



**2006**

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

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

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

**JANUARY 2006**

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER**  
Governor

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

**KEN MIYAO**  
Chief Deputy Director

© California Department of Motor Vehicles, 2006

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE January 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE 2006 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Helen N. Tashima and Sladjana Oulad Daoud				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) California Department of Motor Vehicles Research and Development Section P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  CAL-DMV-RSS-06-220	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) In this fifteenth annual legislatively mandated report, 2003 and 2004 DUI data from diverse sources were compiled and cross-referenced for the purpose of developing a single comprehensive DUI data reference and monitoring system. This report presents crosstabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, court sanctions, administrative actions and alcohol-involved crashes. In addition, this report provides 1-year proportions of DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested in each year over a time period of fourteen years. Also, the long-term recidivism curves of the cumulative proportions of DUI reoffenses are shown for all DUI offenders arrested in 1994. Analyses were conducted on the effectiveness of alcohol education programs upon the 1-year postconviction records of those convicted of the reduced charge of alcohol-related reckless driving, and on the effectiveness of the 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education programs on the 1-year postconviction records of first offenders. Two additional subanalyses were conducted to determine if differences on the outcome measures were related to BAC level (below .20 and .20 and above). The proportions of 2003 convicted first and second offenders who completed their alcohol education/treatment program requirement are also presented.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS drinking drivers, DUI tracking data system, DUI reporting system, DUI countermeasures, DUI recidivism, alcohol education and rehabilitation, driver license disqualification			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 153	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT None	

**DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1994 - 2004**

	YEAR										
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
DUI Arrest Rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers)	1027	983	995	933	908	896	847	803	783	809	792
Total DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	206583	198982	201765	191164	188327	188523	181336	176490	177056	183560	180957
Felony DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	7515	6609	6313	5568	5330	5242	5476	5647	5859	5856	5646
Misdemeanor DUI arrests <sup>1</sup>	199068	192373	195452	185596	182997	183281	175860	170843	171197	177704	175311
DUI convictions received to date (by year of arrest) <sup>2</sup>	152584	149651	149643	142169	143804	149332	143650	139591	138262	141382	133143
Percent convicted of DUI as of <sup>2</sup> September 2005	74%	75%	74%	74%	76%	79%	79%	79%	78%	77%	74%
Total reckless driving convictions <sup>3</sup>	27374	24516	25701	25879	22851	24020	22798	23783	24590	24935	22261
Alcohol-involved reckless	18246	16329	17446	16867	15945	15514	14465	15773	15694	15735	13973
Total mandatory susp/rev <sup>4</sup>	243645	226158	230600	205462	238612	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242	239580
Admin per se/refusal susp/rev	184045	173696	180343	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828
Postconviction susp/rev <sup>6</sup>	59600	52462	50257	35951 <sup>5</sup>	63247 <sup>5</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772	67752
Alcohol-involved fatalities	1488	1343	1254	1100	1072	1170	1233	1308	1416	1445	1462
% of total fatalities	35.3	32.2	31.6	30.0	31.0	32.8	33.1	33.3	34.2	34.2	35.7
Alcohol-involved injuries	39437	36961	35654	31189	30985	29833	30971	31806	32013	31322	31538
% of total injuries	12.5	12.1	11.9	10.9	10.7	10.3	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.2	10.4

<sup>1</sup>These totals do not include duplicate cases as originally reported in the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, MARC data, and beginning with this report, the counts for all the years reflect this change.

<sup>2</sup>These data represent a DMV master file count of the number of DUI abstracts received (by year of violation), minus duplicates. Each year, the DUI abstracts are updated to include the amended and new abstracts for current and previous years. These additions are also reflected in changes for the percent convicted. These totals do not include conviction abstracts not yet received. Thus, for the most recent years, these figures will underestimate the final conviction totals.

<sup>3</sup>These totals were taken from the Research DUI data file and the DMV annual Suspension and Revocation reports and include late reporting of convictions from prior years.

<sup>4</sup>Since 1991, total mandatory suspension/revocation exceeds the number of DUI arrests because many offenders now receive both an APS and postconviction suspension/revocation.

<sup>5</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

<sup>6</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements and include workload counts.

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

**DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1994 - 2004 (continued)**

	YEAR										
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<b>TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCAION (S/R) ACTIONS</b>	243645	226158 <sup>r</sup>	230600 <sup>r</sup>	205462 <sup>1</sup>	238612 <sup>1</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242	239580
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	9971	8608 <sup>r</sup>	9327 <sup>r</sup>	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949	19967
.08 First-offender suspensions	120582	116636 <sup>r</sup>	122111 <sup>r</sup>	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975	116022
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	47429	43218 <sup>r</sup>	43922 <sup>r</sup>	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413	32903
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936
Commercial driver actions	5038	4743 <sup>r</sup>	4939 <sup>r</sup>	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853	3801
Chemical test refusal actions	13264	11711 <sup>r</sup>	11436 <sup>r</sup>	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399	9353
.01 Test refusal suspensions	179	170	154	134	229	268	270	280	290	341	326
.08 Test refusal suspensions	7022	6307 <sup>r</sup>	6299 <sup>r</sup>	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925	6091
.08 Test refusal revocations	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936
<b>TOTAL APS/REFUSAL ACTIONS</b>	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>2</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	879	677	995	769 <sup>1</sup>	1026 <sup>1</sup>	918	741	714	896	794	838
First-offender suspensions	8696	7266	7229	4847 <sup>1</sup>	9588 <sup>1</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521	31012
Misdemeanor	7188	5806	5753	3834 <sup>1</sup>	7497 <sup>1</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298	28799
Felony	1508	1460	1476	1013 <sup>1</sup>	2091 <sup>1</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223	2213
Second-offender S/R actions	34300	31489	30404	22945 <sup>1</sup>	40238 <sup>1</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737	28400
Misdemeanor	33794	30955	29864	22532 <sup>1</sup>	39065 <sup>1</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160	27847
Felony	506	534	540	413 <sup>1</sup>	633 <sup>1</sup>	485	526	577	597	577	553
Third-offender revocations	11193	9471	8728	5569 <sup>1</sup>	9397 <sup>1</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953	5581
Misdemeanor	10974	9261	8550	5471 <sup>1</sup>	9167 <sup>1</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758	5429
Felony	219	210	178	98 <sup>1</sup>	230 <sup>1</sup>	121	148	142	175	195	152
Fourth-offender revocations	4532	3559	2901	1821 <sup>1</sup>	2998 <sup>1</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767	1921
<b>TOTAL POSTCONVICTION ACTIONS</b>	59600	52462	50257 <sup>r</sup>	35951 <sup>1</sup>	63247 <sup>1</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772	67752

<sup>1</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.

<sup>2</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements, and include workload counts.

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

---

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2006 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

- ▶ Alcohol-involved traffic fatalities rose by 1.2% in 2004, continuing a reversal in trend that started in 1999 after well over a decade of continuous decline (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- ▶ The number of persons injured in alcohol-involved crashes increased by 0.7% in 2004, following a decrease of 2.2% in 2003, the first decrease in the last five years (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- ▶ DUI arrests decreased by 1.4% in 2004, following increases of 3.7% in 2003 and 0.3% in 2002 (see Table 1).
- ▶ The DUI arrest rate declined slightly in 2004, remaining relatively unchanged in the last four years, and represents 23% reduction from the arrest rate in 1994 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- ▶ 14.3% of all 2003 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 15.0% in 2002 (see Table 19). 42.6% of these crashes involved an injury or fatality, relatively unchanged from 42.8% in 2002 (see Table 20a).
- ▶ Among 2004 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (44.6%) again constituted the largest racial/ethnic group, as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999). Hispanics, however, continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population (31.8% in 2004). The ethnic distribution among DUI arrestees who are convicted fairly closely parallels the ethnic distribution of the arrestees (see Figure 3).
- ▶ The average age of an arrested DUI offender in 2004 was 33.2 years. Less than 1% of arrested DUI offenders are juveniles (under age 18). This is shown in Table 3a.
- ▶ Among convicted DUI offenders in 2003, 77.1% were first offenders and 22.9% were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 7 years). The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at 37% (see Table 10).
- ▶ The average blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on APS forms, was .161% in 2003, down slightly from the last several years, yet more than double the California illegal per se BAC limit of .08% (see Table 9a).
- ▶ 11.1% of 2003 DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, slightly higher than for 2002 DUI arrests (see Table 8).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

### Report Authors:

Helen N. Tashima, Research Program Specialist II and  
Sladjana Oulad Daoud, Research Program Specialist I, Principal Investigators

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 1994-2004 .....	i
HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2006 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS .....	4
SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS .....	10
SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS .....	22
SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS .....	32
DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES .....	35
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders from 1990-2003 .....	35
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County For 2003 First and Second DUI Offenders .....	39
The Proportions of Alcohol Education Program Completions for 2003 First and Second DUI Offenders .....	42
Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 1994 DUI Offenders .....	43
ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR THE ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS .....	49
Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol-Reckless Driving .....	52
Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders .....	53
Results of the 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels Below .20 Versus .20 and Above .....	55
Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels of .20 and Above .....	56
SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS .....	58
SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL .....	62
DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS .....	72
HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975 .....	73
REFERENCES .....	85
GLOSSARY .....	88

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## APPENDICES

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 757 - CHAPTER 450 .....	90
B1 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	92
B2 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE .....	107
B3 TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT .....	116
B4 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS .....	125
B5 DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES BY YEAR AND SANCTION GROUP FOR ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS AND 3- AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL PROGRAM DRIVERS.....	153

## LIST OF TABLES

1 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2002-2004 .....	7
2 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	8
3a 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	9
3b 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	9
4 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX .....	15
5 MATCHABLE 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX .....	16
6 ADJUSTED 2003 DUI CONVICTION RATES AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	16
7 TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES .....	17
8 ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY .....	19
9a 2003 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS .....	20



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
9b 2003 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21 .....	21
10 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND AVERAGE REPORTED BAC LEVEL .....	21
11 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS .....	24
12 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS	25
13a ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2003 .....	37
13b 2003 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS .....	40
13c 2003 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS .....	41
14 COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED ALCOHOL PROGRAM COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2003 .....	42
15 CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF THE FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES FOR 1994 DUI OFFENDERS .....	43
16a THE EFFECT OF ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM ON SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS CONVICTED OF ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING .....	53
16b FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EVALUATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS .....	54
16c FIRST OFFENDER 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS BELOW .20 VERSUS .20 AND ABOVE .....	55
16d FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS .20 AND ABOVE .....	56

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
17 MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1994-2004.....	60
18 ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES.....	61
19 DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 1993-2003.....	64
20a FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	65
20b FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND TYPE OF ARREST .....	65
21 FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE .....	66
22 FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND TYPE OF ARREST.....	66
23 2003 CRASH-INVOLVED DUI ARRESTEES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST.....	67
24a 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX.....	68
24b 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED).....	68
25a SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES.....	69
25b SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2003 ALCOHOL- INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED).....	69
26a 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS.....	70
26b 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED).....	70
27 2003 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES.....	71

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	DUI management information system.....	2
2	DUI arrests 1994-2004.....	4
3	Percentage of 2004 DUI arrests and 2004 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.....	6
4	DUI abstracts received by DMV and conviction rates, 1994-2004.....	12
5	Relative likelihood of conviction by race/ethnicity.....	15
6	Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2003).....	23
7	Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2003).....	36
8	Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2003).....	38
9a	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction, and first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incidents (alcohol crashes, major convictions, APS suspensions and DUI FTAs).....	44
9b	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions.....	45
9c	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by sex.....	46
9d	Length of time between 1994 DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date).....	47
9e	Length of time between DUI conviction and first subsequent DUI reoffense of 1980, 1984, and 1994 DUI drivers.....	47
10a	Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2003-2004 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.....	52
10b	Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2003) by length of alcohol education program.....	54
11	Mandatory DUI license disqualification actions, 1994-2004.....	59
12	Percentage of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1994-2004.....	63


## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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 for others to assess in making policy decisions, formulating improvements and conducting more in-depth evaluations.

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

## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS


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

Table 1: DUI Arrests by County and Annual Percentage Change from 2002-2004. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2002-2004 and the percentage change from 2003-2004 are shown in Table 1.

Table 2: 2004 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2004 DUI arrests by felony, misdemeanor, and juvenile arrest type, by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2004 DUI Arrests by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a crosstabulates age by sex and age by race/ethnicity of 2004 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Table 3b shows the same data crosstabulated by sex and age within race/ethnicity.

Figure 2 below displays the trend in DUI arrests from 1994 to 2004.



*Figure 2.* DUI arrests 1994-2004.

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

#### Statewide Parameters:

- ▶ DUI arrests decreased by 1.4% in 2004, following increases of 3.7% in 2003 and 0.3% in 2002 (see Table 1).
- ▶ The per capita DUI arrest rate was 0.8 in 2004 (as it was in 2000-03, but down from 0.9 in 1997-99). This represents over a 50% reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990 (see Table 2).
- ▶ The percentage of DUI arrests that were felonies (involving bodily injury or death) decreased slightly from 3.2% in 2003 to 3.1% in 2004; felony DUI arrests continue to constitute a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).

#### County Variation:

- ▶ 20.3% of all 2004 California DUI arrests occurred in Los Angeles County. Four counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, and San Bernardino) had over 10,000 DUI arrests each, accounting for 43.2% of all arrests (see Table 2).
- ▶ The 2004 county per capita DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.3 to 3.8 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers. Eight counties again had rates of 0.7 or below. These low per capita arrest rate counties were San Francisco (0.3), Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Santa Clara and Solano (0.6), Alameda, Orange, and San Mateo (0.7). Five counties had rates of 2.0 or higher—Alpine (3.8), Glen and Sierra (2.5), Colusa and Del Norte (2.1). This is shown in Table 2.
- ▶ As in past years, many counties again showed a decline in DUI arrests in 2004. Among the larger counties, the greatest percentage declines occurred in Sacramento (-10.9%) and Contra Costa (-10.1%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage decreases in DUI arrests occurred in Tehama (-45.5%), Lassen (-43.8%), Alpine (-32.2%), Yuba (-17.9) and Mono (-17.7%). Among counties showing percentage increases in DUI arrests were Amador (47.7%), Calaveras (26.7%), and Plumas (25.1%). This is shown in Table 1.

#### Demographic Characteristics:

- ▶ The average age of a DUI arrestee in 2004 was 33.2 years. After increasing each year during the early 1990's, the average age of a DUI arrestee has declined slightly each year since 1997. Roughly half (50.2%) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters (74%) were age 40 or younger. Less than 1% of all DUI arrests involved juveniles (under age 18). 2.2% of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).



- ▶ Males comprised 83% of all 2004 DUI arrests (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrestees has risen slightly each year this report has been produced, from 10.6% in 1989 to 17% in 2004.
- ▶ In 2004, Hispanics (44.6%) again represented the largest ethnic group among DUI arrestees as they have each year since 1992 (with the exception of 1999, when Whites were the largest group at 42.8%). Hispanics, however, continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2004 population parity of 31.8% (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also slightly overrepresented among DUI arrestees (7.0% of arrests, 6.5% of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2004 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites (41.8% of arrests, 47.4% of the population), and "Other" (6.6% of arrests, 14.3% of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.
- ▶ Among male 2004 DUI arrestees, 49.1% were Hispanic, 37.5% were White, 6.9% were Black, and 6.5% were "Other." Among female DUI arrestees, 62.8% were White, 22.5% were Hispanic, 7.6% were Black, and 7.1% were "Other." The overrepresentation of Hispanics among DUI offenders is clearly limited to males (see Table 3b).
- ▶ In the following 7 counties, Hispanics comprised 60% or more of those arrested for DUI during 2003: Tulare (74.5%), Merced (67.0%), Fresno (65.9%), San Benito (62.7%), Imperial (69.5%), Monterey (67.7%) and Madera (65.8%). In most other counties, the majority of arrestees were White (see Appendix Table B1).
- ▶ The average age of a DUI arrestee varied considerably by race: Blacks were the oldest with a mean age of 35.7 years, while Hispanics were the youngest, with a mean age of 31.1 years (see Table 3a).




Figure 3. Percentage of 2004 DUI arrests and 2004 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2000 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS\* BY COUNTY AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE FROM 2002-2004

COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	% CHANGE 2003-2004
STATEWIDE	177056	183560	180957	-1.4
ALAMEDA	5542	6517	6454	-1.0
ALPINE	73	59	40	-32.2
AMADOR	230	216	319	47.7
BUTTE	1276	1448	1395	-3.7
CALAVERAS	299	296	375	26.7
COLUSA	212	254	267	5.1
CONTRA COSTA	4456	4275	3845	-10.1
DEL NORTE	375	328	378	15.2
EL DORADO	1285	1374	1358	-1.2
FRESNO	5676	5741	6064	5.6
GLENN	307	380	449	18.2
HUMBOLDT	1209	1254	1279	2.0
IMPERIAL	1157	1303	1215	-6.8
INYO	320	277	259	-6.5
KERN	4501	5576	5541	-0.6
KINGS	931	931	935	0.4
LAKE	643	635	601	-5.4
LASSEN	263	304	171	-43.8
LOS ANGELES	38089	38015	36705	-3.4
MADERA	782	835	1001	19.9
MARIN	1472	1667	1533	-8.0
MARIPOSA	120	139	135	-2.9
MENDOCINO	748	861	778	-9.6
MERCED	1728	1442	1495	3.7
MODOC	98	60	60	0.0
MONO	145	158	130	-17.7
MONTEREY	3360	3468	3584	3.3
NAPA	1063	1230	1099	-10.7
NEVADA	570	669	789	17.9
ORANGE	12183	13742	13492	-1.8
PLACER	1652	1741	1805	3.7
PLUMAS	231	215	269	25.1
RIVERSIDE	8700	8566	8533	-0.4
SACRAMENTO	7611	8075	7193	-10.9
SAN BENITO	345	355	357	0.6
SAN BERNARDINO	10184	11466	10695	-6.7
SAN DIEGO	15924	16127	17129	6.2
SAN FRANCISCO	1693	1528	1648	7.9
SAN JOAQUIN	4084	4565	4219	-7.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2343	2247	2321	3.3
SAN MATEO	3678	3682	3501	-4.9
SANTA BARBARA**	2534	2293	2770	20.8
SANTA CLARA	6822	7014	7000	-0.2
SANTA CRUZ	1859	1755	1697	-3.3
SHASTA	1244	1201	1042	-13.2
SIERRA	54	66	69	4.5
SISKIYOU	369	377	396	5.0
SOLANO	1649	1734	1660	-4.3
SONOMA	2911	2764	2907	5.2
STANISLAUS	2284	2375	2575	8.4
SUTTER	716	584	530	-9.2
TEHAMA	1199	1087	592	-45.5
TRINITY	225	208	182	-12.5
TULARE	3437	3621	3446	-4.8
TUOLUMNE	434	548	551	0.5
VENTURA	3985	4047	4370	8.0
YOLO	1067	1124	1146	2.0
YUBA	709	741	608	-17.9

\*DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI (N= 311) removed.

\*\*The count for 2003 was incomplete and therefore the percent change is overestimated.

TABLE 2: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL		TYPE OF ARREST						DUI ARRESTS PER 100 LICENSED DRIVERS
			FELONY		JUVENILE		MISDEMEANOR		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STATEWIDE	180957	100.0	5549	3.1	1488	0.8	173920	96.1	0.8
ALAMEDA	6454	3.6	96	1.5	42	0.7	6316	97.9	0.7
ALPINE	40	0.0	3	7.5	2	5.0	35	87.5	3.8
AMADOR	319	0.2	12	3.8	1	0.3	306	95.9	1.2
BUTTE	1395	0.8	51	3.7	16	1.1	1328	95.2	0.9
CALAVERAS	375	0.2	10	2.7	5	1.3	360	96.0	1.1
COLUSA	267	0.1	6	2.2	1	0.4	260	97.4	2.1
CONTRA COSTA	3845	2.1	104	2.7	36	0.9	3705	96.4	0.6
DEL NORTE	378	0.2	10	2.6	1	0.3	367	97.1	2.1
EL DORADO	1358	0.8	58	4.3	18	1.3	1282	94.4	1.0
FRESNO	6064	3.4	168	2.8	60	1.0	5836	96.2	1.3
GLENN	449	0.2	7	1.6	4	0.9	438	97.6	2.5
HUMBOLDT	1279	0.7	16	1.3	9	0.7	1254	98.0	1.3
IMPERIAL	1215	0.7	34	2.8	18	1.5	1163	95.7	1.3
INYO	259	0.1	6	2.3	1	0.4	252	97.3	1.8
KERN	5541	3.1	142	2.6	57	1.0	5342	96.4	1.3
KINGS	935	0.5	29	3.1	13	1.4	893	95.5	1.4
LAKE	601	0.3	23	3.8	15	2.5	563	93.7	1.3
LASSEN	171	0.1	7	4.1	2	1.2	162	94.7	0.9
LOS ANGELES	36705	20.3	1407	3.8	163	0.4	35135	95.7	0.6
MADERA	1001	0.6	38	3.8	12	1.2	951	95.0	1.4
MARIN	1533	0.8	22	1.4	17	1.1	1494	97.5	0.8
MARIPOSA	135	0.1	4	3.0	2	1.5	129	95.6	0.9
MENDOCINO	778	0.4	19	2.4	17	2.2	742	95.4	1.2
MERCED	1495	0.8	47	3.1	20	1.3	1428	95.5	1.2
MODOC	60	0.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	58	96.7	0.9
MONO	130	0.1	2	1.5	1	0.8	127	97.7	1.4
MONTEREY	3584	2.0	81	2.3	41	1.1	3462	96.6	1.5
NAPA	1099	0.6	27	2.5	13	1.2	1059	96.4	1.2
NEVADA	789	0.4	18	2.3	13	1.6	758	96.1	1.0
ORANGE	13492	7.5	246	1.8	92	0.7	13154	97.5	0.7
PLACER	1805	1.0	52	2.9	22	1.2	1731	95.9	0.8
PLUMAS	269	0.1	12	4.5	6	2.2	251	93.3	1.5
RIVERSIDE	8533	4.7	283	3.3	69	0.8	8181	95.9	0.8
SACRAMENTO	7193	4.0	335	4.7	30	0.4	6828	94.9	0.8
SAN BENITO	357	0.2	13	3.6	1	0.3	343	96.1	1.0
SAN BERNARDINO	10695	5.9	374	3.5	52	0.5	10269	96.0	1.0
SAN DIEGO	17129	9.5	482	2.8	152	0.9	16495	96.3	0.8
SAN FRANCISCO	1648	0.9	91	5.5	2	0.1	1555	94.4	0.3
SAN JOAQUIN	4219	2.3	114	2.7	46	1.1	4059	96.2	1.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	2321	1.3	54	2.3	35	1.5	2232	96.2	1.3
SAN MATEO	3501	1.9	80	2.3	23	0.7	3398	97.1	0.7
SANTA BARBARA	2770	1.5	79	2.9	26	0.9	2665	96.2	1.0
SANTA CLARA	7000	3.9	214	3.1	37	0.5	6749	96.4	0.6
SANTA CRUZ	1697	0.9	34	2.0	34	2.0	1629	96.0	1.0
SHASTA	1042	0.6	41	3.9	10	1.0	991	95.1	0.8
SIERRA	69	0.0	2	2.9	0	0.0	67	97.1	2.5
SISKIYOU	396	0.2	13	3.3	6	1.5	377	95.2	1.1
SOLANO	1660	0.9	45	2.7	13	0.8	1602	96.5	0.6
SONOMA	2907	1.6	87	3.0	29	1.0	2791	96.0	0.9
STANISLAUS	2575	1.4	104	4.0	38	1.5	2433	94.5	0.9
SUTTER	530	0.3	14	2.6	6	1.1	510	96.2	0.9
TEHAMA	592	0.3	33	5.6	3	0.5	556	93.9	1.5
TRINITY	182	0.1	12	6.6	0	0.0	170	93.4	1.7
TULARE	3446	1.9	94	2.7	78	2.3	3274	95.0	1.6
TUOLUMNE	551	0.3	17	3.1	6	1.1	528	95.8	1.3
VENTURA	4370	2.4	121	2.8	51	1.2	4198	96.1	0.8
YOLO	1146	0.6	31	2.7	20	1.7	1095	95.5	1.0
YUBA	608	0.3	23	3.8	1	0.2	584	96.1	1.5

TABLE 3a: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE/ETHNICITY\*

AGE	TOTAL		SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	180957	100.0	150233	83.0	30724	17.0	75669	41.8	80742	44.6	12629	7.0	11917	6.6
UNDER 18	1488	0.8	1183	79.5	305	20.5	796	53.5	584	39.2	35	2.4	73	4.9
18-20	14672	8.1	12338	84.1	2334	15.9	6231	42.5	6988	47.6	548	3.7	905	6.2
21-30	74818	41.3	62793	83.9	12025	16.1	26835	35.9	38258	51.1	4330	5.8	5395	7.2
31-40	43104	23.8	36023	83.6	7081	16.4	16118	37.4	20711	48.0	3523	8.2	2752	6.4
41-50	30650	16.9	24397	79.6	6253	20.4	15801	51.6	10220	33.3	2853	9.3	1776	5.8
51-60	12184	6.7	10057	82.5	2127	17.5	7233	59.4	3153	25.9	1028	8.4	770	6.3
61-70	3239	1.8	2769	85.5	470	14.5	2059	63.6	693	21.4	263	8.1	224	6.9
71 & ABOVE	802	0.4	673	83.9	129	16.1	596	74.3	135	16.8	49	6.1	22	2.7
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	33.2		33.1		33.7		35.0		31.1		35.7		32.5	

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

TABLE 3b: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY SEX, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

SEX	AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
				WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		180957	100.0	75669	41.8	80742	44.6	12629	7.0	11917	6.6
MALE	UNDER 18	1183	0.8	563	47.6	532	45.0	23	1.9	65	5.5
	18-20	12338	8.2	4761	38.6	6417	52.0	449	3.6	711	5.8
	21-30	62793	41.8	20077	32.0	34936	55.6	3515	5.6	4265	6.8
	31-40	36023	24.0	11842	32.9	19033	52.8	2854	7.9	2294	6.4
	41-50	24397	16.2	11368	46.6	9223	37.8	2289	9.4	1517	6.2
	51-60	10057	6.7	5602	55.7	2897	28.8	886	8.8	672	6.7
	61-70	2769	1.8	1680	60.7	648	23.4	241	8.7	200	7.2
	71 & ABOVE	673	0.4	477	70.9	131	19.5	46	6.8	19	2.8
TOTAL		150233	100.0	56370	37.5	73817	49.1	10303	6.9	9743	6.5
FEMALE	UNDER 18	305	1.0	233	76.4	52	17.0	12	3.9	8	2.6
	18-20	2334	7.6	1470	63.0	571	24.5	99	4.2	194	8.3
	21-30	12025	39.1	6758	56.2	3322	27.6	815	6.8	1130	9.4
	31-40	7081	23.0	4276	60.4	1678	23.7	669	9.4	458	6.5
	41-50	6253	20.4	4433	70.9	997	15.9	564	9.0	259	4.1
	51-60	2127	6.9	1631	76.7	256	12.0	142	6.7	98	4.6
	61-70	470	1.5	379	80.6	45	9.6	22	4.7	24	5.1
	71 & ABOVE	129	0.4	119	92.2	4	3.1	3	2.3	3	2.3
TOTAL		30724	100.0	19299	62.8	6925	22.5	2326	7.6	2174	7.1

## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of DUI arrests are reported directly to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on court abstracts of conviction. Although 2004 arrest data are reported earlier, conviction data for those arrested in 2003 are reported here to allow sufficient time for courts to report convictions to DMV. The following tables compile and crosstabulate these conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. In what follows, expressions like "2003 convictions" refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2003, who were subsequently convicted.

Table 4: 2003 DUI Convictions by Age and Sex. This table crosstabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and sex. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 5: Matchable 2003 DUI Convictions by Age, Race/Ethnicity, and Sex. This table displays DUI conviction information by age, race/ethnicity, and sex. "Matchable" DUI convictions are those which are traceable to a DUI arrest appearing on the MACR system. Because not all arrests could be matched to an existing record, these conviction totals underestimate the total number of actual convictions.

Table 6: Adjusted 2003 DUI Conviction Rates and Relative Likelihood of Conviction by Age and Race/Ethnicity. This table shows the relative probability of a DUI arrest leading to a DUI conviction by age and race/ethnicity. DUI conviction totals from categories in Table 5 ("matchable DUI convictions") were increased by the proportion which matchable convictions constituted of "total DUI convictions," shown in Table 7, to arrive at the adjusted DUI conviction rates. As explained above, without this adjustment DUI conviction rates would be underestimated using the conviction data from Table 5 because not all reported convictions are "matchable" to an arrest.

Table 7: Total Conviction Data for 2003 DUI Arrestees. This table portrays county and statewide DUI-related conviction data as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Corresponding court-specific data are shown in Appendix Table B3. Convictions not reported to DMV are considered nonconvictions for the purposes of this report. Actual nonconvictions include cases where the DUI arrest was not filed, not prosecuted, or resulted in a not-guilty verdict. The DUI conviction rates by county were calculated by comparing the county conviction totals with DOJ arrest totals. Because not all 2003 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these conviction totals and rates will slightly underestimate the "final" figures. The DUI conviction rates shown in the "DUI Summary Statistics: 1994-2004" table at the very beginning of this report

include an estimate of these late convictions, and thus are slightly higher than those shown in Tables 7 and 8. Conviction variables include felony and misdemeanor DUI convictions, alcohol- and nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions, convictions of "other" lesser offenses, and DUI convictions dismissed or found unconstitutional. DUI arrest dates from the DOJ MACR system were matched to driver record violation dates to identify nonalcohol-related reckless driving and "other" convictions. The average (mean) adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, were calculated for each county.

Table 8: Adjudication Status of 2003 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows the adjudication status (court disposition) of 2003 DUI arrests, by county. Included are the percentages of arrests which have resulted in DUI convictions (misdemeanor or felony), reckless driving convictions (alcohol-related or nonalcohol-related), convictions of "other" offenses, or no reported conviction, as of the date of writing. Again, because not all 2003 DUI arrests have yet been adjudicated, these rates will slightly underestimate the "final" rate for each category, except for the category "no record of any conviction," which will be slightly reduced (approximately 1-2%) by the eventual adjudication of these few late cases.

Table 9a: 2003 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI Convictions and Table 9b: 2003 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Convicted DUI Offenders Under Age 21. Table 9a shows the frequency of reported positive BAC levels for DUI and alcohol-reckless convictions. Because of more complete reporting of BAC levels on APS reporting forms (79.7%) than on abstracts of conviction, those reports are used to calculate statewide BAC levels. Abstracts of conviction, which were used in prior evaluations, report BAC levels in only 54.3% of cases. Table 9b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21.

Table 10: 2003 DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Average Reported BAC Level. This table displays the proportions of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in seven years), and the average (mean) BAC level from APS reporting forms and abstracts of conviction, for each offense level.

Figure 4 (below) shows, for the years 1994 to 2004, the number of DUI abstracts received to date by DMV from the courts, and conviction rates based on the data received as of September 2005.




Figure 4. DUI abstracts received by DMV and conviction rates, 1994-2004.

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

**Statewide Adjudication Parameters:**

- ▶ 77% of 2003 DUI arrests resulted in convictions of DUI offenses.
- ▶ 10.2% of 2003 DUI arrests resulted in reckless driving convictions, and 17.7% (1.8%/10.2%) of these DUI arrestees were eventually convicted of a nonalcohol-related reckless violation (see Table 8).
- ▶ 1.9% of 2003 DUI arrests have resulted in convictions of offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, which is the same as last year (see Table 8).
- ▶ 11.1% of 2003 DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction on DMV's records, up from 10.9% in 2002, and down from 18.8% in 1993. As additional cases are adjudicated and reported by the courts, this figure will decrease slightly (see Table 8).
- ▶ The average reported BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders in 2003, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was 0.161%, which is down slightly from the

last several years, yet still more than double the illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08% (see Table 9a).

- ▶ Average BAC levels increase as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions, from a 0.157% BAC for a first offense to a 0.188% BAC for a fourth or subsequent offense (see Table 10).
- ▶ Among 2003 convicted DUI offenders, 77.1% were first offenders, 17.9% were second offenders, 4.0% were third offenders, and 1.0% were on their fourth or more offense. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors in California has traditionally been seven years, although that period was just statutorily changed to 10 years by SB1694 – effective 1/1/05, Torlakson, 2004.) The proportion of repeat offenders (22.9%), shown in Table 10, among all convicted DUI offenders, has decreased slightly each year since 1989 (at which time 37% of all convictions were repeat offenses)..
- ▶ The average (mean) adjudication time lags were 3.3 months from DUI arrest to conviction and 3.0 months from conviction to update on the DMV database, totalling over 6 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record. This total elapsed time from arrest to update is slightly shorter than in the last two years (see Table 7).

#### Variation by County:

- ▶ Among the larger counties, 2003 DUI conviction rates varied from highs of 89.2% in Orange to a low of 54.6% in San Francisco. Los Angeles County, which accounted for almost a quarter of all DUI arrests in the state, had a DUI conviction rate of 72.7% (see Table 7).
- ▶ Among the smaller counties, 2003 DUI conviction rates varied from a high of 97.2% in Amador to a low of 38.2% in Tehama (see Table 7).
- ▶ The rates at which DUI arrests were plea-bargained to alcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 25.3% in Del Norte County to 0% in Marin and Ventura counties (see Table 8).



- ▶ The percentage of DUI arrests that were improperly adjudicated as nonalcohol-related reckless driving convictions varied from 0% (Marin) to 11.8% (San Francisco). This is shown in Table 8.
- ▶ The percentage of DUI arrests adjudicated as minor convictions ("other" convictions) varied from 0% to 5.2%. Del Norte, San Luis Obispo, Modoc, Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Sierra counties had rates of 3% or more (see Table 8).
- ▶ In 6 counties, the proportion of arrestees not showing a conviction of any offense exceeded 30%. These counties were Tehama, Imperial, Trinity, Yuba, Mariposa, and Sierra. Twenty eight counties had nonconviction rates of less than 10%, with four counties at 0% (see Table 8).

Variation by Court:

- ▶ Court time lags from arrest to conviction (for courts with more than 200 reported convictions) varied from a high of 7.3 months in the Clovis court (Fresno County) to a low of 1.5 months for the Shafter and Mojave (Kern County) court (see Table B3).
- ▶ Statewide, the proportion of DUI arrests resulting in reckless driving convictions (alcohol and nonalcohol), was 10.2% in 2003. Several counties adjudicated more than 20% of their DUI arrests as reckless driving convictions, including Alpine, Del Norte, Inyo and San Francisco (see Table 8).
- ▶ Statewide, 17.7% of all DUI-related reckless driving convictions in 2003 are inappropriately designated as nonalcohol (see Table 8), compared to 18.2% in 2002, 18.0% in 2001, 17.8% in 2000, 21.1% in 1999 and 19.6% in 1998.

Demographic Characteristics:

- ▶ The average age of a convicted DUI offender in 2003 was 33.6 years (see Table 4).
- ▶ 47.8% of 2003 DUI convictees were aged 30 years or younger and 73.2% were 40 years or younger (see Table 4).
- ▶ Females comprised 16.5% of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2003. The proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994 (see Table 4).

- The racial/ethnic distribution of 2003 DUI convictions (White = 44.1%; Hispanic = 42.9%; Black = 6.7%; “Other” = 6.3%) generally paralleled that of 2003 arrests, although Whites were somewhat more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to be convicted of the offense (as shown in Figure 5 and Table 5 below).




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

TABLE 4: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND SEX\*

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	140847	100.0	117580	83.5	23267	16.5
UNDER 18	686	0.5	569	82.9	117	17.1
18-20	10497	7.5	8727	83.1	1770	16.9
21-30	56099	39.8	47649	84.9	8450	15.1
31-40	35806	25.4	29860	83.4	5946	16.6
41-50	24839	17.6	19943	80.3	4896	19.7
51-60	9686	6.9	8067	83.3	1619	16.7
61-70	2550	1.8	2178	85.4	372	14.6
71 & ABOVE	684	0.5	587	85.8	97	14.2
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	33.6		33.5		34.2	

\*County-specific tabulations of 2003 DUI convictions by age and sex are shown in Appendix Table B2.

TABLE 5: MATCHABLE 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND SEX

AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)															
			WHITE				HISPANIC				BLACK				OTHER			
	MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE		MALE		FEMALE			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
STATEWIDE	118760	100.0	39569	33.3	12845	10.8	46439	39.1	4481	3.8	6521	5.5	1436	1.2	6178	5.2	1291	1.1
UNDER 18	519	0.4	247	47.6	76	14.6	146	28.1	12	2.3	12	2.3	1	0.2	21	4.0	4	0.8
18-20	8766	7.4	3080	35.1	1008	11.5	3477	39.7	345	3.9	259	3.0	56	0.6	432	4.9	109	1.2
21-30	47232	39.8	13949	29.5	4220	8.9	21164	44.8	2045	4.3	2064	4.4	508	1.1	2615	5.5	667	1.4
31-40	29927	25.2	8802	29.4	3183	10.6	12631	42.2	1178	3.9	1895	6.3	451	1.5	1514	5.1	273	0.9
41-50	21125	17.8	8118	38.4	2949	14.0	6397	30.3	685	3.2	1447	6.8	329	1.6	1021	4.8	179	0.8
51-60	8391	7.1	3887	46.3	1073	12.8	2048	24.4	179	2.1	616	7.3	77	0.9	466	5.6	45	0.5
61-70	2200	1.9	1118	50.8	265	12.0	478	21.7	30	1.4	186	8.5	14	0.6	95	4.3	14	0.6
71 & ABOVE	600	0.5	368	61.3	71	11.8	98	16.3	7	1.2	42	7.0	0	0.0	14	2.3	0	0.0

TABLE 6: ADJUSTED 2003 DUI CONVICTION RATES<sup>1</sup> AND RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD<sup>2</sup> OF CONVICTION BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY

AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	ADJUSTED CONVICTION RATE	RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD
STATEWIDE	0.77	1.00	0.80	1.05	0.75	0.97	0.72	0.94	0.74	0.97
UNDER 18	0.39	0.51	0.44	0.57	0.32	0.41	0.34	0.44	0.44	0.57
18-20	0.71	0.93	0.76	0.99	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.68	0.89
21-30	0.75	0.98	0.81	1.06	0.72	0.94	0.70	0.91	0.73	0.95
31-40	0.78	1.02	0.81	1.06	0.77	1.00	0.74	0.96	0.76	0.99
41-50	0.81	1.05	0.82	1.07	0.82	1.07	0.74	0.96	0.76	0.99
51-60	0.81	1.06	0.80	1.05	0.84	1.10	0.75	0.98	0.81	1.06
61-70	0.78	1.02	0.78	1.02	0.83	1.08	0.74	0.97	0.71	0.93
71 & ABOVE	0.79	1.04	0.79	1.03	0.87	1.14	0.74	0.97	0.69	0.90

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

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

TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	AVERAGE DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	76.7%	137126	3721	15413	3362	3480	1155	3.3	3.0
ALAMEDA	60.4%	3886	48	682	132	110	7	4.1	3.0
ALPINE	66.1%	39	0	9	4	0	0	2.2	2.4
AMADOR	97.2%	197	13	24	3	0	1	4.4	2.4
BUTTE	74.4%	1025	53	213	37	36	35	4.0	2.7
CALAVERAS	72.6%	205	10	34	3	2	0	3.6	3.0
COLUSA	71.7%	174	8	34	9	3	3	2.9	2.1
CONTRA COSTA	72.2%	3012	73	402	25	31	14	4.6	3.9
DEL NORTE	47.3%	146	9	83	14	17	2	3.1	3.3
EL DORADO	78.5%	1041	37	99	23	15	14	3.3	5.1
FRESNO	65.5%	3638	124	645	43	43	16	5.3	1.8
GLENN	62.1%	222	14	22	12	8	1	2.9	1.4
HUMBOLDT	61.5%	747	24	174	37	20	1	3.5	1.3
IMPERIAL	40.8%	520	12	59	90	10	24	6.5	5.4
INYO	75.5%	201	8	51	6	7	2	3.6	2.3
KERN	79.8%	4344	105	546	110	86	40	2.1	3.1
KINGS	78.4%	712	18	85	14	15	3	2.9	1.5
LAKE	71.7%	449	6	19	27	10	1	6.4	8.5
LASSEN	80.3%	234	10	7	12	8	2	4.4	3.8
LOS ANGELES	72.7%	27134	494	2630	793	1456	69	2.9	1.9
MADERA	71.4%	573	23	77	38	12	8	4.7	4.7
MARIN	83.7%	1386	9	0	0	35	20	3.1	3.6
MARIPOSA <sup>4</sup>	54.4%	98	1	8	3	2	0	3.4	3.1
MENDOCINO	79.4%	657	27	112	20	11	3	2.3	6.0
MERCED	76.4%	1077	24	120	29	13	4	4.5	4.7
MODOC	63.3%	36	2	3	1	3	1	2.7	2.0
MONO	87.3%	131	7	19	2	0	1	2.7	2.4

<sup>1</sup>Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3.<sup>2</sup>This count includes misdemeanors which carried a felony disposition code. These counts do not include 4th offenses (in seven years) which are statutorily defined as felonies.<sup>3</sup>These dismissals were identified in DMV's DUI Audit and Tracking System Summary Report.<sup>4</sup>The calculation of the conviction rate was based on total arrests including federal DUI arrests of Yosemite National Park not reported in the DOJ MACR system.<sup>5</sup>The calculation of the conviction rate was based on adjustments made for Santa Barbara County for incomplete arrest data in the DOJ MACR system.<sup>6</sup>This count includes both dismissed and reduced convictions. Sonoma's program for counting dismissals is currently being revised to reflect only dismissed cases.

TABLE 7: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES<sup>1</sup> – continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>2</sup>	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NONALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSED <sup>3</sup>	AVERAGE DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
								VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
MONTEREY	82.9%	2805	69	335	73	37	14	1.8	3.8
NAPA	81.5%	956	47	115	14	17	17	2.8	1.9
NEVADA	79.2%	510	20	107	9	4	6	2.5	4.9
ORANGE	89.2%	12002	261	648	73	160	41	3.6	3.0
PLACER	89.0%	1498	52	140	17	6	8	3.1	1.7
PLUMAS	81.4%	173	2	28	10	1	0	2.6	1.7
RIVERSIDE	86.6%	7195	227	43	295	93	61	3.8	1.1
SACRAMENTO	75.9%	5902	223	1230	55	62	18	3.8	5.2
SAN BENITO	85.9%	299	6	39	5	2	0	4.8	5.3
SAN BERNARDINO	73.5%	8094	339	322	273	341	125	4.5	0.9
SAN DIEGO	82.4%	12942	339	1842	259	192	37	3.0	5.5
SAN FRANCISCO	54.6%	809	25	212	181	22	3	2.9	2.0
SAN JOAQUIN	74.5%	3300	102	415	47	84	16	2.4	2.1
SAN LUIS OBISPO	75.2%	1630	60	377	45	107	21	2.3	5.0
SAN MATEO	76.9%	2800	33	505	32	58	20	3.8	4.5
SANTA BARBARA <sup>5</sup>	88.4%	2353	75	421	71	36	13	2.3	5.1
SANTA CLARA	85.3%	5838	143	552	174	66	4	3.1	1.3
SANTA CRUZ	84.2%	1443	34	206	31	9	11	2.8	5.7
SHASTA	87.8%	1006	49	193	10	13	2	2.8	3.9
SIERRA	50.0%	33	0	8	1	2	0	3.6	3.0
SISKIYOU	68.4%	242	16	60	10	6	6	3.0	1.0
SOLANO	81.1%	1367	40	186	20	21	33	3.3	6.9
SONOMA <sup>6</sup>	79.3%	2090	101	505	30	31	364	2.7	4.6
STANISLAUS	65.9%	1510	54	174	27	13	0	3.4	3.6
SUTTER	67.5%	376	18	86	9	10	0	2.8	3.2
TEHAMA	38.2%	399	16	76	16	5	7	2.3	2.4
TRINITY	43.8%	89	2	20	6	4	0	3.6	3.9
TULARE	70.1%	2469	71	97	31	44	4	3.1	3.5
TUOLUMNE	75.7%	397	18	71	17	9	2	3.8	1.3
VENTURA	88.8%	3525	69	0	3	59	21	3.0	1.5
YOLO	72.9%	779	40	178	26	12	2	3.6	4.9
YUBA	57.0%	411	11	65	5	1	5	3.5	1.9

TABLE 8: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2003 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY<sup>1</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTIONS		RECKLESS DRIVING CONVICTIONS		% OTHER CONVICTIONS	% NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION <sup>2</sup>
	% MISDEMEANOR	% FELONY	% ALCOHOL RELATED	% NONALCOHOL RELATED		
STATEWIDE	74.7	2.0	8.4	1.8	1.9	11.1
ALAMEDA	59.6	0.7	10.5	2.0	1.7	25.5
ALPINE	66.1	0.0	15.3	6.8	0.0	11.9
AMADOR	91.2	6.0	11.1	1.4	0.0	0.0*
BUTTE	70.8	3.7	14.7	2.6	2.5	5.8
CALAVERAS	69.3	3.4	11.5	1.0	0.7	14.2
COLUSA	68.5	3.1	13.4	3.5	1.2	10.2
CONTRA COSTA	70.5	1.7	9.4	0.6	0.7	17.1
DEL NORTE	44.5	2.7	25.3	4.3	5.2	18.0
EL DORADO	75.8	2.7	7.2	1.7	1.1	11.6
FRESNO	63.4	2.2	11.2	0.7	0.7	21.7
GLENN	58.4	3.7	5.8	3.2	2.1	26.8
HUMBOLDT	59.6	1.9	13.9	3.0	1.6	20.1
IMPERIAL	39.9	0.9	4.5	6.9	0.8	47.0
INYO	72.6	2.9	18.4	2.2	2.5	1.4
KERN	77.9	1.9	9.8	2.0	1.5	6.9
KINGS	76.5	1.9	9.1	1.5	1.6	9.3
LAKE	70.7	0.9	3.0	4.3	1.6	19.5
LASSEN	77.0	3.3	2.3	3.9	2.6	10.9
LOS ANGELES	71.4	1.3	6.9	2.1	3.8	14.5
MADERA	68.6	2.8	9.2	4.6	1.4	13.4
MARIN	83.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.1	14.2
MARIPOSA <sup>3</sup>	53.8	0.5	4.4	1.6	1.1	38.5
MENDOCINO	76.3	3.1	13.0	2.3	1.3	3.9
MERCED	74.7	1.7	8.3	2.0	0.9	12.4
MODOC	60.0	3.3	5.0	1.7	5.0	25.0
MONO	82.9	4.4	12.0	1.3	0.0	0.0*
MONTEREY	80.9	2.0	9.7	2.1	1.1	4.3
NAPA	77.7	3.8	9.3	1.1	1.4	6.6
NEVADA	76.2	3.0	16.0	1.3	0.6	2.8
ORANGE	87.3	1.9	4.7	0.5	1.2	4.4
PLACER	86.0	3.0	8.0	1.0	0.3	1.6
PLUMAS	80.5	0.9	13.0	4.7	0.5	0.5
RIVERSIDE	84.0	2.7	0.5	3.4	1.1	8.3
SACRAMENTO	73.1	2.8	15.2	0.7	0.8	7.5
SAN BENITO	84.2	1.7	11.0	1.4	0.6	1.1
SAN BERNARDINO	70.6	3.0	2.8	2.4	3.0	18.3
SAN DIEGO	80.3	2.1	11.4	1.6	1.2	3.4
SAN FRANCISCO	52.9	1.6	13.9	11.8	1.4	18.3
SAN JOAQUIN	72.3	2.2	9.1	1.0	1.8	13.5
SAN LUIS OBISPO	72.5	2.7	16.8	2.0	4.8	1.2
SAN MATEO	76.0	0.9	13.7	0.9	1.6	6.9
SANTA BARBARA <sup>4</sup>	85.7	2.7	15.3	2.6	1.3	0.0*
SANTA CLARA	83.2	2.0	7.9	2.5	0.9	3.4
SANTA CRUZ	82.2	1.9	11.7	1.8	0.5	1.8
SHASTA	83.8	4.1	16.1	0.8	1.1	0.0*
SIERRA	50.0	0.0	12.1	1.5	3.0	33.3
SISKIYOU	64.2	4.2	15.9	2.7	1.6	11.4
SOLANO	78.8	2.3	10.7	1.2	1.2	5.8
SONOMA	75.6	3.7	18.3	1.1	1.1	0.3
STANISLAUS	63.6	2.3	7.3	1.1	0.5	25.1
SUTTER	64.4	3.1	14.7	1.5	1.7	14.6
TEHAMA	36.7	1.5	7.0	1.5	0.5	52.9
TRINITY	42.8	1.0	9.6	2.9	1.9	41.8
TULARE	68.2	2.0	2.7	0.9	1.2	25.1
TUOLUMNE	72.4	3.3	13.0	3.1	1.6	6.6
VENTURA	87.1	1.7	0.0	0.1	1.5	9.7
YOLO	69.3	3.6	15.8	2.3	1.1	7.9
YUBA	55.5	1.5	8.8	0.7	0.1	33.5

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

<sup>2</sup>These include failure-to-appear (FTA) notices; the statewide average is 4.4%.

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

<sup>4</sup>The calculation of the DUI conviction rate was based on adjustments made for Santa Barbara county for incomplete arrest data in the DOJ MACR system.

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

TABLE 9a: 2003 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION  
(BAC) LEVELS OF DUI CONVICTIONS

DUI CONVICTIONS			ALCOHOL-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS		
BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.01	72	0.1	.01	20	0.2
.02	74	0.1	.02	11	0.1
.03	86	0.1	.03	19	0.2
.04	104	0.1	.04	39	0.3
.05	405	0.4	.05	57	0.5
.06	500	0.5	.06	193	1.6
.07	800	0.7	.07	643	5.4
.08	2117	1.9	.08	2771	23.4
.09	3525	3.2	.09	3426	28.9
.10	6481	5.8	.10	2090	17.6
.11	8048	7.2	.11	986	8.3
.12	8874	7.9	.12	463	3.9
.13	8819	7.9	.13	307	2.6
.14	8901	7.9	.14	185	1.6
.15	8505	7.6	.15	153	1.3
.16	7990	7.1	.16	115	1.0
.17	7470	6.7	.17	99	0.8
.18	6628	5.9	.18	82	0.7
.19	5943	5.3	.19	43	0.4
.20	5259	4.7	.20	36	0.3
.21	4525	4.0	.21	29	0.2
.22	3578	3.2	.22	26	0.2
.23	2942	2.6	.23	17	0.1
.24	2411	2.2	.24	11	0.1
.25	1814	1.6	.25	4	0.0
.26	1478	1.3	.26	2	0.0
.27	1127	1.0	.27	6	0.1
.28	823	0.7	.28	3	0.0
.29	641	0.6	.29	3	0.0
.30	506	0.5	.30	3	0.0
.31	376	0.3	.31	1	0.0
.32	292	0.3	.32	2	0.0
.33	241	0.2	.33	3	0.0
.34	190	0.2	.35	2	0.0
.35	129	0.1	.36	2	0.0
.36	100	0.1			
.37	82	0.1			
.38	59	0.1			
.39	45	0.0			
.40	26	0.0			
.41	29	0.0			
.42	10	0.0			
.43	6	0.0			
.44	10	0.0			
.45	5	0.0			
.46	5	0.0			
.47	2	0.0			
.48	1	0.0			
.49	1	0.0			
.50+	5	0.0			
TOTAL	112060	100.0	TOTAL	11852	100.0
	MEAN BAC .161			MEAN BAC .097	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted DUI offenders, rather than the abstract of conviction for those offenders, which was the data source in the earliest reports. This change in data source was made because of the more complete BAC reporting on APS forms (79.7% of total) versus court abstracts (with only 54.3% showing BAC levels). This chart does not show 1504 zero BAC levels, which may include driving-under-the-influence of drug convictions..

TABLE 9b: 2003 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC)  
LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21

BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.01	14	0.2	.21	188	2.1
.02	22	0.3	.22	142	1.6
.03	21	0.2	.23	95	1.1
.04	48	0.5	.24	64	0.7
.05	295	3.3	.25	47	0.5
.06	328	3.7	.26	47	0.5
.07	401	4.5	.27	17	0.2
.08	396	4.4	.28	13	0.1
.09	421	4.7	.29	2	0.0
.10	650	7.2	.30	3	0.0
.11	780	8.7	.31	3	0.0
.12	764	8.5	.32	1	0.0
.13	704	7.8	.33	2	0.0
.14	730	8.1	.35	1	0.0
.15	636	7.1	.36	1	0.0
.16	606	6.8	.37	1	0.0
.17	516	5.8	.50+	1	0.0
.18	421	4.7			
.19	335	3.7	TOTAL	8977	100.0
.20	261	2.9		MEAN BAC .132	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for arrested DUI offenders. The percentage of BAC levels found on these forms for 2003 convicted under age 21 cases is 80.3%.

TABLE 10: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY OFFENDER STATUS AND  
AVERAGE REPORTED BAC LEVEL

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	PERCENT	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%)	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM CONVICTION ABSTRACT (%)
STATEWIDE	100.0	.161	.160
1ST DUI	77.1	.157	.157
2ND DUI	17.9	.171	.170
3RD DUI	4.0	.180	.176
4TH+ DUI	1.0	.188	.182



### SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were taken from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2003. Although counts of postconviction court license actions are included, total counts of all license actions, including DMV administrative per se (APS) license suspensions and revocations, are shown in the Administrative Actions Section. APS actions (effective July 1990) are initiated by law enforcement immediately upon arrest for DUI, and are administered independently of the criminal adjudication process. In previous reports, sanction combinations for first and second offenders were reported by county; however, they are no longer presented because recent legislation has eliminated variation in sanctions statewide. This section includes the following tables:

Table 11: 2003 DUI Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions. The specific court sanctions tallied include percentages of probation, jail, alcohol treatment programs (first offender, SB 38 second offender, and 30-month third offender programs), license restriction, court suspension, and ignition interlock. Crosstabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.


Table 12: 2003 DUI Court Sanctions by County and Offender Status. This table displays the distribution of court sanctions by county for all DUI offenders.

From the data in these and the tables in the Appendix, it is evident that the use of alternative sanctions continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status in 2003. For example:

#### Statewide Parameters:

- ▶ The most frequently applied court sanction among all convicted DUI offenders was probation (96.3%), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock (3.8%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 73.0% of the cases. (However, in many jurisdictions, jail is often served as community service rather than actual jail time.)

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



*Figure 6.* Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (2003).

#### County Variation:

- ▶ The proportion of first-DUI offenders arrested in 2003 who received a court postconviction suspension varied by county, from 41.6% in Monterey County, to 0% in Alpine, Sierra, and Yuba Counties (see Table 12).
- ▶ The use of first DUI offender alcohol programs varies by county from over 90% in 11 counties to 21.9% in Placer County (see Table 12).

#### Court Variation:

- ▶ Statewide, courts vary significantly in how they use available sanctions for DUI offenders. In Los Angeles County alone, one court (Lancaster) assigned jail to 97.4% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 764$ ), while another court (Malibu) in the same county assigned jail to only 26.6% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 293$ ). This is shown in Table B4.
- ▶ In 2003, Los Angeles and San Joaquin were the only counties with active 30-month third offender treatment programs. Even within these counties, however, assignment of third offenders to 30-month programs was low, and varied significantly by court (see Table B4).
- ▶ Statewide, courts required only 3.8% of all convicted DUI offenders to install an ignition interlock device in 2003. This is down from 6.3% in 1997 and 1998, primarily because legislation in 1999 shifted the mandatory interlock requirement from all repeat DUI offenders to all suspended or revoked DUI offenders caught driving while disqualified, and data on the new “mandatory” interlock assignments are not captured by the DUI-MIS report.

Variation by Offender Status:

- ▶ About two-thirds of first-DUI offenders arrested in 2003 were sentenced to jail, compared to over 90% of all repeat offenders (see Table 11).
- ▶ 87.2% of first DUI-offenders were assigned to alcohol treatment programs, along with 84.3% of second offenders, 59.6% of third offenders, and 31.8% of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. (By statute, however, all offenders must eventually complete specified alcohol treatment programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement). This is shown in Table 11.
- ▶ 5.9% of first-DUI offenders and 10.4% of repeat-DUI offenders received court license suspensions in 2003 (see Table 11). Under the APS law (since July 1990), all DUI offenders with BAC levels of 0.08% or more are also subject to a 30-day to 1-year administrative license suspension, or two to three years revocation.
- ▶ 12.9% of repeat-DUI offenders were assigned ignition interlock in 2003, compared to 10.9% in 2002, 8.1% in 2001, 7.5% in 2000, 13.3% in 1999 and 22.3% in 1998. In spite of the old mandatory interlock law for all repeat offenders (AB 2851 - Freidman), which took effect on July 1, 1993, judges routinely did not assign interlock to these offenders (over 75% of “mandatory” assignments were not made). This law was repealed in 1998, and a new ignition interlock law (AB 762 - Torlakson) and program was enacted and implemented July 1, 1999, that established mandatory interlock for DUI suspension/revocation violators, while providing incentives for repeat offenders to reinstate early with interlock. Judicial assignments to the new mandatory provisions have steadily risen since the law was implemented, and proportionally more DUI suspension violators are now assigned to interlock than were repeat offenders under the old “mandatory” law.

TABLE 11: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS\*

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROGRAM	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROGRAM	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE	140847	96.3	73.0	67.2	17.7	0.2	75.3	7.0	3.8
1ST DUI	107608	97.0	66.6	84.9	2.3	0.0	80.7	5.9	1.0
REPEAT DUI	33239	93.9	93.7	9.8	67.3	0.7	57.6	10.4	12.9
2ND DUI	26224	96.3	93.8	11.5	72.6	0.2	68.3	8.8	11.4
3RD DUI	5568	91.3	93.5	4.0	52.8	2.8	20.6	17.2	20.1
4TH+ DUI	1447	61.4	92.0	1.2	27.9	1.9	5.6	13.3	12.4

\*Entries represent percentages of 2003 DUI convictees receiving each sanction by offender status. Sanctions within each offender status group (row) are not independent; therefore, row percentages always add to more than 100%. Percentages of sanctions by county and court appear in Appendix Table B4.

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE		140847	96.3	73.0	67.2	17.7	0.2	75.3	7.0	3.8
ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3054	98.4	96.2	84.5	2.2	0.1	85.1	6.0	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	712	99.3	97.5	14.3	71.8	0.0	86.4	5.5	28.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	145	96.6	95.2	4.8	58.6	0.0	42.8	35.2	27.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	23	100.0	95.7	4.3	43.5	0.0	43.5	30.4	21.7
	TOTAL	3934	98.5	96.4	68.4	17.1	0.1	83.5	7.1	7.1
ALPINE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	100.0	75.9	93.1	0.0	0.0	82.8	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	85.7	71.4	28.6	42.9	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	39	97.4	76.9	74.4	15.4	0.0	79.5	0.0	0.0
AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	145	91.7	93.8	86.2	2.8	0.0	82.1	7.6	11.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	49	95.9	98.0	12.2	69.4	0.0	69.4	8.2	40.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	83.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
	TOTAL	210	91.9	94.8	62.4	22.9	0.5	72.9	7.1	21.4
BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	819	91.1	91.6	68.5	2.2	0.0	76.2	11.7	2.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	199	91.5	98.0	19.1	62.8	0.0	66.3	7.5	4.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	47	89.4	100.0	6.4	76.6	0.0	36.2	21.3	2.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	61.5	100.0	0.0	61.5	0.0	23.1	15.4	30.8
	TOTAL	1078	90.7	93.2	55.8	17.3	0.0	72.0	11.4	2.7
CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	147	98.6	97.3	86.4	2.7	0.0	79.6	8.2	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	98.0	100.0	0.0	98.0	0.0	35.3	0.0	11.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	86.7	86.7	0.0	66.7	13.3	6.7	13.3	33.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	215	97.7	97.2	59.1	30.7	0.9	63.3	6.5	6.5
COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	135	88.9	96.3	75.6	1.5	0.0	71.1	10.4	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	74.2	96.8	0.0	64.5	0.0	61.3	6.5	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	92.3	92.3	0.0	30.8	0.0	7.7	46.2	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	182	86.3	96.2	56.0	14.8	0.0	63.7	12.1	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2277	97.0	90.3	89.5	2.2	0.0	86.9	5.5	0.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	648	98.0	98.0	9.6	77.3	0.0	71.0	12.2	0.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	129	96.9	97.7	0.8	57.4	0.0	21.7	18.6	0.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	31	74.2	96.8	0.0	29.0	0.0	6.5	9.7	6.5
	TOTAL	3085	97.0	92.3	68.1	20.5	0.0	80.0	7.5	0.2
DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	119	89.1	95.8	84.0	2.5	0.0	79.8	0.8	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	77.8	96.3	18.5	59.3	0.0	70.4	0.0	37.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	55.6	100.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	44.4
	TOTAL	155	85.2	96.1	68.4	13.5	0.0	75.5	0.6	9.7

\*Entries represent percentages of 2003 convictees receiving each sanction by county and offender status.

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	784	98.2	97.7	87.6	3.7	0.0	90.9	1.4	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	228	98.2	97.8	14.5	77.2	0.0	84.6	2.6	18.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	50	94.0	98.0	6.0	62.0	0.0	16.0	6.0	30.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	16	68.8	75.0	6.3	18.8	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
	TOTAL	1078	97.6	97.4	67.2	22.2	0.0	85.0	1.9	6.3
FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2691	94.1	92.5	85.1	2.5	0.0	80.4	2.3	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	799	93.7	96.7	11.4	74.0	0.0	75.0	2.6	12.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	204	86.8	91.7	5.9	53.9	0.0	18.1	1.5	22.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	68	55.9	95.6	1.5	20.6	0.0	5.9	1.5	2.9
	TOTAL	3762	92.9	93.4	63.6	20.8	0.0	74.5	2.3	4.5
GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	167	92.2	48.5	85.0	1.2	0.0	47.9	10.2	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	53	90.6	86.8	26.4	58.5	0.0	49.1	9.4	3.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	90.9	9.1	45.5	0.0	18.2	27.3	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
	TOTAL	236	90.3	60.2	66.5	16.1	0.0	45.8	11.4	1.3
HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	581	96.2	20.5	90.0	3.8	0.0	92.4	2.9	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	148	97.3	82.4	15.5	77.7	0.0	83.8	12.8	4.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	97.1	88.2	2.9	79.4	0.0	35.3	52.9	8.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	87.5	87.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	25.0
	TOTAL	771	96.4	36.1	71.1	21.8	0.0	87.4	7.4	1.8
IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	415	93.7	18.3	72.0	1.7	0.0	68.9	0.7	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	99	97.0	36.4	39.4	32.3	0.0	66.7	2.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	42.9	21.4	50.0	0.0	57.1	7.1	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	532	94.4	22.4	64.3	8.8	0.0	67.9	1.1	0.0
INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	151	96.0	27.2	84.1	4.0	0.0	84.8	0.7	2.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	93.8	95.8	6.3	72.9	0.0	81.3	0.0	6.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	50.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	TOTAL	209	94.7	44.5	62.2	21.5	0.0	79.9	1.0	3.3
KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3327	96.2	94.4	74.3	1.5	0.0	64.9	3.9	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	864	95.0	98.4	10.4	36.6	0.0	38.3	4.1	8.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	216	93.5	96.8	6.0	14.8	0.0	10.2	10.2	19.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	42	40.5	92.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	11.9	4.8
	TOTAL	4449	95.3	95.3	57.9	8.9	0.1	56.5	4.3	3.1
KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	549	89.6	94.9	77.0	0.4	0.0	70.1	18.2	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	129	82.9	96.9	15.5	55.8	0.0	65.1	18.6	3.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	38	65.8	92.1	2.6	21.1	0.0	13.2	15.8	7.9
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	35.7	92.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0
	TOTAL	730	86.2	95.1	60.8	11.2	0.0	64.9	18.2	1.4

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	342	96.2	23.4	67.8	2.9	0.0	87.7	1.8	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	88	94.3	72.7	25.0	55.7	0.0	64.8	3.4	3.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	90.0	65.0	15.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	15.0	5.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
	TOTAL	455	95.6	35.6	56.5	14.1	0.0	79.6	3.1	1.1
LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	184	94.6	97.8	88.6	2.2	0.0	76.6	10.9	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	46	91.3	95.7	17.4	67.4	0.0	30.4	13.0	10.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	100.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	0.0	36.4	9.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	244	93.4	97.5	70.1	17.6	0.0	63.5	12.3	3.7
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21794	97.5	38.5	89.7	2.5	0.1	86.2	1.3	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4739	96.4	88.5	11.3	78.0	0.7	81.1	3.1	2.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	892	89.2	84.8	4.4	44.4	10.9	16.9	6.8	4.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	203	44.8	93.6	0.5	12.3	4.9	3.4	5.9	1.0
	TOTAL	27628	96.6	49.0	72.8	16.9	0.6	82.5	1.8	0.6
MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	442	95.2	91.4	88.0	2.3	0.0	57.7	12.7	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	123	95.1	92.7	23.6	61.0	0.8	51.2	9.8	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	89.5	100.0	0.0	68.4	0.0	31.6	26.3	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	75.0	75.0	8.3	16.7	25.0	8.3	41.7	8.3
	TOTAL	596	94.6	91.6	70.3	16.8	0.7	54.5	13.1	0.2
MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1136	97.4	9.8	87.9	2.8	0.0	89.3	8.5	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	211	98.1	90.5	6.6	82.0	0.0	88.2	9.5	10.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	100.0	94.4	0.0	27.8	0.0	19.4	69.4	25.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	8.3	75.0	66.7
	TOTAL	1395	97.6	24.9	72.6	16.0	0.0	86.6	10.8	3.1
MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	66	97.0	97.0	84.8	1.5	0.0	87.9	3.0	1.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	29	86.2	93.1	13.8	37.9	0.0	48.3	6.9	10.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	TOTAL	99	93.9	94.9	60.6	14.1	1.0	74.7	4.0	6.1
MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	484	88.2	94.4	77.5	5.6	0.0	77.5	3.7	3.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	169	87.6	93.5	7.7	69.2	0.0	73.4	1.2	33.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	82.1	89.3	3.6	60.7	0.0	25.0	10.7	35.7
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3
	TOTAL	684	87.6	94.0	56.9	23.7	0.0	74.0	3.5	12.6
MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	781	97.4	96.0	88.3	3.5	0.0	85.3	4.2	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	246	97.2	98.4	16.7	70.7	0.0	85.8	3.7	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	62	93.5	96.8	1.6	51.6	0.0	27.4	29.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	66.7	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0
	TOTAL	1101	96.8	96.6	66.5	21.4	0.0	81.3	5.5	0.0
MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	30	100.0	30.0	26.7	3.3	0.0	80.0	10.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	100.0	75.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	75.0	12.5	0.0
	TOTAL	38	100.0	39.5	23.7	7.9	0.0	78.9	10.5	0.0

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	113	96.5	56.6	92.0	1.8	0.0	88.5	0.9	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19	94.7	89.5	26.3	57.9	0.0	63.2	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7
	TOTAL	138	96.4	63.0	79.0	11.6	0.0	83.3	1.4	1.4
MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2232	98.8	97.3	55.6	2.3	0.0	43.6	41.6	8.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	506	97.6	99.0	6.1	61.3	0.0	16.8	40.1	64.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	108	92.6	100.0	2.8	49.1	0.0	4.6	50.0	67.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	28	71.4	100.0	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	42.9
	TOTAL	2874	98.1	97.7	44.3	14.5	0.0	37.0	41.8	20.7
NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	780	98.2	95.0	89.7	2.6	0.0	89.1	2.4	2.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	187	98.4	98.4	16.6	77.0	0.0	95.2	0.5	18.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	92.6	100.0	7.4	77.8	0.0	85.2	0.0	44.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	9	33.3	88.9	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2
	TOTAL	1003	97.5	95.7	73.1	18.6	0.0	89.5	2.0	6.6
NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	396	98.2	90.9	84.8	2.0	0.0	85.4	1.3	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	100	98.0	98.0	14.0	77.0	0.0	84.0	0.0	2.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	26	96.2	100.0	11.5	57.7	0.0	34.6	0.0	3.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	8	62.5	87.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	530	97.5	92.6	66.6	19.2	0.0	81.3	0.9	1.1
ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9583	98.5	21.5	92.4	1.6	0.0	83.2	7.8	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2240	97.9	90.1	8.1	81.2	0.1	62.0	24.9	14.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	374	94.7	95.7	0.5	81.6	0.0	9.6	13.9	39.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	66	54.5	90.9	1.5	39.4	1.5	3.0	4.5	15.2
	TOTAL	12263	98.0	36.7	73.7	18.8	0.0	76.7	11.1	4.3
PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1173	98.0	96.0	21.9	2.0	0.1	85.7	4.3	6.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	301	97.3	97.3	1.7	84.4	0.7	82.1	2.7	36.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	89.2	96.9	0.0	72.3	3.1	33.8	6.2	38.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	11	27.3	90.9	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2
	TOTAL	1550	97.0	96.3	16.9	21.1	0.3	82.2	4.1	13.6
PLUMAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	125	98.4	99.2	92.0	3.2	0.0	92.8	4.8	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	41	100.0	97.6	14.6	85.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	11.1	77.8	0.0	44.4	22.2	0.0
	TOTAL	175	98.3	98.9	69.7	26.3	0.0	92.0	4.6	0.6
RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5669	96.7	79.5	86.4	1.6	0.0	83.6	3.2	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1285	96.6	95.7	13.2	79.1	0.0	65.2	3.3	5.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	347	92.8	96.8	5.5	79.5	0.0	36.6	15.3	12.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	121	66.1	93.4	0.8	50.4	0.0	11.6	10.7	17.4
	TOTAL	7422	96.0	83.3	68.6	19.5	0.0	77.1	3.9	2.0
SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4418	96.6	95.8	75.2	2.2	0.0	67.7	13.7	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1232	97.8	98.5	9.8	55.0	0.0	53.5	16.7	4.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	339	92.6	99.1	1.2	33.6	0.0	16.8	8.6	10.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup> DUI	136	75.7	97.8	1.5	37.5	0.0	3.7	18.4	11.0
	TOTAL	6125	96.2	96.6	56.3	15.3	0.0	60.6	14.1	2.0

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	218	95.4	85.3	65.1	0.0	0.0	61.0	35.8	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	71	100.0	97.2	5.6	67.6	0.0	74.6	16.9	25.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	100.0	91.7	0.0	25.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	75.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
	TOTAL	305	96.1	88.5	47.9	16.7	0.3	61.6	30.8	10.2
SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6409	97.3	57.2	92.7	2.0	0.0	89.8	1.2	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1605	96.9	91.7	14.9	77.9	0.1	80.9	6.5	0.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	315	91.4	93.0	6.7	47.0	0.0	34.9	12.7	0.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	104	54.8	66.3	3.8	24.0	0.0	12.5	6.7	0.0
	TOTAL	8433	96.5	65.2	73.6	18.4	0.0	85.1	2.7	0.1
SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10504	96.4	48.5	85.5	3.7	0.0	83.4	4.8	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2283	96.0	89.6	13.6	70.3	0.0	67.1	5.1	0.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	402	92.5	94.5	4.5	61.9	0.0	25.1	19.9	4.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	92	62.0	94.6	2.2	21.7	0.0	2.2	6.5	7.6
	TOTAL	13281	96.0	57.3	70.1	17.0	0.0	78.3	5.3	0.4
SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	672	99.1	97.5	95.4	1.6	0.0	94.9	0.4	4.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	137	99.3	99.3	25.5	67.2	0.0	86.1	0.0	48.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	100.0	100.0	10.0	80.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	85.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	80.0
	TOTAL	834	99.2	97.8	81.3	14.6	0.0	92.1	0.4	13.7
SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2434	98.4	96.7	90.0	1.7	0.3	81.2	6.6	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	683	98.1	99.6	10.0	82.1	0.1	80.8	7.9	23.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	210	95.2	75.2	2.4	39.5	22.9	16.7	45.2	29.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	75	66.7	81.3	0.0	17.3	14.7	4.0	32.0	22.7
	TOTAL	3402	97.4	95.6	66.5	20.5	2.0	75.5	9.8	7.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1215	97.0	94.8	89.7	1.6	0.0	80.7	1.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	374	97.9	98.7	8.0	84.8	0.0	86.9	0.3	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	87	95.4	98.9	3.4	75.9	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	78.6	100.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1690	96.9	95.9	66.4	24.1	0.0	78.1	0.8	0.0
SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2229	97.9	96.1	89.9	2.0	0.0	79.2	0.4	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	493	97.0	99.2	9.5	82.8	0.0	28.8	2.4	25.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	93	87.1	96.8	5.4	74.2	0.0	11.8	2.2	31.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	18	77.8	100.0	0.0	72.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
	TOTAL	2833	97.3	96.6	72.6	18.8	0.0	67.7	0.8	6.2
SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1887	96.2	57.9	79.1	1.7	0.0	77.7	16.5	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	422	95.3	95.5	10.7	65.6	0.0	39.6	37.2	6.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	104	90.4	98.1	1.0	62.5	0.0	6.7	65.4	23.1
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	66.7	93.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0
	TOTAL	2428	95.6	66.4	63.3	15.6	0.0	67.6	22.5	2.5



TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4549	97.6	94.6	85.7	3.9	0.0	79.8	7.1	1.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1172	94.9	98.2	10.0	77.3	0.0	74.3	9.0	17.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	213	88.3	97.2	2.3	53.5	0.5	11.3	7.0	50.2
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	47	66.0	100.0	0.0	44.7	0.0	2.1	2.1	12.8
	TOTAL	5981	96.5	95.5	67.2	20.4	0.0	75.7	7.4	6.5
SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1063	97.4	95.0	75.6	0.9	0.0	75.7	19.6	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	314	98.7	98.4	7.0	61.1	0.0	68.2	28.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	81	92.6	100.0	1.2	7.4	0.0	6.2	84.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	68.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.9	0.0
	TOTAL	1477	97.0	96.1	56.0	14.1	0.0	69.3	25.4	0.0
SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	737	94.7	96.9	89.8	1.8	0.0	82.9	8.3	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	230	92.6	98.7	12.2	78.3	0.0	83.9	5.2	39.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	69	97.1	98.6	4.3	37.7	0.0	18.8	46.4	73.9
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	47.4	100.0	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	21.1	21.1
	TOTAL	1055	93.6	97.4	65.7	21.0	0.0	77.4	10.3	15.1
SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22	100.0	95.5	95.5	0.0	0.0	95.5	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	33	100.0	97.0	63.6	33.3	0.0	87.9	3.0	0.0
SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	183	91.3	90.2	71.6	2.7	0.0	62.3	10.9	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	53	94.3	96.2	7.5	73.6	0.0	37.7	11.3	24.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	73.7	100.0	10.5	47.4	0.0	10.5	15.8	10.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	258	89.9	92.2	53.1	20.9	0.0	52.7	11.2	6.6
SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1042	95.9	98.1	91.8	1.5	0.0	87.4	1.1	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	289	93.1	97.6	8.7	82.0	0.0	77.5	0.3	4.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	57	78.9	100.0	1.8	64.9	0.0	15.8	15.8	22.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	52.6	100.0	0.0	47.4	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0
	TOTAL	1407	94.0	98.1	69.9	21.3	0.0	81.3	1.6	2.2
SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1548	94.5	92.6	73.6	0.9	0.0	68.0	1.6	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	483	92.3	98.8	3.5	49.3	0.0	49.1	0.0	15.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	124	86.3	100.0	3.2	20.2	0.0	10.5	0.0	22.6
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	36	63.9	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
	TOTAL	2191	93.1	94.5	52.9	12.8	0.0	59.5	1.1	5.4
STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1190	98.2	95.2	89.0	4.2	0.0	71.7	1.8	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	291	98.3	97.9	11.3	79.4	0.0	38.1	3.1	13.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	63	98.4	96.8	4.8	73.0	1.6	11.1	3.2	50.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	20	75.0	100.0	5.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
	TOTAL	1564	98.0	95.8	70.1	21.5	0.1	62.1	2.1	5.3

TABLE 12: 2003 DUI COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND OFFENDER STATUS\* (continued)

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SUTTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	281	94.0	94.7	86.1	1.1	0.4	80.8	3.6	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	91	96.7	98.9	6.6	89.0	0.0	70.3	1.1	48.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	5.9	70.6	0.0	29.4	11.8	82.4
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0
	TOTAL	394	94.4	95.9	63.2	24.6	0.3	75.1	3.6	16.8
TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	291	89.3	96.9	35.7	2.1	0.0	70.8	9.6	3.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	96	87.5	99.0	7.3	70.8	0.0	56.3	4.2	11.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	56.5	100.0	0.0	56.5	0.0	13.0	0.0	34.8
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
	TOTAL	415	86.0	97.6	26.7	21.0	0.0	63.4	7.7	7.7
TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	98.3	91.7	83.3	0.0	0.0	78.3	5.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	81.0	100.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	57.1	4.8	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	87.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	91	93.4	93.4	58.2	13.2	1.1	65.9	7.7	0.0
TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1880	95.3	90.2	85.0	2.7	0.0	63.6	0.9	1.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	509	93.7	95.3	19.3	67.6	0.0	46.4	2.9	12.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	123	91.9	95.1	9.8	67.5	0.0	25.2	10.6	29.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	28	85.7	89.3	0.0	46.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	25.0
	TOTAL	2540	94.7	91.4	67.2	19.3	0.0	57.6	1.8	5.3
TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	295	96.6	98.3	90.8	1.0	0.0	88.8	1.7	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	90	95.6	100.0	14.4	76.7	0.0	82.2	2.2	5.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	95.8	100.0	12.5	33.3	0.0	33.3	8.3	12.5
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	415	95.4	98.3	68.4	19.3	0.0	82.9	2.2	2.4
VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2847	98.0	97.2	78.7	1.0	0.0	73.1	20.5	9.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	591	98.0	99.0	8.8	68.7	0.0	75.1	21.2	69.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	129	89.9	100.0	3.1	49.6	0.0	27.1	40.3	72.9
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	63.0	96.3	0.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	37.0	55.6
	TOTAL	3594	97.4	97.6	63.9	14.2	0.0	71.2	21.5	21.8
YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	610	95.9	93.4	83.9	2.1	0.0	78.9	9.2	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	153	97.4	97.4	32.0	55.6	0.0	85.6	1.3	10.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	85.7	97.6	9.5	47.6	0.0	21.4	21.4	14.3
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	78.6	92.9	0.0	35.7	0.0	7.1	21.4	7.1
	TOTAL	819	95.4	94.4	69.0	15.0	0.0	75.9	8.5	3.1
YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	304	97.7	87.8	85.9	2.0	0.0	77.6	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	101	92.1	98.0	9.9	77.2	0.0	25.7	0.0	5.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	85.7	92.9	7.1	35.7	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3
	TOTAL	422	95.5	90.5	64.5	21.1	0.0	63.0	0.2	1.7

## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

This section presents reoffense and crash rates, and the methodology and results of the effectiveness of alcohol education programs applied to drivers convicted of an alcohol-related offense.

The first part of the section examines descriptive indicators, such as recidivism and crash rates, for different groups of DUI offenders within different periods of time: 1) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders from 1990-2003, 2) one-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for 2003 first and second DUI offenders, 3) proportions of alcohol education program completions for 2003 first and second DUI offenders, and 4) long term recidivism rates of the 1994 DUI offenders.

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

Also in the second part of the section and new this year were two additional subanalyses: 1) an evaluation of 6-month alcohol education programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels below .20 versus first DUI offenders with BACs of .20 or above, and 2) an evaluation of the relative effectiveness of 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education programs for first DUI offenders with BAC levels of .20 and above.

The following are highlights of the findings:

- ▶ The 1-year recidivism rates for all first offenders in 2003 continued to remain at the lower level of the past five years. Comparing these rates to the much higher rate of 1990, DUI reoffenses in 2003 were 38.2% lower than for 1990 for all first offenders (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).
- ▶ The 1-year reoffense rates for second offenders is slightly higher than last year, but overall the rates have leveled out in the past seven years; recidivism decreased from 1990 to 2003 by 33.0% for all second offenders (see Figure 7 and Table 13a).

- ▶ Overall, subsequent 1-year crash rates have declined from 1990 to 2003 by 20.0% for second offenders; although their rate was the lowest in 1996, crashes have gradually increased in recent years for all second offenders. The crash rate for first offenders steadily increased from 1993 to 2001, and has decreased since then. The 2003 rate is now 9.4% lower than the 1990 crash rate (see Figure 8 and Table 13a).
- ▶ Of those arrested in 2003 who were referred to alcohol education or treatment programs, 61.1% of first offenders and 25.1% of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 14).
- ▶ At the end of 10 years, 26% of DUI offenders originally convicted in 1994 had at least one subsequent DUI conviction, and 30% incurred at least one DUI incident (see Figure 9a).
- ▶ Over 10 years, recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third offenders reoffending was 36%, while 30% of second offenders and 24% of first offenders recidivated (see Figure 9b).
- ▶ Males showed a much higher cumulative proportion (27%) of reoffenses than did females (19%) over the 10-year time period (see Figure 9c).
- ▶ Long-term recidivism rates are inversely related to age, with higher reoffense rates associated with the youngest age group, and lowest rates with the oldest group (see Figure 9d).
- ▶ After 5 years, the proportion reoffending among the 1994 group was much lower (18%) compared to the proportion reoffending in 1984 (27%) and in 1980 (35%). (See Figure 9e).
- ▶ Similar to last year's evaluation, this year's results show that the subsequent 1-year crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders assigned to an alcohol education program were not significantly different than those of the nonparticipants. However, the subsequent DUI incident rates of the program participants were significantly lower than those of the nonparticipants (see Table 16a).
- ▶ Like the last three years' evaluations, the 1-year crash rates of first offenders attending the 3-month program did not vary significantly from those attending

6-month programs. However, the subsequent DUI incident rate of the short-term program participants was again significantly lower than that of the long-term participants (see Table 16b).

- ▶ Among first DUI offenders assigned to 6-month alcohol treatment programs, crash rates of DUI offenders with BAC levels .20 and above did not vary significantly from crash rates of those with BAC levels below .20. However, DUI offenders with BAC levels .20 and above had more DUI incidents than those with BAC levels below .20 (see Table 16c).
  
- ▶ The length of time of alcohol treatment program (3-month vs. 6-month) had no effect on crash rates and DUI incidents for first DUI offenders with BAC levels .20 and above (see Table 16d).

*Subject Selection and Data Collection.* Convicted DUI and alcohol-related reckless offenders were identified from monthly abstract update tapes which contain all DUI conviction data reported to DMV by the courts. Except for the 1994 cases, subjects were selected based on the number of prior DUI and alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within the seven years prior to their entry DUI arrest in 2003. For this year's report, subjects selected were: 1) first-DUI offenders—drivers who had no DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving convictions within the previous seven years, 2) second-DUI offenders—drivers who had one DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving conviction within the previous seven years, 3) alcohol-related reckless offenders with no previous DUI offenses in the past seven years, and 4) first-DUI offenders referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs. In addition, all DUI offenders arrested in 1994 were selected for the 10-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders over time, and the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for persons convicted of alcohol-reckless as a DUI offense and first offenders, are evaluated in terms of postconviction driving record as measured by: 1) total crashes and 2) DUI incidents, which include alcohol-involved crashes, DUI convictions, Administrative Per Se suspensions (APS for 0.08% BAC or chemical test refusal), and DUI failure-to-appear notices (FTA). For the 1994 DUI offenders, recidivism is measured by subsequent DUI convictions, along with one comparison of DUI incidents.

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


Although the sanction analyses were not conducted for first and second-DUI offenders as in previous years, the 1-year unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all of the previous and current evaluations were included. In order to maintain comparability to the previous subject selection criteria, certain types of offenders had to be excluded. These previous and current analyses excluded offenders with felony convictions and chemical test refusal suspensions because their license control penalties were different from the misdemeanor offender groups. Drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent time period (because of late conviction dates) were also excluded, as well as drivers with "X" license numbers (meaning that no California license number could be found) and drivers with out-of-state ZIP Codes. Altogether, the excluded cases represented about 20.0% of the original convicted offender file. The only exclusions made for the 1994 offenders were the out-of-state cases and drivers with "X" license numbers.

## DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES

### One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders from 1990-2003

The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident reoffense rates for both first- and second-offender sanction groups were compiled from the 14 previous and current annual DUI-MIS evaluations and configured onto two separate graphs to display these rates over time.

Figure 7 shows the proportions of first- and second-offender sanction groups, respectively, arrested between 1990 and 2003 who reoffended within one year after conviction.



*Figure 7.* Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders reoffending in a DUI incident within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2003).

This figure and Table 13a show an ongoing gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first-offenders overall from 1990 to 2003; although there are slight upward trends in 1995 and 1998, these trends are followed by a leveling out of the rates over the past 5 years. The overall decline translates into a 38.2% reduction in recidivism for all first offenders compared to the rates of 1990. The decline in DUI reoffenses is steeper in the early years (1990-1994), following the enactment of APS suspensions for all DUI arrestees. As is evident in Figure 7, the reoffense rates of first offenders continue to be lower than those of the second offenders; this has been consistently evident throughout all previous analyses conducted on first and second offenders.

TABLE 13a: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF  
SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED  
FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2003


YEAR	DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED		CRASH-INVOLVED	
	FIRST-DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND-DUI OFFENDERS	FIRST-DUI OFFENDERS	SECOND-DUI OFFENDERS
1990	7.6	9.7	5.3	4.0
1991	7.1	9.5	4.7	3.6
1992	6.2	9.1	4.1	3.5
1993	5.8	8.8	4.1	3.5
1994	5.4	7.0	4.5	3.1
1995	5.8	7.0	4.6	3.0
1996	5.1	6.1	4.5	2.4
1997	5.2	6.0	4.7	2.7
1998	5.3	6.0	4.8	2.6
1999	5.0	6.1	5.0	2.8
2000	4.9	6.1	5.1	3.1
2001	4.9	5.9	5.2	3.0
2002	4.8	6.1	5.1	3.3
2003	4.7	6.5	4.8	3.2
% DIFFERENCE 1990-2003	-38.2%	-33.0%	-9.4%	-20.0%

As noted last year, a similar overall decline is evident in the 1-year reoffense rates for the second offender group as displayed in Figure 7 and Table 13a, but the rate of decline is greatest during the years from 1993 to 1996; then the rates level out for several years, followed by a slight decline in 2001 and then show a modest increase from 2001 to 2003. Table 13a shows that, from 1990 to 2003, the reoffense rates decreased 33.0% for the second offender group as a whole. The overall reoffense rates of second offenders remain relatively higher than those of first offenders. Previous DUI-MIS reports suggested that, while many factors may be associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents for both first and second offenders, the reduction may largely be attributable to the implementation of APS suspensions in 1990. An evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS Law, in fact, documents recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders which are attributable to the law.

The 1-year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders were also compiled from previous and current DUI-MIS evaluations and graphically displayed



over time. Figure 8 shows the proportions of 1990-2003 first and second offenders who had crashes within one year after their conviction.



*Figure 8.* Percentages of first- and second-DUI offenders involved in a crash within one year after conviction (arrested in 1990-2003).

Among first offenders from 1990 through 2003, Figure 8 and Table 13a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by a gradual increase after 1993, and slight decline after 2002. The relative difference between first offender crash rates between 1990 and 2003 is - 9.4%, whereas the relative difference for second offenders for those same years shows a much greater decline in crashes of -20.0%.

Figure 8 indicates a declining trend in the overall crash rate of second offenders up to 1996. Following the downward trend in crashes from 1990 through 1996, the crash rates gradually increase and continue on a slow upward trend, dropping slightly in 2001, increasing again in 2002, and decreasing slightly in 2003. Overall, second offenders have lower crash rates than do first offenders (Table 13a), and this fact has been well documented in past evaluations; it has been speculated that the lower crash rate of second offenders may be related to the longer-term (one to two years) license (restriction/suspension) actions imposed on second offenders.

---

### One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for 2003 First and Second DUI Offenders

New to this year's report are the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism and crash rates, by county, for both first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2003.

Table 13b displays 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism rates described above. As shown in this table, among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent DUI incident within one year varied from 7.3 in San Joaquin County to 3.7 in Orange County. Among the smaller counties, Alpine, Calaveras and Del Norte had a DUI recidivism rate above 11.0, while Siskiyou and Lassen had a DUI recidivism rate below 2.0. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, San Joaquin County again had the highest rate, with 10.3% of second offenders having a subsequent DUI incident within one year whereas Orange County's second offenders had the lowest rate of 4.0 for subsequent DUI incidents. Among the smaller counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from 16.0 (Colusa) to 0.0 (Modoc and Plumas).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2003 are displayed in Table 13c. Among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent crash within one year varied from 5.6 in Sacramento County to 3.8 in Santa Clara County. Among the smaller counties, Alpine, Colusa and Del Norte had crash rates above 7.0, while Modoc and Sierra had a 0.0 crash rate. Second offenders have generally lower crash rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, the rate at which second offenders have a subsequent crash within one year varied from 5.5 (Contra Costa) to 1.8 (San Mateo). Among the smaller counties, two counties had a crash rate above 8.0 (Amador and Nevada), and nine counties had 0.0 crash rate (Alpine, Del Norte, Glenn, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Sierra, and Siskiyou).

TABLE 13b. 2003 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

COUNTY	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER		2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDER	
	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	3648	4.7	1244	6.5
ALAMEDA	110	4.9	31	6.1
ALPINE	3	13.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	6	6.1	5	13.9
BUTTE	32	4.8	11	7.1
CALAVERAS	14	11.1	3	6.3
COLUSA	7	7.5	4	16.0
CONTRA COSTA	92	5.2	44	9.0
DEL NORTE	8	11.0	1	5.0
EL DORADO	26	4.3	8	4.5
FRESNO	104	5.7	42	8.0
GLENN	4	3.8	1	2.4
HUMBOLDT	32	7.0	7	6.0
IMPERIAL	12	4.9	3	5.6
INYO	4	3.4	4	9.8
KERN	128	5.4	40	6.3
KINGS	25	6.2	9	9.8
LAKE	8	3.3	2	3.6
LASSEN	2	1.8	3	7.3
LOS ANGELES	598	3.8	180	5.2
MADERA	23	7.8	10	12.3
MARIN	40	4.7	9	5.8
MARIPOSA	6	9.2	1	5.0
MENDOCINO	26	6.9	10	7.4
MERCED	40	7.9	9	5.2
MODOC	1	3.8	0	0.0
MONO	4	4.9	1	7.7
MONTEREY	51	4.4	26	7.4
NAPA	21	4.1	8	6.1
NEVADA	10	3.1	5	6.2
ORANGE	267	3.7	67	4.0
PLACER	46	5.3	19	7.8
PLUMAS	7	6.9	0	0.0
RIVERSIDE	223	5.2	69	7.1
SACRAMENTO	174	5.0	67	7.4
SAN BENITO	7	4.7	2	4.0
SAN BERNARDINO	253	5.2	87	7.7
SAN DIEGO	306	4.2	86	5.1
SAN FRANCISCO	21	3.9	10	9.8
SAN JOAQUIN	133	7.3	57	10.3
SAN LUIS OBISPO	56	6.0	25	8.2
SAN MATEO	63	3.8	20	5.9
SANTA BARBARA	57	4.5	20	6.7
SANTA CLARA	147	4.6	52	6.2
SANTA CRUZ	45	5.5	19	8.1
SHASTA	27	4.4	9	4.5
SIERRA	1	5.9	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	2	1.5	3	6.7
SOLANO	47	6.0	19	8.8
SONOMA	55	5.1	30	9.7
STANISLAUS	50	5.4	15	6.7
SUTTER	14	7.2	8	11.3
TEHAMA	9	4.1	6	7.3
TRINITY	2	4.0	1	5.9
TULARE	75	5.8	26	6.8
TUOLUMNE	25	9.8	10	13.7
VENTURA	72	3.9	30	7.1
YOLO	20	4.5	7	6.5
YUBA	7	3.3	3	4.1

TABLE 13c. 2003 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR  
FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS

COUNTY	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER		2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDER	
	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	3736	4.8	609	3.2
ALAMEDA	123	5.5	19	3.7
ALPINE	2	8.7	0	0.0
AMADOR	4	4.0	3	8.3
BUTTE	18	2.7	4	2.6
CALAVERAS	4	3.2	1	2.1
COLUSA	7	7.5	1	4.0
CONTRA COSTA	73	4.1	27	5.5
DEL NORTE	7	9.6	0	0.0
EL DORADO	29	4.8	2	1.1
FRESNO	77	4.2	12	2.3
GLENN	1	1.0	0	0.0
HUMBOLDT	17	3.7	2	1.7
IMPERIAL	8	3.3	1	1.9
INYO	2	1.7	1	2.4
KERN	93	3.9	17	2.7
KINGS	11	2.7	6	6.5
LAKE	8	3.3	2	3.6
LASSEN	2	1.8	0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	841	5.4	102	2.9
MADERA	19	6.4	6	7.4
MARIN	44	5.1	4	2.6
MARIPOSA	6	9.2	0	0.0
MENDOCINO	17	4.5	4	2.9
MERCED	24	4.8	3	1.7
MODOC	0	0.0	0	0.0
MONO	2	2.5	0	0.0
MONTEREY	49	4.3	10	2.8
NAPA	25	4.9	2	1.5
NEVADA	9	2.8	7	8.6
ORANGE	383	5.3	38	2.3
PLACER	53	6.1	8	3.3
PLUMAS	2	2.0	2	5.7
RIVERSIDE	220	5.1	36	3.7
SACRAMENTO	195	5.6	43	4.7
SAN BENITO	9	6.1	2	4.0
SAN BERNARDINO	246	5.0	35	3.1
SAN DIEGO	290	4.0	44	2.6
SAN FRANCISCO	27	5.1	4	3.9
SAN JOAQUIN	92	5.0	20	3.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	44	4.7	12	3.9
SAN MATEO	78	4.7	6	1.8
SANTA BARBARA	52	4.1	10	3.4
SANTA CLARA	122	3.8	25	3.0
SANTA CRUZ	29	3.6	9	3.8
SHASTA	24	3.9	4	2.0
SIERRA	0	0.0	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	1	0.8	0	0.0
SOLANO	47	6.0	9	4.1
SONOMA	55	5.1	11	3.6
STANISLAUS	50	5.4	10	4.4
SUTTER	8	4.1	2	2.8
TEHAMA	11	5.0	3	3.7
TRINITY	1	2.0	1	5.9
TULARE	58	4.5	14	3.6
TUOLUMNE	10	3.9	3	4.1
VENTURA	88	4.8	12	2.8
YOLO	13	2.9	6	5.6
YUBA	6	2.8	4	5.4

### The Proportions of Alcohol Education Program Completions for 2003 First and Second DUI Offenders

Like last year, an effort was made to capture the number and proportions of convicted first and second offenders (arrested in 2003) whose records indicated that they had completed the alcohol education or treatment programs. This effort was made possible by the recent addition of a subrecord to each person's driving record that contains data on program enrollment and completion dates, court information relevant to the DUI conviction, and program length of time. Previous efforts were limited by the lack of organized fields of data even though part of this information was available.

The proportions of referrals to the various DUI sanctions by the number of prior DUIs appear in Table 14. It can be seen from this table that 87.2% of first offenders and 84.3% of second offenders were referred to an alcohol treatment program. Table 14 shows the counts and proportions of convicted first and second offenders, arrested in 2003, who completed the requirements for attending an alcohol education or treatment program; 57,351 first offenders and 5,541 second offenders completed their alcohol program assignment. This translates into 61.1% of referred first offenders and 25.1% of referred second offenders completing the program requirement. The underreporting of program completions for second offenders is probably related to the insufficient follow-up time thus far allowed for the 18-month completions. Among the offenders who completed the program, 97.0% of first offenders had attended alcohol programs that range from 3 to 6 months, while 94% of second offenders attended the 18-month alcohol program. Note that to obtain a license restriction, there must be evidence that DUI offenders have enrolled in an alcohol program, and that in order to remove the restriction from their driver license, they must have completed the program.

TABLE 14: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED ALCOHOL PROGRAM COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2003

DUI OFFENDERS	TOTAL <i>N</i>	PROGRAM REFERRALS		PROGRAM COMPLETION	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
1 <sup>ST</sup> offenders (3 months to 6 months)	107,608	93,834	87.2%	57,351	61.1%
2nd offenders (18 months)	26,224	22,107	84.3%	5,541	25.1%

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


Since all DUI offenders were included in the 1994 group, it was possible to observe and compare the long-term recidivism rates for subdivided groups within the 1994 cohort, and to see how these groups differ in their long-term recidivism rates. This approach was also taken in a previous study conducted by Peck (1991), in which the reoffense failure curves of various groups among 1980 and 1984 DUI offenders were evaluated. Failure curves are cumulative percentages over time that display the first reoffense that occurs after the initial DUI conviction. Both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 10-year follow-up period for the 1994 group were included as outcome data in order to maintain comparability with the 1984 and 1980 cohorts from a previous evaluation (Peck, 1991).

Table 15 shows cumulative percentages of the first DUI reoffenses for the 1994 offenders, as well as 9- and 10-year cumulative percentages for the 1980 and 1994 groups and 5-year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group (dates were not available beyond 5 years).

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

YEAR	PERCENTAGE											
	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	MALES	FEMALES	16-25	26-45	46-65	65+	1980	1984	1994
1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	6	6	5	3	5	5	4	3	11	7	5
2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	10	12	10	6	10	9	8	6	19	15	9
3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	14	17	13	9	14	13	11	8	25	20	13
4 <sup>TH</sup>	14	18	21	16	11	18	16	13	9	30	24	16
5 <sup>TH</sup>	17	21	25	19	13	20	18	15	10	35	27	18
6 <sup>TH</sup>	19	23	28	22	14	23	21	17	10	38	NA	21
7 <sup>TH</sup>	20	25	31	23	16	25	23	18	11	40	NA	22
8 <sup>TH</sup>	22	27	33	25	17	26	24	19	11	42	NA	24
9 <sup>TH</sup>	23	28	35	26	18	28	25	20	12	44	NA	25
10 <sup>th</sup>	24	30	36	27	19	29	27	21	12	NA	NA	26


In addition to Table 15, figures 9a through 9e, display recidivism rates for 1994 offenders over 10 years.



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

In looking at the 1994 offenders as a whole, it is evident from Figure 9a that at the end of 10 years, 26% accumulated at least one DUI reoffense. Considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses to include all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increased to 30%. These failure curves are steepest in the earliest years following the initial conviction, and then start to flatten out in the 7<sup>th</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> years. For both measures, the steepest climb occurs in the first year following conviction. It is probable that those with more serious alcohol problems would be likely to recidivate earlier than those with lesser drinking problems.

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




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

It is evident from this graph and from Table 15 that the recidivism failure curves increase as the number of prior offenses becomes greater. Third-or-more offenders have the highest overall failure curve, and continue to maintain the higher proportions over the ten year period of time. At the end of 10 years, 36% of third offenders have reoffended compared to 30% of second offenders and 24% of first offenders.

Since the majority of DUI offenders has always been male (87% in 1994), it is relevant to inspect the recidivism rates of the 1994 offenders by gender. As evident in Figure 9c and Table 15, males show much higher cumulative proportions reoffending than females. At the end of 10 years, 27% of males have reoffended as compared to 19% of females. The failure curve of females is noticeably flatter throughout the 10 years as compared to the curve of males. In the final 3 years, the proportion of both males and females recidivating is only one percent per year.





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

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed also by age. Figure 9d displays the failure curves of four age groups. It is evident that reoffense rates are inversely related to age; the failure rates are highest for the youngest group and lowest for the oldest group. Over ten years, the failure curves of the two youngest groups are quite close to each other and are much steeper than the curve of the oldest group; their failure curves are steepest during the first two years following the entry conviction. The failure curve of the 65+ group flattens out at the 5<sup>th</sup> year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality factor of the oldest group could influence the lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be imposing self-restricted driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 10 years, the youngest two groups reoffended by 29% and 27%, respectively, while 21% of the middle age group and 12% of the oldest group recidivated.




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

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




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

Cumulative percentages for the 1980, 1984 and 1994 groups, presented in Figure 9e and Table 15, allow long-term historical comparison with consideration of probable influence of the major DUI laws in California over a 15-year time period.

Figure 9e reveals that at the end of five years, 35% of the 1980 offenders reoffended compared to 27% of the 1984 group and 18% of the 1994 offenders. Quite dramatically, the proportion recidivating in the 1994 group (18%) dropped by half compared to those in the 1980 group (35%). Major pieces of DUI legislation were enacted in California over this time span of 15 years. The noticeably lower reoffense proportions of the 1984 group (27%) compared to the 1980 group (35%) can likely be attributed to the 1982 laws, AB 541 (Moorhead), which applied tougher sanctions on DUI offenders, and AB 7 (Hart) which established the 0.10% per se BAC illegal limit. The effectiveness of these laws was confirmed by a previous California study by Tashima and Peck (1986). Lastly, comparing the 1980 cohort with the 1994 group over nine years in Table 15 shows that 44% of the 1980 group recidivated while 25% of the 1994 group reoffended. The difference between the recidivism rates of these two groups remains quite dramatic at the end of nine years. There was only a one percent increase in recidivism for the 1994 group in the last year of the 10 years.

Continuing with Figure 9e, it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions between the 1984 group (27%) and the 1994 group (18%) is somewhat dramatic; this reduction in reoffenses is possibly attributable to the enactment of the 1990 laws, SB 1623 (Lockyer), which established APS suspensions for all offenders at the time of arrest, and SB 1150 (Lockyer), which set the illegal BAC limit to 0.08% and imposed other stringent sanctions on DUI offenders. As noted earlier, an evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS law documented recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders, both attributable to the APS law.

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

---

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

*Subject Selection and Follow-up Data:* The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of alcohol education programs for these two groups was established by legislation. The evaluation for the offenders with alcohol-related reckless convictions was mandated by SB 1176 (Johnson); for these offenders, this legislation requires the courts to order enrollment in an alcohol/drug education program as a condition of probation. An evaluation of the efficacy of the 3-month versus 6-month alcohol education/counseling program for first offenders was mandated by AB 1916 (Torlakson). In 2004, the courts were required to refer first offenders whose BAC level is less than .20% to a 3-month program, and those with a BAC level of .20% or above, or who refuse to take a chemical test, to a 6-month program.

Two groups of alcohol-related reckless convictees were identified, including: 1) those who were assigned to an alcohol education program, and 2) those who were not assigned to a program. These sanctions are reported by the courts to DMV via disposition codes on the conviction abstracts. Although courts are mandated to require all alcohol-related reckless drivers to attend an alcohol education program as a condition of probation, it was found that 39% of such offenders were not assigned. This discrepancy allowed a comparison of subsequent crashes and DUI incidents between the two groups.

In evaluating the traffic safety impact of length of time of first offender programs, only first offenders who showed the 3-month and 6-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for this analysis. Unfortunately, the records of 66% of first offenders who were referred to the alcohol education programs did not display the specific length of time. These individuals were not included in this evaluation, and this analysis is limited to first offenders who were adjudicated by courts that were in compliance with the law. Of the total sample selected, 74% were referred to 3-month programs, while 26% were assigned to 6-month programs. Subjects for the initial analyses consisted of first offenders assigned to a 3-month alcohol program versus first offenders assigned to a 6-month program. To further explore the possible effects of BAC levels, two additional subanalyses included 1) first offenders assigned to

a 6-month alcohol program with BAC levels below .20 versus those with BAC levels of .20 and above, and 2) first offenders with BAC levels .20 and above assigned to a 3-month alcohol program versus first offenders with BAC levels .20 and above assigned to a 6-month alcohol program.

The conviction date for the prior/post analyses was considered to be the "treatment date" for defining prior and subsequent driving record data, because the penalties and sanctions for the offense are typically effective as of that date. The evaluation period for the postconviction driving measures starts from the conviction date, and was 1) 1-year following conviction for alcohol-related reckless offenders who were arrested from July, 2003 through June, 2004. 2) 1-year following conviction for first DUI convictees who were arrested in 2003, and who were referred to 3-month and 6-month alcohol education programs.

A buffer period of 4 months was allowed between the end of the evaluation period and the data extraction date to allow for processing and reporting of the most recent data to DMV. DUI offenders who had less than the full one-year follow-up time period (from conviction date to the buffer period) were excluded. For all of these groups, the outcome driver record measures consisted of the proportion of offenders who were involved in: 1) any crash, and 2) DUI incidents (alcohol-involved crashes, major convictions, APS/refusal suspensions, or DUI failures-to-appear). Only the first crash or DUI incident or "failure" was evaluated. This is not an important limitation with these data because the incidence of repeat failures (two or more crashes or DUI incidents) was very low over the study time window. More importantly, analysis of repeat failures would be subject to confounding by court sanctions received in connection with the first failure incident. This type of confounding is avoided because multiple incidents were not included in this analysis.

*Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures:* Since it was not possible to randomly assign drivers to the various sanction groups, potential biases due to preexisting group differences were statistically controlled to the extent possible by using biographical data, prior driving record data, and ZIP Code indices, such as crash and traffic conviction averages for each driver's ZIP Code area (Table B5). While this "quasi-experimental" design is subject to a number of limitations in assessing cause-effect relationships, the attempt at statistical control of group differences removes at least part

of the bias in group assignment and provides a more precise estimate of the relationship between type of sanction and subsequent record. It is possible, of course, that the groups also differ on characteristics not measured by, or reflected in, the covariates. The possibility of uncontrolled biases becomes particularly problematic if sanctions are commonly received by offenders through self- or judicial-selectivity (e.g., drivers of higher socio-economic status may be more likely to receive program with restriction and less likely to receive jail than those of lower status).


For the alcohol-related reckless drivers and first offenders attending 3-month and 6-month programs, prior driver record data were extracted for the 2 years preceding their DUI or alcohol-reckless conviction date. The prior driver record variables for these offenders are shown in Appendix Table B5, and these driver record variables were used as covariates in the analyses.

Following the extraction of covariates, simple correlations were computed between demographic and prior driving variables and the outcome measures, number of days to first subsequent crash and number of days to first subsequent DUI incident. The demographic and 2-year prior driving variables that had statistically significant correlations with the outcome measures were identified and selected as potential variables. For each analysis logistic regression was used to test for potential interactions between the covariates and alcohol education program. In the analyses where there were significant interactions, the interaction term was included in the final logistic regression analyses.

There was one significant ( $p = .047$ ) interaction between the ZIP Code covariate injury averages and the alcohol program intervention in the analyses involving the alcohol-related reckless drivers, and between the ZIP Code covariate total crash averages and alcohol programs ( $p = .046$ ) in the subanalysis of those attending the 6-month program. Such an interaction indicates that there is a differential effect of the program intervention upon those with differing ZIP Code averages. Since these ZIP Code averages do not contain data elements specific to the individual but rather to a larger geographic area (ZIP Code) these interactions were not considered to be strongly conclusive and further investigation of these interactions was not explored.

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

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



*Figure 10a.* Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for 2003-2004 (fiscal year) alcohol reckless drivers by type of sanction.

***Total Crashes:*** Like last year's findings, the results show that assignment to the alcohol education program does not have a significant effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of alcohol-related reckless offenders. Comparing these rates to those of the 2003 first DUI offenders, it is evident that alcohol-related reckless drivers who are assigned and those not assigned to an alcohol program are more involved in crashes (5.44 and 5.82 per 100 drivers, respectively; see Table 16a) than are first DUI offenders (4.8 per 100 drivers; see Table 13a). It has been suggested in the past that the lack of postconviction license suspension/restriction prescribed by the court for the alcohol-related reckless drivers might explain the higher crash rates. Past studies have documented the effectiveness of license suspension on crash reduction. However, it is possible that alcohol-related reckless drivers who were arrested with a BAC level of .08 and above incurred an APS license suspension/restriction prior to their conviction.

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

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
7/2003 - 6/2004	1) No program	(3,472)	5.44		3.88	
(follow-up period = 1 year)	2) Alcohol-education program	(5,424)	5.82	-6.5%	2.86	35.7%*


\* $p < .01$

*DUI Incidents:* Figure 10a and Table 16a indicate that program participants again show fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the alcohol-education programs than the nonparticipants, and this difference is statistically significant. The reoffense rate of the program participants is 35.7% lower than that of alcohol-reckless offenders not assigned to the programs, and is very similar to the findings of last year's analyses. These results have to be viewed with some caution because random assignment to program attendance was not possible; there still remains the possibility of uncontrolled biases through self- or judicial-selectivity, even though statistical control of group differences removed part of the biases based on available covariates.

#### Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders

*Total Crashes:* Figure 10b and Table 16b display the results of the fourth evaluation of the effectiveness of the alcohol education program on first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month versus 6-month programs. As was evident in the past three years, the results show that the length of time of the alcohol education program does not have a significant effect on the 1-year subsequent crash rates of first-time DUI offenders. The 6-month program participants have only a 2.4% lower crash rate than that of the 3-month participants. As noted earlier, the short-term APS license suspension/restriction for all first offenders might explain their lower crash rates, compared to the rates of the alcohol reckless drivers. Past studies have supported the effectiveness of license suspension on crash reduction.





*Figure 10b.* Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in year 2003) by length of alcohol education program.

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

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2003  (follow-up period = 1 year)	1) 3-month program	(23,213)	4.22	2.4%	4.43	-28.1%*
	2) 6-month program	(8,098)	4.12		6.16	

\*  $p = .0001$

*DUI Incidents:* In contrast to the crash findings but similar to last year's results, Figure 10b and Table 16b indicate that, among first DUI offenders the 3-month program participants have significantly ( $p = .0001$ ) fewer DUI incidents in the one year following their assignment to the alcohol-education programs than do the 6-month program participants. This finding is consistent with the last 3 years' evaluations of subsequent DUI incidents. The reoffense rate of the 3-month program participants is 28.1% lower than that of the 6-month participants. Again, this finding is not surprising given that

those assigned to the longer-term program have higher BAC levels (.20% and above), and would be more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels.

In order to determine whether BAC level was a major factor in the outcome of the previous analysis, two further subanalyses were conducted to investigate this possibility. Among first offenders assigned to the 6-month program, 34% actually had BAC levels below .20 and 66% had BAC levels .20 and above. This difference in BAC levels allowed for conducting additional analyses comparing the outcome measures between those with BAC levels below .20 and those with BAC levels .20 and above. A second subanalysis was conducted comparing 3-month versus 6-month alcohol treatment program effects for those with BAC levels of .20 and above. There were a sufficient number of drivers who had BAC levels of .20 and above who were assigned to the 3-month program to allow for this second comparison. The results of these additional subanalyses are described below.

#### Results of the 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels Below .20 Versus .20 and Above

*Total Crashes and DUI Incidents:* Table 16c shows the results of the effects of the 6-month alcohol treatment program on crashes and DUI incidents for two groups: 1) those with BAC levels below .20 and, 2) those with BAC levels of .20 and above. As evident in Table 16c, differences in crash rates between the two groups were not significant. Therefore, regardless of differences in BAC levels, the 6-month program did not have an impact on the two groups relative to subsequent 1-year crashes.

TABLE 16c: FIRST OFFENDER 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM  
EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS  
WITH BAC LEVELS BELOW .20 VERSUS .20 AND ABOVE

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2003  (follow-up period = 1 year)	1) BAC below .20	(2,550)	3.57		5.08	
	2) BAC .20 and above	(4,937)	4.17	-14.4%	6.45	-21.2%*

\*  $p = .02$

However, significant differences were apparent between these two groups on DUI incidents, substantiating the fact that those with BAC levels of .20 and above had more DUI incidents in the one-year following their conviction than drivers with BAC levels below .20. These drivers with lower BAC levels had 21.2% fewer DUI incidents than did those with BAC levels of .20 and above. The results of this analysis confirm the earlier suggestion that those with higher BAC levels are more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels, regardless of the length of time of alcohol treatment program. Thus, it may not be that the 6-month programs are less effective than the 3-month programs, but rather that the 6-month programs have a higher proportion of offenders with high arrest BACs, who are more likely to recidivate

Results of the 3-Month and 6-Month Alcohol Education Program Evaluation for First DUI Offenders with BAC Levels of .20 and Above

*Total Crashes and DUI Incidents:* As shown in Table 16d, the length of time of alcohol treatment program for first DUI offenders had no effect on those with BAC levels of .20 and above on both outcome measures, 1-year subsequent crashes and DUI incidents. Although the crash and DUI incident rates for those attending the 3-month program are slightly lower than for those attending the 6-month program, these differences were not significant. Thus, with BAC level held constant, the findings of this analysis indicate that the extended 6-month alcohol treatment program has no beneficial effect on first offenders with high BAC levels on both subsequent 1-year crashes and DUI incidents. While the results of the previous analysis left unclear the relationship between recidivism and length of program or BAC level, the findings from this analysis more clearly indicate that extending the program length for first offenders with high BAC levels does not reduce subsequent 1-year crashes or DUI incidents.

TABLE 16d: FIRST OFFENDER 3-MONTH AND 6-MONTH ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM EFFECTS ON TOTAL CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS FOR DRIVERS WITH BAC LEVELS .20 AND ABOVE

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP (BAC LEVELS .20 AND ABOVE)	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER OF CRASH- INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$	NUMBER OF DUI INCIDENT- INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN FAILURE RATES) $\frac{\text{GRP 1} - \text{GRP 2}}{\text{GRP 2}} \times 100$
2003	1) 3-month program	(1,343)	3.88		6.17	
(follow-up period = 1 year)	2) 6-month program	(4,937)	4.16	-6.7%	6.33	-2.5%

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

## SECTION 5: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

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

Table 17: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1994-2004. This table shows preconviction (APS) and postconviction license disqualification totals from 1994 through 2004. The postconviction totals include juvenile suspensions, first-offender suspensions, second-offender suspensions and revocations, and third- and fourth-offender revocations.


Table 18: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measure data for fiscal years 2002/2003 through 2004/2005.

Figure 11: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 1994-2004. This figure graphically portrays mandatory DUI license disqualification totals from 1994 through 2004, both preconviction and postconviction.

The following statements are based on the data shown in the previously listed tables and Figure 11.

- ▶ During 1991, the first full calendar year of APS license suspension, the total number of DMV DUI preconviction and postconviction S/R actions increased by 60% over that for 1990. These totals declined each subsequent year through 1995, and have fluctuated up and down since 1995. After a 3.9% decrease in 2001, S/R actions increased by 2.3% in 2002, increased again by 2.0% in 2003, and decreased by 0.7% in 2004 (see Table 17).
- ▶ In 2003, 171,828 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 79% were first-offender actions and 21% were repeat-offender actions (see Table 17).

- ▶ In FY 2004/2005, APS actions decreased by 3.9% from FY 2003/2004, following an 8.8% increase in the previous fiscal year (see Table 18).
- ▶ The number of chemical test refusal actions remained relatively unchanged in 2004, after having increased by 7.1% in 2003. The total number of refusal actions has fallen 30% in the past decade (see Table 17).
- ▶ The number of mandatory postconviction license actions fell by 2.9% in 2004, following a 1.9% decrease in 2003 (see Table 17).
- ▶ In the 14 years since APS was implemented in July 1990, almost three million (2,909,847) APS S/R actions had been taken (see Table 17).
- ▶ Requests for APS hearings have increased from 7.1% of all APS actions in FY 1990/1991 to 28.2% in 2004/2005. The rate at which APS S/R actions are upheld after hearing has increased during the past several fiscal years, from 85.4% upheld in 2002/2003, to 86.4% upheld in 2003/2004, to 86.7% upheld in 2004/2005 (see Table 18).
- ▶ During the first 11.5 years after implementation (on January 1, 1994) of the "zero tolerance" law for minors, 178,109 suspension actions have been taken (see Table 17).



*Figure 11.* Mandatory DUI license disqualification actions, 1994-2004.

TABLE 17: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 1994-2004

	YEAR										
	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<b>TOTAL MANDATORY SUSPENSION/ REVOCACTION (S/R) ACTIONS</b>	243645	226158 <sup>r</sup>	230600 <sup>r</sup>	205462 <sup>2</sup>	238612 <sup>2</sup>	236141	240597	231217	236603	241242	239580
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	9971	8608 <sup>r</sup>	9327 <sup>r</sup>	11517	15640	17775	18185	18549	19129	19949	19967
.08 First-offender suspensions	120582	116636 <sup>r</sup>	122111 <sup>r</sup>	114247	116827	119621	114997	109695	109888	114975	116022
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	47429	43218 <sup>r</sup>	43922 <sup>r</sup>	39636	39024	38487	36147	33517	33580	33413	32903
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936
Commercial driver actions	5038	4743 <sup>r</sup>	4939 <sup>r</sup>	4496	4609	4471	4139	4013	3936	3853	3801
Chemical test refusal actions	13264	11711 <sup>r</sup>	11436 <sup>r</sup>	10110	9935	9435	9433	8841	8772	9399	9353
.01 Test refusal suspensions	179	170	154	134	229	268	270	280	290	341	326
.08 Test refusal suspensions	7022	6307 <sup>r</sup>	6299 <sup>r</sup>	5865	5832	5718	5886	5482	5547	5925	6091
.08 Test refusal revocations	6063	5234 <sup>r</sup>	4983 <sup>r</sup>	4111	3874	3449	3277	3079	2908	3133	2936
<b>TOTAL APS/REFUSAL ACTIONS</b>	184045	173696 <sup>r</sup>	180343 <sup>r</sup>	169511	175365	179332	172606	164840	165505	171470	171828
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>1</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	879	677	995	769 <sup>2</sup>	1026 <sup>2</sup>	918	741	714	896	794	838
First-offender suspensions	8696	7266	7229	4847 <sup>2</sup>	9588 <sup>2</sup>	15072	29924	31097	32716	32521	31012
Misdemeanor	7188	5806	5753	3834 <sup>2</sup>	7497 <sup>2</sup>	13401	28118	29188	30563	30298	28799
Felony	1508	1460	1476	1013 <sup>2</sup>	2091 <sup>2</sup>	1671	1806	1909	2153	2223	2213
Second-offender S/R actions	34300	31489	30404	22945 <sup>2</sup>	40238 <sup>2</sup>	31940	29097	26911	29345	28737	28400
Misdemeanor	33794	30955	29864	22532 <sup>2</sup>	39065 <sup>2</sup>	31455	28571	26334	28748	28160	27847
Felony	506	534	540	413 <sup>2</sup>	633 <sup>2</sup>	485	526	577	597	577	553
Third-offender revocations	11193	9471	8728	5569 <sup>2</sup>	9397 <sup>2</sup>	6573	6163	5727	6171	5953	5581
Misdemeanor	10974	9261	8550	5471 <sup>2</sup>	9167 <sup>2</sup>	6452	6015	5585	5996	5758	5429
Felony	219	210	178	98 <sup>2</sup>	230 <sup>2</sup>	121	148	142	175	195	152
Fourth-offender revocations	4532	3559	2901	1821 <sup>2</sup>	2998 <sup>2</sup>	2306	2066	1928	1970	1767	1921
<b>TOTAL POSTCONVICTION ACTIONS</b>	59600	52462	50257 <sup>r</sup>	35951 <sup>2</sup>	63247 <sup>2</sup>	56809	67991	66377	71098	69772	67752

<sup>1</sup>These totals include suspension actions that are associated with lack of compliance with statutory requirements and include workload counts.<sup>2</sup>The 1997/1998 counts reflect backlogged actions from 1997 that were processed in 1998.<sup>r</sup>Revised from prior reports.

TABLE 18. ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

	7/02-6/03	7/03-6/04	7/04-6/05
Total APS actions taken (including actions later set aside)	176,389	191,842	184,324
Total .08 <sup>1</sup> APS actions set aside	15,538	16,540	16,761
Total .01 <sup>2</sup> suspensions set aside	1,319	1,392	1,349
Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside)	159,532	173,910	166,214
Net total .08 APS actions	141,217	153,490	147,196
Net total .01 suspensions	18,315	20,420	19,018
<b>Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification:<sup>3</sup></b>			
Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers	155,684	170,166	162,473
Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken	3,848	3,744	3,741
Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles	19	15	15
Net APS .08 actions for drivers with no prior DUI convictions or APS actions <sup>4</sup>	106,305	116,948	109,174
4-month license suspensions	76,277	85,392	83,908
30-day suspensions plus 3-month restrictions	1,442	1,465	896
30-day suspensions plus 5-month COE <sup>5</sup> restrictions	20,046	20,961	15,705
First-offender chemical test refusals	5,380	6,039	5,761
CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions	3,160	3,091	2,904
Net APS .08 actions taken for drivers with prior DUI convictions	34,912	36,542	38,022
Suspensions	31,996	33,502	34,769
Revocations	2,916	3,040	3,253
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures:</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions taken (including actions later set aside)	9,234	10,100	10,015
Total .08 refusal actions set aside	627	661	614
Total .01 refusal actions set aside	26	28	24
Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside)	8,581	9,411	9,377
Net total .08 refusal actions	8,296	9,079	9,018
Net total .01 refusal actions	285	332	359
Chemical test refusal rate (excluding actions later set aside)	5.24%	5.26%	5.43%
Net .08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no prior DUIs	5,380	6,039	5,761
Net .08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with prior DUIs	2,916	3,040	3,253
<b>APS Hearings<sup>6</sup></b>			
Total .08 and .01 inperson or telephone APS hearings scheduled	43,539	45,627	52,023
Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing <sup>7</sup>	24.7%	23.8%	28.2%
.08 hearings held and/or completed	39,073	41,062	47,139
.08 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	33,386	35,476	40,847
Percentage of .08 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	85.4%	86.4%	86.7%
.01 hearings held and/or completed	3,724	4,088	4,556
.01 actions sustained/upheld following hearings	3,014	3,411	3,830
Percentage of .01 APS actions sustained/upheld following hearings	80.9%	83.4%	84.1%
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal hearings scheduled	3,084	3,113	3,610
.08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed	2,944	3,009	3,488
.08 APS refusal actions sustained/upheld following hearings	2,384	2,517	2,963

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



**SECTION 6: CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL**

This section presents data on alcohol-involved crashes, as compiled and reported by the California Highway Patrol, as well as crash data which have been crosstabulated with Department of Justice DUI arrest data. Only crashes involving injury or fatality are assessed, due to incomplete reporting of property-damage-only (PDO) crashes<sup>1</sup>. Drivers identified as being under the influence of drugs other than alcohol are also included in the "alcohol-involved crash" category, but typically comprise less than 1% of the total (e.g., only 1 case for 2003 data). This section includes the following tables:

Table 19: DUI Arrests Associated with Reported Crashes, 1993-2003. This table shows the number of DUI arrests and the count and percentage of DUI arrests associated with reported crashes from 1993-2003.

Table 20a: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2003 DUI Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity and Sobriety Code. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of sobriety for crash-involved 2003 DUI arrestees, by race/ethnicity.

Table 20b: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2003 DUI Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity and Type of Arrest. This table portrays the fatal/injury crash involvement of DUI arrestees, by race/ethnicity and type of arrest (felony, juvenile, or misdemeanor).

Table 21: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2003 DUI Arrestees by Adjudication Status and Sobriety Code. This table crosstabulates crash sobriety codes (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition of the 2003 DUI arrests associated with those crashes.

Table 22: Fatal/Injury Crashes of 2003 DUI Arrestees by Adjudication Status and Type of Arrest. This table displays the adjudication status of fatal and injury crash-involved 2003 DUI arrestees, by type of arrest.

Table 23: 2003 Crash-Involved DUI Arrestees With No Record of Conviction, by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows the number of crash-involved 2003 DUI arrestees without a corresponding recorded conviction, by type of DUI arrest, by county.

Tables 24a-24b: 2003 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Sex (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2003 alcohol-involved fatal and

---

<sup>1</sup>Among 2003 DUI arrests, 26,270 were associated with a reported traffic crash, with 11,198 involving an injury or fatality, and 15,072 were PDO.


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

Tables 25a-25b: Sobriety Level by Prior DUI Convictions of 2003 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2003 alcohol-involved fatal and injury crashes by sobriety level and prior conviction status, both total (25a) and those of subjects who were not arrested in conjunction with the crash (25b).

Tables 26a-26b: 2003 Alcohol-Involved Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Not Arrested). These two tables show the number of 2003 alcohol-involved fatal and injury crashes by number of prior convictions, both total (26a) and for subjects who were not arrested in conjunction with the crash (26b).

Table 27: 2003 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Drivers Involved in Alcohol-Related Crashes. This table shows the mean and frequency distribution of BAC levels for drivers involved in alcohol-related crashes in 2003.

Figure 12 (below) shows the annual percentages of traffic injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 1994 to 2004. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI summary statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.



*Figure 12.* Percentage of total injuries and total fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 1994-2004.

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

- ▶ The number of alcohol-involved traffic fatalities increased by 1.2% in 2004, following increases of 2.0% in 2003, 8.3% in 2002, 6.1% in 2001, 5.4% in 2000 and

9.1% in 1999, which had been the first increase in over a decade. The proportion of traffic fatalities which are alcohol-involved increased to 35.7%, after two years of being stable at 34.2% (see Figure 12).

- ▶ The proportion of traffic crash injuries that are alcohol-involved increased to 10.4% in 2004 from 10.2% in 2003 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- ▶ 14.3% of all 2003 DUI arrests were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 15.0% in 2002. 42.6% of these crashes involved an injury or fatality, relatively unchanged from 42.8% in 2002 (see Table 19).
- ▶ In almost a quarter (21.2%) of cases where a DUI offender was arrested in connection with a fatal/injury traffic crash, there is no record of any corresponding conviction. In 85.4% of these nonconvicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers had been drinking and that their ability was impaired (see Table 21).
- ▶ Of all 2003 fatal/injury crash-involved DUI arrestees with no record of conviction, 21.3% had been arrested for felony DUI (see Table 22).
- ▶ 6.1% (11,198) of 2003 DUI arrests were associated with a fatal or injury crash. Of these fatal/injury crashes, only 32.1% (3,590) led to an arrest for felony DUI, and only 12.6% (1,411) led to a conviction of felony DUI. 78.8% of DUI arrests stemming from a fatal/injury crash resulted in a reported conviction (see Table 22).
- ▶ Non-arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal/injury crashes in 2003 were less likely to have a prior conviction for DUI or alcohol-related reckless driving than did drivers who were arrested in conjunction with the crash (see Tables 25a and 25b).
- ▶ Almost three-quarters (73.2%) of arrested drivers in alcohol-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or reckless driving conviction (see Table 26a).

TABLE 19: DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 1993-2003

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
TOTAL DUI ARRESTS	231696	206583	198982	201765	191164	188327	188523	181336	176490	177056	183560
DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH CRASHES	30352	27269	24932	25685	23564	24299	23807	24859	25320	26517	26270
PERCENT OF DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH CRASHES	13.1%	13.2%	12.5%	12.7%	12.3%	12.9%	12.6%	13.7%	14.3%	15.0%	14.3%

TABLE 20a: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11198	100.0	5590	49.9	4168	37.2	738	6.6	702	6.3
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	10229	91.3	5010	49.0	3925	38.4	659	6.4	635	6.2
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	58	0.5	33	56.9	20	34.5	1	1.7	4	6.9
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	104	0.9	55	52.9	31	29.8	8	7.7	10	9.6
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	147	1.3	64	43.5	56	38.1	15	10.2	12	8.2
NOT REPORTED	660	5.9	428	64.8	136	20.6	55	8.3	41	6.2

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

TABLE 20b: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND TYPE OF ARREST\*

TYPE OF ARREST	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11198	100.0	5590	49.9	4168	37.2	738	6.6	702	6.3
FELONY DUI	3590	32.1	1600	44.6	1507	42.0	263	7.3	220	6.1
JUVENILE DUI	139	1.2	91	65.5	42	30.2	2	1.4	4	2.9
MISDEMEANOR DUI	7469	66.7	3899	52.2	2619	35.1	473	6.3	478	6.4

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

TABLE 21: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND SOBRIETY CODE\*

SOBRIETY CODE	TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION											
			MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		NONALCOHOL- RECKLESS		OTHER CONVICTIONS		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11198	100.0	6405	57.2	1631	14.6	430	3.8	154	1.4	203	1.8	2375	21.2
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	10229	91.3	6016	58.8	1516	14.8	391	3.8	132	1.3	146	1.4	2028	19.8
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	58	0.5	23	39.7	8	13.8	3	5.2	0	0.0	6	10.3	18	31.0
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	104	0.9	48	46.2	15	14.4	4	3.8	1	1.0	4	3.8	32	30.8
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	147	1.3	72	49.0	13	8.8	7	4.8	1	0.7	8	5.4	46	31.3
NOT REPORTED	660	5.9	246	37.3	79	12.0	25	3.8	20	3.0	39	5.9	251	38.0

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

TABLE 22: FATAL/INJURY CRASHES OF 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND TYPE OF ARREST\*

TYPE OF ARREST	TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION											
			MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		NONALCOHOL- RECKLESS		OTHER CONVICTIONS		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	11198	100.0	6405	57.2	1631	14.6	430	3.8	154	1.4	203	1.8	2375	21.2
FELONY DUI	3590	32.1	1262	35.2	1411	39.3	55	1.5	27	0.8	72	2.0	763	21.3
JUVENILE DUI	139	1.2	32	23.0	18	12.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	88	63.3
MISDEMEANOR DUI	7469	66.7	5111	68.4	202	2.7	375	5.0	127	1.7	130	1.7	1524	20.4

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

TABLE 23: 2003 CRASH-INVOLVED\* DUI ARRESTEES WITH NO RECORD OF CONVICTION, BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL (100%)	TYPE OF ARREST					
		FELONY DUI		JUVENILE DUI		MISDEMEANOR DUI	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	4399	681	15.5	186	4.2	3532	80.3
ALAMEDA	241	21	8.7	3	1.2	217	90.0
ALPINE	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
AMADOR	7	2	28.6	0	0.0	5	71.4
BUTTE	29	4	13.8	1	3.4	24	82.8
CALAVERAS	14	3	21.4	1	7.1	10	71.4
COLUSA	6	1	16.7	0	0.0	5	83.3
CONTRA COSTA	111	10	9.0	4	3.6	97	87.4
DEL NORTE	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
EL DORADO	38	5	13.2	2	5.3	31	81.6
FRESNO	178	33	18.5	3	1.7	142	79.8
GLENN	8	0	0.0	1	12.5	7	87.5
HUMBOLDT	24	2	8.3	1	4.2	21	87.5
IMPERIAL	45	11	24.4	1	2.2	33	73.3
INYO	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
KERN	124	21	16.9	5	4.0	98	79.0
KINGS	17	2	11.8	1	5.9	14	82.4
LAKE	21	2	9.5	2	9.5	17	81.0
LASSEN	10	0	0.0	2	20.0	8	80.0
LOS ANGELES	1027	151	14.7	35	3.4	841	81.9
MADERA	37	8	21.6	0	0.0	29	78.4
MARIN	43	3	7.0	8	18.6	32	74.4
MARIPOSA	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
MENDOCINO	15	4	26.7	2	13.3	9	60.0
MERCED	31	6	19.4	1	3.2	24	77.4
MODOC	4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
MONO	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
MONTEREY	61	16	26.2	9	14.8	36	59.0
NAPA	25	2	8.0	2	8.0	21	84.0
NEVADA	15	2	13.3	0	0.0	13	86.7
ORANGE	260	15	5.8	7	2.7	238	91.5
PLACER	20	2	10.0	1	5.0	17	85.0
PLUMAS	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
RIVERSIDE	256	30	11.7	9	3.5	217	84.8
SACRAMENTO	140	28	20.0	6	4.3	106	75.7
SAN BENITO	6	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
SAN BERNARDINO	282	53	18.8	12	4.3	217	77.0
SAN DIEGO	338	78	23.1	16	4.7	244	72.2
SAN FRANCISCO	83	19	22.9	0	0.0	64	77.1
SAN JOAQUIN	92	5	5.4	4	4.3	83	90.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO	21	4	19.0	5	23.8	12	57.1
SAN MATEO	67	11	16.4	7	10.4	49	73.1
SANTA BARBARA	27	4	14.8	2	7.4	21	77.8
SANTA CLARA	113	29	25.7	1	0.9	83	73.5
SANTA CRUZ	29	3	10.3	2	6.9	24	82.8
SHASTA	26	5	19.2	0	0.0	21	80.8
SIERRA	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
SISKIYOU	10	2	20.0	2	20.0	6	60.0
SOLANO	32	3	9.4	2	6.3	27	84.4
SONOMA	40	3	7.5	1	2.5	36	90.0
STANISLAUS	142	25	17.6	2	1.4	115	81.0
SUTTER	7	1	14.3	0	0.0	6	85.7
TEHAMA	16	4	25.0	0	0.0	12	75.0
TRINITY	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
TULARE	99	19	19.2	10	10.1	70	70.7
TUOLUMNE	5	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
VENTURA	101	18	17.8	11	10.9	72	71.3
YOLO	28	5	17.9	1	3.6	22	78.6
YUBA	11	2	18.2	0	0.0	9	81.8

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

TABLE 24a: 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\* BY AGE AND SEX

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	20632	100.0	16439	79.7	4193	20.3
UNDER 18	376	1.8	279	74.2	97	25.8
18-20	1894	9.2	1523	80.4	371	19.6
21-30	7284	35.3	5927	81.4	1357	18.6
31-40	4441	21.5	3435	77.3	1006	22.7
41-50	3454	16.7	2636	76.3	818	23.7
51-59	1427	6.9	1121	78.6	306	21.4
60-69	575	2.8	474	82.4	101	17.6
70 & ABOVE	305	1.5	237	77.7	68	22.3
AGE UNKNOWN	876	4.2	807	92.1	69	7.9

\*These data are derived from the 2003 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 24b: 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND SEX (NOT ARRESTED)

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8070	100.0	6349	78.7	1721	21.3
UNDER 18	198	2.5	150	75.8	48	24.2
18-20	823	10.2	660	80.2	163	19.8
21-30	2936	36.4	2379	81.0	557	19.0
31-40	1810	22.4	1401	77.4	409	22.6
41-50	1329	16.5	1015	76.4	314	23.6
51-60	586	7.3	443	75.6	143	24.4
61-70	235	2.9	184	78.3	51	21.7
71 & ABOVE	153	1.9	117	76.5	36	23.5

TABLE 25a: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES\*

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18078	100.0	7936	43.9	7931	43.9	1796	9.9	336	1.9	79	0.4
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	13901	76.9	4373	31.5	7429	53.4	1701	12.2	322	2.3	76	0.5
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2922	16.2	2634	90.1	242	8.3	37	1.3	8	0.3	1	0.0
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1221	6.8	904	74.0	251	20.6	58	4.8	6	0.5	2	0.2
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	16	0.1	9	56.3	7	43.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
NOT REPORTED	18	0.1	16	88.9	2	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

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

TABLE 25b: SOBRIETY LEVEL BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS OF 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES (NOT ARRESTED)\*

SOBRIETY LEVEL	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8070	100.0	5421	67.2	2053	25.4	483	6.0	89	1.1	24	0.3
HBD-ABILITY IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	4062	50.3	1913	47.1	1649	40.6	402	9.9	76	1.9	22	0.5
HBD-NOT IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2864	35.5	2613	91.2	211	7.4	31	1.1	8	0.3	1	0.0
HBD-NOT KNOWN IF IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1118	13.9	871	77.9	191	17.1	50	4.5	5	0.4	1	0.1
HNBD-HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING	10	0.1	8	80.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
NOT REPORTED	16	0.2	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

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



TABLE 26a: 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS

ACCIDENTS	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	18078	100.0	7936	43.9	7931	43.9	1796	9.9	336	1.9	79	0.4
FATAL	1000	5.5	732	73.2	213	21.3	47	4.7	6	0.6	2	0.2
INJURY	17078	94.5	7204	42.2	7718	45.2	1749	10.2	330	1.9	77	0.5

TABLE 26b: 2003 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NOT ARRESTED)

ACCIDENTS	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN SEVEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	8070	100.0	5421	67.2	2053	25.4	483	6.0	89	1.1	24	0.3
FATAL	888	11.0	683	76.9	161	18.1	37	4.2	5	0.6	2	0.2
INJURY	7182	89.0	4738	66.0	1892	26.3	446	6.2	84	1.2	22	0.3

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

TABLE 27: 2003 REPORTED\* BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS  
OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES

BAC LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	132	1.2
.01	59	0.5
.02	54	0.5
.03	71	0.7
.04	110	1.0
.05	121	1.1
.06	163	1.5
.07	233	2.1
.08	354	3.2
.09	413	3.8
.10	479	4.4
.11	498	4.6
.12	564	5.2
.13	593	5.4
.14	658	6.0
.15	667	6.1
.16	655	6.0
.17	634	5.8
.18	631	5.8
.19	603	5.5
.20	555	5.1
.21	515	4.7
.22	386	3.5
.23	354	3.2
.24	294	2.7
.25	243	2.2
.26	183	1.7
.27	155	1.4
.28	146	1.3
.29	97	0.9
.30	69	0.6
.31	59	0.5
.32	41	0.4
.33	31	0.3
.34	32	0.3
.35	14	0.1
.36	13	0.1
.37	19	0.2
.38	7	0.1
.39	8	0.1
.40	7	0.1
.41	3	0.0
.42	2	0.0
.43	1	0.0
.45	1	0.0
.46	2	0.0
TOTAL	10929	100.0
	MEAN BAC .161	

\*The source of BAC data is the APS reporting form for convicted alcohol-crash drivers (53.3% of the records showed BAC levels).

## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

### DUI Arrest Data:

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

### DUI Conviction Data:

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

### Alcohol-Involved Crash Data:

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

---

## HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975

SB 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 percent or more by weight, or when the driver refuses to submit to a chemical test. If the driver has one prior DUI conviction within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 5 days, and if the driver has two or more prior DUI convictions within the past 10 years, his/her vehicle shall be impounded for 15 days.

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

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

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

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

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

person to complete a repeat offender treatment program. Finally, it expands court-ordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all persons convicted of a repeat DUI offense within ten years of a prior offense.

SB 1696 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, requires the alcohol treatment program providers to send proof of enrollment in, or proof of completion of, the programs directly to DMV Headquarters, and prohibits the DMV from receiving the certificates from program participants.

SB 1697 (Torlakson), effective 9/20/2005, assigns sole responsibility for imposing driver license actions for DUI arrests and convictions to DMV, and removes this responsibility from the courts. It also ensures that all persons convicted of a DUI will receive a license restriction, suspension or revocation of the driving privilege.

SB 408 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2004, prohibits the DMV (for cases showing a “critical need to drive”) from issuing a restricted drivers license to minors convicted of DUI with a BAC of 0.01% or greater if the minor has other zero tolerance or DUI convictions within seven years of the current violation.

AB 1078 (Jackson), effective 1/1/2002, removes the 10-year limit on certain vehicular manslaughter convictions, resulting in the permanent retention of these violations on the driver’s record. These convictions would be considered by the court as “priors” for enhancing penalties upon subsequent conviction for DUI.

AB 803 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2001, requires the court to order a person who is at least 18 years of age who is convicted of a first violation of DUI with 0.05% or more, by weight, of alcohol to attend the educational component of a licensed DUI program; upon a second or subsequent conviction, the court is required to order the person, in addition to other penalties, to attend a 30-hour DUI program. If the person’s license is suspended, the DMV cannot reinstate the driving privilege until the person provides proof of having completed the program as specified.

AB 1650 (Assembly Transportation Committee), effective 1/1/2000, is a committee bill intended to deal with transportation issues more efficiently by clarifying and making technical changes. This bill authorizes the DMV to impose a driver license suspension on those convicted of DUI in a water vessel involving injury; this remedies an oversight in existing law which provides for sanctions against drivers convicted of DUI in a water vessel without injury, but does not specify sanctions for cases involving injury.

AB 762 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/99, extends the suspension period for a second-DUI offender from 18 months to two years, but allows the second offender to serve 12 months of the license suspension period, followed by a restricted license, with continued enrollment in a treatment program and installation of an ignition interlock device; requires persons convicted of driving with a suspended or revoked license, where that suspension or revocation was based on prior DUI convictions, to install the ignition interlock device for a period not to exceed three years or until the driving privilege is reinstated, and requires DMV to study and report on the effectiveness of these devices. Judges are also encouraged to order installation of an ignition interlock device for first-time DUI offenders if there are aggravating factors such as high blood alcohol readings (0.20% or above), chemical test refusal, numerous traffic violations, or injury crashes. This law requires that upon a first DUI conviction, if a court grants probation, 1) the person's driving privilege shall be suspended for six months by the DMV, in addition to other penalties, or 2) the person may operate a motor vehicle restricted for 90 days, to and from work and alcohol treatment program, if the person establishes proof of financial responsibility and complies with other penalties and fees.

SB 24 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/99, cleans up AB 762, AB 1916, and SB 1186. This law requires the DMV to revoke for one year the driving privilege of any ignition interlock device-restricted driver who is convicted of driving a vehicle not equipped with an ignition interlock device (IID) under authority section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under section 23246(g)] if notified by an installation facility that the driver attempted to bypass, tamper with or remove the device, or has three or more times failed to comply with calibration or servicing requirements of the device; amends certain sections to specify that completion of a program equals enrollment, participation, and completion subsequent to the date of the current violation.

SB 1186 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/99, reorganizes specified provisions relating to DUI-related statutes by amending, repealing, and/or renumbering the DUI-related sections without making substantive changes to the statutes.

SB 1176 (Johnson), effective 1/1/99, requires that, upon a conviction of an alcohol-related reckless driving charge, the courts order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. This bill also requires an evaluation

by the DMV of the effectiveness of the program and a discussion of the findings in its annual report to the Legislature.

SB 1890 (Hurt), effective 1/1/99, deletes the choice of the urine test from the options for chemical tests relating to operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, unless both the blood and breath tests are unavailable or where there is a condition that warrants the use of the urine test.

AB 1916 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/99, provides that the court shall, as a condition of probation, refer a first offender whose BAC level is less than 0.20%, by weight, to participate for at least three months (minimum 30 hours) or longer to a licensed education/counseling program; if the BAC level is equal to 0.20% or more, by weight, or the person refused to take a chemical test, the court shall order the person to participate for at least six months or longer in a program consisting of 45 hours of education/counseling activities; requires the DMV to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the efficacy of the increased drug and alcohol intervention programs; requires repeat offenders who have twice failed the programs to participate in a county alcohol and drug problem assessment program, and requires each county, beginning 1/1/2000, to prepare, or contract to be prepared, an alcohol and drug assessment report on each person ordered by the court to participate in an alcohol and drug assessment program.

AB 130 (Battin), effective 1/1/98, requires that any person guilty of a felony or misdemeanor DUI within 10 years of a prior felony offense be designated as a habitual traffic offender for a 3-year period and have their driver license revoked for four years.

SB 1177 (Johnson), effective 1/1/98, requires that anyone convicted of a second or subsequent DUI within seven years of a separate DUI, alcohol-related reckless driving, or DUI with bodily injury violation, is ordered to enroll in, participate and complete a DUI treatment program, subject to the latest violation, as a condition of probation. The person is not to be given credit for any treatment program activities prior to the date of the current violation.

AB 1985 (Speier), effective 1/1/97, cited as "Courtney's Law"; provides that a person convicted of gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated and who has one or more prior convictions of vehicular manslaughter or multiple prior DUI convictions shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a term of 15 years to life. Also, any person fleeing the scene of a crime after committing specified vehicle

---

offenses which resulted in death, serious injury, or great bodily injury is subject to an additional 5-year prison enhancement.

SB 1579 (Leonard), effective 1/1/97, permits DMV to suspend a driver license on a first FTA for DUI, and establishes an enhanced audit and tracking system to compare DUI arrests with subsequent actions.

SB 833 (Kopp), effective 1/1/96, permits peace officers to seize and cause the removal of a vehicle, without arresting the driver, when the vehicle was being operated by a person whose driving privilege was suspended or revoked or who had never been issued a license; requires an impounding agency to send a notice by certified, return receipt requested mail, to the legal owner of a vehicle that is impounded, and specifies under what conditions an impounded vehicle may be released to the legal owner.

AB 321 (Connolly), effective 1/1/95, allows juveniles cited for driving under the influence, with a BAC of 0.05% or more, by weight (Section 23140), to be charged with vehicular manslaughter (Penal Code (PC) 192) or gross vehicular manslaughter (PC 191.5) if they violate these vehicular manslaughter laws.

SB 1295 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/95, requires every person convicted of a first DUI offense to submit proof of completion of a treatment program within a time period set by the department; requires the department to suspend the driving privilege for noncompliance, prohibits reinstatement until proof of completion is received by the department; enhances the required administrative driving privilege revocation for a minor who refuses to take or fails to complete a preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test, to two years revocation for the second offense in seven years and three years revocation for the third and subsequent offenses; applies the CVC section 23140 to drivers under age 21 (previously under age 18), making it unlawful to drive with a 0.05% BAC level or greater.

SB 1758 (Kopp), effective 1/1/95, permits a noncommercial driver, 21 years of age or older, who was arrested for a first APS DUI offense, who took a chemical test, and enrolled in an alcohol treatment program, to also obtain a restricted driver license, valid for driving to and from and during the course of that person's employment, after serving 30 days of the suspension period. The total time period for suspension/restriction shall be six months, rather than four months. Suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers who drive are subject to having their vehicles towed and impounded for 30 days. If the driver is the registered owner of



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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

SB 185 (Thompson), effective 1/1/92, amends Section 14602 to authorize the court to order the motor vehicle impounded for up to six months for a first conviction, and up to 12 months for a second or subsequent conviction of any of the following offenses: driving with a suspended or revoked license, violation of 2800.2 or .3 (evading a peace officer in a reckless manner, causing injury or death), within seven years of a violation of 23103, 23152, 23153, or PCs 191.5 or 192(c).

AB 2040 (Farr), effective 9/28/90, repeals previous statutes authorizing the installation of ignition interlock devices in DUI cases. This urgency statute authorizes the installation of such devices in all DUI cases, permits the court to grant subjects revoked for 3 or more DUI-related violations a restricted license after 24 months of the revocation have passed. The restricted license is conditioned on satisfactory completion of 18 months of an alcohol treatment program, submission of proof of financial responsibility, and agreement to have an ignition interlock device installed in their vehicles. Courts are authorized to reduce the minimum DUI fine to allow the person to pay the costs of the device.

SB 1150 (Lockyer), effective 7/26/90, provides clean-up legislation for APS; lowers the BAC level from .10 to .08, requires proof of financial responsibility to reinstate from any APS suspension or revocation action, increases sanctions for implied consent refusals (1-year license suspension for no priors or APS actions, 2-year license revocation for one prior or APS action, and 3-year revocation for two or more prior DUI offenses or APS actions), and authorizes suspension or revocation actions taken under 13353 and 13353.2 CVC to be considered as priors.

SB 1623 (Lockyer), effective 7/1/90, establishes authority for a peace officer to serve a notice of suspension or revocation (administrative per se or APS) personally on a person arrested for a DUI offense, to take possession of the driver license for forwarding to the department, and to issue a 45-day temporary operating permit; provides for an administrative review of the order, for an administrative hearing, and for a judicial review of the hearing, and provides for a fee, not to exceed \$100, to be assessed upon the return of the driver license.

AB 757 (Friedman), effective 1/1/90, requires the DMV to establish and maintain a DUI data and recidivism tracking system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI. Annual reports are to be made to the Legislature.

SB 310 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90, authorizes the courts to sell the vehicles of those registered owners who are found in violation of PCs 191.5 or 192 (C3), CVC 23152 which occurred within seven years of two or more convictions of 23152 or 23153, or a violation of 23153 which occurred within seven years of one or more convictions of 23152 or 23153 or the cited PC sections.

SB 408 (Leonard), effective 1/1/90, modifies AB 7 (Hart) to establish a BAC level of .08% or higher as per se evidence of impaired driving.

SB 1119 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90 for vessel provisions and 1/1/92 for commercial driver provisions, prohibits the operation of a commercial vehicle by a person with a BAC of .04% or above; requires a commercial vehicle driver to be ordered out of service for 24 hours if found with a BAC at or above .01%, but less than .04%; establishes separate penalties for refusing to take or complete a chemical test based on the type of vehicle involved. Under this bill, a conviction of operating a vessel while under the influence of alcohol or drugs would also be treated as a DUI prior for driver license sanctions.

SB 1344 (Seymour), effective 1/1/90, requires statewide implementation of 12-week (30-hour) first-offender alcohol education and counseling programs, and requires state licensing of such programs. This bill also adds 6 months of monitoring and follow-up to second offender programs, resulting in 18-month programs. It requires that DMV evaluate program effects on recidivism and report the findings to the Legislature.

SB 1902 (Davis), effective 1/1/90, prohibits DMV from issuing or renewing a driver license unless the applicant agrees in writing to comply with a blood, breath, or urine test. This bill also designates drivers convicted of a third or subsequent DUI within seven years as “habitual traffic offenders.”

AB 3134 (Harris), effective 1/1/89, allows the 4th DUI within seven years to be charged as a felony or misdemeanor. The term of imprisonment to state prison or county jail is not less than 180 days and not more than one year. Allows for second offenders to attend either a one year or 30-month treatment program.

AB 3563 (Killea), effective 1/1/89, authorizes the court to order DMV to suspend, revoke, or delay the driving privilege of a minor failing to show proof of completion of a court-ordered alcohol education program when convicted of CVC 23140.

SB 1300 (Campbell), effective 1/1/89, amends CVC 13202.5 to allow courts to suspend the license of a person under the age of 21 (changed from age 18) for one year, or delay the driving privilege of those 13 years or older, upon conviction of various alcohol and drug offenses, including open container violations.

SB 1964 (Robbins), effective 1/1/89, requires all first-DUI offenders to file proof of insurance when applying for a restricted license or for reinstatement of the driving privilege following a period of license suspension.

SB 885 (Royce), effective 1/1/88, requires that a person who was granted probation for a second DUI offense must show proof of financial responsibility in order to be eligible for the 1-year restricted license.

SB 1365 (Seymour), effective 1/1/88, establishes a 30-month alcohol treatment program as an alternative to the 12-month program for third and subsequent DUI offenders, in counties where such a program exists. In these cases, imprisonment in the county jail shall be imposed for at least 30 days, but not more than one year, in lieu of the 120-day minimum jail term.

AB 2558 (Duffy), effective 1/1/87, provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable in the state prison for 4, 6, or 10 years. Former PC 192(c3) was deleted and incorporated into 191.5(a).

AB 2831 (Killea), effective 1/1/87, makes it unlawful for a minor to drive with a BAC of .05% or more (CVC 23140). A conviction of this violation requires completion of an alcohol education program or alcohol-related community service program.

SB 2206 (Watson), effective 1/1/87, authorizes a county to develop and administer an alcohol and drug problem-assessment program, which could include a pre-sentence alcohol and drug problem-assessment report for persons convicted under CVC 23152 or 23153, and referral to treatment program with follow-up tracking.

SB 2344 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/87, extends the sentencing period for prior DUIs from five to seven years, and specifies a 3- to 5-year probation term for a DUI conviction.

SB 3939 (Farr), effective 1/1/87, authorizes courts to order the installation of IID for repeat offenders in four counties, and establishes a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of the devices.

SB 925 (Seymour), effective 7/1/86, extends the period of license suspension for second-misdemeanor offenders from one year to 18 months, and also requires that offenders with three or more DUI convictions show proof of treatment completion in order to have their licenses reinstated.

AB 144 (Naylor), effective 9/29/85, requires the court to take into consideration in a DUI case a blood alcohol concentration of 0.20 percent or above, or a refusal to take a chemical test, as special factors in the enhancing of penalties for sentencing or to impose additional terms and conditions of probation.

SB 1441 (Petris), effective 1/1/85, requires a 3-year license revocation for persons with two or more DUI or alcohol-related reckless convictions within five years of refusing a chemical test.

SB 1522 (Alquist), effective 1/1/85, retains existing law for first offenders, which authorizes courts to impound a vehicle at the registered owner's expense for up to 30 days if the driver was convicted of DUI pursuant to CVC 23152 or 23153. The same time period for impoundment is required for second offenses within five years. For third and subsequent offenses, the vehicle can be impounded at the registered owner's expense for up to 90 days. Exceptions to the required impoundment arise "where the interests of justice would best be served by not ordering impoundment." Another limitation is that no vehicle driven by a class 3 or

4 licensee is subject to impoundment if another person has a community property interest in the vehicle, and it is the only vehicle available to the driver's family.

AB 624 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/84, requires a 1-year license revocation for minors (up to age 18) for a DUI conviction (Sections 23152, 23153 CVC).

SB 1601 (Sieroty), effective 7/1/82, modifies AB 541 provisions by requiring that SB 38 participants establish proof of insurance in order to remove the license restriction at the end of six months. In addition, SB 38 participants who dropped out of the program are given two more opportunities to reenroll, instead of receiving an immediate license suspension. Program providers are also required to report dropouts directly to DMV.

AB 7 (Hart), effective 1/1/82, makes it a misdemeanor under CVC 23152(b) to drive a vehicle with a BAC level of .10% or higher. Drivers with lower BAC levels (.05 - .09%) can be convicted of DUI when sufficient behavioral evidence of impairment is apparent.

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

the SB 38 program will receive a license suspension for one year and a license restriction for two years.

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

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

---

**REFERENCES**

- Automobile Club of Southern California, California Highway Patrol, California State Automobile Association, & Department of Motor Vehicles. (2005). *Digest of Traffic Legislation*. Sacramento: Authors.
- California Department of Motor Vehicles. (1984-87). *An evaluation of the California drunk driving countermeasure system. Volumes 1-8*. Sacramento: Author.
- California Highway Patrol. (2003). *2003 annual report of fatal and injury motor vehicle traffic collisions*. Sacramento: Author.
- DeYoung, D. J. (1995). *An evaluation of the effectiveness of California drinking driver programs* (Report No. 146). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- DeYoung, D. J. (1997). *An evaluation of the specific deterrent effect of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked and unlicensed drivers in California* (Report No. 171). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- DeYoung, D. J., Peck, R. C., & Helander, C. J. (1999). Estimating the exposure and fatal crash rates of suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers in California. *Crash Analysis & Prevention*, 29(1), 17-23.
- Helander, C. J. (1989). *Development of a California DUI management information system*. Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. (1995, September). DUI legislation 1982-1995. *The 1995 Judicial DUI Seminar*. Presented by the Committee on Drinking Drivers of the Municipal Court Judges Association and the Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning and Research Unit. Oxnard, California.
- Peck, R. C. (1991). The general and specific deterrent effects of DUI sanctions: A review of California's experience. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving*, 7(1), 13-42.



- Peck, R. C. (1993, January). *California DMV's driving under the influence R&D program: Some recent findings and activities*. Paper presented at the 72<sup>nd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Session 86A. Washington DC.
- Rogers, P. N. (1997). *The specific deterrent impact of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws. Volume 2 of an evaluation of the effectiveness of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se license suspension laws* (Report No. 167). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2005). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 211). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2004). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 206). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2003). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 198). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2002). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 191). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2001). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 188). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (2000). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 185). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1999). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 179). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1998). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 169). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1997). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 165). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1996). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 159). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1995). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 145). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1994). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 143). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., Marowitz, L. A., DeYoung, D. J., & Helander, C. J. (1993). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 138). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Helander, C. J. (1992). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 134). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Peck, R. C. (1986). *An evaluation of the specific deterrent effects of alternative sanctions for first and repeat DUI offenders: Vol. 3 of an evaluation of the California drunk driving countermeasure system* (Report No. 95). Sacramento: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

## GLOSSARY

### ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE (APS)

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

### ALCOHOL-INVOLVED CRASH

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

### ALCOHOL-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

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

### ALPHA

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

### BAC

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

### CONVICTION

Conviction of an offense, as used in this report, refers to the receipt by DMV of a court abstract of conviction. In a small proportion of cases, an offender may be

convicted of an offense but that conviction is not reported to DMV. Such cases would functionally be treated by DMV as though the offender had not been convicted. Because convictions can be amended, corrected, dismissed or simply not reported at all, the conviction totals reported herein are dynamic and subject to change.

### COVARIATE

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

### DUI

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

### LOGISTIC REGRESSION

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

### MAJOR CONVICTION

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

### *p*

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

### QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

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

### SIGNIFICANT (STATISTICALLY)

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

## APPENDIX A

### Assembly Bill No. 757

#### CHAPTER 450

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

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

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

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

The bill would declare legislative findings.

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

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## APPENDIX B

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		180957	150233	83.0	30724	17.0	75669	41.8	80742	44.6	12629	7.0	11917	6.6
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	42	29	69.0	13	31.0	21	50.0	13	31.0	3	7.1	5	11.9
	18-20	481	395	82.1	86	17.9	162	33.7	186	38.7	63	13.1	70	14.6
	21-30	2636	2182	82.8	454	17.2	771	29.2	1026	38.9	477	18.1	362	13.7
	31-40	1543	1295	83.9	248	16.1	464	30.1	530	34.3	349	22.6	200	13.0
	41-50	1132	909	80.3	223	19.7	504	44.5	236	20.8	278	24.6	114	10.1
	51-60	496	408	82.3	88	17.7	258	52.0	87	17.5	104	21.0	47	9.5
	61-70	102	86	84.3	16	15.7	53	52.0	10	9.8	27	26.5	12	11.8
	71 & ABOVE	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	13	59.1	0	0.0	9	40.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	6454	5323	82.5	1131	17.5	2246	34.8	2088	32.4	1310	20.3	810	12.6
ALPINE	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
	31-40	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	9	69.2	2	15.4	0	0.0	2	15.4
	41-50	9	6	66.7	3	33.3	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	40	35	87.5	5	12.5	35	87.5	2	5.0	0	0.0	3	7.5
AMADOR	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	19	19	100.0	0	0.0	12	63.2	7	36.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	88	71	80.7	17	19.3	71	80.7	14	15.9	0	0.0	3	3.4
	31-40	54	47	87.0	7	13.0	42	77.8	4	7.4	3	5.6	5	9.3
	41-50	89	71	79.8	18	20.2	79	88.8	4	4.5	4	4.5	2	2.2
	51-60	55	42	76.4	13	23.6	49	89.1	3	5.5	1	1.8	2	3.6
	61-70	12	11	91.7	1	8.3	10	83.3	2	16.7	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	319	263	82.4	56	17.6	265	83.1	34	10.7	8	2.5	12	3.8
BUTTE	UNDER 18	16	12	75.0	4	25.0	15	93.8	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0
	18-20	184	155	84.2	29	15.8	145	78.8	29	15.8	4	2.2	6	3.3
	21-30	514	426	82.9	88	17.1	401	78.0	89	17.3	11	2.1	13	2.5
	31-40	257	193	75.1	64	24.9	200	77.8	37	14.4	9	3.5	11	4.3
	41-50	261	189	72.4	72	27.6	223	85.4	25	9.6	6	2.3	7	2.7
	51-60	113	91	80.5	22	19.5	100	88.5	11	9.7	0	0.0	2	1.8
	61-70	42	34	81.0	8	19.0	40	95.2	2	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1395	1105	79.2	290	20.8	1131	81.1	194	13.9	31	2.2	39	2.8

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	26	22	84.6	4	15.4	22	84.6	2	7.7	1	3.8	1	3.8
	21-30	95	77	81.1	18	18.9	77	81.1	18	18.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	84	65	77.4	19	22.6	70	83.3	11	13.1	1	1.2	2	2.4
	41-50	99	66	66.7	33	33.3	88	88.9	5	5.1	4	4.0	2	2.0
	51-60	44	35	79.5	9	20.5	39	88.6	3	6.8	1	2.3	1	2.3
	61-70	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	375	286	76.3	89	23.7	322	85.9	40	10.7	7	1.9	6	1.6	
COLUSA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	23	20	87.0	3	13.0	11	47.8	12	52.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	85	81	95.3	4	4.7	22	25.9	60	70.6	2	2.4	1	1.2
	31-40	64	52	81.3	12	18.8	34	53.1	30	46.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	49	39	79.6	10	20.4	31	63.3	15	30.6	2	4.1	1	2.0
	51-60	31	28	90.3	3	9.7	21	67.7	9	29.0	0	0.0	1	3.2
	61-70	12	8	66.7	4	33.3	8	66.7	2	16.7	1	8.3	1	8.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	267	230	86.1	37	13.9	129	48.3	129	48.3	5	1.9	4	1.5	
CONTRA	UNDER 18	36	31	86.1	5	13.9	24	66.7	9	25.0	2	5.6	1	2.8
	18-20	324	272	84.0	52	16.0	150	46.3	116	35.8	22	6.8	36	11.1
	21-30	1502	1287	85.7	215	14.3	605	40.3	627	41.7	135	9.0	135	9.0
	31-40	900	746	82.9	154	17.1	377	41.9	323	35.9	146	16.2	54	6.0
	41-50	717	528	73.6	189	26.4	407	56.8	133	18.5	139	19.4	38	5.3
	51-60	274	221	80.7	53	19.3	162	59.1	46	16.8	48	17.5	18	6.6
	61-70	76	64	84.2	12	15.8	47	61.8	12	15.8	12	15.8	5	6.6
	71 & ABOVE	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	10	62.5	3	18.8	3	18.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	3845	3162	82.2	683	17.8	1782	46.3	1269	33.0	507	13.2	287	7.5	
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	20	17	85.0	3	15.0	16	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	20.0
	21-30	104	81	77.9	23	22.1	74	71.2	11	10.6	0	0.0	19	18.3
	31-40	90	61	67.8	29	32.2	73	81.1	9	10.0	1	1.1	7	7.8
	41-50	102	74	72.5	28	27.5	91	89.2	4	3.9	0	0.0	7	6.9
	51-60	43	28	65.1	15	34.9	43	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	10	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	28.6
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	378	279	73.8	99	26.2	312	82.5	24	6.3	1	0.3	41	10.8	



TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	18	15	83.3	3	16.7	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	134	113	84.3	21	15.7	112	83.6	17	12.7	3	2.2	2	1.5
	21-30	430	358	83.3	72	16.7	332	77.2	77	17.9	5	1.2	16	3.7
	31-40	308	249	80.8	59	19.2	262	85.1	34	11.0	3	1.0	9	2.9
	41-50	307	227	73.9	80	26.1	275	89.6	21	6.8	4	1.3	7	2.3
	51-60	124	101	81.5	23	18.5	113	91.1	6	4.8	1	0.8	4	3.2
	61-70	24	19	79.2	5	20.8	19	79.2	3	12.5	0	0.0	2	8.3
	71 & ABOVE	13	8	61.5	5	38.5	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1358	1090	80.3	268	19.7	1142	84.1	160	11.8	16	1.2	40	2.9
FRESNO	UNDER 18	60	49	81.7	11	18.3	21	35.0	36	60.0	1	1.7	2	3.3
	18-20	556	493	88.7	63	11.3	146	26.3	368	66.2	13	2.3	29	5.2
	21-30	2546	2274	89.3	272	10.7	543	21.3	1802	70.8	89	3.5	112	4.4
	31-40	1466	1267	86.4	199	13.6	306	20.9	1032	70.4	85	5.8	43	2.9
	41-50	985	813	82.5	172	17.5	317	32.2	574	58.3	68	6.9	26	2.6
	51-60	347	301	86.7	46	13.3	146	42.1	145	41.8	28	8.1	28	8.1
	61-70	90	84	93.3	6	6.7	42	46.7	38	42.2	3	3.3	7	7.8
	71 & ABOVE	14	13	92.9	1	7.1	9	64.3	3	21.4	2	14.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	6064	5294	87.3	770	12.7	1530	25.2	3998	65.9	289	4.8	247	4.1
GLENN	UNDER 18	4	2	50.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	35	31	88.6	4	11.4	14	40.0	20	57.1	0	0.0	1	2.9
	21-30	164	149	90.9	15	9.1	53	32.3	103	62.8	3	1.8	5	3.0
	31-40	111	91	82.0	20	18.0	46	41.4	61	55.0	1	0.9	3	2.7
	41-50	97	73	75.3	24	24.7	57	58.8	35	36.1	4	4.1	1	1.0
	51-60	27	22	81.5	5	18.5	18	66.7	8	29.6	0	0.0	1	3.7
	61-70	10	9	90.0	1	10.0	8	80.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	1	10.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	449	378	84.2	71	15.8	198	44.1	231	51.4	8	1.8	12	2.7
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	22.2
	18-20	123	101	82.1	22	17.9	89	72.4	14	11.4	3	2.4	17	13.8
	21-30	476	376	79.0	100	21.0	398	83.6	31	6.5	5	1.1	42	8.8
	31-40	244	175	71.7	69	28.3	200	82.0	18	7.4	5	2.0	21	8.6
	41-50	267	183	68.5	84	31.5	223	83.5	17	6.4	7	2.6	20	7.5
	51-60	122	95	77.9	27	22.1	111	91.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	9	7.4
	61-70	33	25	75.8	8	24.2	30	90.9	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1279	967	75.6	312	24.4	1062	83.0	84	6.6	21	1.6	112	8.8

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	18	16	88.9	2	11.1	3	16.7	15	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	104	92	88.5	12	11.5	31	29.8	70	67.3	0	0.0	3	2.9
	21-30	425	362	85.2	63	14.8	107	25.2	289	68.0	7	1.6	22	5.2
	31-40	299	255	85.3	44	14.7	61	20.4	221	73.9	3	1.0	14	4.7
	41-50	241	203	84.2	38	15.8	67	27.8	164	68.0	1	0.4	9	3.7
	51-60	97	92	94.8	5	5.2	29	29.9	65	67.0	3	3.1	0	0.0
	61-70	28	26	92.9	2	7.1	10	35.7	18	64.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1215	1049	86.3	166	13.7	309	25.4	844	69.5	14	1.2	48	4.0
INYO	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	6	37.5	3	18.8	2	12.5	5	31.3
	21-30	63	49	77.8	14	22.2	37	58.7	12	19.0	2	3.2	12	19.0
	31-40	66	46	69.7	20	30.3	47	71.2	9	13.6	1	1.5	9	13.6
	41-50	64	50	78.1	14	21.9	50	78.1	10	15.6	0	0.0	4	6.3
	51-60	32	27	84.4	5	15.6	25	78.1	3	9.4	1	3.1	3	9.4
	61-70	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	13	86.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	13.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	259	201	77.6	58	22.4	181	69.9	37	14.3	6	2.3	35	13.5
KERN	UNDER 18	57	51	89.5	6	10.5	23	40.4	30	52.6	2	3.5	2	3.5
	18-20	525	471	89.7	54	10.3	181	34.5	312	59.4	22	4.2	10	1.9
	21-30	2316	2015	87.0	301	13.0	754	32.6	1382	59.7	104	4.5	76	3.3
	31-40	1264	1072	84.8	192	15.2	443	35.0	715	56.6	82	6.5	24	1.9
	41-50	893	731	81.9	162	18.1	440	49.3	393	44.0	43	4.8	17	1.9
	51-60	363	307	84.6	56	15.4	205	56.5	131	36.1	17	4.7	10	2.8
	61-70	106	93	87.7	13	12.3	58	54.7	38	35.8	7	6.6	3	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	17	15	88.2	2	11.8	10	58.8	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	5541	4755	85.8	786	14.2	2114	38.2	3006	54.3	279	5.0	142	2.6
KINGS	UNDER 18	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	4	30.8	8	61.5	0	0.0	1	7.7
	18-20	88	76	86.4	12	13.6	32	36.4	54	61.4	0	0.0	2	2.3
	21-30	439	387	88.2	52	11.8	124	28.2	273	62.2	26	5.9	16	3.6
	31-40	194	161	83.0	33	17.0	55	28.4	123	63.4	14	7.2	2	1.0
	41-50	133	108	81.2	25	18.8	48	36.1	65	48.9	13	9.8	7	5.3
	51-60	49	44	89.8	5	10.2	15	30.6	26	53.1	8	16.3	0	0.0
	61-70	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	5	33.3	8	53.3	0	0.0	2	13.3
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	935	805	86.1	130	13.9	285	30.5	559	59.8	61	6.5	30	3.2

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LAKE	UNDER 18	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	13	86.7	2	13.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	50	48	96.0	2	4.0	32	64.0	12	24.0	3	6.0	3	6.0
	21-30	140	121	86.4	19	13.6	80	57.1	47	33.6	5	3.6	8	5.7
	31-40	117	90	76.9	27	23.1	89	76.1	18	15.4	5	4.3	5	4.3
	41-50	177	132	74.6	45	25.4	147	83.1	19	10.7	8	4.5	3	1.7
	51-60	69	55	79.7	14	20.3	61	88.4	4	5.8	1	1.4	3	4.3
	61-70	24	20	83.3	4	16.7	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	601	488	81.2	113	18.8	453	75.4	104	17.3	22	3.7	22	3.7
LASSEN	UNDER 18	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	14	11	78.6	3	21.4	10	71.4	1	7.1	2	14.3	1	7.1
	21-30	43	30	69.8	13	30.2	31	72.1	6	14.0	1	2.3	5	11.6
	31-40	44	33	75.0	11	25.0	38	86.4	3	6.8	0	0.0	3	6.8
	41-50	45	32	71.1	13	28.9	38	84.4	5	11.1	1	2.2	1	2.2
	51-60	20	18	90.0	2	10.0	19	95.0	1	5.0	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	171	128	74.9	43	25.1	141	82.5	16	9.4	4	2.3	10	5.8
	LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	163	117	71.8	46	28.2	77	47.2	72	44.2	5	3.1	9
18-20		2286	1891	82.7	395	17.3	624	27.3	1384	60.5	106	4.6	172	7.5
21-30		15234	12637	83.0	2597	17.0	3388	22.2	9449	62.0	1094	7.2	1303	8.6
31-40		9938	8516	85.7	1422	14.3	2200	22.1	5951	59.9	1043	10.5	744	7.5
41-50		6079	5101	83.9	978	16.1	1815	29.9	2927	48.1	869	14.3	468	7.7
51-60		2296	1933	84.2	363	15.8	824	35.9	929	40.5	348	15.2	195	8.5
61-70		598	527	88.1	71	11.9	267	44.6	185	30.9	92	15.4	54	9.0
71 & ABOVE		111	91	82.0	20	18.0	61	55.0	32	28.8	13	11.7	5	4.5
TOTAL		36705	30813	83.9	5892	16.1	9256	25.2	20929	57.0	3570	9.7	2950	8.0
MADERA	UNDER 18	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	93	86	92.5	7	7.5	26	28.0	66	71.0	1	1.1	0	0.0
	21-30	409	378	92.4	31	7.6	78	19.1	321	78.5	3	0.7	7	1.7
	31-40	225	210	93.3	15	6.7	55	24.4	163	72.4	1	0.4	6	2.7
	41-50	161	123	76.4	38	23.6	83	51.6	65	40.4	7	4.3	6	3.7
	51-60	75	67	89.3	8	10.7	40	53.3	31	41.3	2	2.7	2	2.7
	61-70	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	13	68.4	5	26.3	1	5.3	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1001	895	89.4	106	10.6	306	30.6	659	65.8	15	1.5	21	2.1

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIN	UNDER 18	17	16	94.1	1	5.9	17	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	110	85	77.3	25	22.7	70	63.6	33	30.0	1	0.9	6	5.5
	21-30	506	369	72.9	137	27.1	259	51.2	189	37.4	19	3.8	39	7.7
	31-40	395	305	77.2	90	22.8	260	65.8	90	22.8	20	5.1	25	6.3
	41-50	289	196	67.8	93	32.2	223	77.2	34	11.8	16	5.5	16	5.5
	51-60	151	114	75.5	37	24.5	135	89.4	5	3.3	7	4.6	4	2.6
	61-70	49	34	69.4	15	30.6	44	89.8	1	2.0	2	4.1	2	4.1
	71 & ABOVE	16	10	62.5	6	37.5	14	87.5	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	6.3
	TOTAL	1533	1129	73.6	404	26.4	1022	66.7	353	23.0	65	4.2	93	6.1
MARIPOSA	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	15	15	100.0	0	0.0	12	80.0	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	26	25	96.2	1	3.8	15	57.7	9	34.6	0	0.0	2	7.7
	31-40	31	20	64.5	11	35.5	24	77.4	6	19.4	0	0.0	1	3.2
	41-50	34	25	73.5	9	26.5	32	94.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.9
	51-60	20	14	70.0	6	30.0	16	80.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	1	5.0
	61-70	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	135	107	79.3	28	20.7	107	79.3	21	15.6	1	0.7	6	4.4
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	17	12	70.6	5	29.4	12	70.6	3	17.6	0	0.0	2	11.8
	18-20	62	51	82.3	11	17.7	40	64.5	19	30.6	0	0.0	3	4.8
	21-30	274	241	88.0	33	12.0	160	58.4	93	33.9	4	1.5	17	6.2
	31-40	156	125	80.1	31	19.9	105	67.3	31	19.9	4	2.6	16	10.3
	41-50	149	110	73.8	39	26.2	124	83.2	18	12.1	1	0.7	6	4.0
	51-60	95	75	78.9	20	21.1	83	87.4	8	8.4	1	1.1	3	3.2
	61-70	21	18	85.7	3	14.3	17	81.0	4	19.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
	TOTAL	778	635	81.6	143	18.4	544	69.9	176	22.6	10	1.3	48	6.2
MERCED	UNDER 18	20	18	90.0	2	10.0	7	35.0	12	60.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
	18-20	145	134	92.4	11	7.6	38	26.2	100	69.0	3	2.1	4	2.8
	21-30	612	563	92.0	49	8.0	103	16.8	469	76.6	22	3.6	18	2.9
	31-40	372	330	88.7	42	11.3	97	26.1	248	66.7	17	4.6	10	2.7
	41-50	238	195	81.9	43	18.1	94	39.5	118	49.6	17	7.1	9	3.8
	51-60	80	75	93.8	5	6.3	31	38.8	41	51.3	5	6.3	3	3.8
	61-70	22	21	95.5	1	4.5	7	31.8	13	59.1	2	9.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7
	TOTAL	1495	1341	89.7	154	10.3	381	25.5	1002	67.0	66	4.4	46	3.1

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MODOC	18-20	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	20	20	100.0	0	0.0	16	80.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
	31-40	13	10	76.9	3	23.1	8	61.5	2	15.4	1	7.7	2	15.4
	41-50	13	10	76.9	3	23.1	10	76.9	2	15.4	0	0.0	1	7.7
	51-60	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	60	52	86.7	8	13.3	47	78.3	8	13.3	1	1.7	4	6.7
MONO	UNDER 18	1	0	0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	14	11	78.6	3	21.4	14	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	38	32	84.2	6	15.8	26	68.4	8	21.1	1	2.6	3	7.9
	31-40	24	21	87.5	3	12.5	12	50.0	11	45.8	0	0.0	1	4.2
	41-50	36	32	88.9	4	11.1	31	86.1	2	5.6	0	0.0	3	8.3
	51-60	15	11	73.3	4	26.7	14	93.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
	61-70	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	130	109	83.8	21	16.2	100	76.9	21	16.2	1	0.8	8	6.2
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	41	33	80.5	8	19.5	16	39.0	23	56.1	0	0.0	2	4.9
	18-20	350	311	88.9	39	11.1	64	18.3	277	79.1	3	0.9	6	1.7
	21-30	1650	1482	89.8	168	10.2	321	19.5	1253	75.9	35	2.1	41	2.5
	31-40	797	707	88.7	90	11.3	181	22.7	567	71.1	33	4.1	16	2.0
	41-50	490	400	81.6	90	18.4	217	44.3	229	46.7	27	5.5	17	3.5
	51-60	184	153	83.2	31	16.8	100	54.3	65	35.3	10	5.4	9	4.9
	61-70	55	47	85.5	8	14.5	44	80.0	6	10.9	2	3.6	3	5.5
	71 & ABOVE	17	15	88.2	2	11.8	9	52.9	5	29.4	2	11.8	1	5.9
TOTAL	3584	3148	87.8	436	12.2	952	26.6	2425	67.7	112	3.1	95	2.7	
NAPA	UNDER 18	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	9	69.2	4	30.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	106	83	78.3	23	21.7	52	49.1	54	50.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	416	362	87.0	54	13.0	177	42.5	224	53.8	8	1.9	7	1.7
	31-40	244	210	86.1	34	13.9	142	58.2	95	38.9	4	1.6	3	1.2
	41-50	185	128	69.2	57	30.8	124	67.0	51	27.6	4	2.2	6	3.2
	51-60	90	73	81.1	17	18.9	74	82.2	13	14.4	3	3.3	0	0.0
	61-70	37	27	73.0	10	27.0	34	91.9	2	5.4	1	2.7	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	1099	900	81.9	199	18.1	620	56.4	443	40.3	20	1.8	16	1.5	

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	13	9	69.2	4	30.8	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	61	54	88.5	7	11.5	53	86.9	7	11.5	0	0.0	1	1.6
	21-30	232	187	80.6	45	19.4	198	85.3	28	12.1	0	0.0	6	2.6
	31-40	184	145	78.8	39	21.2	155	84.2	20	10.9	5	2.7	4	2.2
	41-50	186	136	73.1	50	26.9	169	90.9	8	4.3	4	2.2	5	2.7
	51-60	84	69	82.1	15	17.9	78	92.9	2	2.4	3	3.6	1	1.2
	61-70	25	22	88.0	3	12.0	23	92.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	789	624	79.1	165	20.9	692	87.7	67	8.5	12	1.5	18	2.3
ORANGE	UNDER 18	92	70	76.1	22	23.9	60	65.2	24	26.1	0	0.0	8	8.7
	18-20	1005	808	80.4	197	19.6	544	54.1	373	37.1	13	1.3	75	7.5
	21-30	5724	4689	81.9	1035	18.1	2573	45.0	2513	43.9	122	2.1	516	9.0
	31-40	3335	2757	82.7	578	17.3	1521	45.6	1443	43.3	91	2.7	280	8.4
	41-50	2237	1791	80.1	446	19.9	1345	60.1	646	28.9	68	3.0	178	8.0
	51-60	845	683	80.8	162	19.2	565	66.9	187	22.1	21	2.5	72	8.5
	61-70	213	180	84.5	33	15.5	143	67.1	43	20.2	4	1.9	23	10.8
	71 & ABOVE	41	30	73.2	11	26.8	35	85.4	3	7.3	2	4.9	1	2.4
	TOTAL	13492	11008	81.6	2484	18.4	6786	50.3	5232	38.8	321	2.4	1153	8.5
PLACER	UNDER 18	22	14	63.6	8	36.4	17	77.3	4	18.2	1	4.5	0	0.0
	18-20	158	131	82.9	27	17.1	118	74.7	35	22.2	3	1.9	2	1.3
	21-30	693	554	79.9	139	20.1	508	73.3	138	19.9	22	3.2	25	3.6
	31-40	381	304	79.8	77	20.2	293	76.9	58	15.2	14	3.7	16	4.2
	41-50	363	256	70.5	107	29.5	303	83.5	44	12.1	6	1.7	10	2.8
	51-60	137	114	83.2	23	16.8	120	87.6	9	6.6	5	3.6	3	2.2
	61-70	40	32	80.0	8	20.0	38	95.0	1	2.5	0	0.0	1	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	11	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1805	1415	78.4	390	21.6	1408	78.0	289	16.0	51	2.8	57	3.2
PLUMAS	UNDER 18	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	5	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7
	18-20	19	17	89.5	2	10.5	17	89.5	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	5.3
	21-30	70	55	78.6	15	21.4	63	90.0	5	7.1	1	1.4	1	1.4
	31-40	52	38	73.1	14	26.9	48	92.3	2	3.8	2	3.8	0	0.0
	41-50	66	48	72.7	18	27.3	64	97.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	1	1.5
	51-60	46	38	82.6	8	17.4	45	97.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.2
	61-70	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	269	209	77.7	60	22.3	252	93.7	9	3.3	3	1.1	5	1.9

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	69	59	85.5	10	14.5	35	50.7	31	44.9	0	0.0	3	4.3
	18-20	803	686	85.4	117	14.6	304	37.9	441	54.9	31	3.9	27	3.4
	21-30	3385	2982	88.1	403	11.9	1048	31.0	2086	61.6	150	4.4	101	3.0
	31-40	1935	1617	83.6	318	16.4	697	36.0	1037	53.6	138	7.1	63	3.3
	41-50	1493	1200	80.4	293	19.6	715	47.9	612	41.0	122	8.2	44	2.9
	51-60	617	497	80.6	120	19.4	378	61.3	182	29.5	38	6.2	19	3.1
	61-70	177	156	88.1	21	11.9	124	70.1	33	18.6	14	7.9	6	3.4
	71 & ABOVE	54	44	81.5	10	18.5	44	81.5	8	14.8	2	3.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	8533	7241	84.9	1292	15.1	3345	39.2	4430	51.9	495	5.8	263	3.1
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	30	26	86.7	4	13.3	17	56.7	6	20.0	2	6.7	5	16.7
	18-20	574	470	81.9	104	18.1	265	46.2	207	36.1	38	6.6	64	11.1
	21-30	3125	2549	81.6	576	18.4	1374	44.0	1075	34.4	379	12.1	297	9.5
	31-40	1665	1335	80.2	330	19.8	766	46.0	453	27.2	319	19.2	127	7.6
	41-50	1221	939	76.9	282	23.1	692	56.7	210	17.2	242	19.8	77	6.3
	51-60	428	344	80.4	84	19.6	263	61.4	53	12.4	71	16.6	41	9.6
	61-70	125	110	88.0	15	12.0	84	67.2	10	8.0	18	14.4	13	10.4
	71 & ABOVE	25	22	88.0	3	12.0	19	76.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	7193	5795	80.6	1398	19.4	3480	48.4	2017	28.0	1072	14.9	624	8.7
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	1	0	0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	38	33	86.8	5	13.2	12	31.6	25	65.8	0	0.0	1	2.6
	21-30	140	123	87.9	17	12.1	26	18.6	101	72.1	1	0.7	12	8.6
	31-40	90	79	87.8	11	12.2	26	28.9	60	66.7	1	1.1	3	3.3
	41-50	65	49	75.4	16	24.6	34	52.3	27	41.5	1	1.5	3	4.6
	51-60	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	8	42.1	9	47.4	0	0.0	2	10.5
	61-70	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	357	302	84.6	55	15.4	109	30.5	224	62.7	3	0.8	21	5.9
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	52	44	84.6	8	15.4	18	34.6	28	53.8	4	7.7	2	3.8
	18-20	887	773	87.1	114	12.9	373	42.1	437	49.3	46	5.2	31	3.5
	21-30	4381	3797	86.7	584	13.3	1393	31.8	2555	58.3	286	6.5	147	3.4
	31-40	2628	2227	84.7	401	15.3	834	31.7	1437	54.7	268	10.2	89	3.4
	41-50	1829	1490	81.5	339	18.5	834	45.6	698	38.2	234	12.8	63	3.4
	51-60	685	606	88.5	79	11.5	338	49.3	239	34.9	80	11.7	28	4.1
	61-70	187	169	90.4	18	9.6	107	57.2	48	25.7	27	14.4	5	2.7
	71 & ABOVE	46	42	91.3	4	8.7	27	58.7	16	34.8	3	6.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	10695	9148	85.5	1547	14.5	3924	36.7	5458	51.0	948	8.9	365	3.4

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	152	117	77.0	35	23.0	95	62.5	48	31.6	4	2.6	5	3.3
	18-20	1505	1230	81.7	275	18.3	771	51.2	590	39.2	62	4.1	82	5.4
	21-30	7908	6449	81.6	1459	18.4	3938	49.8	2898	36.6	567	7.2	505	6.4
	31-40	3693	3035	82.2	658	17.8	1738	47.1	1441	39.0	305	8.3	209	5.7
	41-50	2597	2012	77.5	585	22.5	1536	59.1	742	28.6	202	7.8	117	4.5
	51-60	948	759	80.1	189	19.9	635	67.0	202	21.3	62	6.5	49	5.2
	61-70	257	214	83.3	43	16.7	174	67.7	46	17.9	15	5.8	22	8.6
	71 & ABOVE	69	56	81.2	13	18.8	57	82.6	10	14.5	0	0.0	2	2.9
	TOTAL	17129	13872	81.0	3257	19.0	8944	52.2	5977	34.9	1217	7.1	991	5.8
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
	18-20	85	58	68.2	27	31.8	32	37.6	16	18.8	12	14.1	25	29.4
	21-30	730	566	77.5	164	22.5	290	39.7	136	18.6	108	14.8	196	26.8
	31-40	456	381	83.6	75	16.4	212	46.5	71	15.6	80	17.5	93	20.4
	41-50	229	194	84.7	35	15.3	123	53.7	17	7.4	41	17.9	48	21.0
	51-60	102	86	84.3	16	15.7	62	60.8	3	2.9	20	19.6	17	16.7
	61-70	35	31	88.6	4	11.4	20	57.1	4	11.4	6	17.1	5	14.3
	71 & ABOVE	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1648	1325	80.4	323	19.6	746	45.3	248	15.0	270	16.4	384	23.3
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	46	40	87.0	6	13.0	21	45.7	19	41.3	3	6.5	3	6.5
	18-20	378	348	92.1	30	7.9	120	31.7	221	58.5	17	4.5	20	5.3
	21-30	1725	1513	87.7	212	12.3	407	23.6	1106	64.1	110	6.4	102	5.9
	31-40	1020	871	85.4	149	14.6	297	29.1	587	57.5	92	9.0	44	4.3
	41-50	681	564	82.8	117	17.2	320	47.0	246	36.1	76	11.2	39	5.7
	51-60	269	231	85.9	38	14.1	138	51.3	83	30.9	33	12.3	15	5.6
	61-70	81	73	90.1	8	9.9	36	44.4	29	35.8	9	11.1	7	8.6
	71 & ABOVE	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	14	73.7	3	15.8	1	5.3	1	5.3
	TOTAL	4219	3654	86.6	565	13.4	1353	32.1	2294	54.4	341	8.1	231	5.5
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	35	24	68.6	11	31.4	28	80.0	7	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	265	218	82.3	47	17.7	189	71.3	70	26.4	3	1.1	3	1.1
	21-30	961	779	81.1	182	18.9	585	60.9	334	34.8	19	2.0	23	2.4
	31-40	448	355	79.2	93	20.8	274	61.2	151	33.7	11	2.5	12	2.7
	41-50	374	256	68.4	118	31.6	299	79.9	60	16.0	10	2.7	5	1.3
	51-60	184	140	76.1	44	23.9	157	85.3	25	13.6	0	0.0	2	1.1
	61-70	38	31	81.6	7	18.4	31	81.6	6	15.8	0	0.0	1	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	16	15	93.8	1	6.3	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2321	1818	78.3	503	21.7	1579	68.0	653	28.1	43	1.9	46	2.0



TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	23	19	82.6	4	17.4	13	56.5	7	30.4	1	4.3	2	8.7
	18-20	260	197	75.8	63	24.2	109	41.9	102	39.2	8	3.1	41	15.8
	21-30	1419	1150	81.0	269	19.0	498	35.1	570	40.2	59	4.2	292	20.6
	31-40	848	687	81.0	161	19.0	349	41.2	307	36.2	50	5.9	142	16.7
	41-50	602	474	78.7	128	21.3	354	58.8	117	19.4	43	7.1	88	14.6
	51-60	262	205	78.2	57	21.8	171	65.3	49	18.7	17	6.5	25	9.5
	61-70	66	53	80.3	13	19.7	39	59.1	12	18.2	5	7.6	10	15.2
	71 & ABOVE	21	17	81.0	4	19.0	16	76.2	3	14.3	0	0.0	2	9.5
	TOTAL	3501	2802	80.0	699	20.0	1549	44.2	1167	33.3	183	5.2	602	17.2
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	26	21	80.8	5	19.2	13	50.0	12	46.2	0	0.0	1	3.8
	18-20	194	164	84.5	30	15.5	80	41.2	104	53.6	7	3.6	3	1.5
	21-30	1299	1060	81.6	239	18.4	548	42.2	671	51.7	31	2.4	49	3.8
	31-40	569	466	81.9	103	18.1	257	45.2	280	49.2	19	3.3	13	2.3
	41-50	440	340	77.3	100	22.7	275	62.5	133	30.2	24	5.5	8	1.8
	51-60	196	145	74.0	51	26.0	142	72.4	41	20.9	5	2.6	8	4.1
	61-70	34	26	76.5	8	23.5	26	76.5	6	17.6	1	2.9	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	12	9	75.0	3	25.0	11	91.7	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2770	2231	80.5	539	19.5	1352	48.8	1247	45.0	88	3.2	83	3.0
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	37	31	83.8	6	16.2	17	45.9	15	40.5	2	5.4	3	8.1
	18-20	490	408	83.3	82	16.7	145	29.6	277	56.5	13	2.7	55	11.2
	21-30	3241	2703	83.4	538	16.6	815	25.1	1790	55.2	159	4.9	477	14.7
	31-40	1609	1353	84.1	256	15.9	492	30.6	797	49.5	92	5.7	228	14.2
	41-50	1083	886	81.8	197	18.2	487	45.0	379	35.0	71	6.6	146	13.5
	51-60	421	361	85.7	60	14.3	212	50.4	125	29.7	20	4.8	64	15.2
	61-70	90	75	83.3	15	16.7	56	62.2	19	21.1	3	3.3	12	13.3
	71 & ABOVE	29	25	86.2	4	13.8	14	48.3	10	34.5	0	0.0	5	17.2
	TOTAL	7000	5842	83.5	1158	16.5	2238	32.0	3412	48.7	360	5.1	990	14.1
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	34	20	58.8	14	41.2	20	58.8	12	35.3	2	5.9	0	0.0
	18-20	182	131	72.0	51	28.0	104	57.1	67	36.8	5	2.7	6	3.3
	21-30	708	568	80.2	140	19.8	358	50.6	301	42.5	10	1.4	39	5.5
	31-40	325	261	80.3	64	19.7	205	63.1	107	32.9	8	2.5	5	1.5
	41-50	290	216	74.5	74	25.5	212	73.1	61	21.0	7	2.4	10	3.4
	51-60	132	103	78.0	29	22.0	106	80.3	19	14.4	2	1.5	5	3.8
	61-70	18	11	61.1	7	38.9	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1697	1317	77.6	380	22.4	1029	60.6	569	33.5	34	2.0	65	3.8

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SHASTA	UNDER 18	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	8	80.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0
	18-20	104	80	76.9	24	23.1	95	91.3	5	4.8	1	1.0	3	2.9
	21-30	297	228	76.8	69	23.2	265	89.2	18	6.1	3	1.0	11	3.7
	31-40	247	186	75.3	61	24.7	213	86.2	18	7.3	3	1.2	13	5.3
	41-50	233	169	72.5	64	27.5	209	89.7	16	6.9	2	0.9	6	2.6
	51-60	102	81	79.4	21	20.6	90	88.2	5	4.9	2	2.0	5	4.9
	61-70	40	37	92.5	3	7.5	37	92.5	1	2.5	1	2.5	1	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1042	797	76.5	245	23.5	925	88.8	64	6.1	12	1.2	41	3.9
SIERRA	18-20	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	13	86.7	2	13.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	16	94.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
	41-50	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	19	86.4	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	11	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	69	55	79.7	14	20.3	63	91.3	5	7.2	0	0.0	1	1.4
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	27	25	92.6	2	7.4	20	74.1	6	22.2	0	0.0	1	3.7
	21-30	98	80	81.6	18	18.4	75	76.5	15	15.3	2	2.0	6	6.1
	31-40	94	81	86.2	13	13.8	69	73.4	17	18.1	3	3.2	5	5.3
	41-50	94	76	80.9	18	19.1	84	89.4	5	5.3	3	3.2	2	2.1
	51-60	56	48	85.7	8	14.3	48	85.7	3	5.4	1	1.8	4	7.1
	61-70	16	11	68.8	5	31.3	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	396	332	83.8	64	16.2	322	81.3	47	11.9	9	2.3	18	4.5
SOLANO	UNDER 18	13	9	69.2	4	30.8	7	53.8	3	23.1	1	7.7	2	15.4
	18-20	156	124	79.5	32	20.5	58	37.2	54	34.6	19	12.2	25	16.0
	21-30	599	503	84.0	96	16.0	218	36.4	219	36.6	101	16.9	61	10.2
	31-40	394	315	79.9	79	20.1	139	35.3	110	27.9	95	24.1	50	12.7
	41-50	316	241	76.3	75	23.7	145	45.9	49	15.5	88	27.8	34	10.8
	51-60	141	112	79.4	29	20.6	86	61.0	11	7.8	28	19.9	16	11.3
	61-70	30	24	80.0	6	20.0	16	53.3	4	13.3	6	20.0	4	13.3
	71 & ABOVE	11	8	72.7	3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	9.1
	TOTAL	1660	1336	80.5	324	19.5	676	40.7	451	27.2	340	20.5	193	11.6

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SONOMA	UNDER 18	29	25	86.2	4	13.8	13	44.8	14	48.3	0	0.0	2	6.9
	18-20	272	235	86.4	37	13.6	151	55.5	114	41.9	0	0.0	7	2.6
	21-30	1188	1003	84.4	185	15.6	522	43.9	608	51.2	23	1.9	35	2.9
	31-40	583	500	85.8	83	14.2	310	53.2	246	42.2	9	1.5	18	3.1
	41-50	509	376	73.9	133	26.1	383	75.2	87	17.1	18	3.5	21	4.1
	51-60	249	197	79.1	52	20.9	207	83.1	36	14.5	4	1.6	2	0.8
	61-70	60	43	71.7	17	28.3	55	91.7	4	6.7	1	1.7	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	16	94.1	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2907	2392	82.3	515	17.7	1657	57.0	1110	38.2	55	1.9	85	2.9
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	38	31	81.6	7	18.4	12	31.6	24	63.2	0	0.0	2	5.3
	18-20	263	216	82.1	47	17.9	106	40.3	131	49.8	12	4.6	14	5.3
	21-30	1113	923	82.9	190	17.1	414	37.2	605	54.4	39	3.5	55	4.9
	31-40	553	451	81.6	102	18.4	208	37.6	302	54.6	24	4.3	19	3.4
	41-50	409	333	81.4	76	18.6	195	47.7	173	42.3	23	5.6	18	4.4
	51-60	147	123	83.7	24	16.3	91	61.9	37	25.2	8	5.4	11	7.5
	61-70	37	35	94.6	2	5.4	22	59.5	10	27.0	1	2.7	4	10.8
	71 & ABOVE	15	14	93.3	1	6.7	13	86.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2575	2126	82.6	449	17.4	1061	41.2	1283	49.8	108	4.2	123	4.8
SUTTER	UNDER 18	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	57	47	82.5	10	17.5	27	47.4	26	45.6	1	1.8	3	5.3
	21-30	209	179	85.6	30	14.4	107	51.2	82	39.2	4	1.9	16	7.7
	31-40	135	115	85.2	20	14.8	61	45.2	50	37.0	5	3.7	19	14.1
	41-50	71	50	70.4	21	29.6	45	63.4	20	28.2	0	0.0	6	8.5
	51-60	34	29	85.3	5	14.7	28	82.4	0	0.0	2	5.9	4	11.8
	61-70	15	14	93.3	1	6.7	11	73.3	3	20.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	530	441	83.2	89	16.8	284	53.6	185	34.9	12	2.3	49	9.2
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
	18-20	21	20	95.2	1	4.8	14	66.7	7	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	172	147	85.5	25	14.5	112	65.1	56	32.6	1	0.6	3	1.7
	31-40	135	116	85.9	19	14.1	90	66.7	42	31.1	0	0.0	3	2.2
	41-50	163	127	77.9	36	22.1	138	84.7	20	12.3	2	1.2	3	1.8
	51-60	62	55	88.7	7	11.3	54	87.1	5	8.1	3	4.8	0	0.0
	61-70	25	23	92.0	2	8.0	23	92.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
	71 & ABOVE	11	11	100.0	0	0.0	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	592	502	84.8	90	15.2	443	74.8	132	22.3	6	1.0	11	1.9

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TRINITY	18-20	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	31	30	96.8	1	3.2	30	96.8	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	44	32	72.7	12	27.3	40	90.9	3	6.8	0	0.0	1	2.3
	41-50	49	38	77.6	11	22.4	45	91.8	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	6.1
	51-60	32	30	93.8	2	6.3	31	96.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.1
	61-70	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	182	151	83.0	31	17.0	172	94.5	5	2.7	0	0.0	5	2.7
TULARE	UNDER 18	78	68	87.2	10	12.8	19	24.4	56	71.8	0	0.0	3	3.8
	18-20	359	335	93.3	24	6.7	78	21.7	274	76.3	0	0.0	7	1.9
	21-30	1449	1327	91.6	122	8.4	240	16.6	1151	79.4	22	1.5	36	2.5
	31-40	837	720	86.0	117	14.0	177	21.1	625	74.7	15	1.8	20	2.4
	41-50	505	446	88.3	59	11.7	146	28.9	340	67.3	9	1.8	10	2.0
	51-60	164	149	90.9	15	9.1	61	37.2	91	55.5	1	0.6	11	6.7
	61-70	44	37	84.1	7	15.9	17	38.6	26	59.1	0	0.0	1	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	10	7	70.0	3	30.0	5	50.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	3446	3089	89.6	357	10.4	743	21.6	2567	74.5	48	1.4	88	2.6	
TUOLUMNE	UNDER 18	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	46	39	84.8	7	15.2	45	97.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.2
	21-30	165	124	75.2	41	24.8	155	93.9	9	5.5	0	0.0	1	0.6
	31-40	97	73	75.3	24	24.7	95	97.9	2	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	134	95	70.9	39	29.1	131	97.8	3	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	78	61	78.2	17	21.8	76	97.4	2	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	16	15	93.8	1	6.3	15	93.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	551	421	76.4	130	23.6	532	96.6	17	3.1	0	0.0	2	0.4	
VENTURA	UNDER 18	51	43	84.3	8	15.7	31	60.8	20	39.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	355	300	84.5	55	15.5	170	47.9	175	49.3	2	0.6	8	2.3
	21-30	1791	1476	82.4	315	17.6	728	40.6	972	54.3	31	1.7	60	3.4
	31-40	1034	830	80.3	204	19.7	435	42.1	545	52.7	28	2.7	26	2.5
	41-50	749	576	76.9	173	23.1	454	60.6	252	33.6	22	2.9	21	2.8
	51-60	287	223	77.7	64	22.3	198	69.0	70	24.4	7	2.4	12	4.2
	61-70	79	68	86.1	11	13.9	53	67.1	21	26.6	0	0.0	5	6.3
	71 & ABOVE	24	22	91.7	2	8.3	18	75.0	6	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	4370	3538	81.0	832	19.0	2087	47.8	2061	47.2	90	2.1	132	3.0	

TABLE B1: 2004 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, SEX AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	SEX (100%)				RACE/ETHNICITY (100%)							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	20	15	75.0	5	25.0	10	50.0	9	45.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
	18-20	141	119	84.4	22	15.6	72	51.1	52	36.9	2	1.4	15	10.6
	21-30	487	418	85.8	69	14.2	212	43.5	232	47.6	14	2.9	29	6.0
	31-40	225	194	86.2	31	13.8	105	46.7	103	45.8	8	3.6	9	4.0
	41-50	178	147	82.6	31	17.4	102	57.3	60	33.7	8	4.5	8	4.5
	51-60	69	59	85.5	10	14.5	53	76.8	12	17.4	1	1.4	3	4.3
	61-70	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	15	68.2	6	27.3	1	4.5	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
	TOTAL	1146	975	85.1	171	14.9	572	49.9	474	41.4	34	3.0	66	5.8
YUBA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	48	44	91.7	4	8.3	32	66.7	12	25.0	1	2.1	3	6.3
	21-30	209	180	86.1	29	13.9	97	46.4	96	45.9	8	3.8	8	3.8
	31-40	158	122	77.2	36	22.8	96	60.8	53	33.5	7	4.4	2	1.3
	41-50	121	99	81.8	22	18.2	96	79.3	19	15.7	4	3.3	2	1.7
	51-60	50	46	92.0	4	8.0	35	70.0	9	18.0	4	8.0	2	4.0
	61-70	15	11	73.3	4	26.7	12	80.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	1	6.7
	71 & ABOVE	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	608	508	83.6	100	16.4	374	61.5	192	31.6	24	3.9	18	3.0

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		140847	100.0	117580	100.0	23267	100.0
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	17	0.4	13	0.4	4	0.6
	18-20	191	4.9	161	4.9	30	4.5
	21-30	1440	36.6	1218	37.3	222	33.4
	31-40	1102	28.0	906	27.7	196	29.5
	41-50	756	19.2	608	18.6	148	22.3
	51-60	334	8.5	277	8.5	57	8.6
	61-70	70	1.8	62	1.9	8	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	24	0.6	24	0.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3934	100.0	3269	100.0	665	100.0
ALPINE	18-20	1	2.6	1	2.9	0	0.0
	21-30	8	20.5	8	23.5	0	0.0
	31-40	3	7.7	3	8.8	0	0.0
	41-50	21	53.8	16	47.1	5	100.0
	51-60	4	10.3	4	11.8	0	0.0
	61-70	1	2.6	1	2.9	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	2.6	1	2.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	39	100.0	34	100.0	5	100.0
AMADOR	UNDER 18	2	1.0	1	0.6	1	2.6
	18-20	12	5.7	8	4.7	4	10.3
	21-30	49	23.3	45	26.3	4	10.3
	31-40	52	24.8	39	22.8	13	33.3
	41-50	52	24.8	42	24.6	10	25.6
	51-60	35	16.7	29	17.0	6	15.4
	61-70	6	2.9	5	2.9	1	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.0	2	1.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	210	100.0	171	100.0	39	100.0
BUTTE	UNDER 18	14	1.3	10	1.2	4	1.8
	18-20	154	14.3	123	14.4	31	14.0
	21-30	434	40.3	370	43.2	64	29.0
	31-40	196	18.2	145	16.9	51	23.1
	41-50	181	16.8	128	14.9	53	24.0
	51-60	75	7.0	59	6.9	16	7.2
	61-70	17	1.6	15	1.8	2	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.6	7	0.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1078	100.0	857	100.0	221	100.0
CALAVERAS	UNDER 18	1	0.5	1	0.6	0	0.0
	18-20	15	7.0	12	7.3	3	5.9
	21-30	52	24.2	48	29.3	4	7.8
	31-40	50	23.3	31	18.9	19	37.3
	41-50	57	26.5	37	22.6	20	39.2
	51-60	28	13.0	23	14.0	5	9.8
	61-70	9	4.2	9	5.5	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.4	3	1.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	215	100.0	164	100.0	51	100.0
COLUSA	UNDER 18	2	1.1	2	1.2	0	0.0
	18-20	16	8.8	16	10.0	0	0.0
	21-30	64	35.2	55	34.4	9	40.9
	31-40	36	19.8	31	19.4	5	22.7
	41-50	37	20.3	31	19.4	6	27.3
	51-60	21	11.5	19	11.9	2	9.1
	61-70	5	2.7	5	3.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.5	1	0.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	182	100.0	160	100.0	22	100.0
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	16	0.5	15	0.6	1	0.2
	18-20	219	7.1	181	7.3	38	6.2
	21-30	1194	38.7	973	39.4	221	35.9
	31-40	778	25.2	615	24.9	163	26.5
	41-50	571	18.5	436	17.7	135	21.9
	51-60	229	7.4	183	7.4	46	7.5
	61-70	58	1.9	51	2.1	7	1.1
	71 & ABOVE	20	0.6	15	0.6	5	0.8
	TOTAL	3085	100.0	2469	100.0	616	100.0

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	1	0.6	1	0.8	0	0.0
	18-20	13	8.4	13	9.9	0	0.0
	21-30	31	20.0	25	19.1	6	25.0
	31-40	47	30.3	41	31.3	6	25.0
	41-50	40	25.8	31	23.7	9	37.5
	51-60	14	9.0	12	9.2	2	8.3
	61-70	6	3.9	6	4.6	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.9	2	1.5	1	4.2
TOTAL	155	100.0	131	100.0	24	100.0	
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	4	0.4	4	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	75	7.0	60	6.9	15	7.0
	21-30	350	32.5	300	34.7	50	23.5
	31-40	273	25.3	207	23.9	66	31.0
	41-50	271	25.1	207	23.9	64	30.0
	51-60	78	7.2	64	7.4	14	6.6
	61-70	20	1.9	18	2.1	2	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.6	5	0.6	2	0.9
TOTAL	1078	100.0	865	100.0	213	100.0	
FRESNO	UNDER 18	13	0.3	12	0.4	1	0.2
	18-20	304	8.1	278	8.5	26	5.3
	21-30	1548	41.1	1368	41.9	180	36.4
	31-40	953	25.3	801	24.5	152	30.8
	41-50	648	17.2	540	16.5	108	21.9
	51-60	230	6.1	209	6.4	21	4.3
	61-70	47	1.2	42	1.3	5	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	19	0.5	18	0.6	1	0.2
TOTAL	3762	100.0	3268	100.0	494	100.0	
GLENN	UNDER 18	1	0.4	1	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	24	10.2	23	11.3	1	3.0
	21-30	78	33.1	73	36.0	5	15.2
	31-40	59	25.0	52	25.6	7	21.2
	41-50	39	16.5	30	14.8	9	27.3
	51-60	25	10.6	16	7.9	9	27.3
	61-70	7	3.0	5	2.5	2	6.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.3	3	1.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	236	100.0	203	100.0	33	100.0	
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
	18-20	66	8.6	43	7.3	23	12.7
	21-30	338	43.8	274	46.4	64	35.4
	31-40	141	18.3	104	17.6	37	20.4
	41-50	137	17.8	94	15.9	43	23.8
	51-60	67	8.7	55	9.3	12	6.6
	61-70	18	2.3	16	2.7	2	1.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.4	3	0.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	771	100.0	590	100.0	181	100.0	
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0.0
	18-20	38	7.1	36	7.7	2	3.0
	21-30	174	32.7	156	33.5	18	26.9
	31-40	118	22.2	101	21.7	17	25.4
	41-50	112	21.1	91	19.6	21	31.3
	51-60	64	12.0	60	12.9	4	6.0
	61-70	22	4.1	19	4.1	3	4.5
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.6	1	0.2	2	3.0
TOTAL	532	100.0	465	100.0	67	100.0	
INYO	UNDER 18	3	1.4	1	0.6	2	4.3
	18-20	15	7.2	14	8.6	1	2.2
	21-30	41	19.6	30	18.4	11	23.9
	31-40	42	20.1	30	18.4	12	26.1
	41-50	64	30.6	48	29.4	16	34.8
	51-60	31	14.8	29	17.8	2	4.3
	61-70	11	5.3	9	5.5	2	4.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.0	2	1.2	0	0.0
TOTAL	209	100.0	163	100.0	46	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
KERN	UNDER 18	59	1.3	52	1.4	7	1.1
	18-20	382	8.6	339	8.9	43	6.9
	21-30	1730	38.9	1510	39.5	220	35.1
	31-40	1123	25.2	960	25.1	163	26.0
	41-50	794	17.8	651	17.0	143	22.8
	51-60	264	5.9	223	5.8	41	6.5
	61-70	79	1.8	70	1.8	9	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	18	0.4	18	0.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	4449	100.0	3823	100.0	626	100.0	
KINGS	UNDER 18	7	1.0	5	0.8	2	1.8
	18-20	70	9.6	64	10.3	6	5.4
	21-30	308	42.2	267	43.1	41	36.9
	31-40	157	21.5	128	20.7	29	26.1
	41-50	126	17.3	99	16.0	27	24.3
	51-60	41	5.6	36	5.8	5	4.5
	61-70	12	1.6	11	1.8	1	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	9	1.2	9	1.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	730	100.0	619	100.0	111	100.0	
LAKE	UNDER 18	3	0.7	3	0.9	0	0.0
	18-20	19	4.2	18	5.2	1	0.9
	21-30	122	26.8	101	29.3	21	19.1
	31-40	100	22.0	75	21.7	25	22.7
	41-50	116	25.5	74	21.4	42	38.2
	51-60	71	15.6	55	15.9	16	14.5
	61-70	19	4.2	15	4.3	4	3.6
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.1	4	1.2	1	0.9
TOTAL	455	100.0	345	100.0	110	100.0	
LASSEN	18-20	24	9.8	19	9.4	5	12.2
	21-30	64	26.2	54	26.6	10	24.4
	31-40	51	20.9	40	19.7	11	26.8
	41-50	60	24.6	50	24.6	10	24.4
	51-60	35	14.3	32	15.8	3	7.3
	61-70	10	4.1	8	3.9	2	4.9
	TOTAL	244	100.0	203	100.0	41	100.0
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	33	0.1	28	0.1	5	0.1
	18-20	1425	5.2	1182	5.0	243	6.0
	21-30	11169	40.4	9428	40.0	1741	42.9
	31-40	7922	28.7	6870	29.1	1052	25.9
	41-50	4787	17.3	4070	17.3	717	17.7
	51-60	1740	6.3	1506	6.4	234	5.8
	61-70	461	1.7	413	1.8	48	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	91	0.3	72	0.3	19	0.5
TOTAL	27628	100.0	23569	100.0	4059	100.0	
MADERA	UNDER 18	4	0.7	3	0.6	1	1.4
	18-20	41	6.9	40	7.6	1	1.4
	21-30	212	35.6	195	37.2	17	23.6
	31-40	162	27.2	142	27.1	20	27.8
	41-50	116	19.5	88	16.8	28	38.9
	51-60	48	8.1	45	8.6	3	4.2
	61-70	9	1.5	7	1.3	2	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.7	4	0.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	596	100.0	524	100.0	72	100.0	
MARIN	UNDER 18	17	1.2	13	1.2	4	1.4
	18-20	83	5.9	67	6.1	16	5.4
	21-30	476	34.1	405	36.8	71	24.1
	31-40	361	25.9	280	25.4	81	27.6
	41-50	260	18.6	189	17.2	71	24.1
	51-60	154	11.0	112	10.2	42	14.3
	61-70	36	2.6	28	2.5	8	2.7
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.6	7	0.6	1	0.3
TOTAL	1395	100.0	1101	100.0	294	100.0	



TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIPOSA	UNDER 18	1	1.0	1	1.3	0	0.0
	18-20	4	4.0	4	5.1	0	0.0
	21-30	20	20.2	19	24.1	1	5.0
	31-40	23	23.2	18	22.8	5	25.0
	41-50	36	36.4	26	32.9	10	50.0
	51-60	11	11.1	8	10.1	3	15.0
	61-70	4	4.0	3	3.8	1	5.0
	TOTAL	99	100.0	79	100.0	20	100.0
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	10	1.5	8	1.5	2	1.4
	18-20	53	7.7	42	7.8	11	7.6
	21-30	215	31.4	188	34.9	27	18.6
	31-40	169	24.7	134	24.9	35	24.1
	41-50	148	21.6	105	19.5	43	29.7
	51-60	71	10.4	50	9.3	21	14.5
	61-70	18	2.6	12	2.2	6	4.1
	TOTAL	684	100.0	539	100.0	145	100.0
MERCED	UNDER 18	3	0.3	2	0.2	1	0.8
	18-20	112	10.2	101	10.4	11	8.6
	21-30	431	39.1	390	40.1	41	32.0
	31-40	270	24.5	244	25.1	26	20.3
	41-50	187	17.0	151	15.5	36	28.1
	51-60	72	6.5	61	6.3	11	8.6
	61-70	22	2.0	20	2.1	2	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.4	4	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	1101	100.0	973	100.0	128	100.0	
MODOC	18-20	2	5.3	2	6.3	0	0.0
	21-30	6	15.8	5	15.6	1	16.7
	31-40	7	18.4	5	15.6	2	33.3
	41-50	15	39.5	13	40.6	2	33.3
	51-60	5	13.2	5	15.6	0	0.0
	61-70	2	5.3	1	3.1	1	16.7
	71 & ABOVE	1	2.6	1	3.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	38	100.0	32	100.0	6	100.0
MONO	18-20	12	8.7	11	9.2	1	5.3
	21-30	45	32.6	38	31.9	7	36.8
	31-40	38	27.5	30	25.2	8	42.1
	41-50	26	18.8	25	21.0	1	5.3
	51-60	14	10.1	12	10.1	2	10.5
	61-70	2	1.4	2	1.7	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.7	1	0.8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	138	100.0	119	100.0	19	100.0
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	5	0.2	4	0.2	1	0.3
	18-20	234	8.1	202	8.1	32	8.7
	21-30	1352	47.0	1215	48.5	137	37.3
	31-40	679	23.6	598	23.9	81	22.1
	41-50	380	13.2	303	12.1	77	21.0
	51-60	169	5.9	142	5.7	27	7.4
	61-70	36	1.3	26	1.0	10	2.7
	71 & ABOVE	19	0.7	17	0.7	2	0.5
TOTAL	2874	100.0	2507	100.0	367	100.0	
NAPA	UNDER 18	4	0.4	4	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	93	9.3	79	9.7	14	7.4
	21-30	384	38.3	331	40.6	53	28.2
	31-40	234	23.3	185	22.7	49	26.1
	41-50	176	17.5	133	16.3	43	22.9
	51-60	87	8.7	64	7.9	23	12.2
	61-70	21	2.1	15	1.8	6	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.4	4	0.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	1003	100.0	815	100.0	188	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	7	1.3	4	0.9	3	2.8
	18-20	45	8.5	37	8.8	8	7.4
	21-30	157	29.6	138	32.7	19	17.6
	31-40	131	24.7	106	25.1	25	23.1
	41-50	128	24.2	92	21.8	36	33.3
	51-60	49	9.2	36	8.5	13	12.0
	61-70	11	2.1	8	1.9	3	2.8
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.4	1	0.2	1	0.9
TOTAL	530	100.0	422	100.0	108	100.0	
ORANGE	UNDER 18	67	0.5	51	0.5	16	0.7
	18-20	873	7.1	687	6.8	186	8.5
	21-30	5016	40.9	4215	41.8	801	36.7
	31-40	3313	27.0	2751	27.3	562	25.8
	41-50	2010	16.4	1585	15.7	425	19.5
	51-60	762	6.2	609	6.0	153	7.0
	61-70	177	1.4	146	1.4	31	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	45	0.4	39	0.4	6	0.3
TOTAL	12263	100.0	10083	100.0	2180	100.0	
PLACER	UNDER 18	16	1.0	9	0.7	7	2.0
	18-20	131	8.5	97	8.0	34	9.9
	21-30	565	36.5	456	37.7	109	31.9
	31-40	366	23.6	281	23.3	85	24.9
	41-50	321	20.7	243	20.1	78	22.8
	51-60	111	7.2	90	7.5	21	6.1
	61-70	34	2.2	28	2.3	6	1.8
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.4	4	0.3	2	0.6
TOTAL	1550	100.0	1208	100.0	342	100.0	
PLUMAS	18-20	17	9.7	12	9.1	5	11.6
	21-30	36	20.6	25	18.9	11	25.6
	31-40	42	24.0	31	23.5	11	25.6
	41-50	46	26.3	36	27.3	10	23.3
	51-60	27	15.4	21	15.9	6	14.0
	61-70	7	4.0	7	5.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	175	100.0	132	100.0	43	100.0
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	33	0.4	31	0.5	2	0.2
	18-20	600	8.1	489	7.9	111	9.2
	21-30	2857	38.5	2444	39.3	413	34.4
	31-40	1814	24.4	1512	24.3	302	25.1
	41-50	1324	17.8	1066	17.1	258	21.5
	51-60	562	7.6	482	7.7	80	6.7
	61-70	184	2.5	159	2.6	25	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	48	0.6	37	0.6	11	0.9
TOTAL	7422	100.0	6220	100.0	1202	100.0	
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	27	0.4	22	0.5	5	0.4
	18-20	451	7.4	351	7.3	100	7.7
	21-30	2531	41.3	2010	41.6	521	40.3
	31-40	1528	24.9	1199	24.8	329	25.5
	41-50	1069	17.5	822	17.0	247	19.1
	51-60	394	6.4	321	6.6	73	5.7
	61-70	99	1.6	83	1.7	16	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	26	0.4	25	0.5	1	0.1
TOTAL	6125	100.0	4833	100.0	1292	100.0	
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	4	1.3	4	1.5	0	0.0
	18-20	26	8.5	24	8.9	2	5.6
	21-30	118	38.7	105	39.0	13	36.1
	31-40	70	23.0	62	23.0	8	22.2
	41-50	58	19.0	47	17.5	11	30.6
	51-60	19	6.2	17	6.3	2	5.6
	61-70	10	3.3	10	3.7	0	0.0
TOTAL	305	100.0	269	100.0	36	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	9	0.1	8	0.1	1	0.1
	18-20	615	7.3	523	7.3	92	7.0
	21-30	3357	39.8	2871	40.3	486	37.2
	31-40	2166	25.7	1801	25.3	365	27.9
	41-50	1512	17.9	1238	17.4	274	21.0
	51-60	582	6.9	515	7.2	67	5.1
	61-70	147	1.7	126	1.8	21	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	45	0.5	45	0.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	8433	100.0	7127	100.0	1306	100.0	
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	71	0.5	60	0.5	11	0.5
	18-20	1131	8.5	902	8.2	229	10.3
	21-30	5763	43.4	4905	44.3	858	38.7
	31-40	3155	23.8	2624	23.7	531	24.0
	41-50	2103	15.8	1696	15.3	407	18.4
	51-60	779	5.9	643	5.8	136	6.1
	61-70	214	1.6	179	1.6	35	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	65	0.5	55	0.5	10	0.5
TOTAL	13281	100.0	11064	100.0	2217	100.0	
SAN FRANCISCO	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	24	2.9	19	2.8	5	3.2
	21-30	340	40.8	265	39.0	75	48.7
	31-40	238	28.5	201	29.6	37	24.0
	41-50	146	17.5	129	19.0	17	11.0
	51-60	64	7.7	45	6.6	19	12.3
	61-70	18	2.2	17	2.5	1	0.6
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.4	3	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	834	100.0	680	100.0	154	100.0	
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	23	0.7	22	0.8	1	0.2
	18-20	289	8.5	258	9.0	31	5.9
	21-30	1252	36.8	1090	37.8	162	31.0
	31-40	893	26.2	731	25.4	162	31.0
	41-50	633	18.6	510	17.7	123	23.6
	51-60	223	6.6	188	6.5	35	6.7
	61-70	69	2.0	63	2.2	6	1.1
	71 & ABOVE	20	0.6	18	0.6	2	0.4
TOTAL	3402	100.0	2880	100.0	522	100.0	
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	14	0.8	13	0.9	1	0.3
	18-20	190	11.2	158	11.4	32	10.6
	21-30	687	40.7	586	42.2	101	33.6
	31-40	346	20.5	285	20.5	61	20.3
	41-50	266	15.7	199	14.3	67	22.3
	51-60	139	8.2	105	7.6	34	11.3
	61-70	36	2.1	32	2.3	4	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	12	0.7	11	0.8	1	0.3
TOTAL	1690	100.0	1389	100.0	301	100.0	
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	11	0.4	9	0.4	2	0.4
	18-20	148	5.2	118	5.1	30	5.8
	21-30	1098	38.8	901	39.0	197	37.9
	31-40	721	25.5	607	26.2	114	21.9
	41-50	542	19.1	422	18.2	120	23.1
	51-60	242	8.5	200	8.6	42	8.1
	61-70	58	2.0	48	2.1	10	1.9
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.5	8	0.3	5	1.0
TOTAL	2833	100.0	2313	100.0	520	100.0	
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	14	0.6	13	0.7	1	0.2
	18-20	253	10.4	208	10.5	45	10.0
	21-30	1094	45.1	909	46.0	185	41.1
	31-40	492	20.3	402	20.3	90	20.0
	41-50	389	16.0	301	15.2	88	19.6
	51-60	137	5.6	110	5.6	27	6.0
	61-70	36	1.5	25	1.3	11	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.5	10	0.5	3	0.7
TOTAL	2428	100.0	1978	100.0	450	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	38	0.6	29	0.6	9	0.9
	18-20	454	7.6	379	7.5	75	7.9
	21-30	2477	41.4	2116	42.1	361	37.8
	31-40	1499	25.1	1261	25.1	238	24.9
	41-50	1042	17.4	857	17.0	185	19.4
	51-60	338	5.7	276	5.5	62	6.5
	61-70	102	1.7	83	1.7	19	2.0
	71 & ABOVE	31	0.5	26	0.5	5	0.5
TOTAL	5981	100.0	5027	100.0	954	100.0	
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	16	1.1	12	1.0	4	1.3
	18-20	138	9.3	115	9.8	23	7.7
	21-30	566	38.3	449	38.1	117	39.3
	31-40	319	21.6	258	21.9	61	20.5
	41-50	294	19.9	233	19.8	61	20.5
	51-60	123	8.3	94	8.0	29	9.7
	61-70	13	0.9	10	0.8	3	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	0.5	8	0.7	0	0.0
TOTAL	1477	100.0	1179	100.0	298	100.0	
SHASTA	UNDER 18	12	1.1	10	1.2	2	0.8
	18-20	82	7.8	66	8.2	16	6.5
	21-30	363	34.4	287	35.5	76	30.9
	31-40	232	22.0	165	20.4	67	27.2
	41-50	248	23.5	186	23.0	62	25.2
	51-60	80	7.6	64	7.9	16	6.5
	61-70	29	2.7	23	2.8	6	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	9	0.9	8	1.0	1	0.4
TOTAL	1055	100.0	809	100.0	246	100.0	
SIERRA	UNDER 18	1	3.0	1	3.8	0	0.0
	18-20	5	15.2	4	15.4	1	14.3
	21-30	5	15.2	4	15.4	1	14.3
	31-40	9	27.3	8	30.8	1	14.3
	41-50	6	18.2	6	23.1	0	0.0
	51-60	7	21.2	3	11.5	4	57.1
	TOTAL	33	100.0	26	100.0	7	100.0
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	6	2.3	4	1.9	2	4.4
	18-20	24	9.3	22	10.3	2	4.4
	21-30	57	22.1	50	23.5	7	15.6
	31-40	58	22.5	48	22.5	10	22.2
	41-50	66	25.6	44	20.7	22	48.9
	51-60	33	12.8	33	15.5	0	0.0
	61-70	6	2.3	4	1.9	2	4.4
	71 & ABOVE	8	3.1	8	3.8	0	0.0
TOTAL	258	100.0	213	100.0	45	100.0	
SOLANO	UNDER 18	5	0.4	5	0.4	0	0.0
	18-20	111	7.9	92	7.8	19	8.2
	21-30	476	33.8	425	36.2	51	22.0
	31-40	352	25.0	283	24.1	69	29.7
	41-50	285	20.3	222	18.9	63	27.2
	51-60	133	9.5	107	9.1	26	11.2
	61-70	31	2.2	29	2.5	2	0.9
	71 & ABOVE	14	1.0	12	1.0	2	0.9
TOTAL	1407	100.0	1175	100.0	232	100.0	
SONOMA	UNDER 18	42	1.9	34	1.9	8	2.2
	18-20	214	9.8	182	9.9	32	8.9
	21-30	848	38.7	741	40.5	107	29.7
	31-40	495	22.6	415	22.7	80	22.2
	41-50	352	16.1	267	14.6	85	23.6
	51-60	194	8.9	157	8.6	37	10.3
	61-70	33	1.5	27	1.5	6	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.6	8	0.4	5	1.4
TOTAL	2191	100.0	1831	100.0	360	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	12	0.8	11	0.8	1	0.4
	18-20	187	12.0	155	11.8	32	12.6
	21-30	630	40.3	543	41.4	87	34.4
	31-40	364	23.3	298	22.7	66	26.1
	41-50	239	15.3	187	14.3	52	20.6
	51-60	102	6.5	91	6.9	11	4.3
	61-70	25	1.6	22	1.7	3	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.3	4	0.3	1	0.4
TOTAL	1564	100.0	1311	100.0	253	100.0	
SUTTER	UNDER 18	3	0.8	2	0.6	1	1.7
	18-20	37	9.4	30	8.9	7	12.1
	21-30	165	41.9	147	43.8	18	31.0
	31-40	86	21.8	71	21.1	15	25.9
	41-50	65	16.5	53	15.8	12	20.7
	51-60	26	6.6	22	6.5	4	6.9
	61-70	10	2.5	9	2.7	1	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	2	0.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	394	100.0	336	100.0	58	100.0	
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	3	0.7	3	0.8	0	0.0
	18-20	33	8.0	30	8.5	3	4.9
	21-30	125	30.1	107	30.2	18	29.5
	31-40	110	26.5	89	25.1	21	34.4
	41-50	87	21.0	74	20.9	13	21.3
	51-60	33	8.0	30	8.5	3	4.9
	61-70	19	4.6	17	4.8	2	3.3
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.2	4	1.1	1	1.6
TOTAL	415	100.0	354	100.0	61	100.0	
TRINITY	18-20	13	14.3	13	17.6	0	0.0
	21-30	27	29.7	24	32.4	3	17.6
	31-40	14	15.4	9	12.2	5	29.4
	41-50	19	20.9	15	20.3	4	23.5
	51-60	14	15.4	9	12.2	5	29.4
	61-70	3	3.3	3	4.1	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1.1	1	1.4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	91	100.0	74	100.0	17	100.0
TULARE	UNDER 18	11	0.4	11	0.5	0	0.0
	18-20	234	9.2	207	9.4	27	7.8
	21-30	1053	41.5	912	41.6	141	40.5
	31-40	664	26.1	561	25.6	103	29.6
	41-50	399	15.7	343	15.6	56	16.1
	51-60	121	4.8	106	4.8	15	4.3
	61-70	52	2.0	46	2.1	6	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.2	6	0.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	2540	100.0	2192	100.0	348	100.0	
TUOLUMNE	18-20	28	6.7	21	6.6	7	7.2
	21-30	115	27.7	96	30.2	19	19.6
	31-40	86	20.7	64	20.1	22	22.7
	41-50	109	26.3	78	24.5	31	32.0
	51-60	58	14.0	47	14.8	11	11.3
	61-70	17	4.1	11	3.5	6	6.2
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	1.0
	TOTAL	415	100.0	318	100.0	97	100.0
VENTURA	UNDER 18	6	0.2	5	0.2	1	0.2
	18-20	309	8.6	268	8.9	41	7.1
	21-30	1482	41.2	1292	42.9	190	32.8
	31-40	819	22.8	688	22.8	131	22.6
	41-50	679	18.9	526	17.4	153	26.4
	51-60	231	6.4	183	6.1	48	8.3
	61-70	55	1.5	44	1.5	11	1.9
	71 & ABOVE	13	0.4	9	0.3	4	0.7
TOTAL	3594	100.0	3015	100.0	579	100.0	

TABLE B2: 2003 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, SEX, AND AGE (continued)

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	11	1.3	8	1.1	3	2.8
	18-20	97	11.8	84	11.8	13	11.9
	21-30	358	43.7	318	44.8	40	36.7
	31-40	175	21.4	149	21.0	26	23.9
	41-50	108	13.2	92	13.0	16	14.7
	51-60	48	5.9	40	5.6	8	7.3
	61-70	17	2.1	15	2.1	2	1.8
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.6	4	0.6	1	0.9
	TOTAL	819	100.0	710	100.0	109	100.0
YUBA	UNDER 18	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	41	9.7	37	10.4	4	6.0
	21-30	146	34.6	129	36.3	17	25.4
	31-40	103	24.4	85	23.9	18	26.9
	41-50	81	19.2	58	16.3	23	34.3
	51-60	38	9.0	33	9.3	5	7.5
	61-70	10	2.4	10	2.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	2	0.6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	422	100.0	355	100.0	67	100.0

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	76.7%		137126	3721	15413	3362	3480	1155	3.3	3.0
ALAMEDA	60.4%	SUP OAKLAND	30	9	0	0	2	0	9.0	3.3
		JUV SAN LEANDRO	19	3	1	0	1	0	3.7	2.5
		ALAMEDA	164	2	16	12	3	1	2.2	1.8
		BERKELEY	2	0	0	0	6	0	2.2	0.5
		FREMONT	505	1	74	9	21	0	4.6	2.7
		PLEASANTON	1047	8	278	28	13	1	4.0	2.0
		OAKLAND	1290	17	242	73	31	1	3.7	2.0
		HAYWARD	829	8	71	10	33	4	4.5	6.4
		TOTAL	3886	48	682	132	110	7	---	---
ALPINE	66.1%	SUP MARKLEVILLE	39	0	9	4	0	0	2.2	2.4
		TOTAL	39	0	9	4	0	0	---	---
AMADOR	97.2%	JACKSON	197	13	24	3	0	1	4.4	2.4
		TOTAL	197	13	24	3	0	1	---	---
BUTTE	74.4%	SUP OROVILLE	376	48	96	20	14	2	5.5	2.8
		JUV OROVILLE	19	1	2	0	0	0	3.3	2.5
		CHICO	42	0	8	0	2	22	3.3	2.1
		GRIDLEY	7	0	3	0	0	1	2.4	1.5
		OROVILLE	578	4	103	17	19	8	2.9	2.7
		SUP PARADISE	3	0	1	0	1	2	3.9	6.2
		TOTAL	1025	53	213	37	36	35	---	---
CALAVERAS	72.6%	SUP CALAVERAS	204	10	34	3	2	0	3.6	3.1
		JUV CALAVERAS	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.9	1.2
		TOTAL	205	10	34	3	2	0	---	---
COLUSA	71.7%	SUP COLUSA	1	1	0	0	0	0	7.4	0.3
		JUV COLUSA	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.6	1.0
		COLUSA	172	6	34	9	3	3	2.8	2.2
		TOTAL	174	8	34	9	3	3	---	---
CONTRA COSTA	72.2%	SUP CONTRA COSTA	26	51	0	0	3	0	8.7	3.8
		JUV CONTRA COSTA	26	0	3	0	0	0	4.0	3.4
		CONCORD	777	6	78	5	9	4	3.8	3.8
		RICHMOND	682	6	116	12	9	4	5.2	4.1
		PITTSBURG	736	8	66	3	8	2	4.7	3.9
		WALNUT CREEK	764	2	139	5	2	4	4.1	3.8
		EL CERRITO	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.4	3.9
		TOTAL	3012	73	402	25	31	14	---	---
DEL NORTE	47.3%	SUP DEL NORTE	146	9	83	14	17	0	3.1	3.3
		TOTAL	146	9	83	14	17	2	---	---
EL DORADO	78.5%	SUP EL DORADO	23	5	0	0	1	0	5.5	5.4
		SO LAKE TAHOE	417	6	59	9	3	3	2.2	6.3
		PLACERVILLE	601	26	40	14	11	11	3.9	4.3
		TOTAL	1041	37	99	23	15	14	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
FRESNO	65.5%	JUV FRESNO	15	0	0	1	0	0	3.3	3.6
		FRESNO	2380	96	407	27	23	10	5.3	2.0
		CLOVIS	308	0	42	5	4	0	7.3	1.8
		COALINGA	209	3	67	4	2	0	4.6	1.4
		FIREBAUGH	118	0	18	1	1	0	4.3	0.8
		FOWLER	163	5	42	0	5	1	4.8	0.9
		KERMAN	63	2	11	0	0	0	5.7	1.4
		KINGSBURG	81	5	26	1	0	1	5.7	1.2
		REEDLEY MUNI	194	7	23	2	4	0	4.6	1.6
		SANGER	1	0	0	0	0	2	2.9	0.7
		SELMA	104	6	9	2	4	1	5.9	0.9
		US CT FRESNO	2	0	0	0	0	0	5.7	7.0
TOTAL	3638	124	645	43	43	16	---	---		
GLEN	62.1%	SUP WILLOWS	220	14	22	12	8	1	2.9	1.4
		JUV GLENN	2	0	0	0	0	0	2.9	2.7
		TOTAL	222	14	22	12	8	1	---	---
HUMBOLDT	61.5%	SUPJUV HUMBOLDT	746	24	174	37	20	1	3.5	1.3
		ARCATA	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.7	2.7
		TOTAL	747	24	174	37	20	1	---	---
IMPERIAL	40.8%	SUP IMPERIAL	126	0	0	40	1	0	7.0	6.8
		JUV IMPERIAL	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	2.5
		BRAWLEY	107	0	15	13	1	6	7.2	5.0
		CALEXICO	84	0	26	14	3	3	4.8	2.3
		EL CENTRO	202	12	18	23	5	15	6.6	6.1
		TOTAL	520	12	59	90	10	24	---	---
INYO	75.5%	SUP INYO	5	5	0	0	0	0	2.8	3.8
		JUV TRAFFIC INYO	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.3	8.4
		JUV INYO	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.3	2.0
		BISHOP	194	2	51	5	7	2	3.6	2.2
		TOTAL	201	8	51	6	7	2	---	---
KERN	79.8%	SUP KERN	1	0	0	0	0	2	1.2	11.0
		JUV KERN	65	5	2	4	0	0	2.6	4.8
		ARVIN LAMONT	437	14	24	13	16	0	2.3	3.9
		BAKERSFIELD	2432	40	367	40	40	22	2.1	2.5
		DELANO	320	15	33	2	3	1	2.3	4.7
		LAKE ISABELLA	200	0	26	2	3	0	2.0	2.5
		TAFT	173	11	9	2	2	2	2.3	2.8
		SHAFTER	311	15	32	6	6	10	1.5	3.7
		MOJAVE	239	4	33	39	14	0	1.5	3.4
		RIDGECREST	166	1	20	2	2	3	2.1	3.8
		TOTAL	4344	105	546	110	86	40	---	---



TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
KINGS	78.4%	SUP KINGS	13	7	0	0	0	0	3.5	1.1
		JUV HANFORD	8	0	0	0	0	0	2.6	2.9
		HANFORD	557	10	68	11	12	2	2.8	1.5
		AVENAL	67	0	11	3	2	0	2.9	1.4
		CORCORAN	67	0	6	0	1	1	3.8	1.5
		LEMOORE	0	1	0	0	0	0	---	---
		TOTAL	712	18	85	14	15	3	---	---
LAKE	71.7%	SUP LAKE	280	4	14	19	6	1	6.4	6.6
		CLEARLAKE	169	2	5	8	4	0	6.4	11.0
		TOTAL	449	6	19	27	10	1	---	---
LASSEN	80.3%	SUSANVILLE	234	10	7	12	8	2	4.4	3.8
		TOTAL	234	10	7	12	8	2	---	---
LOS ANGELES	72.7%	SUP LA	118	51	0	0	2	0	4.7	1.2
		SUP POMONA	82	35	0	0	5	0	4.1	1.2
		SUP LANCASTER	23	8	0	0	0	0	3.5	1.4
		SUP VAN NUYS	101	21	0	0	0	0	4.8	1.0
		SUP PASADENA	18	6	0	0	1	0	8.7	1.7
		SUP VAN NUYS	24	10	0	0	0	0	5.4	1.4
		SUP LONG BEACH	21	15	0	0	0	0	4.8	1.4
		SUP COMPTON	16	12	0	0	0	0	6.2	1.0
		SUP NORWALK	61	26	0	0	1	0	4.8	0.7
		SUP TORRANCE	17	12	0	0	0	0	7.5	1.0
		SUP SANTA MONICA	7	5	0	1	1	0	8.0	0.7
		JUV LA	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.5	4.1
		LA JUV CENTRAL	14	1	0	0	0	0	4.6	3.6
		SUP LA AIRPORT	1043	13	98	34	44	0	3.6	0.8
		ALHAMBRA	758	9	97	47	25	1	3.6	1.3
		LANCASTER	753	11	46	11	21	1	2.7	2.3
		BEVERLY HILLS	217	3	21	7	3	0	4.3	1.0
		BURBANK	216	5	30	8	7	0	1.8	1.4
		WEST COVINA	1589	16	60	22	28	1	3.6	1.2
		SUP CHATSWORTH	737	8	36	38	26	0	1.7	4.6
		COMPTON	1256	17	25	78	26	5	3.9	1.7
		CULVER CITY	0	0	0	0	1	0	8.1	1.0
		DOWNEY	853	10	58	20	21	6	3.9	1.3
		EAST LA	831	4	129	68	32	11	4.1	1.3
		EL MONTE	616	9	89	18	29	9	3.4	0.9
		GLENDALE	494	8	63	17	11	0	3.9	1.1
		INGLEWOOD	351	2	24	18	14	2	4.0	1.3
LONG BEACH	1154	19	117	23	22	4	2.7	2.6		
SUPJUD LA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	1.4		
LA METRO	5487	16	554	17	640	1	1.9	3.2		

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
LOS ANGELES (cont.)		BELLFLOWER	296	5	18	12	22	0	3.5	1.2
		VALENCIA	880	8	111	29	15	1	3.1	1.0
		PASADENA	738	9	143	89	26	4	4.0	1.3
		MALIBU	289	4	67	13	23	0	4.3	1.0
		POMONA	1051	7	71	9	22	9	3.1	0.9
		HUNTINGTON PK	714	9	12	11	17	1	2.8	1.0
		MONROVIA	108	0	8	3	2	0	3.7	1.4
		SANTA MONICA	235	3	78	13	12	0	2.9	1.2
		TORRANCE	1227	12	423	59	51	7	3.1	1.1
		SOUTH GATE	2	0	0	0	6	0	7.2	0.4
		WHITTIER	714	20	43	8	12	1	3.5	2.3
		HOLLYWOOD	193	0	10	1	16	0	1.8	1.7
		SAN FERNANDO	980	9	32	29	47	0	1.9	4.6
		SAN PEDRO	310	0	33	8	30	0	2.0	2.4
		VAN NUYS	2515	56	130	82	195	3	1.9	1.1
		LOS ANGELES	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.6	0.2
		AVALON	3	0	0	0	0	0	2.2	4.3
		US DIST CT LA	10	0	3	0	0	0	16.0	2.4
		TOTAL	27134	494	2630	793	1456	69	---	---
	MADERA	71.4%	SUP MADERA	5	2	0	0	0	1	7.8
JUV MADERA			4	1	0	0	0	0	4.0	1.8
CHOWCHILLA			389	1	27	15	6	3	4.4	3.2
MADERA			44	14	4	2	2	1	4.4	10.0
BASS LAKE			131	5	46	21	4	3	5.3	6.7
TOTAL			573	23	77	38	12	8	---	---
MARIN	83.7%	SAN RAFAEL	1386	9	0	0	35	20	3.1	3.6
		TOTAL	1386	9	0	0	35	20	---	---
MARIPOSA	54.4%	JUV MARIPOSA	1	0	0	0	0	0	3.3	2.9
		MARIPOSA	85	1	7	3	2	0	3.5	3.0
		USMAG YOSEMITE	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.6	4.0
		TOTAL	98	1	8	3	2	0	---	---
MENDOCINO	79.4%	SUP UKIAH	2	5	0	0	0	0	4.6	9.6
		JUV UKIAH	9	0	2	0	0	0	2.2	3.6
		WILLITS	114	9	23	2	0	0	3.0	5.9
		UKIAH	396	7	74	12	8	3	2.0	5.8
		BOONVILLE	3	0	1	0	0	0	5.3	3.3
		PT. ARENA	14	0	0	0	0	0	2.0	8.5
		LEGGETT	32	1	7	0	1	0	3.4	7.6
		COVELO	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.0	11.0
		FORT BRAGG	78	5	4	6	2	0	2.5	6.0
		TOTAL	657	27	112	20	11	3	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
MERCED	76.4%	SUP MERCED	29	4	4	0	0	1	4.8	2.9
		JUV MERCED	9	0	0	0	1	0	7.9	3.3
		MERCED	824	14	100	26	8	0	4.4	4.8
		LOS BANOS	215	6	16	3	4	3	4.9	4.4
		TOTAL	1077	24	120	29	13	4	---	---
MODOC	63.3%	SUP ALTURAS	36	2	3	1	3	1	2.7	2.0
		TOTAL	36	2	3	1	3	1	---	---
MONO	87.3%	BRIDGEPORT	13	0	2	0	0	1	4.7	3.5
		MAMMOTH LAKES	118	7	17	2	0	0	2.5	2.3
		TOTAL	131	7	19	2	0	1	---	---
MONTEREY	82.9%	SUP MONTEREY	80	55	3	0	1	0	3.0	9.2
		MARINA	47	0	4	4	12	4	1.8	3.3
		SALINAS	2278	14	304	58	20	9	1.7	3.8
		KING CITY	400	0	24	11	4	1	2.0	2.4
		TOTAL	2805	69	335	73	37	14	---	---
NAPA	81.5%	SUP NAPA	948	47	114	14	17	0	2.8	1.9
		NAPA	8	0	1	0	0	17	3.2	1.3
		TOTAL	956	47	115	14	17	17	---	---
NEVADA	79.2%	SUP NEVADA CITY	1	12	0	1	0	0	3.7	2.5
		JUV NEVADA CITY	7	1	0	0	0	0	3.2	1.2
		JUV TRUCKEE	3	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	0.1
		NEVADA CITY	287	5	43	3	2	3	2.4	6.1
		TRUCKEE	212	2	64	5	2	2	2.6	3.6
		TOTAL	510	20	107	9	4	6	---	---
ORANGE	89.2%	SUP SANTA ANA	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	10.0
		JUV ORANGE	80	5	0	0	0	0	4.0	1.3
		FULLERTON	3189	71	156	26	66	2	3.0	3.2
		WESTMINSTER	2881	54	148	13	42	8	3.6	2.9
		LAGUNA HILLS	1043	16	77	9	11	3	4.8	2.2
		NEWPORT BEACH	2798	50	227	18	18	11	3.4	3.5
		SANTA ANA	2009	65	40	7	23	17	3.8	2.6
		TOTAL	12002	261	648	73	160	41	---	---
PLACER	89.0%	SUP AUBURN	1285	45	101	12	5	0	3.2	1.8
		JUV AUBURN	19	1	3	2	0	0	3.3	3.7
		AUBURN	3	0	0	0	0	8	1.0	1.0
		SUP TAHOE CITY	191	6	36	3	1	0	2.7	0.6
		TOTAL	1498	52	140	17	6	8	---	---
PLUMAS	81.4%	CHESTER	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.7	2.1
		PORTOLA	6	0	1	0	0	0	1.6	0.8
		QUINCY	166	2	27	10	1	0	2.6	1.8
		TOTAL	173	2	28	10	1	0	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
RIVERSIDE	86.6%	SUP RIVERSIDE	395	94	0	1	5	5	3.8	4.2
		SUP INDIO	219	21	1	1	1	31	4.0	3.9
		JUV RIVERSIDE	22	2	0	0	0	0	3.8	4.0
		JUV INDIO	11	2	0	0	0	0	2.6	1.5
		CORONA	2	0	0	0	1	1	2.4	1.0
		HEMET	20	1	0	0	4	2	6.0	10.0
		BANNING	385	9	1	20	1	5	4.1	1.0
		INDIO CONSOLID	1247	14	30	127	34	9	3.5	1.0
		MORENO VLY RIV	2830	51	0	56	29	0	3.8	0.8
		SUP BLYTHE	82	1	9	6	3	2	2.7	1.0
		PERRIS CNSOLID	1979	31	2	84	14	4	4.1	0.7
		TEMCULA CONSOL	3	1	0	0	1	2	4.6	6.0
		TOTAL	7195	227	43	295	93	61	---	---
SACRAMENTO	75.9%	SUP SACRAMENTO	152	158	3	0	1	0	4.9	5.9
		JUV SACTO TRF	33	1	2	0	0	0	5.3	2.2
		SACRAMENTO	5714	64	1225	55	61	18	3.8	5.2
		SACTO US MAG	3	0	0	0	0	0	9.2	5.1
		TOTAL	5902	223	1230	55	62	18	---	---
SAN BENITO	85.9%	SUP SAN BENITO	296	4	39	5	2	0	4.9	5.3
		JUV HOLLISTER	3	2	0	0	0	0	3.7	2.3
		TOTAL	299	6	39	5	2	0	---	---
SAN BERNARDINO	73.5%	SUPDISTSAN BERN	31	57	3	0	1	22	5.1	2.5
		SUP R CUCAMONGA	12	42	0	0	0	3	4.0	1.6
		SUP VICTRVLE	19	48	0	0	0	0	4.8	2.5
		SUP BARSTOW	424	18	20	30	21	16	5.1	2.6
		JUV TF SAN BERN	4	0	0	0	1	0	5.5	5.6
		SUPJUV SAN BERN	1	3	0	0	0	0	1.8	5.1
		SUPJUV VICTORVLE	0	0	0	0	1	0	---	---
		SUP CHINO	351	9	3	3	3	1	3.6	0.5
		SUP REDLANDS	400	17	8	23	27	7	4.0	0.7
		SUPDIV SAN BERN	1663	18	132	38	124	9	4.8	1.0
		SUP FONTANA	927	62	8	9	17	13	4.2	1.0
		VICTRVLE	1264	12	53	67	54	15	5.6	0.8
		RANCHO CUCMNGA	2283	17	44	45	50	18	4.4	0.7
		BGBEAR LK	194	2	7	14	1	0	3.1	0.6
		TWNPEAKS	150	4	15	2	8	1	3.8	0.9
		SUP NEEDLES	110	5	13	34	22	8	4.4	1.1
		SUP JOSHTREE	261	25	16	8	11	12	3.5	1.5
TOTAL	8094	339	322	273	341	125	---	---		
SAN DIEGO	82.4%	SUP SAN DIEGO	127	76	3	0	0	2	6.1	3.5
		SUP VISTA	126	91	3	0	6	2	3.2	8.1
		SUP CHULA VISTA	69	33	0	0	1	1	3.4	7.5

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN DIEGO (cont.)		SUP EL CAJON	25	1	0	0	0	1	1.9	3.8
		JUV SAN DIEGO	88	3	0	1	1	0	5.4	1.8
		EL CAJON	2310	65	162	42	29	10	2.9	5.0
		VISTA	3551	47	742	123	24	11	2.7	7.5
		SAN MARCOS	20	0	0	0	4	0	3.5	2.4
		SAN DIEGO	4904	4	616	43	110	10	3.1	4.3
		CHULA VISTA	1712	19	312	50	17	0	3.1	5.8
		US CT SN DIEGO	10	0	4	0	0	0	4.4	3.2
		TOTAL	12942	339	1842	259	192	37	---	---
SAN FRANCISCO	54.6%	SUP SAN FRAN	2	3	1	0	0	0	7.2	0.8
		JUVTR SAN FRAN	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	1.0
		SUPJUV SAN FRAN	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.8	1.8
		SAN FRANCISCO	805	22	211	181	22	3	2.9	2.0
		TOTAL	809	25	212	181	22	3	---	---
SAN JOAQUIN	74.5%	JUV FRNCH CAMP	25	1	0	2	1	0	5.1	2.6
		LODI	453	26	56	9	19	2	2.2	1.3
		MANTECA	434	5	72	1	13	0	2.7	2.0
		TRACY	375	11	51	8	7	0	2.3	1.3
		STOCKTON SUP	2013	59	236	27	44	14	2.4	2.5
		TOTAL	3300	102	415	47	84	16	---	---
SAN LUIS OBISPO	75.2%	SUP SN LUIS OBISPO	1	2	0	0	0	12	3.1	0.2
		SAN LUIS OBISPO	1629	58	377	45	107	9	2.3	5.0
		TOTAL	1630	60	377	45	107	21	---	---
SAN MATEO	76.9%	SUP REDWOOD CITY	49	16	0	0	2	0	6.7	2.2
		SUPJUV SAN MATEO	15	0	0	0	0	18	3.6	2.8
		SUP SAN MATEO	2	0	0	0	2	0	5.2	2.5
		SUP SO SAN FRAN	1397	11	230	23	29	1	3.7	4.1
		REDWOOD CITY	1337	6	275	9	25	1	3.8	5.1
		TOTAL	2800	33	505	32	58	20	---	---
SANTA BARBARA	88.4%	JUV SANTA BARB	3	0	1	0	0	0	1.5	5.4
		JUV LOMPOC	11	1	1	0	0	0	2.6	1.2
		SANTA BARBARA	1345	29	359	70	27	11	2.8	4.1
		SANTA MARIA	695	36	30	0	4	2	1.8	6.8
		LOMPOC	299	9	30	1	4	0	1.6	5.7
		SOLVANG	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.2	0.0
		TOTAL	2353	75	421	71	36	13	---	---
SANTA CLARA	85.3%	SUP SANTA CLARA	149	61	0	0	5	0	4.5	2.4
		JUV SANTA CLARA	50	6	0	0	0	0	4.8	2.5
		PALO ALTO	754	10	143	7	7	0	3.7	1.5
		SAN JOSE	3970	58	306	157	44	4	2.9	1.4
		TRAF SAN JOSE	5	0	1	0	2	0	2.7	1.9

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SANTA CLARA (cont.)		SANTA CLARA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	1.3
		SUNNYVALE	203	5	10	3	1	0	2.2	0.7
		GILROY	706	3	92	7	7	0	3.0	0.5
		TOTAL	5838	143	552	174	66	4	---	---
SANTA CRUZ	84.2%	SUP SANTA CRUZ	26	3	3	0	0	9	5.2	2.9
		JUV SANTA CRUZ	19	1	0	0	1	0	2.9	0.8
		SANTA CRUZ	1073	27	179	26	3	2	2.9	5.9
		WATSONVILLE	325	3	24	5	5	0	2.5	5.7
		TOTAL	1443	34	206	31	9	11	---	---
SHASTA	87.8%	JUV SHASTA	13	2	0	0	0	0	3.4	1.8
		BURNEY	38	0	13	1	4	0	3.8	2.0
		REDDING	955	47	180	9	9	2	2.7	4.0
		TOTAL	1006	49	193	10	13	2	---	---
SIERRA	50.0%	SUP SIERRA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0.7
		DOWNIEVILLE	32	0	8	1	2	0	3.7	3.1
		TOTAL	33	0	8	1	2	0	---	---
SISKIYOU	68.4%	SUP SISKIYOU	9	1	1	0	0	0	4.3	3.1
		WEED	122	0	24	8	5	0	3.0	0.9
		YREKA JUD DIST	111	15	35	2	1	6	3.0	1.0
		TOTAL	242	16	60	10	6	6	---	---
SOLANO	81.1%	SUP SOLANO	48	14	4	0	0	0	4.3	5.5
		JUV SOLANO	8	0	0	0	0	0	4.6	1.7
		FAIRFIELD	872	12	122	10	12	19	3.0	6.4
		BENICIA	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	1.3
		VALLEJO BENICIA	437	14	60	10	9	14	3.7	8.1
		TOTAL	1367	40	186	20	21	33	---	---
SONOMA	79.3%	SUP SONOMA	7	35	1	0	3	0	6.1	3.5
		JUV SONOMA	47	1	7	1	1	0	2.2	1.8
		SANTA ROSA	2036	65	497	29	27	364	2.6	4.7
		TOTAL	2090	101	505	30	31	364	---	---
STANISLAUS	65.9%	SUP STANISLAUS	1485	54	174	26	8	0	3.3	3.7
		JUV STANISLAUS	21	0	0	1	0	0	4.9	2.3
		MODESTO	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.5	0.2
		TURLOCK	0	0	0	0	3	0	11.0	6.0
		TOTAL	1510	54	174	27	13	0	---	---
SUTTER	67.5%	SUP YUBA CTY	376	18	86	9	10	0	2.8	3.3
		TOTAL	376	18	86	9	10	0	---	---
TEHAMA	38.2%	SUP TEHAMA	9	10	2	0	0	0	3.2	3.3
		JUV TEHAMA	3	1	0	0	0	0	3.1	0.6
		CORNING	134	1	26	8	3	2	2.0	3.2
		RED BLUFF	253	4	48	8	2	5	2.5	1.9
		TOTAL	399	16	76	16	5	7	---	---

TABLE B3: TOTAL CONVICTION DATA FOR 2003 DUI ARRESTEES BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI	ALCOHOL RECKLESS	NON-ALCOHOL RECKLESS	OTHER CONVICTIONS	DUI DISMISSALS	AVERAGE ADJUDICATION TIMES (MONTHS)	
									VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
TRINITY	43.8%	SUP TRINITY	89	2	20	6	4	0	3.6	3.9
		TOTAL	89	2	20	6	4	0	---	---
TULARE	70.1%	SUP TULARE	7	2	1	0	0	2	2.6	1.8
		JUV TULARE	13	1	0	0	0	0	5.1	0.8
		DINUBA	281	9	15	5	2	0	2.7	4.6
		PORTERVILLE	759	17	11	11	22	0	3.1	2.5
		TULARE	499	17	26	3	8	1	3.1	4.9
		VISALIA	910	25	44	12	12	1	3.1	3.1
		TOTAL	2469	71	97	31	44	4	---	---
TUOLUMNE	75.7%	SUP TUOLUMNE	397	18	71	17	9	2	3.8	1.3
		TOTAL	397	18	71	17	9	2	---	---
VENTURA	88.8%	SUP VENTURA	5	1	0	0	1	0	3.5	5.7
		VENTURA	3520	68	0	3	58	21	3.0	1.5
		TOTAL	3525	69	0	3	59	21	---	---
YOLO	72.9%	SUP WOODLND	779	40	178	26	12	2	3.6	4.9
		TOTAL	779	40	178	26	12	2	---	---
YUBA	57.0%	SUP YUBA	14	5	1	0	0	0	4.4	3.5
		JUV YUBA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	1.0
		MARYSVILLE	396	6	64	5	1	5	3.5	1.9
		TOTAL	411	11	65	5	1	5	---	---

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\*

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE			140847	96.3	73.0	67.2	17.7	0.2	75.3	7.0	3.8
ALAMEDA	SUP OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	87.5	100.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	12.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	62.5	100.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	100.0	90.9	0.0	18.2	0.0	54.5	18.2	0.0
		TOTAL	39	79.5	97.4	0.0	10.3	0.0	51.3	7.7	0.0
	JUV SAN LEANDRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	22	86.4	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	59.1	0.0
		TOTAL	22	86.4	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	59.1	0.0
	ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	130	100.0	99.2	69.2	3.1	0.0	94.6	2.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	32	100.0	100.0	12.5	75.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	166	100.0	99.4	56.6	18.7	0.0	95.2	2.4	0.0
	BERKELEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	FREMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	409	99.5	97.8	89.0	3.2	0.2	67.2	2.2	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	82	98.8	97.6	11.0	79.3	0.0	70.7	2.4	2.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	92.9	0.0	78.6	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	506	99.4	97.6	73.7	17.8	0.2	66.6	2.2	0.8
	PLEASANTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	812	98.8	96.8	93.0	1.8	0.1	96.2	1.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	194	100.0	100.0	12.4	84.5	0.0	93.3	5.2	0.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	47	97.9	97.9	8.5	87.2	0.0	38.3	55.3	10.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1055	99.0	97.4	74.2	21.0	0.1	92.9	4.5	0.6
	OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1015	98.2	97.7	80.1	1.4	0.1	84.9	12.0	1.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	244	100.0	95.9	16.8	58.2	0.0	83.2	9.4	56.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	100.0	93.3	4.4	26.7	0.0	48.9	24.4	37.8
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		3	100.0	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	
TOTAL		1307	98.6	97.2	65.6	12.9	0.1	83.2	12.0	13.3	
HAYWARD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	653	98.2	94.8	83.9	3.4	0.0	84.7	4.1	2.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	151	98.0	96.0	15.2	76.2	0.0	89.4	2.0	41.1	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	96.3	92.6	3.7	63.0	0.0	37.0	48.1	66.7	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	50.0	33.3	66.7	
	TOTAL	837	98.1	95.0	68.3	19.0	0.0	83.8	5.4	11.6	
ALPINE	SUP MARKLEVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	29	100.0	75.9	93.1	0.0	0.0	82.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	85.7	71.4	28.6	42.9	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	39	97.4	76.9	74.4	15.4	0.0	79.5	0.0	0.0

\*Entries represent percentages of 2003 DUI convictees receiving each sanction by county, court, and offender status.



TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
AMADOR	JACKSON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	145	91.7	93.8	86.2	2.8	0.0	82.1	7.6	11.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	49	95.9	98.0	12.2	69.4	0.0	69.4	8.2	40.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	83.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
		TOTAL	210	91.9	94.8	62.4	22.9	0.5	72.9	7.1	21.4
BUTTE	SUP OROVLLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	292	91.8	94.2	82.2	3.8	0.0	75.0	10.6	4.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	99	89.9	100.0	19.2	64.6	0.0	60.6	9.1	8.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	87.0	100.0	4.3	78.3	0.0	43.5	8.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	40.0
		TOTAL	424	90.1	96.0	61.3	23.1	0.0	68.4	10.4	5.7
	JUV OROVLLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	20.0	25.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	0.0
	CHICO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	35	88.6	82.9	71.4	2.9	0.0	62.9	22.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	100.0	60.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	42	88.1	81.0	59.5	11.9	0.0	54.8	21.4	0.0
	GRIDLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3
	OROVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	465	93.8	93.5	61.9	1.3	0.0	81.0	9.1	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	92	93.5	97.8	19.6	62.0	0.0	76.1	4.3	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	95.7	100.0	8.7	78.3	0.0	30.4	34.8	4.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		581	93.8	94.5	52.8	14.3	0.0	78.3	9.3	0.7	
PARADISE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	
	TOTAL	3	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	
CALAVERAS	SUP CALAVERAS	1STDUI	146	98.6	97.9	87.0	2.7	0.0	80.1	8.2	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	98.0	100.0	0.0	98.0	0.0	35.3	0.0	11.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	86.7	86.7	0.0	66.7	13.3	6.7	13.3	33.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	214	97.7	97.7	59.3	30.8	0.9	63.6	6.5	6.5
	JUV CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COLUSA	SUP COLUSA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	133	88.7	97.7	76.7	1.5	0.0	72.2	9.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	30	73.3	96.7	0.0	63.3	0.0	60.0	6.7	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		13	92.3	92.3	0.0	30.8	0.0	7.7	46.2	0.0	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		178	86.0	97.2	57.3	14.0	0.0	64.6	11.8	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
CONTRA COSTA	SUP CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	33	81.8	78.8	15.2	3.0	0.0	18.2	12.1	3.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	14	71.4	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	7.1	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	77.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	21	61.9	95.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	77	74.0	87.0	6.5	3.9	0.0	10.4	6.5	1.3	
	JUV CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	26	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
		TOTAL	26	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
	CONCORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	569	98.4	96.1	91.4	1.9	0.2	87.7	9.1	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	182	100.0	98.4	7.7	76.4	0.0	79.1	11.5	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	32	100.0	90.6	0.0	21.9	0.0	12.5	3.1	0.0	
		TOTAL	783	98.9	96.4	68.2	20.1	0.1	82.6	9.5	0.0	
	RICHMOND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	519	99.0	92.1	90.4	2.3	0.0	87.5	6.4	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	138	97.1	95.7	13.8	71.0	0.0	65.9	8.0	1.4	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	32.1	21.4	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		TOTAL	688	98.7	93.2	70.9	19.5	0.0	80.7	7.4	0.4	
	PITTSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	543	97.2	96.7	91.2	2.9	0.0	90.4	1.8	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	162	96.9	100.0	8.0	83.3	0.0	87.7	2.5	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	33	93.9	100.0	0.0	72.7	0.0	33.3	12.1	3.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> +DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	
		TOTAL	744	97.0	97.6	68.3	24.2	0.0	86.7	2.7	0.3	
	WALNUT CREEK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	586	98.5	81.6	93.7	1.5	0.0	90.1	4.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	152	100.0	98.7	10.5	83.6	0.0	53.3	27.6	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	100.0	100.0	3.7	81.5	0.0	14.8	48.1	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	766	98.8	85.6	73.9	20.8	0.0	80.0	10.4	0.0	
	EL CERRITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
DEL NORTE	SUP DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	119	89.1	95.8	84.0	2.5	0.0	79.8	0.8	0.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	77.8	96.3	18.5	59.3	0.0	70.4	0.0	37.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	55.6	100.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	44.4	
		TOTAL	155	85.2	96.1	68.4	13.5	0.0	75.5	0.6	9.7	
EL DORADO	SUP EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	18	94.4	72.2	55.6	11.1	0.0	50.0	5.6	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	71.4	100.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	28	89.3	78.6	39.3	21.4	0.0	42.9	3.6	0.0	
	SO LAKE TAHOE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	325	96.9	97.5	83.4	5.2	0.0	88.0	1.5	2.2	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	87	97.7	95.4	18.4	73.6	0.0	85.1	0.0	34.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	14.3	57.1	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	423	96.5	96.9	68.3	20.1	0.0	85.6	1.2	9.2	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
EL DORADO (cont.)	PLACERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	441	99.3	98.9	92.1	2.3	0.0	94.8	1.1	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	134	100.0	99.3	11.9	81.3	0.0	86.6	4.5	8.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	95.1	97.6	4.9	63.4	0.0	17.1	7.3	31.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	72.7	81.8	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1	0.0	18.2
		TOTAL	627	98.7	98.6	67.6	23.6	0.0	86.4	2.2	4.6
FRESNO	JUV FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	73.3	0.0
		TOTAL	15	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	73.3	0.0
	FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1778	93.4	92.4	85.1	2.3	0.0	83.5	1.0	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	520	94.6	96.3	11.7	73.3	0.0	75.2	2.1	11.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	131	85.5	88.5	3.8	55.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	26.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	47	55.3	93.6	2.1	19.1	0.0	6.4	2.1	2.1
		TOTAL	2476	92.5	93.1	63.8	20.3	0.0	76.7	1.2	4.4
	CLOVIS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	223	96.9	95.1	91.5	1.8	0.0	91.5	0.4	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	74	98.6	98.6	6.8	85.1	0.0	91.9	1.4	47.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	90.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	50.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	308	97.4	95.8	67.9	25.3	0.0	88.6	0.6	13.3
	COALINGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	155	96.1	91.0	87.7	1.9	0.0	58.7	1.3	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	46	87.0	95.7	19.6	65.2	0.0	56.5	2.2	2.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	40.0	10.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	212	94.3	92.5	69.8	18.9	0.0	57.1	1.9	0.9
	FIREBAUGH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	78	92.3	93.6	82.1	3.8	0.0	78.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	90.9	100.0	15.2	69.7	0.0	75.8	3.0	3.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		118	90.7	95.8	58.5	24.6	0.0	72.9	0.8	0.8	
FOWLER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	115	94.8	94.8	81.7	6.1	0.0	88.7	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	36	97.2	97.2	5.6	88.9	0.0	88.9	2.8	2.8	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	91.7	100.0	8.3	58.3	0.0	25.0	8.3	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	168	94.0	95.8	57.7	27.4	0.0	81.5	1.2	0.6	
KERMAN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	41	97.6	100.0	90.2	0.0	0.0	80.5	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	93.3	100.0	13.3	73.3	0.0	73.3	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	100.0	14.3	71.4	0.0	57.1	14.3	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	65	92.3	100.0	61.5	24.6	0.0	73.8	1.5	0.0	
KINGSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	58	93.1	96.6	81.0	1.7	0.0	82.8	1.7	1.7	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	17	88.2	100.0	11.8	70.6	0.0	64.7	5.9	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	80.0	100.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	86	90.7	97.7	58.1	16.3	0.0	69.8	2.3	3.5	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO (cont.)	REEDLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	153	92.8	91.5	81.7	2.6	0.0	47.1	19.0	2.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	33	81.8	90.9	6.1	66.7	0.0	51.5	12.1	6.1	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	
		TOTAL	201	89.1	92.0	63.2	14.9	0.0	44.3	16.4	5.0	
	SANGER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SELMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	73	97.3	100.0	86.3	5.5	0.0	87.7	1.4	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	92.0	100.0	12.0	68.0	0.0	72.0	4.0	4.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	88.9	11.1	44.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	110	94.5	99.1	60.9	23.6	0.0	78.2	1.8	0.9	
	USCT FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
GLENN	SUP WILLOWS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	165	93.3	49.1	86.1	1.2	0.0	48.5	9.7	0.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	53	90.6	86.8	26.4	58.5	0.0	49.1	9.4	3.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	90.9	9.1	45.5	0.0	18.2	27.3	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	234	91.0	60.7	67.1	16.2	0.0	46.2	11.1	1.3	
	JUV GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
	HUMBOLDT	SUP JUV HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	581	96.2	20.5	90.0	3.8	0.0	92.4	2.9	0.3
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	147	97.3	82.3	15.6	77.6	0.0	84.4	12.2	4.1
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	97.1	88.2	2.9	79.4	0.0	35.3	52.9	8.8
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			8	87.5	87.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	25.0	
TOTAL			770	96.4	36.0	71.2	21.7	0.0	87.5	7.3	1.7	
ARCATA		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
IMPERIAL		SUP IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	95	90.5	8.4	57.9	1.1	0.0	62.1	3.2	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	23	100.0	34.8	30.4	26.1	0.0	47.8	4.3	0.0
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		3	66.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL		126	92.1	13.5	50.8	8.7	0.0	59.5	3.2	0.0	
	JUV IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	BRAWLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	80	95.0	38.8	81.3	2.5	0.0	78.8	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	22	100.0	63.6	36.4	59.1	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	60.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	107	96.3	44.9	69.2	16.8	0.0	81.3	0.0	0.0	
	CALEXICO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	67	100.0	13.4	89.6	0.0	0.0	95.5	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	100.0	18.8	68.8	12.5	0.0	87.5	6.3	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	84	100.0	15.5	84.5	3.6	0.0	92.9	2.4	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
IMPERIAL (cont.)	EL CENTRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	172	93.0	16.3	69.2	2.3	0.0	58.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	38	92.1	28.9	34.2	28.9	0.0	55.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	214	93.0	19.2	62.1	7.0	0.0	56.5	0.0	0.0
INYO	SUP INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	62.5	100.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	41.7	91.6	16.7	8.3	0.0	16.7	8.3	0.0
	JUV INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	BISHOP	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	142	97.9	22.5	87.3	4.2	0.0	88.0	0.0	2.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	47	95.7	95.7	6.4	74.5	0.0	83.0	0.0	6.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	50.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
		TOTAL	196	97.4	41.3	64.8	22.4	0.0	83.7	0.5	3.6
KERN	SUP KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	68	88.2	2.9	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	70	88.6	2.9	48.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0
	ARVIN LAMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	341	97.7	97.7	76.2	2.3	0.0	51.9	15.5	0.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	81	93.8	95.1	9.9	59.3	0.0	27.2	18.5	13.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	25	84.0	100.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	32.0	12.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	451	95.6	97.3	59.4	13.7	0.0	44.1	16.9	4.0
	BAKERSFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1842	96.4	97.4	74.0	0.0	0.0	73.0	0.1	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	489	94.5	99.2	13.3	16.4	0.0	30.1	0.2	9.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		117	94.9	97.4	7.7	0.0	0.0	6.8	1.7	22.2	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		24	41.7	95.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	
TOTAL		2472	95.4	97.8	58.2	3.2	0.0	60.7	0.2	3.2	
DELANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	250	95.2	80.0	76.4	6.4	0.0	47.2	4.4	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	57	93.0	94.7	5.3	71.9	0.0	63.2	3.5	3.5	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	90.9	86.4	9.1	40.9	0.0	22.7	13.6	18.2	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	
	TOTAL	335	93.4	82.7	58.5	19.7	0.6	47.5	5.4	1.8	
LAKE ISABELLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	147	95.2	100.0	74.1	0.0	0.0	75.5	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	46	95.7	100.0	2.2	37.0	0.0	41.3	2.2	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	00.0	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	200	95.5	100.0	55.0	9.0	0.0	65.5	0.5	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
KERN (cont.)	TAFT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	144	94.4	97.9	75.7	6.9	0.0	52.1	35.4	4.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	90.3	100.0	12.9	74.2	0.0	32.3	35.5	51.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	87.5	100.0	12.5	62.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	62.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	184	92.9	98.4	62.0	20.7	0.0	47.3	35.3	14.7
	SHAFTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	235	97.0	98.7	85.5	5.1	0.4	51.9	5.1	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	67	100.0	100.0	3.0	88.1	0.0	59.7	7.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	5.3	47.4	0.0	10.5	36.8	5.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
		TOTAL	326	96.9	99.1	62.6	24.5	0.3	50.3	8.0	0.6
	MOJAVE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	170	98.2	97.1	68.2	1.2	0.0	71.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	64	98.4	100.0	6.3	56.3	0.0	65.6	0.0	1.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	87.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	243	98.4	97.5	49.4	16.5	0.0	69.1	0.0	1.2
	RIDGECREST	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	129	93.8	96.9	69.0	0.8	0.0	69.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	27	96.3	96.3	11.1	44.4	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	167	94.0	97.0	55.1	7.8	0.0	62.9	0.0	0.0
KINGS	SUP KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	36.4	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	25.0	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
	JUV HANFORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	HANFORD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	423	92.0	96.5	81.3	0.2	0.0	74.0	15.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	105	86.7	96.2	17.1	59.0	0.0	68.6	18.1	2.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	65.5	89.7	3.4	20.7	0.0	10.3	17.2	6.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	40.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0
		TOTAL	567	88.7	95.9	64.0	12.2	0.0	68.4	16.4	0.9
	AVENAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	55	96.4	96.4	72.7	0.0	0.0	69.1	21.8	3.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	87.5	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	67	95.5	97.0	59.7	7.5	0.0	64.2	20.9	6.0
	CORCORAN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	51	88.2	96.1	74.5	2.0	0.0	64.7	25.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	61.5	100.0	15.4	38.5	0.0	53.8	23.1	7.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
TOTAL		67	83.6	97.0	59.7	11.9	0.0	62.7	25.4	1.5	
LEMOORE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LAKE	SUP LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	220	95.9	22.7	64.1	2.3	0.0	88.6	1.8	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	94.1	76.5	23.5	56.9	0.0	80.4	5.9	2.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	100.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	284	95.8	34.5	54.9	12.3	0.0	84.5	3.5	0.7
	CLEARLAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	122	96.7	24.6	74.6	4.1	0.0	86.1	1.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	37	94.6	67.6	27.0	54.1	0.0	43.2	0.0	5.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	80.0	70.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	171	95.3	37.4	59.1	17.0	0.0	71.3	2.3	1.8
LASSEN	SUSANVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	184	94.6	97.8	88.6	2.2	0.0	76.6	10.9	1.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	46	91.3	95.7	17.4	67.4	0.0	30.4	13.0	10.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	100.0	100.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	0.0	36.4	9.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
		TOTAL	244	93.4	97.5	70.1	17.6	0.0	63.5	12.3	3.7
LOS ANGELES	SUP LA CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	88	63.6	84.1	23.9	3.4	1.1	23.9	10.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	42.9	100.0	5.7	8.6	0.0	11.4	8.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	46.2	92.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	33	39.4	97.0	0.0	6.1	3.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
		TOTAL	169	53.3	90.5	14.2	4.7	1.2	14.8	10.1	0.0
	SUP POMONA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	61	62.3	88.5	14.8	3.3	0.0	8.2	6.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	38.1	95.2	4.8	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	16.7	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	23	13.0	95.7	0.0	4.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	117	43.6	92.3	8.5	4.3	0.9	6.0	3.4	0.0
	SUP LANCASTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	50.0	90.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0
		TOTAL	31	41.9	90.3	22.6	3.2	3.2	12.9	6.5	0.0
	SUP VAN NUYS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	91	56.0	81.3	15.4	2.2	0.0	5.5	15.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	42.9	92.9	0.0	10.7	3.6	10.7	3.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	13.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	18.2	86.4	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	4.5	0.0
		TOTAL	156	44.2	85.9	9.0	3.2	1.9	5.1	10.9	0.0
	SUP PASADENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	16	75.0	93.8	18.8	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	24	75.0	95.8	12.5	4.2	0.0	8.3	8.3	0.0
	SUP LONG BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	45.0	90.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	50.0	87.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		36	47.2	91.7	2.8	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	SUP COMPTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	50.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	20.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	28	46.4	89.3	7.1	7.1	3.6	7.1	3.6	0.0
	SUP NORWALK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	70.0	91.7	35.0	10.0	0.0	53.3	1.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	70.0	90.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	16.7	100.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	87	59.8	93.1	25.3	9.2	1.1	39.1	3.4	0.0
	SUP TORRANCE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	19	68.4	94.7	26.3	5.3	0.0	15.8	10.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	29	51.7	96.6	17.2	6.9	0.0	10.3	6.9	0.0
	SUP SANTA MONICA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	50.0	83.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	58.3	91.7	25.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0
	JUV LA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0
	JUV LA CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	15	100.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SUP LA AIRPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	839	98.7	23.8	92.8	2.7	0.0	88.8	0.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	180	95.6	87.8	12.2	78.9	0.0	81.1	1.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	92.6	96.3	3.7	40.7	3.7	11.1	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	70.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1056	97.7	37.3	75.9	16.7	0.1	84.7	0.3	0.0
	ALHAMBRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	598	96.0	41.1	90.1	0.7	0.0	87.3	1.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	145	95.9	84.1	11.0	80.0	0.0	85.5	2.1	2.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	86.4	90.9	4.5	45.5	9.1	4.5	9.1	13.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	767	95.4	50.8	72.5	16.9	0.3	84.4	1.4	0.9
LANCASTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	593	97.3	98.0	90.7	2.7	0.0	86.2	3.5	1.2	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	147	95.2	96.6	8.8	76.2	0.7	23.1	34.7	30.6	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	78.3	87.0	0.0	43.5	13.0	0.0	26.1	30.4	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	764	96.3	97.4	72.3	18.1	0.5	71.3	10.2	7.7	
BEVERLY HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	180	98.9	51.1	91.7	2.2	0.0	93.9	1.1	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	97.1	88.2	11.8	79.4	0.0	82.4	11.8	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	
	TOTAL	220	98.6	56.8	76.8	15.5	1.4	90.0	3.6	0.0	



TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	BURBANK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	179	99.4	28.5	99.4	0.0	0.0	97.2	0.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	93.5	90.3	16.1	74.2	0.0	90.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	62.5	0.0	50.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	221	98.2	39.4	82.8	12.2	1.4	93.2	0.9	0.5
	WEST COVINA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1302	98.4	31.4	93.6	1.8	0.0	91.7	1.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	249	99.2	88.4	10.4	83.9	0.0	93.2	0.4	3.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	52	98.1	88.5	1.9	73.1	9.6	19.2	0.0	13.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	1605	98.5	42.2	77.6	16.8	0.3	89.5	0.9	1.6
	SUP CHATSWORTH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	561	99.3	47.6	88.2	5.0	0.4	89.1	1.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	153	99.3	94.1	5.9	86.3	1.3	83.0	4.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	100.0	80.0	6.7	46.7	16.7	20.0	6.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	745	99.3	58.4	67.9	23.4	1.3	85.0	2.3	0.0
	COMPTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1010	96.6	64.6	90.2	2.5	0.0	90.3	0.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	216	95.8	93.5	16.2	72.7	0.0	88.0	1.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	38	86.8	89.5	2.6	36.8	5.3	21.1	5.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	55.6	88.9	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1273	95.9	70.4	74.4	15.5	0.2	87.3	0.7	0.0
	DOWNEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	723	96.7	49.0	88.4	2.1	0.3	88.9	1.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	124	96.8	88.7	14.5	77.4	0.0	83.1	6.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	93.3	73.3	13.3	26.7	26.7	13.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	863	96.6	55.2	76.4	13.4	0.7	86.7	2.2	0.0
	EAST LA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	631	96.8	12.7	91.9	1.7	0.2	92.6	0.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	182	98.9	83.5	20.3	72.5	1.6	91.2	1.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	78.9	15.8	36.8	15.8	26.3	10.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	835	97.2	29.7	74.3	18.0	1.1	90.4	1.2	0.0
	EL MONTE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	491	98.6	15.3	94.3	1.6	0.0	93.5	0.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	115	100.0	80.9	20.9	75.7	0.9	92.2	0.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	89.5	63.2	15.8	47.4	21.1	31.6	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	625	98.6	28.8	78.4	16.6	0.8	91.4	0.8	0.0
	GLENDALE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	389	98.5	18.0	94.3	1.5	0.0	95.4	1.3	1.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	93	97.8	81.7	15.1	78.5	1.1	93.5	1.1	6.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	100.0	88.9	11.1	27.8	0.0	33.3	27.8	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	502	98.4	32.7	76.3	16.7	0.2	92.4	2.2	2.6
INGLEWOOD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	280	96.4	14.3	87.5	1.4	0.0	85.4	1.1	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	61	98.4	72.1	9.8	78.7	1.6	83.6	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	81.8	90.9	0.0	54.5	0.0	36.4	9.1	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	353	96.3	26.9	71.1	16.4	0.3	83.3	1.1	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	LONGBEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	916	98.6	32.8	84.8	1.2	0.0	87.6	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	212	98.6	77.4	13.7	70.3	0.0	86.8	0.0	0.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	95.1	80.5	12.2	17.1	9.8	22.0	2.4	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1173	98.5	42.6	69.1	14.3	0.4	84.9	0.5	0.1
	LA METRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4508	98.7	47.2	92.9	3.5	0.0	86.9	0.5	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	841	99.0	93.8	9.2	85.7	0.4	86.3	0.8	2.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	148	94.6	97.3	2.7	67.6	0.7	15.5	0.7	10.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5504	98.6	55.8	77.5	17.9	0.1	84.8	0.6	0.8
	BELLFLOWER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	232	98.3	26.7	91.4	0.9	0.0	83.2	10.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	55	100.0	90.9	9.1	83.6	0.0	81.8	7.3	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	71.4	14.3	28.6	21.4	21.4	14.3	0.0
		TOTAL	301	98.7	40.5	72.8	17.3	1.0	80.1	10.0	0.0
	VALENCIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	703	97.4	23.6	89.0	1.7	0.3	89.6	0.7	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	154	98.1	92.9	11.0	83.1	0.0	89.0	0.6	1.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	96.3	59.3	0.0	33.3	40.7	22.2	14.8	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	888	97.4	37.0	72.4	16.9	1.5	87.0	1.2	0.3
	PASADENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	581	99.1	64.2	85.7	0.7	0.0	93.6	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	141	98.6	94.3	6.4	81.6	1.4	89.4	0.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	23	91.3	100.0	0.0	34.8	0.0	21.7	8.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	747	98.7	71.0	67.9	17.0	0.3	90.5	0.8	0.0
	MALIBU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	217	97.2	9.2	90.8	1.4	0.0	92.6	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	57	96.5	86.0	10.5	82.5	1.8	93.0	0.0	1.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	100.0	37.5	6.3	25.0	56.3	6.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	293	96.9	26.6	69.6	18.4	3.4	87.0	0.3	0.3
	POMONA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	831	97.7	20.7	92.1	1.8	0.0	89.9	0.4	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	186	94.1	78.5	9.7	75.3	0.0	80.1	1.1	3.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	91.9	73.0	5.4	54.1	5.4	27.0	10.8	18.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	1058	96.8	33.0	74.2	16.7	0.2	85.7	0.9	1.5
	HUNTINGTON PARK	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	575	98.4	19.0	91.3	2.1	0.0	92.7	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	129	100.0	82.9	18.6	77.5	2.3	93.8	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	88.2	5.9	52.9	11.8	52.9	5.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	723	98.6	32.2	76.1	16.9	0.7	91.7	0.7	0.0
	MONROVIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	75	100.0	20.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	98.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	31	100.0	87.1	12.9	83.9	0.0	90.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	108	100.0	40.7	72.2	24.1	0.0	96.3	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont.)	SANTA MONICA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	182	98.4	11.5	92.9	3.3	0.0	91.8	1.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	43	100.0	90.7	4.7	83.7	2.3	83.7	11.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	91.7	91.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	25.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	238	98.3	29.8	71.8	19.3	0.4	86.1	4.2	0.0
	TORRANCE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	946	98.4	23.2	93.7	1.6	0.1	87.5	1.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	242	98.3	75.2	16.5	77.3	0.4	84.3	1.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	91.9	75.7	0.0	56.8	10.8	21.6	18.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	42.9	100.0	0.0	35.7	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1239	97.6	35.8	74.7	18.4	0.5	84.2	1.8	0.0
	SOUTHGATE	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
	WHITTIER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	564	98.4	17.2	91.7	1.6	0.2	87.2	6.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	142	95.8	88.7	12.7	76.8	0.0	85.2	5.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	28	92.9	92.9	3.6	28.6	7.1	17.9	28.6	0.0
		TOTAL	734	97.7	33.9	73.0	17.2	0.4	84.2	7.2	0.0
	HOLLYWOOD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	160	99.4	23.1	90.6	2.5	0.0	90.0	0.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	100.0	78.6	10.7	78.6	3.6	85.7	3.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	100.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	193	99.5	32.6	76.7	14.5	0.5	87.6	1.0	0.0
	SAN FERNANDO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	805	98.8	45.1	87.5	4.0	0.2	82.9	2.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	149	98.0	86.6	10.1	73.8	6.0	72.5	5.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	100.0	67.6	5.9	47.1	29.4	11.8	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	989	98.7	52.1	72.9	16.0	2.2	78.8	2.4	0.0
	SAN PEDRO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	229	99.1	37.6	87.3	4.8	0.0	91.3	0.4	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	63	98.4	88.9	11.1	73.0	0.0	87.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	82.4	76.5	0.0	29.4	17.6	5.9	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	310	98.1	50.3	66.8	20.3	1.0	85.5	0.3	0.0
	VAN NUYS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2066	98.5	36.8	90.0	3.6	0.1	74.1	1.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	403	97.3	95.5	6.9	85.9	0.2	72.0	4.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	92.3	87.9	2.2	45.1	11.0	6.6	2.2	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		11	18.2	100.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	
TOTAL		2571	97.7	48.1	73.5	18.0	0.5	71.0	1.8	0.0	
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
AVALON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	3	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	
US DISTRICT LA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	10	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MADERA	SUP MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	7	71.4	85.7	57.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0
		TOTAL	7	71.4	85.7	57.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0
	JUV MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	100.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	100.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	CHOWCHILLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	300	96.0	98.0	92.0	2.3	0.0	60.7	8.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	72	93.1	91.7	23.6	62.5	1.4	55.6	9.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	83.3	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	0.0
		TOTAL	390	95.1	96.2	75.1	14.9	1.0	57.9	10.5	0.0
	MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	38	84.2	92.1	57.9	5.3	0.0	13.2	44.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	93.8	100.0	18.8	43.8	0.0	18.8	25.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	25.0	100.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	58	82.8	94.8	44.8	15.5	0.0	13.8	37.9	0.0
	BASSLAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	92	98.9	72.8	94.6	1.1	0.0	72.8	6.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	100.0	91.4	25.7	65.7	0.0	57.1	2.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	136	99.3	79.4	70.6	24.3	0.0	66.2	5.9	0.7
MARIN	SAN RAFAEL	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1136	97.4	9.8	87.9	2.8	0.0	89.3	8.5	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	211	98.1	90.5	6.7	81.9	0.0	88.1	9.5	10.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	36	100.0	94.4	0.0	27.8	0.0	19.4	69.4	25.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	8.3	75.0	66.7
		TOTAL	1395	97.6	24.9	72.7	15.9	0.0	86.6	10.8	3.0
MARIPOSA	JUV MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	98.3	100.0	91.7	1.7	0.0	93.3	1.7	1.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	22	90.9	95.5	18.2	50.0	0.0	63.6	9.1	13.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	86	96.5	97.7	68.6	16.3	1.2	83.7	3.5	7.0
	USMG YOSEMITE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	100.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	71.4	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	12	83.3	83.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	
	MENDOCINO	UKIAH CONSLD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	60.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL			7	57.1	71.4	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
JUV UKIAH		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	0.0
		TOTAL	9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	0.0
WILLITS		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	81	87.7	97.5	77.8	3.7	0.0	80.2	1.2	2.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	34	91.2	97.1	2.9	79.4	0.0	67.6	0.0	26.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	85.7	85.7	0.0	71.4	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	123	87.8	96.7	52.0	28.5	0.0	72.4	0.8	10.6		

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MENDOCINO (cont.)	UKIAH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	286	88.1	95.8	77.3	6.6	0.0	79.7	2.1	3.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	101	84.2	92.1	6.9	66.3	0.0	75.2	1.0	35.6	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	15	86.7	86.7	0.0	73.3	0.0	26.7	13.3	46.7	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	403	87.1	94.5	56.6	24.3	0.0	76.4	2.5	13.6	
	BOONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	100.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PT ARENA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	91.7	100.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	8.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	85.7	100.0	64.3	7.1	0.0	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
	LEGGETT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	95.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	33	100.0	100.0	72.7	24.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1
	COVELO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	7	85.7	71.4	71.4	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	14.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	9	88.9	77.8	55.6	11.1	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0	33.3
	FORT BRAGG	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	61	98.4	100.0	86.9	6.6	0.0	80.3	3.3	6.6	6.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	19	89.5	89.5	10.5	68.4	0.0	57.9	5.3	42.1	42.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	83	95.2	97.6	66.3	20.5	0.0	72.3	4.8	15.7	15.7
MERCED	SUP MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	80.0	100.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	50.0	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	33	63.6	97.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0
		TOTAL	9	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0
	MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	601	98.2	97.2	90.7	4.5	0.0	87.5	4.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	190	98.4	97.9	13.7	74.7	0.0	87.9	3.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	100.0	97.6	0.0	58.5	0.0	34.1	29.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	66.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	838	98.1	97.4	68.1	23.2	0.0	84.4	5.7	0.0	0.0
	LOS BANOS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	156	98.7	96.8	92.3	0.0	0.0	89.7	1.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	50	98.0	100.0	30.0	64.0	0.0	88.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	7.7	61.5	0.0	23.1	46.2	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	221	98.6	97.7	72.4	19.0	0.0	85.1	5.0	0.0	0.0
	MODOC	SUP MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	30	100.0	30.0	26.7	3.3	0.0	80.0	10.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	100.0	75.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	75.0	12.5	0.0
			TOTAL	38	100.0	39.5	23.7	7.9	0.0	78.9	10.5	0.0

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
MONO	BRIDGEPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	10	100.0	90.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	13	100.0	92.3	76.9	23.1	0.0	84.6	0.0	0.0
	MAMMOTH LAKES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	103	96.1	53.4	91.3	1.9	0.0	88.3	1.0	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	16	93.8	87.5	31.3	50.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7
	TOTAL	125	96.0	60.0	79.2	10.4	0.0	83.2	1.6	1.6	
MONTEREY	SUP MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	83	90.4	92.8	42.2	0.0	0.0	22.9	44.6	10.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	76.0	100.0	4.0	24.0	0.0	4.0	52.0	28.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	55.6	22.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	18	55.6	100.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	50.0	33.3
		TOTAL	135	81.5	95.6	26.7	5.9	0.0	14.8	47.4	17.8
	MARINA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	36	88.9	88.9	72.2	5.6	0.0	69.4	11.1	19.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	77.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	47	91.5	91.5	57.4	25.5	0.0	57.4	12.8	31.9
	SALINAS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1805	99.3	97.4	56.5	2.4	0.0	46.3	40.4	7.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	401	98.5	99.0	6.5	65.3	0.0	16.5	35.7	68.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	76	93.4	100.0	1.3	63.2	0.0	5.3	38.2	78.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	60.0
		TOTAL	2292	99.0	97.8	45.7	15.5	0.0	39.5	39.5	20.7
	KING CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	308	99.0	99.0	51.6	1.9	0.0	30.2	51.6	11.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	71	100.0	98.6	5.6	46.5	0.0	22.5	63.4	50.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	4.8	14.3	0.0	4.8	95.2	47.6
		TOTAL	400	99.3	99.0	41.0	10.5	0.0	27.5	56.0	20.5
NAPA	NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	780	98.2	95.0	89.7	2.6	0.0	89.1	2.4	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	187	98.4	98.4	16.6	77.0	0.0	95.2	0.5	18.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	27	92.6	100.0	7.4	77.8	0.0	85.2	0.0	44.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	33.3	88.9	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2
		TOTAL	1003	97.5	95.7	73.1	18.6	0.0	89.5	2.0	6.6
NEVADA	NEVADA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	238	99.2	89.1	86.1	0.4	0.0	82.4	1.7	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	51	100.0	98.0	7.8	80.4	0.0	80.4	0.0	2.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	94.1	100.0	5.9	58.8	0.0	11.8	0.0	5.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	85.7	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	313	98.4	91.1	67.1	17.3	0.0	76.4	1.3	1.0
	TRUCKEE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
	TRUCKEE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	156	96.8	94.9	83.3	4.5	0.0	91.0	0.0	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	48	95.8	97.9	20.8	72.9	0.0	87.5	0.0	2.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	100.0	100.0	22.2	55.6	0.0	77.8	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		214	96.3	95.8	66.4	22.0	0.0	89.3	0.0	1.4	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ORANGE	SUP SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	82	96.3	12.2	78.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	47.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	85	96.5	15.3	77.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	45.9	0.0
	FULLERTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2563	98.8	29.3	94.7	1.6	0.0	81.9	7.8	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	579	97.9	89.5	8.8	83.2	0.5	57.0	23.1	24.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	103	93.2	95.1	0.0	83.5	0.0	3.9	13.6	47.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	60.0	80.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	13.3
		TOTAL	3260	98.3	42.3	76.0	18.8	0.1	74.7	10.7	6.6
	WESTMINSTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2251	98.4	15.2	90.7	1.6	0.0	90.5	4.7	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	578	98.6	91.2	5.7	81.3	0.0	68.2	20.8	13.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	91	96.7	96.7	1.1	78.0	0.0	13.2	9.9	52.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	66.7	93.3	6.7	40.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	33.3
		TOTAL	2935	98.2	33.1	70.7	19.8	0.0	83.3	8.0	4.9
	LAGUNA HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	834	99.2	14.9	94.5	0.7	0.0	87.1	10.7	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	184	96.2	80.4	9.2	78.8	0.0	76.6	12.5	18.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	94.6	86.5	0.0	75.7	0.0	8.1	2.7	21.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1059	98.4	29.0	76.0	17.1	0.1	82.2	10.8	4.3
	NEWPORT BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2263	98.6	19.0	90.3	1.8	0.0	87.1	10.5	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	496	98.2	92.5	6.7	81.0	0.0	44.2	51.2	1.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	81	97.5	98.8	1.2	84.0	0.0	12.3	32.1	11.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	50.0	87.5	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
		TOTAL	2848	98.4	34.2	73.0	18.0	0.0	77.2	18.2	0.7
	SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1588	97.7	25.3	93.6	2.0	0.0	71.5	4.7	0.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	401	97.0	91.0	11.2	79.8	0.0	75.8	6.5	14.7
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		61	90.2	96.7	0.0	85.2	0.0	11.5	3.3	52.5	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		24	41.7	100.0	0.0	41.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	
TOTAL		2074	96.7	40.9	73.9	19.9	0.0	69.8	4.9	5.1	
PLACER	SUP AUBURN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	995	97.9	97.4	10.5	2.0	0.1	86.3	3.2	7.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	270	97.4	97.0	0.7	84.8	0.7	80.7	3.0	41.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	55	89.1	96.4	0.0	74.5	3.6	27.3	7.3	45.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	30.0	90.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
		TOTAL	1330	96.9	97.2	8.0	22.0	0.4	82.1	3.3	15.9
	JUV AUBURN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	95.0	5.0	65.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	85.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	95.0	5.0	65.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	85.0	0.0
	AUBURN	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
PLACER (cont.)	SUP TAHOE CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	156	98.7	98.7	89.1	1.9	0.0	91.0	1.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	30	96.7	100.0	10.0	83.3	0.0	93.3	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	197	97.5	99.0	72.1	17.3	0.0	89.8	1.0	0.0	
PLUMAS	CHESTER	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
	PORTOLA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
	QUINCY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	119	98.3	99.2	91.6	3.4	0.0	92.4	5.0	0.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	40	100.0	97.5	12.5	87.5	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	11.1	77.8	0.0	44.4	22.2	0.0	
		TOTAL	168	98.2	98.8	68.5	27.4	0.0	91.7	4.8	0.6	
	RIVERSIDE	SUP RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	338	78.1	91.7	70.1	3.6	0.0	50.3	3.0	1.2
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	75	81.3	94.7	13.3	60.0	0.0	40.0	8.0	10.7
			3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	34	61.8	94.1	5.9	47.1	0.0	17.6	2.9	20.6
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			42	50.0	92.9	2.4	35.7	0.0	4.8	11.9	4.8	
TOTAL			489	75.1	92.4	51.1	18.0	0.0	42.5	4.5	4.3	
SUP INDIO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	56	83.9	75.0	67.9	5.4	0.0	57.1	5.4	10.7	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	75	96.0	98.7	4.0	90.7	0.0	88.0	1.3	50.7	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	65	95.4	98.5	3.1	86.2	0.0	86.2	1.5	46.2	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	44	77.3	93.2	0.0	56.8	0.0	20.5	6.8	40.9	
		TOTAL	240	89.6	92.1	17.9	63.3	0.0	67.9	3.3	38.3	
JUV RIVERSIDE		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	24	100.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.2	29.2	0.0	
		TOTAL	24	100.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.2	29.2	0.0	
JUV INDIO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	13	92.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.7	
		TOTAL	13	92.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.7	
CORONA		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	
HEMET		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	75.0	50.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	8	87.5	75.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	21	81.0	61.9	57.1	14.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	4.8	
BANNING		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	297	97.6	73.4	94.3	1.0	0.0	89.2	2.0	0.7	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	77	97.4	92.2	16.9	77.9	0.0	75.3	7.8	1.3	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	94.7	100.0	5.3	89.5	0.0	5.3	21.1	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL	394	97.5	78.4	74.6	20.6	0.0	82.2	4.1	0.8		



TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
RIVERSIDE (cont.)	INDIO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1096	98.6	75.4	95.2	1.2	0.0	96.0	1.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	130	97.7	93.1	22.3	73.8	0.0	95.4	0.8	9.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	29	96.6	93.1	3.4	82.8	0.0	58.6	31.0	3.4	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	83.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	
		TOTAL	1261	98.4	77.6	85.1	10.8	0.0	94.7	2.0	1.1	
	MORENO VALLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2279	98.3	76.5	82.4	1.6	0.0	86.8	5.2	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	490	98.6	95.9	12.0	81.2	0.0	88.8	2.9	0.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	101	98.0	98.0	8.9	75.2	0.0	32.7	23.8	4.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	72.7	100.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	2881	98.2	80.7	67.5	17.9	0.0	84.9	5.5	0.3	
	BLYTHE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	65	98.5	38.5	93.8	3.1	0.0	90.8	7.7	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	93.3	93.3	6.7	80.0	0.0	40.0	53.3	20.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	
		TOTAL	83	97.6	50.6	74.7	19.3	0.0	79.5	16.9	4.8	
	PERRIS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1485	97.6	89.9	91.2	1.5	0.0	79.0	0.2	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	414	96.9	97.1	12.1	80.9	0.0	27.5	1.4	0.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	94	94.7	95.7	4.3	88.3	0.0	13.8	13.8	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	17	64.7	94.1	0.0	58.8	0.0	11.8	5.9	0.0	
		TOTAL	2010	97.1	91.7	70.0	22.4	0.0	64.8	1.1	0.0	
	TEMECULA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	50.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	
	SACRAMENTO	SUP SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	117	74.4	94.0	35.0	11.1	0.0	8.5	30.8	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	72	66.7	97.2	5.6	31.9	0.0	2.8	26.4	4.2
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			40	50.0	92.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	22.5	7.5	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			81	66.7	98.8	2.5	46.9	0.0	1.2	25.9	9.9	
TOTAL			310	67.4	95.8	15.2	27.1	0.0	4.2	27.4	4.5	
JUV SACRAMENTO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	32	100.0	18.8	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.3	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	34	100.0	20.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.9	0.0	
SACRAMENTO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4266	97.2	96.5	76.9	1.9	0.0	69.8	12.9	0.3	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1158	99.7	98.6	10.1	56.6	0.0	56.7	16.1	4.7	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	299	98.3	100.0	1.3	34.8	0.0	19.1	6.7	11.4	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	55	89.1	96.4	0.0	23.6	0.0	7.3	7.3	12.7	
		TOTAL	5778	97.7	97.1	58.9	14.8	0.0	64.0	13.2	1.9	
SACTO USMAG		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
SAN BENITO		SUP SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	213	97.7	87.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	62.4	34.7	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		71	100.0	97.2	5.6	67.6	0.0	74.6	16.9	25.4	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		12	100.0	91.7	0.0	25.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	75.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		4	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	
	TOTAL		300	97.7	90.0	48.7	17.0	0.3	62.7	30.0	10.3	
	JUV HOLLISTR	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN BERNARDINO	SUP SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	54	81.5	87.0	57.4	7.4	0.0	27.8	0.0	3.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	12	50.0	66.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	60.0	80.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	17	52.9	52.9	0.0	29.4	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	88	70.5	77.3	35.2	18.2	0.0	18.2	0.0	2.3
	SUP RANCHO CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	26	76.9	80.8	53.8	11.5	0.0	3.8	3.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	11	63.6	81.8	0.0	45.5	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	7	42.9	71.4	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	20.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	54	59.3	68.5	27.8	20.4	0.0	5.6	1.9	0.0
	SUP VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	34	52.9	85.3	26.5	11.8	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	69.2	84.6	0.0	61.5	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	10	10.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	30.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	67	46.3	79.1	13.4	20.9	0.0	4.5	1.5	0.0
	SUP BARSTOW	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	350	97.4	68.9	91.7	2.6	0.0	91.4	2.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	70	97.1	97.1	12.9	77.1	0.0	77.1	8.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	88.2	88.2	0.0	47.1	0.0	41.2	17.6	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	20.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
		TOTAL	442	96.2	74.4	74.7	16.3	0.0	86.2	3.8	0.0
	SUP DIST JOSHUA TREE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	71.4	57.1	57.1	7.1	0.0	14.3	7.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	22	59.1	59.1	36.4	13.6	0.0	9.1	4.5	0.0
	SUP INF JUV SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
	SUP JUV SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SUP CHINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	262	98.1	27.5	91.2	4.6	0.0	93.5	1.9	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	78	97.4	91.0	16.7	79.5	0.0	92.3	1.3	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	100.0	93.8	0.0	50.0	0.0	56.3	12.5	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	50.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	360	97.5	44.4	70.3	23.1	0.0	90.8	2.2	0.0	
SUP REDLANDS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	309	97.1	59.2	94.2	1.0	0.0	88.7	1.3	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	80	98.8	90.0	12.5	83.8	0.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	21	95.2	100.0	9.5	61.9	0.0	61.9	0.0	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	42.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	417	96.4	67.1	72.7	19.9	0.0	87.5	1.0	0.0	
SUP DIV SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1297	97.3	74.1	93.3	1.9	0.0	88.4	1.9	0.1	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	316	98.4	92.4	19.9	75.0	0.0	64.2	22.5	1.6	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	61	100.0	96.7	9.8	39.3	0.0	18.0	19.7	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	71.4	0.0	28.6	28.6	0.0	
	TOTAL	1681	97.6	78.5	76.1	17.3	0.0	81.0	6.5	0.4	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN BERNARDINO (cont.)	SUP FONTANA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	738	96.6	69.8	92.0	1.9	0.0	87.7	0.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	192	93.8	93.2	12.0	77.6	0.0	76.0	5.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	93.3	88.9	2.2	40.0	0.0	28.9	20.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	57.1	57.1	7.1	14.3	0.0	7.1	14.3	0.0
		TOTAL	989	95.3	75.0	71.2	18.5	0.0	81.6	2.8	0.0
	VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	961	97.7	50.6	94.8	1.9	0.0	92.0	0.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	254	98.4	92.9	15.0	78.7	0.0	87.8	1.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	52	96.2	96.2	5.8	76.9	0.0	53.8	15.4	1.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	9	77.8	100.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1276	97.6	61.2	74.6	20.5	0.0	89.1	1.1	0.1
	SUP RNCHO CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1790	99.1	40.0	96.1	1.3	0.0	96.0	0.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	441	99.1	91.4	15.2	81.4	0.0	93.7	1.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	57	98.2	98.2	5.3	33.3	0.0	24.6	7.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	12	91.7	91.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0
		TOTAL	2300	99.0	51.6	77.8	17.5	0.0	93.3	0.9	0.0
	BIG BEAR LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	159	99.4	81.8	95.6	3.8	0.0	99.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	35	100.0	94.3	5.7	88.6	0.0	94.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	196	99.5	84.2	78.6	19.9	0.0	97.4	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	196	99.5	84.2	78.6	19.9	0.0	97.4	0.0	0.0
	TWIN PEAKS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	113	99.1	85.0	97.3	1.8	0.0	97.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	32	96.9	96.9	15.6	81.3	0.0	93.8	3.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	6	100.0	83.3	33.3	66.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	154	98.1	87.0	76.0	22.1	0.0	95.5	1.3	0.0
	SUP NEEDLES	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	96	99.0	46.9	66.7	1.0	1.0	66.7	11.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	15	100.0	80.0	20.0	53.3	6.7	46.7	26.7	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	2	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		115	99.1	52.2	59.1	10.4	1.7	64.3	13.0	0.0	
SUP JOSHUA TRE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	198	95.5	58.1	92.4	0.5	0.0	85.9	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	52	92.3	80.8	11.5	71.2	0.0	71.2	3.8	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	91.7	100.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	75.0	8.3	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	264	93.9	64.8	72.7	16.7	0.0	81.8	1.1	0.0	
SAN DIEGO	SUP SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	129	79.1	95.3	45.7	1.6	0.0	21.7	0.8	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	36	72.2	94.4	13.9	30.6	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	16	81.3	100.0	6.3	43.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	22	54.5	100.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	203	75.4	96.1	32.0	11.8	0.0	15.3	0.5	0.0
	SUP VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	136	75.7	94.1	27.2	6.6	0.0	14.7	0.7	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	41	78.0	100.0	2.4	36.6	0.0	4.9	2.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	52.9	100.0	0.0	29.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	23	56.5	100.0	0.0	26.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7
		TOTAL	217	72.4	96.3	17.5	16.1	0.0	10.1	0.9	1.4

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN DIEGO (cont.)	SUP CHULA VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	69	84.1	88.4	17.4	2.9	0.0	13.0	11.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	22	59.1	100.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	102	77.5	91.2	11.8	5.9	0.0	9.8	7.8	1.0
	SUP EL CAHON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	71.4	85.7	35.7	7.1	0.0	35.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	7	71.4	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	26	65.4	88.5	19.2	7.7	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	
	JUV SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	85	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	91	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	EL CAJON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1809	98.0	10.8	86.3	2.0	0.0	83.3	4.9	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	464	96.1	79.1	14.4	61.0	0.0	74.1	1.5	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	87	87.4	89.7	6.9	39.1	0.0	31.0	8.0	1.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	53.3	100.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
		TOTAL	2375	96.9	27.6	68.8	14.9	0.0	79.0	4.4	0.0
	VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2725	98.7	19.8	84.6	6.6	0.0	85.5	7.6	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	729	98.6	91.1	9.7	77.0	0.0	79.6	11.7	0.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	136	97.1	95.6	4.4	80.9	0.0	30.9	29.4	2.9
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	100.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	12.5
		TOTAL	3598	98.6	37.2	66.2	23.8	0.0	82.0	9.3	0.5
	SAN MARCOS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	45.0	0.0
		TOTAL	20	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	45.0	0.0
	SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4103	98.1	95.1	93.5	2.8	0.0	91.3	3.8	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	701	96.9	99.1	17.5	77.3	0.0	53.6	2.9	1.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	95	97.9	97.9	4.2	87.4	0.0	24.2	27.4	11.6
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		9	77.8	88.9	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	
TOTAL		4908	97.9	95.7	80.8	15.2	0.0	84.5	4.1	0.7	
CHULA VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1405	97.0	9.3	82.7	3.1	0.0	79.2	2.5	0.1	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	276	98.2	78.3	15.9	68.1	0.0	81.9	1.1	0.7	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	44	97.7	90.9	2.3	22.7	0.0	20.5	15.9	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1731	97.2	22.5	69.8	13.9	0.0	78.0	2.6	0.2	
USCT SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SAN FRANCISCO	SUP SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	75.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	6	83.3	83.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7
	JUV SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN FRANCISCO (cont.)	SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	667	99.4	97.8	96.0	1.5	0.0	95.4	0.1	3.9	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	137	99.3	99.3	25.5	67.2	0.0	86.1	0.0	48.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	19	100.0	100.0	5.3	84.2	0.0	47.4	0.0	89.5	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	827	99.4	98.1	81.7	14.6	0.0	92.5	0.1	13.7	
SAN JOAQUIN	FRENCH CAMP	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	26	88.5	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	3.8	0.0	
		TOTAL	26	88.5	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	3.8	0.0	
	LODI	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	366	99.5	97.8	85.8	0.5	0.0	78.7	16.1	0.3	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	82	96.3	100.0	7.3	73.2	0.0	78.0	18.3	4.9	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	100.0	100.0	0.0	41.7	0.0	25.0	75.0	20.8	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	42.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	
		TOTAL	479	98.1	98.3	66.8	15.0	0.0	74.7	20.0	2.1	
	MANTECA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	325	98.5	96.3	92.0	1.5	0.0	90.2	4.3	1.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	93	100.0	100.0	14.0	82.8	0.0	95.7	3.2	78.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	100.0	92.9	0.0	50.0	7.1	28.6	64.3	85.7	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	71.4	85.7	0.0	42.9	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	
		TOTAL	439	98.4	96.8	71.1	21.0	0.2	88.2	6.4	21.6	
	TRACY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	294	99.3	95.6	92.2	1.7	0.0	83.3	9.2	1.4	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	63	100.0	100.0	6.3	88.9	0.0	85.7	3.2	27.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	100.0	75.0	8.3	54.2	25.0	4.2	41.7	70.8	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	80.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	
		TOTAL	386	99.2	94.6	71.8	19.2	2.1	77.7	10.9	10.4	
	STOCKTON	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1423	98.1	97.5	91.8	2.0	0.6	80.7	4.1	0.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	445	97.8	99.3	10.1	82.7	0.2	77.5	7.6	14.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	148	93.2	69.6	2.0	35.8	27.7	16.2	39.2	18.2	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		56	67.9	80.4	0.0	17.9	16.1	3.6	26.8	19.6		
TOTAL		2072	96.9	95.5	65.4	22.2	2.8	73.3	8.0	5.5		
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SUP SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1214	97.0	94.8	89.8	1.6	0.0	80.8	1.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	372	98.1	98.7	8.1	84.9	0.0	87.4	0.3	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	87	95.4	98.9	3.4	75.9	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	78.6	100.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	1687	97.0	95.9	66.6	24.1	0.0	78.2	0.8	0.0		
	SAN MATEO	SUP REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	34	70.6	97.1	41.2	5.9	0.0	29.4	0.0	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	14	50.0	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			11	36.4	100.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL			65	58.5	98.5	21.5	15.4	0.0	16.9	0.0	0.0	
SUP SAN MATEO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	40.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	15	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	40.0	0.0	
SAN MATEO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN MATEO (cont.)	SO SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1122	98.1	96.4	91.6	2.0	0.1	83.3	0.3	1.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	236	97.9	99.2	9.7	83.9	0.0	40.3	2.5	44.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	93.3	97.8	6.7	80.0	0.0	17.8	0.0	46.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
		TOTAL	1408	97.9	96.9	74.9	18.5	0.1	73.7	0.6	10.1
	REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1056	98.6	97.0	90.9	1.9	0.0	77.4	0.1	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	243	98.8	99.2	9.9	84.8	0.0	18.9	2.5	8.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	37	94.6	94.6	5.4	86.5	0.0	8.1	5.4	21.6
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	7	85.7	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3
		TOTAL	1343	98.4	97.3	73.4	19.6	0.0	64.5	0.7	2.5
SANTA BARBARA	JUV SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
	SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1110	94.9	65.0	83.0	1.3	0.0	83.1	11.5	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	218	95.9	95.4	13.3	63.3	0.0	50.9	12.4	6.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	41	87.8	95.1	2.4	56.1	0.0	14.6	43.9	17.1
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	5	60.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
		TOTAL	1374	94.7	70.7	69.2	12.8	0.0	75.6	12.7	1.7
	SANTA MARIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	528	98.9	54.0	69.9	3.0	0.0	66.7	27.7	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	146	92.5	96.6	7.5	63.0	0.0	21.2	69.2	10.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	49	91.8	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	2.0	79.6	32.7
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		8	62.5	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	
TOTAL		731	96.7	66.1	52.0	19.8	0.0	52.5	39.8	4.8	
LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	234	97.4	36.8	85.9	0.9	0.0	82.5	13.7	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	58	100.0	93.1	8.6	81.0	0.0	43.1	50.0	0.0	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	14	92.9	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	78.6	7.1	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	TOTAL	308	97.7	50.6	66.9	18.8	0.0	70.8	24.0	0.3	
SANTA CLARA	SUP SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	107	71.0	96.3	35.5	14.0	0.0	4.7	6.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	44	54.5	100.0	6.8	27.3	0.0	11.4	2.3	2.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	20	55.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	39	59.0	100.0	0.0	43.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7
		TOTAL	210	63.8	98.1	19.5	24.8	0.0	4.8	4.3	2.9
	JUV SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	55	92.7	36.4	72.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	56	92.9	35.7	71.4	0.0	0.0	8.9	64.3	0.0
	PALO ALTO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	594	99.5	94.6	93.8	2.5	0.0	86.0	9.9	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	139	97.1	99.3	7.9	87.1	0.0	75.5	15.1	17.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	96.7	96.7	6.7	46.7	3.3	13.3	3.3	73.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	764	99.0	95.5	74.6	19.8	0.1	81.2	10.6	6.8		

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SANTA CLARA (cont.)	SAN JOSE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3119	98.2	95.3	85.3	4.1	0.0	84.6	6.0	1.9	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	776	95.6	97.7	10.6	77.6	0.0	78.7	9.8	18.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	130	89.2	96.2	2.3	64.6	0.0	14.6	7.7	52.3	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4028	97.4	95.8	68.1	20.2	0.0	81.2	6.8	6.6	
	SAN JOSE TRAFFIC	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	100.0	100.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SANTA CLARA	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	SUNNYVALE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	160	98.8	98.8	92.5	1.2	0.0	94.4	2.5	0.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	43	100.0	100.0	14.0	81.4	0.0	93.0	4.7	23.3	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	208	99.0	99.0	74.0	19.2	0.0	92.3	2.9	7.2	
	GILROY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	511	97.7	95.5	88.3	3.5	0.0	62.0	5.9	1.6	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	166	98.8	100.0	9.0	80.7	0.0	65.1	1.8	16.9	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	30	96.7	100.0	0.0	23.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	43.3	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	
		TOTAL	709	97.9	96.8	65.7	22.4	0.0	59.9	5.2	7.1	
SANTA CRUZ	SUP SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	17	76.5	94.1	29.4	0.0	0.0	29.4	23.5	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	29	69.0	93.1	17.2	0.0	0.0	17.2	44.8	0.0	
	JUV SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	20	90.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	45.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	20	90.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	45.0	0.0	
	SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	796	97.6	96.6	84.9	1.0	0.0	85.2	10.7	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	231	98.7	99.1	9.1	67.1	0.0	75.8	20.3	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	58	94.8	100.0	1.7	10.3	0.0	8.6	81.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	15	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	1100	97.3	97.4	63.5	15.4	0.0	78.0	17.0	0.0	
	WATSONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	230	98.7	97.8	49.1	0.9	0.0	48.7	47.8	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	80	100.0	97.5	1.2	46.3	0.0	48.8	47.5	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	328	99.1	97.9	34.8	11.9	0.0	46.0	50.6	0.0	
	SHASTA	JUV SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	21.4	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1	71.4	0.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
			TOTAL	15	20.0	13.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	73.3	0.0
		BURNEY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	31	100.0	100.0	96.8	0.0	0.0	83.9	12.9	3.2
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI			4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	
TOTAL			38	100.0	100.0	78.9	15.8	0.0	78.9	13.2	7.9	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
SHASTA (cont.)	REDDING	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	692	96.0	98.6	91.2	1.9	0.0	84.4	6.8	1.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	225	92.9	98.7	12.4	78.2	0.0	84.0	4.9	40.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	66	97.0	98.5	4.5	36.4	0.0	19.7	47.0	74.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	19	47.4	100.0	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	21.1	21.1
		TOTAL	1002	94.4	98.6	66.1	21.6	0.0	78.4	9.3	15.6
SIERRA	SUP SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	00.0	0.0	0.0
	DOWNIEVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	100.0	100.0	95.2	0.0	0.0	95.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	0.0
		TOTAL	32	100.0	100.0	62.5	34.4	0.0	87.5	3.1	0.0
SISKIYOU	SUP SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
	WEED	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	85	98.8	95.3	82.4	1.2	0.0	67.1	16.5	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	28	100.0	92.9	3.6	78.6	0.0	42.9	17.9	28.6
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI		8	87.5	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	
TOTAL		122	98.4	95.1	58.2	24.6	0.0	57.4	16.4	8.2	
YREKA JUV DIST		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	89	93.3	94.4	68.5	4.5	0.0	64.0	5.6	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	25	88.0	100.0	12.0	68.0	0.0	32.0	4.0	20.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	63.6	100.0	18.2	27.3	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	126	88.9	96.0	52.4	19.0	0.0	52.4	6.3	5.6
SOLANO	SUP SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	36	75.0	97.2	72.2	0.0	0.0	36.1	5.6	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	10	60.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	11	27.3	100.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	62	61.3	98.4	41.9	11.3	0.0	24.2	3.2	0.0
	JUV SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	7	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	8	87.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0
	FAIRFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	655	96.9	98.9	92.5	2.0	0.0	89.2	0.3	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	187	95.2	98.9	5.3	88.8	0.0	81.8	0.0	7.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	40	85.0	100.0	2.5	70.0	0.0	12.5	20.0	32.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	884	96.0	99.0	69.8	23.6	0.0	83.9	1.1	3.4
	BENICIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
VALLEJO	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	342	96.2	98.5	94.2	0.9	0.0	91.5	0.0	0.0	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	91	92.3	95.6	16.5	72.5	0.0	75.8	0.0	1.1	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	12	75.0	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	33.3	8.3	0.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	
	TOTAL	451	94.7	98.0	74.7	18.4	0.0	85.6	0.4	0.2	



TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SONOMA	SUP SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	11	72.7	90.9	18.2	0.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	13	53.8	92.3	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	13	46.2	100.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	42	54.8	95.2	4.8	4.8	0.0	11.9	0.0	2.4	
	JUV SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	46	58.7	15.2	52.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	50.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	48	56.3	18.8	50.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	47.9	0.0	
	SANTA ROSA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1491	95.8	95.0	74.6	0.9	0.0	70.3	0.1	0.8	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	468	93.8	98.9	3.6	50.6	0.0	50.4	0.0	16.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	119	88.2	100.0	3.4	21.0	0.0	10.1	0.0	23.5	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	23	73.9	100.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	
		TOTAL	2101	94.7	96.2	54.0	13.2	0.0	61.7	0.0	5.6	
	STANISLAUS	SUP STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1165	98.8	96.9	89.7	4.3	0.0	73.1	1.2	0.9
			2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	291	98.3	97.9	11.3	79.4	0.0	38.1	3.1	13.1
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI			63	98.4	96.8	4.8	73.0	1.6	11.1	3.2	50.8	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI			20	75.0	100.0	5.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	
TOTAL			1539	98.4	97.1	70.3	21.9	0.1	63.0	1.6	5.4	
JUV STANISLAUS		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	21	85.7	19.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	4.8	33.3	0.0	
		TOTAL	21	85.7	19.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	4.8	33.3	0.0	
MODESTO		1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	
SUTTER		SUP YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	91.7	100.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI		4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI		3	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	
	TOTAL		19	89.5	100.0	47.4	21.1	0.0	5.3	5.3	31.6	
	YUBA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	269	94.1	94.4	86.6	1.1	0.4	84.0	3.3	1.5	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	87	96.6	98.9	6.9	88.5	0.0	73.6	1.1	47.1	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	17	100.0	100.0	5.9	70.6	0.0	29.4	11.8	82.4	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	
		TOTAL	375	94.7	95.7	64.0	24.8	0.3	78.7	3.5	16.0	
		TOTAL	375	94.7	95.7	64.0	24.8	0.3	78.7	3.5	16.0	
TEHAMA	SUP TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	12	58.3	100.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	50.0	25.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	3	33.3	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	
		TOTAL	19	42.1	100.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	36.8	36.8	
	JUV TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	4	75.0	75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	75.0	75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	
	CORNING	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	94	98.9	97.9	93.6	4.3	0.0	76.6	0.0	2.1	
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	36	91.7	100.0	13.9	72.2	0.0	22.2	5.6	8.3	
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	
		TOTAL	135	95.6	98.5	68.9	24.4	0.0	59.3	1.5	5.2	

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
TEHAMA (cont.)	RED BLUFF	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	181	86.7	96.7	6.1	1.1	0.0	73.5	9.9	2.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	57	87.7	98.2	1.8	73.7	0.0	80.7	1.8	12.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	18	55.6	100.0	0.0	55.6	0.0	16.7	0.0	33.3
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	257	84.4	97.3	4.7	21.0	0.0	70.8	7.4	7.0
TRINITY	SUP TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	60	98.3	91.7	83.3	0.0	0.0	78.3	5.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	21	81.0	100.0	14.3	42.9	0.0	57.1	4.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	8	100.0	87.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	91	93.4	93.4	58.2	13.2	1.1	65.9	7.7	0.0
TULARE	SUP TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	9	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JUV TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	14	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0
		TOTAL	14	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0
	DINUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	215	96.7	96.3	87.9	1.4	0.0	88.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	58	98.3	96.6	17.2	77.6	0.0	91.4	0.0	3.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	13	100.0	100.0	7.7	69.2	0.0	76.9	0.0	15.4
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	4	100.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	290	97.2	96.2	69.0	20.3	0.0	88.3	0.0	1.4
	PORTERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	553	92.4	89.9	82.6	2.0	0.0	45.0	1.1	3.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	171	93.0	93.0	19.9	66.1	0.0	28.7	1.8	19.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	85.7	92.9	11.9	59.5	0.0	11.9	7.1	45.2
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	10	90.0	80.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
		TOTAL	776	92.1	90.6	63.9	19.6	0.0	39.0	1.5	9.5
	TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	395	98.0	82.5	88.1	4.8	0.0	48.6	1.3	1.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	93	96.8	97.8	9.7	81.7	0.0	31.2	8.6	10.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	22	100.0	95.5	0.0	86.4	0.0	9.1	27.3	31.8
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
TOTAL		516	97.7	86.0	69.2	22.7	0.0	43.2	3.7	4.8	
VISALIA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	697	95.7	94.4	86.7	2.4	0.0	80.8	0.4	0.9	
	2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	185	92.4	95.7	24.3	59.5	0.0	56.8	2.2	8.1	
	3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	45	91.1	95.6	13.3	66.7	0.0	31.1	8.9	17.8	
	4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	8	75.0	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	
	TOTAL	935	94.7	94.8	70.1	17.3	0.0	72.9	1.2	3.3	
TUOLUMNE	SUP SONORA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	295	96.6	98.3	90.8	1.0	0.0	88.8	1.7	0.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	90	95.6	100.0	14.4	76.7	0.0	82.2	2.2	5.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	24	95.8	100.0	12.5	33.3	0.0	33.3	8.3	12.5
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	6	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	415	95.4	98.3	68.4	19.3	0.0	82.9	2.2	2.4

TABLE B4: 2003 DUI SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT AND OFFENDER STATUS\* - continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1ST OFFENDER ALCOHOL PROG	SB 38 ALCOHOL PROG	30-MONTH PROGRAM	LICENSE RESTRICTION	COURT SUSPENSION	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
VENTURA	SUP VENTURA	1ST DUI	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	5	100.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
	VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	2844	98.0	97.3	78.8	1.0	0.0	73.1	20.6	9.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	590	98.0	99.2	8.8	68.8	0.0	75.3	21.2	69.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	128	89.8	100.0	3.1	49.2	0.0	27.3	40.6	72.7
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	27	63.0	96.3	0.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	37.0	55.6
		TOTAL	3589	97.4	97.7	64.0	14.2	0.0	71.3	21.5	21.8
		YOLO	WOODLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	610	95.9	93.4	83.9	2.1	0.0	78.9
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	153	97.4		97.4	32.0	55.6	0.0	85.6	1.3	10.5	
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	42	85.7		97.6	9.5	47.6	0.0	21.4	21.4	14.3	
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	14	78.6		92.9	0.0	35.7	0.0	7.1	21.4	7.1	
TOTAL	819	95.4		94.4	69.0	15.0	0.0	75.9	8.5	3.1	
YUBA	SUP YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	9	88.9	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	6	16.7	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
		TOTAL	19	63.2	100.0	31.6	10.5	0.0	47.4	5.3	5.3
	JUV YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MARYSVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	294	98.0	87.8	86.7	2.0	0.0	77.9	0.0	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	95	96.8	97.9	10.5	81.1	0.0	26.3	0.0	5.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	11	90.9	90.9	9.1	36.4	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	402	97.0	90.3	66.2	21.6	0.0	63.9	0.0	1.5

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

YEAR GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT FEMALE	MEAN AGE	PERCENT COMMERCIAL DRIVERS	MONTHS IN STUDY	2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS PER 100 DRIVERS				ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES**			
						TOTAL ACCIDENTS	ALCOHOL ACCIDENTS	MAJOR CONVICTIONS	MINOR CONVICTIONS	TOTAL ACCIDENTS	INJURY ACCIDENTS	MAJOR VIOLATIONS	MOVING VIOLATIONS
<u>7/03-6/04</u>													
No program	3,472 (39.0%)	22.4	33.0	3.3	16.2	2.9	0.9	.19	9.5	1.70	.45	.42	1.95
Alcohol education program	5,424 (61.0%)	23.9	32.6	2.3	16.1	2.7	0.9	.14	8.8	1.69	.42	.36	1.91
Statistical significance test		$\chi^2 = 2.9$	$F = 2.49$	$\chi^2 = 7.1^*$	$F = 3.6$	$F = 3.07$	$F = .01$	$F = 3.27$	$F = 6.79^*$	$F = 3.93^*$	$F = 126.0^*$	$F = 342.8^*$	$F = 11.8^*$
<u>2003</u>													
3-month program	23,213 (74.0%)	20.0	33.3	2.5	20.1	3.0	1.4	.10	7.5	1.7	.40	.40	1.90
6-month program	8,098 (26.0%)	19.5	36.0	2.6	20.3	3.6	2.2	.10	5.2	1.7	.40	.40	1.90
Statistical significance test		$\chi^2 = .77$	$F = 316.9^*$	$\chi^2 = .31$	$F = .04$	$F = 62.9^*$	$F = 286.7^*$	$F = 3.45$	$F = 251.5^*$	$F = 5.4^*$	$F = 3.7$	$F = 13.5^*$	$F = 2.4$

\* &lt; .05