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DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1998-2008

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| DUI Arrest Rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers) | 908 | 896 | 847 | 803 | 783 | 809 | 792 | 786 | 849 | 863 | 906 |
| Total DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 | 203866 | 214811 |
| Felony DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 5330 | 5242 | 5476 | 5647 | 5859 | 5856 | 5646 | 5962 | 6191 | 6264 | 5966 |
| Misdemeanor DUI arrests ${ }^{1}$ | 182997 | 183281 | 175860 | 170843 | 171197 | 177704 | 175311 | 174326 | 191057 | 197602 | 208845 |
| DUI convictions received to date (by year of arrest) ${ }^{2}$ | 144265 | 149946 | 144667 | 140853 | 140408 | 145529 | 144908 | 145703 | 159126 | 160591 | 162046 |
| Percent convicted of DUI as of Sept. $2009^{2}$ | 77\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 79\% | 79\% | 80\% | 81\% | 81\% | 79\% | 75\% |
| Alcohol-involved reckless driving convictions | 15945 | 15514 | 14465 | 15773 | 15694 | 15735 | 14801 | 14452 | 15563 | 15121 | 16913 |
| Percent convicted of alcohol reckless driving | 8.5\% | 8.2\% | 8.0\% | 8.9\% | 8.9\% | 8.6\% | 8.2\% | 8.0\% | 7.9\% | 7.4\% | 7.9\% |
| Alcohol-involved fatalities ${ }^{3}$ | 1072 | 1170 | 1233 | 1308 | 1416 | 1445 | 1462 | 1574 | 1597 | 1489 | 1355 |
| \% of total fatalities | 31.0 | 32.8 | 33.1 | 33.3 | 34.2 | 34.2 | 35.7 | 36.6 | 38.1 | 37.5 | 39.8 |
| Alcohol-involved injuries ${ }^{3}$ | 30985 | 29833 | 30971 | 31806 | 32013 | 31322 | 31538 | 30810 | 31099 | 30783 | 28463 |
| \% of total injuries | 10.7 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 11.5 | 11.8 |
| Drug-involved fatalities ${ }^{4}$ | 266 | 290 | 428 | 509 | 639 | 784 | 799 | 880 | 859 | 749 | 726 |
| \% of total fatalities | 7.7 | 8.2 | 11.5 | 13.0 | 15.6 | 18.6 | 19.5 | 20.4 | 20.5 | 18.9 | 21.3 |
| Drug-involved injuries ${ }^{4}$ | 1549 | 1774 | 1917 | 2106 | 2373 | 2580 | 2646 | 2722 | 2421 | 2464 | 2227 |
| \% of total injuries | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 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.
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 amended and new abstracts for current and previous years. recent years, these figures will underestimate the final conviction totals.
${ }^{4}$ 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: 1998-2008 (continued)

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS | $238612^{1}$ | 236141 | 240597 | 231217 | 236603 | 241242 | 239580 | 247568 | $339796{ }^{3}$ | 3628593 | 3923193 |
| PRECONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Per Se (APS) Actions | 175365 | 179332 | 172606 | 164840 | 165505 | 171470 | 171828 | 168569 | 185481 | 192213 | 204332 |
| . 01 Zero tolerance suspensions | 15640 | 17775 | 18185 | 18549 | 19129 | 19949 | 19967 | 19374 | 22044 | 22112 | 22180 |
| . 08 First-offender suspensions | 116827 | 119621 | 114997 | 109695 | 109888 | 114975 | 116022 | 107466 | 118468 | 123594 | 132266 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender suspensions | 39024 | 38487 | 36147 | 33517 | 33580 | 33413 | 32903 | 38097 | 41420 | 42979 | 46388 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender revocations | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 | 3528 | 3498 |
| Commercial driver actions | 4609 | 4471 | 4139 | 4013 | 3936 | 3853 | 3801 | 3525 | 2974 | 2903 | 3172 |
| Chemical test refusal actions | 9935 | 9435 | 9433 | 8841 | 8772 | 9399 | 9353 | 9599 | 9315 | 9581 | 9390 |
| . 01 Test refusal suspensions | 229 | 268 | 270 | 280 | 290 | 341 | 326 | 364 | 419 | 426 | 433 |
| . 08 Test refusal suspensions | 5832 | 5718 | 5886 | 5482 | 5547 | 5925 | 6091 | 5603 | 5347 | 5627 | 5459 |
| . 08 Test refusal revocations | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 | 3528 | 3498 |
| POSTCONVICTION ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juvenile DUI suspensions | $1026{ }^{1}$ | 918 | 741 | 714 | 896 | 794 | 838 | 737 | 941 | 1061 | 917 |
| First-offender suspensions | $9588^{1}$ | 15072 | 29924 | 31097 | 32716 | 32521 | 31012 | 39078 | $110525^{3}$ | $124436{ }^{3}$ | $136480^{3}$ |
| Misdemeanor | $7497{ }^{1}$ | 13401 | 28118 | 29188 | 30563 | 30298 | 28799 | 36808 | $108227^{3}$ | $122102^{3}$ | $133987{ }^{3}$ |
| Felony | $2091{ }^{1}$ | 1671 | 1806 | 1909 | 2153 | 2223 | 2213 | 2270 | 2298 | 2334 | 2493 |
| Second-offender S/R actions | $40238{ }^{1}$ | 31940 | 29097 | 26911 | 29345 | 28737 | 28400 | 30294 | 32680 | 34296 | 38266 |
| Misdemeanor | $39065{ }^{1}$ | 31455 | 28571 | 26334 | 28748 | 28160 | 27847 | 29699 | 32046 | 33649 | 37568 |
| Felony | $633{ }^{1}$ | 485 | 526 | 577 | 597 | 577 | 553 | 595 | 634 | 647 | 658 |
| Third-offender revocations | $9397{ }^{1}$ | 6573 | 6163 | 5727 | 6171 | 5953 | 5581 | 6720 | 7649 | 8063 | 9164 |
| Misdemeanor | 91671 | 6452 | 6015 | 5585 | 5996 | 5758 | 5429 | 6537 | 7424 | 7830 | 8933 |
| Felony | $230^{1}$ | 121 | 148 | 142 | 175 | 195 | 152 | 183 | 225 | 233 | 231 |
| Fourth-offender revocations | $2998{ }^{1}$ | 2306 | 2066 | 1928 | 1970 | 1767 | 1921 | 2170 | 2520 | 2790 | 3200 |
| TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS | $63247^{1}$ | 56809 | 67991 | 66377 | 71098 | 69772 | 67752 | 78999 | $154315^{3}$ | $170646^{3}$ | $187987{ }^{3}$ |

${ }^{1}$ The 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 DUIs and removed this responsibility from the courts.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2010 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

> Alcohol-involved traffic fatalities decreased by $9.0 \%$ in 2008; the second consecutive year of decreases after 8 years of a continuous rising trend (see DUI Summary Statistics).
> Drug-involved fatalities declined for the third consecutive year (by $3.1 \%$ in 2008), but still reflect an increase of $173 \%$ in the past decade, from 266 in 1998 to 726 in 2008 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
$>$ The number of persons injured in alcohol-involved crashes decreased by $7.5 \%$ in 2008, following a slight decrease of $1.0 \%$ in 2007 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
$>$ DUI arrests increased by $5.4 \%$ in 2008, following increases of $3.4 \%$ in 2007 and $9.4 \%$ in 2006 (see DUI Summary Statistics and Table 1).
> The DUI arrest rate rose by $5.0 \%$ in 2008, to a level almost the same as 1998 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
> $15.3 \%$ of all 2007 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to $15.5 \%$ in $2006.6 .1 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly lower than $6.3 \%$ in 2006 (see Table 19).
$>$ Among 2008 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (45.5\%) 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 ( $32.8 \%$ in 2008). This is shown in Figure 3.
$>$ The median (midpoint) age of an arrested DUI offender in 2008 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 arrested in 2007, $73.6 \%$ were first offenders and $26.4 \%$ were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 10
years). The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at $37 \%$ (see Table 10).
$>$ The median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on Administrative Per Se (APS) forms, was $0.15 \%$ in 2007, same as last year, yet almost double the California illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08\% (see Table 9a).
$>10.4 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, which is an increase from $9.4 \%$ in 2006 (see Table 8).
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## INTRODUCTION

This report is the nineteenth 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

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 2006-2008. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2006-2008 and the percentage change from 2007-2008 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2008 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2008 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: 2008 DUI Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a crosstabulates age by sex and age by race/ethnicity of 2008 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Also, Table 3a shows the average (mean) age for 2008 arrestees. In addition to the mean, the median (midpoint) was reported to minimize the influence of data values that are not equally distributed. Table 3b shows the same data cross-tabulated by sex and age within race/ethnicity.

Table 3c: DUI Arrests Under Age 21, 1998-2008. Table 3c shows a breakdown of DUI arrests under 21, by age, from 1998 to 2008. It also shows the proportion of total DUI arrests under 21 for the state over the same time period.

Figure 2 displays the trend in DUI arrests from 1998 to 2008.

Figure 3 shows the percentage of 2008 DUI arrests and 2008 projected population by race/ethnicity.


Figure 2. DUI arrests 1998-2008.
Based on the data shown in Figures 2 and 3 and previously listed tables, the following statements can be made about DUI arrests in California:

## Statewide Parameters:

$>$ DUI arrests increased for the third consecutive year, by $5.4 \%$ in 2008, following an increase of $3.4 \%$ in 2007, and an increase of $9.4 \%$ in 2006 (see Table 1).
> Table 2 shows that the DUI arrest rate per 100 licensed drivers was 0.9 in 2008, unchanged from 2007, and up from 0.8 in 2000-2006. This represents a $50 \%$ reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
$>$ The percentage of DUI arrests that were felonies (involving bodily injury or death) decreased slightly from $3.0 \%$ in 2007 to $2.7 \%$ in 2008. Felony DUI arrests continue to constitute a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).

## County Variation:

$>20.4 \%$ of all 2008 California DUI arrests occurred in Los Angeles County. Five counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside) had over 10,000 DUI arrests each, accounting for $48.8 \%$ of all arrests (see Table 2).
$>$ The 2008 county DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.3 to 2.7 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers (the statewide average rate is 0.9 ). Six counties had rates of 0.7 or below. These low arrest rate counties were San Francisco (0.3), Mariposa (0.6), Santa

Clara (0.6), Contra Costa (.07), Los Angeles (0.7), and San Mateo (0.7). Six counties had rates of 2.0 or higher - Glenn (2.7), Inyo (2.4), Tehama (2.4), Sierra (2.2), Trinity (2.2), and Tulare (2.0). This is shown in Table 2.
> Many counties showed an increase in DUI arrests in 2008. Among the larger counties, the greatest percentage increase occurred in San Diego (10.3\%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage increases in DUI arrests occurred in Trinity ( $31.1 \%$ ), Merced ( $22.5 \%$ ), and Yolo ( $20.4 \%$ ). Counties showing the largest percentage declines in DUI arrests were Mariposa (-39.9\%), San Benito (-26.2\%), and Santa Cruz (-22.8\%). This is shown in Table 1.

## Demographic Characteristics:

$>$ The median age of a DUI arrestee in 2008 was 30 years. Slightly more than half ( $52.2 \%$ ) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters ( $74.3 \%$ ) were age 40 or younger. Less than $1 \%$ of all DUI arrests involved juveniles (under age 18). $2.4 \%$ of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).
> Among all DUI arrestees, the proportion of DUI arrests under age 18 decreased slightly from 0.8 in 2007 to 0.7 in 2008; note, however, that the proportion of DUI arrests under age 21 increased $12.6 \%$ in the 10 years from 1998 to 2008. This is shown in Table 3c.
> Males comprised $80.2 \%$ of all 2008 DUI arrests (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen slightly each year this report has been produced, from $10.6 \%$ in 1989 to $19.8 \%$ in 2008.
> In 2008, Hispanics (45.5\%) 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 2008 population parity of $32.8 \%$ (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also slightly overrepresented among DUI arrestees ( $7.3 \%$ of arrests, $6.0 \%$ of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2008 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites ( $39.7 \%$ of arrests, $46.2 \%$ of the population),
and "Other" ( $7.5 \%$ of arrests, $14.9 \%$ of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.
> Among male 2008 DUI arrestees, $50.2 \%$ were Hispanic, $35.4 \%$ were White, $7.1 \%$ were Black, and $7.3 \%$ were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, $57.1 \%$ were White, $26.4 \%$ were Hispanic, $8.0 \%$ were Black, and $8.4 \%$ 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 high. For example, in the following seven counties, Hispanics comprised $60 \%$ or more of those arrested for DUI during 2008: Tulare (75.9\%), Imperial (72.7\%), Merced (66.2\%), Fresno (65.3\%), Kings (63.8\%), Monterey (63.5\%), and Madera ( $62.9 \%$ ). 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 33.0 years, while "Other" were the youngest, with a median age of 28.0 years (see Table 3a).


Figure 3. Percentage of 2008 DUI arrests and 2008 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS* BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2006-2008

| COUNTY | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | \% CHANGE 2007-2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATEWIDE | 197248 | 203866 | 214811 | 5.4 |
| ALAMEDA | 7253 | 7518 | 8203 | 9.1 |
| ALPINE | 22 | 19 | 20 | 5.3 |
| AMADOR | 352 | 345 | 324 | -6.1 |
| BUTTE | 1647 | 1938 | 2208 | 13.9 |
| CALAVERAS | 319 | 360 | 380 | 5.6 |
| COLUSA | 268 | 283 | 228 | -19.4 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 4004 | 4314 | 4775 | 10.7 |
| DEL NORTE | 272 | 308 | 268 | -13.0 |
| EL DORADO | 1411 | 1235 | 1343 | 8.7 |
| FRESNO | 7826 | 7713 | 7751 | 0.5 |
| GLENN | 512 | 539 | 498 | -7.6 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1164 | 1475 | 1424 | -3.5 |
| IMPERIAL | 1371 | 1401 | 1406 | 0.4 |
| INYO | 334 | 295 | 350 | 18.6 |
| KERN | 5232 | 5606 | 5890 | 5.1 |
| KINGS | 1297 | 1106 | 1218 | 10.1 |
| LAKE | 535 | 517 | 571 | 10.4 |
| LASSEN | 262 | 217 | 197 | -9.2 |
| LOS ANGELES | 39518 | 41286 | 43867 | 6.3 |
| MADERA | 1104 | 1043 | 1171 | 12.3 |
| MARIN | 1583 | 1633 | 1609 | -1.5 |
| MARIPOSA | 161 | 153 | 92 | -39.9 |
| MENDOCINO | 1087 | 1019 | 1027 | 0.8 |
| MERCED | 1988 | 2046 | 2506 | 22.5 |
| MODOC | 98 | 93 | 99 | 6.5 |
| MONO | 149 | 167 | 142 | -15.0 |
| MONTEREY | 3052 | 3046 | 3219 | 5.7 |
| NAPA | 1056 | 1127 | 990 | -12.2 |
| NEVADA | 758 | 791 | 773 | -2.3 |
| ORANGE | 16012 | 16492 | 17575 | 6.6 |
| PLACER | 2351 | 2257 | 2428 | 7.6 |
| PLUMAS | 262 | 274 | 294 | 7.3 |
| RIVERSIDE | 9896 | 10252 | 10872 | 6.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 7818 | 8014 | 8586 | 7.1 |
| SAN BENITO | 396 | 423 | 312 | -26.2 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 12233 | 13586 | 13984 | 2.9 |
| SAN DIEGO | 18101 | 16848 | 18588 | 10.3 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 1336 | 1405 | 1483 | 5.6 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 4436 | 4168 | 4496 | 7.9 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 2549 | 2432 | 2504 | 3.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 3542 | 3447 | 3541 | 2.7 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 2665 | 2784 | 3065 | 10.1 |
| SANTA CLARA | 6697 | 6968 | 7484 | 7.4 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1739 | 1920 | 1482 | -22.8 |
| SHASTA | 1276 | 1796 | 1699 | -5.4 |
| SIERRA | 80 | 68 | 60 | -11.8 |
| SISKIYOU | 447 | 475 | 503 | 5.9 |
| SOLANO | 1916 | 2176 | 2104 | -3.3 |
| SONOMA | 3384 | 3455 | 3622 | 4.8 |
| STANISLAUS | 2846 | 3316 | 3342 | 0.8 |
| SUTTER | 584 | 583 | 645 | 10.6 |
| TEHAMA | 748 | 935 | 991 | 6.0 |
| TRINITY | 190 | 180 | 236 | 31.1 |
| TULARE | 3476 | 4115 | 4385 | 6.6 |
| TUOLUMNE | 463 | 524 | 516 | -1.5 |
| VENTURA | 5196 | 5410 | 5265 | -2.7 |
| YOLO | 1293 | 1221 | 1470 | 20.4 |
| YUBA | 681 | 749 | 730 | -2.5 |

*DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI $(N=233)$ removed.

TABLE 2: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

| COUNTY | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF ARREST |  |  |  |  |  | DUI ARRESTS PER <br> 100 LICENSED <br> DRIVERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FELONY |  | JUVENILE |  | MISDEMEANOR |  |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |  |
| STATEWIDE | 214811 | 100.0 | 5905 | 2.7 | 1494 | 0.7 | 207412 | 96.6 | 0.9 |
| ALAMEDA | 8203 | 3.8 | 115 | 1.4 | 39 | 0.5 | 8049 | 98.1 | 0.8 |
| ALPINE | 20 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 100.0 | 1.9 |
| AMADOR | 324 | 0.2 | 7 | 2.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 316 | 97.5 | 1.1 |
| BUTTE | 2208 | 1.0 | 54 | 2.4 | 22 | 1.0 | 2132 | 96.6 | 1.4 |
| CALAVERAS | 380 | 0.2 | 17 | 4.5 | 1 | 0.3 | 362 | 95.3 | 1.0 |
| COLUSA | 228 | 0.1 | 3 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 225 | 98.7 | 1.7 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 4775 | 2.2 | 110 | 2.3 | 39 | 0.8 | 4626 | 96.9 | 0.7 |
| DEL NORTE | 268 | 0.1 | 11 | 4.1 | 2 | 0.7 | 255 | 95.1 | 1.5 |
| EL DORADO | 1343 | 0.6 | 38 | 2.8 | 15 | 1.1 | 1290 | 96.1 | 1.0 |
| FRESNO | 7751 | 3.6 | 218 | 2.8 | 65 | 0.8 | 7468 | 96.3 | 1.5 |
| GLENN | 498 | 0.2 | 9 | 1.8 | 3 | 0.6 | 486 | 97.6 | 2.7 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1424 | 0.7 | 38 | 2.7 | 5 | 0.4 | 1381 | 97.0 | 1.5 |
| IMPERIAL | 1406 | 0.7 | 35 | 2.5 | 21 | 1.5 | 1350 | 96.0 | 1.4 |
| INYO | 350 | 0.2 | 6 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 344 | 98.3 | 2.4 |
| KERN | 5890 | 2.7 | 179 | 3.0 | 53 | 0.9 | 5658 | 96.1 | 1.3 |
| KINGS | 1218 | 0.6 | 17 | 1.4 | 12 | 1.0 | 1189 | 97.6 | 1.7 |
| LAKE | 571 | 0.3 | 14 | 2.5 | 7 | 1.2 | 550 | 96.3 | 1.2 |
| LASSEN | 197 | 0.1 | 6 | 3.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 189 | 95.9 | 1.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | 43867 | 20.4 | 1658 | 3.8 | 136 | 0.3 | 42073 | 95.9 | 0.7 |
| MADERA | 1171 | 0.5 | 28 | 2.4 | 13 | 1.1 | 1130 | 96.5 | 1.5 |
| MARIN | 1609 | 0.7 | 23 | 1.4 | 12 | 0.7 | 1574 | 97.8 | 0.9 |
| MARIPOSA | 92 | 0.0 | 5 | 5.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 87 | 94.6 | 0.6 |
| MENDOCINO | 1027 | 0.5 | 24 | 2.3 | 10 | 1.0 | 993 | 96.7 | 1.6 |
| MERCED | 2506 | 1.2 | 49 | 2.0 | 24 | 1.0 | 2433 | 97.1 | 1.8 |
| MODOC | 99 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 92 | 92.9 | 1.5 |
| MONO | 142 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.7 | 140 | 98.6 | 1.5 |
| MONTEREY | 3219 | 1.5 | 74 | 2.3 | 19 | 0.6 | 3126 | 97.1 | 1.4 |
| NAPA | 990 | 0.5 | 18 | 1.8 | 7 | 0.7 | 965 | 97.5 | 1.1 |
| NEVADA | 773 | 0.4 | 20 | 2.6 | 3 | 0.4 | 750 | 97.0 | 1.0 |
| ORANGE | 17575 | 8.2 | 274 | 1.6 | 137 | 0.8 | 17164 | 97.7 | 0.9 |
| PLACER | 2428 | 1.1 | 67 | 2.8 | 25 | 1.0 | 2336 | 96.2 | 1.0 |
| PLUMAS | 294 | 0.1 | 6 | 2.0 | 4 | 1.4 | 284 | 96.6 | 1.7 |
| RIVERSIDE | 10872 | 5.1 | 229 | 2.1 | 74 | 0.7 | 10569 | 97.2 | 0.9 |
| SACRAMENTO | 8586 | 4.0 | 301 | 3.5 | 39 | 0.5 | 8246 | 96.0 | 0.9 |
| SAN BENITO | 312 | 0.1 | 12 | 3.8 | 4 | 1.3 | 296 | 94.9 | 0.9 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 13984 | 6.5 | 376 | 2.7 | 98 | 0.7 | 13510 | 96.6 | 1.2 |
| SAN DIEGO | 18588 | 8.7 | 472 | 2.5 | 141 | 0.8 | 17975 | 96.7 | 0.9 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 1483 | 0.7 | 96 | 6.5 | 1 | 0.1 | 1386 | 93.5 | 0.3 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 4496 | 2.1 | 103 | 2.3 | 35 | 0.8 | 4358 | 96.9 | 1.1 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 2504 | 1.2 | 53 | 2.1 | 29 | 1.2 | 2422 | 96.7 | 1.3 |
| SAN MATEO | 3541 | 1.6 | 55 | 1.6 | 29 | 0.8 | 3457 | 97.6 | 0.7 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 3065 | 1.4 | 102 | 3.3 | 26 | 0.8 | 2937 | 95.8 | 1.1 |
| SANTA CLARA | 7484 | 3.5 | 258 | 3.4 | 66 | 0.9 | 7160 | 95.7 | 0.6 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1482 | 0.7 | 44 | 3.0 | 18 | 1.2 | 1420 | 95.8 | 0.8 |
| SHASTA | 1699 | 0.8 | 46 | 2.7 | 19 | 1.1 | 1634 | 96.2 | 1.2 |
| SIERRA | 60 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 59 | 98.3 | 2.2 |
| SISKIYOU | 503 | 0.2 | 13 | 2.6 | 6 | 1.2 | 484 | 96.2 | 1.4 |
| SOLANO | 2104 | 1.0 | 59 | 2.8 | 24 | 1.1 | 2021 | 96.1 | 0.8 |
| SONOMA | 3622 | 1.7 | 55 | 1.5 | 27 | 0.7 | 3540 | 97.7 | 1.1 |
| STANISLAUS | 3342 | 1.6 | 100 | 3.0 | 34 | 1.0 | 3208 | 96.0 | 1.1 |
| SUTTER | 645 | 0.3 | 21 | 3.3 | 5 | 0.8 | 619 | 96.0 | 1.1 |
| TEHAMA | 991 | 0.5 | 31 | 3.1 | 4 | 0.4 | 956 | 96.5 | 2.4 |
| TRINITY | 236 | 0.1 | 7 | 3.0 | 1 | 0.4 | 228 | 96.6 | 2.2 |
| TULARE | 4385 | 2.0 | 128 | 2.9 | 58 | 1.3 | 4199 | 95.8 | 2.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 516 | 0.2 | 17 | 3.3 | 6 | 1.2 | 493 | 95.5 | 1.2 |
| VENTURA | 5265 | 2.5 | 148 | 2.8 | 49 | 0.9 | 5068 | 96.3 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | 1470 | 0.7 | 29 | 2.0 | 17 | 1.2 | 1424 | 96.9 | 1.2 |
| YUBA | 730 | 0.3 | 22 | 3.0 | 2 | 0.3 | 706 | 96.7 | 1.6 |

TABLE 3a: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY*

| AGE | TOTAL |  | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 214811 | 100.0 | 172220 | 80.2 | 42591 | 19.8 | 85305 | 39.7 | 97709 | 45.5 | 15678 | 7.3 | 16119 | 7.5 |
| UNDER 18 | 1494 | 0.7 | 1133 | 75.8 | 361 | 24.2 | 759 | 50.8 | 606 | 40.6 | 37 | 2.5 | 92 | 6.2 |
| 18-20 | 17558 | 8.2 | 13948 | 79.4 | 3610 | 20.6 | 7093 | 40.4 | 8332 | 47.5 | 799 | 4.6 | 1334 | 7.6 |
| 21-30 | 92936 | 43.3 | 74317 | 80.0 | 18619 | 20.0 | 32854 | 35.4 | 46403 | 49.9 | 5705 | 6.1 | 7974 | 8.6 |
| 31-40 | 47491 | 22.1 | 39027 | 82.2 | 8464 | 17.8 | 15751 | 33.2 | 24246 | 51.1 | 4001 | 8.4 | 3493 | 7.4 |
| 41-50 | 34124 | 15.9 | 26682 | 78.2 | 7442 | 21.8 | 16287 | 47.7 | 12684 | 37.2 | 3182 | 9.3 | 1971 | 5.8 |
| 51-60 | 16112 | 7.5 | 12855 | 79.8 | 3257 | 20.2 | 9210 | 57.2 | 4371 | 27.1 | 1553 | 9.6 | 978 | 6.1 |
| 61-70 | 4199 | 2.0 | 3505 | 83.5 | 694 | 16.5 | 2715 | 64.7 | 903 | 21.5 | 346 | 8.2 | 235 | 5.6 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 897 | 0.4 | 753 | 83.9 | 144 | 16.1 | 636 | 70.9 | 164 | 18.3 | 55 | 6.1 | 42 | 4.7 |
| MEAN AGE (YEARS) | 33.1 |  | 33.2 |  | 33.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 31.3 |  | 35.6 |  | 31.6 |  |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 29.0 |  | 32.0 |  | 29.0 |  | 33.0 |  | 28.0 |  |

TABLE 3b: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| SEX | AGE | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { STATEWIDE } \\ & \hline \text { MALE } \end{aligned}$ |  | 214811 | 100.0 | 85305 | 39.7 | 97709 | 45.5 | 15678 | 7.3 | 16119 | 7.5 |
|  | UNDER 18 | 1133 | 0.7 | 506 | 44.7 | 523 | 46.2 | 35 | 3.1 | 69 | 6.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 13948 | 8.1 | 5066 | 36.3 | 7239 | 51.9 | 644 | 4.6 | 999 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 74317 | 43.2 | 23350 | 31.4 | 40645 | 54.7 | 4356 | 5.9 | 5966 | 8.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 39027 | 22.7 | 11284 | 28.9 | 21799 | 55.9 | 3107 | 8.0 | 2837 | 7.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 26682 | 15.5 | 11311 | 42.4 | 11294 | 42.3 | 2493 | 9.3 | 1584 | 5.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 12855 | 7.5 | 6797 | 52.9 | 3955 | 30.8 | 1263 | 9.8 | 840 | 6.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 3505 | 2.0 | 2141 | 61.1 | 840 | 24.0 | 306 | 8.7 | 218 | 6.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 753 | 0.4 | 515 | 68.4 | 153 | 20.3 | 53 | 7.0 | 32 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 172220 | 100.0 | 60970 | 35.4 | 86448 | 50.2 | 12257 | 7.1 | 12545 | 7.3 |
| FEMALE | UNDER 18 | 361 | 0.8 | 253 | 70.1 | 83 | 23.0 | 2 | 0.6 | 23 | 6.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 3610 | 8.5 | 2027 | 56.1 | 1093 | 30.3 | 155 | 4.3 | 335 | 9.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 18619 | 43.7 | 9504 | 51.0 | 5758 | 30.9 | 1349 | 7.2 | 2008 | 10.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 8464 | 19.9 | 4467 | 52.8 | 2447 | 28.9 | 894 | 10.6 | 656 | 7.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 7442 | 17.5 | 4976 | 66.9 | 1390 | 18.7 | 689 | 9.3 | 387 | 5.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 3257 | 7.6 | 2413 | 74.1 | 416 | 12.8 | 290 | 8.9 | 138 | 4.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 694 | 1.6 | 574 | 82.7 | 63 | 9.1 | 40 | 5.8 | 17 | 2.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 144 | 0.3 | 121 | 84.0 | 11 | 7.6 | 2 | 1.4 | 10 | 6.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 42591 | 100.0 | 24335 | 57.1 | 11261 | 26.4 | 3421 | 8.0 | 3574 | 8.4 |

TABLE 3c: DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 1998-2008

| AGE |  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL <br> (ALL AGES) | $N$ | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 | 203866 | 214811 |
| UNDER 18 | $N$ | 1761 | 1741 | 1527 | 1645 | 1557 | 1576 | 1488 | 1436 | 1697 | 1635 | 1494 |
|  | \% | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| 18-20 | $N$ | 13093 | 13875 | 14145 | 14075 | 14410 | 14612 | 14672 | 14617 | 16837 | 17201 | 17558 |
|  | \% | 7.0 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.2 |
| UNDER 21 | $N$ | 14854 | 15616 | 15672 | 15720 | 15967 | 16188 | 16160 | 16053 | 18534 | 18836 | 19052 |
|  | \% | 7.9 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 8.9 |

## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of DUI arrests are reported directly to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Although the DUI arrest data reported earlier are based on arrests that occurred in 2008, the DUI conviction data are based on convictions of DUI offenders arrested in 2007, 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 the 2007 DUI-MIS 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 " 2007 convictions" refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2007, and subsequently convicted.

Table 4: 2007 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 2007 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 2007 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 rates for each age and race/ethnicity group in this table were proportionally adjusted to the overall conviction rate to avoid the underestimate that would result from the "matchable DUI convictions" data reported in Table 5 (not all reported convictions are "matchable" to an arrest).

Table 7: Total Conviction Data for 2007 DUI Arrests. 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 not calculated for this report due to recently discovered and still unresolved data reporting problems. 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 2007 DUI Arrests by County. For this year's report, this table only shows the adjudication status (court disposition) of 2007 DUI arrests statewide. Included are the percentages of arrests which resulted in DUI convictions (misdemeanor or felony), reckless driving convictions (alcohol-related or nonalcoholrelated), convictions of "other" offenses, or no reported conviction, as of the date of writing. Again, because of recently discovered data reporting problems, the information on the adjudication status of 2007 DUI arrests by county is not available this year.

Table 9a: 2007 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI Convictions and Table 9b: 2007 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 (83.3\%) 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: 2007 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 10 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 (opposite) shows, for the years 1998 to 2008, 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 2009.


| Percent convicted of <br> DUI as of Sept. 2009 <br> (conviction rate) | $77 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Figure 4. DUI abstracts of conviction received by DMV and conviction rates, 1998-2008.

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

## Statewide Adjudication Parameters:

$>78.8 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of DUI offenses (see Table 7).
$>$ As of January 1, 2005, DUI convictions remain on the driving record for 10 years. Therefore, based on the DUI conviction data for the arrests over 10 years (19982007), $5.3 \%$ of California drivers have one or more DUI convictions on their record.
$>9.2 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrests resulted in reckless driving convictions, and $14.0 \%$ ( $1.3 \% / 9.2 \%$ ) of these were nonalcohol-related reckless violations (see Table 8).
> $1.7 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, which is slightly lower than the $1.8 \%$ reported last year (see Table 8).
$>10.4 \%$ of 2007 DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction on DMV's records, up slightly from $9.4 \%$ last year, and down from $16.3 \%$ in 1995 (see Table 8). As additional cases are adjudicated and reported by the courts, this figure will decrease slightly.
> The average reported BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2007, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was $0.16 \%$ (median BAC level was $0.15 \%$ ), which is the same as last year, yet still 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. The 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 a $0.15 \%$ BAC for a first offense to a $0.19 \%$ BAC for a fourth-orsubsequent offense). This is shown in Table 10.
> Among 2007 DUI arrestees subsequently convicted, $73.6 \%$ were first offenders, $19.8 \%$ were second offenders, $4.9 \%$ 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 changed to 10 years by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective $1 / 1 / 2005$.) The proportion of all convicted DUI offenders that are repeat offenders ( $26.4 \%$ ), shown in Table 10, has increased ever since the counting period for priors changed from 7 to 10 years.
$>$ The median adjudication time lags were 81 days from DUI arrest to conviction and 9 days from conviction to update on the DMV database, totaling about 3 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record. This total elapsed time from arrest to update appears substantially shorter in the last four annual reports, ever since elapsed time for conviction data reported here was calculated using the median instead of the mean (see Table 7).

## Demographic Characteristics:

$>$ The median age of a convicted DUI offender in 2007 was 30.0 years (see Table 4 ).
$>51.9 \%$ of 2007 DUI convictees were 30 years of age or younger and $74.2 \%$ were 40 years or younger (see Table 4).
$>$ Females comprised $19.0 \%$ of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2007 (see Table 4). The proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994.
$>$ The racial/ethnic distribution of 2007 DUI convictions (White $=42.2 \%$; Hispanic $=$ $43.9 \%$; Black $=6.8 \%$; "Other" $=7.0 \%$, see Table 5) generally paralleled that of 2007 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: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX*

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 160591 | 100.0 | 130047 | 81.0 | 30544 | 19.0 |
| UNDER 18 | 768 | 0.5 | 621 | 80.9 | 147 | 19.1 |
| 18-20 | 12838 | 8.0 | 10374 | 80.8 | 2464 | 19.2 |
| 21-30 | 69762 | 43.4 | 56584 | 81.1 | 13178 | 18.9 |
| 31-40 | 35736 | 22.3 | 29582 | 82.8 | 6154 | 17.2 |
| 41-50 | 26318 | 16.4 | 20489 | 77.9 | 5829 | 22.1 |
| 51-60 | 11704 | 7.3 | 9520 | 81.3 | 2184 | 18.7 |
| 61-70 | 2857 | 1.8 | 2366 | 82.8 | 491 | 17.2 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 608 | 0.4 | 511 | 84.0 | 97 | 16.0 |
| MEAN AGE (YEARS) | 33.1 |  | 33.1 |  | 33.3 |  |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |

*County-specific tabulations of 2007 DUI convictions by age and sex are shown in Appendix Table B2.
TABLE 5: MATCHABLE 2007 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 | 137345 | 100.0 | 41778 | 30.4 | 16204 | 11.8 | 53586 | 39.0 | 6717 | 4.9 | 7417 | 5.4 | 1974 | 1.4 | 7573 | 5.5 | 2096 | 1.5 |
| UNDER 18 | 687 | 0.5 | 290 | 42.2 | 125 | 18.2 | 210 | 30.6 | 25 | 3.6 | 11 | 1.6 | 4 | 0.6 | 19 | 2.8 | 3 | 0.4 |
| 18-20 | 11177 | 8.1 | 3526 | 31.5 | 1319 | 11.8 | 4513 | 40.4 | 598 | 5.4 | 347 | 3.1 | 87 | 0.8 | 604 | 5.4 | 183 | 1.6 |
| 21-30 | 59959 | 43.7 | 16557 | 27.6 | 6448 | 10.8 | 25323 | 42.2 | 3471 | 5.8 | 2649 | 4.4 | 789 | 1.3 | 3530 | 5.9 | 1192 | 2.0 |
| 31-40 | 29829 | 21.7 | 7707 | 25.8 | 3039 | 10.2 | 13226 | 44.3 | 1408 | 4.7 | 1890 | 6.3 | 498 | 1.7 | 1654 | 5.5 | 407 | 1.4 |
| 41-50 | 22738 | 16.6 | 7773 | 34.2 | 3468 | 15.3 | 7298 | 32.1 | 919 | 4.0 | 1562 | 6.9 | 428 | 1.9 | 1068 | 4.7 | 222 | 1.0 |
| 51-60 | 9971 | 7.3 | 4454 | 44.7 | 1387 | 13.9 | 2422 | 24.3 | 240 | 2.4 | 710 | 7.1 | 139 | 1.4 | 540 | 5.4 | 79 | 0.8 |
| 61-70 | 2452 | 1.8 | 1181 | 48.2 | 352 | 14.4 | 496 | 20.2 | 48 | 2.0 | 200 | 8.2 | 26 | 1.1 | 142 | 5.8 | 7 | 0.3 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 532 | 0.4 | 290 | 54.5 | 66 | 12.4 | 98 | 18.4 | 8 | 1.5 | 48 | 9.0 | 3 | 0.6 | 16 | 3.0 | 3 | 0.6 |

TABLE 6: ADJUSTED 2007 DUI CONVICTION RATES ${ }^{1}$ AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD² ${ }^{2}$ OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY

${ }^{1}$ 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 2007 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{1}$

| COUNTY | CONVICTION RATE ${ }^{2}$$\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{3} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | $\begin{gathered} \text { NONALCOHOL } \\ \text { RECKLESS } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSED } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION } \\ & \text { TIMES (DAYS) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| STATEWIDE | 78.8 | 155867 | 4724 | 16085 | 2574 | 3488 | 1926 | 81.0 | 9.0 |
| ALAMEDA | - | 5575 | 49 | 858 | 107 | 156 | 143 | 107.0 | 6.0 |
| ALPINE | - | 15 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 9.0 |
| AMADOR | - | 290 | 9 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 61.0 | 8.0 |
| BUTTE | - | 1351 | 55 | 317 | 64 | 27 | 52 | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| CALAVERAS | - | 215 | 13 | 57 | 19 | 13 | 5 | 62.0 | 13.0 |
| COLUSA | - | 189 | 7 | 36 | 14 | 5 | 8 | 73.0 | 9.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | - | 3466 | 101 | 463 | 5 | 64 | 65 | 128.0 | 8.0 |
| DEL NORTE | - | 149 | 7 | 58 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 76.0 | 3.0 |
| EL DORADO | - | 881 | 40 | 189 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 97.0 | 8.0 |
| FRESNO | - | 5067 | 334 | 880 | 56 | 77 | 54 | 104.0 | 2.0 |
| GLENN | - | 334 | 5 | 57 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 60.0 | 15.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | - | 800 | 26 | 224 | 57 | 36 | 1 | 90.0 | 13.0 |
| IMPERIAL | - | 829 | 8 | 18 | 80 | 18 | 55 | 129.0 | 125.0 |
| INYO | - | 189 | 5 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
| KERN | - | 4300 | 154 | 489 | 116 | 66 | 66 | 34.0 | 14.0 |
| KINGS | - | 837 | 33 | 122 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 89.0 | 0.0 |
| LAKE | - | 380 | 13 | 28 | 20 | 9 | 175 | 104.0 | 28.0 |
| LASSEN | - | 178 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 92.0 | 24.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | - | 29690 | 492 | 2839 | 136 | 1481 | 99 | 75.0 | 10.0 |
| MADERA | - | 616 | 31 | 110 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 281.0 | 24.0 |
| MARIN | - | 1431 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 71.0 | 31.0 |
| MARIPOSA | - | 96 | 5 | 21 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 72.0 | 13.0 |
| MENDOCINO | - | 742 | 21 | 194 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 51.0 | 89.0 |
| MERCED | - | 1291 | 33 | 160 | 36 | 35 | 34 | 155.0 | 58.0 |
| MODOC | - | 72 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 69.0 | 17.0 |
| MONO | - | 139 | 2 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 59.0 | 23.0 |
| MONTEREY | - | 2416 | 53 | 273 | 86 | 44 | 22 | 54.0 | 28.0 |

[^0]TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONYDUI $^{3}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | $\begin{gathered} \text { NONALCOHOL } \\ \text { RECKLESS } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSED } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATIONTIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| NAPA | - | 913 | 52 | 121 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 66.0 | 3.0 |
| NEVADA | - | 636 | 25 | 129 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 58.0 | 32.0 |
| ORANGE | - | 14076 | 426 | 810 | 82 | 129 | 75 | 96.0 | 0.0 |
| PLACER | - | 2012 | 86 | 204 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 86.0 | 13.0 |
| PLUMAS | - | 206 | 4 | 43 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 52.0 | 8.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | - | 7929 | 210 | 140 | 285 | 62 | 82 | 79.0 | 2.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | - | 6490 | 308 | 598 | 10 | 106 | 13 | 60.0 | 18.0 |
| SAN BENITO | - | 365 | 17 | 47 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 137.0 | 22.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | - | 9598 | 268 | 478 | 305 | 201 | 108 | 136.0 | 3.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | - | 14082 | 525 | 1569 | 319 | 117 | 203 | 74.0 | 9.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | - | 1056 | 45 | 107 | 109 | 18 | 75 | 106.0 | 4.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | - | 3181 | 105 | 408 | 38 | 70 | 53 | 43.0 | 7.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | - | 1903 | 83 | 342 | 42 | 57 | 12 | 45.0 | 14.0 |
| SAN MATEO | - | 2689 | 53 | 461 | 14 | 62 | 59 | 87.0 | 11.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | - | 2408 | 115 | 271 | 93 | 38 | 11 | 46.0 | 14.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | - | 6002 | 220 | 534 | 89 | 78 | 2 | 73.0 | 5.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | - | 1542 | 31 | 232 | 26 | 25 | 19 | 61.0 | 15.0 |
| SHASTA | - | 1506 | 70 | 207 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 54.0 | 14.0 |
| SIERRA | - | 23 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 88.0 | 41.0 |
| SISKIYOU | - | 335 | 22 | 54 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 96.0 | 9.0 |
| SOLANO | - | 1692 | 48 | 320 | 43 | 32 | 30 | 111.0 | 39.0 |
| SONOMA | - | 2827 | 135 | 542 | 24 | 30 | 54 | 62.0 | 8.0 |
| STANISLAUS | - | 2466 | 73 | 332 | 43 | 29 | 21 | 60.0 | 66.0 |
| SUTTER | - | 433 | 28 | 117 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 62.0 | 42.0 |
| TEHAMA | - | 424 | 20 | 83 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 48.0 | 12.0 |
| TRINITY | - | 79 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
| TULARE | - | 2958 | 62 | 104 | 7 | 91 | 45 | 68.0 | 46.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | - | 436 | 14 | 89 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 54.0 | 8.0 |
| VENTURA | - | 4658 | 68 | 0 | 2 | 73 | 68 | 86.0 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | - | 974 | 58 | 123 | 28 | 11 | 14 | 78.0 | 29.0 |
| YUBA | - | 430 | 17 | 88 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 78.0 | 41.0 |

TABLE 8: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY¹

| COUNTY | DUICONVICTIONS |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RECKLESS DRIVING } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% OTHER <br> CONVICTIONS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% NO RECORD } \\ & \text { OF ANY } \\ & \text { CONVICTION }{ }^{2} \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MISDEMEANOR | \% <br> FELONY | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% ALCOHOL } \\ & \text { RELATED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% NONALCOHOL } \\ \text { RELATED } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| STATEWIDE | 76.5 | 2.3 | 7.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 10.4 |
| ALAMEDA | . | - | - | - | - | - |
| ALPINE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| AMADOR | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| BUTTE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| CALAVERAS | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| COLUSA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| CONTRA COSTA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| DEL NORTE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| EL DORADO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| FRESNO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| GLENN | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| HUMBOLDT | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| IMPERIAL | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| INYO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| KERN | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| KINGS | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LAKE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LASSEN | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LOS ANGELES | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MADERA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MARIN | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MARIPOSA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MENDOCINO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MERCED | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MODOC | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MONO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MONTEREY | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NAPA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NEVADA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ORANGE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PLACER | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PLUMAS | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RIVERSIDE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SACRAMENTO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN BENITO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN BERNARDINO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN DIEGO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN FRANCISCO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN JOAQUIN | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SAN MATEO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SANTA BARBARA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SANTA CLARA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SANTA CRUZ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SHASTA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SIERRA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SISKIYOU | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SOLANO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SONOMA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| STANISLAUS | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SUTTER | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TEHAMA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TRINITY | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TULARE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TUOLUMNE | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| VENTURA | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YOLO | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YUBA | - | - | - | - | - | - |

${ }^{1}$ The information on adjudication status by county is not available in this report due to recently discovered and still unresolved DUI data reporting problems.
${ }^{2}$ These include failure-to-appear (FTA) notices; the statewide average is $4.4 \%$.

TABLE 9a: 2007 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS ${ }^{1}$

| DUI CONVICTIONS |  |  | ALCOHOL-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| . 00 | 1733 | 1.3 | . 00 | 407 | 3.2 |
| . 01 | 89 | 0.1 | . 01 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 02 | 90 | 0.1 | . 02 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 03 | 86 | 0.1 | . 03 | 23 | 0.2 |
| . 04 | 140 | 0.1 | . 04 | 57 | 0.5 |
| . 05 | 479 | 0.4 | . 05 | 111 | 0.9 |
| . 06 | 675 | 0.5 | . 06 | 324 | 2.6 |
| . 07 | 981 | 0.7 | . 07 | 972 | 7.7 |
| . 08 | 2736 | 2.0 | . 08 | 3175 | 25.0 |
| . 09 | 4685 | 3.5 | . 09 | 3471 | 27.4 |
| . 10 | 7613 | 5.7 | . 10 | 1891 | 14.9 |
| . 11 | 9324 | 7.0 | . 11 | 863 | 6.8 |
| . 12 | 9942 | 7.4 | . 12 | 410 | 3.2 |
| . 13 | 10276 | 7.7 | . 13 | 264 | 2.1 |
| . 14 | 10205 | 7.6 | . 14 | 160 | 1.3 |
| . 15 | 9923 | 7.4 | . 15 | 120 | 1.0 |
| . 16 | 9583 | 7.2 | . 16 | 80 | 0.6 |
| . 17 | 8736 | 6.5 | . 17 | 55 | 0.4 |
| . 18 | 7880 | 5.9 | . 18 | 50 | 0.4 |
| . 19 | 6974 | 5.2 | . 19 | 50 | 0.4 |
| . 20 | 6229 | 4.7 | . 20 | 32 | 0.3 |
| . 21 | 5191 | 3.9 | . 21 | 31 | 0.2 |
| . 22 | 4339 | 3.2 | . 22 | 24 | 0.2 |
| . 23 | 3348 | 2.5 | . 23 | 13 | 0.1 |
| . 24 | 2763 | 2.1 | . 24 | 19 | 0.2 |
| . 25 | 2213 | 1.7 | . 25 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 26 | 1724 | 1.3 | . 26 | 9 | 0.1 |
| . 27 | 1347 | 1.0 | . 27 | 6 | 0.1 |
| . 28 | 1032 | 0.8 | . 28 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 29 | 835 | 0.6 | . 29 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 30 | 586 | 0.4 | . 30 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 31 | 502 | 0.4 | . 33 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 32 | 385 | 0.3 | . 34 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 33 | 276 | 0.2 | . 38 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 34 | 241 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| . 35 | 156 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 36 | 146 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 37 | 99 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 38 | 92 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 39 | 38 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 40 | 64 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 41 | 22 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 42 | 24 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 43 | 11 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 44 | 12 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 45 | 7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 46 | 3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 47 | 7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 48 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 49 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 50 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 51 | 3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 59 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 133851 | 100.0 | TOTAL | 12686 | 100.0 |
|  | MEAN² BAC . 16 EDIAN2 BAC . 15 |  |  | MEAN ${ }^{2}$ BAC . 09 EDIAN2 BAC . 09 |  |

${ }^{1}$ 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 ( $83.3 \%$ of total).
${ }^{2}$ The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 9b: 2007 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE $21^{1}$

| BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | 211 | 1.8 | . 21 | 301 | 2.6 |
| . 01 | 26 | 0.2 | . 22 | 213 | 1.9 |
| . 02 | 27 | 0.2 | . 23 | 136 | 1.2 |
| . 03 | 24 | 0.2 | . 24 | 91 | 0.8 |
| . 04 | 56 | 0.5 | . 25 | 76 | 0.7 |
| . 05 | 355 | 3.1 | . 26 | 39 | 0.3 |
| . 06 | 454 | 4.0 | . 27 | 39 | 0.3 |
| . 07 | 458 | 4.0 | . 28 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 08 | 499 | 4.3 | . 29 | 14 | 0.1 |
| . 09 | 595 | 5.2 | . 30 | 9 | 0.1 |
| . 10 | 792 | 6.9 | . 31 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 11 | 877 | 7.6 | . 33 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 12 | 908 | 7.9 | . 34 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 13 | 908 | 7.9 | . 37 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 14 | 886 | 7.7 | . 59 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 15 | 765 | 6.7 |  |  |  |
| . 16 | 821 | 7.1 |  |  |  |
| . 17 | 612 | 5.3 |  | ----------- | ---------- |
| . 18 | 555 | 4.8 | TOTAL | 11505 | 100.0 |
| . 19 | 385 | 3.4 |  | MEAN ${ }^{2}$ BAC . 13 |  |
| . 20 | 346 | 3.0 |  | MEDIAN ${ }^{2}$ BAC . 13 |  |

${ }^{1}$ The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for arrested DUI offenders. The percentage of BAC levels found on these forms for 2007 convicted under age 21 cases is $84.6 \%$.
${ }^{2}$ The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which could be DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 10: 2007 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 | 73.6 | .16 | .15 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 19.8 | .17 | .16 |
| $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4.9 | .18 | .18 |
| $4^{\mathrm{TH}+}$ DUI | 1.7 | .19 | .19 |

## SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were obtained from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2007. The counts of postconviction court license actions are no longer included in this section due to a law change on September 20, 2005 (SB 1697, Torlakson), which gave DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions on DUI offenders. Since courts no longer have the authority to impose license actions on DUI offenders, the count of court license restrictions and suspensions, based on abstracts of DUI convictions, decreased dramatically. Therefore, beginning with the last year's report, this section (Tables 11, 12, and Appendix Table B4) no longer includes information on postconviction license actions. Instead, the Administrative Action Section (Section 5) provides information on both APS license suspensions and revocations, and postconviction license actions. This section includes the following tables:

Table 11: 2007 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 DUI offenders sentenced to probation, jail, DUI programs (first-offender, 18-month, and 30-month DUI programs), and ignition interlock. Cross tabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 12: 2007 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 prescribed for offenders arrested in 2007 continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status. For example:

## Statewide Parameters:

$>$ The court sanction most frequently applied to all convicted DUI offenders was probation ( $95.8 \%$ ), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock ( $5.3 \%$ ). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in $73.4 \%$ of the cases (in many jurisdictions, however, jail is often served as community service rather than actual jail time). This is shown in Table 11, and graphically in Figure 6 (next page). Because virtually all offenders receive more than one type of sanction, the cumulative percentage adds to much more than $100 \%$.


Note: License restriction and suspension sanctions are no longer shown on this figure; they are completely imposed by DMV and not the courts (as of 9/20/2005).

Figure 6. Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2007).

## County Variation:

$>$ The use of DUI programs among first DUI offenders varies by county, from $90 \%$ or more in 12 counties to $35.3 \%$ in Modoc 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 96.0\% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n=1,345$ ), while another court (Malibu) in the same county assigned jail to only $19.6 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders $(n=265)$. This is shown in Table B4 in the Appendix.
$>0.2 \%$ of all DUI offenders arrested in 2007 were referred to 30-month DUI programs (see Table 11). Assignment of DUI offenders (mostly third-or-more) to 30-month programs was low, as there are very few counties that have 30-month programs (see Table B4 in the Appendix).
$>$ Statewide, courts required only $5.3 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2007 to install an ignition interlock device. This is down from $6.3 \%$ for the DUI arrestees 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:

$>66.0 \%$ of first DUI offenders arrested in 2007 were sentenced to jail, compared to $94.1 \%$ of all repeat offenders (see Table 11).
$>87.6 \%$ of first DUI offenders were assigned by courts to DUI intervention programs, along with $82.7 \%$ of second offenders, $69.2 \%$ of third offenders, and $33.3 \%$ of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. This is shown in Table 11. (By statute, however, all offenders must eventually complete specified DUI programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement).
$>16.1 \%$ of repeat DUI offenders arrested in 2007 were assigned ignition interlock, compared to $15.2 \%$ of those arrested in $2006,13.3 \%$ in $2005,14.0 \%$ 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. Despite 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) 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: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$

| DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 160591 | 95.8 | 73.4 | 65.5 | 19.0 | 0.2 | 5.3 |
| $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 118261 | 96.8 | 66.0 | 85.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| REPEAT DUI | 42330 | 93.1 | 94.1 | 10.6 | 65.8 | 0.6 | 16.1 |
| 2ND DUI | 31791 | 96.5 | 93.5 | 12.9 | 69.6 | 0.2 | 14.2 |
| 3RD DUI | 7798 | 92.0 | 95.3 | 4.1 | 63.2 | 1.9 | 24.6 |
| $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 2741 | 56.4 | 96.5 | 2.3 | 30.0 | 1.0 | 13.6 |

${ }^{1}$ Entries represent percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2007 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. The percentages of license restrictions and court suspensions were removed from this table and can be found in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5.

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER DUI PROGAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | 30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 160591 | 95.8 | 73.4 | 65.5 | 19.0 | 0.2 | 5.3 |
| ALAMEDA | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 4027 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 84.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1212 | 99.8 | 98.6 | 16.2 | 55.1 | 0.0 | 13.7 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 281 | 98.6 | 95.7 | 6.8 | 53.0 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 104 | 88.5 | 98.1 | 1.0 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 10.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 5624 | 98.6 | 97.6 | 64.0 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 |
| ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 86.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 43.8 | 81.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
| AMADOR | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 209 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 82.8 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 67 | 98.5 | 98.5 | 16.4 | 80.6 | 0.0 | 61.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 16 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 7 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 299 | 94.6 | 96.7 | 61.9 | 29.8 | 0.0 | 32.8 |
| BUTTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 944 | 92.9 | 87.6 | 86.9 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 340 | 92.1 | 93.5 | 15.0 | 70.6 | 0.0 | 7.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 87 | 82.8 | 93.1 | 0.0 | 74.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 35 | 54.3 | 91.4 | 2.9 | 45.7 | 0.0 | 48.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1406 | 91.1 | 89.5 | 62.0 | 24.8 | 0.1 | 6.2 |
| CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 146 | 97.3 | 97.9 | 91.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 32.9 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 57 | 89.5 | 98.2 | 33.3 | 50.9 | 0.0 | 45.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 20 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 5.0 | 65.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 228 | 94.7 | 97.8 | 68.0 | 20.2 | 0.4 | 39.5 |
| COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 130 | 90.8 | 93.8 | 74.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 47 | 95.7 | 100.0 | 8.5 | 72.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 14 | 100.0 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 196 | 90.8 | 95.4 | 52.0 | 21.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| CONTRA COSTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2538 | 96.3 | 93.7 | 90.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 758 | 99.1 | 98.0 | 11.9 | 79.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 202 | 96.5 | 99.0 | 2.0 | 73.3 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 69 | 68.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 37.7 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 3567 | 96.4 | 95.0 | 67.1 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| DEL NORTE | ${ }^{15 \mathrm{ST}}$ DUI | 106 | 96.2 | 95.3 | 88.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 38 | 94.7 | 81.6 | 7.9 | 65.8 | 18.4 | 42.1 |
|  | 3RD DUI | 9 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 22.2 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+\mathrm{DUI}$ | 3 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 156 | 93.6 | 87.2 | 62.2 | 16.7 | 9.6 | 14.7 |
| EL DORADO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 632 | 97.0 | 93.4 | 83.9 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 211 | 96.7 | 93.4 | 15.2 | 73.5 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 58 | 98.3 | 96.6 | 1.7 | 79.3 | 0.0 | 17.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 20 | 60.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 921 | 96.2 | 93.6 | 61.1 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 |

${ }^{1}$ Due to a law change, SB 1697, which shifted responsibility for license actions from courts to DMV as of September 20, 2005, the percentages of license restrictions and court suspensions by county and offender status are no longer presented in this Table. Statewide information on these sanctions is provided in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5.

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | 30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| FRESNO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3699 | 96.1 | 97.4 | 89.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1199 | 94.7 | 98.9 | 17.8 | 72.4 | 0.1 | 14.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 354 | 87.9 | 97.7 | 5.4 | 74.9 | 0.3 | 18.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 149 | 59.1 | 100.0 | 8.1 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 5401 | 94.3 | 97.8 | 65.8 | 23.6 | 0.1 | 6.3 |
| GLENN | ${ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 231 | 94.4 | 74.0 | 59.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}} \mathrm{DUI}$ | 87 | 93.1 | 94.3 | 19.5 | 39.1 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 18 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 22.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 339 | 93.2 | 80.8 | 46.3 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 590 | 98.1 | 34.2 | 89.8 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 5.3 |
|  | ${ }^{2 N D}$ DUI | 171 | 98.2 | 89.5 | 18.1 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 56.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 51 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 2.0 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 56.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 14 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 826 | 97.7 | 50.5 | 68.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 19.7 |
| IMPERIAL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 661 | 97.6 | 17.5 | 60.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 149 | 96.6 | 52.3 | 30.9 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 22 | 86.4 | 68.2 | 31.8 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 5 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 837 | 97.1 | 25.4 | 53.9 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| INYO | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 118 | 97.5 | 31.4 | 91.5 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 54 | 98.1 | 83.3 | 9.3 | 68.5 | 0.0 | 7.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 17 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 41.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 194 | 95.4 | 53.1 | 58.2 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
| KERN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 3202 | 96.1 | 96.5 | 70.6 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 907 | 94.9 | 98.6 | 10.0 | 18.5 | 0.1 | 5.5 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 265 | 93.6 | 98.5 | 4.2 | 14.0 | 0.4 | 6.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 80 | 48.8 | 93.8 | 3.8 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 1.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 4454 | 94.8 | 97.0 | 53.1 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
| KINGS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 594 | 90.7 | 95.6 | 69.4 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 199 | 89.4 | 97.5 | 13.6 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 22.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 57 | 78.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.4 | 0.0 | 29.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 20 | 20.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 870 | 88.0 | 96.3 | 50.5 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| LAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 258 | 94.2 | 54.7 | 75.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 102 | 91.2 | 87.3 | 7.8 | 61.8 | 4.9 | 6.9 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 24 | 83.3 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 54.2 | 0.0 | 20.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 9 | 55.6 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 393 | 91.9 | 65.9 | 51.4 | 21.4 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
| LASSEN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 131 | 96.2 | 93.9 | 57.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 36 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 55.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 179 | 93.9 | 95.5 | 55.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 7.3 |

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | DUI <br> OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {sT }}$ <br> OFFENDER DUI PROGAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 23466 | 97.1 | 32.7 | 87.3 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 5283 | 96.2 | 87.1 | 12.1 | 73.2 | 0.9 | 2.3 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 1116 | 90.1 | 83.9 | 3.4 | 55.1 | 11.9 | 4.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 317 | 32.5 | 93.4 | 1.3 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 30182 | 96.0 | 44.7 | 70.1 | 17.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| MADERA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 443 | 93.5 | 93.0 | 81.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 135 | 91.9 | 92.6 | 31.9 | 49.6 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 45 | 95.6 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 71.1 | 4.4 | 6.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 24 | 75.0 | 91.7 | 16.7 | 37.5 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 647 | 92.6 | 92.6 | 64.1 | 19.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| MARIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1121 | 96.6 | 10.8 | 87.5 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 267 | 99.3 | 86.5 | 6.4 | 75.3 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 55 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 21 | 81.0 | 90.5 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1464 | 97.0 | 28.9 | 68.2 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| MARIPOSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 65 | 98.5 | 93.8 | 86.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 29 | 96.6 | 96.6 | 17.2 | 58.6 | 0.0 | 20.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 101 | 96.0 | 94.1 | 60.4 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 7.9 |
| MENDOCINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 504 | 92.9 | 92.9 | 83.1 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 196 | 98.5 | 95.9 | 16.3 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 62.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 50 | 86.0 | 96.0 | 2.0 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 72.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 38.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 763 | 93.8 | 94.0 | 59.2 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 24.8 |
| MERCED | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 939 | 97.8 | 95.0 | 87.4 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 290 | 97.6 | 99.0 | 23.4 | 69.3 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 64 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 31 | 51.6 | 100.0 | 3.2 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1324 | 96.8 | 96.2 | 68.1 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| MODOC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 51 | 96.1 | 68.6 | 35.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 73.3 | 20.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 5 | 80.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 73 | 94.5 | 68.5 | 28.8 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |
| MONO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 119 | 99.2 | 53.8 | 84.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 26.7 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 141 | 98.6 | 56.0 | 74.5 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1797 | 98.1 | 98.2 | 69.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 12.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 488 | 97.7 | 99.6 | 6.8 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 72.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 132 | 97.0 | 100.0 | 1.5 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 82.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 52 | 80.8 | 100.0 | 5.8 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 40.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 2469 | 97.6 | 98.6 | 52.0 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 28.8 |

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER DUI PROGAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | 30-MONTH <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| NAPA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 692 | 97.7 | 96.1 | 90.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 196 | 95.4 | 98.5 | 11.7 | 81.6 | 0.0 | 15.8 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 57 | 94.7 | 100.0 | 7.0 | 84.2 | 0.0 | 43.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 20 | 40.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 965 | 95.9 | 96.7 | 67.4 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 6.8 |
| NEVADA | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 482 | 98.8 | 97.3 | 93.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 137 | 99.3 | 98.5 | 10.9 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 8.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 27 | 100.0 | 96.3 | 11.1 | 81.5 | 3.7 | 40.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 15 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 661 | 98.0 | 97.6 | 70.8 | 23.8 | 0.2 | 3.5 |
| ORANGE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11013 | 98.4 | 38.9 | 91.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2736 | 98.3 | 92.1 | 7.7 | 79.2 | 0.0 | 19.5 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 580 | 94.5 | 97.4 | 1.2 | 82.6 | 0.0 | 36.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 173 | 47.4 | 94.8 | 2.3 | 30.6 | 0.6 | 15.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 14502 | 97.6 | 51.9 | 70.7 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
| PLACER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1528 | 97.4 | 97.7 | 80.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 437 | 96.8 | 98.9 | 38.0 | 50.6 | 0.0 | 9.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 106 | 87.7 | 99.1 | 30.2 | 50.9 | 0.0 | 45.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 27 | 25.9 | 96.3 | 7.4 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 18.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 2098 | 95.9 | 98.0 | 67.9 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
| PLUMAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 137 | 97.1 | 95.6 | 91.2 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 59 | 94.9 | 100.0 | 15.3 | 79.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 12 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 210 | 95.2 | 97.1 | 63.8 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 6134 | 96.4 | 94.1 | 92.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1506 | 95.8 | 97.3 | 14.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 13.7 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 363 | 90.9 | 98.1 | 3.3 | 83.2 | 0.0 | 28.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 136 | 62.5 | 97.8 | 2.2 | 52.2 | 0.0 | 11.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 8139 | 95.5 | 94.9 | 72.1 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
| SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 4727 | 97.3 | 96.8 | 89.3 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1493 | 97.7 | 99.1 | 7.1 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 8.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 404 | 95.3 | 99.0 | 1.2 | 80.7 | 0.0 | 15.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 174 | 68.4 | 97.7 | 3.4 | 50.6 | 0.0 | 9.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 6798 | 96.6 | 97.5 | 63.8 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 287 | 93.7 | 87.5 | 47.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 79 | 94.9 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 29.1 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 382 | 92.9 | 90.6 | 37.2 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 8.1 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 7146 | 95.7 | 58.6 | 89.7 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1978 | 94.1 | 93.0 | 14.1 | 73.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 505 | 90.9 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 51.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 237 | 54.4 | 97.5 | 0.4 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 9866 | 94.2 | 68.4 | 68.0 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | 30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 11067 | 95.5 | 20.5 | 82.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 2771 | 96.0 | 81.6 | 11.7 | 64.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 591 | 88.2 | 94.8 | 4.2 | 67.5 | 0.0 | 16.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 178 | 48.9 | 99.4 | 1.7 | 31.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 14607 | 94.7 | 36.1 | 65.0 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 872 | 98.9 | 98.3 | 93.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 180 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 28.3 | 68.3 | 0.0 | 24.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 41 | 95.1 | 92.7 | 9.8 | 75.6 | 7.3 | 41.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1101 | 98.8 | 98.3 | 78.9 | 15.6 | 0.3 | 7.6 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2232 | 98.8 | 97.2 | 89.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 740 | 98.1 | 99.1 | 12.7 | 79.7 | 0.3 | 21.2 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 222 | 96.4 | 98.6 | 5.4 | 77.5 | 0.5 | 41.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 92 | 79.3 | 96.7 | 0.0 | 65.2 | 0.0 | 37.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3286 | 98.0 | 97.7 | 63.7 | 26.8 | 0.1 | 9.4 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1419 | 97.5 | 95.6 | 90.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 389 | 98.5 | 98.7 | 14.7 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 132 | 93.9 | 97.0 | 5.3 | 79.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 46 | 60.9 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 28.3 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1986 | 96.6 | 96.4 | 67.8 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| SAN MATEO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 2054 | 96.0 | 96.6 | 89.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 529 | 96.2 | 100.0 | 8.7 | 83.0 | 0.0 | 26.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 124 | 86.3 | 99.2 | 4.0 | 66.9 | 0.0 | 21.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 35 | 54.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 2742 | 95.1 | 97.4 | 68.9 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
| SANTA BARBARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1874 | 95.9 | 70.2 | 80.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 477 | 96.6 | 94.5 | 0.8 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 15.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 130 | 90.0 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 78.5 | 0.0 | 30.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 42 | 64.3 | 97.6 | 0.0 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 2523 | 95.2 | 76.6 | 59.6 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
| SANTA CLARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 4579 | 98.5 | 97.0 | 90.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1266 | 97.8 | 99.4 | 13.3 | 77.6 | 0.0 | 31.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 290 | 91.7 | 98.6 | 1.0 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 48.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 87 | 58.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 23.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 6222 | 97.5 | 97.6 | 69.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 10.1 |
| SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1118 | 97.8 | 94.5 | 72.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 320 | 97.8 | 98.1 | 12.5 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 96 | 100.0 | 97.9 | 1.0 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 39 | 74.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1573 | 97.3 | 95.5 | 54.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| SHASTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1094 | 95.7 | 96.1 | 88.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 31.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 354 | 94.6 | 98.0 | 17.2 | 72.0 | 0.3 | 75.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 99 | 84.8 | 99.0 | 5.1 | 34.3 | 0.0 | 76.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 29 | 27.6 | 93.1 | 6.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 1576 | 93.5 | 96.6 | 65.5 | 19.4 | 0.1 | 43.7 |
| SIERRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 76.5 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2ND DUI | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 24 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 54.2 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued


TABLE 12: 2007 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued

| OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$ - continued |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER DUI PROGAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| VENTURA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ DUI | 3600 | 96.8 | 86.3 | 71.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 867 | 98.0 | 95.7 | 8.8 | 59.1 | 0.0 | 66.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 206 | 97.6 | 99.5 | 3.9 | 63.1 | 0.0 | 84.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH}+~ D U I ~}$ | 53 | 66.0 | 98.1 | 0.0 | 43.4 | 0.0 | 64.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 4726 | 96.7 | 88.7 | 55.9 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 23.5 |
| YOLO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 769 | 96.6 | 96.2 | 80.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 190 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 46.8 | 34.7 | 0.0 | 41.6 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 48 | 97.9 | 100.0 | 27.1 | 47.9 | 0.0 | 56.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 25 | 52.0 | 84.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1032 | 95.6 | 96.2 | 69.7 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 11.6 |
| YUBA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 317 | 94.0 | 90.9 | 84.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 99 | 97.0 | 96.0 | 7.1 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 21 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 9.5 | 76.2 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 447 | 94.0 | 92.6 | 62.2 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 5.6 |

## 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 DUI intervention programs for 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) 1year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested between 1990-2007, 2) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2007,3) proportions of DUI program referrals for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2007, and 4) long term recidivism rates of DUI offenders arrested in 1994.

The second part of the section contains the results of several analyses evaluating the effectiveness of DUI intervention 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 9-month DUI programs.

Also, in the second part of the section, as in the previous few year's reports, are two additional subanalyses: 1) an evaluation of 9-month DUI 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 9-month DUI 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 2007 continued to remain at the lower level of the past 9 years. The DUI reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 2007 was $40.8 \%$ lower than the reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 1990 (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).
> The 1-year reoffense rate for second offenders continues the decline that started 4 years ago, and is substantially lower than the rates during the early 1990s; recidivism decreased from $9.7 \%$ in 1990 to $5.4 \%$ in 2007, a $44.3 \%$ 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 $2.4 \%$ in 2007, a $40.0 \%$ relative decrease. The crash rate for first offenders has also declined, although not as much as second offenders; their 2007 rate is $22.6 \%$ lower than their 1990 crash rate (see Figure 8 and Table 13a).
$>$ Of the 2007 DUI arrestees who enrolled in a DUI intervention program, $85.9 \%$ of first offenders and $43.9 \%$ of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 14).
$>$ At the end of 14 years, $30 \%$ of DUI offenders originally convicted in 1994 had at least one subsequent DUI conviction, and $33 \%$ incurred at least one DUI incident (see Figure 9a).
$>$ Over 14 years, recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third offenders reoffending was $41 \%$, while $33 \%$ of second offenders and $27 \%$ of first offenders reoffended (see Figure $9 b$ ).
$>$ Males showed a much higher cumulative proportion (31\%) of reoffenses than did females $(22 \%$ ) over the 14-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 the 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 9 e .
> Similar to the last 5 years' evaluations, this year's results continue to show that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders assigned to a DUI intervention program did not vary significantly from those of the nonparticipants. However, the subsequent DUI incident rates of the program participants were significantly $(p=.036)$ lower than those of the nonparticipants (see Table 16a).
> Contrary to the past years' evaluations, the 1-year crash rates of first offenders attending the 3-month program were significantly ( $p=.027$ ) higher than those attending 9-month programs. Also, 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 9-month DUI programs, crash rates of the offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above were not significantly higher than the crash rates of those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$. Previous analyses also did not show significant crash differences between the two groups. Also, DUI offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above did not have significantly more DUI incidents than those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ (see Table 16c). This finding was different from the findings in the past 4 years' evaluations, which showed that offenders with the higher BACs had significantly more DUI incidents.
$>$ Consistent with the past 4 years' results, the length of time of DUI program (3month vs. 9-month) had no effect on crash rates. However, first DUI offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above assigned to the 3-month DUI program had significantly ( $p=.047$ ) higher DUI Incident rates than those assigned to the 9-month DUI program (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 10 years (instead of 7 years due to a law change effective January 1, 2005) prior to their entry DUI arrest in 2007. 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 10 years, 2) second DUI offenders - drivers who had one DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction within the previous 10 years, 3) alcohol-related reckless offenders with no previous DUI offenses in the past 10 years, and 4) first DUI offenders referred to 3-month and 9-month DUI programs. In addition, all DUI offenders arrested in 1994 were selected for the 14-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders over time, and the effectiveness of DUI 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, 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 convictions of a felony, and those with 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 $30 \%$ 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 1990-2007
The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident reoffense rates for both first and second DUI offenders were compiled from the 18 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 offenders, arrested between 1990 and 2007, who reoffended within 1 year after conviction.


Figure 7. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within 1 year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2007).

This figure and Table 13a show an ongoing gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first offenders overall from 1990 to 2007. The overall decline translates into a $40.8 \%$ reduction in recidivism for all first offenders compared to the rates of 1990. The decline in DUI reoffenses is steeper in the early years (1990-1994), following the
enactment of APS suspensions for all DUI arrestees. As 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-INCIDENTINVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2007

| YEAR | DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED |  | CRASH-INVOLVED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FIRST DUI OFFENDERS | SECOND DUI OFFENDERS | FIRST DUI OFFENDERS | SECOND DUI OFFENDERS |
| 1990 | 7.6 | 9.7 | 5.3 | 4.0 |
| 1991 | 7.1 | 9.5 | 4.7 | 3.6 |
| 1992 | 6.2 | 9.1 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| 1993 | 5.8 | 8.8 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| 1994 | 5.4 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 3.1 |
| 1995 | 5.8 | 7.0 | 4.6 | 3.0 |
| 1996 | 5.1 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 2.4 |
| 1997 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 4.7 | 2.7 |
| 1998 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 2.6 |
| 1999 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 2.8 |
| 2000 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 3.1 |
| 2001 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 5.2 | 3.0 |
| 2002 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 3.3 |
| 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 |
| 2006 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 2.7 |
| 2007 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 4.1 | 2.4 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% DIFFERENCE } \\ \text { 1990-2007 } \end{gathered}$ | -40.8\% | -44.3\% | -22.6\% | -40.0\% |

As noted in the past 4 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, with the greatest rate of decline occurring during the years from 1993 to 1996. Table 13a shows that, from 1990 to 2007, the reoffense rates decreased $44.3 \%$ among second offenders. 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 first and second offenders arrested between 1990 and 2007 who had crashes within 1 year after their conviction.


Figure 8. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within 1 year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2007).

Among first offenders from 1990 through 2007, Figure 8 and Table 13a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by an ongoing increase after 1993, and then another decline after 2001. The relative difference between first offender crash rates in 1990 and 2007 is $-22.6 \%$, whereas the relative difference for second offenders for those same years shows a much greater decline in crash involvement of $-40.0 \%$.

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 rates of second offenders may be related to the longer-term (1 to 2 year) 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 2007

For the 5th 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 2007. As shown in this table, among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent DUI incident within 1 year varied from $6.7 \%$ in San Joaquin County to 3.6\% in Los Angeles County. Among the smaller counties, Del Norte, Kings, Madera, and Trinity had DUI recidivism rates above $8.0 \%$, while Alpine and Sierra had zero DUI recidivism rates. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, Kern County had the highest rate, with $8.6 \%$ of second offenders having a subsequent DUI incident within 1 year, whereas Orange County's second offenders had the lowest rate at $3.6 \%$. Among the smaller counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from $20.0 \%$ (Sierra) to $0.0 \%$ (Alpine and Mono).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2007 are displayed in Table 13c. Among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent crash within 1 year varied from $5.2 \%$ in Sonoma County to $3.0 \%$ in Fresno and San Diego counties. Among the smaller counties, Madera had a crash rate of $7.4 \%$, while Alpine, Modoc, and Sierra 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 1 year varied from $3.5 \%$ (San Joaquin) to $1.6 \%$ (Sonoma). Among the smaller counties, Stanislaus County had a crash rate of $4.6 \%$, and eleven counties had $0.0 \%$ crash rates (Alpine, Colusa, Del Norte, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, San Benito, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity).

TABLE 13b: 2007 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 | 3696 | 4.5 | 1216 | 5.4 |
| ALAMEDA | 151 | 5.6 | 62 | 7.9 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 2 | 1.2 | 4 | 7.1 |
| BUTTE | 42 | 5.5 | 17 | 6.3 |
| CALAVERAS | 7 | 5.6 | 5 | 11.1 |
| COLUSA | 3 | 3.2 | 2 | 5.6 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 104 | 5.9 | 28 | 5.1 |
| DEL NORTE | 7 | 9.2 | 3 | 10.0 |
| EL DORADO | 31 | 7.0 | 9 | 6.1 |
| FRESNO | 153 | 6.1 | 65 | 8.0 |
| GLENN | 10 | 6.4 | 6 | 10.3 |
| HUMBOLDT | 32 | 7.0 | 5 | 3.5 |
| IMPERIAL | 18 | 4.2 | 5 | 5.6 |
| INYO | 6 | 6.6 | 5 | 11.6 |
| KERN | 109 | 5.3 | 52 | 8.6 |
| KINGS | 33 | 8.2 | 9 | 6.7 |
| LAKE | 11 | 5.4 | 4 | 4.8 |
| LASSEN | 4 | 4.4 | 1 | 3.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | 581 | 3.6 | 171 | 4.5 |
| MADERA | 14 | 8.6 | 6 | 11.5 |
| MARIN | 23 | 3.1 | 6 | 3.7 |
| MARIPOSA | 5 | 7.9 | 1 | 4.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 17 | 4.6 | 7 | 4.3 |
| MERCED | 29 | 5.7 | 8 | 5.3 |
| MODOC | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 8.3 |
| MONO | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | 44 | 4.8 | 9 | 3.0 |
| NAPA | 19 | 4.4 | 12 | 9.5 |
| NEVADA | 19 | 5.1 | 4 | 3.5 |
| ORANGE | 287 | 3.7 | 69 | 3.6 |
| PLACER | 52 | 4.5 | 12 | 3.5 |
| PLUMAS | 6 | 5.6 | 2 | 3.8 |
| RIVERSIDE | 205 | 4.6 | 55 | 5.1 |
| SACRAMENTO | 158 | 4.4 | 79 | 7.0 |
| SAN BENITO | 9 | 5.1 | 3 | 6.1 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 238 | 5.0 | 80 | 6.2 |
| SAN DIEGO | 334 | 4.3 | 103 | 5.1 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 16 | 2.4 | 5 | 4.7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 105 | 6.7 | 45 | 8.2 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 40 | 3.8 | 23 | 7.2 |
| SAN MATEO | 49 | 3.4 | 16 | 4.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 53 | 4.3 | 13 | 3.9 |
| SANTA CLARA | 134 | 4.4 | 30 | 3.7 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 45 | 5.4 | 14 | 5.6 |
| SHASTA | 58 | 6.1 | 20 | 7.0 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 20.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 10 | 5.6 | 1 | 1.7 |
| SOLANO | 47 | 5.2 | 16 | 5.5 |
| SONOMA | 65 | 4.8 | 20 | 4.5 |
| STANISLAUS | 76 | 5.9 | 26 | 7.4 |
| SUTTER | 14 | 6.4 | 3 | 3.3 |
| TEHAMA | 17 | 6.9 | 4 | 4.9 |
| TRINITY | 5 | 12.2 | 3 | 15.8 |
| TULARE | 74 | 5.6 | 33 | 8.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 17 | 6.3 | 3 | 3.6 |
| VENTURA | 72 | 3.2 | 22 | 4.1 |
| YOLO | 22 | 4.0 | 6 | 4.5 |
| YUBA | 9 | 4.1 | 2 | 2.6 |

TABLE 13c: 20071-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

| COUNTY | $1^{\text {sT }}$ OFFENDER |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 3345 | 4.1 | 542 | 2.4 |
| ALAMEDA | 130 | 4.8 | 24 | 3.1 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 6 | 3.6 | 2 | 3.6 |
| BUTTE | 18 | 2.4 | 4 | 1.5 |
| CALAVERAS | 5 | 4.0 | 2 | 4.4 |
| COLUSA | 3 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 86 | 4.9 | 13 | 2.4 |
| DEL NORTE | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| EL DORADO | 17 | 3.8 | 2 | 1.4 |
| FRESNO | 76 | 3.0 | 21 | 2.6 |
| GLENN | 5 | 3.2 | 1 | 1.7 |
| HUMBOLDT | 10 | 2.2 | 3 | 2.1 |
| IMPERIAL | 12 | 2.8 | 3 | 3.3 |
| INYO | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | 2.3 |
| KERN | 90 | 4.4 | 12 | 2.0 |
| KINGS | 19 | 4.7 | 5 | 3.7 |
| LAKE | 9 | 4.5 | 2 | 2.4 |
| LASSEN | 4 | 4.4 | 1 | 3.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | 771 | 4.8 | 93 | 2.4 |
| MADERA | 12 | 7.4 | 1 | 1.9 |
| MARIN | 38 | 5.0 | 5 | 3.1 |
| MARIPOSA | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 9 | 2.4 | 2 | 1.2 |
| MERCED | 16 | 3.1 | 4 | 2.6 |
| MODOC | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONO | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | 31 | 3.4 | 2 | 0.7 |
| NAPA | 13 | 3.0 | 3 | 2.4 |
| NEVADA | 10 | 2.7 | 5 | 4.4 |
| ORANGE | 340 | 4.4 | 43 | 2.2 |
| PLACER | 40 | 3.4 | 2 | 0.6 |
| PLUMAS | 5 | 4.6 | 1 | 1.9 |
| RIVERSIDE | 176 | 4.0 | 22 | 2.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 168 | 4.7 | 39 | 3.4 |
| SAN BENITO | 3 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 204 | 4.2 | 30 | 2.3 |
| SAN DIEGO | 234 | 3.0 | 45 | 2.2 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 27 | 4.1 | 4 | 3.7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 76 | 4.8 | 19 | 3.5 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 44 | 4.1 | 7 | 2.2 |
| SAN MATEO | 64 | 4.4 | 11 | 2.8 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 48 | 3.9 | 4 | 1.2 |
| SANTA CLARA | 104 | 3.4 | 22 | 2.7 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 46 | 5.5 | 9 | 3.6 |
| SHASTA | 41 | 4.3 | 11 | 3.8 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 2 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SOLANO | 36 | 4.0 | 6 | 2.1 |
| SONOMA | 70 | 5.2 | 7 | 1.6 |
| STANISLAUS | 43 | 3.3 | 16 | 4.6 |
| SUTTER | 9 | 4.1 | 2 | 2.2 |
| TEHAMA | 7 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TRINITY | 2 | 4.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | 49 | 3.7 | 5 | 1.2 |
| TUOLUMNE | 9 | 3.3 | 2 | 2.4 |
| VENTURA | 84 | 3.7 | 20 | 3.8 |
| YOLO | 16 | 2.9 | 3 | 2.3 |
| YUBA | 2 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.3 |

## The Proportions of DUI Program Referrals, Enrollments, and Completions for First and

 Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2007Beginning last year, this report captures the number and proportions of convicted first and second offenders whose records indicated that they had enrolled and completed a DUI intervention program, upon referral received from the court (in previous years Table 14 showed only the proportions of program referrals and completions for these offenders). Inclusion of the information on enrollments was possible due to the addition of a new subrecord to each person's driving record that contains data on DUI 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.

Table 14 shows the proportions of referrals to the various DUI programs for first and second offenders. It can be seen from this table that $85.2 \%$ of first offenders and $71.8 \%$ of second offenders were referred to a DUI program. Table 14 also shows that $67.5 \%$ of first offenders have enrolled in DUI programs that usually range from 3 to 9 months, depending upon their BAC levels at the time of their arrest. Furthermore, $45.8 \%$ of second offenders enrolled in the 18 -month DUI program. Of those enrolled in DUI intervention programs, $85.9 \%$ of first offenders and $43.9 \%$ of second offenders completed their program assignment (some second offenders may still be enrolled in the program at the time of data collection).

TABLE 14: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2007

| DUI OFFENDERS | TOTAL | PROGRAM REFERRALS |  | PROGRAM ENROLLMENT |  | PROGRAM COMPLETION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% ${ }^{1}$ | \% ${ }^{2}$ |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDERS <br> (3 MOS. TO 9 MOS.) | 117,519 | 100,122 | 85.2\% | 79,381 | 67.5\% | 68,202 | 58.0\% | 85.9\% |
| 2ND OFFENDERS <br> (18 MOS.) | 32,115 | 23,060 | 71.8\% | 14,700 | 45.8\% | 6,448 | 20.1\% | 43.9\% |

$1 \%$ of total number of DUI offenders.
$2 \%$ of program
$2 \%$ of program enrollees.

## 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 14-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 (convictions) for the 1994 offenders, as well as 9- and 14-year cumulative percentages for the 1980 and 1994 groups and 5-year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group (data were not available beyond 5 years).

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

| YEAR | PERCENTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \mathrm{ST} \\ \mathrm{DUI} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 2ND } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 3RD } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 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 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 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 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 |
| 107H | 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 |
| $13^{\text {th }}$ | 26 | 32 | 40 | 30 | 21 | 32 | 29 | 22 | 12 | NA | NA | 29 |
| $14^{\text {th }}$ | 27 | 33 | 41 | 31 | 22 | 33 | 30 | 23 | 12 | NA | NA | 30 |

In addition to Table 15, Figures 9a through 9e display recidivism rates for 1994 offenders over 14 years.


Figure 9a. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction, and first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incidents (alcohol crashes, DUI convictions, APS suspensions and DUI FTAs).

Figure 9a shows that, for 1994 offenders as a whole, at the end of 14 years $30 \%$ accumulated at least one DUI reoffense. When considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses including all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increased to $33 \%$. These failure curves are steepest in the earliest years following the initial conviction, after which they start to flatten out, but are still rising slightly in the 7th through 14th years. For both measures, the steepest climb occurs in the first year following conviction.

One way to explore the extent of drinking severity is to examine the recidivism rates by the number of prior DUIs within 10 years (time frame for counting priors) of the entry DUI violation. Figure $9 b$ displays the cumulative proportions of reoffenses by first, second, and third-or-more DUI offenders.

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 14 -year time period. At the end of 14 years, $41 \%$ of third-or-more offenders have reoffended compared to $33 \%$ of second offenders and $27 \%$ of first offenders.


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

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 , the proportion of males that reoffend over 14 years is much higher than that of females. At the end of 14 years, $31 \%$ of males have reoffended as compared to $22 \%$ of females. The failure curve of females is noticeably lower and increases at a slower pace throughout the 14 years as compared to the curve of males. In the final 6 years, the proportion of males recidivating is only one percent per year.

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed by age as well. 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 14 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 2 years following the entry conviction.

The failure curve of the $65+$ group flattens out at the 5 th year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality factor of the oldest group could influence


Figure 9c. Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.
their lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be restricting their driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 14 years, the youngest two groups reoffended by $33 \%$ and $30 \%$, respectively, while $23 \%$ 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 9e. Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2000 DUI drivers.

Three years ago, 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 9 e and Table 15). Because these cohorts of DUI offenders span 20 years, it is possible to consider whether the enactment of major DUI laws over that time period has affected their relative recidivism rates.

Figure 9 e reveals that at the end of 5 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 9 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 9 years. There was only a one percent increase in recidivism each year for the 1994 group in years 8 through 14.

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 due 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 5 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 10 years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers. These findings are not surprising and are consistent 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, in part, to the enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders in the past 2 decades, including the APS suspension law of 1990.

## DUI PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS

Subject Selection and Follow-up Data: The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of DUI programs for offenders convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving, or for first DUI offenders, was established by legislation. The evaluation for the offenders with alcoholrelated reckless convictions was mandated by SB 1176 (Johnson); for these offenders, this legislation requires the courts to order enrollment in a DUI intervention program as a condition of probation. An evaluation of the efficacy of the 3-month versus 6-month DUI intervention 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 DUI intervention 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 a DUI intervention 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 a DUI intervention program as a condition of probation, it was found that $42 \%$ of such offenders arrested from July 2007 through June 2008 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 DUI intervention programs, first offenders arrested in 2007 that showed the 3-month and 9-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for the analysis. Since, as of 2005, the courts were to prescribe 9-month DUI program for first offenders whose BAC level is $0.20 \%$ or above, it was decided to investigate the impact of the 9 -month instead of 6-month DUI program for this analysis.

The records of $54 \%$ of first offenders who were referred to DUI intervention program either did not indicate the specific length of time of the program or indicated other lengths of time that were not 3 or 9 months. These individuals were not included in this evaluation, and the analysis is limited to first offenders that were adjudicated by the courts that were in compliance with the law. Of the total sample selected, $74 \%$ were referred to 3 -month programs, while $26 \%$ were assigned to 9 -month programs. To further explore the possible effects of BAC levels, two additional subanalyses included 1) first offenders assigned to a 9 -month DUI 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 DUI program versus first offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above assigned to a 9-month DUI program.

The conviction date 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 periods for the postconviction driving measures start from the conviction date, and were: 1) 1 year following conviction for alcohol-related reckless offenders who were arrested from July, 2007 through June,

2008, and 2) 1 year following conviction for first DUI convictees who were arrested in 2007, and who were referred to 3-month and 9-month DUI programs.

A buffer period of 4 months was allowed between the end of the evaluation period and the extraction date to allow for processing and reporting of the most recent data to DMV. DUI offenders who had less than the full 1-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, DUI 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 the 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. Therefore, 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 to statistically control for 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 or reflected in 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 9-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, 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 covariates. For each logistic regression analysis, potential interactions between the covariates and treatment/comparison groups were tested. In analyses where there are significant interactions, the levels of the covariate and treatment groups were plotted on a graph to determine if there are differential effects of DUI programs on the covariate levels. The interaction term is then typically included in the final logistic regression analyses.

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

## DUI Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol-Reckless Driving

Figure 10a and Table 16a display the results of the ninth evaluation of the effectiveness of the DUI program on drivers convicted of alcohol-related reckless driving violations.


Figure 10a. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2007-2008 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.

Total Crashes: Like the past 4 years' findings, the results show that assignment to the DUI intervention program does not have a significant effect on 1-year subsequent crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders; the slight differences between the two groups
may be due to chance alone. Comparing these rates to the rates of the 2007 first DUI offenders, it is evident that alcohol-related reckless drivers who are not assigned and those assigned to a DUI program are slightly more involved in crashes (5.07 and 4.24 per 100 drivers, respectively, see Table 16a) than are first DUI offenders (4.1 per 100 drivers; see Table 13a). The crash rates of the 2007 alcohol-reckless drivers with no program are slightly lower than in the last year's evaluation ( 6.14 per 100 drivers), but relatively unchanged from the previous evaluations going back from 2005 to 2003 (4.95, 5.13, and 5.44, respectively). However, the crash rates for those involved in DUI programs are slightly lower this year ( 4.24 per 100 drivers) than in the previous 4 years' evaluations (5.26, 5.07, 5.24, and 5.82, respectively). 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 $85 \%$ of the alcohol-reckless drivers had BAC levels of $0.08 \%$ and above.

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

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\begin{array}{\|\|l\|l} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 | NUMBER OF DUI <br> INCIDENT- <br> INVOLVED, <br> PER 100 <br> DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7/2007-6/2008 } \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | 1) No program <br> 2) DUI program | $\begin{aligned} & (3,123) \\ & (4,336) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.07 \\ & 4.24 \end{aligned}$ | 19.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4.12 \\ & 3.21 \end{aligned}$ | $28.3 \% *$ |

DUI Incidents: Figure 10a and Table 16a indicate that program participants show fewer DUI incidents in the 1 year following their assignment to the DUI programs than the nonparticipants, and this difference is statistically significant ( $p=.036$ ). The reoffense rate of the alcohol-reckless offenders not assigned to the programs is $28.3 \%$ higher than the reoffense rate of the program participants. In the previous 2 years' evaluations, this difference was 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 judicialselectivity, 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 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI

 OffendersTotal Crashes: Figure 10b and Table 16b display the results of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the DUI intervention program on first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month versus 9-month programs. Different from the past 2 years' findings, these results show that the length of time of the DUI program is significantly ( $p=.027$ ) associated with the 1-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders. The 3-month program participants have a $13.8 \%$ higher crash rate than that of the 9 -month participants. However, the findings should be viewed with caution since the prior results generally did not show significant differences between the two groups.


Figure 10b. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2007) by length of DUI program.

DUI Incidents: Comparable to the last 7 years' results, Figure 10b and Table 16b indicate that, among first DUI offenders, the 3-month program participants have significantly fewer DUI incidents in the 1 year following their assignment to the DUI programs than do the 9 -month program participants $(p=.0001)$. The reoffense rate of the 3-month program participants is $22.9 \%$ lower than that of the 9 -month participants. Again, this finding is not surprising given that first DUI offenders 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.

TABLE 16b: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM
EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}\right.$ | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} \text { PERCENTAGE } \\ \text { EFFECT } \end{array} \\ & \text { (DIFFERENCE IN } \\ & \text { FAILURE RATES) } \\ & \frac{\text { GRP } 1-\text { GRP } 2}{\text { GRP } 2} \times 100 \end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF DUI <br> INCIDENTINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text { GRP 1-GRP } 2}{\text { GRP } 2} 100$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```2007 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)``` | 1) 3-month program <br> 2) 9-month program | $(31,193)$ $(10,800)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.04 \\ & \\ & 3.55 \end{aligned}$ | 13.8\%* | $\begin{aligned} & 3.70 \\ & 4.80 \end{aligned}$ | -22.9\%** |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline{ }^{*} p=.027 \\ & * * p=.0001 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 9 -month program, $13 \%$ actually had BAC levels below $0.20 \%$ and $87 \%$ 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 9-month DUI 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 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders with

 BAC Levels Below 0.20\% Versus $0.20 \%$ and AboveTotal Crashes and DUI Incidents: Table 16c shows the results of the effects of the 9-month DUI 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 were not significant. These results are similar to those of the past 4 years, and show that differences in the BAC levels among the 9-month DUI program participants are not associated with their subsequent 1-year crashes. Also, the results of this analysis indicate that there were no significant differences in subsequent 1-year DUI incidents between DUI offenders with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above and those with BAC levels below $0.20 \%$. These findings should be viewed with caution since the prior 4 years' results indicate that those with higher BAC levels are more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels.

TABLE 16c: FIRST OFFENDER 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS BELOW $0.20 \%$ VERSUS $0.20 \%$ AND ABOVE

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\begin{array}{\|\|l\|l} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF CRASH- <br> INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 | NUMBER OF DUI <br> INCIDENT- <br> INVOLVED, <br> PER 100 <br> DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2007 \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | 1) BAC below $0.20 \%$ <br> 2) BAC $0.20 \%$ and above | $\begin{aligned} & (1,288) \\ & (8,308) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.18 \\ & 3.54 \end{aligned}$ | -10.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4.78 \\ & 4.86 \end{aligned}$ | -1.6\% |

Results of the Evaluation of the 3-Month and 9-Month DUI 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 4 years' results, the length of time of DUI intervention program for first DUI offenders with BAC levels of $0.20 \%$ and above were not associated with 1-year subsequent crashes. Although the crash rates for those attending the 3-month program are slightly higher than for those attending the 9-month program, the differences were not significant. Thus, with BAC level held constant, the findings of this analysis indicate that the extended 9-month DUI program does not appear to be more effective than the 3-month DUI program in reducing subsequent 1-year crashes for first offenders with high BAC levels.

In contrast, this year's findings indicate that, for first-DUI offenders with BAC levels $0.20 \%$ and above, the extended 9 -month DUI program appears to be more effective ( $p=.047$ ) in attenuating subsequent 1-year DUI incidents relative to the 3-month DUI program. The 9-month DUI program participants had $26.8 \%$ fewer DUI incidents than the 3-month DUI program participants. This year's findings are different from the prior 4 years' results which indicated that extending the program length for first offenders with high BAC levels does not reduce subsequent 1-year crashes or DUI incidents. One possible explanation for these findings might be the impact of the SB 1756 law (Migden) that imposes a longer-term (10-month) license suspension on first-DUI offenders, with a BAC level of $0.20 \%$ and above, who are assigned to 9 -month DUI programs.

TABLE 16d: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI 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) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NUMBER OF } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { INCIDENT- } \\ & \text { INVOLVED, } \\ & \text { PER 100 } \\ & \text { DRIVERS } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENTAGE EFFECT <br> (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\underline{\text { GRP } 1 \text { - GRP } 2} \times 100$ GRP 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```2007 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)``` | 1) 3-month program <br> 2) 9-month program | $\begin{aligned} & (1,303) \\ & (8,308) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.00 \\ & 3.47 \end{aligned}$ | $15.3 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.97 \\ & 4.71 \end{aligned}$ | $26.8 \% \text { * }$ |

The effectiveness of increasing the duration of time for DUI intervention 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 DUI program, there may be additional unknown biases that this quasiexperimental 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

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, removing this responsibility from the courts. DMV is also responsible for issuing license restrictions to DUI offenders who meet requirements defined by the law.

This section includes the following tables:

Table 17: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1998-2008. This table shows preconviction (APS) and postconviction license disqualification totals from 1998 through 2008. 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 2006/2007 through 2008/2009.
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 $64.4 \%$ over that for 1998 (see Table 17). These totals have increased markedly as of September 20, 2005 due to the law change noted above.
> In 2008, 204,332 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 2008/2009, total APS actions increased by 0.7\% from FY 2007/2008, following a $5.1 \%$ increase in the previous fiscal year (see Table 18).
$>$ The number of chemical test refusal actions decreased by $2.0 \%$ in 2008, after increasing by $2.9 \%$ in 2007. The total number of refusal actions has fallen $5.5 \%$ in the past decade (see Table 17).
$>$ Requests for APS hearings have increased from $25.4 \%$ of all APS actions in FY $2007 / 2008$ to $27.7 \%$ in $2008 / 2009$. The rate at which APS S/R actions are upheld after hearing has increased slightly during the past several fiscal years, from $89.8 \%$ upheld in 2006/2007, to $90.9 \%$ upheld in 2007/2008, to $91.5 \%$ upheld in 2008/2009 (see Table 18).
$>$ During the first 15.5 years after implementation (on January 1, 1994) of the "zero tolerance" law for minors, 254,327 suspension actions have been taken (see Table 17).
TABLE 17: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1998-2008

|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION (S/R) ACTIONS | $238612{ }^{1}$ | 236141 | 240597 | 231217 | 236603 | 241242 | 239580 | 247568 | $339796{ }^{3}$ | 3628593 | 3923193 |
| PRECONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Per Se (APS) Actions | 175365 | 179332 | 172606 | 164840 | 165505 | 171470 | 171828 | 168569 | 185481 | 192213 | 204332 |
| . 01 Zero tolerance suspensions | 15640 | 17775 | 18185 | 18549 | 19129 | 19949 | 19967 | 19374 | 22044 | 22112 | 22180 |
| .08 First-offender suspensions | 116827 | 119621 | 114997 | 109695 | 109888 | 114975 | 116022 | 107466 | 118468 | 123594 | 132266 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender suspensions | 39024 | 38487 | 36147 | 33517 | 33580 | 33413 | 32903 | 38097 | 41420 | 42979 | 46388 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender revocations | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 | 3528 | 3498 |
| Commercial driver actions | 4609 | 4471 | 4139 | 4013 | 3936 | 3853 | 3801 | 3525 | 2974 | 2903 | 3172 |
| Chemical test refusal actions | 9935 | 9435 | 9433 | 8841 | 8772 | 9399 | 9353 | 9599 | 9315 | 9581 | 9390 |
| . 01 Test refusal suspensions | 229 | 268 | 270 | 280 | 290 | 341 | 326 | 364 | 419 | 426 | 433 |
| . 08 Test refusal suspensions | 5832 | 5718 | 5886 | 5482 | 5547 | 5925 | 6091 | 5603 | 5347 | 5627 | 5459 |
| .08 Test refusal revocations | 3874 | 3449 | 3277 | 3079 | 2908 | 3133 | 2936 | 3632 | 3549 | 3528 | 3498 |
| POSTCONVICTION ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juvenile DUI suspensions | $1026{ }^{1}$ | 918 | 741 | 714 | 896 | 794 | 838 | 737 | 941 | 1061 | 917 |
| First-offender suspensions | $9588{ }^{1}$ | 15072 | 29924 | 31097 | 32716 | 32521 | 31012 | 39078 | $110525^{3}$ | $124436{ }^{3}$ | $136480{ }^{3}$ |
| Misdemeanor | $7497{ }^{1}$ | 13401 | 28118 | 29188 | 30563 | 30298 | 28799 | 36808 | $108227^{3}$ | $122102^{3}$ | $133987{ }^{3}$ |
| Felony | $2091{ }^{1}$ | 1671 | 1806 | 1909 | 2153 | 2223 | 2213 | 2270 | 2298 | 2334 | 2493 |
| Second-offender S/R actions | $40238{ }^{1}$ | 31940 | 29097 | 26911 | 29345 | 28737 | 28400 | 30294 | 32680 | 34296 | 38266 |
| Misdemeanor | $39065{ }^{1}$ | 31455 | 28571 | 26334 | 28748 | 28160 | 27847 | 29699 | 32046 | 33649 | 37568 |
| Felony | 6331 | 485 | 526 | 577 | 597 | 577 | 553 | 595 | 634 | 647 | 658 |
| Third-offender revocations | 93971 | 6573 | 6163 | 5727 | 6171 | 5953 | 5581 | 6720 | 7649 | 8063 | 9164 |
| Misdemeanor | $9167{ }^{1}$ | 6452 | 6015 | 5585 | 5996 | 5758 | 5429 | 6537 | 7424 | 7830 | 8933 |
| Felony | $230^{1}$ | 121 | 148 | 142 | 175 | 195 | 152 | 183 | 225 | 233 | 231 |
| Fourth-offender revocations | $2998{ }^{1}$ | 2306 | 2066 | 1928 | 1970 | 1767 | 1921 | 2170 | 2520 | 2790 | 3200 |
| TOTAL POSTCONVICTION S/R ACTIONS | $63247{ }^{1}$ | 56809 | 67991 | 66377 | 71098 | 69772 | 67752 | 78999 | $154315^{3}$ | $170646^{3}$ | $187987{ }^{3}$ |

${ }^{1}$ The 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 DUIs and removed this responsibility from the courts.

TABLE 18: ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

|  | 7/06-6/07 | 7/07-6/08 | 7/08-6/09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total APS actions taken (including actions later set aside) | 208,106 | 218,776 | 220,309 |
| Total $.08^{1}$ APS actions set aside | 17,721 | 16,678 | 17,541 |
| Total $.01^{2}$ suspensions set aside | 1,415 | 1,302 | 1,274 |
| Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside) | 188,970 | 200,796 | 201,494 |
| Net total . 08 APS actions | 166,544 | 178,501 | 180,013 |
| Net total . 01 suspensions | 22,426 | 22,295 | 21,481 |
| Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification: ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers | 186,251 | 197,851 | 200,906 |
| Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken | 2,719 | 2,945 | 2,915 |
| Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles | 4 | 21 | 34 |
| Net APS . 08 actions for drivers with no prior DUI convictions or APS actions ${ }^{4}$ | 121,138 | 129,755 | 130,022 |
| 4-month license suspensions | 85,599 | 92,283 | 89,615 |
| 30-day suspensions plus 5-month $\mathrm{COE}^{5}$ restrictions | 27,596 | 29,250 | 32,451 |
| First-offender chemical test refusals | 5,622 | 5,604 | 5,137 |
| CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions | 2,321 | 2,618 | 2,819 |
| Net APS . 08 actions taken for drivers with prior DUI convictions | 45,406 | 48,746 | 49,991 |
| Suspensions | 41,904 | 45,085 | 46,646 |
| Revocations | 3,502 | 3,661 | 3,345 |
| Total probation violation actions initiated from 1/1/09-6/30/09 ${ }^{6}$ | n/a | n/a | 2,615 |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures: |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 APS refusal actions taken (including actions later set aside) | 10,151 | 10,323 | 9,448 |
| Total .08 refusal actions set aside | 568 | 559 | 568 |
| Total .01 refusal actions set aside | 31 | 30 | 26 |
| Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside) | 9,552 | 9,734 | 8,854 |
| Net total .08 refusal actions | 9,159 | 9,266 | 8,482 |
| Net total .01 refusal actions | 382 | 468 | 372 |
| Chemical test refusal rate (excluding actions later set aside) | 4.88\% | 4.72\% | 4.29\% |
| Net . 08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no prior DUIs | 5,622 | 5,604 | 5,137 |
| Net . 08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with prior DUIs | 3,502 | 3,662 | 3,345 |
| APS Hearings ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |
| Total . 08 and . 01 inperson or telephone APS hearings scheduled | 51,677 | 55,535 | 61,003 |
| Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing ${ }^{8}$ | 24.8\% | 25.4\% | 27.7\% |
| . 08 hearings held and/or completed | 47,093 | 50,360 | 55,788 |
| . 08 actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 42,281 | 45,756 | 51,064 |
| Percentage of . 08 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 89.8\% | 90.9\% | 91.5\% |
| . 01 hearings held and/or completed | 4,766 | 4,861 | 4,922 |
| . 01 actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 4,194 | 4,348 | 4,446 |
| Percentage of .01 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 88.0\% | 89.4\% | 90.3\% |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 APS refusal hearings scheduled | 3,209 | 3,393 | 3,418 |
| . 08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed | 3,075 | 3,254 | 3,291 |
| . 08 APS refusal actions sustained/upheld following hearings | 2,665 | 2,883 | 2,860 |

[^1]
## 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, 1997-2007. This table shows the number of DUI arrests and percentage of DUI arrests associated with reported crashes from 1997-2007.

Table 20: 2007 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Race/Ethnicity and Sobriety Level. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of sobriety and race/ethnicity for 2007 HBD drivers involved in crashes.

Table 21: 2007 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Adjudication Status and Sobriety Level. This table cross tabulates crash sobriety codes (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition for 2007 DUI convictions associated with those crashes.

Table 22: 2007 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: Had-been-drinking Drivers Under Age 21 Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes, 1997-2007. 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.

[^2]Tables 24a-24b: 2007 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 2007 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: 2007 Had-been-drinking Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Type of Crash. This table cross tabulates type of crash by age group for HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes.

Tables 25a-25b: 2007 Had-been-drinking (HBD) Drivers Involved in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Sobriety Level and Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Not Arrested or Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2007 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: 2007 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 2007 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: 2007 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 2007.

Figure 11 (opposite page) shows the annual percentages of traffic injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 1998 to 2008. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI summary statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.

Figure 12 (opposite page) shows the alcohol- and drug-involved fatalities from 1998 to 2008. 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 11. Percentages of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1998-2008.


Figure 12. Alcohol- and drug-involved total fatalities, 1998-2008.

Based on these data, the following statements can be made:
$>$ The number of alcohol-involved traffic fatalities decreased by $9.0 \%$ in 2008, following a decrease of $6.8 \%$ in 2007 and increases of $1.5 \%$ in $2006,7.7 \%$ 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. The proportion of traffic fatalities which are alcohol-involved increased to
$39.8 \%$, which is the highest proportion in the past decade (see Figure 11 and DUI Summary Statistics).
> Drug-involved fatalities show a noticeable growing trend in the past decade, increasing by $173 \%$, from 266 in 1998 to 726 in 2008. However, in the past 3 years, the number of drug-involved fatalities has declined, with 2008 showing a drop of $3.1 \%$. Also, the greatest proportion of fatalities remains alcohol-related (see Figure 12).
> $11.8 \%$ of traffic crash injuries in 2008 were alcohol-involved, relatively unchanged from 11.5\% in 2007 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
> The proportion of HBD drivers involved in fatal/injury crashes under age of 21 increased from $9.9 \%$ in 1997 to $12.1 \%$ in 2007 ( $22.2 \%$ increase, see Table 23).
> $15.3 \%$ of all 2007 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to $15.5 \%$ in 2006. $6.1 \%$ of DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly lower than $6.3 \%$ in 2006 (see Table 19).
$>$ In $40.5 \%$ 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 $56.6 \%$ 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 2007 were less likely to have a prior conviction within 10 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 (71.9\%) of arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 26a). In contrast, almost two-thirds (63\%) of drivers in alcohol-involved injury crashes had at least one prior DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction.
$>$ Among 2007 HBD drivers in fatal/injury crashes, $34.2 \%$ were involved in crashes with fixed objects, while $53.0 \%$ 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, 1997-2007

|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL DUI ARRESTS | 191164 | 188327 | 188523 | 181336 | 176490 | 177056 | 183560 | 180957 | 180288 | 197248 | 203866 |
| PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASSOCIATED WITH <br> CRASHES | $12.3 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $15.5 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ |
| PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASSOCIATED WITH <br> CRASHES INVOLVING <br> INJURIES/FATALITIES | $5.8 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |  |

TABLE 20: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY LEVEL*

| HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD)DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WHITE | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  | UNKNOWN |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 21069 | 100.0 | 8861 | 42.1 | 8324 | 39.5 | 1501 | 7.1 | 1198 | 5.7 | 1185 | 5.6 |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { 易 }}$ | HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 16567 | 78.6 | 7044 | 42.5 | 6979 | 42.1 | 1120 | 6.8 | 899 | 5.4 | 525 | 3.2 |
| - | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF <br> IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 1836 | 8.7 | 544 | 29.6 | 521 | 28.4 | 127 | 6.9 | 94 | 5.1 | 550 | 30.0 |
| ¢ | HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2666 | 12.7 | 1273 | 47.7 | 824 | 30.9 | 254 | 9.5 | 205 | 7.7 | 110 | 4.1 |

*For each sobriety level, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2007 California Highway Patrol data files.
TABLE 21: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY LEVEL*

|  |  | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF CONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MISDEMEANOR DUI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | ALCOHOLRECKLESS |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YOUTH } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | OTHERCONVICTIONS |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NO RECORD OF } \\ \text { ANY } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 18525 | 100.0 | 8295 | 44.8 | 2152 | 11.6 | 501 | 2.7 | 72 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.0 | 7501 | 40.5 |
|  | HBD-OBVIOUSLY DRUNK (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 15035 | 81.2 | 8132 | 54.1 | 2108 | 14.0 | 489 | 3.3 | 59 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.0 | 4243 | 28.2 |
|  | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF <br> IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 1029 | 5.6 | 128 | 12.4 | 40 | 3.9 | 9 | 0.9 | 3 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 849 | 82.5 |
|  | HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2401 | 13.0 | 31 | 1.3 | 4 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 | 10 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2354 | 98.0 |
|  | HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 27 | 0.1 | 3 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 88.9 |
|  | NOT REPORTED | 31 | 0.2 | 1 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 30 | 96.8 |
| *For each sobriety level, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2007 California Highway Patrol data files, and include only cases where the driver was found in the DMV Master file. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 22: 2007 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 (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) |  | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) |  | HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC.01\%-.049\%) |  |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 7456 | 4249 | 57.0 | 840 | 11.3 | 2367 | 31.7 |
| ALAMEDA | 286 | 156 | 54.5 | 31 | 10.8 | 99 | 34.6 |
| AMADOR | 13 | 7 | 53.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 46.2 |
| BUTTE | 53 | 28 | 52.8 | 2 | 3.8 | 23 | 43.4 |
| CALAVERAS | 20 | 13 | 65.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 6 | 30.0 |
| COLUSA | 11 | 7 | 63.6 | 2 | 18.2 | 2 | 18.2 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 171 | 87 | 50.9 | 22 | 12.9 | 62 | 36.3 |
| DEL NORTE | 4 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 |
| EL DORADO | 53 | 30 | 56.6 | 6 | 11.3 | 17 | 32.1 |
| FRESNO | 204 | 134 | 65.7 | 15 | 7.4 | 55 | 27.0 |
| GLENN | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 63 | 40 | 63.5 | 7 | 11.1 | 16 | 25.4 |
| IMPERIAL | 38 | 26 | 68.4 | 2 | 5.3 | 10 | 26.3 |
| INYO | 10 | 7 | 70.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| KERN | 151 | 101 | 66.9 | 18 | 11.9 | 32 | 21.2 |
| KINGS | 31 | 18 | 58.1 | 2 | 6.5 | 11 | 35.5 |
| LAKE | 25 | 13 | 52.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 8 | 32.0 |
| LASSEN | 9 | 2 | 22.2 | 2 | 22.2 | 5 | 55.6 |
| LOS ANGELES | 1876 | 1011 | 53.9 | 239 | 12.7 | 626 | 33.4 |
| MADERA | 63 | 45 | 71.4 | 4 | 6.3 | 14 | 22.2 |
| MARIN | 34 | 21 | 61.8 | 1 | 2.9 | 12 | 35.3 |
| MARIPOSA | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
| MENDOCINO | 8 | 5 | 62.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 37.5 |
| MERCED | 70 | 51 | 72.9 | 5 | 7.1 | 14 | 20.0 |
| MODOC | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
| MONO | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | 66 | 42 | 63.6 | 2 | 3.0 | 22 | 33.3 |
| NAPA | 50 | 19 | 38.0 | 7 | 14.0 | 24 | 48.0 |
| NEVADA | 35 | 13 | 37.1 | 6 | 17.1 | 16 | 45.7 |
| ORANGE | 449 | 225 | 50.1 | 42 | 9.4 | 182 | 40.5 |
| PLACER | 43 | 24 | 55.8 | 5 | 11.6 | 14 | 32.6 |
| PLUMAS | 7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 42.9 | 4 | 57.1 |
| RIVERSIDE | 514 | 333 | 64.8 | 54 | 10.5 | 127 | 24.7 |
| SACRAMENTO | 301 | 168 | 55.8 | 29 | 9.6 | 104 | 34.6 |
| SAN BENITO | 37 | 23 | 62.2 | 7 | 18.9 | 7 | 18.9 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 577 | 347 | 60.1 | 63 | 10.9 | 167 | 28.9 |
| SAN DIEGO | 673 | 374 | 55.6 | 66 | 9.8 | 233 | 34.6 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 115 | 57 | 49.6 | 12 | 10.4 | 46 | 40.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 136 | 97 | 71.3 | 13 | 9.6 | 26 | 19.1 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 60 | 34 | 56.7 | 9 | 15.0 | 17 | 28.3 |
| SAN MATEO | 93 | 35 | 37.6 | 9 | 9.7 | 49 | 52.7 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 89 | 54 | 60.7 | 7 | 7.9 | 28 | 31.5 |
| SANTA CLARA | 209 | 110 | 52.6 | 40 | 19.1 | 59 | 28.2 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 28 | 19 | 67.9 | 1 | 3.6 | 8 | 28.6 |
| SHASTA | 52 | 29 | 55.8 | 13 | 25.0 | 10 | 19.2 |
| SISKIYOU | 16 | 7 | 43.8 | 4 | 25.0 | 5 | 31.3 |
| SOLANO | 63 | 29 | 46.0 | 11 | 17.5 | 23 | 36.5 |
| SONOMA | 73 | 33 | 45.2 | 5 | 6.8 | 35 | 47.9 |
| STANISLAUS | 143 | 98 | 68.5 | 12 | 8.4 | 33 | 23.1 |
| SUTTER | 26 | 11 | 42.3 | 4 | 15.4 | 11 | 42.3 |
| TEHAMA | 26 | 13 | 50.0 | 1 | 3.8 | 12 | 46.2 |
| TRINITY | 10 | 6 | 60.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| TULARE | 107 | 75 | 70.1 | 12 | 11.2 | 20 | 18.7 |
| TUOLUMNE | 21 | 14 | 66.7 | 2 | 9.5 | 5 | 23.8 |
| VENTURA | 187 | 119 | 63.6 | 28 | 15.0 | 40 | 21.4 |
| YOLO | 37 | 23 | 62.2 | 3 | 8.1 | 11 | 29.7 |
| YUBA | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 23: HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 1997-2007

| AGE |  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ (\text { ALL AGES) } \end{gathered}$ | $N$ | 19277 | 19080 | 18720 | 19591 | 20530 | 20633 | 20632 | 20847 | 20818 | 21031 | 21045 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } \\ 18 \end{gathered}$ | $N$ | 407 | 375 | 354 | 366 | 375 | 382 | 376 | 409 | 351 | 344 | 369 |
|  | \% | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| 18-20 | $N$ | 1509 | 1608 | 1678 | 1811 | 1943 | 2016 | 1894 | 1943 | 1946 | 2226 | 2171 |
|  | \% | 7.8 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 10.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNDER } \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | $N$ | 1916 | 1983 | 2032 | 2177 | 2318 | 2398 | 2270 | 2352 | 2297 | 2570 | 2540 |
|  | \% | 9.9 | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 12.2 | 12.1 |

TABLE 24a: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES* BY AGE AND SEX

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $N$ |  | $\%$ |
| TOTAL | 21045 | $100.0 \%$ | 16603 | $78.9 \%$ | 4442 | $21.1 \%$ |
| UNDER 18 | 369 | $1.8 \%$ | 263 | $71.3 \%$ | 106 | $28.7 \%$ |
| $18-20$ | 2171 | $10.3 \%$ | 1721 | $79.3 \%$ | 450 | $20.7 \%$ |
| $21-30$ | 8095 | $38.5 \%$ | 6384 | $78.9 \%$ | 1711 | $21.1 \%$ |
| $31-40$ | 3950 | $18.8 \%$ | 3129 | $79.2 \%$ | 821 | $20.8 \%$ |
| $41-50$ | 3339 | $15.9 \%$ | 2534 | $75.9 \%$ | 805 | $24.1 \%$ |
| $51-59$ | 1555 | $7.4 \%$ | 1227 | $78.9 \%$ | 328 | $21.1 \%$ |
| $60-69$ | 554 | $2.6 \%$ | 447 | $80.7 \%$ | 107 | $19.3 \%$ |
| $70 \&$ ABOVE | 213 | $1.0 \%$ | 172 | $80.8 \%$ | 41 | $19.2 \%$ |
| AGE UNKNOWN | 799 | $3.8 \%$ | 726 | $90.9 \%$ | 73 | $9.1 \%$ |

*These data are derived from the 2007 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 24b: 2007 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 | 4749 | 100.0 | 3755 | 79.1 | 994 | 20.9 |
| UNDER 18 | 79 | 1.7 | 56 | 70.9 | 23 | 29.1 |
| 18-20 | 400 | 8.4 | 326 | 81.5 | 74 | 18.5 |
| 21-30 | 1933 | 40.7 | 1549 | 80.1 | 384 | 19.9 |
| 31-40 | 912 | 19.2 | 722 | 79.2 | 190 | 20.8 |
| 41-50 | 774 | 16.3 | 592 | 76.5 | 182 | 23.5 |
| 51-59 | 387 | 8.1 | 300 | 77.5 | 87 | 22.5 |
| 60-69 | 171 | 3.6 | 138 | 80.7 | 33 | 19.3 |
| 70 \& ABOVE | 93 | 2.0 | 72 | 77.4 | 21 | 22.6 |

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: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND TYPE OF CRASH

| AGE | TOTAL | TYPE OF CRASH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | VEH/FIXEDOBJECT |  | VEHICLEPEDESTRIAN |  | MULTIPLE VEHICLE |  | VEHICLEBICYCLE |  | OTHER |  |
|  | N | N | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| TOTAL | 18525 | 6344 | 34.2 | 327 | 1.8 | 9813 | 53.0 | 131 | 0.7 | 1910 | 10.3 |
| UNDER 18 | 325 | 151 | 46.5 | 5 | 1.5 | 127 | 39.1 | 2 | 0.6 | 40 | 12.3 |
| 18-20 | 1972 | 854 | 43.3 | 28 | 1.4 | 870 | 44.1 | 9 | 0.5 | 211 | 10.7 |
| 21-30 | 7399 | 2780 | 37.6 | 99 | 1.3 | 3734 | 50.5 | 31 | 0.4 | 755 | 10.2 |
| 31-40 | 3599 | 1126 | 31.3 | 71 | 2.0 | 2023 | 56.2 | 21 | 0.6 | 358 | 9.9 |
| 41-50 | 3083 | 876 | 28.4 | 56 | 1.8 | 1775 | 57.6 | 36 | 1.2 | 340 | 11.0 |
| 51-60 | 1542 | 419 | 27.2 | 39 | 2.5 | 891 | 57.8 | 23 | 1.5 | 170 | 11.0 |
| 61-70 | 433 | 99 | 22.9 | 15 | 3.5 | 280 | 64.7 | 7 | 1.6 | 32 | 7.4 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 172 | 39 | 22.7 | 14 | 8.1 | 113 | 65.7 | 2 | 1.2 | 4 | 2.3 |

TABLE 25a: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY SOBRIETY LEVEL AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS*

| HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 18525 | 100.0 | 7239 | 39.1 | 8623 | 46.5 | 2033 | 11.0 | 472 | 2.5 | 158 | 0.9 |
|  | HBD-OBVIOUSLY DRUNK (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 2 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 15035 | 81.2 | 4337 | 28.8 | 8154 | 54.2 | 1941 | 12.9 | 451 | 3.0 | 152 | 1.0 |
|  | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 1029 | 5.6 | 716 | 69.6 | 237 | 23.0 | 58 | 5.6 | 15 | 1.5 | 3 | 0.3 |
|  | HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2401 | 13.0 | 2135 | 88.9 | 223 | 9.3 | 34 | 1.4 | 6 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 |
|  | HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 27 | 0.1 | 23 | 85.2 | 4 | 14.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | NOT REPORTED | 31 | 0.2 | 27 | 87.1 | 4 | 12.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

TABLE 25b: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY SOBRIETY LEVEL AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)*

| HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 4749 | 100.0 | 4082 | 86.0 | 526 | 11.1 | 108 | 2.3 | 24 | 0.5 | 9 | 0.2 |
|  | HBD-OBVIOUSLY DRUNK <br> (BAC . $08 \%$ \& ABOVE) | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .08\% \& ABOVE) | 1648 | 34.7 | 1349 | 81.9 | 215 | 13.0 | 62 | 3.8 | 16 | 1.0 | 6 | 0.4 |
|  | HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .05\%-.079\%) | 803 | 16.9 | 667 | 83.1 | 111 | 13.8 | 20 | 2.5 | 4 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | HBD-NOT IMPAIRED <br> (BAC .01\%-.049\%) | 2246 | 47.3 | 2019 | 89.9 | 195 | 8.7 | 26 | 1.2 | 4 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 |
|  | HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING | 22 | 0.5 | 21 | 95.5 | 13 | 4.5 | 00 | 0.0 | 00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | NOT REPORTED | 29 | 0.6 | 26 | 89.7 |  | 10.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

[^3]TABLE 26a: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS*

| HBD DRIVERS INVOLVED IN CRASHES | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TOTAL | 18525 | 100.0 | 7239 | 39.1 | 8623 | 46.5 | 2033 | 11.0 | 472 | 2.5 | 158 | 0.9 |
| WITH FATALITIES | 1083** | 5.8 | 779 | 71.9 | 229 | 21.1 | 50 | 4.6 | 19 | 1.8 | 6 | 0.6 |
| WITH INJURIES | 17442 | 94.2 | 6460 | 37.0 | 8394 | 48.1 | 1983 | 11.4 | 453 | 2.6 | 152 | 0.9 |

TABLE 26b: 2007 HAD-BEEN-DRINKING (HBD) DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES
BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED OR CONVICTED)*

| HBD DRIVERS INVOLVED IN CRASHES | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TOTAL | 4749 | 100.0 | 4082 | 86.0 | 526 | 11.1 | 108 | 2.3 | 24 | 0.5 | 9 | 0.2 |
| WITH FATALITIES | 830** | 17.5 | 680 | 81.9 | 111 | 13.4 | 25 | 3.0 | 10 | 1.2 | 4 | 0.5 |
| WITH INJURIES | 3919 | 82.5 | 3402 | 86.8 | 415 | 10.6 | 83 | 2.1 | 14 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.1 |

**The records of $88.3 \%$ (733) of these cases indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 27: 2007 REPORTED* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES


## 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 91 (Feuer), effective 7/01/2010, establishes a pilot program in four counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare) that requires convicted first-time and repeat DUI offenders, as a condition of obtaining a restricted driver's license, to install an ignition interlock device (IID) on all vehicles they own or operate. The required time period for the IID installation would be based on the number of prior DUI convictions. The law also requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot program in reducing the recidivism rate of DUI offenders and to report their findings to the legislature.

SB 598 (Huff), effective 7/01/2010, requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to advise second and third offenders convicted of misdemeanor DUI (alcohol only), of the option of obtaining a restricted driver's license after completing a 90-day suspension period for a second misdemeanor DUI or a 6-month suspension period for a third misdemeanor DUI. The issuance of a restricted driver's license is subject to certain conditions among which are the installation and maintenance of an ignition interlock device (IID) in any vehicle that the offender owns or operates and enrollment in a DUI program.

SB 1388 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/2009, transfers regulatory authority for the administration of mandatory ignition interlock device (IID) programs from the state courts to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). This law also authorizes the DMV to require any driver convicted of driving with a suspended license, due to a prior conviction for DUI, to install an IID in any vehicle that the offender owns or operates.

SB 1190 (Oropeza), effective 1/1/2009, reduces the blood alcohol level (BAC) at which the court may require first time offenders convicted of a DUI to install an ignition interlock device (IID) from $0.20 \%$ to $0.15 \%$ at the time of arrest.

AB 2802 (Houston), effective 1/1/2009, requires the court to order a person convicted of alcohol-reckless driving to participate in a licensed DUI program for at least 9 months, if that person has a prior conviction for alcohol-reckless driving or a DUI within 10 years. This law requires the court to revoke the person's probation for failure to enroll in, participate in, or complete the program. It also requires the

Department of Motor Vehicles to include in the annual report to the Legislature an evaluation of the effectiveness of that program.

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 DUI 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 7 to 10 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 a DUI program, even though that prior conviction occurred more than 10 years ago, and authorizes the court to order the person to complete a repeat offender DUI program. Finally, it expands court-ordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all persons convicted of a repeat DUI offense within 10 years of a prior offense.

SB 1696 (Torlakson), effective $1 / 1 / 2005$, requires the DUI 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 7 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 2 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 DUI 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 3 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 6 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 DUI 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 1 year the driving privilege of any ignition interlock device-restricted driver who is convicted of driving a vehicle not equipped with an ignition interlock device (IID) under authority section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IIDrestricted 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 DUI 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 3 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 6 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 4 years.

SB 1177 (Johnson), effective 1/1/1998, requires that anyone convicted of a second or subsequent DUI within 7 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 2 years revocation for the second offense in 7 years and 3 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 6 months, rather than 4 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 1 to 3 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 1 year.

AB 2851 (Friedman), effective 7/1/1993, requires anyone convicted of a second DUI within 7 years of a prior conviction to install an IID on all their vehicles. The device must be maintained for a period of 1 to 3 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 1 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 6 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 7 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 7 years of two or more convictions of 23152 or 23153 , or a violation of 23153 which occurred within 7 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 7 years as "habitual traffic offenders."

AB 3134 (Harris), effective $1 / 1 / 1989$, allows the $4^{\text {th }}$ DUI within 7 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 1 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 1 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 1 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 5 to 7 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 1 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 5 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 5 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 6 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 1 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 7 to 5 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 1 year and a license restriction for 2 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 upon arrest for the following reasons: a person was driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of $0.08 \%$ or more, a person refuses a chemical test, a commercial driver was driving a commercial vehicle with a BAC of $0.04 \%$ or more, or a person was on probation for a violation of Section 23152 or 23153 and had a BAC of $0.01 \%$ or more. Also, 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. Upon arrest, the driver's license is immediately confiscated by the law enforcement officer and an order of suspension or revocation served. The driver is issued a temporary license and allowed due process through administrative review. In July 1990, California became the 28th state to implement APS.

## 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, 192.5a, b, US Codes J36FR46, J36423, and out of state DUI codes.

## DUI CONVICTION RATE

Percent of total DUI convictions with a violation (arrest) date in a given calendar year divided by the total number of DUI arrests in the same calendar year.

## 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.

## 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.
APPENDIX B

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 214811 | 172220 | 80.2 | 42591 | 19.8 | 85305 | 39.7 | 97709 | 45.5 | 15678 | 7.3 | 16119 | 7.5 |
| ALAMEDA | UNDER 18 | 39 | 30 | 76.9 | 9 | 23.1 | 17 | 43.6 | 15 | 38.5 | 2 | 5.1 | 5 | 12.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 602 | 468 | 77.7 | 134 | 22.3 | 183 | 30.4 | 241 | 40.0 | 96 | 15.9 | 82 | 13.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 3524 | 2727 | 77.4 | 797 | 22.6 | 951 | 27.0 | 1350 | 38.3 | 698 | 19.8 | 525 | 14.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 1965 | 1587 | 80.8 | 378 | 19.2 | 454 | 23.1 | 771 | 39.2 | 486 | 24.7 | 254 | 12.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 1304 | 1058 | 81.1 | 246 | 18.9 | 468 | 35.9 | 331 | 25.4 | 362 | 27.8 | 143 | 11.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 602 | 479 | 79.6 | 123 | 20.4 | 265 | 44.0 | 103 | 17.1 | 173 | 28.7 | 61 | 10.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 142 | 114 | 80.3 | 28 | 19.7 | 72 | 50.7 | 22 | 15.5 | 36 | 25.4 | 12 | 8.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 25 | 17 | 68.0 | 8 | 32.0 | 14 | 56.0 | 3 | 12.0 | 5 | 20.0 | 3 | 12.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 8203 | 6480 | 79.0 | 1723 | 21.0 | 2424 | 29.6 | 2836 | 34.6 | 1858 | 22.7 | 1085 | 13.2 |
| ALPINE | 21-30 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 8 | 4 | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 20 | 13 | 65.0 | 7 | 35.0 | 18 | 90.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.0 |
| AMADOR | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 16 | 15 | 93.8 | 1 | 6.3 | 14 | 87.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 6.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 88 | 69 | 78.4 | 19 | 21.6 | 68 | 77.3 | 11 | 12.5 | 1 | 1.1 | 8 | 9.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 60 | 48 | 80.0 | 12 | 20.0 | 42 | 70.0 | 15 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 97 | 64 | 66.0 | 33 | 34.0 | 83 | 85.6 | 6 | 6.2 | 1 | 1.0 | 7 | 7.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 45 | 28 | 62.2 | 17 | 37.8 | 43 | 95.6 | 2 | 4.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 8 | 80.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 324 | 240 | 74.1 | 84 | 25.9 | 265 | 81.8 | 37 | 11.4 | 3 | 0.9 | 19 | 5.9 |
| BUTTE | UNDER 18 | 22 | 21 | 95.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 19 | 86.4 | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 4.5 |
|  | $18-20$ | 240 | 208 | 86.7 | 32 | 13.3 | 186 | 77.5 | 36 | 15.0 | 7 | 2.9 | 11 | 4.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 868 | 769 | 88.6 | 99 | 11.4 | 655 | 75.5 | 152 | 17.5 | 24 | 2.8 | 37 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 402 | 337 | 83.8 | 65 | 16.2 | 315 | 78.4 | 64 | 15.9 | 11 | 2.7 | 12 | 3.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 379 | 310 | 81.8 | 69 | 18.2 | 304 | 80.2 | 50 | 13.2 | 18 | 4.7 | 7 | 1.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 217 | 184 | 84.8 | 33 | 15.2 | 198 | 91.2 | 8 | 3.7 | 6 | 2.8 | 5 | 2.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 64 | 47 | 73.4 | 17 | 26.6 | 57 | 89.1 | 5 | 7.8 | 2 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 15 | 93.8 | 1 | 6.3 | 15 | 93.8 | 1 | 6.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2208 | 1891 | 85.6 | 317 | 14.4 | 1749 | 79.2 | 317 | 14.4 | 69 | 3.1 | 73 | 3.3 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 15 | 78.9 | 3 | 15.8 | 1 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 102 | 95 | 93.1 | 7 | 6.9 | 80 | 78.4 | 18 | 17.6 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | $31-40$ | 75 | 57 | 76.0 | 18 | 24.0 | 58 | 77.3 | 12 | 16.0 | 2 | 2.7 | 3 | 4.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 96 | 69 | 71.9 | 27 | 28.1 | 85 | 88.5 | 8 | 8.3 | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 2.1 |
|  | $51-60$ | 61 | 41 | 67.2 | 20 | 32.8 | 57 | 93.4 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 3.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 18 | 85.7 | 3 | 14.3 | 21 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $5$ | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 380 | 299 | 78.7 | 81 | 21.3 | 322 | 84.7 | 42 | 11.1 | 7 | 1.8 | 9 | 2.4 |
| COLUSA | 18-20 | 21 | 19 | 90.5 | 2 | 9.5 | 8 | 38.1 | 13 | 61.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 72 | 57 | $79.2$ | 15 | 20.8 | 24 | 33.3 | 45 | 62.5 | 2 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 49 | 39 | 79.6 | 10 | 20.4 | 22 | 44.9 | 26 | 53.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 53 | 39 | 73.6 | 14 | 26.4 | 33 | 62.3 | 19 | 35.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 18 | 75.0 | 6 | 25.0 | 17 | 70.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 228 | 179 | 78.5 | 49 | 21.5 | 109 | 47.8 | 114 | 50.0 | 3 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.9 |
| CONTRA COSTA | UNDER 18 | 39 | 27 | 69.2 | 12 | 30.8 | 27 | 69.2 | 8 | 20.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 357 | 285 | 79.8 | 72 | 20.2 | 164 | 45.9 | 138 | 38.7 | 23 | 6.4 | 32 | 9.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 1972 | 1551 | 78.7 | 421 | 21.3 | 764 | 38.7 | 785 | 39.8 | 231 | 11.7 | 192 | 9.7 |
|  | $31-40$ | 1051 | 847 | 80.6 | 204 | 19.4 | 361 | 34.3 | 392 | 37.3 | 203 | 19.3 | 95 | 9.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 819 | 628 | 76.7 | 191 | 23.3 | 427 | 52.1 | 199 | 24.3 | 145 | 17.7 | 48 | 5.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 394 | 283 | 71.8 | 111 | 28.2 | 247 | 62.7 | 56 | 14.2 | 68 | 17.3 | 23 | 5.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 110 | 91 | 82.7 | 19 | 17.3 | 75 | 68.2 | 12 | 10.9 | 15 | 13.6 | 8 | 7.3 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $33$ | $30$ | $90.9$ | $3$ | $9.1$ | 28 | $84.8$ | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 1 | 3.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4775 | 3742 | 78.4 | 1033 | 21.6 | 2093 | 43.8 | 1592 | 33.3 | 688 | 14.4 | 402 | 8.4 |
| DEL NORTE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 18 | 13 | 72.2 | 5 | 27.8 | 12 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 33.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 84 | 72 | 85.7 | 12 | 14.3 | 56 | 66.7 | 16 | 19.0 | 1 | 1.2 | 11 | 13.1 |
|  | $31-40$ | 44 | 33 | 75.0 | 11 | 25.0 | 31 | 70.5 | 7 | 15.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 13.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 70 | 45 | 64.3 | 25 | 35.7 | 56 | 80.0 | 5 | 7.1 | 1 | 1.4 | 8 | 11.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 44 | 34 | 77.3 | 10 | 22.7 | 40 | 90.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 9.1 |
|  | $61-70$ | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 268 | 203 | 75.7 | 65 | 24.3 | 202 | 75.4 | 29 | 10.8 | 2 | 0.7 | 35 | 13.1 |

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| EL DORADO | UNDER 18 | 15 | 11 | 73.3 | 4 | 26.7 | 12 | 80.0 | 2 | 13.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 117 | 95 | 81.2 | 22 | 18.8 | 102 | 87.2 | 9 | 7.7 | 2 | 1.7 | 4 | 3.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 474 | 365 | 77.0 | 109 | 23.0 | 389 | 82.1 | 65 | 13.7 | 4 | 0.8 | 16 | 3.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 250 | 177 | 70.8 | 73 | 29.2 | 202 | 80.8 | 39 | 15.6 | 3 | 1.2 | 6 | 2.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 271 | 183 | 67.5 | 88 | 32.5 | 239 | 88.2 | 21 | 7.7 | 1 | 0.4 | 10 | 3.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 166 | 112 | 67.5 | 54 | 32.5 | 152 | 91.6 | 8 | 4.8 | 3 | 1.8 | 3 | 1.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 44 | 35 | 79.5 | 9 | 20.5 | 41 | 93.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.5 | 1 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1343 | 982 | 73.1 | 361 | 26.9 | 1143 | 85.1 | 144 | 10.7 | 15 | 1.1 | 41 | 3.1 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 65 | 52 | 80.0 | 13 | 20.0 | 22 | 33.8 | 39 | 60.0 | 2 | 3.1 | 2 | 3.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 666 | 555 | 83.3 | 111 | 16.7 | 156 | 23.4 | 436 | 65.5 | 29 | 4.4 | 45 | 6.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 3410 | 2850 | 83.6 | 560 | 16.4 | 764 | 22.4 | 2329 | 68.3 | 116 | 3.4 | 201 | 5.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 1857 | 1563 | 84.2 | 294 | 15.8 | 353 | 19.0 | 1327 | 71.5 | 98 | 5.3 | 79 | 4.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 1134 | 901 | 79.5 | 233 | 20.5 | 353 | 31.1 | 649 | 57.2 | 86 | 7.6 | 46 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 478 | 388 | 81.2 | 90 | 18.8 | 187 | 39.1 | 218 | 45.6 | 50 | 10.5 | 23 | 4.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 119 | 104 | 87.4 | 15 | 12.6 | 53 | 44.5 | 56 | 47.1 | 4 | 3.4 | 6 | 5.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 22 | 17 | 77.3 | 5 | 22.7 | 11 | 50.0 | 10 | 45.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 7751 | 6430 | 83.0 | 1321 | 17.0 | 1899 | 24.5 | 5064 | 65.3 | 385 | 5.0 | 403 | 5.2 |
| GLENN | UNDER 18 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 41 | 35 | 85.4 | 6 | 14.6 | 23 | 56.1 | 16 | 39.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 2.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 160 | 136 | 85.0 | 24 | 15.0 | 70 | 43.8 | 79 | 49.4 | 2 | 1.2 | 9 | 5.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 117 | 90 | 76.9 | 27 | 23.1 | 55 | 47.0 | 57 | 48.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 4.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 108 | 83 | 76.9 | 25 | 23.1 | 68 | 63.0 | 32 | 29.6 | 3 | 2.8 | 5 | 4.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 52 | 48 | 92.3 | 4 | 7.7 | 36 | 69.2 | 15 | 28.8 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 14 | 93.3 | 1 | 6.7 | 11 | 73.3 | 2 | 13.3 | 2 | 13.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 498 | 410 | 82.3 | 88 | 17.7 | 267 | 53.6 | 201 | 40.4 | 9 | 1.8 | 21 | 4.2 |
| HUMBOLDT | UNDER 18 | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 90 | 70 | 77.8 | 20 | 22.2 | 70 | 77.8 | 7 | 7.8 | 1 | 1.1 | 12 | 13.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 554 | 411 | 74.2 | 143 | 25.8 | 456 | 82.3 | 45 | 8.1 | 5 | 0.9 | 48 | 8.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 319 | 241 | 75.5 | 78 | 24.5 | 263 | 82.4 | 15 | 4.7 | 9 | 2.8 | 32 | 10.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 248 | 179 | 72.2 | 69 | 27.8 | 202 | 81.5 | 11 | 4.4 | 8 | 3.2 | 27 | 10.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 167 | 129 | 77.2 | 38 | 22.8 | 145 | 86.8 | 8 | 4.8 | 2 | 1.2 | 12 | 7.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 34 | 26 | 76.5 | 8 | 23.5 | 29 | 85.3 | 3 | 8.8 | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1424 | 1064 | 74.7 | 360 | 25.3 | 1176 | 82.6 | 90 | 6.3 | 26 | 1.8 | 132 | 9.3 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 21 | 19 | 90.5 | 2 | 9.5 | 5 | 23.8 | 15 | 71.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 154 | 120 | 77.9 | 34 | 22.1 | 30 | 19.5 | 118 | 76.6 | 4 | 2.6 | 2 | 1.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 537 | 439 | 81.8 | 98 | 18.2 | 93 | 17.3 | 411 | 76.5 | 18 | 3.4 | 15 | 2.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 262 | 211 | 80.5 | 51 | 19.5 | 42 | 16.0 | 195 | 74.4 | 10 | 3.8 | 15 | 5.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 256 | 210 | 82.0 | 46 | 18.0 | 65 | 25.4 | 173 | 67.6 | 11 | 4.3 | 7 | 2.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 123 | 112 | 91.1 | 11 | 8.9 | 42 | 34.1 | 78 | 63.4 | 1 | 0.8 | 2 | 1.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 45 | 38 | 84.4 | 7 | 15.6 | 14 | 31.1 | 29 | 64.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $8$ | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 4 | 50.0 | 3 | 37.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1406 | 1156 | 82.2 | 250 | 17.8 | 295 | 21.0 | 1022 | 72.7 | 45 | 3.2 | 44 | 3.1 |
| INYO | 18-20 | 23 | 11 | 47.8 | 12 | 52.2 | 15 | 65.2 | 2 | 8.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 26.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 116 | 93 | 80.2 | 23 | 19.8 | 65 | 56.0 | 22 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 25.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 56 | 41 | 73.2 | 15 | 26.8 | 31 | 55.4 | 9 | 16.1 | 1 | 1.8 | 15 | 26.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 80 | 54 | 67.5 | 26 | 32.5 | 61 | 76.3 | 11 | 13.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 10.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 47 | 37 | 78.7 | 10 | 21.3 | 37 | 78.7 | 4 | 8.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 12.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 19 | 90.5 | 2 | 9.5 | 17 | 81.0 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 | 2 | 9.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 71.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 350 | 262 | 74.9 | 88 | 25.1 | 228 | 65.1 | 49 | 14.0 | 2 | 0.6 | 71 | 20.3 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 53 | 42 | 79.2 | 11 | 20.8 | 18 | 34.0 | 33 | 62.3 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 528 | 455 | 86.2 | 73 | 13.8 | 173 | 32.8 | 319 | 60.4 | 15 | 2.8 | 21 | 4.0 |
|  | 21-30 | $2526$ | 2145 | 84.9 | 381 | 15.1 | 791 | 31.3 | 1544 | 61.1 | 133 | 5.3 | 58 | 2.3 |
|  | $31-40$ | 1309 | 1113 | 85.0 | 196 | 15.0 | 376 | 28.7 | 815 | 62.3 | 84 | 6.4 | 34 | 2.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 964 | 767 | 79.6 | 197 | 20.4 | 447 | 46.4 | 436 | 45.2 | 65 | 6.7 | 16 | 1.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 405 | 337 | 83.2 | 68 | 16.8 | 217 | 53.6 | 129 | 31.9 | 45 | 11.1 | 14 | 3.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 89 | 82 | 92.1 | 7 | 7.9 | 47 | 52.8 | 32 | 36.0 | 7 | 7.9 | 3 | 3.4 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $16$ | $14$ | 87.5 | 2 | $12.5$ | $12$ | 75.0 | 4 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 5890 | 4955 | 84.1 | 935 | 15.9 | 2081 | 35.3 | 3312 | 56.2 | 350 | 5.9 | 147 | 2.5 |
| KINGS | UNDER 18 | 12 | 11 | 91.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 8 | 66.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 105 | 84 | 80.0 | 21 | 20.0 | 32 | 30.5 | 62 | 59.0 | 6 | 5.7 | 5 | 4.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 567 | 485 | 85.5 | 82 | 14.5 | 137 | 24.2 | 369 | 65.1 | 35 | 6.2 | 26 | 4.6 |
|  | 31-40 | $254$ | 222 | 87.4 | 32 | 12.6 | 47 | 18.5 | 186 | 73.2 | 15 | 5.9 | 6 | $2.4$ |
|  | 41-50 | 176 | 146 | 83.0 | 30 | 17.0 | 56 | 31.8 | 103 | 58.5 | 12 | 6.8 | 5 | 2.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 86 | 76 | 88.4 | 10 | 11.6 | 34 | 39.5 | 42 | 48.8 | 6 | 7.0 | 4 | 4.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 6 | 42.9 | 5 | 35.7 | 3 | 21.4 | 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 | 1218 | 1040 | 85.4 | 178 | 14.6 | 316 | 25.9 | 777 | 63.8 | 78 | 6.4 | 47 | 3.9 |



| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% |
| LAKE | UNDER 18 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 5 | 71.4 | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 46 | 40 | 87.0 | 6 | 13.0 | 38 | 82.6 | 6 | 13.0 | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 142 | 112 | 78.9 | 30 | 21.1 | 95 | 66.9 | 31 | 21.8 | 6 | 4.2 | 10 | 7.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 114 | 91 | 79.8 | 23 | 20.2 | 87 | 76.3 | 17 | 14.9 | 1 | 0.9 | , | 7.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 123 | 83 | 67.5 | 40 | 32.5 | 103 | 83.7 | 11 | 8.9 | 4 | 3.3 | 5 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 100 | 77 | 77.0 | 23 | 23.0 | 89 | 89.0 | 3 | 3.0 | 6 | 6.0 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 29 | 18 | 62.1 | 11 | 37.9 | 25 | 86.2 | 2 | 6.9 | 1 | 3.4 | 1 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 571 | 436 | 76.4 | 135 | 23.6 | 451 | 79.0 | 72 | 12.6 | 21 | 3.7 | 27 | 4.7 |
| LASSEN | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 17 | 89.5 | 2 | 10.5 | 16 | 84.2 | 2 | 10.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 62 | 48 | 77.4 | 14 | 22.6 | 46 | 74.2 | 9 | 14.5 | 2 | 3.2 | 5 | 8.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 33 | 24 | 72.7 | 9 | 27.3 | 24 | 72.7 | 5 | 15.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 2 | 6.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 40 | 31 | 77.5 | 9 | 22.5 | 35 | 87.5 | 2 | 5.0 | 1 | 2.5 | 2 | 5.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 28 | 21 | 75.0 | 7 | 25.0 | 24 | 85.7 | 1 | 3.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 10.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 197 | 156 | 79.2 | 41 | 20.8 | 160 | 81.2 | 19 | 9.6 | 5 | 2.5 | 13 | 6.6 |
| LOS ANGELES | UNDER 18 | 136 | 110 | 80.9 | 26 | 19.1 | 54 | 39.7 | 66 | 48.5 | 4 | 2.9 | 12 | 8.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 2965 | 2321 | 78.3 | 644 | 21.7 | 772 | 26.0 | 1775 | 59.9 | 154 | 5.2 | 264 | 8.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 19160 | 14910 | 77.8 | 4250 | 22.2 | 4357 | 22.7 | 11223 | 58.6 | 1410 | 7.4 | 2170 | 11.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 10915 | 9146 | 83.8 | 1769 | 16.2 | 2182 | 20.0 | 6515 | 59.7 | 1266 | 11.6 | 952 | 8.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 6945 | 5749 | 82.8 | 1196 | 17.2 | 1873 | 27.0 | 3539 | 51.0 | 1015 | 14.6 | 518 | 7.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 2923 | 2471 | 84.5 | 452 | 15.5 | 959 | 32.8 | 1222 | 41.8 | 491 | 16.8 | 251 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 709 | 635 | 89.6 | 74 | 10.4 | 310 | 43.7 | 234 | 33.0 | 111 | 15.7 | 54 | 7.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 114 | 99 | 86.8 | 15 | 13.2 | 52 | 45.6 | 34 | 29.8 | 21 | 18.4 | 7 | 6.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 43867 | 35441 | 80.8 | 8426 | 19.2 | 10559 | 24.1 | 24608 | 56.1 | 4472 | 10.2 | 4228 | 9.6 |
| MADERA | UNDER 18 | 13 | 11 | 84.6 | 2 | 15.4 | 4 | 30.8 | 9 | 69.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 105 | 89 | 84.8 | 16 | 15.2 | 26 | 24.8 | 72 | 68.6 | 2 | 1.9 | 5 | 4.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 463 | 420 | 90.7 | 43 | 9.3 | 107 | 23.1 | 333 | 71.9 | 10 | 2.2 | 13 | 2.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 242 | 197 | 81.4 | 45 | 18.6 | 60 | 24.8 | 158 | 65.3 | 11 | 4.5 | 13 | 5.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 196 | 155 | 79.1 | 41 | 20.9 | 83 | 42.3 | 104 | 53.1 | 5 | 2.6 | 4 | 2.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 109 | 85 | 78.0 | 24 | 22.0 | 49 | 45.0 | 45 | 41.3 | 8 | 7.3 | 7 | 6.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 35 | 33 | 94.3 | 2 | 5.7 | 22 | 62.9 | 12 | 34.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 25.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1171 | 998 | 85.2 | 173 | 14.8 | 353 | 30.1 | 737 | 62.9 | 36 | 3.1 | 45 | 3.8 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 8 | 66.7 | 3 | 25.0 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 90 | 71 | 78.9 | 19 | 21.1 | 49 | 54.4 | 32 | 35.6 | 3 | 3.3 | 6 | 6.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 580 | 444 | 76.6 | 136 | 23.4 | 257 | 44.3 | 256 | 44.1 | 24 | 4.1 | 43 | 7.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 370 | 283 | 76.5 | 87 | 23.5 | 197 | 53.2 | 113 | 30.5 | 22 | 5.9 | 38 | 10.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 281 | 211 | 75.1 | 70 | 24.9 | 207 | 73.7 | 42 | 14.9 | 21 | 7.5 | 11 | 3.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 189 | 145 | 76.7 | 44 | 23.3 | 159 | 84.1 | 10 | 5.3 | 13 | 6.9 | 7 | 3.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 76 | 52 | 68.4 | 24 | 31.6 | 68 | 89.5 | 3 | 3.9 | 3 | 3.9 | 2 | 2.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $11$ | 10 | 90.9 | 1 | 9.1 | 10 | 90.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 9.1 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 1226 | 76.2 | 383 | 23.8 | 955 | 59.4 | 459 | 28.5 | 87 | 5.4 | 108 | 6.7 |
| MARIPOSA | 18-20 | 9 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 27 | 23 | 85.2 | 4 | 14.8 | 26 | 96.3 | 1 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 16 | 14 | 87.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 10 | 62.5 | 5 | 31.3 | 1 | 6.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 19 | 12 | 63.2 | 7 | 36.8 | 13 | 68.4 | 5 | 26.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 13 | 92.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 7.1 |
|  | $61-70$ | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 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 | 92 | 75 | 81.5 | 17 | 18.5 | 77 | 83.7 | 12 | 13.0 | 1 | 1.1 | 2 | 2.2 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 10 | 7 | 70.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 88 | 69 | 78.4 | 19 | 21.6 | 56 | 63.6 | 23 | 26.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 10.2 |
|  | $21-30$ | 387 | 322 | 83.2 | 65 | 16.8 | 255 | 65.9 | 103 | 26.6 | 8 | 2.1 | 21 | 5.4 |
|  | $31-40$ | 203 | 163 | 80.3 | 40 | 19.7 | 138 | 68.0 | 46 | 22.7 | 4 | 2.0 | 15 | 7.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 187 | 145 | 77.5 | 42 | 22.5 | 140 | 74.9 | 32 | 17.1 | 2 | 1.1 | 13 | 7.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 121 | 83 | 68.6 | 38 | 31.4 | 100 | 82.6 | 11 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 8.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 26 | 20 | 76.9 | 6 | 23.1 | 26 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $5$ | 5 | $100.0$ | 0 | $0.0$ | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1027 | 814 | 79.3 | 213 | 20.7 | 723 | 70.4 | 222 | 21.6 | 14 | 1.4 | 68 | 6.6 |
| MERCED | UNDER 18 | 24 | 22 | 91.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 11 | 45.8 | 12 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.2 |
|  | $18-20$ | 255 | 225 | 88.2 | 30 | 11.8 | 75 | 29.4 | 158 | 62.0 | 8 | 3.1 | 14 | 5.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1119 | 951 | 85.0 | 168 | 15.0 | 222 | 19.8 | 807 | 72.1 | 32 | 2.9 | 58 | 5.2 |
|  | $31-40$ | 526 | 438 | 83.3 | 88 | 16.7 | 120 | 22.8 | 368 | 70.0 | 30 | 5.7 | 8 | 1.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 359 | 283 | 78.8 | 76 | 21.2 | 119 | 33.1 | 211 | 58.8 | 13 | 3.6 | 16 | 4.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 170 | 148 | 87.1 | 22 | 12.9 | 61 | 35.9 | 86 | 50.6 | 12 | 7.1 | 11 | 6.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 41 | 34 | 82.9 | 7 | 17.1 | 19 | 46.3 | 12 | 29.3 | 8 | 19.5 | 2 | 4.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 6 | 50.0 | 6 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2506 | 2111 | 84.2 | 395 | 15.8 | 633 | 25.3 | 1660 | 66.2 | 103 | 4.1 | 110 | 4.4 |

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| MODOC | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 6 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 21 | 17 | 81.0 | 4 | 19.0 | 14 | 66.7 | 5 | 23.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 9.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 17 | 14 | 82.4 | 3 | 17.6 | 11 | 64.7 | 4 | 23.5 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 24 | 19 | 79.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 18 | 75.0 | 3 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 12.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 20 | 83.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 21 | 87.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 99 | 81 | 81.8 | 18 | 18.2 | 75 | 75.8 | 17 | 17.2 | 1 | 1.0 | 6 | 6.1 |
| MONO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 13 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 10 | 76.9 | 2 | 15.4 | 1 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 40 | 31 | 77.5 | 9 | 22.5 | 25 | 62.5 | 13 | 32.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 38 | 33 | 86.8 | 5 | 13.2 | 21 | 55.3 | 16 | 42.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 32 | 23 | 71.9 | 9 | 28.1 | 27 | 84.4 | 2 | 6.3 | 1 | 3.1 | 2 | 6.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 13 | 11 | 84.6 | 2 | 15.4 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 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 | 142 | 115 | 81.0 | 27 | 19.0 | 101 | 71.1 | 34 | 23.9 | 2 | 1.4 | 5 | 3.5 |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 19 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 4 | 21.1 | 14 | 73.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 281 | 244 | 86.8 | 37 | 13.2 | 64 | 22.8 | 202 | 71.9 | 5 | 1.8 | 10 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 1519 | 1281 | 84.3 | 238 | 15.7 | 335 | 22.1 | 1092 | 71.9 | 40 | 2.6 | 52 | 3.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 696 | 584 | 83.9 | 112 | 16.1 | 171 | 24.6 | 476 | 68.4 | 18 | 2.6 | 31 | 4.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 389 | 300 | 77.1 | 89 | 22.9 | 181 | 46.5 | 177 | 45.5 | 15 | 3.9 | 16 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 231 | 172 | 74.5 | 59 | 25.5 | 142 | 61.5 | 70 | 30.3 | 11 | 4.8 | 8 | 3.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 71 | 54 | 76.1 | 17 | 23.9 | 53 | 74.6 | 13 | 18.3 | 3 | 4.2 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | $13$ | 8 | 61.5 | 5 | 38.5 | 10 | 76.9 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 7.7 | 1 | 7.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 3219 | 2659 | 82.6 | 560 | 17.4 | 960 | 29.8 | 2045 | 63.5 | 93 | 2.9 | 121 | 3.8 |
| NAPA | UNDER 18 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 2 | 28.6 | 4 | 57.1 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 87 | 67 | 77.0 | 20 | 23.0 | 39 | 44.8 | 44 | 50.6 | 1 | 1.1 | 3 | 3.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 393 | 326 | 83.0 | 67 | 17.0 | 166 | 42.2 | 204 | 51.9 | 10 | 2.5 | 13 | 3.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 213 | 164 | 77.0 | 49 | 23.0 | 107 | 50.2 | 95 | 44.6 | 5 | 2.3 | 6 | 2.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 166 | 127 | 76.5 | 39 | 23.5 | 99 | 59.6 | 52 | 31.3 | 7 | 4.2 | 8 | 4.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 95 | 77 | 81.1 | 18 | 18.9 | 70 | 73.7 | 21 | 22.1 | 1 | 1.1 | 3 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 25 | 19 | 76.0 | 6 | 24.0 | 20 | 80.0 | 3 | 12.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 8.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 990 | 789 | 79.7 | 201 | 20.3 | 507 | 51.2 | 423 | 42.7 | 25 | 2.5 | 35 | 3.5 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 55 | 41 | 74.5 | 14 | 25.5 | 50 | 90.9 | 2 | 3.6 | 1 | 1.8 | 2 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 242 | 184 | 76.0 | 58 | 24.0 | 205 | 84.7 | 30 | 12.4 | 2 | 0.8 | 5 | 2.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 158 | 128 | 81.0 | 30 | 19.0 | 132 | 83.5 | 19 | 12.0 | 3 | 1.9 | 4 | 2.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 171 | 115 | 67.3 | 56 | 32.7 | 160 | 93.6 | 6 | 3.5 | 2 | 1.2 | 3 | 1.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 105 | 77 | 73.3 | 28 | 26.7 | 101 | 96.2 | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 23 | 74.2 | 8 | 25.8 | 30 | 96.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $8$ | 5 | 62.5 | 3 | 37.5 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 773 | 576 |  | 197 | 25.5 | 688 | 89.0 | 59 | 7.6 | 10 | 1.3 | 16 | 2.1 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 137 | 89 | 65.0 | 48 | 35.0 | 75 | 54.7 | 47 | 34.3 | 2 | 1.5 | 13 | 9.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 1434 | 1118 | 78.0 | 316 | 22.0 | $634$ | 44.2 | 604 | 42.1 | 31 | 2.2 | 165 | $11.5$ |
|  | 21-30 | 7938 | 6264 | 78.9 | 1674 | 21.1 | 3153 | 39.7 | 3683 | 46.4 | 213 | 2.7 | 889 | 11.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 3834 | 3141 | 81.9 | 693 | 18.1 | 1420 | 37.0 | 1945 | 50.7 | 108 | 2.8 | 361 | 9.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 2729 | 2091 | 76.6 | 638 | 23.4 | 1507 | 55.2 | 938 | 34.4 | 71 | 2.6 | 213 | 7.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 1115 | 887 | 79.6 | 228 | 20.4 | 698 | 62.6 | 278 | 24.9 | 27 | 2.4 | 112 | 10.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 330 | 274 | 83.0 | 56 | 17.0 | 234 | 70.9 | 60 | 18.2 | 5 | 1.5 | 31 | 9.4 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 58 | 48 | 82.8 | 10 | 17.2 | 47 | 81.0 | 9 | 15.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 17575 | 13912 | 79.2 | 3663 | 20.8 | 7768 | 44.2 | 7564 | 43.0 | 457 | 2.6 | 1786 | 10.2 |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 25 | 16 | 64.0 | 9 | 36.0 | 20 | 80.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 202 | 148 | 73.3 | 54 | 26.7 | 162 | 80.2 | 26 | 12.9 | 1 | 0.5 | 13 | 6.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 944 | 704 | 74.6 | 240 | 25.4 | 705 | 74.7 | 165 | 17.5 | 29 | 3.1 | 45 | 4.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 499 | 380 | 76.2 | 119 | 23.8 | 355 | 71.1 | 107 | 21.4 | 18 | 3.6 | 19 | 3.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 432 | 306 | 70.8 | 126 | 29.2 | 358 | 82.9 | 47 | 10.9 | 9 | 2.1 | 18 | 4.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 240 | 180 | 75.0 | 60 | 25.0 | 208 | 86.7 | 16 | 6.7 | 4 | 1.7 | 12 | 5.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 71 | 55 | 77.5 | 16 | 22.5 | 63 | 88.7 | 4 | 5.6 | 3 | 4.2 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 15 | 10 | 66.7 | 5 | 33.3 | 12 | 80.0 | 1 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 13.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 2428 | 1799 | 74.1 | 629 | 25.9 | 1883 | 77.6 | 370 | 15.2 | 64 | 2.6 | 111 | 4.6 |
| PLUMAS | UNDER 18 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 22 | 16 | 72.7 | 6 | 27.3 | 20 | 90.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 4.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 74 | 50 | 67.6 | 24 | 32.4 | 64 | 86.5 | 7 | 9.5 | 1 | 1.4 | 2 | 2.7 |
|  | $31-40$ | 59 | 39 | 66.1 | 20 | 33.9 | 50 | 84.7 | 4 | 6.8 | 1 | 1.7 | 4 | 6.8 |
|  | $41-50$ | 67 | 51 | 76.1 | 16 | 23.9 | 57 | 85.1 | 2 | 3.0 | 4 | 6.0 | 4 | 6.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 43 | 32 | 74.4 | 11 | 25.6 | 42 | 97.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 18 | 16 | 88.9 | 2 | 11.1 | 17 | 94.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 294 | 214 | 72.8 | 80 | 27.2 | 261 | 88.8 | 13 | 4.4 | 7 | 2.4 | 13 | 4.4 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 74 | 52 | 70.3 | 22 | 29.7 | 41 | 55.4 | 27 | 36.5 | 4 | 5.4 | 2 | 2.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 998 | 787 | 78.9 | 211 | 21.1 | 360 | 36.1 | 571 | 57.2 | 40 | 4.0 | 27 | 2.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 4567 | 3762 | 82.4 | 805 | 17.6 | 1459 | 31.9 | 2726 | 59.7 | 216 | 4.7 | 166 | 3.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 2307 | 1912 | 82.9 | 395 | 17.1 | 740 | 32.1 | 1352 | 58.6 | 143 | 6.2 | 72 | 3.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 1852 | 1416 | 76.5 | 436 | 23.5 | 868 | 46.9 | 791 | 42.7 | 137 | 7.4 | 56 | 3.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 767 | 608 | 79.3 | 159 | 20.7 | 441 | 57.5 | 261 | 34.0 | 45 | 5.9 | 20 | 2.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 227 | 179 | 78.9 | 48 | 21.1 | 152 | 67.0 | 50 | 22.0 | 14 | 6.2 | 11 | 4.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 80 | 67 | 83.8 | 13 | 16.2 | 62 | 77.5 | 13 | 16.2 | 3 | 3.8 | 2 | 2.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 10872 | 8783 | 80.8 | 2089 | 19.2 | 4123 | 37.9 | 5791 | 53.3 | 602 | 5.5 | 356 | 3.3 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 39 | 25 | 64.1 | 14 | 35.9 | 19 | 48.7 | 8 | 20.5 | 3 | 7.7 | 9 | 23.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 706 | 540 | 76.5 | 166 | 23.5 | 322 | 45.6 | 220 | 31.2 | 70 | 9.9 | 94 | 13.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 4067 | 3059 | 75.2 | 1008 | 24.8 | 1706 | 41.9 | 1295 | 31.8 | 535 | 13.2 | 531 | 13.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 1760 | 1344 | 76.4 | 416 | 23.6 | 699 | 39.7 | 563 | 32.0 | 333 | 18.9 | 165 | 9.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 1284 | 964 | 75.1 | 320 | 24.9 | 678 | 52.8 | 246 | 19.2 | 274 | 21.3 | 86 | 6.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 580 | 472 | 81.4 | 108 | 18.6 | 330 | 56.9 | 87 | 15.0 | 128 | 22.1 | 35 | 6.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 125 | 100 | 80.0 | 25 | 20.0 | 82 | 65.6 | 11 | 8.8 | 20 | 16.0 | 12 | 9.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 25 | 23 | 92.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 17 | 68.0 | 3 | 12.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 1 | 4.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 8586 | 6527 | 76.0 | 2059 | 24.0 | 3853 | 44.9 | 2433 | 28.3 | 1367 | 15.9 | 933 | 10.9 |
| SAN BENITO | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 27 | 24 | 88.9 | 3 | 11.1 | 10 | 37.0 | 16 | 59.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 113 | 101 | 89.4 | 12 | 10.6 | 21 | 18.6 | 90 | 79.6 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 88 | 74 | 84.1 | 14 | 15.9 | 20 | 22.7 | 66 | 75.0 | 2 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 48 | 40 | 83.3 | 8 | 16.7 | 16 | 33.3 | 32 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 22 | 84.6 | 4 | 15.4 | 13 | 50.0 | 12 | 46.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 312 | 270 | 86.5 | 42 | 13.5 | 85 | 27.2 | 221 | 70.8 | 3 | 1.0 | 3 | 1.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | UNDER 18 | 98 | 82 | 83.7 | 16 | 16.3 | 45 | 45.9 | 47 | 48.0 | 1 | 1.0 | 5 | 5.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 1181 | 977 | 82.7 | 204 | 17.3 | 418 | 35.4 | 659 | 55.8 | 60 | 5.1 | 44 | 3.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 5838 | 4780 | 81.9 | 1058 | 18.1 | 1886 | 32.3 | 3231 | 55.3 | 412 | 7.1 | 309 | 5.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 3151 | 2639 | 83.8 | 512 | 16.2 | 940 | 29.8 | 1770 | 56.2 | 301 | 9.6 | 140 | 4.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 2334 | 1902 | 81.5 | 432 | 18.5 | 944 | 40.4 | 1032 | 44.2 | 263 | 11.3 | 95 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 1033 | 845 | 81.8 | 188 | 18.2 | 500 | 48.4 | 343 | 33.2 | 148 | 14.3 | 42 | 4.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 300 | 264 | 88.0 | 36 | 12.0 | 167 | 55.7 | 80 | 26.7 | 39 | 13.0 | 14 | 4.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 49 | 44 | 89.8 | 5 | 10.2 | 34 | 69.4 | 11 | 22.4 | 3 | 6.1 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 13984 | 11533 | 82.5 | 2451 | 17.5 | 4934 | 35.3 | 7173 | 51.3 | 1227 | 8.8 | 650 | 4.6 |

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SAN DIEGO | UNDER 18 | 141 | 104 | 73.8 | 37 | 26.2 | 83 | 58.9 | 46 | 32.6 | 4 | 2.8 | 8 | 5.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 1675 | 1289 | 77.0 | 386 | 23.0 | 861 | 51.4 | 604 | 36.1 | 99 | 5.9 | 111 | 6.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 8696 | 6802 | 78.2 | 1894 | 21.8 | 4228 | 48.6 | 3245 | 37.3 | 602 | 6.9 | 621 | 7.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 3711 | 2997 | 80.8 | 714 | 19.2 | 1671 | 45.0 | 1513 | 40.8 | 279 | 7.5 | 248 | 6.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 2688 | 2064 | 76.8 | 624 | 23.2 | 1470 | 54.7 | 861 | 32.0 | 211 | 7.8 | 146 | 5.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 1291 | 1014 | 78.5 | 277 | 21.5 | 834 | 64.6 | 310 | 24.0 | 82 | 6.4 | 65 | 5.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 319 | 260 | 81.5 | 59 | 18.5 | 225 | 70.5 | 66 | 20.7 | 14 | 4.4 | 14 | 4.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 67 | 55 | 82.1 | 12 | 17.9 | 41 | 61.2 | 18 | 26.9 | 5 | 7.5 | 3 | 4.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 18588 | 14585 | 78.5 | 4003 | 21.5 | 9413 | 50.6 | 6663 | 35.8 | 1296 | 7.0 | 1216 | 6.5 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 87 | 60 | 69.0 | 27 | 31.0 | 30 | 34.5 | 18 | 20.7 | 11 | 12.6 | 28 | 32.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 650 | 492 | 75.7 | 158 | 24.3 | 264 | 40.6 | 98 | 15.1 | 92 | 14.2 | 196 | 30.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 408 | 323 | 79.2 | 85 | 20.8 | 195 | 47.8 | 59 | 14.5 | 46 | 11.3 | 108 | 26.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 203 | 168 | 82.8 | 35 | 17.2 | 118 | 58.1 | 25 | 12.3 | 33 | 16.3 | 27 | 13.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 95 | 76 | 80.0 | 19 | 20.0 | 58 | 61.1 | 4 | 4.2 | 17 | 17.9 | 16 | 16.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 35 | 30 | 85.7 | 5 | 14.3 | 26 | 74.3 | 3 | 8.6 | 1 | 2.9 | 5 | 14.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1483 | 1153 | 77.7 | 330 | 22.3 | 694 | 46.8 | 207 | 14.0 | 201 | 13.6 | 381 | 25.7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | UNDER 18 | 35 | 26 |  | 9 | 25.7 | 18 | 51.4 | 15 | 42.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 399 | 330 | 82.7 | 69 | 17.3 | 128 | 32.1 | 215 | 53.9 | 29 | 7.3 | 27 | 6.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 1884 | 1581 | 83.9 | 303 | 16.1 | 495 | 26.3 | 1128 | 59.9 | 129 | 6.8 | 132 | 7.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 957 | 814 | 85.1 | 143 | 14.9 | 240 | 25.1 | 556 | 58.1 | 94 | 9.8 | 67 | 7.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 751 | 604 | 80.4 | 147 | 19.6 | 288 | 38.3 | 322 | 42.9 | 96 | 12.8 | 45 | 6.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 338 | 264 | 78.1 | 74 | 21.9 | 165 | 48.8 | 103 | 30.5 | 54 | 16.0 | 16 | 4.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 108 | 98 | 90.7 | 10 | 9.3 | 56 | 51.9 | 30 | 27.8 | 15 | 13.9 | 7 | 6.5 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 24 | 17 | 70.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 14 | 58.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 5 | 20.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4496 | 3734 | 83.1 | 762 | 16.9 | 1404 | 31.2 | 2374 | 52.8 | 422 | 9.4 | 296 | 6.6 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | UNDER 18 | 29 | 19 | 65.5 | 10 | 34.5 | 24 | 82.8 | 2 | 6.9 | 2 | 6.9 | 1 | 3.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 298 | 227 | 76.2 | 71 | 23.8 | 204 | 68.5 | 80 | 26.8 | 6 | 2.0 | 8 | 2.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 1052 | 821 | 78.0 | 231 | 22.0 | 675 | 64.2 | 333 | 31.7 | 14 | 1.3 | 30 | 2.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 440 | 345 | 78.4 | 95 | 21.6 | 248 | 56.4 | 163 | 37.0 | 13 | 3.0 | 16 | 3.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 365 | 265 | 72.6 | 100 | 27.4 | 293 | 80.3 | 61 | 16.7 | 6 | 1.6 | 5 | 1.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 240 | 170 | 70.8 | 70 | 29.2 | 198 | 82.5 | 31 | 12.9 | 3 | 1.2 | 8 | 3.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 61 | 41 | 67.2 | 20 | 32.8 | 57 | 93.4 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 3.3 | 1 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 17 | 89.5 | 2 | 10.5 | 18 | 94.7 | 1 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2504 | 1905 | 76.1 | 599 | 23.9 | 1717 | 68.6 | 672 | 26.8 | 46 | 1.8 | 69 | 2.8 |

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 29 | 23 | 79.3 | 6 | 20.7 | 20 | 69.0 | 4 | 13.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 17.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 277 | 206 | 74.4 | 71 | 25.6 | 103 | 37.2 | 121 | 43.7 | 6 | 2.2 | 47 | 17.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 1572 | 1244 | 79.1 | 328 | 20.9 | 492 | 31.3 | 659 | 41.9 | 66 | 4.2 | 355 | 22.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 776 | 632 | 81.4 | 144 | 18.6 | 244 | 31.4 | 320 | 41.2 | 43 | 5.5 | 169 | 21.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 502 | 359 | 71.5 | 143 | 28.5 | 273 | 54.4 | 137 | 27.3 | 31 | 6.2 | 61 | 12.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 298 | 248 | 83.2 | 50 | 16.8 | 180 | 60.4 | 51 | 17.1 | 22 | 7.4 | 45 | 15.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 69 | 59 | 85.5 | 10 | 14.5 | 49 | 71.0 | 7 | 10.1 | 3 | 4.3 | 10 | 14.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 18 | 14 | 77.8 | 4 | 22.2 | 15 | 83.3 | 2 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 3541 | 2785 | 78.7 | 756 | 21.3 | 1376 | 38.9 | 1301 | 36.7 | 171 | 4.8 | 693 | 19.6 |
| SANTA BARBARA | UNDER 18 | 26 | 21 | 80.8 | 5 | 19.2 | 13 | 50.0 | 12 | 46.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 287 | 240 | 83.6 | 47 | 16.4 | 119 | 41.5 | 152 | 53.0 | 3 | 1.0 | 13 | 4.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1418 | 1197 | 84.4 | 221 | 15.6 | 550 | 38.8 | 776 | 54.7 | 30 | 2.1 | 62 | 4.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 535 | 448 | 83.7 | 87 | 16.3 | 182 | 34.0 | 321 | 60.0 | 14 | 2.6 | 18 | 3.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 470 | 351 | 74.7 | 119 | 25.3 | 248 | 52.8 | 200 | 42.6 | 13 | 2.8 | 9 | 1.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 256 | 194 | 75.8 | 62 | 24.2 | 176 | 68.8 | 69 | 27.0 | 6 | 2.3 | 5 | 2.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 54 | 45 | 83.3 | 9 | 16.7 | 47 | 87.0 | 6 | 11.1 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 12 | 63.2 | 7 | 36.8 | 16 | 84.2 | 3 | 15.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3065 | 2508 | 81.8 | 557 | 18.2 | 1351 | 44.1 | 1539 | 50.2 | 67 | 2.2 | 108 | 3.5 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 66 | 50 | 75.8 | 16 | 24.2 | 23 | 34.8 | 36 | 54.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 10.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 555 | 442 | 79.6 | 113 | 20.4 | 179 | 32.3 | 282 | 50.8 | 15 | 2.7 | 79 | 14.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 3571 | 2886 | 80.8 | 685 | 19.2 | 894 | 25.0 | 1989 | 55.7 | 163 | 4.6 | 525 | 14.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 1666 | 1393 | 83.6 | 273 | 16.4 | 410 | 24.6 | 948 | 56.9 | 73 | 4.4 | 235 | 14.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 1035 | 832 | 80.4 | 203 | 19.6 | 421 | 40.7 | 450 | 43.5 | 51 | 4.9 | 113 | 10.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 464 | 380 | 81.9 | 84 | 18.1 | 236 | 50.9 | 148 | 31.9 | 25 | 5.4 | 55 | 11.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 107 | 91 | 85.0 | 16 | 15.0 | 53 | 49.5 | 33 | 30.8 | 8 | 7.5 | 13 | 12.1 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 20 | 17 | 85.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 12 | 60.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 4 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 7484 | 6091 | 81.4 | 1393 | 18.6 | 2228 | 29.8 | 3889 | 52.0 | 336 | 4.5 | 1031 | 13.8 |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 18 | 10 | 55.6 | 8 | 44.4 | 9 | 50.0 | 8 | 44.4 | 1 | 5.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 145 | 104 | 71.7 | 41 | 28.3 | 80 | 55.2 | 59 | 40.7 | 3 | 2.1 | 3 | 2.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 563 | 449 | 79.8 | 114 | 20.2 | 254 | 45.1 | 283 | 50.3 | 7 | 1.2 | 19 | 3.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 297 | 248 | 83.5 | 49 | 16.5 | 130 | 43.8 | 157 | 52.9 | 8 | 2.7 | 2 | 0.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 256 | 195 | 76.2 | 61 | 23.8 | 180 | 70.3 | 61 | 23.8 | 8 | 3.1 | 7 | 2.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 164 | 120 | 73.2 | 44 | 26.8 | 131 | 79.9 | 24 | 14.6 | 1 | 0.6 | 8 | 4.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 6 | 19.4 | 23 | 74.2 | 6 | 19.4 | 1 | 3.2 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1482 | 1159 | 78.2 | 323 | 21.8 | 815 | 55.0 | 598 | 40.4 | 29 | 2.0 | 40 | 2.7 |

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | SEX (100\%) |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY (100\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SHASTA | UNDER 18 | 19 | 12 | 63.2 | 7 | 36.8 | 17 | 89.5 | 1 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 154 | 115 | 74.7 | 39 | 25.3 | 131 | 85.1 | 8 | 5.2 | 5 | 3.2 | 10 | 6.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 605 | 455 | 75.2 | 150 | 24.8 | 522 | 86.3 | 42 | 6.9 | 12 | 2.0 | 29 | 4.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 335 | 248 | 74.0 | 87 | 26.0 | 288 | 86.0 | 24 | 7.2 | 10 | 3.0 | 13 | 3.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 330 | 218 | 66.1 | 112 | 33.9 | 304 | 92.1 | 11 | 3.3 | 6 | 1.8 | 9 | 2.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 190 | 141 | 74.2 | 49 | 25.8 | 173 | 91.1 | 5 | 2.6 | 6 | 3.2 | 6 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 53 | 45 | 84.9 | 8 | 15.1 | 52 | 98.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 13 | 11 | 84.6 | 2 | 15.4 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1699 | 1245 | 73.3 | 454 | 26.7 | 1499 | 88.2 | 92 | 5.4 | 39 | 2.3 | 69 | 4.1 |
| SIERRA | 18-20 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 21 | 15 | 71.4 | 6 | 28.6 | 20 | 95.2 | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 18 | 13 | 72.2 | 5 | 27.8 | 17 | 94.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 60 | 45 | 75.0 | 15 | 25.0 | 54 | 90.0 | 4 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.3 |
| SISKIYOU | UNDER 18 | 6 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 39 | 33 | 84.6 | 6 | 15.4 | 26 | 66.7 | 5 | 12.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 20.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 160 | 121 | 75.6 | 39 | 24.4 | 137 | 85.6 | 15 | 9.4 | 3 | 1.9 | 5 | 3.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 101 | 72 | 71.3 | 29 | 28.7 | 76 | 75.2 | 16 | 15.8 | 3 | 3.0 | 6 | 5.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 108 | 85 | 78.7 | 23 | 21.3 | 96 | 88.9 | 6 | 5.6 | 2 | 1.9 | 4 | 3.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 65 | 51 | 78.5 | 14 | 21.5 | 55 | 84.6 | 4 | 6.2 | 3 | 4.6 | 3 | 4.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 20 | 17 | 85.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 19 | 95.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 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 | 503 | 386 | 76.7 | 117 | 23.3 | 417 | 82.9 | 49 | 9.7 | 11 | 2.2 | 26 | 5.2 |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 24 | 14 | 58.3 | 10 | 41.7 | 8 | 33.3 | 12 | 50.0 | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 189 | 147 | 77.8 | 42 | 22.2 | 91 | 48.1 | 57 | 30.2 | 20 | 10.6 | 21 | 11.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 841 | 679 | 80.7 | 162 | 19.3 | 343 | 40.8 | 298 | 35.4 | 135 | 16.1 | 65 | 7.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 466 | 378 | 81.1 | 88 | 18.9 | 181 | 38.8 | 146 | 31.3 | 105 | 22.5 | 34 | 7.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 354 | 261 | 73.7 | 93 | 26.3 | 185 | 52.3 | 62 | 17.5 | 81 | 22.9 | 26 | 7.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 180 | 146 | 81.1 | 34 | 18.9 | 95 | 52.8 | 23 | 12.8 | 50 | 27.8 | 12 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 45 | 38 | 84.4 | 7 | 15.6 | 28 | 62.2 | 5 | 11.1 | 10 | 22.2 | 2 | 4.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2104 | 1668 | 79.3 | 436 | 20.7 | 933 | 44.3 | 604 | 28.7 | 406 | 19.3 | 161 | 7.7 |

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

TABLE B1: 2008 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

TABLE B1: 2008 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 | 17 | 15 | 88.2 | 2 | 11.8 | 8 | 47.1 | 8 | 47.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 164 | 131 | 79.9 | 33 | 20.1 | 80 | 48.8 | 62 | 37.8 | 2 | 1.2 | 20 | 12.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 657 | 565 | 86.0 | 92 | 14.0 | 290 | 44.1 | 292 | 44.4 | 16 | 2.4 | 59 | 9.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 283 | 249 | 88.0 | 34 | 12.0 | 119 | 42.0 | 139 | 49.1 | 8 | 2.8 | 17 | 6.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 215 | 162 | 75.3 | 53 | 24.7 | 132 | 61.4 | 69 | 32.1 | 8 | 3.7 | 6 | 2.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 96 | 76 | 79.2 | 20 | 20.8 | 67 | 69.8 | 26 | 27.1 | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 2.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 28 | 23 | 82.1 | 5 | 17.9 | 23 | 82.1 | 5 | 17.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 10 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1470 | 1231 | 83.7 | 239 | 16.3 | 725 | 49.3 | 605 | 41.2 | 35 | 2.4 | 105 | 7.1 |
| YUBA | UNDER 18 | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 51 | 40 | 78.4 | 11 | 21.6 | 35 | 68.6 | 13 | 25.5 | 2 | 3.9 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 269 | 224 | 83.3 | 45 | 16.7 | 158 | 58.7 | 82 | 30.5 | 14 | 5.2 | 15 | 5.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 169 | 131 | 77.5 | 38 | 22.5 | 102 | 60.4 | 60 | 35.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 3.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 152 | 110 | 72.4 | 42 | 27.6 | 121 | 79.6 | 23 | 15.1 | 4 | 2.6 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 60 | 51 | 85.0 | 9 | 15.0 | 43 | 71.7 | 15 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 20 | 95.2 | 1 | 4.8 | 16 | 76.2 | 5 | 23.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 730 | 583 | 79.9 | 147 | 20.1 | 480 | 65.8 | 201 | 27.5 | 21 | 2.9 | 28 | 3.8 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 160591 | 100.0 | 130047 | 81.0 | 30544 | 19.0 |
| ALAMEDA | UNDER 18 | 9 | 0.2 | 7 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 317 | 5.6 | 244 | 5.4 | 73 | 6.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 2408 | 42.8 | 1899 | 42.2 | 509 | 45.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 1399 | 24.9 | 1151 | 25.6 | 248 | 22.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 946 | 16.8 | 748 | 16.6 | 198 | 17.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 415 | 7.4 | 341 | 7.6 | 74 | 6.6 |
|  | $61-70$ | 99 | 1.8 | 82 | 1.8 | 17 | 1.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 31 | 0.6 | 28 | 0.6 | 3 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 5624 | 100.0 | 4500 | 100.0 | 1124 | 100.0 |
| ALPINE | 21-30 | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 4 | 25.0 | 2 | 16.7 | 2 | 50.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 5 | 31.3 | 4 | 33.3 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 3 | 18.8 | 3 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $61-70$ | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| AMADOR | UNDER 18 | 4 | 1.3 | 4 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 6.4 | 15 | 6.9 | 4 | 4.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 84 | 28.1 | 64 | 29.5 | 20 | 24.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 61 | 20.4 | 46 | 21.2 | 15 | 18.3 |
|  | $41-50$ | 74 | 24.7 | 46 | 21.2 | 28 | 34.1 |
|  | $51-60$ | 44 | 14.7 | 34 | 15.7 | 10 | 12.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 4.0 | 8 | 3.7 | 4 | 4.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 299 | 100.0 | 217 | 100.0 | 82 | 100.0 |
| BUTTE | UNDER 18 | 25 | 1.8 | 16 | 1.5 | 9 | 2.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 131 | 9.3 | 87 | 8.3 | 44 | 12.3 |
|  | $21-30$ | 577 | 41.0 | 445 | 42.4 | 132 | 37.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 261 | 18.6 | 204 | 19.4 | 57 | 16.0 |
|  | $41-50$ | 244 | 17.4 | 169 | 16.1 | 75 | 21.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 124 | 8.8 | 93 | 8.9 | 31 | 8.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 36 | 2.6 | 27 | 2.6 | 9 | 2.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 0.6 | 8 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1406 | 100.0 | 1049 | 100.0 | 357 | 100.0 |
| CALAVERAS | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.9 | 2 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 18 | 7.9 | 15 | 8.0 | 3 | 7.5 |
|  | $21-30$ | 66 | 28.9 | 60 | 31.9 | 6 | 15.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 46 | 20.2 | 37 | 19.7 | 9 | 22.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 49 | 21.5 | 35 | 18.6 | 14 | 35.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 35 | 15.4 | 29 | 15.4 | 6 | 15.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 11 | 4.8 | 9 | 4.8 | 2 | 5.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 228 | 100.0 | 188 | 100.0 | 40 | 100.0 |
| COLUSA |  | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 17 | 8.7 | 14 | 8.7 | 3 | 8.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 64 | 32.7 | 58 | 36.0 | 6 | 17.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 39 | 19.9 | 29 | 18.0 | 10 | 28.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 37 | 18.9 | 26 | 16.1 | 11 | 31.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 31 | 15.8 | 27 | 16.8 | 4 | 11.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 3.1 | 5 | 3.1 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 196 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | UNDER 18 | 18 | 0.5 | 14 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 313 | 8.8 | 256 | 9.1 | 57 | 7.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1502 | 42.1 | 1174 | 41.8 | 328 | 43.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 735 | 20.6 | 590 | 21.0 | 145 | 19.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 616 | 17.3 | 473 | 16.8 | 143 | 18.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 296 | 8.3 | 234 | 8.3 | 62 | 8.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 71 | 2.0 | 56 | 2.0 | 15 | 2.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 0.4 | 13 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 3567 | 100.0 | 2810 | 100.0 | 757 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| DEL NORTE | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 12 | 7.7 | 9 | 7.3 | 3 | 9.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 57 | 36.5 | 47 | 38.2 | 10 | 30.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 28 | 17.9 | 23 | 18.7 | 5 | 15.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 37 | 23.7 | 26 | 21.1 | 11 | 33.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 16 | 10.3 | 13 | 10.6 | 3 | 9.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 4 | 2.6 | 3 | 2.4 | 1 | 3.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 156 | 100.0 | 123 | 100.0 | 33 | 100.0 |
| EL DORADO | 18-20 | 72 | 7.8 | 57 | 8.1 | 15 | 6.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 324 | 35.2 | 261 | 37.1 | 63 | 28.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 176 | 19.1 | 138 | 19.6 | 38 | 17.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 227 | 24.6 | 151 | 21.5 | 76 | 34.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 99 | 10.7 | 78 | 11.1 | 21 | 9.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 2.1 | 14 | 2.0 | 5 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 921 | 100.0 | 703 | 100.0 | 218 | 100.0 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 17 | 0.3 | 13 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | $448$ | $8.3$ | 381 | $8.5$ | 67 | 7.5 |
|  | $21-30$ | 2370 | 43.9 | 1972 | 43.8 | 398 | 44.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1263 | 23.4 | 1074 | 23.8 | 189 | 21.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 836 | 15.5 | 676 | 15.0 | 160 | 17.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 374 | 6.9 | 309 | 6.9 | 65 | 7.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 80 | 1.5 | 72 | 1.6 | 8 | 0.9 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $13$ | 0.2 | 10 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 5401 | 100.0 | 4507 | 100.0 | 894 | 100.0 |
| GLENN | 18-20 | 39 | 11.5 | 31 | 11.2 | 8 | 12.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 122 | 36.0 | 102 | 36.8 | 20 | 32.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 83 | 24.5 | 63 | 22.7 | 20 | 32.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 65 | 19.2 | 53 | 19.1 | 12 | 19.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 7.1 | 22 | 7.9 | 2 | 3.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 2 | 0.6 | 2 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 339 | 100.0 | 277 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | UNDER 18 | 4 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.3 | 2 | 1.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 68 | 8.2 | 50 | 8.0 | 18 | 9.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 342 | 41.4 | 252 | 40.1 | 90 | 45.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 165 | 20.0 | 125 | 19.9 | 40 | 20.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 145 | 17.6 | 115 | 18.3 | 30 | 15.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 80 | 9.7 | 64 | 10.2 | 16 | 8.1 |
|  | $61-70$ | 18 | 2.2 | 16 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 826 | 100.0 | 628 | 100.0 | 198 | 100.0 |
| IMPERIAL | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 84 | 10.0 | 75 | 10.4 | 9 | 7.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 329 | 39.3 | 285 | 39.7 | 44 | 37.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 176 | 21.0 | 146 | 20.3 | 30 | 25.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 133 | 15.9 | 109 | 15.2 | 24 | 20.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 77 | 9.2 | 67 | 9.3 | 10 | 8.4 |
|  | $61-70$ | 30 | 3.6 | 30 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.7 | 4 | 0.6 | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 837 | 100.0 | 718 | 100.0 | 119 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| INYO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 12 | 6.2 | 11 | 7.4 | 1 | 2.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 54 | 27.8 | 44 | 29.5 | 10 | 22.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 42 | 21.6 | 30 | 20.1 | 12 | 26.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 43 | 22.2 | 28 | 18.8 | 15 | 33.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 33 | 17.0 | 27 | 18.1 | 6 | 13.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 4.1 | 7 | 4.7 | 1 | 2.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 194 | 100.0 | 149 | 100.0 | 45 | 100.0 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 44 | 1.0 | 38 | 1.0 | 6 | 0.9 |
|  | 18-20 | 422 | 9.5 | 369 | 9.8 | 53 | 7.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 1875 | 42.1 | 1603 | 42.7 | 272 | 38.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 1003 | 22.5 | 852 | 22.7 | 151 | 21.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 751 | 16.9 | 586 | 15.6 | 165 | 23.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 273 | 6.1 | 236 | 6.3 | 37 | 5.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 73 | 1.6 | 62 | 1.7 | 11 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 13 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 4454 | 100.0 | 3753 | 100.0 | 701 | 100.0 |
| KINGS | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.3 | 2 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 78 | 9.0 | 71 | 9.9 | 7 | 4.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 429 | 49.3 | 351 | 48.9 | 78 | 51.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 176 | 20.2 | 144 | 20.1 | 32 | 21.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 125 | 14.4 | 97 | 13.5 | 28 | $18.4$ |
|  | $51-60$ | 45 | 5.2 | 41 | 5.7 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | $61-70$ | 10 | 1.1 | 9 | 1.3 | 1 | 0.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.4 | 1 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 870 | 100.0 | 718 | 100.0 | 152 | 100.0 |
| LAKE | 18-20 | 22 | 5.6 | 20 | 6.5 | 2 | 2.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 114 | 29.0 | 92 | 30.1 | 22 | 25.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 84 | 21.4 | 71 | 23.2 | 13 | 14.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 93 | 23.7 | 65 | 21.2 | 28 | 32.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 59 | 15.0 | 40 | 13.1 | 19 | 21.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 18 | 4.6 | 15 | 4.9 | 3 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 393 | 100.0 | 306 | 100.0 | 87 | 100.0 |
| LASSEN | UNDER 18 |  | 0.6 | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 15 | 8.4 | 12 | 8.6 | 3 | 7.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 58 | 32.4 | 48 | 34.3 | 10 | 25.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 36 | 20.1 | 27 | 19.3 | 9 | 23.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 23.5 | 32 | 22.9 | 10 | 25.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 22 | 12.3 | 16 | 11.4 | 6 | 15.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 4 | 2.2 | 4 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $1$ | $0.6$ | 0 | $0.0$ | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 179 | 100.0 | 140 | 100.0 | 39 | 100.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | UNDER 18 | 9 | 0.0 | 8 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 1880 | 6.2 | 1514 | 6.0 | 366 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 13015 | 43.1 | 10556 | 42.1 | 2459 | 48.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 7683 | 25.5 | 6596 | 26.3 | 1087 | 21.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 5024 | 16.6 | 4205 | 16.8 | 819 | 16.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 1982 | 6.6 | 1701 | 6.8 | 281 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 493 | 1.6 | 430 | 1.7 | 63 | 1.2 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | $96$ | $0.3$ | 85 | $0.3$ | 11 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 30182 | 100.0 | 25095 | 100.0 | 5087 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| MADERA | UNDER 18 | 7 | 1.1 | 7 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 35 | 5.4 | 29 | 5.4 | 6 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 265 | 41.0 | 228 | 42.8 | 37 | 32.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 130 | 20.1 | 113 | 21.2 | 17 | 14.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 133 | 20.6 | 95 | 17.8 | 38 | 33.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 62 | 9.6 | 49 | 9.2 | 13 | 11.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 1.9 | 11 | 2.1 | 1 | 0.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.2 | 2 | 1.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 647 | 100.0 | 533 | 100.0 | 114 | 100.0 |
| MARIN | UNDER 18 | 12 | 0.8 | 11 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 113 | 7.7 | 86 | 7.5 | 27 | 8.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 540 | 36.9 | 438 | 38.3 | 102 | 32.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 314 | 21.4 | 253 | 22.1 | 61 | 19.1 |
|  | $41-50$ | 265 | 18.1 | 191 | 16.7 | 74 | 23.2 |
|  | $51-60$ | 153 | 10.5 | 117 | 10.2 | 36 | 11.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 53 | 3.6 | 37 | 3.2 | 16 | 5.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 1.0 | 12 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1464 | 100.0 | 1145 | 100.0 | 319 | 100.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 18-20 | 5 | 5.0 | 4 | 4.9 | 1 | 5.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 29 | 28.7 | 26 | 32.1 | 3 | 15.0 |
|  | $31-40$ | 21 | 20.8 | 15 | 18.5 | 6 | 30.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 21 | 20.8 | 14 | 17.3 | 7 | 35.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 19 | 18.8 | 16 | 19.8 | 3 | 15.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 5 | 5.0 | 5 | 6.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 101 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 8 | 1.0 | 5 | 0.8 | 3 | 2.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 62 | 8.1 | 55 | 8.9 | 7 | 4.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 261 | 34.2 | 225 | 36.5 | 36 | 24.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 181 | 23.7 | 140 | 22.7 | 41 | 28.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 133 | 17.4 | 95 | 15.4 | 38 | 26.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 91 | 11.9 | 73 | 11.8 | 18 | 12.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 22 | 2.9 | 19 | 3.1 | 3 | 2.1 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 5 | 0.7 | 5 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 763 | 100.0 | 617 | 100.0 | 146 | 100.0 |
| MERCED | UNDER 18 | 13 | 1.0 | 12 | 1.1 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 120 | 9.1 | 103 | 9.1 | 17 | 8.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 560 | 42.3 | 487 | 43.3 | 73 | 36.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 291 | 22.0 | 242 | 21.5 | 49 | 24.7 |
|  | $41-50$ | 214 | 16.2 | 173 | 15.4 | 41 | 20.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 102 | 7.7 | 85 | 7.5 | 17 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 1.4 | 19 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1324 | 100.0 | 1126 | 100.0 | 198 | 100.0 |
| MODOC | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 7 | 9.6 | 4 | 7.4 | 3 | 15.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 19 | 26.0 | 14 | 25.9 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 15 | 20.5 | 10 | 18.5 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 19 | 26.0 | 14 | 25.9 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 8 | 11.0 | 7 | 13.0 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 4.1 | 3 | 5.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 1.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 73 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| MONO | UNDER 18 | 4 | 2.8 | 1 | 0.9 | 3 | 12.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 9 | 6.4 | 6 | 5.2 | 3 | 12.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 52 | 36.9 | 50 | 43.1 | 2 | 8.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 25 | 17.7 | 20 | 17.2 | 5 | 20.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 35 | 24.8 | 26 | 22.4 | 9 | 36.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 11 | 7.8 | 8 | 6.9 | 3 | 12.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 2.1 | 3 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 1.4 | 2 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 141 | 100.0 | 116 | 100.0 | 25 | 100.0 |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 8 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 189 | 7.7 | 168 | 7.8 | 21 | 6.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 1243 | 50.3 | 1100 | 51.3 | 143 | 43.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 514 | 20.8 | 448 | 20.9 | 66 | 20.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 305 | 12.4 | 246 | 11.5 | 59 | 18.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 148 | 6.0 | 120 | 5.6 | 28 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 53 | 2.1 | 45 | 2.1 | 8 | 2.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 0.4 | 9 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2469 | 100.0 | 2143 | 100.0 | 326 | 100.0 |
| NAPA | UNDER 18 | 5 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 101 | 10.5 | 86 | 11.0 | 15 | 8.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 368 | 38.1 | 307 | 39.2 | 61 | 33.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 218 | 22.6 | 175 | 22.3 | 43 | 23.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 158 | 16.4 | 120 | 15.3 | 38 | 20.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 82 | 8.5 | 65 | 8.3 | 17 | 9.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 29 | 3.0 | 22 | 2.8 | 7 | 3.8 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 4 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 965 | 100.0 | 783 | 100.0 | 182 | 100.0 |
| NEVADA | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 1.2 |
|  | $18-20$ | 45 | 6.8 | 35 | 7.1 | 10 | 6.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 231 | 34.9 | 169 | 34.2 | 62 | 37.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 136 | 20.6 | 107 | 21.7 | 29 | 17.4 |
|  | $41-50$ | 134 | 20.3 | 93 | 18.8 | 41 | 24.6 |
|  | $51-60$ | 86 | 13.0 | 67 | 13.6 | 19 | 11.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 26 | 3.9 | 22 | 4.5 | 4 | 2.4 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 661 | 100.0 | 494 | 100.0 | 167 | 100.0 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 84 | 0.6 | 60 | 0.5 | 24 | 0.8 |
|  | $18-20$ | $1112$ | 7.7 | 870 | 7.5 | 242 | 8.3 |
|  | $21-30$ | 6574 | 45.3 | 5261 | 45.3 | 1313 | 45.3 |
|  | $31-40$ | 3226 | 22.2 | 2651 | 22.8 | 575 | 19.8 |
|  | $41-50$ | 2298 | 15.8 | 1792 | 15.4 | 506 | 17.5 |
|  | $51-60$ | 933 | 6.4 | 751 | 6.5 | 182 | 6.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 223 | 1.5 | 177 | 1.5 | 46 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 52 | 0.4 | 41 | 0.4 | 11 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 14502 | 100.0 | 11603 | 100.0 | 2899 | 100.0 |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 16 | 0.8 | 14 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.4 |
|  | $18-20$ | 186 | 8.9 | 148 | 9.1 | 38 | 8.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 859 | 40.9 | 680 | 41.8 | 179 | 37.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 403 | 19.2 | 316 | 19.4 | 87 | 18.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 378 | 18.0 | 262 | 16.1 | 116 | 24.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 197 | 9.4 | 157 | 9.7 | 40 | 8.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 48 | 2.3 | 40 | 2.5 | 8 | 1.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 0.5 | 8 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 2098 | 100.0 | 1625 | 100.0 | 473 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| PLUMAS | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 15 | 7.1 | 13 | 8.8 | 2 | 3.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 57 | 27.1 | 39 | 26.5 | 18 | 28.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 39 | 18.6 | 19 | 12.9 | 20 | 31.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 60 | 28.6 | 41 | 27.9 | 19 | 30.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 31 | 14.8 | 27 | 18.4 | 4 | 6.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 3.3 | 7 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 210 | 100.0 | 147 | 100.0 | 63 | 100.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | UNDER 18 | 33 | 0.4 | 26 | 0.4 | 7 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 754 | 9.3 | 609 | 9.2 | 145 | 9.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 3385 | 41.6 | 2787 | 42.0 | 598 | 39.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 1735 | 21.3 | 1425 | 21.5 | 310 | 20.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 1418 | 17.4 | 1110 | 16.7 | 308 | 20.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 602 | 7.4 | 499 | 7.5 | 103 | 6.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 163 | 2.0 | 140 | 2.1 | 23 | 1.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 49 | 0.6 | 42 | 0.6 | 7 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 8139 | 100.0 | 6638 | 100.0 | 1501 | 100.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 30 | 0.4 | 27 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 548 | 8.1 | 429 | 8.2 | 119 | 7.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 3133 | 46.1 | 2382 | 45.5 | 751 | 48.1 |
|  | 31-40 | $1451$ | 21.3 | 1149 | 21.9 | 302 | $19.3$ |
|  | 41-50 | 1081 | 15.9 | 796 | 15.2 | 285 | 18.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 436 | 6.4 | 357 | 6.8 | 79 | 5.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 98 | 1.4 | 79 | 1.5 | 19 | 1.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 21 | 0.3 | 18 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 6798 | 100.0 | 5237 | 100.0 | 1561 | 100.0 |
| SAN BENITO |  | 7 | 1.8 | 6 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | $18-20$ | 43 | 11.3 | 35 | 11.3 | 8 | $11.1$ |
|  | 21-30 | 150 | 39.3 | 128 | 41.3 | 22 | 30.6 |
|  | $31-40$ | 79 | 20.7 | 69 | 22.3 | 10 | 13.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 60 | 15.7 | 40 | 12.9 | 20 | 27.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 32 | 8.4 | 22 | 7.1 | 10 | 13.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 2.6 | 9 | 2.9 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 382 | 100.0 | 310 | 100.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | UNDER 18 | 29 | 0.3 | 25 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 784 | 7.9 | 640 | 7.9 | 144 | 8.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 4235 | 42.9 | 3486 | 43.0 | 749 | 42.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 2212 | 22.4 | 1833 | 22.6 | 379 | 21.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 1662 | 16.8 | 1329 | 16.4 | 333 | 19.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 734 | 7.4 | 619 | 7.6 | 115 | 6.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 173 | 1.8 | 146 | 1.8 | 27 | 1.5 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | $37$ | $0.4$ | 33 | 0.4 | 4 | $0.2$ |
|  | TOTAL | 9866 | 100.0 | 8111 | 100.0 | 1755 | 100.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | UNDER 18 | 81 | 0.6 | 72 | 0.6 | 9 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 1281 | 8.8 | 1046 | 9.1 | 235 | 7.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 6820 | 46.7 | 5388 | 46.7 | 1432 | 46.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 3045 | 20.8 | 2438 | 21.1 | 607 | 19.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 2194 | 15.0 | 1651 | 14.3 | 543 | 17.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 941 | 6.4 | 759 | 6.6 | 182 | 5.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 210 | 1.4 | 164 | 1.4 | 46 | 1.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 35 | $0.2$ | 25 | $0.2$ | 10 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 14607 | 100.0 | 11543 | 100.0 | 3064 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| SAN FRANCISCO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 49 | 4.5 | 36 | 4.3 | 13 | 5.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 489 | 44.4 | 359 | 42.5 | 130 | 50.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 294 | 26.7 | 240 | 28.4 | 54 | 21.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 157 | 14.3 | 120 | 14.2 | 37 | 14.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 88 | 8.0 | 69 | 8.2 | 19 | 7.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 17 | 1.5 | 15 | 1.8 | 2 | 0.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 1101 | 100.0 | 844 | 100.0 | 257 | 100.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | UNDER 18 | 7 | 0.2 | 7 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 304 | 9.3 | 256 | 9.4 | 48 | 8.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 1344 | 40.9 | 1137 | 41.7 | 207 | 37.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 768 | 23.4 | 634 | 23.3 | 134 | 23.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 569 | 17.3 | 454 | 16.7 | 115 | 20.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 216 | 6.6 | 174 | 6.4 | 42 | 7.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 68 | 2.1 | 55 | 2.0 | 13 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 0.3 | 9 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 3286 | 100.0 | 2726 | 100.0 | 560 | 100.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | UNDER 18 | 13 | 0.7 | 11 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 234 | 11.8 | 184 | 11.8 | 50 | 11.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 855 | 43.1 | 706 | 45.1 | 149 | $35.3$ |
|  | $31-40$ | 338 | 17.0 | 274 | 17.5 | 64 | 15.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 338 | 17.0 | 229 | 14.6 | 109 | 25.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 172 | 8.7 | 135 | 8.6 | 37 | 8.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 1.6 | 21 | 1.3 | 10 | 2.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.3 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1986 | 100.0 | 1564 | 100.0 | 422 | 100.0 |
| SAN MATEO | UNDER 18 | 17 | 0.6 | 10 | 0.4 | 7 | 1.4 |
|  | $18-20$ | 193 | 7.0 | 150 | 6.7 | 43 | 8.4 |
|  | $21-30$ | 1197 | 43.7 | 990 | 44.4 | 207 | 40.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 629 | 22.9 | 524 | 23.5 | 105 | 20.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 438 | 16.0 | 343 | 15.4 | 95 | 18.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 224 | 8.2 | 180 | 8.1 | 44 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 32 | 1.2 | 24 | 1.1 | 8 | 1.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 0.4 | 10 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 2742 | 100.0 | 2231 | 100.0 | 511 | 100.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | UNDER 18 | 18 | 0.7 | 16 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 311 | 12.3 | 245 | 12.0 | 66 | 13.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 1112 | 44.1 | 929 | 45.5 | 183 | 38.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 481 | 19.1 | 407 | 19.9 | 74 | 15.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 341 | 13.5 | 253 | 12.4 | 88 | 18.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 202 | 8.0 | 148 | 7.2 | 54 | 11.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 46 | 1.8 | 37 | 1.8 | 9 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 0.5 | 9 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 2523 | 100.0 | 2044 | 100.0 | 479 | 100.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 29 | 0.5 | 27 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 458 | 7.4 | 362 | 7.1 | 96 | 8.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 3006 | 48.3 | 2453 | 48.3 | 553 | 48.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1342 | 21.6 | 1150 | 22.6 | 192 | 16.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 877 | 14.1 | 692 | 13.6 | 185 | 16.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 398 | 6.4 | 317 | 6.2 | 81 | 7.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 90 | 1.4 | 63 | 1.2 | 27 | 2.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 22 | 0.4 | 18 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 6222 | 100.0 | 5082 | 100.0 | 1140 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 18 | 1.1 | 12 | 1.0 | 6 | 1.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 139 | 8.8 | 99 | 8.2 | 40 | 10.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 660 | 42.0 | 509 | 42.4 | 151 | 40.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 330 | 21.0 | 253 | 21.1 | 77 | 20.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 271 | 17.2 | 205 | 17.1 | 66 | 17.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 122 | 7.8 | 97 | 8.1 | 25 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 28 | 1.8 | 21 | 1.7 | 7 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 0.3 | 5 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1573 | 100.0 | 1201 | 100.0 | 372 | 100.0 |
| SHASTA | UNDER 18 | 18 | 1.1 | 13 | 1.1 | 5 | 1.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 132 | 8.4 | 101 | 8.7 | 31 | 7.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 602 | 38.2 | 449 | 38.8 | 153 | 36.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 297 | 18.8 | 214 | 18.5 | 83 | 19.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 330 | 20.9 | 219 | 18.9 | 111 | 26.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 158 | 10.0 | 126 | $10.9$ | 32 | 7.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 32 | 2.0 | 30 | 2.6 | 2 | 0.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 0.4 | 6 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1576 | 100.0 | 1158 | 100.0 | 418 | 100.0 |
| SIERRA | 18-20 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 9 | 37.5 | 7 | 31.8 | 2 | 100.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 5 | 20.8 | 5 | 22.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 24 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| SISKIYOU | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $18-20$ | 29 | 8.1 | 24 | 8.5 | 5 | 6.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 104 | 29.1 | 81 | 28.7 | 23 | 30.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 66 | 18.5 | 57 | 20.2 | 9 | 12.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 89 | 24.9 | 68 | 24.1 | 21 | 28.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 46 | 12.9 | 29 | 10.3 | 17 | 22.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 4.2 | 15 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 5 | 1.4 | 5 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 357 | 100.0 | 282 | 100.0 | 75 | 100.0 |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 19 | 1.1 | 13 | 0.9 | 6 | 1.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 153 | 8.8 | 124 | 9.0 | 29 | 8.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 710 | 40.8 | 578 | 42.0 | 132 | 36.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 348 | 20.0 | 282 | 20.5 | 66 | 18.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 305 | 17.5 | 220 | 16.0 | 85 | 23.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 165 | 9.5 | 124 | 9.0 | 41 | 11.3 |
|  | $61-70$ | 33 | 1.9 | 29 | 2.1 | 4 | 1.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 0.4 | 7 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1740 | 100.0 | 1377 | 100.0 | 363 | 100.0 |
| SONOMA | UNDER 18 | 40 | 1.4 | 30 | 1.3 | 10 | 1.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 232 | 7.8 | 191 | 8.1 | 41 | 6.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 1275 | 43.0 | 1048 | 44.2 | 227 | 38.5 |
|  | $31-40$ | $598$ | 20.2 | 494 | 20.8 | 104 | 17.6 |
|  | $41-50$ | 467 | 15.8 | 353 | 14.9 | 114 | 19.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 265 | 8.9 | 187 | 7.9 | 78 | 13.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 70 | 2.4 | 58 | 2.4 | 12 | 2.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 15 | 0.5 | 11 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 2962 | 100.0 | 2372 | 100.0 | 590 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| STANISLAUS | UNDER 18 | 24 | 0.9 | 23 | 1.1 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 255 | 10.0 | 204 | 9.8 | 51 | 11.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1178 | 46.4 | 963 | 46.2 | 215 | 47.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 512 | 20.2 | 443 | 21.3 | 69 | 15.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 370 | 14.6 | 285 | 13.7 | 85 | 18.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 148 | 5.8 | 123 | 5.9 | 25 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 46 | 1.8 | 38 | 1.8 | 8 | 1.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 2539 | 100.0 | 2084 | 100.0 | 455 | 100.0 |
| SUTTER | UNDER 18 | 8 | 1.7 | 4 | 1.0 | 4 | 5.5 |
|  | $18-20$ | 55 | 11.9 | 47 | 12.1 | 8 | 11.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 184 | 39.9 | 155 | 39.9 | 29 | 39.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 93 | 20.2 | 82 | 21.1 | 11 | 15.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 81 | 17.6 | 65 | 16.8 | 16 | 21.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 30 | 6.5 | 25 | 6.4 | 5 | 6.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 2.0 | 9 | 2.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $71 \text { \& ABOVE }$ | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 461 | 100.0 | 388 | 100.0 | 73 | 100.0 |
| TEHAMA | UNDER 18 | 10 | 2.3 | 9 | 2.6 | 1 | 1.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 37 | 8.3 | 29 | 8.3 | 8 | 8.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 158 | 35.6 | 128 | 36.6 | 30 | 31.9 |
|  | $31-40$ | 88 | 19.8 | 65 | 18.6 | 23 | 24.5 |
|  | $41-50$ | 92 | 20.7 | 69 | 19.7 | 23 | 24.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 42 | 9.5 | 38 | 10.9 | 4 | 4.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 13 | 2.9 | 9 | 2.6 | 4 | 4.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 0.9 | 3 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 444 | 100.0 | 350 | 100.0 | 94 | 100.0 |
| TRINITY | 18-20 | 6 | 7.3 | 6 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $21-30$ | 18 | 22.0 | 15 | 25.0 | 3 | 13.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 21 | 25.6 | 11 | 18.3 | 10 | 45.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 14 | 17.1 | 9 | 15.0 | 5 | 22.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 17 | 20.7 | 14 | 23.3 | 3 | 13.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 7.3 | 5 | 8.3 | 1 | 4.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 82 | 100.0 | 60 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| TULARE | UNDER 18 | 13 | 0.4 | 13 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 278 | 9.2 | 240 | 9.2 | 38 | 9.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1392 | 46.1 | 1207 | 46.4 | 185 | 44.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 677 | 22.4 | 588 | 22.6 | 89 | 21.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 422 | 14.0 | 355 | 13.6 | 67 | 16.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 197 | 6.5 | 161 | 6.2 | 36 | 8.6 |
|  | $61-70$ | 34 | 1.1 | 31 | 1.2 | 3 | 0.7 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 7 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 3020 | 100.0 | 2601 | 100.0 | 419 | 100.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.4 | 2 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 34 | 7.6 | 27 | 8.0 | 7 | 6.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 130 | 28.9 | 101 | 30.0 | 29 | 25.7 |
|  | $31-40$ | 93 | 20.7 | 72 | 21.4 | 21 | 18.6 |
|  | $41-50$ | 99 | 22.0 | 66 | 19.6 | 33 | 29.2 |
|  | $51-60$ | 72 | 16.0 | 52 | 15.4 | 20 | 17.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 17 | 3.8 | 14 | 4.2 | 3 | 2.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 450 | 100.0 | 337 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 |
| VENTURA | UNDER 18 | 34 | 0.7 | 28 | 0.7 | 6 | 0.6 |
|  | $18-20$ | 409 | 8.7 | 318 | 8.5 | 91 | 9.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 2139 | 45.3 | 1724 | 46.1 | 415 | 42.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 982 | 20.8 | 794 | 21.2 | 188 | 19.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 767 | 16.2 | 571 | 15.3 | 196 | 19.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 301 | 6.4 | 237 | 6.3 | 64 | 6.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 78 | 1.7 | 59 | 1.6 | 19 | 1.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 0.3 | 12 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 4726 | 100.0 | 3743 | 100.0 | 983 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: 2007 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| YOLO | UNDER 18 | 9 | 0.9 | 8 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 123 | 11.9 | 107 | 12.4 | 16 | 9.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 477 | 46.2 | 410 | 47.4 | 67 | 40.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 184 | 17.8 | 148 | 17.1 | 36 | 21.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 138 | 13.4 | 108 | 12.5 | 30 | 18.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 81 | 7.8 | 69 | 8.0 | 12 | 7.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 17 | 1.6 | 12 | 1.4 | 5 | 3.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1032 | 100.0 | 865 | 100.0 | 167 | 100.0 |
| YUBA | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 2.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 28 | 6.3 | 24 | 6.7 | 4 | 4.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 156 | 34.9 | 130 | 36.5 | 26 | 28.6 |
|  | $31-40$ | 99 | 22.1 | 78 | 21.9 | 21 | 23.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 84 | 18.8 | 66 | 18.5 | 18 | 19.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 55 | 12.3 | 37 | 10.4 | 18 | 19.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 20 | 4.5 | 18 | 5.1 | 2 | 2.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 447 | 100.0 | 356 | 100.0 | 91 | 100.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE ${ }^{1}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| STATEWIDE | 78.8\% |  | 155867 | 4724 | 16085 | 2574 | 3488 | 1926 | 81.0 | 9.0 |
| ALAMEDA | - | OAKLAND | 110 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 121.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | JUV OAKLAND | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | ALAMEDA | 158 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 62.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | FREMONT | 755 | 8 | 107 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 184.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | PLEASANTON | 1043 | 3 | 227 | 21 | 26 | 10 | 97.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | OAKLAND | 1864 | 10 | 253 | 39 | 32 | 33 | 93.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | HAYWARD | 1632 | 9 | 253 | 30 | 65 | 87 | 102.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5575 | 49 | 858 | 107 | 156 | 143 | 107.0 | 6.0 |
| ALPINE | - | ALPINE | 15 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 9.0 |
| AMADOR | - | JUV AMADOR | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | JACKSON | 285 | 9 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 61.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 290 | 9 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 61.0 | 8.0 |
| BUTTE | - | BUTTE | 1299 | 54 | 316 | 64 | 24 | 0 | 70.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | JUV BUTTE | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | CHICO | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 34.0 | 353.0 |
|  |  | GRIDLEY | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 68.0 | 381.0 |
|  |  | OROVILLE | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 34.0 | 98.0 |
|  |  | PARADISE | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 41.0 | 167.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1351 | 55 | 317 | 64 | 27 | 52 | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| CALAVERAS | - | CALAVERAS | 214 | 13 | 57 | 18 | 13 | 5 | 62.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN ANDREAS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 58.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 215 | 13 | 57 | 19 | 13 | 5 | 62.0 | 13.0 |
| COLUSA | - | COLUSA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 628.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | JUV COLUSA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 85.0 | 56.0 |
|  |  | COLUSA OAK | 186 | 6 | 36 | 14 | 4 | 8 | 73.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 189 | 7 | 36 | 14 | 5 | 8 | 73.0 | 9.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | - | CONTRA COSTA | 17 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 249.0 | 31.0 |
|  |  | MARTINEZ EST DV | 25 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 111.0 | 74.0 |
|  |  | CONCORD | 30 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 221.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | RICHMOND | 791 | 14 | 116 | 2 | 16 | 14 | 118.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | PITTSBURG | 856 | 15 | 95 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 138.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | WALNUT CREEK | 1747 | 20 | 245 | 2 | 22 | 17 | 123.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3466 | 101 | 463 | 5 | 64 | 65 | 128.0 | 8.0 |
| DEL NORTE | - | DEL NORTE | 149 | 7 | 58 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 76.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 149 | 7 | 58 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 76.0 | 3.0 |
| El DORADO | - | SO LAKE TAHOE | 290 | 4 | 68 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 71.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | PLACERVILLE | 591 | 36 | 121 | 15 | 6 | 10 | 107.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 881 | 40 | 189 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 97.0 | 8.0 |

[^4]TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONY DUI | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NON-ALCOHOL } \\ & \text { RECKLESS } \end{aligned}$ | OTHER <br> CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{gathered}$ |
| FRESNO | - | JUV FRESNO | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128.0 | 58.0 |
|  |  | FRESNO CENTRAL | 3534 | 277 | 655 | 41 | 54 | 42 | 101.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | CLOVIS | 440 | 2 | 74 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 94.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | COALINGA | 169 | 2 | 27 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 136.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | FIREBAUGH | 153 | 5 | 25 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 138.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | FOWLER | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81.0 | 551.0 |
|  |  | KERMAN | 81 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 122.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | KINGSBURG | 374 | 26 | 51 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 104.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | REEDLEY | 288 | 13 | 36 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 110.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | SUPSANGER | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 104.0 | 193.0 |
|  |  | SELMA | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 247.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5067 | 334 | 880 | 56 | 77 | 54 | 104.0 | 2.0 |
| GLENN | - | GLENN | 334 | 5 | 57 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 60.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 334 | 5 | 57 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 60.0 | 15.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | - | EUREKA | 800 | 26 | 224 | 57 | 36 | 1 | 90.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 800 | 26 | 224 | 57 | 36 | 1 | 90.0 | 13.0 |
| IMPERIAL | - | IMPERIAL | 40 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 98.0 | 114.0 |
|  |  | JUV IMPERIAL | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61.0 | 97.0 |
|  |  | BRAWLEY | 89 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 55 | 203.0 | 134.0 |
|  |  | CALEXICO | 272 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 128.0 | 126.0 |
|  |  | EL CENTRO | 424 | 3 | 14 | 36 | 13 | 0 | 123.0 | 124.0 |
|  |  | WINTERHAVEN | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 829 | 8 | 18 | 80 | 18 | 55 | 129.0 | 125.0 |
| INYO | - |  | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | JUV INYO | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | BISHOP | 182 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 64.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 189 | 5 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
| KERN | - | KERN | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 132.0 | 82.0 |
|  |  | JUV KERN | 49 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82.0 | 31.0 |
|  |  | LAMONT | 317 | 10 | 29 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 25.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | BAKERSFIELD | 2573 | 76 | 274 | 51 | 19 | 3 | 37.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | DELANO | 241 | 28 | 17 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 29.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | LAKE ISABELLA | 101 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 45.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TAFT | 165 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 39.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | SHAFTER | 290 | 14 | 33 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 25.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | MOJAVE | 434 | 2 | 97 | 29 | 17 | 9 | 35.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | RIDGECREST | 129 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 57.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4300 | 154 | 489 | 116 | 66 | 66 | 34.0 | 14.0 |
| KINGS | - | JUV KINGS | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 163.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | HANFORD | 653 | 29 | 102 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 87.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | AVENAL | 65 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 96.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | CORCORAN | 113 | $2$ | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 95.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 837 | 33 | 122 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 89.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONY DUI | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| LAKE | - | LAKE | 207 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 96 | 94.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | CLEARLAKE | 173 | 7 | 12 | 17 | 2 | 79 | 118.0 | 41.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 380 | 13 | 28 | 20 | 9 | 175 | 104.0 | 28.0 |
| LASSEN | - | JUV LASSEN | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | SUSANVILLE | 176 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 92.0 | 27.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 178 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 92.0 | 24.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | - | LOS ANGELES | 114 | 72 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 122.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | POMONA | 83 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 83.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | LANCASTER | 32 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | SAN FERNANDO | 75 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | PASADENA | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 173.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | VAN NUYS | 25 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | LONG BEACH | 41 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | COMPTON | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | NORWALK | 77 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TORRANCE | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | SANTA MONICA | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | JUV LOS ANGELES | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285.0 | 57.0 |
|  |  | LOS ANGELES DLQ | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | LANGELES AIRPRT | 1437 | 10 | 223 | 14 | 74 | 0 | 88.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | ALHAMBRA | 645 | 10 | 51 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 97.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | LANCASTER | 1293 | 5 | 94 | 16 | 22 | 7 | 66.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | BEVERLY HILLS | 391 | 3 | 30 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 115.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | BURBANK | 300 | 8 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 51.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | WEST COVINA | 1845 | 10 | 47 | 5 | 29 | 3 | 77.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | CHATSWORTH | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | COMPTON | 1077 | 19 | 68 | 2 | 22 | 12 | 96.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | DOWNEY | 1059 | 9 | 25 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 83.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | EAST LOS ANGELES | 1390 | 7 | 63 | 7 | 21 | 16 | 68.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | ELMONTE | 720 | 6 | 35 | 5 | 13 | 9 | 84.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | GLENDALE | 552 | 6 | 88 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 95.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | INGLEWOOD | 283 | 6 | 28 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 110.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | LONG BEACH | 1493 | 14 | 258 | 14 | 50 | 2 | 84.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | LA METRO | 5855 | 17 | 603 | 2 | 789 | 4 | 55.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | BELLFLOWER | 677 | 11 | 14 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 98.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | SANTA CLARITA | 967 | 13 | 82 | 11 | 22 | 6 | 106.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | PASADENA | 854 | 16 | 220 | 11 | 41 | 6 | 110.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | MALIBU | 262 | 3 | 79 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 124.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | POMONA | 1096 | 13 | 48 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 76.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | HUNTINGTON PK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 108.0 | 331.0 |
|  |  | TORRANCE | 1758 | 10 | 249 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 95.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | WHITTIER | 734 | 22 | 44 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 95.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | HOLLYWOOD | 129 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 59.0 | 8.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONY DUI | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI <br> DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| LOS ANGELES (cont.) |  | SAN FERNANDO | 1630 | 11 | 235 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 40.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | VAN NUYS | 2629 | 36 | 210 | 7 | 203 | 0 | 46.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | L ANGELES PURD | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | AVALON | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 57.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | US DIST CTLA | 67 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 29690 | 492 | 2839 | 136 | 1481 | 99 | 75.0 | 10.0 |
| MADERA | - | MADERA | 31 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 219.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | JUV MADERA | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77.0 | 79.0 |
|  |  | CHOWCHILLA | 394 | 0 | 73 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 294.0 | 34.0 |
|  |  | MADERA CRIM | 26 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 274.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | BASS LAKE SIERRA | 154 | 3 | 35 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 266.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 616 | 31 | 110 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 281.0 | 24.0 |
| MARIN | - | MARIN | 1431 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 71.0 | 31.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1431 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 71.0 | 31.0 |
| MARIPOSA | - | MARIPOSA JUD | 95 | 5 | 21 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 72.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | USMG YOSEMITE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62.0 | 41.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 96 | 5 | 21 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 72.0 | 13.0 |
| MENDOCINO | - | MENDOCINO | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 52.0 | 175.0 |
|  |  | JUV MENDOCINO | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 104.0 | 152.0 |
|  |  | WILLITS | 132 | 7 | 26 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 57.0 | 84.0 |
|  |  | UKIAH | 448 | 2 | 136 | 15 | 7 | 18 | 47.0 | 77.0 |
|  |  | POINT ARENA | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88.0 | 117.0 |
|  |  | COVELO | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 48.0 | 209.0 |
|  |  | FORT BRAGG | 123 | 2 | 28 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 56.0 | 146.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 742 | 21 | 194 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 51.0 | 89.0 |
| MERCED | - | MERCED PROB | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | MERCED | 1001 | 22 | 133 | 29 | 20 | 29 | 144.0 | 57.0 |
|  |  | LOS BANOS | 284 | 11 | 27 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 186.0 | 61.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1291 | 33 | 160 | 36 | 35 | 34 | 155.0 | 58.0 |
| MODOC | - | ALTURAS | 72 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 69.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 72 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 69.0 | 17.0 |
| MONO | - | JUV MONO | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | BRIDGEPORT | 21 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | MAMMOTH LAKES | 117 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 66.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 139 | 2 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 59.0 | 23.0 |
| MONTEREY | - | MONTEREY | 120 | 37 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 99.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | JUV MONTEREY | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177.0 | 32.0 |
|  |  | MARINA | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 34.0 | 36.0 |
|  |  | SALINAS | 1890 | 10 | 234 | 77 | 26 | 17 | 43.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | KING CITY | 381 | 6 | 30 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 74.0 | 36.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2416 | 53 | 273 | 86 | 44 | 22 | 54.0 | 28.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | DUI CONVICTION RATE | COURT | MISD <br> DUI | FELONY <br> DUI | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | DUI <br> DISMISSALS | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{gathered}$ |
| NAPA | - | NAPA | 913 | 52 | 121 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 66.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 913 | 52 | 121 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 66.0 | 3.0 |
| NEVADA | - | NEVADA | 6 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | JUV NEVADA | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 99.0 | 96.0 |
|  |  | JUV TRUCKEE | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | NEVADA CITY | 426 | 4 | 78 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 62.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | TRUCKEE | 200 | 10 | 45 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 53.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 636 | 25 | 129 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 58.0 | 32.0 |
| ORANGE | - | ORANGE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171.0 | 252.0 |
|  |  | JUV ORANGE | 111 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 114.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | FULLERTON | 3716 | 106 | 176 | 12 | 35 | 12 | 70.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | WESTMINSTER | 3627 | 95 | 219 | 29 | 35 | 30 | 124.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | LAGUNA HILLS | 1002 | 61 | 79 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 89.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | LAGUNA NIGUEL | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 101.0 | 205.0 |
|  |  | NEWPORT BEACH | 3197 | 66 | 238 | 25 | 23 | 9 | 93.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | SANTA ANA | 2421 | 88 | 98 | 10 | 24 | 10 | 115.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 14076 | 426 | 810 | 82 | 129 | 75 | 96.0 | 0.0 |
| PLACER | - | JUV PLACER | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | JUV TAHOE VISTA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | AUBURN | 1832 | 82 | 180 | 6 | 12 | 21 | 88.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | ROSEVILLE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 78.0 | 61.0 |
|  |  | TAHOE CITY | 152 | 4 | 24 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 65.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2012 | 86 | 204 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 86.0 | 13.0 |
| PLUMAS | - | GREENVILLE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 48.0 | 145.0 |
|  |  | QUINCY | 205 | 4 | 43 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 52.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 206 | 4 | 43 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 52.0 | 8.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | - | RIVERSIDE | 3104 | 137 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 78.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | INDIO | 61 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 39 | 83.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | JUV RIVERSIDE | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | JUV MURRIETA | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97.0 | 125.0 |
|  |  | HEMET | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 16 | 4 | 96.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | BANNING | 440 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 5 | 6 | 83.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | INDIO | 1714 | 14 | 83 | 127 | 17 | 12 | 73.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | BLYTHE | 142 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 60.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | MURRIETA | 2409 | 23 | 33 | 85 | 11 | 12 | 81.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TEMECULA | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 91.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7929 | 210 | 140 | 285 | 62 | 82 | 79.0 | 2.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | - | SACRAMENTO | 154 | 213 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 110.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | JUV SACRAMENTO | 42 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | SACRAMENTO CM | 6283 | 94 | 591 | 9 | 102 | 13 | 57.0 | 18.0 |
|  |  | US DIST COURT | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6490 | 308 | 598 | 10 | 106 | 13 | 60.0 | 18.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS 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 | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SAN BENITO | - | SAN BENITO | 356 | 16 | 47 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 138.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN BENITO | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 83.0 | 59.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 365 | 17 | 47 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 137.0 | 22.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | - | SAN BERNARDINO | 71 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 150.0 | 38.0 |
|  |  | R CUCAMONGA | 65 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 131.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | VICTORVILLE | 82 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 103.0 | 36.0 |
|  |  | BARSTOW | 512 | 21 | 88 | 20 | 19 | 8 | 99.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | JOSHUA TREE | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 67.0 | 43.0 |
|  |  | JUV SN BRNDNO | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 101.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | JUV TR CUCMNGA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 95.0 | 47.0 |
|  |  | JUV R CUCMONGA | 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 119.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | JUV VICTORVILLE | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | CHINO | 555 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 114.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | REDLANDS | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 87.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | SN BRNDND IV | 2300 | 22 | 109 | 95 | 55 | 0 | 139.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | FONTANA | 1060 | 39 | 26 | 25 | 27 | 1 | 176.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | VICTORVILLE | 1614 | 11 | 92 | 24 | 34 | 39 | 165.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | RN CHCUMGA DIST | 2549 | 21 | 15 | 34 | 25 | 13 | 126.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | BIG BEAR LAKE | 217 | 7 | 24 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 70.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | SUP NEEDLES | 115 | 4 | 53 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 80.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | JOSHUA TREE DIST | 396 | 3 | 67 | 77 | 17 | 0 | 103.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9598 | 268 | 478 | 305 | 201 | 108 | 136.0 | 3.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | - | SAN DIEGO | 75 | 104 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 153.0 | 138.0 |
|  |  | VISTA | 63 | 158 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 103 | 76.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN DIEGO | 111 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 159.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | EL CAJON | 2235 | 112 | 304 | 46 | 15 | 16 | 60.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | VISTA | 4469 | 77 | 694 | 169 | 38 | 2 | 46.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | VISTA 2 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 71.0 | 57.0 |
|  |  | SN DIEGO KRNYBR | 5298 | 17 | 435 | 52 | 48 | 12 | 119.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | CHULA VISTA | 1794 | 54 | 128 | 51 | 8 | 11 | 86.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | US CT SN DIEGO | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 644.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 14082 | 525 | 1569 | 319 | 117 | 203 | 74.0 | 9.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | - | SAN FRANCISCO | 12 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 280.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | JUV DEL SANFRAN | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | TRAF SAN FRAN | 1041 | 26 | 105 | 108 | 18 | 75 | 104.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | US DIST COURT | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 733.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1056 | 45 | 107 | 109 | 18 | 75 | 106.0 | 4.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | - | JUV SAN JOAQUIN | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 170.0 | 47.0 |
|  |  | LODI | 495 | 29 | 42 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 38.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | MANTECA | 479 | 9 | 82 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 51.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | TRACY | 439 | 7 | 60 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 52.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | STOCKTON | 1753 | 59 | 223 | 15 | 40 | 34 | 37.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3181 | 105 | 408 | 38 | 70 | 53 | 43.0 | 7.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS 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 RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | - | JUV S L OBISPO | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 108.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | S L OBISPO MONT | 1892 | 83 | 339 | 42 | 56 | 12 | 45.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1903 | 83 | 342 | 42 | 57 | 12 | 45.0 | 14.0 |
| SAN MATEO | - | SAN MATEO | 55 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 150.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | JUV SAN N MATEO | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117.0 | 24.0 |
|  |  | SAN MATEO NO MB | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | SO SN FRANCSCO | 1387 | 6 | 247 | 4 | 33 | 31 | 90.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | REDWOOD CITY | 1217 | 7 | 214 | 9 | 22 | 28 | 81.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2689 | 53 | 461 | 14 | 62 | 59 | 87.0 | 11.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | - | JUV SNTA BARBRA | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94.0 | 97.0 |
|  |  | JUV SNTA MARIA | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 27.0 |
|  |  | JUV S MARIA WST | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | SNT BARBARA FIG | 1259 | 50 | 229 | 56 | 24 | 5 | 57.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | MILL S MARIA | 927 | 59 | 25 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 37.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | LOMPOC | 200 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 34.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | SOLVANG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2408 | 115 | 271 | 93 | 38 | 11 | 46.0 | 14.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | - | SANTA CLARA | 134 | 146 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | JUV SNTA CLARA | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 130.0 | 29.0 |
|  |  | PALO ALTO | 957 | 7 | 167 | 29 | 9 | 0 | 71.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | SAN JOSE | 4167 | 54 | 280 | 56 | 46 | 2 | 61.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | SAN JOSE TRAF | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 113.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | PALO ALTO 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101.0 | 38.0 |
|  |  | SAN MARTIN | 673 | 9 | 84 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 82.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6002 | 220 | 534 | 89 | 78 | 2 | 73.0 | 5.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | - | SANTA CRUZ | 27 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 142.0 | 52.0 |
|  |  | JUV SANTA CRUZ | 17 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 63.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | TRAF SNTA CRUZ | 1157 | 18 | 197 | 21 | 19 | 5 | 64.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | WATSONVILLE | 341 | 6 | 33 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 46.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1542 | 31 | 232 | 26 | 25 | 19 | 61.0 | 15.0 |
| SHASTA | - | JUV SHASTA | 14 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 130.0 | 26.0 |
|  |  | BURNEY | 41 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 97.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | REDDING | 1451 | 69 | 193 | 22 | 19 | 19 | 53.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1506 | 70 | 207 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 54.0 | 14.0 |
| SIERRA | - | SIERRA | 23 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 88.0 | 41.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 23 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 88.0 | 41.0 |
| SISKIYOU | - | SISKIYOU | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123.0 | 286.0 |
|  |  | JUV SISKIYOU | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | HAPPYCAMP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | WEED | 186 | 1 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 96.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | YREKA | 143 | 18 | 32 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 96.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 335 | 22 | 54 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 96.0 | 9.0 |

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | COURT | MISDDUI | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL RECKLESS | NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS | OTHER CONVICTIONS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { DISMISSALS } \end{gathered}$ | MEDIAN ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| SOLANO | - | SOLANO | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43.0 | 92.0 |
|  |  | JUV SOLANO | 24 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 114.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | FAIRFIELD | 1171 | 23 | 232 | 22 | 23 | 18 | 93.0 | 48.0 |
|  |  | VALLEJO | 486 | 24 | 86 | 21 | 8 | 12 | 148.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1692 | 48 | 320 | 43 | 32 | 30 | 111.0 | 39.0 |
| SONOMA | - | SONOMA | 2775 | 131 | 539 | 24 | 25 | 1 | 61.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | JUV SONOMA | 46 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 66.0 | 23.0 |
|  |  | SANTA ROSA | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 53 | 71.0 | 45.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2827 | 135 | 542 | 24 | 30 | 54 | 62.0 | 8.0 |
| STANISLAUS | - | STANISLAUS | 2416 | 72 | 331 | 42 | 22 | 4 | 59.0 | 66.0 |
|  |  | JUV STANISLAUS | 22 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 112.0 | 78.0 |
|  |  | MODESTO | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 79.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TURLOCK | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 136.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2466 | 73 | 332 | 43 | 29 | 21 | 60.0 | 66.0 |
| SUTTER | - | TRAF YUBA CITY | 433 | 28 | 117 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 62.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 433 | 28 | 117 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 62.0 | 42.0 |
| TEHAMA | - | TEHAMA | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 171.0 | 52.0 |
|  |  | JUV TEHAMA | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | CORNING | 142 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 46.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | RED BLUFF | 254 | 10 | 42 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 46.0 | 13.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 424 | 20 | 83 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 48.0 | 12.0 |
| TRINITY | - | TRINITY | 79 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 79 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 65.0 | 4.0 |
| TULARE | - | JUV VISALIA | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | DINUBA | 414 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 102.0 | 12.0 |
|  |  | PORTERVILLE | 847 | 12 | 40 | 2 | 33 | 8 | 46.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | TULARE | 1535 | 2 | 44 | 5 | 39 | 2 | 71.0 | 94.0 |
|  |  | VISALIA DIV | $141$ | 37 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 33 | 117.0 | 35.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2958 | 62 | 104 | 7 | 91 | 45 | 68.0 | 46.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | - | TUOLUMNE | 436 | 14 | 89 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 54.0 | 8.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 436 | 14 | 89 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 54.0 | 8.0 |
| VENTURA | - | VENTURA 2 | 4658 | 68 | 0 | 2 | 73 | 68 | 86.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4658 | 68 | 0 | 2 | 73 | 68 | 86.0 | 1.0 |
| YOLO | - | YOLO | 974 | 58 | 123 | 28 | 11 | 14 | 78.0 | 29.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 974 | 58 | 123 | 28 | 11 | 14 | 78.0 | 29.0 |
| YUBA | - | YUBA | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110.0 | 68.0 |
|  |  | JUV YUBA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | MARYSVILLE | 415 | 6 | 88 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 78.0 | 37.0 |
|  |  | BEALE AFB | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45.0 | 44.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 430 | 17 | 88 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 78.0 | 41.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS ${ }^{1}$

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  |  | 160591 | 95.8 | 73.4 | 65.5 | 19.0 | 0.2 | 5.3 |
| ALAMEDA | OAKLAND | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 1419 | 98.4 | 96.9 | 78.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 393 | 99.5 | 97.2 | 14.5 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 109 | 97.2 | 92.7 | 3.7 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 9.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 81 | 86.4 | 97.5 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2002 | 98.1 | 96.8 | 58.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  | JUV OAKLAND | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 14 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 14 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | ALAMEDA | $1^{\text {sr }}$ DUI | 119 | 97.5 | 94.1 | 90.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 35 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 22.9 | 65.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 158 | 98.1 | 94.9 | 74.1 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  | FREMONT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 540 | 98.9 | 98.5 | 86.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 181 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 21.5 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD DUI }}$ | 38 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 7.9 | 60.5 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 763 | 99.2 | 98.8 | 66.6 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | PLEASANTON | $1^{\text {sr }}$ DUI | 775 | 98.2 | 97.7 | 93.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 215 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 13.5 | 81.9 | 0.0 | 17.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 51 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 60.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1046 | 98.7 | 97.8 | 72.3 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 7.4 |
|  | HAYWARD | $1^{\text {sr }}$ DUI | 1160 | 98.9 | 98.8 | 83.5 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 388 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 16.2 | 73.2 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 79 | 98.7 | 96.2 | 12.7 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 29.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 14 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1641 | 99.1 | 99.0 | 63.5 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
| ALPine | ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 86.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 43.8 | 81.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
| AMADOR | JUV AMADOR | $1^{\text {IT }}$ DUI | 5 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 5 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JACKSON | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 204 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 83.8 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 21.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 67 | 98.5 | 98.5 | 16.4 | 80.6 | 0.0 | 61.2 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 16 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 294 | 95.6 | 97.6 | 62.2 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
| butte | BUTTE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 899 | 94.2 | 91.3 | 88.2 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 335 | 91.9 | 94.3 | 14.9 | 71.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 84 | 82.1 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 31.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 35 | 54.3 | 91.4 | 2.9 | 45.7 | 0.0 | 48.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1353 | 91.9 | 92.2 | 62.4 | 25.4 | 0.1 | 6.1 |
|  | JUV BUTTE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 29 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2NDDUI }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 31 | 83.9 | 0.0 | 71.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

[^5]TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| BUTTE (cont) | CHICO | $1{ }^{\text {STD }}$ DUI | 7 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 10 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 |
|  | GRIDLEY | 2NDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | OROVILLE | 1sTDUI | 6 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 57.1 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  | PARADISE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| CALAVERAS | CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 145 | 97.2 | 98.6 | 92.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 33.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 57 | 89.5 | 98.2 | 33.3 | 50.9 | 0.0 | 45.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 20 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 5.0 | 65.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+DUI }}$ | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 227 | 94.7 | 98.2 | 68.3 | 20.3 | 0.4 | 39.6 |
|  | JUV CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| COLUSA | SUP COLUSA | $4{ }^{\text {TH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV COLUSA | 1sTDUI | 3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | COLUSA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 127 | 92.1 | 95.3 | 76.4 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 47 | 95.7 | 100.0 | 8.5 | 72.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RDDUI }}$ | 14 | 100.0 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 192 | 91.7 | 96.4 | 53.1 | 21.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | CONTRA COSTA | $1^{\text {STD }}$ DUI | 18 | 77.8 | 94.4 | 33.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 12 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 5 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 26 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 61 | 65.6 | 98.4 | 9.8 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  | MARTINEZ | 1stDUI | 26 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 26 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CONCORD | $1{ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 16 | 68.8 | 68.8 | 43.8 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 10 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+DUI }}$ | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 37 | 78.4 | 83.8 | 21.6 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
|  | RICHMOND | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 557 | 97.1 | 96.6 | 88.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 191 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 79.6 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RDD }}$ DUI | 45 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 12 | 58.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 805 | 97.3 | 97.6 | 63.5 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 1.1 |

TABLE B4: 2007 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 DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| CONTRA COSTA ${ }^{\text {(cont) }}$ | PITTSBURG | 1sTDUI | 601 | 96.8 | 93.7 | 92.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 197 | 100.0 | 97.5 | 14.7 | 79.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3rduI | 64 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.9 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 77.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 871 | 97.1 | 95.1 | 67.0 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  | WALNUT CREEK | 1stDui | 1320 | 98.2 | 94.5 | 94.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | 2 NDDUI | 348 | 99.1 | 97.1 | 11.2 | 81.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | 3 3rduI | 84 | 98.8 | 98.8 | 4.8 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1767 | 98.4 | 95.3 | 72.8 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| DEL NORTE | DEL NORTE | 15TDUI | 106 | 96.2 | 95.3 | 88.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDPDUI }}$ | 38 | 94.7 | 81.6 | 7.9 | 65.8 | 18.4 | 42.1 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 9 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 22.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
|  |  | total | 156 | 93.6 | 87.2 | 62.2 | 16.7 | 9.6 | 14.7 |
| El DORADO | SOUTH LAKE TAHOE | ${ }^{\text {stidui }}$ | 225 | 96.9 | 95.1 | 81.8 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 56 | 94.6 | 96.4 | 21.4 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 10 | 100.0 | 90.0 | 10.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 294 | 96.3 | 95.2 | 67.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  | PLACERVILLE | 1 ITDUI | 407 | 97.1 | 92.4 | 85.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 155 | 97.4 | 92.3 | 12.9 | 75.5 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RdDUI }}$ | 48 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 17 | 58.8 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 23.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 627 | 96.2 | 92.8 | 58.4 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
| FRESNO | JUV FRESNO | ${ }^{\text {stidui }}$ | 21 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 100.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FRESNO CENTRAL | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 2588 | 95.3 | 98.1 | 89.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2NDDUI }}$ | 835 | 93.5 | 98.9 | 17.4 | 71.9 | 0.1 | 15.3 |
|  |  | 3 3rdui | 266 | 86.8 | 98.1 | 5.6 | 74.4 | 0.0 | 17.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 122 | 59.8 | 100.0 | 7.4 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 12.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3811 | 93.2 | 98.3 | 65.2 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 6.6 |
|  | CLOVIS | 1 stDUI | 321 | 99.4 | 98.8 | 96.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 98 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 13.3 | 82.7 | 0.0 | 10.2 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 21 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 81.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 442 | 99.1 | 98.4 | 73.3 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  | COALINGA | 1 1sTDUI | 123 | 99.2 | 94.3 | 92.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 60.6 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 171 | 97.7 | 95.9 | 75.4 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  | FIREBAUGH | $1^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 104 | 98.1 | 98.1 | 89.4 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 49 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 30.6 | 59.2 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 158 | 96.8 | 98.7 | 68.4 | 24.1 | 0.0 | 7.6 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| FRESNO (cont) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { FOWLER } \\ & \text { KERMAN } \end{aligned}$ | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {sTIDUI }}$ | 61 | 98.4 | 93.4 | 90.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 19 | 89.5 | 100.0 | 31.6 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 10.5 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 88 | 95.5 | 94.3 | 72.7 | 14.8 | 1.1 | 3.4 |
|  | KINGSBURG | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 278 | 96.4 | 97.8 | 90.3 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No }}$ DUI | 84 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 76.2 | 0.0 | 19.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 27 | 88.9 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 81.5 | 0.0 | 48.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 54.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 400 | 94.8 | 98.3 | 66.3 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 |
|  | REEDLEY | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 197 | 98.5 | 99.0 | 82.7 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 78 | 98.7 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 80.8 | 0.0 | 10.3 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 19 | 84.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 5.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 7 | 57.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 301 | 96.7 | 99.3 | 57.5 | 28.2 | 0.3 | 4.7 |
|  | SUP SANGER | ${ }^{\text {sTIDUI }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SELMA | 1 STDUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| GLENN | GLENN | 1 STDUI | 231 | 94.4 | 74.0 | 59.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 87 | 93.1 | 94.3 | 19.5 | 39.1 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 18 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 22.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 339 | 93.2 | 80.8 | 46.3 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| HUMBOLDT | SUP HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 590 | 98.1 | 34.2 | 89.8 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 5.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No }}$ DUI | 171 | 98.2 | 89.5 | 18.1 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 56.1 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 51 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 2.0 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 56.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 14 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 826 | 97.7 | 50.5 | 68.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 19.7 |
| IMPERIAL | IMPERIAL | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 37 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 59.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 5 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 45 | 97.8 | 26.7 | 53.3 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV IMPERIAL | 15TDUI | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | BRAWLEY | 1 STDUI | 66 | 97.0 | 27.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 18 | 94.4 | 50.0 | 27.8 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 89 | 94.4 | 33.7 | 43.8 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2007 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KERN (cont) | LAKE ISABELLA | ${ }^{\text {1sTDUI }}$ | 62 | 98.4 | 100.0 | 27.4 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.3 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDDUI }}$ | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 105 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 19.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TAFT | 1 STDUI | 129 | 96.1 | 98.4 | 55.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 34 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 14.7 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 38.2 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 9 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 174 | 95.4 | 97.1 | 44.3 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 10.3 |
|  | SHAFTER | 1 stDUI | 232 | 97.4 | 98.3 | 85.3 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 53 | 98.1 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 66.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 12 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 304 | 96.1 | 98.7 | 68.1 | 15.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  | mojave | ${ }^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 324 | 99.1 | 96.9 | 64.5 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 86 | 98.8 | 94.2 | 4.7 | 33.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd DUI }}$ | 22 | 90.9 | 95.5 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 436 | 98.2 | 96.3 | 48.9 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  | RIDGECREST | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 99 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 65.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 36.4 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3rdoui | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 134 | 99.3 | 97.8 | 55.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| KINGS | JUV KINGS | 1 1stdui | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | HANFORD | 1 srDui | 459 | 91.1 | 96.7 | 69.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 159 | 89.9 | 98.1 | 13.8 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RrD DUI }}$ | 46 | 76.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 0.0 | 28.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 18 | 16.7 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 682 | 87.8 | 97.2 | 50.1 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 9.8 |
|  | AVENAL | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 44 | 95.5 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 15 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 46.7 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 66 | 89.4 | 100.0 | 54.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 10.6 |
|  | CORCORAN | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 85 | 92.9 | 94.1 | 69.4 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 24 | 95.8 | 95.8 | 8.3 | 70.8 | 0.0 | 29.2 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 115 | 93.9 | 94.8 | 53.0 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 11.3 |
| LAKE | LAKE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 148 | 93.9 | 63.5 | 81.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 47 | 95.7 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 74.5 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 13 | 92.3 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 5 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 213 | 93.4 | 72.3 | 57.7 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 2.8 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LAKE (cont) | CLEARLAKE | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 110 | 94.5 | 42.7 | 67.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 55 | 87.3 | 81.8 | 9.1 | 50.9 | 9.1 | 9.1 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 11 | 72.7 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 18.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 180 | 90.0 | 58.3 | 43.9 | 20.6 | 3.3 | 4.4 |
| LASSEN | JUV LASSEN | $1^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUSANVILLE | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 129 | 96.1 | 95.3 | 58.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 36 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 55.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 177 | 93.8 | 96.6 | 55.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 94 | 64.9 | 86.2 | 33.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 31 | 38.7 | 90.3 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RdDUI }}$ | 14 | 35.7 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 47 | 40.4 | 89.4 | 2.1 | 4.3 | 10.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 186 | 52.2 | 88.2 | 17.2 | 5.4 | 3.2 | 0.0 |
|  | POMONA | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 911 | 94.7 | 22.5 | 86.8 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 227 | 92.5 | 69.6 | 18.1 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 41 | 78.0 | 90.2 | 7.3 | 51.2 | 4.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 43 | 14.0 | 97.7 | 2.3 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1222 | 90.9 | 36.2 | 68.4 | 12.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  | LANCASTER | 1 srdui | 1011 | 95.7 | 97.1 | 86.9 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No }}$ DUI | 261 | 93.5 | 96.2 | 13.0 | 64.8 | 1.9 | 12.3 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 55 | 78.2 | 74.5 | 3.6 | 40.0 | 25.5 | 29.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 18 | 16.7 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1345 | 93.5 | 96.0 | 68.0 | 16.4 | 1.6 | 4.2 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1311 | 96.1 | 29.8 | 81.2 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 305 | 96.4 | 91.5 | 10.2 | 76.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 88 | 88.6 | 84.1 | 2.3 | 54.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 34 | 8.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1738 | 94.1 | 44.8 | 63.1 | 20.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  | PASADENA | $1^{\text {srdui }}$ | 705 | 96.5 | 54.6 | 91.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 146 | 96.6 | 93.8 | 15.8 | 77.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 33 | 87.9 | 72.7 | 0.0 | 48.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 54.5 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 895 | 95.6 | 62.1 | 74.5 | 15.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  | VANNUYS | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 2151 | 98.2 | 41.3 | 86.1 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {Nod }}$ di | 419 | 97.6 | 93.6 | 8.1 | 78.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 108 | 85.2 | 90.7 | 0.0 | 32.4 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 22 | 18.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2700 | 96.9 | 51.9 | 69.8 | 16.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | LONG BEACH | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1193 | 97.3 | 20.2 | 85.6 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 290 | 96.6 | 75.5 | 9.7 | 66.9 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 61 | 93.4 | 39.3 | 3.3 | 21.3 | 50.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 20 | 30.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1564 | 96.2 | 32.2 | 67.2 | 14.3 | 3.4 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES ${ }^{\text {(cont) }}$ | COMPTON | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 839 | 97.3 | 47.0 | 84.9 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 215 | 95.3 | 83.3 | 23.3 | 61.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3rDDUI | 50 | 90.0 | 84.0 | 8.0 | 58.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 18 | 44.4 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1122 | 95.7 | 56.3 | 68.3 | 15.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
|  | NORWALK | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 55 | 52.7 | 81.8 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 17 | 47.1 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RDUI | 14 | 28.6 | 85.7 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 18 | 27.8 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 104 | 44.2 | 85.6 | 14.4 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
|  | TORRANCE | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 1373 | 97.7 | 17.9 | 93.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 338 | 97.0 | 83.1 | 15.1 | 71.3 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {rbd Dui }}$ | 64 | 95.3 | 82.8 | 7.8 | 57.8 | 15.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 23 | 26.1 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1798 | 96.6 | 33.5 | 74.7 | 16.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
|  | SANTA MONICA | 1 ITDUI | 14 | 100.0 | 78.6 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 7 | 57.1 | 71.4 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 3RDUI | 4 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 33.3 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 31 | 64.5 | 77.4 | 19.4 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV LOS ANGELES | 1 STDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV EASTLAKE | ${ }^{\text {ITIDUI }}$ | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LOS ANGELES AIRPORT | 1 1stdui | 1150 | 98.3 | 16.0 | 89.9 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 258 | 97.7 | 81.8 | 16.3 | 69.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 32 | 90.6 | 90.6 | 6.3 | 40.6 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 28.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1447 | 97.7 | 29.8 | 74.5 | 15.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  | ALHAMBRA | 1 1stdui | 529 | 98.1 | 16.3 | 89.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 110 | 95.5 | 85.5 | 12.7 | 77.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 16 | 93.8 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 655 | 97.6 | 29.3 | 74.5 | 15.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
|  | BEVERLY HILLS | 1 STDUI | 328 | 99.4 | 14.9 | 92.4 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DU | 59 | 94.9 | 84.7 | 13.6 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3rddui | 6 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 394 | 98.7 | 26.6 | 79.2 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BURBANK | 1 ITDUI | 234 | 99.1 | 47.4 | 88.5 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 57 | 98.2 | 91.2 | 5.3 | 84.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
|  |  | 3rdDUI | 14 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 7.1 | 35.7 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 308 | 98.7 | 57.1 | 68.5 | 18.2 | 2.6 | 1.0 |
|  | WEST COVINA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1461 | 97.9 | 16.5 | 92.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 327 | 97.6 | 89.0 | 11.0 | 77.7 | 0.0 | 7.6 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 66 | 100.0 | 90.9 | 1.5 | 80.3 | 7.6 | 18.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1855 | 97.9 | 31.9 | 75.2 | 18.2 | 0.3 | 2.4 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | CHATSWORTH | ${ }^{\text {ST}}$ SUI | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | DOWNEY | 1 sTDUI | 877 | 97.3 | 32.4 | 79.6 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 169 | 98.8 | 79.9 | 16.0 | 68.0 | 3.6 | 1.8 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 20 | 95.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 30.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1068 | 97.5 | 40.5 | 67.9 | 14.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
|  | EAST LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1090 | 97.3 | 37.0 | 90.5 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 243 | 98.4 | 86.8 | 17.3 | 78.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 57 | 98.2 | 91.2 | 3.5 | 77.2 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1397 | 97.5 | 48.2 | 73.7 | 19.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | EL MONTE | 1 15TDUI | 564 | 98.2 | 26.6 | 89.7 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 134 | 97.8 | 90.3 | 14.2 | 73.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 726 | 98.1 | 41.2 | 72.3 | 18.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  | GLENDALE | $1^{\text {srdui }}$ | 450 | 98.2 | 11.3 | 92.7 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 88 | 98.9 | 78.4 | 12.5 | 75.0 | 1.1 | 9.1 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 18 | 88.9 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 5.6 | 11.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 558 | 98.0 | 24.6 | 76.7 | 14.9 | 0.4 | 2.2 |
|  | INGLEWOOD | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 207 | 97.6 | 20.3 | 71.5 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 64 | 100.0 | 78.1 | 14.1 | 60.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 15 | 86.7 | 66.7 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 289 | 96.9 | 36.3 | 55.0 | 16.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 |
|  | LA METRO | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 4651 | 98.3 | 38.2 | 91.3 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1020 | 98.1 | 93.6 | 6.6 | 86.1 | 0.3 | 3.7 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 191 | 96.9 | 94.2 | 1.0 | 80.1 | 2.6 | 6.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 60.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5872 | 98.2 | 49.7 | 73.5 | 21.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
|  | BELLFLOWER | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 547 | 98.7 | 16.5 | 87.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 117 | 98.3 | 82.1 | 12.8 | 70.9 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 21 | 100.0 | 90.5 | 14.3 | 61.9 | 4.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 688 | 98.7 | 30.2 | 72.4 | 15.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA CLARITA | ${ }^{\text {sTPUI }}$ | 741 | 97.2 | 19.6 | 72.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 174 | 94.3 | 86.8 | 14.4 | 59.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 57 | 86.0 | 89.5 | 1.8 | 31.6 | 8.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 980 | 95.5 | 36.2 | 57.6 | 13.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | MALIBU | $1^{\text {srdui }}$ | 217 | 97.7 | 8.8 | 76.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 36 | 100.0 | 80.6 | 11.1 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 11 | 100.0 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 54.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 265 | 98.1 | 19.6 | 64.2 | 13.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | HUNTINGTON PARK | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WHITTIER | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 581 | 97.8 | 25.5 | 92.4 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 142 | 95.8 | 85.2 | 15.5 | 73.2 | 1.4 | 4.2 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 31 | 100.0 | 90.3 | 9.7 | 77.4 | 3.2 | 25.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 756 | 97.4 | 39.6 | 74.3 | 18.5 | 0.5 | 2.0 |
|  | HOLLYWOOD | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 108 | 99.1 | 14.8 | 79.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 17 | 100.0 | 88.2 | 11.8 | 88.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 129 | 99.2 | 27.1 | 68.2 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WEST LOS ANGELES | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | AVALON | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 6 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | US DISTRICT LA | 1 ${ }^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 53 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No }}$ DUI | 11 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 67 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| MADERA | MADERA | 15TDUI | 36 | 75.0 | 88.9 | 50.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 12 | 83.3 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 58.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 59 | 76.3 | 89.8 | 32.2 | 28.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV MADERA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 11 | 72.7 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 727 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CHOWCHILLA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 286 | 97.6 | 96.9 | 88.8 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 82 | 97.6 | 97.6 | 32.9 | 61.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 22 | 100.0 | 86.4 | 18.2 | 72.7 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 394 | 97.2 | 96.4 | 72.6 | 19.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  | MADERA CRIMINAL | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 9 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 26 | 88.5 | 88.5 | 34.6 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  | BASS LAKE SIERRA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 101 | 91.1 | 91.1 | 84.2 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 35 | 88.6 | 82.9 | 37.1 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 17 | 88.2 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 70.6 | 0.0 | 17.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 7 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 157 | 89.2 | 89.8 | 64.3 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 1.9 |

TABLE B4: 2007 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 DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| MARIN | SUP SAN RAFAEL | ${ }^{\text {15TDUI }}$ | 1121 | 96.6 | 10.8 | 87.5 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDPDUI }}$ | 267 | 99.3 | 86.5 | 6.4 | 75.3 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 55 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 21 | 81.0 | 90.5 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1464 | 97.0 | 28.9 | 68.2 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| MARIPOSA | SUP MARIPOSA | ${ }^{\text {STTDUI }}$ | 65 | 98.5 | 93.8 | 86.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 28 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 17.9 | 60.7 | 0.0 | 21.4 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 5 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 100 | 96.0 | 95.0 | 61.0 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 |
|  | US MG YOSEMITE | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ du | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| MENDOCINO | SUP UKIAH | 1 1stDui | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
|  |  | total | 19 | 84.2 | 94.7 | 15.8 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 26.3 |
|  | JUV MENDOCINO | $1{ }^{\text {STPDU }}$ | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WILLITS | 1 15TDUI | 80 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 81.3 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 45 | 97.8 | 93.3 | 15.6 | 71.1 | 0.0 | 55.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RrdDUI }}$ | 12 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 83.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 139 | 97.1 | 96.4 | 51.8 | 36.7 | 0.0 | 30.2 |
|  | UKIAH | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 303 | 94.4 | 94.7 | 88.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 118 | 98.3 | 98.3 | 16.1 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 68.6 |
|  |  | 3 3rdui | 28 | 85.7 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 450 | 94.7 | 95.6 | 63.6 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 25.8 |
|  | POINT ARENA | 1sTDUI | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 69.2 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 15.4 |
|  | COVELO | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {2vDDUI }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 55.6 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
|  | FORT BRAGG | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 91 | 91.2 | 89.0 | 76.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 25 | 100.0 | 92.0 | 24.0 | 48.0 | 0.0 | 44.0 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 62.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 125 | 93.6 | 90.4 | 61.6 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
| MERCED | MERCED JUV | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ |  | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 6 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MERCED | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 723 | 97.9 | 94.7 | 86.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 227 | 97.8 | 98.7 | 22.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 48 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ +DUI TOTAL | 25 1023 | 44.0 96.7 | 100.0 96.0 | 4.0 67.3 | 28.0 22.9 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1023 | 96.7 | 96.0 | 67.3 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| NEVADA | NEVADA | $1{ }^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 17 | 76.5 | 100.0 | 41.2 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV NEVADA | ${ }^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV TRUCKEE | 1 stDUI | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | NEVADA CITY | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 314 | 98.4 | 96.8 | 93.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 91 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 8.8 | 87.9 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 21 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 4.8 | 85.7 | 4.8 | 47.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 430 | 98.8 | 97.0 | 70.5 | 24.7 | 0.2 | 5.1 |
|  | TRUCKEE | $1{ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 155 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 94.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 44 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 15.9 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 210 | 98.1 | 100.0 | 73.8 | 23.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| ORANGE | ORANGE | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV ORANGE | 15TDUI | 117 | 97.4 | 17.1 | 86.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ di | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 120 | 97.5 | 18.3 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FULLERTON | 1 STDUI | 2924 | 99.1 | 46.7 | 91.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 708 | 98.6 | 92.2 | 7.6 | 80.6 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 153 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 0.0 | 92.2 | 0.0 | 48.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 37 | 54.1 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3822 | 98.5 | 57.6 | 71.7 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 7.6 |
|  | WESTMINSTER | 1sTDUI | 2778 | 98.6 | 16.8 | 90.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 734 | 98.0 | 91.8 | 5.7 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 16.8 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 167 | 92.8 | 95.2 | 0.6 | 73.1 | 0.0 | 47.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 43 | 46.5 | 95.3 | 2.3 | 30.2 | 2.3 | 27.9 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3722 | 97.6 | 36.0 | 68.8 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
|  | LAGUNA HILLS | ${ }^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 830 | 98.4 | 22.5 | 91.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 189 | 98.4 | 88.4 | 9.0 | 73.0 | 0.0 | 11.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 27 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 85.2 | 0.0 | 22.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 17 | 58.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 17.6 |
|  |  | total | 1063 | 97.7 | 37.3 | 72.7 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  | LAGUNA NIGUEL | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | NEWPORT BEACH | 1stDUI | 2480 | 98.1 | 62.9 | 91.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 606 | 98.8 | 94.1 | 7.8 | 79.5 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 144 | 95.8 | 98.6 | 2.1 | 85.4 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 33 | 54.5 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3263 | 97.7 | 70.6 | 71.0 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 3.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| ORANGE | SANTA ANA | $1^{\text {srduI }}$ | 1883 | 97.7 | 36.2 | 90.7 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 494 | 98.0 | 91.3 | 10.3 | 77.7 | 0.0 | 25.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 89 | 88.8 | 98.9 | 2.2 | 78.7 | 0.0 | 39.3 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 43 | 32.6 | 93.0 | 2.3 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  | total | 2509 | 96.3 | 50.2 | 70.2 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 7.5 |
| PLACER | JUV PLACER | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 23 | 100.0 | 56.5 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 24 | 100.0 | 58.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV TAHOE VISTA | ${ }^{\text {stdui }}$ | 3 | 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 |
|  | AUBURN | $1{ }^{\text {stDUI }}$ | 1379 | 97.4 | 98.5 | 82.4 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 407 | 96.6 | 98.8 | 39.1 | 49.6 | 0.0 | 10.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd }}$ DUI | 101 | 87.1 | 99.0 | 31.7 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 47.5 |
|  |  | $4 \mathrm{TH}+$ DUI | 27 | 25.9 | 96.3 | 7.4 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 18.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1914 | 95.7 | 98.6 | 69.4 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 5.5 |
|  | ROSEVILLE | ${ }^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TAHOE CITY | ${ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 122 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 70.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 29 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 24.1 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 156 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 59.6 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| PLUMAS | GREENVILLE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | QUINCY | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 136 | 97.8 | 96.3 | 91.9 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 59 | 94.9 | 100.0 | 15.3 | 79.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd }}$ DUI | 12 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | , | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 209 | 95.7 | 97.6 | 64.1 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | RIVERSIDE | $1{ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 182 | 74.7 | 95.6 | 62.6 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 60 | 58.3 | 93.3 | 8.3 | 43.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDDUI }}$ | 34 | 58.8 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 60 | 43.3 | 95.0 | 1.7 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 336 | 64.6 | 94.9 | 36.3 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
|  | INDIO | 1 STDUI | 1377 | 96.8 | 95.5 | 90.6 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 333 | 96.4 | 99.1 | 17.1 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 7.8 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 73 | 84.9 | 100.0 | 5.5 | 76.7 | 0.0 | 11.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 36 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 52.8 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | total | 1819 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 72.0 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  | JUV RIVERSIDE | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 40 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 40 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV MURRIETA | ${ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 4 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | HEMET | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 2280 | 98.1 | 96.8 | 94.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 520 | 96.9 | 97.5 | 15.6 | 77.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd }}$ DUI | 92 | 95.7 | 96.7 | 4.3 | 85.9 | 0.0 | 27.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI TOTAL | 15 2907 | 66.7 97.6 | 100.0 96.9 | 6.7 77.1 | 60.0 18.3 | 0.0 0.0 | 26.7 3.0 |
|  |  | IOTAL | 2907 | 97.6 | 96.9 | 77.1 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 3.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 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 DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| RIVERSIDE (cont) | BANNING | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 353 | 98.9 | 96.3 | 92.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NodDUI }}$ | 71 | 98.6 | 91.5 | 18.3 | 70.4 | 0.0 | 32.4 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 17 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 47.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 444 | 98.9 | 95.7 | 77.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
|  | BLYTHE | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 107 | 96.3 | 62.6 | 86.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 28 | 100.0 | 82.1 | 14.3 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 142 | 95.8 | 68.3 | 68.3 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  | MURRIETA | $1{ }^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 1778 | 98.8 | 93.7 | 95.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 492 | 98.2 | 98.2 | 10.4 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 140 | 98.6 | 98.6 | 0.0 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 86.4 | 0.0 | 31.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2432 | 98.7 | 94.9 | 72.2 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 8.1 |
|  | TEMECULA | ${ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 13 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO | ${ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 109 | 81.7 | 98.2 | 38.5 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 70 | 70.0 | 97.1 | 10.0 | 37.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 49 | 67.3 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 46.9 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 139 | 66.9 | 97.8 | 1.4 | 50.4 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 367 | 71.9 | 97.8 | 14.2 | 36.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 |
|  | JUV SACRAMENTO | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 41 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 43 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SACRAMENTO CM | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 4567 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 91.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 1420 | 99.1 | 99.4 | 7.0 | 88.2 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 355 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 1.1 | 85.4 | 0.0 | 17.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 35 | 74.3 | 97.1 | 11.4 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6377 | 98.1 | 98.3 | 67.2 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  | US DISTRICT SAC | $1^{\text {SrIDUI }}$ | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 277 | 96.8 | 90.6 | 49.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 79 | 94.9 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 29.1 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 372 | 95.2 | 93.0 | 38.2 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  | JUV SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 10 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 10 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 52 | 65.4 | 98.1 | 50.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {Nod }}$ DUI | 19 | 63.2 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 9 | 55.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 39 | 48.7 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 119 | 58.8 | 98.3 | 23.5 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | R CUCAMONGA | ${ }^{\text {STPDUI }}$ | 40 | 72.5 | 87.5 | 47.5 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 14 | 64.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 6 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 31 | 38.7 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 91 | 59.3 | 93.4 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | VICTORVILLE | 15TDUI | 1213 | 95.0 | 57.8 | 87.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {Nod }}$ DUI | 386 | 92.7 | 91.5 | 15.8 | 71.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 90 | 85.6 | 92.2 | 7.8 | 73.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 56 | 44.6 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1745 | 92.4 | 68.1 | 64.6 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BARSTOW | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 390 | 96.7 | 75.1 | 88.7 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 110 | 94.5 | 93.6 | 11.8 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 23 | 91.3 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 533 | 95.3 | 80.5 | 67.5 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SN BRNDNO | 1stDUI | 11 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 11 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV TR CUCAMONGA | 1 1stdui | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV R CUCAMONGA | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 15 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV VICTORVILLE | $1^{\text {STP }}$ dUI | 11 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CHINO | 1stDUI | 434 | 97.9 | 43.1 | 93.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {No }}$ DUI | 97 | 96.9 | 82.5 | 11.3 | 73.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 31 | 87.1 | 96.8 | 6.5 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 570 | 96.7 | 53.5 | 73.7 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | REDLANDS | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 13 | 100.0 | 69.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 100.0 | 73.3 | 86.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN BERNARDINO DIV | ${ }^{\text {sTruil }}$ | 1705 | 96.4 | 61.8 | 91.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ DUI | 467 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 14.8 | 73.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 130 | 91.5 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 70.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2322 | 95.4 | 70.5 | 70.4 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FONTANA | ${ }^{\text {STPDUI }}$ | 777 | 93.8 | 94.2 | 86.5 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 224 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 16.5 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 67 | 92.5 | 98.5 | 0.0 | 49.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 31 | 54.8 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1099 | 92.4 | 95.7 | 64.5 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  | SUP R CUCAMONGA | ${ }^{\text {15TDUI }}$ | 1918 | 97.8 | 38.9 | 93.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 507 | 97.4 | 91.3 | 14.2 | 78.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 121 | 97.5 | 96.7 | 2.5 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {THH}+ \text { DUI }}$ | 24 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2570 | 97.5 | 52.6 | 72.9 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 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 DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | BIG BEAR LAKE | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 168 | 95.8 | 68.5 | 92.9 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| (cont) |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 40 | 97.5 | 95.0 | 12.5 | 77.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 8 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 224 | 95.1 | 75.4 | 71.9 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUP NEEDLES | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 99 | 96.0 | 70.7 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 19 | 89.5 | 94.7 | 15.8 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 119 | 95.0 | 74.8 | 78.2 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JOSHUA TREE DISTRICT | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 299 | 90.3 | 65.2 | 82.9 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NdDUI }}$ | 93 | 92.5 | 96.8 | 7.5 | 81.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 19 | 94.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 73.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 44.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 420 | 90.0 | 74.5 | 60.7 | 24.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 112 | 82.1 | 75.9 | 41.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 28 | 82.1 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd DUI }}$ | 11 | 63.6 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 28 | 28.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 179 | 72.6 | 84.9 | 28.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  | VISTA | 1stDUI | 3496 | 97.1 | 33.8 | 68.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 987 | 95.2 | 85.8 | 6.5 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 212 | 83.5 | 96.2 | 2.4 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 72 | 41.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4767 | 95.2 | 48.4 | 51.9 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | JUV SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 112 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 114 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | El CAJON | 1sTDUI | 1708 | 96.8 | 38.2 | 92.4 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 486 | 94.2 | 88.9 | 12.8 | 73.9 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RDD }}$ DUI | 111 | 86.5 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 42 | 61.9 | 97.6 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2347 | 95.1 | 52.7 | 70.0 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  | VISTA 2 | ${ }^{\text {stDUI }}$ | 33 | 12.1 | 6.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 33 | 12.1 | 6.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | KEARNY NESA | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 4155 | 97.6 | 4.1 | 93.7 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 944 | 97.9 | 74.8 | 14.9 | 71.1 | 0.1 | 4.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 194 | 95.4 | 91.8 | 6.7 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 36.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 22 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 13.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5315 | 97.5 | 20.2 | 76.2 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
|  | CHULA VISTA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1447 | 94.4 | 12.4 | 83.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 324 | 96.9 | 76.5 | 16.0 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 63 | 88.9 | 88.9 | 4.8 | 52.4 | 0.0 | 15.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 14 | 35.7 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1848 | 94.2 | 26.9 | 68.7 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  | US CT SAN DIEGO | ${ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | probation | Jall | 1ST OFFENDER DU PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN FRANCISCO | SAN FRANCISCO | $1{ }^{\text {siddu }}$ | 20 | 85.0 | 85.0 | 65.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 28.6 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | 3rodu | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DII }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | total | 33 | 90.9 | 87.9 | 45.5 | 24.2 | 3.0 | 12.1 |
|  | Traf San francisco | 1 sTDUI | 851 | 99.3 | 98.7 | 94.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2NDDUI }}$ | 173 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 28.3 | 68.8 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 24.9 |
|  |  | 3rodu | 39 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 10.3 | 79.5 | 5.1 | 43.6 |
|  |  | $4 \mathrm{TH}+\mathrm{DUI}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1067 | 99.2 | 98.7 | 80.0 | 15.4 | 0.2 | 7.5 |
|  | US DISTRICT SF | ${ }^{1 \text { ITPDU }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| San joaquin | JUV SAN JoAQuinLOdi | ${ }_{\text {Tridul }}^{\text {TOTAL }}$ | 16 | 100.0 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 1 1spui | 347 | 99.1 | 99.1 | 88.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  | LODI | 2NDDUI | 129 | 96.9 | 99.2 | 11.6 | 78.3 | 0.0 | 14.7 |
|  |  | 3rDDU | 34 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 2.9 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 26.5 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DII }}$ | 14 | 71.4 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  | MANTECA | total | 524 | 97.5 | 98.7 | 61.5 | 24.4 | 0.0 | ${ }^{6} 3$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {1sTDu }}$ | 336 | 99.4 | 97.9 | 79.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2vNDUI }}$ | 103 | 10.0 94.4 | 98.1 | 19.4 83 | ${ }_{722}{ }^{1}$ | 0.0 | 32.0 528 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {3rodut }}$ | 36 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 8.3 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 52.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 13 | 84.6 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 69.2 | 0.0 | 46.2 |
|  | TRACY | TOTAL | 488 | 98.8 | 98.0 | 59.2 | 21.9 | 0.0 | 13.9 |
|  |  |  | 327 | 99.7 989 | 97.9 | 93.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 22 | 90.9 | 95.5 | 9.1 | 72.7 | ${ }_{4.5}^{2.2}$ | 27.3 |
|  |  | $4{ }^{\text {TH+ }}$ DUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | total | 446 | 98.9 | 97.5 | 71.3 | 22.0 | 0.7 | 6.5 |
|  | Stockton | ${ }^{\text {1spldul }}$ | ${ }^{1206}$ | 98.3 | 96.9 998 | ${ }^{91.8}$ | 3.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {3RDDU }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{13}$ | 97.8 | 99.8 | 12.0 | ${ }_{847}$ | 0.0 | 20.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH}}+$ DUI | 59 | 79.7 | 98.3 | 0.0 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 42.4 |
|  |  | total | 1812 | 97.6 | 97.8 | 64.2 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 9.9 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | JUV SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1 1sDuI | 11 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN LUIS OBISPOMONT | 1 15PUI | 1408 | 97.5 | 96.3 | 91.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {vNDUI }}$ | 389 | 98.5 | 98.7 | 14.7 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | ${ }^{3 \text { RrDDU }}$ | 132 | 93.9 | 97.0 | 5.3 | 79.5 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {4THH+DUI }}$ | 46 | 60.9 | 100.0 | 4.3 | ${ }_{28}^{28.3}$ | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $\underset{\text { TSTAL }}{\text { TSTUI }}$ | 1975 45 | 96.6 77.8 | 96.9 100.0 | 68.2 11.1 | 22.6 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.2 0.0 |
| SANMATEO | San mateo | 2 2vDUI | 14 | 77.6 | 100.0 | 11.1 7.1 | 0.0 | ${ }_{0}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{0} 0$ |
|  |  | 3RDDU | ${ }^{11}$ | 36.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{95}^{25}$ | 40.0 63.2 | 100.0 100.0 | ${ }_{6.3}^{0.0}$ | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  | JUV SAN MATEO | $\underset{\text { TSTAL }}{\text { TSTUI }}$ | 95 25 | 63.2 100.0 | 100.0 0.0 | 6.3 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 25 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN MATEO (cont) | SAN MATEO NORTH | 1sTDUI | 5 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MB | TOTAL | 5 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SOUTH | 1 STDUI | 1033 | 97.1 | 97.6 | 93.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | SAN FRANCISCO | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 292 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 10.3 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 40.4 |
|  |  | 3 3rduI | 61 | 91.8 | 98.4 | 6.6 | 70.5 | 0.0 | 32.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1393 | 96.8 | 98.1 | 71.6 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
|  | REDWOOD CITY | 1 STDUI | 946 | 95.9 | 98.4 | 91.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 223 | 96.0 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 52 | 90.4 | 100.0 | 1.9 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 13.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1224 | 95.7 | 98.8 | 72.1 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| SANTA BARbARA | JUV SANTA BARBARA | 1stDui | 8 | 87.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 88.9 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  | JUV SANTA MARIA | 1 1stoui | 9 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SANTA MARIA | 1 1stoui | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WEST | TOTAL | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA BARBARA FIG | 15TDUI | 1006 | 95.3 | 79.5 | 78.4 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 226 | 95.6 | 94.7 | 1.8 | 78.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 56 | 91.1 | 96.4 | 0.0 | 80.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 21 | 76.2 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1309 | 94.9 | 83.1 | 60.3 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  | SUP SANTA MARIA | 1 1stdui | 694 | 96.5 | 68.9 | 90.6 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 208 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 0.0 | 75.5 | 0.0 | 31.3 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 63 | 88.9 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 49.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 21 | 52.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 986 | 95.2 | 77.3 | 63.8 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 11.7 |
|  | LOMPOC | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 153 | 98.7 | 23.5 | 55.6 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 42 | 100.0 | 81.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 11 | 90.9 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 72.7 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 206 | 98.5 | 38.8 | 41.3 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| SANTA CLARA | SANTA CLARA | 1 15TDUI | 98 | 79.6 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 72 | 68.1 | 98.6 | 4.2 | 45.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 44 | 54.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 66 | 45.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 280 | 64.6 | 99.6 | 18.6 | 27.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
|  | JUV SANTA CLARA | ${ }^{\text {sTrDUI }}$ | 44 | 97.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 45 | 97.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SUP PALO ALTO | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 765 | 99.1 | 96.5 | 93.3 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 173 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 22.5 | 72.8 | 0.0 | 38.7 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 23 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 78.3 | 0.0 | 60.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 964 | 99.3 | 97.1 | 78.1 | 16.8 | 0.1 | 9.3 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SANTA CLARA | SAN JOSE | ${ }^{\text {STPDUI }}$ | 3166 | 99.5 | 99.0 | 93.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 865 | 99.5 | 99.4 | 11.9 | 83.1 | 0.0 | 30.9 |
|  |  | 3 RdDUI | 180 | 98.3 | 98.3 | 0.6 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 55.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4221 | 99.5 | 99.1 | 72.2 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 10.1 |
|  | SAN JOSE TRAF | $1{ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 22 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 22 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Palo alto | 1stDUI | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 87.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN MARTIN | ${ }^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 477 | 99.4 | 97.7 | 85.5 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | $2{ }^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 154 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 67.5 | 0.0 | 37.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 43 | 97.7 | 97.7 | 4.7 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 55.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 682 | 99.3 | 98.2 | 63.3 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 13.9 |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | 1 1stdui | 10 | 80.0 | 90.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 8 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 12 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 32 | 71.9 | 96.9 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SANTA CRUZ | 15TDUI | 19 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 19 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TRAFFIC SANTA CRUZ | 1 STDUI | 861 | 98.0 | 95.5 | 79.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 228 | 98.7 | 97.4 | 16.2 | 46.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3 RDDUI | 62 | 100.0 | 96.8 | 1.6 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 24 | 70.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1175 | 97.7 | 96.0 | 61.1 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WATSONVILLE | 1 1stdui | 228 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 52.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 84 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 3.6 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3rdDUI | 32 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 347 | 98.6 | 98.8 | 35.4 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| SHASTA | JUV SHASTA | 1 1stDUI | 15 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BURNEY | $1^{\text {sTPDUI }}$ | 29 | 93.1 | 93.1 | 89.7 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 20.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 41 | 92.7 | 95.1 | 65.9 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 34.1 |
|  | REDDING | $1{ }^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 1050 | 96.3 | 97.2 | 89.3 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 32.2 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 348 | 94.5 | 98.0 | 17.2 | 71.8 | 0.3 | 75.3 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 93 | 84.9 | 98.9 | 5.4 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 77.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 29 1520 | 27.6 93.9 | 93.1 | 6.9 | 3.4 19.5 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1520 | 93.9 | 97.4 | 66.1 | 19.5 | 0.1 | 44.3 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | 18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SIERRA | SIERRA | ${ }^{\text {stDUI }}$ | 17 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 76.5 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 54.2 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | SISKIYOU | 1 sTDUI | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | total | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SISKIYOU | 1 stDui | 4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2NDDUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | WEED | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 138 | 94.2 | 85.5 | 76.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 35 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 34.3 | 54.3 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 11 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 54.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 187 | 95.2 | 88.8 | 62.6 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  | YREKA | ${ }^{\text {STIDUI }}$ | 104 | 94.2 | 92.3 | 70.2 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 40 | 97.5 | 97.5 | 17.5 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 32.5 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 77.8 | 88.9 | 22.2 | 44.4 | 0.0 | 77.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 161 | 93.2 | 93.8 | 50.9 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 18.0 |
| SOLANO | SOLANO | 1 stDui | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2NDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3rdDUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 54.5 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JUV SOLANO | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 25 | 92.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 25 | 92.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FAIRFIELD | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 854 | 97.2 | 98.0 | 93.2 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 253 | 95.7 | 99.2 | 7.5 | 87.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 67 | 86.6 | 97.0 | 1.5 | 79.1 | 0.0 | 13.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 20 | 50.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1194 | 95.5 | 98.2 | 68.3 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
|  | VALLEJO | 1 STDUI | 343 | 96.2 | 97.7 | 90.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DI | 119 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 15.1 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RrD DUI }}$ | 39 | 89.7 | 94.9 | 5.1 | 71.8 | 0.0 | 17.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 9 | 55.6 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 510 | 95.5 | 97.8 | 64.9 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| SONOMA | SONOMA | 1 sTDUI | 1939 | 97.5 | 94.0 | 67.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 690 | 95.5 | 98.4 | 7.1 | 45.7 | 0.0 | 17.5 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 182 | 96.2 | 96.7 | 4.4 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 26.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 95 | 54.7 | 94.7 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 10.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2906 | 95.6 | 95.2 | 46.8 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
|  | JUV SONOMA | $1^{\text {STDUI }}$ | 48 | 56.3 | 12.5 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 50 | 54.0 | 12.0 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA ROSA | 1 STDUI | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STANISLAUS | STANISLAUS | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 1799 | 99.2 | 98.5 | 88.4 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 510 | 99.8 | 99.4 | 27.5 | 64.1 | 0.0 | 9.8 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 136 | 99.3 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 86.8 | 0.0 | 33.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 43 | 69.8 | 95.3 | 2.3 | 51.2 | 0.0 | 27.9 |
|  |  | total | 2488 | 98.8 | 98.7 | 69.9 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 5.2 |
|  | JUV STANISLAUS | 1 stDUI | 23 | 87.0 | 17.4 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 23 | 87.0 | 17.4 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MODESTO | $1{ }^{\text {STPDU }}$ | 24 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TURLOCK | 1stDUI | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SUTTER | YUBA CITY | 1 15TDUI | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TRAF YUBA CITY | ${ }^{\text {STPUI }}$ | 308 | 94.5 | 95.1 | 88.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 118 | 93.2 | 99.2 | 13.6 | 78.8 | 0.0 | 60.2 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 23 | 87.0 | 100.0 | 8.7 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 65.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 11 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 460 | 92.4 | 96.5 | 63.3 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 23.5 |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | $1^{\text {sTDUI }}$ | 8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 7 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  |  | 3 3rdui | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 25 | 24.0 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 |
|  | JUV TEHAMA | 1 stDUI | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | CORNING | ${ }^{\text {sTPUUI }}$ | 98 | 95.9 | 96.9 | 85.7 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 36 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 13.9 | 72.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {rbd dui }}$ | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 142 | 92.3 | 97.9 | 63.4 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  | RED BLUFF | $1^{\text {sriduI }}$ | 187 | 86.6 | 95.7 | 79.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 58 | 79.3 | 96.6 | 8.6 | 69.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 |
|  |  | 3RdDUI | 14 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 64.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 264 | 82.6 | 96.2 | 58.3 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 7.6 |
| TRINITY | TRINITY | $1^{\text {sridui }}$ | 52 | 90.4 | 96.2 | 78.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDD }}$ DUI | 23 | 95.7 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {Rrd DUI }}$ | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH+ }+ \text { DUI }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 82 | 91.5 | 97.6 | 53.7 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | JUV VISALIA | ${ }^{\text {15TDUI }}$ | 21 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 21 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | DINUBA | 1stDUI | 289 | 95.5 | 99.3 | 61.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 81 | 92.6 | 96.3 | 8.6 | 43.2 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 42 | 90.5 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ DUI | 13 | 76.9 | 100.0 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 425 | 93.9 | 98.8 | 44.5 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 7.5 |

TABLE B4: 2007 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | Probation | JALL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| TULARE ${ }^{\text {(cont) }}$ | PORTERVILLE | 15TDU | 548 | 95.8 | 97.6 | 84.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {NDDUI }}$ | 223 | 94.6 | 97.8 | 13.0 | 74.4 | 0.4 | 22.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 62 | 87.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 41.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ +DUI | 26 | 57.7 | 88.5 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 34.6 |
|  |  | total | 859 | 93.7 | 97.6 | 57.3 | 26.9 | 0.5 | 10.8 |
|  | tulare | 1sTDU | 1121 | 96.8 | 81.6 | 70.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {voduI }}$ | 305 | 94.8 | 96.7 | 5.6 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 98 | 92.9 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 71.4 | 2.0 | 32.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ +DUI | 13 | 76.9 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 15.4 |
|  | VISALIA DIV | TOTAL | 1537 | 96.0 | 85.7 | 53.0 | 22.6 | 0.1 | 5.9 |
|  |  | 1sTDU | 95 | 75.8 | 84.2 | 18.9 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {2vNDUI }}$ | 30 | 80.0 | ${ }^{93.3}$ | 3.3 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | 3RbDUI | 21 | 66.7 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
|  |  | $4^{4 T H+D U I}$ | ${ }^{32}$ | 53.1 | ${ }^{93.8}$ | 3.1 | 9.4 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 21.9 |
|  | tuolumne | TOTAL | 178 | ${ }^{71.3}$ | 88.8 | 11.2 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| TUOLUMNE |  |  | 307 96 | 95.4 95.8 | 97.7 100.0 | 83.1 6.3 | 1.3 81.3 | ${ }_{0}^{0.0}$ | 0.7 |
|  |  | 3rDDUI | 31 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 48.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ + DUI | 16 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  | VENTURA | TOTAL | 450 | 93.6 | 98.4 | 58.0 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
| VEntura |  | ${ }^{1 \text { 1TTDUI }}$ | ${ }^{3600}$ | 96.8 | 86.3 | 7.11 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {voduI }}$ | 867 | 98.0 | 95.7 | 8.8 | 59.1 | 0.0 | 66.8 |
|  |  | 3 3RDDI | ${ }^{206}$ | 97.6 | 99.5 | 3.9 | 63.1 | 0.0 | 84.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ +DUI | 53 | 66.0 | 98.1 | 0.0 | 43.4 | 0.0 | 64.2 |
|  | YOLO | $\underset{\text { TOTAL }}{\text { STDU }}$ | 4726 769 | 96.7 | 88.7 | 55.9 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 23.5 |
| yolo |  | 1sTDU 2vodu | 769 190 | ${ }_{96.6}^{96.6}$ | 96.2 96.8 | 80.0 46.8 | 2.0 34.7 | 0.0 0.0 | 1.3 41.6 |
|  |  | 3RDDU | 48 | 99.9 | 100.0 | ${ }_{27.1}$ | ${ }_{47.9}$ | ${ }_{0} 0$ | ${ }_{56.3}^{41.6}$ |
|  |  | $4 \mathrm{TH}+\mathrm{DUI}$ | 25 | 52.0 | 84.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  | YUBA | TOTAL | 1032 | 95.6 | 96.2 | 69.7 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 11.6 |
| YUBA |  | ${ }_{151}{ }^{\text {spuI }}$ | 12 | 75.0 | 91.7 | 58.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {voduI }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}$ + DUI | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 19 | 68.4 | 94.7 | 36.8 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 10.5 |
|  | JUV YUBA <br> MARYSVILLE | ${ }^{151501}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 15TDU | 298 | 96.0 | ${ }^{93.0}$ | 87.9 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  | MARYSVILLE | ${ }^{\text {2vNDU }}$ | 97 | 97.9 | 95.9 | 7.2 | 78.4 | 0.0 | 12.4 |
|  |  | 3RDDUI | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {4TH+ DUI }}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | TOTAL | ${ }_{4}^{421}$ | 96.0 | ${ }^{94.1}$ | 64.4 | ${ }^{23.3}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 5.5 0.0 |
|  | BEALE AFB | 1spul TOTAL | 4 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 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

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { GROUP } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \substack{\text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE }} \end{gathered}$ | PERCENT FEMALE | MEAN AGE | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT } \\ \text { COMMERCIAL } \\ \text { DRIVERS } \end{gathered}$ | MEAN MONTHS IN STUDY | 2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS PER 100 DRIVERS |  |  |  | ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL ACCIDENTS | Alcohol ACCIDENTS | MAJOR CONVICTIONS | MINOR CONVICTIONS | TOTAL ACCIDENTS | inJURY ACCIDENTS | MAJOR VIOLATIONS | MOVING VIOLATIONS |
| 7/07-6/08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No program | $\begin{gathered} 3,123 \\ (41.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 27.6 | 33.7 | 2.7 | 15.8 | 2.7 | 0.8 | . 17 | 9.4 | 1.34 | . 30 | . 46 | 2.14 |
| Alcohol education program | $\begin{gathered} 4,336 \\ (58.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 26.0 | 33.0 | 1.8 | 15.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | . 10 | 9.2 | 1.38 | . 29 | . 41 | 2.10 |
| Statistical significance test |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=2.41$ | $F=6.2^{*}$ | $x^{2}=6.73^{*}$ | $F=3.5$ | $F=0.0$ | $F=0.3$ | $F=6.8^{*}$ | $F=0.5$ | $F=37 .{ }^{*}$ | $F=17.8^{*}$ | $F=137.1^{*}$ | $F=14.7{ }^{*}$ |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-month program | $\begin{gathered} 31,193 \\ (74.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 26.4 | 33.1 | 1.3 | 19.0 | 3.4 | 1.5 | . 09 | 8.7 | 1.41 | . 30 | . 40 | 2.13 |
| 9 -month program | $\begin{aligned} & 10,800 \\ & (25.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 27.8 | 36.7 | 1.7 | 19.1 | 4.3 | 2.7 | . 07 | 6.0 | 1.42 | . 31 | . 41 | 2.15 |
| Statistical significance test |  | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=7.65^{*}$ | $F=688.2^{*}$ | $\mathrm{X}^{2}=9.69^{*}$ | $F=0.4$ | $F=202.5^{*}$ | $F=721.6$ * | $F=5.7^{*}$ | $F=439.4 *$ | $F=21.8^{*}$ | $F=98 .{ }^{*}$ | $F=5.2^{*}$ | $F=9.2{ }^{*}$ |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3
    ${ }^{2}$ The information on DUI conviction rates by county is not available in this report due to recently discovered and still unresolved DUI data reporting problems. ${ }^{3}$ This count includes misdemeanors which carried a felony disposition code. These counts do not include 4th offenses (in ten years) which are statutorily defined as felonies. 4These dismissals were identified in DMV's DUI Audit and Tracking System Summary Report.
    ${ }^{5}$ Adjudication time is presented using median values (in days) for 2007 data.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1} .08$ 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 10 years (7 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).
    ${ }^{6}$ Probation violation APS actions are those taken under VC $\S 23154$ (including actions later set aside). A single arrest results in concurrent actions taken for both the APS and probation violation if a violator was arrested for DUI while on DUI probation.
    ${ }^{7}$ These figures include refusal hearings but exclude Driver Safety/Investigation hearings, subsequent APS dismissal hearings and departmental reviews.
    ${ }^{8}$ Both numerator and denominator include those actions later set aside as a result of the hearing.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Among 2007 DUI arrests, 31,209 were associated with a reported traffic crash, with 12,451 involving an injury or fatality, and 18,758 PDO.

[^3]:    *These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ The information on DUI conviction rates by county is not available in this report due to recently discovered and still unresolved DUI data reporting problems
    ${ }^{2}$ Adjudication time is presented using median values (in days) for 2007 data.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Entries represent percentages of 2007 DUI convictees receiving each sanction by county, court and offender status. Due to a law change, as of September 20, 2005, SB 1697 ,
    court suspensions by county and offender status are no longer available in this Table. Statewide information on these sanctions is provided in Tables 17 and 18 in Section 5 .

