

The following is only an abstract of one of our earlier reports. An email request for a printed or PDF copy of the complete report can be generated by clicking on the **Report Number** of this report in the table of reports on the [Research Studies and Reports](#) page. The PDF copy of the complete report was created by scanning an original, printed copy, and thus is only *partially* searchable and *is not* accessible, but is fully printable.

A printed or PDF copy of our studies and reports may also be requested by mail or phone at:

Department of Motor Vehicles
Research and Development Branch
2570 24th Street, MS H-126
Sacramento, CA 95818-2606
(916) 657-5805

For a request by mail, please include the report number and your name, address, and phone number. Also, please state whether you are requesting a printed copy, a PDF copy, or both. For a PDF copy, please include your email address.

TITLE: Negligent-Operator Treatment Evaluation System - Program Effectiveness Report No. 6
(Detailed Findings)

AUTHOR(S): William C. Marsh

DATE: December 1992

REPORT NUMBER: 137

NTIS NUMBER: PB89-230569

FUNDING SOURCE: Departmental Budget

PROTECT OBTECTIVE:

To implement and maintain an automated on-line evaluation system for monitoring the effectiveness of the negligent-operator (neg-op) program and to issue periodic reports which present program cost and impact data for this program.

SUMMARY:

This is one of series of reports that provides periodic cost-effectiveness analyses of the neg-op program. The evaluation is based on a comparison of the driver records of neg-ops (drivers with multiple traffic conviction and *I* or accident points) who were randomly assigned to a treatment or to a no-contact control group. Three levels of progressively more severe neg-op treatments were evaluated in this manner-warning letter (W/L), notice of intent to suspend (N/I) and probation hearing (P/H). Beginning with Report #4, probation violation suspensions (the fourth and most severe level of neg-op treatment) were evaluated indirectly, using data from level-3 recidivists. Drivers at each level were eligible to receive either a standard or an alcohol-tailored treatment.

Only at level 3 was there a statistically significant reduction in total accidents due to the interventions, although there was some evidence that the interventions at levels 1 and 2 also reduced total accidents. Regarding injury accidents, both levels 1 and 3 showed statistically significant impacts. Intervention at each of the first three levels produced statistically significant reductions in traffic citations; however, at levels 1 and 2 each of the standard letters was significantly more effective in reducing citations than the corresponding alcohol letter. Regarding alcohol and drug-related incidents, only the level-3 intervention produced statistically significant reductions. At level 4, the data showed strong indirect evidence that probation violator sanctions were very effective in reducing accidents and citations. A comparison of telephone versus in-person hearings at level 3, showed no evidence of any adverse impact on traffic citations associated with the adoption of telephone hearings.

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This report generally supported the continuation of the neg-op program, except that the inconsistent accident results for the level 1 treatment in Report #2 supported a decision to discontinue sending level 1 W/Ls in May 1987. However, more positive findings in Reports #3 and #4 led to a reversal of that decision, and DMV resumed sending level 1 W/Ls in September 1989. A recommendation in Reports #2 and #3 that the use of license suspensions be increased in the regular level-3 treatments was adopted and implemented in the fall of 1988. Reports #2 and #4 recommended the elimination of the alcohol treatment at level 3 (because of negative directional results). These results plus questions about the legal authority for this treatment led to its discontinuance in September 1989.

This report evaluated the adoption of telephone hearings (versus in-person hearings) and showed no negative safety impact related to the change in policy. This result tended to support the continued

use of the new hearing format.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

See Marsh, 1985 (Report #94) Negligent-Operator Treatment Evaluation System: Progress Report. A paper containing results of Report #4 was presented at the Conference on Driver Competency Assessment, San Diego, October 1990.