



**2017**

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

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

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

**EDMUND G. BROWN JR.**  
Governor

**BRIAN C. ANNIS, Secretary**  
California State Transportation Agency

**JEAN SHIOMOTO**  
Director

© California Department of Motor Vehicles, 2018



**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 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 Service, 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.

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> October 2018		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Final Report		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b>	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> 2017 Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System				<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Sladjana Oulad Daoud, Helen N. Tashima				<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> California Department of Motor Vehicles Research and Development Branch P.O. Box 932382 Sacramento, CA 94232-3820				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>  CAL-DMV-RSS-18-257	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b>	
				<b>11. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b>					
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> - Corresponding author: Sladjana.OuladDaoud@dmv.ca.gov					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> In this twenty-sixth annual legislatively-mandated report, 2014 and 2015 driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs (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 cross-tabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, postconviction sanctions, driver license suspension/revocation actions, and on drivers in alcohol- or drug-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 25 years. Also, the long-term recidivism curves of the cumulative proportions of DUI reoffenses are shown for all DUI offenders arrested in 2005. An analysis was conducted to evaluate if referrals to the 9-month DUI program were associated with reductions in 1-year subsequent DUI incidents and crashes when compared to referrals to the 3-month DUI program among first DUI offenders. The proportions of convicted first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2014, who were referred, enrolled, and completed DUI programs are also presented. Additionally, the numbers and percentages of DUI offenders who installed ignition interlock devices are presented by county and DUI offender status.					
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b> Drinking drivers, DUI tracking data system, DUI reporting system, DUI countermeasures, DUI recidivism, DUI Program, license suspension/revocation, drugged driving, ignition interlock					
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b> Unclassified			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>  None	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>  168	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b> Karin Oakley
<b>A. REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>B. ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>C. THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b> 916-657-5768



## DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 2005- 2015

DUI measures	YEAR										
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
DUI arrest rate (per 100,000 licensed drivers)	786	849	863	906	880	823	752	712	651	619	546
Total DUI arrests <sup>a</sup>	180288	197248	203866	214811	208531	195879	180212 <sup>b</sup>	172893	160388	154743	141372
Felony DUI arrests <sup>a</sup>	5962	6191	6264	5966	5577	4902	4655	5047	4789	4835	4899
Misdemeanor DUI arrests <sup>a</sup>	174326	191057	197602	208845	202954	190977	175557	167846	155599	149908	136473
Total DUI convictions <sup>c</sup>	140879	156595	160591	169035	161074	148042	142121	133525	121304	116190	N/A
DUI conviction rates <sup>c</sup>	78.1%	79.4%	78.8%	78.7%	77.2%	73.1% <sup>d</sup>	73.3% <sup>d</sup>	73.7% <sup>d</sup>	72.5% <sup>d</sup>	72.7% <sup>d</sup>	N/A
Alcohol- or drug-involved reckless driving convictions <sup>c</sup>	14452	15563	16085	17887	19802	19552	19204	17568	16494	14563	N/A
Percent convicted of alcohol or drug reckless driving <sup>c</sup>	8.0%	7.9%	7.9%	8.3%	9.5%	8.1% <sup>d</sup>	7.9% <sup>d</sup>	8.1% <sup>d</sup>	8.1% <sup>d</sup>	7.3% <sup>d</sup>	N/A
Alcohol-involved crash fatalities <sup>e</sup>	1574	1597	1489	1355	1263	1072	1089	1169	1197	1155	1144
% of total crash fatalities	36.6	38.1	37.5	39.8	41.1	39.1	38.5	39.0	38.6	36.9	33.3
Alcohol-involved crash injuries <sup>e</sup>	30810	31099	30783	28463	26058	24343	23853	23905	23178	23993	25152
% of total crash injuries	10.5	11.2	11.5	11.8	11.2	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.4	10.4	9.9
Drug-involved crash fatalities <sup>f</sup>	880	859	749	726	713	696	709	818	892	864	831
% of total crash fatalities	20.4	20.5	18.9	21.3	23.2	25.4	25.0	27.3	28.7	27.6	24.2
Drug-involved crash injuries <sup>f</sup>	2722	2421	2464	2227	2309	2384	2289	2622	2489	2867	3031
% of total crash injuries	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2

Note: N/A indicates that this information is not available yet for 2015.

<sup>a</sup>These totals do not include duplicate cases as originally reported in the Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center data.

<sup>b</sup>Due to the underreporting of DUI arrest data by CHP for the month of April 2011, the total for 2011 is undercounted by approximately 6,500 DUI arrests.

<sup>c</sup>These figures show the total counts of convictions and conviction rates, by year of violation, as typically reported in Section 2 of this report.

<sup>d</sup>The 2010 and later DUI conviction rates and percent convicted of alcohol-reckless driving are derived using different data extraction procedures than those used in years prior to 2010 and are not comparable to figures in those prior years. These rates are computed only on "matchable DUI cases", and not by using total DUI arrests divided by total DUI convictions presented in this table. See Section 2 for more details.

<sup>e</sup>For some fatalities in these figures, drugs were also involved. These figures were provided by CHP on February 21, 2018.

<sup>f</sup>For some fatalities in these figures, alcohol was also involved. These figures were provided by CHP on February 21, 2018.

## DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 2005– 2015 (CONTINUED)

DUI license actions	YEAR										
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total mandatory suspension/ revocation (S/R) actions	247568	339796	362859	392319	382111	351802	337700	313870	286981	264833	255357
<b>PRECONVICTION</b>											
Admin Per Se (APS) Actions	168569	185481	192213	204332	198851	183743	177231	163522	150337	139405	130468
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	19374	22044	22112	22180	20861	18684	17463	14835	11750	10213	9074
.08 First-offender suspensions	107466	118468	123594	132266	127933	117884	114858	106562	99475	93014	86933
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	38097	41420	42979	46388	46747	44101	42127	39563	35646	32823	31093
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	3632	3549	3528	3498	3310	3074	2783	2562	3466	3355	3368
Commercial driver actions	3911 <sup>g</sup>	3834 <sup>g</sup>	3862 <sup>g</sup>	4355 <sup>g</sup>	3964 <sup>g</sup>	3614 <sup>g</sup>	3108 <sup>g</sup>	2983 <sup>g</sup>	2782 <sup>g</sup>	2498	2322
Chemical test refusal actions	9599	9315	9581	9390	8737	8275	7520	7069	9214	9089	9257
.01 Test refusal suspensions	364	419	426	433	372	354	279	280	300	286	293
.08 Test refusal suspensions	5603	5347	5627	5459	5055	4847	4458	4227	5448	5448	5596
.08 Test refusal revocations	3632	3549	3528	3498	3310	3074	2783	2562	3466	3355	3368
<b>POSTCONVICTION<sup>h</sup></b>											
Juvenile DUI suspensions	737	941	1061	917	482	538	351	312	311	253	246
First-offender suspensions	39078	110525	124436	136480	132709	120254	113749	107035	93897	81845	82570
Misdemeanor	36808	108227	122102	133987	130462	118168	111760	105013	91809	79955	80492
Felony	2270	2298	2334	2493	2247	2086	1989	2022	2088	1890	2078
Second-offender S/R actions	30294	32680	34296	38266	37836	35565	34519	32156	32408	32935	31587
Misdemeanor	29699	32046	33649	37568	37155	34928	33878	31533	31771	32275	30896
Felony	595	634	647	658	681	637	641	623	637	660	691
Third-offender revocations	6720	7649	8063	9164	9187	8905	8918	8083	7665	8239	8160
Misdemeanor	6537	7424	7830	8933	8945	8707	8662	7852	7446	8019	7938
Felony	183	225	233	231	242	198	256	231	219	220	222
Fourth-or-more-offender revocations	2170	2520	2790	3200	3046	2797	2932	2762	2363	2156	2326
Total postconviction S/R actions	78999	154315	170646	187987	183260	168059	160469	150348	136644	125428	124889

<sup>g</sup> Previous counts have been adjusted to include commercial driver APS actions not previously identified as such.

<sup>h</sup> These totals might include multiple license action activities associated with the same event. Total counts for 2006 and later increased as a result of a law change, effective 09/20/2005. This law assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUIs and removed this responsibility from the courts.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2017 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT

### **Background**

The California DUI Management Information System was developed in California in 1989 as a result of the legislative mandate that required the development of a monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI in California.

The California Legislature recently enacted substantial changes to the laws governing driving under the influence (DUI) of alcohol and/or drugs. Senate Bill 1046 (Hill), which was signed by Governor Brown in September of 2016, will (among other provisions) require that all repeat DUI (alcohol) offenders, and first offenders whose offense involved an injury, install an ignition interlock device (IID) for a specified period of time as a condition of the reinstatement of their driving privilege. The provisions of this law will commence on January 1, 2019. It is therefore expected that the full effects of this law on traffic safety measures (such as recidivism) will become known subsequent to that date.

The annual report of the California DUI Management Information System provides current and comprehensive statistics on the processing of DUI offenders from the point of arrest through adjudication to treatment and license control actions. The report presents cross-tabulated information on DUI arrests, convictions, postconviction sanctions, administrative license actions, and on drivers in crashes involving alcohol and drugs. In compliance with provisions of the law, the efficacy of specific sanctions and their results are also included in the report. Specifically, a separate analysis was conducted to evaluate if referrals to the 9-month DUI program were associated with reductions in 1-year subsequent DUI incidents and crashes when compared to referrals to the 3-month DUI program among first DUI offenders. The report is divided into six sections with each section covering specific topics of the report. The following are highlights from each section of the 2017 report reflecting on the current state of DUI in California.

### **DUI Summary Statistics**

- ◆ Alcohol-involved crash fatalities decreased by 1.0% in 2015, following a decrease of 3.5% in 2014 (see DUI Summary Statistics).
- ◆ Drug-involved crash fatalities decreased by 3.8% in 2015, after a decrease of 3.1% in 2014.

- ◆ Of the total number of crash fatalities in 2015, 33.3% were alcohol-involved, which is lower than the 36.9% in 2014. The percentage of drug-involved fatalities decreased from the prior year's 27.6% to 24.2% in 2015.
- ◆ In 2015, 9.9% of total crash injuries were alcohol-involved; slightly lower than 10.4% reported for 2014.
- ◆ The DUI arrest rate per 100,000 licensed drivers declined by 11.8% in 2015, following a decline of 4.9% in 2014.

### **Section 1: DUI Arrests**

- ◆ DUI arrests decreased by 8.6% in 2015, following decreases of 3.5% in 2014 and 7.2% in 2013 (see DUI Summary Statistics and Table 1).
- ◆ The median (midpoint) age of a DUI arrestee in 2015 was 31 years and almost three-quarters (72.4%) of arrestees were age 40 or younger. Less than one percent (0.4%) of all DUI arrests were of juveniles (under age 18) and 3.6% were of drivers over age 60. This is shown in Table 3a.
- ◆ Males comprised 77.4% of all 2015 DUI arrests, slightly higher than the 76.9% in 2014 (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen from 10.6% in 1989 to 22.6% in 2015.
- ◆ Based on data from the Department of Justice (DOJ), among 2015 DUI arrestees, Hispanics (47.2%) were the largest racial/ethnic group, as they have been each year for over a decade. Hispanics continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated percentage of California's adult population (36.0% in 2015). This is shown in Figure 3.

### **Section 2: Convictions**

- ◆ 72.7% of 2014 DUI arrests resulted in convictions for DUI offenses (see Table 6).
- ◆ Among convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2014, 73.1% were first offenders and 26.9% were repeat offenders (one or more prior convictions within the previous 10 years), identical to 2013 percentages. The proportion of repeat offenders has decreased considerably since 1989, when it stood at 37%, even though prior DUI convictions are currently retained on record and thus



counted longer than in the past (10 years compared to 7 years in 1989). This is shown in Table 8.

- ◆ The median blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of a convicted DUI offender, as reported by law enforcement on Administrative Per Se (APS) forms, was 0.16% in 2014, which is double the California illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08% (see Table 7a).
- ◆ In 2014, 17.0% of DUI arrest cases did not show any corresponding conviction on DMV records, up 3.7% from 2013 (see Table 6).

### **Section 3: Postconviction Sanctions**

- ◆ The most frequent court sanction for all convicted DUI offenders was probation (96.5%), while the least frequently imposed court sanction was ignition interlock (6.6%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 73.5% of the cases (see Table 9).
- ◆ Among first DUI offenders arrested in 2014, 65.3% were sentenced to jail, compared to 95.7% of all repeat offenders (see Table 9).
- ◆ Among first DUI offenders, 92.0% were ordered by courts to complete DUI programs, as were 88.8% of second offenders, 77.4% of third offenders, and 44.5% of fourth-or-more DUI offenders (see Table 9).

### **Section 4: Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness**

- ◆ The 1-year DUI reoffense rate for first DUI offenders arrested in 2014 was 3.7% compared to 7.6% in 1990. The 1-year reoffense rate for second DUI offenders was 4.7% compared to 9.7% in 1990. Each of these represents slightly over 50% fewer reoffenses compared to that of 1990 arrestees (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- ◆ Long-term reoffense rates, those occurring over years following an initial DUI conviction, are higher among those with more DUI priors (within 10 years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers (see Figures 8b, 8c, and 8d).
- ◆ Of the DUI offenders arrested in 2014 who, by court order, enrolled in a DUI program, 87.3% of first offenders and 41.2% of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 13).

### **Section 5: License Suspension/Revocation Actions**

- ◆ The total number of both DMV APS and DUI postconviction suspension or revocation actions decreased by 3.6% in 2015, continuing the trend of the prior 6 consecutive years (see Table 15).
- ◆ In 2015, 130,468 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 73.6% were first-offender actions (including “zero tolerance” actions taken for drivers under age 21) and 26.4% were repeat-offender actions (see Table 15).

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

- ◆ While the number of alcohol-involved fatalities declined by 15% over the past 20 years, the number of drug-involved fatalities increased by 212% over the same time period. Some of the increase in the number of fatalities reported as drug-involved over this time period may be, in part, associated with an increase in training and ability of California law enforcement to detect and report drug involvement in fatal crashes in recent years (see Figure 11).
- ◆ Of all 2014 DUI arrests, 15.3% were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 14.4% in 2013. Of 2014 DUI arrests, 6.0% of them were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly higher than the 5.6% in 2013 (see Table 17).
- ◆ In 2014, over three-fourths (77.5.0%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 24a). In contrast, almost two-thirds (61.5%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved injury crashes had at least one prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 24a).

## 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, for providing annual DUI arrest data and documentation, as well as the California Highway Patrol, Information Management Division, for providing annual alcohol- and drug-involved crash data and documentation. The contributions of Douglas Rickard, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, in transforming computer files into readable data tables and figures, as well as his general assistance in the production of this report, are acknowledged with appreciation. Further, we acknowledge, with great appreciation, the contributions of Ainsley Mitchum, Research Manager II, for information presented in section 5 of this report. We also would like to acknowledge the contributions of Michael Gebers, Research Scientist III; Patrice Rogers, Research Manager II, Alcohol/Drugs Projects; and Bayliss J. Camp, Chief, Research and Development Branch.

### Report Authors:

Sladjana Oulad Daoud, Research Program Specialist II, and  
Helen N. Tashima, Retired Annuitant, Principle Investigators.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
DUI SUMMARY STATISTICS: 2005-2015 .....	i
HIGHLIGHTS OF YEAR 2017 CALIFORNIA DUI-MIS REPORT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS .....	5
SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS .....	7
SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS .....	15
SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS .....	25
SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS .....	45
DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES .....	48
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested from 1990-2014 .....	48
One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014 .....	51
Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 2005 DUI Offenders .....	54
The Proportions of DUI Program Referrals, Enrollments, and Completions for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014 .....	60
DUI PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED RECKLESS OFFENDERS AND FIRST DUI OFFENDERS .....	60
Methods .....	60
DUI Program Evaluation for Drivers Convicted of Alcohol- or Drug-Reckless Driving .....	63
9-Month DUI Program Evaluation for Repeat Alcohol- or Drug-Related Reckless Drivers .....	63
Results of the Evaluation of 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders .....	63
SECTION 5: LICENSE SUSPENSION/REVOCATION ACTIONS .....	67
SECTION 6: DRIVERS IN CRASHES INVOLVING ALCOHOL AND DRUGS .....	71
REFERENCES .....	83

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

APPENDICES

NUMBER	PAGE
A HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975 .....	87
GLOSSARY .....	102
ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 757 - CHAPTER 450.....	105
B APPENDIX TABLES .....	107
B1 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER AND RACE/ETHNICITY...	107
B2 2014 DUI CONVICTIONS BY COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE .....	122
B3 DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT .....	133
B4 COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014.....	142
B5 DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES FOR FIRST DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014.....	168

LIST OF TABLES

1 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, 2013–2015 AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2014–2015 .....	11
2 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST.....	12
3a 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	13
3b 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY GENDER, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY .....	13
3c DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 2005-2015.....	14
4 DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND GENDER FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS .....	19
5 DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS .....	20
6 ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY.....	21
7a REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI AND ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS .....	22

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

NUMBER	PAGE
7b REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21 ARRESTED IN 2014.....	23
8 DUI CONVICTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS AND REPORTED BAC LEVEL FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS .....	23
9a COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 .....	26
9b IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE INSTALLATIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 .....	28
10a COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 .....	30
10b IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 .....	37
11a ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2014 .....	49
11b 2014 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT DUI RECIDIVISM RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS .....	52
11c 2014 1-YEAR SUBSEQUENT CRASH RATES BY COUNTY FOR FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS .....	53
12 CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF FIRST SUBSEQUENT DUI REOFFENSES FOR 2005 DUI OFFENDERS AND COHORT GROUPS.....	54
13 COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014.....	60
14 THE RELATIONSHIP OF 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAMS WITH SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS AMONG FIRST DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014.....	65

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

## LIST OF TABLES (continued)

NUMBER	PAGE
15 MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 2005-2015.....	69
16 ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES.....	70
17 DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 2004-2014 .....	76
18 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE.....	77
19 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE .....	77
20 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY COUNTY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE .....	78
21 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES, 2004-2014.....	79
22a 2014 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND GENDER .....	79
22b 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY AGE AND GENDER (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED) .....	79
23a 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS.....	80
23b 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED).....	80
24a 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS.....	81



## TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

### LIST OF TABLES (continued)

NUMBER	PAGE
24b	2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED) ..... 81
25	2014 REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF ALCOHOL- AND DRUG- INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES ..... 82

### LIST OF FIGURES

1	DUI management information system ..... 2
2	DUI arrests, 2005-2015..... 8
3	Percentage of 2015 DUI arrests and 2015 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2010 census) by race/ethnicity ..... 10
4	DUI convictions and conviction rates based on arrest year, 2005-2014..... 17
5	Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (for 2014 DUI arrests) ..... 26
6	Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending with a DUI incident within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2014) ..... 48
7	Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2014)..... 50
8a	Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incident (alcohol crashes, DUI convictions, APS suspensions, and DUI FTAs) for 1994 and 2005 DUI offenders..... 55
8b	Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by number of prior DUI convictions for the 2005 DUI offenders..... 56
8c	Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by gender for the 2005 DUI offenders..... 57

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

## LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

<u>NUMBER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
8d	Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction by age group (age at conviction date) for the 2005 DUI offenders.....	58
8e	Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI reoffense of the 1980, 1984, 1994, and 2005 DUI offenders.....	58
9	Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in 2014) by length of DUI program.....	64
10	Percentages of crash injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 2005-2015.....	73
11	Alcohol- and drug-involved crash fatalities, 1995-2015 .....	73

## INTRODUCTION

This report is the twenty-sixth *Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System*, produced in response to Assembly Bill 757 (Friedman), Chapter 450, 1989 legislative session, adding Section 1821 to the California Vehicle Code (see Appendix A). This bill requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to “establish and maintain a data and monitoring system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted” of DUI in order to provide “accurate and up-to-date comprehensive statistics” to enhance “the ability of the Legislature to make informed and timely policy decisions.” The need for such a data system had long been documented by numerous authorities, including the 1983 Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. In responding to this legislative mandate, this report combines and cross-references DUI data from diverse sources and presents them in a single reference. Data sources drawn upon include the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for crash data, Department of Justice (DOJ) for arrest data, and the DMV driver record database. Each of these reporting agencies, however, initially draw their data from diffuse primary sources such as individual law enforcement agencies (arrest and crash reports) and the courts (abstracts of conviction).

The general conceptual design of the California DUI management information system (DUI-MIS) was developed by Helander (1989) and is presented in Figure 1. The basic theme of the DUI-MIS is to track the processing of offenders through the DUI system from the point of arrest and to identify the frequency with which offenders flow through each branch of the system process (from law enforcement through adjudication to treatment and license control actions). Figure 1 also illustrates the relationship between offender flow and data collection at each point of the process. The initiating data source for the DUI-MIS is the DUI arrest report, as compiled by the DOJ, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system.

Another major objective of this report is to evaluate the effectiveness of court and administrative sanctions on convicted DUI offenders. In the earlier years of this report, these evaluations were accomplished by examining the postconviction recidivism records (alcohol/drug-related crashes and traffic convictions) of offenders assigned to alternative sanctions within offender group. In recent years as the sanctions became increasingly homogenous within each offender group, the evaluations (as mandated by law) became focused on available sanctions within selected groups. These evaluations are detailed in Section 4 on “Postconviction Sanction Effectiveness.”




Figure 1. DUI management information system.

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

The California Legislature recently enacted substantial changes to the laws governing driving under the influence (DUI) of alcohol and/or drugs. Senate Bill 1046 (Hill), which was signed by Governor Brown in September of 2016, will (among other provisions) require that all repeat DUI (alcohol) offenders, and first offenders whose offense involved an injury, install an ignition interlock device (IID) for a specified period of time as a condition of the reinstatement of their driving privilege. The provisions of this law will commence on January 1, 2019. It is therefore expected that the full effects of this law on traffic safety measures (such as recidivism) will become known subsequent to that date.

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).



## DATA SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

### DUI Arrest Data:

Arrest data are reported to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Criminal Justice Statistics Center, by individual law enforcement agencies throughout the state. As such, these data are subject to reporting errors such as incorrect names, birthdates, or arrest dates. Nonreporting of arrest data due to error or omission can also occur; for example, in 1995 the Oakland Police Department reported no DUI arrests, after reporting 960 such arrests in 1994.<sup>1</sup> In addition, when data are entered into DOJ's Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) system, only the highest-order offense is included. Therefore, in cases where a DUI arrest is made in conjunction with, for example, an auto theft arrest, that DUI arrest will not be included in the database. This results in a slight but systematic underreporting of the number of DUI arrests annually.

### DUI Conviction Data:

Abstracts of conviction for DUI and other traffic-related offenses are reported to the DMV by courts throughout the state. As abstracts are received (either hard copy or through direct electronic access from the courts), they are entered onto the DMV driver record database. Abstracts without an identifying driver license number are run through the Automated Name Index (ANI) system in order to match the abstract with an existing driver record; in cases where no such match can be made, an "X"-numbered record is created to store the abstract information. Conviction data are subject to change since abstracts of conviction can be amended, corrected, or dismissed after the initial abstract of conviction is reported to DMV. Also, reporting and non-reporting errors can occur as with DUI arrest data.

### Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Crash Data:

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, there was an undercount of approximately 6,500 DUI arrests for April 2011 by CHP.





SECTION 1:  
DUI ARRESTS



## SECTION 1: DUI ARRESTS

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

Table 1: DUI Arrests by County, 2013–2015 and Annual Percentage Change, 2014-2015. The number of DUI arrests by county for the years 2013-2015 and the percentage change from 2014-2015 are shown in Table 1.


Table 2: 2015 DUI Arrests by County and Type of Arrest. This table shows a breakdown of 2015 DUI arrests by arrest type (i.e., felony, juvenile, and misdemeanor arrests), by county. The table also shows county and statewide DUI arrest rates per 100 licensed drivers.

Tables 3a and 3b: 2015 DUI Arrests by Age, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. Table 3a cross tabulates age by gender and age by race/ethnicity of 2015 DUI arrestees statewide. The same tabulations by county are found in Appendix Table B1. Also, Table 3a shows the median age for 2015 arrestees. Table 3b shows the same data cross-tabulated by gender and age within race/ethnicity.

Table 3c: DUI Arrests Under Age 21, 2005-2015. Table 3c shows a breakdown of DUI arrests under 21, by age, from 2005 to 2015. It also shows the proportion of total DUI arrests under 21 for the state over the same time period.

Figure 2: DUI Arrests, 2005-2015. Figure 2 displays the trend in DUI arrests from 2005 to 2015.

Figure 3: Percentage of 2015 DUI Arrests and 2015 Projected Population (Age 15 and Over, based on the 2010 Census) by Race/Ethnicity. Figure 3 shows the percentages of 2015 DUI arrests and 2015 projected population by race/ethnicity.



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

Figure 2. DUI arrests, 2005-2015.

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

#### Statewide Parameters

- ◆ DUI arrests decreased by 8.6% in 2015, after decreasing by 3.5% in 2014 (see Table 1). DUI arrests have decreased each year since 2008.
- ◆ Table 2 shows that the DUI arrest rate per 100 licensed drivers was 0.5 in 2015, a slight decline from 0.6 in 2014 and 0.7 in 2013. The 2015 rate represents a 72% reduction from the 1.8 rate in 1990.
- ◆ The percentage of DUI arrests in 2015 that involved bodily injury or death was 3.4%, increasing from 3.1% in 2014. This type of DUI arrest constitutes a relatively small percentage of all DUI arrests (see Table 2).

#### County Variation


- ◆ Of all 2015 California DUI arrests, 21.8% occurred in Los Angeles County. Three counties (Los Angeles, San Diego, and Orange) had over 10,000 DUI arrests each, accounting for 37.4% of all arrests (see Table 2).

- ◆ The 2015 county DUI arrest rates ranged from 0.2 to 1.8 DUI arrests per 100 licensed drivers (the statewide average rate was 0.5). Seventeen counties had arrest rates of 0.5 or below in 2015 compared to seven counties in 2014. Three counties had rates of 0.4 or below: Contra Costa (0.4), San Francisco (0.2), and Santa Clara (0.4). This is shown in Table 2.
- ◆ The majority of counties had fewer DUI arrests in 2015 than in 2014. Among larger counties, the greatest percentage decreases occurred in Sacramento (-20.5%), Alameda (-17.0%), and Los Angeles (-14.8%), while there was an increase in DUI arrests in San Bernardino (2.4%). Among smaller counties, the largest percentage decreases in DUI arrests occurred in Sierra (-37.8%), Glenn (-33.3%), Santo Cruz (-28.0%), and San Benito (-27.4%). Small counties showing the largest percentage increase in DUI arrests were Mono (60.6 %) and Mariposa (54.7 %). These are shown in Table 1.

### Demographic Characteristics

- ◆ The median age of a DUI arrestee in 2015 was 31 years. Almost half (49.4%) of all arrestees were age 30 or younger and almost three-quarters (72.4%) were age 40 or younger. Less than one percent (0.4%) of all DUI arrestees were juveniles (under age 18). 3.6% of all arrestees were over age 60 (see Table 3a).
- ◆ Among all DUI arrestees in a year, the percentage of DUI arrests under age 18 has declined from 0.8 in 2005 to 0.4 in 2015, a 50.0% relative decrease. The percentage of DUI arrests under age 21 decreased from 8.9 in 2005 to 6.1 in 2015, a 31.5% relative decline. This is shown in Table 3c.
- ◆ Males comprised 77.4% of all 2015 DUI arrests, slightly higher than 76.9% in 2014 (see Table 3a). The proportion of females among DUI arrests has risen from 10.6% in 1989 to 22.6% in 2015.
- ◆ In 2015, Hispanics (47.2%) again represented the largest ethnic group among DUI arrestees, as they have each year for over a decade. Hispanics continued to be arrested at a rate substantially higher than their estimated 2015 population parity of 36.0% (Department of Finance, Demographic Research and Census Data Center). Blacks were also overrepresented among DUI arrestees (8.9% of arrests, 5.9% of the population), while other racial/ethnic groups were underrepresented among DUI arrestees, relative to their estimated 2015 population parity. These underrepresented groups were Whites (35.3% of arrests, 41.3% of the population) and “Other” (8.6% of arrests, 16.8% of the population). This is shown in Table 3a and Figure 3.

- ◆ Among male 2015 DUI arrestees, 51.0% were Hispanic, 31.7% were White, 8.7% were Black, and 8.5% were “Other.” Among female DUI arrestees, 47.6% were White, 33.9% were Hispanic, 9.4% were Black, and 9.0% were “Other.” The overrepresentation of Hispanics among DUI offenders appears to be limited to males (see Table 3b).
- ◆ In some counties where the population of Hispanics is high, their DUI arrest rate is also high. For example, in the following eight counties, Hispanics comprised 60% or more of those arrested for DUI during 2015: Imperial (81.4%), Tulare (74.8%), Merced (69.0%), Monterey (66.9%), Kings (65.4%), San Benito (62.6%), Madera (61.6%), and Fresno (60.3%). However, in most other counties, the majority of arrestees were White (see Appendix Table B1).
- ◆ The median age of a DUI arrestee varied by race: Blacks and Whites were the oldest with a median age of 34.0 and 33.0 years, respectively, while “Other” and Hispanics had a median age of 30.0 and 29.0 years, respectively (see Table 3a).



*Figure 3.* Percentage of 2015 DUI arrests and 2015 projected population (age 15 and over, based on the 2010 census) by race/ethnicity.

TABLE 1: DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, 2013–2015 AND ANNUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE, 2014–2015

COUNTY	2013	2014	2015	% CHANGE 2014-2015
STATEWIDE	160388	154743	141372	-8.6
ALAMEDA	6496	6405	5319	-17.0
ALPINE	13	19	17	-10.5
AMADOR	141	198	188	-5.1
BUTTE	1293	1213	1266	4.4
CALAVERAS	277	284	255	-10.2
COLUSA	159	181	182	0.6
CONTRA COSTA	3824	3432	3173	-7.5
DEL NORTE	168	124	118	-4.8
EL DORADO	1115	987	734	-25.6
FRESNO	5123	5113	4566	-10.7
GLENN	216	234	156	-33.3
HUMBOLDT	1148	998	1178	18.0
IMPERIAL	887	790	737	-6.7
INYO	234	210	175	-16.7
KERN	4282	4289	4291	0.0
KINGS	1133	987	944	-4.4
LAKE	354	375	352	-6.1
LASSEN	169	188	166	-11.7
LOS ANGELES	37559	36125	30779	-14.8
MADERA	838	871	805	-7.6
MARIN	1333	1369	1246	-9.0
MARIPOSA	118	64	99	54.7
MENDOCINO	627	506	525	3.8
MERCED	1330	1229	1275	3.7
MODOC	70	66	50	-24.2
MONO	92	71	114	60.6
MONTEREY	2164	2227	2103	-5.6
NAPA	809	921	985	6.9
NEVADA	452	519	448	-13.7
ORANGE	13020	12620	11467	-9.1
PLACER	1632	1571	1363	-13.2
PLUMAS	152	124	118	-4.8
RIVERSIDE	9918	9601	8887	-7.4
SACRAMENTO	5628	6361	5059	-20.5
SAN BENITO	261	354	257	-27.4
SAN BERNARDINO	10168	9256	9478	2.4
SAN DIEGO	12298	11120	10547	-5.2
SAN FRANCISCO	1377	1075	1094	1.8
SAN JOAQUIN	2795	2435	2399	-1.5
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1956	2038	1772	-13.1
SAN MATEO	2905	2789	2547	-8.7
SANTA BARBARA	2261	2314	1989	-14.0
SANTA CLARA	5550	5338	5224	-2.1
SANTA CRUZ	1493	1424	1025	-28.0
SHASTA	920	776	762	-1.8
SIERRA	25	37	23	-37.8
SISKIYOU	313	276	271	-1.8
SOLANO	1339	1354	1350	-0.3
SONOMA	2303	2699	2640	-2.2
STANISLAUS	2609	2209	1986	-10.1
SUTTER	417	519	569	9.6
TEHAMA	504	458	386	-15.7
TRINITY	146	148	160	8.1
TULARE	3164	2943	2957	0.5
TUOLUMNE	409	410	356	-13.2
VENTURA	3261	3215	3281	2.1
YOLO	675	765	674	-11.9
YUBA	465	519	485	-6.6

TABLE 2: 2015 DUI ARRESTS<sup>a</sup> BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF ARREST

COUNTY	TOTAL		TYPE OF DUI ARREST						DUI ARRESTS PER 100 LICENSED DRIVERS
			FELONY		JUVENILE		MISDEMEANOR		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STATEWIDE	141372	100.0	4870	3.4	516	0.4	135986	96.2	0.5
ALAMEDA	5319	3.8	90	1.7	11	0.2	5218	98.1	0.5
ALPINE	17	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	100.0	1.8
AMADOR	188	0.1	3	1.6	0	0.0	185	98.4	0.6
BUTTE	1266	0.9	33	2.6	4	0.3	1229	97.1	0.8
CALAVERAS	255	0.2	3	1.2	0	0.0	252	98.8	0.7
COLUSA	182	0.1	5	2.7	0	0.0	177	97.3	1.2
CONTRA COSTA	3173	2.2	101	3.2	14	0.4	3058	96.4	0.4
DEL NORTE	118	0.1	6	5.1	2	1.7	110	93.2	0.7
EL DORADO	734	0.5	41	5.6	1	0.1	692	94.3	0.5
FRESNO	4566	3.2	113	2.5	16	0.4	4437	97.2	0.8
GLENN	156	0.1	13	8.3	1	0.6	142	91.0	0.8
HUMBOLDT	1178	0.8	18	1.5	7	0.6	1153	97.9	1.2
IMPERIAL	737	0.5	13	1.8	1	0.1	723	98.1	0.6
INYO	175	0.1	4	2.3	3	1.7	168	96.0	1.2
KERN	4291	3.0	153	3.6	16	0.4	4122	96.1	0.8
KINGS	944	0.7	25	2.6	5	0.5	914	96.8	1.3
LAKE	352	0.2	13	3.7	0	0.0	339	96.3	0.7
LASSEN	166	0.1	5	3.0	1	0.6	160	96.4	0.9
LOS ANGELES	30779	21.8	1289	4.2	56	0.2	29434	95.6	0.5
MADERA	805	0.6	25	3.1	3	0.4	777	96.5	0.9
MARIN	1246	0.9	23	1.8	10	0.8	1213	97.4	0.6
MARIPOSA	99	0.1	1	1.0	0	0.0	98	99.0	0.7
MENDOCINO	525	0.4	18	3.4	0	0.0	507	96.6	0.8
MERCED	1275	0.9	50	3.9	7	0.5	1218	95.5	0.8
MODOC	50	0.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	48	96.0	0.8
MONO	114	0.1	3	2.6	0	0.0	111	97.4	1.2
MONTEREY	2103	1.5	76	3.6	19	0.9	2008	95.5	0.8
NAPA	985	0.7	24	2.4	4	0.4	957	97.2	1.0
NEVADA	448	0.3	14	3.1	1	0.2	433	96.7	0.5
ORANGE	11467	8.1	266	2.3	44	0.4	11157	97.3	0.5
PLACER	1363	1.0	53	3.9	9	0.7	1301	95.5	0.5
PLUMAS	118	0.1	6	5.1	0	0.0	112	94.9	0.7
RIVERSIDE	8887	6.3	225	2.5	35	0.4	8627	97.1	0.6
SACRAMENTO	5059	3.6	251	5.0	12	0.2	4796	94.8	0.5
SAN BENITO	257	0.2	12	4.7	3	1.2	242	94.2	0.7
SAN BERNARDINO	9478	6.7	316	3.3	28	0.3	9134	96.4	0.7
SAN DIEGO	10547	7.5	470	4.5	25	0.2	10052	95.3	0.5
SAN FRANCISCO	1094	0.8	66	6.0	0	0.0	1028	94.0	0.2
SAN JOAQUIN	2399	1.7	69	2.9	13	0.5	2317	96.6	0.5
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1772	1.3	31	1.7	9	0.5	1732	97.7	0.9
SAN MATEO	2547	1.8	39	1.5	13	0.5	2495	98.0	0.5
SANTA BARBARA	1989	1.4	78	3.9	8	0.4	1903	95.7	0.7
SANTA CLARA	5224	3.7	258	4.9	44	0.8	4922	94.2	0.4
SANTA CRUZ	1025	0.7	36	3.5	10	1.0	979	95.5	0.5
SHASTA	762	0.5	30	3.9	5	0.7	727	95.4	0.6
SIERRA	23	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	0.9
SISKIYOU	271	0.2	10	3.7	2	0.7	259	95.6	0.8
SOLANO	1350	1.0	42	3.1	7	0.5	1301	96.4	0.5
SONOMA	2640	1.9	69	2.6	7	0.3	2564	97.1	0.7
STANISLAUS	1986	1.4	88	4.4	13	0.7	1885	94.9	0.6
SUTTER	569	0.4	15	2.6	4	0.7	550	96.7	0.9
TEHAMA	386	0.3	9	2.3	2	0.5	375	97.2	0.9
TRINITY	160	0.1	6	3.8	0	0.0	154	96.3	1.5
TULARE	2957	2.1	113	3.8	17	0.6	2827	95.6	1.2
TUOLUMNE	356	0.3	12	3.4	2	0.6	342	96.1	0.9
VENTURA	3281	2.3	113	3.4	17	0.5	3151	96.0	0.5
YOLO	674	0.5	21	3.1	4	0.6	649	96.3	0.5
YUBA	485	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.2	482	99.4	1.0

<sup>a</sup>DOJ DUI arrest totals with boat DUI (N = 164) removed.



TABLE 3a: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

AGE	TOTAL		GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	141372	100.0	109468	77.4	31904	22.6	49953	35.3	66666	47.2	12530	8.9	12223	8.6
UNDER 18	517	0.4	405	78.3	112	21.7	178	34.4	284	54.9	13	2.5	42	8.1
18-20	8084	5.7	6377	78.9	1707	21.1	2218	27.4	4729	58.5	433	5.4	704	8.7
21-30	61267	43.3	46959	76.6	14308	23.4	18948	30.9	31871	52.0	4691	7.7	5757	9.4
31-40	32449	23.0	25543	78.7	6906	21.3	10325	31.8	16102	49.6	3131	9.6	2891	8.9
41-50	20290	14.4	15677	77.3	4613	22.7	7965	39.3	8562	42.2	2178	10.7	1585	7.8
51-60	13654	9.7	10516	77.0	3138	23.0	7176	52.6	4012	29.4	1574	11.5	892	6.5
61-70	4311	3.0	3375	78.3	936	21.7	2597	60.2	969	22.5	434	10.1	311	7.2
71 & ABOVE	800	0.6	616	77.0	184	23.0	546	68.3	137	17.1	76	9.5	41	5.1
MEDIAN AGE (YEARS)	31.0		31.0		30.0		33.0		29.0		34.0		30.0	

TABLE 3b: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY GENDER, AGE, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

GENDER	AGE	TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY							
				WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		141372	100.0	49953	35.3	66666	47.2	12530	8.9	12223	8.6
MALE	UNDER 18	405	0.4	123	30.4	239	59.0	12	3.0	31	7.7
	18-20	6377	5.8	1619	25.4	3899	61.1	345	5.4	514	8.1
	21-30	46959	42.9	13256	28.2	26037	55.4	3410	7.3	4256	9.1
	31-40	25543	23.3	7283	28.5	13698	53.6	2357	9.2	2205	8.6
	41-50	15677	14.3	5311	33.9	7418	47.3	1667	10.6	1281	8.2
	51-60	10516	9.6	4909	46.7	3575	34.0	1294	12.3	738	7.0
	61-70	3375	3.1	1865	55.3	862	25.5	373	11.1	275	8.1
	71 & ABOVE	616	0.6	386	62.7	127	20.6	65	10.6	38	6.2
	TOTAL	109468	100.0	34752	31.7	55855	51.0	9523	8.7	9338	8.5
FEMALE	UNDER 18	112	0.4	55	49.1	45	40.2	1	0.9	11	9.8
	18-20	1707	5.4	599	35.1	830	48.6	88	5.2	190	11.1
	21-30	14308	44.8	5692	39.8	5834	40.8	1281	9.0	1501	10.5
	31-40	6906	21.6	3042	44.0	2404	34.8	774	11.2	686	9.9
	41-50	4613	14.5	2654	57.5	1144	24.8	511	11.1	304	6.6
	51-60	3138	9.8	2267	72.2	437	13.9	280	8.9	154	4.9
	61-70	936	2.9	732	78.2	107	11.4	61	6.5	36	3.8
	71 & ABOVE	184	0.6	160	87.0	10	5.4	11	6.0	3	1.6
	TOTAL	31904	100.0	15201	47.6	10811	33.9	3007	9.4	2885	9.0

TABLE 3c: DUI ARRESTS UNDER AGE 21, 2005-2015

AGE		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011 <sup>a</sup>	2012	2013	2014	2015
TOTAL (ALL AGES)	<i>N</i>	180288	197248	203866	214811	208531	195879	180212	172893	160388	154743	141372
UNDER 18	<i>N</i>	1436	1697	1635	1494	1262	1085	891	746	600	529	517
	%	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4
18-20	<i>N</i>	14617	16837	17201	17558	16382	14859	13073	11767	9846	9048	8084
	%	8.1	8.5	8.4	8.2	7.9	7.6	7.3	6.8	6.1	5.8	5.7
UNDER 21	<i>N</i>	16053	18534	18836	19052	17644	15944	13964	12513	10446	9577	8601
	%	8.9	9.4	9.2	8.9	8.5	8.1	7.8	7.2	6.5	6.1	6.1

<sup>a</sup>The non-reporting of approximately 6,500 DUI arrests by CHP for the month of April 2011 is reflected in this table's 2011 figures.

SECTION 2:  
CONVICTIONS



## SECTION 2: CONVICTIONS

Data on convictions resulting from court adjudication of DUI arrests are reported directly to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. Although the DUI arrest data reported earlier are based on arrests that occurred in 2015, the DUI conviction data are based on convictions of DUI offenders arrested in 2014 in order to allow sufficient time for courts to report convictions to DMV. Tables in this section compile and cross tabulate these conviction data by demographic, geographic, and adjudicative categories. In what follows, expressions like “2014 convictions” refer to DUI offenders arrested in 2014 and subsequently convicted. Starting with the 2013 DUI-MIS Report, the data source, placement, and type of information provided in Figure 4 and Tables 5 and 6 have changed. In particular, since some DUI arrest data from the Department of Justice (DOJ) MACR system could not be matched to the driver records on the DMV database, the information in Table 6 is estimated based only on DUI cases whose arrest and/or conviction was found on the DMV database (“matchable DUI cases”). This section contains the following tables and figures:

Table 4: DUI Convictions by Age and Gender for 2014 DUI Arrests. This table cross tabulates statewide DUI conviction information by age and gender. Corresponding county-specific conviction data are presented in Appendix Table B2.

Table 5: DUI Conviction Data for 2014 DUI Arrests. This table shows county and statewide DUI-related conviction data (felony and misdemeanor DUI convictions as well as alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions) as reported to the DMV on court abstracts of conviction. For DUI convictions, it also shows the median adjudication time lags from DUI arrest to conviction, and from conviction to update on the DMV database, both statewide and by county.


Table 6: Adjudication Status of 2014 DUI Arrests by County. This table shows information on DUI conviction rates and adjudication status (court disposition) of 2014 DUI arrests statewide and by county. It includes the estimated percentages of arrests that resulted in DUI convictions (DUI conviction rates), misdemeanor and felony DUI convictions, reckless driving convictions (alcohol/drug and non-alcohol/drug related), other convictions, and the percentage of DUI arrests with no record of any conviction. Starting with the 2013 DUI-MIS report, these estimates are limited to DUI arrests or individual cases from the MACR file for which a matching arrest and/or conviction was found in the DMV database. These arrest cases were tracked individually to determine their final adjudication status. In early DUI-MIS reports, the information on DUI conviction rates and adjudication status in this table was obtained by dividing the total number of convictions by the total number of arrests, either statewide or by county, without matching individual cases. Starting with 2010 DUI conviction rates, this information is estimated by tracking

matched individual DUI arrest cases and by calculating percentages of those that resulted in conviction of DUI, of some other type of violation, and those that resulted in no conviction.

Table 7a: Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of DUI and Alcohol- or Drug-Reckless Convictions for 2014 DUI Arrests and Table 7b: Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Convicted DUI Offenders Under Age 21 Arrested in 2014. Table 7a shows the frequency of reported BAC levels for DUI and alcohol- or drug-reckless convictions. Because the APS forms, submitted following most DUI arrests, more completely report BAC levels than do abstracts of conviction, they are used here to calculate statewide BAC levels. Table 7b shows the BAC distribution for convicted arrestees under age 21.

Table 8: DUI Convictions by Offender Status and Reported BAC Level for 2014 DUI Arrests. This table displays the percentages of convicted DUI offenders by offender status (number of prior convictions in 10 years), with the average (mean) and median BAC level from APS reporting forms for each offense level.

Figure 4: DUI Convictions and Conviction Rates Based on Arrest Year, 2005-2014. Figure 4 shows, for the years 2005 to 2014, the total number of DUI convictions and DUI conviction rates based on the violation year.



DUI conviction rate (percent convicted)	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
	78.1%	79.4%	78.8%	78.7%	77.2%	73.1% <sup>a</sup>	73.3% <sup>a</sup>	73.7% <sup>a</sup>	72.5% <sup>a</sup>	72.7% <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The 2010 and later DUI conviction rates are based on different data extraction procedures than those used in the past and are not comparable to prior years.

*Figure 4.* DUI convictions and conviction rates based on arrest year, 2005-2014.

Based on this report's DUI conviction data, the following statements can be made:

#### Statewide Adjudication Parameters

- ◆ In 2014, 72.7% of DUI arrests resulted in convictions for DUI offenses (see Table 6).
- ◆ Based on the DUI conviction data for arrests within 10 years (2005-2014), 4.5% of all California drivers (including those who do not have a permanent driving record) have one or more DUI convictions on their record.
- ◆ Among 2014 DUI arrestees, 7.3% resulted in alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions and 1.5% resulted in reckless driving convictions not alcohol- or drug-related (see Table 6).
- ◆ In 2014, 1.4% of DUI arrests resulted in convictions for offenses other than DUI or reckless driving, such as speed contest or driving with a suspended or revoked license (see Table 6).
- ◆ In 2014, 17.0% of DUI arrests have not yet resulted in any conviction that could be found on DMV's database (see Table 6).

- ◆ The average (mean) reported non-zero BAC level for all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2014, using APS reporting forms as the data source, was 0.165%, up from 0.16% in 2013. The midpoint (median) BAC level reported was 0.16%. Both measures are at least double the illegal per se BAC limit of 0.08% (see Table 7a).
- ◆ The average (mean) and median non-zero BAC levels increased as a function of the number of prior DUI convictions. The average BAC level increased from 0.165% BAC for first offenders to 0.191% BAC for fourth-or-subsequent offenders (the median BAC level increased from 0.15% BAC for first offenders to 0.19% BAC for fourth-or-subsequent offenders). This is shown in Table 8.
- ◆ Among 2014 DUI arrestees subsequently convicted, 73.1% were first offenders, 20.4% were second offenders, 5.0% were third offenders, and 1.5% were fourth-or-more offenders. (The statutorily defined time period for counting priors for DUI in California is 10 years). The proportion of all convicted DUI offenders that are repeat offenders (26.9%), shown in Table 8, has increased ever since the counting period for priors changed from 7 to 10 years (by SB 1694, Torlakson, effective 1/1/2005). For example, in the last year before the change in criteria for counting prior convictions (2004), the percentage of repeat offenders was 23.5% versus 26.9% in 2014.
- ◆ The median adjudication time lags were 105 days from DUI arrest to conviction and 7 days from conviction to update on the DMV database, totaling over 3 months from arrest to update on the offender's driving record (see Table 5).

#### Demographic Characteristics

- ◆ The median age of convicted DUI offenders in 2014 was 31.0 years (see Table 4).
- ◆ Among 2014 DUI convictees, 49.1% were 30 years of age or younger and 72.5% were 40 years or younger (see Table 4).
- ◆ Females comprised 23.2% of convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2014 (see Table 4), relatively unchanged from 23.4% last year. In general, the proportion of females among convicted DUI offenders has risen slightly each year since 1994.



TABLE 4: DUI CONVICTIONS BY AGE AND GENDER FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS<sup>a</sup>

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
STATEWIDE	116190	100.0	89203	76.8	26987	23.2
UNDER 18	238	0.2	190	79.8	48	20.2
18-20	5866	5.0	4481	76.4	1385	23.6
21-30	50982	43.9	38435	75.4	12547	24.6
31-40	27167	23.4	21352	78.6	5815	21.4
41-50	16814	14.5	12976	77.2	3838	22.8
51-60	11085	9.5	8559	77.2	2526	22.8
61-70	3451	3.0	2760	80.0	691	20.0
71 & ABOVE	587	0.5	450	76.7	137	23.3
MEAN AGE (YEARS)	34.3		34.5		33.8	
MEDIAN AGE (YEARS)	31.0		31.0		30.0	

<sup>a</sup>County-specific tabulations of 2014 DUI convictions by age and gender are shown in Appendix Table B2. Percents may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS<sup>a</sup>

COUNTY	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>b</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>c</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
					VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE	111680	3862	648	14563	105	7
ALAMEDA	3559	40	20	1098	103	4
ALPINE	16	0	0	2	63	9
AMADOR	119	5	4	34	100	33
BUTTE	852	31	8	129	164	14
CALAVERAS	191	8	0	61	59	7
COLUSA	118	9	1	32	66	9
CONTRA COSTA	2335	91	25	424	235	12
DEL NORTE	76	8	0	25	93	49
EL DORADO	711	33	4	121	152	14
FRESNO	4113	205	18	416	125	0
GLENN	160	6	4	26	166	23
HUMBOLDT	569	15	3	172	130	66
IMPERIAL	474	15	6	77	206	11
INYO	100	8	0	42	88	2
KERN	2945	84	28	575	48	13
KINGS	416	8	4	25	182	6
LAKE	306	9	0	17	130	24
LASSEN	124	1	1	6	128	6
LOS ANGELES	24520	504	85	2841	101	6
MADERA	587	16	1	45	325	20
MARIN	1149	15	13	7	76	14
MARIPOSA	51	1	0	7	80	8
MENDOCINO	397	19	3	68	93	135
MERCED	488	102	3	73	217	87
MODOC	47	0	1	10	60	21
MONO	71	1	1	8	107	14
MONTEREY	1877	49	7	252	52	12
NAPA	756	38	3	138	84	2
NEVADA	428	25	0	63	94	20
ORANGE	11106	319	63	473	136	0
PLACER	1297	78	5	188	114	9
PLUMAS	110	2	0	9	71	3
RIVERSIDE	7115	197	10	680	129	2
SACRAMENTO	4511	399	38	419	73	5
SAN BENITO	312	7	2	53	110	12
SAN BERNARDINO	5331	204	36	680	159	5
SAN DIEGO	8619	418	63	1912	75	35
SAN FRANCISCO	659	26	3	140	95	11
SAN JOAQUIN	2093	97	9	392	43	11
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1592	57	5	330	64	2
SAN MATEO	1842	46	10	382	145	82
SANTA BARBARA	1896	69	16	208	62	43
SANTA CLARA	4336	144	34	498	85	7
SANTA CRUZ	1154	26	9	141	64	4
SHASTA	581	52	6	133	112	17
SIERRA	14	0	0	6	92	51
SISKIYOU	157	5	0	38	122	8
SOLANO	1002	40	6	156	169	6
SONOMA	2234	83	20	319	74	56
STANISLAUS	1695	56	10	132	96	30
SUTTER	267	23	6	99	76	57
TEHAMA	250	11	2	49	59	63
TRINITY	60	2	0	6	128	18
TULARE	2074	43	14	180	76	32
TUOLUMNE	287	13	3	2	77	15
VENTURA	2669	68	25	0	134	0
YOLO	554	24	6	69	132	31
YUBA	308	7	4	75	95	21

<sup>a</sup>Conviction data by court are found in Appendix Table B3.<sup>b</sup>Violations of CVC 23153 and CVC 23152 with a felony disposition code. 4th offenses of CVC 23152 (in 10 years), which are statutorily defined as violations of CVC 23153, are not included.<sup>c</sup>Violations of CVC 23140.

TABLE 6: ADJUDICATION STATUS OF 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY<sup>a</sup>

COUNTY	DUI CONVICTION RATE	DUI CONVICTIONS		RECKLESS DRIVING CONVICTIONS		% OTHER CONVICTIONS	% NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTION <sup>b</sup>
		% MIS- DEMEANOR	% FELONY	% ALCOHOL OR DRUG	% NONALCOHOL NOR DRUG		
STATEWIDE	72.7	71.1	1.6	7.3	1.5	1.4	17.0
ALAMEDA	54.3	53.7	0.6	13.6	5.0	1.2	25.9
ALPINE	84.2	84.2	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	10.5
AMADOR	61.7	61.2	0.5	13.9	7.0	1.5	15.9
BUTTE	74.1	72.0	2.1	7.8	2.5	0.5	15.1
CALAVERAS	68.2	66.8	1.4	15.5	2.2	0.0	14.1
COLUSA	65.2	62.4	2.8	15.5	3.9	1.7	13.8
CONTRA COSTA	68.8	67.7	1.1	8.5	0.4	0.8	21.5
DEL NORTE	64.6	63.1	1.5	15.4	1.5	0.0	18.5
EL DORADO	75.3	72.6	2.7	9.8	1.8	0.4	12.7
FRESNO	75.3	73.8	1.5	5.6	0.3	0.6	18.2
GLENN	75.6	74.2	1.4	8.9	0.5	0.0	15.0
HUMBOLDT	59.2	57.7	1.5	14.2	1.7	2.3	22.6
IMPERIAL	63.5	61.7	1.8	9.0	4.2	0.8	22.5
INYO	61.4	59.1	2.3	11.4	2.3	3.4	21.6
KERN	70.1	68.7	1.4	11.5	2.4	1.4	14.6
KINGS	45.4	44.9	0.5	1.9	0.4	0.4	52.1
LAKE	78.2	76.4	1.8	3.4	4.2	1.3	12.8
LASSEN	68.0	67.4	0.6	2.8	11.6	1.1	16.6
LOS ANGELES	71.0	69.7	1.3	6.4	1.6	3.1	18.0
MADERA	61.3	59.7	1.6	2.7	5.4	0.2	30.4
MARIN	81.5	80.8	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.0	16.9
MARIPOSA	72.7	72.7	0.0	4.6	3.0	3.0	16.7
MENDOCINO	72.5	70.5	2.0	7.0	1.1	1.1	18.4
MERCED	48.1	46.4	1.7	4.0	0.2	0.4	47.3
MODOC	69.8	69.8	0.0	9.5	3.2	0.0	17.5
MONO	74.7	74.7	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	16.8
MONTEREY	79.3	77.3	2.0	8.7	1.2	0.4	10.4
NAPA	79.3	76.9	2.4	11.9	0.9	1.0	6.9
NEVADA	78.2	76.1	2.1	8.9	1.3	0.9	10.7
ORANGE	85.6	84.2	1.4	3.0	0.2	0.5	10.8
PLACER	77.7	75.1	2.6	7.6	0.4	0.2	14.0
PLUMAS	81.3	79.7	1.6	4.7	0.8	0.8	12.5
RIVERSIDE	73.2	71.5	1.7	5.4	1.1	0.8	19.5
SACRAMENTO	79.6	76.1	3.5	5.9	0.3	1.1	13.2
SAN BENITO	76.6	75.6	1.0	9.6	0.3	0.5	13.1
SAN BERNARDINO	64.2	62.2	2.0	5.9	2.7	2.4	24.7
SAN DIEGO	73.6	71.2	2.4	12.5	2.4	0.6	11.0
SAN FRANCISCO	61.5	59.5	2.0	11.6	1.9	1.4	23.6
SAN JOAQUIN	75.8	74.4	1.4	10.3	0.5	1.1	12.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO	76.5	75.3	1.2	13.1	0.7	0.8	9.0
SAN MATEO	65.4	64.5	0.9	12.0	0.3	1.0	21.5
SANTA BARBARA	74.7	73.4	1.3	6.6	2.7	1.3	14.7
SANTA CLARA	77.3	75.6	1.7	7.3	1.4	1.1	13.0
SANTA CRUZ	75.9	74.3	1.6	7.6	1.6	0.7	14.2
SHASTA	73.4	70.9	2.5	9.1	0.2	0.2	17.0
SIERRA	58.3	58.3	0.0	16.7	4.2	0.0	20.8
SISKIYOU	63.8	63.8	0.0	9.6	1.2	2.4	23.1
SOLANO	72.4	70.2	2.2	9.0	1.4	0.6	16.6
SONOMA	79.6	78.3	1.3	9.1	1.5	0.5	9.4
STANISLAUS	75.2	73.5	1.7	4.6	1.5	0.5	18.2
SUTTER	66.1	62.6	3.5	17.6	1.2	1.4	13.9
TEHAMA	67.2	65.9	1.3	8.2	1.3	0.3	23.0
TRINITY	67.0	65.9	1.1	2.3	1.1	0.0	29.6
TULARE	75.5	74.2	1.3	5.4	0.4	1.9	16.8
TUOLUMNE	73.8	72.2	1.6	0.5	8.8	0.0	17.0
VENTURA	84.0	82.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.2	14.8
YOLO	71.9	70.2	1.7	6.2	4.0	0.7	17.2
YUBA	67.9	67.2	0.7	11.8	0.9	0.7	18.9

<sup>a</sup>Table 6 estimates are based only on DUI arrest cases from the MACR system whose arrests or convictions were found on the DMV database.

<sup>b</sup>These include dismissals and DUI failures-to-appear (FTA); the statewide DUI FTA average for 2014 DUI arrests was 2.2%.

TABLE 7a: REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF DUI AND ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS <sup>a</sup>

DUI CONVICTIONS			ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RECKLESS CONVICTIONS		
BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	1453	1.5	.00	470	4.1
.01	61	0.1	.01	15	0.1
.02	64	0.1	.02	20	0.2
.03	71	0.1	.03	23	0.2
.04	87	0.1	.04	33	0.3
.05	283	0.3	.05	78	0.7
.06	384	0.4	.06	251	2.2
.07	592	0.6	.07	782	6.8
.08	1759	1.8	.08	2469	21.4
.09	3113	3.2	.09	2840	24.6
.10	4940	5.0	.10	1852	16.0
.11	6303	6.4	.11	1009	8.7
.12	7025	7.1	.12	541	4.7
.13	7332	7.5	.13	305	2.6
.14	7614	7.7	.14	202	1.8
.15	7292	7.4	.15	132	1.1
.16	7039	7.2	.16	123	1.1
.17	6576	6.7	.17	91	0.8
.18	5935	6.0	.18	75	0.7
.19	5225	5.3	.19	58	0.5
.20	4555	4.6	.20	40	0.4
.21	4006	4.1	.21	22	0.2
.22	3279	3.3	.22	24	0.2
.23	2733	2.8	.23	28	0.2
.24	2291	2.3	.24	12	0.1
.25	1803	1.8	.25	10	0.1
.26	1468	1.5	.26	4	0.0
.27	1152	1.2	.27	4	0.0
.28	872	0.9	.28	9	0.1
.29	652	0.7	.29	3	0.0
.30	579	0.6	.30	5	0.0
.31	447	0.5	.31	3	0.0
.32	333	0.3	.32	4	0.0
.33	282	0.3	.35	2	0.0
.34	203	0.2	.36	4	0.0
.35	177	0.2	.38	2	0.0
.36	132	0.1			
.37	90	0.1			
.38	75	0.1			
.39	58	0.1			
.40	37	0.0			
.41	34	0.0			
.42	18	0.0			
.43	14	0.0			
.44	9	0.0			
.45	6	0.0			
.46	4	0.0			
.47	4	0.0			
.49	1	0.0			
.50	3	0.0			
.53	1	0.0			
	----	----		----	----
TOTAL	98466	100.0	TOTAL	11545	100.0
	MEAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .165			MEAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .10	
	MEDIAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .16			MEDIAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .09	

<sup>a</sup>The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with convictions presented in this table. The percentage of DUI convictees with BAC levels reported is 84.7%.

<sup>b</sup>The calculation of the mean and the median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to drug DUI convictions.

TABLE 7b: REPORTED BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS  
OF CONVICTED DUI OFFENDERS UNDER AGE 21 ARRESTED IN 2014<sup>a</sup>

BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	128	2.4	.23	71	1.3
.01	15	0.3	.24	50	1.0
.02	17	0.3	.25	23	0.4
.03	18	0.3	.26	24	0.5
.04	22	0.4	.27	21	0.4
.05	175	3.3	.28	8	0.2
.06	194	3.7	.29	10	0.2
.07	189	3.6	.30	4	0.1
.08	210	4.0	.31	5	0.1
.09	236	4.5	.32	2	0.0
.10	339	6.4	.33	1	0.0
.11	364	6.9	.35	2	0.0
.12	424	8.0	.36	1	0.0
.13	426	8.1			
.14	406	7.7			
.15	360	6.8			
.16	339	6.4			
.17	292	5.5			
.18	259	4.9			
.19	238	4.5	TOTAL	5289	100.0
.20	173	3.3			
.21	137	2.6			
.22	106	2.0			
				MEAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .14	
				MEDIAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .13	

<sup>a</sup>The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with convictions presented in the table. The percentage of DUI convictees under age 21 with BAC levels found is 86.6%

<sup>b</sup>The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to DUI drug convictions.

TABLE 8: DUI CONVICTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS AND  
REPORTED BAC LEVEL FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS<sup>a</sup>

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	PERCENT	AVERAGE BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%) <sup>b</sup>	MEDIAN BAC LEVEL FROM APS REPORTING FORM (%) <sup>b</sup>
STATEWIDE	100.0	.165	.16
1 <sup>ST</sup> DUI	73.1	.161	.15
2 <sup>ND</sup> DUI	20.4	.173	.17
3 <sup>RD</sup> DUI	5.0	.183	.18
4 <sup>TH</sup> + DUI	1.5	.191	.19

<sup>a</sup>The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with DUI convictions presented in the table.

<sup>b</sup>The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to drug DUI convictions.



SECTION 3:  
POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS





### SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

Data on court sanctions assigned to convicted DUI offenders were obtained from DUI abstracts of conviction for offenders arrested in 2014. This section includes the following tables and figures:

Table 9a: Court Sanctions by DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014. This table shows the frequency of specific court sanctions statewide by number of prior DUI convictions in 10 years. The specific court sanctions tallied include percentages of DUI offenders sentenced to probation, jail, DUI programs (first-offender, 18-month, and 30-month DUI programs), and ignition interlock. Cross tabulations of sanctions by county, court, and number of prior convictions appear in Appendix Table B4.

Table 9b: Ignition Interlock Device (IID) Installations by DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014. This table shows the statewide frequency of DUI offenders arrested in 2014 who installed an IID subsequent to their DUI arrest by number of prior DUI convictions in 10 years. For each DUI offender level, the table also shows the number and percentage of DUI convictees who installed an IID.

Table 10a: Court Sanctions by County and DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014. This table displays the distribution of court sanctions by county for all DUI offenders.

Table 10b: Ignition Interlock Device (IID) Installations by County and DUI Offender Status for DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014. Table 10b displays the number of DUI offenders arrested in 2014 who installed an IID subsequent to their DUI arrest by county and by DUI offender status. For each county and DUI offender level, the table also shows the number and percentage of DUI convictees that installed an IID relative to the number of DUI convictions.

Figure 5: Percentage Representation of Court-Ordered DUI Sanctions (for 2014 DUI arrests). Figure 5 shows the percentage representation of court-ordered postconviction sanctions for DUI offenders arrested in 2014.

TABLE 9a: COURT SANCTIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014<sup>a</sup>

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE	116190	96.5	73.5	67.6	22.2	0.2	6.6
1 <sup>ST</sup>	84905	97.6	65.3	89.6	2.4	0.0	2.1
REPEAT	31285	93.7	95.7	7.7	75.9	0.6	18.7
2 <sup>ND</sup>	23648	96.6	95.4	9.4	79.2	0.2	16.9
3 <sup>RD</sup>	5868	91.4	96.7	3.0	72.7	1.7	26.4
4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1769	62.2	95.3	1.6	41.4	1.5	17.5

<sup>a</sup>Entries represent percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2014 receiving each sanction, by offender status. Sanctions for each offender status group (row) are not exclusive; therefore, row percentages always add to more than 100%. Percentages of sanctions by county and court appear in Appendix Table B4.




Figure 5. Percentage representation of court-ordered DUI sanctions (for 2014 DUI arrests).

<sup>a</sup>This percentage does not include ignition interlock requirements administered by DMV (i.e., ignition interlock requirements under AB 91 law).

From the data in these tables and those in Appendix B4, it is evident that the use of sanctions prescribed for offenders arrested in 2014 continued to vary widely by county, court, and offender status. For example:

#### Statewide Sanctions

- ◆ The most frequent court sanction for all convicted DUI offenders was probation (96.5%), while the least frequently used court sanction was ignition interlock (6.6%). DUI offenders were sentenced to jail in 73.5% of the cases. This is shown in Table 9a, and graphically in Figure 5 (previous page). In many jurisdictions, however, all or a portion of the jail sentence is often served as community service or home confinement rather than actual jail time, particularly for first offenders (Guenzburger & Atkinson, 2012). Because virtually all offenders receive more than one type of sanction, the cumulative percentage adds to more than 100%.
  
- ◆ Among convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2014, 6.6% were ordered by court to install an IID, whereas 17.9% of them installed a device subsequent to their arrest date (see Tables 9a and 9b). The higher percentage of offenders installing an IID than those who were ordered to install one is likely related to specific ignition interlock laws that were implemented starting in 2010 or later. On July 1, 2010, two ignition interlock laws took effect. The first law (SB 598 – Huff) allows second and third DUI offenders, convicted for driving under the influence of alcohol only, to reinstate licensure after 3 months and 6 months of license suspension/revocation, respectively, if they install an IID. The second law (AB 91 – Feuer) created a pilot program in four counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare) that requires first and repeat DUI offenders to install an ignition interlock device in all vehicles they own or operate for a specific time period based on their number of prior DUI convictions. More recently, on January 1, 2017, SB 1046 (Hill) was implemented which extended the AB 91 pilot program until January 1, 2019. Also, effective January 1, 2019 until January 1, 2026, this bill specifies new IID requirements for all persons convicted of an alcohol-related DUI offense (relative to specific DUI offense and number of prior DUI violations) and allows DUI offenders who are willing to install an IID to apply for a restricted driver license without serving any period of license suspension or revocation.

TABLE 9b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS <sup>a</sup>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	%
STATEWIDE	116190	20833	17.9
1 <sup>ST</sup>	84905	14120	16.6
REPEAT	31285	6713	21.5
2 <sup>ND</sup>	23648	5527	23.4
3 <sup>RD</sup>	5868	1101	18.8
4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1769	85	4.8

<sup>a</sup>Entries represent numbers and percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2014 that installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date, which may be related to different IID requirements, including those administered by DMV (i.e., under AB 91 law), and may not be initiated by IID court sanctions (presented in Table 9a) or associated with DUI convictions resulting from arrests in 2014.

### County Variation

- ◆ The referral to first-offender DUI programs (mostly from 3 to 9 months long) among first DUI offenders varies by county, from 90% or more in 31 counties to only 16.1% in San Benito County (see Table 10a).
- ◆ In 2014, 0.6% of arrested repeat DUI offenders were assigned to 30-month DUI programs (see Table 9a). Assignment of DUI offenders (mostly third-or-more) to 30-month DUI programs was low, as there are very few counties that have 30-month DUI programs (see Table 10a).
- ◆ The highest percentage of DUI offenders installing an IID subsequent to their arrest in 2014 is among DUI offenders who were subject to the AB 91 pilot program, in Alameda, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and Tulare counties; the installations ranged from 47.9% (Los Angeles) to 31.2% (Tulare). This is shown in Table 10b.
- ◆ Among the larger counties not included in the AB 91 pilot program, the percentage of DUI offenders who installed an IID ranged from 4.4% (Riverside) to 6.8% (Orange). At the same time, among the smaller counties, the percentage of DUI offenders installing an IID ranged from 2.1% in Modoc to 10.2% in Amador (see Table 10b).

### Court Variation

- ◆ Statewide, courts vary significantly in how they prescribe available sanctions for DUI offenders. In Los Angeles County alone, one court (Antelope Valley) assigned jail to 57.1% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 1,266$ ), while another court (Pasadena) in the same county assigned jail to only 28.1% of all convicted DUI offenders ( $n = 930$ ). This is shown in Table B4 in the Appendix.
- ◆ Courts in five counties did not require any of the convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2014 to install an ignition interlock device (see Table 10a and Table B4 in the Appendix).

### Variation by Offender Status

- ◆ Among first DUI offenders arrested in 2014, 65.3% were sentenced to jail, compared to 95.7% of all repeat offenders (see Table 9a).
- ◆ Among first DUI offenders, 92.0% were assigned by courts to complete DUI programs, as were 88.8% of second offenders, 77.4% of third offenders, and 44.5% of fourth-or-more DUI offenders. This is shown in Table 9a. (By statute, however, all DUI offenders must eventually complete specified DUI programs in order to be eligible for license reinstatement.)
- ◆ In 2014, 18.7% of repeat DUI offenders were required by the courts to install an ignition interlock device in their vehicles, compared to 17.8% of those arrested in 2013 (see Table 9a). Judges routinely did not require interlocks for repeat offenders despite the ignition interlock law (AB 762 - Torlakson), enacted in 1999, which provides incentives for repeat offenders to reinstate after 12 months of license suspension/revocation with interlocks and establishes mandatory interlock for DUI suspension/revocation violators.
- ◆ The majority of DUI offenders arrested in 2014 who installed an IID subsequent to their arrest were first offenders from the AB 91 pilot counties; approximately half of first DUI offenders in Alameda, Sacramento, and Los Angeles counties and just over one third of those from Tulare County installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date (see Tables 9b and 10b).
- ◆ Among repeat DUI offenders, IID installation rates are higher among second DUI offenders (see Table 9b). Of the repeat offenders who installed an IID, 40.6% are from the AB 91 pilot counties (see Tables 9b and 10b).

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE		116190	96.5	73.5	67.6	22.2	0.2	6.6
ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2497	98.2	97.8	84.2	2.9	0.0	10.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	806	98.0	97.0	10.5	74.1	0.1	20.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	239	96.2	87.9	2.9	70.3	0.8	22.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	77	70.1	93.5	0.0	22.1	0.0	6.5
	TOTAL	3619	97.5	96.8	60.7	23.6	0.1	13.6
ALPINE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	14	100.0	92.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	16	100.0	93.8	93.8	6.3	0.0	6.3
AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup>	72	94.4	95.8	87.5	8.3	0.0	13.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	43	93.0	100.0	11.6	74.4	0.0	51.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	8	87.5	87.5	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	60.0
	TOTAL	128	92.2	96.9	53.1	36.7	0.0	32.0
BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	611	96.1	91.8	93.3	1.3	0.7	4.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	213	94.8	98.6	16.9	73.2	2.3	11.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	51	74.5	96.1	11.8	21.6	45.1	51.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	16	50.0	100.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	43.8
	TOTAL	891	93.7	93.8	68.7	19.9	4.3	9.5
CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	121	98.3	100.0	95.0	3.3	0.0	9.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	50	98.0	100.0	16.0	80.0	0.0	32.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	92.0	100.0	12.0	72.0	4.0	68.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	199	97.5	100.0	63.3	32.7	0.5	24.1
COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	91	92.3	96.7	82.4	1.1	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	26	96.2	100.0	42.3	38.5	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	20.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	128	90.6	97.7	70.3	10.2	0.8	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1679	96.8	93.1	90.2	3.0	0.0	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	571	97.5	97.7	7.5	86.7	0.0	4.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	143	95.8	95.8	0.0	83.9	0.0	19.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	58	87.9	91.4	0.0	48.3	0.0	22.4
	TOTAL	2451	96.7	94.3	63.6	28.3	0.0	3.0
DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	58	93.1	100.0	81.0	5.2	0.0	5.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	21	66.7	100.0	4.8	52.4	4.8	47.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	84	84.5	100.0	57.1	20.2	1.2	19.0
EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	513	97.7	97.3	88.7	3.3	0.0	2.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	171	97.1	99.4	7.0	80.1	0.0	31.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	44	79.5	88.6	2.3	52.3	0.0	43.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	20	65.0	85.0	0.0	45.0	0.0	25.0
	TOTAL	748	95.6	96.9	62.6	24.9	0.0	12.0

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR  
DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18- MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2918	97.4	98.3	93.1	1.8	0.0	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	990	96.0	99.3	12.3	79.9	0.1	17.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	297	92.3	99.3	6.1	75.8	0.0	41.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	131	51.9	100.0	6.9	37.4	3.1	4.6
	TOTAL	4336	95.4	98.6	66.1	25.8	0.1	7.5
GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	108	95.4	42.6	64.8	3.7	0.9	1.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	47	97.9	95.7	4.3	61.7	6.4	14.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	170	96.5	62.4	42.9	22.4	4.7	7.6
HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	427	98.8	92.3	94.4	0.0	0.2	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	124	97.6	95.2	23.4	72.6	0.8	69.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	27	96.3	96.3	14.8	85.2	0.0	85.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	587	98.5	93.2	74.3	20.4	0.3	19.8
IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup>	380	92.4	12.6	77.1	2.1	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	85	80.0	78.8	14.1	69.4	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	24	87.5	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	83.3	83.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	495	89.9	29.1	61.6	18.2	0.0	0.0
INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	63	98.4	34.9	90.5	3.2	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	28	92.9	78.6	17.9	60.7	0.0	3.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	11	100.0	100.0	9.1	36.4	0.0	18.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	66.7	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	66.7
	TOTAL	108	95.4	56.5	58.3	24.1	0.0	6.5
KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2116	97.0	96.6	70.7	1.3	0.0	1.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	666	95.6	99.2	12.0	16.4	0.8	29.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	221	91.0	97.7	4.1	7.2	0.0	44.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	54	63.0	98.1	5.6	3.7	9.3	14.8
	TOTAL	3057	95.7	97.3	51.9	5.0	0.4	11.0
KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	290	91.7	93.8	85.2	2.4	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	105	92.4	95.2	19.0	67.6	0.0	1.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	80.0	100.0	4.0	76.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	8	37.5	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	428	90.2	94.6	62.6	23.1	0.0	0.5
LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	214	96.3	19.6	80.8	0.5	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	67	94.0	79.1	25.4	62.7	0.0	6.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	23	78.3	82.6	13.0	56.5	8.7	4.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	11	63.6	100.0	0.0	36.4	0.0	9.1
	TOTAL	315	93.3	39.7	61.3	19.0	0.6	1.9
LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	91	89.0	83.5	72.5	3.3	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	92.0	92.0	32.0	48.0	0.0	16.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	66.7	100.0	50.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	126	87.3	85.7	61.1	15.9	0.0	4.8

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR  
DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18- MONTH DUI PROGRA M	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	19636	97.6	27.7	89.2	2.7	0.1	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	4380	96.8	93.1	6.6	84.2	0.5	0.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	887	90.6	96.3	2.4	69.9	6.8	1.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	205	42.4	96.1	0.5	20.0	3.4	2.0
	TOTAL	25108	96.8	42.1	71.0	19.4	0.4	0.1
MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	424	96.9	98.6	89.9	5.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	126	98.4	99.2	27.8	67.5	0.8	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	32	84.4	96.9	6.3	81.3	6.3	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	22	68.2	100.0	4.5	27.3	18.2	0.0
	TOTAL	604	95.5	98.7	69.4	22.8	1.2	0.0
MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	870	98.4	11.1	93.9	2.0	0.0	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	235	98.7	91.1	3.8	88.9	0.0	28.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	60	91.7	98.3	0.0	28.3	0.0	51.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	12	75.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	75.0
	TOTAL	1177	97.9	32.5	70.2	21.3	0.0	9.9
MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	34	100.0	94.1	79.4	2.9	0.0	2.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	12	100.0	91.7	0.0	83.3	0.0	25.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	52	98.1	94.2	51.9	28.8	0.0	7.7
MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	271	94.8	93.7	87.5	4.4	0.0	11.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	105	97.1	98.1	3.8	91.4	0.0	57.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	36	88.9	100.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	66.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	71.4	100.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	28.6
	TOTAL	419	94.5	95.5	57.5	34.4	0.0	27.9
MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup>	420	91.9	91.2	36.4	3.6	0.2	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	138	86.2	84.1	5.1	68.1	0.7	5.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	29	75.9	82.8	3.4	58.6	0.0	13.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	50.0	83.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	593	89.4	89.0	27.2	21.6	0.3	2.5
MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup>	35	100.0	77.1	82.9	0.0	0.0	2.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	100.0	87.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	12.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	40.0
	TOTAL	48	100.0	81.3	62.5	14.6	0.0	8.3
MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	51	98.0	49.0	94.1	2.0	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	17	100.0	94.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	73	94.5	61.6	65.8	28.8	0.0	0.0
MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1395	99.1	97.9	86.9	4.1	0.0	2.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	401	98.3	98.5	8.5	80.5	0.2	29.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	98.2	100.0	2.8	77.1	0.0	31.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	28	75.0	96.4	0.0	42.9	0.0	7.1
	TOTAL	1933	98.5	98.1	64.6	24.6	0.1	10.0



TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	584	98.3	96.6	92.6	1.5	0.0	30.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	161	99.4	98.1	16.1	78.3	0.0	79.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	44	86.4	97.7	0.0	77.3	0.0	70.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	8	75.0	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	25.0
	TOTAL	797	97.6	97.0	71.1	21.8	0.0	42.8
NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	331	100.0	97.6	93.1	3.0	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	95	98.9	98.9	26.3	68.4	0.0	3.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	21	95.2	90.5	19.0	66.7	0.0	19.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	83.3	100.0	16.7	66.7	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	453	99.3	97.6	74.6	20.5	0.0	2.2
ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8632	98.3	40.3	93.1	1.7	0.0	0.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2258	98.1	94.7	4.3	88.2	0.0	6.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	483	94.2	96.7	1.4	86.7	0.0	6.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	115	60.9	98.3	0.0	59.1	0.0	6.1
	TOTAL	11488	97.7	53.9	70.9	22.9	0.0	1.6
PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	984	97.7	98.5	93.8	1.9	0.0	1.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	288	95.5	100.0	10.4	83.7	0.0	60.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	84	82.1	100.0	3.6	77.4	0.0	71.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	24	75.0	100.0	4.2	66.7	0.0	66.7
	TOTAL	1380	95.9	98.9	69.3	24.7	0.0	19.3
PLUMAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	81	98.8	98.8	85.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	96.0	100.0	12.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
	TOTAL	112	98.2	99.1	64.3	30.4	0.0	0.9
RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	5426	97.9	95.8	94.1	2.9	0.0	0.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1451	95.1	96.7	8.1	85.6	0.0	1.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	318	87.1	97.2	1.3	85.5	0.0	2.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	127	60.6	88.2	0.0	62.2	0.0	5.5
	TOTAL	7322	96.2	95.9	71.4	23.9	0.0	0.5
SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3456	98.4	97.5	92.7	1.6	0.0	1.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1071	96.4	99.3	7.1	82.3	0.0	4.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	297	91.6	99.3	0.7	70.7	0.3	13.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	124	49.2	98.4	0.8	37.9	0.0	36.3
	TOTAL	4948	96.3	98.0	66.3	24.1	0.0	3.7
SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	217	97.2	97.7	16.1	0.0	0.0	3.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	66	95.5	100.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	36.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	28	96.4	100.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	67.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	70.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
	TOTAL	321	96.0	98.4	10.9	1.9	0.0	16.8
SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3967	96.9	78.6	90.4	3.7	0.0	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1207	95.0	93.8	9.6	82.6	0.0	2.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	293	91.5	92.2	2.0	73.7	0.0	5.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	104	72.1	75.0	2.9	40.4	0.0	1.0
	TOTAL	5571	95.7	82.6	66.6	25.2	0.0	1.0

## SECTION 3: POSTCONVICTION SANCTIONS

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6611	96.5	20.5	90.7	2.2	0.0	8.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1967	94.7	88.3	9.8	79.1	0.0	17.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	415	90.1	95.9	3.4	80.0	0.0	15.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	107	49.5	99.1	1.9	30.8	0.0	2.8
	TOTAL	9100	95.3	39.5	68.2	22.7	0.0	10.4
SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	529	98.9	98.7	97.0	1.5	0.0	2.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	125	100.0	100.0	8.8	88.0	0.0	80.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	24	100.0	100.0	8.3	83.3	4.2	83.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	50.0
	TOTAL	688	99.1	99.0	76.5	21.4	0.1	20.2
SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1499	98.7	98.8	91.5	1.7	0.0	1.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	480	98.3	99.0	9.6	73.8	0.4	45.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	151	96.0	99.3	5.3	73.5	2.0	55.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	69	78.3	98.6	0.0	63.8	1.4	36.2
	TOTAL	2199	97.8	98.9	64.8	24.3	0.3	15.8
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1145	99.3	98.1	94.4	1.5	0.0	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	373	98.9	100.0	21.4	73.7	0.3	5.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	95.4	99.1	5.5	86.2	0.9	8.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	27	85.2	96.3	3.7	40.7	0.0	3.7
	TOTAL	1654	98.7	98.5	70.6	24.0	0.1	1.9
SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1421	98.9	98.2	91.8	2.5	0.0	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	376	98.4	98.1	9.8	84.3	0.0	9.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	83	92.8	97.6	3.6	77.1	0.0	19.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	18	83.3	100.0	5.6	55.6	0.0	11.1
	TOTAL	1898	98.4	98.2	70.9	22.4	0.0	3.2
SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1444	97.8	70.8	92.0	2.2	0.0	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	398	98.5	96.5	7.3	81.4	0.0	20.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	117	93.2	98.3	3.4	82.1	0.0	31.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	23	82.6	95.7	0.0	73.9	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1982	97.5	77.9	68.7	23.7	0.0	6.6
SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3395	98.5	98.0	95.1	2.4	0.0	3.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	852	98.7	98.2	12.8	84.6	0.1	50.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	223	95.1	98.7	3.1	83.0	0.0	82.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	44	77.3	100.0	2.3	65.9	0.0	65.9
	TOTAL	4514	98.2	98.1	74.1	22.6	0.0	16.7
SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup>	876	98.1	97.0	59.4	0.8	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	234	99.1	100.0	6.4	39.3	0.0	0.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	64	95.3	100.0	1.6	23.4	0.0	1.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	15	73.3	100.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	1189	97.8	97.8	45.1	9.8	0.0	0.2
SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	386	95.3	97.2	83.2	2.6	0.3	37.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	188	95.7	98.9	10.1	70.7	0.0	69.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	48	85.4	95.8	2.1	54.2	2.1	54.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	17	76.5	100.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	11.8
	TOTAL	639	94.2	97.7	53.5	26.4	0.3	47.4

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	14	100.0	100.0	78.6	14.3	0.0	0.0
SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup>	120	98.3	96.7	76.7	5.0	0.0	1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	30	86.7	96.7	26.7	60.0	0.0	13.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	10	80.0	100.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	70.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	162	95.1	96.9	62.3	19.1	0.0	9.3
SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	702	96.6	98.0	93.0	1.9	0.0	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	226	97.3	99.6	6.2	90.7	0.0	28.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	90	94.4	100.0	0.0	87.8	0.0	75.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	30	53.3	100.0	0.0	43.3	0.0	40.0
	TOTAL	1048	95.3	98.6	63.6	29.6	0.0	14.6
SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1611	96.0	96.1	85.4	1.6	0.0	4.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	547	93.8	98.5	6.2	79.5	0.0	65.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	154	85.7	98.7	1.9	83.1	0.0	80.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	25	80.0	100.0	0.0	64.0	0.0	76.0
	TOTAL	2337	94.7	96.9	60.4	25.8	0.0	24.3
STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1242	98.6	99.0	94.0	2.8	0.0	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	374	98.7	100.0	19.8	78.3	0.0	7.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	107	96.3	100.0	3.7	93.5	0.0	24.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	38	57.9	100.0	0.0	60.5	0.0	21.1
	TOTAL	1761	97.6	99.3	70.8	25.6	0.0	3.9
SUTTER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	215	96.3	96.7	90.7	2.8	0.0	3.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	54	96.3	100.0	11.1	85.2	0.0	68.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	22	90.9	100.0	9.1	81.8	0.0	81.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	80.0
	TOTAL	296	95.9	97.6	68.6	25.3	0.0	22.3
TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	178	98.3	98.9	92.1	5.1	0.0	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	60	96.7	100.0	13.3	83.3	0.0	3.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	19	94.7	100.0	0.0	94.7	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	16.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	263	95.8	99.2	65.4	29.3	0.0	2.3
TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	43	100.0	95.3	81.4	2.3	0.0	2.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	17	100.0	88.2	11.8	41.2	0.0	52.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	62	98.4	93.5	59.7	12.9	0.0	16.1
TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1435	97.6	46.6	92.8	1.5	0.1	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	483	97.5	94.2	10.1	82.8	0.0	12.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	144	93.8	96.5	2.8	84.7	0.0	14.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	69	71.0	92.8	1.4	36.2	0.0	23.2
	TOTAL	2131	96.5	62.2	65.0	26.7	0.1	4.9

TABLE 10a: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 - continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
		<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	199	96.5	64.3	86.9	5.0	0.5	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	85	96.5	68.2	10.6	81.2	0.0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	16	87.5	93.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	303	95.7	67.3	60.1	27.7	0.3	0.3
VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2098	97.6	95.7	93.5	3.1	0.0	4.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	505	96.0	97.8	9.5	85.5	0.0	81.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	127	87.4	95.3	0.8	81.1	0.0	84.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	32	53.1	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	53.1
	TOTAL	2762	96.3	96.1	72.8	22.3	0.0	22.8
YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	426	97.4	96.5	74.6	1.9	0.0	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	125	96.8	97.6	32.0	47.2	0.0	32.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	26	100.0	100.0	11.5	65.4	0.0	57.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	42.9	57.1	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	584	96.7	96.4	61.8	14.7	0.0	9.9
YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	241	98.3	77.2	92.9	1.2	0.0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	63	100.0	92.1	30.2	69.8	0.0	6.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	0.0	91.7	0.0	8.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
	TOTAL	319	98.1	81.2	76.2	18.5	0.0	1.9

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS <sup>a</sup>	
			N	%
STATEWIDE		116190	20833	17.9
ALAMEDA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2497	1175	47.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	806	241	29.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	239	44	18.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	77	5	6.5
	TOTAL	3619	1465	40.5
ALPINE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	14	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	1	50.0
	TOTAL	16	1	6.3
AMADOR	1 <sup>ST</sup>	72	1	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	43	12	27.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	8	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	128	13	10.2
BUTTE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	611	1	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	213	32	15.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	51	8	15.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	16	1	6.3
	TOTAL	891	42	4.7
CALAVERAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	121	2	1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	50	8	16.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	3	12.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	199	13	6.5
COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	91	1	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	26	3	11.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	1	16.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	128	5	3.9
CONTRA COSTA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1679	10	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	571	84	14.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	143	33	23.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	58	2	3.4
	TOTAL	2451	129	5.3
DEL NORTE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	58	1	1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	21	3	14.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	84	4	4.8
EL DORADO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	513	7	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	171	31	18.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	44	8	18.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	20	0	0.0
	TOTAL	748	46	6.1

<sup>a</sup>Entries represent numbers and percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2014 that installed an IID subsequent to their arrest date, which may be related to different IID requirements, including those administered by DMV (i.e., under AB 91 law), and may not be initiated by IID court sanctions (presented in Table 10a) or associated with DUI convictions resulting from arrests in 2014.

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			N	%
FRESNO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2918	29	1.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	990	106	10.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	297	33	11.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	131	2	1.5
	TOTAL	4336	170	3.9
GLENN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	108	3	2.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	47	11	23.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	170	14	8.2
HUMBOLDT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	427	1	0.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	124	22	17.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	27	4	14.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	9	1	11.1
	TOTAL	587	28	4.8
IMPERIAL	1 <sup>ST</sup>	380	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	85	13	15.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	24	2	8.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	1	16.7
	TOTAL	495	16	3.2
INYO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	63	2	3.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	28	1	3.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	11	2	18.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	108	5	4.6
KERN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2116	13	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	666	72	10.8
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	221	27	12.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	54	1	1.9
	TOTAL	3057	113	3.7
KINGS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	290	1	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	105	14	13.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	2	8.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	428	17	4.0
LAKE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	214	2	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	67	12	17.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	23	1	4.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	11	0	0.0
	TOTAL	315	15	4.8
LASSEN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	91	2	2.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	7	28.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	1	16.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	0	0.0
	TOTAL	126	10	7.9

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND  
DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			N	%
LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	19636	10122	51.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	4380	1688	38.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	887	209	23.6
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	205	6	2.9
	TOTAL	25108	12025	47.9
MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	424	4	0.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	126	7	5.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	32	3	9.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	22	0	0.0
	TOTAL	604	14	2.3
MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	870	5	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	235	35	14.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	60	12	20.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	12	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1177	52	4.4
MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	34	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	12	2	16.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	52	2	3.8
MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	271	5	1.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	105	21	20.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	36	5	13.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	419	31	7.4
MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup>	420	2	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	138	14	10.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	29	3	10.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	0	0.0
	TOTAL	593	19	3.2
MODOC	1 <sup>ST</sup>	35	1	2.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	0	0.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	5	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>			
	TOTAL	48	1	2.1
MONO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	51	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	17	6	35.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	0	0.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	73	6	8.2
MONTEREY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1395	27	1.9
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	401	59	14.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	12	11.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	28	2	7.1
	TOTAL	1933	100	5.2

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND  
DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			N	%
NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	584	13	2.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	161	46	28.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	44	12	27.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	8	0	0.0
	TOTAL	797	71	8.9
NEVADA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	331	1	0.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	95	18	18.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	21	5	23.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	1	16.7
	TOTAL	453	25	5.5
ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8632	86	1.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2258	549	24.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	483	135	28.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	115	16	13.9
	TOTAL	11488	786	6.8
PLACER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	984	14	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	288	87	30.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	84	20	23.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	24	2	8.3
	TOTAL	1380	123	8.9
PLUMAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	81	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	3	12.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	3	50.0
	TOTAL	112	6	5.4
RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	5426	57	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1451	196	13.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	318	66	20.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	127	2	1.6
	TOTAL	7322	321	4.4
SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3456	1737	50.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1071	344	32.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	297	50	16.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	124	9	7.3
	TOTAL	4948	2140	43.2
SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	217	6	2.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	66	8	12.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	28	3	10.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	0	0.0
	TOTAL	321	17	5.3



TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND  
DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			N	%
SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3967	28	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1207	187	15.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	293	47	16.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	104	4	3.8
	TOTAL	5571	266	4.8
SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6611	49	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1967	359	18.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	415	79	19.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	107	7	6.5
	TOTAL	9100	494	5.4
SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	529	4	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	125	28	22.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	24	5	20.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	0	0.0
	TOTAL	688	37	5.4
SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1499	17	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	480	112	23.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	151	21	13.9
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	69	2	2.9
	TOTAL	2199	152	6.9
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1145	15	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	373	60	16.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	15	13.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	27	2	7.4
	TOTAL	1654	92	5.6
SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1421	8	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	376	72	19.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	83	10	12.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	18	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1898	90	4.7
SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1444	6	0.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	398	68	17.1
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	117	29	24.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	23	1	4.3
	TOTAL	1982	104	5.2
SANTA CLARA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3395	49	1.4
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	852	170	20.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	223	35	15.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	44	2	4.5
	TOTAL	4514	256	5.7

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			N	%
SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup>	876	6	0.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	234	41	17.5
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	64	12	18.8
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	15	1	6.7
	TOTAL	1189	60	5.0
SHASTA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	386	10	2.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	188	39	20.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	48	8	16.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	17	1	5.9
	TOTAL	639	58	9.1
SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	12	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	1	50.0
	TOTAL	14	1	7.1
SISKIYOU	1 <sup>ST</sup>	120	1	0.8
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	30	4	13.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	10	2	20.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	162	7	4.3
SOLANO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	702	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	226	67	29.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	90	18	20.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	30	3	10.0
	TOTAL	1048	88	8.4
SONOMA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1611	21	1.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	547	157	28.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	154	35	22.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	25	2	8.0
	TOTAL	2337	215	9.2
STANISLAUS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1242	8	0.6
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	374	55	14.7
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	107	9	8.4
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	38	3	7.9
	TOTAL	1761	75	4.3
SUTTER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	215	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	54	16	29.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	22	4	18.2
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	296	20	6.8
TEHAMA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	178	3	1.7
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	60	8	13.3
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	19	4	21.1
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	1	16.7
	TOTAL	263	16	6.1

TABLE 10b: IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICE (IID) INSTALLATIONS BY COUNTY AND  
DUI OFFENDER STATUS FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

- continued

COUNTY	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	DUI CONVICTIONS	IID INSTALLATIONS	
			<i>N</i>	%
TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	43	1	2.3
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	17	3	17.6
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	1	100.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	62	5	8.1
TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1435	534	37.2
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	483	107	22.2
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	144	22	15.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	69	2	2.9
	TOTAL	2131	665	31.2
TUOLUMNE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	199	4	2.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	85	19	22.4
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	16	5	31.3
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	303	28	9.2
VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2098	23	1.1
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	505	156	30.9
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	127	28	22.0
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	32	3	9.4
	TOTAL	2762	210	7.6
YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	426	2	0.5
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	125	25	20.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	26	3	11.5
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	584	30	5.1
YUBA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	241	0	0.0
	2 <sup>ND</sup>	63	17	27.0
	3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	2	16.7
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	319	19	6.0



SECTION 4:  
POSTCONVICTION SANCTION  
EFFECTIVENESS



## SECTION 4: POSTCONVICTION SANCTION EFFECTIVENESS

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

The first part of this section examines descriptive indicators, such as DUI recidivism and crash rates, for different groups of DUI offenders within different periods of time: 1) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates for first and second DUI offenders arrested between 1990-2014, 2) 1-year DUI recidivism and crash rates by county, for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2014, 3) percentages of DUI program referrals, enrollments, and completions for first and second DUI offenders arrested in 2014, and 4) long-term recidivism rates of DUI offenders arrested in 2005.

The second part of this section contains the results of the analyses evaluating the relationship between DUI programs and DUI recidivism and crashes for first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month or 9-month DUI programs.

The following are highlights of the findings:

- ◆ The 1-year recidivism rate for first DUI offenders arrested in 2014 was 3.7%, relatively unchanged from the recidivism rates for first DUI offenders in the past 4 years. The 2014 first offender reoffense rate was 51.3% lower than the reoffense rate for first offenders arrested in 1990 (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- ◆ The 1-year recidivism rate for second DUI offenders arrested in 2014 was 4.7%, slightly up from the 4.6% for those arrested in 2013. This rate is a 51.5% decrease from the 9.7% rate for those arrested in 1990 (see Figure 6 and Table 11a).
- ◆ Subsequent 1-year crash rates among second DUI offenders have increased from 2.6% for offenders arrested in 2013 to 3.2% for those arrested in 2014, a 23.1% relative increase. This rate is 20% lower than the rate for offenders arrested in 1990. The crash rates among first offenders have increased from 3.6% in 2013 to 4.0% in 2014, an 11.1% increase. The 2014 first offender crash rate is 24.5% lower than the 1990 crash rate. The crash rates of both first

and second DUI offenders arrested in 2014 have increased each year since 2011 (see Figure 7 and Table 11a).

- ◆ Of the DUI offenders arrested in 2014 who, by court referral, enrolled in a DUI program, 87.3% of first offenders and 41.2% of second offenders completed their program assignment (see Table 13).
- ◆ Over 10 years, DUI recidivism rates of DUI offenders originally convicted in 2005 are consistently lower than the rates of those convicted in 1994. At the end of 10 years, 25% of the 2005 DUI offenders had at least one subsequent DUI conviction compared to 26% of the 1994 group. Also, 27% of the 2005 DUI offenders incurred at least one subsequent DUI incident, lower than the 30% of 1994 offenders who incurred at least one subsequent DUI incident (see Figure 8a).
- ◆ Over 10 years, DUI recidivism rates increased as the number of prior offenses increased. The proportion of third-or-more offenders reoffending was 34%, while 27% of second offenders and 23% of first offenders reoffended (see Figure 8b).
- ◆ Males showed a much higher cumulative percentage (26%) of reoffenses than did females (20%) over the 10-year time period (see Figure 8c).
- ◆ Long term recidivism rates are inversely related to age, with higher reoffense rates associated with the youngest age group, and the lowest rates with the oldest group (see Figure 8d).
- ◆ After 5 years, the percentage of DUI offenders reoffending in the 2005 group was much lower (17%) compared to the percentages reoffending in the 1984 group (27%) and in the 1980 group (35%), and was slightly lower than the percentage reoffending in the 1994 group (18%). This is shown in Figure 8e.
- ◆ One-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month DUI programs were not significantly higher than the crash rates of those assigned to 9-month programs (see Table 14). Also, the 1-year postconviction DUI incident rates were not significantly different between the two groups.

*Subject Selection and Data Collection* Convicted DUI and alcohol- or drug-related reckless offenders were identified from monthly abstract update files which contain all DUI conviction data



reported to DMV by the courts. Subjects were chosen based on their number of DUI and alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions within 10 years prior to their DUI arrest in 2014. The following groups of subjects were selected: 1) first DUI offenders—drivers who had no DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions within the previous 10 years, 2) second DUI offenders—drivers who had one DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction within the previous 10 years, 3) first DUI offenders assigned to 3-month and 9-month DUI programs. In addition, DUI offenders arrested in 2005 and subsequently convicted were selected for the 10-year follow-up evaluation.

The crash and DUI recidivism rates of first and second DUI offenders, and the relationship between DUI programs and DUI recidivism for persons convicted of a first DUI offense, are evaluated in terms of postconviction driving record, as measured by: 1) total crashes and, 2) DUI incidents, which include alcohol-involved crashes, DUI convictions, Administrative Per Se (APS) suspensions, and DUI Failure-to-Appear (FTA) violations. For the 2005 DUI offenders, DUI recidivism is measured by subsequent DUI convictions, along with one comparison of DUI incidents. For first and second DUI offenders, the 1-year subsequent unadjusted crash and DUI reoffense data from all of the previous and current evaluations are included.


To maintain comparability to the previous subject-selection criteria, certain types of offenders had to be excluded. For the sanction analyses among first DUI offenders, previous and current analyses excluded offenders with convictions of a DUI with injury, and those with chemical-test refusal APS suspensions, because their license control penalties were different from those convicted of DUI with no injury. Drivers who did not have a full 1-year subsequent follow-up period (because of late conviction dates) were also excluded, as were drivers with “X” license numbers (meaning that no California driver license number could be found for that driver) and drivers with out-of-state ZIP Codes. The only exclusions made for the 2005 offenders were out-of-state cases and drivers with “X” license numbers.

## DUI RECIDIVISM AND CRASH RATES

One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested from 1990-2014

The 1-year subsequent DUI-incident and crash reoffense rates for both first and second DUI offenders were compiled from previous and current DUI-MIS reports and plotted onto two separate graphs to display these rates over time.

Figure 6 shows the percentages of first and second offenders, arrested between 1990 and 2014, who reoffended within 1 year after their conviction.



*Figure 6.* Percentages of first and second DUI offenders reoffending with a DUI incident within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2014).

This figure and Table 11a show an overall gradual decline in the 1-year recidivism rates for first offenders from 1990 to 2014. The general decline translates into a 51.3% reduction in recidivism for all first offenders from 1990 to 2014. The decline in DUI reoffenses is steeper in the early years (1990-1994), following the implementation of the APS law. As is evident in Figure 6, 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 11a: ONE-YEAR UNADJUSTED PERCENTAGES OF SUBSEQUENT DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED AND CRASH-INVOLVED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS, 1990-2014

YEAR	DUI-INCIDENT-INVOLVED		CRASH-INVOLVED	
	FIRST OFFENDERS	SECOND OFFENDERS	FIRST OFFENDERS	SECOND OFFENDERS
1990	7.6	9.7	5.3	4.0
1991	7.1	9.5	4.7	3.6
1992	6.2	9.1	4.1	3.5
1993	5.8	8.8	4.1	3.5
1994	5.4	7.0	4.5	3.1
1995	5.8	7.0	4.6	3.0
1996	5.1	6.1	4.5	2.4
1997	5.2	6.0	4.7	2.7
1998	5.3	6.0	4.8	2.6
1999	5.0	6.1	5.0	2.8
2000	4.9	6.1	5.1	3.1
2001	4.9	5.9	5.2	3.0
2002	4.8	6.1	5.1	3.3
2003	4.7	6.5	4.8	3.2
2004	4.5	5.9	4.8	3.1
2005	4.7	5.6	4.8	3.0
2006	4.5	5.5	4.6	2.7
2007	4.5	5.4	4.1	2.4
2008	4.7	5.7	3.7	2.3
2009	4.2	5.2	3.1	1.9
2010	4.1	5.2	2.8	1.8
2011	3.8	4.9	2.5	1.7
2012	3.8	4.8	2.9	2.2
2013	3.6	4.6	3.6	2.6
2014	3.7	4.7	4.0	3.2
% DIFFERENCE 1990 TO 2014	-51.3%	-51.5%	-24.5%	-20.0%

A similar overall decline is evident in the 1-year reoffense rates for the second offender group, as displayed in Figure 6 and Table 11a, with the greatest rate of decline occurring during the years from 1993 to 1996. Table 11a also shows that, from 1990 to 2014, the reoffense rates decreased 51.5% among second offenders. This is almost identical to the 51.3% decrease among first DUI offenders across the same time period. The reoffense rates of second offenders remain higher than those of first offenders across all years. Previous DUI-MIS reports suggested that, while many factors may be associated with the overall decline in DUI incidents for both first and second offenders, the reduction may largely be attributed to the implementation of APS suspensions in 1990. An evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS Law documents recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders, attributable to the law.

The 1-year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders were also compiled from previous and current DUI-MIS evaluations and graphically displayed over time. Figure 7 shows the percentages of first and second offenders arrested between 1990 and 2014 who had crashes within 1 year after their conviction.




Figure 7. Percentages of first and second DUI offenders involved in a crash within 1 year after conviction (arrested between 1990 and 2014).

For the third consecutive year, crash rates for first and second offenders increased from the prior year. Among first offenders arrested between 1990 and 2014, Figure 7 and Table 11a show an initial decline in crash rates for the earliest years, followed by an ongoing increase after 1993, and then another decline from 2001 to 2011. However, the 1-year subsequent crash rates for both first and second offenders increased in 2012 and continued to increase in 2013 and in 2014. The relative difference between first offender crash rates in 1990 and 2014 is -24.5%, whereas the relative difference for second offenders for those same years shows a 20.0% decline in crash involvement.

Overall, second offenders have lower 1-year subsequent crash rates than do first offenders (Table 11a), and this fact has been well documented in past evaluations; it has been speculated that the lower crash rates of second offenders may be related to the longer-term (2 years) license suspensions imposed on second offenders.

---

### One-Year DUI Recidivism and Crash Rates by County for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014

Table 11b displays the 1-year subsequent DUI recidivism rates of offenders arrested in 2014 by county. As shown in this table, among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent DUI incident within 1 year varied from 6.2% in Fresno to 2.6% in Los Angeles. Among the smaller counties, Colusa, Del Norte, and Glenn had DUI recidivism rates at 9.0% or above, while Alpine, Mono, and Sierra had no first or second offenders recidivating within 1 year. Second offenders had generally higher DUI recidivism rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, Fresno had the highest rate, with 7.6% of second offenders having a subsequent DUI incident within 1 year, whereas second offenders in Orange County had the lowest rate at 2.4%. Among the smaller counties, the DUI recidivism rate for second offenders ranged from 20.0% (Modoc) to 0.0% (Alpine, Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Mono, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Sutter).

One-year subsequent crash rates, by county, for both first and second offenders arrested in 2014 are displayed in Table 11c. Among the larger counties, the rate at which first offenders had a subsequent crash within 1 year varied from 4.6% in San Bernardino and Orange counties to 3.1% in San Diego County. Among the smaller counties, Alpine, Modoc, Sierra, and Trinity had a 0.0% crash rate. In contrast to DUI recidivism rates, second offenders have generally lower crash rates than first offenders. Among the larger counties, second offender 1-year subsequent crash rates varied from 4.9% (San Mateo) to 2.4% (Fresno). Among the smaller counties, the rates varied from 9.1% (Trinity) to 0.0% in 14 counties (Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, Inyo, Lassen, Madera, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, San Benito, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Sutter).

TABLE 11b: 2014 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	2239	3.7	795	4.7
ALAMEDA	60	3.4	34	5.5
ALPINE	0	0.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	4	7.1	0	0.0
BUTTE	21	4.6	7	5.0
CALAVERAS	3	2.9	4	8.7
COLUSA	6	9.1	0	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	36	3.6	15	4.6
DEL NORTE	4	10.0	0	0.0
EL DORADO	8	2.2	4	3.3
FRESNO	130	6.2	53	7.6
GLENN	8	12.5	1	2.7
HUMBOLDT	9	3.1	4	5.3
IMPERIAL	6	2.9	3	7.1
INYO	2	4.0	0	0.0
KERN	84	5.7	34	7.1
KINGS	11	6.0	4	6.0
LAKE	6	3.9	2	4.4
LASSEN	3	5.1	0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	362	2.6	109	3.5
MADERA	8	6.0	1	2.9
MARIN	22	3.7	8	4.8
MARIPOSA	1	3.9	0	0.0
MENDOCINO	9	4.4	3	3.4
MERCED	10	4.2	4	5.6
MODOC	0	0.0	1	20.0
MONO	0	0.0	0	0.0
MONTEREY	33	4.2	13	5.9
NAPA	6	1.6	7	6.3
NEVADA	11	4.4	4	5.3
ORANGE	188	3.1	36	2.4
PLACER	35	5.0	9	4.3
PLUMAS	2	3.3	2	8.7
RIVERSIDE	171	4.3	70	6.6
SACRAMENTO	109	3.8	61	6.8
SAN BENITO	9	5.6	3	7.1
SAN BERNARDINO	128	4.7	46	5.4
SAN DIEGO	178	3.5	57	3.5
SAN FRANCISCO	9	2.3	3	3.2
SAN JOAQUIN	64	5.4	8	2.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO	32	3.4	22	7.1
SAN MATEO	26	2.5	8	3.0
SANTA BARBARA	43	4.5	15	5.3
SANTA CLARA	89	3.7	35	6.0
SANTA CRUZ	27	4.1	6	3.4
SHASTA	13	4.0	6	4.0
SIERRA	0	0.0	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	1	1.2	0	0.0
SOLANO	24	5.2	6	4.3
SONOMA	48	4.0	9	2.1
STANISLAUS	53	5.8	20	7.2
SUTTER	11	7.1	0	0.0
TEHAMA	4	3.0	4	7.7
TRINITY	0	0.0	1	9.1
TULARE	51	4.9	31	8.7
TUOLUMNE	1	0.6	5	7.6
VENTURA	43	3.2	13	4.0
YOLO	11	3.5	2	2.3
YUBA	6	3.1	2	3.7

TABLE 11c: 2014 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	2420	4.0	541	3.2
ALAMEDA	74	4.2	21	3.4
ALPINE	0	0.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	4	7.1	0	0.0
BUTTE	21	4.6	10	7.1
CALAVERAS	2	2.0	0	0.0
COLUSA	2	3.0	1	4.8
CONTRA COSTA	51	5.2	13	4.0
DEL NORTE	1	2.5	0	0.0
EL DORADO	6	1.7	2	1.7
FRESNO	82	3.9	17	2.4
GLENN	5	7.8	2	5.4
HUMBOLDT	13	4.4	1	1.3
IMPERIAL	4	2.0	1	2.4
INYO	2	4.0	0	0.0
KERN	59	4.0	11	2.3
KINGS	5	2.8	3	4.5
LAKE	4	2.6	3	6.7
LASSEN	2	3.4	0	0.0
LOS ANGELES	585	4.3	108	3.5
MADERA	7	5.3	0	0.0
MARIN	24	4.0	3	1.8
MARIPOSA	1	3.9	0	0.0
MENDOCINO	6	2.9	4	4.5
MERCED	13	5.5	1	1.4
MODOC	0	0.0	0	0.0
MONO	1	2.8	0	0.0
MONTEREY	34	4.3	8	3.7
NAPA	6	1.6	5	4.5
NEVADA	5	2.0	2	2.7
ORANGE	275	4.6	42	2.8
PLACER	23	3.3	7	3.4
PLUMAS	2	3.3	2	8.7
RIVERSIDE	164	4.1	35	3.3
SACRAMENTO	108	3.8	30	3.3
SAN BENITO	6	3.7	0	0.0
SAN BERNARDINO	126	4.6	32	3.8
SAN DIEGO	157	3.1	41	2.5
SAN FRANCISCO	9	2.3	4	4.2
SAN JOAQUIN	53	4.5	9	2.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO	40	4.2	15	4.9
SAN MATEO	38	3.7	4	1.5
SANTA BARBARA	32	3.4	15	5.3
SANTA CLARA	90	3.7	21	3.6
SANTA CRUZ	40	6.0	8	4.5
SHASTA	7	2.2	3	2.0
SIERRA	0	0.0	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	3	3.6	0	0.0
SOLANO	24	5.2	6	4.3
SONOMA	39	3.2	7	1.7
STANISLAUS	46	5.0	13	4.7
SUTTER	2	1.3	0	0.0
TEHAMA	4	3.0	2	3.9
TRINITY	0	0.0	1	9.1
TULARE	41	4.0	13	3.6
TUOLUMNE	5	3.0	3	4.6
VENTURA	49	3.7	8	2.5
YOLO	11	3.5	3	3.4
YUBA	7	3.6	1	1.9

Long Term Recidivism Rates of the 2005 DUI Offenders

Although last year's report displayed long-term recidivism rates for the 1994 DUI offenders over a 20-year time span, it was decided, for this year's report, to present the recidivism rates for a more recent group of DUI offenders; the intention is to reflect on more contemporary trends in DUI occurrences, associated DUI law changes, or other more recent efforts to reduce DUI. Therefore, the recidivism rates for the convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2005, over the 10 years following their conviction that resulted from the 2005 arrest, are presented in this year's report. Since all convicted DUI offenders arrested in 2005 were included in the 2005 group, it was possible to observe and compare the long term recidivism rates for different sub-groups within the 2005 cohort, and to examine how these sub-groups differ in their long term recidivism rates. This approach was also taken in a previous study conducted by Peck (1991), in which the reoffense failure curves of various groups among 1980 and 1984 DUI offenders were compared. Failure curves are cumulative percentages over time of first reoffenses occurring after the initial DUI conviction. Both DUI convictions (alone) and DUI incidents over the 10-year follow-up period for both the 1994 and 2005 groups were included as outcome data in order to maintain comparability with the 1984 and 1980 cohorts from a previous evaluation (Peck, 1991).


Table 12 shows cumulative percentages of first subsequent DUI reoffenses (convictions) for the 2005 offenders, as well as 9- and 10-year cumulative percentages for the 1980, 1994, and 2005 groups and 5-year cumulative percentages for the 1984 group. For 20-year cumulative percentages for the 1980, 1984, and 1994 cohorts, see Table 12 in the 2016 annual report.

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

YEAR	PERCENTAGE												
	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2 <sup>ND</sup>	3 <sup>RD</sup>	MALES	FEMALES	16-25	26-45	46-65	66+	1980	1984	1994	2005
1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	5	6	5	3	5	4	4	2	11	7	5	4
2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	9	11	9	6	9	8	7	4	19	15	9	8
3 <sup>RD</sup>	11	13	16	13	9	14	12	10	6	25	20	13	12
4 <sup>TH</sup>	14	16	20	16	12	17	15	12	7	30	24	16	15
5 <sup>TH</sup>	16	19	24	18	14	21	17	14	8	35	27	18	17
6 <sup>TH</sup>	18	21	27	21	15	23	19	16	9	38	NA	21	20
7 <sup>TH</sup>	20	23	29	22	17	25	21	17	9	40	NA	22	21
8 <sup>TH</sup>	21	25	31	24	18	27	22	18	10	42	NA	24	23
9 <sup>TH</sup>	22	26	33	25	19	28	23	19	10	44	NA	25	24
10 <sup>TH</sup>	23	27	34	26	20	29	24	19	10	NA	NA	26	25



In addition to Table 12, Figure 8a displays recidivism rates for 1994 and 2005 offenders over 10 years.




*Figure 8a.* Cumulative percent of first subsequent DUI conviction and DUI incident (alcohol crashes, DUI convictions, APS suspensions, and DUI FTAs) for 1994 and 2005 DUI offenders.

Figure 8a shows that, for 1994 offenders as a whole, at the end of 10 years 26% were convicted of at least one DUI reoffense. When considering a more expanded view of DUI reoffenses including all DUI incidents, the recidivism rate increased to 30%. For the 2005 offenders, 25% reoffended at the end of 10 years, just slightly fewer than the 26% of 1994 offenders. However, for DUI incidents, the 10-year recidivism rate of the 2005 group (27%) was notably lower than that of the 1994 offenders (30%). As evident in previous years, these failure curves are steepest in the several years following the initial conviction, after which they start to flatten out, but are still rising slightly in the 7th through 10th years.

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

From this graph and Table 12, it is evident that the recidivism failure curves are higher for DUI offenders with higher numbers of prior offenses. Third-or-more offenders have the highest overall failure curve, and continue to maintain higher failure percentages over the 10-year time period. At the end of 10 years, for the 2005 group, 34% of third-or-more offenders have reoffended, compared to 27% of second offenders and 23% of first offenders. The cumulative percentages at the end of 10 years for the 1994 first, second, and third-or-more offenders are higher than those of the 2005 offenders.



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

Because the majority of DUI offenders has always been male (79% in 2005), it is relevant to inspect the recidivism rates of the 2005 offenders by gender. As evident in Figure 8c and Table 12, the percentage of males that reoffend over 10 years is much higher than that of females. At the end of 10 years, 26% of males have reoffended as compared to 20% of females. The failure curve for females is noticeably lower and increases at a slower pace throughout the 10 years than the curve for males.




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

Since it is also well known that DUI violations are associated with certain age groups, the recidivism curves are assessed by age as well. Figure 8d displays the failure curves of four age groups. 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 10 years, the failure curves of the two youngest groups are much steeper than the curve of the oldest group; the failure curves of all age groups are steepest during the first few years following the 2005 conviction.

The failure curve of the 66+ group begins to flatten out at the fifth year, much sooner than the curves of the other groups. The mortality of the oldest group could influence their lower recidivism rate; also, this group may be restricting their driving by driving less frequently than the other age groups. After 10 years, the two youngest groups reoffended by 29% and 24%, respectively, while 19% of the middle age group (for whom mortality may also be a factor) and 10% of the oldest group recidivated.




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

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




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

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

Figure 8e reveals that at the end of 5 years, 35% of the 1980 offenders reoffended compared to 27% of the 1984 group, 18% of the 1994, and 17% of the 2005 groups. Quite dramatically, the proportion recidivating in the 1994 and 2005 groups dropped by half compared to those in the 1980 group (35%). Major pieces of DUI legislation were enacted in California over this time span of 25 years. The notably lower reoffense proportions of the 1984 group (27%) compared to the 1980 group (35%) can likely be attributed to the 1982 laws, AB 541 (Moorhead), which applied tougher sanctions for DUI offenders, and AB 7 (Hart) which established the initial 0.10% per se BAC illegal limit. The effectiveness of these laws was confirmed by a previous California study by Tashima and Peck (1986). Table 12, which compares the 1980 cohort with the 1994 group over 9 years, shows that 44% of the 1980 group recidivated versus 25% of the 1994 group. The difference between the recidivism rates of these two groups remains quite dramatic at the end of 9 years. There was only a one percentage-point increase in recidivism each year for the 1994 and 2005 groups in years 8 through 10.

Continuing with Figure 8e, it is evident that the difference in the reoffending proportions between the 1984 group (27%), the 1994 group (18%), and the 2005 group (17%) is substantial; this reduction in reoffenses is possibly due to the enactment of two 1990 laws: SB 1623 (Lockyer), which established APS suspensions for all offenders at the time of arrest, and SB 1150 (Lockyer), which lowered the Per Se BAC limit to 0.08% and imposed other stringent sanctions for persons that are subject to APS suspension and revocation actions. As noted earlier, an evaluation (Rogers, 1997) of the California APS law documented recidivism reductions of up to 21.1% for first offenders and 19.5% for repeat offenders, both attributable to the APS law. Figure 8e also shows that the reoffense levels are very similar for both the 1994 and 2005 cohorts. The reoffense rates of the 2005 offenders were only one percentage-point lower than that of the 1994 group for the first 5 years.

In summary, the 2005 offenders have long term reoffense rates that are higher among those with more DUI priors (within 10 years), among males, and among younger-aged drivers. These findings are not surprising and are consistent with previous studies. In comparing the reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2005 groups with those of the 1980 and 1984 offenders, it was found that the cumulative percentages of reoffenses were much lower among the 1994 and 2005 offenders. The dramatically lower reoffense rates of the 1994 and 2005 groups could be attributed, in part, to the

enactment of more stringent sanctions for DUI offenders in the past 25 years, including the APS suspension law of 1990.

### The Proportions of DUI Program Referrals, Enrollments, and Completions for First and Second DUI Offenders Arrested in 2014

Beginning 8 years ago, this report captures the numbers and proportions of convicted first and second offenders whose records indicated that they had enrolled in and completed a DUI program, upon referral received from the court. Inclusion of the information on enrollments and completions was possible due to the addition of information to each person's driving record that contains data on DUI program enrollment and completion dates, court information relevant to the DUI conviction, and program length.

Table 13 shows the percentages of referrals to the various DUI programs for first and second offenders. It can be seen from this table that 89.6% of first offenders and 79.2% of second offenders were assigned to a DUI program. Among first offenders, 73.2% enrolled in a DUI program, which usually ranges from 3 to 9 months in length, depending upon the offender's BAC level at the time of their arrest. Furthermore, 61.6% of second offenders were enrolled in an 18-month DUI program. Of those enrolled in DUI programs, 87.3% of first offenders and 41.2% of second offenders completed their program assignment (some second offenders may still have been enrolled in the program at the time this report was completed).

TABLE 13: COUNTS AND PROPORTIONS OF REPORTED DUI PROGRAM REFERRALS, ENROLLMENTS, AND COMPLETIONS FOR CONVICTED FIRST AND SECOND OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

OFFENDERS	TOTAL	PROGRAM REFERRALS		PROGRAM ENROLLMENT		PROGRAM COMPLETION		
	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	% <sup>a</sup>	% <sup>b</sup>
1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDERS	84,905	76,075 <sup>c</sup>	89.6	62,132	73.2	54,216	63.9	87.3
2 <sup>ND</sup> OFFENDERS	23,648	18,729 <sup>d</sup>	79.2	14,566	61.6	6,000	25.4	41.2

<sup>a</sup>Percent of total number of DUI offenders. <sup>b</sup>Percent of program enrollees. <sup>c</sup>Referrals to first offender DUI program (3 to 9 months). <sup>d</sup>Referrals to 18-month DUI program.

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

#### Methods

*Subject Selection and Follow-up Data* The basis for evaluating the effectiveness of DUI programs for offenders convicted of alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving, or for first DUI offenders, was

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

In evaluating the relationship between the length of DUI programs and DUI recidivism, first offenders arrested in 2014 and convicted of DUI that showed the 3-month and 9-month designations on their conviction abstracts were identified and selected for the analysis. The records of 34.3% of first offenders who were ordered to a DUI intervention program either did not indicate the specific length of time of the program or indicated other lengths of time that were not 3 or 9 months. These individuals were excluded from the comparison. Cases further excluded from the analysis were: first DUI offenders convicted of DUI with injury, drivers with “X” license numbers, and drivers with out-of-state ZIP codes. Of the total sample selected, 77% were ordered to 3-month programs, while 23% were ordered to 9-month programs. To explore if the BAC level of first DUI offenders was associated with DUI recidivism, only DUI offenders with available information on their BAC level were included in the comparison.

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

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

during the evaluation period. More importantly, analysis of repeat failures would be subject to confounding by court sanctions received in connection with the first failure incident. This confounding was avoided by excluding multiple incidents from the analyses.

*Evaluation Design and Analytical Procedures* Since it was not possible to randomly assign drivers to the various sanction groups, potential biases due to preexisting group differences were statistically controlled to the extent possible by using biographical data, prior driving record data, and ZIP Code indices, such as crash and traffic conviction averages for each driver's ZIP Code area (Appendix Table B5). While this “quasi-experimental” design is subject to a number of limitations, the attempt to statistically control for group differences removes at least part of the bias in group assignment and provides a less-confounded comparison of the sanction groups. It is possible, of course, that the groups also differ on characteristics not measured or reflected in covariates. The possibility of uncontrolled biases becomes particularly problematic if sanctions received by offenders systematically vary through self- or judicial-selectivity (e.g., drivers of higher socioeconomic status may be more likely to enroll in a program, and obtain a license restriction, and less likely to receive jail than are those of lower status).

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

Following the extraction of covariates, simple correlations were computed between demographic variables, prior driving variables, and the outcome measures (first subsequent crash and first subsequent DUI incident). The demographic and 2-year prior driving variables that had statistically significant correlations with the outcome measures were identified and selected as potential covariates. For each logistic regression analysis, potential interactions between the covariates and treatment/comparison groups were tested. In analyses with significant interactions, the interaction terms are typically included in the final logistic regression models. There were no significant interactions among the first offenders and either of the outcome measures.



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

The evaluation of the effectiveness of DUI program assignment on drivers convicted of alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving violations is not available in this report. The R&D Branch is currently undertaking an assessment of the accuracy and completeness of reported conviction abstract information related to court orders to enroll in a DUI treatment program for this type of offender. Upon completion of the investigation, the assessment findings and any resulting implications will be used to determine how best to fulfill the legislative mandate to conduct this particular evaluation.

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

An evaluation of a referral to a 9-month DUI program for offenders with an alcohol- or drug-related reckless conviction who have a prior conviction for alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving or DUI within 10 years, was mandated by AB 2802 (Houston). This legislation requires the courts to order these offenders to enroll in a DUI program for at least 9 months as a condition of probation. The records of persons arrested for DUI in 2014 and subsequently convicted of alcohol- or drug-reckless driving indicate that 1,364 of them have a prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless conviction. The court-reported conviction abstracts for these offenders show that 51% of them were ordered to DUI programs when they were granted probation. However, the records of only 52 offenders (3.8%) indicated a 9-month DUI program referral. Since this critical information indicating an assignment to the 9-month DUI program was missing on the records for 96.2% of the repeat alcohol- or drug-reckless offenders, it was not possible to evaluate this program referral for the current report.

### Results of the Evaluation of 3-Month and 9-Month DUI Programs for First DUI Offenders

Total Crashes Figure 9 and Table 14 display the results of the evaluation of the relationship between DUI program length and DUI recidivism and crashes among first DUI offenders ordered to 3-month versus 9-month programs. The results show that the length of time of the DUI program is not significantly associated with 1-year subsequent crash rates of first DUI offenders. First DUI offenders ordered to the 9-month program had a directionally lower crash rate (9.8%) than those ordered to the 3-month program (Table 14), but this difference was not statistically significant. This year's findings are similar to prior years' results that generally did not show significant differences in 1-year subsequent crashes between the two groups.




Figure 9. Adjusted 1-year crash and DUI incident rates for first offender drivers (arrested in 2014) by length of DUI program.

*DUI Incidents* Similar to last year's results, Figure 9 and Table 14 indicate that first DUI offenders ordered to the 3-month program do not have significantly different 1-year subsequent DUI incident rates than DUI offenders ordered to the 9-month program. The reoffense rate of those ordered to the 3-month program is not very different from that of those ordered to the 9-month program, and this difference is not large enough to be statistically significant. In evaluations prior to the last 6 years, results indicated that DUI offenders ordered to the 9-month program had significantly more subsequent DUI incidents than offenders ordered to the 3-month program. That was not surprising given that first DUI offenders ordered to the 9-month program have higher BAC levels (0.20% and above), and would be more likely to recidivate than DUI offenders with lower BAC levels. Therefore, in those prior years, two further subanalyses were conducted to determine whether BAC level was associated with the outcomes of this evaluation. The results of these two subanalyses generally confirmed that first DUI offenders with higher BAC levels (0.20% and above) were more likely to recidivate than those with lower BAC levels. Also, when BAC level is held constant, there were no significant differences in the DUI incident rates between DUI offenders ordered to the 3-month DUI program and those ordered to the 9-month program.

TABLE 14: THE RELATIONSHIP OF 3-MONTH AND 9-MONTH DUI PROGRAMS WITH SUBSEQUENT CRASHES AND DUI INCIDENTS AMONG FIRST DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014

YEAR	SANCTION GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER CRASH-INVOLVED, PER 100 DRIVERS	PERCENTAGE EFFECT (DIFFERENCE IN % RATES) =	
				$\frac{\text{GRP 2} - \text{GRP 1}}{\text{GRP 1}} \times 100$	$\frac{\text{GRP 2} - \text{GRP 1}}{\text{GRP 1}} \times 100$
2014 (FOLLOW-UP PERIOD = 1 YEAR)	3-MONTH PROGRAM (GRP 1)	28,245	3.88	-9.8%	13.7%
	9-MONTH PROGRAM (GRP 2)	8,696	3.50		

Starting 6 years ago, BAC level information has been included in the initial analysis as a covariate so that its effects on the outcome measures (1-year subsequent crashes and DUI incidents) were removed before assessment of the relationship between ordered program length and DUI recidivism among first DUI offenders. When the effect of BAC level on DUI recidivism was removed, the results indicated that being ordered to the extended 9-month DUI program does not appear to be associated with fewer DUI incidents than being ordered to the 3-month program, which is comparable to the findings in prior years.

The effectiveness of increasing the duration of time for DUI intervention programs has also not been supported in the literature. DeYoung examined the effectiveness of lengthening SB 38 alcohol treatment programs from 12 to 18 months for second offenders and found no evidence that the additional 6 months reduced DUI recidivism (DeYoung, 1995).

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



SECTION 5:  
LICENSE SUSPENSION/REVOCAATION  
ACTIONS



## SECTION 5: LICENSE SUSPENSION/REVOCACTION ACTIONS

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

The total count of postconviction suspension/revocation actions has dramatically increased as a result of a law change (SB 1697), effective September 20, 2005, which assigned to DMV sole responsibility for imposing postconviction license actions for all DUI offenders, removing this responsibility from the courts. DMV is also responsible for issuing license restrictions to DUI offenders who meet requirements defined by the law.

This section includes the following tables:

Table 15: Mandatory DUI License Disqualification Actions, 2005-2015. This table shows APS and postconviction license disqualification totals from 2005 through 2015.

Table 16: Administrative Per Se Process Measures. This table presents APS process measures data from 2013 to 2015.

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

- ◆ The total number of DMV APS and DUI postconviction S/R actions decreased by 3.6% in 2015, continuing the trend of 6 consecutive years of decline.
- ◆ In 2015, 130,468 APS license actions were taken. Of these actions, 73.6% were first-offender actions (including “zero tolerance” actions taken for drivers under age 21) and 26.4% were repeat-offender actions (see Table 15).
- ◆ The number of chemical test refusal actions (excluding those later set aside) increased by 1.8% in 2015, after decreasing by 1.4% in 2014. Despite the unusual 2013 increase that followed the 2012 Supreme Court ruling strictly limiting refusal enforcement proceedings, the total numbers of refusal actions have decreased 3.6% since 2005 (see Table 15).
- ◆ Total APS actions (including actions later set aside) decreased by 5.5% in 2015, following a 6.8% decrease in 2014 (see Table 16).
- ◆ APS actions were set aside for 10.4% of all APS actions initiated in 2015, less than 1% (0.9%) increase from 2014. The set-aside rate for 2015 is the highest seen since 2005 (9.6%).
- ◆ Requests for APS hearings remained relatively unchanged from 35.2% in 2014 to 34.2% in 2015. However, the percentage of .08 APS S/R actions set aside after a hearing increased from 7.3% in 2014 to 8.1% in 2015 (see Table 16).
- ◆ Total postconviction S/R actions remained relatively stable, decreasing by only 0.4% in 2015, after having decreased 8.2% in 2014; first offender suspensions increased slightly by 0.9%, while fourth-or-more-offender revocations increased by 7.9% (see Table 15).
- ◆ APS and postconviction S/R action decreases in 2014 and 2015 are consistent with the decline in DUI arrests for the same years.



Table 15: MANDATORY DUI LICENSE DISQUALIFICATION ACTIONS, 2005-2015

DUI license actions	Year										
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total mandatory suspension/revocation (S/R) actions	247568	339796	362859	392319	382111	351802	337700	313870	286981	264833	255357
<b>Preconviction</b>											
Administrative Per Se (APS) Actions	168569	185481	192213	204332	198851	183743	177231	163522	150337	139405	130468
.01 Zero tolerance suspensions	19374	22044	22112	22180	20861	18684	17463	14835	11750	10213	9074
.08 First-offender suspensions	107466	118468	123594	132266	127933	117884	114858	106562	99475	93014	86933
.08 Repeat-offender suspensions	38097	41420	42979	46388	46747	44101	42127	39563	35646	32823	31093
.08 Repeat-offender revocations	3632	3549	3528	3498	3310	3074	2783	2562	3466	3355	3368
Commercial driver actions	3911 <sup>a</sup>	3834 <sup>a</sup>	3862 <sup>a</sup>	4355 <sup>a</sup>	3964 <sup>a</sup>	3614 <sup>a</sup>	3108 <sup>a</sup>	2983 <sup>a</sup>	2782 <sup>a</sup>	2498	2322
Chemical test refusal actions	9599	9315	9581	9390	8737	8275	7520	7069	9214	9089	9257
.01 Test refusal suspensions	364	419	426	433	372	354	279	280	300	286	293
.08 Test refusal suspensions	5603	5347	5627	5459	5055	4847	4458	4227	5448	5448	5596
.08 Test refusal revocations	3632	3549	3528	3498	3310	3074	2783	2562	3466	3355	3368
<b>Postconviction<sup>b</sup></b>											
Total postconviction S/R actions	78999	154315	170646	187987	183260	168059	160469	150348	136644	125428	124889
Juvenile DUI suspensions	737	941	1061	917	482	538	351	312	311	253	246
First-offender suspensions	39078	110525	124436	136480	132709	120254	113749	107035	93897	81845	82570
Misdemeanor	36808	108227	122102	133987	130462	118168	111760	105013	91809	79955	80492
Felony	2270	2298	2334	2493	2247	2086	1989	2022	2088	1890	2078
Second-offender S/R actions	30294	32680	34296	38266	37836	35565	34519	32156	32408	32935	31587
Misdemeanor	29699	32046	33649	37568	37155	34928	33878	31533	31771	32275	30896
Felony	595	634	647	658	681	637	641	623	637	660	691
Third-offender revocations	6720	7649	8063	9164	9187	8905	8918	8083	7665	8239	8160
Misdemeanor	6537	7424	7830	8933	8945	8707	8662	7852	7446	8019	7938
Felony	183	225	233	231	242	198	256	231	219	220	222
Fourth-or-more-offender revocations	2170	2520	2790	3200	3046	2797	2932	2762	2363	2156	2326

<sup>a</sup>Previous counts have been adjusted to include commercial driver APS actions not previously identified as such.

<sup>b</sup>These totals might include multiple license action activities associated with the same event. Total counts for years 2006 and later increased as a result of a law change, effective 09/20/2005. This law assigned to DMV the sole responsibility for imposing license actions for all DUIs and removed this responsibility from the courts.

TABLE 16: ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE PROCESS MEASURES

	2013	2014	2015
<b>Total APS actions initiated (including actions later set aside):</b>	165,302	154,107	145,663
Total .08 <sup>a</sup> APS actions set aside	14,147	13,814	14,235
Total .01 <sup>b</sup> suspensions set aside	818	888	960
Net total APS actions taken (excluding actions later set aside)	150,337	139,405	130,468
Net total .08 APS actions	138,587	129,192	121,394
Net total .01 actions	11,750	10,213	9,074
<b>Net APS Actions by Offender Status/License Classification:<sup>c</sup></b>			
Net total APS actions, noncommercial drivers <sup>d</sup>	147,555	136,907	128,146
Net total commercial driver (CDL) APS actions taken <sup>d</sup>	2,782	2,498	2,322
Net total actions of commercial drivers in commercial vehicles	96	81	70
Net APS .08 actions for drivers with no priors <sup>e</sup>	99,475	93,014	86,933
4-month license suspensions	68,953	62,574	60,431
Non-CDL 30-day suspensions plus 5-month COE <sup>f</sup> restrictions	23,219	23,317	19,400
First-offender chemical test refusals	5,448	5,448	5,596
CDL first offender suspensions/restrictions	1,855	1,675	1,506
Net APS .08 actions taken for drivers with priors	39,112	36,178	34,461
Suspensions	35,646	32,823	31,093
Revocations	3,466	3,355	3,368
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Process Measures:</b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions initiated (including actions later set aside)	9,615	9,553	9,614
Total .08 refusal actions set aside	388	444	339
Total .01 refusal actions set aside	13	20	18
Net total .08 and .01 APS refusal actions (excluding actions later set aside)	9,214	9,089	9,257
Net total .08 refusal actions	8,914	8,803	8,964
Net total .01 refusal actions	300	286	293
Chemical test refusal rate (including actions later set aside)	5.8%	6.2%	6.6%
Net .08 APS refusal (suspension) actions for subjects with no priors <sup>g</sup>	5,448	5,448	5,596
Net .08 APS refusal (revocation) actions for subjects with priors	3,466	3,355	3,368
<b>APS Hearings:<sup>h,i</sup></b>			
Total .08 and .01 in person or telephone APS hearings scheduled	57,791	54,212	49,757
Percentage of total APS actions resulting in a scheduled hearing <sup>j</sup>	35.0%	35.2%	34.2%
.08 hearings held and/or completed	54,301	51,068	47,113
.08 actions set aside following hearings	4,645	3,734	3,828
Percentage of .08 APS actions set aside following hearings	8.6%	7.3%	8.1%
.01 hearings held and/or completed	3,310	2,903	2,506
.01 actions set aside following hearings	291	233	206
Percentage of .01 APS actions set aside following hearings	8.8%	8.0%	8.2%
<b>APS Chemical Test Refusal Hearings:<sup>i</sup></b>			
Total .08 and .01 APS refusal hearings scheduled	3,558	3,926	3,797
.08 APS refusal hearings held and/or completed	3,473	3,814	3,702
.08 APS refusal actions set aside following hearings	295	335	293

<sup>a</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>b</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>c</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>d</sup>Previous counts for 2013 have been adjusted to include commercial driver APS actions not previously identified as such.

<sup>e</sup>Priors for these APS actions are defined in CVC 13353.3.

<sup>f</sup>This restriction allows driving to, from, and during the course of employment (COE, enacted 1/1/95), and to and from DUI program.

<sup>g</sup>Defined in CVC 13353.

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

<sup>i</sup>Figures for 2013 hearings have been revised to reflect changes in how set asides are entered on records, so what is presented here may differ from what was presented in the 2015 report.

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

SECTION 6:  
DRIVERS IN CRASHES INVOLVING  
ALCOHOL AND DRUGS



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

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

Table 17: DUI Arrests Associated with Reported Crashes, 2004-2014. This table shows the number and percentage of DUI arrests associated with reported crashes from 2004-2014.

Table 18: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Race/Ethnicity and Impairment Type. This table shows the law enforcement officer's determination of impairment type and race/ethnicity for 2014 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes.

Table 19: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Adjudication Status and Impairment Type. This table cross tabulates crash-involved drivers' impairment type (from law enforcement crash reports) with the court disposition for 2014 DUI convictions associated with those crash involvements.

Table 20: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by County and Impairment Type. This table shows the number of alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes, by county and impairment type.

Table 21: Alcohol-Involved Drivers Under Age 21 in Fatal/Injury Crashes, 2004-2014. This table shows the total number of alcohol-involved drivers under age 21 in fatal/injury crashes in California. It also shows their percentage of the total count of alcohol-involved drivers in the state over the same time period.

Table 22a: 2014 Alcohol-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Gender. This table shows the total number of 2014 alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by age and gender.

---

<sup>1</sup>Among 2014 DUI arrestees, 23,649 (15.3%) were involved in a reported traffic crash; 9,302 of the crashes included an injury or fatality, and 14,347 involved property damage only.

Table 22b: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Age and Gender (Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). This table shows the number of 2014 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by age and gender who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash.

Tables 23a-23b: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Impairment Type and Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2014 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by impairment type and prior DUI conviction status, both total (23a) and for drivers who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash (23b).

Tables 24a-24b: 2014 Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes by Prior DUI Convictions (Total and Neither Suspended Upon Arrest nor Convicted). These two tables show the number of 2014 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes by number of prior DUI convictions, both total (24a) and for drivers who were not suspended upon arrest or convicted in conjunction with the crash (24b).

Table 25: 2014 Reported Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Levels of Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Drivers in Fatal/Injury Crashes. This table shows the mean, median, and frequency distribution of BAC levels for alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes in 2014.

Figure 10: Percentages of Crash Injuries and Fatalities that were Alcohol-Involved, 2005-2015. Figure 10 (opposite page) shows the annual percentages of crash injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved from 2005 to 2015. The numerical data for this graph are shown on the DUI Summary Statistics sheet at the beginning of this report.

Figure 11: Alcohol- and Drug-Involved Crash Fatalities, 1995-2015. Figure 11 (opposite page) shows numbers of alcohol- and drug-involved crash fatalities from 1995 to 2015. It also shows a breakdown of the number of fatalities when only alcohol was known to be involved, when only drugs were involved, or when both alcohol and drugs were involved in the fatality.




Figure 10. Percentages of crash injuries and fatalities that were alcohol-involved, 2005-2015.

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

- ◆ The percentage of alcohol-involved crash fatalities declined from 36.9% in 2014 to 33.3% in 2015 (see Figure 10).
- ◆ The percentage of alcohol-involved crash injuries decreased from 10.4% in 2013 and 2014 to 9.9% in 2015 (see Figure 10 and DUI Summary Statistics).
- ◆ The total number of alcohol- and/or drug-involved crash fatalities increased by 0.6% in 2015, following a decrease of 3.8% in 2014. The greatest proportion of these crash fatalities remains alcohol-related (see Figure 11).
- ◆ While the number of alcohol-involved fatalities declined by 15% over the past 20 years, the number of drug-involved fatalities increased by 212% over the same time period. Some of the increase in the number of fatalities reported as drug-involved over this time period may be, in part, associated with an increase in training and ability of California law enforcement to detect and report drug involvement in fatal crashes in recent years (see Figure 11).
- ◆ Of all 2014 DUI arrests, 15.3% were associated with a reported traffic crash, compared to 14.4% in 2013. 6.0% of DUI arrests were associated with crashes involving injuries or fatalities, slightly higher than 5.6% in 2013 (see Table 17).




Figure 11. Alcohol- and drug-involved crash fatalities, 1995-2015



- ◆ The percentage of alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes under the age of 21 decreased from 11.3% in 2004 to 8.2% in 2014 (see Table 21).
- ◆ Among drivers in fatal/injury crashes in 2014 with reported involvement of alcohol and/or drugs, alcohol-related impairment (of different levels) were determined and reported by law enforcement for about 90% of these drivers, while drug-involvement was reported for slightly over 10% of them (see Table 18).
- ◆ Among the 2014 alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes in the larger counties, the percentage of drivers with drug-related impairment varied from 7.7% in Santa Clara to 16.4% in Riverside (see Table 20). Among the smaller counties with more than 10 of such drivers, the reported percentage of drivers with drug-involved impairment was around 20% or above: Tehama (31.8), Del Norte (25.1), Sutter (20.7), Tulare (19.9), Tuolumne (19.6), and El Dorado (19.6).
- ◆ Among alcohol- and drug-involved drivers, 43.9% do not have a record of any conviction in connection with their involvement in a fatal/injury crash. In 42.2% (3,107/7,358) of these non-convicted cases, the crash report indicated that the drivers had been drinking and that their ability was impaired (see Table 19).
- ◆ The majority of drug-involved as well as drug- and alcohol-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes are not convicted for DUI associated with the crash and do not have either prior DUI or alcohol- and drug-related reckless driving convictions within 10 years indicated on their records (see Tables 19 and 23a).
- ◆ Over three-fourths (77.5%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved fatal crashes had no prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction (see Table 24a). In contrast, almost two-thirds (61.5%) of drivers in alcohol- and drug-involved injury crashes had at least one prior DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction.
- ◆ The average (mean) BAC level of alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes increased from 0.16% BAC in 2013 to 0.17% BAC in 2014 (see Table 25).

TABLE 17: DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED CRASHES, 2004-2014<sup>a</sup>

ARRESTS/ CRASHES	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
TOTAL DUI ARRESTS	180957	180288	197248	203866	214811	208531	195879	180212	172893	160388	154743
DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH CRASHES	14.8%	15.8%	15.5%	15.3%	14.2%	13.4%	12.6%	13.0%	13.8%	14.4%	15.3%
DUI ARRESTS ASSOCIATED WITH FATAL/ INJURY CRASHES	6.2%	6.6%	6.3%	6.1%	5.5%	5.2%	4.8%	5.0%	5.4%	5.6%	6.0%

<sup>a</sup>These data include DUI arrest cases where the driver license was found in the DMV database and whose DUI arrest date matched the crash involvement date found on their driver record.

Table 18: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE<sup>a</sup>

ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS		TOTAL		RACE/ETHNICITY									
				WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER		UNKNOWN	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL		18325	100.0	7180	39.2	7296	39.8	1447	7.9	1365	7.4	1037	5.7
IMPAIRMENT TYPE	ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	12382	67.6	4730	38.2	5492	44.4	943	7.6	869	7.0	348	2.8
	NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	1421	7.8	336	23.6	395	27.8	106	7.5	82	5.8	502	35.3
	NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2392	13.1	949	39.7	840	35.1	232	9.7	261	10.9	110	4.6
	DRUG- AND ALCOHOL- INVOLVED (ALL LEVELS)	471 <sup>b</sup>	2.6	217	46.1	175	37.2	34	7.2	37	7.9	8	1.7
	DRUG-INVOLVED	1659	9.1	948	57.1	394	23.7	132	8.0	116	7.0	69	4.2

<sup>a</sup> For each impairment type, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2014 California Highway Patrol data files.

<sup>b</sup> 86.6% (408) of the drivers who were alcohol- and drug-involved were alcohol impaired (BAC .08% and above).

Table 19: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY ADJUDICATION STATUS AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE<sup>a</sup>

ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS		TOTAL		TYPE OF CONVICTION											
				MISDEMEANOR DUI		FELONY DUI		ALCOHOL- RECKLESS		YOUTH DUI		OTHER CONVICTION		NO RECORD OF ANY CONVICTIONS	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL		16776	100.0	6912	41.2	2004	11.9	494	2.9	0	0.0	8	0.1	7358	43.9
IMPAIRMENT TYPE	ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	11739	70.0	6416	54.7	1811	15.4	405	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3107	26.5
	NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	760	4.5	65	8.6	15	2.0	5	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.1	674	88.7
	NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2243	13.4	16	0.7	6	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2221	99.0
	DRUG- AND ALCOHOL- INVOLVED (ALL LEVELS)	454 <sup>b</sup>	2.7	72	15.9	48	10.6	13	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.2	320	70.5
	DRUG-INVOLVED	1580	9.4	343	21.7	124	7.8	71	4.5	0	0.0	6	0.4	1036	65.6

<sup>a</sup> For each impairment type, percentages are based on row totals. These data are derived from the 2014 California Highway Patrol data files, and include only cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.

<sup>b</sup> 87.0% (395) of the drivers who were alcohol- and drug-involved were alcohol impaired (BAC .08% and above).

TABLE 20: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY COUNTY AND IMPAIRMENT TYPE<sup>a</sup>

COUNTY	TOTAL	IMPAIRMENT TYPE					
		ALCOHOL INVOLVED		DRUG- AND ALCOHOL-INVOLVED		DRUG-INVOLVED	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE	16776	14742	87.9	454	2.7	1580	9.4
ALAMEDA	551	497	90.2	9	1.6	45	8.2
ALPINE	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AMADOR	31	29	93.5	0	0.0	2	6.5
BUTTE	127	109	85.8	5	3.9	13	10.2
CALAVERAS	52	47	90.4	3	5.8	2	3.8
COLUSA	22	20	90.9	1	4.5	1	4.5
CONTRA COSTA	313	279	89.1	11	3.5	23	7.3
DEL NORTE	16	12	75.0	1	6.3	3	18.8
EL DORADO	153	123	80.4	5	3.3	25	16.3
FRESNO	407	348	85.5	12	2.9	47	11.5
GLENN	14	13	92.9	0	0.0	1	7.1
HUMBOLDT	135	109	80.7	3	2.2	23	17.0
IMPERIAL	59	53	89.8	3	5.1	3	5.1
INYO	17	14	82.4	1	5.9	2	11.8
KERN	395	338	85.6	11	2.8	46	11.6
KINGS	62	53	85.5	3	4.8	6	9.7
LAKE	48	42	87.5	2	4.2	4	8.3
LASSEN	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7
LOS ANGELES	4328	3932	90.9	77	1.8	319	7.4
MADERA	96	87	90.6	2	2.1	7	7.3
MARIN	100	85	85.0	3	3.0	12	12.0
MARIPOSA	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0.0
MENDOCINO	70	57	81.4	4	5.7	9	12.9
MERCED	128	109	85.2	5	3.9	14	10.9
MODOC	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MONO	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
MONTEREY	209	180	86.1	5	2.4	24	11.5
NAPA	115	103	89.6	4	3.5	8	7.0
NEVADA	69	61	88.4	2	2.9	6	8.7
ORANGE	1303	1123	86.2	37	2.8	143	11.0
PLACER	104	87	83.7	1	1.0	16	15.4
PLUMAS	36	31	86.1	3	8.3	2	5.6
RIVERSIDE	759	634	83.5	45	5.9	80	10.5
SACRAMENTO	753	637	84.6	22	2.9	94	12.5
SAN BENITO	65	57	87.7	2	3.1	6	9.2
SAN BERNARDINO	1235	1068	86.5	37	3.0	130	10.5
SAN DIEGO	1460	1330	91.1	26	1.8	104	7.1
SAN FRANCISCO	257	233	90.7	7	2.7	17	6.6
SAN JOAQUIN	286	235	82.2	12	4.2	39	13.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	174	146	83.9	8	4.6	20	11.5
SAN MATEO	208	192	92.3	5	2.4	11	5.3
SANTA BARBARA	219	195	89.0	9	4.1	15	6.8
SANTA CLARA	626	578	92.3	16	2.6	32	5.1
SANTA CRUZ	141	123	87.2	3	2.1	15	10.6
SHASTA	139	118	84.9	2	1.4	19	13.7
SIERRA	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SISKIYOU	30	28	93.3	0	0.0	2	6.7
SOLANO	198	174	87.9	5	2.5	19	9.6
SONOMA	250	214	85.6	7	2.8	29	11.6
STANISLAUS	227	203	89.4	7	3.1	17	7.5
SUTTER	82	65	79.3	2	2.4	15	18.3
TEHAMA	41	28	68.3	4	9.8	9	22.0
TRINITY	21	17	81.0	2	9.5	2	9.5
TULARE	201	161	80.1	4	2.0	36	17.9
TUOLUMNE	51	41	80.4	0	0.0	10	19.6
VENTURA	281	228	81.1	12	4.3	41	14.6
YOLO	85	74	87.1	2	2.4	9	10.6
YUBA	2	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from the 2014 California Highway Patrol data files and include only cases where the driver record was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 21: ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS UNDER AGE 21 IN FATAL/INJURY  
CRASHES, 2004-2014<sup>a</sup>

AGE		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
TOTAL ALL AGES)	N	20847	20818	21031	21045	19604	17874	16501	16231	16325	15892	16633
UNDER 18	N	409	351	344	369	316	239	233	190	199	174	150
	%	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.9
18-20	N	1943	1946	2226	2171	1901	1831	1641	1569	1379	1201	1214
	%	9.3	9.4	10.6	10.3	9.7	10.2	9.9	9.7	8.4	8.4	7.3
UNDER 21	N	2352	2297	2570	2540	2217	2070	1874	1759	1578	1375	1364
	%	11.3	11.0	12.2	12.1	11.3	11.6	11.4	10.8	9.7	8.7	8.2

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from the 2014 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 22a: 2014 ALCOHOL-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY  
AGE AND GENDER<sup>a</sup>

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	16633	100.0	12454	74.9	4179	25.1
UNDER 18	150	0.9	112	74.7	38	25.3
18-20	1214	7.3	895	73.7	319	26.3
21-30	6824	41.0	4991	73.1	1833	26.9
31-40	3228	19.4	2395	74.2	833	25.8
41-50	2096	12.6	1585	75.6	511	24.4
51-59	1474	8.9	1109	75.2	365	24.8
60-69	727	4.4	583	80.2	144	19.8
70 & ABOVE	252	1.5	183	72.6	69	27.4
AGE UNKNOWN	668	4.0	601	90.0	67	10.0

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from the 2014 California Highway Patrol's Annual Report of Fatal and Injury Motor Vehicle Traffic Collisions.

TABLE 22b: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY  
CRASHES BY AGE AND GENDER (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR  
CONVICTED)<sup>a</sup>

AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	4765	100.0	3532	74.1	1233	25.9
UNDER 18	67	1.4	61	91.0	6	9.0
18-20	325	6.8	249	76.6	76	23.4
21-30	1778	37.3	1342	75.5	436	24.5
31-40	974	20.4	716	73.5	258	26.5
41-50	664	13.9	484	72.9	180	27.1
51-59	493	10.3	348	70.6	145	29.4
60-69	303	6.4	221	72.9	82	27.1
70 & ABOVE	161	3.4	111	68.9	50	31.1

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from California Highway Patrol data files and include only cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 23a: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS<sup>a</sup>

ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS		TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS							
						ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
						N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL		16776	100.0	6920	41.2	7505	44.7	1832	10.9	405	2.4	114	0.7
IMPAIRMENT TYPE	ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	11739	70.0	3053	26.0	6605	56.3	1617	13.8	366	3.1	98	0.8
	NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	760	4.5	579	76.2	140	18.4	31	4.1	7	0.9	3	0.4
	NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2243	13.4	2034	90.7	171	7.6	32	1.4	5	0.2	1	0.0
	DRUG- AND ALCOHOL- INVOLVED (ALL LEVELS)	454	2.7	274	60.4	137	30.2	39	8.6	2	0.4	2	0.4
	DRUG-INVOLVED	1580	9.4	980	62.0	452	28.6	113	7.2	25	1.6	10	0.6

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from California Highway Patrol data files and include only those cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.

TABLE 23b: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY IMPAIRMENT TYPE AND PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED)<sup>a</sup>

ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS		TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS							
						ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
						N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL		4765	100.0	4151	87.1	490	10.3	102	2.1	18	0.4	4	0.1
IMPAIRMENT TYPE	ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .08% & ABOVE)	994	20.9	794	79.9	156	15.7	36	3.6	7	0.7	1	0.1
	NOT KNOWN IF ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .05%-.079%)	642	13.5	546	85.0	76	11.8	16	2.5	3	0.5	1	0.2
	NOT ALCOHOL IMPAIRED (BAC .01%-.049%)	2158	45.3	1975	91.5	153	7.1	25	1.2	4	0.2	1	0.0
	DRUG- AND ALCOHOL- INVOLVED (ALL LEVELS)	232	4.9	190	81.9	33	14.2	9	3.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	DRUG-INVOLVED	739	15.5	646	87.4	72	9.7	16	2.2	4	0.5	1	0.1

<sup>a</sup>These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

TABLE 24a: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS<sup>a</sup>

DRIVERS INVOLVED IN CRASHES	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
TOTAL	16776	100.0	6920	41.2	7505	44.7	1832	10.9	405	2.4	114	0.7
WITH FATALITIES	1183 <sup>b</sup>	7.1	917	77.5	225	19.0	35	3.0	4	0.3	2	0.2
WITH INJURIES	15593	92.9	6003	38.5	7280	46.7	1797	11.5	401	2.6	112	0.7

<sup>a</sup>These data are derived from California Highway Patrol data files and include only those cases where the driver license was found in the DMV Master file.

<sup>b</sup>The records of 67.2% (795) of these cases indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 24b: 2014 ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES BY PRIOR DUI CONVICTIONS (NEITHER SUSPENDED UPON ARREST NOR CONVICTED)<sup>a</sup>

DRIVERS INVOLVED IN CRASHES	TOTAL		NO DUI PRIORS		PRIORS IN TEN YEARS							
					ONE PRIOR		TWO PRIORS		THREE PRIORS		FOUR + PRIORS	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
TOTAL	4765	100.0	4151	87.1	490	10.3	102	2.1	18	0.4	4	0.1
WITH FATALITIES	954 <sup>b</sup>	20.0	806	84.5	119	12.5	27	2.8	1	0.1	1	0.1
WITH INJURIES	3811	80.0	3345	87.8	371	9.7	75	2.0	17	0.4	3	0.1

<sup>a</sup>These figures are a subset of the counts in the table above.

<sup>b</sup>The records of 82.2% (784) of these cases indicated they were deceased.

TABLE 25: 2014 REPORTED<sup>a</sup> BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BAC) LEVELS OF ALCOHOL- AND DRUG- INVOLVED DRIVERS IN FATAL/INJURY CRASHES

BAC LEVEL (%)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
.00	458	4.4
.01	35	0.3
.02	48	0.5
.03	54	0.5
.04	65	0.6
.05	102	1.0
.06	151	1.5
.07	187	1.8
.08	297	2.9
.09	391	3.8
.10	404	3.9
.11	495	4.8
.12	507	4.9
.13	562	5.4
.14	612	5.9
.15	610	5.9
.16	596	5.8
.17	626	6.0
.18	584	5.6
.19	531	5.1
.20	484	4.7
.21	456	4.4
.22	388	3.7
.23	340	3.3
.24	295	2.8
.25	220	2.1
.26	187	1.8
.27	124	1.2
.28	112	1.1
.29	96	0.9
.30	76	0.7
.31	57	0.6
.32	53	0.5
.33	45	0.4
.34	30	0.3
.35	27	0.3
.36	18	0.2
.37	10	0.1
.38	13	0.1
.39	8	0.1
.40	5	0.1
.41	3	0.0
.42	1	0.0
.43	3	0.0
.44	2	0.0
.45	1	0.0
.47	2	0.0
.50	1	0.0
	-----	-----
TOTAL	10372	100.0
	MEAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .17	
	MEDIAN <sup>b</sup> BAC .16	

<sup>a</sup>The BAC data are obtained from the DMV driver record database for initiated APS license actions associated with alcohol- and drug-involved drivers in fatal/injury crashes (60.0% of the records showed BAC levels).

<sup>b</sup>The calculation of the mean and median BAC level does not include zero BAC levels which may relate to drug-involved drivers.



---

## REFERENCES

- Automobile Club of Southern California, California Highway Patrol, California State Automobile Association, & Department of Motor Vehicles. (2016). *Digest of Traffic Legislation*. Sacramento: Authors.
- California Highway Patrol. (n.d.). *2013 annual report of fatal and injury motor vehicle traffic collisions*. Retrieved March 3, 2016, from <http://www.chp.ca.gov/switrs/index.html>
- DeYoung, D. J. (1995). *An evaluation of the effectiveness of California drinking driver programs* (Report No. 146). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Guenzburger, G. V., & Atkinson, D. B. (2012). *Differences between jail sentences and jail terms actually served among DUI offenders in selected Californian counties* (Report No. 239). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Helander, C. J. (1989). *Development of a California DUI management information system* (Report No. 121). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S., & Tashima, H. N. (2009). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 228). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S., & Tashima, H. N. (2010). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 231). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S., & Tashima, H. N. (2011). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 233). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S., & Tashima, H. N. (2012). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 236). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.

- Oulad Daoud, S., & Tashima, H. N. (2013). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 243). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S. (2014). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 246). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Oulad Daoud, S., Tashima, H. N., & Grippe, R. (2015). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 250). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- 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.
- 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: 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 CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2006). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 220). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2007). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 222). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2008). *Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 224). Sacramento CA: California Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Tashima, H. N., & Oulad Daoud, S. (2018). *2016 Annual report of the California DUI management information system. Annual report to the Legislature of the State of California* (Report No. 256). Sacramento CA: 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.

# APPENDICES



**APPENDIX A****HISTORY OF MAJOR DUI LAWS IN CALIFORNIA SINCE 1975**

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

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

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

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

AB 2020 (Pan), effective 1/1/2013, removes the option to choose a urine test to determine the drug

content level for a person lawfully arrested for driving under the influence of drugs or the combination of alcohol and drugs. The bill specifies that the person's only options are a blood or breath test. A person consents to a urine test if a blood test is unavailable or if the person is exempted from a blood test for medical reasons.

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

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

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

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

SB 598 (Huff), effective 7/01/2010, requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to advise second and third offenders convicted of misdemeanor DUI (alcohol only), of the option of obtaining a restricted driver's license after completing a 90-day suspension period for a second



misdemeanor DUI, or a 6-month suspension period for a third misdemeanor DUI. The issuance of a restricted driver's license is subject to certain conditions, among which are the installation and maintenance of an ignition interlock device (IID) in any vehicle that the offender owns or operates, and enrollment in a DUI program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AB 2559 (Benoit), effective 1/1/2007, reorganizes the section of the Penal Code 192(c)(3) related

to gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, to include the offense where the intoxication was a contributing factor in the killing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AB 1353 (Liu), effective 9/20/2005, increases the duration of DUI programs from 6 to 9 months

(consisting of at least 60 hours of program activities) for first DUI offenders, who are granted probation, and whose blood alcohol content (BAC) is 0.20% or greater, or who refuse to take a chemical test.

SB 1694 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2005, increases the time period from 7 to 10 years during which convictions considered as prior for DUI will be counted for enhanced penalties (includes DUI convictions of persons under age 21). This law also requires the court to order a person convicted of a prior DUI to complete a DUI program, even though that prior conviction occurred more than 10 years ago, and authorizes the court to order the person to complete a repeat offender DUI program. Finally, it expands court-ordered participation in a county alcohol/drug assessment program to all persons convicted of a repeat DUI offense within 10 years of a prior offense.

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

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

SB 408 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2004, prohibits the DMV (for cases showing a "critical need to drive") from issuing a restricted drivers license to minors convicted of DUI with a BAC of 0.01% or greater if the minor has other zero tolerance or DUI convictions within 7 years of the current violation.

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

AB 803 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/2001, requires the court to order a person who is at least 18 years of age who is convicted of a first violation of DUI with a BAC of 0.05% or more, to attend the educational component of a licensed DUI program. Upon a second or subsequent conviction, the court is required to order the person, in addition to other penalties, to attend a

30-hour DUI program. If the person's license is suspended, the DMV cannot reinstate the driving privilege until the person provides proof of having completed the program as specified.

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

AB 762 (Torlakson), effective 7/1/1999, extends the suspension period for a second DUI offender from 18 months to 2 years, but allows the second offender to serve 12 months of the license suspension period, followed by a restricted license, with continued enrollment in a DUI program and installation of an ignition interlock device. It also requires persons convicted of driving with a suspended or revoked license, where that suspension or revocation was based on prior DUI convictions, to install the ignition interlock device for a period not to exceed 3 years or until the driving privilege is reinstated, and requires DMV to study and report on the effectiveness of these devices. Judges are also encouraged to order installation of an ignition interlock device for first-time DUI offenders if there are aggravating factors such as high blood alcohol readings (0.20% or above), chemical test refusal, numerous traffic violations, or injury crashes. This law requires that upon a first DUI conviction, if a court grants probation, 1) the person's driving privilege shall be suspended for 6 months by the DMV, in addition to other penalties, or 2) the person may operate a motor vehicle restricted for 90 days, to and from work and DUI program, if the person establishes proof of financial responsibility and complies with other penalties and fees.

SB 24 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/1999, cleans up AB 762, AB 1916, and SB 1186. This law requires the DMV to revoke for 1 year the driving privilege of any ignition interlock device-restricted driver who is convicted of driving a vehicle not equipped with an ignition interlock device (IID) under CVC Section 23247(g); requires the department to suspend or revoke the driving privilege of any IID-restricted driver [under Section 23575(g)] if notified by an installation facility that the driver attempted to bypass, tamper with, or remove the device, or has three or more times failed to comply with calibration or servicing requirements of the device; amends certain CVC sections to specify that completion of a DUI program equals enrollment, participation, and completion subsequent to the date of the current violation.

SB 1186 (Committee on Public Safety), effective 7/1/1999, reorganizes specified provisions relating to DUI-related statutes by amending, repealing, and/or renumbering the DUI-related sections without making substantive changes to the statutes.

SB 1176 (Johnson), effective 1/1/1999, requires that, upon a conviction of an alcohol-related reckless driving charge, the courts order enrollment in an alcohol and drug education program as a condition of probation. This bill also requires an evaluation by the DMV of the effectiveness of the program and a discussion of the findings in its annual report to the Legislature.

SB 1890 (Hurt), effective 1/1/1999, deletes the choice of the urine test from the options for chemical tests relating to operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, unless both the blood and breath tests are unavailable or where there is a condition that warrants the use of the urine test.

AB 1916 (Torlakson), effective 1/1/1999, provides that the court shall, as a condition of probation, order a first offender whose BAC level is less than 0.20%, by weight, to participate for at least 3 months (minimum 30 hours) or longer in a licensed education/counseling program; if the BAC level is equal to 0.20% or more, by weight, or the person refused to take a chemical test, the court shall order the person to participate for at least 6 months or longer in a program consisting of 45 hours of education/counseling activities; requires the DMV to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the efficacy of the increased drug and alcohol intervention programs; requires repeat offenders who have twice failed the programs to participate in a county alcohol and drug problem assessment program, and requires each county, beginning 1/1/2000, to prepare, or contract to be prepared, an alcohol and drug assessment report on each person ordered by the court to participate in an alcohol and drug assessment program.

AB 130 (Battin), effective 1/1/1998, requires that any person guilty of a felony or misdemeanor DUI within 10 years of a prior felony offense be designated as a habitual traffic offender for a 3-year period and have their driver license revoked for 4 years.

SB 1177 (Johnson), effective 1/1/1998, requires that anyone convicted of a second or subsequent DUI within 7 years of a separate DUI, alcohol-related reckless driving, or DUI with bodily injury violation, be ordered to enroll, participate in, and complete a DUI treatment program, subject to the latest violation, as a condition of probation. The person is not to be given credit or any treatment program activities prior to the date of the current violation.

AB 1985 (Speier), effective 1/1/1997, cited as “Courtney’s Law”; provides that a person convicted of gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated and who has one or more prior convictions of vehicular manslaughter or multiple prior DUI convictions shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a term of 15 years to life. Also, any person fleeing the scene of a crime after committing specified vehicle offenses which resulted in death, serious injury, or great bodily injury is subject to an additional 5-year prison enhancement.

SB 1579 (Leonard), effective 1/1/1997, permits DMV to suspend a driver license on a first Failure to Appear (FTA) for DUI, and establishes an enhanced audit and tracking system to compare DUI arrests with subsequent actions.

SB 833 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1996, permits peace officers to seize and cause the removal of a vehicle, without arresting the driver, when the vehicle was being operated by a person whose driving privilege was suspended or revoked or who had never been issued a license; requires an impounding agency to send a notice by certified, return receipt requested mail, to the legal owner of a vehicle that is impounded, and specifies under what conditions an impounded vehicle may be released to the legal owner.

AB 3148 (Katz), effective 6/30/1995, prescribes procedures for the forfeiture of a motor vehicle if the driver of the vehicle has a prior conviction for driving while unlicensed or suspended/revoked, and if the driver is the registered owner of the vehicle.

AB 321 (Connolly), effective 1/1/1995, allows juveniles cited for driving under the influence, with a BAC of 0.05% or more, by weight (Section 23140), to be charged with vehicular manslaughter (Penal Code (PC) 192) or gross vehicular manslaughter (PC 191.5) if they violate these laws.

SB 1295 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1995, requires every person convicted of a first DUI offense to submit proof of completion of a treatment program within a time period set by the department; requires the department to suspend the driving privilege for noncompliance, prohibits reinstatement until proof of completion is received by the department; enhances the required administrative driving privilege revocation for a minor who refuses to take or fails to complete a preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test, to 2 years revocation for the second offense in 7 years and 3 years revocation for the third and subsequent offenses; applies the CVC Section 23140 to drivers under age 21 (previously under age 18), making it unlawful to drive with a 0.05% BAC level or greater.

SB 1758 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1995, permits a noncommercial driver, 21 years of age or older, who was arrested for a first APS DUI offense, who took a chemical test, and enrolled in an alcohol treatment program, to also obtain a restricted driver license, valid for driving to and from and during the course of that person's employment, after serving 30 days of the suspension period. The total time period for suspension/restriction shall be 6 months, rather than 4 months. Suspended/revoked and unlicensed drivers who drive are subject to having their vehicles towed and impounded for 30 days.

AB 2639 (Friedman), effective 9/30/1994, repeals the statutes which authorized discretionary IID orders (CVC 23235), although part of the repealed statutes were incorporated into the sections establishing mandatory orders (CVC 23246 et seq.). Previously, the discretionary IID orders applied to all DUI offenders, but now they apply only to first DUI offenders. For third and subsequent offenders, the statutes are amended to clarify that the court must require proof of installation of the device before issuing an order granting a restricted license. Some of the exemptions to the IID orders were revised.

SB 126 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1994, amends CVC 23161 to provide that if the court orders a 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 APS suspension; as part of the sentencing of repeat DUI offenders, CVC 23161 requires an ignition interlock device to remain on the vehicle for 1 to 3 years after restoration of the driving privilege; specifies that the person cannot operate a motor vehicle when the driving privilege is suspended or revoked even if the vehicle is equipped with an ignition interlock device; requires second offenders who have been suspended for 18 months to provide proof of financial responsibility and proof of successful completion of an alcohol or drug program in order to reinstate their license privilege, includes violation of CVC 23140 for administrative suspension for minors driving with 0.05% BAC or greater.

SB 689 (Kopp), effective 1/1/1994, prohibits a person under 21 years of age from driving with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, as measured by a PAS test; violators receive a 1-year license suspension. A person under the age of 21 who refuses the PAS test will be suspended for 1 year.

AB 2851 (Friedman), effective 7/1/1993, requires anyone convicted of a second DUI within 7 years of a prior conviction to install an IID on all their vehicles. The device must be maintained for a period of 1 to 3 years. Proof of installation must be provided to the court or probation

officer within 30 days of conviction. If proof is not provided, the DMV will revoke the license for 1 year. Exceptions to installing a device are for medical problems, use of vehicle in emergencies, and driving the employer's vehicle during employment.

AB 3580 (Farr), effective 7/1/1993, changes the effective date of APS suspension from 45 to 30 days after the notice is given.

SB 1600 (Bergeson), effective 9/26/1992, provides that DMV is required to suspend or revoke the driver's licenses of those who drop out of an alcohol treatment program a second time.

AB 37 (Katz), effective 1/1/1992, combines elements of the formal and informal review hearing into a single hearing for those who were suspended under the APS laws, and provides that DMV need not stay a suspension or revocation pending review, if the hearing followed APS suspension or revocation for refusing a chemical test for alcohol or for driving with a BAC of 0.08% or more.

SB 185 (Thompson), effective 1/1/1992, amends CVC Section 14602 to authorize the court to order the motor vehicle impounded for up to 6 months for a first conviction, and up to 12 months for a second or subsequent conviction of any of the following offenses: driving with a suspended or revoked license, violation of CVC 2800.2 or 2800.3 (evading a peace officer in a reckless manner, causing injury or death), within 7 years of a violation of CVC Sections 23103, 23152, 23153, or Penal Code Sections 191.5 or 192(c).

AB 2040 (Farr), effective 9/28/1990, repeals previous statutes authorizing the installation of ignition interlock devices in DUI cases. This statute authorizes the installation of such devices in all DUI cases and permits the court to grant subjects revoked for three-or-more DUI-related violations a restricted license after 24 months of the revocation period have passed. The restricted license is conditioned on satisfactory completion of 18 months of an alcohol treatment program, submission of proof of financial responsibility, and agreement to have an ignition interlock device installed in their vehicles. Courts are authorized to reduce the minimum DUI fine to allow the person to pay the costs of the device.

SB 1150 (Lockyer), effective 7/26/1990, provides clean-up legislation for APS; lowers the BAC level from 0.10% to 0.08%, requires proof of financial responsibility to reinstate from any APS suspension or revocation action, increases sanctions for implied consent refusals (1-year license suspension for no priors or APS actions, 2-year license revocation for one prior or APS



action, and 3-year revocation for two or more prior DUI offenses or APS actions), and authorizes suspension or revocation actions taken under CVC Sections 13353 and 13353.2 to be considered as priors.

SB 1623 (Lockyer), effective 7/1/1990, establishes authority for a peace officer to serve a notice of suspension or revocation (administrative per se or APS) personally on a person arrested for a DUI offense, to take possession of the driver license for forwarding to the department, and to issue a 45-day temporary operating permit; provides for an administrative review of the order, for an administrative hearing, and for a judicial review of the hearing, and provides for a fee, not to exceed \$100, to be assessed upon the return of the driver license.

AB 757 (Friedman), effective 1/1/1990, requires the DMV to establish and maintain a DUI data and recidivism tracking system to evaluate the efficacy of intervention programs for persons convicted of DUI. Annual reports are to be made to the Legislature.

SB 310 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990, authorizes the courts to sell the vehicles of those registered owners who are found in violation of Penal Code Sections 191.5 or 192(c3), CVC 23152 which occurred within 7 years of two or more convictions of CVC 23152 or CVC 23153, or a violation of CVC 23153 which occurred within 7 years of one or more convictions of CVC 23152 or CVC 23153 or the cited Penal Code sections.

SB 408 (Leonard), effective 1/1/1990, modifies AB 7 (Hart) to establish a BAC level of 0.08% or higher as per se evidence of impaired driving.

SB 1119 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990 for vessel provisions and 1/1/1992 for commercial driver provisions, prohibits the operation of a commercial vehicle by a person with a BAC of 0.04% or above; requires a commercial vehicle driver to be ordered out of service for 24 hours if found with a BAC at or above 0.01%, but less than 0.04%; establishes separate penalties for refusing to take or complete a chemical test based on the type of vehicle involved. Under this bill a conviction of operating a vessel while under the influence of alcohol or drugs would also be treated as a DUI prior for driver license sanctions.

SB 1344 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1990, requires statewide implementation of 12-week (30-hour) first-offender alcohol education and counseling programs, and requires state licensing of such programs. This bill also adds 6 months of monitoring and follow-up to second offender

programs, resulting in 18-month programs. It requires that DMV evaluate program effects on recidivism and report the findings to the Legislature.

SB 1902 (Davis), effective 1/1/1990, prohibits DMV from issuing or renewing a driver license unless the applicant agrees in writing to comply with a blood, breath, or urine test. This bill also designates drivers convicted of a third or subsequent DUI within 7 years as “habitual traffic offenders.”

AB 3134 (Harris), effective 1/1/1989, allows the fourth DUI within 7 years to be charged as a felony or misdemeanor. The term of imprisonment to state prison or county jail is not less than 180 days and not more than 1 year. Allows for second offenders to attend either a 1-year or 30-month treatment program.

AB 3563 (Killea), effective 1/1/1989, authorizes the court to order DMV to suspend, revoke, or delay issuing the driving privilege of a minor failing to show proof of completion of a court-ordered alcohol education program when convicted of CVC 23140.

SB 1300 (Campbell), effective 1/1/1989, amends CVC 13202.5 to allow courts to suspend the license of a person under the age of 21 (changed from age 18) for 1 year, or delay issuing the driving privilege of those 13 years or older for 1 year, upon conviction of various alcohol and drug offenses, including open container violations.

SB 1964 (Robbins), effective 1/1/1989, requires all first DUI offenders to file proof of insurance when applying for a restricted license or for reinstatement of the driving privilege following a period of license suspension.

SB 885 (Royce), effective 1/1/1988, requires a person who was granted probation for a second DUI offense to show proof of financial responsibility in order to be eligible for the 1-year restricted license.

SB 1365 (Seymour), effective 1/1/1988, establishes a 30-month alcohol treatment program as an alternative to the 12-month program for third and subsequent DUI offenders, in counties where such a program exists. In these cases, imprisonment in the county jail shall be imposed for at least 30 days, but not more than 1 year, in lieu of the 120-day minimum jail term.

AB 2558 (Duffy), effective 1/1/1987, provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable in the state prison for 4, 6, or 10 years. Former Penal Code Section 192(c3) was deleted and incorporated into 191.5(a).

AB 2831 (Killea), effective 1/1/1987, makes it unlawful for a minor to drive with a BAC of 0.05% or more (CVC 23140). A conviction of this violation requires completion of an alcohol education program or alcohol-related community service program.

SB 2206 (Watson), effective 1/1/1987, authorizes a county to develop and administer an alcohol and drug problem-assessment program, which could include a pre-sentence alcohol and drug problem-assessment report for persons convicted under CVC 23152 or 23153, and referral to treatment program with follow-up tracking.

SB 2344 (Lockyer), effective 1/1/1987, extends the sentencing period for prior DUIs from 5 to 7 years, and specifies a 3- to 5-year probation term for a DUI conviction.

SB 3939 (Farr), effective 1/1/1987, authorizes courts to order the installation of IID for repeat offenders in four counties, and establishes a pilot project to evaluate the effectiveness of the devices.

SB 925 (Seymour), effective 7/1/1986, extends the period of license suspension for second-misdemeanor offenders from 1 year to 18 months, and also requires that offenders with three-or-more DUI convictions show proof of treatment completion in order to have their licenses reinstated.

AB 144 (Naylor), effective 9/29/1985, requires the court to take into consideration in a DUI case a blood alcohol concentration of 0.20% percent or above, or a refusal to take a chemical test, as special factors in the enhancing of penalties for sentencing or to impose additional terms and conditions of probation.

SB 1441 (Petris), effective 1/1/1985, requires a 3-year license revocation for persons with two-or-more DUI or alcohol-related reckless convictions within 5 years of refusing a chemical test.

SB 1522 (Alquist), effective 1/1/1985, retains existing law for first offenders, which authorizes courts to impound a vehicle at the registered owner's expense for up to 30 days if the driver was convicted of DUI pursuant to CVC 23152 or 23153. The same time period for

impoundment is required for second offenses within 5 years. For third-and-subsequent offenses, the vehicle can be impounded at the registered owner's expense for up to 90 days. Exceptions to the required impoundment arise "where the interests of justice would best be served by not ordering impoundment." Another limitation is that no vehicle driven by a class 3 or 4 licensee is subject to impoundment if another person has a community property interest in the vehicle, and it is the only vehicle available to the driver's family.

AB 624 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/1984, requires a 1-year license revocation for minors (up to age 18) for a DUI conviction (CVC Sections 23152, 23153).

SB 1601 (Sieroty), effective 7/1/1982, modifies AB 541 provisions by requiring that SB 38 participants establish proof of insurance in order to remove the license restriction at the end of 6 months. In addition, SB 38 participants who dropped out of the program are given two more opportunities to reenroll, instead of receiving an immediate license suspension. Program providers are also required to report dropouts directly to DMV.

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

AB 541 (Moorhead), effective 1/1/1982, establishes that under CVC 23152(a), driving under the influence of an alcoholic beverage or drugs or their combined influence is a misdemeanor, while felony charges are filed under CVC 23153, and alcohol-related reckless charges are filed under CVC 23103.5. A conviction under 23103.5 constitutes a prior for a second offense (but not for third offenses). The penalties imposed are a 90-day license restriction (work- and treatment-related driving only) and referral to an alcohol education program for most first offenders; a 1-year license restriction for second offenders who enroll in an approved 12-month alcohol treatment (SB 38) program. First offenders not placed on probation receive a 6-month license suspension. Second offenders not assigned to an alcohol program are suspended for 1 year. A minimum jail term of 48 hours is mandatory for all repeat offenders, and a minimum fine of \$390 is assessed for all DUI offenses. Offenders with three-or-more DUI or alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions receive a 3-year license revocation along with a jail term and fine, and a small proportion are assigned to a 12-month SB 38 program. Enrollment in the program cannot be substituted for license revocation. The period defining prior DUIs changes from 7 to 5 years. Conviction of a DUI offense with bodily injury or fatality, when prosecuted as a felony, continue to result in more severe penalties (such as longer

license actions and jail terms) than misdemeanor offenses. The only change in the 1982 law for felony second offenders is that those participating in the SB 38 program will receive a license suspension for 1 year and a license restriction for 2 years.

SB 38 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/1978, extends the pilot 12-month alcohol treatment program for repeat offenders statewide.

SB 330 (Gregorio), effective 1/1/1976, permits repeat DUI offenders in four counties to participate in a 12-month pilot alcohol treatment program in lieu of the usual 12-month suspension or 3-year revocation.

## GLOSSARY

### ADMINISTRATIVE PER SE (APS)

Administrative per se (“on-the-spot”) license suspension or revocation occurs immediately upon arrest for the following reasons: a person was driving with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08% or more, a person refuses a chemical test, a commercial driver was driving a commercial vehicle with a BAC of 0.04% or more, or a person was on probation for a violation of Section 23152 or 23153 and had a BAC of 0.01% or more. Also, in January 1994, California enacted a “zero tolerance” statute which requires the administrative suspension of any driver under age 21 with a BAC of 0.01% or greater, or who refuses to be tested. Upon arrest, the driver's license is immediately confiscated by the law enforcement officer and an order of suspension or revocation served. The driver is issued a temporary license and allowed due process through administrative review. In July 1990, California became the 28th state to implement APS.

### ALCOHOL-INVOLVED CRASH

Alcohol-involved crashes are those in which the investigating law enforcement officer indicates on the crash report that the driver “had-been-drinking (HBD).”

### ALCOHOL- OR DRUG-RELATED RECKLESS DRIVING

Alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving conviction refers to a conviction of the California Vehicle Code (VC) Section VC 23103.5 of reckless driving involving alcohol and/or drugs. It is typically associated with DUI arrests with weaker circumstances (for example, BAC level lower than or close to .08%) and results in lesser penalties and sanctions than a DUI conviction. Alcohol- or drug-related reckless driving convictions count as priors for the purposes of enhanced penalties upon subsequent conviction of DUI.

### ALPHA

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

### BAC

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

### CONVICTION

Conviction refers to a violation of a specific California Vehicle Code Section reported by courts to DMV in the abstract of conviction. Since courts' abstracts of conviction can be amended, corrected, or dismissed, the conviction totals reported here are dynamic and subject to change.

### COVARIATE

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

### DUI

DUI is an acronym for "driving under the influence" of alcohol and/or drugs, a violation of Sections 23152, 23153, 23140, of the California Vehicle Code, Penal Codes 191.5a, b, US Codes J36FR46, J36423, and out of state DUI codes.

### DUI CONVICTION RATE

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

### LOGISTIC REGRESSION

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

### MAJOR CONVICTION

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

### MEAN

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

### MEDIAN

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

### P

*P* stands for probability. For example, if  $p < .05$ , the probability is less than 5 chances in 100 that the difference found or one larger would occur by chance alone.

### QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS

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

### STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

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



## 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: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		141372	109468	77.4	31904	22.6	49953	35.3	66666	47.2	12530	8.9	12223	8.6
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	11	7	63.6	4	36.4	4	36.4	4	36.4	0	0.0	3	27.3
	18-20	256	192	75.0	64	25.0	68	26.6	116	45.3	25	9.8	47	18.4
	21-30	2191	1620	73.9	571	26.1	537	24.5	892	40.7	337	15.4	425	19.4
	31-40	1408	1105	78.5	303	21.5	334	23.7	528	37.5	332	23.6	214	15.2
	41-50	808	610	75.5	198	24.5	226	28.0	250	30.9	208	25.7	124	15.3
	51-60	479	369	77.0	110	23.0	198	41.3	80	16.7	148	30.9	53	11.1
	61-70	143	117	81.8	26	18.2	78	54.5	16	11.2	35	24.5	14	9.8
	71 & ABOVE	23	16	69.6	7	30.4	13	56.5	1	4.3	9	39.1	0	0.0
TOTAL	5319	4036	75.9	1283	24.1	1458	27.4	1887	35.5	1094	20.6	880	16.5	
ALPINE	18-20	1	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7
	41-50	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	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
	TOTAL	17	16	94.1	1	5.9	15	88.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.8
AMADOR	18-20	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	56	42	75.0	14	25.0	43	76.8	12	21.4	0	0.0	1	1.8
	31-40	36	25	69.4	11	30.6	28	77.8	4	11.1	2	5.6	2	5.6
	41-50	30	21	70.0	9	30.0	18	60.0	9	30.0	1	3.3	2	6.7
	51-60	39	29	74.4	10	25.6	31	79.5	5	12.8	1	2.6	2	5.1
	61-70	18	16	88.9	2	11.1	16	88.9	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	5.6
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	188	139	73.9	49	26.1	144	76.6	32	17.0	4	2.1	8	4.3
BUTTE	UNDER 18	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	89	71	79.8	18	20.2	53	59.6	25	28.1	2	2.2	9	10.1
	21-30	511	405	79.3	106	20.7	359	70.3	93	18.2	21	4.1	38	7.4
	31-40	254	185	72.8	69	27.2	187	73.6	39	15.4	8	3.1	20	7.9
	41-50	212	158	74.5	54	25.5	168	79.2	30	14.2	5	2.4	9	4.2
	51-60	138	96	69.6	42	30.4	117	84.8	10	7.2	2	1.4	9	6.5
	61-70	44	32	72.7	12	27.3	38	86.4	6	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	14	10	71.4	4	28.6	10	71.4	3	21.4	1	7.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1266	961	75.9	305	24.1	934	73.8	208	16.4	39	3.1	85	6.7

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CALAVERAS	18-20	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	9	81.8	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	57	45	78.9	12	21.1	42	73.7	11	19.3	1	1.8	3	5.3
	31-40	47	34	72.3	13	27.7	40	85.1	3	6.4	1	2.1	3	6.4
	41-50	60	40	66.7	20	33.3	54	90.0	6	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	51-60	53	31	58.5	22	41.5	48	90.6	4	7.5	1	1.9	0	0.0
	61-70	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	17	89.5	2	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5
	TOTAL	255	180	70.6	75	29.4	217	85.1	28	11.0	3	1.2	7	2.7
COLUSA	18-20	20	18	90.0	2	10.0	3	15.0	16	80.0	0	0.0	1	5.0
	21-30	62	47	75.8	15	24.2	22	35.5	35	56.5	4	6.5	1	1.6
	31-40	39	33	84.6	6	15.4	16	41.0	22	56.4	0	0.0	1	2.6
	41-50	21	13	61.9	8	38.1	9	42.9	9	42.9	1	4.8	2	9.5
	51-60	25	20	80.0	5	20.0	19	76.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
	61-70	9	9	100.0	0	0.0	7	77.8	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	11.1
	71 & ABOVE	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	182	144	79.1	38	20.9	81	44.5	88	48.4	7	3.8	6	3.3
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	14	7	50.0	7	50.0	6	42.9	5	35.7	0	0.0	3	21.4
	18-20	166	116	69.9	50	30.1	60	36.1	72	43.4	17	10.2	17	10.2
	21-30	1260	947	75.2	313	24.8	466	37.0	453	36.0	184	14.6	157	12.5
	31-40	780	617	79.1	163	20.9	266	34.1	267	34.2	166	21.3	81	10.4
	41-50	474	347	73.2	127	26.8	207	43.7	133	28.1	94	19.8	40	8.4
	51-60	353	272	77.1	81	22.9	196	55.5	42	11.9	84	23.8	31	8.8
	61-70	104	84	80.8	20	19.2	55	52.9	15	14.4	25	24.0	9	8.7
	71 & ABOVE	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	17	77.3	0	0.0	4	18.2	1	4.5
	TOTAL	3173	2409	75.9	764	24.1	1273	40.1	987	31.1	574	18.1	339	10.7
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	2	0	0.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
	18-20	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	60.0
	21-30	39	29	74.4	10	25.6	28	71.8	5	12.8	1	2.6	5	12.8
	31-40	23	17	73.9	6	26.1	16	69.6	6	26.1	0	0.0	1	4.3
	41-50	18	10	55.6	8	44.4	16	88.9	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	5.6
	51-60	26	18	69.2	8	30.8	22	84.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	15.4
	61-70	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	118	82	69.5	36	30.5	89	75.4	12	10.2	1	0.8	16	13.6

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	35	23	65.7	12	34.3	30	85.7	3	8.6	0	0.0	2	5.7
	21-30	296	215	72.6	81	27.4	236	79.7	42	14.2	7	2.4	11	3.7
	31-40	149	107	71.8	42	28.2	118	79.2	21	14.1	7	4.7	3	2.0
	41-50	104	74	71.2	30	28.8	90	86.5	9	8.7	1	1.0	4	3.8
	51-60	99	75	75.8	24	24.2	85	85.9	10	10.1	2	2.0	2	2.0
	61-70	42	31	73.8	11	26.2	38	90.5	3	7.1	0	0.0	1	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	734	531	72.3	203	27.7	606	82.6	88	12.0	17	2.3	23	3.1
FRESNO	UNDER 18	16	11	68.8	5	31.3	4	25.0	11	68.8	1	6.3	0	0.0
	18-20	282	224	79.4	58	20.6	40	14.2	201	71.3	17	6.0	24	8.5
	21-30	1985	1553	78.2	432	21.8	429	21.6	1255	63.2	110	5.5	191	9.6
	31-40	1085	856	78.9	229	21.1	256	23.6	671	61.8	75	6.9	83	7.6
	41-50	634	507	80.0	127	20.0	162	25.6	377	59.5	59	9.3	36	5.7
	51-60	391	300	76.7	91	23.3	167	42.7	169	43.2	34	8.7	21	5.4
	61-70	145	124	85.5	21	14.5	55	37.9	65	44.8	11	7.6	14	9.7
	71 & ABOVE	28	24	85.7	4	14.3	18	64.3	5	17.9	3	10.7	2	7.1
	TOTAL	4566	3599	78.8	967	21.2	1131	24.8	2754	60.3	310	6.8	371	8.1
GLENN	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	3	50.0	0	0.0	1	16.7
	21-30	50	37	74.0	13	26.0	30	60.0	13	26.0	3	6.0	4	8.0
	31-40	39	26	66.7	13	33.3	23	59.0	13	33.3	2	5.1	1	2.6
	41-50	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	14	63.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	1	4.5
	51-60	22	17	77.3	5	22.7	15	68.2	5	22.7	2	9.1	0	0.0
	61-70	14	11	78.6	3	21.4	11	78.6	1	7.1	0	0.0	2	14.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	156	119	76.3	37	23.7	97	62.2	41	26.3	9	5.8	9	5.8
HUMBOLDT	UNDER 18	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3
	18-20	54	46	85.2	8	14.8	39	72.2	10	18.5	1	1.9	4	7.4
	21-30	473	328	69.3	145	30.7	350	74.0	56	11.8	21	4.4	46	9.7
	31-40	303	207	68.3	96	31.7	244	80.5	26	8.6	8	2.6	25	8.3
	41-50	151	111	73.5	40	26.5	116	76.8	17	11.3	5	3.3	13	8.6
	51-60	119	80	67.2	39	32.8	103	86.6	4	3.4	5	4.2	7	5.9
	61-70	64	47	73.4	17	26.6	56	87.5	1	1.6	0	0.0	7	10.9
	71 & ABOVE	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	6	85.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
	TOTAL	1178	829	70.4	349	29.6	919	78.0	115	9.8	40	3.4	104	8.8

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IMPERIAL	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	61	49	80.3	12	19.7	3	4.9	55	90.2	1	1.6	2	3.3
	21-30	313	254	81.2	59	18.8	35	11.2	268	85.6	2	0.6	8	2.6
	31-40	134	101	75.4	33	24.6	16	11.9	113	84.3	3	2.2	2	1.5
	41-50	103	80	77.7	23	22.3	15	14.6	81	78.6	4	3.9	3	2.9
	51-60	93	84	90.3	9	9.7	25	26.9	65	69.9	3	3.2	0	0.0
	61-70	25	20	80.0	5	20.0	12	48.0	11	44.0	2	8.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	85.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	737	596	80.9	141	19.1	107	14.5	600	81.4	15	2.0	15	2.0
INYO	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
	18-20	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	8	66.7	3	25.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
	21-30	51	36	70.6	15	29.4	31	60.8	7	13.7	1	2.0	12	23.5
	31-40	46	30	65.2	16	34.8	23	50.0	9	19.6	0	0.0	14	30.4
	41-50	22	13	59.1	9	40.9	17	77.3	3	13.6	0	0.0	2	9.1
	51-60	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	17	60.7	3	10.7	0	0.0	8	28.6
	61-70	11	6	54.5	5	45.5	9	81.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
	TOTAL	175	121	69.1	54	30.9	108	61.7	25	14.3	1	0.6	41	23.4
KERN	UNDER 18	16	14	87.5	2	12.5	5	31.3	10	62.5	1	6.3	0	0.0
	18-20	249	206	82.7	43	17.3	77	30.9	148	59.4	15	6.0	9	3.6
	21-30	1912	1539	80.5	373	19.5	534	27.9	1167	61.0	138	7.2	73	3.8
	31-40	1026	836	81.5	190	18.5	348	33.9	580	56.5	77	7.5	21	2.0
	41-50	550	439	79.8	111	20.2	202	36.7	257	46.7	67	12.2	24	4.4
	51-60	396	313	79.0	83	21.0	209	52.8	141	35.6	40	10.1	6	1.5
	61-70	125	100	80.0	25	20.0	68	54.4	29	23.2	24	19.2	4	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	17	15	88.2	2	11.8	10	58.8	6	35.3	0	0.0	1	5.9
	TOTAL	4291	3462	80.7	829	19.3	1453	33.9	2338	54.5	362	8.4	138	3.2
KINGS	UNDER 18	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
	18-20	56	50	89.3	6	10.7	11	19.6	38	67.9	7	12.5	0	0.0
	21-30	375	303	80.8	72	19.2	85	22.7	235	62.7	27	7.2	28	7.5
	31-40	240	198	82.5	42	17.5	42	17.5	169	70.4	13	5.4	16	6.7
	41-50	131	105	80.2	26	19.8	28	21.4	90	68.7	8	6.1	5	3.8
	51-60	103	88	85.4	15	14.6	31	30.1	65	63.1	5	4.9	2	1.9
	61-70	27	21	77.8	6	22.2	7	25.9	14	51.9	3	11.1	3	11.1
	71 & ABOVE	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	944	776	82.2	168	17.8	209	22.1	617	65.4	63	6.7	55	5.8

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LAKE	18-20	16	14	87.5	2	12.5	9	56.3	3	18.8	1	6.3	3	18.8
	21-30	115	98	85.2	17	14.8	61	53.0	40	34.8	2	1.7	12	10.4
	31-40	69	60	87.0	9	13.0	43	62.3	19	27.5	4	5.8	3	4.3
	41-50	65	48	73.8	17	26.2	54	83.1	7	10.8	2	3.1	2	3.1
	51-60	59	41	69.5	18	30.5	51	86.4	6	10.2	1	1.7	1	1.7
	61-70	24	21	87.5	3	12.5	21	87.5	2	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.2
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	352	285	81.0	67	19.0	243	69.0	77	21.9	10	2.8	22	6.3
LASSEN	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	7	87.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5
	21-30	41	34	82.9	7	17.1	32	78.0	5	12.2	1	2.4	3	7.3
	31-40	36	27	75.0	9	25.0	26	72.2	4	11.1	1	2.8	5	13.9
	41-50	40	29	72.5	11	27.5	35	87.5	2	5.0	1	2.5	2	5.0
	51-60	32	26	81.3	6	18.8	29	90.6	1	3.1	0	0.0	2	6.3
	61-70	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	166	133	80.1	33	19.9	138	83.1	12	7.2	3	1.8	13	7.8
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	57	49	86.0	8	14.0	16	28.1	36	63.2	0	0.0	5	8.8
	18-20	1557	1210	77.7	347	22.3	263	16.9	1050	67.4	106	6.8	138	8.9
	21-30	13624	10428	76.5	3196	23.5	2419	17.8	8530	62.6	1383	10.2	1292	9.5
	31-40	7310	5859	80.2	1451	19.8	1272	17.4	4349	59.5	992	13.6	697	9.5
	41-50	4628	3786	81.8	842	18.2	1005	21.7	2448	52.9	814	17.6	361	7.8
	51-60	2707	2274	84.0	433	16.0	764	28.2	1173	43.3	574	21.2	196	7.2
	61-70	759	640	84.3	119	15.7	249	32.8	279	36.8	155	20.4	76	10.0
	71 & ABOVE	137	117	85.4	20	14.6	62	45.3	32	23.4	30	21.9	13	9.5
TOTAL	30779	24363	79.2	6416	20.8	6050	19.7	17897	58.1	4054	13.2	2778	9.0	
MADERA	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3
	18-20	62	54	87.1	8	12.9	16	25.8	45	72.6	0	0.0	1	1.6
	21-30	317	270	85.2	47	14.8	71	22.4	228	71.9	3	0.9	15	4.7
	31-40	196	167	85.2	29	14.8	73	37.2	116	59.2	5	2.6	2	1.0
	41-50	117	86	73.5	31	26.5	44	37.6	67	57.3	4	3.4	2	1.7
	51-60	77	56	72.7	21	27.3	42	54.5	27	35.1	6	7.8	2	2.6
	61-70	29	22	75.9	7	24.1	18	62.1	10	34.5	1	3.4	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	1	25.0	3	75.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	805	659	81.9	146	18.1	267	33.2	496	61.6	19	2.4	23	2.9	

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARIN	UNDER 18	10	8	80.0	2	20.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	57	48	84.2	9	15.8	21	36.8	27	47.4	3	5.3	6	10.5
	21-30	415	319	76.9	96	23.1	176	42.4	182	43.9	26	6.3	31	7.5
	31-40	287	211	73.5	76	26.5	145	50.5	107	37.3	10	3.5	25	8.7
	41-50	232	158	68.1	74	31.9	138	59.5	61	26.3	16	6.9	17	7.3
	51-60	151	99	65.6	52	34.4	116	76.8	20	13.2	7	4.6	8	5.3
	61-70	80	49	61.3	31	38.8	71	88.8	4	5.0	2	2.5	3	3.8
	71 & ABOVE	14	9	64.3	5	35.7	13	92.9	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1246	901	72.3	345	27.7	686	55.1	405	32.5	65	5.2	90	7.2
MARIPOSA	18-20	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
	21-30	25	21	84.0	4	16.0	20	80.0	5	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	31-40	18	13	72.2	5	27.8	15	83.3	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	18	11	61.1	7	38.9	15	83.3	2	11.1	1	5.6	0	0.0
	51-60	26	19	73.1	7	26.9	23	88.5	2	7.7	0	0.0	1	3.8
	61-70	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	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	99	75	75.8	24	24.2	84	84.8	12	12.1	2	2.0	1	1.0
	MENDOCINO	18-20	29	26	89.7	3	10.3	13	44.8	13	44.8	0	0.0	3
21-30		192	157	81.8	35	18.2	104	54.2	67	34.9	5	2.6	16	8.3
31-40		132	104	78.8	28	21.2	87	65.9	33	25.0	4	3.0	8	6.1
41-50		76	56	73.7	20	26.3	55	72.4	14	18.4	1	1.3	6	7.9
51-60		57	41	71.9	16	28.1	46	80.7	9	15.8	0	0.0	2	3.5
61-70		32	22	68.8	10	31.3	31	96.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.1
71 & ABOVE		7	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL		525	412	78.5	113	21.5	343	65.3	136	25.9	10	1.9	36	6.9
MERCED		UNDER 18	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	2	28.6	5	71.4	0	0.0	0
	18-20	95	78	82.1	17	17.9	12	12.6	75	78.9	3	3.2	5	5.3
	21-30	598	480	80.3	118	19.7	111	18.6	431	72.1	20	3.3	36	6.0
	31-40	269	226	84.0	43	16.0	40	14.9	205	76.2	11	4.1	13	4.8
	41-50	167	136	81.4	31	18.6	44	26.3	104	62.3	15	9.0	4	2.4
	51-60	104	85	81.7	19	18.3	39	37.5	49	47.1	10	9.6	6	5.8
	61-70	27	19	70.4	8	29.6	13	48.1	8	29.6	3	11.1	3	11.1
	71 & ABOVE	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	1	12.5
	TOTAL	1275	1038	81.4	237	18.6	264	20.7	880	69.0	63	4.9	68	5.3



TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MODOC	21-30	20	16	80.0	4	20.0	13	65.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	4	20.0
	31-40	6	3	50.0	3	50.0	3	50.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	1	16.7
	41-50	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	8	88.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
	51-60	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	7	63.6	3	27.3	0	0.0	1	9.1
	61-70	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
	TOTAL	50	39	78.0	11	22.0	34	68.0	8	16.0	0	0.0	8	16.0
MONO	18-20	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	40	34	85.0	6	15.0	27	67.5	8	20.0	2	5.0	3	7.5
	31-40	21	20	95.2	1	4.8	13	61.9	6	28.6	1	4.8	1	4.8
	41-50	23	18	78.3	5	21.7	19	82.6	3	13.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
	51-60	16	13	81.3	3	18.8	16	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	10	6	60.0	4	40.0	7	70.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	2	20.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	0	0.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	114	93	81.6	21	18.4	85	74.6	19	16.7	3	2.6	7	6.1
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	6	31.6	13	68.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	191	150	78.5	41	21.5	33	17.3	146	76.4	5	2.6	7	3.7
	21-30	891	725	81.4	166	18.6	175	19.6	672	75.4	20	2.2	24	2.7
	31-40	471	378	80.3	93	19.7	106	22.5	327	69.4	15	3.2	23	4.9
	41-50	255	204	80.0	51	20.0	85	33.3	149	58.4	10	3.9	11	4.3
	51-60	184	141	76.6	43	23.4	102	55.4	72	39.1	3	1.6	7	3.8
	61-70	79	59	74.7	20	25.3	47	59.5	26	32.9	1	1.3	5	6.3
	71 & ABOVE	13	6	46.2	7	53.8	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2103	1677	79.7	426	20.3	566	26.9	1406	66.9	54	2.6	77	3.7
NAPA	UNDER 18	4	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	40	32	80.0	8	20.0	9	22.5	28	70.0	1	2.5	2	5.0
	21-30	399	320	80.2	79	19.8	156	39.1	212	53.1	9	2.3	22	5.5
	31-40	216	176	81.5	40	18.5	85	39.4	111	51.4	7	3.2	13	6.0
	41-50	153	117	76.5	36	23.5	83	54.2	59	38.6	4	2.6	7	4.6
	51-60	123	91	74.0	32	26.0	75	61.0	39	31.7	4	3.3	5	4.1
	61-70	42	32	76.2	10	23.8	33	78.6	7	16.7	1	2.4	1	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25.0	0	0.0	1	12.5
	TOTAL	985	777	78.9	208	21.1	448	45.5	460	46.7	26	2.6	51	5.2

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	157	113	72.0	44	28.0	138	87.9	13	8.3	2	1.3	4	2.5
	31-40	108	78	72.2	30	27.8	91	84.3	13	12.0	1	0.9	3	2.8
	41-50	77	55	71.4	22	28.6	65	84.4	10	13.0	1	1.3	1	1.3
	51-60	60	37	61.7	23	38.3	54	90.0	3	5.0	1	1.7	2	3.3
	61-70	37	28	75.7	9	24.3	35	94.6	2	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	448	318	71.0	130	29.0	390	87.1	43	9.6	5	1.1	10	2.2
ORANGE	UNDER 18	44	36	81.8	8	18.2	14	31.8	25	56.8	2	4.5	3	6.8
	18-20	676	523	77.4	153	22.6	225	33.3	362	53.6	17	2.5	72	10.7
	21-30	5312	3942	74.2	1370	25.8	1823	34.3	2656	50.0	216	4.1	617	11.6
	31-40	2390	1898	79.4	492	20.6	834	34.9	1180	49.4	82	3.4	294	12.3
	41-50	1603	1210	75.5	393	24.5	709	44.2	668	41.7	48	3.0	178	11.1
	51-60	1084	778	71.8	306	28.2	680	62.7	273	25.2	31	2.9	100	9.2
	61-70	300	232	77.3	68	22.7	208	69.3	61	20.3	6	2.0	25	8.3
	71 & ABOVE	58	39	67.2	19	32.8	43	74.1	8	13.8	1	1.7	6	10.3
	TOTAL	11467	8658	75.5	2809	24.5	4536	39.6	5233	45.6	403	3.5	1295	11.3
PLACER	UNDER 18	9	5	55.6	4	44.4	5	55.6	3	33.3	0	0.0	1	11.1
	18-20	71	55	77.5	16	22.5	45	63.4	20	28.2	4	5.6	2	2.8
	21-30	539	387	71.8	152	28.2	416	77.2	89	16.5	16	3.0	18	3.3
	31-40	278	203	73.0	75	27.0	220	79.1	33	11.9	11	4.0	14	5.0
	41-50	201	130	64.7	71	35.3	152	75.6	23	11.4	12	6.0	14	7.0
	51-60	190	129	67.9	61	32.1	162	85.3	14	7.4	8	4.2	6	3.2
	61-70	69	47	68.1	22	31.9	64	92.8	2	2.9	1	1.4	2	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1363	961	70.5	402	29.5	1069	78.4	185	13.6	52	3.8	57	4.2
PLUMAS	18-20	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	31	21	67.7	10	32.3	28	90.3	2	6.5	0	0.0	1	3.2
	31-40	16	15	93.8	1	6.3	13	81.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3
	41-50	25	16	64.0	9	36.0	23	92.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
	51-60	31	22	71.0	9	29.0	30	96.8	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0
	61-70	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	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	118	84	71.2	34	28.8	109	92.4	4	3.4	3	2.5	2	1.7

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	35	27	77.1	8	22.9	13	37.1	21	60.0	0	0.0	1	2.9
	18-20	576	462	80.2	114	19.8	111	19.3	397	68.9	38	6.6	30	5.2
	21-30	3856	2999	77.8	857	22.2	1013	26.3	2360	61.2	300	7.8	183	4.7
	31-40	1999	1593	79.7	406	20.3	546	27.3	1181	59.1	172	8.6	100	5.0
	41-50	1270	987	77.7	283	22.3	458	36.1	645	50.8	114	9.0	53	4.2
	51-60	832	643	77.3	189	22.7	434	52.2	282	33.9	78	9.4	38	4.6
	61-70	254	201	79.1	53	20.9	149	58.7	68	26.8	24	9.4	13	5.1
	71 & ABOVE	65	49	75.4	16	24.6	42	64.6	19	29.2	2	3.1	2	3.1
	TOTAL	8887	6961	78.3	1926	21.7	2766	31.1	4973	56.0	728	8.2	420	4.7
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	7	58.3	2	16.7	3	25.0	0	0.0
	18-20	267	196	73.4	71	26.6	112	41.9	82	30.7	32	12.0	41	15.4
	21-30	2276	1661	73.0	615	27.0	910	40.0	630	27.7	391	17.2	345	15.2
	31-40	1165	875	75.1	290	24.9	493	42.3	311	26.7	204	17.5	157	13.5
	41-50	721	512	71.0	209	29.0	354	49.1	152	21.1	150	20.8	65	9.0
	51-60	454	337	74.2	117	25.8	260	57.3	56	12.3	103	22.7	35	7.7
	61-70	138	114	82.6	24	17.4	92	66.7	14	10.1	19	13.8	13	9.4
	71 & ABOVE	26	21	80.8	5	19.2	11	42.3	7	26.9	5	19.2	3	11.5
	TOTAL	5059	3726	73.7	1333	26.3	2239	44.3	1254	24.8	907	17.9	659	13.0
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	26	20	76.9	6	23.1	7	26.9	18	69.2	0	0.0	1	3.8
	21-30	102	82	80.4	20	19.6	34	33.3	66	64.7	1	1.0	1	1.0
	31-40	61	48	78.7	13	21.3	21	34.4	39	63.9	1	1.6	0	0.0
	41-50	33	28	84.8	5	15.2	13	39.4	18	54.5	1	3.0	1	3.0
	51-60	24	19	79.2	5	20.8	7	29.2	15	62.5	1	4.2	1	4.2
	61-70	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	5	71.4	2	28.6	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	257	208	80.9	49	19.1	88	34.2	161	62.6	4	1.6	4	1.6
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	28	21	75.0	7	25.0	5	17.9	21	75.0	1	3.6	1	3.6
	18-20	526	444	84.4	82	15.6	88	16.7	373	70.9	41	7.8	24	4.6
	21-30	4215	3299	78.3	916	21.7	1087	25.8	2495	59.2	420	10.0	213	5.1
	31-40	2244	1770	78.9	474	21.1	609	27.1	1265	56.4	275	12.3	95	4.2
	41-50	1310	1047	79.9	263	20.1	405	30.9	666	50.8	157	12.0	82	6.3
	51-60	867	681	78.5	186	21.5	375	43.3	324	37.4	135	15.6	33	3.8
	61-70	237	200	84.4	37	15.6	106	44.7	84	35.4	38	16.0	9	3.8
	71 & ABOVE	51	45	88.2	6	11.8	34	66.7	10	19.6	5	9.8	2	3.9
	TOTAL	9478	7507	79.2	1971	20.8	2709	28.6	5238	55.3	1072	11.3	459	4.8

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	25	19	76.0	6	24.0	9	36.0	15	60.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
	18-20	662	531	80.2	131	19.8	241	36.4	334	50.5	33	5.0	54	8.2
	21-30	4822	3591	74.5	1231	25.5	1901	39.4	2086	43.3	392	8.1	443	9.2
	31-40	2272	1722	75.8	550	24.2	939	41.3	929	40.9	209	9.2	195	8.6
	41-50	1441	1082	75.1	359	24.9	701	48.6	521	36.2	111	7.7	108	7.5
	51-60	1002	750	74.9	252	25.1	614	61.3	261	26.0	77	7.7	50	5.0
	61-70	283	210	74.2	73	25.8	197	69.6	59	20.8	12	4.2	15	5.3
	71 & ABOVE	40	27	67.5	13	32.5	33	82.5	2	5.0	3	7.5	2	5.0
	TOTAL	10547	7932	75.2	2615	24.8	4635	43.9	4207	39.9	837	7.9	868	8.2
SAN FRANCISCO	18-20	42	31	73.8	11	26.2	14	33.3	12	28.6	5	11.9	11	26.2
	21-30	502	360	71.7	142	28.3	217	43.2	87	17.3	60	12.0	138	27.5
	31-40	277	221	79.8	56	20.2	130	46.9	49	17.7	38	13.7	60	21.7
	41-50	159	127	79.9	32	20.1	85	53.5	21	13.2	23	14.5	30	18.9
	51-60	85	75	88.2	10	11.8	48	56.5	5	5.9	14	16.5	18	21.2
	61-70	26	25	96.2	1	3.8	12	46.2	1	3.8	7	26.9	6	23.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1094	841	76.9	253	23.1	507	46.3	175	16.0	149	13.6	263	24.0
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	13	10	76.9	3	23.1	4	30.8	8	61.5	0	0.0	1	7.7
	18-20	136	112	82.4	24	17.6	36	26.5	76	55.9	5	3.7	19	14.0
	21-30	1018	776	76.2	242	23.8	283	27.8	525	51.6	93	9.1	117	11.5
	31-40	611	458	75.0	153	25.0	153	25.0	309	50.6	86	14.1	63	10.3
	41-50	326	246	75.5	80	24.5	134	41.1	120	36.8	45	13.8	27	8.3
	51-60	210	161	76.7	49	23.3	81	38.6	60	28.6	46	21.9	23	11.0
	61-70	73	60	82.2	13	17.8	39	53.4	13	17.8	14	19.2	7	9.6
	71 & ABOVE	12	8	66.7	4	33.3	5	41.7	6	50.0	1	8.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2399	1831	76.3	568	23.7	735	30.6	1117	46.6	290	12.1	257	10.7
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	9	7	77.8	2	22.2	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1	0	0.0
	18-20	94	71	75.5	23	24.5	53	56.4	33	35.1	2	2.1	6	6.4
	21-30	775	592	76.4	183	23.6	448	57.8	266	34.3	20	2.6	41	5.3
	31-40	350	266	76.0	84	24.0	220	62.9	106	30.3	8	2.3	16	4.6
	41-50	247	174	70.4	73	29.6	170	68.8	60	24.3	6	2.4	11	4.5
	51-60	206	133	64.6	73	35.4	168	81.6	30	14.6	4	1.9	4	1.9
	61-70	83	58	69.9	25	30.1	69	83.1	8	9.6	3	3.6	3	3.6
	71 & ABOVE	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1772	1307	73.8	465	26.2	1143	64.5	504	28.4	44	2.5	81	4.6

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	13	10	76.9	3	23.1	6	46.2	4	30.8	0	0.0	3	23.1
	18-20	135	104	77.0	31	23.0	24	17.8	72	53.3	9	6.7	30	22.2
	21-30	1027	805	78.4	222	21.6	267	26.0	461	44.9	56	5.5	243	23.7
	31-40	629	508	80.8	121	19.2	175	27.8	261	41.5	40	6.4	153	24.3
	41-50	393	323	82.2	70	17.8	148	37.7	139	35.4	22	5.6	84	21.4
	51-60	258	200	77.5	58	22.5	138	53.5	54	20.9	17	6.6	49	19.0
	61-70	74	57	77.0	17	23.0	46	62.2	10	13.5	4	5.4	14	18.9
	71 & ABOVE	18	14	77.8	4	22.2	16	88.9	0	0.0	2	11.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2547	2021	79.3	526	20.7	820	32.2	1001	39.3	150	5.9	576	22.6
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	6	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	156	125	80.1	31	19.9	42	26.9	103	66.0	3	1.9	8	5.1
	21-30	889	718	80.8	171	19.2	284	31.9	520	58.5	22	2.5	63	7.1
	31-40	391	315	80.6	76	19.4	140	35.8	232	59.3	6	1.5	13	3.3
	41-50	244	182	74.6	62	25.4	120	49.2	112	45.9	4	1.6	8	3.3
	51-60	199	151	75.9	48	24.1	136	68.3	54	27.1	3	1.5	6	3.0
	61-70	87	61	70.1	26	29.9	68	78.2	14	16.1	3	3.4	2	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	15	9	60.0	6	40.0	9	60.0	5	33.3	0	0.0	1	6.7
	TOTAL	1989	1568	78.8	421	21.2	801	40.3	1046	52.6	41	2.1	101	5.1
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	44	34	77.3	10	22.7	7	15.9	27	61.4	2	4.5	8	18.2
	18-20	317	252	79.5	65	20.5	65	20.5	196	61.8	14	4.4	42	13.2
	21-30	2445	1877	76.8	568	23.2	628	25.7	1250	51.1	107	4.4	460	18.8
	31-40	1218	1006	82.6	212	17.4	278	22.8	648	53.2	57	4.7	235	19.3
	41-50	669	523	78.2	146	21.8	212	31.7	298	44.5	38	5.7	121	18.1
	51-60	399	313	78.4	86	21.6	187	46.9	123	30.8	31	7.8	58	14.5
	61-70	107	80	74.8	27	25.2	57	53.3	23	21.5	8	7.5	19	17.8
	71 & ABOVE	25	16	64.0	9	36.0	20	80.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	1	4.0
	TOTAL	5224	4101	78.5	1123	21.5	1454	27.8	2567	49.1	259	5.0	944	18.1
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	10	5	50.0	5	50.0	5	50.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
	18-20	71	43	60.6	28	39.4	33	46.5	33	46.5	0	0.0	5	7.0
	21-30	434	318	73.3	116	26.7	220	50.7	182	41.9	10	2.3	22	5.1
	31-40	215	155	72.1	60	27.9	114	53.0	86	40.0	3	1.4	12	5.6
	41-50	142	115	81.0	27	19.0	93	65.5	42	29.6	4	2.8	3	2.1
	51-60	102	71	69.6	31	30.4	77	75.5	19	18.6	1	1.0	5	4.9
	61-70	39	27	69.2	12	30.8	28	71.8	7	17.9	2	5.1	2	5.1
	71 & ABOVE	12	10	83.3	2	16.7	10	83.3	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	8.3
	TOTAL	1025	744	72.6	281	27.4	580	56.6	373	36.4	22	2.1	50	4.9

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SHASTA	UNDER 18	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	29	18	62.1	11	37.9	25	86.2	2	6.9	2	6.9	0	0.0
	21-30	306	231	75.5	75	24.5	266	86.9	19	6.2	4	1.3	17	5.6
	31-40	170	117	68.8	53	31.2	148	87.1	13	7.6	3	1.8	6	3.5
	41-50	108	66	61.1	42	38.9	95	88.0	6	5.6	3	2.8	4	3.7
	51-60	94	59	62.8	35	37.2	82	87.2	4	4.3	1	1.1	7	7.4
	61-70	42	31	73.8	11	26.2	38	90.5	2	4.8	1	2.4	1	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	762	533	69.9	229	30.1	667	87.5	46	6.0	14	1.8	35	4.6
SIERRA	21-30	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7
	31-40	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	41-50	7	5	71.4	2	28.6	6	85.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
	51-60	6	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	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
	TOTAL	23	19	82.6	4	17.4	20	87.0	1	4.3	0	0.0	2	8.7
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	9	5	55.6	4	44.4	8	88.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	70	51	72.9	19	27.1	53	75.7	9	12.9	4	5.7	4	5.7
	31-40	59	40	67.8	19	32.2	39	66.1	13	22.0	1	1.7	6	10.2
	41-50	55	39	70.9	16	29.1	45	81.8	1	1.8	2	3.6	7	12.7
	51-60	55	42	76.4	13	23.6	47	85.5	4	7.3	1	1.8	3	5.5
	61-70	17	17	100.0	0	0.0	14	82.4	1	5.9	2	11.8	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	271	200	73.8	71	26.2	209	77.1	31	11.4	11	4.1	20	7.4
SOLANO	UNDER 18	7	4	57.1	3	42.9	2	28.6	3	42.9	0	0.0	2	28.6
	18-20	66	55	83.3	11	16.7	24	36.4	24	36.4	6	9.1	12	18.2
	21-30	497	387	77.9	110	22.1	200	40.2	165	33.2	67	13.5	65	13.1
	31-40	328	253	77.1	75	22.9	118	36.0	113	34.5	62	18.9	35	10.7
	41-50	216	175	81.0	41	19.0	91	42.1	59	27.3	48	22.2	18	8.3
	51-60	172	137	79.7	35	20.3	94	54.7	15	8.7	48	27.9	15	8.7
	61-70	55	36	65.5	19	34.5	31	56.4	6	10.9	15	27.3	3	5.5
	71 & ABOVE	9	8	88.9	1	11.1	5	55.6	1	11.1	2	22.2	1	11.1
	TOTAL	1350	1055	78.1	295	21.9	565	41.9	386	28.6	248	18.4	151	11.2

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SONOMA	UNDER 18	7	6	85.7	1	14.3	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	138	95	68.8	43	31.2	63	45.7	63	45.7	3	2.2	9	6.5
	21-30	1082	816	75.4	266	24.6	548	50.6	457	42.2	32	3.0	45	4.2
	31-40	571	421	73.7	150	26.3	294	51.5	217	38.0	27	4.7	33	5.8
	41-50	365	265	72.6	100	27.4	238	65.2	102	27.9	10	2.7	15	4.1
	51-60	307	231	75.2	76	24.8	234	76.2	47	15.3	9	2.9	17	5.5
	61-70	142	95	66.9	47	33.1	121	85.2	12	8.5	1	0.7	8	5.6
	71 & ABOVE	28	19	67.9	9	32.1	26	92.9	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2640	1948	73.8	692	26.2	1527	57.8	904	34.2	82	3.1	127	4.8
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	4	30.8	8	61.5	0	0.0	1	7.7
	18-20	132	103	78.0	29	22.0	37	28.0	77	58.3	7	5.3	11	8.3
	21-30	885	664	75.0	221	25.0	281	31.8	509	57.5	39	4.4	56	6.3
	31-40	448	361	80.6	87	19.4	152	33.9	246	54.9	29	6.5	21	4.7
	41-50	261	195	74.7	66	25.3	115	44.1	125	47.9	12	4.6	9	3.4
	51-60	186	150	80.6	36	19.4	97	52.2	67	36.0	9	4.8	13	7.0
	61-70	56	44	78.6	12	21.4	36	64.3	12	21.4	3	5.4	5	8.9
	71 & ABOVE	5	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	1986	1532	77.1	454	22.9	727	36.6	1044	52.6	99	5.0	116	5.8
SUTTER	UNDER 18	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0
	18-20	45	33	73.3	12	26.7	19	42.2	19	42.2	0	0.0	7	15.6
	21-30	230	174	75.7	56	24.3	92	40.0	100	43.5	11	4.8	27	11.7
	31-40	125	108	86.4	17	13.6	53	42.4	52	41.6	6	4.8	14	11.2
	41-50	81	55	67.9	26	32.1	40	49.4	25	30.9	4	4.9	12	14.8
	51-60	68	47	69.1	21	30.9	52	76.5	8	11.8	3	4.4	5	7.4
	61-70	13	10	76.9	3	23.1	10	76.9	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	569	434	76.3	135	23.7	269	47.3	207	36.4	25	4.4	68	12.0
TEHAMA	UNDER 18	2	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	30	23	76.7	7	23.3	16	53.3	14	46.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
	21-30	117	97	82.9	20	17.1	69	59.0	39	33.3	2	1.7	7	6.0
	31-40	83	65	78.3	18	21.7	53	63.9	25	30.1	1	1.2	4	4.8
	41-50	71	58	81.7	13	18.3	48	67.6	17	23.9	3	4.2	3	4.2
	51-60	51	37	72.5	14	27.5	41	80.4	8	15.7	0	0.0	2	3.9
	61-70	28	16	57.1	12	42.9	27	96.4	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	386	301	78.0	85	22.0	260	67.4	104	26.9	6	1.6	16	4.1

TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TRINITY	21-30	53	50	94.3	3	5.7	50	94.3	2	3.8	0	0.0	1	1.9
	31-40	41	35	85.4	6	14.6	39	95.1	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4
	41-50	25	18	72.0	7	28.0	24	96.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
	51-60	28	23	82.1	5	17.9	27	96.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6
	61-70	12	12	100.0	0	0.0	12	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	160	139	86.9	21	13.1	153	95.6	2	1.2	2	1.2	3	1.9
TULARE	UNDER 18	17	17	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	94.1	0	0.0	1	5.9
	18-20	210	175	83.3	35	16.7	19	9.0	176	83.8	2	1.0	13	6.2
	21-30	1295	1060	81.9	235	18.1	233	18.0	993	76.7	29	2.2	40	3.1
	31-40	716	584	81.6	132	18.4	131	18.3	550	76.8	14	2.0	21	2.9
	41-50	392	319	81.4	73	18.6	91	23.2	280	71.4	7	1.8	14	3.6
	51-60	253	201	79.4	52	20.6	79	31.2	156	61.7	10	4.0	8	3.2
	61-70	66	57	86.4	9	13.6	22	33.3	37	56.1	1	1.5	6	9.1
	71 & ABOVE	8	6	75.0	2	25.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	2957	2419	81.8	538	18.2	579	19.6	2212	74.8	63	2.1	103	3.5
TUOLUMNE	UNDER 18	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	15	13	86.7	2	13.3	11	73.3	3	20.0	0	0.0	1	6.7
	21-30	104	85	81.7	19	18.3	91	87.5	11	10.6	0	0.0	2	1.9
	31-40	69	46	66.7	23	33.3	53	76.8	12	17.4	1	1.4	3	4.3
	41-50	66	48	72.7	18	27.3	58	87.9	6	9.1	0	0.0	2	3.0
	51-60	62	42	67.7	20	32.3	54	87.1	8	12.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	61-70	34	25	73.5	9	26.5	32	94.1	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	356	263	73.9	93	26.1	305	85.7	42	11.8	1	0.3	8	2.2
VENTURA	UNDER 18	17	12	70.6	5	29.4	9	52.9	7	41.2	0	0.0	1	5.9
	18-20	210	168	80.0	42	20.0	70	33.3	126	60.0	4	1.9	10	4.8
	21-30	1433	1106	77.2	327	22.8	537	37.5	775	54.1	43	3.0	78	5.4
	31-40	714	567	79.4	147	20.6	275	38.5	375	52.5	28	3.9	36	5.0
	41-50	471	337	71.5	134	28.5	233	49.5	206	43.7	10	2.1	22	4.7
	51-60	325	238	73.2	87	26.8	220	67.7	89	27.4	3	0.9	13	4.0
	61-70	91	68	74.7	23	25.3	66	72.5	20	22.0	3	3.3	2	2.2
	71 & ABOVE	20	14	70.0	6	30.0	17	85.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	3281	2510	76.5	771	23.5	1427	43.5	1601	48.8	91	2.8	162	4.9



TABLE B1: 2015 DUI ARRESTS BY COUNTY, AGE, GENDER, AND RACE/ETHNICITY - continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL	GENDER				RACE/ETHNICITY							
			MALE		FEMALE		WHITE		HISPANIC		BLACK		OTHER	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YOLO	UNDER 18	4	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
	18-20	41	37	90.2	4	9.8	9	22.0	23	56.1	1	2.4	8	19.5
	21-30	302	241	79.8	61	20.2	114	37.7	134	44.4	19	6.3	35	11.6
	31-40	148	109	73.6	39	26.4	53	35.8	65	43.9	19	12.8	11	7.4
	41-50	98	80	81.6	18	18.4	42	42.9	34	34.7	13	13.3	9	9.2
	51-60	59	40	67.8	19	32.2	36	61.0	18	30.5	3	5.1	2	3.4
	61-70	17	13	76.5	4	23.5	11	64.7	3	17.6	1	5.9	2	11.8
	71 & ABOVE	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	674	526	78.0	148	22.0	268	39.8	282	41.8	57	8.5	67	9.9
YUBA	UNDER 18	1	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	18-20	24	22	91.7	2	8.3	15	62.5	7	29.2	0	0.0	2	8.3
	21-30	176	145	82.4	31	17.6	117	66.5	43	24.4	7	4.0	9	5.1
	31-40	107	79	73.8	28	26.2	73	68.2	24	22.4	1	0.9	9	8.4
	41-50	86	53	61.6	33	38.4	66	76.7	12	14.0	5	5.8	3	3.5
	51-60	69	52	75.4	17	24.6	58	84.1	6	8.7	3	4.3	2	2.9
	61-70	19	14	73.7	5	26.3	14	73.7	3	15.8	1	5.3	1	5.3
	71 & ABOVE	3	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	TOTAL	485	369	76.1	116	23.9	347	71.5	95	19.6	17	3.5	26	5.4

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE		116190	100.0	89203	100.0	26987	100.0
ALAMEDA	UNDER 18	8	0.2	6	0.2	2	0.2
	18-20	114	3.2	84	3.0	30	3.6
	21-30	1497	41.4	1104	39.6	393	47.2
	31-40	980	27.1	761	27.3	219	26.3
	41-50	542	15.0	442	15.9	100	12.0
	51-60	355	9.8	291	10.4	64	7.7
	61-70	101	2.8	80	2.9	21	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	22	0.6	18	0.6	4	0.5
	TOTAL	3619	100.0	2786	100.0	833	100.0
ALPINE	18-20	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	33.3
	21-30	5	31.3	5	38.5	0	0.0
	31-40	2	12.5	2	15.4	0	0.0
	41-50	2	12.5	1	7.7	1	33.3
	51-60	4	25.0	4	30.8	0	0.0
	61-70	2	12.5	1	7.7	1	33.3
		TOTAL	16	100.0	13	100.0	3
AMADOR	UNDER 18	2	1.6	2	2.2	0	0.0
	18-20	4	3.1	3	3.2	1	2.9
	21-30	35	27.3	26	28.0	9	25.7
	31-40	26	20.3	16	17.2	10	28.6
	41-50	32	25.0	25	26.9	7	20.0
	51-60	21	16.4	15	16.1	6	17.1
	61-70	6	4.7	5	5.4	1	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.6	1	1.1	1	2.9
	TOTAL	128	100.0	93	100.0	35	100.0
BUTTE	UNDER 18	2	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.4
	18-20	45	5.1	32	5.0	13	5.2
	21-30	375	42.1	276	43.2	99	39.3
	31-40	181	20.3	121	18.9	60	23.8
	41-50	129	14.5	93	14.6	36	14.3
	51-60	89	10.0	62	9.7	27	10.7
	61-70	53	5.9	41	6.4	12	4.8
	71 & ABOVE	17	1.9	13	2.0	4	1.6
	TOTAL	891	100.0	639	100.0	252	100.0
CALAVERAS	18-20	7	3.5	5	3.3	2	4.3
	21-30	55	27.6	48	31.6	7	14.9
	31-40	45	22.6	38	25.0	7	14.9
	41-50	42	21.1	25	16.4	17	36.2
	51-60	31	15.6	20	13.2	11	23.4
	61-70	14	7.0	11	7.2	3	6.4
	71 & ABOVE	5	2.5	5	3.3	0	0.0
	TOTAL	199	100.0	152	100.0	47	100.0

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
COLUSA	UNDER 18	2	1.6	1	0.9	1	4.8
	18-20	7	5.5	6	5.6	1	4.8
	21-30	38	29.7	30	28.0	8	38.1
	31-40	31	24.2	27	25.2	4	19.0
	41-50	21	16.4	18	16.8	3	14.3
	51-60	26	20.3	23	21.5	3	14.3
	61-70	1	0.8	1	0.9	0	0.0
	71 & ABOVE	2	1.6	1	0.9	1	4.8
	TOTAL	128	100.0	107	100.0	21	100.0
CONTRA COSTA	UNDER 18	4	0.2	3	0.2	1	0.2
	18-20	91	3.7	63	3.4	28	4.5
	21-30	926	37.8	690	37.6	236	38.2
	31-40	629	25.7	490	26.7	139	22.5
	41-50	410	16.7	293	16.0	117	19.0
	51-60	293	12.0	217	11.8	76	12.3
	61-70	80	3.3	62	3.4	18	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	18	0.7	16	0.9	2	0.3
	TOTAL	2451	100.0	1834	100.0	617	100.0
DEL NORTE	UNDER 18	1	1.2	0	0.0	1	3.8
	18-20	5	6.0	3	5.2	2	7.7
	21-30	23	27.4	18	31.0	5	19.2
	31-40	20	23.8	16	27.6	4	15.4
	41-50	17	20.2	9	15.5	8	30.8
	51-60	13	15.5	10	17.2	3	11.5
	61-70	5	6.0	2	3.4	3	11.5
	71 & ABOVE	84	100.0	58	100.0	26	100.0
	TOTAL	84	100.0	58	100.0	26	100.0
EL DORADO	UNDER 18	6	0.8	5	0.9	1	0.5
	18-20	28	3.7	25	4.5	3	1.6
	21-30	307	41.0	232	41.5	75	39.7
	31-40	147	19.7	117	20.9	30	15.9
	41-50	104	13.9	66	11.8	38	20.1
	51-60	112	15.0	84	15.0	28	14.8
	61-70	41	5.5	30	5.4	11	5.8
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.4	0	0.0	3	1.6
	TOTAL	748	100.0	559	100.0	189	100.0
FRESNO	UNDER 18	7	0.2	4	0.1	3	0.3
	18-20	263	6.1	210	6.1	53	5.9
	21-30	1949	44.9	1523	44.4	426	47.1
	31-40	1014	23.4	827	24.1	187	20.7
	41-50	611	14.1	474	13.8	137	15.2
	51-60	361	8.3	284	8.3	77	8.5
	61-70	116	2.7	97	2.8	19	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	15	0.3	13	0.4	2	0.2
	TOTAL	4336	100.0	3432	100.0	904	100.0

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
GLENN	UNDER 18	1	0.6	1	0.8	0	0.0
	18-20	11	6.5	8	6.3	3	7.1
	21-30	45	26.5	33	25.8	12	28.6
	31-40	35	20.6	29	22.7	6	14.3
	41-50	24	14.1	18	14.1	6	14.3
	51-60	37	21.8	27	21.1	10	23.8
	61-70	13	7.6	10	7.8	3	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	4	2.4	2	1.6	2	4.8
TOTAL	170	100.0	128	100.0	42	100.0	
HUMBOLDT	18-20	28	4.8	20	4.6	8	5.2
	21-30	244	41.6	179	41.4	65	41.9
	31-40	149	25.4	113	26.2	36	23.2
	41-50	74	12.6	52	12.0	22	14.2
	51-60	62	10.6	46	10.6	16	10.3
	61-70	28	4.8	20	4.6	8	5.2
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.3	2	0.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	587	100.0	432	100.0	155	100.0
IMPERIAL	18-20	32	6.5	28	7.1	4	4.0
	21-30	208	42.0	169	42.7	39	39.4
	31-40	119	24.0	83	21.0	36	36.4
	41-50	70	14.1	56	14.1	14	14.1
	51-60	41	8.3	36	9.1	5	5.1
	61-70	19	3.8	18	4.5	1	1.0
	71 & ABOVE	6	1.2	6	1.5	0	0.0
	TOTAL	495	100.0	396	100.0	99	100.0
INYO	18-20	2	1.9	1	1.3	1	3.2
	21-30	20	18.5	14	18.2	6	19.4
	31-40	24	22.2	16	20.8	8	25.8
	41-50	29	26.9	20	26.0	9	29.0
	51-60	24	22.2	18	23.4	6	19.4
	61-70	6	5.6	5	6.5	1	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	3	2.8	3	3.9	0	0.0
	TOTAL	108	100.0	77	100.0	31	100.0
KERN	UNDER 18	10	0.3	10	0.4	0	0.0
	18-20	229	7.5	194	7.8	35	6.0
	21-30	1314	43.0	1068	43.2	246	42.2
	31-40	722	23.6	588	23.8	134	23.0
	41-50	455	14.9	356	14.4	99	17.0
	51-60	241	7.9	188	7.6	53	9.1
	61-70	77	2.5	62	2.5	15	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	9	0.3	8	0.3	1	0.2
TOTAL	3057	100.0	2474	100.0	583	100.0	
KINGS	UNDER 18	2	0.5	2	0.6	0	0.0
	18-20	31	7.2	24	6.8	7	9.3
	21-30	195	45.6	165	46.7	30	40.0
	31-40	87	20.3	66	18.7	21	28.0
	41-50	63	14.7	55	15.6	8	10.7
	51-60	35	8.2	27	7.6	8	10.7
	61-70	13	3.0	12	3.4	1	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.5	2	0.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	428	100.0	353	100.0	75	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
LAKE	UNDER 18	3	1.0	2	0.9	1	1.1
	18-20	14	4.4	11	5.0	3	3.2
	21-30	117	37.1	85	38.5	32	34.0
	31-40	66	21.0	50	22.6	16	17.0
	41-50	44	14.0	29	13.1	15	16.0
	51-60	44	14.0	26	11.8	18	19.1
	61-70	22	7.0	16	7.2	6	6.4
	71 & ABOVE	5	1.6	2	0.9	3	3.2
TOTAL	315	100.0	221	100.0	94	100.0	
LASSEN	18-20	5	4.0	3	3.2	2	6.3
	21-30	44	34.9	31	33.0	13	40.6
	31-40	26	20.6	22	23.4	4	12.5
	41-50	20	15.9	17	18.1	3	9.4
	51-60	17	13.5	9	9.6	8	25.0
	61-70	13	10.3	11	11.7	2	6.3
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.8	1	1.1	0	0.0
TOTAL	126	100.0	94	100.0	32	100.0	
LOS ANGELES	UNDER 18	10	0.0	8	0.0	2	0.0
	18-20	1064	4.2	798	4.1	266	4.7
	21-30	11168	44.5	8257	42.4	2911	51.6
	31-40	6170	24.6	4853	24.9	1317	23.4
	41-50	3790	15.1	3085	15.8	705	12.5
	51-60	2227	8.9	1904	9.8	323	5.7
	61-70	586	2.3	494	2.5	92	1.6
	71 & ABOVE	93	0.4	71	0.4	22	0.4
TOTAL	25108	100.0	19470	100.0	5638	100.0	
MADERA	18-20	27	4.5	22	4.2	5	6.2
	21-30	267	44.2	242	46.3	25	30.9
	31-40	128	21.2	111	21.2	17	21.0
	41-50	92	15.2	81	15.5	11	13.6
	51-60	64	10.6	44	8.4	20	24.7
	61-70	19	3.1	17	3.3	2	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	7	1.2	6	1.1	1	1.2
TOTAL	604	100.0	523	100.0	81	100.0	
MARIN	UNDER 18	3	0.3	2	0.2	1	0.3
	18-20	52	4.4	41	4.6	11	3.8
	21-30	410	34.8	312	35.1	98	34.1
	31-40	265	22.5	213	23.9	52	18.1
	41-50	230	19.5	170	19.1	60	20.9
	51-60	137	11.6	98	11.0	39	13.6
	61-70	64	5.4	44	4.9	20	7.0
	71 & ABOVE	16	1.4	10	1.1	6	2.1
TOTAL	1177	100.0	890	100.0	287	100.0	
MARIPOSA	21-30	14	26.9	14	29.8	0	0.0
	31-40	6	11.5	5	10.6	1	20.0
	41-50	8	15.4	8	17.0	0	0.0
	51-60	15	28.8	12	25.5	3	60.0
	61-70	9	17.3	8	17.0	1	20.0
TOTAL	52	100.0	47	100.0	5	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
MENDOCINO	UNDER 18	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	1.2
	18-20	18	4.3	15	4.4	3	3.7
	21-30	145	34.6	118	34.9	27	33.3
	31-40	89	21.2	71	21.0	18	22.2
	41-50	75	17.9	66	19.5	9	11.1
	51-60	61	14.6	42	12.4	19	23.5
	61-70	26	6.2	22	6.5	4	4.9
	71 & ABOVE	3	0.7	3	0.9	0	0.0
TOTAL	419	100.0	338	100.0	81	100.0	
MERCED	UNDER 18	4	0.7	4	0.8	0	0.0
	18-20	28	4.7	25	5.1	3	2.8
	21-30	263	44.4	209	42.9	54	50.9
	31-40	152	25.6	131	26.9	21	19.8
	41-50	72	12.1	58	11.9	14	13.2
	51-60	41	6.9	32	6.6	9	8.5
	61-70	31	5.2	26	5.3	5	4.7
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.3	2	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	593	100.0	487	100.0	106	100.0	
MODOC	18-20	1	2.1	1	2.4	0	0.0
	21-30	13	27.1	10	23.8	3	50.0
	31-40	11	22.9	11	26.2	0	0.0
	41-50	8	16.7	8	19.0	0	0.0
	51-60	8	16.7	5	11.9	3	50.0
	61-70	7	14.6	7	16.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	48	100.0	42	100.0	6	100.0
MONO	18-20	2	2.7	1	1.7	1	7.1
	21-30	27	37.0	21	35.6	6	42.9
	31-40	17	23.3	14	23.7	3	21.4
	41-50	11	15.1	11	18.6	0	0.0
	51-60	10	13.7	7	11.9	3	21.4
	61-70	5	6.8	4	6.8	1	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	1	1.4	1	1.7	0	0.0
TOTAL	73	100.0	59	100.0	14	100.0	
MONTEREY	UNDER 18	11	0.6	10	0.6	1	0.3
	18-20	133	6.9	113	7.0	20	6.1
	21-30	885	45.8	731	45.6	154	46.7
	31-40	443	22.9	380	23.7	63	19.1
	41-50	244	12.6	199	12.4	45	13.6
	51-60	160	8.3	121	7.5	39	11.8
	61-70	50	2.6	42	2.6	8	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.4	7	0.4	0	0.0
TOTAL	1933	100.0	1603	100.0	330	100.0	
NAPA	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
	18-20	27	3.4	21	3.3	6	3.8
	21-30	316	39.6	249	38.9	67	42.7
	31-40	180	22.6	148	23.1	32	20.4
	41-50	132	16.6	110	17.2	22	14.0
	51-60	105	13.2	80	12.5	25	15.9
	61-70	30	3.8	26	4.1	4	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.8	5	0.8	1	0.6
TOTAL	797	100.0	640	100.0	157	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
NEVADA	UNDER 18	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	12	2.6	9	2.7	3	2.5
	21-30	153	33.8	121	36.1	32	27.1
	31-40	116	25.6	93	27.8	23	19.5
	41-50	78	17.2	49	14.6	29	24.6
	51-60	63	13.9	41	12.2	22	18.6
	61-70	28	6.2	19	5.7	9	7.6
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.4	2	0.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	453	100.0	335	100.0	118	100.0	
ORANGE	UNDER 18	22	0.2	18	0.2	4	0.1
	18-20	633	5.5	461	5.4	172	5.9
	21-30	5387	46.9	3938	46.0	1449	49.4
	31-40	2533	22.0	1982	23.2	551	18.8
	41-50	1575	13.7	1177	13.8	398	13.6
	51-60	1016	8.8	741	8.7	275	9.4
	61-70	282	2.5	206	2.4	76	2.6
	71 & ABOVE	40	0.3	33	0.4	7	0.2
TOTAL	11488	100.0	8556	100.0	2932	100.0	
PLACER	UNDER 18	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	63	4.6	50	5.1	13	3.3
	21-30	530	38.4	397	40.2	133	33.9
	31-40	309	22.4	222	22.5	87	22.2
	41-50	237	17.2	166	16.8	71	18.1
	51-60	163	11.8	105	10.6	58	14.8
	61-70	62	4.5	37	3.7	25	6.4
	71 & ABOVE	15	1.1	10	1.0	5	1.3
TOTAL	1380	100.0	988	100.0	392	100.0	
PLUMAS	18-20	5	4.5	4	4.9	1	3.2
	21-30	37	33.0	29	35.8	8	25.8
	31-40	19	17.0	13	16.0	6	19.4
	41-50	22	19.6	16	19.8	6	19.4
	51-60	20	17.9	11	13.6	9	29.0
	61-70	8	7.1	7	8.6	1	3.2
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.9	1	1.2	0	0.0
TOTAL	112	100.0	81	100.0	31	100.0	
RIVERSIDE	UNDER 18	7	0.1	7	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	341	4.7	274	4.9	67	4.0
	21-30	3340	45.6	2509	44.6	831	49.1
	31-40	1750	23.9	1380	24.5	370	21.9
	41-50	986	13.5	752	13.4	234	13.8
	51-60	673	9.2	531	9.4	142	8.4
	61-70	187	2.6	146	2.6	41	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	38	0.5	30	0.5	8	0.5
TOTAL	7322	100.0	5629	100.0	1693	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SACRAMENTO	UNDER 18	6	0.1	4	0.1	2	0.1
	18-20	265	5.4	198	5.6	67	4.8
	21-30	2251	45.5	1597	45.1	654	46.5
	31-40	1140	23.0	833	23.5	307	21.8
	41-50	707	14.3	492	13.9	215	15.3
	51-60	424	8.6	298	8.4	126	9.0
	61-70	135	2.7	105	3.0	30	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	20	0.4	14	0.4	6	0.4
TOTAL	4948	100.0	3541	100.0	1407	100.0	
SAN BENITO	UNDER 18	2	0.6	1	0.4	1	1.3
	18-20	22	6.9	16	6.6	6	7.8
	21-30	142	44.2	105	43.0	37	48.1
	31-40	75	23.4	59	24.2	16	20.8
	41-50	47	14.6	34	13.9	13	16.9
	51-60	24	7.5	21	8.6	3	3.9
	61-70	9	2.8	8	3.3	1	1.3
	TOTAL	321	100.0	244	100.0	77	100.0
SAN BERNARDINO	UNDER 18	16	0.3	12	0.3	4	0.3
	18-20	301	5.4	242	5.5	59	5.1
	21-30	2474	44.4	1913	43.4	561	48.2
	31-40	1313	23.6	1048	23.8	265	22.7
	41-50	791	14.2	634	14.4	157	13.5
	51-60	483	8.7	400	9.1	83	7.1
	61-70	168	3.0	141	3.2	27	2.3
	71 & ABOVE	25	0.4	16	0.4	9	0.8
TOTAL	5571	100.0	4406	100.0	1165	100.0	
SAN DIEGO	UNDER 18	20	0.2	14	0.2	6	0.3
	18-20	447	4.9	340	4.9	107	4.8
	21-30	4132	45.4	3116	45.3	1016	45.6
	31-40	2030	22.3	1573	22.9	457	20.5
	41-50	1319	14.5	986	14.3	333	15.0
	51-60	862	9.5	617	9.0	245	11.0
	61-70	252	2.8	202	2.9	50	2.2
	71 & ABOVE	38	0.4	26	0.4	12	0.5
TOTAL	9100	100.0	6874	100.0	2226	100.0	
SAN FRANCISCO	18-20	19	2.8	13	2.5	6	3.5
	21-30	326	47.4	234	45.2	92	54.1
	31-40	183	26.6	143	27.6	40	23.5
	41-50	88	12.8	67	12.9	21	12.4
	51-60	56	8.1	47	9.1	9	5.3
	61-70	15	2.2	13	2.5	2	1.2
	71 & ABOVE	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
	TOTAL	688	100.0	518	100.0	170	100.0



TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SAN JOAQUIN	UNDER 18	3	0.1	3	0.2	0	0.0
	18-20	128	5.8	107	6.2	21	4.5
	21-30	973	44.2	752	43.4	221	47.5
	31-40	496	22.6	386	22.3	110	23.7
	41-50	309	14.1	240	13.8	69	14.8
	51-60	214	9.7	184	10.6	30	6.5
	61-70	62	2.8	51	2.9	11	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	14	0.6	11	0.6	3	0.6
TOTAL	2199	100.0	1734	100.0	465	100.0	
SAN LUIS OBISPO	UNDER 18	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.2
	18-20	82	5.0	56	4.6	26	6.1
	21-30	703	42.5	530	43.2	173	40.5
	31-40	341	20.6	264	21.5	77	18.0
	41-50	260	15.7	185	15.1	75	17.6
	51-60	190	11.5	137	11.2	53	12.4
	61-70	69	4.2	48	3.9	21	4.9
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.4	6	0.5	1	0.2
TOTAL	1654	100.0	1227	100.0	427	100.0	
SAN MATEO	UNDER 18	7	0.4	6	0.4	1	0.2
	18-20	62	3.3	40	2.7	22	5.2
	21-30	806	42.5	614	41.6	192	45.6
	31-40	477	25.1	383	25.9	94	22.3
	41-50	267	14.1	215	14.6	52	12.4
	51-60	186	9.8	143	9.7	43	10.2
	61-70	79	4.2	64	4.3	15	3.6
	71 & ABOVE	14	0.7	12	0.8	2	0.5
TOTAL	1898	100.0	1477	100.0	421	100.0	
SANTA BARBARA	UNDER 18	4	0.2	4	0.3	0	0.0
	18-20	165	8.3	129	8.2	36	9.0
	21-30	882	44.5	702	44.4	180	44.8
	31-40	401	20.2	324	20.5	77	19.2
	41-50	247	12.5	199	12.6	48	11.9
	51-60	212	10.7	161	10.2	51	12.7
	61-70	57	2.9	50	3.2	7	1.7
	71 & ABOVE	14	0.7	11	0.7	3	0.7
TOTAL	1982	100.0	1580	100.0	402	100.0	
SANTA CLARA	UNDER 18	7	0.2	5	0.1	2	0.2
	18-20	283	6.3	207	5.9	76	7.6
	21-30	2117	46.9	1594	45.4	523	52.0
	31-40	1057	23.4	869	24.8	188	18.7
	41-50	570	12.6	462	13.2	108	10.7
	51-60	349	7.7	261	7.4	88	8.7
	61-70	110	2.4	95	2.7	15	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	21	0.5	15	0.4	6	0.6
TOTAL	4514	100.0	3508	100.0	1006	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
SANTA CRUZ	UNDER 18	8	0.7	6	0.7	2	0.6
	18-20	74	6.2	52	6.0	22	6.9
	21-30	540	45.4	405	46.4	135	42.6
	31-40	250	21.0	188	21.6	62	19.6
	41-50	151	12.7	110	12.6	41	12.9
	51-60	118	9.9	74	8.5	44	13.9
	61-70	41	3.4	33	3.8	8	2.5
	71 & ABOVE	7	0.6	4	0.5	3	0.9
TOTAL	1189	100.0	872	100.0	317	100.0	
SHASTA	UNDER 18	2	0.3	2	0.4	0	0.0
	18-20	28	4.4	22	4.6	6	3.7
	21-30	246	38.5	188	39.6	58	35.4
	31-40	154	24.1	114	24.0	40	24.4
	41-50	100	15.6	71	14.9	29	17.7
	51-60	76	11.9	51	10.7	25	15.2
	61-70	25	3.9	20	4.2	5	3.0
	71 & ABOVE	8	1.3	7	1.5	1	0.6
TOTAL	639	100.0	475	100.0	164	100.0	
SIERRA	21-30	1	7.1	1	8.3	0	0.0
	31-40	1	7.1	1	8.3	0	0.0
	41-50	4	28.6	4	33.3	0	0.0
	51-60	8	57.1	6	50.0	2	100.0
	TOTAL	14	100.0	12	100.0	2	100.0
SISKIYOU	UNDER 18	1	0.6	1	0.8	0	0.0
	18-20	6	3.7	4	3.1	2	6.3
	21-30	36	22.2	26	20.0	10	31.3
	31-40	41	25.3	34	26.2	7	21.9
	41-50	30	18.5	26	20.0	4	12.5
	51-60	35	21.6	29	22.3	6	18.8
	61-70	10	6.2	7	5.4	3	9.4
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.9	3	2.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	162	100.0	130	100.0	32	100.0	
SOLANO	UNDER 18	4	0.4	3	0.4	1	0.4
	18-20	49	4.7	37	4.7	12	4.5
	21-30	404	38.5	290	37.1	114	42.9
	31-40	282	26.9	219	28.0	63	23.7
	41-50	147	14.0	106	13.6	41	15.4
	51-60	114	10.9	88	11.3	26	9.8
	61-70	43	4.1	34	4.3	9	3.4
	71 & ABOVE	5	0.5	5	0.6	0	0.0
TOTAL	1048	100.0	782	100.0	266	100.0	
SONOMA	UNDER 18	17	0.7	13	0.7	4	0.7
	18-20	109	4.7	73	4.2	36	6.1
	21-30	975	41.7	740	42.3	235	39.9
	31-40	506	21.7	378	21.6	128	21.7
	41-50	333	14.2	250	14.3	83	14.1
	51-60	271	11.6	203	11.6	68	11.5
	61-70	109	4.7	77	4.4	32	5.4
	71 & ABOVE	17	0.7	14	0.8	3	0.5
TOTAL	2337	100.0	1748	100.0	589	100.0	

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
STANISLAUS	UNDER 18	4	0.2	3	0.2	1	0.2
	18-20	101	5.7	80	5.9	21	5.1
	21-30	763	43.3	580	43.0	183	44.3
	31-40	422	24.0	314	23.3	108	26.2
	41-50	257	14.6	201	14.9	56	13.6
	51-60	164	9.3	131	9.7	33	8.0
	61-70	44	2.5	34	2.5	10	2.4
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.3	5	0.4	1	0.2
TOTAL	1761	100.0	1348	100.0	413	100.0	
SUTTER	UNDER 18	2	0.7	1	0.4	1	1.8
	18-20	26	8.8	20	8.4	6	10.5
	21-30	120	40.5	97	40.6	23	40.4
	31-40	72	24.3	60	25.1	12	21.1
	41-50	37	12.5	27	11.3	10	17.5
	51-60	23	7.8	19	7.9	4	7.0
	61-70	16	5.4	15	6.3	1	1.8
	TOTAL	296	100.0	239	100.0	57	100.0
TEHAMA	18-20	14	5.3	14	7.1	0	0.0
	21-30	98	37.3	72	36.4	26	40.0
	31-40	65	24.7	55	27.8	10	15.4
	41-50	34	12.9	19	9.6	15	23.1
	51-60	38	14.4	27	13.6	11	16.9
	61-70	11	4.2	9	4.5	2	3.1
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.1	2	1.0	1	1.5
	TOTAL	263	100.0	198	100.0	65	100.0
TRINITY	18-20	3	4.8	2	4.2	1	7.1
	21-30	15	24.2	13	27.1	2	14.3
	31-40	13	21.0	13	27.1	0	0.0
	41-50	15	24.2	10	20.8	5	35.7
	51-60	11	17.7	6	12.5	5	35.7
	61-70	4	6.5	3	6.3	1	7.1
	71 & ABOVE	1	1.6	1	2.1	0	0.0
	TOTAL	62	100.0	48	100.0	14	100.0
TULARE	UNDER 18	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0
	18-20	143	6.7	110	6.3	33	8.3
	21-30	938	44.0	756	43.6	182	45.8
	31-40	513	24.1	436	25.1	77	19.4
	41-50	288	13.5	234	13.5	54	13.6
	51-60	183	8.6	138	8.0	45	11.3
	61-70	58	2.7	52	3.0	6	1.5
	71 & ABOVE	6	0.3	6	0.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	2131	100.0	1734	100.0	397	100.0	
TUOLUMNE	18-20	15	5.0	13	5.5	2	2.9
	21-30	88	29.0	69	29.4	19	27.9
	31-40	49	16.2	35	14.9	14	20.6
	41-50	58	19.1	42	17.9	16	23.5
	51-60	69	22.8	55	23.4	14	20.6
	61-70	21	6.9	19	8.1	2	2.9
	71 & ABOVE	3	1.0	2	0.9	1	1.5
	TOTAL	303	100.0	235	100.0	68	100.0

TABLE B2: DUI CONVICTIONS FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY  
COUNTY, GENDER, AND AGE – continued

COUNTY	AGE	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
VENTURA	UNDER 18	15	0.5	14	0.7	1	0.1
	18-20	147	5.3	109	5.3	38	5.3
	21-30	1190	43.1	875	42.7	315	44.3
	31-40	619	22.4	486	23.7	133	18.7
	41-50	376	13.6	260	12.7	116	16.3
	51-60	317	11.5	233	11.4	84	11.8
	61-70	77	2.8	62	3.0	15	2.1
	71 & ABOVE	21	0.8	12	0.6	9	1.3
TOTAL	2762	100.0	2051	100.0	711	100.0	
YOLO	UNDER 18	5	0.9	4	0.9	1	0.7
	18-20	34	5.8	24	5.4	10	7.1
	21-30	277	47.4	211	47.6	66	46.8
	31-40	119	20.4	89	20.1	30	21.3
	41-50	79	13.5	59	13.3	20	14.2
	51-60	46	7.9	35	7.9	11	7.8
	61-70	20	3.4	18	4.1	2	1.4
	71 & ABOVE	4	0.7	3	0.7	1	0.7
TOTAL	584	100.0	443	100.0	141	100.0	
YUBA	UNDER 18	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0.0
	18-20	20	6.3	18	7.4	2	2.6
	21-30	133	41.7	102	42.0	31	40.8
	31-40	57	17.9	39	16.0	18	23.7
	41-50	51	16.0	38	15.6	13	17.1
	51-60	43	13.5	34	14.0	9	11.8
	61-70	12	3.8	11	4.5	1	1.3
	71 & ABOVE	2	0.6	0	0.0	2	2.6
TOTAL	319	100.0	243	100.0	76	100.0	

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STATEWIDE		111680	3862	648	14563	105	7
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND 1	104	18	0	2	137	38
	OAKLAND JUV	10	2	0	0	87	63
	FREMONT	512	5	14	84	96	4
	PLEASANTON	670	5	0	282	135	6
	OAKLAND 2	1358	9	4	384	96	2
	HAYWARD	905	1	2	346	97	5
	TOTAL	3559	40	20	1098	103	4
ALPINE	ALPINE	16	0	0	2	63	9
	TOTAL	16	0	0	2	63	9
AMADOR	AMADOR JUV	0	0	2	0	135	41
	JACKSON	119	5	2	34	99	33
	TOTAL	119	5	4	34	100	33
BUTTE	BUTTE	848	31	8	129	164	15
	BUTTE JUV	4	0	0	0	152	5
	TOTAL	852	31	8	129	164	14
CALAVERAS	CALAVERAS	191	8	0	61	59	7
	TOTAL	191	8	0	61	59	7
COLUSA	COLUSA JUV	2	0	0	0	95	177
	COLUSA	116	9	1	32	65	9
	TOTAL	118	9	1	32	66	9
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA	32	41	0	0	381	21
	MARTINEZ	9	1	0	0	194	62
	CONCORD	1	0	0	0	200	65
	RICHMOND	560	12	5	96	166	12
	PITTSBURG	576	17	10	106	209	6
	WALNUT CREEK	1157	20	10	222	274	14
	TOTAL	2335	91	25	424	235	12
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE	76	8	0	25	93	49
	TOTAL	76	8	0	25	93	49

<sup>a</sup>Violations of CVC 23153. They do not include 4th offenses of CVC 23152 (in 10 years) which are statutorily defined as violations of CVC 23153.

<sup>b</sup>Violations of CVC 23140

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
EL DORADO	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	306	3	3	57	144	21
	PLACERVILLE	405	30	1	64	155	10
	TOTAL	711	33	4	121	152	14
FRESNO	FRESNO JUV	12	1	0	1	133	42
	FRESNO CENTRAL	4096	203	18	415	125	0
	CLOVIS	4	1	0	0	100	0
	USDT FRESNO	1	0	0	0	221	11
	TOTAL	4113	205	18	416	125	0
GLENN	GLENN	160	6	4	26	166	23
	TOTAL	160	6	4	26	166	23
HUMBOLDT	SUP HUMBOLDT	569	15	3	172	130	66
	TOTAL	569	15	3	172	130	66
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	73	0	1	8	213	72
	EL CENTRO	401	15	4	69	206	10
	WINTERHAVEN	0	0	1	0	68	2
	TOTAL	474	15	6	77	206	11
INYO	INYO	0	4	0	2	254	10
	TRAFF INYO JUV	0	1	0	0	142	534
	BISHOP	100	3	0	40	86	2
	TOTAL	100	8	0	42	88	2
KERN	KERN	9	0	0	3	22	42
	KERN JUV	12	1	1	0	53	9
	LAMONT	225	6	7	64	32	29
	BAKERSFIELD	1963	60	19	378	53	14
	DELANO	146	5	0	14	31	3
	SHAFTER	186	8	0	21	37	5
	MOJAVE	262	3	0	58	52	0
	RIDGECREST	142	1	1	37	87	1
	TOTAL	2945	84	28	575	48	13

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
KINGS	KINGS JUV	3	0	0	0	68	1
	HANFORD	394	8	3	24	183	9
	AVENAL	9	0	1	0	49	1
	CORCORAN	10	0	0	1	176	0
	TOTAL	416	8	4	25	182	6
LAKE	LAKE	306	9	0	17	130	24
	TOTAL	306	9	0	17	130	24
LASSEN	SUSANVILLE	124	1	1	6	128	6
	TOTAL	124	1	1	6	128	6
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES	40	27	0	0	195	9
	POMONA 1	9	16	0	0	203	7
	LANCASTER 1	24	11	2	0	207	6
	SAN FERNANDO 1	10	3	0	0	294	12
	PASADENA 1	3	8	0	0	279	5
	VAN NUYS 1	15	9	0	1	258	21
	LONG BEACH 1	5	7	0	0	275	6
	COMPTON 1	7	5	0	0	219	15
	NORWALK	11	7	0	0	160	5
	TORRANCE 1	7	3	0	0	270	7
	SANTA MONICA 1	8	7	0	0	210	9
	LOS ANGELES JUV	2	1	0	0	130	4
	EASTLAKE JUV	3	0	0	0	189	5
	LA PROBATION	6	0	2	0	143	32
	LA AIRPORT	995	22	0	115	135	20
	ALHAMBRA	425	14	1	52	131	4
	LANCASTER 2	1209	52	5	141	93	10
	BEVERLY HILLS	2	0	1	0	195	21
	BURBANK	347	7	0	49	102	5
	WEST COVINA	1415	21	9	100	101	5
	CHATSWORTH	0	0	7	0	249	0
	COMPTON 2	791	24	2	66	136	5
	DOWNEY	1135	43	0	53	121	5
EAST LOS ANGELES	644	2	0	25	117	5	

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
LOS ANGELES (cont)	EL MONTE	670	3	5	36	122	11
	GLENDALE	443	10	0	72	212	6
	INGLEWOOD	692	7	2	65	136	8
	LONG BEACH 2	1385	15	8	90	90	9
	LA METRO	5010	30	19	838	75	11
	BELLFLOWER	1183	30	4	16	121	5
	SANTA CLARITA	618	1	3	75	130	5
	PASADENA 2	911	16	3	207	141	4
	POMONA 2	1152	19	1	79	88	5
	SANTA MONICA 2	1	0	1	0	134	238
	TORRANCE 2	1349	16	1	134	116	6
	SAN FERNANDO 2	1245	37	0	231	60	9
	VAN NUYS 2	2704	31	9	395	67	7
	AVALON	22	0	0	0	112	9
USDT LOS ANGELES	22	0	0	1	117	18	
TOTAL		24520	504	85	2841	101	6
MADERA	MADERA	59	13	0	5	372	32
	CHOWCHILLA	519	0	1	40	319	15
	BASS LAKE SIERRA	9	3	0	0	408	38
	TOTAL	587	16	1	45	325	20
MARIN	SAN RAFAEL	1149	15	13	7	76	14
	TOTAL	1149	15	13	7	76	14
MARIPOSA	SUP MARIPOSA	51	1	0	7	80	8
	TOTAL	51	1	0	7	80	8
MENDOCINO	SUP UKIAH	6	12	0	0	109	322
	MENDOCINO JUV	3	0	2	0	143	21
	UKIAH	310	0	1	49	103	137
	POINT ARENA	2	0	0	0	80	205
	FORT BRAGG	76	7	0	19	68	76
	TOTAL	397	19	3	68	93	135



TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
MERCED	MERCED JUV	2	0	0	0	134	79
	MERCED	352	73	2	47	213	110
	LOS BANOS	134	29	1	26	232	31
	TOTAL	488	102	3	73	217	87
MODOC	ALTURAS	47	0	1	10	60	21
	TOTAL	47	0	1	10	60	21
MONO	MAMMOTH LAKES	71	1	1	8	107	14
	TOTAL	71	1	1	8	107	14
MONTEREY	MONTEREY	125	35	0	10	132	28
	MONTEREY JUV	13	0	1	0	74	9
	MARINA	0	0	3	0	122	6
	SALINAS	1739	14	3	242	44	11
	TOTAL	1877	49	7	252	52	12
NAPA	NAPA	756	38	3	138	84	2
	TOTAL	756	38	3	138	84	2
NEVADA	NEVADA JUV	1	1	0	0	162	101
	NEVADA CITY	259	17	0	33	113	32
	TRUCKEE	168	7	0	30	67	13
	TOTAL	428	25	0	63	94	20
ORANGE	ORANGE JUV	30	0	5	0	110	16
	FULLERTON	3030	72	7	27	129	0
	WESTMINSTER	2962	96	4	96	127	0
	NEWPORT BEACH	2979	94	38	223	134	0
	SANTA ANA	2105	57	9	127	166	0
	TOTAL	11106	319	63	473	136	0
PLACER	PLACER JUV	2	0	0	0	179	10
	ROSEVILLE	1133	68	3	152	114	9
	ROSEVILLE TRAFFIC	19	7	0	9	663	3
	TAHOE CITY	143	3	2	27	98	8
	TOTAL	1297	78	5	188	114	9
PLUMAS	PLUMAS JUV	1	0	0	0	80	3
	QUINCY	109	2	0	9	70	3
	TOTAL	110	2	0	9	71	3

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE	3367	118	0	259	137	1
	INDIO	1665	19	6	171	125	2
	RIVERSIDE JUV	5	1	0	0	130	9
	MURRIETA JUV	0	0	2	0	136	1
	BANNING	372	7	0	36	110	6
	INDIO	0	0	2	0	272	99
	BLYTHE	49	0	0	4	96	2
	MURRIETA	1649	52	0	210	117	4
	TEMECULA	8	0	0	0	209	207
	TOTAL	7115	197	10	680	129	2
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	47	289	0	1	126	2
	SACRAMENTO JUV	6	0	0	0	144	11
	SACRAMENTO CM	4447	110	38	418	69	5
	USDT SACRAMENTO	11	0	0	0	132	11
	TOTAL	4511	399	38	419	73	5
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO	310	7	2	53	110	12
	JUV SAN BENITO	2	0	0	0	58	60
	TOTAL	312	7	2	53	110	12
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO 1	1297	62	7	168	159	6
	R CUCAMONGA	2516	59	5	183	159	4
	VICTORVILLE 1	1086	60	4	237	184	6
	BARSTOW	2	1	1	2	232	65
	JOSHUA TREE	12	0	0	32	593	13
	S BERNARDINO JUV	8	1	0	0	86	33
	VICTORVILLE JUV	4	0	0	0	141	8
	SAN BERNARDINO 2	15	0	0	2	109	55
	FONTANA	114	7	18	2	86	6
	VICTORVILLE 2	24	3	0	13	244	167
	SUP R CUCAMONGA	22	3	0	11	205	125
	SUP NEEDLES	4	0	0	0	252	180
	JOSHUA TREE DIST	227	8	1	30	108	7
TOTAL	5331	204	36	680	159	5	

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO	85	68	1	5	146	8
	VISTA 1	21	132	0	0	116	18
	SAN DIEGO JUV	26	2	0	0	116	29
	EL CAJON	1594	86	7	514	73	75
	VISTA 2	2420	65	0	491	63	48
	VISTA 3	0	0	14	1	78	41
	KEARNY MESA	3290	14	20	718	85	7
	CHULA VISTA	1178	51	21	183	74	12
	USDT SOUTH SD	5	0	0	0	410	2
TOTAL	8619	418	63	1912	75	35	
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	3	8	0	0	446	7
	SAN FRAN YOUTH	0	0	1	0	111	0
	SAN FRAN TRAFFIC	656	18	2	140	94	11
	TOTAL	659	26	3	140	95	11
SAN JOAQUIN	SAN JOAQUIN	3	0	0	0	283	223
	SAN JOAQUIN JUV	2	1	0	0	182	42
	LODI	29	0	0	3	100	3
	MANTECA	598	35	0	148	55	21
	STOCKTON	1461	61	9	241	38	8
	TOTAL	2093	97	9	392	43	11
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO JUV	2	0	0	0	195	196
	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1590	57	5	330	64	2
	TOTAL	1592	57	5	330	64	2
SAN MATEO	SAN MATEO	177	32	1	35	265	231
	SAN MATEO JUV	7	0	1	0	117	44
	SAN MATEO NORTH	0	0	1	0	277	1
	SO SAN FRANCISCO	20	0	3	4	113	46
	REDWOOD CITY	1638	14	4	343	141	78
	TOTAL	1842	46	10	382	145	82

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA JUV	5	0	0	0	82	9
	SANTA BARBARA	941	29	11	139	73	28
	SUP SANTA MARIA	714	33	0	46	57	101
	LOMPOC	236	7	5	23	55	16
	TOTAL	1896	69	16	208	62	43
SANTA CLARA	SANTA CLARA	55	75	0	1	142	72
	SANTA CLARA JUV	13	1	0	0	108	38
	PALO ALTO	814	3	10	121	87	18
	SAN JOSE	2970	58	12	297	84	3
	SAN JOSE TRAFFIC	0	0	12	0	87	62
	SAN MARTIN	484	7	0	79	77	9
	TOTAL	4336	144	34	498	85	7
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ JUV	6	1	0	0	94	3
	SANTA CRUZ TRAF	1085	25	9	140	67	4
	WATSONVILLE	63	0	0	1	39	2
	TOTAL	1154	26	9	141	64	4
SHASTA	SHASTA JUV	1	1	0	0	54	104
	BURNEY	19	1	0	5	96	48
	REDDING	561	50	6	128	114	17
	TOTAL	581	52	6	133	112	17
SIERRA	SIERRA	14	0	0	6	92	51
	TOTAL	14	0	0	6	92	51
SISKIYOU	SISKIYOU	1	0	0	0	5	15
	YREKA	156	5	0	38	123	7
	TOTAL	157	5	0	38	122	8
SOLANO	SOLANO JUV	5	0	1	0	107	1
	FAIRFIELD	735	24	5	99	184	6
	VALLEJO	262	16	0	57	116	7
	TOTAL	1002	40	6	156	169	6
SONOMA	SONOMA	2221	82	7	319	74	56
	SONOMA JUV	13	1	4	0	60	29
	SANTA ROSA	0	0	9	0	90	0
	TOTAL	2234	83	20	319	74	56

TABLE B3: DUI CONVICTION DATA FOR 2014 DUI ARRESTS BY COURT - continued

COUNTY	COURT	MISD DUI	FELONY DUI <sup>a</sup>	UNDER 21 DUI <sup>b</sup>	ALCOHOL OR DRUG RECKLESS	MEDIAN DUI ADJUDICATION TIMES (DAYS)	
						VIOLATION TO CONVICTION	CONVICTION TO DMV UPDATE
STANISLAUS	STANISLAUS	1687	55	0	132	95	30
	STANISLAUS JUV	8	1	0	0	113	84
	MODESTO	0	0	10	0	124	20
	TOTAL	1695	56	10	132	96	30
SUTTER	YUBA CITY	267	23	6	99	76	57
	TOTAL	267	23	6	99	76	57
TEHAMA	TEHAMA	1	6	0	0	198	45
	RED BLUFF	249	5	2	49	57	65
	TOTAL	250	11	2	49	59	63
TRINITY	TRINITY	60	2	0	6	128	18
	TOTAL	60	2	0	6	128	18
TULARE	VISALIA JUV	7	0	0	0	186	8
	PORTERVILLE	649	16	3	44	73	25
	TULARE	79	0	0	2	100	32
	VISALIA DIV	1339	27	11	134	78	33
	TOTAL	2074	43	14	180	76	32
TUOLUMNE	TUOLUMNE	287	13	3	2	77	15
	TOTAL	287	13	3	2	77	15
VENTURA	VENTURA	2669	68	25	0	134	0
	TOTAL	2669	68	25	0	134	0
YOLO	YOLO	554	24	6	69	132	31
	TOTAL	554	24	6	69	132	31
YUBA	YUBA	306	7	3	73	95	21
	YUBA JUV	1	0	1	2	124	4
	USDT BEALE	1	0	0	0	108	12
	TOTAL	308	7	4	75	95	21

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014<sup>a</sup>

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
STATEWIDE			116190	96.5	73.5	67.6	22.2	0.2	6.6
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1009	97.9	98.4	75.5	2.3	0.0	5.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	304	97.0	98.0	8.6	59.5	0.0	8.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	95.4	83.5	1.8	50.5	1.8	8.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	71	69.0	93.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	4.2
		TOTAL	1493	96.2	97.0	52.9	18.1	0.1	6.3
	OAKLAND JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	11	81.8	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	83.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FREMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	386	96.1	96.1	87.8	2.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	117	95.7	95.7	7.7	85.5	0.9	1.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	92.0	96.0	4.0	88.0	0.0	4.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	531	95.7	96.0	65.7	25.6	0.2	0.6
	PLEASANTON	1 <sup>ST</sup>	465	99.8	99.4	95.9	2.8	0.0	44.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	166	100.0	98.8	16.9	82.5	0.0	80.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	42	97.6	92.9	7.1	92.9	0.0	92.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	675	99.7	98.8	70.7	28.3	0.0	56.3
	HAYWARD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	626	99.2	98.2	88.3	4.0	0.0	1.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	218	99.1	95.4	9.6	82.1	0.0	0.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	63	98.4	88.9	1.6	82.5	0.0	7.9
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		908	99.1	96.9	63.3	28.3	0.0	1.5	
ALPINE	MARKLEEVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	14	100.0	92.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	16	100.0	93.8	93.8	6.3	0.0	6.3
AMADOR	JACKSON JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	JACKSON	1 <sup>ST</sup>	70	97.1	98.6	88.6	8.6	0.0	14.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	43	93.0	100.0	11.6	74.4	0.0	51.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	8	87.5	87.5	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	60.0
		TOTAL	126	93.7	98.4	53.2	37.3	0.0	32.5

<sup>a</sup>Entries represent percentages of DUI convictees arrested in 2014 receiving each sanction by county, court, and offender status.

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
BUTTE	OROVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	611	96.1	91.8	93.3	1.3	0.7	4.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	213	94.8	98.6	16.9	73.2	2.3	11.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	51	74.5	96.1	11.8	21.6	45.1	51.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	16	50.0	100.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	43.8
		TOTAL	891	93.7	93.8	68.7	19.9	4.3	9.5
CALAVERAS	SAN ANDREAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	121	98.3	100.0	95.0	3.3	0.0	9.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	50	98.0	100.0	16.0	80.0	0.0	32.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	92.0	100.0	12.0	72.0	4.0	68.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	199	97.5	100.0	63.3	32.7	0.5	24.1
COLUSA	COLUSA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	COLUSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	89	93.3	98.9	84.3	1.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	26	96.2	100.0	42.3	38.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	20.0	100.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	126	91.3	99.2	71.4	10.3	0.8	0.0
CONTRA COSTA	MARTINEZ	1 <sup>ST</sup>	21	81.0	95.2	38.1	9.5	0.0	9.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	12	50.0	91.7	8.3	25.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	11	72.7	72.7	0.0	18.2	0.0	27.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	29	89.7	86.2	0.0	13.8	0.0	27.6
		TOTAL	73	78.1	87.7	12.3	15.1	0.0	17.8
	MARTINEZ JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CONCORD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	RICHMOND	1 <sup>ST</sup>	397	98.2	97.5	90.4	5.0	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	147	100.0	99.3	6.8	87.8	0.0	12.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	30	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	50.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
		TOTAL	577	98.8	98.1	64.0	30.5	0.0	6.4

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
CONTRA COSTA (cont)	PITTSBURG	1 <sup>ST</sup>	416	96.9	87.7	89.9	2.9	0.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	135	96.3	95.6	10.4	85.2	0.0	0.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	39	92.3	100.0	0.0	87.2	0.0	12.8
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	13	92.3	92.3	0.0	92.3	0.0	23.1
		TOTAL	603	96.4	90.4	64.3	28.7	0.0	1.7
	WALNUT CREEK	1 <sup>ST</sup>	834	97.6	94.8	92.7	2.0	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	277	98.9	98.2	6.5	89.5	0.0	2.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	63	100.0	95.2	0.0	93.7	0.0	7.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	13	76.9	100.0	0.0	76.9	0.0	7.7
		TOTAL	1187	97.8	95.7	66.6	28.1	0.0	1.2
DEL NORTE	CRESCENT CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	58	93.1	100.0	81.0	5.2	0.0	5.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	21	66.7	100.0	4.8	52.4	4.8	47.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	84	84.5	100.0	57.1	20.2	1.2	19.0
EL DORADO	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	224	97.3	97.3	87.9	3.6	0.0	4.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	65	95.4	98.5	3.1	80.0	0.0	53.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	16	87.5	81.3	0.0	68.8	0.0	81.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	28.6
		TOTAL	312	95.5	96.8	63.8	24.0	0.0	18.9
	PLACERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	289	97.9	97.2	89.3	3.1	0.0	1.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	106	98.1	100.0	9.4	80.2	0.0	17.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	28	75.0	92.9	3.6	42.9	0.0	21.4
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	13	69.2	76.9	0.0	38.5	0.0	23.1
		TOTAL	436	95.6	97.0	61.7	25.5	0.0	7.1
FRESNO	FRESNO JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FRESNO CENTRAL	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2904	97.4	98.7	93.5	1.8	0.0	0.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	988	96.0	99.4	12.2	80.0	0.1	17.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	295	92.2	99.3	6.1	75.9	0.0	41.7
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	130	51.5	100.0	6.2	37.7	3.1	4.6
		TOTAL	4317	95.3	98.9	66.3	25.9	0.1	7.5



TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
FRESNO (cont)	CLOVIS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	100.0	100.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
	USDT FRESNO	2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
GLENN	WILLOWS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	108	95.4	42.6	64.8	3.7	0.9	1.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	47	97.9	95.7	4.3	61.7	6.4	14.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	170	96.5	62.4	42.9	22.4	4.7	7.6
HUMBOLDT	EUREKA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	427	98.8	92.3	94.4	0.0	0.2	0.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	124	97.6	95.2	23.4	72.6	0.8	69.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	27	96.3	96.3	14.8	85.2	0.0	85.2
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	9	100.0	100.0	0.0	77.8	0.0	33.3
		TOTAL	587	98.5	93.2	74.3	20.4	0.3	19.8
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	55	96.4	16.4	85.5	1.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	11	72.7	90.9	9.1	90.9	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	7	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	74	93.2	35.1	64.9	25.7	0.0	0.0
	EL CENTRO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	324	92.0	12.0	75.9	2.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	74	81.1	77.0	14.9	66.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	17	82.4	100.0	0.0	76.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	420	89.5	28.1	61.2	16.9	0.0	0.0
	WINTERHAVEN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
INYO	INDEPENDENCE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
		TOTAL	4	75.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
	INYO JUV	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
INYO (cont)	BISHOP	1 <sup>ST</sup>	62	98.4	35.5	90.3	3.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	28	92.9	78.6	17.9	60.7	0.0	3.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	11	100.0	100.0	9.1	36.4	0.0	18.2
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	103	97.1	55.3	60.2	24.3	0.0	4.9
KERN	BAKERSFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1411	96.7	97.7	75.7	0.4	0.1	2.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	438	94.1	99.3	9.6	3.0	0.7	42.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	161	88.8	96.9	3.1	2.5	0.0	60.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	41	63.4	97.6	7.3	0.0	9.8	19.5
		TOTAL	2051	94.9	98.0	54.5	1.1	0.4	15.7
	BAKERSFIELD JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	14	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	100.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LAMONT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	165	93.3	92.1	43.6	0.6	0.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	54	100.0	100.0	7.4	24.1	0.0	1.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	16	93.8	100.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	238	94.1	94.5	31.9	6.3	0.0	0.8
	DELANO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	107	100.0	95.3	93.5	1.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	32	100.0	100.0	31.3	53.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	10	90.0	100.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	151	99.3	96.7	72.8	15.2	0.0	0.0
	SHAFTER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	140	98.6	97.9	86.4	11.4	0.0	1.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	45	97.8	97.8	20.0	82.2	0.0	8.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	8	100.0	100.0	12.5	75.0	0.0	12.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	194	97.9	97.9	67.5	30.4	0.0	3.6
	MOJAVE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	181	99.4	98.3	55.2	1.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	60	100.0	100.0	6.7	48.3	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	19	100.0	100.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		265	98.9	98.9	40.0	13.2	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
KERN (cont)	RIDGECREST	1 <sup>ST</sup>	98	96.9	98.0	24.5	0.0	0.0	1.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	37	94.6	97.3	29.7	0.0	5.4	16.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	144	96.5	97.9	25.0	0.0	2.1	4.9
KINGS	HANFORD JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	HANFORD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	273	92.7	95.2	86.4	2.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	100	93.0	95.0	19.0	68.0	0.0	2.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	80.0	100.0	4.0	76.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	42.9	100.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	405	91.1	95.6	63.2	23.5	0.0	0.5
	AVENAL	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	87.5	75.0	75.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CORCORAN	TOTAL	10	80.0	80.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	4	75.0	100.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	10	90.0	100.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0		
LAKE	LAKEPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	214	96.3	19.6	80.8	0.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	67	94.0	79.1	25.4	62.7	0.0	6.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	23	78.3	82.6	13.0	56.5	8.7	4.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	11	63.6	100.0	0.0	36.4	0.0	9.1
		TOTAL	315	93.3	39.7	61.3	19.0	0.6	1.9
LASSEN	SUSANVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	91	89.0	83.5	72.5	3.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	92.0	92.0	32.0	48.0	0.0	16.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	66.7	100.0	50.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	126	87.3	85.7	61.1	15.9	0.0	4.8
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	41	65.9	95.1	34.1	9.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	12.5	100.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	7	57.1	100.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	11	27.3	90.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	67	52.2	95.5	20.9	10.4	1.5	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	POMONA 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	14	7.1	100.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	25	8.0	96.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LANCASTER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	25	56.0	76.0	36.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	25.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	37	51.4	83.8	24.3	13.5	0.0	2.7
	SAN FERNANDO 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	7	71.4	71.4	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	5	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	13	53.8	69.2	23.1	7.7	0.0	0.0
	PASADENA 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	9	55.6	100.0	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	11	45.5	100.0	18.2	9.1	0.0	0.0
	VAN NUYS 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	17	70.6	70.6	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	3	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	24	66.7	75.0	29.2	4.2	0.0	0.0
	LONG BEACH 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	37.5	100.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
		TOTAL	12	41.7	100.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0
	COMPTON 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	87.5	75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		12	75.0	83.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	NORWALK	1 <sup>ST</sup>	13	46.2	84.6	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	18	38.9	88.9	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TORRANCE 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	50.0	60.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0
	SANTA MONICA 1	1 <sup>ST</sup>	9	77.8	66.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	15	80.0	80.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0
	LOS ANGELES JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	EASTLAKE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LA PROBATION	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	LA AIRPORT	1 <sup>ST</sup>	814	99.1	16.8	89.1	2.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	149	97.3	90.6	10.1	75.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	41	95.1	95.1	4.9	65.9	7.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	13	76.9	100.0	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1017	98.4	31.9	73.0	16.0	0.3	0.0
	ALHAMBRA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	345	98.8	18.3	92.8	1.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	75	100.0	85.3	9.3	84.0	0.0	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup>		19	94.7	100.0	0.0	68.4	10.5	10.5	
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		440	98.9	33.4	74.3	18.4	0.5	0.5	

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	934	94.5	43.9	87.9	2.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	248	90.7	92.7	6.5	77.4	1.6	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	63	93.7	98.4	3.2	74.6	4.8	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	21	28.6	100.0	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1266	92.7	57.1	66.3	21.0	0.6	0.0
	BEVERLY HILLS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	66.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
	BURBANK	1 <sup>ST</sup>	286	97.6	18.5	89.5	1.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	53	100.0	88.7	5.7	81.1	1.9	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	100.0	91.7	8.3	58.3	16.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	354	98.0	32.2	73.4	15.3	0.8	0.0
	WEST COVINA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1124	98.3	23.2	92.4	2.0	0.3	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	255	98.4	96.1	3.9	89.8	0.4	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	51	88.2	98.0	3.9	72.5	5.9	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	15	53.3	100.0	0.0	26.7	6.7	0.0
		TOTAL	1445	97.5	39.5	72.7	20.3	0.6	0.1
	CHATSWORTH	1 <sup>ST</sup>	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	COMPTON 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	650	97.7	28.0	87.4	3.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	128	93.8	85.2	10.2	78.1	0.8	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	33	93.9	93.9	3.0	75.8	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	83.3	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	817	96.8	40.1	71.2	18.1	0.1	0.0
	DOWNEY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	930	97.6	18.5	83.9	2.7	0.3	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	198	98.0	91.4	8.6	80.8	1.0	1.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	46	84.8	95.7	0.0	58.7	13.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1178	97.0	34.0	67.7	18.0	1.0	0.3

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	EAST LA JUD DST	1 <sup>ST</sup>	528	99.2	36.7	67.8	2.7	0.2	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	97	96.9	97.9	4.1	66.0	2.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	19	100.0	100.0	0.0	68.4	5.3	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	646	98.9	48.0	56.0	14.4	0.6	0.0
	EL MONTE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	526	98.1	36.7	92.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	124	99.2	96.0	4.0	91.9	0.0	3.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	27	96.3	96.3	11.1	70.4	11.1	7.4
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	678	98.1	50.0	72.6	20.9	0.4	0.9
	GLENDALE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	364	99.5	13.7	94.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	70	97.1	87.1	17.1	74.3	1.4	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	15	93.3	80.0	0.0	86.7	6.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	453	98.9	28.0	78.1	15.5	0.4	0.4
	INGLEWOOD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	537	98.7	29.8	72.1	3.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	131	100.0	93.1	7.6	64.9	3.1	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	30	93.3	100.0	6.7	46.7	26.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	701	98.4	44.9	56.9	16.7	1.7	0.0
	LONG BEACH 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1113	97.5	36.3	91.5	1.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	231	94.4	86.1	5.6	84.8	0.0	0.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	55	87.3	90.9	0.0	76.4	0.0	3.6
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	9	33.3	88.9	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1408	96.2	46.9	73.2	18.5	0.0	0.3
	LA METRO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	4034	97.9	35.0	91.7	4.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	847	97.4	96.1	5.2	90.1	0.2	0.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	156	90.4	98.7	1.3	80.1	1.3	1.9
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		22	22.7	100.0	0.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		5059	97.3	47.5	74.0	20.9	0.1	0.1	

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	BELLFLOWER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	924	98.2	22.0	92.3	2.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	235	99.1	91.9	8.1	86.0	1.3	1.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	46	89.1	95.7	2.2	71.7	8.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	12	33.3	83.3	0.0	25.0	0.0	8.3
		TOTAL	1217	97.4	38.9	71.7	21.2	0.6	0.3
	SANTA CLARITA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	477	99.2	19.9	82.8	1.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	121	97.5	95.0	5.8	78.5	0.0	1.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	21	95.2	100.0	4.8	71.4	4.8	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	622	98.7	37.6	64.8	19.3	0.2	0.3
	PASADENA 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	729	98.8	10.6	94.1	1.9	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	171	98.8	91.8	5.3	91.2	1.2	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	28	85.7	89.3	3.6	32.1	46.4	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
		TOTAL	930	98.3	28.1	74.8	19.2	1.7	0.0
	POMONA 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	891	98.8	24.2	94.9	2.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	233	98.3	93.6	9.4	88.0	0.0	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	37	100.0	100.0	0.0	91.9	2.7	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	11	45.5	90.9	9.1	27.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1172	98.2	41.0	74.1	22.5	0.1	0.1
	SANTA MONICA 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TORRANCE 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1077	98.8	28.6	94.0	2.3	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	234	98.7	92.3	7.3	90.2	0.0	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	46	95.7	91.3	4.3	89.1	2.2	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	9	22.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1366	98.2	42.1	75.5	20.3	0.1	0.1
	SAN FERNANDO 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	977	97.4	18.0	87.0	3.2	0.0	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup>		239	95.8	90.8	7.9	79.9	0.0	0.0	
3 <sup>RD</sup>		51	80.4	100.0	0.0	56.9	3.9	0.0	
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		15	33.3	100.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL		1282	95.7	35.8	67.8	19.8	0.2	0.0	



TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
LOS ANGELES (cont)	VAN NUYS 2	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2158	98.6	24.7	93.4	2.5	0.1	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	499	98.4	96.2	5.4	89.6	0.2	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	71	97.2	95.8	1.4	63.4	4.2	1.4
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	16	50.0	93.8	0.0	18.8	12.5	0.0
		TOTAL	2744	98.3	39.9	74.5	20.0	0.3	0.1
	CATALINA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	17	100.0	5.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	22	90.9	27.3	77.3	13.6	0.0	0.0
	USDT LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	21	4.8	4.8	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
	MADERA	MADERA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	36	86.1	97.2	72.2	5.6	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup>			14	92.9	100.0	0.0	85.7	7.1	0.0
3 <sup>RD</sup>			6	66.7	83.3	0.0	50.0	33.3	0.0
4 <sup>TH+</sup>			16	56.3	100.0	0.0	18.8	25.0	0.0
TOTAL			72	79.2	97.2	36.1	27.8	9.7	0.0
MADERA TRAF		1 <sup>ST</sup>	381	98.2	98.7	91.6	5.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	109	99.1	99.1	32.1	65.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	26	88.5	100.0	7.7	88.5	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	100.0	100.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	520	97.9	98.8	74.4	22.3	0.0	0.0
BASS LAKE		1 <sup>ST</sup>	7	85.7	100.0	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	91.7	100.0	50.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
		MARIN	MARIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	870	98.4	11.1	93.9	2.0
2 <sup>ND</sup>	235			98.7	91.1	3.8	88.9	0.0	28.1
3 <sup>RD</sup>	60			91.7	98.3	0.0	28.3	0.0	51.7
4 <sup>TH+</sup>	12			75.0	100.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	75.0
TOTAL	1177			97.9	32.5	70.2	21.3	0.0	9.9

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	34	100.0	94.1	79.4	2.9	0.0	2.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	12	100.0	91.7	0.0	83.3	0.0	25.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	75.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	52	98.1	94.2	51.9	28.8	0.0	7.7
MENDOCINO	UKIAH	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	75.0	87.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	25.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	50.0	100.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	18	61.1	94.4	11.1	22.2	0.0	5.6
	UKIAH JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MENDOCINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	205	97.1	95.1	91.7	3.4	0.0	15.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	79	98.7	98.7	1.3	96.2	0.0	69.6
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	96.0	100.0	0.0	96.0	0.0	76.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	311	97.4	96.5	60.8	35.0	0.0	33.8
	ARENA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FORT BRAGG	1 <sup>ST</sup>	51	98.0	98.0	90.2	7.8	0.0	0.0
2 <sup>ND</sup>		24	91.7	95.8	8.3	79.2	0.0	20.8	
3 <sup>RD</sup>		7	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	71.4	
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
TOTAL		83	96.4	97.6	57.8	37.3	0.0	13.3	
MERCED	MERCED JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MERCED	1 <sup>ST</sup>	298	91.6	89.3	28.2	3.7	0.3	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	101	85.1	83.2	4.0	67.3	1.0	5.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	24	75.0	83.3	0.0	58.3	0.0	16.7
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	427	88.5	87.4	20.6	21.8	0.5	2.3		

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
MERCED (cont)	LOS BANOS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	120	94.2	97.5	55.8	3.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	37	89.2	86.5	8.1	70.3	0.0	8.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	5	80.0	80.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	164	92.7	94.5	43.3	21.3	0.0	3.0
MODOC	ALTURAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	35	100.0	77.1	82.9	0.0	0.0	2.9
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	8	100.0	87.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	12.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	40.0
		TOTAL	48	100.0	81.3	62.5	14.6	0.0	8.3
MONO	MAMMOTH LAKES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	51	98.0	49.0	94.1	2.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	17	100.0	94.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	50.0	75.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	73	94.5	61.6	65.8	28.8	0.0	0.0
MONTEREY	SALINAS	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1380	99.3	98.6	87.8	4.1	0.0	2.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	399	98.2	98.7	8.5	81.0	0.3	30.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	98.2	100.0	2.8	77.1	0.0	31.2
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	28	75.0	96.4	0.0	42.9	0.0	7.1
		TOTAL	1916	98.6	98.6	65.2	24.8	0.1	10.1
	SALINAS JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	12	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MARINA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NAPA	NAPA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	584	98.3	96.6	92.6	1.5	0.0	30.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	161	99.4	98.1	16.1	78.3	0.0	79.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	44	86.4	97.7	0.0	77.3	0.0	70.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	8	75.0	100.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	25.0
		TOTAL	797	97.6	97.0	71.1	21.8	0.0	42.8
NEVADA	NEVADA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
NEVADA (cont)	NEVADA CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	191	100.0	100.0	95.3	4.2	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	68	100.0	98.5	13.2	85.3	0.0	4.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	91.7	91.7	0.0	91.7	0.0	33.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	80.0	100.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	20.0
		TOTAL	276	99.3	99.3	69.2	29.3	0.0	3.3
	TRUCKEE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	138	100.0	95.7	89.9	1.4	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	27	96.3	100.0	59.3	25.9	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	9	100.0	88.9	44.4	33.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	175	99.4	96.0	82.9	6.9	0.0	0.6
ORANGE	ORANGE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	35	85.7	8.6	54.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	35	85.7	8.6	54.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FULLERTON	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2384	98.5	36.6	93.8	1.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	568	98.1	94.5	4.2	87.0	0.0	6.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	129	94.6	96.9	1.6	88.4	0.0	3.1
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	28	57.1	100.0	0.0	53.6	0.0	7.1
		TOTAL	3109	97.9	50.2	72.8	21.2	0.0	1.4
	WESTMINSTER	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2311	98.7	22.8	93.9	2.2	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	599	98.3	94.5	4.0	89.5	0.2	2.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	125	93.6	96.0	0.8	85.6	0.0	7.2
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	27	59.3	92.6	0.0	51.9	0.0	14.8
		TOTAL	3062	98.1	40.5	71.7	23.1	0.0	0.9
	NEWPORT BEACH	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2304	97.8	71.5	92.7	1.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	622	99.2	95.0	5.5	88.6	0.0	5.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	148	95.9	96.6	2.0	87.8	0.0	6.1
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	37	73.0	100.0	0.0	81.1	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	3111	97.7	77.7	69.8	23.9	0.0	1.4
	SANTA ANA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1598	98.2	26.7	92.6	2.1	0.0	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	469	96.6	94.9	3.0	87.6	0.0	11.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	81	91.4	97.5	1.2	84.0	0.0	11.1
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		23	47.8	100.0	0.0	39.1	0.0	4.3	
TOTAL		2171	97.1	44.8	68.9	24.0	0.0	3.1	
PLACER	PLACER JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
PLACER (cont)	ROSEVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	839	98.0	98.9	94.9	2.3	0.0	1.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	266	95.1	100.0	6.0	88.3	0.0	63.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	76	81.6	100.0	1.3	81.6	0.0	75.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	23	73.9	100.0	4.3	69.6	0.0	65.2
		TOTAL	1204	95.8	99.3	67.6	27.6	0.0	21.3
	ROSEVILLE TRAFFIC	1 <sup>ST</sup>	21	81.0	90.5	76.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	26	80.8	92.3	61.5	15.4	0.0	15.4
	TAHOE CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	122	98.4	98.4	91.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	18	100.0	100.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	7	100.0	100.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	42.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	148	98.6	98.6	85.8	3.4	0.0	4.1
PLUMAS	QUINCY JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	QUINCY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	80	98.8	100.0	86.3	11.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	25	96.0	100.0	12.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
TOTAL	111	98.2	100.0	64.9	30.6	0.0	0.9		
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2587	97.7	97.7	94.2	2.9	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	685	95.3	97.5	7.4	86.7	0.0	0.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	155	87.7	97.4	1.3	87.1	0.0	0.6
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	58	58.6	89.7	0.0	62.1	0.0	1.7
		TOTAL	3485	96.1	97.5	71.4	24.1	0.0	0.2
	INDIO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1241	97.9	91.1	93.2	2.9	0.0	0.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	349	93.4	93.7	7.2	83.1	0.0	1.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	71	87.3	98.6	0.0	85.9	0.0	5.6
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	31	71.0	83.9	0.0	67.7	0.0	16.1
	TOTAL	1692	96.0	91.8	69.8	24.1	0.0	0.8	
	RIVERSIDE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	6	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	MURRIETA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	
RIVERSIDE (cont)	BANNING	1 <sup>ST</sup>	280	98.6	95.7	93.6	3.6	0.0	0.4	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	76	97.4	94.7	3.9	93.4	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	18	100.0	94.4	5.6	88.9	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	60.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	379	97.9	95.5	70.2	26.4	0.0	0.3	
	BLYTHE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	32	93.8	75.0	81.3	12.5	0.0	3.1	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	11	100.0	90.9	9.1	90.9	0.0	18.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	5	40.0	100.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	49	89.8	81.6	55.1	34.7	0.0	6.1	
	MURRIETA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1272	98.4	97.6	95.9	2.4	0.0	0.1	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	328	95.7	98.8	11.6	83.8	0.0	1.8	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	69	85.5	95.7	1.4	84.1	0.0	5.8	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	32	53.1	87.5	0.0	56.3	0.0	3.1	
		TOTAL	1701	96.5	97.5	74.0	22.4	0.0	0.7	
	TEMECULA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	8	100.0	100.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
	SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	100	83.0	99.0	64.0	2.0	0.0	38.0
			2 <sup>ND</sup>	73	57.5	97.3	5.5	35.6	0.0	34.2
3 <sup>RD</sup>			52	51.9	96.2	0.0	46.2	0.0	42.3	
4 <sup>TH+</sup>			111	43.2	98.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	38.7	
TOTAL			336	59.5	97.9	20.2	26.5	0.0	38.1	
SACRAMENTO JUV		1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	6	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SACRAMENTO TRAF		1 <sup>ST</sup>	3341	98.9	97.9	93.7	1.5	0.0	0.4	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	996	99.3	99.5	7.1	85.8	0.0	2.2	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	245	100.0	100.0	0.8	75.9	0.4	7.3	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	13	100.0	100.0	7.7	76.9	0.0	15.4	
		TOTAL	4595	99.0	98.3	69.8	24.0	0.0	1.2	
USDT EAST DST		1 <sup>ST</sup>	9	88.9	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	11	81.8	9.1	72.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	215	98.1	98.6	16.3	0.0	0.0	3.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	66	95.5	100.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	36.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	28	96.4	100.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	67.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	70.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
		TOTAL	319	96.6	99.1	11.0	1.9	0.0	16.9
	HOLLISTER JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	959	96.8	88.5	88.6	3.5	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	314	93.3	90.1	9.2	77.4	0.0	0.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	75	93.3	81.3	2.7	77.3	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	33	90.9	78.8	6.1	54.5	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1381	95.7	88.3	63.9	25.6	0.0	0.1
	R CUCAMONGA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1871	98.3	78.2	93.2	3.3	0.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	569	97.4	96.0	9.3	87.2	0.0	3.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	123	96.7	96.7	2.4	66.7	0.0	8.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	42	59.5	66.7	2.4	16.7	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2605	97.4	82.8	69.1	24.8	0.0	1.3
	VICTORVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	814	95.6	72.4	89.3	4.8	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	260	90.8	95.4	8.5	79.2	0.0	0.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	79	82.3	93.7	1.3	79.7	0.0	5.1
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	24	62.5	79.2	0.0	50.0	0.0	4.2
		TOTAL	1177	92.9	79.0	63.7	27.2	0.0	0.9
	BARSTOW	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	4	75.0	75.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
	JOSHUA TREE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	194	96.4	85.1	91.2	4.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	39	100.0	94.9	17.9	82.1	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	83.3	100.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	248	96.4	87.5	74.2	21.0	0.0	0.0
	S BERNARDINO JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK	
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%	
SAN BERNARDINO (cont)	VICTORVILLE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	FONTANA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	110	83.6	44.5	77.3	3.6	0.0	2.7	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	24	100.0	70.8	20.8	79.2	0.0	12.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	33.3	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	139	87.1	51.1	64.7	20.1	0.0	5.0	
	NEEDLES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	100.0	66.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	
		TOTAL	4	100.0	75.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	
	SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	92	75.0	83.7	22.8	3.3	0.0	2.2
			2 <sup>ND</sup>	38	68.4	97.4	10.5	15.8	0.0	2.6
3 <sup>RD</sup>			8	37.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
4 <sup>TH+</sup>			16	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
TOTAL			154	66.2	89.6	16.2	5.8	0.0	1.9	
VISTA		1 <sup>ST</sup>	1872	98.3	26.4	93.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	589	94.9	91.7	5.8	86.2	0.0	0.5	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	153	95.4	97.4	2.6	83.7	0.0	0.7	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	38	52.6	100.0	2.6	42.1	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	2652	96.8	46.0	67.4	26.7	0.0	0.2	
SAN DIEGO JUV		1 <sup>ST</sup>	27	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
EL CAJON		1 <sup>ST</sup>	1120	97.1	41.0	89.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	438	95.2	87.0	11.9	69.4	0.0	0.0	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	100	89.0	95.0	3.0	77.0	0.0	1.0	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	29	51.7	100.0	0.0	34.5	0.0	0.0	
		TOTAL	1687	95.3	57.1	63.0	24.7	0.0	0.1	
SAN DIEGO TRAF		1 <sup>ST</sup>	2580	97.4	8.5	92.8	1.9	0.0	20.3	
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	632	96.0	86.4	10.9	83.9	0.0	54.3	
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	105	88.6	97.1	2.9	83.8	0.0	61.0	
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	85.7	85.7	14.3	57.1	0.0	42.9	
		TOTAL	3324	96.8	26.3	74.2	20.2	0.0	28.1	



TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK		
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%		
SAN DIEGO (cont)	CHULA VISTA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	916	94.9	11.4	90.1	1.3	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	268	94.8	86.9	12.7	77.2	0.0	0.4		
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	49	87.8	89.8	8.2	79.6	0.0	0.0		
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	17	47.1	100.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	1250	93.9	31.8	69.0	20.9	0.0	0.1		
	USDT SAN DIEGO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	4	100.0	100.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
				2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3 <sup>RD</sup>	2			100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0		
4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4			100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	25.0		
TOTAL	11			100.0	100.0	27.3	54.5	0.0	36.4		
SAN FRAN JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>		1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	TOTAL		1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
SAN FRAN TRAF	1 <sup>ST</sup>		524	99.0	98.9	97.3	1.5	0.0	2.3		
	2 <sup>ND</sup>		124	100.0	100.0	8.9	88.7	0.0	80.6		
	3 <sup>RD</sup>		22	100.0	100.0	9.1	81.8	4.5	86.4		
	4 <sup>TH+</sup>	6	100.0	100.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	66.7			
	TOTAL	676	99.3	99.1	77.4	20.9	0.1	20.0			
SAN JOAQUIN	SAN JOAQUIN	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	SAN JOAQUIN JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	3	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		TOTAL	3	100.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	LODI	1 <sup>ST</sup>	20	100.0	100.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	9	100.0	100.0	11.1	66.7	11.1	44.4		
		TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0	69.0	20.7	3.4	13.8		
	MANTECA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	422	99.3	99.8	91.7	1.7	0.0	0.7		
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	143	97.9	100.0	14.0	79.7	0.0	10.5		
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	43	95.3	100.0	11.6	83.7	0.0	37.2		
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	25	88.0	96.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	52.0		
		TOTAL	633	98.3	99.7	65.1	28.0	0.0	7.4		

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
SAN JOAQUIN (cont)	STOCKTON	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1052	98.4	98.7	91.8	1.8	0.0	2.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	327	98.5	98.8	7.6	71.6	0.3	60.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	108	96.3	99.1	2.8	69.4	2.8	62.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	44	72.7	100.0	0.0	54.5	2.3	27.3
		TOTAL	1531	97.5	98.8	64.9	23.0	0.3	19.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1143	99.3	98.3	94.6	1.5	0.0	0.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	373	98.9	100.0	21.4	73.7	0.3	5.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	109	95.4	99.1	5.5	86.2	0.9	8.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	27	85.2	96.3	3.7	40.7	0.0	3.7
		TOTAL	1652	98.7	98.7	70.7	24.0	0.1	1.9
SAN MATEO	REDWOOD CITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1393	99.3	99.0	92.6	2.5	0.0	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	373	98.4	98.4	9.9	84.5	0.0	9.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	82	92.7	97.6	3.7	78.0	0.0	19.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	18	83.3	100.0	5.6	55.6	0.0	11.1
		TOTAL	1866	98.7	98.8	71.3	22.7	0.0	3.2
	SAN MATEO JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	7	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	8	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SAN MATEO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SO SAN FRANCISCO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	20	80.0	80.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	23	82.6	82.6	65.2	8.7	0.0	4.3
SANTA BARBARA	USDT LOS ANGELES	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SNTA BARBARA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	5	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	5	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SANTA BARBARA (cont)	SANTA BARBARA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	733	98.1	85.7	95.6	1.2	0.0	0.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	188	98.4	97.3	7.4	87.8	0.0	2.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	50	98.0	100.0	4.0	90.0	0.0	22.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	10	100.0	100.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	981	98.2	88.8	73.1	23.2	0.0	1.7
	SANTA MARIA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	524	98.3	61.1	88.9	4.0	0.0	1.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	158	99.4	98.7	8.2	84.8	0.0	42.4
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	53	92.5	96.2	1.9	84.9	0.0	41.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	12	66.7	91.7	0.0	58.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	747	97.6	72.0	64.3	27.7	0.0	13.1
	LOMPOC	1 <sup>ST</sup>	181	95.6	41.4	89.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	52	96.2	86.5	3.8	48.1	0.0	23.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	14	78.6	100.0	7.1	42.9	0.0	28.6
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	248	94.8	54.4	66.1	13.7	0.0	6.5
SANTA CLARA	SAN JOSE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2373	98.7	98.7	96.3	2.4	0.0	3.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	603	98.5	98.3	13.3	84.2	0.2	51.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	153	94.8	98.7	2.0	83.7	0.0	81.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	41	75.6	100.0	2.4	68.3	0.0	63.4
		TOTAL	3170	98.2	98.7	74.7	22.7	0.1	17.3
	SAN JOSE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PALO ALTO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	637	98.7	98.3	93.6	2.8	0.0	2.8
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	152	98.7	98.0	13.2	84.9	0.0	42.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	37	91.9	97.3	8.1	81.1	0.0	78.4
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	827	98.4	98.2	74.8	21.5	0.0	13.5
	SAN JOSE TRAFFIC	1 <sup>ST</sup>	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
SANTA CLARA (cont)	MORGAN HILL	1 <sup>ST</sup>	360	100.0	99.7	96.7	2.2	0.0	1.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	96	100.0	99.0	9.4	87.5	0.0	61.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	33	100.0	100.0	3.0	81.8	0.0	90.9
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	491	100.0	99.6	72.9	24.2	0.0	19.6
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	7	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	SANTA CRUZ	1 <sup>ST</sup>	824	97.9	97.7	59.6	0.8	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	220	99.1	100.0	6.4	39.1	0.0	0.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	60	95.0	100.0	1.7	18.3	0.0	1.7
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	15	73.3	100.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	1119	97.7	98.3	45.2	9.5	0.0	0.2
	WATSONVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	45	100.0	100.0	62.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	14	100.0	100.0	7.1	42.9	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	4	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL		63	100.0	100.0	46.0	15.9	0.0	0.0	
SHASTA	REDDING JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	BURNEY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	11	100.0	100.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	45.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	7	100.0	100.0	14.3	57.1	0.0	85.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	20	100.0	100.0	55.0	30.0	0.0	60.0
	REDDING	1 <sup>ST</sup>	373	95.7	97.6	83.4	2.4	0.3	37.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	181	95.6	98.9	9.9	71.3	0.0	69.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	46	84.8	95.7	2.2	54.3	2.2	54.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	17	76.5	100.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	11.8
TOTAL		617	94.3	97.9	53.6	26.4	0.3	47.2	
SIERRA	SIERRA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	14	100.0	100.0	78.6	14.3	0.0	0.0

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			N	%	%	%	%	%	%
SISKIYOU	YREKA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	120	98.3	96.7	76.7	5.0	0.0	1.7
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	30	86.7	96.7	26.7	60.0	0.0	13.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	10	80.0	100.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	70.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	100.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
		TOTAL	162	95.1	96.9	62.3	19.1	0.0	9.3
SOLANO	FAIRFIELD JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	6	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FAIRFIELD	1 <sup>ST</sup>	515	96.9	98.4	93.6	1.9	0.0	1.2
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	164	97.0	99.4	7.9	88.4	0.0	33.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	65	93.8	100.0	0.0	86.2	0.0	78.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	20	45.0	100.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	35.0
	TOTAL	764	95.3	98.8	64.8	28.5	0.0	15.6	
	VALLEJO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	181	97.2	100.0	94.5	1.7	0.0	1.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	62	98.4	100.0	1.6	96.8	0.0	16.1
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	25	96.0	100.0	0.0	92.0	0.0	68.0
4 <sup>TH+</sup>		10	70.0	100.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	50.0	
TOTAL	278	96.4	100.0	61.9	33.1	0.0	12.2		
SONOMA	SANTA ROSA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1593	96.7	96.9	85.6	1.6	0.0	4.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	547	93.8	98.5	6.2	79.5	0.0	65.3
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	154	85.7	98.7	1.9	83.1	0.0	80.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	25	80.0	100.0	0.0	64.0	0.0	76.0
		TOTAL	2319	95.1	97.4	60.4	26.0	0.0	24.5
	SANTA ROSA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	18	38.9	27.8	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	18	38.9	27.8	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
STANISLAUS	MODESTO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1224	99.3	99.8	94.9	2.9	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	373	98.7	100.0	19.6	78.6	0.0	7.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	107	96.3	100.0	3.7	93.5	0.0	24.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	38	57.9	100.0	0.0	60.5	0.0	21.1
		TOTAL	1742	98.1	99.9	71.1	25.9	0.0	4.0
	STANISLAUS JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	8	100.0	87.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	9	100.0	88.9	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	MODESTO TRAF	1 <sup>ST</sup>	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued**

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
SUTTER	YUBA CITY TRAF	1 <sup>ST</sup>	215	96.3	96.7	90.7	2.8	0.0	3.3
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	54	96.3	100.0	11.1	85.2	0.0	68.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	22	90.9	100.0	9.1	81.8	0.0	81.8
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	5	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	80.0
		TOTAL	296	95.9	97.6	68.6	25.3	0.0	22.3
TEHAMA	RED BLUFF	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
		TOTAL	7	28.6	100.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	57.1
	TEHAMA TRAF	1 <sup>ST</sup>	176	98.9	98.9	93.2	5.1	0.0	0.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	59	96.6	100.0	13.6	83.1	0.0	1.7
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	19	94.7	100.0	0.0	94.7	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	2	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	256	97.7	99.2	67.2	29.7	0.0	0.8
		TRINITY	TRINITY	1 <sup>ST</sup>	43	100.0	95.3	81.4	2.3
2 <sup>ND</sup>	17			100.0	88.2	11.8	41.2	0.0	52.9
3 <sup>RD</sup>	1			100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 <sup>TH+</sup>	1			0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	62			98.4	93.5	59.7	12.9	0.0	16.1
TULARE	VISALIA JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	6	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	7	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	PORTERVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	436	97.5	94.7	90.6	1.6	0.0	1.1
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	157	96.2	97.5	11.5	79.0	0.0	10.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	41	97.6	97.6	2.4	90.2	0.0	19.5
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	34	64.7	88.2	0.0	32.4	0.0	14.7
		TOTAL	668	95.5	95.2	62.0	26.8	0.0	5.1
	TULARE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	993	97.8	25.7	94.3	1.4	0.2	0.4
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	325	98.2	92.9	9.5	84.9	0.0	12.9
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	103	92.2	96.1	2.9	82.5	0.0	12.6
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	35	77.1	97.1	2.9	40.0	0.0	31.4
		TOTAL	1456	97.0	47.4	66.7	26.7	0.1	4.8

TABLE B4: COURT SANCTIONS BY COUNTY, COURT, AND DUI OFFENDER STATUS  
FOR DUI OFFENDERS ARRESTED IN 2014 – continued

COUNTY	COURT	DUI OFFENDER STATUS	TOTAL	PROBATION	JAIL	1 <sup>ST</sup> OFFENDER DUI PROGRAM	18-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	30-MONTH DUI PROGRAM	IGNITION INTERLOCK
			<i>N</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
TUOLUMNE	SONORA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	199	96.5	64.3	86.9	5.0	0.5	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	85	96.5	68.2	10.6	81.2	0.0	0.0
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	16	87.5	93.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	66.7	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	303	95.7	67.3	60.1	27.7	0.3	0.3
VENTURA	VENTURA	1 <sup>ST</sup>	2098	97.6	95.7	93.5	3.1	0.0	4.6
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	505	96.0	97.8	9.5	85.5	0.0	81.2
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	127	87.4	95.3	0.8	81.1	0.0	84.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	32	53.1	100.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	53.1
		TOTAL	2762	96.3	96.1	72.8	22.3	0.0	22.8
YOLO	YOLO	1 <sup>ST</sup>	426	97.4	96.5	74.6	1.9	0.0	0.5
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	125	96.8	97.6	32.0	47.2	0.0	32.8
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	26	100.0	100.0	11.5	65.4	0.0	57.7
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	7	42.9	57.1	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0
		TOTAL	584	96.7	96.4	61.8	14.7	0.0	9.9
YUBA	MARYSVILLE	1 <sup>ST</sup>	239	99.2	77.4	93.7	1.3	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	62	100.0	93.5	30.6	69.4	0.0	6.5
		3 <sup>RD</sup>	12	100.0	100.0	0.0	91.7	0.0	8.3
		4 <sup>TH+</sup>	3	33.3	100.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
		TOTAL	316	98.7	81.6	76.9	18.4	0.0	1.9
	MARYSVILLE JUV	1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2 <sup>ND</sup>	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	USDT BEALE AFB	TOTAL	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
		1 <sup>ST</sup>	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

**TABLE B5: DEMOGRAPHIC 2-YEAR PRIOR DRIVER RECORD VARIABLES FOR FIRST DUI OFFENDERS  
ARRESTED IN 2014**

YEAR GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	PERCENT FEMALE	MEAN AGE	PERCENT COMMERCIAL DRIVERS	MEAN MONTHS IN STUDY	MEAN 2-YEAR PRIOR INCIDENTS				ZIP CODE ACCIDENT AND CONVICTION INDICES			
						TOTAL ACCIDENTS	ALCOHOL ACCIDENTS	MAJOR CONVICTIONS	MINOR CONVICTIONS	TOTAL ACCIDENTS	INJURY ACCIDENTS	MAJOR VIOLATIONS	MOVING VIOLATIONS
FDO													
3-month program	28,245 (76.5%)	29.0	33.7	1.2	19.7	0.31	0.17	0.006	0.58	0.119	0.0807	0.0281	0.141
9-month program	8,696 (23.5%)	30.2	37.4	1.4	19.8	0.43	0.30	0.004	0.44	0.118	0.0308	0.0283	0.140
		$\chi^2 = 4.3^*$	$F = 580.1^*$	$\chi^2 = 1.4$	$F = 3.9^*$	$F = 281.5^*$	$F = 589.1^*$	$F = 2.04$	$F = 165.1^*$	$F = 16.1^*$	$F = .13$	$F = 2.7$	$F = 1.8$

Note. FDO = First DUI offenders.

\* $p < .05$ .