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DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 2009-2019

| DUI measures | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| DUI arrest rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers) | 880 | 823 | 752 | 712 | 651 | 619 | 546 | 491 | 458 | 470 | 455 |
| Total DUI arrests ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 208531 | 195879 | $180212^{\text {b }}$ | 172893 | 160388 | 154743 | 141372 | 130054 | 123548 | 127437 | 124141 |
| Felony DUI arrests ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5577 | 4902 | 4655 | 5047 | 4789 | 4835 | 4899 | 5186 | 4944 | 4919 | 4920 |
| Misdemeanor DUI arrests ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 202954 | 190977 | 175557 | 167846 | 155599 | 149908 | 136473 | 124868 | 118604 | 122518 | 119221 |
| Total DUI convictions ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 161074 | 148042 | 142121 | 133525 | 121304 | 116190 | 106627 | 98430 | 93606 | 93926 | N/A |
| DUI conviction rates ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 77.2\% | $73.1 \%^{\text {d }}$ | $73.3 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $73.7 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $72.5 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $72.7 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $72.6 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $73.6 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $72.9 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 71.1\% | N/A |
| Alcohol- or drug-involved reckless driving convictions ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 19802 | 19552 | 19204 | 17568 | 16494 | 14563 | 12887 | 11803 | 11303 | 12231 | N/A |
| Percent convicted of alcohol or drug reckless driving ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 9.5\% | $8.1 \%^{\text {d }}$ | $7.9 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $8.1 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $8.1 \%^{\text {d }}$ | $7.3 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $7.0 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $7.1 \%^{\text {d }}$ | 7.0\% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 7.4\% | N/A |
| Alcohol-involved crash fatalities ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 1263 | 1072 | 1089 | 1169 | 1197 | 1155 | 1144 | 1223 | 1294 | 1221 | 1187 |
| $\%$ of total crash fatalities | 41.1 | 39.1 | 38.5 | 39.0 | 38.6 | 36.9 | 33.3 | 31.7 | 33.1 | 32.1 | 31.8 |
| Alcohol-involved crash injuries ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 26058 | 24343 | 23853 | 23905 | 23178 | 23993 | 25152 | 27394 | 26967 | 27425 | 27333 |
| \% of total crash injuries | 11.2 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 10.2 |
| Drug-involved crash fatalities ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 713 | 696 | 709 | 818 | 892 | 864 | 831 | 733 | 829 | 742 | 798 |
| \% of total crash fatalities | 23.2 | 25.4 | 25.0 | 27.3 | 28.7 | 27.6 | 24.2 | 19.0 | 21.2 | 19.5 | 21.4 |
| Drug-involved crash injuries ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 2309 | 2384 | 2289 | 2622 | 2489 | 2867 | 3031 | 3233 | 2982 | 2976 | 2998 |
| \% of total crash injuries | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |

Note: N/A indicates that this information is not available yet for 2019 .
These totals do not include duplicate cases as originally reported in the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center data.
Due to the underreporting of DUI arrest data by CHP for the month of April 2011, the total for 2011 is undercounted by approximately 6,500 DUI arrests.
These figures show the total counts of convictions and conviction rates, by year of violation, as typically reported in Section 2 of this report.
The 2010 and later DUI conviction rates and percent convicted of alcohol-reckless driving are derived using different data extraction procedures than those used in years prior to 2010 and are not comparable to figures in those prior years. These rates are computed only on "matchable DUI cases", and not by using total DUI arrests divided by total DUI convictions presented in this table. See Section 2 for more details.
For some fatalities and injuries in these figures, drugs were also involved. These figures were provided by CHP on January 4, 2022.
du I Sumarry statistics: 2009-2019 (CONTINUED)

| DUI license actions | YEAR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Total mandatory suspension/ revocation (S/R) actions | 382111 | 351802 | 337700 | 313870 | 286981 | 264833 | 255357 | 239491 | 227595 | 227719 | 225624 |
| PRECONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Per Se (APS) Actions | 198851 | 183743 | 177231 | 163522 | 150337 | 139405 | 130468 | 120339 | 115374 | 117535 | 117067 |
| . 01 Zero tolerance suspensions | 20861 | 18684 | 17463 | 14835 | 11750 | 10213 | 9074 | 8184 | 7227 | 6561 | 6542 |
| .08 First-offender suspensions | 127933 | 117884 | 114858 | 106562 | 99475 | 93014 | 86933 | 80371 | 77689 | 79776 | 80091 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender suspensions | 46747 | 44101 | 42127 | 39563 | 35646 | 32823 | 31093 | 28439 | 27032 | 27409 | 26572 |
| . 08 Repeat-offender revocations | 3310 | 3074 | 2783 | 2562 | 3466 | 3355 | 3368 | 3345 | 3426 | 3789 | 3862 |
| Commercial driver actions | $3964{ }^{\text {g }}$ | 3614 ${ }^{\text {g }}$ | $3108^{\text {g }}$ | $2983{ }^{\text {g }}$ | $2782^{\text {g }}$ | 2498 | 2322 | 2087 | 1988 | 1818 | 1748 |
| Chemical test refusal actions | 8737 | 8275 | 7520 | 7069 | 9214 | 9089 | 9257 | 9262 | 9489 | 10647 | 11016 |
| .01 Test refusal suspensions | 372 | 354 | 279 | 280 | 300 | 286 | 293 | 269 | 248 | 223 | 245 |
| . 08 Test refusal suspensions | 5055 | 4847 | 4458 | 4227 | 5448 | 5448 | 5596 | 5648 | 6118 | 6998 | 7300 |
| . 08 Test refusal revocations | 3310 | 3074 | 2783 | 2562 | 3466 | 3355 | 3368 | 3345 | 3426 | 3789 | 3862 |
| POSTCONVICTION ${ }^{h}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juvenile DUI suspensions | 482 | 538 | 351 | 312 | 311 | 253 | 246 | 234 | 249 | 159 | 160 |
| First-offender suspensions | 132709 | 120254 | 113749 | 107035 | 93897 | 81845 | 82570 | 78933 | 74400 | 72833 | 72100 |
| Misdemeanor | 130462 | 118168 | 111760 | 105013 | 91809 | 79955 | 80492 | 76712 | 72116 | 70539 | 69624 |
| Felony | 2247 | 2086 | 1989 | 2022 | 2088 | 1890 | 2078 | 2221 | 2284 | 2294 | 2476 |
| Second-offender S/R actions | 37836 | 35565 | 34519 | 32156 | 32408 | 32935 | 31587 | 29948 | 28029 | 28051 | 27198 |
| Misdemeanor | 37155 | 34928 | 33878 | 31533 | 31771 | 32275 | 30896 | 29183 | 27271 | 27217 | 26379 |
| Felony | 681 | 637 | 641 | 623 | 637 | 660 | 691 | 765 | 758 | 834 | 826 |
| Third-offender revocations | 9187 | 8905 | 8918 | 8083 | 7665 | 8239 | 8160 | 7699 | 7358 | 7008 | 6919 |
| Misdemeanor | 8945 | 8707 | 8662 | 7852 | 7446 | 8019 | 7938 | 7453 | 7111 | 6732 | 6648 |
| Felony | 242 | 198 | 256 | 231 | 219 | 220 | 222 | 246 | 247 | 276 | 271 |
| Fourth-or-more-offender revocations | 3046 | 2797 | 2932 | 2762 | 2363 | 2156 | 2326 | 2338 | 2185 | 2133 | 2180 |
| Total postconviction S/R actions | 183260 | 168059 | 160469 | 150348 | 136644 | 125428 | 124889 | 119152 | 112221 | 110184 | 108557 |

Previous counts have been adjusted to include commercial driver APS actions not previously identified as such. These totals might include multiple license action activities associated with the same event.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2021 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

## Background

The California Driving Under the Influence Management Information System (DUI-MIS) was developed in California in 1989 as a result of the legislative mandate that required the development of a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI in California.

The annual report of the California DUI-MIS provides current and comprehensive statistics on the processing of DUI offenders from the point of arrest through adjudication to treatment and license control actions. The report presents cross-tabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, postconviction sanctions, administrative license actions, and on drivers in crashes involving alcohol and drugs. In compliance with provisions of the law, evaluations of the efficacy of specific sanctions are also included in the report. Specifically, two separate analyses were conducted to evaluate: 1) if referrals to alcohol and drug education programs were associated with reductions in 1 -year subsequent DUI incidents and crashes among drivers convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving, and 2) if referrals to the 9 -month DUI program were associated with reductions in 1-year subsequent violations and crashes when compared to referrals to the 3-month DUI program among first DUI offenders. The report is divided into six sections, with each section covering specific topics. The following are highlights from each section of the 2021 report reflecting on the current state of DUI in California.

## DUI Summary Statistics

- Alcohol-involved crash fatalities decreased by $2.8 \%$ in 2019, following a decrease of $5.6 \%$ in 2018 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- Drug-involved crash fatalities increased by $7.5 \%$ in 2019, after a decrease of $10.5 \%$ in 2018.
- Of the total number of crash fatalities in $2019,31.8 \%$ were alcohol-involved, which is only marginally lower than the $32.1 \%$ in 2018. The percentage of drug-involved fatalities increased from the prior year's $19.5 \%$ to $21.4 \%$ in 2019.
- In 2019, 10.2\% of total crash injuries were alcohol-involved; relatively unchanged from $10.0 \%$ reported for 2018.
- The DUI arrest rate per 100,000 licensed drivers decreased by $3.2 \%$ in 2019 , following an increase of $2.6 \%$ in 2018.


## Section 1: DUI Arrests

- DUI arrests decreased by $2.6 \%$ in 2019, after increasing by $3.1 \%$ in 2018. After a one-year increase in 2018, DUI arrests in 2019 potentially resumed a declining trend that began in 2008 (see DUI Summary Statistics and Table 1).
- The median (midpoint) age of a DUI arrestee in 2019 was 31 years and almost three-quarters ( $72.4 \%$ ) of arrestees were age 40 or younger. Less than one percent ( $0.4 \%$ ) of all DUI arrestees were juveniles (under age 18) and $4.5 \%$ were drivers over age 60 (see Table 3a).
- Males comprised 77.2\% of all 2019 DUI arrests, about the same as in 2018 (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen from $10.6 \%$ in 1989 to $22.8 \%$ in 2019.
- Based on data from the Department of Justice (DOJ), Hispanic drivers (51.6\%) were the largest racial/ethnic group among 2019 DUI arrestees, as has been the case each year for over a decade. Hispanic individuals continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population ( $36.7 \%$ in 2019). This is shown in Figure 3.


## Section 2: Convictions

- $71.1 \%$ of 2018 DUI arrests resulted in convictions for DUI offenses (see Table 6).
- $6.0 \%$ of DUI convictions among those arrested in 2018 were driving under the influence of drugs (DUID) convictions. This represents a slight increase from 5.7\% among DUI offenders arrested in 2017, which was itself marginally higher than the $5.5 \%$ among DUI offenders arrested in 2016 (see Table 5a).
- Among convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018, $72.5 \%$ were first offenders and $27.5 \%$ were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 10 years), relatively unchanged from 2017 (see Table 8). The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989 , when it stood at $37 \%$, even though prior DUI convictions are currently retained on record, and thus counted, longer than in the past ( 10 years compared to 7 years in 1989).
- The median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on Administrative Per Se (APS) forms, was $0.16 \%$ in 2018, which is double the California illegal per se BAC limit of $0.08 \%$ (see Table 7a).
- In 2018, $18.9 \%$ of DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) records, higher than the value in 2017 ( $17.6 \%$; see Table 6). This percentage has seen a considerable increase over the course of 8 years (it was $15.5 \%$ in 2010).


## Section 3: Postconviction Sanctions

- The most frequent court sanction for all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018 was probation ( $96.0 \%$ ), while the least frequently imposed court sanction was ignition interlock (9.3\%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in $75.5 \%$ of the cases (see Table 9a).
- Among first DUI offenders arrested in 2018, 67.8\% were sentenced to jail, compared to $95.9 \%$ of all repeat offenders (see Table 9a).
- The majority (59.1\%) of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who installed an IID subsequent to their arrest were first offenders from the AB 91 pilot counties; between $37 \%$ and $50 \%$ of first DUI offenders in each pilot county (Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare) installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date (see Table 10b).


## Section 4: Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness

- The 1-year DUI reoffense rate for first DUI offenders arrested in 2018 was $4.0 \%$ compared to $7.6 \%$ in 1990. The 1 -year reoffense rate for second DUI offenders was $5.3 \%$ compared to $9.7 \%$ in 1990. Each of these represents approximately $45 \%$ to $47 \%$ fewer reoffenses compared to that of 1990 arrestees (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- Long-term reoffense rates, those occurring over years following an initial DUI conviction, are higher among those with more DUI priors (within 10 years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers (see Figures $8 \mathrm{~b}, 8 \mathrm{c}$, and 8 d ).
- Of the DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who, by court order, enrolled in a DUI program, $85.9 \%$ of first offenders and $38.2 \%$ of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 13).


## Section 5: License Suspension/Revocation Actions

- The total number of both DMV APS and DUI postconviction suspension or revocation actions decreased by $0.9 \%$ in 2019. After a marginal increase in 2018, this potentially resumes a declining trend that started in 2008 (see Table 15).
- In 2019, 117,067 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 74.0\% were first-offender actions (including "zero tolerance" actions taken for drivers under age 21 ) and $26.0 \%$ were repeat-offender actions (see Table 15).


## Section 6: Drivers in Crashes Involving Alcohol and Drugs

- While the number of alcohol-involved fatalities declined by about $12 \%$ over the past 24 years, the number of drug-involved fatalities tripled over the same time period (see Figure 11).
- Of all 2018 DUI arrests, $20.5 \%$ were associated with a reported traffic crash, whereas $8.1 \%$ were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities. Both of these statistics have been fairly stable since 2016 (see Table 17).
- In 2018, three-fourths (74.5\%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction. In contrast, the majority (59.0\%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved injury crashes had at least one prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 24a).


## DUI-MIS Dashboards

Starting in 2022, the data presented in the DUI-MIS reports can also be viewed as a set of online dashboards prepared and maintained by the Research \& Development Branch of the California Department of Motor Vehicles. To access these dashboards, visit the DMV's website at: https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv-research-reports/research-development-data-dashboards/dui-management-information-system-dashboards/.
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## INTRODUCTION

This report is the thirtieth Annual Report of the California Driving Under the Influence Management Information System (DUI-MIS), produced in response to Assembly Bill 757 (Friedman), Chapter 450, 1989 legislative session, adding Section 1821 to the California Vehicle Code (see Appendix A). This bill requires 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-MIS was developed by Helander (1989) and 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 subsequent years, as the sanctions became increasingly homogenous within each offender group, the evaluations (as mandated by law) became focused on available sanctions within selected groups. These evaluations are detailed in Section 4 on "Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness."


Figure 1. DUI management information system.

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. The publication of these data may assist others in making policy decisions, formulating improvements, and conducting more in-depth evaluations.

The DUI-MIS data system and report have led to numerous improvements in the California DUI system, from the identification of minor errors in processing and/or reporting of DUI data, to major initiatives to improve the tracking and reporting of DUI cases. The success of the California DUIMIS has also contributed to a national initiative to design a model DUI reporting system, developed under contract for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

## DUI Arrest Data:

Arrest data are reported to the 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 $1994 .{ }^{1}$ In addition, when data are entered into DOJ's 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 annual number of DUI arrests.

## 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 information. Conviction data are subject to change since abstracts of conviction can be amended, corrected, or dismissed after the initial abstract of conviction is reported to DMV. Also, reporting, and non- reporting errors can occur as with DUI arrest data.

## Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Crash Data:

Crash data are reported to the 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.
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## SECTION 1:

## DUI ARRESTS

## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS

The information on driving under the influence (DUI) arrests presented below 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. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 1: DUI Arrests by County, 2017-2019 and Annual Percentage Change, 2018-2019. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2017-2019 and the percentage change from 2018 to 2019 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2019 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2019 DUI arrests by arrest type (i.e., felony, juvenile, or misdemeanor arrests), by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2019 DUI Arrests by Age, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a cross-tabulates age by gender and age by race/ethnicity of 2019 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Also, Table 3a shows the median age for 2019 arrestees. Table 3b shows the same data cross-tabulated by gender and age within race/ethnicity.

Table 3c: DUI Arrests Under Age 21, 2009-2019. Table 3c shows a breakdown of DUI arrests under 21, by age, from 2009 to 2019. It also shows the proportion of total DUI arrests under 21 for the state over the same time period.

Figure 2: DUI Arrests, 2009-2019. Figure 2 displays the trend in DUI arrests from 2009 to 2019.

Figure 3: Percentage of 2019 DUI Arrests and 2019 Projected Population (Age 15 and Over, based on the 2010 Census) by Race/Ethnicity. Figure 3 shows the percentages of 2019 DUI arrests and 2019 projected population by race/ethnicity.


Note. Due to the non-reporting of DUI arrest data by CHP for the month of April 2011, an undercount is present in the figures for 2011 (with approximately 6,500 fewer total DUI arrests).

Figure 2. DUI arrests, 2009-2019.

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

## Statewide Parameters

- DUI arrests decreased by $2.6 \%$ in 2019, after increasing by $3.1 \%$ in 2018. DUI arrests have decreased after one year of increase in 2018, which itself followed a nine-year trend of continuous decline (see DUI Summary Statistics and Table 1).
- Table 2 shows that the DUI arrest rate per 100 licensed drivers was 0.5 in 2019, which is the same as it has been each year since 2015. The 2019 rate represents a $72 \%$ reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
- The percentage of felony DUI arrests in 2019 was $3.9 \%$, relatively unchanged from $3.8 \%$ in 2018. This type of DUI arrest constitutes a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).


## County Variation

- Of all 2019 California DUI arrests, 19.0\% occurred in Los Angeles County. Three counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, and Orange) had over 9,000 DUI arrests each, together accounting for $35.2 \%$ of all arrests (see Table 2).
- The 2019 county DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.2 to 1.4 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers (the statewide average rate was 0.5 ). Twenty two counties had arrest rates of 0.5 or below in 2019. Thirteen counties had rates of 0.4 or below: Alameda (0.4), Calaveras (0.4), El Dorado (0.4), Los Angeles (0.4), Riverside (0.4), Sacramento (0.4), San Diego (0.4), San Mateo (0.4), Yolo (0.4), Contra Costa (0.3), Placer (0.3), Santa Clara (0.3), and San Francisco (0.2). This is shown in Table 2.
- More than two thirds of California counties (69\%) had fewer DUI arrests in 2019 than in 2018. Among the 10 counties with at least 4,000 DUI arrests, the greatest percentage decrease occurred in Riverside ( $-13.3 \%$ ), while there was an increase in DUI arrests in Sacramento ( $15.6 \%$ ) and Fresno ( $9.9 \%$ ). Among the remaining 48 counties, the largest percentage decreases in DUI arrests occurred in Alpine (-47.4\%), San Benito (-34.0\%), Modoc (-21.2\%), and Lake ( $-20.6 \%$ ). Small counties showing the largest percentage increase in DUI arrests were Sierra (30.4\%) and Yuba (19.9\%). These are shown in Table 1.


## Demographic Characteristics

- The median age of a DUI arrestee in 2019 was 31 years. Almost half ( $47.1 \%$ ) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters ( $72.4 \%$ ) were age 40 or younger. Less than one percent ( $0.4 \%$ ) of all DUI arrestees were juveniles (under age 18), whereas $4.5 \%$ of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).
- Among all DUI arrestees in a year, the percentage of DUI arrests under age 18 has declined from 0.6 in 2009 to 0.4 in 2019, a $33.3 \%$ relative decrease. The percentage of DUI arrests under age 21 decreased from 8.5 in 2009 to 5.2 in 2019, a $38.8 \%$ relative decline. This is shown in Table 3c.
- Males comprised $77.2 \%$ of all 2019 DUI arrests (see Table 3a), relatively unchanged from $77.3 \%$ in 2018. The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen from $10.6 \%$ in 1989 to $22.8 \%$ in 2019.
- In 2019, Hispanic drivers (51.6\%) again represented the largest ethnic group among DUI arrestees, as they have each year for over a decade. Hispanic individuals continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2019 population parity of $36.7 \%$ (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Black individuals were also overrepresented among DUI arrestees ( $9.3 \%$ of arrests, $6.1 \%$ of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2019 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites $(31.1 \%$ of arrests, $38.7 \%$ of the population) and "Other" ( $8.0 \%$ of arrests, $18.5 \%$ of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.
- Among male 2019 DUI arrestees, $55.2 \%$ were Hispanic, $27.9 \%$ were White, $9.0 \%$ were Black, and $7.8 \%$ were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, $41.8 \%$ were White, $39.4 \%$ were Hispanic, $10.3 \%$ were Black, and $8.4 \%$ were "Other" (see Table 3b).
- In 16 out of 58 counties, Hispanic drivers comprised more than half of those arrested for DUI during 2019. In particular, the following were the eight counties with the highest percentage of Hispanic DUI arrestees: Imperial (82.2\%), San Benito (76.9\%), Tulare (73.9\%), Monterey (73.0\%), Madera (72.5\%), Kings (71.7\%), Merced (70.8\%), and Fresno (65.2\%). In 33 out of the remaining 42 counties, the majority of arrestees were White (see Appendix Table B1).
- The median age of a DUI arrestee varied by race: White and Black arrestees were the oldest with a median age of 35.0 and 33.0 years, respectively, while "Other" and Hispanic arrestees had a median age of 31.0 and 30.0 years, respectively (see Table 3a).


Figure 3. Percentage of 2019 DUI arrests and 2019 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2010 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ BY COUNTY, 2017-2019 AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2018-2019

| COUNTY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | \% CHANGE 2018-2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATEWIDE | 123548 | 127437 | 124141 | -2.6 |
| ALAMEDA | 4820 | 5172 | 5123 | -0.9 |
| ALPINE | 17 | 19 | 10 | -47.4 |
| AMADOR | 176 | 175 | 164 | -6.3 |
| BUTTE | 1126 | 1062 | 961 | -9.5 |
| CALAVERAS | 237 | 168 | 158 | -6.0 |
| COLUSA | 136 | 148 | 125 | -15.5 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 2639 | 2725 | 2717 | -0.3 |
| DEL NORTE | 185 | 316 | 261 | -17.4 |
| EL DORADO | 720 | 762 | 684 | -10.2 |
| FRESNO | 3414 | 4873 | 5354 | 9.9 |
| GLENN | 168 | 165 | 143 | -13.3 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1088 | 1113 | 1038 | -6.7 |
| IMPERIAL | 674 | 866 | 764 | -11.8 |
| INYO | 100 | 99 | 110 | 11.1 |
| KERN | 3945 | 4355 | 4000 | -8.2 |
| KINGS | 690 | 838 | 807 | -3.7 |
| LAKE | 411 | 471 | 374 | -20.6 |
| LASSEN | 100 | 143 | 155 | 8.4 |
| LOS ANGELES | 25087 | 24642 | 23529 | -4.5 |
| MADERA | 1080 | 1086 | 1052 | -3.1 |
| MARIN | 991 | 1306 | 1118 | -14.4 |
| MARIPOSA | 105 | 79 | 77 | -2.5 |
| MENDOCINO | 560 | 590 | 610 | 3.4 |
| MERCED | 1313 | 1233 | 1316 | 6.7 |
| MODOC | 47 | 52 | 41 | -21.2 |
| MONO | 123 | 141 | 117 | -17.0 |
| MONTEREY | 2022 | 2114 | 2385 | 12.8 |
| NAPA | 688 | 812 | 702 | -13.5 |
| NEVADA | 426 | 465 | 443 | -4.7 |
| ORANGE | 10009 | 10934 | 11107 | 1.6 |
| PLACER | 1178 | 1139 | 994 | -12.7 |
| PLUMAS | 121 | 159 | 152 | -4.4 |
| RIVERSIDE | 8075 | 7706 | 6683 | -13.3 |
| SACRAMENTO | 3445 | 4002 | 4625 | 15.6 |
| SAN BENITO | 283 | 426 | 281 | -34.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 7785 | 7599 | 7169 | -5.7 |
| SAN DIEGO | 9866 | 9413 | 9092 | -3.4 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 841 | 909 | 934 | 2.8 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 2154 | 2087 | 2240 | 7.3 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1775 | 1799 | 1633 | -9.2 |
| SAN MATEO | 2281 | 2364 | 2269 | -4.0 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 1848 | 1822 | 1811 | -0.6 |
| SANTA CLARA | 4176 | 4303 | 4003 | -7.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1416 | 1508 | 1623 | 7.6 |
| SHASTA | 794 | 770 | 666 | -13.5 |
| SIERRA | 28 | 23 | 30 | 30.4 |
| SISKIYOU | 300 | 291 | 228 | -21.6 |
| SOLANO | 1759 | 1806 | 1625 | -10.0 |
| SONOMA | 2380 | 2322 | 2382 | 2.6 |
| STANISLAUS | 1941 | 1984 | 2187 | 10.2 |
| SUTTER | 438 | 511 | 418 | -18.2 |
| TEHAMA | 326 | 391 | 386 | -1.3 |
| TRINITY | 144 | 146 | 125 | -14.4 |
| TULARE | 2514 | 2511 | 2711 | 8.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 304 | 335 | 352 | 5.1 |
| VENTURA | 3264 | 3333 | 3105 | -6.8 |
| YOLO | 586 | 528 | 581 | 10.0 |
| YUBA | 429 | 326 | 391 | 19.9 |

${ }^{a}$ DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI $(N=140)$ removed.

TABLE 2: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

| COUNTY | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF DUI ARREST |  |  |  |  |  | DUI ARRESTS PER <br> 100 LICENSED DRIVERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FELONY |  | JUVENILE |  | MISDEMEANOR |  |  |
|  | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |  |
| STATEWIDE | 124141 | 100.0 | 4887 | 3.9 | 484 | 0.4 | 118770 | 95.7 | 0.5 |
| ALAMEDA | 5123 | 4.1 | 77 | 1.5 | 14 | 0.3 | 5032 | 98.2 | 0.4 |
| ALPINE | 10 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 0.9 |
| AMADOR | 164 | 0.1 | 5 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 159 | 97.0 | 0.5 |
| BUTTE | 961 | 0.8 | 39 | 4.1 | 4 | 0.4 | 918 | 95.5 | 0.6 |
| CALAVERAS | 158 | 0.1 | 4 | 2.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 153 | 96.8 | 0.4 |
| COLUSA | 125 | 0.1 | 6 | 4.8 | 1 | 0.8 | 118 | 94.4 | 0.8 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 2717 | 2.2 | 98 | 3.6 | 14 | 0.5 | 2605 | 95.9 | 0.3 |
| DEL NORTE | 261 | 0.2 | 6 | 2.3 | 2 | 0.8 | 253 | 96.9 | 1.4 |
| EL DORADO | 684 | 0.6 | 29 | 4.2 | 6 | 0.9 | 649 | 94.9 | 0.4 |
| FRESNO | 5354 | 4.3 | 140 | 2.6 | 24 | 0.4 | 5190 | 96.9 | 0.9 |
| GLENN | 143 | 0.1 | 4 | 2.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 139 | 97.2 | 0.7 |
| HUMBOLDT | 1038 | 0.8 | 20 | 1.9 | 6 | 0.6 | 1012 | 97.5 | 1.1 |
| IMPERIAL | 764 | 0.6 | 21 | 2.7 | 4 | 0.5 | 739 | 96.7 | 0.6 |
| INYO | 110 | 0.1 | 2 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 108 | 98.2 | 0.8 |
| KERN | 4000 | 3.2 | 115 | 2.9 | 13 | 0.3 | 3872 | 96.8 | 0.7 |
| KINGS | 807 | 0.7 | 21 | 2.6 | 2 | 0.2 | 784 | 97.1 | 1.0 |
| LAKE | 374 | 0.3 | 14 | 3.7 | 2 | 0.5 | 358 | 95.7 | 0.8 |
| LASSEN | 155 | 0.1 | 5 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 150 | 96.8 | 0.8 |
| LOS ANGELES | 23529 | 19.0 | 1071 | 4.6 | 37 | 0.2 | 22421 | 95.3 | 0.4 |
| MADERA | 1052 | 0.8 | 30 | 2.9 | 5 | 0.5 | 1017 | 96.7 | 1.1 |
| MARIN | 1118 | 0.9 | 34 | 3.0 | 9 | 0.8 | 1075 | 96.2 | 0.6 |
| MARIPOSA | 77 | 0.1 | 3 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 74 | 96.1 | 0.5 |
| MENDOCINO | 610 | 0.5 | 16 | 2.6 | 4 | 0.7 | 590 | 96.7 | 0.9 |
| MERCED | 1316 | 1.1 | 53 | 4.0 | 3 | 0.2 | 1260 | 95.7 | 0.8 |
| MODOC | 41 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 40 | 97.6 | 0.6 |
| MONO | 117 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 | 115 | 98.3 | 1.2 |
| MONTEREY | 2385 | 1.9 | 111 | 4.7 | 13 | 0.5 | 2261 | 94.8 | 0.9 |
| NAPA | 702 | 0.6 | 34 | 4.8 | 3 | 0.4 | 665 | 94.7 | 0.7 |
| NEVADA | 443 | 0.4 | 6 | 1.4 | 4 | 0.9 | 433 | 97.7 | 0.5 |
| ORANGE | 11107 | 8.9 | 302 | 2.7 | 37 | 0.3 | 10768 | 96.9 | 0.5 |
| PLACER | 994 | 0.8 | 50 | 5.0 | 6 | 0.6 | 938 | 94.4 | 0.3 |
| PLUMAS | 152 | 0.1 | 2 | 1.3 | 2 | 1.3 | 148 | 97.4 | 0.9 |
| RIVERSIDE | 6683 | 5.4 | 223 | 3.3 | 29 | 0.4 | 6431 | 96.2 | 0.4 |
| SACRAMENTO | 4625 | 3.7 | 317 | 6.9 | 17 | 0.4 | 4291 | 92.8 | 0.4 |
| SAN BENITO | 281 | 0.2 | 6 | 2.1 | 2 | 0.7 | 273 | 97.2 | 0.6 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 7169 | 5.8 | 345 | 4.8 | 14 | 0.2 | 6810 | 95.0 | 0.5 |
| SAN DIEGO | 9092 | 7.3 | 441 | 4.9 | 33 | 0.4 | 8618 | 94.8 | 0.4 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 934 | 0.8 | 62 | 6.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 872 | 93.4 | 0.2 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 2240 | 1.8 | 93 | 4.2 | 7 | 0.3 | 2140 | 95.5 | 0.5 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1633 | 1.3 | 53 | 3.2 | 18 | 1.1 | 1562 | 95.7 | 0.8 |
| SAN MATEO | 2269 | 1.8 | 73 | 3.2 | 9 | 0.4 | 2187 | 96.4 | 0.4 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 1811 | 1.5 | 78 | 4.3 | 21 | 1.2 | 1712 | 94.5 | 0.6 |
| SANTA CLARA | 4003 | 3.2 | 240 | 6.0 | 18 | 0.4 | 3745 | 93.6 | 0.3 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1623 | 1.3 | 52 | 3.2 | 7 | 0.4 | 1564 | 96.4 | 0.8 |
| SHASTA | 666 | 0.5 | 30 | 4.5 | 6 | 0.9 | 630 | 94.6 | 0.5 |
| SIERRA | 30 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 28 | 93.3 | 1.2 |
| SISKIYOU | 228 | 0.2 | 7 | 3.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 221 | 96.9 | 0.6 |
| SOLANO | 1625 | 1.3 | 41 | 2.5 | 7 | 0.4 | 1577 | 97.0 | 0.5 |
| SONOMA | 2382 | 1.9 | 86 | 3.6 | 16 | 0.7 | 2280 | 95.7 | 0.6 |
| STANISLAUS | 2187 | 1.8 | 103 | 4.7 | 10 | 0.5 | 2074 | 94.8 | 0.6 |
| SUTTER | 418 | 0.3 | 20 | 4.8 | 3 | 0.7 | 395 | 94.5 | 0.6 |
| TEHAMA | 386 | 0.3 | 14 | 3.6 | 2 | 0.5 | 370 | 95.9 | 0.9 |
| TRINITY | 125 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 124 | 99.2 | 1.3 |
| TULARE | 2711 | 2.2 | 101 | 3.7 | 15 | 0.6 | 2595 | 95.7 | 1.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 352 | 0.3 | 9 | 2.6 | 3 | 0.9 | 340 | 96.6 | 0.8 |
| VENTURA | 3105 | 2.5 | 143 | 4.6 | 26 | 0.8 | 2936 | 94.6 | 0.5 |
| YOLO | 581 | 0.5 | 19 | 3.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 562 | 96.7 | 0.4 |
| YUBA | 391 | 0.3 | 8 | 2.0 | 4 | 1.0 | 379 | 96.9 | 0.8 |

TABLE 3a: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| AGE | TOTAL |  | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 124141 | 100.0 | 95839 | 77.2 | 28302 | 22.8 | 38627 | 31.1 | 64058 | 51.6 | 11554 | 9.3 | 9902 | 8.0 |
| UNDER 18 | 486 | 0.4 | 372 | 76.5 | 114 | 23.5 | 167 | 34.4 | 281 | 57.8 | 12 | 2.5 | 26 | 5.3 |
| 18-20 | 5986 | 4.8 | 4761 | 79.5 | 1225 | 20.5 | 1341 | 22.4 | 3917 | 65.4 | 282 | 4.7 | 446 | 7.5 |
| 21-30 | 52068 | 41.9 | 39713 | 76.3 | 12355 | 23.7 | 13190 | 25.3 | 30114 | 57.8 | 4433 | 8.5 | 4331 | 8.3 |
| 31-40 | 31415 | 25.3 | 24592 | 78.3 | 6823 | 21.7 | 9148 | 29.1 | 16485 | 52.5 | 3139 | 10.0 | 2643 | 8.4 |
| 41-50 | 17201 | 13.9 | 13336 | 77.5 | 3865 | 22.5 | 5949 | 34.6 | 8120 | 47.2 | 1788 | 10.4 | 1344 | 7.8 |
| 51-60 | 11424 | 9.2 | 8813 | 77.1 | 2611 | 22.9 | 5470 | 47.9 | 3877 | 33.9 | 1303 | 11.4 | 774 | 6.8 |
| 61-70 | 4669 | 3.8 | 3578 | 76.6 | 1091 | 23.4 | 2737 | 58.6 | 1112 | 23.8 | 543 | 11.6 | 277 | 5.9 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 892 | 0.7 | 674 | 75.6 | 218 | 24.4 | 625 | 70.1 | 152 | 17.0 | 54 | 6.1 | 61 | 6.8 |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 31.0 |  | 31.0 |  | 31.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 33.0 |  | 31.0 |  |

TABLE 3b: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY GENDER, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| GENDER | AGE | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  | N | \% | $N$ | \% | N | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 124141 | 100.0 | 38627 | 31.1 | 64058 | 51.6 | 11554 | 9.3 | 9902 | 8.0 |
| MALE | UNDER 18 | 372 | 0.4 | 120 | 32.3 | 225 | 60.5 | 7 | 1.9 | 20 | 5.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 4761 | 5.0 | 994 | 20.9 | 3220 | 67.6 | 205 | 4.3 | 342 | 7.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 39713 | 41.4 | 9210 | 23.2 | 24132 | 60.8 | 3171 | 8.0 | 3200 | 8.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 24592 | 25.7 | 6413 | 26.1 | 13848 | 56.3 | 2340 | 9.5 | 1991 | 8.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 13336 | 13.9 | 3971 | 29.8 | 6951 | 52.1 | 1381 | 10.4 | 1033 | 7.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 8813 | 9.2 | 3731 | 42.3 | 3399 | 38.6 | 1026 | 11.6 | 657 | 7.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 3578 | 3.7 | 1906 | 53.3 | 999 | 27.9 | 455 | 12.7 | 218 | 6.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 674 | 0.7 | 439 | 65.1 | 133 | 19.7 | 51 | 7.6 | 51 | 7.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 95839 | 100.0 | 26784 | 27.9 | 52907 | 55.2 | 8636 | 9.0 | 7512 | 7.8 |
| FEMALE | UNDER 18 | 114 | 0.4 | 47 | 41.2 | 56 | 49.1 | 5 | 4.4 | 6 | 5.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 1225 | 4.3 | 347 | 28.3 | 697 | 56.9 | 77 | 6.3 | 104 | 8.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 12355 | 43.7 | 3980 | 32.2 | 5982 | 48.4 | 1262 | 10.2 | 1131 | 9.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 6823 | 24.1 | 2735 | 40.1 | 2637 | 38.6 | 799 | 11.7 | 652 | 9.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 3865 | 13.7 | 1978 | 51.2 | 1169 | 30.2 | 407 | 10.5 | 311 | 8.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 2611 | 9.2 | 1739 | 66.6 | 478 | 18.3 | 277 | 10.6 | 117 | 4.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 1091 | 3.9 | 831 | 76.2 | 113 | 10.4 | 88 | 8.1 | 59 | 5.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 218 | 0.8 | 186 | 85.3 | 19 | 8.7 | 3 | 1.4 | 10 | 4.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 28302 | 100.0 | 11843 | 41.8 | 11151 | 39.4 | 2918 | 10.3 | 2390 | 8.4 |

TABLE 3c: DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 2009-2019

| AGE |  | 2009 | 2010 | $2011^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (ALL | $N$ | 208531 | 195879 | 180212 | 172893 | 160388 | 154743 | 141372 | 130054 | 123548 | 127437 | 124141 |
| AGES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNDER | $N$ | 1262 | 1085 | 891 | 746 | 600 | 529 | 517 | 496 | 539 | 526 | 486 |
|  | $\%$ | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| $18-20$ | $N$ | 16382 | 14859 | 13073 | 11767 | 9846 | 9048 | 8084 | 7627 | 6624 | 6345 | 5986 |
|  | $\%$ | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 4.8 |
| UNDER | $N$ | 17644 | 15944 | 13964 | 12513 | 10446 | 9577 | 8601 | 8123 | 7163 | 6871 | 6472 |
|  | $\%$ | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.2 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The non-reporting of approximately 6,500 DUI arrests by CHP for the month of April 2011 is reflected in this table's 2011 figures.

## SECTION 2:

## CONVICTIONS

## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of driving under the influence (DUI) arrests are reported directly to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on court abstracts of conviction. Although the DUI arrest data reported earlier are based on arrests that occurred in 2019, the DUI conviction data are based on convictions of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 in order to allow sufficient time for courts to report convictions to DMV. Tables in this section presents combined and cross-tabulated DUI conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. In what follows, expressions like "2018 convictions" refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2018 and subsequently convicted. Starting with the 2013 DUI Management Information System (DUI-MIS) report, the data source, placement, and type of information provided in Figure 4 and Tables 5 and 6 have changed. In particular, since some DUI arrest data from the Department of Justice (DOJ) Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system could not be matched to the driver records on the DMV database, the information in Table 6 is estimated based only on DUI cases whose arrest and/or conviction were found on the DMV database ("matchable DUI cases"). Starting with the 2019 DUI-MIS report, separate information on drug-specific DUI conviction (DUID) is presented in this section in addition to existing overall DUI conviction information. This section contains the following tables and figures:

Table 4a: DUI Convictions by Age and Gender for 2018 DUI Arrests. This table cross tabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and gender. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 4b: DUID Convictions by Age and Gender for 2018 DUI Arrests. This table cross tabulates statewide DUID conviction information by age and gender.

Table 5a: DUI and DUID Convictions by County among DUI Offenders, 2015-2018. This table shows the total numbers of DUI and DUID convictions statewide and by county among DUI offenders arrested in the years 2015-2018. It also shows the percentages of DUID convictions of the total DUI convictions for those years.

Table 5b: DUI Conviction Data for 2018 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows county and statewide DUI-related conviction data (felony and misdemeanor DUI convictions as well as alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions) as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. For DUI convictions, it also shows the median adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, both statewide and by county.

Table 5c: DUID Conviction Data for 2018 DUI Arrests By County. This table shows county and statewide DUID conviction data (violations of CVC 23152 and CVC 23153 involving either drugs alone or the combined influence of alcohol and drugs) as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. The table also shows the median adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to DUID conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, both statewide and by county.

Table 6: Adjudication Status of 2018 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows information on DUI conviction rates and adjudication status (court disposition) of 2018 DUI arrests statewide and by county. It includes the estimated percentages of arrests that resulted in DUI convictions (DUI conviction rates), misdemeanor and felony DUI convictions, reckless driving convictions (alcohol/drug and non-alcohol/drug related), other convictions, and the percentage of DUI arrests with no record of any conviction. Starting with the 2013 DUI-MIS report, these estimates are limited to DUI arrests or individual cases from the MACR file for which a matching arrest and/or conviction was found in the DMV database. These arrest cases were tracked individually to determine their final adjudication status. In early DUI-MIS reports, the information on DUI conviction rates and adjudication status in this table was obtained by dividing the total number of convictions by the total number of arrests, either statewide or by county, without matching individual cases. Starting with 2010 DUI conviction rates, this information is estimated by tracking matched individual DUI arrest cases and by calculating percentages of those that resulted in conviction of DUI, of some other type of violation, and those that resulted in no conviction.

Table 7a: Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI and Alcohol- or DrugReckless Convictions for 2018 DUI Arrests and Table 7b: Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Convicted DUI Offenders Under Age 21 Arrested in 2018. Table 7a shows the frequency of reported BAC levels for DUI and alcohol- or drug-reckless convictions, whereas Table 7 b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21. Administrative Per Se (APS) forms, submitted following most DUI arrests, are used here to calculate statewide BAC levels because they report this information more completely than do abstracts of conviction.

Table 8: DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Reported BAC Level for 2018 DUI Arrests. This table displays the percentages of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in 10 years), with the average (mean) and median BAC level from APS reporting forms for each offense level.

Figure 4: DUI Convictions and Conviction Rates Based on Arrest Year, 2009-2018. Figure 4 shows, for the years 2008 to 2017, the total number of DUI convictions and DUI conviction rates based on the violation year.


| DUI conviction rate <br> (percent convicted) | $77.2 \%$ | $73.1 \%^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $73.3 \% \mathrm{a}$ | $73.7 \%^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $72.5 \%^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $72.7 \% \mathrm{o}^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $72.6 \%$ | $73.6 \%$ | $72.9 \%$ | $71.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

${ }^{2}$ DUI conviction rates for 2010 and later are based on different data extraction procedures than those used in the past and are not comparable to prior years.

Figure 4. DUI convictions and conviction rates based on arrest year, 2009-2018.
Based on this report's DUI conviction data, the following statements can be made:

## Statewide Adjudication Parameters

- In 2018, 71.1\% of DUI arrests resulted in convictions for DUI offenses (see Table 6).
- Based on the DUI conviction data for arrests within 10 years (2009-2018), 3.6\% of all California drivers (including those who do not have a permanent driving record) have one or more DUI convictions on their record.
- The percentage of DUID convictions of the total DUI convictions in California increased slightly from $5.7 \%$ among DUI offenders arrested in 2017 to $6.0 \%$ among those arrested in 2018, which is higher than the $4.7 \%$ among DUI offenders arrested in 2015. Although, the number of DUID convictions increased by $5.2 \%$, from 5,339 in 2017 to 5,618 in 2018, the total number of DUI convictions increased only by $0.3 \%$ in the same time period (see Table 5a).
- Among 2018 DUI arrests, $7.4 \%$ resulted in alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions and $1.5 \%$ resulted in reckless driving convictions not alcohol- or drug-related (see Table 6).
- Among 2018 DUI arrests, $1.0 \%$ resulted in convictions for offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, such as speed contest or driving with a suspended or revoked license (see Table 6).
- Among 2018 statewide DUI arrests, 18.9\% have not yet resulted in any conviction that could be found on DMV's database. In just under half of all counties (26 out of 58), no record of conviction could be found for $20 \%$ or more of 2018 DUI arrests (see Table 6).
- The average (mean) reported non-zero BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was $0.169 \%$, the same as in 2017. The midpoint (median) BAC level reported was $0.16 \%$. Both measures are at least double the illegal per se BAC limit of $0.08 \%$ (see Table 7a).
- The average (mean) and median non-zero BAC levels increased as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions. The average BAC level increased from $0.165 \%$ BAC for first offenders to $0.192 \%$ BAC for fourth-or-subsequent offenders (the median BAC level increased from $0.16 \%$ BAC for first offenders to $0.19 \%$ BAC for fourth-or-subsequent offenders). This is shown in Table 8.
- Among 2018 DUI arrestees subsequently convicted, $72.5 \%$ were first offenders, $20.5 \%$ were second offenders, $5.3 \%$ were third offenders, and $1.7 \%$ were fourth-or-more offenders. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors for DUI in California is 10 years.) The proportion of all convicted DUI offenders that are repeat offenders (27.5\%), shown in Table 8, has increased ever since the counting period for priors changed from 7 to 10 years (by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective $1 / 1 / 2005$ ). For example, in the last year before the change in criteria for counting prior convictions (2004), the percentage of repeat offenders was $23.5 \%$ versus $27.5 \%$ in 2018.
- The median adjudication time lags were 132 days from DUI arrest to DUI conviction and 6 days from conviction to update on the DMV database, totaling over 4 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record (see Table 5b). However, the median adjudication time from DUI arrest to conviction is $72 \%$ longer for DUID convictions ( 227 days) when compared to the same adjudication time lag for overall DUI convictions (see Table 5c).


## Demographic Characteristics

- The median age of convicted DUI offenders in 2018 was 32 years, identical for females and males (see Table 4a).
- Among 2018 DUI convictees, $44.9 \%$ were 30 years of age or younger and $71.2 \%$ were 40 years or younger (see Table 4a).
- Females comprised $23.5 \%$ of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018 (see Table 4a), unchanged from $23.5 \%$ last year. In general, the proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994.
- The median age of convicted DUID offenders in 2018 was 31 years. However, females convicted of DUID are older than males, which is reflected in their median age of 35.5, compared to a median age of 30.0 for males (see Table $4 b$ ).

TABLE 4a: DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND GENDER FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 93926 | 100.0 | 71866 | 76.5 | 22060 | 23.5 |
| UNDER 18 | 56 | 0.1 | 44 | 78.6 | 12 | 21.4 |
| 18-20 | 2572 | 2.7 | 2024 | 78.7 | 548 | 21.3 |
| 21-30 | 39529 | 42.1 | 29850 | 75.5 | 9679 | 24.5 |
| 31-40 | 24748 | 26.3 | 19217 | 77.7 | 5531 | 22.3 |
| 41-50 | 13426 | 14.3 | 10359 | 77.2 | 3067 | 22.8 |
| 51-60 | 9125 | 9.7 | 6981 | 76.5 | 2144 | 23.5 |
| 61-70 | 3716 | 4.0 | 2823 | 76.0 | 893 | 24.0 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 754 | 0.8 | 568 | 75.3 | 186 | 24.7 |
| MEAN AGE (YEARS) | 35.5 |  | 35.5 |  | 35.4 |  |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 32.0 |  | 32.0 |  | 32.0 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ County-specific tabulations of 2018 DUI convictions by age and gender are shown in Appendix Table B2.

TABLE 4b: DUID CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND GENDER FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ |
| STATEWIDE | 5618 | 100.0 | 4414 | 78.6 | 1204 | 21.4 |
| UNDER 18 | 11 | 0.2 | 9 | 81.8 | 2 | 18.2 |
| $18-20$ | 361 | 6.4 | 294 | 81.4 | 67 | 18.6 |
| $21-30$ | 2379 | 42.3 | 1999 | 84.0 | 380 | 16.0 |
| $31-40$ | 1405 | 25.0 | 1088 | 77.4 | 317 | 22.6 |
| $41-50$ | 745 | 13.3 | 539 | 72.3 | 206 | 27.7 |
| 51-60 | 523 | 9.3 | 351 | 67.1 | 172 | 32.9 |
| 61-70 | 180 | 3.2 | 124 | 68.9 | 56 | 31.1 |
| 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 0.2 | 10 | 71.4 | 4 | 28.6 |
| MEAN AGE (YEARS) | 34.1 |  |  | 33.2 | 37.3 |  |
| MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) | 31.0 |  |  |  | 30.0 | 35.5 |

[^1]TABLE 5a: DUI AND DUID CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY AMONG DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2015-2018

| COUNTY | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 106627 | 5021 | 4.7 | 98430 | 5414 | 5.5 | 93606 | 5339 | 5.7 | 93926 | 5618 | 6.0 |
| ALAMEDA | 2927 | 69 | 2.4 | 2481 | 43 | 1.7 | 2209 | 40 | 1.8 | 2292 | 41 | 1.8 |
| ALPINE | 16 | 0 | 0.0 | 20 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 | 1 | 6.3 |
| AMADOR | 136 | 8 | 5.9 | 135 | 7 | 5.2 | 134 | 2 | 1.5 | 151 | 3 | 2.0 |
| BUTTE | 950 | 53 | 5.6 | 968 | 43 | 4.4 | 904 | 35 | 3.9 | 840 | 52 | 6.2 |
| CALAVERAS | 214 | 31 | 14.5 | 210 | 20 | 9.5 | 178 | 15 | 8.4 | 125 | 8 | 6.4 |
| COLUSA | 124 | 13 | 10.5 | 131 | 13 | 9.9 | 99 | 12 | 12.1 | 112 | 9 | 8.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 2016 | 12 | 0.6 | 1681 | 12 | 0.7 | 1649 | 36 | 2.2 | 1704 | 43 | 2.5 |
| DEL NORTE | 74 | 2 | 2.7 | 110 | 2 | 1.8 | 109 | 2 | 1.8 | 165 | 2 | 1.2 |
| EL DORADO | 654 | 42 | 6.4 | 640 | 48 | 7.5 | 641 | 44 | 6.9 | 621 | 37 | 6.0 |
| FRESNO | 4043 | 246 | 6.1 | 3555 | 197 | 5.5 | 3183 | 137 | 4.3 | 3695 | 155 | 4.2 |
| GLENN | 126 | 12 | 9.5 | 128 | 14 | 10.9 | 125 | 7 | 5.6 | 104 | 5 | 4.8 |
| HUMBOLDT | 713 | 57 | 8.0 | 787 | 48 | 6.1 | 722 | 32 | 4.4 | 729 | 10 | 1.4 |
| IMPERIAL | 457 | 5 | 1.1 | 426 | 6 | 1.4 | 420 | 4 | 1.0 | 394 | 3 | 0.8 |
| INYO | 125 | 11 | 8.8 | 104 | 0 | 0.0 | 105 | 9 | 8.6 | 76 | 4 | 5.3 |
| KERN | 2948 | 215 | 7.3 | 2799 | 177 | 6.3 | 2733 | 208 | 7.6 | 2887 | 227 | 7.9 |
| KINGS | 473 | 42 | 8.9 | 411 | 33 | 8.0 | 462 | 29 | 6.3 | 640 | 54 | 8.4 |
| LAKE | 303 | 24 | 7.9 | 293 | 36 | 12.3 | 310 | 20 | 6.5 | 297 | 16 | 5.4 |
| LASSEN | 108 | 5 | 4.6 | 94 | 3 | 3.2 | 57 | 3 | 5.3 | 87 | 2 | 2.3 |
| LOS ANGELES | 22040 | 907 | 4.1 | 19673 | 968 | 4.9 | 17984 | 749 | 4.2 | 17472 | 672 | 3.8 |
| MADERA | 479 | 28 | 5.8 | 576 | 57 | 9.9 | 609 | 47 | 7.7 | 657 | 29 | 4.4 |
| MARIN | 1139 | 53 | 4.7 | 1022 | 32 | 3.1 | 863 | 37 | 4.3 | 1072 | 55 | 5.1 |
| MARIPOSA | 84 | 2 | 2.4 | 47 | 2 | 4.3 | 80 | 2 | 2.5 | 56 | 2 | 3.6 |
| MENDOCINO | 401 | 9 | 2.2 | 476 | 22 | 4.6 | 451 | 38 | 8.4 | 488 | 34 | 7.0 |
| MERCED | 774 | 3 | 0.4 | 771 | 11 | 1.4 | 899 | 14 | 1.6 | 854 | 18 | 2.1 |
| MODOC | 37 | 1 | 2.7 | 21 | 2 | 9.5 | 28 | 4 | 14.3 | 29 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONO | 101 | 5 | 5.0 | 77 | 2 | 2.6 | 89 | 4 | 4.5 | 103 | 3 | 2.9 |
| MONTEREY | 1743 | 103 | 5.9 | 1726 | 63 | 3.7 | 1474 | 63 | 4.3 | 1624 | 55 | 3.4 |
| NAPA | 783 | 15 | 1.9 | 654 | 11 | 1.7 | 586 | 21 | 3.6 | 638 | 28 | 4.4 |
| NEVADA | 408 | 9 | 2.2 | 358 | 6 | 1.7 | 418 | 18 | 4.3 | 472 | 14 | 3.0 |
| ORANGE | 10428 | 1100 | 10.5 | 9779 | 1173 | 12.0 | 9100 | 1236 | 13.6 | 9222 | 1271 | 13.8 |
| PLACER | 1227 | 151 | 12.3 | 1176 | 130 | 11.1 | 1080 | 110 | 10.2 | 1036 | 111 | 10.7 |
| PLUMAS | 90 | 3 | 3.3 | 103 | 7 | 6.8 | 82 | 4 | 4.9 | 98 | 1 | 1.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | 6494 | 90 | 1.4 | 6010 | 157 | 2.6 | 6179 | 491 | 7.9 | 6135 | 577 | 9.4 |
| SACRAMENTO | 4517 | 332 | 7.4 | 4363 | 489 | 11.2 | 4395 | 409 | 9.3 | 4284 | 541 | 12.6 |
| SAN BENITO | 203 | 15 | 7.4 | 195 | 9 | 4.6 | 234 | 12 | 5.1 | 327 | 41 | 12.5 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 5302 | 91 | 1.7 | 5233 | 166 | 3.2 | 5050 | 91 | 1.8 | 4753 | 147 | 3.1 |
| SAN DIEGO | 8731 | 375 | 4.3 | 8047 | 527 | 6.5 | 7866 | 478 | 6.1 | 7614 | 415 | 5.5 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 692 | 24 | 3.5 | 448 | 12 | 2.7 | 419 | 3 | 0.7 | 396 | 8 | 2.0 |

TABLE 5a: DUI AND DUID CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY AMONG DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2015-2018

| COUNTY | 2015 |  |  | 2016 |  |  | 2017 |  |  | 2018 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  | DUI | DUID |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |  | $N$ | \% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 2085 | 57 | 2.7 | 1914 | 85 | 4.4 | 1668 | 93 | 5.6 | 1365 | 47 | 3.4 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1441 | 61 | 4.2 | 1355 | 98 | 7.2 | 1494 | 89 | 6.0 | 1499 | 96 | 6.4 |
| SAN MATEO | 1871 | 17 | 0.9 | 1774 | 32 | 1.8 | 1609 | 24 | 1.5 | 1610 | 29 | 1.8 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 1702 | 19 | 1.1 | 1629 | 26 | 1.6 | 1493 | 49 | 3.3 | 1446 | 48 | 3.3 |
| SANTA CLARA | 4266 | 48 | 1.1 | 3638 | 25 | 0.7 | 3457 | 48 | 1.4 | 3247 | 94 | 2.9 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1009 | 29 | 2.9 | 914 | 41 | 4.5 | 1017 | 27 | 2.7 | 1085 | 38 | 3.5 |
| SHASTA | 627 | 33 | 5.3 | 600 | 24 | 4.0 | 611 | 32 | 5.2 | 605 | 49 | 8.1 |
| SIERRA | 13 | 1 | 7.7 | 9 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 162 | 4 | 2.5 | 126 | 0 | 0.0 | 152 | 1 | 0.7 | 177 | 3 | 1.7 |
| SOLANO | 985 | 13 | 1.3 | 1004 | 9 | 0.9 | 1038 | 20 | 1.9 | 999 | 15 | 1.5 |
| SONOMA | 2276 | 96 | 4.2 | 2086 | 74 | 3.5 | 1491 | 31 | 2.1 | 2047 | 80 | 3.9 |
| STANISLAUS | 1589 | 67 | 4.2 | 1587 | 61 | 3.8 | 1609 | 81 | 5.0 | 1537 | 68 | 4.4 |
| SUTTER | 326 | 26 | 8.0 | 311 | 25 | 8.0 | 275 | 27 | 9.8 | 321 | 21 | 6.5 |
| TEHAMA | 232 | 3 | 1.3 | 180 | 8 | 4.4 | 180 | 9 | 5.0 | 226 | 8 | 3.5 |
| TRINITY | 59 | 3 | 5.1 | 75 | 4 | 5.3 | 59 | 1 | 1.7 | 43 | 4 | 9.3 |
| TULARE | 2083 | 124 | 6.0 | 1813 | 121 | 6.7 | 1880 | 124 | 6.6 | 1790 | 151 | 8.4 |
| TUOLUMNE | 270 | 27 | 10.0 | 239 | 22 | 9.2 | 236 | 10 | 4.2 | 240 | 10 | 4.2 |
| VENTURA | 2713 | 176 | 6.5 | 2601 | 176 | 6.8 | 2685 | 184 | 6.9 | 2757 | 143 | 5.2 |
| YOLO | 541 | 18 | 3.3 | 580 | 20 | 3.4 | 455 | 12 | 2.6 | 421 | 15 | 3.6 |
| YUBA | 297 | 36 | 12.1 | 267 | 15 | 5.6 | 249 | 11 | 4.4 | 234 | 5 | 2.1 |

TABLE 5b: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | UNDER$21 \mathrm{DUI}^{\mathrm{c}}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { VIOLATION } \\ \text { TO CONVICTION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { TO DMV UPDATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| STATEWIDE | 89431 | 4271 | 224 | 12231 | 132 | 6 |
| ALAMEDA | 2206 | 85 | 1 | 1301 | 168 | 5 |
| ALPINE | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 79 | 10 |
| AMADOR | 136 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 136 | 15 |
| BUTTE | 791 | 45 | 4 | 107 | 130 | 7 |
| CALAVERAS | 121 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 113 | 3 |
| COLUSA | 107 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 81 | 19 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 1655 | 43 | 6 | 7 | 270 | 4 |
| DEL NORTE | 158 | 5 | 2 | 54 | 97 | 9 |
| EL DORADO | 589 | 29 | 3 | 76 | 202 | 7 |
| FRESNO | 3469 | 213 | 13 | 709 | 179 | 25 |
| GLENN | 101 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 193 | 20 |
| HUMBOLDT | 718 | 8 | 3 | 113 | 135 | 14 |
| IMPERIAL | 379 | 7 | 8 | 207 | 268 | 6 |
| INYO | 73 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 133 | 2 |
| KERN | 2806 | 73 | 8 | 593 | 70 | 9 |
| KINGS | 620 | 19 | 1 | 53 | 140 | 2 |
| LAKE | 287 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 164 | 7 |
| LASSEN | 82 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 224 | 4 |
| LOS ANGELES | 16884 | 555 | 33 | 1778 | 120 | 6 |
| MADERA | 627 | 30 | 0 | 108 | 358 | 34 |
| MARIN | 1035 | 28 | 9 | 146 | 102 | 7 |
| MARIPOSA | 55 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 115 | 3 |
| MENDOCINO | 461 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 109 | 5 |
| MERCED | 779 | 72 | 3 | 69 | 183 | 6 |
| MODOC | 26 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 139 | 13 |
| MONO | 102 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 123 | 8 |
| MONTEREY | 1551 | 68 | 5 | 204 | 78 | 44 |
| NAPA | 613 | 24 | 1 | 90 | 116 | 2 |
| NEVADA | 458 | 11 | 3 | 47 | 129 | 9 |
| ORANGE | 8887 | 323 | 12 | 378 | 204 | 0 |
| PLACER | 938 | 96 | 2 | 98 | 106 | 4 |
| PLUMAS | 90 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 58 | 14 |
| RIVERSIDE | 5876 | 259 | 0 | 316 | 149 | 3 |
| SACRAMENTO | 3851 | 420 | 13 | 314 | 93 | 2 |
| SAN BENITO | 313 | 14 | 0 | 48 | 150 | 23 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 4428 | 320 | 5 | 836 | 201 | 3 |
| SAN DIEGO | 7136 | 466 | 12 | 1311 | 77 | 11 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 365 | 31 | 0 | 130 | 167 | 7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 1296 | 67 | 2 | 89 | 69 | 5 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1431 | 63 | 5 | 163 | 88 | 0 |
| SAN MATEO | 1544 | 60 | 6 | 353 | 179 | 15 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 1362 | 80 | 4 | 180 | 99 | 18 |
| SANTA CLARA | 3119 | 122 | 6 | 772 | 121 | 32 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 1037 | 42 | 6 | 203 | 77 | 1 |
| SHASTA | 567 | 38 | 0 | 97 | 114 | 10 |
| SIERRA | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 102 | 114 |
| SISKIYOU | 158 | 19 | 0 | 27 | 196 | 4 |
| SOLANO | 967 | 29 | 3 | 348 | 171 | 19 |
| SONOMA | 1942 | 101 | 4 | 200 | 109 | 490 |
| STANISLAUS | 1441 | 92 | 4 | 112 | 118 | 14 |
| SUTTER | 298 | 18 | 5 | 95 | 88 | 10 |
| TEHAMA | 214 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 102 | 23 |
| TRINITY | 41 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 145 | 12 |
| TULARE | 1700 | 80 | 10 | 149 | 137 | 5 |
| TUOLUMNE | 235 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 69 | 59 |
| VENTURA | 2663 | 84 | 10 | 0 | 134 | 0 |
| YOLO | 399 | 20 | 2 | 66 | 121 | 4 |
| YUBA | 220 | 11 | 3 | 43 | 97 | 3 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Violations of CVC 23153 and CVC 23152 with a felony disposition code. 4th offenses of CVC 23152 (in 10 years), which are statutorily defined as violations of CVC 23153, are not included.
${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Violations of CVC 23140.

TABLE 5c: DUID CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| COUNTY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MISD } \\ & \text { DUID } \end{aligned}$ | FELONY DUID ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { VIOLATION } \\ \text { [O CONVICTION } \end{gathered}$ | CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE |
| STATEWIDE | 5161 | 457 | 227 | 5 |
| ALAMEDA | 33 | 8 | 216 | 8 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 1 | 623 | 8 |
| AMADOR | 3 | 0 | 366 | 56 |
| BUTTE | 46 | 6 | 263 | 15 |
| CALAVERAS | 8 | 0 | 286 | 5 |
| COLUSA | 7 | 2 | 294 | 12 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 41 | 2 | 365 | 4 |
| DEL NORTE | 1 | 1 | 325 | 33 |
| EL DORADO | 32 | 5 | 311 | 7 |
| FRESNO | 130 | 25 | 242 | 27 |
| GLENN | 5 | 0 | 532 | 66 |
| HUMBOLDT | 10 | 0 | 159 | 16 |
| IMPERIAL | 3 | 0 | 250 | 4 |
| INYO | 4 | 0 | 285 | 6 |
| KERN | 222 | 5 | 89 | 10 |
| KINGS | 52 | 2 | 145 | 4 |
| LAKE | 13 | 3 | 221 | 8 |
| LASSEN | 1 | 1 | 371 | 4 |
| LOS ANGELES | 635 | 37 | 193 | 6 |
| MADERA | 27 | 2 | 457 | 41 |
| MARIN | 53 | 2 | 222 | 6 |
| MARIPOSA | 2 | 0 | 229 | 18 |
| MENDOCINO | 30 | 4 | 328 | 23 |
| MERCED | 17 | 1 | 306 | 6 |
| MODOC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MONO | 3 | 0 | 148 | 18 |
| MONTEREY | 55 | 0 | 396 | 19 |
| NAPA | 25 | 3 | 251 | 8 |
| NEVADA | 13 | 1 | 227 | 9 |
| ORANGE | 1184 | 87 | 304 | 0 |
| PLACER | 94 | 17 | 204 | 8 |
| PLUMAS | 1 | 0 | 344 | 17 |
| RIVERSIDE | 539 | 38 | 206 | 4 |
| SACRAMENTO | 471 | 70 | 167 | 3 |
| SAN BENITO | 40 | 1 | 373 | 25 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 133 | 14 | 268 | 8 |
| SAN DIEGO | 378 | 37 | 120 | 14 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 5 | 3 | 303 | 10 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 41 | 6 | 212 | 6 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 90 | 6 | 109 | 0 |
| SAN MATEO | 24 | 5 | 175 | 24 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 41 | 7 | 311 | 23 |
| SANTA CLARA | 88 | 6 | 201 | 67 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 33 | 5 | 290 | 6 |
| SHASTA | 45 | 4 | 416 | 16 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SISKIYOU | 1 | 2 | 184 | 6 |
| SOLANO | 13 | 2 | 225 | 29 |
| SONOMA | 77 | 3 | 448 | 262 |
| STANISLAUS | 57 | 11 | 323 | 7 |
| SUTTER | 19 | 2 | 224 | 12 |
| TEHAMA | 7 | 1 | 346 | 5 |
| TRINITY | 3 | 1 | 393 | 12 |
| TULARE | 144 | 7 | 222 | 6 |
| TUOLUMNE | 10 | 0 | 598 | 49 |
| VENTURA | 133 | 10 | 255 | 13 |
| YOLO | 14 | 1 | 386 | 8 |
| YUBA | 5 | 0 | 148 | 5 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These figures are a subset of the counts in Table 5 b .
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Violations of CVC 23153 and CVC 23152 with a felony disposition code. 4th offenses of CVC 23152 (in 10 years), which are statutorily defined as violations of CVC 23153, are not included.

TABLE 6: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| COUNTY | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \\ \text { RATE } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | DUI CONVICTIONS |  | RECKLESS DRIVING CONVICTIONS |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { \% OTHER } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \% NORECORD OFANYCONVICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% MIS- DEMEANOR | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { FELONY } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { ALCOHOL } \\ \text { OR DRUG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% NONALCOHOL } \\ \text { NOR DRUG } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| STATEWIDE | 71.1 | 68.8 | 2.3 | 7.4 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 18.9 |
| ALAMEDA | 43.9 | 43.1 | 0.8 | 21.0 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 30.5 |
| ALPINE | 70.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
| AMADOR | 85.2 | 82.9 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| BUTTE | 77.5 | 74.6 | 2.9 | 7.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 13.6 |
| CALAVERAS | 71.9 | 70.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
| COLUSA | 69.2 | 68.5 | 0.7 | 11.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 18.2 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 64.8 | 63.2 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 1.0 | 22.1 |
| DEL NORTE | 54.2 | 53.9 | 0.3 | 15.7 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 25.3 |
| EL DORADO | 76.4 | 73.5 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 15.3 |
| FRESNO | 68.4 | 66.8 | 1.6 | 10.7 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 20.3 |
| GLENN | 72.0 | 71.3 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 21.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 66.2 | 65.4 | 0.8 | 8.5 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 21.2 |
| IMPERIAL | 48.9 | 48.1 | 0.8 | 21.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 27.5 |
| INYO | 68.0 | 68.0 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 23.3 |
| KERN | 65.7 | 64.4 | 1.3 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 18.0 |
| KINGS | 78.1 | 76.1 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 15.1 |
| LAKE | 61.9 | 60.0 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 30.6 |
| LASSEN | 59.7 | 58.4 | 1.3 | 6.7 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 29.5 |
| LOS ANGELES | 71.4 | 69.2 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 19.1 |
| MADERA | 60.0 | 57.6 | 2.4 | 7.4 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 29.8 |
| MARIN | 75.7 | 74.4 | 1.3 | 9.2 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 12.8 |
| MARIPOSA | 76.4 | 75.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
| MENDOCINO | 79.2 | 77.0 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 13.9 |
| MERCED | 67.3 | 64.2 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 27.9 |
| MODOC | 58.0 | 52.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 |
| MONO | 64.3 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 16.9 |
| MONTEREY | 70.2 | 67.3 | 2.9 | 7.2 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 19.9 |
| NAPA | 74.3 | 71.7 | 2.6 | 8.9 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 14.0 |
| NEVADA | 78.7 | 77.6 | 1.1 | 6.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 13.9 |
| ORANGE | 82.5 | 80.6 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 14.4 |
| PLACER | 83.9 | 78.7 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 9.4 |
| PLUMAS | 65.7 | 61.6 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 28.1 |
| RIVERSIDE | 75.5 | 72.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 20.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | 83.9 | 79.2 | 4.7 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 11.6 |
| SAN BENITO | 65.7 | 63.8 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 25.1 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 65.3 | 62.7 | 2.6 | 9.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 23.1 |
| SAN DIEGO | 74.9 | 71.8 | 3.1 | 10.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 13.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 43.0 | 39.9 | 3.1 | 12.1 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 40.1 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 62.1 | 59.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 34.4 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 77.9 | 76.5 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 12.8 |
| SAN MATEO | 66.5 | 64.4 | 2.1 | 13.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 19.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 71.6 | 69.2 | 2.4 | 6.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 21.2 |
| SANTA CLARA | 66.8 | 64.8 | 2.0 | 13.4 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 16.8 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 68.3 | 66.5 | 1.8 | 12.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 18.0 |
| SHASTA | 76.7 | 73.5 | 3.2 | 10.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 12.8 |
| SIERRA | 66.7 | 61.1 | 5.6 | 16.7 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
| SISKIYOU | 62.2 | 60.8 | 1.4 | 8.1 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 25.4 |
| SOLANO | 55.8 | 54.7 | 1.1 | 13.2 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 24.0 |
| SONOMA | 79.2 | 76.5 | 2.7 | 6.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 13.6 |
| STANISLAUS | 74.0 | 71.1 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 20.8 |
| SUTTER | 68.5 | 65.4 | 3.1 | 14.1 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 15.2 |
| TEHAMA | 56.6 | 55.3 | 1.3 | 7.9 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 31.8 |
| TRINITY | 46.9 | 44.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
| TULARE | 74.6 | 73.3 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 19.4 |
| TUOLUMNE | 75.5 | 74.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.6 | 16.3 |
| VENTURA | 83.0 | 80.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 15.2 |
| YOLO | 70.8 | 68.8 | 2.0 | 7.0 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 18.0 |
| YUBA | 73.0 | 71.1 | 1.9 | 10.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 16.0 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Table 6 estimates are based only on DUI arrest cases from the MACR system whose arrests or convictions were found on the DMV database.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ These include dismissals and DUI failures-to-appear (FTA); the statewide DUI FTA average for 2018 DUI arrests was $2.1 \%$.

TABLE 7a: REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI AND ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| DUI CONVICTIONS |  |  | ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| . 00 | 1264 | 1.6 | . 00 | 416 | 4.3 |
| . 01 | 50 | 0.1 | . 01 | 20 | 0.2 |
| . 02 | 46 | 0.1 | . 02 | 24 | 0.3 |
| . 03 | 68 | 0.1 | . 03 | 26 | 0.3 |
| . 04 | 72 | 0.1 | . 04 | 43 | 0.4 |
| . 05 | 169 | 0.2 | . 05 | 86 | 0.9 |
| . 06 | 249 | 0.3 | . 06 | 231 | 2.4 |
| . 07 | 458 | 0.6 | . 07 | 616 | 6.3 |
| . 08 | 1384 | 1.8 | . 08 | 1874 | 19.2 |
| . 09 | 2217 | 2.9 | . 09 | 2016 | 20.7 |
| . 10 | 3504 | 4.5 | . 10 | 1432 | 14.7 |
| . 11 | 4356 | 5.6 | . 11 | 937 | 9.6 |
| . 12 | 5127 | 6.6 | . 12 | 525 | 5.4 |
| . 13 | 5479 | 7.1 | . 13 | 392 | 4.0 |
| . 14 | 5722 | 7.4 | . 14 | 235 | 2.4 |
| . 15 | 5732 | 7.4 | . 15 | 196 | 2.0 |
| . 16 | 5648 | 7.3 | . 16 | 170 | 1.7 |
| . 17 | 5359 | 6.9 | . 17 | 106 | 1.1 |
| . 18 | 4814 | 6.2 | . 18 | 101 | 1.0 |
| . 19 | 4378 | 5.6 | . 19 | 66 | 0.7 |
| . 20 | 3880 | 5.0 | . 20 | 66 | 0.7 |
| . 21 | 3343 | 4.3 | . 21 | 45 | 0.5 |
| . 22 | 2826 | 3.6 | . 22 | 27 | 0.3 |
| . 23 | 2236 | 2.9 | . 23 | 23 | 0.2 |
| . 24 | 1852 | 2.4 | . 24 | 22 | 0.2 |
| . 25 | 1610 | 2.1 | . 25 | 9 | 0.1 |
| . 26 | 1206 | 1.6 | . 26 | 14 | 0.1 |
| . 27 | 1003 | 1.3 | . 27 | 15 | 0.2 |
| . 28 | 775 | 1.0 | . 28 | 7 | 0.1 |
| . 29 | 616 | 0.8 | . 29 | 6 | 0.1 |
| . 30 | 484 | 0.6 | . 30 | 7 | 0.1 |
| . 31 | 387 | 0.5 | . 31 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 32 | 295 | 0.4 | . 32 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 33 | 258 | 0.3 | . 33 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 34 | 206 | 0.3 | . 39 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 35 | 136 | 0.2 | . 44 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 36 | 113 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| . 37 | 89 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 38 | 66 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 39 | 37 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 40 | 38 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| . 41 | 25 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 42 | 15 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 43 | 9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 44 | 8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 45 | 8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 46 | 2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 47 | 3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 48 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 49 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| . 52 | 1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 77625 | 100.0 | TOTAL | 9762 | 100.0 |
| MEAN ${ }^{\text {b }}$ BAC. 169 MEDIAN ${ }^{\text {b }}$ BAC 16 |  |  | MEAN ${ }^{\text {b }}$ BAC. 10 MEDIAN ${ }^{\text {b }}$ BAC. 09 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 7b: REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21 ARRESTED IN $2018^{\text {a }}$

| $\underline{\text { BAC LEVEL (\%) }}$ | FREQUENCY | PERCENT | BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | 114 | 4.1 | . 23 | 50 | 1.8 |
| . 01 | 8 | 0.3 | . 24 | 39 | 1.4 |
| . 02 | 9 | 0.3 | . 25 | 34 | 1.2 |
| . 03 | 8 | 0.3 | . 26 | 24 | 0.9 |
| . 04 | 6 | 0.2 | . 27 | 16 | 0.6 |
| . 05 | 51 | 1.8 | . 28 | 11 | 0.4 |
| . 06 | 59 | 2.1 | . 29 | 8 | 0.3 |
| . 07 | 73 | 2.6 | . 30 | 5 | 0.2 |
| . 08 | 94 | 3.3 | . 31 | 11 | 0.4 |
| . 09 | 107 | 3.8 | . 32 | 2 | 0.1 |
| . 10 | 166 | 5.9 | . 33 | 2 | 0.1 |
| . 11 | 189 | 6.7 | . 34 | 2 | 0.1 |
| . 12 | 203 | 7.2 | . 35 | 3 | 0.1 |
| . 13 | 208 | 7.4 | . 36 | 3 | 0.1 |
| . 14 | 217 | 7.7 | . 37 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 15 | 187 | 6.7 |  |  |  |
| . 16 | 208 | 7.4 |  |  |  |
| . 17 | 163 | 5.8 |  |  |  |
| . 18 | 147 | 5.2 |  |  |  |
| . 19 | 118 | 4.2 | TOTAL | 2814 | 100.0 |
| . 20 | 105 | 3.7 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { MEAN }^{\text {b }} \text { BAC } .147 \\ \text { MEDIAN } \end{array}$ |  |  |
| . 21 | 91 | 3.2 |  |  |  |
| . 22 | 72 | 2.6 |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with convictions presented in the table. The percentage of DUI convictees under age 21 with BAC levels found is $93.4 \%$.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 8: DUI CONVICTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS AND REPORTED BAC LEVEL FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| 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 | .169 | .16 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ DUI | 72.5 | .165 | .16 |
| $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ DUI | 20.5 | .177 | .17 |
| $3^{\text {RD }}$ DUI | 5.3 | .184 | .18 |
| $4^{\mathrm{TH}+\text { DUI }}$ | 1.7 | .192 | .19 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with DUI convictions presented in the table.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to drug DUI convictions.

## SECTION 3:

## POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

## SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted driving under the influence (DUI) offenders were obtained from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2018. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 9a: Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2018. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions in 10 years. 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 court (within each county) and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 9b: Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status for DUID Offenders Arrested in 2018. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions in 10 years. The specific court sanctions tallied include percentages of driving under the influence of drugs (DUID) offenders sentenced to probation, jail, DUI programs (first-offender, 18-month, and 30-month DUI programs), and ignition interlock.

Table 9c: Ignition Interlock Device (IID) Installations by DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2018. This table shows the statewide frequency of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who installed an IID subsequent to their DUI arrest by number of prior DUI convictions in 10 years. For each DUI offender level, the table also shows the number and percentage of DUI offenders who installed an IID.

Table 10a: Court Sanctions by County and DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2018. This table displays the distribution of court sanctions by county for all DUI offenders.

Table 10b: Ignition Interlock Device (IID) Installations by County and DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2018. Table 10b displays the number of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who installed an IID subsequent to their DUI arrest by county and by DUI offender status. For each county and DUI offender level, the table also shows the number and percentage of DUI offenders who installed an IID relative to the number of DUI convictions.

Figure 5: Percentage Representation of Court-Ordered DUI Sanctions (for 2018 DUI arrests). Figure 5 shows the percentage representation of court-ordered postconviction sanctions for DUI offenders arrested in 2018.


Figure 5. Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (for 2018 DUI arrests). ${ }^{\text {a This }}$ percentage does not include ignition interlock requirements administered by DMV (i.e., ignition interlock requirements under AB 91 law).

From the data in these tables and those in Appendix B4, it is evident that the use of sanctions prescribed for offenders arrested in 2018 continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status. For example:

## Statewide Sanctions

- The most frequent court sanction for all convicted DUI offenders was probation (96.0\%), while the least frequent court sanction was ignition interlock (9.3\%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in $75.5 \%$ of the cases. This is shown in Table 9a, and graphically in Figure 5. Int many jurisdictions, however, all or a portion of the jail sentence is often served as community service or home confinement rather than actual jail time, particularly for first offenders (Guenzburger \& Atkinson, 2012). Because virtually all offenders receive more than one type of sanction, the cumulative percentage adds to more than $100 \%$.
- Whereas the frequency of most court sanctions was virtually identical for 2017 and 2018 convicted DUI offenders, the frequency of IID saw a relative increase of $27 \%$ (from $7.3 \%$ in 2017 to $9.3 \%$ in 2018).
- The most frequent sanction imposed on 2018 DUID offenders was probation (88.2\%), although it was not imposed as frequently as it was among all 2018 DUI offenders (96.0\%). Similar to patterns observed for DUI offenders, a higher percentage of repeat DUID offenders were given jail time than first DUID offenders. However, 79.1\% of DUID offenders were sentenced to

DUI program, which is lower than $91.1 \%$ of all DUI offenders who received this sanction (see Tables 9a and 9b).

- Among convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018, $9.3 \%$ were ordered by courts to install an IID, whereas $16.8 \%$ of them actually installed a device subsequent to their arrest date (see Tables 9 a and 9 c ). The higher percentage of offenders installing an IID than those who were ordered to install one is likely related to specific ignition interlock laws that were implemented starting in 2010 or later. On July 1, 2010, two ignition interlock laws took effect. The first law (SB 598 - Huff) allows second and third DUI offenders, convicted for driving under the influence of alcohol only, to reinstate licensure after 3 months and 6 months of license suspension/revocation, respectively, if they install an IID. The second law (AB 91 - Feuer) created a pilot program in four counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare) that requires first and repeat DUI offenders to install an ignition interlock device in all vehicles they own or operate for a specific time period based on their number of prior DUI convictions. More recently, on January 1, 2017, SB 1046 (Hill) was implemented which extended the AB 91 pilot program until January 1, 2019. Also, effective January 1, 2019 until January 1, 2026, this bill specifies new IID requirements for all persons convicted of an alcohol-related DUI offense (relative to specific DUI offense and number of prior DUI violations) and allows DUI offenders who are willing to install an IID to apply for a restricted driver license without serving any period of license suspension or revocation.


## County Variation

- The referral to first-offender DUI programs (mostly from 3 to 9 months long) among first DUI offenders varied by county, from $90 \%$ or more in 32 counties to only $21.5 \%$ in San Benito County (see Table 10a).
- In 2018, $1.1 \%$ of arrested repeat DUI offenders were assigned to 30 -month DUI programs (see Table 9a). Assignment of DUI offenders (mostly third-or-more) to 30 -month DUI programs was low, as there are very few counties that have 30 -month DUI programs (see Table 10a).
- The highest percentage of DUI offenders installing an IID subsequent to their arrest in 2018 is among DUI offenders who were subject to the AB 91 pilot program, in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare counties; the installations ranged from 46.0\% (Los Angeles) to 30.9\% (Tulare). This is shown in Table 10b.
- In counties not included in the AB 91 pilot program, the percentage of 2018 DUI offenders who installed an IID varied greatly. Among such counties with less than 1,000 DUI convictions, this percentage ranged from $1 \%$ (Glenn) to $15.2 \%$ (Colusa). Among counties with more than 1,000 DUI convictions, the percentage ranged from $4.2 \%$ (Kern) to $11.9 \%$ (Placer). This is shown in Table 10b.


## Court Variation

- Statewide, courts vary significantly in how they prescribe available sanctions for DUI offenders, even when they are in the same county and are processing similar number of DUI offenders. For example, in Los Angeles County alone, one court (West Covina) assigned jail to $72.8 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n=1,142$ ), while another court (Bellflower) in the same county assigned jail to only $33.7 \%$ of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n=1,085$ ). This is shown in Table B4 in the Appendix.
- Courts in 14 counties required less than $2 \%$ of the convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2018 to install an ignition interlock device (see Table 10a and Table B4 in the Appendix).


## Variation by Offender Status

- Among first DUI offenders arrested in 2018 and subsequently convicted, $67.8 \%$ were sentenced to jail, compared to $95.9 \%$ of all repeat offenders (see Table 9 a ).
- Among first DUI offenders, $92.9 \%$ were assigned by courts to attend DUI programs, as were $90.2 \%$ of second offenders, $82.5 \%$ of third offenders, and $45.1 \%$ of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. This is shown in Table 9a. (By statute, however, all DUI offenders must eventually complete specified DUI programs to be eligible for license reinstatement.)
- In 2018, $25.3 \%$ of repeat DUI offenders were required by the courts to install an ignition interlock device in their vehicles (see Table 9a), compared to $20.3 \%$ of those arrested in 2017. Judges routinely did not require interlocks for repeat offenders despite the ignition interlock law (AB 762 - Torlakson), enacted in 1999, which provides incentives for repeat offenders to reinstate after 12 months of license suspension/revocation with interlocks and establishes mandatory interlock law for DUI suspension/revocation violators.
- The majority of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who installed an IID subsequent to their arrest were first offenders from the AB 91 pilot counties; the percentage of first DUI offenders in Alameda, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and Tulare counties who installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date ranged from $37.1 \%$ in Tulare to $50.1 \%$ in Los Angeles (see Table 10b).
- Among repeat DUI offenders, IID installation rates are higher among second DUI offenders (see Table 9c). The percentage of second DUI offenders from the AB 91 pilot counties who installed an IID ranged from $22.6 \%$ (Alameda) to $35.8 \%$ (Los Angeles). This is shown in Table 10b.

TABLE 9a: COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 93926 | 96.0 | 75.5 | 68.1 | 22.7 | 0.3 | 9.3 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 68139 | 97.4 | 67.8 | 90.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| REPEAT | 25787 | 92.3 | 95.9 | 8.7 | 76.1 | 1.1 | 25.3 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 19252 | 95.6 | 95.4 | 10.4 | 79.2 | 0.6 | 24.2 |
| $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4953 | 89.6 | 97.3 | 3.9 | 76.0 | 2.6 | 31.8 |
| $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1582 | 60.0 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 38.7 | 3.0 | 19.6 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Entries represent percentages of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 receiving each sanction, by offender status. Sanctions for each offender status group (row) are not exclusive; therefore, row percentages always add to more than $100 \%$. Percentages of sanctions by county and court appear in Appendix Table B4.

TABLE 9b: COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUID OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

| DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 5618 | 88.2 | 78.4 | 59.6 | 19.3 | 0.2 | 4.9 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4058 | 89.9 | 72.6 | 78.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| REPEAT | 1560 | 83.8 | 93.5 | 10.7 | 62.8 | 0.7 | 13.7 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1165 | 86.7 | 92.6 | 12.6 | 63.7 | 0.3 | 12.3 |
| $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 294 | 84.4 | 95.9 | 5.8 | 70.1 | 2.0 | 19.0 |
| $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 101 | 49.5 | 96.0 | 3.0 | 31.7 | 2.0 | 13.9 |

TABLE 9c: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

| DUI OFFENDER STATUS | DUI CONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS $^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | $N$ | $\%$ |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 93926 | 15740 | 16.8 |
| REPEAT | 68139 | 10100 | 14.8 |
| $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 25787 | 5640 | 21.9 |
| $3^{\mathrm{RD}}$ | 19252 | 4726 | 24.5 |
| $4^{\mathrm{TH}+}$ | 4953 | 849 | 17.1 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Entries represent numbers and percentages of DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date, which may be related to different IID requirements, including those administered by DMV (i.e., under AB 91 law), and may not be initiated by IID court sanctions (presented in Table 9a) or associated with DUI convictions resulting from arrests in 2018.

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

|  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 93926 | 96.0 | 75.5 | 68.1 | 22.7 | 0.3 | 9.3 |
| ALAMEDA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1494 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 93.4 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 576 | 99.0 | 99.8 | 17.7 | 78.5 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 172 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 4.7 | 87.8 | 1.7 | 5.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 50 | 94.0 | 100.0 | 14.0 | 66.0 | 0.0 | 38.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2292 | 99.2 | 99.8 | 66.0 | 30.4 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
| ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 54.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 43.8 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 18.8 |
| AMADOR | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 98 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 83.7 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 24.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 38 | 94.7 | 94.7 | 7.9 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 84.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 151 | 90.7 | 98.7 | 56.3 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 42.4 |
| BUTTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 582 | 95.0 | 94.3 | 90.9 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 186 | 90.9 | 98.4 | 7.0 | 72.0 | 7.5 | 25.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 55 | 67.3 | 94.5 | 1.8 | 25.5 | 40.0 | 27.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 17 | 52.9 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 47.1 | 35.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 840 | 91.4 | 95.2 | 64.6 | 18.6 | 5.5 | 10.2 |
| CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 90 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 95.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 65.4 | 0.0 | 26.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 125 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 74.4 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
| COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 74 | 95.9 | 98.6 | 91.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 25 | 92.0 | 96.0 | 60.0 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 112 | 93.8 | 98.2 | 78.6 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1160 | 98.4 | 94.7 | 88.4 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 388 | 97.4 | 96.1 | 9.0 | 79.4 | 0.0 | 28.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 115 | 94.8 | 98.3 | 1.7 | 79.1 | 0.0 | 53.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 41 | 80.5 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 41.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1704 | 97.5 | 95.4 | 62.4 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 12.6 |
| DEL NORTE |  | 125 | 94.4 | 98.4 | 88.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
|  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 31 | 90.3 | 100.0 | 19.4 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 64.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 165 | 91.5 | 98.8 | 70.3 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 18.8 |
| EL DORADO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 433 | 98.4 | 97.9 | 88.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 17.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 141 | 94.3 | 97.9 | 7.1 | 79.4 | 0.0 | 70.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 31 | 93.5 | 90.3 | 0.0 | 77.4 | 0.0 | 71.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 16 | 75.0 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 621 | 96.6 | 97.4 | 63.1 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 33.2 |

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued
$\left.\begin{array}{l|l||r|r|r|r|r|r|r}\hline & & & & & 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } & 18-\mathrm{MONTH} & 30-\mathrm{MONTH}\end{array}\right)$

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued

|  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 13546 | 97.3 | 32.2 | 87.6 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3098 | 94.7 | 91.2 | 7.5 | 79.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 655 | 85.8 | 96.8 | 1.5 | 70.5 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 173 | 30.6 | 99.4 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 17472 | 95.8 | 45.8 | 69.3 | 19.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| MADERA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 408 | 91.9 | 96.8 | 91.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 163 | 91.4 | 96.3 | 25.2 | 68.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 53 | 77.4 | 98.1 | 15.1 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 33 | 69.7 | 87.9 | 6.1 | 39.4 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 657 | 89.5 | 96.3 | 64.7 | 26.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| MARIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 743 | 98.7 | 97.2 | 95.2 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 251 | 98.0 | 97.2 | 4.4 | 92.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 67 | 100.0 | 95.5 | 1.5 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 91.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 45.5 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1072 | 98.0 | 97.1 | 67.2 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 24.3 |
| MARIPOSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 35 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 77.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 56.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 56 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 53.6 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 23.2 |
| MENDOCINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 320 | 95.3 | 96.6 | 87.2 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 108 | 94.4 | 98.1 | 11.1 | 84.3 | 0.0 | 50.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 50 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 8.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 68.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 70.0 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 488 | 94.9 | 97.1 | 60.5 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 21.1 |
| MERCED | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 596 | 97.3 | 97.0 | 78.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 182 | 96.7 | 97.8 | 9.3 | 79.1 | 0.0 | 34.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 52 | 90.4 | 96.2 | 1.9 | 82.7 | 0.0 | 46.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 75.0 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 854 | 96.1 | 97.0 | 56.9 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
| MODOC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 20 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 100.0 | 82.8 | 51.7 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| MONO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 77 | 97.4 | 72.7 | 90.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 17 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.5 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 103 | 98.1 | 77.7 | 71.8 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| MONTEREY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1125 | 97.5 | 97.4 | 87.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 370 | 97.8 | 98.6 | 7.8 | 85.9 | 0.0 | 48.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 105 | 91.4 | 99.0 | 1.9 | 83.8 | 0.0 | 64.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 75.0 | 95.8 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 29.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1624 | 96.9 | 97.8 | 62.7 | 28.4 | 0.0 | 24.1 |

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued

|  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{1^{\mathrm{ST}}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| NAPA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 470 | 86.8 | 84.5 | 79.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 28.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 125 | 91.2 | 90.4 | 2.4 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 78.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 63.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 638 | 87.9 | 86.4 | 59.2 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 40.9 |
| NEVADA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 344 | 98.3 | 99.1 | 94.5 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 94 | 97.9 | 100.0 | 44.7 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 46.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 26 | 96.2 | 100.0 | 42.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 73.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 472 | 98.1 | 99.4 | 80.5 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 16.3 |
| ORANGE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 7067 | 98.3 | 33.9 | 94.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1668 | 94.9 | 91.5 | 6.4 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 391 | 89.0 | 96.9 | 2.0 | 80.8 | 0.3 | 5.4 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}+}$ | 96 | 65.6 | 97.9 | 0.0 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 9222 | 96.9 | 47.7 | 73.3 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| PLACER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 736 | 90.8 | 97.4 | 88.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 245 | 88.6 | 99.6 | 6.5 | 70.6 | 0.0 | 73.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 36 | 72.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 69.4 | 0.0 | 69.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 19 | 47.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 47.4 | 0.0 | 36.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 1036 | 88.8 | 98.1 | 64.1 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 24.8 |
| PLUMAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 69 | 97.1 | 95.7 | 91.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 27 | 92.6 | 100.0 | 3.7 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 98 | 95.9 | 96.9 | 65.3 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4569 | 97.5 | 96.0 | 94.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1180 | 93.9 | 97.1 | 7.5 | 85.4 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 299 | 87.0 | 95.7 | 3.7 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 33.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 87 | 57.5 | 93.1 | 1.1 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 14.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 6135 | 95.7 | 96.1 | 72.1 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
| SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2993 | 97.8 | 97.3 | 93.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 904 | 96.1 | 99.6 | 9.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 284 | 91.2 | 100.0 | 1.1 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 103 | 56.3 | 97.1 | 1.0 | 31.1 | 0.0 | 34.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4284 | 96.0 | 97.9 | 67.3 | 24.1 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 214 | 96.7 | 100.0 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 74 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 36.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 15 | 53.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 327 | 95.1 | 100.0 | 14.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 16.8 |
| SAN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 3414 | 97.5 | 72.7 | 92.9 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| BERNARDINO | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 970 | 95.3 | 94.8 | 12.3 | 79.2 | 0.1 | 15.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 255 | 87.5 | 97.6 | 2.7 | 68.6 | 0.0 | 16.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 114 | 55.3 | 98.2 | 3.5 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 4753 | 95.5 | 79.2 | 69.5 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 5.4 |

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued

|  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN <br> DIEGO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 5614 | 96.8 | 12.8 | 91.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1540 | 96.2 | 89.7 | 6.9 | 84.9 | 0.0 | 19.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 370 | 86.5 | 94.9 | 3.0 | 78.6 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 90 | 50.0 | 98.9 | 1.1 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 7614 | 95.6 | 33.4 | 69.3 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
| SAN <br> FRANCISCO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 292 | 99.3 | 99.0 | 94.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 6.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 88 | 97.7 | 100.0 | 10.2 | 85.2 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 16.7 | 91.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 396 | 98.5 | 99.2 | 72.0 | 23.7 | 0.8 | 24.5 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 923 | 98.3 | 98.3 | 90.7 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 2.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 324 | 96.6 | 98.8 | 11.7 | 75.9 | 7.4 | 31.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 87 | 90.8 | 100.0 | 1.1 | 65.5 | 20.7 | 36.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 31 | 74.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 38.7 | 16.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1365 | 96.8 | 98.5 | 64.2 | 25.1 | 4.0 | 11.9 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1031 | 98.2 | 97.6 | 94.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 338 | 98.2 | 99.4 | 8.9 | 83.4 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 102 | 94.1 | 99.0 | 11.8 | 77.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 28 | 71.4 | 96.4 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1499 | 97.4 | 98.1 | 68.2 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| SAN MATEO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1209 | 98.7 | 98.8 | 93.3 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 318 | 96.5 | 98.7 | 8.2 | 82.1 | 0.0 | 56.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 63 | 93.7 | 93.7 | 3.2 | 81.0 | 0.0 | 60.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 20 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1610 | 97.8 | 98.6 | 71.8 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 16.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1029 | 97.4 | 88.7 | 91.5 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 301 | 94.7 | 98.3 | 8.3 | 82.7 | 0.0 | 25.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 97 | 79.4 | 96.9 | 0.0 | 77.3 | 0.0 | 29.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 19 | 84.2 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 73.7 | 0.0 | 26.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1446 | 95.4 | 91.4 | 66.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| SANTA CLARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2328 | 99.4 | 98.4 | 95.5 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 6.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 686 | 99.4 | 99.3 | 10.8 | 87.0 | 0.0 | 68.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 186 | 96.8 | 99.5 | 5.4 | 89.8 | 0.0 | 81.2 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 47 | 80.9 | 97.9 | 2.1 | 74.5 | 0.0 | 70.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 3247 | 99.0 | 98.6 | 71.1 | 26.6 | 0.1 | 24.5 |
| SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 746 | 97.6 | 94.4 | 92.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 257 | 98.1 | 98.8 | 49.8 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 64 | 89.1 | 96.9 | 31.3 | 53.1 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 18 | 61.1 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1085 | 96.6 | 95.7 | 77.2 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| SHASTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 395 | 97.0 | 97.7 | 90.4 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 36.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 154 | 95.5 | 98.7 | 12.3 | 65.6 | 10.4 | 74.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 43 | 88.4 | 93.0 | 0.0 | 65.1 | 16.3 | 76.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 69.2 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 38.5 | 7.7 | 38.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 605 | 95.4 | 97.5 | 62.3 | 23.3 | 4.0 | 48.9 |

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued

|  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SIERRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 118 | 87.3 | 86.4 | 57.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 34 | 88.2 | 82.4 | 14.7 | 64.7 | 0.0 | 41.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 20 | 95.0 | 85.0 | 5.0 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 177 | 87.6 | 85.9 | 41.8 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 18.1 |
| SOLANO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 660 | 98.0 | 98.6 | 94.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 259 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 6.9 | 91.5 | 0.0 | 17.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 61 | 90.2 | 100.0 | 4.9 | 85.2 | 0.0 | 65.6 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 19 | 78.9 | 100.0 | 5.3 | 73.7 | 0.0 | 73.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 999 | 97.5 | 98.9 | 64.4 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 13.1 |
| SONOMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1438 | 98.7 | 94.8 | 93.9 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 464 | 98.9 | 98.3 | 9.5 | 86.0 | 0.2 | 81.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 112 | 95.5 | 95.5 | 2.7 | 89.3 | 2.7 | 85.7 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 33 | 60.6 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 48.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 2047 | 98.0 | 95.6 | 68.2 | 26.3 | 0.2 | 29.7 |
| STANISLAUS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1054 | 97.0 | 98.8 | 92.2 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 2.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 337 | 96.4 | 98.8 | 9.8 | 75.7 | 9.2 | 21.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 101 | 92.1 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 64.4 | 26.7 | 38.6 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 45 | 53.3 | 95.6 | 4.4 | 28.9 | 24.4 | 26.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1537 | 95.3 | 98.6 | 65.6 | 24.1 | 4.6 | 9.8 |
| SUTTER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 215 | 97.7 | 96.7 | 96.3 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 77 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 19.5 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 4.5 | 86.4 | 0.0 | 81.8 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 321 | 97.2 | 97.5 | 69.5 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 168 | 96.4 | 98.2 | 91.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 45 | 95.6 | 100.0 | 26.7 | 68.9 | 0.0 | 26.7 |
|  | $3^{\mathrm{RD}}$ | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 72.7 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 226 | 95.6 | 98.7 | 74.3 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| TRINITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 29 | 86.2 | 96.6 | 69.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 76.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 43 | 86.0 | 93.0 | 46.5 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 25.6 |
| TULARE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1201 | 96.7 | 54.2 | 92.7 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 419 | 95.9 | 93.6 | 10.7 | 82.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 102 | 88.2 | 96.1 | 1.0 | 80.4 | 0.0 | 7.8 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 68 | 60.3 | 85.3 | 1.5 | 42.6 | 0.0 | 16.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1790 | 94.6 | 67.0 | 64.8 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 |

TABLE 10a: DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018 - continued

|  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| TUOLUMNE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 152 | 96.7 | 13.2 | 42.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 69 | 100.0 | 81.2 | 10.1 | 59.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 76.9 | 84.6 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 15.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 16.7 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 240 | 94.6 | 37.5 | 30.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| VENTURA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2134 | 97.2 | 97.5 | 94.2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 492 | 95.1 | 98.6 | 9.6 | 83.5 | 0.0 | 81.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 108 | 87.0 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 85.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 23 | 60.9 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 47.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 2757 | 96.1 | 97.6 | 74.8 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 25.6 |
| YOLO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 298 | 96.0 | 94.6 | 83.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 88 | 97.7 | 95.5 | 10.2 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 48.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 29 | 100.0 | 89.7 | 10.3 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 72.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 421 | 96.7 | 94.5 | 62.2 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 16.4 |
| YUBA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 173 | 96.0 | 66.5 | 95.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 48 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 22.9 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 234 | 96.2 | 71.8 | 75.2 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 1.3 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { CONVICTIONS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IID INSTALLATIONS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 93926 | 15740 | 16.8 |
| ALAMEDA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1494 | 658 | 44.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 576 | 130 | 22.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 172 | 18 | 10.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 50 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2292 | 806 | 35.2 |
| ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 11 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 5 | 2 | 40.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 2 | 12.5 |
| AMADOR | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 98 | 1 | 1.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 38 | 7 | 18.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 3 | 30.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 151 | 11 | 7.3 |
| BUTTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 582 | 5 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 186 | 38 | 20.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 55 | 10 | 18.2 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}_{+}}$ | 17 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 840 | 54 | 6.4 |
| CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 90 | 1 | 1.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 26 | 8 | 30.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 8 | 3 | 37.5 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 125 | 12 | 9.6 |
| COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 74 | 4 | 5.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 25 | 8 | 32.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 5 | 50.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 112 | 17 | 15.2 |
|  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1160 | 9 | 0.8 |
| COSTA | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 388 | 65 | 16.8 |
|  | $3^{\mathrm{RD}}$ | 115 | 22 | 19.1 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 41 | 2 | 4.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 1704 | 98 | 5.8 |
| DEL NORTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 125 | 2 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 31 | 7 | 22.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 2 | 28.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 165 | 11 | 6.7 |
| EL DORADO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 433 | 19 | 4.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 141 | 37 | 26.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 31 | 10 | 32.3 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}$ | 16 | 2 | 12.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 621 | 68 | 11.0 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Entries represent numbers and percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2018 that installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date, which may be related to different IID requirements, including those administered by DMV (i.e., under AB 91 law), and may not be initiated by IID court sanctions (presented in Table 10a) or associated with DUI convictions resulting from arrests in 2018.

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ & \text { STATUS } \end{aligned}$ | DUICONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| FRESNO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2438 | 28 | 1.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 874 | 125 | 14.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 266 | 36 | 13.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 117 | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 3695 | 191 | 5.2 |
| GLENN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 76 | 1 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 21 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 104 | 1 | 1.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 503 | 11 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 154 | 35 | 22.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 59 | 11 | 18.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 729 | 57 | 7.8 |
| IMPERIAL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 303 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 73 | 12 | 16.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 12 | 4 | 33.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 394 | 17 | 4.3 |
| INYO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 61 | 1 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 9 | 2 | 22.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 76 | 5 | 6.6 |
| KERN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2024 | 17 | 0.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 634 | 82 | 12.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 177 | 20 | 11.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 52 | 2 | 3.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 2887 | 121 | 4.2 |
| KINGS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 433 | 7 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 139 | 14 | 10.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 46 | 5 | 10.9 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 22 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 640 | 26 | 4.1 |
| LAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 202 | 3 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 69 | 12 | 17.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 15 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 11 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 297 | 16 | 5.4 |
| LASSEN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 67 | 1 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 13 | 4 | 30.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 6 | 2 | 33.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 1 | 100.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 87 | 8 | 9.2 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{array} \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | DUI CONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 13546 | 6792 | 50.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3098 | 1109 | 35.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 655 | 131 | 20.0 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}_{+}}$ | 173 | 12 | 6.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 17472 | 8044 | 46.0 |
| MADERA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 408 | 3 | 0.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 163 | 14 | 8.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 53 | 5 | 9.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 33 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 657 | 22 | 3.3 |
| MARIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 743 | 13 | 1.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 251 | 84 | 33.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 67 | 13 | 19.4 |
|  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}_{+}}$ | 11 | 3 | 27.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1072 | 113 | 10.5 |
| MARIPOSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 35 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 16 | 4 | 25.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ |  | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 56 | 4 | 7.1 |
| MENDOCINO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 320 | 3 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 108 | 28 | 25.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 50 | 7 | 14.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 488 | 38 | 7.8 |
| MERCED | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 596 | 13 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 182 | 27 | 14.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 52 | 4 | 7.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 1 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 854 | 45 | 5.3 |
| MODOC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 20 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 2 | 28.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | , | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 2 | 6.9 |
| MONO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 77 | 2 | 2.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 17 | 4 | 23.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 2 | 28.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 103 | 8 | 7.8 |
| MONTEREY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1125 | 55 | 4.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 370 | 85 | 23.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 105 | 21 | 20.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1624 | 163 | 10.0 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DUICONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| NAPA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 470 | 23 | 4.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 125 | 44 | 35.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 6 | 18.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 2 | 18.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 638 | 75 | 11.8 |
| NEVADA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 344 | 8 | 2.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 94 | 35 | 37.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 26 | 8 | 30.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 472 | 51 | 10.8 |
| ORANGE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 7067 | 63 | 0.9 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1668 | 432 | 25.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 391 | 77 | 19.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 96 | 4 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 9222 | 576 | 6.2 |
| PLACER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 736 | 15 | 2.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 245 | 99 | 40.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 36 | 8 | 22.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 19 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1036 | 123 | 11.9 |
| PLUMAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 69 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 27 | 9 | 33.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 98 | 10 | 10.2 |
| RIVERSIDE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4569 | 68 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1180 | 255 | 21.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 299 | 61 | 20.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 87 | 5 | 5.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 6135 | 389 | 6.3 |
| SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2993 | 1402 | 46.8 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 904 | 235 | 26.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 284 | 21 | 7.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 103 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4284 | 1658 | 38.7 |
| SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 214 | 5 | 2.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 74 | 13 | 17.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 24 | 4 | 16.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 15 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 327 | 23 | 7.0 |
| SAN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 3414 | 39 | 1.1 |
| BERNARDINO | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 970 | 178 | 18.4 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 255 | 36 | 14.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 114 | 4 | 3.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 4753 | 257 | 5.4 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | DUI CONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 5614 | 90 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1540 | 313 | 20.3 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 370 | 68 | 18.4 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 90 | 5 | 5.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 7614 | 476 | 6.3 |
| SAN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 292 | 3 | 1.0 |
| FRANCISCO | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 88 | 19 | 21.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 12 | 3 | 25.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 396 | 26 | 6.6 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 923 | 24 | 2.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 324 | 71 | 21.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 87 | 9 | 10.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 31 | 2 | 6.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1365 | 106 | 7.8 |
| SAN LUIS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1031 | 14 | 1.4 |
| OBISPO | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 338 | 84 | 24.9 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 102 | 18 | 17.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 28 | 1 | 3.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1499 | 117 | 7.8 |
| SAN MATEO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1209 | 18 | 1.5 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 318 | 101 | 31.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 63 | 15 | 23.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 20 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1610 | 134 | 8.3 |
| SANTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1029 | 12 | 1.2 |
| BARBARA | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 301 | 59 | 19.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 97 | 11 | 11.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 19 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1446 | 82 | 5.7 |
| SANTA CLARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2328 | 51 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 686 | 161 | 23.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 186 | 35 | 18.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 47 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3247 | 247 | 7.6 |
| SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 746 | 12 | 1.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 257 | 54 | 21.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 64 | 11 | 17.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 18 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1085 | 78 | 7.2 |
| SHASTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 395 | 28 | 7.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 154 | 51 | 33.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 43 | 8 | 18.6 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH+ }}+$ | 13 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 605 | 87 | 14.4 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DUICONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| SIERRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 12 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 12 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 118 | 2 | 1.7 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 34 | 4 | 11.8 |
|  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 20 | 2 | 10.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 177 | 8 | 4.5 |
| SOLANO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 660 | 13 | 2.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 259 | 59 | 22.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 61 | 19 | 31.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 19 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 999 | 92 | 9.2 |
| SONOMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1438 | 32 | 2.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 464 | 112 | 24.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 112 | 26 | 23.2 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 33 | 2 | 6.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 2047 | 172 | 8.4 |
| STANISLAUS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1054 | 13 | 1.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 337 | 69 | 20.5 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 101 | 22 | 21.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 45 | 1 | 2.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 1537 | 105 | 6.8 |
| SUTTER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 215 | 3 | 1.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 77 | 24 | 31.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 2 | 9.1 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 321 | 29 | 9.0 |
| TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 168 | 7 | 4.2 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 45 | 10 | 22.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 11 | 3 | 27.3 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 226 | 20 | 8.8 |
| TRINITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 29 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 13 | 4 | 30.8 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 43 | 4 | 9.3 |
| TULARE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1201 | 445 | 37.1 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 419 | 95 | 22.7 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 102 | 11 | 10.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 68 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 1790 | 553 | 30.9 |

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

- continued

| COUNTY | DUI OFFENDERSTATUS | DUI CONVICTIONS | IID INSTALLATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% |
| TUOLUMNE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 152 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 69 | 20 | 29.0 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 5 | 38.5 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 240 | 29 | 12.1 |
| VENTURA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2134 | 51 | 2.4 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 492 | 148 | 30.1 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 108 | 18 | 16.7 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 23 | 2 | 8.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 2757 | 219 | 7.9 |
| YOLO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 298 | 4 | 1.3 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 88 | 16 | 18.2 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 29 | 4 | 13.8 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 1 | 16.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 421 | 25 | 5.9 |
| YUBA |  | 173 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 48 | 7 | 14.6 |
|  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 2 | 20.0 |
|  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 234 | 9 | 3.8 |

## SECTION 4:

## POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

This section presents reoffense and crash rates of driving under the influence (DUI) offenders over various time periods, as well as the methodology and results of evaluations assessing the relationship between DUI program sanctions and DUI recidivism and crash involvement for drivers convicted of alcohol-or drug-related reckless driving and for first DUI offenders.

The first part of this section examines descriptive indicators, such as DUI recidivism and crash rates, for different groups of DUI offenders within different periods of time: 1) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested between 1990-2018, 2) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second drug-specific DUI (DUID) offenders arrested in 2015-2018, 3) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2018 , 4) percentages of DUI program referrals, enrollments, and completions for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2018, and 5) long-term recidivism rates of DUI offenders arrested in 2005.

The second part of this section contains the results of the analyses evaluating the relationship between DUI program sanctions and DUI recidivism and crashes for two groups of offenders: 1) drivers convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol- or drug-reckless driving, and 2) first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month or 9-month DUI programs.

The following are highlights of the findings:

- The 1-year recidivism rate for first DUI offenders arrested in 2018 was $4.0 \%$, relatively unchanged from $4.1 \%$ in 2017. The 2018 first offender reoffense rate was $47.4 \%$ lower than the reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 1990 (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- The 1-year recidivism rate for second DUI offenders arrested in 2018 was $5.3 \%$, the same as in 2017. This rate represents a $45.4 \%$ decrease from the $9.7 \%$ rate for those arrested in 1990 (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- The subsequent 1-year crash rate among first DUI offenders was $4.5 \%$ in 2018, which is not very different from $4.7 \%$ in 2017. The 2018 first offender crash rate is $15.1 \%$ lower than the 1990 crash rate. The crash rate among second DUI offenders arrested in 2018 was $4.1 \%$, slightly higher than $3.8 \%$ for those arrested in 2017 . Despite this rate being only $2.5 \%$ higher
than the 1990 crash rate, it represents the highest value recorded for second DUI offenders in this entire time span (see Figure 7 and Table 11a).
- First and second DUID offenders arrested in 2018 have lower 1-year subsequent DUI-incident rates, but higher 1-year subsequent crash rates, compared to those of the overall first and second DUI offenders (see Tables 11a and 11b).
- Over 14 years, DUI recidivism rates of DUI offenders originally convicted in 2005 are consistently lower than the rates of those convicted in 1994 (see Table 12). At the end of 14 years, $29 \%$ of the 2005 DUI offenders incurred at least one subsequent DUI incident and $27 \%$ had at least one subsequent DUI conviction (see Figure 8a).
- Over 14 years, DUI recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of first offenders reoffending was $25 \%$, while $30 \%$ of second offenders and $37 \%$ of third-or-more offenders reoffended (see Figure 8b).
- Males showed a much higher cumulative percentage (28\%) of reoffenses than did females ( $22 \%$ ) over the 14-year time period (see Figure 8c).
- 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 8d).
- After 5 years, the percentage of DUI offenders reoffending in the 2005 group was much lower $(17 \%)$ compared to the percentages reoffending in the 1984 group ( $27 \%$ ) and in the 1980 group ( $35 \%$ ) and was slightly lower than the percentage reoffending in the 1994 group ( $18 \%$ ). This is shown in Figure 8e.
- Of the DUI offenders arrested in 2018 who, by court referral, enrolled in a DUI program, $85.9 \%$ of first offenders and $38.2 \%$ of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 13). Due to the longer program length for repeat offenders some second offenders may have still been enrolled in the program at the time this report was completed.
- Based on the limited administrative data available for analysis, it appeared that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol- or drug-related reckless offenders assigned to an alcohol and drug education program were not significantly different than the rates of those who were not assigned. Similarly, the subsequent DUI incident rates of those assigned to alcohol and drug education programs were not significantly different than the rates of those who were not
assigned. Importantly, these findings reflect between-group differences (or the lack thereof) in terms of being assigned to alcohol and drug education programs, rather than enrolling in, or completing, such programs.
- One-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders assigned to 9-month DUI programs were not significantly different than the crash rates of those assigned to 3-month programs (see Table 14). Also, the 1-year postconviction DUI incident rates were not significantly different between the two groups.

Subject Selection and Data Collection Convicted DUI and alcohol- or drug-related reckless offenders were identified from monthly abstract update files which contain all DUI conviction data reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) by the courts. Subjects were chosen based on their number of DUI and alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions within 10 years prior to their DUI arrest in 2018. The following groups of subjects were selected: 1) first DUI and DUID offenders-drivers who had no DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions within the previous 10 years, 2) second DUI and DUID offenders-drivers who had one DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction within the previous 10 years, 3) alcohol- or drug-related reckless offenders with and without prior conviction for DUI or alcohol- or drugrelated reckless driving within the previous 10 years, and 4) first DUI offenders assigned to 3month and 9 -month DUI programs. In addition, DUI offenders arrested in 2005 and subsequently convicted were selected for the 14-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and DUI recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders, and the relationship between DUI programs and DUI recidivism for persons convicted of alcohol- or drug-reckless driving 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 (APS) suspensions, and DUI Failure-to-Appear (FTA) violations. For the 2005 DUI offenders, DUI recidivism is measured by subsequent DUI convictions, along with one comparison of DUI incidents. For first and second DUI offenders, the 1-year subsequent unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all the previous and current evaluations are included.

To maintain comparability to the previous subject-selection criteria, certain types of offenders had to be excluded. For the sanction analyses among first DUI offenders, previous and current analyses excluded offenders with convictions of a DUI with injury, and those with chemical-test refusal APS suspensions, because their license control penalties were different from those convicted of

DUI with no injury. Drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent follow-up period (because of late conviction dates) were also excluded, as were drivers with " $X$ " license numbers (meaning that no California driver license number could be found for that driver) and drivers with out-ofstate ZIP Codes. The only exclusions made for the 2005 offenders were 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 Arrested from 1990-2018
The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident and crash reoffense rates for both first and second DUI offenders were compiled from previous and current DUI Management Information System (DUIMIS) reports and plotted onto two separate graphs to display these rates over time.

Figure 6 shows the percentages of first and second offenders, arrested between 1990 and 2018, who reoffended within 1 year after their conviction.


Figure 6. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending with a DUI incident within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2018).

This figure and Table 11a show an overall gradual decline in the 1 -year recidivism rates for first and second offenders. The decline was steeper in the early years of the observation (1990-1994 for first offenders, 1993-1996 for second offenders), following the implementation of the APS law.

Rates in 2018 remained consistent, following a slight increase in 2017. Even so, the overall decline translates into a $47.4 \%$ reduction in recidivism for all first offenders from 1990 to 2018 and a $45.4 \%$ reduction for second offenders over the same period. As is evident in Figure 6, the reoffense rates of first offenders continue to be lower than those of second offenders; this has been consistently evident throughout all previous analyses comparing first and second offenders.

TABLE 11a: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND DUI OFFENDERS, 1990-2018

| YEAR | DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED |  | CRASH-INVOLVED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FIRST OFFENDERS | $\begin{gathered} \text { SECOND } \\ \text { OFFENDERS } \end{gathered}$ | FIRST OFFENDERS | $\begin{gathered} \text { SECOND } \\ \text { OFFENDERS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 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 |
| 2008 | 4.7 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 2.3 |
| 2009 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
| 2010 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| 2011 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 2.5 | 1.7 |
| 2012 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 2.9 | 2.2 |
| 2013 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| 2014 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| 2015 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| 2016 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 3.7 |
| 2017 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 3.8 |
| 2018 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% DIFFERENCE } \\ 1990 \text { TO } 2018 \end{gathered}$ | -47.4\% | -45.4\% | -15.1\% | 2.5\% |

TABLE 11b: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND DUID OFFENDERS, 2015-2018

|  | DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED |  | CRASH-INVOLVED |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | FIRST <br> OFFENDERS | SECOND <br> OFFENDERS | FIRST <br> OFFENDERS | SECOND <br> OFFENDERS |
| 2015 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 5.0 |
| 2016 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 5.4 |
| 2017 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 5.4 |
| 2018 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 6.0 | 4.9 |
| \% DIFFERENCE | $22.6 \%$ | $-7.8 \%$ | $-3.2 \%$ | $-2.0 \%$ |
| 2015 TO 2018 |  |  |  |  |

While many factors may be associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents for both first and second offenders, previous DUI-MIS reports suggested that the reduction may largely be attributed to the implementation of major DUI laws enacted in the 1990s or later (e.g., SB 1623 and SB 1150; see Appendix A). Past research evaluations indicated that these DUI law changes were associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents among DUI offenders (DeYoung, 1995, 1997; DeYoung, Tashima \& Masten, 2005; Helander, 2002; Peck, Wilson \& Sutton, 1995; Rogers, 1995, 1997).

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 7 shows the percentages of first and second offenders arrested between 1990 and 2018 who had crashes within 1 year after their conviction.


Figure 7. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2018).

For the seventh consecutive year, crash rates for second offenders increased from the prior year, whereas crash rates for first offenders decreased for the first time in seven years. Among first offenders arrested between 1990 and 2018, Figure 7 and Table 11a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by a sustained increase after 1993, and then another decline from 2001 to 2011. The rates for second offenders follow a similar path through 2011, except for a more pronounced initial decline lasting until 1996. However, the 1 -year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders increased in 2012 and continued to increase through 2017. The 2018 first offender crash rate is $15.1 \%$ lower than the corresponding rate in 1990. In contrast, the 2018 crash rate for second offenders is $2.5 \%$ higher than the crash rate in 1990 and represents the highest value recorded in this entire time span.

Overall, second offenders have lower 1-year subsequent crash rates than do first offenders (Figure 7 and Table 11a), which is not surprising considering that repeat offenders are subject to tougher sanctions (e.g., longer-term license suspensions) aimed at keeping these high risk drivers off the road. The fact that second offenders have lower 1-year subsequent crash rates than first offenders has been well documented in past evaluations (Arstein-Kerslake \& Peck, 1985; Hagen, 1977; Hagen, McConnell \& Williams, 1980; Peck, 1987, 1991; Sadler \& Perrine, 1984; Tashima \& Marelich, 1989; Tashima \& Peck, 1986). However, the difference in 1-year subsequent crash rates between first and second DUI offenders in 2018 was the smallest recorded over the observation period (i.e., since 1990).

Starting with the 2019 DUI-MIS report, new information on 1-year subsequent DUI-incident and crash rates for first and second DUID offenders (shown in Table 11b) is added to this report. The 1-year reoffense rates among first DUID offenders arrested between 2015 and 2018 ranged from $3.0 \%$ to $3.8 \%$. At the same time, the 1-year reoffense rates for second DUID offenders arrested in those years ranged from $4.0 \%$ to $5.1 \%$.

The 1-year subsequent crash rates are noticeably higher among both first and second DUID offenders arrested in 2015-2018 than that of overall first and second DUI offenders. Indeed, among first DUID offenders arrested in 2015-2018, the 1-year subsequent crash rates varied between $6.0 \%$ and $6.4 \%$, while second DUID offenders had somewhat lower crash rates that varied from $4.9 \%$ to $5.4 \%$. However, 1-year subsequent crash rates declined in 2018 for both first and second DUID offenders when compared to rates in years 2015-2017.

One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2018
Table 11c displays the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism rates of offenders arrested in 2018 by county. As shown in this table, among the 10 counties with the largest number of first offenders recidivating within 1 year, the rate varied from $5.8 \%$ in Fresno to $2.9 \%$ in Los Angeles. Among the rest of the counties, Alpine, Kings, Marin, Mariposa, Merced, Monterey, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, and Tehama had DUI recidivism rates at or above $6.0 \%$, while Calaveras, Modoc, Sierra, and Siskiyou had no first offenders recidivating within 1 year. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the 10 counties with the largest number of second offenders recidivating within 1 year, Alameda had the highest rate ( $9.3 \%$ ), whereas Orange County had the lowest rate (3.1\%). Among the rest of the counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from $25.0 \%$ (Alpine) to $0.0 \%$ (Amador, Del Norte, Inyo, Modoc, San Francisco, Sierra, and Trinity).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2018 are displayed in Table 11d. Among the 10 counties with the largest number of first offenders who incurred a crash within 1 year, the rate varied from $6.2 \%$ in Contra Costa County to $3.5 \%$ in Fresno County. Among the rest of the counties, Alpine, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Trinity had a $0.0 \%$ crash rate. In contrast to DUI recidivism rates, second offenders have generally lower crash rates than first offenders. Among the 10 counties with the largest number of second offender incurring a crash within 1 year, rates varied from $6.2 \%$ (Alameda) to $2.1 \%$ (Fresno). Among the rest of the counties, the rates varied from $11.1 \%$ (Lassen) to $0.0 \%$ in 11 counties (Alpine, Calaveras, Glenn, Inyo, Madera, Modoc, Sierra, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, and Tuolumne).

TABLE 11c: 2018 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND DUI OFFENDERS

| COUNTY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 1896 | 4.0 | 681 | 5.3 |
| ALAMEDA | 38 | 3.7 | 33 | 9.3 |
| ALPINE | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 25.0 |
| AMADOR | 4 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| BUTTE | 24 | 5.7 | 9 | 7.6 |
| CALAVERAS | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
| COLUSA | 2 | 3.6 | 1 | 5.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 31 | 5.2 | 10 | 5.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 4 | 4.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| EL DORADO | 5 | 1.9 | 4 | 4.6 |
| FRESNO | 93 | 5.8 | 39 | 7.5 |
| GLENN | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 8.3 |
| HUMBOLDT | 19 | 5.0 | 9 | 8.1 |
| IMPERIAL | 6 | 4.0 | 3 | 6.8 |
| INYO | 2 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| KERN | 83 | 5.3 | 28 | 6.3 |
| KINGS | 21 | 7.2 | 4 | 4.3 |
| LAKE | 6 | 4.4 | 1 | 2.2 |
| LASSEN | 1 | 2.7 | 1 | 11.1 |
| LOS ANGELES | 283 | 2.9 | 84 | 4.0 |
| MADERA | 6 | 4.8 | 2 | 4.0 |
| MARIN | 35 | 6.5 | 7 | 3.7 |
| MARIPOSA | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 6.7 |
| MENDOCINO | 8 | 3.3 | 11 | 13.4 |
| MERCED | 33 | 8.1 | 13 | 13.1 |
| MODOC | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONO | 2 | 4.1 | 1 | 7.1 |
| MONTEREY | 46 | 6.4 | 12 | 5.2 |
| NAPA | 13 | 4.0 | 3 | 3.2 |
| NEVADA | 9 | 3.6 | 4 | 5.4 |
| ORANGE | 145 | 3.3 | 27 | 3.1 |
| PLACER | 19 | 3.6 | 5 | 2.6 |
| PLUMAS | 2 | 3.9 | 5 | 22.7 |
| RIVERSIDE | 129 | 4.0 | 45 | 5.8 |
| SACRAMENTO | 88 | 3.8 | 49 | 7.2 |
| SAN BENITO | 9 | 5.6 | 4 | 7.7 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 79 | 3.8 | 27 | 4.9 |
| SAN DIEGO | 167 | 3.9 | 46 | 3.8 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 6 | 3.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SAN JOAOUIN | 56 | 7.5 | 22 | 8.2 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 42 | 5.0 | 16 | 5.8 |
| SAN MATEO | 16 | 2.1 | 4 | 2.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 41 | 5.8 | 4 | 2.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | 67 | 3.9 | 22 | 4.8 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 36 | 6.0 | 15 | 7.5 |
| SHASTA | 7 | 2.4 | 5 | 4.4 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.2 |
| SOLANO | 21 | 4.9 | 15 | 8.5 |
| SONOMA | 35 | 3.3 | 17 | 5.5 |
| STANISLAUS | 38 | 4.8 | 15 | 6.6 |
| SUTTER | 7 | 4.4 | 5 | 9.3 |
| TEHAMA | 8 | 6.2 | 2 | 6.3 |
| TRINITY | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | 39 | 4.7 | 26 | 9.2 |
| TUOLUMNE | 5 | 3.9 | 2 | 3.7 |
| VENTURA | 44 | 3.0 | 11 | 3.5 |
| YOLO | 5 | 2.2 | 3 | 4.3 |
| YUBA | 6 | 4.8 | 5 | 13.5 |

TABLE 11d: 2018 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND DUI OFFENDERS

| COUNTY | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 2136 | 4.5 | 520 | 4.1 |
| ALAMEDA | 43 | 4.2 | 22 | 6.2 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 2 | 2.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| BUTTE | 17 | 4.0 | 6 | 5.0 |
| CALAVERAS | 4 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| COLUSA | 4 | 7.1 | 1 | 5.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 37 | 6.2 | 6 | 3.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | 3.7 |
| EL DORADO | 6 | 2.3 | 3 | 3.4 |
| FRESNO | 56 | 3.5 | 11 | 2.1 |
| GLENN | 2 | 4.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 14 | 3.7 | 3 | 2.7 |
| IMPERIAL | 5 | 3.3 | 2 | 4.6 |
| INYO | 2 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| KERN | 70 | 4.5 | 29 | 6.5 |
| KINGS | 6 | 2.1 | 4 | 4.3 |
| LAKE | 4 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.2 |
| LASSEN | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 11.1 |
| LOS ANGELES | 443 | 4.6 | 98 | 4.6 |
| MADERA | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MARIN | 26 | 4.9 | 4 | 2.1 |
| MARIPOSA | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
| MENDOCINO | 7 | 2.9 | 3 | 3.7 |
| MERCED | 28 | 6.9 | 4 | 4.0 |
| MODOC | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONO | 2 | 4.1 | 1 | 7.1 |
| MONTEREY | 40 | 5.6 | 9 | 3.9 |
| NAPA | 12 | 3.7 | 6 | 6.4 |
| NEVADA | 9 | 3.6 | 6 | 8.1 |
| ORANGE | 191 | 4.3 | 35 | 4.0 |
| PLACER | 25 | 4.7 | 7 | 3.6 |
| PLUMAS | 1 | 1.9 | 2 | 9.1 |
| RIVERSIDE | 144 | 4.5 | 37 | 4.7 |
| SACRAMENTO | 118 | 5.1 | 31 | 4.5 |
| SAN BENITO | 13 | 8.1 | 2 | 3.9 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 121 | 5.8 | 20 | 3.7 |
| SAN DIEGO | 170 | 3.9 | 36 | 3.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 9 | 4.9 | 1 | 1.9 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | 46 | 6.2 | 16 | 6.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 38 | 4.6 | 9 | 3.3 |
| SAN MATEO | 31 | 4.1 | 4 | 2.1 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 24 | 3.4 | 6 | 3.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | 84 | 4.9 | 19 | 4.2 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 28 | 4.7 | 12 | 6.0 |
| SHASTA | 8 | 2.7 | 4 | 3.5 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.2 |
| SOLANO | 29 | 6.7 | 8 | 4.6 |
| SONOMA | 47 | 4.5 | 10 | 3.2 |
| STANISLAUS | 46 | 5.8 | 12 | 5.3 |
| SUTTER | 5 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TEHAMA | 2 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TRINITY | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| TULARE | 39 | 4.7 | 15 | 5.3 |
| TUOLUMNE | 4 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| VENTURA | 60 | 4.0 | 6 | 1.9 |
| YOLO | 5 | 2.2 | 3 | 4.3 |
| YUBA | 6 | 4.8 | 1 | 2.7 |

## Long-Term Recidivism Rates of 2005 DUI Offenders

Although earlier year's reports displayed long-term recidivism rates for the 1994 DUI offenders over a 20-year time span, it was decided, since the 2017 report, to present the recidivism rates for a more recent group of DUI offenders; the intention is to reflect on more contemporary trends in DUI occurrences, associated DUI law changes, or other more recent efforts to reduce DUI. Therefore, the recidivism rates for the convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2005, over the 14 years following their conviction that resulted from the 2005 arrest, are presented in this year's report. Since all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2005 were included in the 2005 group, it was possible to observe and compare the long term recidivism rates for different sub-groups within the 2005 cohort, and to examine how these sub-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 compared. Failure curves are cumulative percentages over time of first reoffenses occurring after the initial DUI conviction. Both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 14-year follow-up period for both the 1994 and 2005 groups were included as outcome data in order to maintain comparability with the 1984 and 1980 cohorts from a previous evaluation (Peck, 1991).

Table 12 shows cumulative percentages of first subsequent DUI reoffenses (convictions) for the 2005 offenders, as well as 5 -year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group, 9 -year cumulative percentages for the 1980 group, and 14-year cumulative percentages for the 1994 and 2005 groups. For 20-year cumulative percentages for the 1994 cohort group, see Table 12 in the 2016 annual report.

TABLE 12: CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES FOR 2005 DUI OFFENDERS AND COHORT GROUPS

| YEAR | PERCENTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | MALES | FEMALES | 16-25 | 26-45 | 46-65 | 66+ | 1980 | 1984 | 1994 | 2005 |
| $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 4 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 8 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 9 | 8 |
| $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 11 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 25 | 20 | 13 | 12 |
| $4^{\text {TH }}$ | 14 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 30 | 24 | 16 | 15 |
| $5^{\text {TH }}$ | 16 | 19 | 24 | 18 | 14 | 21 | 17 | 14 | 8 | 35 | 27 | 18 | 17 |
| $6^{\text {TH }}$ | 18 | 21 | 27 | 21 | 15 | 23 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 38 | NA | 21 | 20 |
| $7^{\text {TH }}$ | 20 | 23 | 29 | 22 | 17 | 25 | 21 | 17 | 9 | 40 | NA | 22 | 21 |
| $8^{\text {TH }}$ | 21 | 25 | 31 | 24 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 18 | 10 | 42 | NA | 24 | 23 |
| $9^{\text {TH }}$ | 22 | 26 | 33 | 25 | 19 | 28 | 23 | 19 | 10 | 44 | NA | 25 | 24 |
| $10^{\text {TH }}$ | 23 | 27 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 19 | 10 | NA | NA | 26 | 25 |
| $11^{\text {TH }}$ | 23 | 28 | 35 | 27 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 10 | NA | NA | 27 | 25 |
| $12^{\text {TH }}$ | 24 | 29 | 36 | 27 | 21 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 10 | NA | NA | 28 | 26 |
| $13{ }^{\text {TH }}$ | 25 | 30 | 37 | 28 | 21 | 32 | 26 | 21 | 10 | NA | NA | 29 | 27 |
| $14^{\text {TH }}$ | 25 | 30 | 37 | 28 | 22 | 32 | 26 | 21 | 10 | NA | NA | 30 | 27 |

In addition to Table 12, Figure 8a displays recidivism rates for 2005 offenders over 14 years.


Figure 8a. Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incident (alcohol crashes, DUI convictions, APS suspensions, and DUI FTAs) for 2005 DUI offenders.

Figure 8a shows that, at the end of 14 years, $27 \%$ of all 2005 offenders were convicted of at least one DUI reoffense. When considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses including all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate is slightly higher at $29 \%$. As evident in previous years, these failure curves are steepest in the several years following the initial conviction, after which they start to flatten out, but are still rising slightly in the later years.

One way to take into account the degree of alcohol- and drug-use severity is to examine the recidivism rates by the number of prior DUIs within 10 years (statutorily defined time frame for counting priors) of the 2005 DUI violation. Figure 8 b displays the cumulative proportions of reoffenses for first, second, and third-or-more DUI offenders.

From this graph and Table 12, it is evident that the recidivism failure curves are higher for DUI offenders with higher numbers of prior offenses. The failure rates for third-or-more offenders are consistently higher over the 14 -year time period than the failure rates of second or first offenders. At the end of 14 years, for the 2005 group, $37 \%$ of third-or-more offenders have reoffended, compared to $30 \%$ of second offenders and $25 \%$ of first offenders.


Figure $8 b$. Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions for the 2005 DUI offenders.

Because the majority of DUI offenders has always been male ( $79 \%$ in 2005), it is relevant to inspect the recidivism rates of the 2005 offenders by gender. As evident in Figure 8c and Table 12 , the percentage of males that reoffend over 14 years is much higher than that of females. At the end of 14 years, $28 \%$ of males have reoffended as compared to $22 \%$ of females. The failure
curve for females is noticeably lower and increases at a slower pace throughout the 14 years than the curve for males.


Figure 8c. Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by gender for the 2005 DUI offenders.

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 8d displays the failure curves of four age groups, which are all steepest during the first few years following the 2005 convictions.

It is also 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 much steeper than the curve of the oldest group. Indeed, the failure curve of the $66+$ group begins to flatten out at the sixth year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality of the oldest group could be associated with their lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 14 years, $32 \%$ and $26 \%$ of the two youngest groups reoffended respectively, while $21 \%$ of the middle age group (for whom mortality may also be a factor) and $10 \%$ of the oldest group recidivated.


Figure $8 d$. Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date) for the 2005 DUI offenders.

The final figure, Figure 8e, compares the 2005 recidivism curves with those of the 1980, 1984, and 1994 cohorts over a 5 -year time period.


Figure $8 e$. Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI reoffense of the 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2005 DUI offenders.

The reoffense rates of the 2005 cohort over the 5-year time period are shown among the cumulative percentages of the 1980, 1984, and 1994 groups (Figure 8e and Table 12). Because these cohorts of DUI offenders span 25 years, it is possible to consider whether the enactment of major DUI laws over that time period has affected their relative recidivism rates.

Figure 8 e reveals that at the end of 5 years, $35 \%$ of the 1980 offenders recidivated compared to $27 \%$ of the 1984 group, $18 \%$ of the 1994 , and $17 \%$ of the 2005 groups. Quite dramatically, the proportion reoffending in the 1994 and 2005 groups 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 25 years. The notably 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 for DUI offenders, and AB 7 (Hart) which established the initial $0.10 \%$ per se Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) illegal limit. The effectiveness of these laws was confirmed by a previous California study by Tashima and Peck (1986). Table 12, which compares the 1980 cohort with the 1994 and 2005 groups over 9 years, shows that $44 \%$ of the 1980 group recidivated versus $25 \%$ of the 1994 and $24 \%$ of the 2005 group. There was only a one percentage-point increase in recidivism each year for the 1994 and 2005 groups in years 8 through 10 . In the $11^{\text {th }}$ through $14^{\text {th }}$ year, there was still a one percentage-point increase for the 1994 group. However, there was no change in recidivism for the 2005 group in the $11^{\text {th }}$ and in the $14^{\text {th }}$ years.

Based on Figure 8e, it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions of the 1984 group ( $27 \%$ ) versus the 1994 group ( $18 \%$ ) and the 2005 group ( $17 \%$ ) is substantial. This reduction in reoffenses is likely due to the enactment of major DUI laws in 1990 or later, most notably SB 1623 (Lockyer) and SB 1150 (Lockyer), which established the APS license action and lowered the BAC legal limit from $0.10 \%$ to $0.08 \%$ (see Appendix A). Past evaluations documented that such changes in the DUI countermeasure system were associated with reductions in DUI recidivism among DUI offenders (DeYoung, 1995, 1997; DeYoung, Tashima \& Masten, 2005; Helander, 2002; Peck, Wilson \& Sutton, 1995; Rogers, 1995, 1997).

In summary, the 2005 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 with previous studies. In comparing the reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2005 groups with those of the 1980 and 1984 offenders, it was found that the cumulative percentages of reoffenses were much lower among the more recent cohorts. The dramatically lower reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2005 groups could be attributed, in part, to the enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders in the past 25 years, including the APS suspension law of 1990.

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

 Offenders Arrested in 2018Beginning 12 years ago, this report captures the numbers and proportions of convicted first and second offenders whose records indicate that they had enrolled in and completed a DUI program, upon referral received from the court. Inclusion of the figures on enrollments and completions was possible due to the addition of information 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.

Table 13 shows the percentages of referrals to the various DUI programs for 2018 first and second offenders. It can be seen from this table that $90.5 \%$ of first offenders and $79.2 \%$ of second offenders were assigned to a DUI program. Among first offenders, $73.8 \%$ enrolled in a DUI program, which usually ranges from 3 to 9 months in length, depending upon the offender's BAC level at the time of arrest. In contrast, $58.9 \%$ of second offenders were enrolled in an 18 -month DUI program. Of those enrolled in DUI programs, $85.9 \%$ of first offenders and $38.2 \%$ of second offenders completed their program assignment. While some second offenders may still have been enrolled in the program at the time this report was finished, their 2018 completion rate represents a steep decline from the corresponding rate in 2017 (47.5\%).

TABLE 13: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

| OFFENDERS | $\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{N}$ | PROGRAM <br> REFERRALS |  | PROGRAM ENROLLMENT |  | PROGRAM COMPLETION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | \% ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDERS | 68,139 | 61,689 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 90.5 | 50,256 | 73.8 | 43,178 | 63.4 | 85.9 |
| $2^{\text {ND }}$ OFFENDERS | 19,252 | $15,251^{\text {d }}$ | 79.2 | 11,344 | 58.9 | 4,328 | 22.5 | 38.2 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Percent of total number of DUI offenders. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Percent of program enrollees. ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Referrals to first offender DUI program (3 to 9 months). ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Referrals to 18 -month DUI program.

## EVALUATIONS OF DUI PROGRAM SANCTIONS FOR ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS

## Background

The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of assigning offenders convicted of alcohol- or drugrelated reckless driving and first DUI offenders to various DUI programs was established by legislation. The evaluation for offenders with alcohol- or drug-related reckless convictions was mandated by SB 1176 (Johnson); for these offenders, this legislation requires the courts to order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. An evaluation of the efficacy of ordering first DUI offenders to a 3-month versus 6 -month DUI program was mandated by AB 1916 (Torlakson). The courts were required to refer first offenders whose BAC level is less than $0.20 \%$ to at least a 3-month program, and those with a BAC level of $0.20 \%$ or above, or who refuse to take a chemical test, to at least a 6-month program. Starting in 2005, AB 1353 (Liu) increased the duration of DUI intervention programs from 6 to 9 months for first DUI offenders on probation whose BAC levels are $0.20 \%$ or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

## Methods

Subject Selection and Follow-up Data. The evaluation pertaining to alcohol- or drug-related reckless convictees involves comparing two groups: 1) those who were ordered to an alcohol and drug education program, and 2) those who were not ordered to a program. These sanctions are reported by the courts to the DMV via disposition codes on the conviction abstracts. Although courts are mandated to require all alcohol- or drug-related reckless drivers to attend an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation, for a significant proportion of such offenders ( $39.8 \%$ of those arrested in 2018 and subsequently convicted) the courts provide no indication of having issued such an order. This discrepancy allows for a comparison of subsequent crashes and DUI incidents between the two groups. Still, some concerns exist regarding the composition of these two groups. Indeed, this evaluation was not included in the last 4 reports, due to possible problems with a court-reported disposition code indicating alcohol and drug education program sanctions on the conviction abstracts for persons convicted of alcohol- and drug-related reckless driving. For the present report, the author conducted a thorough examination of conviction abstract data and investigated the completeness and frequency of disposition code reporting at the county and court level. The author concluded that the magnitude and frequency of potential reporting problems (i.e., missing disposition codes for alcohol and drug education program on the conviction abstract) were unlikely to significantly impact the results of this evaluation. Nevertheless, it is possible that a portion of offenders from the group whose conviction abstract indicates no program referrals was actually assigned to an alcohol and drug education program. This important limitation
should be considered when interpreting the results of this evaluation.

In evaluating the relationship between the length of DUI programs sanctions and DUI recidivism, first offenders arrested in 2018 and convicted of CVC 23152 that showed the 3-month and 9-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for the analysis. The records of $39.6 \%$ of first offenders who were ordered to a 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 excluded from the comparison. Cases further excluded from the analysis were: first DUI offenders convicted of DUI with injury (CVC 23152), drivers with "X" license numbers, and drivers with out-of-state ZIP codes (the latter two were also excluded from the evaluation of alcohol- or drug-related reckless offenders described above). Of the total sample selected, $73.3 \%$ were ordered to 3 -month programs, while $26.7 \%$ were ordered to 9 -month programs. To explore if the BAC level of first DUI offenders was associated with DUI recidivism, only DUI offenders with available information on their BAC level were included in the comparison.

The conviction date was considered to be the "treatment date" for defining prior and subsequent driving record data for both alcohol- or drug-reckless and first DUI offenders, because the penalties and sanctions for the offense are typically effective as of that date. The evaluation period for the postconviction driving measures lasted at least 1 year from the conviction date, ranging from 12 to 29 months.

A buffer period of 4 months was allowed between the end of the evaluation period and the date of data extraction to allow for processing and reporting of the most recent data to DMV for both alcohol- or drug-reckless and first DUI offenders. Offenders from either of these groups who had less than the full 1-year follow-up time period (from conviction date to the end of the evaluation period) were excluded from the evaluation. There were two driver record outcome measures used in these evaluations. The first outcome measure consisted of the percentage of offenders who were involved in a crash, and the second outcome measure consisted of the percentage of offenders who were involved in a DUI incident (i.e., alcohol-involved crashes, DUI convictions, APS/refusal suspensions, or DUI FTAs). Only the first crash or the first DUI incident was evaluated, which is not an important limitation because the incidence of repeat failures (two-or-more crashes or DUI incidents) was very low during the evaluation period. More importantly, analysis of repeat failures would be subject to confounding by court sanctions received in connection with the first failure incident. This confounding was avoided by excluding multiple incidents from the analyses.

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, the attempt to statistically control for group differences removes at least part of the bias in group assignment and provides a less-confounded comparison of the sanction groups. 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 received by offenders systematically vary through self- or judicial selectivity (e.g., drivers of higher socioeconomic status may be more likely to enroll in a program, and obtain a license restriction, and less likely to receive jail than are those of lower status).

Prior driver record data were extracted for the 2 years preceding the alcohol- or drug-reckless conviction date (alcohol- or drug-reckless evaluation) and for the 3 years preceding the DUI conviction date (first DUI offenders' evaluation). The prior driver record variables for these offenders are shown in Appendix Table B5. Since some of these driver record variables were significantly different between the two groups, they were used as covariates in the analyses to adjust for differences in the outcomes associated with group differences on these variables.

Following the extraction of covariates, simple correlations were computed between demographic variables, prior driving variables, and the outcome measures (first subsequent crash and first subsequent DUI incident). The demographic and 2- or 3-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. However, no such interactions reached the significance level in either of the evaluations.

Results of the Evaluation of Alcohol and Drug Education Program Assignment for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol- or Drug-Related Reckless Driving
Figure 9 a and Table 14a display the results of the evaluation of the effectiveness of alcohol and drug education program sanctions on drivers convicted of alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving violations. Importantly, these findings reflect between-group differences (or the lack thereof) in terms of being assigned to alcohol and drug education programs, rather than enrolling in, or completing, such programs.


Figure 9a. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for alcohol- or drug-reckless drivers (arrested in 2018) by alcohol and drug education program assignment.

Total Crashes. The results suggest that court order to an alcohol and drug education program is not significantly associated with the 1 -year subsequent crash rates of alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders arrested in 2018. The offenders ordered to an alcohol and drug education program showed a $6.2 \%$ lower crash rate than those not ordered to the program, but this difference was not large enough to be statistically significant; in other words, it is possible that the difference between the two groups may be due to chance alone. The crash rates for both groups of drivers are higher compared to those of 2013 offenders, the last cohort for which this evaluation was published. Specifically, the crash rate of alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders not ordered to an alcohol and drug education program went from 4.58 to 6.33 per 100 drivers, whereas the crash rate for those ordered to a program went from 4.72 to 5.94 per 100 drivers.

TABLE 14a: THE RELATIONSHIP OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAM SANCTIONS WITH SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING ARRESTED IN 2018

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\begin{gathered} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBERCRASH-INVOLVED,PER 100DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE <br> EFFECT (DIFFERENCE <br> IN \% RATES $)=$ <br> GRP 2 -GRP 1 X 100 | NUMBER DUI INCIDENTINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE <br> EFFECT (DIFFERENCE $\begin{gathered} \text { IN } \% \text { RATES })= \\ \text { GRP } 2-\text { GRP } 1 \end{gathered} \text { X } 100$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | GRP 1 |  | GRP 1 |
|  | NO PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | ASSIGNMENT | 3,304 | 6.33 |  | 3.19 |  |
| (FOLLOW-UP | (GRP 1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD $=1$ | DUI PROGRAM |  |  | -6.2\% |  | -8.5\% |
| YEAR) | ASSIGNMENT (GRP 2) | 4,989 | 5.94 |  | 2.92 |  |

DUI Incidents Figure 9a and Table 14a indicate that, even though alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders ordered to an alcohol and drug education program had less DUI incidents in the 1 year following their assignment than those who were not ordered, this difference was not statistically significant. The reoffense rate of the alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders ordered to the programs was $8.5 \%$ lower than the reoffense rate of those not ordered to the programs. As a reminder, these results have to be viewed with some caution because random assignment to program sanction was not possible; there still remains the possibility of uncontrolled biases through self- or judicialselectivity, even though statistical controls based on available covariates should remove some of the bias.

## Evaluation of 9-Month DUI Program Assignment for Repeat Alcohol- or Drug-Related Reckless Drivers

An evaluation of a referral to a 9-month DUI program for offenders with an alcohol- or drugrelated reckless conviction who have a prior conviction for alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving or DUI within 10 years, was mandated by AB 2802 (Houston). This legislation requires the courts to order these offenders to enroll in a DUI program for at least 9 months as a condition of probation. The records of persons arrested for DUI in 2018 and subsequently convicted of alcohol- or drug-reckless driving indicate that 980 of them have a prior DUI or alcohol- or drugrelated reckless conviction. The court-reported conviction abstracts for these offenders show that $39 \%$ of them were ordered to DUI programs when they were granted probation. However, the records of only 29 offenders (3.0\%) indicated a 9-month DUI program referral. Since this critical information indicating an assignment to the 9-month DUI program was missing on the records for $97.0 \%$ of the repeat alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders, it was not possible to evaluate this program referral for the current report.

## Results of the Evaluation of 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Program Assignment for First DUI

## Offenders

Total Crashes Figure 9b and Table 14b display the results of the evaluation of the relationship between the length of DUI program assignment and DUI recidivism and crashes among first DUI offenders ordered to 3 -month versus 9 -month programs. The results show that the length of time of the DUI program sanction was not significantly associated with 1-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders. First DUI offenders ordered to the 9 -month program had a directionally lower crash rate than that of those ordered to the 3-month program (Table 14b), but this difference ( $13.2 \%$ ) was not large enough to be statistically significant. Even so, the difference was larger than the one observed between the two groups in 2017 (6.8\%).


Figure $9 b$. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in 2018) by length of DUI program sanction.

DUI Incidents Similar to last year's results, Figure 9 b and Table 14 b indicate that first DUI offenders ordered to the 9 -month program do not have significantly different 1-year subsequent DUI incident rates than DUI offenders ordered to the 3-month program. The reoffense rate of those ordered to the 9 -month program was slightly higher than that of those ordered to the 3-month program ( 4.28 vs. 3.99 ). In evaluations prior to the last 10 years, results indicated that DUI offenders ordered to the 9-month program had significantly more subsequent DUI incidents than offenders ordered to the 3-month program. That was not surprising given that first DUI offenders ordered to the 9 -month program have higher BAC levels ( $0.20 \%$ and above) and would be more likely to recidivate than DUI offenders with lower BAC levels. Therefore, in those prior years, two further subanalyses were conducted to determine whether BAC level was associated with the
outcomes of this evaluation. The results of these two subanalyses generally confirmed that first DUI offenders with higher BAC levels ( $0.20 \%$ and above) were more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels. Also, when BAC level was held constant, there were no significant differences in the DUI incident rates between DUI offenders ordered to the 3-month DUI program and those ordered to the 9 -month program.

TABLE 14b: THE RELATIONSHIP OF 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAM SANCTIONS WITH SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS AMONG FIRST DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2018

| YEAR | SANCTION GROUP | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | NUMBER CRASHINVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE <br> EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN \% RATES $)=$ $\frac{\text { GRP } 2-\text { GRP } 1}{\text { GRP } 1} \times 100$ | NUMBER DUI INCIDENT- INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS | PERCENTAGE <br> EFFECT (DIFFERENCE <br> IN \% RATES $)=$ $\frac{\text { GRP } 2-\text { GRP } 1}{\text { GRP } 1} \text { X } 100$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2018 \\ & \text { (FOLLOW-UP } \\ & \text { PERIOD = } 1 \\ & \text { YEAR) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3-MONTH } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \\ & \text { (GRP 1) } \\ & \text { 9-MONTH } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \\ & \text { (GRP 2) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,870 \\ & 7,234 \end{aligned}$ | $4.46$ $3.87$ | $-13.2 \%^{a}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.99 \\ & 4.28 \end{aligned}$ | $7.3 \%{ }^{\text {a }}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These differences in $\%$ rates are not statistically significant.

Starting 10 years ago, BAC level information has been included in the initial analysis as a covariate so that its effects on the outcome measures (1-year subsequent crashes and DUI incidents) were removed before assessment of the relationship between ordered program length and DUI recidivism among first DUI offenders. When the effect of BAC level on DUI recidivism was removed, the results indicated that being ordered to the extended 9-month DUI program does not appear to be associated with fewer DUI incidents than being ordered to the 3-month program, which is comparable to the findings in prior years.

The effectiveness of increasing the duration of time for DUI intervention programs has also not been supported in the literature. DeYoung (1995) 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 reduced DUI recidivism.

Another limitation of these analyses should be noted. Since this study only included first offenders whose conviction abstracts had information on the length of DUI program, there may be additional unknown biases that this quasi-experimental design cannot rule out. However, the statistical control of group differences based on available covariates would be expected to remove at least part of the bias.

## SECTION 5:

## LICENSE SUSPENSION/REVOCATION ACTIONS

## SECTION 5: LICENSE SUSPENSION/REVOCATION ACTIONS

Data on Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) license disqualification actions (license suspension or revocation [S/R]) based upon either driving under the influence (DUI) arrest or DUI conviction are presented in this section. These statutorily-mandated actions are initiated by the receipt of either a law enforcement Administrative Per Se (APS) report ( $0.08 \%$ Blood Alcohol Concentration [BAC], zero tolerance, DUI probation violation, or chemical test refusal) or court abstract of conviction. It should be noted that multiple actions can result from a single DUI incident-for example, a single DUI arrest frequently will result in both an APS suspension and a (later) mandatory postconviction suspension action.

This section includes the following tables:

Table 15: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 2009-2019. This table shows APS and postconviction license disqualification totals from 2009 through 2019.

Table 16: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measures data from 2017 to 2019.

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

- The total number of DMV APS and DUI postconviction S/R actions in 2019 decreased by $0.9 \%$ in 2019. After a marginal increase in 2018, this potentially resumes a declining trend that started in 2008 (see Table 15).
- In 2019, 117,067 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, $74.0 \%$ were first-offender actions (including "zero tolerance" actions taken for drivers under age 21) and $26.0 \%$ were repeat-offender actions (see Table 15).
- Total APS actions (including actions later set aside) decreased less than $1.0 \%$ in 2019, following a $1.7 \%$ increase in 2018 (see Table 16).
- The number of chemical test refusal actions (excluding those later set aside) increased by $3.5 \%$ in 2019, after increasing by $12.2 \%$ in 2018 .
- APS actions were set aside for $10.0 \%$ of all APS actions initiated in 2019, which is marginally less than the 2018 rate of $10.4 \%$.
- Total postconviction S/R actions decreased by $1.5 \%$ in 2019, compared to $1.8 \%$ decrease in 2018 (see Table 15).
TABLE 15: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 2009-2019


TABLE 16: ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

|  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total APS actions initiated (including actions later set aside): | 128,904 | 131,112 | 130,058 |
| Total $.08^{\text {a }}$ APS actions set aside | 12,707 | 12,724 | 12,310 |
| Total $.01^{\text {b }}$ suspensions set aside | 823 | 853 | 681 |
| Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside) | 115,374 | 117,535 | 117,067 |
| Net total .08 APS actions | 108,147 | 110,974 | 110,525 |
| Net total . 01 actions | 7,227 | 6,561 | 6,542 |
| Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification: ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |
| Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers | 113,386 | 115,717 | 115,319 |
| Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken | 1,988 | 1,818 | 1,748 |
| Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles | 90 | 85 | 60 |
| Net APS . 08 actions for drivers with no priors ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 77,689 | 79,776 | 80,091 |
| Net APS . 08 actions taken for drivers with priors | 30,458 | 31,198 | 30,434 |
| Suspensions | 27,032 | 27,409 | 26,572 |
| Revocations | 3,426 | 3,789 | 3,862 |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures: |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 APS refusal actions initiated (including actions later set aside) | 9,917 | 11,141 | 11,542 |
| Total 08 refusal actions set aside | 414 | 479 | 516 |
| Total .01 refusal actions set aside | 14 | 15 | 10 |
| Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside) | 9,489 | 10,647 | 11,016 |
| Net total . 08 refusal actions | 9,241 | 10,424 | 10,771 |
| Net total .01 refusal actions | 248 | 223 | 245 |
| Chemical test refusal rate (including actions later set aside) | 7.7\% | 8.5\% | 8.9\% |
| Net . 08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no priors | 6,118 | 6,998 | 7,300 |
| Net . 08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with priors | 3,426 | 3,789 | 3,862 |
| APS Hearings: ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |  |
| Total .08 and . 01 in person or telephone APS hearings scheduled | 43,281 | 44,213 | 44,763 |
| Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing ${ }^{f}$ | 33.6\% | 33.7\% | 34.4\% |
| . 08 hearings held and/or completed | 41,188 | 42,349 | 42,926 |
| . 08 actions set aside following hearings | 3,796 | 3,701 | 3,472 |
| Percentage of . 08 APS actions set aside following hearings | 9.2\% | 8.7\% | 8.1\% |
| . 01 hearings held and/or completed | 2,025 | 1,775 | 1,713 |
| . 01 actions set aside following hearings | 158 | 166 | 147 |
| Percentage of . 01 APS actions set aside following hearings | 7.8\% | 9.4\% | 8.6\% |
| APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings: |  |  |  |
| Total . 08 and . 01 APS refusal hearings scheduled | 3,746 | 4,252 | 4,741 |
| . 08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed | 3,658 | 4,179 | 4,668 |
| .08 APS refusal actions set aside following hearings | 342 | 426 | 479 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }} .08$ 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. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} .01$ 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. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ 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. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Priors for these APS actions are defined in CVC 13353.3. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$ These figures include refusal hearings but exclude Driver Safety investigation hearings, subsequent APS dismissal hearings, and departmental reviews. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ Both numerator and denominator include those actions later set aside as a result of the hearing. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

SECTION 6:
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## SECTION 6: DRIVERS IN CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

This section presents data on drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved crashes, as compiled and reported by the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Only crashes involving injury or fatality are included, due to incomplete reporting of property-damage-only (PDO) crashes. ${ }^{1}$ Beginning with the 2013 DUI Management Information System (DUI-MIS) Report, in addition to information about drivers under the influence of alcohol, this section contains information about drivers under the influence of drugs and about drivers under the influence of both alcohol and drugs. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 17: DUI Arrests Associated with Reported Crashes, 2008-2018. This table shows the number and percentage of driving under the influence (DUI) arrests associated with reported crashes from 2008-2018.

Table 18: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Race/Ethnicity and Impairment Type. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of impairment type and race/ethnicity for 2018 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes.

Table 19: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Adjudication Status and Impairment Type. This table cross tabulates crash-involved drivers' impairment type (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition for DUI convictions associated with those crash involvements.

Table 20: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by County and Impairment Type. This table shows the number of alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes, by county and impairment type.

Table 21: Alcohol-Involved Drivers Under Age 21 in Fatal/Injury Crashes, 2008-2018. This table shows the total number of alcohol-involved drivers under age 21 in fatal/injury crashes in California. It also shows their percentage of the total count of alcohol-involved drivers in the state over the same time period.

[^2]Table 22a: 2018 Alcohol-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Gender. This table shows the total number of 2018 alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by age and gender.

Table 22b: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Gender (Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). This table shows the number of 2018 alcoholand drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by age and gender who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash.

Tables 23a-23b: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Impairment Type and Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2018 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by impairment type and prior DUI conviction status, both total (23a) and for drivers who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash (23b).

Tables 24a-24b: 2018 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2018 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by number of prior DUI convictions, both total (24a) and for drivers who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash $(24 b)$.

Table 25: 2018 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Alcohol- and DrugInvolved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes. This table shows the mean, median, and frequency distribution of BAC levels for alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes in 2018.

Figure 10: Percentages of Crash Injuries and Fatalities that were Alcohol-Involved, 2009-2019. Figure 10 (opposite page) shows the annual percentages of crash injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 2009 to 2019. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI Summary Statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.

Figure 11: Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Crash Fatalities, 1995-2019. Figure 11 (opposite page) shows numbers of alcohol- and drug-involved crash fatalities from 1995 to 2019. 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 10. Percentages of crash injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 2009-2019.

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

- The percentage of alcohol-involved crash fatalities remain relatively unchanged, going from $32.1 \%$ in 2018 to $31.8 \%$ in 2019 (see Figure 10).
- The percentage of alcohol-involved crash injuries remained relatively unchanged, going from $10.0 \%$ in 2018 to $10.2 \%$ in 2019 (see Figure 10 and DUI Summary Statistics).
- The total number of alcohol- and/or drug-involved crash fatalities increased by $0.7 \%$ in 2019, following a decrease of $6.9 \%$ in 2018. The majority of these crash fatalities remains alcoholrelated (see Figure 11).
- While the number of alcohol-involved fatalities declined by about $12 \%$ over the past 24 years, the number of drug-involved fatalities tripled over the same time period. (see Figure 11).
- Of all 2018 DUI arrests, 20.5\% were associated with a reported traffic crash, whereas $8.1 \%$ of DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities. Both of these statistics have been fairly stable since 2016 (see Table 17).

- The percentage of alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes under the age of 21 decreased from $11.3 \%$ in 2008 to $6.1 \%$ in 2018 (see Table 21).
- Among 2018 drivers in fatal/injury crashes with reported involvement of alcohol and/or drugs, alcohol only involvement was determined and reported by law enforcement $89.6 \%$ of the time, drug only involvement was reported in $8.2 \%$ of cases, while involvement of both alcohol and drugs was reported for $2.2 \%$ of these drivers (see Table 18).
- Among alcohol- and drug-involved drivers, $44.4 \%$ do not have a record of any conviction in connection with their involvement in a fatal/injury crash. In $41.8 \%(3,559 / 8,525)$ of these nonconvicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers' ability was impaired by alcohol (see Table 19).
- Among the 10 counties with the largest number of 2018 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes, the percentage of drivers with drug-related impairment varied from 5.9\% in Santa Clara to $12.7 \%$ in Orange (see Table 20). Among all other counties, five had $15 \%$ or higher percentage of drivers with drug-involved impairment: Lake (20.4\%), Plumas (19.4\%), Modoc (16.7\%), Ventura (15.9\%), and Trinity (15.0\%).
- The majority of drug-involved as well as drug- and alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes are not convicted for DUI associated with the crash and have neither prior DUI convictions nor alcohol- and drug-related reckless driving convictions within 10 years indicated on their records (see Tables 19 and 23a).
- Three-fourths (74.5\%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction. In contrast, the majority $(59.0 \%)$ of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved injury crashes had at least one prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 24a).
- The median BAC level of alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes was $0.16 \%$ in 2018 (see Table 25), unchanged since 2012.

TABLE 17: DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 2008-2018 ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| ARRESTS/ <br> CRASHES | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL DUI <br> ARRESTS | 214811 | 208531 | 195879 | 180212 | 172893 | 160388 | 154743 | 141372 | 130054 | 123548 | 127437 |
| DUI ARRESTS <br> ASSOCIATED WITH <br> CRASHES | $14.2 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $21.0 \%$ | $21.0 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ |
| DUI ARRESTS <br> ASSOCIATED WITH <br> FATAL/INJURY <br> CRASHES | $5.5 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These data include DUI arrest cases where the driver license was found in the DMV database and whose DUI arrest date matched the crash involvement date found on their driver record.
TABLE 18: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WHITE | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  | UNKNOWN |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 21010 | 100.0 | 7155 | 34.1 | 9197 | 43.8 | 1922 | 9.1 | 1590 | 7.6 | 1146 | 5.5 |
| 1 | ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 14036 | 66.8 | 4774 | 34.0 | 6753 | 48.1 | 1223 | 8.7 | 985 | 7.0 | 301 | 2.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\zeta}{8} \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 1792 | 8.5 | 377 | 21.0 | 543 | 30.3 | 122 | 6.8 | 83 | 4.6 | 667 | 37.2 |
| $\sum_{\mathrm{I}}^{\mathrm{I}}$ | NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 2998 | 14.3 | 1011 | 33.7 | 1156 | 38.6 | 357 | 11.9 | 363 | 12.1 | 111 | 3.7 |
| $\frac{a}{2}$ | DRUG- AND ALCOHOLINVOLVED (ALL LEVELS) | 452 | 2.2 | 183 | 40.5 | 163 | 36.1 | 58 | 12.8 | 34 | 7.5 | 14 | 3.1 |
| $\geqq$ | DRUG-INVOLVED | 1732 | 8.2 | 810 | 46.8 | 582 | 33.6 | 162 | 9.4 | 125 | 7.2 | 53 | 3.1 |

For each impairment level, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2018 California Highway Patrol data files. $92.0 \%$ (416) of the drivers who were alcohol- and drug-involved were alcohol impaired (BAC $.08 \%$ and above).
TABLE 19: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION

| ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | TYPE OF CONVICTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { MISDEMEANOR } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALCOHOL- } \\ & \text { RECKLESS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YOUTH } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { OTHER } \\ \text { CONVICTION } \end{gathered}$ |  | NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTIONS |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 19183 | 100.0 | 7568 | 39.5 | 2495 | 13.0 | 581 | 3.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 13 | 0.1 | 8525 | 44.4 |
| $\underline{1}$ | ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 13317 | 69.4 | 7029 | 52.8 | 2232 | 16.8 | 495 | 3.7 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 3559 | 26.7 |
| $\stackrel{H}{E}$ | NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 951 | 5.0 | 67 | 7.0 | 22 | 2.3 | 7 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.1 | 854 | 89.8 |
| \% | NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 2816 | 14.7 | 6 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 2806 | 99.6 |
| $\frac{2}{4}$ | DRUG- AND ALCOHOLINVOLVED (ALL LEVELS) | 434 | 2.3 | 92 | 21.2 | 60 | 13.8 | 17 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.2 | 264 | 60.8 |
| $\leq$ | DRUG-INVOLVED | 1665 | 8.7 | 374 | 22.5 | 178 | 10.7 | 62 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 0.5 | 1042 | 62.6 |

For each impairment level, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2018 California Highway Patrol data files, and include only cases where the
$91.9 \%$ (399) of the drivers who were alcohol- and drug-involved were alcohol impaired (BAC $.08 \%$ and above).

TABLE 20: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY COUNTY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| COUNTY | TOTAL | IMPAIRMENT TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ALCOHOL INVOLVED |  | DRUG- AND <br> ALCOHOL-INVOLVED |  | DRUG-INVOLVED |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE | 19183 | 17084 | 89.1 | 434 | 2.3 | 1665 | 8.7 |
| ALAMEDA | 689 | 604 | 87.7 | 21 | 3.0 | 64 | 9.3 |
| ALPINE | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| AMADOR | 32 | 29 | 90.6 | 1 | 3.1 | 2 | 6.3 |
| BUTTE | 153 | 130 | 85.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 20 | 13.1 |
| CALAVERAS | 44 | 36 | 81.8 | 3 | 6.8 | 5 | 11.4 |
| COLUSA | 19 | 15 | 78.9 | 2 | 10.5 | 2 | 10.5 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 411 | 370 | 90.0 | 9 | 2.2 | 32 | 7.8 |
| DEL NORTE | 18 | 18 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| EL DORADO | 167 | 147 | 88.0 | 3 | 1.8 | 17 | 10.2 |
| FRESNO | 349 | 309 | 88.5 | 7 | 2.0 | 33 | 9.5 |
| GLENN | 20 | 18 | 90.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 10.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 125 | 103 | 82.4 | 5 | 4.0 | 17 | 13.6 |
| IMPERIAL | 77 | 69 | 89.6 | 2 | 2.6 | 6 | 7.8 |
| INYO | 27 | 24 | 88.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 11.1 |
| KERN | 454 | 395 | 87.0 | 8 | 1.8 | 51 | 11.2 |
| KINGS | 60 | 51 | 85.0 | 3 | 5.0 | 6 | 10.0 |
| LAKE | 49 | 38 | 77.6 | 1 | 2.0 | 10 | 20.4 |
| LASSEN | 17 | 16 | 94.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.9 |
| LOS ANGELES | 4672 | 4269 | 91.4 | 74 | 1.6 | 329 | 7.0 |
| MADERA | 126 | 114 | 90.5 | 1 | 0.8 | 11 | 8.7 |
| MARIN | 115 | 106 | 92.2 | 1 | 0.9 | 8 | 7.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MENDOCINO | 78 | 70 | 89.7 | 2 | 2.6 | 6 | 7.7 |
| MERCED | 199 | 186 | 93.5 | 3 | 1.5 | 10 | 5.0 |
| MODOC | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| MONO | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| MONTEREY | 277 | 251 | 90.6 | 3 | 1.1 | 23 | 8.3 |
| NAPA | 140 | 130 | 92.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 7.1 |
| NEVADA | 89 | 74 | 83.1 | 4 | 4.5 | 11 | 12.4 |
| ORANGE | 1273 | 1083 | 85.1 | 28 | 2.2 | 162 | 12.7 |
| PLACER | 167 | 142 | 85.0 | 4 | 2.4 | 21 | 12.6 |
| PLUMAS | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 19.4 |
| RIVERSIDE | 1065 | 911 | 85.5 | 49 | 4.6 | 105 | 9.9 |
| SACRAMENTO | 903 | 816 | 90.4 | 12 | 1.3 | 75 | 8.3 |
| SAN BENITO | 113 | 109 | 96.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 3.5 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | 1316 | 1188 | 90.3 | 41 | 3.1 | 87 | 6.6 |
| SAN DIEGO | 1604 | 1441 | 89.8 | 39 | 2.4 | 124 | 7.7 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 305 | 285 | 93.4 | 8 | 2.6 | 12 | 3.9 |
| SAN JOAOUIN | 461 | 405 | 87.9 | 13 | 2.8 | 43 | 9.3 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | 150 | 133 | 88.7 | 4 | 2.7 | 13 | 8.7 |
| SAN MATEO | 283 | 264 | 93.3 | 4 | 1.4 | 15 | 5.3 |
| SANTA BARBARA | 199 | 171 | 85.9 | 5 | 2.5 | 23 | 11.6 |
| SANTA CLARA | 663 | 616 | 92.9 | 8 | 1.2 | 39 | 5.9 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 178 | 153 | 86.0 | 7 | 3.9 | 18 | 10.1 |
| SHASTA | 114 | 95 | 83.3 | 4 | 3.5 | 15 | 13.2 |
| SIERRA | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 33 | 28 | 84.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 9.1 |
| SOLANO | 232 | 191 | 82.3 | 7 | 3.0 | 34 | 14.7 |
| SONOMA | 310 | 275 | 88.7 | 8 | 2.6 | 27 | 8.7 |
| STANISLAUS | 372 | 326 | 87.6 | 9 | 2.4 | 37 | 9.9 |
| SUTTER | 130 | 107 | 82.3 | 4 | 3.1 | 19 | 14.6 |
| TEHAMA | 46 | 37 | 80.4 | 3 | 6.5 | 6 | 13.0 |
| TRINITY | 20 | 17 | 85.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
| TULARE | 244 | 214 | 87.7 | 6 | 2.5 | 24 | 9.8 |
| TUOLUMNE | 49 | 47 | 95.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| VENTURA | 389 | 317 | 81.5 | 10 | 2.6 | 62 | 15.9 |
| YOLO | 101 | 93 | 92.1 | 1 | 1.0 | 7 | 6.9 |
| YUBA | 9 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These data are derived from the 2018 California Highway Patrol data files and include only cases where the driver record was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 21: ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 2008-2018 ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| AGE |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL <br> ALL AGES) | $N$ | 19604 | 17874 | 16501 | 16231 | 16325 | 15892 | 16633 | 17633 | 19133 | 18934 | 19232 |
| UNDER 18 | $N$ | 316 | 239 | 233 | 190 | 199 | 174 | 150 | 147 | 164 | 167 | 146 |
|  | \% | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| 18-20 | $N$ | 1901 | 1831 | 1641 | 1569 | 1379 | 1201 | 1214 | 1204 | 1271 | 1155 | 1033 |
|  | \% | 9.7 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.4 |
| UNDER 21 | $N$ | 2217 | 2070 | 1874 | 1759 | 1578 | 1375 | 1364 | 1351 | 1435 | 1322 | 1179 |
|  | \% | 11.3 | 11.6 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 9.7 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.1 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These data are derived from the 2018 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 22a: 2018 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND GENDER ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ |
| TOTAL | 19232 | 100.0 | 14403 | 74.9 | 4829 | 25.1 |
| UNDER 18 | 146 | 0.8 | 103 | 70.5 | 43 | 29.5 |
| $18-20$ | 1033 | 5.4 | 753 | 72.9 | 280 | 27.1 |
| $21-30$ | 7870 | 40.9 | 5732 | 72.8 | 2138 | 27.2 |
| $31-40$ | 4072 | 21.2 | 3106 | 76.3 | 966 | 23.7 |
| $41-50$ | 2258 | 11.7 | 1681 | 74.4 | 577 | 25.6 |
| $51-59$ | 1680 | 8.7 | 1258 | 74.9 | 422 | 25.1 |
| 60-69 | 973 | 5.1 | 731 | 75.1 | 242 | 24.9 |
| 70 \& ABOVE | 371 | 1.9 | 263 | 70.9 | 108 | 29.1 |
| AGE UNKNOWN | 829 | 4.3 | 776 | 93.6 | 53 | 6.4 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ These data are derived from the 2018 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 22b: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND GENDER (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED) ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ | $N$ | $\%$ |
| TOTAL | 5551 | 100.0 | 4014 | 72.3 | 1537 | 27.7 |
| UNDER 18 | 46 | 0.8 | 36 | 78.3 | 10 | 21.7 |
| $18-20$ | 297 | 5.4 | 221 | 74.4 | 76 | 25.6 |
| $21-30$ | 2044 | 36.8 | 1478 | 72.3 | 566 | 27.7 |
| $31-40$ | 1212 | 21.8 | 899 | 74.2 | 313 | 25.8 |
| $41-50$ | 736 | 13.3 | 534 | 72.6 | 202 | 27.4 |
| $51-59$ | 608 | 11.0 | 434 | 71.4 | 174 | 28.6 |
| $60-69$ | 387 | 7.0 | 273 | 70.5 | 114 | 29.5 |
| $70 \&$ ABOVE | 221 | 4.0 | 139 | 62.9 | 82 | 37.1 |

[^3]TABLE 23a: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS |  | TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR + PRIORS |  |
|  |  | $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
|  | TOTAL |  |  | 19183 | 100.0 | 8228 | 42.9 | 8246 | 43.0 | 2115 | 11.0 | 469 | 2.4 | 125 | 0.7 |
| 1 | ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 13317 | 69.4 | 3623 | 27.2 | 7269 | 54.6 | 1895 | 14.2 | 415 | 3.1 | 115 | 0.9 |
|  | NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 951 | 5.0 | 753 | 79.2 | 142 | 14.9 | 44 | 4.6 | 10 | 1.1 | 2 | 0.2 |
| $\sum_{i}^{m}$ | NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED | 2816 | 14.7 | 2611 | 92.7 | 171 | 6.1 | 29 | 1.0 | 4 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| 危 | DRUG- AND ALCOHOLINVOLVED (ALL LEVELS) | 434 | 2.3 | 232 | 53.5 | 147 | 33.9 | 38 | 8.8 | 13 | 3.0 | 4 | 0.9 |
| $\leq$ | DRUG-INVOLVED | 1665 | 8.7 | 1009 | 60.6 | 517 | 31.1 | 109 | 6.5 | 27 | 1.6 | 3 | 0.2 |

These data are derived from California Highway Patrol data files and include only those cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.
TABLE 23b: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE

| TOTAL |  | NO DUI PRIORS |  | PRIORS IN TEN YEARS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ONE PRIOR | TWO PRIORS |  | THREE PRIORS |  | FOUR +PRIORS |  |
| $N$ | \% |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| 5551 | 100.0 | 4925 | 88.7 | 478 | 8.6 | 117 | 2.1 | 27 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.1 |
| 1090 | 19.6 | 878 | 80.6 | 146 | 13.4 | 52 | 4.8 | 13 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.1 |
| 826 | 14.9 | 718 | 86.9 | 75 | 9.1 | 26 | 3.1 | 5 | 0.6 | 2 | 0.2 |
| 2759 | 49.7 | 2563 | 92.9 | 166 | 6.0 | 25 | 0.9 | 4 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| 182 | 3.3 | 145 | 79.7 | 34 | 18.7 | 3 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 694 | 12.5 | 621 | 89.5 | 57 | 8.2 | 11 | 1.6 | 5 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 |

These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.
TABLE 24a: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY

| 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 | 19183 | 100.0 | 8228 | 42.9 | 8246 | 43.0 | 2115 | 11.0 | 469 | 2.4 | 125 | 0.7 |
| WITH FATALITIES | $1104{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 5.8 | 822 | 74.5 | 227 | 20.6 | 42 | 3.8 | 11 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.2 |
| WITH INJURIES | 18079 | 94.2 | 7406 | 41.0 | 8019 | 44.4 | 2073 | 11.5 | 458 | 2.5 | 123 | 0.7 |

TABLE 24b: 2018 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI

| 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 | 5551 | 100.0 | 4925 | 88.7 | 478 | 8.6 | 117 | 2.1 | 27 | 0.5 | 4 | 0.1 |
| WITH FATALITIES | $852^{\text {b }}$ | 15.3 | 710 | 83.3 | 113 | 13.3 | 24 | 2.8 | 4 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.1 |
| WITH INJURIES | 4699 | 84.7 | 4215 | 89.7 | 365 | 7.8 | 93 | 2.0 | 23 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.1 |

TABLE 25: 2018 REPORTED ${ }^{\text {a }}$ BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF ALCOHOL- AND DRUG- INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES

| BAC LEVEL (\%) | FREQUENCY | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | 441 | 4.1 |
| . 01 | 28 | 0.3 |
| . 02 | 45 | 0.4 |
| . 03 | 52 | 0.5 |
| . 04 | 65 | 0.6 |
| . 05 | 119 | 1.1 |
| . 06 | 136 | 1.3 |
| . 07 | 215 | 2.0 |
| . 08 | 326 | 3.0 |
| . 09 | 381 | 3.5 |
| . 10 | 441 | 4.1 |
| . 11 | 486 | 4.5 |
| . 12 | 551 | 5.1 |
| . 13 | 599 | 5.5 |
| . 14 | 634 | 5.8 |
| . 15 | 668 | 6.2 |
| . 16 | 688 | 6.3 |
| . 17 | 682 | 6.3 |
| . 18 | 603 | 5.6 |
| . 19 | 560 | 5.2 |
| . 20 | 538 | 5.0 |
| . 21 | 431 | 4.0 |
| . 22 | 414 | 3.8 |
| . 23 | 350 | 3.2 |
| . 24 | 258 | 2.4 |
| . 25 | 243 | 2.2 |
| . 26 | 158 | 1.5 |
| . 27 | 168 | 1.6 |
| . 28 | 114 | 1.1 |
| . 29 | 109 | 1.0 |
| . 30 | 73 | 0.7 |
| . 31 | 70 | 0.6 |
| . 32 | 51 | 0.5 |
| . 33 | 51 | 0.5 |
| . 34 | 26 | 0.2 |
| . 35 | 22 | 0.2 |
| . 36 | 15 | 0.1 |
| . 37 | 21 | 0.2 |
| . 38 | 13 | 0.1 |
| . 39 | 8 | 0.1 |
| . 40 | 9 | 0.1 |
| . 41 | 2 | 0.0 |
| . 42 | 3 | 0.0 |
| . 44 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 45 | 1 | 0.0 |
| . 46 | 1 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL | 10870 | 100.0 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { MEAN }^{b} \text { BAC } .17 \\ \text { MEDIAN }^{\mathrm{b}} \text { BAC. } 16 \end{array}$ |  |  |

[^4]
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## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

## HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975

AB 2717 (Lackey), effective 1/1/2019, clarifies that enhanced penalties for refusing to submit to driving under the influence (DUI) chemical test apply only to a person who refuses to submit to or complete the breath or urine test. In addition, this bill requires a peace officer to advise a person that their failure to submit to a chemical test would result in the administrative license suspension or revocation of the driving privilege. This bill also changes the conditions under which a peace officer can request a blood test if the officer suspects that the person was driving under the influence.

SB 611 (Hill), effective 1/1/2018, makes clarifying and conforming changes to specific provisions of SB 1046 (Hill) in regards to ignition interlock device IID programs and driver license restriction requirements for persons convicted of first and repeat alcohol- and/or drug-related DUI offenses during the period between January 1, 2019 and January 1, 2026.

SB 2687 (Achadjian), effective 7/1/2018, amends Sections 23152 and 23153 of the Vehicle Code, to make it unlawful for a person with a BAC of $0.04 \%$ or more, to drive a vehicle when a "passenger-for-hire" is in the vehicle at the time of the offense. This bill also makes it unlawful for a person with a BAC of $0.04 \%$ or more, to drive a motor vehicle and at the same time do any act that causes bodily injury to another person other than the driver.

SB 1046 (Hill), effective 1/1/2017, extends the existing ignition interlock pilot program in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties, authorized by AB 91, until January 1, 2019. In addition, effective January 1, 2019 until January 1, 2026, this bill allows persons convicted of a first alcohol-related DUI offense and requires persons convicted of a first alcohol-related DUI offense with injury and persons convicted of a repeat alcohol-related DUI offense to install an ignition interlock device for a specific period of time (relative to specific DUI offense and number of prior DUI violations). These persons were able to apply for a restricted driver license without serving any period of license suspension or revocation. This bill would require ignition interlock device manufacturers to adopt a fee schedule that provides for the payment of the cost of the ignition interlock device in amounts proportionate to the offenders' income relative to the federal poverty level. The bill requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to report data to the California State Transportation Agency regarding the implementation and efficacy of the ignition interlock program enacted by provisions of this law by March 1, 2024.

SB 61 (Hill), effective 1/1/2016, extends the existing ignition interlock pilot program in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare Counties authorized by AB 91 law until July 1, 2017. This pilot program mandates the use of an ignition interlock device for all persons convicted of CVC Sections 23152 and 23153 in the four pilot counties during the pilot program implementation period.

AB 2552 (Torres), effective $1 / 1 / 2014$, amends and repeals Sections 23152 and 23153 of the Vehicle Code, to separate and define distinctly the offenses of driving under the influence of an alcoholic beverage, drug, or combined influence of alcohol and drugs, including causing bodily injury while committing any of these offenses.

AB 2020 (Pan), effective 1/1/2013, removes the option to choose a urine test to determine the drug content level for a person lawfully arrested for driving under the influence of drugs or the combination of alcohol and drugs. The bill specifies that the person's only options are a blood or breath test. A person consents to a urine test if a blood test is unavailable or if the person is exempted from a blood test for medical reasons.

AB 520 (Ammiano), effective 1/1/2012, allows persons convicted of alcohol-reckless driving and who have no more than two prior alcohol-related convictions within 10 years, to obtain an IID restricted license after completing a 90-day Administrative Per Se (APS) suspension period, if they enroll in a 9 -month DUI program, provide proof of financial responsibility, pay the necessary fees, and provide proof of IID installation. The license restriction remains in effect for the remainder of the 12-month APS suspension period.

AB 1601 (Hill), effective 1/1/2012, authorizes the court to order a 10-year revocation of the driver license of a person who has been convicted of three-or-more DUI offenses if the court considers certain factors. This bill also allows a person whose driver license is revoked for 10 years to apply to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for driver license reinstatement, 5 years from the date of the last DUI conviction, if certain conditions are met; these conditions include, among other things, that the person was not convicted of any other drug- or alcoholrelated offenses during the driver license revocation period.

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 is
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 its findings to the legislature.

SB 895 (Huff), effective 6/22/2010, provides clean-up legislation for SB 598. This bill terminates the 1-year (APS) license suspension if the person has been convicted of a DUI as stated under SB 598, and the person meets all specified conditions for a restricted driver's license including the installation of an ignition interlock device (IID).

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 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 alcoholreckless 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 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 refuses 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 remained operative until January 1, 2009 and required 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 convictions considered as prior for DUI will be counted for enhanced penalties (includes DUI convictions of persons under age 21). This 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 DUI program providers to send proof of enrollment in, or proof of completion of, the programs directly to DMV, and prohibits the DMV from receiving the certificates from program participants.

SB 1697 (Torlakson), effective 9/20/2005, assigns sole responsibility for imposing APS and DUIrelated post-conviction driver license actions to DMV, and removes this responsibility from the courts. It also ensures that for all persons convicted of a DUI, license restriction, suspension, or revocation of the driving privilege are DMV's responsibility.

SB 408 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2004, prohibits the DMV (for cases showing a "critical need to drive") from issuing a restricted driver's 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 a BAC of $0.05 \%$ or more, 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 remedy an oversight in the law which provided for sanctions against drivers convicted of DUI in a water vessel without injury, but did 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. It also 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 CVC Section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under Section 23575(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 CVC 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 alcohol-related reckless driving charge, the courts order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. This bill also requires an evaluation by the DMV of the effectiveness of the program and a discussion of the findings in its annual report to the Legislature.

SB 1890 (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, order 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 in 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, be ordered to enroll, participate in, and complete a DUI treatment program, subject to the latest violation, as a condition of probation. The person is not to be given credit or 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 3148 (Katz), effective $6 / 30 / 1995$, prescribes procedures for the forfeiture of a motor vehicle if the driver of the vehicle has a prior conviction for driving while unlicensed or suspended/revoked, and if the driver is the registered owner of the vehicle.

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 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.

AB 2639 (Friedman), effective 9/30/1994, repeals the statutes which authorized discretionary IID orders (CVC 23235), although part of the repealed statutes was incorporated into the sections establishing mandatory orders (CVC 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 90day 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 APS suspension; as part of the sentencing of repeat DUI offenders, CVC 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 CVC 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 driver's 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 APS 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 CVC 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 CVC 2800.2 or 2800.3 (evading a peace officer in
a reckless manner, causing injury or death), within 7 years of a violation of CVC Sections 23103, 23152, 23153, or Penal Code Sections 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 statute authorizes the installation of such devices in all DUI cases and permits the court to grant subjects revoked for three-or-more DUI-related violations a restricted license after 24 months of the revocation period 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 CVC Sections 13353 and 13353.2 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 Penal Code Sections 191.5 or 192(c3), CVC 23152 which occurred within 7 years of two or more convictions of CVC 23152 or CVC 23153, or a violation of CVC 23153 which occurred within 7 years of one or more convictions of CVC 23152 or CVC 23153 or the cited Penal Code 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 fourth 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 issuing the driving privilege of a minor failing to show proof of completion of a courtordered 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 issuing the driving privilege of those 13 years or older for 1 year, 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 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 Penal Code Section 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 secondmisdemeanor offenders from 1 year to 18 months, and 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-ormore 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 (CVC Sections 23152, 23153).

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 alcoholor drug-related reckless driving convictions receive a 3-year license revocation along with a jail term and fine, and a small proportion are assigned 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. Conviction 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 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 3year revocation.

## 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)."

## ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

Alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction refers to a conviction of the California Vehicle Code (VC) Section VC 23103.5 of reckless driving involving alcohol and/or drugs. It is typically associated with driving under the influence (DUI) arrests with weaker circumstances (for example, BAC level lower than or close to $.08 \%$ ) and results in lesser penalties and sanctions than a DUI conviction. Alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving 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 refers to a violation of a specific California Vehicle Code Section reported by courts to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) in the abstract of conviction. Since courts' abstracts of conviction can be amended, corrected, or dismissed, the conviction totals reported here 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, US Codes J36FR46, J36423, and out of state DUI codes.

## DUI CONVICTION RATE

Percent of total number of DUI arrests in a given calendar year that resulted in DUI convictions (total DUI convictions/total DUI arrests * 100).

## DUID

DUID is an acronym for "driving under the influence of drugs" (either alone or in combination with other drugs and/or alcohol), a violation of subdivisions (e) and (f) prior to July 1, 2018, or later of subdivisions (f) and (g) of Sections 23152 or 23153 of the California Vehicle Code.

## LOGISTIC REGRESSION

Logistic regression analysis is a statistical procedure evaluating the linear relationship between various factors and the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an outcome event. In this study, the procedure was used to explain the relationship between 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.
$\underline{P}$
$P$ stands for probability. For example, if $p<.05$, the probability is less than 5 chances in 100 that the difference found or one larger would occur by chance alone.

## QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

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

## STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

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

## CHAPTER 450

An act to add Section 1821 to the Vehicle Code. Relating to driving offenses.
(Approved by Governor September 14, 1989. Filed with
Secretary of State September 15, 1989.)

## LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 757, Friedman. Driving offenses: intervention programs: evaluation.
Under existing law, the Department of Motor Vehicles maintains records of driver's offenses reported by the courts. Including violations of the prohibitions against driving while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage, any drug, or both, driving with an excessive blood-alcohol concentration, or driving while addicted to any drug.

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

The bill would declare legislative findings.

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

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares as follows:
(a) Drivers under the influence of drugs or alcohol continue to present a grave danger to the citizens of this state.
(b) The Legislature has taken stern action to deter this crime and punish its offenders and has provided a range of sanctions available to the courts to use at their discretion.
(c) No system exists to monitor and evaluate the efficacy of these measures or to determine the achievement of the Legislature's goals.
(d) This lack of accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics hampers the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions.
(e) It is essential that the Legislature acquire this information, from available resources, as soon as practicable, and that this information be updated and transmitted annually to the Legislature.

SEC. 2. Section 1821 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read:
1821: The department shall establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The system may include a recidivism tracking system. The recidivism tracking system may include, but not be limited to, jail sentencing, license restriction, license suspension. Level I (first offender) and II (multiple offender) alcohol and drug education and treatment program assignment, alcohol and drug education treatment program readmission and dropout rates, adjudicating court, length of jail term, actual jail or alternative sentence served, type of treatment program assigned, actual program compliance status, subsequent accidents related to
driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and subsequent convictions of violations of Section 23152 or 23153.

The department shall submit an annual report of its evaluations to the Legislature. The evaluations shall include a ranking of the relative efficacy of criminal penalties, other sanctions, and intervention programs and the various combinations thereof.
APPENDIX B
TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 124141 | 95839 | 77.2 | 28302 | 22.8 | 38627 | 31.1 | 64058 | 51.6 | 11554 | 9.3 | 9902 | 8.0 |
| ALAMEDA | UNDER 18 | 14 | 10 | 71.4 | 4 | 28.6 | 4 | 28.6 | 8 | 57.1 | 1 | 7.1 | 1 | 7.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 225 | 172 | 76.4 | 53 | 23.6 | 33 | 14.7 | 144 | 64.0 | 26 | 11.6 | 22 | 9.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 2103 | 1560 | 74.2 | 543 | 25.8 | 413 | 19.6 | 989 | 47.0 | 356 | 16.9 | 345 | 16.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 1371 | 1074 | 78.3 | 297 | 21.7 | 260 | 19.0 | 580 | 42.3 | 308 | 22.5 | 223 | 16.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 754 | 599 | 79.4 | 155 | 20.6 | 165 | 21.9 | 284 | 37.7 | 194 | 25.7 | 111 | 14.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 474 | 386 | 81.4 | 88 | 18.6 | 175 | 36.9 | 104 | 21.9 | 126 | 26.6 | 69 | 14.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 163 | 122 | 74.8 | 41 | 25.2 | 70 | 42.9 | 30 | 18.4 | 47 | 28.8 | 16 | 9.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 19 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 57.9 | 3 | 15.8 | 2 | 10.5 | 3 | 15.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 5123 | 3942 | 76.9 | 1181 | 23.1 | 1131 | 22.1 | 2142 | 41.8 | 1060 | 20.7 | 790 | 15.4 |
| ALPINE | 18-20 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 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 |
|  | TOTAL | 10 | 7 | 70.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 7 | 70.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| AMADOR | 18-20 | 5 | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 49 | 36 | 73.5 | 13 | 26.5 | 37 | 75.5 | 6 | 12.2 | 2 | 4.1 | 4 | 8.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 33 | 23 | 69.7 | 10 | 30.3 | 22 | 66.7 | 6 | 18.2 | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 9.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 21 | 10 | 47.6 | 11 | 52.4 | 17 | 81.0 | 4 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 37 | 25 | 67.6 | 12 | 32.4 | 31 | 83.8 | 2 | 5.4 | 3 | 8.1 | 1 | 2.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 13 | 11 | 84.6 | 2 | 15.4 | 10 | 76.9 | 3 | 23.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | $6$ | 3 | 50.0 | 3 | 50.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 164 | 110 | 67.1 | 54 | 32.9 | 126 | 76.8 | 23 | 14.0 | 7 | 4.3 | 8 | 4.9 |
| BUTTE | UNDER 18 | 4 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 57 | 41 | 71.9 | 16 | 28.1 | 34 | 59.6 | 14 | 24.6 | 2 | 3.5 | 7 | 12.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 373 | 285 | 76.4 | 88 | 23.6 | 225 | 60.3 | 105 | 28.2 | 23 | 6.2 | 20 | 5.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 230 | 169 | 73.5 | 61 | 26.5 | 168 | 73.0 | 41 | 17.8 | 8 | 3.5 | 13 | 5.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 127 | 87 | 68.5 | 40 | 31.5 | 94 | 74.0 | 21 | 16.5 | 5 | 3.9 | 7 | 5.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 116 | 77 | 66.4 | 39 | 33.6 | 93 | 80.2 | 14 | 12.1 | 3 | 2.6 | 6 | 5.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 39 | 24 | 61.5 | 15 | 38.5 | 34 | 87.2 | 4 | 10.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 15 | 11 | 73.3 | 4 | 26.7 | 13 | 86.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 961 | 696 | 72.4 | 265 | 27.6 | 665 | 69.2 | 201 | 20.9 | 41 | 4.3 | 54 | 5.6 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| CALAVERAS | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 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 | 43 | 36 | 83.7 | 7 | 16.3 | 32 | 74.4 | 6 | 14.0 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 39 | 33 | 84.6 | 6 | 15.4 | 29 | 74.4 | 8 | 20.5 | 1 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 28 | 18 | 64.3 | 10 | 35.7 | 22 | 78.6 | 5 | 17.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 28 | 19 | 67.9 | 9 | 32.1 | 23 | 82.1 | 3 | 10.7 | 1 | 3.6 | 1 | 3.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 158 | 121 | 76.6 | 37 | 23.4 | 122 | 77.2 | 25 | 15.8 | 5 | 3.2 | 6 | 3.8 |
| COLUSA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 43 | 31 | 72.1 | 12 | 27.9 | 13 | 30.2 | 26 | 60.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 9.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 28 | 21 | 75.0 | 7 | 25.0 | 12 | 42.9 | 7 | 25.0 | 2 | 7.1 | 7 | 25.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 21 | 20 | 95.2 | 1 | 4.8 | 7 | 33.3 | 12 | 57.1 | 1 | 4.8 | 1 | 4.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 15 | 13 | 86.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 8 | 53.3 | 6 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 11 | 10 | 90.9 | 1 | 9.1 | 8 | 72.7 | 3 | 27.3 | 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 | 125 | 101 | 80.8 | 24 | 19.2 | 50 | 40.0 | 59 | 47.2 | 3 | 2.4 | 13 | 10.4 |
| CONTRA | UNDER 18 | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 5 | 35.7 | 5 | 35.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 2 | 14.3 |
| COSTA | 18-20 | 116 | 84 | 72.4 | 32 | 27.6 | 26 | 22.4 | 62 | 53.4 | 14 | 12.1 | 14 | 12.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1037 | 802 | 77.3 | 235 | 22.7 | 287 | 27.7 | 491 | 47.3 | 155 | 14.9 | 104 | 10.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 691 | 537 | 77.7 | 154 | 22.3 | 200 | 28.9 | 283 | 41.0 | 142 | 20.5 | 66 | 9.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 404 | 295 | 73.0 | 109 | 27.0 | 130 | 32.2 | 129 | 31.9 | 108 | 26.7 | 37 | 9.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 320 | 229 | 71.6 | 91 | 28.4 | 154 | 48.1 | 69 | 21.6 | 70 | 21.9 | 27 | 8.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 119 | 92 | 77.3 | 27 | 22.7 | 66 | 55.5 | 12 | 10.1 | 34 | 28.6 | 7 | 5.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 12 | 75.0 | 4 | 25.0 | 8 | 50.0 | 1 | 6.3 | 3 | 18.8 | 4 | 25.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2717 | 2062 | 75.9 | 655 | 24.1 | 876 | 32.2 | 1052 | 38.7 | 528 | 19.4 | 261 | 9.6 |
| DEL NORTE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 12 | 8 | 66.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 7 | 58.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 3 | 25.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 79 | 55 | 69.6 | 24 | 30.4 | 50 | 63.3 | 17 | 21.5 | 1 | 1.3 | 11 | 13.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 70 | 51 | 72.9 | 19 | 27.1 | 51 | 72.9 | 7 | 10.0 | 1 | 1.4 | 11 | 15.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 29 | 69.0 | 13 | 31.0 | 35 | 83.3 | 4 | 9.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 7.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 34 | 25 | 73.5 | 9 | 26.5 | 26 | 76.5 | 4 | 11.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 11.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 16 | 13 | 81.3 | 3 | 18.8 | 14 | 87.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 33.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 261 | 187 | 71.6 | 74 | 28.4 | 188 | 72.0 | 35 | 13.4 | 3 | 1.1 | 35 | 13.4 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| EL DORADO | UNDER 18 | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 21 | 14 | 66.7 | 7 | 33.3 | 15 | 71.4 | 6 | 28.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 224 | 158 | 70.5 | 66 | 29.5 | 169 | 75.4 | 33 | 14.7 | 8 | 3.6 | 14 | 6.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 166 | 118 | 71.1 | 48 | 28.9 | 123 | 74.1 | 28 | 16.9 | 5 | 3.0 | 10 | 6.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 102 | 60 | 58.8 | 42 | 41.2 | 87 | 85.3 | 9 | 8.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 5 | 4.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 89 | 57 | 64.0 | 32 | 36.0 | 73 | 82.0 | 11 | 12.4 | 4 | 4.5 | 1 | 1.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 64 | 53 | 82.8 | 11 | 17.2 | 61 | 95.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 3.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 10 | 83.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 684 | 475 | 69.4 | 209 | 30.6 | 545 | 79.7 | 88 | 12.9 | 19 | 2.8 | 32 | 4.7 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 24 | 19 | 79.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 6 | 25.0 | 16 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 295 | 223 | 75.6 | 72 | 24.4 | 46 | 15.6 | 207 | 70.2 | 12 | 4.1 | 30 | 10.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 2351 | 1797 | 76.4 | 554 | 23.6 | 381 | 16.2 | 1590 | 67.6 | 156 | 6.6 | 224 | 9.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1406 | 1106 | 78.7 | 300 | 21.3 | 224 | 15.9 | 949 | 67.5 | 108 | 7.7 | 125 | 8.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 693 | 543 | 78.4 | 150 | 21.6 | 145 | 20.9 | 451 | 65.1 | 57 | 8.2 | 40 | 5.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 417 | 338 | 81.1 | 79 | 18.9 | 134 | 32.1 | 211 | 50.6 | 44 | 10.6 | 28 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 139 | 108 | 77.7 | 31 | 22.3 | 43 | 30.9 | 59 | 42.4 | 25 | 18.0 | 12 | 8.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 29 | 25 | 86.2 | 4 | 13.8 | 13 | 44.8 | 10 | 34.5 | 4 | 13.8 | 2 | 6.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 5354 | 4159 | 77.7 | 1195 | 22.3 | 992 | 18.5 | 3493 | 65.2 | 406 | 7.6 | 463 | 8.6 |
| GLENN | 18-20 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 55 | 44 | 80.0 | 11 | 20.0 | 16 | 29.1 | 36 | 65.5 | 1 | 1.8 | 2 | 3.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 38 | 30 | 78.9 | 8 | 21.1 | 17 | 44.7 | 18 | 47.4 | 2 | 5.3 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 19 | 14 | 73.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 13 | 68.4 | 6 | 31.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 19 | 10 | 52.6 | 9 | 47.4 | 14 | 73.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 143 | 108 | 75.5 | 35 | 24.5 | 70 | 49.0 | 67 | 46.9 | 3 | 2.1 | 3 | 2.1 |
| HUMBOLDT | UNDER 18 | 6 | 5 | 83.3 | 1 | 16.7 | 5 | 83.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 39 | 32 | 82.1 | 7 | 17.9 | 26 | 66.7 | 9 | 23.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 10.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 367 | 266 | 72.5 | 101 | 27.5 | 242 | 65.9 | 73 | 19.9 | 17 | 4.6 | 35 | 9.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 314 | 243 | 77.4 | 71 | 22.6 | 229 | 72.9 | 46 | 14.6 | 13 | 4.1 | 26 | 8.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 154 | 110 | 71.4 | 44 | 28.6 | 119 | 77.3 | 16 | 10.4 | 8 | 5.2 | 11 | 7.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 94 | 65 | 69.1 | 29 | 30.9 | 79 | 84.0 | 6 | 6.4 | 1 | 1.1 | 8 | 8.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 51 | 37 | 72.5 | 14 | 27.5 | 46 | 90.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.9 | 3 | 5.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 13 | 7 | 53.8 | 6 | 46.2 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1038 | 765 | 73.7 | 273 | 26.3 | 759 | 73.1 | 150 | 14.5 | 41 | 3.9 | 88 | 8.5 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| IMPERIAL | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 57 | 47 | 82.5 | 10 | 17.5 | 10 | 17.5 | 47 | 82.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 313 | 250 | 79.9 | 63 | 20.1 | 30 | 9.6 | 271 | 86.6 | 9 | 2.9 | 3 | 1.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 181 | 139 | 76.8 | 42 | 23.2 | 17 | 9.4 | 157 | 86.7 | 2 | 1.1 | 5 | 2.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 104 | 88 | 84.6 | 16 | 15.4 | 13 | 12.5 | 82 | 78.8 | 4 | 3.8 | 5 | 4.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 65 | 60 | 92.3 | 5 | 7.7 | 15 | 23.1 | 50 | 76.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 35 | 34 | 97.1 | 1 | 2.9 | 19 | 54.3 | 16 | 45.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 764 | 627 | 82.1 | 137 | 17.9 | 108 | 14.1 | 628 | 82.2 | 15 | 2.0 | 13 | 1.7 |
| $\overline{\text { INYO }}$ | 18-20 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 43 | 29 | 67.4 | 14 | 32.6 | 16 | 37.2 | 14 | 32.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 30.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 27 | 19 | 70.4 | 8 | 29.6 | 17 | 63.0 | 4 | 14.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 22.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 15 | 13 | 86.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 7 | 46.7 | 6 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 13.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 11 | 7 | 63.6 | 4 | 36.4 | 8 | 72.7 | 1 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 18.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 5 | 62.5 | 2 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 110 | 79 | 71.8 | 31 | 28.2 | 57 | 51.8 | 29 | 26.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 21.8 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 14 | 13 | 92.9 | 1 | 7.1 | 2 | 14.3 | 12 | 85.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 233 | 193 | 82.8 | 40 | 17.2 | 42 | 18.0 | 173 | 74.2 | 8 | 3.4 | 10 | 4.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 1792 | 1364 | 76.1 | 428 | 23.9 | 376 | 21.0 | 1211 | 67.6 | 142 | 7.9 | 63 | 3.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 1025 | 792 | 77.3 | 233 | 22.7 | 252 | 24.6 | 656 | 64.0 | 89 | 8.7 | 28 | 2.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 534 | 412 | 77.2 | 122 | 22.8 | 177 | 33.1 | 280 | 52.4 | 62 | 11.6 | 15 | 2.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 280 | 224 | 80.0 | 56 | 20.0 | 128 | 45.7 | 119 | 42.5 | 22 | 7.9 | 11 | 3.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 101 | 87 | 86.1 | 14 | 13.9 | 52 | 51.5 | 36 | 35.6 | 10 | 9.9 | 3 | 3.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 21 | 18 | 85.7 | 3 | 14.3 | 13 | 61.9 | 4 | 19.0 | 4 | 19.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4000 | 3103 | 77.6 | 897 | 22.4 | 1042 | 26.0 | 2491 | 62.3 | 337 | 8.4 | 130 | 3.3 |
| KINGS | UNDER 18 | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 58 | 50 | 86.2 | 8 | 13.8 | 3 | 5.2 | 51 | 87.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 318 | 255 | 80.2 | 63 | 19.8 | 43 | 13.5 | 243 | 76.4 | 16 | 5.0 | 16 | 5.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 208 | 166 | 79.8 | 42 | 20.2 | 42 | 20.2 | 139 | 66.8 | 11 | 5.3 | 16 | 7.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 98 | 85 | 86.7 | 13 | 13.3 | 24 | 24.5 | 67 | 68.4 | 7 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 87 | 73 | 83.9 | 14 | 16.1 | 24 | 27.6 | 59 | 67.8 | 3 | 3.4 | 1 | 1.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 31 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 19.4 | 17 | 54.8 | 6 | 19.4 | 2 | 6.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 807 | 665 | 82.4 | 142 | 17.6 | 146 | 18.1 | 579 | 71.7 | 43 | 5.3 | 39 | 4.8 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| LAKE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 128 | 98 | 76.6 | 30 | 23.4 | 63 | 49.2 | 55 | 43.0 | 3 | 2.3 | 7 | 5.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 96 | 66 | 68.8 | 30 | 31.3 | 62 | 64.6 | 24 | 25.0 | 3 | 3.1 | 7 | 7.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 55 | 41 | 74.5 | 14 | 25.5 | 34 | 61.8 | 14 | 25.5 | 3 | 5.5 | 4 | 7.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 52 | 34 | 65.4 | 18 | 34.6 | 43 | 82.7 | 5 | 9.6 | 1 | 1.9 | 3 | 5.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 24 | 17 | 70.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 20 | 83.3 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 6 | 85.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 374 | 272 | 72.7 | 102 | 27.3 | 233 | 62.3 | 107 | 28.6 | 12 | 3.2 | 22 | 5.9 |
| LASSEN | 18-20 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 45 | 36 | 80.0 | 9 | 20.0 | 38 | 84.4 | 2 | 4.4 | 1 | 2.2 | 4 | 8.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 48 | 38 | 79.2 | 10 | 20.8 | 36 | 75.0 | 5 | 10.4 | 2 | 4.2 | 5 | 10.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 20 | 14 | 70.0 | 6 | 30.0 | 17 | 85.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 21 | 87.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 20 | 83.3 | 2 | 8.3 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 13 | 4 | 30.8 | 9 | 69.2 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 | 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 | 155 | 117 | 75.5 | 38 | 24.5 | 128 | 82.6 | 11 | 7.1 | 6 | 3.9 | 10 | 6.5 |
| LOS ANGELES | UNDER 18 | 37 | 26 | 70.3 | 11 | 29.7 | 6 | 16.2 | 30 | 81.1 | 1 | 2.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 962 | 746 | 77.5 | 216 | 22.5 | 115 | 12.0 | 701 | 72.9 | 69 | 7.2 | 77 | 8.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 10042 | 7659 | 76.3 | 2383 | 23.7 | 1420 | 14.1 | 6776 | 67.5 | 1123 | 11.2 | 723 | 7.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 6206 | 5014 | 80.8 | 1192 | 19.2 | 916 | 14.8 | 3966 | 63.9 | 836 | 13.5 | 488 | 7.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 3365 | 2742 | 81.5 | 623 | 18.5 | 558 | 16.6 | 2057 | 61.1 | 517 | 15.4 | 233 | 6.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 2052 | 1698 | 82.7 | 354 | 17.3 | 493 | 24.0 | 1005 | 49.0 | 423 | 20.6 | 131 | 6.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 752 | 630 | 83.8 | 122 | 16.2 | 262 | 34.8 | 284 | 37.8 | 161 | 21.4 | 45 | 6.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 113 | 94 | 83.2 | 19 | 16.8 | 47 | 41.6 | 29 | 25.7 | 18 | 15.9 | 19 | 16.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 23529 | 18609 | 79.1 | 4920 | 20.9 | 3817 | 16.2 | 14848 | 63.1 | 3148 | 13.4 | 1716 | 7.3 |
| MADERA | UNDER 18 | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 65 | 58 | 89.2 | 7 | 10.8 | 10 | 15.4 | 50 | 76.9 | 2 | 3.1 | 3 | 4.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 450 | 366 | 81.3 | 84 | 18.7 | 72 | 16.0 | 346 | 76.9 | 15 | 3.3 | 17 | 3.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 266 | 217 | 81.6 | 49 | 18.4 | 54 | 20.3 | 192 | 72.2 | 9 | 3.4 | 11 | 4.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 142 | 118 | 83.1 | 24 | 16.9 | 26 | 18.3 | 109 | 76.8 | 3 | 2.1 | 4 | 2.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 75 | 57 | 76.0 | 18 | 24.0 | 27 | 36.0 | 42 | 56.0 | 5 | 6.7 | 1 | 1.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 41 | 35 | 85.4 | 6 | 14.6 | 18 | 43.9 | 20 | 48.8 | 3 | 7.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1052 | 862 | 81.9 | 190 | 18.1 | 214 | 20.3 | 763 | 72.5 | 38 | 3.6 | 37 | 3.5 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| MARIN | UNDER 18 | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 33.3 | 6 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 53 | 45 | 84.9 | 8 | 15.1 | 16 | 30.2 | 36 | 67.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 379 | 289 | 76.3 | 90 | 23.7 | 130 | 34.3 | 198 | 52.2 | 23 | 6.1 | 28 | 7.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 278 | 213 | 76.6 | 65 | 23.4 | 118 | 42.4 | 112 | 40.3 | 26 | 9.4 | 22 | 7.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 172 | 126 | 73.3 | 46 | 26.7 | 101 | 58.7 | 49 | 28.5 | 5 | 2.9 | 17 | 9.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 125 | 85 | 68.0 | 40 | 32.0 | 91 | 72.8 | 19 | 15.2 | 6 | 4.8 | 9 | 7.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 78 | 44 | 56.4 | 34 | 43.6 | 68 | 87.2 | 2 | 2.6 | 4 | 5.1 | 4 | 5.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 24 | 16 | 66.7 | 8 | 33.3 | 21 | 87.5 | 1 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1118 | 827 | 74.0 | 291 | 26.0 | 548 | 49.0 | 423 | 37.8 | 64 | 5.7 | 83 | 7.4 |
| MARIPOSA | 18-20 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 24 | 17 | 70.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 22 | 91.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 16 | 10 | 62.5 | 6 | 37.5 | 14 | 87.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 20 | 14 | 70.0 | 6 | 30.0 | 14 | 70.0 | 3 | 15.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 8 | 5 | 62.5 | 3 | 37.5 | 6 | 75.0 | 2 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 77 | 52 | 67.5 | 25 | 32.5 | 63 | 81.8 | 11 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.9 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 4 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 16 | 13 | 81.3 | 3 | 18.8 | 8 | 50.0 | 5 | 31.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 18.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 201 | 155 | 77.1 | 46 | 22.9 | 108 | 53.7 | 73 | 36.3 | 1 | 0.5 | 19 | 9.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 173 | 133 | 76.9 | 40 | 23.1 | 117 | 67.6 | 44 | 25.4 | 5 | 2.9 | 7 | 4.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 103 | 80 | 77.7 | 23 | 22.3 | 75 | 72.8 | 23 | 22.3 | 1 | 1.0 | 4 | 3.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 57 | 31 | 54.4 | 26 | 45.6 | 43 | 75.4 | 7 | 12.3 | 2 | 3.5 | 5 | 8.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 47 | 38 | 80.9 | 9 | 19.1 | 40 | 85.1 | 4 | 8.5 | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 4.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 7 | 77.8 | 2 | 22.2 | 6 | 66.7 | 2 | 22.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 11.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 610 | 460 | 75.4 | 150 | 24.6 | 398 | 65.2 | 160 | 26.2 | 10 | 1.6 | 42 | 6.9 |
| MERCED | UNDER 18 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 91 | 77 | 84.6 | 14 | 15.4 | 15 | 16.5 | 69 | 75.8 | 1 | 1.1 | 6 | 6.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 594 | 465 | 78.3 | 129 | 21.7 | 76 | 12.8 | 471 | 79.3 | 20 | 3.4 | 27 | 4.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 328 | 256 | 78.0 | 72 | 22.0 | 71 | 21.6 | 213 | 64.9 | 19 | 5.8 | 25 | 7.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 160 | 133 | 83.1 | 27 | 16.9 | 33 | 20.6 | 105 | 65.6 | 16 | 10.0 | 6 | 3.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 107 | 82 | 76.6 | 25 | 23.4 | 36 | 33.6 | 59 | 55.1 | 7 | 6.5 | 5 | 4.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 26 | 83.9 | 5 | 16.1 | 11 | 35.5 | 13 | 41.9 | 7 | 22.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1316 | 1043 | 79.3 | 273 | 20.7 | 243 | 18.5 | 932 | 70.8 | 72 | 5.5 | 69 | 5.2 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| MODOC | 18-20 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 12 | 9 | 75.0 | 3 | 25.0 | 8 | 66.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 62.5 | 3 | 37.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 7 | 4 | 57.1 | 3 | 42.9 | 3 | 42.9 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 42.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 5 | 55.6 | 4 | 44.4 | 7 | 77.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 22.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 41 | 31 | 75.6 | 10 | 24.4 | 27 | 65.9 | 9 | 22.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 12.2 |
| MONO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 40 | 31 | 77.5 | 9 | 22.5 | 23 | 57.5 | 12 | 30.0 | 2 | 5.0 | 3 | 7.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 31 | 24 | 77.4 | 7 | 22.6 | 19 | 61.3 | 8 | 25.8 | 1 | 3.2 | 3 | 9.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 18 | 14 | 77.8 | 4 | 22.2 | 13 | 72.2 | 5 | 27.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 15 | 8 | 53.3 | 7 | 46.7 | 13 | 86.7 | 1 | 6.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 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 | 117 | 89 | 76.1 | 28 | 23.9 | 78 | 66.7 | 29 | 24.8 | 3 | 2.6 | 7 | 6.0 |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 13 | 9 | 69.2 | 4 | 30.8 | 1 | 7.7 | 12 | 92.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 186 | 158 | 84.9 | 28 | 15.1 | 21 | 11.3 | 161 | 86.6 | 1 | 0.5 | 3 | 1.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 1040 | 864 | 83.1 | 176 | 16.9 | 141 | 13.6 | 844 | 81.2 | 28 | 2.7 | 27 | 2.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 567 | 478 | 84.3 | 89 | 15.7 | 114 | 20.1 | 427 | 75.3 | 12 | 2.1 | 14 | 2.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 289 | 240 | 83.0 | 49 | 17.0 | 73 | 25.3 | 194 | 67.1 | 8 | 2.8 | 14 | 4.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 179 | 137 | 76.5 | 42 | 23.5 | 84 | 46.9 | 78 | 43.6 | 10 | 5.6 | 7 | 3.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 97 | 76 | 78.4 | 21 | 21.6 | 65 | 67.0 | 23 | 23.7 | 4 | 4.1 | 5 | 5.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2385 | 1973 | 82.7 | 412 | 17.3 | 510 | 21.4 | 1742 | 73.0 | 63 | 2.6 | 70 | 2.9 |
| NAPA | UNDER 18 | 3 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 34 | 21 | 61.8 | 13 | 38.2 | 8 | 23.5 | 25 | 73.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 258 | 188 | 72.9 | 70 | 27.1 | 89 | 34.5 | 148 | 57.4 | 10 | 3.9 | 11 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 170 | 128 | 75.3 | 42 | 24.7 | 67 | 39.4 | 83 | 48.8 | 7 | 4.1 | 13 | 7.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 113 | 94 | 83.2 | 19 | 16.8 | 50 | 44.2 | 49 | 43.4 | 2 | 1.8 | 12 | 10.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 82 | 59 | 72.0 | 23 | 28.0 | 50 | 61.0 | 22 | 26.8 | 4 | 4.9 | 6 | 7.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 6 | 19.4 | 22 | 71.0 | 6 | 19.4 | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 6 | 54.5 | 5 | 45.5 | 9 | 81.8 | 1 | 9.1 | 1 | 9.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 702 | 522 | 74.4 | 180 | 25.6 | 297 | 42.3 | 335 | 47.7 | 26 | 3.7 | 44 | 6.3 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| NEVADA | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 11 | 8 | 72.7 | 3 | 27.3 | 9 | 81.8 | 2 | 18.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 137 | 95 | 69.3 | 42 | 30.7 | 110 | 80.3 | 21 | 15.3 | 2 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 132 | 94 | 71.2 | 38 | 28.8 | 109 | 82.6 | 15 | 11.4 | 1 | 0.8 | 7 | 5.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 75 | 55 | 73.3 | 20 | 26.7 | 60 | 80.0 | 9 | 12.0 | 3 | 4.0 | 3 | 4.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 49 | 38 | 77.6 | 11 | 22.4 | 42 | 85.7 | 6 | 12.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 30 | 13 | 43.3 | 17 | 56.7 | 29 | 96.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 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 | 443 | 310 | 70.0 | 133 | 30.0 | 367 | 82.8 | 55 | 12.4 | 6 | 1.4 | 15 | 3.4 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 37 | 30 | 81.1 | 7 | 18.9 | 15 | 40.5 | 20 | 54.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 564 | 466 | 82.6 | 98 | 17.4 | 168 | 29.8 | 318 | 56.4 | 16 | 2.8 | 62 | 11.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 4936 | 3729 | 75.5 | 1207 | 24.5 | 1517 | 30.7 | 2607 | 52.8 | 246 | 5.0 | 566 | 11.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 2538 | 1952 | 76.9 | 586 | 23.1 | 927 | 36.5 | 1193 | 47.0 | 111 | 4.4 | 307 | 12.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 1491 | 1139 | 76.4 | 352 | 23.6 | 621 | 41.6 | 619 | 41.5 | 70 | 4.7 | 181 | 12.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 1069 | 798 | 74.6 | 271 | 25.4 | 629 | 58.8 | 277 | 25.9 | 47 | 4.4 | 116 | 10.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 389 | 293 | 75.3 | 96 | 24.7 | 264 | 67.9 | 68 | 17.5 | 16 | 4.1 | 41 | 10.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 83 | 53 | 63.9 | 30 | 36.1 | 60 | 72.3 | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 4.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 11107 | 8460 | 76.2 | 2647 | 23.8 | 4201 | 37.8 | 5121 | 46.1 | 506 | 4.6 | 1279 | 11.5 |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 7 | 5 | 71.4 | 2 | 28.6 | 5 | 71.4 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 39 | 32 | 82.1 | 7 | 17.9 | 25 | 64.1 | 11 | 28.2 | 2 | 5.1 | 1 | 2.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 336 | 258 | 76.8 | 78 | 23.2 | 207 | 61.6 | 76 | 22.6 | 30 | 8.9 | 23 | 6.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 228 | 170 | 74.6 | 58 | 25.4 | 159 | 69.7 | 45 | 19.7 | 11 | 4.8 | 13 | 5.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 186 | 126 | 67.7 | 60 | 32.3 | 141 | 75.8 | 21 | 11.3 | 7 | 3.8 | 17 | 9.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 127 | 86 | 67.7 | 41 | 32.3 | 104 | 81.9 | 18 | 14.2 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | 1.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 62 | 32 | 51.6 | 30 | 48.4 | 57 | 91.9 | 2 | 3.2 | 3 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 994 | 717 | 72.1 | 277 | 27.9 | 707 | 71.1 | 174 | 17.5 | 56 | 5.6 | 57 | 5.7 |
| PLUMAS | UNDER 18 | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 3 | 42.9 | 3 | 42.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 39 | 25 | 64.1 | 14 | 35.9 | 35 | 89.7 | 3 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 35 | 24 | 68.6 | 11 | 31.4 | 28 | 80.0 | 1 | 2.9 | 4 | 11.4 | 2 | 5.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 30 | 23 | 76.7 | 7 | 23.3 | 29 | 96.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 17 | 70.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 23 | 95.8 | 1 | 4.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 152 | 111 | 73.0 | 41 | 27.0 | 135 | 88.8 | 8 | 5.3 | 5 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.6 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| RIVERSIDE | UNDER 18 | 29 | 24 | 82.8 | 5 | 17.2 | 4 | 13.8 | 24 | 82.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 350 | 303 | 86.6 | 47 | 13.4 | 64 | 18.3 | 257 | 73.4 | 15 | 4.3 | 14 | 4.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 2874 | 2241 | 78.0 | 633 | 22.0 | 608 | 21.2 | 1911 | 66.5 | 221 | 7.7 | 134 | 4.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 1668 | 1290 | 77.3 | 378 | 22.7 | 407 | 24.4 | 1029 | 61.7 | 150 | 9.0 | 82 | 4.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 863 | 665 | 77.1 | 198 | 22.9 | 263 | 30.5 | 505 | 58.5 | 58 | 6.7 | 37 | 4.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 593 | 470 | 79.3 | 123 | 20.7 | 249 | 42.0 | 267 | 45.0 | 60 | 10.1 | 17 | 2.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 244 | 197 | 80.7 | 47 | 19.3 | 144 | 59.0 | 67 | 27.5 | 24 | 9.8 | 9 | 3.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 62 | 43 | 69.4 | 19 | 30.6 | 42 | 67.7 | 12 | 19.4 | 5 | 8.1 | 3 | 4.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 6683 | 5233 | 78.3 | 1450 | 21.7 | 1781 | 26.6 | 4072 | 60.9 | 533 | 8.0 | 297 | 4.4 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 17 | 8 | 47.1 | 9 | 52.9 | 7 | 41.2 | 6 | 35.3 | 1 | 5.9 | 3 | 17.6 |
|  | 18-20 | 194 | 159 | 82.0 | 35 | 18.0 | 75 | 38.7 | 72 | 37.1 | 23 | 11.9 | 24 | 12.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 1944 | 1392 | 71.6 | 552 | 28.4 | 719 | 37.0 | 627 | 32.3 | 359 | 18.5 | 239 | 12.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 1218 | 879 | 72.2 | 339 | 27.8 | 462 | 37.9 | 345 | 28.3 | 257 | 21.1 | 154 | 12.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 623 | 465 | 74.6 | 158 | 25.4 | 262 | 42.1 | 160 | 25.7 | 145 | 23.3 | 56 | 9.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 428 | 328 | 76.6 | 100 | 23.4 | 214 | 50.0 | 82 | 19.2 | 89 | 20.8 | 43 | 10.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 170 | 124 | 72.9 | 46 | 27.1 | 99 | 58.2 | 23 | 13.5 | 36 | 21.2 | 12 | 7.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 31 | 25 | 80.6 | 6 | 19.4 | 24 | 77.4 | 3 | 9.7 | 4 | 12.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4625 | 3380 | 73.1 | 1245 | 26.9 | 1862 | 40.3 | 1318 | 28.5 | 914 | 19.8 | 531 | 11.5 |
| SAN BENITO | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 19 | 15 | 78.9 | 4 | 21.1 | 1 | 5.3 | 18 | 94.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 117 | 91 | 77.8 | 26 | 22.2 | 14 | 12.0 | 95 | 81.2 | 3 | 2.6 | 5 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 72 | 51 | 70.8 | 21 | 29.2 | 19 | 26.4 | 52 | 72.2 | 1 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 40 | 28 | 70.0 | 12 | 30.0 | 12 | 30.0 | 27 | 67.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 20 | 18 | 90.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 5 | 25.0 | 15 | 75.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 7 | 7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 42.9 | 4 | 57.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 281 | 216 | 76.9 | 65 | 23.1 | 55 | 19.6 | 216 | 76.9 | 4 | 1.4 | 6 | 2.1 |
| SAN | UNDER 18 | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 4 | 28.6 | 9 | 64.3 | 1 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| BERNARDINO | 18-20 | 292 | 243 | 83.2 | 49 | 16.8 | 47 | 16.1 | 209 | 71.6 | 20 | 6.8 | 16 | 5.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 3064 | 2361 | 77.1 | 703 | 22.9 | 614 | 20.0 | 1986 | 64.8 | 328 | 10.7 | 136 | 4.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 1911 | 1486 | 77.8 | 425 | 22.2 | 446 | 23.3 | 1101 | 57.6 | 274 | 14.3 | 90 | 4.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 1001 | 793 | 79.2 | 208 | 20.8 | 269 | 26.9 | 560 | 55.9 | 125 | 12.5 | 47 | 4.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 631 | 495 | 78.4 | 136 | 21.6 | 230 | 36.5 | 269 | 42.6 | 108 | 17.1 | 24 | 3.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 228 | 191 | 83.8 | 37 | 16.2 | 106 | 46.5 | 78 | 34.2 | 38 | 16.7 | 6 | 2.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 28 | 24 | 85.7 | 4 | 14.3 | 18 | 64.3 | 8 | 28.6 | 1 | 3.6 | 1 | 3.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 7169 | 5604 | 78.2 | 1565 | 21.8 | 1734 | 24.2 | 4220 | 58.9 | 895 | 12.5 | 320 | 4.5 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SAN DIEGO | UNDER 18 | 33 | 24 | 72.7 | 9 | 27.3 | 17 | 51.5 | 13 | 39.4 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 6.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 460 | 348 | 75.7 | 112 | 24.3 | 135 | 29.3 | 261 | 56.7 | 26 | 5.7 | 38 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 4082 | 3076 | 75.4 | 1006 | 24.6 | 1334 | 32.7 | 2053 | 50.3 | 398 | 9.8 | 297 | 7.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 2129 | 1638 | 76.9 | 491 | 23.1 | 793 | 37.2 | 951 | 44.7 | 234 | 11.0 | 151 | 7.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 1152 | 880 | 76.4 | 272 | 23.6 | 494 | 42.9 | 486 | 42.2 | 96 | 8.3 | 76 | 6.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 833 | 615 | 73.8 | 218 | 26.2 | 455 | 54.6 | 249 | 29.9 | 83 | 10.0 | 46 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 345 | 243 | 70.4 | 102 | 29.6 | 234 | 67.8 | 77 | 22.3 | 24 | 7.0 | 10 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 58 | 36 | 62.1 | 22 | 37.9 | 46 | 79.3 | 9 | 15.5 | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 3.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 9092 | 6860 | 75.5 | 2232 | 24.5 | 3508 | 38.6 | 4099 | 45.1 | 863 | 9.5 | 622 | 6.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 28 | 20 | 71.4 | 8 | 28.6 | 11 | 39.3 | 14 | 50.0 | 1 | 3.6 | 2 | 7.1 |
| FRANCISCO | 21-30 | 409 | 302 | 73.8 | 107 | 26.2 | 115 | 28.1 | 144 | 35.2 | 61 | 14.9 | 89 | 21.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 248 | 197 | 79.4 | 51 | 20.6 | 80 | 32.3 | 75 | 30.2 | 43 | 17.3 | 50 | 20.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 142 | 125 | 88.0 | 17 | 12.0 | 62 | 43.7 | 36 | 25.4 | 23 | 16.2 | 21 | 14.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 74 | 66 | 89.2 | 8 | 10.8 | 34 | 45.9 | 11 | 14.9 | 18 | 24.3 | 11 | 14.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 28 | 24 | 85.7 | 4 | 14.3 | 14 | 50.0 | 3 | 10.7 | 5 | 17.9 | 6 | 21.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 3 | 60.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 40.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 934 | 738 | 79.0 | 196 | 21.0 | 319 | 34.2 | 283 | 30.3 | 151 | 16.2 | 181 | 19.4 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | UNDER 18 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 14.3 | 5 | 71.4 | 1 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 102 | 83 | 81.4 | 19 | 18.6 | 15 | 14.7 | 75 | 73.5 | 4 | 3.9 | 8 | 7.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 890 | 664 | 74.6 | 226 | 25.4 | 210 | 23.6 | 492 | 55.3 | 85 | 9.6 | 103 | 11.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 617 | 483 | 78.3 | 134 | 21.7 | 169 | 27.4 | 308 | 49.9 | 75 | 12.2 | 65 | 10.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 322 | 232 | 72.0 | 90 | 28.0 | 98 | 30.4 | 142 | 44.1 | 47 | 14.6 | 35 | 10.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 211 | 155 | 73.5 | 56 | 26.5 | 91 | 43.1 | 69 | 32.7 | 33 | 15.6 | 18 | 8.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 74 | 55 | 74.3 | 19 | 25.7 | 29 | 39.2 | 23 | 31.1 | 15 | 20.3 | 7 | 9.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 17 | 10 | 58.8 | 7 | 41.2 | 11 | 64.7 | 3 | 17.6 | 2 | 11.8 | 1 | 5.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 2240 | 1688 | 75.4 | 552 | 24.6 | 624 | 27.9 | 1117 | 49.9 | 262 | 11.7 | 237 | 10.6 |
| SAN LUIS | UNDER 18 | 18 | 11 | 61.1 | 7 | 38.9 | 10 | 55.6 | 6 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 11.1 |
| OBISPO | 18-20 | 94 | 75 | 79.8 | 19 | 20.2 | 40 | 42.6 | 49 | 52.1 | 2 | 2.1 | 3 | 3.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 631 | 499 | 79.1 | 132 | 20.9 | 289 | 45.8 | 285 | 45.2 | 17 | 2.7 | 40 | 6.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 355 | 270 | 76.1 | 85 | 23.9 | 202 | 56.9 | 122 | 34.4 | 6 | 1.7 | 25 | 7.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 234 | 162 | 69.2 | 72 | 30.8 | 159 | 67.9 | 61 | 26.1 | 3 | 1.3 | 11 | 4.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 180 | 133 | 73.9 | 47 | 26.1 | 146 | 81.1 | 22 | 12.2 | 6 | 3.3 | 6 | 3.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 95 | 60 | 63.2 | 35 | 36.8 | 86 | 90.5 | 7 | 7.4 | 2 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 26 | 20 | 76.9 | 6 | 23.1 | 24 | 92.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1633 | 1230 | 75.3 | 403 | 24.7 | 956 | 58.5 | 554 | 33.9 | 36 | 2.2 | 87 | 5.3 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SAN MATEO | UNDER 18 | 9 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 96 | 77 | 80.2 | 19 | 19.8 | 15 | 15.6 | 60 | 62.5 | 3 | 3.1 | 18 | 18.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 937 | 699 | 74.6 | 238 | 25.4 | 211 | 22.5 | 454 | 48.5 | 53 | 5.7 | 219 | 23.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 595 | 485 | 81.5 | 110 | 18.5 | 165 | 27.7 | 290 | 48.7 | 33 | 5.5 | 107 | 18.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 301 | 224 | 74.4 | 77 | 25.6 | 103 | 34.2 | 111 | 36.9 | 19 | 6.3 | 68 | 22.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 232 | 182 | 78.4 | 50 | 21.6 | 136 | 58.6 | 51 | 22.0 | 11 | 4.7 | 34 | 14.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 83 | 54 | 65.1 | 29 | 34.9 | 52 | 62.7 | 11 | 13.3 | 4 | 4.8 | 16 | 19.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 12 | 75.0 | 4 | 25.0 | 13 | 81.3 | 2 | 12.5 | 1 | 6.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2269 | 1741 | 76.7 | 528 | 23.3 | 703 | 31.0 | 980 | 43.2 | 124 | 5.5 | 462 | 20.4 |
| SANTA BARBARA | UNDER 18 | 21 | 19 | 90.5 | 2 | 9.5 | 3 | 14.3 | 17 | 81.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 108 | 90 | 83.3 | 18 | 16.7 | 24 | 22.2 | 79 | 73.1 | 1 | 0.9 | 4 | 3.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 785 | 642 | 81.8 | 143 | 18.2 | 194 | 24.7 | 537 | 68.4 | 20 | 2.5 | 34 | 4.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 402 | 323 | 80.3 | 79 | 19.7 | 110 | 27.4 | 268 | 66.7 | 10 | 2.5 | 14 | 3.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 201 | 155 | 77.1 | 46 | 22.9 | 78 | 38.8 | 113 | 56.2 | 3 | 1.5 | 7 | 3.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 185 | 129 | 69.7 | 56 | 30.3 | 116 | 62.7 | 62 | 33.5 | 2 | 1.1 | 5 | 2.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 90 | 65 | 72.2 | 25 | 27.8 | 59 | 65.6 | 21 | 23.3 | 6 | 6.7 | 4 | 4.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 15 | 78.9 | 4 | 21.1 | 11 | 57.9 | 6 | 31.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 10.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 1811 | 1438 | 79.4 | 373 | 20.6 | 595 | 32.9 | 1103 | 60.9 | 42 | 2.3 | 71 | 3.9 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 18 | 11 | 61.1 | 7 | 38.9 | 5 | 27.8 | 12 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 5.6 |
|  | $18-20$ | 200 | 148 | 74.0 | 52 | 26.0 | 30 | 15.0 | 142 | 71.0 | 8 | 4.0 | 20 | 10.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 1713 | 1326 | 77.4 | 387 | 22.6 | 301 | 17.6 | 1039 | 60.7 | 96 | 5.6 | 277 | 16.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 1026 | 857 | 83.5 | 169 | 16.5 | 198 | 19.3 | 615 | 59.9 | 54 | 5.3 | 159 | 15.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 567 | 449 | 79.2 | 118 | 20.8 | 148 | 26.1 | 290 | 51.1 | 35 | 6.2 | 94 | 16.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 344 | 272 | 79.1 | 72 | 20.9 | 163 | 47.4 | 117 | 34.0 | 15 | 4.4 | 49 | 14.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 115 | 95 | 82.6 | 20 | 17.4 | 58 | 50.4 | 31 | 27.0 | 9 | 7.8 | 17 | 14.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 20 | 16 | 80.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 11 | 55.0 | 5 | 25.0 | 1 | 5.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 4003 | 3174 | 79.3 | 829 | 20.7 | 914 | 22.8 | 2251 | 56.2 | 218 | 5.4 | 620 | 15.5 |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 7 | 4 | 57.1 | 3 | 42.9 | 3 | 42.9 | 4 | 57.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 84 | 66 | 78.6 | 18 | 21.4 | 22 | 26.2 | 52 | 61.9 | 3 | 3.6 | 7 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 697 | 519 | 74.5 | 178 | 25.5 | 267 | 38.3 | 381 | 54.7 | 17 | 2.4 | 32 | 4.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 366 | 268 | 73.2 | 98 | 26.8 | 196 | 53.6 | 155 | 42.3 | 4 | 1.1 | 11 | 3.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 217 | 169 | 77.9 | 48 | 22.1 | 120 | 55.3 | 83 | 38.2 | 7 | 3.2 | 7 | 3.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 158 | 116 | 73.4 | 42 | 26.6 | 114 | 72.2 | 41 | 25.9 | 2 | 1.3 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 75 | 57 | 76.0 | 18 | 24.0 | 62 | 82.7 | 9 | 12.0 | 3 | 4.0 | 1 | 1.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 19 | 14 | 73.7 | 5 | 26.3 | 18 | 94.7 | 1 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1623 | 1213 | 74.7 | 410 | 25.3 | 802 | 49.4 | 726 | 44.7 | 36 | 2.2 | 59 | 3.6 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SHASTA | UNDER 18 | 6 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 4 | 66.7 | 2 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 29 | 17 | 58.6 | 12 | 41.4 | 21 | 72.4 | 6 | 20.7 | 1 | 3.4 | 1 | 3.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 236 | 174 | 73.7 | 62 | 26.3 | 176 | 74.6 | 23 | 9.7 | 11 | 4.7 | 26 | 11.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 150 | 114 | 76.0 | 36 | 24.0 | 108 | 72.0 | 18 | 12.0 | 2 | 1.3 | 22 | 14.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 104 | 70 | 67.3 | 34 | 32.7 | 85 | 81.7 | 6 | 5.8 | 7 | 6.7 | 6 | 5.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 82 | 60 | 73.2 | 22 | 26.8 | 70 | 85.4 | 5 | 6.1 | 3 | 3.7 | 4 | 4.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 51 | 40 | 78.4 | 11 | 21.6 | 44 | 86.3 | 2 | 3.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 4 | 7.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 7 | 87.5 | 1 | 12.5 | 6 | 75.0 | 1 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 666 | 486 | 73.0 | 180 | 27.0 | 514 | 77.2 | 63 | 9.5 | 25 | 3.8 | 64 | 9.6 |
| SIERRA | 21-30 | 11 | 9 | 81.8 | 2 | 18.2 | 3 | 27.3 | 2 | 18.2 | 2 | 18.2 | 4 | 36.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 10 | 9 | 90.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 4 | 40.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 40.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 60.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 1 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 30 | 26 | 86.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 12 | 40.0 | 4 | 13.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 12 | 40.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 18-20 | 8 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 37.5 | 5 | 62.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 72 | 55 | 76.4 | 17 | 23.6 | 46 | 63.9 | 7 | 9.7 | 3 | 4.2 | 16 | 22.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 61 | 42 | 68.9 | 19 | 31.1 | 47 | 77.0 | 8 | 13.1 | 3 | 4.9 | 3 | 4.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 36 | 21 | 58.3 | 15 | 41.7 | 28 | 77.8 | 2 | 5.6 | 1 | 2.8 | 5 | 13.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 34 | 24 | 70.6 | 10 | 29.4 | 30 | 88.2 | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.9 | 2 | 5.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 9 | 75.0 | 3 | 25.0 | 9 | 75.0 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 16.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 80.0 | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 228 | 164 | 71.9 | 64 | 28.1 | 167 | 73.2 | 25 | 11.0 | 8 | 3.5 | 28 | 12.3 |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 1 | 14.3 | 4 | 57.1 | 3 | 42.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 82 | 56 | 68.3 | 26 | 31.7 | 20 | 24.4 | 47 | 57.3 | 8 | 9.8 | 7 | 8.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 609 | 450 | 73.9 | 159 | 26.1 | 184 | 30.2 | 220 | 36.1 | 149 | 24.5 | 56 | 9.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 465 | 352 | 75.7 | 113 | 24.3 | 139 | 29.9 | 154 | 33.1 | 126 | 27.1 | 46 | 9.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 247 | 189 | 76.5 | 58 | 23.5 | 85 | 34.4 | 61 | 24.7 | 75 | 30.4 | 26 | 10.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 131 | 105 | 80.2 | 26 | 19.8 | 57 | 43.5 | 21 | 16.0 | 42 | 32.1 | 11 | 8.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 69 | 50 | 72.5 | 19 | 27.5 | 33 | 47.8 | 9 | 13.0 | 17 | 24.6 | 10 | 14.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 15 | 10 | 66.7 | 5 | 33.3 | 10 | 66.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 3 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1625 | 1218 | 75.0 | 407 | 25.0 | 532 | 32.7 | 517 | 31.8 | 420 | 25.8 | 156 | 9.6 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SONOMA | UNDER 18 | 16 | 14 | 87.5 | 2 | 12.5 | 3 | 18.8 | 11 | 68.8 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 6.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 110 | 85 | 77.3 | 25 | 22.7 | 34 | 30.9 | 69 | 62.7 | 4 | 3.6 | 3 | 2.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 853 | 653 | 76.6 | 200 | 23.4 | 340 | 39.9 | 435 | 51.0 | 35 | 4.1 | 43 | 5.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 608 | 475 | 78.1 | 133 | 21.9 | 281 | 46.2 | 266 | 43.8 | 23 | 3.8 | 38 | 6.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 373 | 276 | 74.0 | 97 | 26.0 | 221 | 59.2 | 116 | 31.1 | 14 | 3.8 | 22 | 5.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 233 | 170 | 73.0 | 63 | 27.0 | 161 | 69.1 | 50 | 21.5 | 8 | 3.4 | 14 | 6.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 154 | 105 | 68.2 | 49 | 31.8 | 118 | 76.6 | 20 | 13.0 | 11 | 7.1 | 5 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 35 | 24 | 68.6 | 11 | 31.4 | 31 | 88.6 | 2 | 5.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 2382 | 1802 | 75.7 | 580 | 24.3 | 1189 | 49.9 | 969 | 40.7 | 96 | 4.0 | 128 | 5.4 |
| STANISLAUS | UNDER 18 | 10 | 7 | 70.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 103 | 93 | 90.3 | 10 | 9.7 | 22 | 21.4 | 73 | 70.9 | 2 | 1.9 | 6 | 5.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 926 | 692 | 74.7 | 234 | 25.3 | 225 | 24.3 | 589 | 63.6 | 45 | 4.9 | 67 | 7.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 591 | 472 | 79.9 | 119 | 20.1 | 166 | 28.1 | 355 | 60.1 | 37 | 6.3 | 33 | 5.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 300 | 232 | 77.3 | 68 | 22.7 | 93 | 31.0 | 170 | 56.7 | 15 | 5.0 | 22 | 7.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 169 | 126 | 74.6 | 43 | 25.4 | 70 | 41.4 | 84 | 49.7 | 10 | 5.9 | 5 | 3.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 76 | 65 | 85.5 | 11 | 14.5 | 42 | 55.3 | 23 | 30.3 | 8 | 10.5 | 3 | 3.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 8 | 66.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 7 | 58.3 | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 25.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2187 | 1695 | 77.5 | 492 | 22.5 | 628 | 28.7 | 1302 | 59.5 | 118 | 5.4 | 139 | 6.4 |
| SUTTER | UNDER 18 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 66.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 33.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 31 | 26 | 83.9 | 5 | 16.1 | 7 | 22.6 | 19 | 61.3 | 2 | 6.5 | 3 | 9.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 164 | 131 | 79.9 | 33 | 20.1 | 64 | 39.0 | 72 | 43.9 | 9 | 5.5 | 19 | 11.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 109 | 88 | 80.7 | 21 | 19.3 | 52 | 47.7 | 40 | 36.7 | 6 | 5.5 | 11 | 10.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 47 | 34 | 72.3 | 13 | 27.7 | 26 | 55.3 | 15 | 31.9 | 3 | 6.4 | 3 | 6.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 48 | 39 | 81.3 | 9 | 18.8 | 30 | 62.5 | 11 | 22.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 14.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 11 | 78.6 | 3 | 21.4 | 7 | 50.0 | 7 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 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 | 418 | 334 | 79.9 | 84 | 20.1 | 187 | 44.7 | 166 | 39.7 | 20 | 4.8 | 45 | 10.8 |
| TEHAMA | UNDER 18 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 14 | 10 | 71.4 | 4 | 28.6 | 8 | 57.1 | 6 | 42.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 130 | 107 | 82.3 | 23 | 17.7 | 73 | 56.2 | 49 | 37.7 | 1 | 0.8 | 7 | 5.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 103 | 78 | 75.7 | 25 | 24.3 | 60 | 58.3 | 35 | 34.0 | 3 | 2.9 | 5 | 4.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 47 | 36 | 76.6 | 11 | 23.4 | 27 | 57.4 | 16 | 34.0 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 55 | 44 | 80.0 | 11 | 20.0 | 39 | 70.9 | 12 | 21.8 | 1 | 1.8 | 3 | 5.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 26 | 19 | 73.1 | 7 | 26.9 | 17 | 65.4 | 7 | 26.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 7.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 8 | 88.9 | 1 | 11.1 | 8 | 88.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 11.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 386 | 304 | 78.8 | 82 | 21.2 | 234 | 60.6 | 125 | 32.4 | 6 | 1.6 | 21 | 5.4 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TRINITY | 18-20 | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 36 | 32 | 88.9 | 4 | 11.1 | 33 | 91.7 | 3 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 37 | 34 | 91.9 | 3 | 8.1 | 35 | 94.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 5.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 12 | 85.7 | 2 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 23 | 20 | 87.0 | 3 | 13.0 | 22 | 95.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 5 | 55.6 | 4 | 44.4 | 9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 125 | 108 | 86.4 | 17 | 13.6 | 116 | 92.8 | 6 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 2.4 |
| TULARE | UNDER 18 | 15 | 11 | 73.3 | 4 | 26.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 14 | 93.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 18-20 | 172 | 135 | 78.5 | 37 | 21.5 | 20 | 11.6 | 142 | 82.6 | 4 | 2.3 | 6 | 3.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 1234 | 968 | 78.4 | 266 | 21.6 | 173 | 14.0 | 950 | 77.0 | 35 | 2.8 | 76 | 6.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 673 | 523 | 77.7 | 150 | 22.3 | 109 | 16.2 | 510 | 75.8 | 20 | 3.0 | 34 | 5.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 366 | 290 | 79.2 | 76 | 20.8 | 88 | 24.0 | 250 | 68.3 | 6 | 1.6 | 22 | 6.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 168 | 134 | 79.8 | 34 | 20.2 | 54 | 32.1 | 96 | 57.1 | 8 | 4.8 | 10 | 6.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 69 | 55 | 79.7 | 14 | 20.3 | 25 | 36.2 | 36 | 52.2 | 3 | 4.3 | 5 | 7.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 14 | 14 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 50.0 | 6 | 42.9 | 1 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2711 | 2130 | 78.6 | 581 | 21.4 | 476 | 17.6 | 2004 | 73.9 | 77 | 2.8 | 154 | 5.7 |
| TUOLUMNE | UNDER 18 | 3 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 10 | 5 | 50.0 | 5 | 50.0 | 8 | 80.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 113 | 81 | 71.7 | 32 | 28.3 | 95 | 84.1 | 13 | 11.5 | 2 | 1.8 | 3 | 2.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 84 | 68 | 81.0 | 16 | 19.0 | 66 | 78.6 | 15 | 17.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 3.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 60 | 40 | 66.7 | 20 | 33.3 | 50 | 83.3 | 7 | 11.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 46 | 35 | 76.1 | 11 | 23.9 | 42 | 91.3 | 3 | 6.5 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 20 | 64.5 | 11 | 35.5 | 27 | 87.1 | 1 | 3.2 | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 40.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 352 | 255 | 72.4 | 97 | 27.6 | 296 | 84.1 | 40 | 11.4 | 5 | 1.4 | 11 | 3.1 |
| VENTURA | UNDER 18 | 26 | 22 | 84.6 | 4 | 15.4 | 8 | 30.8 | 17 | 65.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 3.8 |
|  | 18-20 | 155 | 122 | 78.7 | 33 | 21.3 | 33 | 21.3 | 116 | 74.8 | 1 | 0.6 | 5 | 3.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1311 | 1016 | 77.5 | 295 | 22.5 | 367 | 28.0 | 843 | 64.3 | 53 | 4.0 | 48 | 3.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 723 | 570 | 78.8 | 153 | 21.2 | 242 | 33.5 | 415 | 57.4 | 22 | 3.0 | 44 | 6.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 440 | 333 | 75.7 | 107 | 24.3 | 188 | 42.7 | 217 | 49.3 | 17 | 3.9 | 18 | 4.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 307 | 235 | 76.5 | 72 | 23.5 | 185 | 60.3 | 107 | 34.9 | 9 | 2.9 | 6 | 2.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 122 | 90 | 73.8 | 32 | 26.2 | 81 | 66.4 | 28 | 23.0 | 5 | 4.1 | 8 | 6.6 |
|  | $71 \& \text { ABOVE }$ | 21 | 15 | 71.4 | 6 | 28.6 | 18 | 85.7 | 2 | 9.5 | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3105 | 2403 | 77.4 | 702 | 22.6 | 1122 | 36.1 | 1745 | 56.2 | 108 | 3.5 | 130 | 4.2 |

TABLE B1: 2019 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL | GENDER |  |  |  | RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  | WHITE |  | HISPANIC |  | BLACK |  | OTHER |  |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| YOLO | 18-20 | 34 | 31 | 91.2 | 3 | 8.8 | 9 | 26.5 | 21 | 61.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 11.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 221 | 171 | 77.4 | 50 | 22.6 | 68 | 30.8 | 93 | 42.1 | 28 | 12.7 | 32 | 14.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 152 | 122 | 80.3 | 30 | 19.7 | 54 | 35.5 | 67 | 44.1 | 12 | 7.9 | 19 | 12.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 77 | 63 | 81.8 | 14 | 18.2 | 38 | 49.4 | 30 | 39.0 | 3 | 3.9 | 6 | 7.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 62 | 42 | 67.7 | 20 | 32.3 | 36 | 58.1 | 17 | 27.4 | 6 | 9.7 | 3 | 4.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 23 | 74.2 | 8 | 25.8 | 20 | 64.5 | 8 | 25.8 | 2 | 6.5 | 1 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 75.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 581 | 456 | 78.5 | 125 | 21.5 | 228 | 39.2 | 237 | 40.8 | 51 | 8.8 | 65 | 11.2 |
| YUBA | UNDER 18 | 4 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 25.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 22 | 15 | 68.2 | 7 | 31.8 | 11 | 50.0 | 7 | 31.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 18.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 154 | 107 | 69.5 | 47 | 30.5 | 76 | 49.4 | 61 | 39.6 | 9 | 5.8 | 8 | 5.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 101 | 78 | 77.2 | 23 | 22.8 | 61 | 60.4 | 29 | 28.7 | 3 | 3.0 | 8 | 7.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 55 | 38 | 69.1 | 17 | 30.9 | 33 | 60.0 | 17 | 30.9 | 1 | 1.8 | 4 | 7.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 38 | 29 | 76.3 | 9 | 23.7 | 27 | 71.1 | 7 | 18.4 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 7.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 9 | 60.0 | 6 | 40.0 | 12 | 80.0 | 2 | 13.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 391 | 281 | 71.9 | 110 | 28.1 | 223 | 57.0 | 125 | 32.0 | 14 | 3.6 | 29 | 7.4 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  | 93926 | 100.0 | 71866 | 76.5 | 22060 | 23.5 |
| ALAMEDA | 18-20 | 30 | 1.3 | 19 | 1.1 | 11 | 2.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 856 | 37.3 | 628 | 35.7 | 228 | 42.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 720 | 31.4 | 573 | 32.6 | 147 | 27.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 394 | 17.2 | 307 | 17.5 | 87 | 16.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 212 | 9.2 | 166 | 9.4 | 46 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 71 | 3.1 | 59 | 3.4 | 12 | 2.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 0.4 | 6 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 2292 | 100.0 | 1758 | 100.0 | 534 | 100.0 |
| ALPINE | 21-30 | 5 | 31.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 2 | 50.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 4 | 25.0 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 4 | 25.0 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 2 | 12.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 50.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 1 | 6.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 16 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| AMADOR | 18-20 | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 50 | 33.1 | 38 | 36.5 | 12 | 25.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 38 | 25.2 | 23 | 22.1 | 15 | 31.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 25 | 16.6 | 18 | 17.3 | 7 | 14.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 24 | 15.9 | 16 | 15.4 | 8 | 17.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 7.9 | 8 | 7.7 | 4 | 8.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 151 | 100.0 | 104 | 100.0 | 47 | 100.0 |
| BUTTE | 18-20 | 19 | 2.3 | 14 | 2.2 | 5 | 2.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 330 | 39.3 | 251 | 40.2 | 79 | 36.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 198 | 23.6 | 149 | 23.8 | 49 | 22.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 119 | 14.2 | 82 | 13.1 | 37 | 17.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 102 | 12.1 | 79 | 12.6 | 23 | 10.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 63 | 7.5 | 44 | 7.0 | 19 | 8.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 9 | 1.1 | 6 | 1.0 | 3 | 1.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 840 | 100.0 | 625 | 100.0 | 215 | 100.0 |
| CALAVERAS | 18-20 | 2 | 1.6 | 2 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 40 | 32.0 | 33 | 36.3 | 7 | 20.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 21 | 16.8 | 13 | 14.3 | 8 | 23.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 27 | 21.6 | 21 | 23.1 | 6 | 17.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 23 | 18.4 | 14 | 15.4 | 9 | 26.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 10 | 8.0 | 7 | 7.7 | 3 | 8.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 1.6 | 1 | 1.1 | 1 | 2.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 125 | 100.0 | 91 | 100.0 | 34 | 100.0 |
| COLUSA | 18-20 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 36 | 32.1 | 31 | 33.3 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 37 | 33.0 | 29 | 31.2 | 8 | 42.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 16 | 14.3 | 14 | 15.1 | 2 | 10.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 19 | 17.0 | 15 | 16.1 | 4 | 21.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 2.7 | 3 | 3.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 112 | 100.0 | 93 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| CONTRA COSTA | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 27 | 1.6 | 18 | 1.4 | 9 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 615 | 36.1 | 448 | 36.0 | 167 | 36.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 450 | 26.4 | 335 | 27.0 | 115 | 24.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 294 | 17.3 | 215 | 17.3 | 79 | 17.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 212 | 12.4 | 150 | 12.1 | 62 | 13.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 78 | 4.6 | 58 | 4.7 | 20 | 4.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 25 | 1.5 | 17 | 1.4 | 8 | 1.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1704 | 100.0 | 1243 | 100.0 | 461 | 100.0 |
| DEL NORTE | 18-20 | 4 | 2.4 | 3 | 2.7 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 55 | 33.3 | 40 | 35.4 | 15 | 28.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 49 | 29.7 | 31 | 27.4 | 18 | 34.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 22 | 13.3 | 13 | 11.5 | 9 | 17.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 15.8 | 17 | 15.0 | 9 | 17.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 6 | 3.6 | 6 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 1.8 | 3 | 2.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 165 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 | 52 | 100.0 |
| EL DORADO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | 18-20 | 8 | 1.3 | 5 | 1.2 | 3 | 1.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 215 | 34.6 | 162 | 37.6 | 53 | 27.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 148 | 23.8 | 107 | 24.8 | 41 | 21.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 112 | 18.0 | 65 | 15.1 | 47 | 24.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 80 | 12.9 | 61 | 14.2 | 19 | 10.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 52 | 8.4 | 26 | 6.0 | 26 | 13.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 0.8 | 5 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 621 | 100.0 | 431 | 100.0 | 190 | 100.0 |
| FRESNO | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 113 | 3.1 | 85 | 3.0 | 28 | 3.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1594 | 43.1 | 1183 | 41.8 | 411 | 47.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 1045 | 28.3 | 821 | 29.0 | 224 | 26.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 495 | 13.4 | 393 | 13.9 | 102 | 11.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 309 | 8.4 | 244 | 8.6 | 65 | 7.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 119 | 3.2 | 91 | 3.2 | 28 | 3.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 18 | 0.5 | 13 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 3695 | 100.0 | 2832 | 100.0 | 863 | 100.0 |
| GLENN | 18-20 | 6 | 5.8 | 4 | 5.0 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 37 | 35.6 | 30 | 37.5 | 7 | 29.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 26 | 25.0 | 21 | 26.2 | 5 | 20.8 |
|  | 41-50 | 13 | 12.5 | 11 | 13.8 | 2 | 8.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 12 | 11.5 | 8 | 10.0 | 4 | 16.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 9 | 8.7 | 5 | 6.3 | 4 | 16.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 104 | 100.0 | 80 | 100.0 | 24 | 100.0 |
| HUMBOLDT | 18-20 | 14 | 1.9 | 5 | 1.0 | 9 | 4.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 284 | 39.0 | 198 | 37.7 | 86 | 42.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 217 | 29.8 | 164 | 31.2 | 53 | 26.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 125 | 17.1 | 95 | 18.1 | 30 | 14.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 61 | 8.4 | 43 | 8.2 | 18 | 8.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 22 | 3.0 | 15 | 2.9 | 7 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.8 | 5 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 729 | 100.0 | 525 | 100.0 | 204 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| IMPERIAL | 18-20 | 14 | 3.6 | 13 | 4.0 | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 160 | 40.6 | 131 | 40.4 | 29 | 41.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 98 | 24.9 | 76 | 23.5 | 22 | 31.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 62 | 15.7 | 52 | 16.0 | 10 | 14.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 41 | 10.4 | 35 | 10.8 | 6 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 16 | 4.1 | 14 | 4.3 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.8 | 3 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 394 | 100.0 | 324 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 |
| INYO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 1.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 2 | 2.6 | 2 | 3.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 19 | 25.0 | 14 | 23.0 | 5 | 33.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 11 | 14.5 | 10 | 16.4 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 15 | 19.7 | 12 | 19.7 | 3 | 20.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 12 | 15.8 | 11 | 18.0 | 1 | 6.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 18.4 | 11 | 18.0 | 3 | 20.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 2.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 13.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 76 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 |
| KERN | UNDER 18 | 5 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | 18-20 | 110 | 3.8 | 89 | 4.0 | 21 | 3.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 1299 | 45.0 | 993 | 44.7 | 306 | 46.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 803 | 27.8 | 613 | 27.6 | 190 | 28.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 392 | 13.6 | 307 | 13.8 | 85 | 12.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 192 | 6.7 | 147 | 6.6 | 45 | 6.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 76 | 2.6 | 60 | 2.7 | 16 | 2.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 10 | 0.3 | 10 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2887 | 100.0 | 2223 | 100.0 | 664 | 100.0 |
| KINGS | 18-20 | 29 | 4.5 | 22 | 4.4 | 7 | 5.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 261 | 40.8 | 197 | 39.1 | 64 | 47.1 |
|  | 31-40 | 193 | 30.2 | 160 | 31.7 | 33 | 24.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 90 | 14.1 | 69 | 13.7 | 21 | 15.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 47 | 7.3 | 38 | 7.5 | 9 | 6.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 3.0 | 17 | 3.4 | 2 | 1.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 640 | 100.0 | 504 | 100.0 | 136 | 100.0 |
| LAKE | 18-20 | 7 | 2.4 | 3 | 1.4 | 4 | 4.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 87 | 29.3 | 68 | 31.5 | 19 | 23.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 86 | 29.0 | 69 | 31.9 | 17 | 21.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 38 | 12.8 | 21 | 9.7 | 17 | 21.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 44 | 14.8 | 29 | 13.4 | 15 | 18.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 27 | 9.1 | 18 | 8.3 | 9 | 11.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 2.7 | 8 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 297 | 100.0 | 216 | 100.0 | 81 | 100.0 |
| LASSEN | 18-20 | 2 | 2.3 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 3.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 30 | 34.5 | 21 | 34.4 | 9 | 34.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 27 | 31.0 | 21 | 34.4 | 6 | 23.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 12 | 13.8 | 5 | 8.2 | 7 | 26.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 13 | 14.9 | 11 | 18.0 | 2 | 7.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 3.4 | 2 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 87 | 100.0 | 61 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| LOS ANGELES | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 364 | 2.1 | 286 | 2.1 | 78 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 7361 | 42.1 | 5570 | 40.8 | 1791 | 46.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 4884 | 28.0 | 3840 | 28.2 | 1044 | 27.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 2542 | 14.5 | 2014 | 14.8 | 528 | 13.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 1609 | 9.2 | 1342 | 9.8 | 267 | 7.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 602 | 3.4 | 500 | 3.7 | 102 | 2.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 107 | 0.6 | 83 | 0.6 | 24 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 17472 | 100.0 | 13638 | 100.0 | 3834 | 100.0 |
| MADERA | 18-20 | 27 | 4.1 | 19 | 3.5 | 8 | 7.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 256 | 39.0 | 217 | 39.9 | 39 | 34.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 180 | 27.4 | 149 | 27.4 | 31 | 27.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 105 | 16.0 | 86 | 15.8 | 19 | 16.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 64 | 9.7 | 53 | 9.7 | 11 | 9.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 19 | 2.9 | 15 | 2.8 | 4 | 3.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 6 | 0.9 | 5 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 657 | 100.0 | 544 | 100.0 | 113 | 100.0 |
| MARIN | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 32 | 3.0 | 25 | 3.1 | 7 | 2.7 |
|  | 21-30 | 379 | 35.4 | 309 | 38.2 | 70 | 26.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 258 | 24.1 | 200 | 24.8 | 58 | 22.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 170 | 15.9 | 120 | 14.9 | 50 | 18.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 149 | 13.9 | 99 | 12.3 | 50 | 18.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 67 | 6.3 | 45 | 5.6 | 22 | 8.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.2 | 6 | 2.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1072 | 100.0 | 808 | 100.0 | 264 | 100.0 |
| MARIPOSA | 21-30 | 20 | 35.7 | 16 | 36.4 | 4 | 33.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 13 | 23.2 | 9 | 20.5 | 4 | 33.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 10 | 17.9 | 8 | 18.2 | 2 | 16.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 11 | 19.6 | 10 | 22.7 | 1 | 8.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 2 | 3.6 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 8.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 56 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 |
| MENDOCINO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 12 | 2.5 | 10 | 2.6 | 2 | 2.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 174 | 35.7 | 136 | 34.7 | 38 | 39.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 144 | 29.5 | 121 | 30.9 | 23 | 24.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 82 | 16.8 | 65 | 16.6 | 17 | 17.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 43 | 8.8 | 32 | 8.2 | 11 | 11.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 24 | 4.9 | 21 | 5.4 | 3 | 3.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 1.6 | 6 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 488 | 100.0 | 392 | 100.0 | 96 | 100.0 |
| MERCED | 18-20 | 22 | 2.6 | 20 | 2.9 | 2 | 1.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 357 | 41.8 | 278 | 40.2 | 79 | 48.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 234 | 27.4 | 190 | 27.5 | 44 | 27.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 128 | 15.0 | 109 | 15.8 | 19 | 11.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 74 | 8.7 | 60 | 8.7 | 14 | 8.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 31 | 3.6 | 27 | 3.9 | 4 | 2.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 0.9 | 7 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 854 | 100.0 | 691 | 100.0 | 163 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| MODOC | 21-30 | 6 | 20.7 | 5 | 23.8 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 7 | 24.1 | 3 | 14.3 | 4 | 50.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 4 | 13.8 | 3 | 14.3 | 1 | 12.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 8 | 27.6 | 6 | 28.6 | 2 | 25.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 3 | 10.3 | 3 | 14.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 3.4 | 1 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 29 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 |
| MONO | 18-20 | 2 | 1.9 | 2 | 2.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 38 | 36.9 | 28 | 38.4 | 10 | 33.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 23 | 22.3 | 17 | 23.3 | 6 | 20.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 17 | 16.5 | 11 | 15.1 | 6 | 20.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 12 | 11.7 | 7 | 9.6 | 5 | 16.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 8 | 7.8 | 8 | 11.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 10.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 103 | 100.0 | 73 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |
| MONTEREY | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 66 | 4.1 | 56 | 4.2 | 10 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 745 | 45.9 | 629 | 46.6 | 116 | 42.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 397 | 24.4 | 334 | 24.8 | 63 | 22.9 |
|  | 41-50 | 221 | 13.6 | 181 | 13.4 | 40 | 14.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 131 | 8.1 | 96 | 7.1 | 35 | 12.7 |
|  | 61-70 | 45 | 2.8 | 37 | 2.7 | 8 | 2.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 1.0 | 14 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1624 | 100.0 | 1349 | 100.0 | 275 | 100.0 |
| NAPA | 18-20 | 19 | 3.0 | 15 | 3.2 | 4 | 2.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 284 | 44.5 | 204 | 43.8 | 80 | 46.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 154 | 24.1 | 121 | 26.0 | 33 | 19.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 87 | 13.6 | 60 | 12.9 | 27 | 15.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 70 | 11.0 | 48 | 10.3 | 22 | 12.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 23 | 3.6 | 17 | 3.6 | 6 | 3.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 638 | 100.0 | 466 | 100.0 | 172 | 100.0 |
| NEVADA | 18-20 | 9 | 1.9 | 5 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 156 | 33.1 | 112 | 33.8 | 44 | 31.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 135 | 28.6 | 95 | 28.7 | 40 | 28.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 75 | 15.9 | 56 | 16.9 | 19 | 13.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 61 | 12.9 | 40 | 12.1 | 21 | 14.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 29 | 6.1 | 16 | 4.8 | 13 | 9.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 1.5 | 7 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 472 | 100.0 | 331 | 100.0 | 141 | 100.0 |
| ORANGE | UNDER 18 | 3 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 253 | 2.7 | 207 | 3.0 | 46 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 4210 | 45.7 | 3137 | 45.1 | 1073 | 47.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 2197 | 23.8 | 1712 | 24.6 | 485 | 21.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 1252 | 13.6 | 945 | 13.6 | 307 | 13.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 897 | 9.7 | 656 | 9.4 | 241 | 10.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 346 | 3.8 | 254 | 3.7 | 92 | 4.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 64 | 0.7 | 44 | 0.6 | 20 | 0.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 9222 | 100.0 | 6958 | 100.0 | 2264 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| PLACER | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 38 | 3.7 | 33 | 4.3 | 5 | 1.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 369 | 35.6 | 276 | 36.0 | 93 | 34.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 273 | 26.4 | 192 | 25.0 | 81 | 30.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 164 | 15.8 | 125 | 16.3 | 39 | 14.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 114 | 11.0 | 85 | 11.1 | 29 | 10.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 68 | 6.6 | 48 | 6.3 | 20 | 7.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 0.8 | 6 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1036 | 100.0 | 767 | 100.0 | 269 | 100.0 |
| PLUMAS | 18-20 | 5 | 5.1 | 4 | 5.1 | 1 | 5.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 33 | 33.7 | 27 | 34.2 | 6 | 31.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 21 | 21.4 | 16 | 20.3 | 5 | 26.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 16 | 16.3 | 12 | 15.2 | 4 | 21.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 10 | 10.2 | 7 | 8.9 | 3 | 15.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 12.2 | 12 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 98 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 19 | 100.0 |
| RIVERSIDE | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 171 | 2.8 | 135 | 2.9 | 36 | 2.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 2681 | 43.7 | 1991 | 42.9 | 690 | 46.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 1535 | 25.0 | 1174 | 25.3 | 361 | 24.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 816 | 13.3 | 636 | 13.7 | 180 | 12.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 623 | 10.2 | 475 | 10.2 | 148 | 9.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 238 | 3.9 | 185 | 4.0 | 53 | 3.6 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 69 | 1.1 | 47 | 1.0 | 22 | 1.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 6135 | 100.0 | 4645 | 100.0 | 1490 | 100.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 95 | 2.2 | 71 | 2.3 | 24 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 1730 | 40.4 | 1208 | 39.2 | 522 | 43.4 |
|  | 31-40 | 1241 | 29.0 | 904 | 29.3 | 337 | 28.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 623 | 14.5 | 449 | 14.6 | 174 | 14.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 416 | 9.7 | 314 | 10.2 | 102 | 8.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 151 | 3.5 | 114 | 3.7 | 37 | 3.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 27 | 0.6 | 21 | 0.7 | 6 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 4284 | 100.0 | 3082 | 100.0 | 1202 | 100.0 |
| SAN BENITO | 18-20 | 9 | 2.8 | 6 | 2.2 | 3 | 5.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 149 | 45.6 | 119 | 44.2 | 30 | 51.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 78 | 23.9 | 67 | 24.9 | 11 | 19.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 12.8 | 37 | 13.8 | 5 | 8.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 34 | 10.4 | 28 | 10.4 | 6 | 10.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 4.6 | 12 | 4.5 | 3 | 5.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 327 | 100.0 | 269 | 100.0 | 58 | 100.0 |
| SAN BERNARDINO | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 95 | 2.0 | 76 | 2.1 | 19 | 1.8 |
|  | 21-30 | 2017 | 42.4 | 1502 | 40.8 | 515 | 48.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 1265 | 26.6 | 991 | 26.9 | 274 | 25.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 677 | 14.2 | 542 | 14.7 | 135 | 12.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 472 | 9.9 | 375 | 10.2 | 97 | 9.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 182 | 3.8 | 153 | 4.2 | 29 | 2.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 43 | 0.9 | 38 | 1.0 | 5 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 4753 | 100.0 | 3679 | 100.0 | 1074 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SAN DIEGO | UNDER 18 | 11 | 0.1 | 9 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 218 | 2.9 | 177 | 3.1 | 41 | 2.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 3426 | 45.0 | 2569 | 44.4 | 857 | 46.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 1892 | 24.8 | 1442 | 24.9 | 450 | 24.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 996 | 13.1 | 749 | 12.9 | 247 | 13.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 722 | 9.5 | 570 | 9.9 | 152 | 8.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 281 | 3.7 | 218 | 3.8 | 63 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 68 | 0.9 | 50 | 0.9 | 18 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 7614 | 100.0 | 5784 | 100.0 | 1830 | 100.0 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 18-20 | 3 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.3 | 2 | 2.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 169 | 42.7 | 122 | 40.4 | 47 | 50.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 99 | 25.0 | 72 | 23.8 | 27 | 28.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 62 | 15.7 | 56 | 18.5 | 6 | 6.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 44 | 11.1 | 37 | 12.3 | 7 | 7.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 3.8 | 10 | 3.3 | 5 | 5.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.0 | 4 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 396 | 100.0 | 302 | 100.0 | 94 | 100.0 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | UNDER 18 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 58 | 4.2 | 48 | 4.5 | 10 | 3.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 515 | 37.7 | 401 | 37.7 | 114 | 37.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 376 | 27.5 | 297 | 27.9 | 79 | 26.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 217 | 15.9 | 168 | 15.8 | 49 | 16.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 145 | 10.6 | 108 | 10.2 | 37 | 12.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 41 | 3.0 | 29 | 2.7 | 12 | 4.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 0.8 | 10 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1365 | 100.0 | 1063 | 100.0 | 302 | 100.0 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 53 | 3.5 | 39 | 3.5 | 14 | 3.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 623 | 41.6 | 483 | 43.9 | 140 | 35.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 362 | 24.1 | 255 | 23.2 | 107 | 26.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 198 | 13.2 | 153 | 13.9 | 45 | 11.3 |
|  | 51-60 | 165 | 11.0 | 107 | 9.7 | 58 | 14.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 81 | 5.4 | 49 | 4.5 | 32 | 8.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 1.1 | 13 | 1.2 | 3 | 0.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 1499 | 100.0 | 1099 | 100.0 | 400 | 100.0 |
| SAN MATEO | 18-20 | 29 | 1.8 | 23 | 1.9 | 6 | 1.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 621 | 38.6 | 475 | 38.8 | 146 | 37.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 445 | 27.6 | 342 | 27.9 | 103 | 26.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 231 | 14.3 | 180 | 14.7 | 51 | 13.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 198 | 12.3 | 143 | 11.7 | 55 | 14.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 68 | 4.2 | 48 | 3.9 | 20 | 5.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 18 | 1.1 | 13 | 1.1 | 5 | 1.3 |
|  | TOTAL | 1610 | 100.0 | 1224 | 100.0 | 386 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SANTA BARBARA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 78 | 5.4 | 66 | 5.7 | 12 | 4.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 633 | 43.8 | 518 | 44.6 | 115 | 40.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 325 | 22.5 | 264 | 22.7 | 61 | 21.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 190 | 13.1 | 156 | 13.4 | 34 | 12.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 144 | 10.0 | 106 | 9.1 | 38 | 13.4 |
|  | 61-70 | 62 | 4.3 | 41 | 3.5 | 21 | 7.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 13 | 0.9 | 10 | 0.9 | 3 | 1.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1446 | 100.0 | 1162 | 100.0 | 284 | 100.0 |
| SANTA CLARA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | 18-20 | 104 | 3.2 | 86 | 3.4 | 18 | 2.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 1483 | 45.7 | 1128 | 44.1 | 355 | 51.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 781 | 24.1 | 642 | 25.1 | 139 | 20.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 457 | 14.1 | 370 | 14.5 | 87 | 12.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 273 | 8.4 | 211 | 8.2 | 62 | 9.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 128 | 3.9 | 102 | 4.0 | 26 | 3.8 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 20 | 0.6 | 19 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 3247 | 100.0 | 2558 | 100.0 | 689 | 100.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 46 | 4.2 | 30 | 3.8 | 16 | 5.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 478 | 44.1 | 363 | 45.7 | 115 | 39.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 255 | 23.5 | 189 | 23.8 | 66 | 22.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 144 | 13.3 | 98 | 12.3 | 46 | 15.8 |
|  | 51-60 | 99 | 9.1 | 71 | 8.9 | 28 | 9.6 |
|  | 61-70 | 54 | 5.0 | 36 | 4.5 | 18 | 6.2 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 0.7 | 6 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1085 | 100.0 | 794 | 100.0 | 291 | 100.0 |
| SHASTA | 18-20 | 21 | 3.5 | 17 | 3.7 | 4 | 2.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 200 | 33.1 | 151 | 33.3 | 49 | 32.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 153 | 25.3 | 106 | 23.3 | 47 | 31.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 93 | 15.4 | 74 | 16.3 | 19 | 12.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 76 | 12.6 | 56 | 12.3 | 20 | 13.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 50 | 8.3 | 39 | 8.6 | 11 | 7.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 12 | 2.0 | 11 | 2.4 | 1 | 0.7 |
|  | TOTAL | 605 | 100.0 | 454 | 100.0 | 151 | 100.0 |
| SIERRA | 21-30 | 5 | 41.7 | 4 | 40.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 3 | 25.0 | 3 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 3 | 25.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 12 | 100.0 | 10 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| SISKIYOU | 18-20 | 2 | 1.1 | 2 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 54 | 30.5 | 43 | 31.9 | 11 | 26.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 45 | 25.4 | 36 | 26.7 | 9 | 21.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 30 | 16.9 | 21 | 15.6 | 9 | 21.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 14.7 | 20 | 14.8 | 6 | 14.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 15 | 8.5 | 11 | 8.1 | 4 | 9.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 2.8 | 2 | 1.5 | 3 | 7.1 |
|  | TOTAL | 177 | 100.0 | 135 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| SOLANO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | 18-20 | 13 | 1.3 | 9 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.5 |
|  | 21-30 | 342 | 34.2 | 245 | 33.7 | 97 | 35.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 318 | 31.8 | 241 | 33.2 | 77 | 28.2 |
|  | 41-50 | 168 | 16.8 | 123 | 16.9 | 45 | 16.5 |
|  | 51-60 | 103 | 10.3 | 69 | 9.5 | 34 | 12.5 |
|  | 61-70 | 47 | 4.7 | 33 | 4.5 | 14 | 5.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 7 | 0.7 | 6 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | TOTAL | 999 | 100.0 | 726 | 100.0 | 273 | 100.0 |
| SONOMA | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 61 | 3.0 | 43 | 2.8 | 18 | 3.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 781 | 38.2 | 598 | 38.8 | 183 | 36.3 |
|  | 31-40 | 530 | 25.9 | 414 | 26.8 | 116 | 23.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 301 | 14.7 | 226 | 14.6 | 75 | 14.9 |
|  | 51-60 | 228 | 11.1 | 168 | 10.9 | 60 | 11.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 114 | 5.6 | 76 | 4.9 | 38 | 7.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 31 | 1.5 | 17 | 1.1 | 14 | 2.8 |
|  | TOTAL | 2047 | 100.0 | 1543 | 100.0 | 504 | 100.0 |
| STANISLAUS | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 59 | 3.8 | 48 | 4.0 | 11 | 3.4 |
|  | 21-30 | 668 | 43.5 | 511 | 42.2 | 157 | 48.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 416 | 27.1 | 341 | 28.2 | 75 | 23.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 208 | 13.5 | 167 | 13.8 | 41 | 12.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 124 | 8.1 | 95 | 7.8 | 29 | 8.9 |
|  | 61-70 | 50 | 3.3 | 39 | 3.2 | 11 | 3.4 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 11 | 0.7 | 9 | 0.7 | 2 | 0.6 |
|  | TOTAL | 1537 | 100.0 | 1211 | 100.0 | 326 | 100.0 |
| SUTTER | 18-20 | 13 | 4.0 | 10 | 4.0 | 3 | 4.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 139 | 43.3 | 114 | 45.6 | 25 | 35.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 85 | 26.5 | 70 | 28.0 | 15 | 21.1 |
|  | 41-50 | 43 | 13.4 | 33 | 13.2 | 10 | 14.1 |
|  | 51-60 | 23 | 7.2 | 15 | 6.0 | 8 | 11.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 4.4 | 7 | 2.8 | 7 | 9.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.2 | 1 | 0.4 | 3 | 4.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 321 | 100.0 | 250 | 100.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| TEHAMA | 18-20 | 6 | 2.7 | 5 | 2.8 | 1 | 2.2 |
|  | 21-30 | 78 | 34.5 | 62 | 34.4 | 16 | 34.8 |
|  | 31-40 | 57 | 25.2 | 48 | 26.7 | 9 | 19.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 36 | 15.9 | 29 | 16.1 | 7 | 15.2 |
|  | 51-60 | 26 | 11.5 | 20 | 11.1 | 6 | 13.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 21 | 9.3 | 15 | 8.3 | 6 | 13.0 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 2 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 | 2.2 |
|  | TOTAL | 226 | 100.0 | 180 | 100.0 | 46 | 100.0 |
| TRINITY | 18-20 | 2 | 4.7 | 2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 11 | 25.6 | 10 | 26.3 | 1 | 20.0 |
|  | 31-40 | 14 | 32.6 | 13 | 34.2 | 1 | 20.0 |
|  | 41-50 | 5 | 11.6 | 5 | 13.2 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 51-60 | 9 | 20.9 | 8 | 21.1 | 1 | 20.0 |
|  | 61-70 | 2 | 4.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 40.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 43 | 100.0 | 38 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 |

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE - continued

| COUNTY | AGE | TOTAL |  | MALE |  | FEMALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% | $N$ | \% |
| TULARE | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 93 | 5.2 | 76 | 5.5 | 17 | 4.3 |
|  | 21-30 | 831 | 46.4 | 648 | 46.5 | 183 | 46.2 |
|  | 31-40 | 455 | 25.4 | 343 | 24.6 | 112 | 28.3 |
|  | 41-50 | 230 | 12.8 | 188 | 13.5 | 42 | 10.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 124 | 6.9 | 95 | 6.8 | 29 | 7.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 48 | 2.7 | 39 | 2.8 | 9 | 2.3 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 8 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.3 | 4 | 1.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1790 | 100.0 | 1394 | 100.0 | 396 | 100.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | 18-20 | 4 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.2 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | 21-30 | 80 | 33.3 | 61 | 35.5 | 19 | 27.9 |
|  | 31-40 | 62 | 25.8 | 42 | 24.4 | 20 | 29.4 |
|  | 41-50 | 42 | 17.5 | 30 | 17.4 | 12 | 17.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 33 | 13.8 | 24 | 14.0 | 9 | 13.2 |
|  | 61-70 | 14 | 5.8 | 10 | 5.8 | 4 | 5.9 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 5 | 2.1 | 3 | 1.7 | 2 | 2.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 240 | 100.0 | 172 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 |
| VENTURA | UNDER 18 | 4 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.3 |
|  | 18-20 | 76 | 2.8 | 63 | 3.0 | 13 | 2.1 |
|  | 21-30 | 1201 | 43.6 | 910 | 42.7 | 291 | 46.6 |
|  | 31-40 | 683 | 24.8 | 560 | 26.3 | 123 | 19.7 |
|  | 41-50 | 396 | 14.4 | 305 | 14.3 | 91 | 14.6 |
|  | 51-60 | 267 | 9.7 | 193 | 9.1 | 74 | 11.8 |
|  | 61-70 | 114 | 4.1 | 86 | 4.0 | 28 | 4.5 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 16 | 0.6 | 13 | 0.6 | 3 | 0.5 |
|  | TOTAL | 2757 | 100.0 | 2132 | 100.0 | 625 | 100.0 |
| YOLO | UNDER 18 | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 18-20 | 16 | 3.8 | 14 | 4.3 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  | 21-30 | 167 | 39.7 | 132 | 40.9 | 35 | 35.7 |
|  | 31-40 | 120 | 28.5 | 97 | 30.0 | 23 | 23.5 |
|  | 41-50 | 54 | 12.8 | 36 | 11.1 | 18 | 18.4 |
|  | 51-60 | 42 | 10.0 | 29 | 9.0 | 13 | 13.3 |
|  | 61-70 | 18 | 4.3 | 11 | 3.4 | 7 | 7.1 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 3 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | TOTAL | 421 | 100.0 | 323 | 100.0 | 98 | 100.0 |
| YUBA | 18-20 | 9 | 3.8 | 6 | 3.3 | 3 | 5.6 |
|  | 21-30 | 86 | 36.8 | 69 | 38.3 | 17 | 31.5 |
|  | 31-40 | 62 | 26.5 | 46 | 25.6 | 16 | 29.6 |
|  | 41-50 | 36 | 15.4 | 27 | 15.0 | 9 | 16.7 |
|  | 51-60 | 25 | 10.7 | 19 | 10.6 | 6 | 11.1 |
|  | 61-70 | 12 | 5.1 | 10 | 5.6 | 2 | 3.7 |
|  | 71 \& ABOVE | 4 | 1.7 | 3 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | TOTAL | 234 | 100.0 | 180 | 100.0 | 54 | 100.0 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT

| COUNTY | COURT | MISD <br> DUI | FELONY DUI ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| STATEWIDE |  | 89431 | 4271 | 224 | 12231 | 132 | 6 |
| ALAMEDA | OAKLAND 1 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 4 | 255 | 62 |
|  | FREMONT | 577 | 20 | 0 | 350 | 166 | 3 |
|  | PLEASANTON | 499 | 40 | 0 | 268 | 262 | 2 |
|  | OAKLAND 2 | 1109 | 7 | 1 | 679 | 129 | 9 |
|  | TOTAL | 2206 | 85 | 1 | 1301 | 168 | 5 |
| ALPINE | ALPINE | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 79 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 79 | 10 |
| AMADOR | JACKSON | 136 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 136 | 15 |
|  | TOTAL | 136 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 136 | 15 |
| BUTTE | BUTTE | 791 | 45 | 4 | 107 | 130 | 7 |
|  | TOTAL | 791 | 45 | 4 | 107 | 130 | 7 |
| CALAVERAS | CALAVERAS | 121 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 113 | 3 |
|  | TOTAL | 121 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 113 | 3 |
| COLUSA | COLUSA | 107 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 81 | 19 |
|  | TOTAL | 107 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 81 | 19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CONTRA } \\ & \text { COSTA } \end{aligned}$ | CONTRA COSTA | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 7 |
|  | RICHMOND | 914 | 26 | 4 | 6 | 220 | 4 |
|  | WALNUT CREEK | 730 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 301 | 4 |
|  | TOTAL | 1655 | 43 | 6 | 7 | 270 | 4 |
| DEL NORTE | DEL NORTE | 158 | 5 | 2 | 54 | 97 | 9 |
|  | TOTAL | 158 | 5 | 2 | 54 | 97 | 9 |
| EL DORADO | SOUTH LAKE TAHOE |  | 6 | 1 | 20 | 193 | 20 |
|  | PLACERVILLE | 394 | 23 | 2 | 56 | 209 | 6 |
|  | TOTAL | 589 | 29 | 3 | 76 | 202 | 7 |
| FRESNO | FRESNO JUV | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 207 | 25 |
|  | FRESNO CENTRAL | 3446 | 213 | 13 | 705 | 179 | 25 |
|  | USDT FRESNO | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 122 | 22 |
|  | TOTAL | 3469 | 213 | 13 | 709 | 179 | 25 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | MISD <br> DUI | FELONY <br> DUI ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\mathrm{b}} \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{gathered}$ |
| GLENN | GLENN | 101 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 193 | 20 |
|  | TOTAL | 101 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 193 | 20 |
| HUMBOLDT | SUP HUMBOLDT | 718 | 8 | 3 | 113 | 135 | 14 |
|  | TOTAL | 718 | 8 | 3 | 113 | 135 | 14 |
| IMPERIAL | BRAWLEY | 63 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 261 | 4 |
|  | EL CENTRO | 249 | 5 | 2 | 154 | 278 | 6 |
|  | WINTERHAVEN | 67 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 179 | 6 |
|  | TOTAL | 379 | 7 | 8 | 207 | 268 | 6 |
| $\overline{\text { INYO }}$ | INYO JUV TRAFF | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 41 |
|  | BISHOP | 72 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 135 | 2 |
|  | TOTAL | 73 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 133 | 2 |
| KERN | KERN | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 52 |
|  | KERN JUV | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 3 |
|  | LAMONT | 135 | 7 | 2 | 62 | 45 | 1 |
|  | BAKERSFIELD | 2121 | 34 | 4 | 430 | 72 | 10 |
|  | DELANO | 123 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 51 | 1 |
|  | SHAFTER | 119 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 67 | 1 |
|  | MOJAVE | 206 | 9 | 1 | 50 | 89 | 0 |
|  | RIDGECREST | 89 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 81 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2806 | 73 | 8 | 593 | 70 | 9 |
| KINGS | KINGS TRAF | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 10 |
|  | HANFORD | 618 | 19 | 1 | 53 | 140 | 2 |
|  | TOTAL | 620 | 19 | 1 | 53 | 140 | 2 |
| LAKE | LAKE | 284 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 162 | 7 |
|  | CLEARLAKE | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 287 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 164 | 7 |
| LASSEN | SUSANVILLE | 82 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 224 | 4 |
|  | TOTAL | 82 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 224 | 4 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | MISD <br> DUI | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{\mathrm{a}} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 5 |
|  | POMONA 1 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 6 |
|  | LANCASTER 1 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 9 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 30 |
|  | PASADENA 1 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 328 | 6 |
|  | VAN NUYS 1 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 9 |
|  | LONG BEACH 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 6 |
|  | COMPTON 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 317 | 6 |
|  | NORWALK 1 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 382 | 18 |
|  | TORRANCE 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 6 |
|  | SANTA MONICA 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 308 | 5 |
|  | LOS ANGELES JUV | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 1 |
|  | EASTLAKE JUV | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 3 |
|  | LOS ANGELES AIRPRT | 868 | 39 | 2 | 83 | 147 | 6 |
|  | ALHAMBRA | 460 | 3 | 0 | 36 | 146 | 5 |
|  | LANCASTER 2 | 850 | 47 | 4 | 94 | 104 | 5 |
|  | BURBANK | 182 | 4 | 1 | 38 | 122 | 9 |
|  | WEST COVINA | 1103 | 37 | 2 | 47 | 131 | 6 |
|  | CHATSWORTH | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 148 | 0 |
|  | COMPTON 2 | 555 | 37 | 0 | 58 | 159 | 5 |
|  | DOWNEY | 869 | 28 | 1 | 43 | 156 | 5 |
|  | EAST LOS ANGELES | 538 | 6 | 1 | 61 | 152 | 5 |
|  | EL MONTE | 509 | 12 | 1 | 42 | 150 | 5 |
|  | GLENDALE | 342 | 13 | 0 | 43 | 180 | 5 |
|  | INGLEWOOD | 420 | 15 | 0 | 51 | 184 | 10 |
|  | LONG BEACH 2 | 1045 | 28 | 1 | 66 | 102 | 6 |
|  | LOS ANGELES NORTH | 39 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 313 | 7 |
|  | LA METRO | 2890 | 20 | 10 | 340 | 59 | 14 |
|  | BELLFLOWER | 1040 | 44 | 1 | 98 | 145 | 5 |
|  | SANTA CLARITA | 730 | 4 | 1 | 72 | 144 | 5 |
|  | PASADENA 2 | 496 | 19 | 1 | 111 | 157 | 5 |
|  | POMONA 2 | 816 | 34 | 0 | 70 | 146 | 6 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONY $\mathrm{DUI}^{\mathrm{a}}$ | UNDER 21 DUI ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | TORRANCE 2 | 702 | 16 | 1 | 119 | 123 | 9 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO 2 | 745 | 21 | 2 | 83 | 82 | 6 |
|  | VAN NUYS 2 | 1574 | 31 | 2 | 219 | 87 | 6 |
|  | AVALON | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 11 |
|  | USDT LOS ANGELES | 24 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 138 | 71 |
|  | TOTAL | 16884 | 555 | 33 | 1778 | 120 | 6 |
| MADERA | MADERA | 190 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 353 | 40 |
|  | CHOWCHILLA | 436 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 360 | 31 |
|  | MADERA CRIM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 41 |
|  | TOTAL | 627 | 30 | 0 | 108 | 358 | 34 |
| MARIN | SAN RAFAEL | 1035 | 28 | 9 | 146 | 102 | 7 |
|  | TOTAL | 1035 | 28 | 9 | 146 | 102 | 7 |
| MARIPOSA | SUP MARIPOSA | 55 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 115 | 3 |
|  | TOTAL | 55 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 115 | 3 |
| MENDOCINO | SUP UKIAH | 8 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 167 | 83 |
|  | MENDOCINO JUV | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 339 | 19 |
|  | UKIAH | 363 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 114 | 3 |
|  | FORT BRAGG | 87 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 88 | 14 |
|  | TOTAL | 461 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 109 | 5 |
| MERCED | MERCED JUV | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 38 |
|  | MERCED | 563 | 59 | 2 | 49 | 189 | 5 |
|  | LOS BANOS | 215 | 13 | 1 | 20 | 165 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 779 | 72 | 3 | 69 | 183 | 6 |
| MODOC | ALTURAS | 26 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 139 | 13 |
|  | TOTAL | 26 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 139 | 13 |
| MONO | MAMMOTH LAKES | 102 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 123 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 102 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 123 | 8 |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY | 1543 | 67 | 0 | 203 | 77 | 44 |
|  | MONTEREY JUV | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 91 | 54 |
|  | MARINA | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 136 | 1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1551 | 68 | 5 | 204 | 78 | 44 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | FELONY <br> DUI ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{gathered}$ |
| NAPA | NAPA | 613 | 24 | 1 | 90 | 116 | 2 |
|  | TOTAL | 613 | 24 | 1 | 90 | 116 | 2 |
| NEVADA | NEVADA CITY | 304 | 9 | 1 | 28 | 140 | 11 |
|  | TRUCKEE | 154 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 107 | 7 |
|  | TOTAL | 458 | 11 | 3 | 47 | 129 | 9 |
| ORANGE | ORANGE JUV | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 5 |
|  | FULLERTON | 2569 | 93 | 2 | 77 | 167 | 0 |
|  | WESTMINSTER | 2416 | 114 | 3 | 75 | 227 | 0 |
|  | NEWPORT BEACH | 2533 | 63 | 5 | 156 | 206 | 0 |
|  | SANTA ANA | 1359 | 53 | 2 | 70 | 215 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 8887 | 323 | 12 | 378 | 204 | 0 |
| PLACER | PLACER JUV | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 138 | 38 |
|  | ROSEVILLE TRAFFIC | 833 | 89 | 0 | 92 | 108 | 4 |
|  | TAHOE CITY | 99 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 86 | 5 |
|  | TOTAL | 938 | 96 | 2 | 98 | 106 | 4 |
| PLUMAS | QUINCY | 90 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 58 | 14 |
|  | TOTAL | 90 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 58 | 14 |
| RIVERSIDE | RIVERSIDE | 2619 | 125 | 0 | 133 | 166 | 2 |
|  | INDIO | 1230 | 50 | 0 | 89 | 146 | 4 |
|  | RIVERSIDE JUV | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 92 | 22 |
|  | INDIO JUV | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 336 |
|  | MURRIETA JUV | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 10 |
|  | BANNING | 736 | 26 | 0 | 23 | 129 | 3 |
|  | INDIO | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 302 |
|  | BLYTHE | 75 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 116 | 5 |
|  | MURRIETA | 1197 | 56 | 0 | 58 | 123 | 3 |
|  | TOTAL | 5876 | 259 | 0 | 316 | 149 | 3 |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO | 3843 | 420 | 2 | 314 | 93 | 2 |
|  | SACRAMENTO JUV | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 21 |
|  | SACRAMENTO CM | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 93 | 0 |
|  | USDT SACRAMENTO | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 71 |
|  | TOTAL | 3851 | 420 | 13 | 314 | 93 | 2 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{\mathrm{a}} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO | 313 | 14 | 0 | 48 | 150 | 23 |
|  | TOTAL | 313 | 14 | 0 | 48 | 150 | 23 |
| SAN | SAN BERNARDINO 1 | 1327 | 97 | 0 | 326 | 213 | 1 |
| BERNARDINO | R CUCAMONGA | 2112 | 140 | 0 | 245 | 191 | 6 |
|  | VICTORVILLE 1 | 833 | 72 | 0 | 207 | 220 | 1 |
|  | BARSTOW | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 106 | 0 |
|  | JOSHUA TREE | 149 | 11 | 1 | 58 | 146 | 5 |
|  | SAN BERNARDINO JUV | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 29 |
|  | FONTANA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 165 | 2 |
|  | SUP R CUCAMONGA | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 106 |
|  | TOTAL | 4428 | 320 | 5 | 836 | 201 | 3 |
| SAN DIEGO | SAN DIEGO | 54 | 97 | 0 | 1 | 137 | 26 |
|  | VISTA 1 | 22 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 49 |
|  | SAN DIEGO JUV | 23 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 23 |
|  | EL CAJON | 1313 | 75 | 0 | 205 | 73 | 13 |
|  | VISTA 2 | 2213 | 59 | 0 | 557 | 62 | 19 |
|  | VISTA 3 | 31 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 150 | 7 |
|  | KEARNY MESA | 2383 | 5 | 7 | 407 | 89 | 5 |
|  | CHULA VISTA | 1076 | 87 | 3 | 117 | 80 | 11 |
|  | USDT SOUTH SD | 21 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 455 | 31 |
|  | TOTAL | 7136 | 466 | 12 | 1311 | 77 | 11 |
| SAN | SAN FRANCISCO | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 23 |
| FRANCISCO | SAN FRAN TRAFFIC | 364 | 19 | 0 | 130 | 167 | 7 |
|  | TOTAL | 365 | 31 | 0 | 130 | 167 | 7 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | SAN JOAQUIN | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 5 |
|  | LODI | 184 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 60 | 11 |
|  | MANTECA | 545 | 22 | 0 | 36 | 86 | 3 |
|  | STOCKTON | 560 | 37 | 2 | 38 | 51 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 1296 | 67 | 2 | 89 | 69 | 5 |
| SAN LUIS | SAN LUIS OBISPO | 1428 | 63 | 5 | 163 | 88 | 0 |
| OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO JUV | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 18 |
|  | TOTAL | 1431 | 63 | 5 | 163 | 88 | 0 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { MISD } \\ \text { DUI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FELONY } \\ \text { DUI }^{\mathrm{a}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUIb }^{b} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SAN MATEO | SAN MATEO | 1542 | 60 | 5 | 353 | 179 | 15 |
|  | SAN MATEO JUV | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 74 |
|  | REDWOOD CITY | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 290 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1544 | 60 | 6 | 353 | 179 | 15 |
| SANTA BARBARA | SANTA BARBARA JUV | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 6 |
|  | SANTA MARIA W JUV | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 5 |
|  | SANTA BARBARA | 596 | 45 | 4 | 116 | 121 | 18 |
|  | SUP SANTA MARIA | 668 | 30 | 0 | 45 | 87 | 20 |
|  | LOMPOC | 94 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 98 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 1362 | 80 | 4 | 180 | 99 | 18 |
| SANTA CLARA | SANTA CLARA | 21 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 111 | 88 |
|  | SANTA CLARA JUV | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 53 |
|  | PALO ALTO | 561 | 14 | 0 | 157 | 127 | 42 |
|  | SAN JOSE | 2013 | 78 | 2 | 485 | 129 | 43 |
|  | SAN JOSE TRAFFIC | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 206 | 0 |
|  | SAN MARTIN | 518 | 15 | 0 | 128 | 95 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 3119 | 122 | 6 | 772 | 121 | 32 |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 31 |
|  | SANTA CRUZ JUV | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 5 |
|  | SANTA CRUZ TRAF | 946 | 41 | 6 | 201 | 77 | 1 |
|  | WATSONVILLE | 88 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 65 | 1 |
|  | TOTAL | 1037 | 42 | 6 | 203 | 77 | 1 |
| SHASTA | SHASTA JUV | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 16 |
|  | BURNEY | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 418 | 21 |
|  | REDDING | 565 | 38 | 0 | 97 | 114 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 567 | 38 | 0 | 97 | 114 | 10 |
| SIERRA | SIERRA | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 102 | 114 |
|  | TOTAL | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 102 | 114 |
| SISKIYOU | YREKA | 158 | 19 | 0 | 27 | 196 | 4 |
|  | TOTAL | 158 | 19 | 0 | 27 | 196 | 4 |

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2018 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

| COUNTY | COURT | MISD <br> DUI | FELONY DUI $^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER } 21 \\ \text { DUI }^{\text {b }} \end{gathered}$ | ALCOHOL <br> OR DRUG <br> RECKLESS | MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | VIOLATION TO CONVICTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONVICTION TO } \\ & \text { DMV UPDATE } \end{aligned}$ |
| SOLANO | SOLANO JUV | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 8 |
|  | FAIRFIELD | 669 | 16 | 1 | 266 | 178 | 25 |
|  | VALLEJO | 298 | 12 | 2 | 82 | 157 | 8 |
|  | TOTAL | 967 | 29 | 3 | 348 | 171 | 19 |
| SONOMA | SONOMA | 1938 | 101 | 1 | 199 | 109 | 490 |
|  | SONOMA JUV | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 116 | 7 |
|  | SANTA ROSA | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 113 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1942 | 101 | 4 | 200 | 109 | 490 |
| STANISLAUS | STANISLAUS | 1440 | 92 | 1 | 112 | 118 | 14 |
|  | STANISLAUS JUV | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 27 |
|  | MODESTO | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 149 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 1441 | 92 | 4 | 112 | 118 | 14 |
| SUTTER | YUBA CITY | 298 | 18 | 5 | 95 | 88 | 10 |
|  | TOTAL | 298 | 18 | 5 | 95 | 88 | 10 |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | 214 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 102 | 23 |
|  | TOTAL | 214 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 102 | 23 |
| TRINITY | TRINITY | 41 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 145 | 12 |
|  | TOTAL | 41 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 145 | 12 |
| TULARE | VISALIA | 1045 | 49 | 9 | 88 | 143 | 3 |
|  | PORTERVILLE | 651 | 31 | 1 | 61 | 126 | 7 |
|  | TULARE | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 16 |
|  | TOTAL | 1700 | 80 | 10 | 149 | 137 | 5 |
| TUOLUMNE | TUOLUMNE | 235 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 69 | 59 |
|  | TOTAL | 235 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 69 | 59 |
| VENTURA | VENTURA JUV | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 83 |
|  | VENTURA | 2657 | 83 | 10 | 0 | 134 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 2663 | 84 | 10 | 0 | 134 | 0 |
| YOLO | YOLO | 399 | 20 | 2 | 66 | 121 | 4 |
|  | TOTAL | 399 | 20 | 2 | 66 | 121 | 4 |
| YUBA | YUBA | 220 | 11 | 3 | 43 | 97 | 3 |
|  | TOTAL | 220 | 11 | 3 | 43 | 97 | 3 |

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

|  |  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER }} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| STATEWIDE |  |  | 93926 | 96.0 | 75.5 | 68.1 | 22.7 | 0.3 | 9.3 |
| ALAMEDA | OAKLAND RCD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 20 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 45.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 27.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 39 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 43.6 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 12.8 |
|  | FREMONT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 382 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 95.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 163 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 15.3 | 80.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 39 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 5.1 | 94.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 69.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 597 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 65.3 | 31.5 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  | PLEASANTON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 343 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 93.9 | 4.7 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 135 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 14.8 | 81.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 48 | 95.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 4.2 | 10.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 7.7 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 53.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 539 | 99.1 | 99.8 | 63.6 | 33.8 | 0.6 | 4.1 |
|  | OAKLAND TRAFFIC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 749 | 99.6 | 99.7 | 93.6 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 273 | 99.3 | 99.6 | 19.4 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 82 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 6.1 | 84.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1117 | 99.3 | 99.7 | 68.2 | 28.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| ALPINE | ALPINE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 54.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 43.8 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 18.8 |
| AMADOR | JACKSON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 98 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 83.7 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 24.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 38 | 94.7 | 94.7 | 7.9 | 76.3 | 0.0 | 84.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}_{+}}$ | 5 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 151 | 90.7 | 98.7 | 56.3 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 42.4 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDERSTATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| BUTTE | BUTTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 582 | 95.0 | 94.3 | 90.9 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 186 | 90.9 | 98.4 | 7.0 | 72.0 | 7.5 | 25.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 55 | 67.3 | 94.5 | 1.8 | 25.5 | 40.0 | 27.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 17 | 52.9 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 47.1 | 35.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 840 | 91.4 | 95.2 | 64.6 | 18.6 | 5.5 | 10.2 |
| CALAVERAS | CALAVERAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 90 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 95.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 65.4 | 0.0 | 26.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 125 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 74.4 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
| COLUSA | COLUSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 74 | 95.9 | 98.6 | 91.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 25 | 92.0 | 96.0 | 60.0 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 112 | 93.8 | 98.2 | 78.6 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CONTRA COSTA | CONTRA COSTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 9 | 33.3 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 54.2 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  | RICHMOND | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 296 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 92.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 85 | 97.6 | 96.5 | 8.2 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 27.1 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 19 | 100.0 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 89.5 | 0.0 | 68.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 404 | 99.0 | 96.5 | 70.0 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
|  | PITTSBURG | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 367 | 97.8 | 95.6 | 91.8 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 124 | 99.2 | 96.8 | 7.3 | 91.1 | 0.0 | 37.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 93.8 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 84.4 | 0.0 | 65.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 17 | 82.4 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 29.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 540 | 97.4 | 96.1 | 64.4 | 30.9 | 0.0 | 15.0 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | DUIOFFENDER STATUS | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| COSTA <br> (cont) | WALNUT CREEK | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 491 | 98.4 | 92.7 | 83.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 170 | 99.4 | 96.5 | 11.2 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 24.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 60 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 43.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 15 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 736 | 98.1 | 94.3 | 58.4 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 11.7 |
| DEL NORTE | DEL NORTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 125 | 94.4 | 98.4 | 88.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 31 | 90.3 | 100.0 | 19.4 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 64.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 165 | 91.5 | 98.8 | 70.3 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 18.8 |
| EL DORADO | SOUTH LAKE TAHOE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 143 | 99.3 | 95.8 | 83.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 3.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 45 | 95.6 | 97.8 | 8.9 | 75.6 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 9 | 88.9 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 5 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 202 | 97.5 | 95.5 | 60.9 | 24.8 | 0.0 | 20.3 |
|  | PLACERVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 290 | 97.9 | 99.0 | 90.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 24.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 96 | 93.8 | 97.9 | 6.3 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 95.5 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 72.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 72.7 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 419 | 96.2 | 98.3 | 64.2 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 39.4 |
| FRESNO | FRESNO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 8 | 100.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FRESNO |  | 2422 | 96.3 | 98.5 | 93.4 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 867 | 92.4 | 99.5 | 13.4 | 75.8 | 0.2 | 30.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 266 | 91.4 | 99.2 | 6.0 | 80.8 | 0.0 | 55.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 117 | 53.8 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 29.9 | 2.6 | 12.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3672 | 93.7 | 98.9 | 65.6 | 25.8 | 0.1 | 12.5 |
|  | USDT FRESNO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 8 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 90.9 | 9.1 | 45.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| GLENN | GLENN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 76 | 98.7 | 53.9 | 86.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 21 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 23.8 | 47.6 | 14.3 | 4.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 104 | 97.1 | 65.4 | 68.3 | 11.5 | 6.7 | 4.8 |
| HUMBOLDT | SUP HUMBOLDT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 503 | 98.8 | 95.8 | 94.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 154 | 96.8 | 98.1 | 14.9 | 78.6 | 0.0 | 73.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 59 | 100.0 | 98.3 | 3.4 | 89.8 | 1.7 | 89.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 46.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 30.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 729 | 97.5 | 96.6 | 68.6 | 25.0 | 0.1 | 24.3 |
| IMPERIAL | BRAWLEY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 44 | 93.2 | 40.9 | 86.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 17 | 76.5 | 76.5 | 29.4 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 65 | 87.7 | 53.8 | 66.2 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
|  | EL CENTRO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 197 | 94.4 | 23.9 | 82.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 45 | 84.4 | 68.9 | 37.8 | 46.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 8 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 12.5 | 25.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 256 | 91.8 | 35.2 | 70.3 | 12.1 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
|  | WINTERHAVEN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 62 | 71.0 | 14.5 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 11 | 90.9 | 63.6 | 36.4 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 73 | 74.0 | 21.9 | 54.8 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| INYO | INYO JUV TRAFF | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | BISHOP | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 60 | 98.3 | 16.7 | 88.3 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 9 | 88.9 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 22.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 75 | 96.0 | 30.7 | 73.3 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 8.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KERN | KERN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | , | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | KERN JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 12 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LAMONT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 99 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 34.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 33 | 97.0 | 100.0 | 6.1 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 144 | 94.4 | 97.9 | 25.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  | BAKERSFIELD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1519 | 98.7 | 99.3 | 78.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 471 | 97.5 | 98.5 | 8.9 | 63.7 | 0.6 | 30.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 130 | 92.3 | 97.7 | 4.6 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 39 | 61.5 | 94.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 10.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2159 | 97.4 | 98.9 | 57.6 | 18.9 | 0.3 | 10.8 |
|  | DELANO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 88 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 90.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 34 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 26.5 | 58.8 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 133 | 97.0 | 99.2 | 66.9 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
|  | SHAFTER | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 96 | 92.7 | 95.8 | 79.2 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 23 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 17.4 | 65.2 | 0.0 | 17.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 9 | 88.9 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 128 | 93.0 | 95.3 | 62.5 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  | MOJAVE | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 145 | 97.9 | 98.6 | 77.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 53 | 94.3 | 100.0 | 28.3 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 12 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 216 | 95.8 | 99.1 | 59.3 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KERN (cont) | RIDGECREST | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 63 | 98.4 | 100.0 | 55.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 19 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 36.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 91 | 98.9 | 100.0 | 48.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| KINGS | KINGS TRAFFIC <br> HANFORD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 431 | 96.3 | 99.3 | 87.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 139 | 92.1 | 98.6 | 15.8 | 75.5 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 46 | 87.0 | 97.8 | 8.7 | 84.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 22 | 72.7 | 100.0 | 4.5 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 638 | 93.9 | 99.1 | 63.5 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| LAKE | LAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 199 | 97.0 | 94.0 | 85.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 69 | 94.2 | 95.7 | 21.7 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 37.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 15 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 53.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 100.0 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 18.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 294 | 96.3 | 94.6 | 62.9 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  | CLEARLAKE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LASSEN | SUSANVILLE |  | 67 | 97.0 | 89.6 | 89.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 13 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 38.5 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 87 | 95.4 | 90.8 | 75.9 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 8 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 15 | 60.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | POMONA 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ |  | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 7.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LANCASTER 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 14 | 64.3 | 92.9 | 42.9 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 6 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 25 | 44.0 | 88.0 | 24.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 44.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | PASADENA 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 12 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | VAN NUYS 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 16 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LONG BEACH 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 7 | 57.1 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 55.6 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | COMPTON 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | NORWALK | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 14 | 28.6 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | TORRANCE 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA MONICA 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 10 | 60.0 | 90.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | LOS ANGELES JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 5 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | EASTLAKE JUV | $1^{\mathrm{ST}}$ | 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 |
|  | LA AIRPORT | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 736 | 98.5 | 28.8 | 88.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 139 | 100.0 | 89.2 | 9.4 | 81.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 26 | 84.6 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 25.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 909 | 97.7 | 40.6 | 73.2 | 16.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  | ALHAMBRA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 376 | 99.5 | 12.2 | 93.4 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 71 | 100.0 | 90.1 | 7.0 | 88.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 76.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 463 | 98.7 | 27.0 | 77.1 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | LANCASTER 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 651 | 92.8 | 31.5 | 87.7 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 184 | 86.4 | 92.9 | 5.4 | 78.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 53 | 75.5 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 67.9 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 13 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 901 | 89.1 | 48.8 | 64.5 | 21.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | BURBANK | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 144 | 97.9 | 18.1 | 84.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 38 | 89.5 | 76.3 | 13.2 | 68.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 187 | 95.7 | 31.6 | 67.9 | 16.0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
|  | WEST COVINA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 885 | 97.9 | 66.3 | 93.2 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 208 | 91.8 | 93.8 | 6.3 | 84.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 42 | 81.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 76.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 7 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1142 | 95.8 | 72.8 | 73.4 | 20.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
|  | CHATSWORTH | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | COMPTON 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 452 | 96.7 | 21.0 | 82.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 110 | 93.6 | 88.2 | 5.5 | 80.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 19 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 5.3 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 27.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 592 | 93.9 | 37.5 | 64.0 | 18.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  | DOWNEY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 694 | 98.0 | 15.9 | 87.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 163 | 93.9 | 89.6 | 9.8 | 76.7 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 38 | 94.7 | 97.4 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 23.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 898 | 96.9 | 33.0 | 69.0 | 19.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | EAST LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 426 | 98.4 | 17.1 | 83.6 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 101 | 98.0 | 83.2 | 11.9 | 72.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 18 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 5.6 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 545 | 98.3 | 31.7 | 67.7 | 17.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | EL MONTE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 407 | 99.0 | 41.8 | 89.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 90 | 98.9 | 97.8 | 3.3 | 86.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 16 | 93.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 9 | 55.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 522 | 98.1 | 54.2 | 70.7 | 20.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | GLENDALE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 278 | 98.6 | 17.3 | 92.4 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 64 | 96.9 | 90.6 | 4.7 | 89.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 92.3 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 76.9 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 355 | 98.0 | 33.2 | 73.5 | 20.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | INGLEWOOD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 335 | 97.9 | 19.1 | 92.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 81 | 91.4 | 85.2 | 12.3 | 76.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 18 | 83.3 | 88.9 | 5.6 | 50.0 | 27.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 435 | 96.1 | 34.5 | 73.8 | 18.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | LONG BEACH 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 820 | 98.0 | 50.6 | 83.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 195 | 93.8 | 85.1 | 9.2 | 73.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 49 | 85.7 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 63.3 | 8.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1074 | 96.0 | 59.3 | 65.6 | 18.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | LOS ANGELES NORTH | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 44 | 79.5 | 77.3 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 19 | 68.4 | 73.7 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 72 | 69.4 | 79.2 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | LA METRO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2346 | 97.6 | 48.6 | 87.5 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 459 | 96.3 | 96.1 | 5.2 | 86.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 95 | 98.9 | 97.9 | 1.1 | 85.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | $20$ | 40.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2920 | 97.0 | 58.0 | 71.1 | 20.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | BELLFLOWER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 834 | 98.4 | 17.1 | 85.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 211 | 96.2 | 87.2 | 13.3 | 66.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 34 | 79.4 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1085 | 97.0 | 33.7 | 68.0 | 16.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA CLARITA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 550 | 99.5 | 9.1 | 92.2 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 147 | 100.0 | 89.1 | 9.5 | 85.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 93.8 | 96.9 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 50.0 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 735 | 98.9 | 29.5 | 70.9 | 23.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | PASADENA 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 394 | 98.2 | 13.7 | 94.7 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 102 | 98.0 | 87.3 | 8.8 | 86.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 9 | 77.8 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 55.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 516 | 96.5 | 31.6 | 74.2 | 20.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  | POMONA 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 652 | 97.1 | 27.1 | 87.0 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 152 | 94.7 | 92.8 | 6.6 | 77.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 35 | 91.4 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 68.6 | 11.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 850 | 95.2 | 42.7 | 68.0 | 18.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | TORRANCE 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 563 | 98.2 | 23.6 | 92.5 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 126 | 96.8 | 96.0 | 7.9 | 82.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 90.9 | 95.5 | 4.5 | 72.7 | 9.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 719 | 97.1 | 39.4 | 74.0 | 19.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN FERNANDO 2 | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 573 | 96.2 | 29.5 | 89.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 139 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 5.0 | 83.5 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 46 | 84.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 69.6 | 10.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 768 | 94.3 | 46.5 | 67.4 | 20.8 | 1.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| LOS ANGELES (cont) | VAN NUYS 2 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1279 | 98.6 | 26.9 | 86.6 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 268 | 97.4 | 94.0 | 5.6 | 79.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 53 | 90.6 | 98.1 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 7 | 71.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1607 | 98.0 | 40.8 | 69.9 | 18.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
|  | AVALON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | USDT LOS ANGELES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 24 | 20.8 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 24 | 20.8 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| MADERA | MADERA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 121 | 91.7 | 93.4 | 85.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 51 | 80.4 | 90.2 | 21.6 | 60.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 23 | 69.6 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 65.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 25 | 60.0 | 84.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 220 | 83.2 | 91.8 | 52.3 | 26.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | CHOWCHILLA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 286 | 92.3 | 98.3 | 94.8 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 112 | 96.4 | 99.1 | 26.8 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 30 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 23.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 436 | 92.9 | 98.6 | 71.1 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  | MADERA CRIM | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| MARIN | SAN RAFAEL | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 743 | 98.7 | 97.2 | 95.2 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 251 | 98.0 | 97.2 | 4.4 | 92.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 67 | 100.0 | 95.5 | 1.5 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 91.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 45.5 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1072 | 98.0 | 97.1 | 67.2 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 24.3 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { TOTAL }}{N}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { PROBATION } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $30-\mathrm{MONTH}$ <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM <br> $\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MARIPOSA | SUP MARIPOSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 35 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 77.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 56.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 56 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 53.6 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 23.2 |
| MENDOCINO | SUP UKIAH | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 14 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 78.6 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 71.4 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 28 | 82.1 | 96.4 | 39.3 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 17.9 |
|  | MENDOCINO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 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 |
|  | UKIAH | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 247 | 95.5 | 96.8 | 87.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 84 | 95.2 | 98.8 | 13.1 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 96.9 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 68.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 365 | 95.6 | 97.5 | 63.0 | 28.8 | 0.0 | 22.2 |
|  | FORT BRAGG | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 57 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 93.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 17 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 29.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 14 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 78.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 92 | 98.9 | 98.9 | 58.7 | 35.9 | 0.0 | 18.5 |
| MERCED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MERCED JUV } \\ & \text { MERCED } \end{aligned}$ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 440 | 96.8 | 96.6 | 74.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 125 | 98.4 | 99.2 | 9.6 | 80.8 | 0.0 | 20.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 39 | 89.7 | 94.9 | 2.6 | 79.5 | 0.0 | 35.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 20 | 75.0 | 90.0 | 10.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 624 | 96.0 | 96.8 | 54.6 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 7.7 |

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

| COUNTY MERCED (cont) | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { PROBATION } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS BANOS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 155 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 90.3 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 57 | 93.0 | 94.7 | 8.8 | 75.4 | 0.0 | 64.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 76.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 229 | 96.5 | 97.8 | 63.3 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 23.6 |
| MODOC | ALTURAS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 20 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 29 | 100.0 | 82.8 | 51.7 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| MONO | MAMMOTH LAKES | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 77 | 97.4 | 72.7 | 90.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 17 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 23.5 | 76.5 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 103 | 98.1 | 77.7 | 71.8 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1111 | 98.5 | 98.6 | 88.8 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 12.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 370 | 97.8 | 98.6 | 7.8 | 85.9 | 0.0 | 48.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 105 | 91.4 | 99.0 | 1.9 | 83.8 | 0.0 | 64.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 75.0 | 95.8 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 29.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1610 | 97.5 | 98.6 | 63.2 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 24.3 |
|  | MONTEREY JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MARINA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| NAPA | NAPA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 470 | 86.8 | 84.5 | 79.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 28.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 125 | 91.2 | 90.4 | 2.4 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 32 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 78.1 |
|  |  | $4^{\mathrm{TH}}+$ | 11 | 81.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 63.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 638 | 87.9 | 86.4 | 59.2 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 40.9 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { STATUS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROBATION } \\ \hline \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IGNITION } \\ \text { INTERLOCK } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEVADA | NEVADA CITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 219 | 98.2 | 99.5 | 94.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 66 | 97.0 | 100.0 | 22.7 | 71.2 | 0.0 | 66.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 95.5 | 100.0 | 31.8 | 59.1 | 0.0 | 86.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 314 | 97.8 | 99.7 | 72.9 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 24.5 |
|  | TRUCKEE | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 125 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 158 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 95.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ORANGE | ORANGE JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 10 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 10 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FULLERTON |  | 2027 | 97.6 | 35.7 | 92.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 484 | 93.8 | 91.9 | 5.4 | 84.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 124 | 91.1 | 99.2 | 2.4 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 29 | 55.2 | 93.1 | 0.0 | 55.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2664 | 96.1 | 49.5 | 71.8 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
|  | WESTMINSTER | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1952 | 98.2 | 22.4 | 94.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 449 | 94.4 | 89.8 | 6.5 | 85.5 | 0.0 | 11.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 104 | 86.5 | 96.2 | 3.8 | 76.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 28 | 82.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 82.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2533 | 96.8 | 38.3 | 74.4 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
|  | NEWPORT BEACH | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2035 | 99.0 | 49.5 | 94.2 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 450 | 97.8 | 92.2 | 7.1 | 87.8 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 92 | 92.4 | 98.9 | 0.0 | 85.9 | 1.1 | 2.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2601 | 98.2 | 59.1 | 74.9 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

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

|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| RIVERSIDE <br> (cont) | RIVERSIDE JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | INDIO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | MURRIETA JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | BANNING | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 557 | 97.5 | 95.7 | 95.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 148 | 91.2 | 95.9 | 7.4 | 83.8 | 0.0 | 48.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 48 | 79.2 | 91.7 | 6.3 | 72.9 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 9 | 77.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 762 | 94.9 | 95.5 | 71.3 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
|  | BLYTHE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 54 | 98.1 | 83.3 | 96.3 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 16 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 77 | 97.4 | 87.0 | 71.4 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
|  | MURRIETA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 929 | 98.2 | 96.7 | 95.3 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 7.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 250 | 95.2 | 97.6 | 8.4 | 86.0 | 0.0 | 24.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 50 | 90.0 | 92.0 | 4.0 | 84.0 | 0.0 | 42.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 41.7 | 91.7 | 4.2 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1253 | 96.2 | 96.6 | 72.5 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 12.3 |
|  | TEMECULA | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2974 | 98.4 | 97.9 | 94.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 904 | 96.1 | 99.6 | 9.0 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 284 | 91.2 | 100.0 | 1.1 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 103 | 56.3 | 97.1 | 1.0 | 31.1 | 0.0 | 34.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4265 | 96.4 | 98.4 | 67.6 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
|  | SACRAMENTO JUV | 1ST | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SACRAMENTO (cont) | SACRAMENTO CM | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 11 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | USDT SACRAMENTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 214 | 96.7 | 100.0 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 74 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 36.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 24 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 15 | 53.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 327 | 95.1 | 100.0 | 14.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 16.8 |
| SAN <br> BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1024 | 97.6 | 68.0 | 93.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 292 | 93.8 | 91.4 | 16.1 | 73.6 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 72 | 91.7 | 94.4 | 2.8 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 36 | 69.4 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1424 | 95.8 | 74.9 | 70.6 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  | R CUCAMONGA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1638 | 98.3 | 76.1 | 94.1 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 443 | 97.3 | 97.1 | 8.4 | 85.6 | 0.2 | 30.5 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 122 | 86.1 | 98.4 | 2.5 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 29.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 49 | 44.9 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2252 | 96.3 | 82.0 | 70.3 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 |
|  | VICTORVILLE 1 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 623 | 96.5 | 71.1 | 91.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 203 | 92.1 | 95.6 | 14.8 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 56 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 3.6 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 23 | 52.2 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 905 | 93.7 | 79.1 | 66.3 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
|  | BARSTOW | $1^{\mathrm{ST}}$ | 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 |
|  | JOSHUA TREE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 118 | 94.9 | 79.7 | 88.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 32 | 100.0 | 90.6 | 15.6 | 84.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 5 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 16.7 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 161 | 94.4 | 82.0 | 68.3 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\mathrm{ST}^{\mathrm{T}}} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ & \text { DUI } \\ & \text { PROGRAM } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | N |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN BERNARDINO (cont) | S BERNARDINO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }} 5$ |  | $100.0$ | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | FONTANA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | SUP R CUCAMONGA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SAN DIEGO | SAN DIEGO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 85 | 80.0 | 90.6 | 15.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 32 | 71.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 61.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 21 | 61.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 151 | 74.2 | 94.7 | 8.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  | VISTA 1 |  | 68 | 79.4 | 95.6 | 66.2 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 51 | 66.7 | 100.0 | 3.9 | 56.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 15 | 20.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 25 | 28.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 159 | 61.6 | 98.1 | 29.6 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SAN DIEGO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | EL CAJON |  | 980 | 98.6 | 12.2 | 94.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 308 | 98.1 | 89.3 | 6.5 | 85.4 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 76 | 82.9 | 93.4 | 1.3 | 71.1 | 0.0 | 7.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 24 | 54.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1388 | 96.8 | 35.3 | 68.0 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  | VISTA 2 | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 1652 | 98.4 | 12.4 | 94.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 488 | 96.7 | 89.1 | 5.7 | 89.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 126 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 5.6 | 88.9 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2272 | 97.8 | 33.7 | 70.1 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 |

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

|  |  | DUI OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN DIEGO (cont) | VISTA 3 | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 25 | 92.0 | 4.0 | 88.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 33 | 93.9 | 27.3 | 66.7 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
|  | KEARNY MESA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1865 | 98.2 | 5.8 | 95.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 23.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 439 | 99.3 | 86.3 | 10.9 | 88.2 | 0.0 | 57.2 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 88 | 92.0 | 95.5 | 1.1 | 89.8 | 0.0 | 60.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 3 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2395 | 98.2 | 23.9 | 76.5 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 30.9 |
|  | CHULA VISTA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 891 | 97.3 | 15.9 | 91.1 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 214 | 96.7 | 94.9 | 4.2 | 85.5 | 0.0 | 12.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 50 | 88.0 | 94.0 | 4.0 | 82.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 11 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1166 | 96.2 | 34.6 | 70.6 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 4.2 |
|  | USDT SOUTH SD | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 21 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SAN <br> FRANCISCO | SAN FRANCISCO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 8 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 13 | 92.3 | 100.0 | 30.8 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 53.8 |
|  | SAN FRAN TRAFFIC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 284 | 99.6 | 98.9 | 95.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 5.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 85 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 10.6 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 74.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 91.7 | 16.7 | 91.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 383 | 98.7 | 99.2 | 73.4 | 23.8 | 0.5 | 23.5 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | SAN JOAQUIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 8 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 8 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SAN JOAQUIN (cont) | LODI | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 128 | 96.9 | 96.1 | 95.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 41 | 90.2 | 92.7 | 22.0 | 68.3 | 0.0 | 17.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 7.7 | 46.2 | 30.8 | 30.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | , | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 44.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 191 | 94.8 | 95.8 | 69.1 | 19.4 | 4.2 | 6.8 |
|  | MANTECA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 400 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 96.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 134 | 97.0 | 100.0 | 13.4 | 67.9 | 14.9 | 43.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 25 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 72.0 | 28.0 | 76.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 37.5 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 567 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 70.9 | 21.7 | 5.5 | 15.3 |
|  | STOCKTON | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 387 | 97.2 | 99.0 | 85.5 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 149 | 98.0 | 99.3 | 7.4 | 85.2 | 2.7 | 25.5 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 49 | 87.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 67.3 | 14.3 | 18.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 14 | 57.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 21.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 599 | 95.7 | 99.2 | 57.1 | 30.6 | 2.7 | 10.5 |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO CIV | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 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 |
|  | SAN LUIS OBISPO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | SAN LUIS OBISPO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1028 | 98.4 | 97.9 | 94.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 337 | 98.2 | 99.4 | 8.9 | 83.4 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 102 | 94.1 | 99.0 | 11.8 | 77.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 28 | 71.4 | 96.4 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1495 | 97.6 | 98.3 | 68.4 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| SAN MATEO | SAN MATEO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1206 | 98.8 | 99.1 | 93.5 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 318 | 96.5 | 98.7 | 8.2 | 82.1 | 0.0 | 56.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 63 | 93.7 | 93.7 | 3.2 | 81.0 | 0.0 | 60.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 20 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1607 | 97.8 | 98.8 | 71.9 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 16.1 |
|  | SAN MATEO JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \hline \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline N \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PROBATION } \\ \hline \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { JAIL } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ OFFENDER <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM | 18-MONTH <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM <br> $\%$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30-\mathrm{MONTH} \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | IGNITION <br> INTERLOCK <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAN MATEO } \\ & \text { (cont) } \end{aligned}$ | REDWOOD CITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
| SANTA BARBARA | SANTA BARBARA JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | SANTA MARIA JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA BARBARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 477 | 96.2 | 91.0 | 92.5 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 116 | 93.1 | 99.1 | 6.9 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 44 | 81.8 | 93.2 | 0.0 | 84.1 | 0.0 | 20.5 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 87.5 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 645 | 94.6 | 92.6 | 69.6 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
|  | SUP SANTA MARIA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 468 | 98.5 | 89.3 | 91.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 171 | 95.3 | 97.7 | 8.8 | 83.0 | 0.0 | 38.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 49 | 75.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 40.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 698 | 95.8 | 92.3 | 63.9 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
|  | LOMPOC | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 79 | 98.7 | 77.2 | 89.9 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 14 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 78.6 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 98 | 99.0 | 81.6 | 74.5 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| SANTA CLARA | SANTA CLARA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 15 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 73.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 36 | 80.6 | 100.0 | 30.6 | 47.2 | 0.0 | 27.8 |
|  | SANTA CLARA JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {ST }} \text { OFFENDER } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SANTA CLARA (cont) | PaLO ALTO | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 403 | 99.8 | 98.3 | 95.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 136 | 99.3 | 99.3 | 6.6 | 92.6 | 0.0 | 69.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 28 | 96.4 | 100.0 | 10.7 | 89.3 | 0.0 | 60.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 0.0 | 87.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 575 | 99.1 | 98.6 | 69.2 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 24.0 |
|  | SAN JOSE | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 1512 | 99.7 | 99.1 | 95.6 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 437 | 99.5 | 99.3 | 12.6 | 84.9 | 0.0 | 74.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 123 | 96.7 | 100.0 | 5.7 | 88.6 | 0.0 | 88.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 21 | 76.2 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 61.9 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2093 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 72.0 | 25.8 | 0.1 | 26.6 |
|  | SAN JOSE TRAFFIC | $1^{\mathrm{ST}}$ | 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 |
|  | SAN MARTIN | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 388 | 99.7 | 98.2 | 98.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 106 | 100.0 | 99.1 | 9.4 | 87.7 | 0.0 | 45.3 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 31 | 100.0 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 77.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 87.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 533 | 99.8 | 98.3 | 73.7 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 16.9 |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | SANTA CRUZ JUV |  | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 3 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | SANTA CRUZ TRAF | $1{ }^{\text {ST }}$ | 684 | 97.4 | 94.3 | 92.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 237 | 97.9 | 98.7 | 53.2 | 39.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 54 | 87.0 | 96.3 | 31.5 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 18 | 61.1 | 100.0 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 993 | 96.3 | 95.6 | 78.5 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | WATSONVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 58 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 87.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {3D }}$ | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 30.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 88 | 100.0 | 97.7 | 63.6 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |

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

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

|  |  | DUI <br> OFFENDER | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IGNITION } \\ & \text { INTERLOCK } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY | COURT | STATUS | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| SONOMA | SONOMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1431 | 99.2 | 95.2 | 94.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\mathrm{ND}}$ | 464 | 98.9 | 98.3 | 9.5 | 86.0 | 0.2 | 81.0 |
|  |  | $3{ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 112 | 95.5 | 95.5 | 2.7 | 89.3 | 2.7 | 85.7 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 33 | 60.6 | 90.9 | 0.0 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 48.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2040 | 98.3 | 95.9 | 68.5 | 26.4 | 0.2 | 29.8 |
|  | SONOMA JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
|  | SANTA ROSA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 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 |
| STANISLAUS | STANISLAUS | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1050 | 97.2 | 99.0 | 92.5 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 2.6 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 337 | 96.4 | 98.8 | 9.8 | 75.7 | 9.2 | 21.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 101 | 92.1 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 64.4 | 26.7 | 38.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 45 | 53.3 | 95.6 | 4.4 | 28.9 | 24.4 | 26.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1533 | 95.4 | 98.8 | 65.8 | 24.1 | 4.6 | 9.7 |
|  | STANISLAUS JUV | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1 | 100.0 | $100.0$ | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | MODESTO | $1^{\mathrm{ST}}$ | 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 |
| SUTTER | YUBA CITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 215 | 97.7 | 96.7 | 96.3 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 77 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 19.5 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 22 | 90.9 | 100.0 | 4.5 | 86.4 | 0.0 | 81.8 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 7 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 321 | 97.2 | 97.5 | 69.5 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 168 | 96.4 | 98.2 | 91.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 45 | 95.6 | 100.0 | 26.7 | 68.9 | 0.0 | 26.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 11 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 72.7 | 0.0 | 36.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 2 | 0.0 | $100.0$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | $0.0$ | $0.0$ |
|  |  | TOTAL | 226 | 95.6 | 98.7 | 74.3 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | $\begin{gathered} \text { DUI } \\ \text { OFFENDER } \\ \hline \text { STATUS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL | PROBATION | JAIL | $\begin{gathered} 1^{1^{\mathrm{TT}} \text { OFFENDER }} \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 30-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| TRINITY | TRINITY | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 29 | 86.2 | 96.6 | 69.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 13 | 84.6 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 61.5 | 0.0 | 76.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 43 | 86.0 | 93.0 | 46.5 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 25.6 |
| TULARE | VISALIA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 752 | 96.7 | 31.9 | 92.8 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 248 | 96.4 | 93.1 | 11.3 | 83.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 61 | 91.8 | 96.7 | 1.6 | 78.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 42 | 61.9 | 85.7 | 2.4 | 40.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 1103 | 95.0 | 51.3 | 66.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  | PORTERVILLE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 447 | 96.6 | 91.5 | 92.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 169 | 95.3 | 94.1 | 10.1 | 79.9 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 41 | 82.9 | 95.1 | 0.0 | 82.9 | 0.0 | 14.6 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 26 | 57.7 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 38.5 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 683 | 94.0 | 92.1 | 63.0 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
|  | TULARE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| TUOLUMNE | TUOLUMNE | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 152 | 96.7 | 13.2 | 42.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 69 | 100.0 | 81.2 | 10.1 | 59.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 13 | 76.9 | 84.6 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 15.4 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 6 | 16.7 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 240 | 94.6 | 37.5 | 30.0 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| VENTURA | VENTURA JUV <br> VENTURA | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 7 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 7 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $1^{\text {ST }}$ | 2127 | 97.3 | 97.8 | 94.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 492 | 95.1 | 98.6 | 9.6 | 83.5 | 0.0 | 81.7 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 108 | 87.0 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 86.1 | 0.0 | 85.2 |
|  |  | $4^{\text {TH }}+$ | 23 | 60.9 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 47.8 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 2750 | 96.2 | 97.9 | 75.0 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 25.7 |

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

| COUNTY | COURT | $\underset{\text { OFFENDER }}{\text { DUI }}$ | total | Probation | JAIL | 1ST OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM | $\begin{gathered} \text { 18-MONTH } \\ \text { DUI } \\ \text { PROGRAM } \end{gathered}$ | 30-MONTH <br> DUI <br> PROGRAM | IGNITION INTERLOCK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | status | $N$ | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| YOLO | YOLO | $1^{\text {sT }}$ | 298 | 96.0 | 94.6 | 83.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 88 | 97.7 | 95.5 | 10.2 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 48.9 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 29 | 100.0 | 89.7 | 10.3 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 72.4 |
|  |  | $4^{7 \mathrm{TH}}+$ | 6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  |  | total | 421 | 96.7 | 94.5 | 62.2 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 16.4 |
| YUBA | YUBA | $1^{\text {sT }}$ | 173 | 96.0 | 66.5 | 95.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
|  |  | $2^{\text {ND }}$ | 48 | 100.0 | 83.3 | 22.9 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $3^{\text {RD }}$ | 10 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | $4^{4^{\mathrm{HH}+}}$ | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  |  | total | 234 | 96.2 | 71.8 | 75.2 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 1.3 |

TABLE B5: DEMOGRAPHIC 3-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES FOR ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { GROUP } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { SAMPLE } \\ \text { SIZE } \end{array}$ | PERCENT FEMALE | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEAN } \\ \text { AGE } \end{gathered}$ | PERCENTCOMMERCIALDRIVERS | MEAN MONTHS IN STUDY | MEAN 3-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS |  |  |  | ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL ACCIDENTS | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ALCOHOL } \\ \text { ACCIDENTS } \end{array}$ | MAJOR CONVICTIONS | MINOR <br> CONVICTIONS | TOTAL ACCIDENTS | INJURY ACCIDENTS | MAJOR VIOLATIONS | MOVING VIOLATIONS |
| ARO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No program | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|\|} \hline 3,304 \\ (39.8 \%) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 26.9 | 34.9 | 2.4 | 18.59 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.013 | 0.51 | 0.1032 | 0.0276 | 0.0172 | 0.0903 |
| Alcohol education | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|\|} \hline 4,989 \\ (60.2 \%) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 26.0 | 34.2 | 2.1 | 18.65 | 0.30 | 0.14 | 0.006 | 0.49 | 0.1045 | 0.0282 | 0.0158 | 0.0868 |
|  |  | $X^{2}=1.0$ | $F=5.8 *$ | $X^{2}=0.5$ | $F=0.5$ | $F=0.4$ | $F=0.1$ | $F=8.9$ * | $F=0.9$ | $F=4.7^{*}$ | $F=9.2$ * | $F=63.5^{*}$ | $F=31.4 *$ |
| FDO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-month program | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 19,870 \\ (73.3 \%) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 27.7 | 34.6 | 1.1 | 19.1 | 0.48 | 0.25 | 0.007 | 0.67 | 0.1068 | 0.0284 | 0.0158 | 0.0855 |
| 9-month program | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|\|} 7,234 \\ (26.7 \%) \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | 30.0 | 37.6 | 1.2 | 19.3 | 0.56 | 0.36 | 0.008 | 0.49 | 0.1066 | 0.0291 | 0.0157 | 0.0860 |
|  |  | $X^{2}=13.9 *$ | $F=295.9^{*}$ | $X^{2}=0.5$ | $F=13.7 *$ | $F=66.6$ * | $F=293.5^{*}$ | $F=1.2$ | $F=170.2 *$ | $F=0.4$ | $F=34.0$ * | $F=0.2$ | $F=2.4$ |

Note. ARO $=$ Alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders; FDO $=$ First DUI offenders. For ARO, mean prior incidents were expressed for the prior 2 years.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Similarly, there was an undercount of approximately 6,500 DUI arrests for April 2011 by CHP.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ These figures are a subset of the counts in the Table 4 a. Percents may not add to $100 \%$ due to rounding.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Among 2018 DUI arrestees, 26,097 (20.5\%) were involved in a reported traffic crash; 10,333 of the crashes included an injury or fatality, and 15,764 involved property damage only.

[^3]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ These data are derived from California Highway Patrol data files and include only cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes ( $54.9 \%$ of the records showed BAC levels).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to drug-involved drivers.

