



U.S. Department
of Transportation
National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration

DOT HS 807 615
Final Report

December 1989

Assessment of Multiple DWI Offender Restrictions

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufactures. Trade or manufacturer's names appear only because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

1. Report No. DOT HS 807 615	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Assessment of Multiple DWI Offender Restrictions		5. Report Date December, 1989	6. Performing Organization Code
		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
		7. Author(s) Wayne M. Harding, Ed.M.; Robert Apsler, Ph.D.; Wendi A. Walsh, B.A.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Harold Russell Associates, Inc. 12 Lakeside Office Park Wakefield, Massachusetts 01880		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-87-07271
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report September, 1987 -- December, 1989	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 400 Seventh Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590		15. Supplementary Notes Prepared in cooperation with the subcontractor: Social Science Research and Evaluation, Inc., 4 Austin Park, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	
		16. Abstract <p>This report discusses nine new approaches for reducing recidivism among multiple DWI offenders: dedicated detention facilities, diversion programs, electronic monitoring, ignition interlock systems, intensive probation supervision, publishing offenders' names, special license tags, victim restitution, and weekend intervention programs. Data on 33 programs that use these approaches were collected through telephone discussions, review of written materials, and site visits to 11 programs. The approaches provide a much wider range of options for dealing with DWI offenders than traditional sanctions such as jail, fines, license suspension, and probation. They also have appealing features: many cost less than jailing offenders; offenders tend to complete the programs; many very closely monitor offenders in the community, which provides security while alleviating jail overcrowding; they can be used at many points in the criminal justice system; they are supported by the community, etc. However, critical information about the efficiency and effectiveness of these approaches is not available: it is not clear how well programs detect drinking-driving and other violations; cost data are incomplete, and reliable data on post-program recidivism is rarely available. Descriptions of programs and additional information appears in a companion report: Users' Guide To New Approaches And Sanctions For Multiple DWI Offenders.</p>	
17. Key Words DWI drinking and driving offenders sanctions	18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield Virginia 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages	22. Price

PREFACE

This project required the cooperation of many people who were contacted for information about new approaches for dealing with multiple DWI offenders. These included staff in the ten regional offices of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and spokespeople for Governors's Highway Representatives and for other agencies in many states. Information was also obtained by contacting: (1) spokespeople for many programs implementing the new approaches, and (2) manufacturers of electronic monitoring devices and in-vehicle alcohol test devices.

We especially wish to thank the staff of the eleven programs we visited. Without exception these staff members were very cooperative; they answered our questions and allowed us to observe activities, inspect equipment and records, etc. The programs we visited and others we studied are identified in Appendix A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	1
Findings.....	2
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
Background.....	5
Objectives of This Study.....	8
Organization of This Report.....	9
A Source for Additional Information.....	9
METHODS.....	11
Determining the Types of Approaches To Be Studied.....	11
Strategies for identifying programs.....	11
Number and Types of Program Leads.....	12
Criteria for Selecting Programs for Detailed Study.....	12
Collecting Detailed Information On Selected Programs.....	13
Site Visits.....	15
FINDINGS.....	17
How to Interpret the Findings.....	17
Types of Organizations that Operate the Programs.....	17
Where the Programs Fit in the Criminal Justice System....	17
Rationales and Goals.....	18
Prevention of Drinking and Driving.....	19
What Kinds of Offenders Participate?.....	21
How Appealing Are These Programs To Offenders?.....	22
Community Response.....	22

Staffing Requirements.....	22
Program Costs and Funding.....	23
Program Effectiveness.....	25
Common Problems and Solutions.....	27
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS.....	29
Dedicated detention.....	30
Diversion.....	33
Electronic monitoring.....	36
Ignition interlock.....	40
Intensive probation supervision.....	44
Publishing offenders' names.....	47
Special license tags.....	49
Victim restitution.....	51
Weekend intervention.....	54
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	57
Conclusions.....	57
Recommendations.....	58
REFERENCES.....	61
APPENDICES:	
Appendix A: Programs on Which Detailed Information Was Collected.....	A-1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: TYPES OF APPROACHES INVESTIGATED.....6

**TABLE 2: NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ON WHICH DETAILED
DATA WERE COLLECTED BY PROGRAM TYPE.....13**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In recent years, many new approaches and procedures have been applied to dealing with multiple DWI offenders. These approaches can replace or supplement such traditional sanctions as jail, fines, license suspension, and probation. The new alternatives include intensive probation supervision, use of in-vehicle alcohol test devices (IVATs), detention facilities dedicated to DWI offenders, and electronic monitoring.

The objectives of this project were: (1) to identify new procedures and sanctions for dealing with multiple DWI offenders; and (2) to provide information about them, e.g., how they work, their staffing requirements, costs, resource requirements, potential effectiveness, etc.

This report discusses: (1) the methods used to conduct the study, (2) findings that apply to all the approaches investigated, (3) findings for each type of approach, and (3) conclusions about the approaches and recommendations for future research. An appendix provides information that can be used to contact programs using these approaches. More detailed descriptive information about the approaches can be found in a companion report titled "Users' Guide to New Approaches and Sanctions for Multiple DWI Offenders" (Harding et al., in press).

Methods

In cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), we decided to concentrate on nine approaches: dedicated detention facilities, diversion, electronic monitoring, ignition interlock (also called in-vehicle alcohol test devices), intensive probation supervision, special license tags, publishing offenders' names, victim restitution, and weekend intervention.

The methods used to identify programs included reviewing scientific and popular literature, and contacting manufacturers of electronic monitoring and in-vehicle alcohol test devices. A particularly fruitful source of leads was telephone conversations with 44 people knowledgeable about highway safety and criminal justice. Among them were staff from all ten NHTSA regional offices, spokespeople for state offices of highway and/or traffic safety, members of the criminal justice system, and other researchers.

We obtained leads on approximately 224 programs in 42 states and British Columbia. We collected basic information from 56 of these programs.

In conjunction with NHTSA, we developed a set of criteria to select programs for detailed study. The most important criterion emphasized selecting the broadest variety of programs to illustrate each of the nine major types. Of the 56 programs contacted, 23 were eliminated because they did not meet selection criteria. Usually programs were rejected either because they turned out to use traditional rather than new approaches, because they did not serve multiple DWI offenders.

Detailed information was collected about the remaining 33 programs through telephone conversations with program spokespeople and review of written materials provided by 23 programs. In addition, we visited 11 of the programs. A listing of the 33 programs which indicates which were visited appears in Appendix A.

The reader should keep in mind that we did not sample programs in a manner which would ensure that they represent all programs. Also, due to the limited scope of the project, we could not independently verify the information reported to us and, therefore, we cannot be certain that the data are accurate.

Findings

Key findings from the study include the following:

- o The program studies were operated by variety of organizations: universities; government agencies, such as departments of probation; private for profit companies, etc.
- o The programs can be implemented at many points in the criminal justice system, e.g., publicizing offenders' names takes place immediately upon arrest and/or conviction, diversion and weekend intervention programs can be used before the offender comes to trial or is sentenced, electronically monitored "house arrest" can be used as an alternative to jail or probation, and so on. In addition, some individual approaches can be implemented at several steps in the system, e.g., electronic monitoring has been used at virtually all points (Byrne and Kelly, 1984).
- o The new programs can be used to replace traditional sanctions (e.g., dedication detention can replace jail); can be used in combination with traditional sanctions (e.g., electronic monitoring can be used to enhance surveillance during probation), and can be combined with one another (e.g., an offender on electronic monitoring can also be involved in making victim restitution payments).
- o The programs serve a variety of criminal justice goals. For example, ignition interlocks, dedication detention programs and electronic monitoring incapacitate the offender from DWI. Weekend intervention programs and

intensive probation supervision rehabilitate through diagnosis and treatment. Although the programs may be viewed as less punitive than jail, many, such as electronic monitoring and dedicated detention have punitive aspects. Victim restitution provide for retribution.

- o Although the approaches vary in the extent to which they attempt to prevent drinking-driving by the offender, several provide the community with a good deal of security. Obvious examples are approaches which place the offender under twenty-four hour custody such as weekend intervention programs and selected dedicated detention programs. But approaches which release the offender to the community also provide security. For example, an electronic monitoring program maintained constant electronic surveillance when the offender was required to be at home, made regular random checks on his/her attendance at work, required the offender to report to the program once a week, made spot checks at the offender's home to check for tampering with the equipment or other violations, and administered random alcohol and drug tests. Ignition interlocks provide security by attempting to prevent intoxicated offenders from starting their cars.
- o Offenders seem to prefer the new approaches to jail, even to the point of being willing to trade a smaller number of days in jail for more days in one of the new programs.
- o Many of the programs serves as alternatives to jail. This helps reduce jail overcrowding, which is an acute problem in many locations.
- o Two types of programs, publicizing of offender names in local papers and issuing special license tags operate at no significant cost. Most other types of programs claimed lower costs per offender per day than jail. Weekend intervention and dedicated detention programs were the two types that reported costs equal to or higher than jail.
- o Nineteen of 29 programs offset their costs in full or in part by collecting fees from offenders.
- o Community response to these programs has been generally quite favorable. Many programs are endorsed by community groups such as MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving).
- o The majority of DWI offenders complete these programs. The completion rate for DWI offenders averaged 73% among the 12 programs that were able to supply specific data.
- o Few programs can provide evidence about post-program recidivism. Only about 24% have conducted an evaluation of post program recidivism, though some evaluations are in progress or planned for the future.

- o Programs reported no serious intractable problems.

Conclusions and Recommendations

On the whole these programs have many appealing features. They can help reduce jail overcrowding, some cost less than jail, some are self-supporting through collection of offender fees, they serve a variety of criminal justice goals, they fit in many places within the criminal justice process, they can supplant or be combined with other approaches in many ways, etc.

At the same time, information about important aspects of the programs are missing. For example, it is not clear how many offenders who are released to the community can drink and drive without being detected by program staff. Although 62% of the programs reported lower costs per offender per day than jail, these program tend to retain offenders longer than jail, so it is not clear whether there are still savings when this is considered. Perhaps the most important reservation about the programs is that so few could provide a methodologically sound evaluation (or adequate data) concerning post-program recidivism.

Given the lack critical information, we recommend that these programs be regarded as more experimental than as proven alternatives to traditional approaches. We also recommend that rigorous evaluations be undertaken so these uncertainties can be resolved.

INTRODUCTION

Background

In recent years, many new approaches have been developed as substitutes or supplements for the "traditional" sanctions applied to DWI (Driving While Intoxicated) offenders: jail, fines, license suspension, education/treatment, and probation. These approaches, include intensive probation supervision, use of in-vehicle alcohol test devices (IVATs), detention facilities dedicated to DWI offenders, electronic monitoring and other approaches/sanctions discussed in Table 1.

One reason for the emergence of new approaches is that drunk driving has placed very high demands on the criminal justice system. Between 1970 and 1986, arrests for drunk driving increased about 223%, while the number of licensed drivers increased only 42% (Greenfield, 1988). For the last decade, there have been more than one million drunk driving arrests each year, making drunk driving our most commonly prosecuted offense (Jacobs, 1988). As sentences have become stricter and opportunities for plea bargaining have been reduced through the imposition of mandatory penalties, drunk driving offenders have taxed the criminal justice system. The backlog in the courts has increased as more offenders try to avoid stricter punishments, DWI offenders have exacerbated overcrowding in local jails, and the costs of jailing offenders has drained local budgets (Ball and Lilly, 1983; Ball et al., 1988; U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a, U.S. Department of Justice, 1984, Voas, 1986). When pointing out that jail space is insufficient to cope with drunk driving offenders, Ball et al. (1988) comment that, "motels, vacant buildings, and even high school gymnasiums have been converted into 'jails' housing DWI offenders doing weekend 'jail' terms."

Another reason behind the development of new programs for DWI offenders is that this type of offender seems especially suitable for community corrections approaches. Highly dangerous chronically violent offenders are not good candidates for new community corrections programs "since they are clearly inappropriate for placement in any community based alternative" (Armstrong et al., 1987). At the other extreme, it makes little sense to jail offenders who pose little to no threat to the community (Armstrong et al., 1987). Most multiple DWI offenders fall somewhere in between these extremes: jail is too severe for this population and non-supervised probation is insufficient to prevent them from drinking and driving again (Armstrong et al., 1987). Although some argue that every DWI offender should spend time in jail, the reality is that there is not enough room. In addition, it appears that electronic monitoring and other new alternatives offer some advantages over jail while providing the surveillance and control needed for community safety.

TABLE 1: TYPES OF APPROACHES INVESTIGATED

Dedicated detention These programs¹ use special detention facilities that are dedicated to DWI and sometimes other alcohol offenders. Offenders reside at the facility, but may be released for work or community service. While at the facility, offenders participate in such activities as alcohol education, vocational training, and individual and group counseling. The duration of incarceration in the programs we studied varies from two weeks in a program that focuses on diagnosis to as long as three years in a program that emphasizes long-term treatment.

Diversion: Diversion programs offer DWI offenders the opportunity to defer sentencing (usually for a month or two) while they participate in various treatment, training, and educational programs recommended by assessment counselors. If the offender complies with program recommendations, he may be given the opportunity to plead to a lesser offense (e.g., a misdemeanor versus a DWI felony) and receive a reduced sentence. The primary program activities are assessment of the offender, referral to appropriate treatment/training, monitoring compliance with the referral, and reporting on the offender to the court shortly before sentencing.

Electronic monitoring: Electronic monitoring (EM) refers to the use of various devices in house arrest or community corrections programs to verify that an offender remains where he or she is supposed to be. Typically, EM is used in probation programs to verify that the DWI offender remains in his residence except when he has been excused to attend work, treatment, church, etc. EM systems can be divided into two broad types: (1) programmed contact and (2) continuous monitoring. One example of a programmed contact system uses a central computer to telephone the offender at random times when he or she should be at home. The offender must respond by inserting a special device worn on either the wrist or ankle into a verifying unit attached to the telephone. (Other programmed contact systems will be discussed under the PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS section). In continuous monitoring

¹ Strictly speaking, some of the approaches studied, such as electronic monitoring, are methods or techniques that can be applied to a wide variety of programs, rather than programs in and of themselves. Nevertheless, as a matter of convenience, the term "programs" will be applied to these approaches throughout this Guide.

TABLE 1 (continued)

systems the offender wears a device which signals a program computer through his telephone if he moves outside a designated area. The devices the offender wears cannot be removed without indicating that tampering has occurred.

Ignition interlock Sometimes, courts order a DWI offender to have an in-vehicle alcohol test device (IVAT) installed in his vehicle as a condition of diversion, pre-release, or probation. These devices are designed to measure and record the existence and extent of alcohol use by the driver. To start his vehicle, an offender must blow into the device and his BAC (blood alcohol concentration) as measured by this breath sample must register below a predetermined level.

Intensive probation supervision: This type of program monitors the activities of probationers more closely than is the case under conditions of normal probation. Offenders make an increased number of contacts with probation officers and participate in various educational and therapeutic programs in the community. Most programs for DWI offenders also require abstinence from alcohol which may be randomly verified through breath or urine analysis.

Publishing offenders' names Many community newspapers publish columns which identify individuals either arrested for and/or convicted of DWI. Most newspapers list at least the name, address, and offense of the individual. While the goal of the newspaper may be to simply inform its readers, the listing may serve as an additional sanction imposed on the offender, or a deterrent for potential offenders.

Special license tags In order to assist police in identifying motor vehicles owned by DWI offenders with suspended or revoked licenses, the court may require that special license plates or bumper stickers be attached to the vehicle. Law enforcement officials may stop such a tagged vehicle in order to verify that the operator holds a valid license (is not the DWI offender), without any other probable cause.

Victim restitution Offenders involved in these programs are required to repay the victim for the financial losses incurred as a result of the offense. Typically repayment is made over a period of time and monitored by program personnel.

TABLE 1 (continued)

Weekend intervention These programs are short term (approximately 48 hours) residential therapeutic/assessment programs, often dedicated to DWI offenders. The programs evaluate the existence and extent of the offender's alcohol problem, attempt to break through the tendency of the abuser to deny that he has an alcohol problem, and make treatment recommendations and referrals to community agencies.

Another reason that new approaches are appealing is that there is some question as to whether traditional sanctions work well. For example, one study indicates that about one third of second offenders who had their license suspended for one year drove while their license was suspended (Williams et al., 1984a). This is a conservative estimate based on driver records. Another study (Williams et al., 1984b) found that about two thirds of drivers admitted that they drove while their license was suspended or revoked.

New programs have also been stimulated by the development of two new technologies during the 1980's: in-vehicle alcohol test devices and electronic monitoring devices. These technologies are still rapidly evolving and providing new programmatic options. For example, manufacturers of electronic monitoring devices has recently offered systems with the capacity to remotely measure blood alcohol levels.

Objectives of This Study

This study had two primary objectives:

1. To identify new procedures and sanctions for dealing with multiple DWI offenders.
2. To provide information about them, e.g., how they work, their staffing requirements, costs, resource requirements, potential effectiveness, etc.

Organization of This Report

The remainder of this report consists of five major sections:

1. A discussion of the methods used for this study.
2. A section titled "FINDINGS" presents findings that apply to all the programs. The main topics discussed are where the programs fit in the criminal justice system, program rationales and goals, the types of offenders that participate, the degree of security the programs provide,

how appealing the programs are to offenders, community responses to the programs, staffing requirements, program costs and sources of funding, program effectiveness, and problems experienced by the programs.

3. A section, titled PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, discusses findings for each of the nine types of programs studied. The topics are similar to those discussed for all programs in the FINDINGS section. .
4. The text of the report ends with our conclusions about these programs and recommendations for future research.
5. An appendix provides information that can be used to find out more about 33 programs we on which we collected detailed information.

A Source for Additional Information

A companion report on the study was developed for readers who are more interested in descriptive materials about selected programs and less interested in the details about methods and findings. This report titled "Users' Guide to New Approaches and Sanctions for Multiple DWI Offenders" (Harding et al., in press).

METHODS

Determining the Types of Approaches To Be Studied

At the outset of the project, guidelines were formulated in cooperation with NHTSA to define the types of programs to be studied. Emphasis was placed on non-traditional or "new" programs; meaning programs which were not in widespread use with multiple DWI offenders - regardless of when they began chronologically. As it turned out, many of the programs we studied in detail were chronologically new: of 33 programs, one had begun as early as 1955, but 21 began after 1982 (data were missing for 2).

In order to avoid repeating the work of other investigators, we also adopted criteria that eliminated programs that had already been studied by NHTSA (community service) or were slated for study in the near future (vehicle and license plate impoundment).

Application of these rules led us to focus on the set of nine program types described in Table 1.

Strategies for identifying programs

Since there was no central inventory of the programs, we searched for them by reviewing many sources including: recent popular periodicals; clippings provided by NHTSA staff; DWI microfiche files at the The National Criminal Justice Reference Service of the National Institute of Justice; and program files at Metametrics, Inc. of Washington, D.C., a consulting firm which has conducted closely related projects.

One especially productive source of program leads was telephone conversations with 44 people knowledgeable about highway safety and criminal justice. These sources came from 15 states and British Columbia. Among them were staff from the ten NHTSA regional offices, Governor's Highway Representatives, researchers in highway safety, judges in courts at all levels, and spokespeople for state offices of highway and/or traffic safety.

A useful source of leads to programs using electronic monitoring and in vehicle alcohol test devices was conversations with manufacturers of these devices. During these discussions, we also collected information about how their devices operate, their costs, their reliability, etc.

When we began contacting programs directly, we also asked program spokespeople to supply leads to other programs.

Number and Types of Program Leads

Leads were collected on approximately 224 programs in 42 states and British Columbia. At various points during the project, attempts were made to contact many of these programs. In some cases, phone calls were made repeatedly without success; in others we did not have accurate or sufficient information to contact the program. Of the 224 leads, we were able to verify information on 56 through telephone calls.

Criteria for Selecting Programs for Detailed Study

In conjunction with NHTSA, we developed guidelines that were used to select programs from the 56 for more detailed study:

- o Preference was given to DWI programs which had some feature or combination of features for which we had no or relatively few examples. This reflects the emphasis placed on including new and unique programs on which we had not previously collected data.
- o Faced with a choice among related programs of the same type, we selected the model or "parent" program as opposed to secondary programs or "offspring." We reasoned that since parent programs had been in operation for a longer time, they were more apt to have records reflecting the information we needed such as who started the program, how the program began, and evaluation materials.
- o This study attempted to determine how successful an alternative approach could be in dealing with multiple DWI offenders, therefore, programs with a reputation for being particularly efficient and effective were contacted before others.
- o We selected programs that had been in operation for at least one year. This criterion was based on the argument that established programs would be able to provide more evaluation information which was required in order to describe its effectiveness. This criterion was waived if a program represented a unique feature which could not be found in a more established program.
- o Preference was given to programs serving a comparatively large number of multiple DWI offenders. If evaluation information was available, it would be more meaningful for programs serving a larger number of offenders. Again, this guideline was modified if the program was particularly unique.

- o Preference was given to programs that could supply more of the detailed evaluative information we desired. Since the opportunity did not exist to directly measure a program's effectiveness in the course of this study, it was necessary to collect as much information as possible about the effectiveness of these programs from materials the programs supplied.
- o Once the above criteria were satisfied, we selected programs to assure geographic diversity in the sample.

Collecting Detailed Information On Selected Programs

Of the 56 programs we telephoned, 23 did not pass the screening. The most common reasons programs were rejected were (1) it turned out they employed traditional rather than new approaches for dealing with offenders, and (2) they did not serve multiple DWI offenders.

Comprehensive telephone conversations were held with 33 qualified programs. Table 2 shows the distribution of these calls by program type.

TABLE 2 NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ON WHICH DETAILED DATA WERE COLLECTED BY PROGRAM TYPE

<u>PROGRAM TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
Dedicated detention facility	5
Diversion	3
Electronic monitoring	6
Ignition interlock (IVATs)	2
Intensive probation supervision	4
Special license tags	2
Publishing offenders' names	4
Victim restitution	4
Weekend intervention	3
Totals	33

The main discussion topics were:

- o Basic contact information: program name, address, phone number, spokesperson's name and position, etc.
- o Background information on when, why, and how the program began.
- o The population served: the geographic area; referral criteria and restrictions on participation; the number of multiple DWI versus other types of offenders; the age, sex, and social class of the offenders; etc.
- o Program operation: length of stay in the program, program activities, methods for monitoring compliance with program rules, sanctions imposed for violations of rules, and frequency of noncompliance. If specialized equipment was used (e.g., electronic monitoring or ignition interlock), the spokesperson was also asked to discuss how the device worked, its reliability, and problems they may have had with it.
- o The number and types of program staff and the type of training provided to staff.
- o Program costs: total annual operating costs broken down into expense categories (staff salaries, equipment, special startup costs, etc.). Spokespeople were also asked to compare their costs to jail or another traditional approach the program replaced.
- o How funds and other resources were obtained.
- o Program impact, including: number of offenders served; number who completed the program; recidivism rate; results of formal evaluations; and reactions by the criminal justice system (judges, lawyers, probation officers, etc.), the larger community, program staff and offenders.
- o Any past or present problems and how they were addressed.
- o Changes the spokesperson would like to see made in order to improve the program.

At the close of the discussion, we requested any written materials describing the program which had not already been received and asked for leads to other programs. Written materials were provided by 23 of the programs.

Site Visits

We made site visits to eleven of the 33 programs studied in order to gain a better understanding of selected types of programs than was possible through telephone calls or examination of written materials. The program types visited were those about which we expected to be able to learn the most from first hand exposure. Specific programs were selected based on (1) our interest in visiting a wide variety of programs, and (2) scheduling constraints. The programs visited are identified in Appendix A.

The activities undertaken during these visits varied somewhat from program to program, but usually included discussions with program management and relevant staff members concerning the program's operation and impact; and inspection of program forms, records and, when appropriate, specialized equipment. At some sites, we were able to speak with offenders about their views of the program.

FINDINGS

How to Interpret the Findings

To simplify the presentation of the findings, we have adopted three conventions:

1. Unless otherwise indicated, the discussion applies to multiple DWI offenders and not necessarily to first-time DWI offenders or any other type of offender.
2. Unless otherwise stated, we have excluded publicizing offenders' names when presenting results. The reason is that this approach is very different from the others (see pages 47-48).
3. When presenting findings, we will indicate how many programs the result is based on ($n = x$) and the number of programs for which there were no data ($ND = x$). Since we will usually be excluding programs which publicize offenders' names (there are four in the sample) the total number of program on which findings are based equals 29 (a total of 33 less 4 that publicize offenders' names).

When reviewing the findings and the descriptions of programs in the next section of the report, the reader should keep two limitations of the study. First, we did not sample programs in a manner which would ensure that they represent all programs (e.g., we did not sample randomly and we imposed selection criteria). Second, due to the limited scope of the project, we could not independently verify the information reported to us and, therefore, we cannot be certain that the data are accurate.

Types of Organizations that Operate the Programs

The programs we studied were operated by a wide array of organizations: private for-profit corporations, private non-profit organizations (created for the task), newspapers, government entities such as a county probation department, universities, and hospitals.

Where the Programs Fit in the Criminal Justice System

One of the most striking features of these programs is that as a group they can be implemented at many steps in the criminal justice system. For example, publicizing offenders' names can be used immediately after arrest and/or conviction; diversion programs and weekend intervention programs can be used to deal with offenders before they come to trial or before they are sentenced; dedicated detention facilities and electronic monitoring programs can be used as alternatives to a jail sentence; intensive probation supervision, IVATs and Special

license tags can be used as substitutes for ordinary probation or parole, and so on.

Some individual types of programs can be implemented at several steps in the system. For example, weekend intervention programs can be used as a diagnostic mechanism used prior to sentencing and or as an alternative to short term incarceration. Electronic monitoring is perhaps the most flexible of all these approaches. It has been used at many key points in the criminal justice system (Byrne and Kelly, 1984): in pretrial release programs, in diversion to residential community correction programs, as a direct sentence (i.e. as means of enforcing house arrest), as a condition of probation, as a system for monitoring probation violators who otherwise might have been returned to jail, as a condition of parole, as a program for monitoring parole violators who otherwise might have been returned to prison and so on.

In addition to replacing traditional sanctions (e.g., using a dedicated detention facility as an alternative to jail), new programs can be combined with traditional approaches. For example, electronic monitoring can be used to enforce compliance with restricted driving privileges or other conditions of probation. In fact, all of the electronic monitoring programs studied for this project (described in Harding et al., in press) are used to monitor compliance with other conditions of probation.

The new approaches can also be combined in many different ways, though among the programs we studied this was rarely done. It would be possible, for example, to diagnose a multiple DWI offender in a weekend intervention program which would then make recommendations concerning treatment to the judge. The judge might sentence the offender to a dedicated detention facility for treatment and release to the community for work during the day, followed by a longer period during which the offender would pay victim restitution and be required to display special license tags on his car (until his license was reinstated). For example, Pride's electronic monitoring program (described in Harding et al., in press, page 35) also combines other probation conditions in its program. Pride monitors the offender's compliance with treatment requirements as part of an overall intensive probation supervision program. As well, the DWI offender may be required to pay victim restitution as part of Pride's overall probation program.

Rationales and Goals

The rationales behind these programs vary widely, and usually more than one rationale was offered for a given program. The rationale cited most often was that the program reduced jail overcrowding. This was frequently linked to the closely related claim that the program was also less costly than jail.

Another common rationale for these programs was the claim that they are more effective in rehabilitating DWI offenders than jail alone. As might be expected, rehabilitation was a goal associated with dedicated detention facilities, diversion programs, and weekend intervention programs which provide counselling and diagnostic services. But other programs with much less emphasis on therapeutic services also claimed that they rehabilitate. For example, spokespeople for programs using electronic monitoring and intensive probation supervision pointed out that jails normally provide little or no rehabilitation programming, whereas their programs rehabilitate by providing close personal supervision while maintaining the offender's ties to family and to the community. These programs may also require abstinence from alcohol and drugs, may use random testing to enforce this provision, and may also require the offender to participate in Alcoholics Anonymous or other treatment.

Although most programs clearly distinguished themselves from jail on the grounds that they are more efficient and effective, most spokespeople also felt that like jail, their programs were punitive. For example spokespeople for electronic monitoring programs, victim restitution, and special detention programs, indicated that although these approaches are less restrictive than jail, they are punitive in that they restrict the offender more than simple probation or a fine (if restitution payments do not replace court fines). If embarrassment is another form of punishment, programs which issue offenders special license tags, electronic monitoring programs, IVATs, and publishing offenders' names all can embarrass the offender by revealing to employers, friends, neighbors, and others that he or she is a drunk driver. In the case of publicizing offenders' names in local newspapers, some spokespeople argued that the threat of embarrassment may be sufficiently painful to deter others from drunk driving.

Interestingly, the promise of reducing recidivism was rarely cited as a major premise underlying these programs. This omission may be tied to the fact that very few of these program had any information about their long term recidivism rate (see section titled Program Effectiveness below).

In the next section of the report we will see that some of the alternate programs claim that they also serve another criminal justice goal: to protect society by incapacitating the offender.

Prevention of Drinking and Driving

With respect to the ability to prevent drinking and driving, again it is the variability among the types of programs and within the same type of program that is striking.

For some programs, preventing drunk driving is a long-term goal, but is not relevant while the offender is enrolled. This applies to programs which keep offender under custody twenty-four hours a day, which include weekend intervention programs, and one of the

short-term dedicated detention facilities studied (Residential Alcohol Treatment Program of Rutland, Massachusetts). Preventing drunk driving is also not a major concern for dedicated detention programs which let the offender out on work release during the day, but require them to remain in the facility at night. The offender is not allowed to drive while enrolled in the dedicated detention programs we studied (she or he must take public transportation to work or arrange other transportation), but the program may not monitor this directly.

Victim restitution, which does not keep the offender in custody, is another type of program in which preventing drunk driving is not an immediate and central issue, although this type of program is often linked to other programs, such as probation, that do monitor drinking and driving.

Publicizing offenders' names is another approach which is not directed at preventing the offender from driving, however, it may prevent DWI by making the offender's neighbors, friends, employer etc. aware of his drinking-driving. These people may then act to help prevent the offender from driving after drinking. The offender may also be more careful about drinking-driving knowing that these people may be observing his behavior.

For other programs (diversion, electronic monitoring, intensive probation supervision, IVATs, special license tags), stopping the DWI offender from drinking and driving is a more central concern, although there is considerable diversity here as well. In the first place, the programs differ in terms of whether they serve only offenders whose licenses have been suspended (diversion programs are an example), offenders who have conditional licenses (IVATs, electronic monitoring, and special license tags are prime examples) or both kinds of offenders (e.g., some intensive probation programs allow both). The programs also differ in the level of control they adopt. At one extreme, programs leave large gaps in surveillance and provide little assurance that offenders will not drink and drive. For example, in one intensive probation supervision program, security consisted of monthly interviews with the offender, checks on his attendance at work, treatment programming, and completion of community service, and little else. Toward the other extreme, an electronic monitoring program maintained constant electronic surveillance when the offender was required to be at home, made regular random checks on his/her attendance at work, required the offender to report to the program once a week, made spot checks at the offender's home to check for tampering with the equipment or other violations, and administered random alcohol and drug tests. From a theoretical perspective, apart from twenty-four hour detention, programs using IVATs are designed to provide the greatest security against drinking and driving simply because they are designed to interfere directly with drinking and driving behavior.

A serious problem for all programs is assessing the level of risk they are running; knowing how likely it is that an offender in their charge may drink and drive. The best evidence programs could provide was the number/proportion of offenders who were rearrested for DWI while enrolled in the program. The proportion was very small: the range was zero to 8% and the average 3% (n = 13, ND = 8, the question is not relevant for the 3 weekend intervention and 5 dedicated detention programs that are custodial). However, programs did not know how many violations went undetected. Estimates of undetected violations could be generated through confidential interviews with offenders in the program and/or offenders who have graduated. (Some offenders discussed violations of program rules, including driving and driving, during our study, but the sample was too small to generalize). No program we studied had undertaken this type of investigation.

The lack of reliable information about covert drinking and driving among offenders leaves open important questions about what level of security is cost-effective, the thresholds that should be set for violations of program rules, and appropriate punishments for violations. For example, a program which requires offenders to remain at home except when they are at work has to decide such how often it should check to validate the offender's whereabouts, how it should do this (e.g., by electronic monitoring, by random visit, or both), how late an offender can arrive home (5 minutes, 10 minutes, etc.), how often he or she can be late before this constitutes a breach of program rules, etc. At present, these decisions are made without adequate information to ensure that an optimum balance is struck among protecting the community, the welfare of the offender, and program cost.

What Kinds of Offenders Participate?

In addition to serving DWI offenders, 16 of the 33 programs accept offenders involved in offenses other than DWI such as fraud, burglary, and other non-violent crimes. At least 20 of the programs serve both first and multiple DWI offenders. The proportion of multiple DWI offenders in the programs varied widely from 5% to 100% with an average of about 61% (n = 21, ND = 12). High proportions of multiple DWI offenders were common: in nearly one half of the programs which supplied data, 80% or more of the offenders were of this type.

Twelve programs were unable to provide specific information on this question, and for the most part programs were unable to give detailed information about other characteristics of their offenders, such as sex, age, number of prior offenses of various kinds, socio-economic class, etc. Descriptive data are available in the offenders' court records, and/or are collected by the programs at intake. Most programs, however, do not regularly process and summarize this information.

We do know that the offenders served by these programs do not necessarily typify all DWI offenders. Most programs impose restrictions on the types of offenders who may participate - one of the most common restrictions is the lack of a previous arrest or conviction for violent crimes. Consequently, comparisons between these programs and jail should take into account this and any other systematic differences in the types of offenders served. Otherwise, these new programs may appear more successful because they deal with the more manageable offenders.

How Appealing Are These Programs To Offenders?

On the whole, it appears that the alternative programs have great appeal for offenders, at least as compared to jail. In cases where the offenders were given a choice, they overwhelmingly elected the alternative program, even when this meant they had to pay program fees and/or remain in the alternative (e.g., home detention) for much longer than they would have been incapacitated in jail. This appeal makes it more likely the programs can operate at capacity where cost per offender is lowest.

There are many reasons why a very small minority of offenders elect jail over alternative sanctions. Explanations frequently reported by program spokespeople were:

- o These non-conformist offenders are not willing to acknowledge they have an alcohol problem and are not interested in being treated.
- o Some offenders fear they will violate the rules of the alternative program and wind up being returned to jail where they may be required to serve a full sentence without credit for time served in the program.

Community Response

It would be reasonable to assume that alternative programs might encounter substantial community opposition for being "too soft" on offenders and/or for placing the community at risk. In fact, these programs have encountered minimal opposition and 22 of the programs report to be either officially or unofficially endorsed/supported by police departments, citizen activist groups such as MADD and SADD (Students Against Drunk Driving), and other community organizations. In the few cases where opposition was reported, opposition tended to arise when the program was new and then dissipated over time.

Staffing Requirements

With respect to staffing requirements, again there is great variation among the programs we examined. At one extreme there were programs that required very few staff per offender. For example, in the two ignition interlock programs we studied (the

first (no program name) in San Jose, California, and The Guardian Interlock Responsible Driver Program in Prince Frederick, Maryland), staff time consists of the small amount of extra time it takes to process ignition interlock cases versus other cases. The Maryland program estimated staff time at one half to one hour per case (the other program could not provide a specific estimate). The time required to install the devices, instruct the offenders in their use, and to maintain them is provided by employees of the manufacturers. Another example of a program requiring little staff time was the victim restitution program which is part of Pride, Inc. in West Palm Beach, Florida. One full time staff person handles a total of approximately 250 cases per year.

At the other extreme, there were programs that required many staff. Custodial programs fall into this category. For example, weekend intervention programs have staff to offender ratios from 1:3 to 1:10, since the programs require both correctional and treatment staff.

Program Costs and Funding

Two types of programs, publicizing of offenders' names in local papers and issuing special license tags operate at no significant cost. In the case of publishing offenders' names, cost is treated as a part of overall program operations, and even if it could be broken-out, program spokespeople felt it would be negligible. For issuing special license tags, the costs consist of manufacturing and distributing (through the Department of Motor Vehicles or similar channel) plates. In the two programs we investigated the costs were nominal and covered by registration fees paid by the offender of \$4 - \$25,

Most other programs claimed to have lower costs than jail per offender per day which in 1983 was about \$33 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988; includes fixed costs). Programs that tended to make this claim were electronic monitoring, diversion, intensive probation supervision, IVATs and victim restitution programs. Of the 19 programs of these types, 16 claimed lower costs than jail (ND = 2).

Weekend intervention and dedicated detention programs were the two types that reported costs equal to or higher than jail. In the case of Weekend intervention, the program duration is so short (2 to 3 days) that higher cost is not a major consideration. Dedicated Detention programs tend to be expensive because not only are they jails, which must therefore provide appropriate security, but they also provide various forms of treatment and counseling, which make the programs more costly to operate.

The fact that many programs operate below the costs for jail on a daily basis is welcome; however, the total savings of the program also depends on how long the offenders remain in the program as

compared to jail. As mentioned above, offenders may be required to participate in electronic monitoring and other programs for a period several times longer than they might have spent in jail. Therefore, even at a lower cost per day, the total cost per offender can still be above the cost for jail. Unfortunately, comparative data on total costs were generally not available from the programs we studied.

Another source of uncertainty about costs is the fact that many programs did not have complete data. For example, many programs could not provide an itemized budget, so it was unclear whether all their costs were being included. For example, in such cases it was not clear how the program treated costs for equipment, a building or similar one-time expenditures.

Both daily and total program cost may be offset by charging offenders participation fees. Nineteen of the programs we studied were wholly or largely supported by fees collected from offenders. This, of course, is a great advantage as compared to the costs to the state for operating jails. It also appeared that some programs that were not assessing offenders might well be able to do so, since they closely resembled programs that were charging fees. Spokespeople for some of these programs felt they might charge fees in the future. For example, this is true of the Home Detention Program of Upper Marlboro, Maryland: an electronic monitoring program which does not charge fees as opposed to other electronic monitoring programs such as the In-House

Arrest Program in Daytona Beach, Florida (both are described in Harding et al., in press, pp. 35 - 46). Similarly, the Longwood Treatment Center of Massachusetts and the Prince George's County DWI Facility of Maryland are both dedicated detention facilities, but the former is supported by the Commonwealth while the latter is supported by charging offenders fees.

It is important to note that the equipment costs associated with electronic monitoring and IVAT programs did not preclude operating them at less than the cost of jail (per offender per day). In the long term, it would usually be more economical to purchase versus lease the equipment, but funding to cover the capital costs, which may run to tens of thousands of dollars, may not be available. Many programs, therefore, take advantage of leasing agreements offered by manufacturers. Their long-term average costs may be greater than programs that purchase equipment, but even so, these programs can operate at costs competitive with jail and can cover their costs by charging offenders for the service (examples of electronic monitoring programs that lease equipment include the Home Arrest Programs in Brighton, Colorado and Prince Frederick, Maryland).

The rapid growth in private correctional services has also touched some of the programs we studied. Two (n = 29) programs were operated for profit: the Alternative Sentencing Program of California and the Felony DWI Diversion Program of New York.

One final comment about costs concerns possible savings to the larger society. Savings may accrue from programs that release offenders for work, like many electronic monitoring programs, intensive probation supervisions programs, and program using IVATs and special license tags. Offenders involved in these programs can be expected to support their families, and this saves the welfare costs to the state that might arise if the offender's income were interrupted by jail. The offender is also better able to pay any victim restitution fees that the courts may have ordered. One reason offered for keeping some programs short was to minimize disruption to work.

Program Effectiveness

There are a variety of ways to measure the effectiveness of these programs including: cost savings versus jail, jail days saved, proportion of offenders who complete the program, and long-term recidivism, and time to rearrest. On the whole, these programs tended to fare reasonably well on the first three criteria, but their performance with respect to recidivism, which is perhaps the most important measure of program success, is largely unknown.

Earlier we pointed out that many of these programs appear to be cost-saving as compared to jail and that costs are often offset by charging offender fees. We also mentioned that these programs were often justified in terms of the fact that they reduce jail overcrowding. The argument that these programs are valuable because they save jail days depends on at least two factors. The first is the question of whether the offenders served would have otherwise been jailed. If not, then no jail days are really being saved. A closely related issue is the possibility that more offenders may be prosecuted and sanctioned than otherwise would be because these new alternatives are less severe and costly than jail (Armstrong et al., 1987; Petersilia, 1986; Friel and Vaughn, 1986). It appears that this is not the case with the programs we studied. Spokespeople consistently reported that the vast majority of the offenders in the program would have normally gone to jail.

The second consideration that bears on the question of jail days saved is how many offenders these programs serve and what their jail sentences would have been. On average, the programs we studied appear to have saved an appreciable number of jail days: approximately 624 offenders per year (n = 24, ND = 4, 1 outlying value of 22,170 offenders per year in a statewide program was omitted). But many of the programs serving the largest numbers of offenders were relatively short term and many programs served relatively few offenders. The range was from 36 to 3,000 offenders per year, and six programs served 100 or fewer offender per year. Although a more consistent dramatic impact on jail overcrowding would be desirable, there are two reasons to view the situation positively. First, even small savings in jail

space become important since overcrowding is serious in many locations and many jails are under court orders to reduce their population (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a and 1988b). Secondly, it should be remembered that most of the programs we studied are still experimental in many ways, and the capacity of these programs may increase over time if they prove to be efficient and effective alternatives to jail.

It should also be kept in mind that as substitutes for jail, these programs avoid the risks to the offender associated with jail: the risks of assault, illness, emotional trauma, and suicide. This is an especially important for DWI offenders who are less likely to be experienced with jail and perhaps more likely to be victimized than some other types of offenders.

Most programs reported that there were few serious violations of program rules and that very few offenders were removed from the program, which usually meant they were returned to jail. This is reflected in the high proportion of DWI offenders who completed the programs. The range was 60% to 100% with an average of 90% (n = 22, ND = 7, completion rate for all offenders was used when data for DWI offenders alone was not available). Although this is good news, it does not necessarily mean that DWI recidivism remains low while offenders are enrolled in these programs. As discussed above, that conclusion depends on the assumption that the programs are effective in detecting DWI among offenders. While it is reasonable to believe that some programs were probably very effective because they monitored the offenders so intensively, other programs left ample room for undetected violations to occur. The good news is also qualified by the fact that some of the programs studied retain DWI offenders only for a short time (a short as a weekend in the case of weekend intervention programs). Also, judgments about recidivism within these programs must be made from the perspective of a comparison with jail - where DWI offenders do not recidivate while incarcerated.

A few programs had conducted studies to evaluate post-program recidivism, and some of these studies incorporated comparison groups (e.g., DWI offenders who were jailed). Thirteen of the 26 programs for which such data would be relevant were able to determine the number of participants who recidivated while in the program. However, only 7 of the programs (n = 29) were able to provide any findings concerning post-program recidivism (an especially small number given that we tried to select programs which had evaluation data). One reason for this is that some of the programs have been in existence for a short time, and few offenders have graduated and had an opportunity to recidivate. This is true, for example, of an interlock program in San Jose, California, which began in May, 1987 and which retains most offenders for three years. As well, the intensive probation supervision program in Portland, Oregon, which began in September, 1987, retains offenders for an average of 2 to 3

years, making it too soon to gather any substantial post-program recidivism data.

Another reason programs have not been evaluated, is that the funding for many of them does not appear to depend on proof of reductions in recidivism. The programs are viable because they promise to alleviate - if only to a small extent - the acute problem of jail overcrowding. In 1984, about one third of a national sample of criminal justice administrators (judges, attorneys general, police chiefs, etc.) identified jail and prison overcrowding "as the most pressing issue facing criminal justice institutions (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988b).

More information about the effectiveness of these program will become available as programs mature. Four programs had begun evaluation studies and one said they had plans to conduct a study in the near future. We cannot be sure, of course, about the quality of these studies.

Common Problems and Solutions

On the whole, the programs seemed to run smoothly and had experienced relatively few serious problems. Three problems, however, did occur often.

The most frequently reported problem (8 of 29 programs) was a lack of uniformity in the way in which judges used the program. For example, there were instances in which judges ignored program guidelines and sent first offenders to a program designed to serve multiple offenders, ordered offenders to attend a program that the program ordinarily would have rejected as unsuitable due to a history of violent crime, etc. Some diversion programs complained that judges do not follow the programs' recommendations when sentencing offenders. Another and more common manifestation of the problem was extreme variations in the number of offenders judges referred to a program. We found some programs to which some judges flatly refused to refer any DWI offenders. In a study of a weekend intervention programs, Siegal (1985) also found a wide variety of sentencing patterns across 17 courts: "one... court assigns virtually all (93%) of its convictees to the WIP [Weekend Intervention Program]; others send as few as 1%..." A partial solution to this problem is to educate judges, paying special attention to those do not adhere to program goals and procedures. One useful strategy is to have judges who are cooperative address their recalcitrant colleagues. Another is to present solid evidence about lower costs and better outcomes as compared to other sanctions. All these approaches, however, will not completely eliminate this problem, because some judges appear to feel very deeply that multiple DWI offenders deserve to be punished by being sent to jail or should receive another traditional sanctions.

A problem related to the above that was mentioned by several fee-based programs was funding problems caused by periodic drops in

the client population. Lower than desirable enrollment may also be a problem when a program first begins; many judges and others who are expected to refer offenders may delay making referrals until they see how well the program operates. Program planners should make plans for alternative sources of funding during these periods. They should also examine any ways in which program costs can be reduced when the client population falls. They might, for example, decide to lease rather than purchase electronic monitoring components so the number of components can be contracted when the population drops.

The third problem is that many of these alternatives have unintended negative consequences for the offender's family - they punish the offender's family as well as the offender. For example, publishing offenders' names in the local newspaper, issuing special license plates, and requiring that the family vehicle be outfitted with an IVAT, may embarrass the family. The random telephone calls and visits which may occur with electronic monitoring and intensive probation supervision programs may also inconvenience the entire family. Although these effects are cause for concern, they do not seem serious as compared to the family hardships and embarrassment that may result from alcohol abuse or from jailing the offender. Moreover, it is difficult to see how such effects can be totally avoided. Interestingly, spokespeople tended to report that families who might well have been embarrassed or inconvenienced still endorse the programs because they believe the programs help keep the offender from drinking and driving.

A fourth problem (not reported by program personnel) applies to programs using IVATs and electronic monitoring. There is keen competition among manufacturers of both devices, and, since the early 1980's, there have been very rapid advances in the technologies. Although the rapid rate of innovation has benefited programs by solving earlier technical problems, it has presented problems as well. Some observers (Byrne and Kelly, 1987) remark that it is difficult to keep abreast of the developments and to thoroughly evaluate their value. For program people, the rate of changes complicates the choice of a system and raises the possibility that it may quickly become obsolete. One solution is to consider leasing rather than purchasing a system -- an option which is available from many manufacturers.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

This section contains brief discussions of each of the nine types of programs (discussed in Table 1). The types appear in alphabetical order on the following pages:

Dedicated detention.....	30
Diversion.....	33
Electronic monitoring.....	36
Ignition interlock.....	40
Intensive probation supervision.....	44
Publishing offenders' names.....	47
Special license tags.....	49
Victim restitution.....	51
Weekend intervention.....	54

Readers interested in learning more about specific programs are directed to two sources: (1) Appendix A contains a listing of the programs with information that can be used to contact them; (2) the companion report, "Users Guide to New Approaches and Sanctions for Multiple DWI Offenders" (Harding et al., in press), contains descriptions for selected individual programs for each of the nine program types.

Dedicated detention

Five dedicated detention centers were studied for this report: Prince George's County DWI Facility, Upper Marlboro, Maryland; Longwood Treatment Center, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts (described in Harding et al., in press, page 16); Residential Alcohol Treatment Program, Rutland, Massachusetts; Suffolk County DWI Alternative Facility, Yaphank, New York; and, the DUI DAART Program, Fairfax, Virginia.

Dedicated detention facilities combine intensive treatment with confinement of DWI offenders, primarily multiple offenders. The offenders are incarcerated in a secured facility while receiving treatment, and in some instances may be released during the day to work in the community and return to the facility at night.

Dedicated detention centers are based on the assumption that the multiple DWI offender is a chronic alcohol user or, more probably, abuser. These programs operate on the premise that alcohol education, alcohol abuse counseling, and personal counseling are necessary to prevent the reoccurrence of drunk-driving by the multiple offender.

The five dedicated detention centers contacted for this report began operation fairly recently, between 1982 and 1985. All are operated by county or state agencies. All of the facilities serve multiple DWI offenders almost exclusively. Each of the programs was begun partly in response to a need to reduce increased jail overcrowding caused by the strict enforcement of DWI legislation. Offenders enter dedicated detention centers upon the recommendation of various members of the criminal justice system, such as judges, district attorneys, or the defendants' attorneys. In four of the five programs, participation is voluntary for at least some offenders, while in one program it is required. If they did not participate in these programs, the offenders would receive jail terms of equal duration or longer. Program spokespeople felt that offenders who choose not to participate probably do so because they do not believe that they need treatment or are unwilling to be treated.

The number of offenders served by the programs per year ranged from 500 to 2600 (two programs did not have data about this). The facilities' capacities range from 16 to 131. Two of the five programs sometimes maintain a waiting list of eligible offenders when they have reached capacity.

During the initial phase of the program, the offender's individual treatment needs are assessed. Based on this assessment, an individualized treatment plan is developed for each offender. In all of the programs, residents receive alcohol education, alcohol treatment such as participation in Alcoholics Anonymous, and group and individual counseling. Residents are confined to these facilities anywhere from 7 days

to 36 months. The average duration across facilities is 36 days. Following the on-site treatment period, offenders may be released into the community either under conditions of probation or under the continuing authority of the facility. In some programs, such as the Longwood Treatment Center, offenders are released during the day to work or continue treatment on an out-patient basis, but they must return to the facility at night. In other programs, the offenders are released into the community on a full-time basis while still participating in a variety of probation activities. This probation period may last up to 5 years and may or may not be monitored by the treatment center.

The facility may be staffed by full-time counselors or by private vendors contracted to provide counseling services (as in the Longwood program). Correctional staff are responsible for securing the facility. The opinions among spokespeople for programs we contacted differed as to whether the programs required more, less, or the same staff time as jail. All of the programs offer both initial and periodic staff training, usually performed at the facility by veteran counselors or administrators. Correctional and treatment staff are trained about one another's roles, since neither know much about the duties of the other. For instance, in the Longwood program, correctional staff are given 80 hours of initial training in alcohol abuse and recovery.

The three programs which supplied cost information spent between approximately \$145,000 and \$2,255,000 annually on the programs, with an average of nearly \$817,000. Two programs estimate cost per offender per day at \$57 and \$67.

Only one of the programs contacted was fully funded by fees paid by offenders, and one was fully funded by the state. The remaining three programs were funded by either a combination of user fees and state funds or DWI fines and state funds. Services provided by volunteer programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, or by religious organizations were often donated to the dedicated detention centers.

Since one of the centers contacted had just recently begun operation, no information is available on its effectiveness. The percentage of offenders who completed the other four programs ranged from 86% to 100%, with an average completion rate of 96%. Three of these programs reported recidivism rates of between 5% and 8% per year. The fourth program reported a recidivism rate of 10% over a two year period. A variety of definitions of recidivism were used including "rearrest" and "return to jail for a period of at least 30 days."

While two of the programs reported that their recidivism rates are significantly lower than the rates of alternative sanctions (jail, or other low security facility), a study of the Prince George's County DWI facility in Maryland found that their 5% recidivism rate was not significantly lower than that for

offenders who were not treated at the facility (American Correctional Association, 1987). This study compared the records of DWI offenders sent to the facility during a sixth month period to a random stratified sample (matched on gender, age, and race) of offenders who were served their sentence through some alternative sanction during that same period. The recidivism comparison was made approximately one year after graduation from the program.

These programs enjoy the support of various county and state agencies, service organizations such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, MADD, the police and members of the criminal justice system.

Three of the programs contacted complained that some members of the judicial system do not always make appropriate or sufficient referrals to the program. For example, one program reports that a judge who handles many DWI cases failed to refer any offenders for months because he felt they should be punished rather than treated. Another concern expressed by program staff is friction between correctional and treatment staff due to differences in the way they view program goals. For instance, correctional staff may feel that incarceration is the main goal while treatment staff emphasize rehabilitation.

Diversion

Three DWI Diversion programs were studied for this report: the Alternative Sentencing Program, Fresno, California; the Felony DWI Diversion Program, Rochester, New York (described in Harding et al., in press, page 24); and Stop-DWI, Syracuse, New York.

Diversion programs, also known as alternative sentencing programs, offer offenders the opportunity to defer sentencing while they participate in various treatment, training and educational activities recommended by assessment counselors. In exchange for completing treatment/training provided by other agencies, offenders are allowed to plead to a lesser offense which carries a less severe sentence (e.g., probation).

The rationale underlying this approach is that most multiple DWI offenders have alcohol and other problems which must be addressed in order to reduce recidivism. Other goals are to reduce overcrowding in the courts and jails.

All three programs contacted for this report began in the late 1970's. Two are operated by private non-profit agencies, and the third by a public agency. One program (the Felony DWI Diversion Program of Rochester, New York) is exclusively dedicated to serving multiple DWI offenders. The other two serve other offenders as well (e.g., fraud and burglary offenders); multiple DWI offenders make up 35% of the clients for one and 5% for the other.

Defendants enter diversion programs upon the recommendation of various members of the criminal justice system, such as judges, district attorneys, or the defendants' attorneys. Some defendants enter on a voluntary basis. The three programs exclude offenders with a history of violence, extensive criminal histories, or involvement in personal injury or fatality accidents. Since participation in the program usually leads to a reduction in sentence, less than 5% of the offenders accepted into the programs choose not to participate. Those who do make this choice are either confident that they can win their cases or are not prepared to make a commitment to treatment.

The number of offenders of all types served by the programs studied varied widely from about 200 to 2300 per year.

The diversion program assigns a counselor to assess the defendant's willingness to participate in the program, as well as his/her treatment needs. The recommendations of the counselor must be strictly followed in order for the defendant to attain a positive recommendation from the program at the time of sentencing. Programs monitor the offender's compliance through regular contacts with the outside agencies that provide training/treatment services. One of the programs contacted for this report (the Felony DWI Diversion Program of Rochester, New

York) carries monitoring a step further by requiring the offender to report to a counselor once each week. Other than reviewing local arrest records, none of the programs monitor whether the offenders drive.

Depending on the assessment of program counselors, an offender may enter traditional alcohol education programs, participate in Alcoholics Anonymous, or enter an in-patient or out-patient alcohol treatment program. Since the diversion programs are based on the philosophy that many DWI offenders come in contact with the criminal justice system because of a wide range of social problems, recommendations for treatment can vary greatly. Offenders may be encouraged to participate in programs concerning remedial education, counseling, assertiveness training, job training and job placement. The amount of time spent in treatment and/or training can range anywhere from four weeks to one year or longer, depending on the specific needs of the individual. Offenders spend varying amounts of time participating in treatment/training activities, ranging from three hours/week to constant participation in an in-patient program.

The three programs we investigated last approximately one or two months, at which point the offender returns to court for sentencing. The diversion program staff report to the judge on the defendant's success in the program. Usually, treatment can be completed prior to sentencing, but if not, completion of treatment may be made a condition of probation.

Two programs were staffed by full-time counselors and the other by "freelance" certified alcohol evaluators, who are called on as needed. Although more time may be spent by the district attorneys on diversion cases, program spokespeople believed that overall less staff time was needed than if the offender had been incarcerated.

Two of the programs contacted for this report spent between \$78,000 and \$196,000 per year on DWI cases. The third spends \$98,000 on all types of cases. One program estimates that cost per offender per day is \$61. Program spokespeople believe that these programs save taxpayers money in comparison to alternative approaches by minimizing time spent in court by each offender, by reducing time spent in jail, and by lowering the recidivism rates. Revenues for these programs come from public funds administered through various county, state, and government agencies. In two cases, offenders are charged for program services (\$50- \$75), and for one of these programs these fees cover the bulk of its operating costs.

Two programs reported that 67% and 90% of offenders complete the program; no clear data were available for the third. Although program spokespeople are very confident about the ability of the programs to reduce DWI recidivism, hard data to support their views is scarce. One program reported a DWI recidivism rate of

13% after 5 years. Another program reported a recidivism rate of 10% after three years. Satisfactory comparative data for other sanctions were not available. The programs enjoy the approval of the criminal justice system and the larger community including endorsements by such organizations as MADD, SADD, and Concerned Citizens Against Drunk Driving.

Spokespeople for these programs identified two general problems. First, sometimes clients must be put on waiting lists at treatment/training programs. The second problem is that some judges do not follow program recommendations when sentencing offenders. For example, the program may recommend that the offender be required to attend an alcoholism treatment program as a part of his sentence, but a judge may fail to impose this condition.

Electronic monitoring

Six electronic monitoring programs were studied for this report: the Home Arrest Program, Brighton, Colorado; Pride In-House Arrest Program, Daytona Beach, Florida (described in Harding et al., in press, page 35); Home Arrest Alternative Sentence Program, Anne Arundel, Maryland; Calvert County Home Arrest Program, Prince Frederick, Maryland; Home Detention Program, Upper Marlboro, Maryland (described in Harding et al., in press, page 40); and Hampden County Day Reporting, Springfield, Massachusetts.

Electronic monitoring is used to verify that an offenders remains where she or he is supposed to be. In some cases electronic monitoring (EM) is used to help enforce total confinement to the home. With DWI offenders, however, the "inmate" is usually allowed to leave at specified times to work or to participate in treatment or other authorized activities.

While a variety of monitoring systems are available, most devices take one of two forms: continuous monitoring systems or programmed contact devices. With continuous monitoring systems, the offender wears a transmitter (wristlet or anklet) which sends a signal to a receiver-dialer attached to the offenders telephone. The receiver-dialer is linked to central computer by normal telephone lines. The receiver-dialer reports when it stops receiving the signal from the offender's transmitter and when it starts receiving it again. The computer can compare the signals received to the offender's curfew schedule and makes a record of signals which can later be examined by program personnel. The In-House Arrest Program in Florida is an example of a program utilizing a continuous monitoring system.

Programmed contact devices intermittently verify the location of the offender. These devices use computers to call offenders either at selected times or randomly or both and the computer maintains a record of the results. The devices differ in how they verify whether the offender is actually present. For example, one approach is to have the offender insert a device which he wears on his wrist into a verification box connected to his telephone (the wrist device cannot be removed without indicating it has been tampered with). Another approach involves technology which can identify the offender's voice. Visual verification is also possible using specially equipped phones which can transmit a picture of the offender (we investigated a program using this technology - the House Arrest Alternative Sentence Program in Annapolis, Maryland). The Home Detention Program in Maryland also utilizes a programmed contact device.

EM technology has been evolving quite rapidly (Byrne and Kelly, 1987) and one recent development is the emergence of hybrid systems that can function as both continuous monitoring (CM) or

programmed contact (PC) devices. For example, a hybrid system may monitor the offender continuously, but when the computer detects a violation it will then call to verify that the violation is not a false signal due to radio interference or some other problem.

According to a recent survey (Schmidt, 1988) CM equipment is used with more offenders nationwide (56%) than PC devices (42%). Three of the programs we contacted utilize continuous monitoring systems and three utilize programmed contact devices.

Some of the major advantages and disadvantages associated with different systems (see for example Grinter, 1988 and Schmidt, 1988) include the following:

- o CM systems provide more security. Offenders monitored by CM systems know that surveillance is constant; offenders on PC systems may be tempted to leave their home thinking that the next random call may not come while they are gone.
- o Constant monitoring systems tend to generate more false alarms than PC systems, due to electronic interference and other problems.
- o Programmed contact systems tend to be less expensive than CM systems.
- o PC systems are more disruptive to the offender who may receive system calls in the middle of the night.

One of the newest developments in electronic monitoring is the ability to monitor the offenders level of intoxication. One approach uses the special telephone mentioned above, which can transmit a picture of the offender. The offender blows into a portable breathtester and a picture of the offender and the BAC reading is transmitted to the program (The House Arrest Alternative Sentence Program, Annapolis, Maryland uses this system). Another approach utilizes a breath tester as part of the receiver-monitor. The offender first passes a voice verification test, then blows into the breathtester. Results of the breathtest are transmitted to the central computer.

There are three main rationales for using electronic monitoring. First, this approach can reduce jail overcrowding by incapacitating offenders in their homes. Second, the cost of electronic monitoring tends to be less than the costs of jail (e.g., Petersilia, 1986). Third, this sanction is more humane and provide greater opportunities for rehabilitation than jail: it allows the offender to continue working and the offender can attend treatment programs in the community.

Although electronic monitoring has been under consideration for about 20 years (Friel and Vaughn, 1986), it wasn't until the invention of the electronic bracelet in the early 1980's that

electronic monitoring programs began to develop. Of the six programs we studied, one began as early as 1982 while the others began between 1986 and 1988. In 1988, the National Institute of Justice reported that 33 states used EM with nearly 200 offenders which was about three times the number of states that had been using the approach a year earlier (Schmidt, 1988). It appears that there are currently about 10 manufacturers of electronic monitoring devices.

All but one of the programs we studied are operated by county probation or correction departments. The one exception was a the In-House Arrest Program in Daytona Beach, Florida, run by a private, non-profit organization.

Electronic monitoring is flexible and has been used at all key points in the criminal justice system: in pretrial release programs, in diversion to residential community correction programs, as a direct sentence that is as means of enforcing house arrest, as a condition of probation, as a system for monitoring probation violators who otherwise might have been returned to jail, as a condition of parole, as a program for monitoring parole violators who otherwise might have been returned to prison and so on (Byrne and Kelly, 1987). In three of the programs investigated for this project, electronic monitoring is ordered in lieu of a jail term. In two programs, electronic monitoring is a condition of probation. Two programs use the device as part of a pre-release program.

Nationally DWI offenders are one of the largest categories of offenders placed on electronic monitoring (property offenders are slightly more common: 20% versus 18%) (Schmidt, 1988). In the programs contacted, 27% to 100% of the participants were DWI offenders, with an average of 63%. One program is dedicated to multiple DWI offenders. The majority of the DWI offenders in the other programs are multiple offenders.

Participation in these programs is voluntary. However, an overwhelming majority of offenders choose to participate because they would rather stay at home and keep their jobs than go to jail. One reason offenders may not choose to participate is that duration of electronic monitoring is usually significantly longer than a jail term would be.

The electronic monitoring programs we studied accommodate 50 to 150 offenders per year. These programs can usually serve between 25 to 50 offenders at any one time, depending on the number of devices available. The number of offenders served, especially with continuous monitoring systems, can be easily expanded with the purchase of additional devices.

In addition to wearing the device and complying with curfews, most participants are required to participate in some other activities. In some cases, offenders must attend treatment programs in the community, abstain from alcohol and drugs, make

periodic visits to their probation officers, work, do community service work, etc. These requirements are determined by the judge or correctional personnel on an individual basis. In one of the programs contacted, where 88% of participants are DWI offenders, the offenders' licenses are revoked for one year. In the other programs, driving restrictions are determined by the court on an individual basis. The duration of the programs ranged from 21 days to one year, and averaged 48 days.

The programs studied required relatively small numbers of staff. Usually, one director oversees the entire operation and probation officers (2 to 8 in these programs) help check on the system and the offenders. This does not usually require the full-time attention of the officers. One program functions with only a program director because all monitoring of the devices is carried out under contract by the manufacturer's staff (since most EM systems utilize telephone lines, monitoring can be carried out at remote locations far from the program site). Program staff needed little training in the use of the equipment, and this was provided by the manufacturers.

The chief program expenses are for the lease or purchase of the equipment and staff salaries. Among the programs in this project, the cost per offender per day ranges from \$.62 to \$14.00, with an average of \$8.11 per offender per day. All of the programs agreed that the cost per offender per day is significantly less expensive than incarceration in a county or state facility. Four of the six programs studied are funded almost entirely through fees paid by the offenders, which provides a great savings to the community. (The other two programs are funded by the county, but nothing about these programs precluded their being funded through offender fees.)

All of the program spokespeople felt their programs were very successful. The percentage of offenders completing the programs ranged from 75% to 97%; the average rate was 89%. Only one program, however, could supply separate completion rate data for DWI offenders versus all offenders. In that case the completion rate for DWI offender (90%) was significantly higher than for all participants (75%). None of the programs could supply post-program recidivism data.

None of the program spokespeople reported significant problems with the equipment. The programs encountered some initial community opposition when they began, but this has subsided with time. The major complaint expressed by was that since electronic monitoring is a fairly new alternative, some judges have failed to utilize it.

Ignition interlock

Two programs utilizing ignition interlock devices were studied for this report: (No program name), San Jose, California; and, the Guardian Interlock Responsible Driver Program, Prince Frederick, Maryland (described in Harding et al., in press, page 51).

Ignition interlock devices, also referred to as in-vehicle alcohol test devices (IVATs) are designed to prevent drivers with BAC's above a predetermined limit (e.g., .05) from starting their vehicle.

Although studies of the feasibility of ignition interlock devices date back to the early 1970's, it was not until the mid 1980's that new advances in breath-testing equipment led to the development of commercial interlock devices (Compton, 1988). At present, there are two U.S. manufacturers: Autosense in Hayward, California and Guardian Interlock, in Denver, Colorado. Both devices use three components: "an alcohol breath test unit, an electronic control device, and a connector to the vehicle's ignition and electrical system (Compton, 1988). To operate the unit, the driver turns on the device and blows into a hand held breath test unit. If his/her BAC measures below a preset level the car will start; if his/her BAC is above the limit, the vehicle will not start. The two systems have different features some of which are listed below:

- o The Autosense device is activated by entering a special numeric code. This is done to help prevent theft or unauthorized use of the car.
- o The Autosense device maintains a record of all attempts to start the car, including the date, time, the driver's BAC score, and successful attempts to start the car without providing a breath sample.
- o The Guardian interlock has an optional feature which requires the driver to match a preset sequence of puffs and pauses to activate the device. This feature, called Coordinated Breath Pulse Access, is designed to prevent persons other than the driver or those trained in use of the code (e.g., a family member who also uses the car) to start the vehicle. This makes it difficult for the driver to circumvent the system by having someone blow into the device on his/her behalf.
- o If the driver's BAC is low enough to permit him to start the vehicle, the Guardian system will require another breath test be taken after approximately 20 minutes. If the driver ignores the retest signal, the horn will sound until a retest is taken or the vehicle is shut off. This feature is designed to prevent a person from continuing to

drive when their BAC is low but will rise above permitted levels.

- o The Guardian system will lock the ignition if the driver fails to take the system for scheduled maintenance. Attempts to tamper with the system will also activate the warning that the unit must be serviced and the ignition will lock if the warning is ignored for a set time.
- o The Guardian system will shut off the ignition if the car is left idling for an extended period. This is designed to prevent some one from leaving the vehicle running while they drink in a bar, etc.

Laboratory testing by NHTSA has indicated that these devices "are reasonably accurate in detecting low BAC levels, and hence in preventing people with even moderate BAC's from passing the test" (Compton, 1988). On the other hand, NHTSA also found that "relatively uncomplicated strategies can be used to fool" these devices in spite of their anti-circumvention features" (Compton, 1988).

Several states have passed laws enabling the use of interlock devices to prevent DWI offenders from driving while intoxicated. In some other states, which have no such laws, interlock devices are used by court order. It appears that approximately 100 judges in 12 states have ordered offenders to use an interlock device (Compton, 1988).

We studied two interlock programs in detail: a program in San Jose, California that uses an Autosense device, and the Guardian Interlock Responsible Driver Program located in Prince Frederick, Maryland. The primary objective for both programs is to prevent the DWI offender from driving while intoxicated. Both programs also expect that the program may have therapeutic benefit; that the presence of the device may help break habitual drinking-driving behavior.

The Prince Frederick program, which began in June 1986, is reputed to be the first to have used an IVAT with DWI offenders. It was begun by Judge Larry Lamson as a response to jail overcrowding. The San Jose program was begun by Judge LaDoris Hazzard Cordell in May, 1987. She was motivated by a belief that traditional sanctions were not effective in preventing recidivism.

The Prince Frederick program is operated by a county parole and probation department. Offenders participate as a condition of probation and otherwise would serve a jail sentence. The San Jose program is operated directly by Judge Cordell, who serves in the Santa Clara County Superior Court. Both programs serve first and multiple DWI offenders in their respective counties, and a single judge (Judges Lamson and Cordell) refers all offenders to the programs.

The San Jose program deals mostly with first offenders (81% versus 19% multiple offenders), while the Prince Frederick program population is more evenly split between first (51%) and multiple (49%) offenders. Offenders in both programs are predominately male: 84% of the San Jose offenders and 89% of the Prince Frederick offenders.

Both programs give the offender a choice about participating in the program, but the results are quiet different. In San Jose, about one half to two thirds of the offenders choose jail over the program, whereas in Prince Frederick no offender has refused to participate. Judge Cordell speculates that offenders refuse the programs because it is too expensive, because they expect they will be unable to stop drinking and driving, or because they would be embarrassed by having the device in their car.

Judge Cordell offers the program to all first and second DWI offenders who are insured. Judge Lamson is more selective and offers the program to about 10% of DWI offenders.

About 200 offenders per year begin the San Jose program. The Prince Frederic Program serves about 65 per year.

The first step in these programs is to have the device installed in the offender's car. In the Prince Frederick program two probation officers make installation appointments for the offenders to help ensure compliance with this step. In San Jose, Judge Cordell notifies the installer of offenders who have been ordered to have the interlock installed. Offenders are responsible for having the IVAT inspected (for possible tampering) and calibrated periodically; every 90 days in the San Jose program, every 60 in the other. Offenders in both programs are ordered not to drive any vehicle without an IVAT installed. The Prince Frederick offenders are also required to attend alcohol education and counseling as condition of their probation. There is no similar requirement for San Jose offenders. San Jose offenders must use an interlock device for between one and three years, though three years is the usually sentence. In contrast, all Prince Frederick offenders must use an interlock for only 1 year (though they may remain on probation without the device installed for another two years).

Staffing for these programs is minimal. Judge Cordell is the staff for the San Jose Program. Two probation officers handle cases for the Prince Frederick as part of their normal case load. They estimate it takes approximately one half to one hour longer to handle offenders required to use the IVAT. Technitions/mechanics who work for the manufactures perform installation and maintenance for both programs.

Costs for both programs are covered by offender fees: \$30 per month for the San Jose program; approximately \$47 per month for the other.

In 1986, under the Farr-Davis Driver Safety Act, California became the first state to authorize use of ignition interlocks as a condition of probation for DUI offenders. This act also mandated a pilot program in order to provide evaluation data on the effectiveness of interlocks (EMT Group, 1989). Originally, the evaluation was to focus on 3 pilot counties (Alameda, San Diego, and Sonoma), but it has since included Santa Clara county and thus the offenders sentenced by Judge Cordell. Preliminary data from the evaluation indicate the following:

- o About half of the San Jose offenders from the sample successfully bypassed the interlock at least once. That is they succeed in starting the vehicles without passing a breath test (e.g., by having someone provide a breath sample for them, by push-starting the car, etc.).
- o San Jose offenders had a low rate of reconviction for DUI while sentenced to interlock (about 2%), but most of the sample of 193 offenders have not yet completed the program. The reconviction rates were low across all the counties: ranging from 0% to 4.8%.

The final evaluation report, due in 1990, will include comparative data on rearrests and reconvictions for interlock offenders versus a matched group of DUI offenders not assigned to interlock.

An evaluation is also underway on the Prince Frederick program which will compare 60 offenders using ignition interlock to 60 who do not use it. At present, no post-program recidivism data are available. Limited data are available on recidivism during the program. To date some 20 people have completed the program. Three other offenders were terminated and jailed: two were rearrested for DWI while they were in the program, and another removed the interlock without authorization.

Both programs have the support of community agencies such as MADD. Both also report that family members have been positive even though they may be inconvenienced by having an IVAT in a vehicle they may drive.

Judge Cordell would like more judges to make use of this alternative. Judge Lamson would like to secure funds so that indigent offenders could participate in the program.

Intensive probation supervision

Four Intensive probation supervision programs were studied for this report: the Community Release Program, Redwood City, California (described in Harding et al., in press, page 60); (No program name), West Palm Beach, Florida; Alcohol Intensive Supervision Program, Evansville, Illinois; and, Intensive Probation Supervision of DUII Offenders, Portland, Oregon.

When an offender is assigned to probation, the level of supervision they receive may range from the traditional once a month brief meeting by a probation officer who inquires about the offender's well being and participation in criminal activity to very intensive monitoring on a regular basis. In addition, under traditional probation the offender may not be required to participate in any activities barring normal employment or restricted from any activities aside from criminal acts. Under intensive supervision, the offender may be required to participate in a wide range of educational, vocational, and therapeutic activities; may be restricted from certain activities such as the consumption of alcohol; and may even be required to remain at home unless excused to attend approved activities.

The goal of intensive probation supervision (IPS), is twofold: first, through close monitoring of offenders' activities, the probation officer aims to reduce the likelihood that violations of probation will go unnoticed, and thereby protects the community; second, by requiring participation in and restrictions from certain activities, the probation officer attempts to better prepare the offender for successfully reintegration into the community. Ultimately, the activities undertaken during IPS should also reduce the likelihood of the offender recidivating.

Of the four programs offering intensive probation supervision contacted for this report, one program which has been in existence for over ten years, is operated by a private, non-profit organization. The others are operated by local probation departments and were established within the last six years. While offenders usually participate in these in these programs as a condition of probation, at least 2 of the 4 programs contacted also offer a pre-sentencing or pre-release option. In most cases, the sentencing judge will determine the appropriate time for participation. When given a choice, an overwhelming majority of offenders elect to participate in IPS rather than go to or remain in jail.

IPS can provide a wide array of checks and procedures appropriate for multiple DWI offenders who are likely to be alcohol abusers and likely to relapse. The probationer is usually required to maintain regular contacts with the probation officer (anywhere from once a week to once a day), which

provides the opportunity to monitor his/her alcohol consumption. IPS programs require that the offender abstain from alcohol use altogether and the offender may also be subjected to random alcohol and drug testing as a condition of probation. In a program operated by San Mateo County in California, offenders are required to take the prescription drug disulfiram (brand name Antabuse) three to five days a week for four years. If the user ingest alcohol while being treated with disulfiram, he will become quite ill very suddenly. The obvious purpose of these various measures is to enforce abstinence in the hope that many offenders will remain abstinent after probation ends.

Three of the four programs contacted subject the client to home detention, allowing him/her to leave only for work or approved activities such as attendance at treatment or church. Verification of compliance is done through either random phone calls or visits to the offenders' homes and/or work site.

All of the programs contacted for this report require the probationers to participate in some form of treatment: individual and group counselling, participation in Alcoholics Anonymous, etc. Assignment to a specific type of treatment may be based on assessment of the offender's needs. Some programs require the offender to do community service work, others offer educational and vocational training. Still others may require participation in an educational program on drinking and driving. All of the programs tend to require more of the offender's time than traditional probation.

Since the caseloads of probation officers in intensive probation are smaller than in traditional probation, additional time is available for assessing and monitoring the progress of each offender. For example, in one intensive supervision program, the officers each handle 50 cases, as opposed to the 150 cases/officer in normal probation.

The duration of participation varied widely among the programs we studied. Offenders in two of the programs participate for between 45-90 days, while in another they may participate for 2-3 years. For offenders in the program utilizing Antabuse, a four year enrollment is required.

The number of probation officers required by the program is dependent on the number of offenders served. Program spokespeople believe that the intensive program requires more staff time than does normal probation supervision but less staff time than that required by jail.

Annual program costs ranged from \$130,000 to over \$2 million due to the great variability in program size. At one end of the spectrum, The County Release Program in Redwood City, CA is a county-wide program serving 148 offenders per year. The intensive probation supervision program operated by Pride, Inc. serves is a much larger program serving over 3000 offenders per

year. A more apt measure of cost would be cost per offender per day, however such data were not available from any of the programs. Staff salaries make up the largest percentage of these costs. Some states, such as Florida, have laws that require offenders to pay for probation services. This may be either an initial or monthly fee, or both (for the programs contacted, first year fees ranged from \$30-50/month). Other programs are funded by either county, state, and/or federal funds.

The proportion of offenders who complete the intensive supervision programs without violation ranges from 60-95% (the average completion rate for the four programs was 85%). No recidivism data was available from these programs.

Overall, feelings toward the programs by the community have been very positive. It appears that the idea of probation does not initially receive a warm welcome in the community since offenders are being released rather than incarcerated. Once programs are established, however, they are well-received, especially intensive programs since they so closely monitor the activities of the offender. The criminal justice system has also responded enthusiastically to the programs, although there were scattered complaints from program spokespeople that some judges did not use the programs.

Publishing offenders' names

Four newspapers which publish offenders' names were studied for this report: The Anchorage Times, Anchorage, Alaska; The Plymouth Old Colony Memorial Newspaper, Plymouth, Massachusetts; The Syracuse Herald Journal, Syracuse, New York; and, The Providence Journal, Providence, Rhode Island (described in Harding et al., in press, page 67).

Many newspapers make it a practice to publish the names of individuals arrested and/or convicted of various crimes, including DWI. A recent survey conducted by the Governor's Highway Safety Bureau of Massachusetts (McGovern, 1989) underscores how commonplace this is. Of 264 questionnaires returned by Massachusetts cities and towns (351 were distributed for a return rate of 75%), approximately 91% reported that one or more papers circulated in these communities publish the names of people involved in DWI offenses. This same survey indicates that only about 11% of the newspapers, including the Providence Journal contacted for this report, publish the names of DWI offenders separately from other offenders. Presumably, separate listings draw more attention to DWI offenders and intensify their embarrassment.

Some newspapers choose to publish each offender's name only once, either at the time of arrest or conviction, while others may report on the offender several times, e.g., after arrest, conviction, and sentencing. In the Massachusetts survey, about two thirds (69%) of the papers published both arrests and convictions.

Since DWI arrests and convictions are a matter of public record, it is relatively easy for newspapers to access the information through the police department, department of motor vehicles, or the courts. For example, in the case of the Providence Journal, the Department of Motor Vehicles facilitates this process.

For the newspapers we spoke to, maintaining the column usually becomes the part-time responsibility of one staff member in addition to his/her other tasks. The cost of publishing DWI offenders' names, then, is essentially equivalent to the cost of this staff time, which was described as minimal to negligible.

According to newspaper spokespeople, very few problems have been encountered with these listings. While some offenders and their families ask not to have their names published, the newspapers' policy is to publish the names of all adult offenders. No other opposition to the listings has been encountered.

The four newspapers included in this project describe the purpose of these columns as informing the public of criminal activity in the community. Although it may not be the direct intention of a newspaper, the columns may also serve to deter

drunk driving in two ways. First, some potential offenders may be deterred because the publicity, in and of itself, constitutes meaningful punishment. One assistant editor of a paper serving approximately 30 Massachusetts cities and towns (Flynn, 1988) reports that the single column which continually draws the most feedback from readers is one that presents court convictions (of all kinds). Most people who call about the column are offenders or their friends and relatives who are trying to keep the offender's name out of the paper, and many callers indicate that this is a greater concern than the punishment mandated by the courts. In the case of DWI, some, and perhaps many, offenders perceive publicity as more severe punishment than sanctions such as 48 hours in jail, fines, etc. It also seems reasonable to assume that listings have become a source of increased embarrassment as the stigma attached to DWI has increased in recent years.

The second way in which these columns may deter drunk driving is by underscoring the certainty of punishment (Anderson et al., 1983). Publication of offenders' names communicates a clear message that drunk drivers are being arrested/punished.

The columns may also help reduce recidivism by enhancing social deterrence. Without this publicity, many people who interact with the offender would probably be unaware that he has been convicted for DWI. The offender can conduct business as usual with these people, and this may include excessive drinking. With publicity, family, friends, employers, and others who learn about the offense can help monitor the offender's post-conviction behavior and can intervene to help keep the behavior in check. An offender may also sense that his drinking/driving behavior is being monitored and, therefore, be less likely to indulge in drinking and/or driving.

Although publicizing offenders' names is a strategy which is easy to implement and has the potential to impact both the offender and other drivers, we know of no studies which have tried to assess the effectiveness of this approach. Recent endorsement of the approach by the Surgeon General (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989) may stimulate its implementation and investigation.

Special license tags

Two programs that utilize special license tags were studied for this report: (No program name), St. Paul, Minnesota; (No program name), New Philadelphia, Ohio (described in Harding et al., in press, page 71).

Issuing special license plates is another strategy for addressing the fact that many DWI offenders continue to drive although their licenses have been either suspended or revoked. These plates are easily distinguished (in Minnesota for example they begin with the letters "X-Y") so as to draw the attention of police. The use of special license plates also gives the police the legal right to stop these vehicles for the purpose of verifying that the operator (usually a member of the offender's family) has a valid license.

A variation of this approach is the use of special license tags on vehicles owned by offenders who have been issued conditional licenses. Typically, the conditional license allows them to drive to and from work, but not at other times. Again, police officers can stop such vehicles without additional probable cause in order to determine whether the driver may be violating his/her license restrictions or is driving while intoxicated.

Spokespeople for the two programs we studied argue that these programs deter offenders from driving with a suspended license or exceeding license restrictions because the chance of their being apprehended is increased. The spokesperson for one of the programs also argued that this approach deters drunk driving in the general population because people fear being arrested and suffering social stigma of displaying special plates (not all programs issue plates which can be readily identified by the general public).

Details of the programs we investigated differ in several ways, illustrating that the approach is flexible. For example, in Minnesota, the distribution of special plates is a statewide program, while the other program serves only one county in Ohio. The Minnesota program issues special plates to both drivers whose license has been suspended and to those who have been issued a restricted license, while the Ohio program only issues plates to the former type of offender. The county-based Ohio program issues about 250 to 300 plates per year; the statewide Minnesota program about 175 plates per year. Both programs have been able to accommodate all suitable candidates (the only factor limiting enrollment in the program is the number of special plates on hand, which has been sufficient).

The amount of time the plates must be attached depends on the length of the licensing sanction imposed by the courts. It appears that periods of approximately one year are common, but

the variation is large - from periods of a few months to many years.

The cost for these programs consists of the expense associated with the production and distribution of the license plates. In the programs we contacted, this expense is small. The labor involved in distributing the plates is part of the normal operation of the Bureau of Motor Vehicles or Department of Public Safety. Program costs are recovered by charging offenders a "registration fee" ranging from \$4.00 to \$25.00.

Although no formal research has been undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the plates in keeping offenders from recidivating, spokespeople in the Minnesota program estimate that 95% of the offenders successfully complete their sentence without any violations (without being stopped for driving when they should not have been). If a violation does occur, the special plates are impounded and the offender will again appear in court. She or he may then be sentenced to serve a jail term and/or to pay a fine.

No information was available about the frequency with which offenders attempt to defeat this approach by leasing or purchasing other vehicle, by borrowing plates from another vehicle, etc.

The criminal justice system as well as the larger community have been supportive of these programs, and very little public opposition to the programs has been encountered. Families of the offenders, who are subject to being stopped by police when driving the offenders' vehicles, have been very cooperative and even grateful to the program for helping to keep the offender from drinking and driving. No data are available, incidentally, to indicate how often vehicles with these plates are stopped, so the extent to which family members are inconvenienced is unclear.

Victim restitution

Four victim restitution programs were studied for this report: (No program name), West Palm Beach, Florida (described in Harding et al., in press, page 77); (No program name), Atlanta, Georgia; (No program name), Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and, the Earn-It Program, Quincy, Massachusetts.

In drunk-driving cases where a victim can be identified, the offenders must often pay restitution to the victims as part of the conditions of their probation. Restitution is usually monetary, although the offender may be required to perform some service for the victim, especially if the offender lacks adequate funds.

Victim restitution has been a common facet of probation for a number of years. Of the four programs contacted for this report, one began as early as 1950, while the other three began in the mid to late 1970's. As of 1987, 41 of the 50 states in the U.S. had implemented or approved legislation concerning victim restitution by drunk-drivers (National Commission Against Drunk Driving, 1987, p.4). Victim restitution cases are usually handled by agencies that monitor probation requirements, such as state departments of correction or private, non-profit organizations.

The concept of victim restitution emerged out of the frustration of the criminal justice system over traditional sentencing options that often fail for DWI offenders and from the lack of attention given to the angry and often ignored victim. The programs we studied note the need to reduce jail overcrowding while simultaneously utilizing alternative sanctions to enhance the effectiveness of traditional probation activities. The goals of victim restitution are two-fold: (1) to compensate the victim for his or her loss with funds provided directly from the offender; (2) to rehabilitate the offender by helping him/her to understand the impact of the crime upon the victim and by increasing the offender's sense of responsibility and accountability for the offense. The hope of these programs is that this gained understanding and sense of responsibility will reduce recidivism.

Any crime that involves a tangible cost to a victim is eligible for victim restitution such as theft, vandalism, assault, as well as drunk-driving. In the one program contacted that could supply such data, 75% of the offenders paying restitution were DWI offenders. Of these, 45% were multiple offenders. In three of the four programs contacted, restitution is ordered by the court and participation is mandatory. If the offender lacks adequate funds, community service or a jail term may be ordered. The fourth program screens potential participants and will not accept uncooperative or violent offenders.

Since many of these programs deal with victim restitution as part of an overall probation program, little data was available concerning only those offenders paying restitution. The size of these programs varied significantly since some operated statewide and others were countywide. For example, one of the countywide programs served an average of 250 offenders per year, while a statewide program served 22,170 offenders. Since very little time is required by either the offender or probation officer for restitution, all of the programs could handle a large number of referrals for restitution.

Offenders usually have the duration of probation to pay the restitution in installments. Usually, payments are made monthly and last one year. However, one program noted that probation, and thus payments, may last as long as 4 years. In some programs, the victim receives monthly installments in the amount that the offender is paying. However, in one program the victim waits for payment until monthly payments are complete.

The offender usually makes payments to the probation officer who in turn makes payments to the victim. Less frequently, the offender makes a one-time payment or periodic payments directly to the victim.

Very little staff time is required for victim restitution. Payment collection is usually a small part of the probation officer's or county clerk's normal duties. In the Pride, Inc. program, one full-time director is employed exclusively for the management of victim restitution cases.

The only real cost incurred for victim restitution is the salaries of the probation officers and/or program administrators. Again, since this cost is tied in with the overall probation program, programs could supply no data on the cost of the victim restitution alone.

Most of the probation programs are funded through the state. The Pride, Inc. program is fully funded through fines collected from offenders which are put in a general fund for such programs.

Two of the four programs contacted were able to supply data on the percentage of offenders who complete restitution. Ten to fifteen percent of offenders do not complete their restitution obligations either due to rearrest, lack of funds, or a simple failure to pay. In these cases, the offender may be returned to jail or the restitution agreement may reassessed and restructured.

None of the programs were able to supply recidivism data on offenders involved in victim restitution. Overall, the spokespersons for these programs agree that victim restitution has been very successful. The programs require very little effort on the part of the probation departments and criminal justice system, yet program spokespeople felt the benefits to

the offenders as well as the victims are substantial. The only difficulties found with the programs are in determining an appropriate restitution amount. Many of the program spokespersons would prefer that the sentencing judge or district attorney would investigate the victim's claim and set the amount of restitution. Otherwise, both the victims and program staff appear to be satisfied with the success of victim restitution.

Weekend intervention

Three Weekend intervention programs were studied for this report: The Weekender Intervention Program, Augusta, Maine; The Weekend Intervention Program, Springfield, Missouri (described in Harding et al., in press, page 84); and, The Weekend Intervention Program, Cleveland, Ohio.

Weekend intervention programs (WIPs) are very short term residential therapeutic/assessment programs, often dedicated solely to DWI offenders. These programs tend to share three major goals:

1. To educate the DWI offender concerning substance use and dependency.
2. To make a diagnostic evaluation of the offender concerning the existence and extent of problems with alcohol.
3. To make therapeutic recommendations and referrals to community agencies and programs based on these evaluations.

The WIP is based on the view that many, if not most, DWI offenders have experienced a pattern of abusive drinking or alcoholism. The program hopes to break through the alcohol abuser's tendency to deny they have a drinking problem and to prepare them for further treatment. Individual and group counseling activities may be part of the WIP, but the primary goal is to motivate offenders to begin treatment. WIPs prepare people for treatment rather than providing the treatment.

The primary rationale behind these programs is that DWI offenders recidivate at high rates because jail, fines and other approaches do not address the root cause of the problem: alcohol abuse. By motivating offenders to enter treatment, WIPs hope to reduce recidivism. A secondary program benefit may be a reduction in jail overcrowding. The WIP provides an alternative sanction for the many offenders who are sentenced to serve only a few days in jail. In addition, jail space may be saved because judges may be more inclined to place WIP graduates on probation than to sentence them to jail.

Since the development of the first WIP at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio in 1978 by Dr. Harvey Siegal, several programs based on this model have been established. Dissemination of WIPs has been bolstered by the availability of training programs, materials, and implementation assistance offered (for a fee) by Dr. Siegal.

The three WIPs studied for this report were modeled on the Wright State program, but are not exact replications. For instance, these programs are operated by a variety of

organizations: a large community hospital, a state agency, and an urban university.

WIPs can differ in terms of how they interact with the courts, and for a single WIP, the interaction can vary from judge to judge. The WIP was designed to be utilized prior to sentencing an offender; the extent of the individual's problems with alcohol is assessed and recommendations for treatment are made to the court. In some cases, however, participation in the program is the sentence given to the offender by the courts. Sometimes, judges make the treatment plan recommended by the program a condition of probation; at other times, compliance with treatment recommendations is voluntary. Participation in a WIP is often court-ordered, but it may also be offered on a voluntary basis as in the Weekend Intervention Program in Cleveland, Ohio.

Normally, WIP programs place restrictions on which offenders are eligible to participate based on the offender's receptiveness to the program and whether they are intoxicated at intake. If an offender is intoxicated when they arrive, she or he is sent to a separate detoxification program prior to entering the WIP.

The three programs studied for this project varied in terms of the number of offenders served - from 30 per month to as many as 125 per month. None of the programs has had to turn offenders away, and there have been times when these programs operated well under capacity.

All of the programs are of short duration - from 48 to 72 consecutive hours. They usually operate from Friday night to Sunday night. During this time, activities include group and individual counseling, extensive alcohol education, screening of films concerning substance abuse, and an introduction to Alcoholics Anonymous. Participation in these activities is required, and the offender is left with little or no free time. Activities are usually suspended at approximately 10:00 pm. Participants are then returned to their housing facilities, where they are supervised by security staff.

The staff required for a WIP depends on the number of participants. In addition to the security staff, one counselor, perhaps with the assistance of a "junior counselor", is generally responsible for one group of participants (approximately 10-15 participants). Most counselors are licensed substance abuse counselors, receive anywhere from 8 to 90 hours of orientation training, and are hired on a probationary basis. For the most part, training is done by the program directors with the assistance of veteran counselors.

In general, the program spokespeople believe that this type of program requires more staff hours per offender than a jail sentence of equal length, since so much time is spent with each individual offender.

The annual costs of operating the WIPs range from \$50,000 to \$450,000, depending on the size of the program. The cost per offender among the programs was quite similar ranging from \$63.33 to \$100.00, averaging \$81.66. All of the programs contacted are completely funded through user-fees ranging from \$190-\$250 for the weekend. Sometimes, the courts pay the costs for an indigent offender, or financial assistance to cover such cases is provided by the organization operating the program. For example, Deaconess Hospital, in Cleveland, Ohio, offers a scholarship fund for offenders who cannot afford to pay.

Given that WIPs last only 2-3 days, it is not surprising that nearly 100% of the offenders complete the program. The programs studied do not determine what proportion of the offenders also complete the post-program treatment the staff recommend. Although no formal studies of program effectiveness had been done for the programs contacted for this report, a comparative evaluation of the Wright State University WIP was conducted by Dr. Siegal under a NHTSA contract (Siegal, 1985). The evaluation indicated that repeat offenders participating in the WIP had lower recidivism rates (defined as rearrest for any alcohol-related offense within 2 years) than offenders who either went to jail or received a suspended sentence/fine. This difference was small (and approached but did not quite achieve statistical significance, $p < .08$): 21.8% of WIP offenders were rearrested within two years versus 26.8% for those jailed and 30.4% for those who received a suspended sentence and/or fine. The results were more encouraging and statistically significant ($p = .05$) when the groups were compared on the average number of days they went without being rearrested for an alcohol-related offense: WIP offenders went 457 days, jailed offenders 374 days, and those suspended and/or fines 362 days. Although random assignment was not used this generally sound study did make use of comparison groups.

According to program spokespeople, staff members as well as members of the criminal justice system and the community are supportive of these programs. Overall, spokespeople are satisfied with the structure and effectiveness of these three programs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

These new approaches to dealing with multiple DWI offenders have very attractive features. Some of their strengths are:

- o The programs that serve as an alternative to jail both alleviate jail overcrowding and avoid exposing offenders to assault, suicide and other risks associated with jail.
- o The programs appear to be attractive to offenders. This makes it more likely the programs can operate at capacity which reduces the cost per offender.
- o With the exception of dedicated detention and weekend intervention, these approaches are reported to be less costly than jail per offender per day.
- o Nineteen of the programs offset all or a part of their costs by charging offenders fees. Also, in most of these programs, the offender continues to work so that he can pay these fees.
- o Depending on how they are implemented, these programs can afford a good deal of protection to the public. Some operate in specialized jails and detain offenders twenty-four hours a day (e.g., weekend intervention and some dedicated detention facilities). Other programs, although they are obviously not as incapacitating as this, provide very close surveillance to minimize the chances that the offender will continue to drink and drive while involved with the program.
- o They are flexible in the sense that they can fit at many points in the criminal justice process.
- o They serve a variety of criminal justice goals: incapacitation, rehabilitation, retribution, etc.
- o They enjoy a good deal of public support and little opposition.
- o They can be implemented by a wide range of public and private organizations.
- o Approximately three-quarters of DWI offenders complete these programs -- they do not disappear, nor is it common to have them incarcerated for violating program rules.
- o Program spokespeople reported relatively few serious persistent operational problems.

At the same time, there are many unknowns about these programs which leave significant doubts about how suitable they are as alternatives to traditional approaches. We commented earlier that although very few DWI offenders are jailed for violating program rules, it is not clear how many drink and drive or violate other rules without being detected. In programs which closely monitor the offender's whereabouts (e.g., electronic monitoring using a continuous system) and which test regularly (but randomly) for alcohol use, the number of undetected violations is probably very small. On the other hand, many programs are not so restrictive. Certainly there is a need for careful investigations to determine how foolproof these programs are.

We also pointed out that although it appears that the programs may save money as compared to jailing offenders, it is difficult to be precise about the magnitude of the savings. For example, programs did not report the total cost per offender for an average length of stay in their program as compared to the same figure for jailed offenders. Also, as mentioned above, many programs did not provide itemized budgets leaving open the question of whether such expenses as equipment and building purchases were included in their total annual cost figures.

The most serious area of doubt is the extent to which these programs reduce recidivism. If recidivism is higher than jail, for example, this would tend to outweigh benefits such as cost savings. As discussed, at present, there is very little good information about recidivism rates for these programs. Also, programs were unable to provide related information such as the extent to which they may have reduced the number of DWI trips or alcohol related crashes.

Recommendations

The uncertainties that remain about these programs indicate that they should be regarded as experimental efforts rather than proven alternatives. Accordingly, those interested in implementing them should be cautious. Implementation of small scale test programs may be appropriate, but large scale implementation should probably be deferred until better information becomes available.

Obviously, conducting careful evaluations of these programs should be a high priority. The evaluations should compare how well offenders do in these programs versus the effectiveness of traditional approaches or other alternatives. Short of this, programs at least need to keep basic records, something that we did not always find. The types of information should include such things as:

- o The number of qualified offenders who chose not to participate in the program and the sanctions/programs they selected instead.

- o The average enrollment in the program.
- o The length of time offenders spend in the program.
- o The types of offenders enrolled: offense, age, sex, previous criminal history, etc. In the case of DWI offenders, it would also be helpful to know their BAC at the time they were arrested (because of theories linking a high BAC with longstanding alcohol abuse and higher chances of recidivism).
- o The program should also collect and report data on characteristics of offenders who receive jail or other sanctions. This information will help clarify if the alternative program is enrolling only those offenders who have the best chance at avoiding more drinking-driving.
- o The number of offenders who have ever been enrolled in the program, the number who completed the program, the number of terminated from the program (including the reasons for termination), the number who voluntarily return to jail, and the number currently enrolled.
- o The annual program costs (total and per offender), the costs per offender per day, and the costs per offender for the average length of stay.

REFERENCES

American Correctional Association, Drunk Drivers: A Study of Prince George's County (MD) DWI Facility. December 1987.

Anderson, T.E., Compton, R.P., Snyder, M.B., and Engle, R.E., Potential Enforcement, Adjudication, and Public Information Strategies for the General Deterrence of Driving While Intoxicated. U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Washington D.C., February 1983, (DOT Publication No. DOT HS-806-360).

Armstrong, T., Reiner, G., and Phillips, J., Electronic Monitoring Programs: An Overview. EMT Groups, Inc.: Sacramento, California, April, 1987.

Ball, R.A., and Lilly, R.J., "The Potential Use of Home Incarceration with Drunken Drivers." Paper presented at American Society for Criminology Meetings, Denver, 1983.

Ball, R.A., Huff, R.C. and Lilly, R.J., House Arrest and Correctional Policy: Doing Time at Home, Sage Publications: Newbury Park, California, 1988.

Byrne, J. and Kelly, L., "The Use of Electronic Surveillance in the Criminal Justice System: the Marketing of Punishment." Center for Criminal Justice Research, University of Lowell, Massachusetts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Chicago, Illinois, August 14, 1987.

Compton, R.P., Potential for Application of Ignition Interlock Devices to Prohibit Operation of Motor Vehicles By Intoxicated Individuals. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Washington D.C., Report No. DOT HS 807-281, May 1988.

EMT Group, Inc. Evaluation of the California Ignition Interlock Pilot Program for DUI Offenders (Farr-Davis Driver Safety Act of 1986): Second Interim Report. Sacramento, California, August 15, 1989.

Flynn, W. (Assistant Editor, Quincy Patriot Ledger), Speech at the Connecticut/Massachusetts Alcohol Safety Workshop, Hyannis, Massachusetts, May 23, 1988.

Friel, C. and Vaughn, J., "A Consumer's Guide to the Electronic Monitoring of Probationers." Federal Probation Quarterly, 2(3), 3-14, 1986.

Greenfield, L.A. Drunk Driving. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington D.C., 1988.

Grinter, R.C., "Hardware Wars." Offender Monitoring, 1(5), pp. 1,8,9,12,17, 1988.

Harding, W.M., Apsler, R., and Walsh, W.A., Users' Guide to New Approaches and Sanctions for Multiple DWI Offenders. U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Washington D.C., in press.

Jacobs, J.B., "The Law and Criminology of Drunk Driving." In: M. Tonry and N. Morris, Crime and Justice, Vol. 10, University of Chicago: Chicago, Illinois, in press.

McGovern, T. (Regional Coordinator, Governor's Highway Safety Bureau of Massachusetts), Personal Communication, 1989.

National Commission Against Drunk Driving, Progress Report on Recommendations Proposed by the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, National Commission Against Drunk Driving: Washington, D.C., December, 1987.

Petersilia, J., "Exploring the Option of House Arrest." Federal Probation, 50 (2), 1986.

Schmidt, A.K., Electronic Monitoring of Offenders Increases. NIJ Reports. National Institute of Justice: Washington, D.C. January/February 1989.

Siegal, H., Impact of a Driver Intervention Program on DWI Recidivism and Problem Drinking: Final Report. Report No. DOT HS 807 023, U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Washington, D.C., December 1985.

United States Department of Health and Human Services, Surgeon General's Workshop on Drunk Driving: Proceedings, United States Department of Health and Human Services: Rockville, Maryland, 1989.

U.S. Department of Justice, "Jailing Drunk Drivers: Impact on the Criminal Justice System." National Institute of Justice - Research in Brief. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice: Washington, D.C. November, 1984.

U.S. Department of Justice, Census of Local Jails, 1983: Volume V. Selected Findings, Methodology and Summary Tables. U.S. Department of Justice: Washington, D.C. November, 1988a (Report number NCJ-112795).

U.S. Department of Justice, Our Crowded Jails: A National Plight. U.S. Department of Justice: Washington, D.C. November, 1988b (Report number NCJ-110643).

Voas, R.B., "Evaluation of Jail as a Penalty for Drunk Driving." Alcohol, Drugs and Driving. 2(2): 47-70, 1986.

Williams, R., Hagen, R., and McConnell, E.J., "A Driving Record Analysis of Suspension and Revocation Effects on the Drinking-Driving Offender." Accident Analysis and Prevention, 16: 333-338, 1984a.

Williams, R.L., Hagen R.E. and McConnell, E.J., "A Survey of Suspension and Revocation Effects on the Drinking-Driver Offender," Accident Analysis and Prevention, 16:339-350, 1984b.

**APPENDIX A:
PROGRAMS ON WHICH DETAILED INFORMATION WAS COLLECTED**

This list provides information on the program name, the organization that operates the program, program spokesperson, the spokesperson's title/position, the program address, and telephone number. Some additional information appears in a "comments" field including relationships to other programs and whether a site visit was conducted (11 of the 33 programs were visited). The programs have been subgrouped by the type of services the programs offer.

1. Dedicated Detention Facilities

Program Name: Prince George's County DWI Facility
Organization that operates the program: Prince George's County
Department of Corrections
Spokesperson's name: Bruce Orenstein (1), Consuella Harris (2),
Carol Porto (3)
Spokesperson's position: Division Chief of Program Services,
Department of Corrections (1), Acting DWI Facility
Director (2), Treatment Director (3)
Address: 13400 Dille Drive, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
Telephone: (301) 952-7050
Comments: Site visited. For information on another program for
multiple DWI offenders operated by the Department of Corrections
see the Home Detention Program under Electronic Monitoring
below).

Program Name: Longwood Treatment Center
Organization that operates the program: Massachusetts
Department of Correction
Spokesperson's name: David MacDonald
Spokesperson's position: Superintendent
Address: 125 South Huntington Avenue, Jamaica Plain,
Massachusetts
Telephone: (617) 727-0280
Comments: Site visited.

Program Name: Residential Alcohol Treatment Program
Organization that operates the program: Executive Office Of
Human Services, Department of Public Health, Rutland
Heights Hospital
Spokesperson's name: Mr. Paul Deignan
Spokesperson's position: Program Director
Address: 86 Maple Avenue, Rutland, Massachusetts 01543
Telephone: (617) 886-4711 x185
Comments: Site visited.

Program Name: Suffolk County DWI Alternative Facility
Organization that operates the program: Suffolk County
Sheriff's
Department
Spokesperson's name: Eileen Kremers (1), Ann Bernagozzi (2)
Spokesperson's position: STOP-DWI Coordinator (1), Program
Director (2)
Address: P.O. Box 69, Yaphank, New York 11980
Telephone: (516) 924-4300 x466
Comments:

Program Name: DUI DAART (Drugs and Alcohol Resources
Treatment) Program
Organization that operates the program: Community Services
Board
Spokesperson's name: Elaine Boyle
Spokesperson's position: Director
Address: 10520 Judicial Drive, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Telephone: (703) 246-4309
Comments:

2. Diversion Programs

Program Name: Alternative Sentencing Program (ASP)
Organization that operates the program: Criminal Justice
Alternatives, Inc.
Spokesperson's name: Steve Bolm (1), Nancy Pierce-Grant (2)
Spokesperson's position: Administrative Assistant (1),
Program Director (2)
Address: 1100 Van Ness Ave., Room 402, Fresno, California 93721
Telephone: (209) 488-3546
Comments:

Program Name: Felony DWI Diversion Program
Organization that operates the program: Pretrial Services
Corporation of the Monroe County Bar Association
Spokesperson's name: Lee Wood (1), Barbara Darbey (2)
Spokesperson's position: Executive Director (1),
Diversion Counselor (2)
Address: 65 West Broad Street, Rochester, New York 14614
Telephone: (716) 454-3491
Comments: Site visited.

Program Name: STOP-DWI
Organization that operates the program: District Attorney's
Office, DWI Unit
Spokesperson's name: John LaParo (1), Liz Morgan (2)
Spokesperson's position: Chief Assistant District Attorney and
Coordinator of the DWI Unit (1), Program Administrator
Address: Onondaga County STOP-DWI, 421 Montgomery Street,
12th Floor, Syracuse, New York 13202
Telephone: (315) 425-3964
Comments:

3. Electronic Monitoring

Program Name: Home Arrest Program
Organization that operates the program: Adams County Jail
Spokesperson's name: Mr. Carl Hanson
Spokesperson's position: Coordinator
Address: 150 North 19th St, Brighton, Colorado 80601
Telephone: (303) 654-18150
Comments: Uses Guardian Technologies, BI Device

Program Name: In-House Arrest Program
Organization that operates the program: Pride, Inc.
Spokesperson's name: Mr. Fred Rasmussen (1), Gina Walker (2),
Jeanne McGowen (3)
Spokesperson's position: Executive Director (1),
Program Director for Palm Beach Program (2) Program
Director
for Daytona Beach (branch) Program.
Address: P.O. Box 307, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402
Telephone: (407) 683-6776
Comments: Site visited the Palm Beach Program, telephone data
were collected for both the Daytona and Palm Beach
programs. For information on other programs for multiple
DWI offenders operated by PRIDE see Intensive Probation
Supervision and Victim Restitution below.

Program Name: House Arrest Alternative Sentence Program
Organization that operates the program: Anne Arundel County
Detention Centers
Spokesperson's name: Ralph Thomas (1), Kathy King (2)
Spokesperson's position: Division Chief, Community Service (1),
Coordinator (2)
Address: Anne Arundel County Detention Center, 131 Jennifer
Road, Annapolis, Maryland 21401
Telephone: (301) 224-7373
Comments: Site visited. Uses LIMS (Luma Interactive Monitoring
System) manufactured by Mitsubishi. The system uses a video
telephone which transmits pictures of the offender. This
is a random calling system.

Program Name: Home Detention Program
Organization that operates the program: Calvert County
Sheriff's Department
Spokesperson's name: Sergeant Pat Nutter
Spokesperson's position: Sergeant
Address: Calvert County Sheriff's Department, Court House,
Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678
Telephone: (301) 535-2800
Comments: Uses Guardian continuous monitoring system.

Program Name: Home Detention Program
Organization that operates the program: Prince George's County
Department of Corrections
Spokesperson's name: Bruce Orenstein (1), Al Hall (2),
Diane Shaw (3)
Spokesperson's position: Division Chief of Program Services,
Department of Corrections (1) Director (2), Correctional
Treatment Coordinator (3)
Address: 13400 Dille Drive, Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
Telephone: (301) 952-7121
Comments: Site visited. Uses Hitek On-Guard random calling
device. For information on another program for multiple DWI
offenders operated by the Department of Corrections see the
Prince George's County DWI Facility under Dedicated
Detention Facilities above.

Program Name: Hampden County House of Corrections Pre-Release
and Day Reporting Center
Organization that operates the program: Hampden County
Sheriff's Department
Spokesperson's name: Kevin Warwick
Spokesperson's position: Center's Director
Address: 590 West Columbus Ave, Springfield, Massachusetts
01105
Telephone: 413-787-1780
Comments: Uses Hitek On-Guard random calling device

4. Ignition Interlock Devices

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Santa Clara County
Municipal Court
Spokesperson's name: Judge LaDoris Hazzard Cordell
Spokesperson's position: Judge
Address: 191 North First Street, San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 299-3411
Comments:

Program Name: Guardian Interlock Responsible Driver Program
Organization that operates the program: Department of Public
Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and
Probation
Spokesperson's name: Marisa Mansueti (1), Judge Larry Lamson
(2)
Spokesperson's position: Probation officer in charge of
program (1), Judge (2)
Address: P.O. Box 98, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678
Telephone: (301) 535-1600 x325 (1), (301) 535-1600 x233 (2)
Comments: Site visited.

5. Intensive Probation Supervision

Program Name: Community Release Program
Organization that operates the program: County of San Mateo
Adult Probation Office
Spokesperson's name: Amos L. Dana
Spokesperson's position: Assistant Director
Address: Hall of Justice and Records, 401 Marshall Street,
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (415) 363-4289
Comments: Site visited.

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Pride, Inc.
Spokesperson's name: Fred Rasmussen (1), Andrea Sheldon (2)
Spokesperson's position: Executive Director (1),
Program Director (2)
Address: P.O. Box 307, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402
Telephone: (407) 683-6776
Comments: Site visited. For information on other programs for
multiple DWI offenders operated by PRIDE see In House
Arrest Program under Electronic Monitoring above and see
Victim Restitution below.

Program Name: Alcohol Intensive Supervision Program (AIS)
Organization that operates the program: Vanderburgh Circuit
Court
Spokesperson's name: Allan Henson
Spokesperson's position: Director
Address: Vanderburgh Circuit Court, Civic Courts Complex,
Courts Building Room 210, Evansville, Indiana 47708
Telephone: (812) 426-5192
Comments:

Program Name: Intensive Probation Supervision of DUII Offenders
Organization that operates the program: Multnomah County
Probation Services
Spokesperson's name: Wayne Salvo (1), Charlea Couckuyt (2)
Spokesperson's position: Director (1), Unit Supervisor (2)
Address: 1021 SW 4th Avenue, Room 811, Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 248-3810
Comments:

6. Publishing Offenders' Names

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Anchorage Times
Spokesperson's name: Lois Padgett
Spokesperson's position: Executive Secretary to the Publisher
Address: P.O. Box 40, Anchorage, Alaska 99510
Telephone: (907) 263-9105
Comments:

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Plymouth Old Colony
Memorial Newspaper
Spokesperson's name: Melissa Moore
Spokesperson's position: Court Reporter
Address: 9 Long Pond Road, P.O. Box 959, Plymouth,
Massachusetts 02360
Telephone: 1-800-242-0264
Comments:

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Syracuse Herald Journal
Spokesperson's name: Rebecca Schultz
Spokesperson's position: City Editor
Address: Clinton Square, P.O. Box 4195, Syracuse, New York
13221
Telephone: (315) 470-0011
Comments:

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Department of
Transportation, Division of Motor Vehicles
Spokesperson's name: Robert Halpin
Spokesperson's position: Chief of Operator Control Section,
Suspension Unit
Address: 345 Harris Avenue, Providence, Rhode Island 02903
Telephone: (401) 277-2994
Comments:

7. Special License Tags

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Department of Public
Safety, Driver and Vehicle Services
Spokesperson's name: Jane Brust, Kathy Moret
Spokesperson's position: Supervisor, Violations (1)
Address: Department of Public Safety, Driver and Vehicle
Safety,
205 Transportation Building, Violation Unit, St. Paul,
Minnesota 55155
Telephone: (612) 296-2994
Comments: Issues license plates beginning with the letters X-W
after original plates have been impounded due to driving
with a revoked or suspended license.

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: New Philadelphia, Ohio
Municipal Court
Spokesperson's name: Judge Edward Emmett O'Farrell
Spokesperson's position: Judge
Address: 166 E. High Avenue, New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663
Telephone: (216) 364-4491
Comments:

8. Victim Restitution

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Pride, Inc.
Spokesperson's name: Fred Rasmussen (1), Bill Carr (2)
Spokesperson's position: Executive Director (1) Program
Director for Victim Restitution
Address: P.O. Box 307, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402
Telephone: (407) 683-6776
Comments: Site visited. For information on other programs for
multiple DWI offenders operated by PRIDE see In House
Arrest Program under Electronic Monitoring above and se
Intensive Probation Supervision above.

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: Georgia Department of
Corrections, Probation Division
Spokesperson's name: Annette Henderson
Spokesperson's position: Community Service Program Coordinator
Address: Suite 954 (East Tower), Floyd Veterans Memorial
Building, 2 Martin Luther King Drive, Atlanta, Georgia
30334
Telephone: (404) 656-4696
Comments: Many different services are currently being
implemented
at the Georgia DOC, including intensive probation
supervision.

Program Name: No program name
Organization that operates the program: State Department of
Corrections
Spokesperson's name: Anne Vestal
Spokesperson's position: Area Supervisor
Address: 1035 3rd Ave, SouthEast, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52403
Telephone: (319) 398-3675
Comments:

Program Name: Earn-It Program
Organization that operates the program: Quincy District Court
Spokesperson's name: Lorraine Rosenblatt
Spokesperson's position: Director of Victim Services
Address: Quincy District Court, 1 Dennis Ryan Parkway, Quincy,
MA 02169
Telephone: (617) 471-1650
Comments: