 | 71.9 | 20 | 8.3 | 48 | 19.8 |
| GLENN | 9 | 7 | 77.8 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 |
| HUMBOLDT | 41 | 31 | 75.6 | 4 | 9.8 | 6 | 14.6 |
| IMPERIAL | 42 | 31 | 73.8 | 2 | 4.8 | 9 | 21.4 |
| INYO | 12 | 3 | 25.0 | 4 | 33.3 | 5 | 41.7 |
| KERN | 184 | 109 | 59.2 | 20 | 10.9 | 55 | 29.9 |
| KINGS | 46 | 27 | 58.7 | 5 | 10.9 | 14 | 30.4 |
| LAKE | 31 | 15 | 48.4 | 2 | 6.5 | 14 | 45.2 |
| LASSEN | 11 | 9 | 81.8 | 1 | 9.1 | 1 | 9.1 |
| LOS ANGELES | 1764 | 908 | 51.5 | 236 | 13.4 | 620 | 35.1 |
| MADERA | 59 | 34 | 57.6 | 7 | 11.9 | 18 | 30.5 |
| MARIN | 45 | 23 | 51.1 | 2 | 4.4 | 20 | 44.4 |
| MARIPOSA | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 27 | 16 | 59.3 | 5 | 18.5 | 6 | 22.2 |
| MERCED | 80 | 48 | 60.0 | 8 | 10.0 | 24 | 30.0 |
| MODOC | 3 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 33.3 |
| MONO | 3 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 |
| MONTEREY | 56 | 33 | 58.9 | 7 | 12.5 | 16 | 28.6 |
| NAPA | 41 | 14 | 34.1 | 8 | 19.5 | 19 | 46.3 |
| NEVADA | 41 | 21 | 51.2 | 4 | 9.8 | 16 | 39.0 |
| ORANGE | 462 | 195 | 42.2 | 68 | 14.7 | 199 | 43.1 |
| PLACER | 57 | 29 | 50.9 | 5 | 8.8 | 23 | 40.4 |
| PLUMAS | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 528 | 337 | 63.8 | 49 | 9.3 | 142 | 26.9 |
| SACRAMENTO | 361 | 200 | 55.4 | 36 | 10.0 | 125 | 34.6 |
| SAN BENITO | 41 | 25 | 61.0 | 6 | 14.6 | 10 | 24.4 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 612 | 345 | 56.4 | 78 | 12.7 | 189 | 30.9 |
| SAN DIEGO | 722 | 380 | 52.6 | 87 | 12.0 | 255 | 35.3 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 166 | 70 | 42.2 | 19 | 11.4 | 77 | 46.4 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 172 | 108 | 62.8 | 15 | 8.7 | 49 | 28.5 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 47 | 23 | 48.9 | 8 | 17.0 | 16 | 34.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 89 | 45 | 50.6 | 11 | 12.4 | 33 | 37.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 97 | 42 | 43.3 | 17 | 17.5 | 38 | 39.2 |
| SANTA CLARA | 209 | 108 | 51.7 | 33 | 15.8 | 68 | 32.5 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 54 | 26 | 48.1 | 13 | 24.1 | 15 | 27.8 |
| SHASTA | 56 | 27 | 48.2 | 9 | 16.1 | 20 | 35.7 |
| SISKIYOU | 16 | 10 | 62.5 | 3 | 18.8 | 3 | 18.8 |
| SOLANO | 76 | 39 | 51.3 | 8 | 10.5 | 29 | 38.2 |
| SONOMA | 110 | 44 | 40.0 | 12 | 10.9 | 54 | 49.1 |
| STANISLAUS | 158 | 102 | 64.6 | 15 | 9.5 | 41 | 25.9 |
| SUTTER | 24 | 10 | 41.7 | 4 | 16.7 | 10 | 41.7 |
| TEHAMA | 16 | 6 | 37.5 | 5 | 31.3 | 5 | 31.3 |
| TRINITY | 13 | 9 | 69.2 | 2 | 15.4 | 2 | 15.4 |
| TULARE | 136 | 73 | 53.7 | 17 | 12.5 | 46 | 33.8 |
| TUOLUMNE | 25 | 9 | 36.0 | 6 | 24.0 | 10 | 40.0 |
| VENTURA | 165 | 92 | 55.8 | 21 | 12.7 | 52 | 31.5 |
| YOLO | 36 | 22 | 61.1 | 4 | 11.1 | 10 | 27.8 |
| YUBA | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 23: HAD BEEN DRINKING DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 1995-2005

| AGE |  | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL (ALL AGES) | $N$ | 22804 | 21959 | 19277 | 19080 | 18720 | 19591 | 20530 | 20633 | 20632 | 20847 | 20818 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } \\ 18 \end{gathered}$ | $N$ | 399 | 459 | 407 | 375 | 354 | 366 | 375 | 382 | 376 | 409 | 351 |
|  | \% | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 |
| 18-20 | $N$ | 1711 | 1796 | 1509 | 1608 | 1678 | 1811 | 1943 | 2016 | 1894 | 1943 | 1946 |
|  | \% | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 9.4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNDER } \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | $N$ | 2110 | 2255 | 1916 | 1983 | 2032 | 2177 | 2318 | 2398 | 2270 | 2352 | 2297 |
|  | \% | 9.3 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.0 |

TABLE 24a: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES* BY AGE AND SEX

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $N$ | $\%$ |  |
| TOTAL | 20818 | 100.0 | 16584 | 79.7 | 4234 | 20.3 |
| UNDER 18 | 351 | 1.7 | 255 | 72.6 | 96 | 27.4 |
| 18-20 | 1946 | 9.3 | 1528 | 78.5 | 418 | 21.5 |
| $21-30$ | 7896 | 37.9 | 6345 | 80.4 | 1551 | 19.6 |
| $31-40$ | 4027 | 19.3 | 3211 | 79.7 | 816 | 20.3 |
| $41-50$ | 3440 | 16.5 | 2607 | 75.8 | 833 | 24.2 |
| 51-59 | 1487 | 7.1 | 1192 | 80.2 | 295 | 19.8 |
| 60-69 | 534 | 2.6 | 425 | 79.6 | 109 | 20.4 |
| 70 \& ABOVE | 248 | 1.2 | 198 | 79.8 | 50 | 20.2 |
| AGE UNKNOWN | 889 | 4.3 | 823 | 92.6 | 66 | 7.4 |

*These data are derived from the 2005 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 24b: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ |  | $N$ | $\%$ |
| TOTAL | 5059 | 100.0 | 3971 | 78.5 | 1088 | 21.5 |
| UNDER 18 | 95 | 1.9 | 71 | 74.7 | 24 | 25.3 |
| $18-20$ | 366 | 7.2 | 291 | 79.5 | 75 | 20.5 |
| $21-30$ | 2021 | 39.9 | 1591 | 78.7 | 430 | 21.3 |
| $31-40$ | 992 | 19.6 | 809 | 81.6 | 183 | 18.4 |
| $41-50$ | 877 | 17.3 | 676 | 77.1 | 201 | 22.9 |
| $51-59$ | 416 | 8.2 | 320 | 76.9 | 96 | 23.1 |
| $60-69$ | 186 | 3.7 | 132 | 71.0 | 54 | 29.0 |
| $70 \&$ ABOVE | 106 | 2.1 | 81 | 76.4 | 25 | 23.6 |

These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above, and include only cases where the drivers license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 24c: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND TYPE OF CRASH

| AGE | $\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{N}$ | TYPE OF CRASH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | VEH/FIXED OBJECT |  | VEHICLEPEDESTRIAN |  | MULTIPLE <br> VEHICLE |  | VEHICLEBICYCLE |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| TOTAL | 18192 | 5894 | 32.4 | 357 | 2.0 | 10028 | 55.1 | 136 | 0.7 | 1777 | 9.8 |
| UNDER 18 | 308 | 142 | 46.1 | 2 | 0.6 | 132 | 42.9 | 2 | 0.6 | 30 | 9.7 |
| 18-20 | 1801 | 778 | 43.2 | 22 | 1.2 | 787 | 43.7 | 5 | 0.3 | 209 | 11.6 |
| 21-30 | 7164 | 2539 | 35.4 | 117 | 1.6 | 3807 | 53.1 | 25 | 0.3 | 676 | 9.4 |
| 31-40 | 3688 | 1101 | 29.9 | 80 | 2.2 | 2113 | 57.3 | 30 | 0.8 | 364 | 9.9 |
| 41-50 | 3152 | 835 | 26.5 | 69 | 2.2 | 1916 | 60.8 | 35 | 1.1 | 297 | 9.4 |
| 51-60 | 1453 | 373 | 25.7 | 36 | 2.5 | 860 | 59.2 | 26 | 1.8 | 158 | 10.9 |
| 61-70 | 443 | 92 | 20.8 | 17 | 3.8 | 294 | 66.4 | 9 | 2.0 | 31 | 7.0 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 183 | 34 | 18.6 | 14 | 7.7 | 119 | 65.0 | 4 | 2.2 | 12 | 6.6 |

TABLE 25a: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN 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 | 18230 | 100.0 | 7326 | 40.2 | 8116 | 44.5 | 2082 | 11.4 | 543 | 3.0 | 163 | 0.9 |
| HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC . $08 \%$ \& ABOVE) | 14399 | 79.0 | 4116 | 28.6 | 7640 | 53.1 | 1969 | 13.7 | 521 | 3.6 | 153 | 1.1 |
| HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 1133 | 6.2 | 806 | 71.1 | 240 | 21.2 | 72 | 6.4 | 8 | 0.7 | 7 | 0.6 |
| HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2661 | 14.6 | 2379 | 89.4 | 226 | 8.5 | 40 | 1.5 | 13 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.1 |
| HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 20 | 0.1 | 13 | 65.0 | 7 | 35.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| NOT REPORTED | 17 | 0.1 | 12 | 70.6 | 3 | 17.6 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 | 0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 25b: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)*

| 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 | 5059 | 100.0 | 4332 | 85.6 | 531 | 10.5 | 146 | 2.9 | 41 | 0.8 | 9 | 0.2 |
| HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC . $08 \%$ \& ABOVE) | 1637 | 32.4 | 1306 | 79.8 | 232 | 14.2 | 70 | 4.3 | 25 | 1.5 | 4 | 0.2 |
| HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 891 | 17.6 | 742 | 83.3 | 103 | 11.6 | 40 | 4.5 | 4 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.2 |
| HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2504 | 49.5 | 2260 | 90.3 | 194 | 7.7 | 35 | 1.4 | 12 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.1 |
| HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 12 | 0.2 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| NOT REPORTED | 15 | 0.3 | 12 | 80.0 | 2 | 13.3 | 1 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

*These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.
TABLE 26a: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS

| CRASHES | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TOTAL | 18230 | 100.0 | 7326 | 40.2 | 8116 | 44.5 | 2082 | 11.4 | 543 | 3.0 | 163 | 0.9 |
| FATAL | 1097** | 6.0 | 741 | 67.5 | 264 | 24.1 | 72 | 6.6 | 15 | 1.4 | 5 | 0.5 |
| INJURY | 17133 | 94.0 | 6585 | 38.4 | 7852 | 45.8 | 2010 | 11.7 | 528 | 3.1 | 158 | 0.9 |

TABLE 26b: 2005 HAD BEEN DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)

| CRASHES | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TOTAL | 5059 | 100.0 | 4332 | 85.6 | 531 | 10.5 | 146 | 2.9 | 41 | 0.8 | 9 | 0.2 |
| FATAL | 804** | 15.9 | 630 | 78.4 | 124 | 15.4 | 40 | 5.0 | 8 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.2 |
| INJURY | 4255 | 84.1 | 3702 | 87.0 | 407 | 9.6 | 106 | 2.5 | 33 | 0.8 | 7 | 0.2 |

*These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.
**The records of $87.8 \%$ (706) of these cases indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 27: 2005 REPORTED* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES

| BAC LEVEL | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | 153 | 1.3 |
| . 01 | 34 | 0.3 |
| . 02 | 61 | 0.5 |
| . 03 | 68 | 0.6 |
| . 04 | 93 | 0.8 |
| . 05 | 143 | 1.2 |
| . 06 | 163 | 1.4 |
| . 07 | 237 | 2.0 |
| . 08 | 380 | 3.2 |
| . 09 | 426 | 3.6 |
| . 10 | 550 | 4.6 |
| . 11 | 584 | 4.9 |
| . 12 | 603 | 5.1 |
| . 13 | 672 | 5.7 |
| . 14 | 645 | 5.4 |
| . 15 | 705 | 5.9 |
| . 16 | 727 | 6.1 |
| . 17 | 757 | 6.4 |
| . 18 | 691 | 5.8 |
| . 19 | 624 | 5.3 |
| . 20 | 577 | 4.9 |
| . 21 | 516 | 4.4 |
| . 22 | 433 | 3.7 |
| . 23 | 359 | 3.0 |
| . 24 | 323 | 2.7 |
| . 25 | 294 | 2.5 |
| . 26 | 202 | 1.7 |
| . 27 | 178 | 1.5 |
| . 28 | 153 | 1.3 |
| . 29 | 117 | 1.0 |
| . 30 | 83 | 0.7 |
| . 31 | 61 | 0.5 |
| . 32 | 59 | 0.5 |
| . 33 | 38 | 0.3 |
| . 34 | 39 | 0.3 |
| . 35 | 29 | 0.2 |
| . 36 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 37 | 16 | 0.1 |
| . 38 | 8 | 0.1 |
| . 39 | 13 | 0.1 |
| . 40 | 10 | 0.1 |
| . 41 | 7 | 0.1 |
| . 42 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 43 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 44 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 45 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 46 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 47 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 50 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 51 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 60 | 1 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | ------------ | --------- |
|  | MEAN** BAC . 16 |  |
|  | MEDIAN** BAC. 16 |  |

*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted alcohol-crash drivers ( $60.9 \%$ of the records showed BAC levels).
**The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be related to drivers driving under the influence of drugs.

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

## DUI Arrest Data:

Arrest data are reported to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Criminal Justice Statistics 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 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. Although the 1993 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System documented the fact that thousands of DUI convictions appearing in court records did not appear on the DMV driver record database, an upcoming study by DMV's Justice and Government Branch will document the current level of discrepancy.

## 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 their annual report.

## HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975

AB 1165 (Maze), effective $1 / 1 / 2009$, authorizes law enforcement to issue a notice of suspension and impound the vehicle of a convicted DUI offender, who is on probation and is driving with a BAC of $0.01 \%$ or greater (as measured by a preliminary alcohol screen test or other chemical test).

SB 1756 (Migden), effective $1 / 1 / 2007$, extends driver's license suspension from 6 to 10 months for a person convicted of a first DUI offense, who is granted probation, and whose blood alcohol level (BAC) is $0.20 \%$ or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

AB 2520 (Committee on Transportation), effective $1 / 1 / 2007$, requires the DMV to immediately suspend (APS action) the commercial driver's license of a driver operating a commercial vehicle with a blood alcohol level (BAC) of $0.04 \%$ or greater.

AB 2559 (Benoit), effective 1/1/2007, reorganizes the section of the Penal Code 192 (c) (3) related to gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, to include the offense where the intoxication was a contributing factor in the killing.

AB 2752 (Spitzer), effective 1/1/2007, makes it an infraction for a person under the age of 21 to drive with any measurable $(0.01 \%$ or greater) blood alcohol concentration. Persons under the age of 21 will now be subject to criminal penalties.

AB 3045 (Koretz), effective $1 / 1 / 2007$, requires the DMV to verify installment of an ignition interlock device (IID) before reinstating the driving privilege, when an IID restriction is imposed by the courts.

SB 207 (Scott), effective 1/1/2006, establishes a statewide administrative vehicle impoundment program for repeat DUI offenders, when the driver's BAC level is $0.10 \%$ or more by weight, or when the driver refuses to submit to a chemical test. If the driver has one prior DUI conviction within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 5 days, and if the driver has two or more prior DUI convictions within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 15 days.

SB 547 (Cox), effective 1/1/2006, establishes a pilot program in Sacramento County that would authorize a peace officer to impound a person's vehicle for up to 30 days, if the driver has one or more prior DUI convictions within the past 10 years. Vehicle impoundment will take place in combination with a DUI intervention program established by the county. This bill shall remain operative until January 1, 2009, and would require the county to report the effectiveness of the pilot program to the Legislature.

SB 571 (Levine), effective 1/1/2006, lowers the blood alcohol level (BAC) at which the court must consider enhanced penalties from $0.20 \%$ to $0.15 \%$, if a person is convicted of DUI.

AB 979 (Runner), effective $1 / 1 / 2006$, reduces the mandatory suspension/revocation period, from a 12 to 30 month range to 12 months for repeat DUI offenders, before they become eligible to obtain a restricted driver's license. The license restriction requires the installation of an ignition interlock device (IID). This bill allows for a mandatory 30-day vehicle impoundment period if a person is operating the vehicle in violation of the ignition interlock device restriction.

AB 1353 (Liu), effective 9/20/2005, increases the duration of alcohol treatment programs from 6 to 9 months (consisting of at least 60 hours of program activities) for first DUI offenders, who are granted probation, and whose blood alcohol content (BAC) is $0.20 \%$ or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

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 courtordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all persons convicted 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, but does not specify sanctions for cases involving injury.

AB 762 (Torlakson), effective $7 / 1 / 1999$, 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 7/1/1999, 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 $23247(\mathrm{~g})$; requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under section $23246(\mathrm{~g})$ ] 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 $7 / 1 / 1999$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1999$, requires that, upon a conviction of an alcoholrelated 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 (Hurtt), effective $1 / 1 / 1999$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1999$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1998$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1998$, 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 1/1/1997, 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 1/1/1997, permits DMV to suspend a driver license on a first Failure to appear (FTA) for DUI, and establishes an enhanced audit and tracking system to compare DUI arrests with subsequent actions.

SB 833 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1996, 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 $1 / 1 / 1995$, 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 1/1/1995, 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 1/1/1995, 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 9/30/1994, 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 1/1/1994, 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 1/1/1994, 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 7/1/1993, 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 7/1/1993, changes the effective date of APS suspension from 45 to 30 days after the notice is given.

SB 1600 (Bergeson), effective 9/26/1992, 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 1/1/1992, 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 $1 / 1 / 1992$, 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 9/28/1990, 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 7/26/1990, provides clean-up legislation for APS; lowers the BAC level from $0.10 \%$ to $0.08 \%$, 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 7/1/1990, 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 $1 / 1 / 1990$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1990$, 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 1/1/1990, modifies AB 7 (Hart) to establish a BAC level of $0.08 \%$ or higher as per se evidence of impaired driving.

SB 1119 (Seymour), effective $1 / 1 / 1990$ for vessel provisions and $1 / 1 / 1992$ for commercial driver provisions, prohibits the operation of a commercial vehicle by a person with a BAC of $0.04 \%$ or above; requires a commercial vehicle driver to be
ordered out of service for 24 hours if found with a BAC at or above $0.01 \%$, but less than $0.04 \%$; 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 $1 / 1 / 1990$, 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 1/1/1990, 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 $1 / 1 / 1989$, allows the $4^{\text {th }}$ 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 1-year or 30-month treatment program.

AB 3563 (Killea), effective $1 / 1 / 1989$, 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 $1 / 1 / 1989$, 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 1/1/1989, 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 $1 / 1 / 1988$, requires that a person who was granted probation for a second DUI offense to show proof of financial responsibility in order to be eligible for the 1-year restricted license.

SB 1365 (Seymour), effective $1 / 1 / 1988$, 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 1/1/1987, 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 1/1/1987, makes it unlawful for a minor to drive with a BAC of $0.05 \%$ 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 1/1/1987, 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 $1 / 1 / 1987$, 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 1/1/1987, 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 7/1/1986, 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 9/29/1985, 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 1/1/1985, 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 $1 / 1 / 1985$, 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 1/1/1984, requires a 1-year license revocation for minors (up to age 18) for a DUI conviction (Sections 23152, 23153 CVC).

SB 1601 (Sieroty), effective $7 / 1 / 1982$, 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 1/1/1982, makes it a misdemeanor under CVC 23152(b) to drive a vehicle with a BAC level of $0.10 \%$ or higher. Drivers with lower BAC levels $(0.05 \%-$ $0.09 \%$ ) can be convicted of DUI when sufficient behavioral evidence of impairment is apparent.

AB 541 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/1982, 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 $1 / 1 / 1978$, extends the pilot 12-month alcohol treatment program for repeat offenders statewide.

SB 330 (Gregorio), effective $1 / 1 / 1976$, 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.
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## 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 28 th 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., . 01, .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, 23153, 23140, of the California Vehicle Code, Penal Codes 191.5a, b, 192.3c, d, US Codes J36FR46, J36423, and out of state DUI codes.

## DUI CONVICTION RATE

Percent of DUI convictions divided by the number of DUI arrests (based on year of arrest).

## 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.

## MEAN

Arithmetic average computed by adding up all the values and dividing them by the number of values.

## MEDIAN

The median is the midpoint in a set of values arranged from lowest to highest, so that half of the values are below and half are above.

## p

$p$ stands for probability. For example, if $p<.05$, the probability is less than 5 chances in 100 that the difference 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 excercised 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.

## STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

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

APPENDICES

## 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 bloodalcohol 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.
q XIGNGddV


| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 197248 | 161581 | 81.9 | 35667 | 18.1 | 79644 | 40.4 | 90296 | 45.8 | 13734 | 7.0 | 13574 | 6.9 |
| ALAMEDA | UNDER 18 | 41 | 23 | 56.1 | 18 | 43.9 | 17 | 41.5 | 16 | 39.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 7 | 17.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 558 | 449 | 80.5 | 109 | 19.5 | 179 | 32.1 | 227 | 40.7 | 74 | 13.3 | 78 | 14.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 3249 | 2576 | 79.3 | 673 | 20.7 | 875 | 26.9 | 1334 | 41.1 | 585 | 18.0 | 455 | 14.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 1650 | 1345 | 81.5 | 305 | 18.5 | 438 | 26.5 | 640 | 38.8 | 404 | 24.5 | 168 | 10.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 1173 | 916 | 78.1 | 257 | 21.9 | 518 | 44.2 | 273 | 23.3 | 278 | 23.7 | 104 | 8.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 450 | 376 | 83.6 | 74 | 16.4 | 213 | 47.3 | 84 | 18.7 | 107 | 23.8 | 46 | 10.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 108 | 96 | 88.9 | 12 | 11.1 | 64 | 59.3 | 10 | 9.3 | 24 | 22.2 | 10 | 9.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 24 | 20 | 83.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 13 | 54.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 7 | 29.2 | 1 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 7253 | 5801 | 80.0 | 1452 | 20.0 | 2317 | 31.9 | 2587 | 35.7 | 1480 | 20.4 | 869 | 12.0 |
| ALPINE | 21-30 | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 8 | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 5 | 62.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 22 | 19 | 86.4 | 3 | 13.6 | 17 | 77.3 | 2 | 9.1 | 2 | 9.1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| AMADOR | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 18 | 17 | 94.4 | 1 | 5.6 | 13 | 72.2 | 4 | 22.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 93 | 77 | 82.8 | 16 | 17.2 | 70 | 75.3 | 18 | 19.4 | 1 | 1.1 | 4 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 64 | 52 | 81.3 | 12 | 18.8 | 50 | 78.1 | 9 | 14.1 | 2 | 3.1 | 3 | 4.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 108 | 73 | 67.6 | 35 | 32.4 | 95 | 88.0 | 7 | 6.5 | 1 | 0.9 | 5 | 4.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 42 | 31 | 73.8 | 11 | 26.2 | 31 | 73.8 | 5 | 11.9 | 2 | 4.8 | 4 | 9.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 17 | 89.5 | 2 | 10.5 | 15 | 78.9 | 2 | 10.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 10.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 352 | 274 | 77.8 | 78 | 22.2 | 282 | 80.1 | 45 | 12.8 | 6 | 1.7 | 19 | 5.4 |
| BUTTE | UNDER 18 | 21 | 17 | 81.0 | 4 | 19.0 | 16 | 76.2 | 3 | 14.3 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 204 | 163 | 79.9 | 41 | 20.1 | 164 | 80.4 | 27 | 13.2 | 4 | 2.0 | 9 | 4.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 687 | 592 | 86.2 | 95 | 13.8 | 516 | 75.1 | 122 | 17.8 | 21 | 3.1 | 28 | 4.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 279 | 230 | 82.4 | 49 | 17.6 | 219 | 78.5 | 48 | 17.2 | 7 | 2.5 | 5 | 1.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 269 | 199 | 74.0 | 70 | 26.0 | 228 | 84.8 | 24 | 8.9 | 9 | 3.3 | 8 | 3.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 136 | 101 | 74.3 | 35 | 25.7 | 118 | 86.8 | 10 | 7.4 | 4 | 2.9 | 4 | 2.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 39 | 33 | 84.6 | 6 | 15.4 | 35 | 89.7 | 3 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 9 | 75.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1647 | 1346 | 81.7 | 301 | 18.3 | 1305 | 79.2 | 239 | 14.5 | 47 | 2.9 | 56 | 3.4 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 17 | 14 | 82.4 | 3 | 17.6 | 15 | 88.2 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 102 | 85 | 83.3 | 17 | 16.7 | 88 | 86.3 | 14 | 13.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 61 | 41 | 67.2 | 20 | 32.8 | 51 | 83.6 | 10 | 16.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 70 | 44 | 62.9 | 26 | 37.1 | 67 | 95.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 53 | 37 | 69.8 | 16 | 30.2 | 48 | 90.6 | 4 | 7.5 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 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 | 319 | 235 | 73.7 | 84 | 26.3 | 283 | 88.7 | 31 | 9.7 | 3 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.6 |
| COLUSA | UNDER 18 | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 6 | 31.6 | 12 | 63.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 97 | 86 | 88.7 | 11 | 11.3 | 30 | 30.9 | 59 | 60.8 | 2 | 2.1 | 6 | 6.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 54 | 47 | 87.0 | 7 | 13.0 | 20 | 37.0 | 27 | 50.0 | 1 | 1.9 | 6 | 11.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 49 | 39 | 79.6 | 10 | 20.4 | 27 | 55.1 | 21 | 42.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 29 | 25 | 86.2 | 4 | 13.8 | 18 | 62.1 | 8 | 27.6 | 2 | 6.9 | 1 | 3.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 11 | 10 | 90.9 | 1 | 9.1 | 5 | 45.5 | 5 | 45.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 9.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 268 | 232 | 86.6 | 36 | 13.4 | 107 | 39.9 | 140 | 52.2 | 6 | 2.2 | 15 | 5.6 |
| CONTRA COSTA | UNDER 18 | 53 | 44 | 83.0 | 9 | 17.0 | 33 | 62.3 | 15 | 28.3 | 1 | 1.9 | 4 | 7.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 330 | 265 | 80.3 | 65 | 19.7 | 167 | 50.6 | 113 | 34.2 | 17 | 5.2 | 33 | 10.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 1694 | 1356 | 80.0 | 338 | 20.0 | 699 | 41.3 | 626 | 37.0 | 194 | 11.5 | 175 | 10.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 860 | 703 | 81.7 | 157 | 18.3 | 309 | 35.9 | 302 | 35.1 | 184 | 21.4 | 65 | 7.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 660 | 478 | 72.4 | 182 | 27.6 | 389 | 58.9 | 112 | 17.0 | 108 | 16.4 | 51 | 7.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 328 | 268 | 81.7 | 60 | 18.3 | 203 | 61.9 | 43 | 13.1 | 58 | 17.7 | 24 | 7.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 67 | 60 | 89.6 | 7 | 10.4 | 49 | 73.1 | 8 | 11.9 | 6 | 9.0 | 4 | 6.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 10 | 83.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4004 | 3185 | 79.5 | 819 | 20.5 | 1859 | 46.4 | 1219 | 30.4 | 570 | 14.2 | 356 | 8.9 |
| DEL NORTE | UNDER 18 | 4 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 28 | 21 | 75.0 | 7 | 25.0 | 23 | 82.1 | 3 | 10.7 | 1 | 3.6 | 1 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 91 | 75 | 82.4 | 16 | 17.6 | 75 | 82.4 | 9 | 9.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 7.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 49 | 35 | 71.4 | 14 | 28.6 | 41 | 83.7 | 4 | 8.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 8.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 59 | 40 | 67.8 | 19 | 32.2 | 55 | 93.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 20 | 76.9 | 6 | 23.1 | 24 | 92.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 9 | 90.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 272 | 207 | 76.1 | 65 | 23.9 | 236 | 86.8 | 18 | 6.6 | 1 | 0.4 | 17 | 6.3 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 18 | 13 | 72.2 | 5 | 27.8 | 16 | 88.9 | 1 | 5.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 126 | 102 | 81.0 | 24 | 19.0 | 102 | 81.0 | 20 | 15.9 | 1 | 0.8 | 3 | 2.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 473 | 377 | 79.7 | 96 | 20.3 | 383 | 81.0 | 76 | 16.1 | 2 | 0.4 | 12 | 2.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 317 | 264 | 83.3 | 53 | 16.7 | 259 | 81.7 | 47 | 14.8 | 3 | 0.9 | 8 | 2.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 291 | 198 | 68.0 | 93 | 32.0 | 264 | 90.7 | 16 | 5.5 | 5 | 1.7 | 6 | 2.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 155 | 121 | 78.1 | 34 | 21.9 | 144 | 92.9 | 8 | 5.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 1.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 25 | 20 | 80.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 24 | 96.0 | 1 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1411 | 1099 | 77.9 | 312 | 22.1 | 1198 | 84.9 | 169 | 12.0 | 11 | 0.8 | 33 | 2.3 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 74 | 66 | 89.2 | 8 | 10.8 | 21 | 28.4 | 50 | 67.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 750 | 643 | 85.7 | 107 | 14.3 | 172 | 22.9 | 517 | 68.9 | 27 | 3.6 | 34 | 4.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 3444 | 3003 | 87.2 | 441 | 12.8 | 705 | 20.5 | 2450 | 71.1 | 121 | 3.5 | 168 | 4.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 1791 | 1560 | 87.1 | 231 | 12.9 | 333 | 18.6 | 1288 | 71.9 | 93 | 5.2 | 77 | 4.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 1124 | 901 | 80.2 | 223 | 19.8 | 345 | 30.7 | 668 | 59.4 | 81 | 7.2 | 30 | 2.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 520 | 456 | 87.7 | 64 | 12.3 | 195 | 37.5 | 255 | 49.0 | 49 | 9.4 | 21 | 4.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 99 | 86 | 86.9 | 13 | 13.1 | 46 | 46.5 | 40 | 40.4 | 7 | 7.1 | 6 | 6.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 24 | 21 | 87.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 15 | 62.5 | 6 | 25.0 | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 7826 | 6736 | 86.1 | 1090 | 13.9 | 1832 | 23.4 | 5274 | 67.4 | 379 | 4.8 | 341 | 4.4 |
| GLENN | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 60 | 51 | 85.0 | 9 | 15.0 | 26 | 43.3 | 31 | 51.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 3.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 179 | 163 | 91.1 | 16 | 8.9 | 76 | 42.5 | 96 | 53.6 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 3.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 132 | 115 | 87.1 | 17 | 12.9 | 50 | 37.9 | 77 | 58.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 3.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 92 | 73 | 79.3 | 19 | 20.7 | 69 | 75.0 | 19 | 20.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 4.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 35 | 28 | 80.0 | 7 | 20.0 | 30 | 85.7 | 5 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 4 | 57.1 | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 14.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 512 | 442 | 86.3 | 70 | 13.7 | 260 | 50.8 | 231 | 45.1 | 3 | 0.6 | 18 | 3.5 |
| HUMBOLDT | UNDER 18 | 13 | 10 | 76.9 | 3 | 23.1 | 8 | 61.5 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 7.7 | 3 | 23.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 116 | 85 | 73.3 | 31 | 26.7 | 96 | 82.8 | 10 | 8.6 | 2 | 1.7 | 8 | 6.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 444 | 335 | 75.5 | 109 | 24.5 | 363 | 81.8 | 21 | 4.7 | 14 | 3.2 | 46 | 10.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 246 | 186 | 75.6 | 60 | 24.4 | 203 | 82.5 | 10 | 4.1 | 8 | 3.3 | 25 | 10.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 204 | 155 | 76.0 | 49 | 24.0 | 172 | 84.3 | 9 | 4.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 23 | 11.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 109 | 87 | 79.8 | 22 | 20.2 | 100 | 91.7 | 3 | 2.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 27 | 21 | 77.8 | 6 | 22.2 | 23 | 85.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 14.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1164 | 883 | 75.9 | 281 | 24.1 | 970 | 83.3 | 54 | 4.6 | 25 | 2.1 | 115 | 9.9 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 13 | 11 | 84.6 | 2 | 15.4 | 4 | 30.8 | 9 | 69.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 165 | 130 | 78.8 | 35 | 21.2 | 55 | 33.3 | 100 | 60.6 | 2 | 1.2 | 8 | 4.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 521 | 435 | 83.5 | 86 | 16.5 | 107 | 20.5 | 366 | 70.2 | 18 | 3.5 | 30 | 5.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 318 | 276 | 86.8 | 42 | 13.2 | 65 | 20.4 | 224 | 70.4 | 6 | 1.9 | 23 | 7.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 197 | 173 | 87.8 | 24 | 12.2 | 56 | 28.4 | 133 | 67.5 | 1 | 0.5 | 7 | 3.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 115 | 110 | 95.7 | 5 | 4.3 | 32 | 27.8 | 78 | 67.8 | 2 | 1.7 | 3 | 2.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 30 | 27 | 90.0 | 3 | 10.0 | 13 | 43.3 | 15 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 66.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1371 | 1174 | 85.6 | 197 | 14.4 | 340 | 24.8 | 929 | 67.8 | 29 | 2.1 | 73 | 5.3 |
| INYO | UNDER 18 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 25 | 12 | 48.0 | 13 | 52.0 | 10 | 40.0 | 9 | 36.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 24.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 99 | 80 | 80.8 | 19 | 19.2 | 52 | 52.5 | 16 | 16.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 31 | 31.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 54 | 43 | 79.6 | 11 | 20.4 | 28 | 51.9 | 9 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 17 | 31.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 89 | 63 | 70.8 | 26 | 29.2 | 71 | 79.8 | 12 | 13.5 | 1 | 1.1 | 5 | 5.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 43 | 36 | 83.7 | 7 | 16.3 | 31 | 72.1 | 4 | 9.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 18.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 5 | 35.7 | 3 | 21.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 42.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 334 | 256 | 76.6 | 78 | 23.4 | 207 | 62.0 | 53 | 15.9 | 1 | 0.3 | 73 | 21.9 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 45 | 37 | 82.2 | 8 | 17.8 | 22 | 48.9 | 22 | 48.9 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 455 | 388 | 85.3 | 67 | 14.7 | 160 | 35.2 | 278 | 61.1 | 7 | 1.5 | 10 | 2.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 2265 | 1934 | 85.4 | 331 | 14.6 | 733 | 32.4 | 1370 | 60.5 | 121 | 5.3 | 41 | 1.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 1115 | 941 | 84.4 | 174 | 15.6 | 366 | 32.8 | 635 | 57.0 | 88 | 7.9 | 26 | 2.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 918 | 713 | 77.7 | 205 | 22.3 | 461 | 50.2 | 372 | 40.5 | 67 | 7.3 | 18 | 2.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 322 | 275 | 85.4 | 47 | 14.6 | 185 | 57.5 | 98 | 30.4 | 24 | 7.5 | 15 | 4.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 90 | 82 | 91.1 | 8 | 8.9 | 61 | 67.8 | 21 | 23.3 | 6 | 6.7 | 2 | 2.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 22 | 21 | 95.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 14 | 63.6 | 7 | 31.8 | 1 | 4.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 5232 | 4391 | 83.9 | 841 | 16.1 | 2002 | 38.3 | 2803 | 53.6 | 315 | 6.0 | 112 | 2.1 |
| KINGS | UNDER 18 | 18 | 15 | 83.3 | 3 | 16.7 | 2 | 11.1 | 12 | 66.7 | 2 | 11.1 | 2 | 11.1 |
|  | $18-20$ | 125 | 106 | 84.8 | 19 | 15.2 | 31 | 24.8 | 89 | 71.2 | 2 | 1.6 | 3 | 2.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 625 | 523 | 83.7 | 102 | 16.3 | 179 | 28.6 | 389 | 62.2 | 40 | 6.4 | 17 | 2.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 271 | 223 | 82.3 | 48 | 17.7 | 74 | 27.3 | 174 | 64.2 | 17 | 6.3 | 6 | 2.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 169 | 144 | 85.2 | 25 | 14.8 | 68 | 40.2 | 77 | 45.6 | 17 | 10.1 | 7 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 68 | 59 | 86.8 | 9 | 13.2 | 26 | 38.2 | 38 | 55.9 | 2 | 2.9 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 20 | 20 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 40.0 | 10 | 50.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1297 | 1091 | 84.1 | 206 | 15.9 | 388 | 29.9 | 789 | 60.8 | 83 | 6.4 | 37 | 2.9 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 11 | 10 | 90.9 | 1 | 9.1 | 8 | 72.7 | 1 | 9.1 | 1 | 9.1 | 1 | 9.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 42 | 38 | 90.5 | 4 | 9.5 | 27 | 64.3 | 10 | 23.8 | 1 | 2.4 | 4 | 9.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 135 | 110 | 81.5 | 25 | 18.5 | 85 | 63.0 | 37 | 27.4 | 2 | 1.5 | 11 | 8.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 102 | 81 | 79.4 | 21 | 20.6 | 73 | 71.6 | 19 | 18.6 | 5 | 4.9 | 5 | 4.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 156 | 118 | 75.6 | 38 | 24.4 | 131 | 84.0 | 16 | 10.3 | 4 | 2.6 | 5 | 3.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 63 | 44 | 69.8 | 19 | 30.2 | 52 | 82.5 | 5 | 7.9 | 4 | 6.3 | 2 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 16 | 15 | 93.8 | 1 | 6.3 | 14 | 87.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 8 | 80.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 535 | 424 | 79.3 | 111 | 20.7 | 400 | 74.8 | 90 | 16.8 | 17 | 3.2 | 28 | 5.2 |
| LASSEN | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 22 | 12 | 54.5 | 10 | 45.5 | 16 | 72.7 | 3 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 13.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 66 | 57 | 86.4 | 9 | 13.6 | 44 | 66.7 | 16 | 24.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 9.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 51 | 37 | 72.5 | 14 | 27.5 | 40 | 78.4 | 7 | 13.7 | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 5.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 72 | 56 | 77.8 | 16 | 22.2 | 61 | 84.7 | 5 | 6.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 8.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 6 | 19.4 | 28 | 90.3 | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 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 | 262 | 207 | 79.0 | 55 | 21.0 | 208 | 79.4 | 33 | 12.6 | 2 | 0.8 | 19 | 7.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | UNDER 18 | 169 | 134 | 79.3 | 35 | 20.7 | 70 | 41.4 | 82 | 48.5 | 4 | 2.4 | 13 | 7.7 |
|  | $18-20$ | 2611 | 2072 | 79.4 | 539 | 20.6 | 721 | 27.6 | 1575 | 60.3 | 127 | 4.9 | 188 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 17140 | 13820 | 80.6 | 3320 | 19.4 | 3934 | 23.0 | 10203 | 59.5 | 1228 | 7.2 | 1775 | 10.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 9987 | 8440 | 84.5 | 1547 | 15.5 | 2030 | 20.3 | 6032 | 60.4 | 1103 | 11.0 | 822 | 8.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 6359 | 5344 | 84.0 | 1015 | 16.0 | 1743 | 27.4 | 3249 | 51.1 | 906 | 14.2 | 461 | 7.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 2535 | 2191 | 86.4 | 344 | 13.6 | 835 | 32.9 | 1060 | 41.8 | 423 | 16.7 | 217 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 601 | 526 | 87.5 | 75 | 12.5 | 250 | 41.6 | 177 | 29.5 | 121 | 20.1 | 53 | 8.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 116 | 97 | 83.6 | 19 | 16.4 | 56 | 48.3 | 27 | 23.3 | 22 | 19.0 | 11 | 9.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 39518 | 32624 | 82.6 | 6894 | 17.4 | 9639 | 24.4 | 22405 | 56.7 | 3934 | 10.0 | 3540 | 9.0 |
| MADERA | UNDER 18 | 13 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 15.4 | 11 | 84.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 103 | 94 | 91.3 | 9 | 8.7 | 17 | 16.5 | 82 | 79.6 | 1 | 1.0 | 3 | 2.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 455 | 426 | 93.6 | 29 | 6.4 | 83 | 18.2 | 357 | 78.5 | 7 | 1.5 | 8 | 1.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 252 | 230 | 91.3 | 22 | 8.7 | 62 | 24.6 | 184 | 73.0 | 2 | 0.8 | 4 | 1.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 188 | 156 | 83.0 | 32 | 17.0 | 83 | 44.1 | 96 | 51.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 6 | 3.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 69 | 55 | 79.7 | 14 | 20.3 | 29 | 42.0 | 32 | 46.4 | 3 | 4.3 | 5 | 7.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 17 | 89.5 | 2 | 10.5 | 12 | 63.2 | 6 | 31.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1104 | 995 | 90.1 | 109 | 9.9 | 290 | 26.3 | 770 | 69.7 | 17 | 1.5 | 27 | 2.4 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 21 | 19 | 90.5 | 2 | 9.5 | 14 | 66.7 | 5 | 23.8 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 114 | 87 | 76.3 | 27 | 23.7 | 66 | 57.9 | 35 | 30.7 | 3 | 2.6 | 10 | 8.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 577 | 472 | 81.8 | 105 | 18.2 | 252 | 43.7 | 252 | 43.7 | 25 | 4.3 | 48 | 8.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 366 | 281 | 76.8 | 85 | 23.2 | 218 | 59.6 | 111 | 30.3 | 15 | 4.1 | 22 | 6.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 277 | 184 | 66.4 | 93 | 33.6 | 213 | 76.9 | 33 | 11.9 | 9 | 3.2 | 22 | 7.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 169 | 115 | 68.0 | 54 | 32.0 | 153 | 90.5 | 9 | 5.3 | 3 | 1.8 | 4 | 2.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 45 | 36 | 80.0 | 9 | 20.0 | 38 | 84.4 | 2 | 4.4 | 1 | 2.2 | 4 | 8.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 13 | 92.9 | 1 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1583 | 1205 | 76.1 | 378 | 23.9 | 967 | 61.1 | 448 | 28.3 | 57 | 3.6 | 111 | 7.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 18-20 | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 46 | 40 | 87.0 | 6 | 13.0 | 35 | 76.1 | 8 | 17.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 6.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 23 | 18 | 78.3 | 5 | 21.7 | 18 | 78.3 | 3 | 13.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 8.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 48 | 32 | 66.7 | 16 | 33.3 | 45 | 93.8 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 19 | 73.1 | 7 | 26.9 | 24 | 92.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 161 | 124 | 77.0 | 37 | 23.0 | 138 | 85.7 | 16 | 9.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 4.3 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 14 | 9 | 64.3 | 5 | 35.7 | 9 | 64.3 | 3 | 21.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 14.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 84 | 68 | 81.0 | 16 | 19.0 | 56 | 66.7 | 24 | 28.6 | 1 | 1.2 | 3 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 399 | 313 | 78.4 | 86 | 21.6 | 252 | 63.2 | 106 | 26.6 | 10 | 2.5 | 31 | 7.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 241 | 183 | 75.9 | 58 | 24.1 | 160 | 66.4 | 58 | 24.1 | 3 | 1.2 | 20 | 8.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 196 | 144 | 73.5 | 52 | 26.5 | 148 | 75.5 | 28 | 14.3 | 5 | 2.6 | 15 | 7.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 110 | 87 | 79.1 | 23 | 20.9 | 93 | 84.5 | 10 | 9.1 | 1 | 0.9 | 6 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 6 | 19.4 | 26 | 83.9 | 3 | 9.7 | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 91.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1087 | 841 | 77.4 | 246 | 22.6 | 755 | 69.5 | 232 | 21.3 | 21 | 1.9 | 79 | 7.3 |
| MERCED | UNDER 18 | 16 | 11 | 68.8 | 5 | 31.3 | 2 | 12.5 | 13 | 81.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 205 | 182 | 88.8 | 23 | 11.2 | 54 | 26.3 | 135 | 65.9 | 5 | 2.4 | 11 | 5.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 868 | 785 | 90.4 | 83 | 9.6 | 186 | 21.4 | 622 | 71.7 | 18 | 2.1 | 42 | 4.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 470 | 402 | 85.5 | 68 | 14.5 | 117 | 24.9 | 316 | 67.2 | 22 | 4.7 | 15 | 3.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 267 | 225 | 84.3 | 42 | 15.7 | 86 | 32.2 | 148 | 55.4 | 19 | 7.1 | 14 | 5.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 120 | 98 | 81.7 | 22 | 18.3 | 56 | 46.7 | 52 | 43.3 | 9 | 7.5 | 3 | 2.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 33 | 30 | 90.9 | 3 | 9.1 | 14 | 42.4 | 15 | 45.5 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 44.4 | 3 | 33.3 | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 11.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1988 | 1742 | 87.6 | 246 | 12.4 | 519 | 26.1 | 1304 | 65.6 | 76 | 3.8 | 89 | 4.5 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 18-20 | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 3 | 37.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 21 | 15 | 71.4 | 6 | 28.6 | 15 | 71.4 | 4 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 9.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 23 | 16 | 69.6 | 7 | 30.4 | 18 | 78.3 | 2 | 8.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 13.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 26 | 21 | 80.8 | 5 | 19.2 | 21 | 80.8 | 4 | 15.4 | 1 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 13 | 10 | 76.9 | 3 | 23.1 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 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 | 98 | 76 | 77.6 | 22 | 22.4 | 77 | 78.6 | 14 | 14.3 | 1 | 1.0 | 6 | 6.1 |
| MONO | UNDER 18 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 4 | 57.1 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 28.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 58 | 53 | 91.4 | 5 | 8.6 | 43 | 74.1 | 15 | 25.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 34 | 28 | 82.4 | 6 | 17.6 | 28 | 82.4 | 5 | 14.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 23 | 16 | 69.6 | 7 | 30.4 | 22 | 95.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 16 | 13 | 81.3 | 3 | 18.8 | 12 | 75.0 | 2 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 12.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 149 | 126 | 84.6 | 23 | 15.4 | 119 | 79.9 | 24 | 16.1 | 1 | 0.7 | 5 | 3.4 |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 34 | 27 | 79.4 | 7 | 20.6 | 12 | 35.3 | 20 | 58.8 | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 287 | 257 | 89.5 | 30 | 10.5 | 68 | 23.7 | 214 | 74.6 | 3 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 1406 | 1258 | 89.5 | 148 | 10.5 | 271 | 19.3 | 1055 | 75.0 | 40 | 2.8 | 40 | 2.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 673 | 574 | 85.3 | 99 | 14.7 | 152 | 22.6 | 482 | 71.6 | 19 | 2.8 | 20 | 3.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 377 | 296 | 78.5 | 81 | 21.5 | 183 | 48.5 | 170 | 45.1 | 15 | 4.0 | 9 | 2.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 207 | 164 | 79.2 | 43 | 20.8 | 119 | 57.5 | 66 | 31.9 | 13 | 6.3 | 9 | 4.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 51 | 38 | 74.5 | 13 | 25.5 | 36 | 70.6 | 6 | 11.8 | 6 | 11.8 | 3 | 5.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $17$ | $15$ | $88.2$ | 2 | 11.8 | 14 | 82.4 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 3052 | 2629 | 86.1 | 423 | 13.9 | 855 | 28.0 | 2014 | 66.0 | 98 | 3.2 | 85 | 2.8 |
| NAPA | UNDER 18 | 9 | 7 | 77.8 | 2 | 22.2 | 4 | 44.4 | 4 | 44.4 | 1 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 101 | 87 | 86.1 | 14 | 13.9 | 47 | 46.5 | 51 | 50.5 | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 417 | 348 | 83.5 | 69 | 16.5 | 174 | 41.7 | 216 | 51.8 | 9 | 2.2 | 18 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 239 | 201 | 84.1 | 38 | 15.9 | 117 | 49.0 | 104 | 43.5 | 4 | 1.7 | 14 | 5.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 165 | 129 | 78.2 | 36 | 21.8 | 107 | 64.8 | 40 | 24.2 | 9 | 5.5 | 9 | 5.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 95 | 74 | 77.9 | 21 | 22.1 | 76 | 80.0 | 14 | 14.7 | 2 | 2.1 | 3 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 25 | 18 | 72.0 | 7 | 28.0 | 23 | 92.0 | 1 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.0 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | $5$ | 5 | $100.0$ | 0 | $0.0$ | 4 | $80.0$ | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1056 | 869 | 82.3 | 187 | 17.7 | 552 | 52.3 | 430 | 40.7 | 26 | 2.5 | 48 | 4.5 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 6 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 55 | 40 | 72.7 | 15 | 27.3 | 50 | 90.9 | 4 | 7.3 | 1 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 251 | 202 | 80.5 | 49 | 19.5 | 196 | 78.1 | 49 | 19.5 | 1 | 0.4 | 5 | 2.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 152 | 115 | 75.7 | 37 | 24.3 | 125 | 82.2 | 18 | 11.8 | 5 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 169 | 126 | 74.6 | 43 | 25.4 | 154 | 91.1 | 11 | 6.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 94 | 82 | 87.2 | 12 | 12.8 | 91 | 96.8 | 3 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 29 | 25 | 86.2 | 4 | 13.8 | 25 | 86.2 | 2 | 6.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 758 | 591 | 78.0 | 167 | 22.0 | 649 | 85.6 | 87 | 11.5 | 7 | 0.9 | 15 | 2.0 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 93 | 73 | 78.5 | 20 | 21.5 | 59 | 63.4 | 28 | 30.1 | 3 | 3.2 | 3 | 3.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 1328 | 1060 | 79.8 | 268 | 20.2 | 680 | 51.2 | 513 | 38.6 | 25 | 1.9 | 110 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 7199 | 5903 | 82.0 | 1296 | 18.0 | 2968 | 41.2 | 3345 | 46.5 | 180 | 2.5 | 706 | 9.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 3648 | 3004 | 82.3 | 644 | 17.7 | 1458 | 40.0 | 1722 | 47.2 | 113 | 3.1 | 355 | 9.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 2456 | 1910 | 77.8 | 546 | 22.2 | 1417 | 57.7 | 755 | 30.7 | 73 | 3.0 | 211 | 8.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 988 | 812 | 82.2 | 176 | 17.8 | 627 | 63.5 | 241 | 24.4 | 27 | 2.7 | 93 | 9.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 240 | 189 | 78.8 | 51 | 21.2 | 179 | 74.6 | 37 | 15.4 | 4 | 1.7 | 20 | 8.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 60 | 46 | 76.7 | 14 | 23.3 | 43 | 71.7 | 10 | 16.7 | 2 | 3.3 | 5 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 16012 | 12997 | 81.2 | 3015 | 18.8 | 7431 | 46.4 | 6651 | 41.5 | 427 | 2.7 | 1503 | 9.4 |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 31 | 18 | 58.1 | 13 | 41.9 | 27 | 87.1 | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 | 2 | 6.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 180 | 133 | 73.9 | 47 | 26.1 | 145 | 80.6 | 25 | 13.9 | 5 | 2.8 | 5 | 2.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 947 | 723 | 76.3 | 224 | 23.7 | 695 | 73.4 | 190 | 20.1 | 28 | 3.0 | 34 | 3.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 505 | 390 | 77.2 | 115 | 22.8 | 387 | 76.6 | 78 | 15.4 | 17 | 3.4 | 23 | 4.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 418 | 312 | 74.6 | 106 | 25.4 | 347 | 83.0 | 55 | 13.2 | 6 | 1.4 | 10 | 2.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 211 | 165 | 78.2 | 46 | 21.8 | 184 | 87.2 | 15 | 7.1 | 4 | 1.9 | 8 | 3.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 48 | 38 | 79.2 | 10 | 20.8 | 40 | 83.3 | 6 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 7 | 63.6 | 4 | 36.4 | 10 | 90.9 | 1 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2351 | 1786 | 76.0 | 565 | 24.0 | 1835 | 78.1 | 371 | 15.8 | 61 | 2.6 | 84 | 3.6 |
| PLUMAS | UNDER 18 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 25 | 18 | 72.0 | 7 | 28.0 | 21 | 84.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 8.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 56 | 44 | 78.6 | 12 | 21.4 | 49 | 87.5 | 3 | 5.4 | 1 | 1.8 | 3 | 5.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 63 | 49 | 77.8 | 14 | 22.2 | 55 | 87.3 | 3 | 4.8 | 1 | 1.6 | 4 | 6.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 63 | 46 | 73.0 | 17 | 27.0 | 56 | 88.9 | 4 | 6.3 | 2 | 3.2 | 1 | 1.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 42 | 31 | 73.8 | 11 | 26.2 | 35 | 83.3 | 2 | 4.8 | 3 | 7.1 | 2 | 4.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 262 | 200 | 76.3 | 62 | 23.7 | 228 | 87.0 | 14 | 5.3 | 7 | 2.7 | 13 | 5.0 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 99 | 80 | 80.8 | 19 | 19.2 | 42 | 42.4 | 49 | 49.5 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 4.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 1017 | 870 | 85.5 | 147 | 14.5 | 374 | 36.8 | 567 | 55.8 | 36 | 3.5 | 40 | 3.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 4043 | 3462 | 85.6 | 581 | 14.4 | 1270 | 31.4 | 2473 | 61.2 | 172 | 4.3 | 128 | 3.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 2224 | 1919 | 86.3 | 305 | 13.7 | 676 | 30.4 | 1357 | 61.0 | 135 | 6.1 | 56 | 2.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 1578 | 1207 | 76.5 | 371 | 23.5 | 759 | 48.1 | 654 | 41.4 | 123 | 7.8 | 42 | 2.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 688 | 572 | 83.1 | 116 | 16.9 | 362 | 52.6 | 245 | 35.6 | 51 | 7.4 | 30 | 4.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 195 | 163 | 83.6 | 32 | 16.4 | 124 | 63.6 | 45 | 23.1 | 19 | 9.7 | 7 | 3.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 52 | 46 | 88.5 | 6 | 11.5 | 37 | 71.2 | 12 | 23.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 3.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 9896 | 8319 | 84.1 | 1577 | 15.9 | 3644 | 36.8 | 5402 | 54.6 | 541 | 5.5 | 309 | 3.1 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 73 | 58 | 79.5 | 15 | 20.5 | 42 | 57.5 | 15 | 20.5 |  | 12.3 | 7 | 9.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 696 | 566 | 81.3 | 130 | 18.7 | 307 | 44.1 | 256 | 36.8 | 82 | 11.8 | 51 | 7.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 3489 | 2753 | 78.9 | 736 | 21.1 | 1455 | 41.7 | 1217 | 34.9 | 438 | 12.6 | 379 | 10.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 1682 | 1302 | 77.4 | 380 | 22.6 | 711 | 42.3 | 513 | 30.5 | 322 | 19.1 | 136 | 8.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 1242 | 935 | 75.3 | 307 | 24.7 | 692 | 55.7 | 214 | 17.2 | 252 | 20.3 | 84 | 6.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 502 | 402 | 80.1 | 100 | 19.9 | 295 | 58.8 | 73 | 14.5 | 96 | 19.1 | 38 | 7.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 115 | 96 | 83.5 | 19 | 16.5 | 64 | 55.7 | 22 | 19.1 | 21 | 18.3 | 8 | 7.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 18 | 94.7 | 1 | 5.3 | 13 | 68.4 | 3 | 15.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 15.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 7818 | 6130 | 78.4 | 1688 | 21.6 | 3579 | 45.8 | 2313 | 29.6 | 1220 | 15.6 | 706 | 9.0 |
| SAN BENITO | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 44 | 33 | 75.0 | 11 | 25.0 | 18 | 40.9 | 22 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 9.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 154 | 137 | 89.0 | 17 | 11.0 | 36 | 23.4 | 112 | 72.7 | 2 | 1.3 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 83 | 73 | 88.0 | 10 | 12.0 | 12 | 14.5 | 68 | 81.9 | 1 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 76 | 64 | 84.2 | 12 | 15.8 | 34 | 44.7 | 34 | 44.7 | 1 | 1.3 | 7 | 9.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 22 | 84.6 | 4 | 15.4 | 10 | 38.5 | 14 | 53.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 7.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 10 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 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 | 396 | 342 | 86.4 | 54 | 13.6 | 117 | 29.5 | 256 | 64.6 | 4 | 1.0 | 19 | 4.8 |
| SAN | UNDER 18 | 90 | 71 | 78.9 | 19 | 21.1 | 45 | 50.0 | 41 | 45.6 | 1 | 1.1 | 3 | 3.3 |
| BERNARDINO | 18-20 | 1099 | 934 | 85.0 | 165 | 15.0 | 402 | 36.6 | 607 | 55.2 | 54 | 4.9 | 36 | 3.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 5129 | 4308 | 84.0 | 821 | 16.0 | 1619 | 31.6 | 2996 | 58.4 | 344 | 6.7 | 170 | 3.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 2813 | 2360 | 83.9 | 453 | 16.1 | 814 | 28.9 | 1620 | 57.6 | 278 | 9.9 | 101 | 3.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 2082 | 1687 | 81.0 | 395 | 19.0 | 902 | 43.3 | 880 | 42.3 | 224 | 10.8 | 76 | 3.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 796 | 649 | 81.5 | 147 | 18.5 | 399 | 50.1 | 289 | 36.3 | 85 | 10.7 | 23 | 2.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 185 | 168 | 90.8 | 17 | 9.2 | 110 | 59.5 | 50 | 27.0 | 15 | 8.1 | 10 | 5.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 39 | 33 | 84.6 | 6 | 15.4 | 28 | 71.8 | 9 | 23.1 | 2 | 5.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 12233 | 10210 | 83.5 | 2023 | 16.5 | 4319 | 35.3 | 6492 | 53.1 | 1003 | 8.2 | 419 | 3.4 |

TABLE B1: 2006 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 32 | 28 | 87.5 | 4 | 12.5 | 21 | 65.6 | 7 | 21.9 | 1 | 3.1 | 3 | 9.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 264 | 216 | 81.8 | 48 | 18.2 | 115 | 43.6 | 113 | 42.8 | 4 | 1.5 | 32 | 12.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1568 | 1285 | 82.0 | 283 | 18.0 | 504 | 32.1 | 669 | 42.7 | 76 | 4.8 | 319 | 20.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 755 | 625 | 82.8 | 130 | 17.2 | 270 | 35.8 | 305 | 40.4 | 46 | 6.1 | 134 | 17.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 559 | 430 | 76.9 | 129 | 23.1 | 318 | 56.9 | 114 | 20.4 | 34 | 6.1 | 93 | 16.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 272 | 237 | 87.1 | 35 | 12.9 | 176 | 64.7 | 46 | 16.9 | 15 | 5.5 | 35 | 12.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 73 | 62 | 84.9 | 11 | 15.1 | 55 | 75.3 | 4 | 5.5 | 2 | 2.7 | 12 | 16.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 17 | 89.5 | 1 | 5.3 | 1 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3542 | 2899 | 81.8 | 643 | 18.2 | 1476 | 41.7 | 1259 | 35.5 | 179 | 5.1 | 628 | 17.7 |
| SANTA <br> BARBARA | UNDER 18 | 24 | 19 | 79.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 9 | 37.5 | 15 | 62.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 248 | 209 | 84.3 | 39 | 15.7 | 105 | 42.3 | 138 | 55.6 | 2 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1165 | 943 | 80.9 | 222 | 19.1 | 474 | 40.7 | 602 | 51.7 | 23 | 2.0 | 66 | 5.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 525 | 437 | 83.2 | 88 | 16.8 | 193 | 36.8 | 302 | 57.5 | 15 | 2.9 | 15 | 2.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 450 | 353 | 78.4 | 97 | 21.6 | 224 | 49.8 | 193 | 42.9 | 22 | 4.9 | 11 | 2.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 188 | 149 | 79.3 | 39 | 20.7 | 132 | 70.2 | 49 | 26.1 | 4 | 2.1 | 3 | 1.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 50 | 43 | 86.0 | 7 | 14.0 | 38 | 76.0 | 11 | 22.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 15 | 13 | 86.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 10 | 66.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 3 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2665 | 2166 | 81.3 | 499 | 18.7 | 1185 | 44.5 | 1312 | 49.2 | 69 | 2.6 | 99 | 3.7 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 80 | 55 | 68.8 | 25 | 31.3 | 42 | 52.5 | 30 | 37.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 10.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 526 | 431 | 81.9 | 95 | 18.1 | 168 | 31.9 | 287 | 54.6 | 16 | 3.0 | 55 | 10.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 3179 | 2621 | 82.4 | 558 | 17.6 | 766 | 24.1 | 1811 | 57.0 | 141 | 4.4 | 461 | 14.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1440 | 1233 | 85.6 | 207 | 14.4 | 394 | 27.4 | 774 | 53.8 | 62 | 4.3 | 210 | 14.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 967 | 792 | 81.9 | 175 | 18.1 | 411 | 42.5 | 345 | 35.7 | 62 | 6.4 | 149 | 15.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 401 | 313 | 78.1 | 88 | 21.9 | 214 | 53.4 | 108 | 26.9 | 23 | 5.7 | 56 | 14.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 94 | 82 | 87.2 | 12 | 12.8 | 56 | 59.6 | 19 | 20.2 | 9 | 9.6 | 10 | 10.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 10 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 6697 | 5537 | 82.7 | 1160 | 17.3 | 2057 | 30.7 | 3378 | 50.4 | 313 | 4.7 | 949 | 14.2 |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 25 | 18 | 72.0 | 7 | 28.0 | 14 | 56.0 | 10 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 199 | 151 | 75.9 | 48 | 24.1 | 115 | 57.8 | 72 | 36.2 | 3 | 1.5 | 9 | 4.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 733 | 546 | 74.5 | 187 | 25.5 | 426 | 58.1 | 263 | 35.9 | 16 | 2.2 | 28 | 3.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 313 | 254 | 81.2 | 59 | 18.8 | 162 | 51.8 | 133 | 42.5 | 7 | 2.2 | 11 | 3.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 258 | 175 | 67.8 | 83 | 32.2 | 176 | 68.2 | 70 | 27.1 | 6 | 2.3 | 6 | 2.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 167 | 131 | 78.4 | 36 | 21.6 | 137 | 82.0 | 26 | 15.6 | 1 | 0.6 | 3 | 1.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 37 | 30 | 81.1 | 7 | 18.9 | 34 | 91.9 | 1 | 2.7 | 1 | 2.7 | 1 | 2.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 4 | 57.1 | 3 | 42.9 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1739 | 1309 | 75.3 | 430 | 24.7 | 1071 | 61.6 | 575 | 33.1 | 34 | 2.0 | 59 | 3.4 |


| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | N | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| SHASTA | UNDER 18 | 15 | 12 | 80.0 | 3 | 20.0 | 13 | 86.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 124 | 98 | 79.0 | 26 | 21.0 | 111 | 89.5 | 5 | 4.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 7 | 5.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 402 | 327 | 81.3 | 75 | 18.7 | 334 | 83.1 | 36 | 9.0 | 7 | 1.7 | 25 | 6.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 262 | 185 | 70.6 | 77 | 29.4 | 231 | 88.2 | 19 | 7.3 | 1 | 0.4 | 11 | 4.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 295 | 219 | 74.2 | 76 | 25.8 | 263 | 89.2 | 18 | 6.1 | 5 | 1.7 | 9 | 3.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 127 | 100 | 78.7 | 27 | 21.3 | 113 | 89.0 | 4 | 3.1 | 3 | 2.4 | 7 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 39 | 31 | 79.5 | 8 | 20.5 | 35 | 89.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.1 | 2 | 5.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | total | 1276 | 983 | 77.0 | 293 | 23.0 | 1112 | 87.1 | 82 | 6.4 | 20 | 1.6 | 62 | 4.9 |
| SIERRA | 18-20 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 25 | 21 | 84.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 22 | 88.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 1 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 19 | 14 | 73.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 15 | 12 | 80.0 | 3 | 20.0 | 14 | 93.3 | 1 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 15 | 14 | 93.3 | 1 | 6.7 | 13 | 86.7 | 1 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 80 | 67 | 83.8 | 13 | 16.2 | 67 | 83.8 | 9 | 11.3 | 1 | 1.2 | 3 | 3.8 |
| SISKIYOU | UNDER 18 | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 62.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 25 | 23 | 92.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 20 | 80.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 12.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 121 | 95 | 78.5 | 26 | 21.5 | 97 | 80.2 | 12 | 9.9 | 3 | 2.5 | 9 | 7.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 95 | 72 | 75.8 | 23 | 24.2 | 73 | 76.8 | 14 | 14.7 | 2 | 2.1 | 6 | 6.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 123 | 95 | 77.2 | 28 | 22.8 | 107 | 87.0 | 8 | 6.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 6 | 4.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 50 | 44 | 88.0 | 6 | 12.0 | 43 | 86.0 | 5 | 10.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 20 | 17 | 85.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 19 | 95.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 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 | 447 | 358 | 80.1 | 89 | 19.9 | 369 | 82.6 | 43 | 9.6 | 10 | 2.2 | 25 | 5.6 |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 24 | 19 | 79.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 14 | 58.3 | 6 | 25.0 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 184 | 147 | 79.9 | 37 | 20.1 | 90 | 48.9 | 58 | 31.5 | 17 | 9.2 | 19 | 10.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 774 | 657 | 84.9 | 117 | 15.1 | 287 | 37.1 | 281 | 36.3 | 141 | 18.2 | 65 | 8.4 |
|  | $31-40$ | 373 | 309 | 82.8 | 64 | 17.2 | 133 | 35.7 | 117 | 31.4 | 90 | 24.1 | 33 | 8.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 335 | 265 | 79.1 | 70 | 20.9 | 162 | 48.4 | 79 | 23.6 | 79 | 23.6 | 15 | 4.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 181 | 147 | 81.2 | 34 | 18.8 | 105 | 58.0 | 29 | 16.0 | 35 | 19.3 | 12 | 6.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 33 | 29 | 87.9 | 4 | 12.1 | 25 | 75.8 | 4 | 12.1 | 4 | 12.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 50.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1916 | 1585 | 82.7 | 331 | 17.3 | 822 | 42.9 | 576 | 30.1 | 372 | 19.4 | 146 | 7.6 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 49 | 36 | 73.5 | 13 | 26.5 | 32 | 65.3 | 17 | 34.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 327 | 248 | 75.8 | 79 | 24.2 | 178 | 54.4 | 129 | 39.4 | 4 | 1.2 | 16 | 4.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 1452 | 1222 | 84.2 | 230 | 15.8 | 669 | 46.1 | 697 | 48.0 | 27 | 1.9 | 59 | 4.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 695 | 575 | 82.7 | 120 | 17.3 | 344 | 49.5 | 300 | 43.2 | 19 | 2.7 | 32 | 4.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 520 | 378 | 72.7 | 142 | 27.3 | 361 | 69.4 | 116 | 22.3 | 16 | 3.1 | 27 | 5.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 264 | 195 | 73.9 | 69 | 26.1 | 209 | 79.2 | 40 | 15.2 | 4 | 1.5 | 11 | 4.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 51 | 44 | 86.3 | 7 | 13.7 | 44 | 86.3 | 6 | 11.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 26 | 20 | 76.9 | 6 | 23.1 | 25 | 96.2 | 1 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3384 | 2718 | 80.3 | 666 | 19.7 | 1862 | 55.0 | 1306 | 38.6 | 70 | 2.1 | 146 | 4.3 |
| STANISLAUS | UNDER 18 | 38 | 30 | 78.9 | 8 | 21.1 | 14 | 36.8 | 20 | 52.6 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 259 | 204 | 78.8 | 55 | 21.2 | 103 | 39.8 | 134 | 51.7 | 12 | 4.6 | 10 | 3.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 1304 | 1076 | 82.5 | 228 | 17.5 | 449 | 34.4 | 752 | 57.7 | 40 | 3.1 | 63 | 4.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 582 | 471 | 80.9 | 111 | 19.1 | 211 | 36.3 | 324 | 55.7 | 26 | 4.5 | 21 | 3.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 441 | 351 | 79.6 | 90 | 20.4 | 215 | 48.8 | 178 | 40.4 | 24 | 5.4 | 24 | 5.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 162 | 126 | 77.8 | 36 | 22.2 | 104 | 64.2 | 34 | 21.0 | 15 | 9.3 | 9 | 5.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 51 | 43 | 84.3 | 8 | 15.7 | 29 | 56.9 | 17 | 33.3 | 3 | 5.9 | 2 | 3.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 7 | 77.8 | 2 | 22.2 | 6 | 66.7 | 2 | 22.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 11.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 2846 | 2308 | 81.1 | 538 | 18.9 | 1131 | 39.7 | 1461 | 51.3 | 121 | 4.3 | 133 | 4.7 |
| SUTTER | UNDER 18 | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 3 | 42.9 | 4 | 57.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 60 | 53 | 88.3 | 7 | 11.7 | 32 | 53.3 | 23 | 38.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 240 | 211 | 87.9 | 29 | 12.1 | 114 | 47.5 | 95 | 39.6 | 14 | 5.8 | 17 | 7.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 135 | 114 | 84.4 | 21 | 15.6 | 52 | 38.5 | 65 | 48.1 | 7 | 5.2 | 11 | 8.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 92 | 70 | 76.1 | 22 | 23.9 | 53 | 57.6 | 26 | 28.3 | 3 | 3.3 | 10 | 10.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 38 | 34 | 89.5 | 4 | 10.5 | 25 | 65.8 | 8 | 21.1 | 2 | 5.3 | 3 | 7.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 7 | 70.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 584 | 498 | 85.3 | 86 | 14.7 | 287 | 49.1 | 224 | 38.4 | 27 | 4.6 | 46 | 7.9 |
| TEHAMA | UNDER 18 | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 40.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 43 | 37 | 86.0 | 6 | 14.0 | 32 | 74.4 | 10 | 23.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 259 | 215 | 83.0 | 44 | 17.0 | 196 | 75.7 | 56 | 21.6 | 4 | 1.5 | 3 | 1.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 153 | 111 | 72.5 | 42 | 27.5 | 124 | 81.0 | 29 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 159 | 110 | 69.2 | 49 | 30.8 | 141 | 88.7 | 16 | 10.1 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 103 | 83 | 80.6 | 20 | 19.4 | 94 | 91.3 | 5 | 4.9 | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 12 | 57.1 | 9 | 42.9 | 19 | 90.5 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 | 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 | 748 | 577 | 77.1 | 171 | 22.9 | 614 | 82.1 | 117 | 15.6 | 9 | 1.2 | 8 | 1.1 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | UNDER 18 | 4 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 5 | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 69 | 61 | 88.4 | 8 | 11.6 | 68 | 98.6 | 1 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 33 | 25 | 75.8 | 8 | 24.2 | 31 | 93.9 | 1 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 50 | 37 | 74.0 | 13 | 26.0 | 49 | 98.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 17 | 16 | 94.1 | 1 | 5.9 | 16 | 94.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 4 | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 190 | 151 | 79.5 | 39 | 20.5 | 183 | 96.3 | 4 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 1.6 |
| TULARE | UNDER 18 | 48 | 44 | 91.7 | 4 | 8.3 | 8 | 16.7 | 37 | 77.1 | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 4.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 365 | 326 | 89.3 | 39 | 10.7 | 61 | 16.7 | 297 | 81.4 | 3 | 0.8 | 4 | 1.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1507 | 1371 | 91.0 | 136 | 9.0 | 250 | 16.6 | 1214 | 80.6 | 17 | 1.1 | 26 | 1.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 801 | 711 | 88.8 | 90 | 11.2 | 153 | 19.1 | 624 | 77.9 | 2 | 0.2 | 22 | 2.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 504 | 447 | 88.7 | 57 | 11.3 | 145 | 28.8 | 335 | 66.5 | 10 | 2.0 | 14 | 2.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 203 | 179 | 88.2 | 24 | 11.8 | 72 | 35.5 | 121 | 59.6 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | 2.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 43 | 40 | 93.0 | 3 | 7.0 | 20 | 46.5 | 22 | 51.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3476 | 3122 | 89.8 | 354 | 10.2 | 712 | 20.5 | 2652 | 76.3 | 38 | 1.1 | 74 | 2.1 |
| TUOLUMNE | UNDER 18 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 33 | 25 | 75.8 | 8 | 24.2 | 31 | 93.9 | 2 | 6.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 127 | 109 | 85.8 | 18 | 14.2 | 120 | 94.5 | 5 | 3.9 | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 86 | 64 | 74.4 | 22 | 25.6 | 81 | 94.2 | 2 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 119 | 78 | 65.5 | 41 | 34.5 | 117 | 98.3 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 64 | 44 | 68.8 | 20 | 31.3 | 62 | 96.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 24 | 22 | 91.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 24 | 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 | 463 | 351 | 75.8 | 112 | 24.2 | 444 | 95.9 | 11 | 2.4 | 1 | 0.2 | 7 | 1.5 |
| VENTURA | UNDER 18 | 53 | 42 | 79.2 | 11 | 20.8 | 38 | 71.7 | 15 | 28.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 492 | 405 | 82.3 | 87 | 17.7 | 222 | 45.1 | 251 | 51.0 | 8 | 1.6 | 11 | 2.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 2386 | 1945 | 81.5 | 441 | 18.5 | 1011 | 42.4 | 1256 | 52.6 | 45 | 1.9 | 74 | 3.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 1093 | 886 | 81.1 | 207 | 18.9 | 458 | 41.9 | 564 | 51.6 | 36 | 3.3 | 35 | 3.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 784 | 609 | 77.7 | 175 | 22.3 | 465 | 59.3 | 265 | 33.8 | 22 | 2.8 | 32 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 310 | 247 | 79.7 | 63 | 20.3 | 214 | 69.0 | 80 | 25.8 | 8 | 2.6 | 8 | 2.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 66 | 53 | 80.3 | 13 | 19.7 | 45 | 68.2 | 18 | 27.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 4.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 9 | 75.0 | 3 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 5196 | 4197 | 80.8 | 999 | 19.2 | 2462 | 47.4 | 2452 | 47.2 | 119 | 2.3 | 163 | 3.1 |

TABLE B1: 2006 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 | 22 | 21 | 95.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 12 | 54.5 | 8 | 36.4 | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 4.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 151 | 129 | 85.4 | 22 | 14.6 | 56 | 37.1 | 81 | 53.6 | 4 | 2.6 | 10 | 6.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 591 | 506 | 85.6 | 85 | 14.4 | 231 | 39.1 | 296 | 50.1 | 17 | 2.9 | 47 | 8.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 245 | 199 | 81.2 | 46 | 18.8 | 114 | 46.5 | 118 | 48.2 | 10 | 4.1 | 3 | 1.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 167 | 126 | 75.4 | 41 | 24.6 | 80 | 47.9 | 68 | 40.7 | 11 | 6.6 | 8 | 4.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 91 | 74 | 81.3 | 17 | 18.7 | 57 | 62.6 | 20 | 22.0 | 8 | 8.8 | 6 | 6.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 22 | 21 | 95.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 15 | 68.2 | 5 | 22.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 9.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1293 | 1078 | 83.4 | 215 | 16.6 | 568 | 43.9 | 597 | 46.2 | 51 | 3.9 | 77 | 6.0 |
| YUBA | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 44 | 38 | 86.4 | 6 | 13.6 | 28 | 63.6 | 12 | 27.3 | 2 | 4.5 | 2 | 4.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 286 | 240 | 83.9 | 46 | 16.1 | 147 | 51.4 | 110 | 38.5 | 12 | 4.2 | 17 | 5.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 128 | 95 | 74.2 | 33 | 25.8 | 83 | 64.8 | 38 | 29.7 | 4 | 3.1 | 3 | 2.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 148 | 98 | 66.2 | 50 | 33.8 | 122 | 82.4 | 18 | 12.2 | 3 | 2.0 | 5 | 3.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 53 | 47 | 88.7 | 6 | 11.3 | 42 | 79.2 | 7 | 13.2 | 4 | 7.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 10 | 71.4 | 4 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 681 | 538 | 79.0 | 143 | 21.0 | 437 | 64.2 | 192 | 28.2 | 25 | 3.7 | 27 | 4.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 140879 | 100.0 | 116340 | 82.6 | 24539 | 17.4 |
| ALAMEDA | UNDER 18 | 6 | 0.1 | 6 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 270 | 5.4 | 220 | 5.4 | 50 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 2137 | 42.4 | 1729 | 42.2 | 408 | 43.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 1309 | 26.0 | 1074 | 26.2 | 235 | 25.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 847 | 16.8 | 684 | 16.7 | 163 | 17.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 360 | 7.1 | 297 | 7.2 | 63 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 85 | 1.7 | 71 | 1.7 | 14 | 1.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 23 | 0.5 | 21 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 5037 | 100.0 | 4102 | 100.0 | 935 | 100.0 |
| ALPINE | 21-30 | 8 | 47.1 | 6 | 42.9 | 2 | 66.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 2 | 11.8 | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 4 | 23.5 | 4 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 3 | 17.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 | 14 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| AMADOR | 18-20 | 12 | 4.5 | 12 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 66 | 24.6 | 53 | 25.5 | 13 | 21.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 58 | 21.6 | 36 | 17.3 | 22 | 36.7 |
|  | $41-50$ | 65 | 24.3 | 51 | 24.5 | 14 | 23.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 51 | 19.0 | 41 | 19.7 | 10 | 16.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 4.5 | 11 | 5.3 | 1 | 1.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 268 | 100.0 | 208 | 100.0 | 60 | 100.0 |
| BUTTE | UNDER 18 | 11 | 1.0 | 7 | 0.8 | 4 | 2.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 118 | 10.9 | 86 | 9.8 | 32 | 15.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 471 | 43.6 | 399 | 45.5 | 72 | 35.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 187 | 17.3 | 154 | 17.6 | 33 | $16.1$ |
|  | $41-50$ | 183 | 16.9 | 138 | 15.8 | 45 | $22.0$ |
|  | $51-60$ | 84 | 7.8 | 69 | 7.9 | 15 | 7.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 21 | 1.9 | 19 | 2.2 | 2 | 1.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.6 | 4 | 0.5 | 2 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1081 | 100.0 | 876 | 100.0 | 205 | 100.0 |
| CALAVERAS | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 15 | 7.3 | 14 | 8.6 | 1 | 2.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 56 | 27.3 | 46 | 28.2 | 10 | 23.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 46 | 22.4 | 33 | 20.2 | 13 | 31.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 54 | 26.3 | 40 | 24.5 | 14 | 33.3 |
|  | $51-60$ | 25 | 12.2 | 22 | 13.5 | 3 | 7.1 |
|  | $61-70$ | 5 | 2.4 | 4 | 2.5 | 1 | 2.4 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 3 | 1.5 | 3 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 205 | 100.0 | 163 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 |
| COLUSA | 18-20 | 11 | 5.6 | 8 | 4.9 | 3 | 9.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 70 | 35.7 | 60 | 36.6 | 10 | 31.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 40 | 20.4 | 38 | 23.2 | 2 | 6.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 43 | 21.9 | 33 | 20.1 | 10 | 31.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 12.2 | 19 | 11.6 | 5 | 15.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 3.6 | 5 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.3 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 196 | 100.0 | 164 | 100.0 | 32 | 100.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | UNDER 18 | 14 | 0.4 | 12 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 228 | 7.2 | 184 | 7.3 | 44 | 6.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1255 | 39.4 | 995 | 39.6 | 260 | 38.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 732 | 23.0 | 593 | 23.6 | 139 | 20.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 584 | 18.3 | 438 | 17.4 | 146 | 21.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 283 | 8.9 | 224 | 8.9 | 59 | 8.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 75 | 2.4 | 56 | 2.2 | 19 | 2.8 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 17 | 0.5 | 13 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 3188 | 100.0 | 2515 | 100.0 | 673 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| DEL NORTE | UNDER 18 | 6 | 4.5 | 4 | 3.8 | 2 | 7.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 3.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 35 | 26.5 | 31 | 29.5 | 4 | 14.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 29 | 22.0 | 22 | 21.0 | 7 | 25.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 31.8 | 30 | 28.6 | 12 | 44.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 11 | 8.3 | 9 | 8.6 | 2 | 7.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 2.3 | 3 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 132 | 100.0 | 105 | 100.0 | 27 | 100.0 |
| EL DORADO | UNDER 18 | 4 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 76 | 7.0 | 67 | 7.9 | 9 | 3.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 355 | 32.5 | 295 | 34.7 | 60 | 24.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 228 | 20.9 | 185 | 21.8 | 43 | 17.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 265 | 24.3 | 176 | 20.7 | 89 | 36.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 130 | 11.9 | 103 | 12.1 | 27 | 11.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 2.8 | 20 | 2.4 | 11 | 4.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 1091 | 100.0 | 850 | 100.0 | 241 | 100.0 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 12 | 0.3 | 8 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 351 | 7.8 | 297 | 7.8 | 54 | 7.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 1875 | 41.8 | 1614 | 42.6 | 261 | 37.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1087 | 24.2 | 898 | 23.7 | 189 | 27.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 785 | 17.5 | 643 | 17.0 | 142 | 20.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 284 | 6.3 | 252 | 6.6 | 32 | 4.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 83 | 1.9 | 70 | 1.8 | 13 | 1.9 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 9 | 0.2 | 8 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 4486 | 100.0 | 3790 | 100.0 | 696 | 100.0 |
| GLENN | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 26 | 6.9 | 22 | 6.9 | 4 | 7.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 136 | 36.3 | 119 | 37.4 | 17 | 29.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 88 | 23.5 | 76 | 23.9 | 12 | 21.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 74 | 19.7 | 54 | 17.0 | 20 | 35.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 38 | 10.1 | 35 | 11.0 | 3 | 5.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 2.1 | 7 | 2.2 | 1 | 1.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 375 | 100.0 | 318 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 44 | 6.5 | 34 | 6.8 | 10 | 5.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 283 | 42.0 | 208 | 41.7 | 75 | 42.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 144 | 21.4 | 115 | 23.0 | 29 | 16.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 110 | 16.3 | 73 | 14.6 | 37 | 21.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 74 | 11.0 | 56 | 11.2 | 18 | 10.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 2.1 | 9 | 1.8 | 5 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 674 | 100.0 | 499 | 100.0 | 175 | 100.0 |
| IMPERIAL | 18-20 | 45 | 7.2 | 38 | 7.0 | 7 | 8.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 232 | 37.1 | 202 | 37.4 | 30 | 35.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 156 | 25.0 | 131 | 24.3 | 25 | 29.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 117 | 18.7 | 97 | 18.0 | 20 | 23.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 64 | 10.2 | 61 | 11.3 | 3 | 3.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 1.3 | 8 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 625 | 100.0 | 540 | 100.0 | 85 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| INYO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 12 | 7.3 | 11 | 8.6 | 1 | 2.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 39 | 23.8 | 28 | 21.9 | 11 | 30.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 37 | 22.6 | 33 | 25.8 | 4 | 11.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 41 | 25.0 | 26 | 20.3 | 15 | 41.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 21 | 12.8 | 16 | 12.5 | 5 | 13.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 6.1 | 10 | 7.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 1.8 | 3 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 164 | 100.0 | 128 | 100.0 | 36 | 100.0 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 44 | 1.1 | 40 | 1.2 | 4 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 338 | 8.3 | 292 | 8.5 | 46 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1693 | 41.6 | 1460 | 42.6 | 233 | 36.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 960 | 23.6 | 814 | 23.8 | 146 | 22.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 702 | 17.3 | 539 | 15.7 | 163 | 25.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 257 | 6.3 | 218 | 6.4 | 39 | 6.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 60 | 1.5 | 53 | 1.5 | 7 | 1.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 0.3 | 10 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 4066 | 100.0 | 3426 | 100.0 | 640 | 100.0 |
| KINGS | UNDER 18 | 10 | 1.4 | 10 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 58 | 7.8 | 52 | 8.2 | 6 | 5.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 335 | 45.3 | 291 | 45.8 | 44 | 42.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 166 | 22.4 | 140 | 22.0 | 26 | 25.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 116 | 15.7 | 94 | 14.8 | 22 | 21.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 43 | 5.8 | 41 | 6.4 | 2 | 1.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 1.1 | 6 | 0.9 | 2 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.3 | 2 | 1.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 740 | 100.0 | 636 | 100.0 | 104 | 100.0 |
| LAKE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.4 | 1 | 1.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 30 | 8.2 | 25 | 9.0 | 5 | 5.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 101 | 27.7 | 81 | 29.0 | 20 | 23.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 77 | 21.2 | 58 | 20.8 | 19 | 22.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 95 | 26.1 | 66 | 23.7 | 29 | 34.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 44 | 12.1 | 35 | 12.5 | 9 | 10.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 3.3 | 11 | 3.9 | 1 | 1.2 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 3 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 364 | 100.0 | 279 | 100.0 | 85 | 100.0 |
| LASSEN | UNDER 18 | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 15 | 7.3 | 14 | 8.2 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 61 | 29.8 | 55 | 32.4 | 6 | 17.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 51 | 24.9 | 38 | 22.4 | 13 | 37.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 36 | 17.6 | 27 | 15.9 | 9 | 25.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 32 | 15.6 | 26 | 15.3 | 6 | 17.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 3.4 | 7 | 4.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 205 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 |
| LOS ANGELES |  |  |  | 17 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 |
|  | $18-20$ | 1485 | 5.2 | 1235 | 5.1 | 250 | 5.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 11769 | 41.3 | 9719 | 40.5 | 2050 | 45.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 7746 | 27.2 | 6685 | 27.9 | 1061 | 23.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 4976 | 17.5 | 4155 | 17.3 | 821 | 18.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 1932 | 6.8 | 1665 | 6.9 | 267 | 5.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 455 | 1.6 | 415 | 1.7 | 40 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 110 | 0.4 | 94 | 0.4 | 16 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 28493 | 100.0 | 23985 | 100.0 | 4508 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| MADERA | UNDER 18 | 6 | 0.9 | 6 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 38 | 5.8 | 34 | 5.8 | 4 | 6.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 260 | 39.7 | 235 | 39.9 | 25 | 37.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 168 | 25.6 | 153 | 26.0 | 15 | 22.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 117 | 17.9 | 103 | 17.5 | 14 | 21.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 50 | 7.6 | 42 | 7.1 | 8 | 12.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 1.8 | 12 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 4 | 0.6 | 4 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 655 | 100.0 | 589 | 100.0 | 66 | 100.0 |
| MARIN | UNDER 18 | 10 | 0.8 | 8 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 90 | 6.9 | 71 | 7.2 | 19 | 6.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 433 | 33.3 | 351 | 35.5 | 82 | 26.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 332 | 25.5 | 250 | 25.3 | 82 | 26.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 250 | 19.2 | 173 | 17.5 | 77 | 24.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 126 | 9.7 | 92 | 9.3 | 34 | 10.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 49 | 3.8 | 37 | 3.7 | 12 | 3.8 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 11 | 0.8 | 7 | 0.7 | 4 | 1.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1301 | 100.0 | 989 | 100.0 | 312 | 100.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 18-20 | 4 | 3.9 | 3 | 3.6 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 23 | 22.3 | 18 | 21.4 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 26 | 25.2 | 24 | 28.6 | 2 | 10.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 27 | 26.2 | 17 | 20.2 | 10 | 52.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 18 | 17.5 | 17 | 20.2 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 5 | 4.9 | 5 | 6.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 103 | 100.0 | 84 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 8 | 1.4 | 7 | 1.5 | 1 | 1.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 37 | 6.6 | 31 | 6.8 | 6 | 5.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 201 | 35.9 | 169 | 37.0 | 32 | 31.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 134 | 23.9 | 106 | 23.2 | 28 | 27.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 107 | 19.1 | 80 | 17.5 | 27 | 26.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 58 | 10.4 | 51 | 11.2 | 7 | 6.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 13 | 2.3 | 12 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 560 | 100.0 | 457 | 100.0 | 103 | 100.0 |
| MERCED |  | 9 | 0.8 | 8 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | $18-20$ | 118 | 10.2 | 108 | 10.9 | 10 | 6.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 490 | 42.5 | 435 | 43.7 | 55 | 34.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 276 | 23.9 | 232 | 23.3 | 44 | 27.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 164 | 14.2 | 133 | 13.4 | 31 | 19.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 77 | 6.7 | 62 | 6.2 | 15 | 9.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 1.6 | 16 | 1.6 | 3 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | total | 1154 | 100.0 | 995 | 100.0 | 159 | 100.0 |
| MODOC | 18-20 | 2 | 3.8 | 2 | 4.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 16 | 30.8 | 12 | 29.3 | 4 | 36.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 10 | 19.2 | 8 | 19.5 | 2 | 18.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 15 | 28.8 | 12 | 29.3 | 3 | 27.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 7 | 13.5 | 6 | 14.6 | 1 | 9.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 9.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 52 | 100.0 | 41 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 |
| MONO |  | 3 | 2.4 | 3 | 2.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 10 | 8.1 | 8 | 7.5 | 2 | 11.8 |
|  | $21-30$ | 36 | 29.3 | 33 | 31.1 | 3 | 17.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 31 | 25.2 | 26 | 24.5 | 5 | 29.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 23 | 18.7 | 20 | 18.9 | 3 | 17.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 14 | 11.4 | 11 | 10.4 | 3 | 17.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 4.9 | 5 | 4.7 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 123 | 100.0 | 106 | 100.0 | 17 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 13 | 0.5 | 10 | 0.4 | 3 | 1.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 213 | 8.3 | 195 | 8.6 | 18 | 5.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 1159 | 45.2 | 1058 | 46.9 | 101 | 32.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 565 | 22.0 | 502 | 22.2 | 63 | 20.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 388 | 15.1 | 305 | 13.5 | 83 | 27.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 174 | 6.8 | 146 | 6.5 | 28 | 9.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 43 | 1.7 | 38 | 1.7 | 5 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.2 | 6 | 2.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2565 | 100.0 | 2258 | 100.0 | 307 | 100.0 |
| NAPA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 64 | 7.6 | 54 | 7.6 | 10 | 7.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 343 | 40.7 | 303 | 42.7 | 40 | 30.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 192 | 22.8 | 161 | 22.7 | 31 | 23.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 133 | 15.8 | 96 | 13.5 | 37 | 28.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 81 | 9.6 | 71 | 10.0 | 10 | 7.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 20 | 2.4 | 17 | 2.4 | 3 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 1.0 | 7 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 842 | 100.0 | 710 | 100.0 | 132 | 100.0 |
| NEVADA | UNDER 18 | 6 | 1.1 | 3 | 0.7 | 3 | 2.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 41 | 7.3 | 33 | 7.2 | 8 | 7.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 189 | 33.6 | 160 | 34.7 | 29 | 28.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 114 | 20.2 | 93 | 20.2 | 21 | 20.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 118 | 21.0 | 95 | 20.6 | 23 | 22.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 75 | 13.3 | 61 | 13.2 | 14 | 13.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 2.1 | 10 | 2.2 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 1.4 | 6 | 1.3 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 563 | 100.0 | 461 | 100.0 | 102 | 100.0 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 51 | 0.4 | 38 | 0.4 | 13 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 830 | 6.8 | 631 | 6.4 | 199 | 8.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 5367 | 44.0 | 4350 | 44.0 | 1017 | 44.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 2940 | 24.1 | 2492 | 25.2 | 448 | 19.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 2029 | 16.6 | 1598 | 16.1 | 431 | 18.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 747 | 6.1 | 595 | 6.0 | 152 | 6.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 178 | 1.5 | 145 | 1.5 | 33 | 1.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 54 | 0.4 | 47 | 0.5 | 7 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 12196 | 100.0 | 9896 | 100.0 | 2300 | 100.0 |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 13 | 0.7 | 12 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 144 | 8.2 | 122 | 8.8 | 22 | 5.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 719 | 40.9 | 573 | 41.4 | 146 | 38.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 347 | 19.7 | 267 | 19.3 | 80 | 21.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 353 | 20.1 | 257 | 18.6 | 96 | 25.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 139 | 7.9 | 112 | 8.1 | 27 | 7.2 |
|  | $61-70$ | 29 | 1.6 | 28 | 2.0 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 0.8 | 12 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1758 | 100.0 | 1383 | 100.0 | 375 | 100.0 |
| PLUMAS | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 8 | 4.7 | 7 | 5.4 | 1 | 2.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 50 | 29.6 | 40 | 31.0 | 10 | 25.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 39 | 23.1 | 28 | 21.7 | 11 | 27.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 24.9 | 26 | 20.2 | 16 | 40.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 20 | 11.8 | 18 | 14.0 | 2 | 5.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 4.7 | 8 | 6.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 169 | 100.0 | 129 | 100.0 | 40 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| RIVERSIDE | UNDER 18 | 15 | 0.2 | 12 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 647 | 9.0 | 547 | 9.2 | 100 | 8.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 2929 | 40.7 | 2464 | 41.3 | 465 | 37.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 1610 | 22.4 | 1353 | 22.7 | 257 | 20.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 1335 | 18.6 | 1032 | 17.3 | 303 | 24.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 484 | 6.7 | 406 | 6.8 | 78 | 6.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 134 | 1.9 | 120 | 2.0 | 14 | 1.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 42 | 0.6 | 32 | 0.5 | 10 | 0.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 7196 | 100.0 | 5966 | 100.0 | 1230 | 100.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 23 | 0.4 | 22 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 406 | 7.6 | 331 | 7.7 | 75 | 7.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 2384 | 44.5 | 1957 | 45.4 | 427 | 40.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 1201 | 22.4 | 947 | 22.0 | 254 | 24.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 893 | 16.7 | 685 | 15.9 | 208 | 19.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 341 | 6.4 | 276 | 6.4 | 65 | 6.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 90 | 1.7 | 75 | 1.7 | 15 | 1.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 18 | 0.3 | 14 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 5356 | 100.0 | 4307 | 100.0 | 1049 | 100.0 |
| SAN BENITO | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 25 | 6.9 | 20 | 6.5 | 5 | 9.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 159 | 44.2 | 146 | 47.2 | 13 | 25.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 80 | 22.2 | 61 | 19.7 | 19 | 37.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 61 | 16.9 | 50 | 16.2 | 11 | 21.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 22 | 6.1 | 20 | 6.5 | 2 | 3.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 1.7 | 6 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.1 | 3 | 1.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 360 | 100.0 | 309 | 100.0 | 51 | 100.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | UNDER 18 | 27 | 0.3 | 22 | 0.3 | 5 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 565 | 6.6 | 463 | 6.5 | 102 | 7.3 |
|  | $21-30$ | 3601 | 42.3 | 3048 | 42.9 | 553 | 39.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 2039 | 24.0 | 1701 | 23.9 | 338 | 24.1 |
|  | $41-50$ | 1485 | 17.5 | 1190 | 16.7 | 295 | 21.1 |
|  | $51-60$ | 586 | 6.9 | 498 | 7.0 | 88 | 6.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 174 | 2.0 | 155 | 2.2 | 19 | 1.4 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 29 | 0.3 | 29 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 8506 | 100.0 | 7106 | 100.0 | 1400 | 100.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | UNDER 18 | 56 | 0.4 | 43 | 0.4 | 13 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 1017 | 7.5 | 827 | 7.5 | 190 | 7.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 6233 | 46.0 | 5133 | 46.5 | 1100 | 43.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 3039 | 22.4 | 2496 | 22.6 | 543 | 21.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 2156 | 15.9 | 1661 | 15.1 | 495 | 19.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 840 | 6.2 | 685 | 6.2 | 155 | 6.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 174 | 1.3 | 150 | 1.4 | 24 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 46 | 0.3 | 39 | 0.4 | 7 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 13561 | 100.0 | 11034 | 100.0 | 2527 | 100.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | $18-20$ | 36 | 4.2 | 28 | 4.1 | 8 | 4.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 367 | 43.1 | 284 | 41.8 | 83 | 48.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 231 | 27.1 | 188 | 27.7 | 43 | 25.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 139 | 16.3 | 112 | 16.5 | 27 | 15.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 61 | 7.2 | 52 | 7.7 | 9 | 5.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 0.9 | 7 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 0.8 | 7 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 851 | 100.0 | 679 | 100.0 | 172 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | UNDER 18 | 15 | 0.5 | 15 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 247 | 8.4 | 220 | 8.8 | 27 | 6.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1150 | 39.1 | 1006 | 40.2 | 144 | 32.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 705 | 24.0 | 589 | 23.6 | 116 | 26.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 537 | 18.3 | 429 | 17.2 | 108 | 24.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 228 | 7.7 | 197 | 7.9 | 31 | 7.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 56 | 1.9 | 41 | 1.6 | 15 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.1 | 4 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2942 | 100.0 | 2501 | 100.0 | 441 | 100.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | UNDER 18 | 7 | 0.4 | 6 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 169 | 9.8 | 131 | 9.6 | 38 | 10.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 740 | 43.0 | 605 | 44.2 | 135 | 38.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 314 | 18.2 | 260 | 19.0 | 54 | 15.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 303 | 17.6 | 223 | 16.3 | 80 | 22.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 150 | 8.7 | 111 | 8.1 | 39 | 11.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 28 | 1.6 | 23 | 1.7 | 5 | 1.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 0.6 | 10 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1722 | 100.0 | 1369 | 100.0 | 353 | 100.0 |
| SAN MATEO | UNDER 18 | 11 | 0.4 | 9 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 137 | 5.5 | 109 | 5.4 | 28 | 5.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 1079 | 43.2 | 880 | 43.4 | 199 | 42.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 581 | 23.2 | 473 | 23.3 | 108 | 22.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 423 | 16.9 | 334 | 16.5 | 89 | 18.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 203 | 8.1 | 165 | 8.1 | 38 | 8.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 50 | 2.0 | 44 | 2.2 | 6 | 1.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 0.6 | 14 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 2500 | 100.0 | 2028 | 100.0 | 472 | 100.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | NDER 18 | 3 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 214 | 9.6 | 178 | 9.6 | 36 | 9.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 1009 | 45.0 | 851 | 45.9 | 158 | 41.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 475 | 21.2 | 413 | 22.3 | 62 | 16.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 338 | 15.1 | 253 | 13.6 | 85 | 22.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 157 | 7.0 | 123 | 6.6 | 34 | 8.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 34 | 1.5 | 28 | 1.5 | 6 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 0.4 | 7 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 2240 | 100.0 | 1855 | 100.0 | 385 | 100.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 29 | 0.5 | 25 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 402 | 7.3 | 336 | 7.4 | 66 | 7.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 2532 | 46.1 | 2129 | 46.7 | 403 | 43.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 1276 | 23.2 | 1092 | 23.9 | 184 | 19.7 |
|  | $41-50$ | 820 | 14.9 | 625 | 13.7 | 195 | 20.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 333 | 6.1 | 264 | 5.8 | 69 | 7.4 |
|  | $61-70$ | 87 | 1.6 | 77 | 1.7 | 10 | 1.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 0.3 | 13 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 5495 | 100.0 | 4561 | 100.0 | 934 | 100.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 28 | 2.1 | 18 | 1.8 | 10 | 3.1 |
|  | $18-20$ | 108 | 8.2 | 85 | 8.5 | 23 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 515 | 39.0 | 402 | 40.1 | 113 | 35.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 305 | 23.1 | 244 | 24.3 | 61 | 19.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 244 | 18.5 | 162 | 16.2 | 82 | 25.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 98 | 7.4 | 72 | 7.2 | 26 | 8.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 1.6 | 18 | 1.8 | 3 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1321 | 100.0 | 1003 | 100.0 | 318 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| SHASTA | UNDER 18 | 6 | 0.7 | 5 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 50 | 5.7 | 39 | 6.0 | 11 | 5.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 316 | 36.3 | 245 | 37.7 | 71 | 32.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 186 | 21.4 | 137 | 21.1 | 49 | 22.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 184 | 21.1 | 124 | 19.1 | 60 | 27.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 91 | 10.5 | 67 | 10.3 | 24 | 10.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 28 | 3.2 | 25 | 3.8 | 3 | 1.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 1.0 | 8 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 870 | 100.0 | 650 | 100.0 | 220 | 100.0 |
| SIERRA | 18-20 | 2 | 7.1 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 6 | 21.4 | 5 | 20.8 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 6 | 21.4 | 5 | 20.8 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 7 | 25.0 | 6 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 5 | 17.9 | 5 | 20.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $61-70$ | 1 | 3.6 | 1 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 1 | 3.6 | 1 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 28 | 100.0 | 24 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| SISKIYOU | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 9 | 3.3 | 6 | 2.7 | 3 | 6.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 63 | 23.2 | 52 | 23.2 | 11 | 22.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 73 | 26.8 | 57 | 25.4 | 16 | 33.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 76 | 27.9 | 62 | 27.7 | 14 | 29.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 39 | 14.3 | 36 | 16.1 | 3 | 6.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 8 | 2.9 | 7 | 3.1 | 1 | 2.1 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 3 | 1.1 | 3 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 272 | 100.0 | 224 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 11 | 0.7 | 11 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 113 | 7.4 | 87 | 6.8 | 26 | 10.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 590 | 38.6 | 512 | 40.0 | 78 | 31.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 346 | 22.7 | 289 | 22.6 | 57 | 23.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 306 | 20.0 | 245 | 19.1 | 61 | 24.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 124 | 8.1 | 103 | 8.0 | 21 | 8.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 29 | 1.9 | 27 | 2.1 | 2 | 0.8 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 8 | 0.5 | 7 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 1527 | 100.0 | 1281 | 100.0 | 246 | 100.0 |
| SONOMA | UNDER 18 | 24 | 1.0 | 22 | 1.1 | 2 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 187 | 7.9 | 164 | 8.4 | 23 | 5.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1014 | 42.7 | 860 | 44.0 | 154 | 36.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 436 | 18.4 | 355 | 18.2 | 81 | 19.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 404 | 17.0 | 309 | 15.8 | 95 | 22.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 226 | 9.5 | 180 | 9.2 | 46 | 11.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 64 | 2.7 | 50 | 2.6 | 14 | 3.3 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 17 | 0.7 | 13 | 0.7 | 4 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2372 | 100.0 | 1953 | 100.0 | 419 | 100.0 |
| STANISLAUS | UNDER 18 | 16 | 1.0 | 14 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 151 | 9.0 | 119 | 8.8 | 32 | 10.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 729 | 43.6 | 595 | 44.0 | 134 | 41.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 361 | 21.6 | 292 | 21.6 | 69 | 21.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 281 | 16.8 | 211 | 15.6 | 70 | 21.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 98 | 5.9 | 88 | 6.5 | 10 | 3.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 25 | 1.5 | 22 | 1.6 | 3 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 0.7 | 11 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1673 | 100.0 | 1352 | 100.0 | 321 | 100.0 |
| SUTTER | UNDER 18 | 6 | 1.7 | 5 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 33 | 9.2 | 25 | 8.2 | 8 | 15.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 122 | 34.0 | 114 | 37.3 | 8 | 15.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 76 | 21.2 | 65 | 21.2 | 11 | 20.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 75 | 20.9 | 56 | 18.3 | 19 | 35.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 38 | 10.6 | 33 | 10.8 | 5 | 9.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 2.5 | 8 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 359 | 100.0 | 306 | 100.0 | 53 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2005 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| TEHAMA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 4.6 | 15 | 4.5 | 4 | 4.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 135 | 32.8 | 113 | 34.1 | 22 | 27.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 99 | 24.0 | 79 | 23.9 | 20 | 24.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 89 | 21.6 | 67 | 20.2 | 22 | 27.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 58 | 14.1 | 47 | 14.2 | 11 | 13.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 2.2 | 7 | 2.1 | 2 | 2.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 412 | 100.0 | 331 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 |
| TRINITY | 21-30 | 16 | 26.2 | 14 | 29.2 | 2 | 15.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 14 | 23.0 | 11 | 22.9 | 3 | 23.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 13 | 21.3 | 7 | 14.6 | 6 | 46.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 12 | 19.7 | 11 | 22.9 | 1 | 7.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 5 | 8.2 | 4 | 8.3 | 1 | 7.7 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 61 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 | 13 | 100.0 |
| TULARE | UNDER 18 | 16 | 0.6 | 15 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 268 | 10.7 | 238 | 10.8 | 30 | 10.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1069 | 42.8 | 945 | 42.9 | 124 | 42.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 602 | 24.1 | 531 | 24.1 | 71 | 24.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 359 | 14.4 | 312 | 14.1 | 47 | 16.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 151 | 6.0 | 136 | 6.2 | 15 | 5.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 32 | 1.3 | 27 | 1.2 | 5 | 1.7 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2498 | 100.0 | 2205 | 100.0 | 293 | 100.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 27 | 6.9 | 25 | 7.8 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 125 | 32.0 | 109 | 34.2 | 16 | 22.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 66 | 16.9 | 50 | 15.7 | 16 | 22.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 93 | 23.8 | 69 | 21.6 | 24 | 33.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 42 | 10.7 | 34 | 10.7 | 8 | 11.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 27 | 6.9 | 25 | 7.8 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 8 | 2.0 | 6 | 1.9 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 391 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| VENTURA | UNDER 18 | 11 | 0.3 | 11 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 284 | 7.8 | 223 | 7.5 | 61 | 9.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 1651 | 45.6 | 1365 | 45.9 | 286 | 44.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 781 | 21.6 | 653 | 21.9 | 128 | 19.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 574 | 15.8 | 453 | 15.2 | 121 | 18.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 245 | 6.8 | 199 | 6.7 | 46 | 7.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 67 | 1.8 | 61 | 2.1 | 6 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 0.3 | 10 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 3624 | 100.0 | 2975 | 100.0 | 649 | 100.0 |
| YOLO | UNDER 18 | 6 | 0.6 | 6 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 86 | 9.0 | 72 | 9.0 | 14 | 9.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 446 | 46.8 | 386 | 48.0 | 60 | 40.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 169 | 17.8 | 144 | 17.9 | 25 | 16.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 166 | 17.4 | 134 | 16.7 | 32 | 21.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 60 | 6.3 | 50 | 6.2 | 10 | 6.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 1.5 | 8 | 1.0 | 6 | 4.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 952 | 100.0 | 804 | 100.0 | 148 | 100.0 |
| YUBA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 18 | 5.3 | 16 | 5.6 | 2 | 3.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 125 | 36.5 | 111 | 39.1 | 14 | 24.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 72 | 21.1 | 63 | 22.2 | 9 | 15.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 73 | 21.3 | 50 | 17.6 | 23 | 39.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 38 | 11.1 | 31 | 10.9 | 7 | 12.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 11 | 3.2 | 8 | 2.8 | 3 | 5.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 342 | 100.0 | 284 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT

| COUNTY | DUICONVICTIONRATE | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATIONTIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| STATEWIDE | 78.1\% |  | 136591 | 4288 | 14452 | 2890 | 3488 | 1253 | 73.0 | 13.0 |
| ALAMEDA | 69.6\% | OAKLAND | 62 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 134.0 | 53.0 |
|  |  | JUV OAKLAND | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205.0 | 70.0 |
|  |  | ALAMEDA | 142 | 2 | 23 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 47.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | BERKELEY | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 332.0 | 46.0 |
|  |  | FREMONT | 666 | 4 | 101 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 116.0 | 18.0 |
|  |  | PLEASANTON | 1183 | 7 | 271 | 14 | 24 | 20 | 115.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | OAKLAND | 1556 | 16 | 103 | 52 | 29 | 9 | 62.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | HAYWARD | 1352 | 6 | 190 | 24 | 60 | 55 | 107.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4973 | 64 | 690 | 103 | 137 | 97 | 95.0 | 11.0 |
| ALPINE | 63.0\% | ALPINE | 16 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 42.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 42.0 | 17.0 |
| AMADOR | 86.5\% | JACKSON | 261 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 76.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 261 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 76.0 | 14.0 |
| BUTTE | 75.5\% | BUTTE | 1013 | 44 | 200 | 64 | 21 | 37 | 72.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | JUV BUTTE | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | CHICO | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 64.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | OROVILLE | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 88.0 | 26.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1036 | 45 | 205 | 65 | 26 | 98 | 72.0 | 19.0 |
| CALAVERAS | 65.5\% | CALAVERAS | 190 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 48.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN ANDREAS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 191 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 48.0 | 14.0 |
| COLUSA | 66.7\% | COLUSA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97.0 | 83.0 |
|  |  | JUV COLUSA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 44.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | COLUSA OAK | 191 | 3 | 47 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 63.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 192 | 4 | 48 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 63.0 | 7.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 91.2\% | CONTRA COSTA | 27 | 68 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 191.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | MARTINEZ | 26 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 136.0 | 56.0 |
|  |  | CONCORD | 716 | 4 | 74 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 108.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | RICHMOND | 675 | 14 | 103 | 2 | 14 | 18 | 103.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | PITTSBURG | 704 | 15 | 61 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 125.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | WALNUT CREEK | 928 | 9 | 196 | 3 | 12 | 26 | 129.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3076 | 112 | 437 | 11 | 48 | 64 | 118.0 | 14.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 40.4\% | DEL NORTE | 125 | 7 | 73 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 59.0 | 33.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 125 | 7 | 73 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 59.0 | 33.0 |
| EL DORADO | 79.6\% | SOUTH LAKE TAHOE | 391 | 7 | 102 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 67.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | PLACERVILLE | 656 | 37 | 66 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 82.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1047 | 44 | 168 | 29 | 10 | 9 | 77.0 | 16.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | MISD DUI | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO <br> DMV UPDATE |
| FRESNO | 70.2\% | FRESNO | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 14.0 | 248.0 |
|  |  | JUV FRESNO | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125.0 | 54.0 |
|  |  | FRESNO CENTRAL | 3218 | 95 | 312 | 37 | 38 | 1 | 107.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | CLOVIS | 384 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 135.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | COALINGA | 110 | 0 | 38 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 114.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | FIREBAUGH | 105 | 1 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 136.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | FOWLER | 135 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 109.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | KERMAN | 51 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 126.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | KINGSBURG | 118 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 116.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | REEDLEY | 185 | 4 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 139.0 | 32.0 |
|  |  | SUP SANGER | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202.0 | 285.0 |
|  |  | SELMA | 45 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 111.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4376 | 110 | 454 | 57 | 51 | 12 | 112.0 | 40.0 |
| GLENN | 63.7\% | GLENN | 366 | 6 | 65 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 41.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | JUV GLENN | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318.0 | 183.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 369 | 6 | 65 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 42.0 | 15.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 54.4\% | EUREKA | 642 | 32 | 223 | 24 | 28 | 3 | 79.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 642 | 32 | 223 | 24 | 28 | 3 | 79.0 | 21.0 |
| IMPERIAL | 52.9\% | IMPERIAL | 258 | 3 | 2 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 172.0 | 90.0 |
|  |  | BRAWLEY | 106 | 0 | 22 | 7 | 1 | 17 | 216.0 | 70.0 |
|  |  | CALEXICO | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 368.0 | 170.0 |
|  |  | EL CENTRO | 232 | 13 | 3 | 61 | 2 | 7 | 184.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 609 | 16 | 27 | 124 | 8 | 28 | 192.0 | 63.0 |
| INYO | 75.2\% | INYO | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 39.0 | 80.0 |
|  |  | JUV INYO | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85.0 | 95.0 |
|  |  | BISHOP | 149 | 2 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 71.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 156 | 8 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 71.0 | 9.0 |
| KERN | 79.6\% | KERN | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 244.0 | 62.0 |
|  |  | JUV KERN | 51 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 73.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | LAMONT | 389 | 15 | 31 | 14 | 12 | 3 | 25.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | BAKERSFIELD | 2432 | 41 | 324 | 27 | 18 | 14 | 34.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | DELANO | 167 | 10 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 29.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | LAKE ISABELLA | 98 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 46.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TAFT | 166 | 9 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 33.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | SHAFTER | 184 | 7 | 13 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 26.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | MOJAVE | 333 | 6 | 55 | 45 | 14 | 5 | 45.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | RIDGECREST | 154 | 1 | 30 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 44.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3975 | 91 | 497 | 104 | 63 | 60 | 34.0 | 19.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| KINGS | 74.6\% | JUV KINGS | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | HANFORD | 589 | 18 | 52 | 23 | 8 | 4 | 83.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | AVENAL | 40 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | CORCORAN | 75 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 80.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | LEMOORE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 90.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 718 | 22 | 62 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 82.0 | 0.0 |
| LAKE | 76.5\% | LAKE | 197 | 7 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 192.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | CLEARLAKE | 152 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 213.0 | 91.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 349 | 15 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 5 | 202.0 | 51.0 |
| LASSEN | 84.0\% | LASSEN | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | JUV LASSEN | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | SUSANVILLE | 199 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 120.0 | 18.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 203 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 122.0 | 17.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | 74.3\% | LOS ANGELES | 118 | 48 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 108.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | POMONA | 63 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 86.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | LANCASTER | 44 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | SAN FERNANDO | 75 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | VAN NUYS | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 229.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | LONG BEACH | 34 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | COMPTON | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | NORWALK | 72 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 118.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TORRANCE | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | SANTA MONICA | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 219.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | JUV LOS ANGELES | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81.0 | 248.0 |
|  |  | LA AIRPORT | 1341 | 23 | 278 | 54 | 85 | 2 | 83.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | ALHAMBRA | 688 | 6 | 54 | 4 | 23 | 8 | 95.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | LANCASTER | 1056 | 6 | 80 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 58.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | BEVERLY HILLS | 294 | 2 | 26 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 112.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | BURBANK | 238 | 6 | 38 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 44.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | WEST COVINA | 1631 | 11 | 73 | 6 | 42 | 1 | 80.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | COMPTON | 1388 | 20 | 66 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 94.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | DOWNEY | 903 | 5 | 43 | 10 | 19 | 2 | 74.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | EAST LOS ANGELES | 1288 | 3 | 162 | 45 | 22 | 28 | 77.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | EL MONTE | 615 | 9 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 72.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | GLENDALE | 511 | 7 | 65 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 80.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | INGLEWOOD | 294 | 5 | 16 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 96.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | LONG BEACH | 1342 | 10 | 184 | 47 | 55 | 2 | 48.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | LA METRO | 5378 | 19 | 550 | 17 | 682 | 3 | 45.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | BELLFLOWER | 705 | 11 | 52 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 85.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | SANTA CLARITA | 882 | 12 | 67 | 43 | 19 | 1 | 82.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | PASADENA | 813 | 6 | 193 | 84 | 41 | 3 | 90.0 | 10.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| LOS ANGELES <br> (cont.) |  | MALIBU | 242 | 5 | 61 | 19 | 16 | 1 | 110.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | POMONA | 1188 | 18 | 46 | 6 | 31 | 11 | 67.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | HUNTINGTON PARK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 199.0 | 85.0 |
|  |  | SANTA MONICA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TORRANCE | 1375 | 18 | 340 | 72 | 20 | 4 | 70.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | WHITTIER | 798 | 12 | 39 | 11 | 22 | 8 | 75.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | HOLLYWOOD | 190 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 43.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | SAN FERNANDO | 1486 | 19 | 78 | 37 | 59 | 1 | 27.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | VAN NUYS | 2850 | 32 | 262 | 42 | 230 | 3 | 43.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | AVALON | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | US DIST CT LA | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167.0 | 26.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 28056 | 437 | 2798 | 600 | 1493 | 63 | 66.0 | 14.0 |
| MADERA | 64.5\% | MADERA | 32 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 161.0 | 30.0 |
|  |  | JUV MADERA | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 89.0 | 68.0 |
|  |  | CHOWCHILLA | 452 | 0 | 75 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 185.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | MADERA CRIM | 34 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 71.0 | 29.0 |
|  |  | BASS LAKE SIERRA | 105 | 4 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 164.0 | 97.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 629 | 26 | 86 | 25 | 8 | 18 | 170.0 | 20.0 |
| MARIN | 83.6\% | MARIN | 1279 | 22 | 1 | 5 | 61 | 0 | 68.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1279 | 22 | 1 | 5 | 61 | 0 | 68.0 | 23.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 52.3\% | MARIPOSA | 82 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 69.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | US MG YOSEMITE | 18 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.0 | 86.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 100 | 3 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 69.0 | 32.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 73.8\% | MENDOCINO | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.0 | 63.0 |
|  |  | JUV MENDOCINO | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107.0 | 37.0 |
|  |  | WILLITS | 90 | 11 | 33 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 51.0 | 88.0 |
|  |  | UKIAH | 295 | 5 | 67 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 36.0 | 57.0 |
|  |  | POINT ARENA | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 90.0 |
|  |  | LEGGETT | 16 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.0 | 150.0 |
|  |  | COVELO | 20 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.0 | 135.0 |
|  |  | FORT BRAGG | 88 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 | 94.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 525 | 35 | 121 | 28 | 2 | 3 | 43.0 | 78.0 |
| MERCED | 65.8\% | MERCED PROB | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 160.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | MERCED | 851 | 27 | 136 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 87.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | LOS BANOS | 255 | 6 | 27 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 127.0 | 59.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1121 | 33 | 164 | 14 | 18 | 23 | 90.0 | 57.0 |
| MODOC | 72.2\% | ALTURAS | 49 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 60.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 49 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 60.0 | 13.0 |
| MONO | 98.4\% | BRIDGEPORT | 26 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | MAMMOTH LAKES | 97 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 54.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 123 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 49.0 | 17.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | MISD DUI | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| MONTEREY | 86.3\% | MONTEREY | 131 | 37 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 46.0 | 104.0 |
|  |  | JUV MONTEREY | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 108.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | MARINA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 89.0 | 119.0 |
|  |  | SALINAS | 2017 | 12 | 149 | 52 | 17 | 24 | 24.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | KING CITY | 342 | 7 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 58.0 | 41.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2508 | 57 | 185 | 56 | 35 | 27 | 30.0 | 43.0 |
| NAPA | 85.8\% | NAPA | 811 | 31 | 89 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 54.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 811 | 31 | 89 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 54.0 | 3.0 |
| NEVADA | 84.8\% | NEVADA | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176.0 | 65.0 |
|  |  | JUV NEVADA | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | NEVADA CITY | 335 | 2 | 55 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 55.0 | 94.0 |
|  |  | TRUCKEE | 194 | 4 | 48 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 53.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 542 | 21 | 104 | 9 | 7 | 12 | 56.0 | 72.0 |
| ORANGE | 89.8\% | JUV ORANGE | 69 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 118.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | FULLERTON | 2862 | 97 | 96 | 11 | 44 | 10 | 77.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | WESTMINSTER | 2905 | 69 | 149 | 16 | 41 | 15 | 73.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | LAGUNA HILLS | 1017 | 36 | 74 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 100.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | NEWPORT BEACH | 2861 | 78 | 257 | 22 | 24 | 13 | 101.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | SANTA ANA | 2107 | 91 | 67 | 11 | 26 | 8 | 82.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11821 | 375 | 645 | 61 | 149 | 52 | 85.0 | 2.0 |
| PLACER | 95.9\% | JUV PLACER | 20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 137.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | AUBURN | 1481 | 68 | 83 | 28 | 9 | 12 | 74.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | TAHOE CITY | 187 | 2 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 65.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1688 | 70 | 111 | 33 | 9 | 12 | 74.0 | 10.0 |
| PLUMAS | 76.5\% | GREENVILLE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | CHESTER | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | PORTOLA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62.0 | 37.0 |
|  |  | QUINCY | 158 | 3 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 64.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 166 | 3 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 60.0 | 17.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 82.2\% | RIVERSIDE | 3005 | 183 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 69.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | INDIO | 90 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 67.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | JUV RIVERSIDE | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119.0 | 27.0 |
|  |  | HEMET | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 62.0 | 88.0 |
|  |  | BANNING | 390 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 94.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | INDIO | 1384 | 10 | 28 | 104 | 37 | 3 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | BLYTHE | 114 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 37.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | MURRIETA | 1940 | 25 | 5 | 38 | 14 | 2 | 76.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TEMECULA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 95.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6943 | 253 | 65 | 189 | 96 | 27 | 73.0 | 3.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SACRAMENTO | 74.7\% | SACRAMENTO | 179 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 118.0 | 49.0 |
|  |  | JUV SACRAMENTO | 27 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 76.0 | 37.0 |
|  |  | SACRAMENTO TRAF | 4919 | 83 | 716 | 20 | 90 | 12 | 50.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | US DIST COURT | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221.0 | 141.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5137 | 219 | 717 | 21 | 95 | 12 | 52.0 | 29.0 |
| SAN BENITO | 95.5\% | SAN BENITO | 341 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 136.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN BENITO | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138.0 | 53.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 344 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 136.0 | 27.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 78.7\% | SAN BERNARDINO | 17 | 72 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 70.0 | 55.0 |
|  |  | R CUCAMONGA | 15 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 123.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | VICTORVILLE | 27 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87.0 | 44.0 |
|  |  | BARSTOW | 365 | 29 | 22 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 97.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | JOSHUA TREE | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 72.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | JUV SN BRNDNO | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | JUV R CUCAMONGA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 323.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | JUV TR VCTORVLLE | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 34.0 |
|  |  | JUV VCTORVLLE | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 101.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | CHINO | 371 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 73.0 | 103.0 |
|  |  | REDLANDS | 460 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 5 | 63.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | SAN BRNDNO TRAF | 1813 | 43 | 63 | 59 | 101 | 7 | 117.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | FONTANA | 837 | 63 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 1 | 102.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | VICTORVILLE | 1470 | 11 | 66 | 70 | 43 | 39 | 101.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | RANCHO CUCMNGA | 2083 | 27 | 11 | 24 | 28 | 27 | 85.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | BIG BEAR LAKE | 193 | 6 | 16 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 67.0 | 76.0 |
|  |  | TWIN PEAKS | 85 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 46.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | SUP NEEDLES | 112 | 5 | 37 | 20 | 9 | 2 | 105.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | JOSHUA TREE | 220 | 3 | 35 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 89.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8098 | 408 | 294 | 240 | 269 | 157 | 94.0 | 8.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | 82.4\% | SAN DIEGO | 141 | 98 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 127.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | VISTA | 76 | 139 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 69.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN DIEGO | 78 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 130.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | EL CAJON | 2291 | 65 | 190 | 40 | 19 | 5 | 69.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | VISTA | 3951 | 103 | 799 | 176 | 29 | 20 | 51.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | SAN DIEGO KEARNY | 4838 | 4 | 567 | 22 | 75 | 28 | 89.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | CHULA VISTA | 1724 | 51 | 102 | 36 | 17 | 6 | 75.0 | 53.0 |
|  |  | US CT SAN DIEGO | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 531.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13100 | 461 | 1667 | 277 | 143 | 79 | 73.0 | 10.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 62.4\% | SAN FRANCISCO | 3 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN FRAN | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TRAF SAN FRAN | 799 | 25 | 197 | 155 | 40 | 47 | 80.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 803 | 48 | 199 | 155 | 40 | 47 | 82.0 | 6.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | MISD DUI | FELONY DUI | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 74.4\% | JUV SAN JOAQUIN | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215.0 | 129.0 |
|  |  | LODI | 415 | 24 | 42 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 42.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | MANTECA | 388 | 13 | 45 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 59.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TRACY | 240 | 10 | 24 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 59.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | STOCKTON | 1755 | 68 | 242 | 26 | 22 | 6 | 37.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2826 | 116 | 353 | 44 | 50 | 10 | 44.0 | 7.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 76.0\% | SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1648 | 74 | 354 | 37 | 107 | 15 | 45.0 | 27.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1648 | 74 | 354 | 37 | 107 | 15 | 45.0 | 27.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 75.5\% | SAN MATEO | 45 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 95.0 | 64.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN MATEO | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 108.0 | 49.0 |
|  |  | SAN MATEO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 92.0 | 113.0 |
|  |  | SO SN FRANCSCO | 1242 | 13 | 227 | 9 | 35 | 1 | 138.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | REDWOOD CITY | 1156 | 7 | 249 | 7 | 21 | 7 | 86.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2458 | 42 | 477 | 17 | 64 | 37 | 121.0 | 16.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 89.0\% | JUV SNTA BARBRA | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86.0 | 70.0 |
|  |  | JUV SNTA MARIA | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | SANTA BARBARA | 1199 | 59 | 235 | 60 | 22 | 5 | 61.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | SANTA MARIA | 706 | 50 | 21 | 19 | 12 | 1 | 34.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | LOMPOC | 204 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 47.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2118 | 122 | 270 | 83 | 40 | 6 | 48.0 | 14.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | 83.0\% | SANTA CLARA | 135 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 117.0 | 49.0 |
|  |  | JUV SNTA CLARA | 44 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | PALO ALTO | 847 | 13 | 126 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 75.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | SAN JOSE | 3624 | 34 | 458 | 115 | 59 | 3 | 69.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | SAN JOSE TRAF | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207.0 | 228.0 |
|  |  | SAN MARTIN | 639 | 7 | 92 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 75.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | US MAG SAN JOSE | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5293 | 202 | 676 | 138 | 82 | 3 | 73.0 | 5.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 82.3\% | SANTA CRUZ | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 138.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | JUV SANTA CRUZ | 29 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 81.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TRAF SNTA CRUZ | 975 | 13 | 133 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 66.0 | 39.0 |
|  |  | WATSONVILLE | 281 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 40.0 | 34.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1299 | 22 | 151 | 20 | 18 | 1 | 61.0 | 34.0 |
| SHASTA | 97.6\% | JUV SHASTA | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150.0 | 62.0 |
|  |  | BURNEY | 43 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | REDDING | 741 | 78 | 75 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 61.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 792 | 78 | 79 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 65.0 | 6.0 |
| SIERRA | 33.7\% | SIERRA | 10 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122.0 | 91.0 |
|  |  | DOWNIEVILLE | 15 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 25 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105.0 | 30.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL <br> RECKLESS | $\begin{gathered} \text { OTHER } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \end{gathered}$ | DUI <br> DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SISKIYOU | 74.5\% | SISKIYOU | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | JUV SISKIYOU | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | WEED | 114 | 2 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 70.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | YREKA | 140 | 14 | 40 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 62.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 255 | 17 | 66 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 66.0 | 17.0 |
| SOLANO | 87.5\% | SOLANO | 56 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 120.0 | 44.0 |
|  |  | JUV SOLANO | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 124.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | FAIRFIELD | 936 | 9 | 161 | 23 | 10 | 26 | 61.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | VALLEJO | 483 | 14 | 66 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 104.0 | 18.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1488 | 39 | 233 | 35 | 17 | 30 | 81.0 | 18.0 |
| SONOMA | 79.5\% | SONOMA | 2219 | 124 | 548 | 30 | 22 | 0 | 58.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | JUV SONOMA | 25 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 72.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | SANTA ROSA | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 80.0 | 63.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2247 | 125 | 552 | 32 | 24 | 79 | 58.0 | 22.0 |
| STANISLAUS | 62.9\% | STANISLAUS | 1588 | 63 | 232 | 40 | 24 | 1 | 64.0 | 53.0 |
|  |  | JUV STANISLAUS | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | MODESTO | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 92.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TURLOCK | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 56.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1610 | 63 | 232 | 40 | 25 | 14 | 64.0 | 52.0 |
| SUTTER | 75.9\% | TRAF YUBA CITY | 337 | 22 | 85 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 63.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 337 | 22 | 85 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 63.0 | 17.0 |
| TEHAMA | 57.4\% | TEHAMA | 11 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157.0 | 118.0 |
|  |  | JUV TEHAMA | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | CORNING | 164 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | RED BLUFF | 220 | 2 | 36 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 53.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 396 | 16 | 67 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 57.0 | 20.0 |
| TRINITY | 36.1\% | TRINITY | 58 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 71.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 58 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 71.0 | 35.0 |
| TULARE | 75.4\% | JUV VISALIA | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | DINUBA | 277 | 14 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 44.0 | 56.0 |
|  |  | PORTERVILLE | 735 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 23 | 2 | 46.0 | 90.0 |
|  |  | TULARE | 988 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 27 | 5 | 48.0 | 67.0 |
|  |  | VISALIA | 398 | 39 | 6 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 63.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2420 | 78 | 41 | 39 | 67 | 17 | 51.0 | 39.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 86.3\% | TUOLUMNE | 370 | 21 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 60.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 370 | 21 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 60.0 | 6.0 |
| VENTURA | 86.6\% | VENTURA | 3553 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 3 | 62.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3553 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 3 | 62.0 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | 74.8\% | YOLO | 914 | 38 | 198 | 18 | 5 | 4 | 108.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 914 | 38 | 198 | 18 | 5 | 4 | 108.0 | 23.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2005 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| YUBA | 61.1\% | YUBA | 8 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100.0 | 58.0 |
|  |  | JUV YUBA | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | MARYSVILLE | 314 | 4 | 74 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 69.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | BEALE AFB | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83.0 | 332.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 327 | 15 | 77 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 69.0 | 36.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS*

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE | OAKLAND | 140879 |  | 96.6 | 74.6 | 65.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| ALAMEDA |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI 1228 |  | 99.2 | 97.9 | 78.3 | 19.3 0.7 | 0.0 | 51.2 63.8 | 6.1 7.3 | 4.3 0.7 |
|  |  |  | 295 | 99.2 98.3 | 95.3 | 17.6 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 63.8 45.1 | 7.1 11.2 | 0.7 23.7 |
|  |  |  | 83 | 97.6 | 90.4 | 3.6 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 20.5 | 18.1 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { 3RD DUI } \\ 4^{\mathrm{TH}}+\mathrm{DUS} \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 56 | 89.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 10.7 | 10.7 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {TOTAL }}^{\text {TST }}$ | 1662 | 98.6 | $\begin{array}{r} 97.1 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | 61.2 | 5.1 |  | 56.7 | $\begin{array}{r} 8.8 \\ 20.0 \end{array}$ | 6.00.0 |
|  | JUV OAKLAND |  | 102 | 60.0 |  | 40.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  | 0.0 0.0 | 0.00.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 20.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 12 | 66.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 50.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 16.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ALAMEDA |  | 109 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 50.0 80.7 | 0.0 0.9 | 0.0 | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 73.4 \end{gathered}$ | 16.7 4.6 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 287 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 21.4 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 14.3 | $0.0$ |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 144 | 100.0 | 95.8 | 65.3 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 73.6 | 4.2 |  |
|  | BERKELEY |  | 14 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65. 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $0.0$ | 0.00.0 | 0.048.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | FREMONT |  | 479 | 99.8 | 99.699.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 92.1 \\ & 16.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \\ 70.9 \end{array}$ |  |  | 15.2 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI} \\ & 3^{2 R D} \end{aligned}$ | 148 | 100.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 0.0 | 49.3 | $14.2$ | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 403 | 100.0 | 97.5 | 7.5 | 60.0 | 2.5 | 17.5 |  | 0.0 2.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 27.5 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | 0.0 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { 1'ST DUI }^{\text {2ND DUI }} \end{aligned}$ | 670 | 99.9 | 99.499.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.0 \\ & 9.0 \end{aligned}$ | 22.21.6 | 0.10.0 | 46.9 | 0.0 15.7 | 0.1 |
|  | PLEASANTON |  | $\begin{aligned} & 867 \\ & 267 \end{aligned}$ | 99.5 |  |  |  |  | 43.9 | 5.3 | 0.7 |
|  |  |  |  | 100.0 | 99.3 | 12.7 | 79.4 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 4.1 | 7.5 |
|  |  |  | 46 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 76.1 | 0.0 | 23.9 | 41.3 | 32.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1190 | 99.7 | 99.2 | 71.6 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 44.9 | 6.6 | 3.7 |
|  | HAYWARD | ${ }^{\text {STP DUI }}$ | 1001 | 99.2 | 98.1 | 78.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 4.1 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 266 | 99.6 | 98.5 | 24.8 | 57.5 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 5.6 | 36.8 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 75 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 6.7 | 64.0 | 1.3 | 37.3 | 37.3 | 52.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 16 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1358 | 99.0 | 98.2 | 63.0 | 17.1 | 0.1 | 54.0 | 6.5 | 11.4 |
| ALPINE | ALPINE | ${ }^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 12 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 17 | 100.0 | 82.4 | 52.9 | 35.3 | 5.9 | 64.7 | 11.8 | 23.5 |
| AMADOR | JACKSON | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 177 | 98.3 | 93.8 | 72.3 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 49.2 | 10.2 | 5.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 61 | 96.7 | 98.4 | 6.6 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 42.6 | 14.8 | 44.3 |
|  |  | 3 BDD DUI | 21 | 76.2 | 85.7 | 9.5 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 47.6 | 66.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 22.2 | 33.3 |
|  |  | total | 268 | 94.0 | 94.4 | 50.0 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 43.3 | 14.6 | 20.1 |
| butte | BUtTE | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 693 | 96.1 | 95.4 | 89.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 11.3 | 2.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 254 | 94.9 | 97.6 | 19.3 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 5.9 | 4.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 84 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 9.5 | 65.5 | 3.6 | 42.9 | 15.5 | 21.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 26 | 65.4 | 96.2 | 7.7 | 42.3 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 34.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1057 | 94.2 | 95.2 | 64.0 | 25.5 | 0.3 | 57.0 | 10.2 | 5.2 |
|  | JUV butte | ${ }^{\text {15T DUI }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 0.0 |
|  | CHICO | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | + | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| BUTTE (cont.) | OROVILLE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
| CALAVERAS | Calaveras | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 138 | 96.4 | 97.1 | 82.6 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 46.4 | 5.8 | 4.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 41 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 12.2 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 4.9 | 17.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 15 | 86.7 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 66.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 26.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 204 | 93.6 | 97.5 | 58.8 | 23.5 | 0.5 | 37.3 | 5.9 | 8.8 |
|  | JUV CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
| COLUSA | SUP COLUSA | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ 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 COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | colusa | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 124 | 94.4 | 97.6 | 78.2 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 58.1 | 7.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 55 | 94.5 | 98.2 | 18.2 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 11 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 194 | 91.8 | 97.4 | 56.2 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 55.7 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | CONTRA COSTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 29 | 69.0 | 96.6 | 17.2 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 13.8 | 3.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 13 | 92.3 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 15.4 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 42 | 66.7 | 97.6 | 0.0 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 95 | 72.6 | 96.8 | 6.3 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 9.5 | 8.4 |
|  | MARTINEZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 27 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 28 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 |
|  | CONCORD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 520 | 99.2 | 97.1 | 91.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 61.5 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 152 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 11.8 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 61.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 44 | 97.7 | 95.5 | 4.5 | 43.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 6.8 | 6.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 720 | 99.3 | 97.1 | 68.6 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 57.9 | 8.8 | 0.4 |
|  | RICHMOND | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 479 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 90.2 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 159 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 26.4 | 63.5 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 31 | 93.5 | 100.0 | 3.2 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 689 | 98.8 | 99.1 | 68.9 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 46.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 |
|  | PITTSBURG | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 467 | 99.6 | 93.8 | 90.4 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 7.7 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 188 | 97.3 | 96.3 | 13.8 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 70.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 55 | 92.7 | 96.4 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 719 | 98.1 | 94.7 | 62.3 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 6.1 | 0.1 |
|  | WALNUT CREEK | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 721 | 98.2 | 95.0 | 95.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 58.1 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 173 | 99.4 | 98.8 | 15.0 | 77.5 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 17.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 37 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 8.1 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 21.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 937 | 98.5 | 95.9 | 76.7 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 51.4 | 7.5 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | Probation | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| DEL NORTE | DEL NORTE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 92 | 91.3 | 92.4 | 89.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 59.8 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 25 | 84.0 | 96.0 | 16.0 | 64.0 | 4.0 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 132 | 86.4 | 92.4 | 65.2 | 15.2 | 2.3 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 14.4 |
| El DORADO | SO LAKE TAHOE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 299 | 97.0 | 95.7 | 86.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 42.8 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 79 | 96.2 | 96.2 | 31.6 | 59.5 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 1.3 | 8.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 15 | 86.7 | 80.0 | 6.7 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 398 | 96.2 | 94.7 | 71.4 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 41.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
|  | PLACERVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 450 | 99.3 | 99.1 | 91.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 63.1 | 1.8 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 159 | 98.7 | 97.5 | 16.4 | 76.1 | 0.0 | 49.1 | 4.4 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 58 | 91.4 | 96.6 | 6.9 | 69.0 | 0.0 | 22.4 | 1.7 | 19.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 26 | 69.2 | 80.8 | 7.7 | 34.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 693 | 97.4 | 97.8 | 63.9 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| FRESNO | FRESNO | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV FRESNO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 22 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 77.3 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 75.0 | 4.2 |
|  | FRESNO CENTRAL | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2219 | 95.1 | 97.4 | 85.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 783 | 91.7 | 96.7 | 13.4 | 72.3 | 0.0 | 51.1 | 0.4 | 9.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD D DUI }}$ | 229 | 90.4 | 96.9 | 4.8 | 62.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 1.7 | 14.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 82 | 57.3 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3313 | 93.1 | 97.1 | 60.9 | 23.9 | 0.0 | 49.4 | 0.4 | 4.4 |
|  | clovis | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 272 | 98.2 | 94.5 | 92.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 88 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 13.6 | 80.7 | 0.0 | 65.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 24 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 4.2 | 70.8 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 384 | 97.4 | 96.1 | 68.8 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | COALINGA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 79 | 93.7 | 94.9 | 83.5 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 39.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 20 | 100.0 | 95.0 | 20.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD D DUI }}$ | 6 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 60.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 110 | 92.7 | 93.6 | 64.5 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
|  | Firebaugh | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 71 | 98.6 | 95.8 | 91.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 20 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 13 | 76.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 15.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 106 | 95.3 | 96.2 | 65.1 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 1.9 | 2.8 |
|  | FOWLER | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 87 | 96.6 | 98.9 | 71.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 41.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20.7 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 37.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  |  | $3 \mathrm{3RD}$ DUI | 16 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 137 | 97.1 | 98.5 | 49.6 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  | KERMAN | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 34 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 41.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 38.5 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 51 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 72.5 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 |



| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \end{array}$ | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| FRESNO (cont.) | KINGSBURG | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 82 | 97.6 | 97.6 | 76.8 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 51.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 29 | 89.7 | 100.0 | 17.2 | 62.1 | 0.0 | 44.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 10 | 100.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 124 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 54.8 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | REEDLEY | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 129 | 95.3 | 96.9 | 89.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 6.2 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 38 | 92.1 | 100.0 | 26.3 | 65.8 | 0.0 | 36.8 | 5.3 | 10.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 18 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 5.6 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 5.6 | 16.7 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 189 | 92.6 | 97.9 | 67.2 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 32.3 | 5.8 | 4.2 |
|  | SUP SANGER | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 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 |
|  | SELMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 87.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD DUI }}$ | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 46 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 65.2 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| GLENN | GLENN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 242 | 95.9 | 70.2 | 74.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 84 | 94.0 | 92.9 | 22.6 | 48.8 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 14.3 | 3.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD DUI }}$ | 34 | 79.4 | 100.0 | 11.8 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 8.8 | 2.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 12 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 372 | 93.0 | 79.0 | 54.8 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 27.4 | 5.9 | 1.1 |
|  | JUV GLENN | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | SUP HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 453 | 97.1 | 20.8 | 91.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 75.1 | 2.9 | 3.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 165 | 98.2 | 86.1 | 18.2 | 70.9 | 0.0 | 69.1 | 4.8 | 47.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 41 | 95.1 | 87.8 | 7.3 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 43.9 | 9.8 | 53.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 26.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 13.3 | 46.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 674 | 97.2 | 42.6 | 66.9 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 70.5 | 4.0 | 18.2 |
| IMPERIAL | IMPERIAL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 211 | 99.1 | 9.5 | 75.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 45 | 95.6 | 44.4 | 37.8 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 261 | 98.5 | 16.9 | 67.8 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 74.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
|  | BRAWLEY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 82 | 96.3 | 24.4 | 82.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 20 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 50.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 106 | 97.2 | 35.8 | 75.5 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 50.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CALEXICO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | EL CENTRO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 187 | 98.4 | 13.4 | 69.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 57.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 48 | 91.7 | 45.8 | 22.9 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 7 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 3 245 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 66.7 58.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 245 | 96.7 | 22.9 | 58.4 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \end{array}$ | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| INYO | INYO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI |  | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 8 | 62.5 | 87.5 | 37.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV TRAFFIC INYO | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV INYO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BISHOP | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 100 | 98.0 | 13.0 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 40 | 97.5 | 87.5 | 17.5 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | , | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 33.3 | 55.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 151 | 98.0 | 33.8 | 66.9 | 20.5 | 0.7 | 60.3 | 3.3 | 6.6 |
| KERN | KERN | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | , | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV KERN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 47 | 97.9 | 10.6 | 83.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 51 | 98.0 | 11.8 | 84.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | ARVIN LAMONT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 276 | 96.4 | 97.8 | 78.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 51.1 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 91 | 96.7 | 98.9 | 17.6 | 56.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 15.4 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 25 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 16.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 12 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 404 | 95.8 | 98.3 | 58.4 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 46.3 | 14.4 | 1.0 |
|  | BAKERSFIELD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1706 | 95.4 | 99.3 | 74.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 554 | 96.2 | 99.1 | 10.5 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 2.3 | 4.7 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 155 | 90.3 | 98.7 | 5.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 58 | 51.7 | 98.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  |  | total | 2473 | 94.3 | 99.2 | 54.3 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 35.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 |
|  | DELANO | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 122 | 94.3 | 74.6 | 78.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 40.2 | 6.6 | 2.5 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 39 | 100.0 | 87.2 | 12.8 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 15.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 7.7 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 23.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 177 | 94.9 | 79.7 | 57.6 | 20.9 | 0.6 | 39.0 | 10.2 | 1.7 |
|  | LAKE ISABELLA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 76 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 84.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 21 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.8 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 BD DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 100 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 69.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 71.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TAFT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 126 | 96.8 | 98.4 | 81.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 40.5 | 2.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 38 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 18.4 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 28.9 | 42.1 | 42.1 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 57.1 | 71.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 175 | 96.6 | 97.7 | 62.9 | 18.3 | 0.6 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 14.3 |
|  | SHAFTER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 129 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 89.9 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 53.5 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 46 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 8.7 | 69.6 | 2.2 | 43.5 | 10.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 46.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 191 |  |  | 64.4 | 20.4 | 0.5 | 47.6 | 9.9 | 0.0 |



| COUNTY | COURT | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KERN (cont.) | MOJAVE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 245 | 97.6 | 98.8 | 54.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 72 | 90.3 | 98.6 | 4.2 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3R DUI | 16 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 339 | 94.4 | 98.8 | 40.4 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 37.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
|  | RIDGECREST | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 105 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 64.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 37 | 91.9 | 97.3 | 5.4 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 10 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 155 | 96.1 | 99.4 | 45.2 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| KINGS | JUV KINGS | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 13 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | HANFORD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 410 | 91.7 | 98.3 | 79.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 45.1 | 14.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 141 | 87.2 | 98.6 | 38.3 | 34.0 | 0.0 | 32.6 | 17.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 37 | 86.5 | 97.3 | 18.9 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 18.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 19 | 21.1 | 94.7 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 607 | 88.1 | 98.2 | 64.3 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 15.3 | 0.7 |
|  | AVENAL | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 31 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 77.4 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 35.5 | 25.8 | 3.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 42 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 19.0 | 2.4 |
|  | CORCORAN | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 39 | 94.9 | 97.4 | 61.5 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 33.3 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 23 | 82.6 | 100.0 | 43.5 | 34.8 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 17.4 | 17.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 11 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 27.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 77 | 88.3 | 98.7 | 49.4 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 24.7 | 13.0 |
|  | LEMOORE | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LAKE | LAKE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 131 | 96.2 | 42.0 | 80.9 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 50 | 90.0 | 88.0 | 22.0 | 58.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 19 | 89.5 | 94.7 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 42.1 | 21.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 204 | 94.1 | 59.3 | 57.4 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 43.6 | 8.3 | 5.9 |
|  | CLEARLAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 104 | 90.4 | 26.9 | 76.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 48.1 | 2.9 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 46 | 95.7 | 73.9 | 8.7 | 54.3 | 8.7 | 15.2 | 6.5 | 10.9 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RPD DUI }}$ | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 160 | 90.0 | 45.0 | 52.5 | 20.0 | 2.5 | 36.3 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| LASSEN | LASSEN | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | JUV LASSEN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUSANVILLE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 136 | 95.6 | 98.5 | 83.1 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 46.3 | 5.9 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 50 | 88.0 | 96.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 36.4 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 201 | 93.0 | 96.5 | 63.2 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 6.0 | 1.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | court | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | probation | JAll | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ALCOHOLT PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES | ${ }^{\text {15T DUI }}$ | 80 | 65.0 | 83.8 | 27.5 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 8.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No DUI }}$ | 28 | 46.4 | 92.9 | 3.6 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 BrD DUI | 16 | 31.3 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 42 | 38.1 | 95.2 | 2.4 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 166 | 51.8 | 89.2 | 14.5 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 10.2 | 6.6 | 0.0 |
|  | POMONA | ${ }^{\text {15T DU }}$ | 944 | 96.7 | 21.5 | 88.2 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 58.9 | 2.3 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No DUI }}$ | 254 | 93.7 | 76.8 | 12.6 | 72.0 | 1.6 | 50.0 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
|  |  | 3Rd dui | 61 | 90.2 | 73.8 | 11.5 | 44.3 | 14.8 | 18.0 | 9.8 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 30 | 16.7 | 90.0 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1289 | 93.9 | 36.5 | 67.8 | 18.5 | 1.2 | 54.0 | 2.6 | 0.4 |
|  | LANCASTER | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 838 | 94.6 | 96.4 | 86.2 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 47.9 | 3.5 | 0.7 |
|  |  | ${ }^{2 \times N D}$ DUI | 216 | 93.1 | 95.4 | 19.9 | ${ }^{63.4}$ | 1.4 | 19.4 | 17.1 | 23.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 57 | 84.2 | 80.7 | 1.8 | 54.4 | 19.3 | 3.5 | 14.0 | 40.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 19 | 36.8 | 100.0 | 5.3 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 21.1 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO | TOTAL | 1130 1167 | 92.8 | 95.5 | ${ }_{8}^{67.9}$ | 17.5 | 1.3 | ${ }^{39.5}$ | 6.5 | 7.3 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 \mathrm{~T} ~ D U I ~}$ | 1167 | 97.8 | 49.4 | 80.1 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 50.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 308 | 95.1 | 92.2 | 11.7 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {rro DuI }}$ | 91 | 83.5 | 90.1 | 5.5 | 52.7 | 4.4 | 16.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 30 | 23.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | PASADENA | TOTAL | 1596 | 95.1 | 61.0 | 61.2 | 21.0 | 0.4 | 46.4 | 5.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 624 | 98.6 | 56.6 | 91.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 170 | 99.4 | 89.4 | 12.9 | 82.4 | 0.6 | 67.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {3nd DUI }}$ | ${ }_{11}$ | 95.3 | 81.4 | 11.6 | 41.9 | 9.3 | 18.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | VANNUYS | TOTAL | 848 | 98.2 | 65.0 | 70.8 | 20.0 | 0.6 | 64.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{151}$ DUI | 2227 | 98.4 | 39.7 | 89.8 | 3.4 | ${ }^{0.1}$ | ${ }_{51.7}^{53.7}$ | ${ }^{0.3}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 552 | 97.6 | 93.7 | 6.9 | 83.2 | 1.3 | 51.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 102 | 92.2 | 76.5 | 3.9 | 38.2 | 21.6 | 11.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 27 | 48.1 | 92.6 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
|  | LONG BEACH | total | 2908 | 97.6 | 51.7 | 70.3 | 19.8 | 1.2 | 51.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 \mathrm{TS}}$ DUI | 1099 | 98.7 | 36.9 | 90.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 70.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{2 \times N D}$ DUI | 227 | 96.9 | 79.3 | 23.8 | 58.6 | 0.9 | 47.6 | 10.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 61 | 88.5 | 65.6 | 8.2 | 37.7 | 24.6 | 21.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | COMPTON | TOTAL | 1402 | 97.1 | 45.7 | 74.9 | 12.0 | 1.3 | 63.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{1 \text { 1sT DU }}$ | 1079 | 97.4 | 85.9 925 | 88.9 | 2.4 | ${ }^{0.1}$ | ${ }_{66.0}^{613}$ | ${ }^{0.6}$ | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2No DUI }}$ | 266 | 98.5 | 92.5 | 26.3 | 65.0 | 0.4 | 61.3 | 2.3 | 0.4 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | ${ }_{6} 8$ | 85.7 | 85.7 | 7.9 | 49.2 | 11.1 | 27.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 18 | 50.0 | 83.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 5.6 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  | NORWALK | TOTAL | 1426 | ${ }^{96.5}$ | 87.1 | ${ }^{72.6}$ | 16.1 | ${ }^{0.8}$ | ${ }^{62.6}$ | 1.1 | 0.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 39 | 59.0 | 79.5 | 28.2 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 30.8 | 2.6 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | $\underbrace{\text { 2nd DUI }}_{\text {2nd }}$ | 19 8 8 | 42.1 | 94.7 1000 | $\begin{array}{r}5.3 \\ 125 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }_{125}^{10.5}$ | 5.3 0.0 | 10.5 | ${ }^{5.3}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  |  | 8 27 | 25.0 33.3 | 100.0 85.2 | 12.5 3.7 | 12.5 0.0 | 0.0 14.8 | 25.0 3.7 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | TORRANCE | total | 93 | 45.2 | 86.0 | 15.1 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 18.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {1st DUI }}$ | 1049 | 98.7 979 | 24.7 80.0 | ${ }_{193} 93$ | 1.7 | ${ }_{11}^{0.1}$ | 62.9 | ${ }^{0.8}$ | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {and }}^{\text {2NDUI }}$ | 280 | 97.9 | 80.0 | 14.3 | 72.9 | ${ }^{1.1}$ | ${ }^{60.0}$ | 2.9 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 32 | 40.6 | 96.9 | 0.0 | 18.8 | ${ }_{0.0}$ | 9.4 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 1419 | 97.0 | 39.7 | 71.7 | 18.7 | 0.5 | 59.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 |



| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{array}$ | $\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{}$ | PROBATION$\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \end{array} \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array} \\ \hline \% \end{gathered}$ | LICENSE <br> RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |
| LOS ANGELES (cont.) | SANTA MONICA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 8 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD DUI }}$ |  | 75.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 17 | 82.4 | 70.6 | 23.5 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 11.8 | 23.5 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | LOS ANGELES DLQ | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LA AIRPORT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1040 | 99.4 | 25.0 | 92.5 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 65.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 244 | 96.3 | 86.1 | 13.5 | 77.9 | 0.0 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 57 | 98.2 | 89.5 | 5.3 | 43.9 | 3.5 | 24.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 23 | 73.9 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1364 | 98.4 | 39.8 | 73.2 | 17.5 | 0.2 | 62.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  | ALHAMBRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 524 | 98.9 | 14.9 | 94.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 60.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 128 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 23.4 | 69.5 | 1.6 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 35 | 91.4 | 82.9 | 5.7 | 54.3 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 5.7 | 17.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 85.7 | 57.1 | 28.6 | 42.9 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 694 | 98.6 | 29.8 | 76.1 | 16.3 | 1.3 | 57.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
|  | BEVERLY HILLS | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 245 | 99.6 | 49.4 | 89.8 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 45 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 35.6 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 296 | 99.7 | 54.7 | 79.7 | 12.8 | 0.3 | 69.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 |
|  | BURBANK | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 183 | 98.4 | 29.0 | 92.9 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 61.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 42 | 100.0 | 92.9 | 16.7 | 78.6 | 0.0 | 54.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  |  | 3 SD DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 47.1 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 17.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 244 | 98.4 | 42.2 | 72.5 | 16.4 | 3.3 | 56.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
|  | WEST COVINA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1271 | 99.4 | 19.8 | 93.2 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 61.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 294 | 99.7 | 84.7 | 18.0 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 72 | 95.8 | 88.9 | 2.8 | 75.0 | 9.7 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1642 | 99.3 | 34.7 | 75.5 | 19.4 | 0.5 | 60.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
|  | DOWNEY | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 707 | 99.0 | 36.6 | 90.8 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 71.7 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 163 | 97.5 | 89.6 | 16.0 | 77.9 | 0.0 | 79.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 36 | 91.7 | 72.2 | 13.9 | 52.8 | 22.2 | 38.9 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 908 | 98.5 | 47.6 | 74.1 | 18.8 | 1.1 | 71.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | EAST LOS ANGELES | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 987 | 98.2 | 16.0 | 90.2 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 246 | 99.2 | 74.4 | 25.6 | 67.5 | 0.0 | 58.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 50 | 96.0 | 90.0 | 10.0 | 62.0 | 0.0 | 32.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1291 | 98.1 | 30.5 | 74.2 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
|  | EL MONTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 472 | 98.9 | 21.0 | 93.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 48.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 119 | 99.2 | 82.4 | 20.2 | 73.1 | 0.0 | 56.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 29 | 100.0 | 69.0 | 10.3 | 55.2 | 24.1 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 624 | 98.7 | 35.3 | 74.8 | 17.6 | 1.4 | 48.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | TOTAL | Probation | Jail | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES <br> (cont.) | GLENDALE | ${ }^{\text {sr }}$ DUI | 384 | 99.5 | 24.5 | 95.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 104 | 97.1 | 75.0 | 20.2 | 68.3 | 0.0 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 21 | 100.0 | 81.0 | 23.8 | 61.9 | 0.0 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 518 | 98.6 | 38.0 | 75.5 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  | INGLEWOOD | $1^{\text {sr }}$ DUI | 214 | 98.1 | 15.4 | 90.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 79.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 65 | 98.5 | 63.1 | 26.2 | 64.6 | 1.5 | 78.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 14 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 42.9 | 7.1 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 299 | 98.0 | 30.1 | 71.9 | 20.4 | 0.7 | 77.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  | LA METRO | $1^{\text {st }}$ DUI | 4158 | 98.7 | 48.1 | 91.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 50.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1011 | 99.2 | 93.4 | 8.9 | 85.9 | 0.1 | 45.0 | 0.9 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 212 | 97.2 | 96.2 | 2.4 | 76.4 | 1.9 | 7.5 | 1.4 | 5.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 16 | 81.3 | 93.8 | 6.3 | 68.8 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5397 | 98.6 | 58.6 | 71.9 | 23.5 | 0.1 | 47.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
|  | BELLFLOWER | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 544 | 99.6 | 14.0 | 93.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 66.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 140 | 99.3 | 75.7 | 23.6 | 67.1 | 1.4 | 69.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 31 | 96.8 | 58.1 | 6.5 | 35.5 | 22.6 | 19.4 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 716 | 99.4 | 27.9 | 75.7 | 15.5 | 1.5 | 64.9 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA CLARITA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 643 | 97.5 | 27.5 | 83.7 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 49.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 191 | 94.8 | 90.6 | 8.9 | 75.9 | 0.0 | 51.8 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 50 | 94.0 | 88.0 | 10.0 | 46.0 | 6.0 | 14.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 894 | 95.9 | 45.2 | 62.6 | 22.0 | 0.3 | 47.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 |
|  | MALIBU | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 198 | 99.0 | 4.5 | 88.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 39 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 7.7 | 82.1 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 10 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 247 | 99.2 | 19.4 | 72.5 | 16.2 | 1.6 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WHITTIER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 622 | 98.4 | 17.4 | 91.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 60.6 | 6.4 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 148 | 94.6 | 84.5 | 14.2 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 60.1 | 4.7 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 36 | 91.7 | 75.0 | 2.8 | 55.6 | 22.2 | 25.0 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 810 | 97.3 | 32.3 | 73.0 | 18.0 | 1.2 | 58.6 | 6.4 | 1.1 |
|  | HOLLYWOOD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 151 | 100.0 | 15.9 | 90.1 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 87.4 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 31 | 100.0 | 77.4 | 12.9 | 64.5 | 3.2 | 71.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 8 | 100.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 190 | 100.0 | 27.9 | 73.7 | 14.2 | 1.6 | 81.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  | AVALON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 81.8 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 13 | 100.0 | 15.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  | US DISTCT LA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 35 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 43 | 18.6 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUP MADERA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 31 | 77.4 | 90.3 | 61.3 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 32.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 5 | 40.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | . | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 54 | 66.7 | 88.9 | 38.9 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 7.4 | 29.6 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | Probation | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| MADERA (cont.) | CHOWCHILLA | ${ }^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 83.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 309 | 95.1 | 98.7 | 86.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 104 | 96.2 | 97.1 | 23.1 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 39.4 | 12.5 | 1.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 32 | 87.5 | 96.9 | 6.3 | 59.4 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
|  | MADERA CRIM | total | 452 | 94.9 | 98.2 | 64.8 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 11.5 | 0.7 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 18 | 77.8 | 72.2 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 5 | 40.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BASS LAKE SIERRA | TOTAL | 34 | 67.6 | 76.5 | 41.2 | 11.8 | 2.9 | 8.8 | 26.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 64 | 98.4 | 93.8 | 92.2 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 42.2 | 3.1 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 31 | 93.5 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 32.3 | 6.5 | 3.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUP SAN RAFAEL | Total | 109 | 97.2 | 96.3 | 57.8 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| MARIN |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1003 | 99.2 | 10.3 | 91.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 7.6 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 231 | 100.0 | 86.6 | 9.5 | 83.5 | 0.0 | 79.2 | 4.8 | 6.1 |
|  |  | 3 SRD DUI | 55 | 98.2 | 92.7 | 5.5 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 54.5 | 30.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 12 | 75.0 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
|  | SUP MARIPOSA | TOTAL | 1301 | 99.1 | 28.1 | 72.7 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 9.3 | 3.2 |
| MARIPOSA |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 56 | 100.0 | 96.4 | 83.9 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 89.3 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ |  | 100.0 | 87.5 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | USMG YOSEMITE | TOTAL | 85 | 100.0 | 95.3 | 63.5 | 22.4 | 1.2 | 83.5 | 2.4 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 29.4 | 41.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RDD DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUP UKIAH | TOTAL | 18 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| MENDOCINO |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 16.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 8.3 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 8.3 |
|  | JUV MENDOCINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
|  | wILLITS | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 67 | 97.0 | 95.5 | 82.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 52.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20.8 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 101 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 60.4 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 46.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
|  | UKIAH | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 199 | 96.5 | 98.0 | 82.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 55.8 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 82 | 96.3 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 63.4 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 0.0 | 25.6 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 11.8 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 47.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 300 | 96.3 | 98.7 | 61.0 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 51.3 | 0.3 | 11.0 |
|  | POINT ARENA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |



| COUNTY | COURT | DUI <br> OFFENDER <br> STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | Jall | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-MONTH } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { MENDOCINO } \\ & \text { (cont.) } \end{aligned}$ | LEGGETT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | COVELO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 20 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 55.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 |
|  | FORT BRAGG | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 60 | 98.3 | 96.7 | 86.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 26 | 92.3 | 96.2 | 23.1 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 26.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 9 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 55.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 96 | 96.9 | 95.8 | 61.5 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 2.1 | 12.5 |
| MERCED | SUP MERCED | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 55.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  | MERCED JUV | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 15 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  | MERCED | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 613 | 98.7 | 97.1 | 90.9 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 186 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 14.0 | 81.7 | 0.0 | 57.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 61 | 88.5 | 93.4 | 18.0 | 54.1 | 0.0 | 26.2 | 19.7 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 869 | 98.2 | 97.2 | 68.5 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 3.7 | 0.1 |
|  | LOS BANOS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 191 | 97.9 | 96.9 | 92.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 83.8 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 48 | 97.9 | 95.8 | 35.4 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 81.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 43.8 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 261 | 98.1 | 96.9 | 74.7 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 79.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
| MODOC | Alturas | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 34 | 100.0 | 55.9 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 41.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 14 | 100.0 | 92.9 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 52 | 100.0 | 67.3 | 34.6 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 36.5 | 1.9 | 5.8 |
| MONO | BRIDGEPORT | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 17 | 100.0 | 76.5 | 82.4 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | , | 100.0 | 83.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RD DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 26 | 96.2 | 80.8 | 61.5 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 42.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MAMMOTH LAKES | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 61 | 98.4 | 60.7 | 93.4 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 55.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 30 | 100.0 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 93.3 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 97 | 97.9 | 74.2 | 59.8 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 86 | 90.7 | 94.2 | 36.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 41.9 | 16.3 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 33 | 84.8 | 97.0 | 12.1 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 36.4 | 45.5 |
|  |  | 3 RDD DUI | 16 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.3 | 62.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 33 | 60.6 | 97.0 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 48.5 | 39.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 168 | 83.3 | 95.8 | 21.4 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 43.5 | 31.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \hline \text { MONTEREY } & \\ & \text { (cont.) } \end{array}$ | JUV MONTEREY | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 16 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 93.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 93.8 | 0.0 |
|  | MARINA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | SALINAS | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1521 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 62.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 35.3 | 9.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 413 | 99.3 | 99.5 | 12.3 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 21.5 | 74.8 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 79 | 97.5 | 100.0 | 1.3 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 58.2 | 89.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 16 | 100.0 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 43.8 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 50.0 | 68.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2029 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 49.6 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 33.5 | 26.6 |
|  | KING CITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 259 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 56.4 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 44.0 | 5.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 68 | 97.1 | 98.5 | 13.2 | 41.2 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 51.5 | 58.8 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 47.1 | 76.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 60.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 349 | 98.3 | 98.6 | 44.7 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 45.6 | 19.8 |
| NAPA | NAPA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 612 | 98.2 | 93.1 | 93.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 85.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 172 | 97.7 | 99.4 | 12.2 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 1.2 | 64.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 45 | 91.1 | 100.0 | 4.4 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 73.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 13 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 842 | 96.8 | 94.9 | 70.7 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 80.9 | 2.3 | 19.5 |
| NEVADA | NEVADA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ duI | 10 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 21 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
|  | JUV NEVADA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  | NEVADA CITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 242 | 99.6 | 93.8 | 91.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 56.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 70 | 97.1 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 19 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 5.3 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 57.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 337 | 99.1 | 95.5 | 67.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 47.2 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
|  | TRUCKEE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 157 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 94.3 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 79.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 31 | 93.5 | 100.0 | 25.8 | 67.7 | 0.0 | 71.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 R D}$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 28.6 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 14.3 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 198 | 99.0 | 99.5 | 79.8 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 77.3 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| ORANGE | JUV ORANGE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 73 | 97.3 | 16.4 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 83.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 73 | 97.3 | 16.4 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 83.6 | 0.0 |
|  | FULLERTON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2228 | 99.4 | 42.4 | 93.9 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 49.7 | 13.2 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 576 | 97.7 | 90.8 | 10.4 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 9.5 | 39.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 120 | 92.5 | 95.8 | 3.3 | 79.2 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 15.0 | 63.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 35 | 60.0 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 5.7 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2959 | 98.3 | 54.6 | 72.9 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 47.2 | 12.5 | 12.2 |
|  | WESTMINSTER | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2188 | 98.6 | 16.5 | 92.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 4.1 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 618 | 98.5 | 87.1 | 11.5 | 75.9 | 0.0 | 51.1 | 3.7 | 14.7 |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 R D}$ DUI | 135 | 97.0 | 97.0 | 3.7 | 85.2 | 0.0 | 21.5 | 3.0 | 37.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 33 | 75.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 24.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2974 | 98.3 | 35.7 | 70.3 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 3.9 | 5.7 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| county | court | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | тOTAL | Probation | Jall | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | ${ }^{30-M O N T H} \begin{aligned} & \text { PROGRAM }\end{aligned}$ | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| ORANGE  <br>  (cont.) <br>   <br>   <br>   <br>   <br>   <br>   | LAGUNA HILLS | ${ }^{\text {15T DUI }}$ | 834 | 99.9 | 15.9 | 94.4 | 1.3 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 55.2 | 12.1 | ${ }^{0.4}$ |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 180 | 98.3 | 87.2 | 11.1 | 80.6 | 0.0 | 43.3 | 17.2 | 8.3 |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 \text { Red DUI }}$ | 31 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 93.5 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 12.9 | 22.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | total | 1053 | 99.2 | 31.2 | 76.6 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 51.2 | 13.1 | 2.7 |
|  | NEWPORT BEACH | ${ }^{15 T}$ DU | 2212 | 99.3 | ${ }^{22.4}$ | 91.7 | 1.3 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{61.3}$ | 5.3 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 564 | 98.8 | 93.4 | 8.3 | 78.4 | 0.0 | 36.5 | 22.9 | 5.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 R \mathrm{D}}$ DUI | 136 | 95.6 | 95.6 | 0.7 | 77.2 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 13.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 27 | 70.4 | 100.0 | 3.7 | 48.1 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
|  | Santa ana | TOTAL | 2939 | 98.8 | 40.1 | 70.7 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 53.7 | 9.1 | 1.7 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {1spl }}^{1 \text { STI }}$ | 1672 394 | 98.5 | 37.2 | 91.7 | 3.4 797 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{38.0}$ | 4.4 | 0.7 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 394 | 97.7 | ${ }_{971}^{92.4}$ | 11.7 | 79.7 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{38.6}$ | 4.1 | 14.7 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {3re DUI }}$ | 105 | 91.4 | 97.1 | 4.8 | ${ }^{73.3}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 12.4 | 4.8 | ${ }^{35.2}$ |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH4 }}$ + DUI | 27 | 29.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
|  | juv Placer | total | 2198 | 97.2 | 50.7 | 72.1 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 41.9 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| placer |  | ${ }_{\text {lem }}^{\text {1st DUI }}$ | ${ }_{20}^{20}$ | 95.0 950 950 | 75.0 75.0 | ${ }_{45.0}^{45.0}$ | 0.0 0.0 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.0}$ | 90.0 | 0.0 00 |
|  | AUburn | ${ }_{15 T}$ DUI | 1144 | 99.0 | 97.2 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 4.1 | ${ }_{3.1}$ |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 286 | 93.0 | 98.6 | 2.4 | 73.4 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 11.5 | 33.6 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {red DUI }}$ | 88 | 81.8 | 98.9 | 1.1 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 4.5 | 67.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THI }}$ DUI | 31 | 38.7 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 29.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1549 | 95.7 | 97.5 | 3.1 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 40.9 | 5.4 | 12.8 |
|  | tahoe city | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 143 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 80.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 59.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 7.5 | 85.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{45.0}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | ${ }^{33.3}$ | ${ }^{33.3}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THI }}$ + DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| PLUMAS | Greenvilue | TOTAL | 189 | 100.0 | 98.9 1000 | ${ }^{63.0}$ | 20.1 | 1.1 | 55.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 100.0 | 100.0 100.0 | 100.0 100.0 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 0.0 0.0 | 100.0 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ |
|  | Chester | $1{ }^{15 T}$ DuI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | portola | ${ }^{1 \text { 1sT DU }}$ | 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 |
|  | Quincy | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 105 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 89.5 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {2nd }}^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 38 13 | 100.0 100.0 | 100.0 100.0 | ${ }_{23.1}^{18.4}$ | 76.3 76.9 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 68.4 538 | ${ }_{77}^{2.6}$ | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | $4^{\text {Pru+ DUI }}$ | $\begin{array}{r}13 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 40.0 | 100.0 | 02.1 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.0 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | RIVERSIDE | TOTAL | 161 | 96.9 | 99.4 | ${ }_{89.6}$ | 26.7 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{56.9}^{61.5}$ | 5.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  |  | 2360 565 | 96.9 | 96.8 979 | 89.5 | 1.4 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 56.9 | 5.8 | ${ }_{0}^{0.1}$ |
|  |  | ${ }_{3 \text { Red DuI }}$ | ${ }_{173}$ | 94.3 | 99.8 | 10.8 8.7 | ${ }_{76.3}$ | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 22.5 | ${ }_{6.9}^{7.4}$ | 2.9 6.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 90 | 57.8 | 98.9 | 2.2 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 7.8 | 1.1 |
|  | indio |  | 3188 1111 | ${ }_{97.0}^{95.0}$ | 97.1 86.9 | ${ }_{92.1}^{69.8}$ | 19.7 2.4 | 0.0 0.0 | ${ }_{73.3}^{52.8}$ | 6.2 1.8 | 0.9 0.3 |
|  |  |  | 1111 302 | 99.0 | ${ }_{96.4}^{86,9}$ | ${ }_{21.5}^{92.1}$ | 2.4 69.5 | ${ }_{0}^{0.0}$ | 73.3 68.9 | ${ }_{2.3}^{1.8}$ | 0.3 1.3 |
|  |  | 3rD DUI | 71 | 91.5 | 97.2 | 11.3 | 69.0 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 32.4 | 9.9 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {TOTAL }}$ | ${ }_{1513}^{29}$ | ${ }_{95.4}^{34.5}$ | 100.0 89.6 | 0.0 72.4 | 31.0 19.5 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 0.0 68.4 | 10.3 3.5 | 3.4 1.0 |
|  | JUV RIVERSIDE | (1sT DU | 16 16 | 75.0 75.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 6.3 6.3 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG |  | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| RIVERSIDE <br> (cont.) | HEMET | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL |  | 100.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BANNING | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 312 | 99.4 | 87.8 | 93.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 67.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 61 | 100.0 | 98.4 | 31.1 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 57.4 | 4.9 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 17.6 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 41.2 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BLYTHE | TOTAL | 393 | 99.2 | 89.8 | 80.2 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 63.9 | 2.3 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 90 | 97.8 | 26.7 | 96.7 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 21 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 23.8 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 9.5 | 4.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | , | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  | MURRIETA | TOTAL | 117 | 97.4 | 38.5 | 78.6 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 56.4 | 5.1 | 1.7 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1493 | 98.8 | 90.9 | 96.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 53.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 372 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 16.9 | 78.5 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
|  | SACRAMENTO | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 90 | 91.1 | 96.7 | 8.9 | 81.1 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 1.1 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1965 | 98.0 | 92.3 | 76.9 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 44.6 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 93 | 74.2 | 94.6 | 36.6 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 29.0 | 0.0 |
| SACRAMENTO |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 62 | 67.7 | 98.4 | 8.1 | 33.9 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 16.1 | 3.2 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 46 | 58.7 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 111 | 70.3 | 99.1 | 0.0 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 2.7 |
|  | JUV SACRAMENTO | TOTAL | 312 | 69.2 | 97.1 | 12.5 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 14.7 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 30 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 30 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SACTO TRAFFIC | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3539 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 91.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 54.4 | 11.5 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1099 | 99.5 | 99.3 | 8.6 | 73.5 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 13.6 | 4.3 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 327 | 98.5 | 98.8 | 1.5 | 48.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 5.2 | 8.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 37 | 94.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 5.4 |
|  | US DIST COURT | TOTAL | 5002 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 66.6 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 48.9 | 11.5 | 1.8 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 9 | 88.9 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN BENITO | TOTAL | 12 | 91.7 | 41.7 | 58.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BENITO |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 236 | 98.3 | 91.5 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.8 | 32.2 | 3.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 82 | 96.3 | 95.1 | 13.4 | 43.9 | 0.0 | 31.7 | 26.8 | 18.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 29 | 93.1 | 100.0 | 3.4 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 3.4 | 48.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 30.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 357 | 95.5 | 93.3 | 45.7 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 27.7 | 10.6 |
|  | JUV SAN BENITO | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ 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 BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 49 | 79.6 | 89.8 | 61.2 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 16 | 68.8 | 87.5 | 25.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 9 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 66.7 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 89 | 76.4 | 88.8 | 39.3 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | RCH CUCAMONGA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 35 | 68.6 | 85.7 | 45.7 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 11 | 81.8 | 81.8 | 9.1 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 5 | 60.0 | ${ }^{60.0}$ | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 16 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 67 | 65.7 | 80.6 | 31.3 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | Jail | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN BERNARDINO (cont.) | VICTORVILLE | 15 DUI | 1114 | 96.1 | 73.2 | 89.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 82.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 323 | 95.0 | 91.6 | 21.4 | 68.7 | 0.0 | 69.3 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 88 | 89.8 | 96.6 | 5.7 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 6.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 36 | 61.1 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1561 | 94.7 | 78.0 | 68.3 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 76.4 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
|  | BARSTOW | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 294 | 96.9 | 58.8 | 88.8 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 71 | 93.0 | 84.5 | 32.4 | 49.3 | 0.0 | 64.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 20 | 95.0 | 100.0 | 15.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 9 | 55.6 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 394 | 95.2 | 66.2 | 72.8 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 74.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  | JOSHUA TREE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 23 | 69.6 | 87.0 | 52.2 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SAN BERNDNO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 20 | 95.0 | 20.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 20 | 95.0 | 20.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV R CUCAMONG | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV VCTORVILLE | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 12 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CHINO | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 293 | 98.0 | 32.8 | 93.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 63.8 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 63 | 96.8 | 87.3 | 12.7 | 76.2 | 0.0 | 58.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 27 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 387 | 97.4 | 46.8 | 72.9 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 59.2 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
|  | REDLANDS | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 381 | 100.0 | 14.7 | 96.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 62 | 100.0 | 51.6 | 38.7 | 56.5 | 3.2 | 83.9 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 462 | 99.8 | 21.6 | 85.5 | 11.0 | 0.4 | 90.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN BERNRDN SUP | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 1320 | 97.4 | 71.8 | 90.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 406 | 95.8 | 87.4 | 17.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 61.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 102 | 93.1 | 94.1 | 13.7 | 48.0 | 0.0 | 30.4 | 11.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 28 | 71.4 | 89.3 | 3.6 | 46.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 10.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1856 | 96.4 | 76.7 | 69.0 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 62.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  | FONTANA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 653 | 96.3 | 74.7 | 85.9 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 60.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 175 | 92.6 | 92.0 | 10.3 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 49 | 83.7 | 89.8 | 2.0 | 36.7 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 6.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 23 | 47.8 | 78.3 | 4.3 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 900 | 93.7 | 79.0 | 64.6 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 56.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
|  | RNCH CUMGA DIST | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1589 | 99.2 | 30.4 | 93.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 87.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 417 | 99.3 | 88.7 | 16.5 | 78.7 | 0.0 | 84.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD D DUI }}$ | 85 | 96.5 | 97.6 | 4.7 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 19 | 78.9 | 89.5 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 2110 | 99.0 | 45.2 | 73.7 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 84.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
|  | big bear lake | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 148 | 100.0 | 44.6 | 94.6 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 93.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 42 | 97.6 | 83.3 | 23.8 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 2.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 SD DUI |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | , | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 199 | 98.0 | 54.3 | 75.9 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 88.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued
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TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| county | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | probation | Jall | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH <br> PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \end{gathered}$ | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SANTA BARBARA <br>  <br>  <br> SANTA Clara | JUV SANTA BARB JUV SNT MARIA WST SANTA BARbARA | ${ }^{\text {15T DUI }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{25.0}$ | 50.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | total | 4 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 \mathrm{sr}}$ DuI | 7 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 | 28.6 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 \mathrm{Sr}}$ DUI | 937 | 97.4 | 77.7 | 13.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 62.1 | 7.6 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 239 | 95.8 | 97.5 | 1.3 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 40.6 | 18.4 | 6.3 |
|  | SNTA MARIA | ${ }^{\text {rro DUI }}$ | 59 | 89.8 | 96.6 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 0.0 | 20.3 | 27.1 | 8.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 23 | 65.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 8.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1258 | 96.2 | 82.8 | 10.4 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 10.8 | 1.8 |
|  |  | 15T DUI 2ND DUI | 511 | ${ }_{958}^{98.6}$ | 57.3 952 | 5.9 | 2.0 590 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 51.3 | 17.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2ND DUI | 166 | 95.8 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 72.9 | ${ }^{6.6}$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 \text { 3RD DUI }}$ | 67 | ${ }^{86.6}$ | 100.0 | 0.0 | 64.2 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 3.0 | ${ }^{71.6}$ | 11.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 12 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  | LOMPOC | TOTAL | 756 | 95.9 | ${ }^{70.1}$ | 4.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 36.6 | 34.4 | 2.5 |
|  |  |  | 152 46 | 99.3 100.0 | ${ }_{76.1}^{53.3}$ | 3.9 0.0 | 2.0 56.5 | 0.0 0.0 | ${ }_{21.7}^{57.2}$ | 12.5 58.7 | 0.0 4.3 |
|  | Santa Clara | ${ }_{\text {3RO DUI }}$ | ${ }_{14}^{46}$ | 100.0 85.7 | 76.1 100.0 | ${ }_{0}^{0.0}$ | 57.1 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 21.7 0.0 | ${ }_{71.4} 58$ | 4.3 21.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 215 | 97.2 | 61.9 | 2.8 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 45.1 | 26.0 | 2.3 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 119 | ${ }^{75.6}$ | 97.5 | 33.6 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2N0 DUI }}$ | 57 | 56.1 | 100.0 | 7.0 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
|  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 3RD DUI } \\ & 4 \text { THeDU }\end{aligned}\right.$ | ${ }_{71}$ | 40.6 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 21.9 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 3.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THP }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 71 | 43.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 5.6 |
|  | juv Santa clara | TOTAL | 279 | 59.5 | 98.9 | 16.1 | 20.8 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 3.9 | 2.2 809 | 3.9 |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { 15T DU } \\ \text { 2ND DUI }}}{ }$ | 47 1 | 100.0 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 12.8 <br> 0.0 | 80.9 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | SUP Palo alto | TOTAL | 48 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }_{0} 0$ | ${ }_{0.0}$ | ${ }_{12.5}^{0.0}$ | 100.0 81.3 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{15 T}$ DUI | 674 | 99.4 | 96.0 | 93.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 77.2 | 1.2 | ${ }^{1.3}$ |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2ND DUI }}$ | 142 | 97.9 | 99.3 | 23.2 | 69.0 | 0.7 | 66.9 | ${ }^{1.5}$ | 28.9 |
|  | SAN Jose | ${ }^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 67.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 856 | 99.2 | 96.7 | 77.6 | 16.5 | 0.1 | 72.8 | 1.5 | ${ }^{8.8}$ |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { 15T DU } \\ \text { 2ND DUI }}}{ }$ | 2750 740 | 99.7 99.3 | 98.7 99.5 | 92.8 14.3 | 4.6 80.3 | ${ }_{0.1}^{0.0}$ | 57.1 51.5 | 3.7 3.0 | 2.3 29.9 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 162 | 96.9 | 100.0 | ${ }^{24} 5$ | 66.0 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 1.2 | 59.9 |
|  | SAN JoSe traf | $4^{\text {THH }+ \text { DUI }}$ |  | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3658 | 99.5 | 98.9 | 72.7 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 53.9 | 3.4 | 10.5 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {1sT DUI }}$ | ${ }_{2}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 100.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | palo alto | ${ }_{15 \mathrm{ST}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | ${ }_{0.0}$ |
|  |  | 2N0 DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN MARTIN | TOTAL |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 433 149 | 100.0 100.0 | 98.6 99.3 | 73.2 6.7 | 2.8 72.5 | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 42.0 32.9 | 16.9 4.7 | 0.7 22.1 |
|  |  | $3 \mathrm{3RDOI}$ | 53 | 98.1 | 100.0 | ${ }_{11.3}^{6.7}$ | ${ }_{18.9}$ | ${ }_{0.0}^{0.0}$ | 32.7 | ${ }_{5.7}^{4.7}$ | ${ }_{60.4}^{26.4}$ |
|  | US MAG SAN JoSe | $4^{\text {TH4 }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  |  | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { TST DUI }}}_{\text {TOTAL }}$ | 646 1 | 99.8 100.0 | 98.9 0.0 | 51.5 100. 1 | 21.2 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 36.2 1000 |  | 11.1 0. 0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {2ND DUI }}^{\substack{\text { 1rat }}}$ | 1 | 10.0 100.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 0.0 | 0.0 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 100.0 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { LICENSE } \\ \text { RESTRICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 71.4 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 21 | 76.2 | 95.2 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 29 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 37.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 51.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 29 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 37.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 51.7 | 0.0 |
|  | TRAF SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 685 | 99.1 | 98.4 | 81.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 53.0 | 13.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 230 | 98.7 | 97.8 | 8.3 | 63.9 | 0.0 | 42.2 | 20.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 64 | 92.2 | 100.0 | 1.6 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 73.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 988 | 98.3 | 98.4 | 58.8 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 47.2 | 19.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WATSONVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 195 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 47.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 49.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 62 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 9.7 | 38.7 | 0.0 | 40.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 23 | 95.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 91.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 283 | 99.3 | 99.6 | 35.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 36.7 | 53.4 | 0.0 |
| SHASTA | JUV SHASTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 100.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 |
|  | BURNEY | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.2 | 12.5 | 4.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 15 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 86.7 |
|  |  | 3RD DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 43 | 97.7 | 100.0 | 58.1 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 53.5 | 9.3 | 41.9 |
|  | REDDING | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 501 | 96.6 | 99.6 | 91.4 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 8.2 | 2.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 219 | 93.6 | 99.1 | 15.1 | 73.5 | 0.0 | 58.9 | 5.5 | 66.7 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 61 | 90.2 | 98.4 | 4.9 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 26.2 | 80.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 38 | 21.1 | 97.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 7.9 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 819 | 91.8 | 99.3 | 60.3 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 52.3 | 9.4 | 25.8 |
|  | US DIST REDDING | $2^{\text {ND }}$ 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 |
| SIERRA | SIERRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 91.7 | 91.7 | 25.0 | 41.7 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | DOWNIEVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | SISKIYOU | 3RD 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 |
|  | JUV SISKIYOU | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | WEED | $1^{\text {ST }} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 82 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 73.2 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 27 | 96.3 | 100.0 | 25.9 | 70.4 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 3.7 | 25.9 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 71.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 116 | 99.1 | 99.1 | 57.8 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 31.0 | 5.2 | 12.1 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | Jail | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 1ST OFFENDER } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { ALCOHOL PROG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SOLANO | YREKA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 97 | 96.9 | 99.0 | 78.4 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 2.1 | 4.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 38 | 97.4 | 97.4 | 23.7 | 68.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 21.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 14 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | total | 154 | 94.2 | 98.7 | 55.2 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 23.4 | 3.2 | 13.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 31 | 83.9 | 96.8 | 77.4 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 14 | 64.3 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  | JUV SOLANO | total | 71 | 74.6 | 98.6 | 36.6 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 13 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FAIRFIELD | TOTAL | 14 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 684 | 98.4 | 99.0 | 93.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 66.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 200 | 97.5 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
|  |  | 3 BRD DUI | 55 | 83.6 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SONOMA | VALLEJO | total | 945 | 97.0 | 99.3 | 72.3 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 59.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 316 | 98.7 | 99.1 | 94.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 64.2 | 0.9 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 118 | 93.2 | 100.0 | 16.9 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 7.6 |
|  | SONOMA | ${ }^{\text {3RD DUI }}$ | 46 | 93.5 | 95.7 | 6.5 | 76.1 | 0.0 | 41.3 | 0.0 | 15.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 17 | 64.7 | 94.1 | 11.8 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  |  | total | 497 | 95.8 | 98.8 | 64.8 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 58.1 | 0.6 | 4.4 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1583 | 97.2 | 90.7 | 71.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 44.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 512 | 94.5 | 98.4 | 9.6 | 48.4 | 0.0 | 36.9 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
|  |  | 3 BRD DUI | 180 | 87.8 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 68 | 57.4 | 97.1 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  | JUV SONOMA | TOTAL | 2343 | 94.8 | 93.3 | 50.5 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 24 | 66.7 | 8.3 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 75.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| STANISLAUS | SANTA ROSA | TOTAL | 25 | 64.0 | 12.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 76.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | STANISLAUS | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1202 | 99.1 | 99.3 | 85.4 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 2.7 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 311 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 18.0 | 68.8 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 97 | 97.9 | 99.0 | 9.3 | 71.1 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 2.1 | 16.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 41 | 68.3 | 100.0 | 4.9 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.1 |
| SUTTER | JUV STANISLAUS | total | 1651 | 98.1 | 99.3 | 66.2 | 21.7 | 0.1 | 27.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{1}$ ST DUI | 18 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 18 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 |
|  | MODESTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | TURLOCK <br> TRAF YUBA CITY | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 241 | 97.1 | 93.8 | 90.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 61.4 | 0.8 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 74 | 95.9 | 98.6 | 14.9 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 55.4 | 1.4 | 21.6 |
|  |  | 3 BDDUI | 31 | 93.5 | 96.8 | 12.9 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 12.9 | 41.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | $13$ | $84.6$ | $84.6$ | 7.7 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 30.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 359 | 96.1 | 94.7 | 65.5 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 2.2 | 10.9 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | TOTAL | Probation | Jail | 1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG | ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { COURT } \\ \text { SUSPENSION } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 6 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 29.2 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 58.3 |
|  | JUV TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | CORNING | TOTAL | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 93 | 98.9 | 100.0 | 94.6 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 68.8 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 52 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 16 | 68.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 164 | 92.1 | 100.0 | 57.3 | 31.1 | 0.0 | 46.3 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
|  | Redbluff | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 139 | 91.4 | 97.1 | 78.4 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 82.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 60 | 95.0 | 100.0 | 18.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 86.7 | 8.3 | 5.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RRD DUI }}$ | 14 | 64.3 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 28.6 | 21.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 22.2 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 222 | 89.6 | 97.7 | 55.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 79.7 | 8.6 | 4.1 |
| TRINITY | TRINITY | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 40 | 65.0 | 90.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 17 | 94.1 | 88.2 | 11.8 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RD DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 61 | 73.8 | 88.5 | 42.6 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | JUV VISALIA | ${ }^{\text {ST DU }}$ DUI | 21 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 23 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | DINUBA | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 216 | 94.0 | 96.3 | 80.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 51 | 98.0 | 94.1 | 15.7 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 11.8 |
|  |  | 3 BDD DUI | 16 | 87.5 | 87.5 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 87.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 291 | 94.2 | 94.8 | 62.9 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 54.6 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
|  | PORTERVILLE | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 476 | 93.1 | 92.4 | 79.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 202 | 85.1 | 95.5 | 14.9 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 10.9 |
|  |  | $3 \mathrm{3RD}$ DUI | 47 | 89.4 | 93.6 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 27.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 23 | 56.5 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 748 | 89.6 | 93.6 | 54.7 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 1.9 | 6.3 |
|  | TULARE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 730 | 96.4 | 82.7 | 84.8 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 27.1 | 6.4 | 1.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 206 | 97.6 | 97.6 | 14.1 | 78.2 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 24.8 | 13.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 46 | 97.8 | 93.5 | 2.2 | 87.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 34.8 | 28.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 17 | 88.2 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 47.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 999 | 96.6 | 86.5 | 65.0 | 24.1 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 11.6 | 6.0 |
|  | VISALIA DIV | $1^{\text {ST DUI }}$ | 297 | 89.9 | 89.6 | 70.4 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 1.7 | 5.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 93 | 93.5 | 95.7 | 19.4 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 2.2 | 16.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 27 | 92.6 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 18.5 | 48.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 55.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 437 | 89.2 | 91.8 | 52.6 | 12.4 | 0.0 | 50.8 | 2.7 | 10.3 |
| tuolumne | TUOLUMNE | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 257 | 92.6 | 95.7 | 82.9 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 2.7 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 91 | 93.4 | 98.9 | 13.2 | 73.6 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 32 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 6.3 | 21.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 72.7 | $100.0$ | 0.0 578 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 391 | 92.3 | 96.9 | 57.8 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 52.4 | 2.6 | 2.0 |

TABLE B4: 2005 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER <br> ALCOHOL PROG | 18-MONTH ALCOHOL PROG | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | LICENSE RESTRICTION | COURT SUSPENSION | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| VENTURA | VENTURA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2768 | 99.1 | 90.4 | 75.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 48.0 | 19.4 | 5.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 640 | 98.6 | 96.6 | 11.4 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 13.6 | 67.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 165 | 94.5 | 94.5 | 4.2 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 79.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 51 | 72.5 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 43.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 27.5 | 64.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3624 | 98.5 | 91.8 | 59.6 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 18.4 | 20.9 |
| YOLO | YOLO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 667 | 97.3 | 95.1 | 86.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 2.7 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 208 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 27.9 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 63.9 | 1.4 | 46.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 55 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 18.2 | 50.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 22 | 59.1 | 95.5 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 13.6 | 9.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 952 | 96.5 | 96.2 | 67.1 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 58.7 | 3.6 | 13.9 |
| YUBA | YUBA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 19 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 47.4 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 31.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV YUBA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |
|  | MARYSVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 219 | 97.7 | 90.9 | 85.4 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 73 | 95.9 | 91.8 | 15.1 | 68.5 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 4.1 | 15.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 23 | 100.0 | 91.3 | 4.3 | 56.5 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 21.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 318 | 97.2 | 91.2 | 62.9 | 22.6 | 0.3 | 41.2 | 1.9 | 5.3 |
|  | BEALE AFB | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ 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 |

TABLE B5: DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { GROUP } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { SIZE } \\ \text { SAPLE }}}{ }$ | PERCENT FEMALE | $\underset{\text { AGE }}{\substack{\text { MEAN }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT } \\ \text { COMMERCIAL } \\ \text { DRIVERS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | MONTHS IN STUDY | 2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS PER 100 DRIVERS |  |  |  | ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL ACCIDENTS | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { ALCOHOL } \\ \text { ACCIDENTS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | MAJOR CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { MINOR } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { ACCIDENTS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { INJURY } \\ \text { ACCIDENTS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MAJOR } \\ \text { VIOLATIONS } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | MOVING VIOLATIONS |
| 7/05-6/06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No program | $\begin{gathered} 2,474 \\ (35.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 23.9 | 33.0 | 3.4 | 16.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | . 19 | 9.1 | 1.50 | . 38 | . 43 | 2.12 |
| Alcohol education program | $\begin{gathered} 4,570 \\ (64.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 24.7 | 32.6 | 2.8 | 16.0 | 2.6 | . 9 | . 11 | 9.2 | 1.55 | . 37 | . 37 | 2.11 |
| Statistical significance test |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=.67$ | $F=1.34$ | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=2.72$ | $F=.02$ | $F=.19$ | $F=2.93$ | $F=6.54 *$ | $F=.22$ | $F=36.7^{*}$ | $F=1.4$ | $F=205.5^{*}$ | $F=.95$ |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-month program | $\begin{gathered} 22,059 \\ (77.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 24.8 | 33.5 | 2.1 | 19.5 | 3.3 | 1.5 | . 09 | 8.7 | 1.5 | . 36 | . 39 | 2.11 |
| 6 -month program | $\begin{gathered} 6,471 \\ (22.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 25.6 | 36.6 | 2.6 | 19.8 | 4.1 | 2.6 | . 08 | 6.1 | 1.5 | . 37 | . 39 | 2.11 |
| Statistical significance test |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=1.78$ | $F=327.7^{*}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=5.86^{*}$ | $F=19.3$ * | $F=76.6^{*}$ | $F=365.5^{*}$ | $F=1.46$ | $F=228.3^{*}$ | $F=1.63$ | $F=27.8^{*}$ | $F=.01$ | $F=.71$ |


[^0]:    *County-specific tabulations of 2005 DUI convictions by age and sex are shown in Appendix Table B2.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This count includes misdemeanors which carried a felony disposition code. These counts do not include 4 th offenses (in ten years) which are statutorily defined as felonies.
    ${ }^{3}$ These dismissals were identified in DMV's DUI Audit and Tracking System Summary Report.
    Adjudication time is presented using median values (in days) for 2005 data.
    ${ }^{5}$ 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.

[^2]:    *Entries represent percentages of 2005 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.

[^3]:    *Entries represent percentages of 2005 convictees receiving each sanction by county and offender status

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Among 2005 DUI arrests, 28,504 were associated with a reported traffic crash, with 11,811 involving an injury or fatality, and 16,693 were PDO.

