



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

DOT HS 807 571
Final Report

December 1989

Users' Guide To New Approaches and Sanctions For Multiple DWI Offenders

1. Report No. DOT HS 807 571	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subject Users' Guide To New Approaches and Sanctions For Multiple DWI Offenders		5. Report Date December, 1989	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s) Wayne M. Harding, Ed.M.; Robert Apsler, Ph.D.; and Wendi A. Walsh, B.A.		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
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. DTNR22-87-R-07271
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		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report September, 1987 -- December, 1989	
15. Supplementary Notes Prepared in cooperation with the subcontractor: Social Science Research and Evaluation, Inc., 4 Austin Park, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139			
16. Abstract This guide describes nine new approaches for reducing recidivism among multiple DWI offenders: dedicated detention facilities, diversion programs, electronic monitoring, ignition interlock systems, intensive probation supervision, publishing offender names, special license tags, victim restitution, and weekend intervention programs. Data on 33 programs that use these approaches was collected through telephone discussions, correspondence, and site visits to 11 programs. Information presented on each approach includes: the number and types of offenders served, staffing requirements, costs, funding sources, program requirements, and effectiveness. Selected program descriptions illustrate how each approach can be implemented. A table lists key characteristics on all 33 programs studied, e.g., cost, number of offenders served, program duration, etc. 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, e.g., many cost less than jail; offenders tend to complete the programs; many monitor offenders very closely, which provides security while alleviating jail overcrowding. The most important shortcoming of the approaches is that reliable data on post-program recidivism is rarely available. More information about the study methods and findings appears in a companion report: Assessment Of Multiple DWI Offender Restrictions.			
17. Key Words DWI Offenders Drinking and Driving Sanctions		18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the U.S. 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 149	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

INTRODUCTION.....1

 Background.....1

 Objectives of The Guide.....1

 Organization of The Guide.....1

SUMMARY OF METHODS AND KEY FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS.....5

 Methods.....5

 Key Findings/Conclusions.....6

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS.....11

 Dedicated detention.....13

 Diversion.....21

 Electronic monitoring.....31

 Ignition interlock.....47

 Intensive probation supervision.....57

 Publishing offender names.....65

 Special license tags.....69

 Victim restitution.....75

 Weekend intervention.....81

TABLE OF PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS.....91

 Dedicated detention.....96

 Diversion.....102

 Electronic monitoring.....106

 Ignition interlock.....112

 Intensive probation supervision.....114

 Publishing offender names.....118

 Special license tags.....122

 Victim restitution.....124

 Weekend intervention.....128

REFERENCES.....133

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: PROGRAMS ON WHICH DETAILED INFORMATION

WAS COLLECTED.....A-1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: TYPES OF APPROACHES INVESTIGATED.....3

**TABLE 2: NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ON WHICH DETAILED
DATA WERE COLLECTED BY PROGRAM TYPE.....6**

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, detention facilities dedicated to DWI offenders, and electronic monitoring.

Claims that the alternatives are less costly than traditional sanctions, more effective in preventing recidivism, more humane and effective methods for rehabilitating DWI offenders, can reduce jail overcrowding, etc. have stirred the interest of state and local planners, advocacy groups, and the judiciary. Unfortunately, comprehensive information about the new approaches has been difficult to obtain. Although some (e.g., electronic monitoring) have been described in both scientific and more popular literature, there has been little or nothing written about other approaches (e.g., use of special license tags and publicizing offenders names). Another problem is that articles usually discuss how these approaches work for all types offenders, rather than focusing on DWI offenders or on programs that are specially designed for DWI offenders. The articles also tend to discuss one approach at a time and so it is difficult to get an overview of all the alternatives.

Objectives of The Guide

This guide has three major objectives:

1. To acquaint decision makers and planners with new approaches directed at DWI offenders, specifically multiple DWI offenders.
2. To provide people who may be interested in implementing these approaches with an idea of how programs operate, the resources they require, how well they work, and where they can get additional information.
3. To point out some of the questions and uncertainties about these approaches.

Organization of The Guide

The Guide has four major parts.

First, there is a SUMMARY OF METHODS AND KEY FINDINGS/ CONCLUSIONS. This section concentrates on how the study was conducted and what can be said about the approaches as a group. We have placed the conclusions early in the Guide to give

readers a general understanding of the strengths and limitations of these approaches and unresolved issues before we examine each approach individually in later sections. We recommend that readers at least skim the discussion of findings and conclusions. Those who would like more technical detail about the study methods and findings should examine a companion report, "Assessment of Multiple DWI Offender Restrictions: Final Technical Report" (Harding et al., in press).

The second section, titled PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, discusses each of the nine types of programs studied¹: dedicated detention facilities, diversion, electronic monitoring, ignition interlock, intensive probation supervision, publishing offender names, special license tags, victim restitution, and weekend intervention (these are briefly described in Table 1 on the following page). A summary of the main features of each approach is followed by a description of one or two specific programs. These descriptions have been structured using the same subheadings to facilitate comparisons among programs on such dimensions as: when and why the program began, how offenders become involved in the program, what offenders are required to do, staffing requirements, costs, funding, and evidence of program effectiveness. This section of the report provides the most detailed information about both the major types of programs and about selected individual programs. Readers who know the approach that most interests them can turn here first. This section will also interest readers who want detailed information about all or many of the nine program types.

The third section, TABLE OF PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS, provides an overview of 33 programs by charting some of their key characteristics: how many offenders are served per year, the percentage who are DWI offenders, number of staff, program costs, sources of revenues, problems reported by program personnel, etc. The programs are grouped according to the nine major types, and the structure of the table permits quick comparisons within and across the types. This section provides the most compact information about the programs studied and readers can use it to determine which programs may meet their interests. They could look up, for example, programs that are operated by probation departments, are funded primarily by user fees, and accommodate more than 200 offenders per year. This process can identify general approaches and specific programs they can read about in more detail in the PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS section.

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.

The last section is an appendix that provides information that can be used to contact the programs we studied.

TABLE 1: TYPES OF APPROACHES INVESTIGATED

Dedicated Detention These programs 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 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.

TABLE 1 (continued)

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.

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.

SUMMARY OF METHODS AND KEY FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

Methods

In cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), we decided to concentrate on the nine approaches described in Table 1. Some non-traditional approaches were excluded either because they had been extensively assessed by NHTSA (e.g., community service) or were slated for evaluation by NHTSA in the near future (e.g., vehicle and license plate impoundment).

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. At various points during the project, attempts were made to contact spokespeople for many of these programs and by the close of the project we had collected at least basic information from 56 of them (e.g., telephone number, organization that operates the program, and key staff members to contact).

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. Another important criterion was the need to select programs that could supply the most comprehensive information, especially information about the effectiveness of the program in reducing DWI. Of the 56 programs contacted, 23 were eliminated because they did not meet these criteria. The most common reasons for rejecting programs were: they did not serve multiple DWI offenders and they turned out not to be sanctions upon closer examination.

Detailed information was collected about the remaining 33 programs through telephone conversations with program spokespeople and review of written materials provided by 23 of the programs (e.g., brochures, client intake and assessment forms, annual reports). In addition, we visited 11 of the programs. Although procedures varied from program to program, during a typical visit we discussed the program's operation and impact with program managers and staff; and inspected program forms, and, when appropriate, specialized equipment. At some sites, we were able to speak with offenders about their views of the program. (A listing of the 33 programs which indicates which were visited detail appears in Appendix A. The distribution of the programs by program type is shown in Table 2.)

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

When reviewing the conclusions and descriptions of programs in later sections the reader should keep in mind that 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). 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.

Key Findings/Conclusions

These programs have many desirable features:

- o Perhaps the most striking thing about them is how much they vary and from one another and how much variation there can be even within one type of program. This diversity is valuable because it provides criminal justice personnel with a much wider range of options for coping with multiple DWI offenders. The range is further extended because, 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 (e.g., electronic monitoring can be used to enforce compliance with restricted driving privileges or other conditions of probation). Although rarely done, it is also possible to

combine the new approaches (e.g., an offender might be sentenced to a dedicated detention facility, and following this, he might be required to pay victim restitution and to display special license tags on his car (until his license was reinstated)).

- o The programs can be used at many points in the criminal justice system: 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 programs are designed to serve a variety of criminal justice goals, including rehabilitation, retribution and incapacitation. For example, dedicated detention and weekend intervention programs emphasize the rehabilitation of the drunk driver through the diagnosis and treatment of alcohol problems. Although none of the alternatives are as punitive as jail, spokespeople for electronic monitoring programs, special detention, and victim restitution programs, indicate that these approaches place significant restrictions on offenders and are certainly more punitive than simple probation or a fine. Programs which issue offenders special license tags, electronic monitoring programs, IVATs (In-Vehicle Alcohol Testing devices), and publishing offender names may also "punish" offenders by revealing to employers, friends, neighbors, and others that he or she is a convicted drunk driver. Incapacitating or preventing the offender from drinking and driving is a central goal for programs using electronic monitoring, intensive probation supervision, IVATs, and special license tags. Although there is considerable diversity in the degree to which programs monitor drinking and driving, some offer fairly tight security. For example, one of the electronic monitoring programs studied, the Home Detention Program in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, maintains constant electronic surveillance when the offender is required to be at home, makes regular random checks on his attendance at work, requires the offender to report to the program once a week, makes spot checks at the offender's home to check for tampering with the equipment or other violations, and administers random alcohol and drug tests.
- o Many of the programs serve as an alternative to jail which helps alleviate jail overcrowding. At present, even small savings in jail space are often highly valued because overcrowding is very serious in many locations and many jails are under court orders to reduce their population (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a and 1988b). As

substitutes for jail, these programs also avoid the risks to the offender associated with jail: the risks of assault, illness, emotional trauma, and suicide. This is especially important for DWI offenders who are less likely to be experienced with jail and more likely to be victimized than some other types of offenders. (This advantage also applies, of course, to the traditional sanctions of fines, community service, and license suspension/revocation)

- 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, which was about \$33 in 1983 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a). 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.
- o Nineteen of 29 programs offset all or part of their cost by charging offenders participation fees. Unlike jailed offenders, offenders in alternative programs are usually able to continue to work, therefore, they can pay these fees and/or victim restitution payments.
- o By and large, it appears that the alternative programs are appealing to 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 program (e.g., electronically monitored home detention) for a much longer time than they would have been jailed. This makes it more likely the programs can operate at capacity which reduces the cost per offender.
- o It would be reasonable to assume that alternative programs might encounter substantial community opposition for being "too soft" on offenders. In fact, these programs have encountered minimal opposition and 22 of 33 programs report that they are either officially or unofficially endorsed/supported by police departments, citizen activist groups such as MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving), and other community organizations.
- o The programs can be implemented by a wide range of public and private organizations: private for-profit corporations, private non-profit organizations, newspapers, government entities such as a county probation department, universities, hospitals, etc.

- o The majority of offenders complete these programs. The completion rate for DWI offenders averaged 73% among the 12 programs that could supply data. Offenders rarely flee and it is rare to have them expelled for violating program rules (usually expelled offenders are jailed).
- o Spokespeople for most programs indicated the programs ran smoothly and had experienced few serious problems.

Despite these positive features, enthusiasm for the programs must be tempered by the fact that critical information about their efficiency and effectiveness is missing.

For example, although some programs closely monitor offenders to prevent drunk driving, it is not clear how foolproof the programs are and how many offenders evade detection. Good estimates of undetected drinking and driving by offenders could be generated through confidential interviews by third-party evaluators, by participant observation, and other research techniques, however, no program we studied had undertaken this type of investigation.

We indicated above that most programs reported the cost per offender per day is less than jail, however, the total savings of the program also depends on how long offenders remain in it as compared to jail. As mentioned, offenders may be required to participate in electronic monitoring and other programs for a longer period than they would spend in jail. Therefore, even when such programs operate at a lower cost per day, the total cost per offender can still be greater than for jail. Information comparing the cost for the average jail term to the cost for the average time spent in these programs was not available.

The most serious area of doubt is the extent to which these programs reduce post-program recidivism. Only 7 of the 33 programs were able to provide us with any hard data on recidivism. Furthermore, only a few of these had conducted studies which compared the recidivism rate of their offenders to the rate for similar offenders who had received jail or other traditional or non-traditional sanctions.

Given the lack of such important information about these programs, they should be viewed more as experimental efforts than as proven options and people who are interested in implementing them should consider taking two precautions. First, they should plan on conducting rigorous evaluations that will compare the costs and recidivism rates for the new programs to more traditional approaches or other alternatives. Second, they should refrain from implementing the programs on a very large scale until good evaluation data are available. These recommendations may be hard to sell when surrounded by cries for quick and cheap solutions to an overburdened criminal justice system and amid claims that many of the new approaches are cheap and effective. Nevertheless, accountability and restraint are

necessary to develop alternatives that are as effective as they are appealing.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

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

Dedicated detention.....	13
Diversion.....	21
Electronic monitoring.....	31
Ignition interlock.....	47
Intensive probation supervision.....	57
Publishing offender names.....	65
Special license tags.....	69
Victim restitution.....	75
Weekend intervention.....	81

Following each of these discussions, one or two programs illustrating the approach are described in detail. These descriptions begin with an overview of the program; some readers may wish to scan these overviews to determine which programs most interest them.

All the programs descriptions have been organized according to the same topic headings so that the programs can be more easily compared. The headings are:

o BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program?
Program setting
When and why did the program begin?

o PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served?
How do offenders become involved in the program?
How many offenders does the program serve?
What types of offenders are served?

o PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program?
What are offenders required to do?
If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered?
How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures?
What are the staffing requirements for the program?
What does it cost to operate the program?
How is the program funded?

o **OUTCOMES AND IMPACT**

**What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness?
How have staff and the wider community reacted to the
program?**

**What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how
have they been addressed?**

o **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS**

DEDICATED DETENTION CENTERS

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 described below, 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 described below, 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. 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.

LONGWOOD TREATMENT CENTER
Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts

OVERVIEW

The Longwood Treatment Center is a dedicated detention facility which serves multiple DWI offenders. The program aims to both incapacitate and rehabilitate offenders. Through alcohol education, treatment, and counseling, the programs hopes to prevent the reoccurrence of drunk-driving by repeat offenders. The facility has helped to reduce overcrowding in other jails caused by strictly enforced DWI legislation.

The program serves approximately 500 offenders per year at a cost of \$67 per offender per day. The program is funded by the Commonwealth. Approximately 86% of participants complete the program. Six percent of participants who completed the Longwood program were rearrested and returned to jail within one year. Some comparative recidivism data is available.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The Longwood Treatment Center is operated by the Massachusetts Department of Correction.

Program setting The facility, located in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, a suburb of Boston, serves much of the eastern part of the Commonwealth.

When and why did the program begin? In 1982, strict new legislation concerning drunk-driving offenders resulted in an increase in jail overcrowding. The Longwood facility, first proposed by the Sentencing and Corrections Committee of the Governor's Anti-Crime Council, opened in March, 1985, in response to this overcrowding. The Department of Correction based the facility's philosophy on the assumption that many drunk-driving offenders are older and more educated than other offenders, and are likely to be chronic alcohol abusers without criminal backgrounds. Based on this profile, the facility, which opened its doors in March, 1985, hopes to return offenders to the community as recovering alcoholics through intensive, short-term treatment. The primary goals of the facility are to protect the public by retaining multiple drunk-driving offenders and to rehabilitate offenders in order to prevent the reoccurrence of drunk-driving.

Initially, the community in which the program was sited expressed strong opposition to the Center. The community was opposed to having criminals in a residential area. In response, the Center agreed to exclude offenders who had served a jail

term for a violent crime. Thereafter, relations between the facility and the community improved.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? The Longwood Treatment Center is dedicated to serving multiple DWI offenders. Seven percent are second offenders; almost all the others are third offenders. The facility serves approximately 500 inmates per year.

Multiple offenders must either be incarcerated in a "normal" jail, or serve their sentence in the Longwood Treatment Center or two similar facilities that serve other parts of Massachusetts.

Approximately 88% of the offenders involved in the program are male; 12% female. The average age of offenders is nearly 33 years old. Ninety-four percent of participants are White, 4% Black, and 2% Hispanic. Eighty-one percent are single; 19% married. Seventy-two percent of the offenders have a high school diploma or better; 17% have college degrees.

How do offenders become involved in the program? Approximately 90% of participants are referred to the treatment center by the sentencing judge. The other 10% are referred by offenders' attorneys. An offender who has been sentenced to jail may later request entering the Longwood program. Offenders have the choice to either go to jail or to the Longwood Treatment Center. Approximately 26% of those accepted to the treatment center choose not to participate either because they do not want treatment or do not believe that they need it.

The Longwood program may refuse a referral from the court. The potential participant is interviewed by a Longwood counselor. If the offender's response to the program is positive and the criminal record shows no history of violent crime, a recommendation is sent to the superintendent of the facility. If approved, the offender is transferred to the facility or put on a waiting list.

How many offenders does the program serve? Since the program's inception through August, 1988, the facility has served approximately 1500 DWI offenders. Serving approximately 500 clients per year, the facility can house and treat 125 men and women at any given time. The facility nearly always operates at full capacity. At times, there may be a waiting list of up to 40 offenders. If space is available, offenders will be sent to one of the other treatment centers in the Commonwealth.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Participation in the program ranges from 60 days to 36 months. The facility prefers to retain offenders for a minimum of 90 days.

What are offenders required to do? The treatment program at Longwood consists of three phases. Phase one, which lasts from 4 to 6 weeks, begins with a one-week orientation process for testing and admitting offenders into the program. This includes extensive psychological assessment and a group orientation meeting to review program goals, objectives, and rules. In order to "be introduced to the disease concept of alcoholism" the offender then participates in a series of meditations, lectures, group therapy, spirituality groups and AA meetings.

Phase II is more therapeutic. Individuals are expected to examine their own individual behaviors in relation to alcohol more closely. Residents must exhibit characteristics such as an ability to share unmanageable life situations with others, the internalization AA principles, and developed the ability to identify alternatives to alcohol.

Phase three includes community restitution, work release for those eligible, discharge and aftercare planning and continuing therapy. In this phase, participants learn a variety of skills including job seeking and communication skills. The length of Phase 3 varies depending on individual needs. During this time, the client must obtain an AA sponsor and attend at least three AA meetings each week in the community.

Participants are not allowed to drive while enrolled in the program.

Family members can become involved in the program either by simply visiting the offender or participating in family or couples counseling.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? The Longwood Treatment Center is a minimum security facility. Correctional staff are responsible for making regular checks on residents (e.g. head counts while residents are sleeping) and searches for contraband (weapons, alcohol, etc.). While on work release, participants must call the Longwood facility when they arrive at the job site, when they leave to return to the facility and when they leave the job site for any reason. Random urinalysis or saliva testing is done to check for the presence of alcohol. At the time of the interview, the facility was hoping to make

aftercare recommendations a requirement. At present, the facility monitors compliance with these recommendations.

Of 497 admissions and releases in 1987, 8% of offenders were returned to jail for violating facility rules.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? Treatment staff are contracted through a private vendor, Valle Associates. There are 12 full-time treatment counselors. The Department of Correction supplies 20 correctional staff and there are also four administrators and 11 clerical and maintenance staff.

The correctional staff are given approximately 80 hours of training in alcohol and recovery issues. Counseling staff are given equivalent training in correctional and security issues. More specific training on alcohol and recovery is offered weekly. All training is provided by existing Longwood staff.

What does it cost to operate the program? In fiscal year 1986, the annual operating cost of the facility was \$2,255,443. The per year average inmate cost at Longwood is \$24,418, or \$66.89 per day. Based on average inmate cost, Longwood Treatment Center is the fourth most costly of the 20 Department of Correction detention facilities.

Approximately two-thirds of the total annual budget is spent on staff salaries. The remainder is spent on rent, equipment and maintenance.

How is the program funded? All funds are received from the Commonwealth.

Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, as well as various religious organizations offer group counseling and educational services free of charge. In addition, various college students have unpaid internships with the facility.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Preliminary outcome measures by the Massachusetts Department of Correction revealed that relatively few individuals completing the program are rearrested and returned to prison within one year of release. During the period 4/10/85 - 6/30/86, 86% completed the program while 14% failed. The research demonstrated that 6% of the Longwood program completers were returned to prison within one year of release. This compares to a department wide recidivism rate of 25% and to a rate of 19% for other low security institutions similar to Longwood. An additional longterm evaluation is currently underway.

(Note that the definition of recidivism is quite narrow and does not encompass all behaviors that many would regard as

recidivism. Recidivism is defined here as "rearrested and returned to prison for more than 30 days within one year of release", as opposed to simply rearrested as is often accepted as a recidivism measure.)

Of those residents questioned by the aftercare coordinator within the first six months of release, 80% claimed to be participating in either AA or other alcoholism treatment programs.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? The superintendent of the facility feels that the various staff have become increasingly cohesive and dedicated to the program. Members of the criminal justice system have been very supportive.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? The program received initial opposition to the facility from the neighboring community. Since the facility agreed to exclude violent offenders from participation, all opposition has dissipated and relations between the treatment center and community have been characterized as good.

The treatment center hopes to increase the attention given by the courts to aftercare recommendations. Ultimately, they hope to make aftercare required, which the facility would monitor.

The Center hopes to add recreational facilities on the grounds.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

The Longwood Treatment Center is affiliated with two similar dedicated detention facilities in the state, also operated by the Department of Correction.

DWI DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Diversions 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. The program described below 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 offenders 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. The program described below 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 or 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. Two programs report DWI recidivism rates of 13% during ten years of program operation and 10% over three years. The last program reports a 10% rate per year for all offenders. 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 to 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.

**FELONY DWI DIVERSION PROGRAM
Rochester, New York**

OVERVIEW

Under The DWI Diversion Program, all criminal proceedings of felony DWI offenders are deferred for six months while clients are enrolled in the program. The defendant surrenders his license for one year, undergoes an intensive diagnostic assessment, and is referred to various training or treatment programs in the community. If the offender completes the program successfully, he or she may be allowed to plead guilty to a misdemeanor charge, rather than face prosecution for felony DWI.

The program hopes to reduce: 1) recidivism among multiple offenders, 2) the number of felony DWI cases that have overwhelmed the court system, and 3) jail overcrowding. This approach is based on the view that many multiple DWI offenders are alcohol abusers who need both individualized treatment and the fear of punishment to be rehabilitated. Clients are referred by the District Attorney, and the program is funded by state agencies.

The program serves about 150 people per year at a cost of about \$79,000. Revenues come from public funds (a portion of which come from fines for DWI offenses). Approximately 67% of offenders complete the program. About 5% of the non-completers are rearrested for DWI while in the program. The recidivism rate (defined as the proportion of program graduates rearrested for DWI within three years) is 10%. Comparative data on traditional alternatives is not available.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The DWI Diversion Program is operated by the Pretrial Services Corporation of the Monroe County Bar Association, a private for-profit organization.

Program setting The program, located in Rochester, New York, serves DWI offenders arrested in Monroe County, which has a population of approximately 700,000.

When and why did the program begin? The Pretrial Services Corporation, formed in 1970, operated a pretrial release program as an alternative to bail for a wide range of offenders. In 1977, an evaluation of the program indicated it reduced recidivism and, consequently, there was considerable support for this type of alternative to incarceration from both criminal justice policy makers and local government officials. Concurrently, Monroe county law enforcement, encouraged by a

citizens group called Rochester Against Intoxicated Drivers (RAID), instituted a selective DWI enforcement unit in the Sheriff's Department and adopted a strict no plea-bargaining policy in the prosecutor's office. By 1979, there had been a large increase in arrests for DWI. This created a backlog in the courts and DWI multiple offenders awaiting their trials continued to drive without restriction. A rise in DWI convictions also contributed to jail overcrowding. In response to this situation, the District Attorney asked the Pretrial Services agency to develop a deferred prosecution program for DWI offenders. The DWI Diversion Program was begun soon after by Lee Wood, the current Executive Director.

The program is based on the view that DWI offenders abuse alcohol for a wide variety of reasons and that their rehabilitation requires careful assessment and individualized treatment and training (coupled with appropriate threats). The following are some of the program's specific aims:

- o To lower the DWI recidivism rate by at least 5% by rehabilitating DWI offenders.
- o To divert as many defendants as possible to appropriate training and treatment programs.
- o To reduce the number of felony DWI cases clogging the county and supreme court.
- o To encourage a period of abstinence from alcohol.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? The program is dedicated to multiple offenders who have had a prior DWI misdemeanor conviction within the past 10 years.

Defendants who choose not to participate in the program are tried for a felony DWI offense. If they are convicted, a sentence of 3-5 years in jail can be imposed. However, most of these offenders receive a "shock probation" sentence of 60 days in jail and 5 years probation.

Nearly 90% of the DWI defendants involved in the diversion program are male. The average client is between 30 and 36 years of age. Seventy-three percent of the clients have graduated from high school, and 33% have attended college. Seventy-seven percent of the clients are employed full-time; 5% part-time, and 18% were unemployed. Eighty-seven percent of the clients are white. According to program assessments, 99% of the clients have significant problems with alcohol.

How do offenders become involved in the program? All felony DWI offenders are notified that the program may be an option for

them. Those interested are screened by the District Attorney's DWI Bureau. Defendants involved in serious personal injury accidents or those with extensive criminal or motor vehicle records are excluded, since the Diversion Program aims to serve those who will benefit most from short-term intervention. Only those facing felony charges are chosen, since the threat of a DWI misdemeanor does not appear severe enough to induce a commitment to the program.

If the defendant chooses not to participate, he will be tried on felony DWI charges. In most cases, the defendant chooses to participate in the program, since Monroe County's conviction rate is high (95%), and there is no plea bargaining process. Of 202 referrals in 1987, only 1 chose not to participate, while 8 were rejected due to a lack of motivation. The few offenders who choose not to participate either do not believe they have an alcohol problem or feel they may win an acquittal in court.

How many offenders does the program serve? Between 1981 and 1983, initial interviews were conducted with 580 people (or about 193 people per year). The program accepted 455 (78%) of the defendants. The remaining 125 defendants were not accepted due to legal reasons, because they were not motivated, or because they chose not to participate.

Each of 5 diversion counselors is responsible for 40 to 50 clients at any one time. The program has never had to turn away any clients due to a lack of available counselors.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Participants are assigned a sentencing date six months after beginning participation in program. During this period, they are enrolled in the program on a voluntary basis.

What are offenders required to do? The defendants must surrender their driver's license for one year, must comply with the recommended course of treatment and/or training, and must contact the program at least once a week.

Treatment and training are tailored to each client based on assessments by program staff. Options include: alcohol education, remedial education, alcohol abuse counseling, job training, job placement, assertiveness training, social skills training, etc. The majority of clients receive intensive out-patient treatment for 6 to 8 weeks (9 hours/week) which is then reduced to 3 hours/week. Some clients may receive in-patient treatment for 28 to 48 days.

Most clients receive treatment delivered by mental health agencies that combine behavioral and/or cognitive treatment methods and abstinence and/or moderation concerning alcohol use.

Clients with long histories of alcohol use, high BACs at time of arrest, and blackouts or other signs of dependence are referred to more traditional disease-based treatment programs.

After six months, the offender returns to the court for sentencing. The program submits a report to the court indicating either that the person successfully completed the program, and therefore should be prosecuted for a misdemeanor, or that offender did not successfully complete it and should be prosecuted for a felony. For successful graduates, the judge's sentence may include requirements for further treatment, and usually their driver's license is suspended for two to three years.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? Clients are required to call their diversion counselor once a week. The program staff call or visit the treatment personnel approximately once a month and check on the client's attendance and progress. Diversion staff monitor the arrests in the county to be sure that the client has not violated his/her license suspension. If the client does violate the suspension, immediate prosecution as a DWI felony is undertaken.

If the client fails to comply with some aspect of the treatment program, one warning is given before they are removed from the program and tried as a felony DWI. According to program spokespeople, 90% of the clients receive a warning, and setbacks in treatment are normal. From 1981 through 1983, 5% of the clients were rearrested for DWI while participating in the program.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? There are 5 diversion counselors who spend approximately 60% of their time on the program. The remainder of the time is spent on other types of diversion cases. The program director dedicates approximately 25% of her time to DWI diversion. Once a month, a clinical psychologist consults to the diversion counselors on difficult cases. Also, two secretaries spend 60% of their time on the program.

Spokespeople felt that the total staff time per offender is probably less than shock probation, the usual sanction for offenders who do not participate in the program.

Each counselor participates in 3-5 days of training per year. Approximately 60-70% of this training is with the New York State Alcohol and Substance Abuse training program. They also attend other workshops in the community on such topics as: the family,

substance abuse, and assessment. The clinical psychologist provides periodic training in assessment skills and other areas.

What does it cost to operate the program? In 1988, the total operating budget for the DWI Diversion Program was \$78,895. Staff salaries made up 70% of the budget; rent, office supplies, etc., made up the remainder.

According to program spokespeople, the program saves the state money by reducing or eliminating the costs of convening a grand jury, holding a trial, jail time, and probation time. Spokespeople also feel the low recidivism rate reduces the costs associated with repeat offenders.

How is the program funded? Resources for the program come primarily from the county, channeled through the Department of Public Safety and Judicial Services. Approximately 18% of the program's budget is paid for by funds from a surcharge imposed on all DWI fines.

Although the defendants do not pay for the program, they are required to pay for the recommended treatment. For indigent offenders, the counselor tries to find a treatment program that will provide financial assistance. The program expects that most clients can pay for their treatment (approximately \$45.00 per week) since they previously supported their alcohol use.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? In 1977, the program was evaluated by the Center for Governmental Research. In 1979, it was again evaluated by the Executive Director and a diversion counselor. Questionnaires were distributed to counselors who worked for the agency during 1981-1983 to gain the counselors' perspectives on the rationale for referral decisions. The study also focused on clients who were favorably terminated from program (completed the program), the type of treatment they received, and their rearrest rate. Of the 455 who were accepted into the program from 1981-83, 307 (67%) completed the program. About 5% of those who did not complete the program were rearrested for DWI while in the program. Thirty-one (10%) of those who completed the program were rearrested for DWI within 3 years of completion. Spokespeople believe that this approach is more effective than the alternative of shock probation, but no comparative data are available.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? Staff are described as being very dedicated to the program. Spokespeople also indicate that the community supports the program, including the citizen activist groups RAID, MADD and SADD.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? Traditional treatment providers who use a disease-based model have criticized the program for referring clients to non-traditional treatment. The program continues to make these referrals because it has found that non-traditional treatment is more effective for some clients.

There has been no opposition claiming that the program is not punitive enough.

There are two other persistent problems. The first is that judges sometimes ignore the program's sentencing recommendations, e.g., the program may make a positive report on an offender recommending that he be allowed to plead guilty to a misdemeanor charge, but the judge may elect to sentence him for felony DWI. The second problem is that treatment space is limited in the community, so clients are sometimes placed on waiting lists at the treatment programs.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS The Pretrial Services Corporation also operates diversion programs for other types of offenders.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

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, described on page 35, 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, described on page 40 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 program run by a private, non-profit organization (see the description of the In-House Arrest Program, Daytona Beach, Florida on page 35).

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.

IN-HOUSE ARREST PROGRAM Daytona Beach, Florida

OVERVIEW

The In-House Arrest Program uses a continuous electronic monitoring system manufactured by Corrections Systems, Inc. (CSI) of Florida. Beginning in November, 1985, Pride, Inc., a private non-profit organization, implemented this program to reduce jail overcrowding and to provide rehabilitative opportunities for offenders. Twenty to 30 offenders, 50% of whom are DWI offenders, are served by the program at any one time. Approximately 30-45% of the DWI offenders are multiple offenders. Throughout the program, participants are required to be at home unless they are working or participating in a treatment program as a condition of probation. Offenders wear an anklet which continuously broadcasts a signal to a receiver-dialer unit connected to the offender's home telephone. The unit monitors the signal from the transmitter and automatically dials a host computer when the offender goes beyond (or returns) approximately a 100 foot radius. The computer records are monitored by program personnel. Offenders must make weekly visits to their probation officers so that the anklet can be checked for signs of tampering.

The program costs approximately \$7 per day per offender. Program personnel estimate that jail costs \$27 per day. Program costs are covered by having the offenders pay fees (\$7.00 per day). Based on data from a five month period, approximately, 97% of all offenders complete the program. Two DWI of 22 offenders were rearrested for the same offense while participating in the program. Since the program began recently, no post-program recidivism data is available yet.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The In-House Arrest Program is operated by Pride, Inc., a private non-profit organization. Pride, Inc. monitors the probation activities of a variety of offenders throughout Florida.

Program setting The In-House Arrest Program is operated in Daytona Beach, Florida located in Volusia County. Offenders may be referred to the program from anywhere in the state of Florida. Electronic monitoring is also conducted by Pride, Inc. from its headquarters in Palm Beach County. Pride also operates probation and related program in Monroe and Pasco Counties.

When and why did the program begin? The In-House Arrest Program was first instituted in Daytona Beach in November, 1985. The primary reason for beginning the program was to reduce jail overcrowding. The program also serves a number of other purposes: to shift the financial burden from the community to

the offender; to offer the offender a wider variety of treatment and rehabilitative opportunities; to maintain the family unit throughout the period of incarceration.

No special legislation was required to begin the program. Florida judges agreed that electronic monitoring would be a legal and desirable alternative to jail. A pilot program was implemented and a variety of monitoring devices were tested.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? Program participants may have been sentenced for a variety of offenses including theft, DWI, driving with a suspended license, reckless driving, etc. Throughout Pride's organization, approximately 50% of all participants are DWI offenders, 30%-45% of which are multiple offenders. Eighty-three percent of all Pride's clients are male (this includes all of the probationers, even those not participating in electronic monitoring). The ages of these clients ranges from 17 to 82; the average is 30 years. Similar data on just those offenders participating in electronic monitoring is not available.

Offenders admitted to the program would have otherwise been incarcerated or been ordered to participate in traditional probation. Instead, offenders serve in this program as a condition of probation.

How do offenders become involved in the program? Before sentencing, the judge may recommend the offender to the electronic monitoring program. If Pride determines that the offender is eligible for the program, the judge makes participation a condition of probation. Participation is voluntary. If the offender chooses not to participate, he or she will serve a jail sentence. Only approximately 10 offenders have declined to participate out of hundreds of eligible offenders. Most offenders would rather be confined to home where they may continue to go to work and spend time with their families, rather than be incarcerated in jail. Those who choose not to participate may prefer a short-term jail sentence to a longer term on electronic monitoring.

Pride does not accept violent offenders. In addition, the offender must own a phone and must be employed. Offenders are very rarely rejected. No training is necessary in order for the offender to use the electronic monitoring device.

How many offenders does the program serve? During a five month period, 71 offenders were electronically monitored; 22 of them were DWI offenders. An average of 14 new cases were added monthly, with 20-30 offenders participating at any one time. The program now has 47 monitoring (receiver-dialer) units, they could expand to accommodate 300 offenders at one time by

purchasing additional units. The program has never had to turn away an offender due to a lack of available equipment.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? In most cases, offenders are sentenced to electronic monitoring for three times the normal jail sentence. Clients may be electronically monitored anywhere from 30 days to one year, with an average duration of 90 days. Some clients serve a short jail term prior to electronic monitoring.

What are offenders required to do? Offenders are required to be at home unless they are at work or attending an activity approved as part of the probation program, such as Alcoholics Anonymous. A continuous monitoring device (see next item) provides the program with a computer record of each time the offender leaves (and returns) to his home. The offender must allow probation officers to make unscheduled visits (also telephone calls) to their home and work to check on the equipment. These visits are usually made only when the computer indicates a violation. Otherwise, the offender must meet with the probation officer weekly at Pride's office during which time the officer checks the equipment and reviews the client's compliance with probation treatment requirements. Also at this time, the offender pays the fee (\$7.00 per day) for the electronic monitoring.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? The program utilizes a continuous monitoring system manufactured by Corrections Services, Inc. (CSI) of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. Offenders wear a battery powered, moisture proof transmitter fastened by riveted plastic straps just above offender's ankle. The transmission range of this anklet is about 100' and it continuously broadcasts a signal to a receiver-dialer unit connected to the offender's home telephone. The unit monitors the signal from the transmitter and automatically dials a host computer when the offender goes beyond (or returns into) the transmitter's range. Program staff can retrieve this information from the computer along with data as to whether excursions occurred when the offender was allowed to be at work or the computer and reviewed by the probation officer.

The monitoring system has several safeguards to prevent evasion. For example, The anklet strap is designed to will show evidence of efforts to remove it. If the receiver dialer unit is unplugged, the computer records the time when it was unplugged and plugged back in. The unit is backed up by battery for 14 hours in case of electrical failure. The computer also records any attempts to move or tamper with the receiver dialer (e.g. cutting wires).

As far as the program staff know, no offender has been able to circumvent the equipment. Program spokespersons find the equipment to be very reliable. Some offenders complain that the transmitter is too large.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? In addition to reviewing the computer printout daily and making weekly checks on the equipment, probation officers monitor the client's compliance with all probation activities. For example, attendance at treatment programs and at the place of employment are verified. The client must bring proof of attendance to the weekly meeting with the probation officer.

The program only knows if the client has driven illegally or driven under the influence of alcohol if the offender is rearrested. Since the program's inception, 7 to 8 offenders have violated curfew. All but one of these offenders were returned to jail. Two DWI offenders were rearrested for the same offense while participating in the program.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? The program is staffed by one program director and two probation officers. The probation officers are given special training concerning in-house arrest. The program director does the training, although the manufacturer sometimes holds special seminars which the staff attend. Refresher training is provided as necessary.

What does it cost to operate the program? To begin the electronic monitoring program, a central unit monitor was purchased for \$50,000 and anklets and receiver-transmitter units for approximately \$1800 each (organizations can also lease the equipment). To participate in the In-House Arrest Program, the clients pay \$7.00 per day, which covers all costs of electronic monitoring. Program spokespeople estimate that the cost of incarceration in the county jail is \$27.00 per day, significantly higher than house arrest.

How is the program funded? The electronic monitoring program is fully funded by fees of \$7.00 per day paid by each offender.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Based on 73 clients served during a 5 month period, approximately 97 percent completed the program. Two of 22 DWI offenders were rearrested for DWI while participating in the program during this same period. Since the program was only recently implemented, no recidivism data is available.

Program spokespeople feel that the program has been very successful and is a valuable alternative to jail.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program?

Program staff find the equipment easy to use. Members of the criminal justice system have also reacted very positively to the program.

There has been no community opposition to the program.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed?

No significant problems with the program were reported.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

See Victim Restitution and Intensive Probation Supervision for more information on services provided by Pride, Inc.

**HOME DETENTION PROGRAM
Upper Marlboro, Maryland**

OVERVIEW

This county-operated home detention program uses a programmed contact electronic monitoring system manufactured by the Hitek Community Control Corporation of Florida. The program, which began in April 1986, serves Maryland residents who are tried and convicted (or are on pre-trial release) within Prince George's County. The primary rationale for operating the program is that it reduces jail overcrowding, however, staff also feel that the program is more rehabilitative than jail. Approximately 30 participants are enrolled in the program at one time. About one third of these are DWI offenders; the remainder have been arrested or convicted for a variety of non-violent offenses. All offenders are required to remain at home except when they are working or are excused for medical treatment or some other "good cause." DWI offenders with conditional licenses may drive to and from work or other approved destinations. Monitoring of offenders includes home visits by program staff. Use of alcohol and drugs is forbidden for all offenders and urine testing is used as needed to verify abstinence. DWI offenders must attend Alcoholics Anonymous twice each week.

Program costs are approximately \$14.00 per day per offender as compared to \$44.00 per day for county jail. In its first 26 months of operation, the program served about 181 offenders. Approximately 75% of all offenders and 90% of DWI offenders complete the program. No recidivism data are available.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The program is operated by the Prince George's County Department of Corrections, and is housed within the county jail facility.

Program setting The program serves Maryland residents tried within Prince George's County, which is comprised of suburban-to-rural communities with a total population of approximately 700,000.

When and why did the program begin? The program began in April 1986 by the Department of Corrections. It appears that the primary reason for starting the program was to alleviate jail overcrowding, however, program spokespeople note that the program fulfills all the basic goals of corrections: incarceration/incapacitation, rehabilitation, deterrence, and punishment/retribution. They emphasize the program's rehabilitative value, pointing out that offenders are required to attend Alcoholics Anonymous and, that the individual remains

in society "where family unity and positive support systems have not been interrupted."

No special legislation was required to establish the program and no major difficulties were encountered in beginning the program. Before the program began, considerable effort was expended in meeting with judges individually to explain the program's philosophy and operation.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? Offenders admitted to the program would have otherwise been incarcerated; either they would have been serving a jail sentence or, in a few cases, they would have been jailed awaiting trial. At some point during their incarceration, some offenders would have been given an alternative sentence; usually participation in a work release program.

There are two types of program participants: (1) people delinquent for non-payment of child support who are placed on home detention, but not on electronic monitoring; and (2) criminals who are always placed on electronic monitoring. Multiple DWI offenders, who are part of the latter group, comprise approximately one third of the program population. Program spokespeople estimated that the bulk of these are second offenders.

Little demographic information was available on offenders, however they appear to be predominantly male (28 of 30 offenders currently in the program were male) and young (current participants were 29 to 34 year of age).

How do offenders become involved in the program? The criteria for admission to the electronic monitoring component of the program include the following: the offender must have been sentenced to a county correctional facility for a non-violent offense, must be a Maryland resident (and tried or will be tried in Prince George's County), must not have any other charges pending, must have a verifiable address and operable telephone without call-forwarding, must be employed or willing to participate in full-time employment/education or training; must have family willing to cooperate with program rules (see below What are offenders required to do?); and they must not have been terminated from another community release program.

Multiple DWI offenders and other criminal offenders enter the Home Detention Program in two primary ways: (1) a judge recommends the offender participate, the program decides if he/she is qualified, and the offender decides whether or not to participate; (2) a judge orders the offender to participate and the program must accept this referral. Occasionally, an offender who is in jail asks to be admitted to the program. If

the program population is low, the administrator may write the sentencing judge to ask that the applicant be admitted.

In February 1988, the program adopted a new policy of "shock incarceration" for offenders. Offenders who are sentenced to serve 30 days or less under house arrest must first spend 5 days in jail; those sentenced to house arrests for more than 60 days spend 10 days in jail. This policy does not apply to offenders ordered into the program, unless the sentencing judge stipulates this.

Very rarely does a qualified offender, who has a choice about participating, refuse to join the program. In the 2 or 3 cases of this kind, reasons for refusing were that the offender felt the rules were too strict and/or that he was likely to violate, which could result in his being returned to jail with no credit for time spent in Home Detention.

All applicants are interviewed by trained investigators, and informed about program policies and procedures both verbally and in writing. Those placed on electronic monitoring are trained in the use of the equipment.

How many offenders does the program serve? During the 26 month period from the inception of the program in April 1986 through June 1988, the program served 181 offenders of all types. Of these, 30 were still enrolled in the program and 151 had terminated (either successfully or unsuccessfully - see information on completion rate under What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness?, below). As noted above, approximately one third of all participants are multiple DWI offenders.

The monitoring equipment on hand can accommodate up to 70 offenders, however, current staff can handle only about 40 at one time (see Who staffs the program?, below). Demand for the program fluctuates. There have been times when there was a waiting list of 12 offenders, some of whom had to wait as long as 30 days to begin the program. At other times, there have been well under 40 offenders.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Most multiple DWI offenders remain in the program 30 to 60 days. Most other offenders remain for 6 months.

What are offenders required to do? They must remain at home unless they are at work, attending Alcoholics Anonymous (a weekly requirement for DWI offenders) or have been excused to attend another activity such as religious services. They must, of course, respond to telephone calls from the electronic monitoring device. These calls can come at any time an offender

is home. They must call the program before leaving their home and upon their return. To permit close monitoring, the offender must refrain from using his telephone more than ten minutes in a 30 minute period. They must allow program staff to make unannounced visits to their home and/or place of work at least once each week. They can have no visitors at home, unless this is approved by program staff. All offenders are required to abstain from alcohol and recreational drug use. If requested by program staff they must also submit to urine testing for alcohol and other drugs.

Those DWI offenders who have a conditional license are allowed to drive to work. Those whose license has been suspended or revoked must designate a driver who will transport them to work. The designated driver must sign a program form stating they will transport the offender to and from work (usually a family member does this).

Although the offender's family does not participate in the program directly, the family is informed by telephone about the rules of the program and use of the Hitek device. Obviously, the family is affected by program requirements such as the rule that limits use of the telephone.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? The program opted for an electronic monitoring system that uses programmed contact based on the view that it would be less expensive and generate fewer false positive signals than a continuous monitoring system. The program uses the On Guard System manufactured by Hitek Community Control Corporation. A computer, located at the program office, automatically calls the offender at random times each day during periods when the offender is required to be at home. (Within these periods, calls may come at any time during the day and/or the evening.) The offender must respond to the call by inserting a device into a verifying unit attached to his telephone. This device, called a wristlet, is attached to the offender's wrist or ankle by program staff and cannot be removed without indicating that it has been tampered with. The offender must also repeat a series of words which the computer randomly selects from a predetermined list. Later, program staff review an audio recording of the offender's responses to verify his or her identity. The computer maintains a record which indicates when each call was placed and the result, such as whether the telephone was malfunctioning, whether the line was busy, and whether the wristlet was engaged. (Note, that the manner in which this program uses the Hitek system does not necessarily reflect all the possibilities, e.g., the program does not use an option for telephone paging of staff when the offender fails to respond correctly.)

The equipment was characterized as "very reliable" by program spokespeople. Complaints about the equipment by program staff

have been rare and minor - the most common complaint has been that a wristlet is too tight and these situations were quickly remedied by program staff. The most serious equipment problem occurred early in the program when the computer failed and calls were made by hand for 3 or 4 days until the system was replaced by the manufacturer. As an ongoing check that the system is functioning properly, the program coordinator has placed herself on the system and responds to calls at home about twice each day.

There have been no reports that offenders can circumvent the system.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offenders' compliance with program rules and procedures? In addition to inspecting the computer print out generated by the monitoring system each day and listening to audio recordings of the offenders' voices, the program verifies compliance with program rules in several other ways. For example, staff visit the offenders at home or at their place of work at least once each week. During home visits, the wristlets and electronic equipment are closely inspected for signs of tampering. Drug testing is performed if there is reasonable suspicion of alcohol and/or drug use. The time an offender requires to drive to and from work or other approved destinations is verified by estimating from maps and traffic patterns.

The punishment for violations by offenders who are referred to the program (see above How do offenders become involved in the program?) is determined in an administrative hearing by program staff. Sanctions vary from a simple warning, to being sent to jail to serve a few weeks before being allowed to return to the program, to being sent to jail without the possibility of returning. Sanctions for offenders who are ordered into the program by the court are determined by the sentencing judge. About ten percent of multiple DWI offenders have failed to complete the program because of violations. It is not clear how many of violations involved driving.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? The Correctional Treatment Coordinator works full-time administering the program. She is assisted by 5 part-time staff who make home visits to the offenders, help screen candidates, etc., and who spend their other staff time on a pre-release program. The total staff time devoted to the program was estimated as the equivalent of 2 full-time positions.

Most staff are retired police officers or have had other criminal justice experience.

The manufacturer trained the program administrator for two days in the use of the monitoring equipment. No other formal staff training has been necessary.

What does it cost to operate the program? The chief expenses are for the lease of Hitek equipment and staff salaries. Program costs are approximately \$14.00 per day per offender as compared to \$44.00 per day for county jail.

How is the program funded? The program is totally funded by Prince George's County. Program staff have considered assessing offenders a fee to help support the program, but no action has been taken as yet.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? The program has not been formally evaluated and there are essentially two types of information concerning program effectiveness. The first is the assessment of program spokespeople that the program has operated very well with relatively few problems. The second is data showing that approximately 75% of all offenders complete the program successfully and that this figure increases to 90% for multiple DWI offenders.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? Staff are described as committed to the program. The bulk of the judiciary also support the program, although some judges do not refer offenders (see following section). Other parts of the criminal justice system have expressed interest in the approach and Home Detention staff are assisting juvenile services in developing a similar program.

There has been no community opposition.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? In general, the program has experienced few significant problems.

Although judicial support has been sufficient to populate the program at most times, the referral rate varies widely among judges. Some judges feel that eligible offenders should be jailed and do not refer any offenders to the program.

As mentioned, the program recently adopted a policy requiring that offenders spend a small amount of time in jail before beginning home detention. The policy does not apply to offenders whom the courts order into the program and, in order to avoid shock incarceration, many offenders now try to have the courts order them into the program. The program hopes to interfere with this trend by educating judges about the new policy and encouraging them to incorporate shock incarceration as part of an order into the program.

If funds were available, the administration would expand the current staff to eliminate a waiting list during peak periods of use.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

The Home detention program is located adjacent to the Prince George's County DWI Facility, a detention facility dedicated to DWI offenders which was also investigated for this study.

IGNITION INTERLOCK DEVICES

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 quite 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. Technicians/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.

GUARDIAN INTERLOCK RESPONSIBLE DRIVER PROGRAM
Prince Frederick, Maryland

OVERVIEW

This program, operated by a County Probation Department, requires that offenders install an interlock in their car. Manufactured by Guardian Interlock, Inc. of Denver, Colorado, this device is designed to measure and record the existence and extent of alcohol use by the driver. In order to start the vehicles, offenders must blow into the device, and if their BACs, as measured by this breath sample, register above a predetermined level, the vehicles will not start. The program, which began in 1986, serves first-time (51%) and multiple (49%) DWI offenders in Calvert County, Maryland. The program's goals are to reduce jail overcrowding, to prevent offenders from drinking-driving, and to rehabilitate them. Offenders must have the interlock device in their vehicle for one year as a condition of probation, and they remain on probation for up to 24 additional months.

Data on staffing costs for the program are not available -- program offenders are part of the normal case load of two probation officers. The costs of equipment and maintenance are covered by a \$570 per year fee paid by the offender. The program has served approximately 88 offenders over two years. Twenty have completed the program and 3 more have had their probation revoked and sent to jail for violating program rules. No recidivism data are available.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The program is operated by a state agency: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Parole and Probation.

Program setting The program, located in Prince Frederick, Maryland, serves DWI offenders arrested in Calvert County, which has a population of approximately 35,000.

When and why did the program begin? The program was begun in June, 1986, by Judge Larry Lamson, who hears all DWI cases for Calvert County (about 800 cases per year). Judge Lamson believes he may have been the first person in the country to use interlock devices with DWI offenders.

Judge Lamson first obtained information about the Guardian Interlock device while attending a national judges conference. He secured the cooperation of the County Probation Department, which operates the program. Guardian Interlock, Inc. (Denver, Colorado) sent a representative to Prince Frederick and trained mechanics at a local garage to install and maintain the devices.

One of the primary reasons for establishing the program was to help alleviate crowding in the county jail. At the time, many DWI offenders were receiving weekend sentences, and as many as a dozen were detained in a single room. Judge Lamson felt that the IVAT system, coupled with alcohol treatment and education, would be more lasting and punitive than a weekend or two in jail and easier to administer than community service, and that the device might help enforce sobriety at all times by reminding the offender of the costs of drinking.

The goals of the program are to punish the offender, to protect the public by reducing the chances that the offender will drive while intoxicated, and to help the offender stop drinking and driving in the future by interfering with established behavior patterns.

There were no significant problems encountered in establishing the program.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? The program serves only DWI offenders. Of the 65 enrolled when this study was conducted, about half (33) were first offenders and half (32) multiple offenders. Fifty-eight, or 89%, of the offenders were males. Offender's ages ranged from 19 to 64; their mean age was 37. No precise information about social class was available, but program staff characterized them as predominately "lower" or "working" class.

All offenders in the program are on probation (see next item).

How do offenders become involved in the program? All offenders are referred by Judge Lamson. He gives selected offenders a choice between jail and participating in the interlock program. If they choose the interlock, he suspends their jail sentence, places them on probation, and makes participation on the program a condition of probation.

There are few criteria for selecting which offenders will be offered the program. Judge Lamson reports that he tends to offer the program to: (1) young first offenders with high BAC's who pose a threat to public safety; and (2) second offenders with several years since their last offense who do not have access to public transportation and who do have a family and a job. Offenders must be able to pay for the program. The fee is \$570 per year (\$70 of which is a refundable security deposit).

Approximately 10% of DWI offenders are offered the interlock. No one had ever refused the program even though the typical jail sentence is shorter than time they must spend in the program.

Usually multiple offenders choose between 60 days in jail versus 12 months using the interlock device and a total of up to 36 months probation.

The offender signs a contract prepared (and also signed) by Judge Lamson. This document specifies the sentence and other conditions, including agreements that they will not drive a car which does not have the interlock installed, they will attend work or school regularly as determined by the probation officer, and will have the IVAT inspected every 60 days.

A probation officer describes the use of the interlock to the offenders. Training in the details of its operation is provided by a local installer who works for the manufacturer. Family members who may be using the vehicle are also trained. It usually takes 30 days to have the machine installed.

How many offenders does the program serve? Approximately 88 people have been involved with the program since it began (2 year period). Sixty-five of these are currently enrolled.

The program can handle approximately 70 offenders at one time. No applicant has ever been refused admission for lack of space.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? All offenders are required to have the interlock installed in their vehicle for 12 months. During this period, and for as long as 2 more years, offenders are on probation.

What are offenders required to do? As indicated above, offenders are required to have the IVAT installed in their vehicle and to have it inspected every 60 days. They are not permitted to drive a vehicle without the interlock installed. As would be true for "ordinary" probation, the offenders are also required to report to their probation officer on a regular basis (usually once per month) and to attend work or school regularly. DWI offenders must also participate in alcohol education and/or treatment once each week (treatment usually consists of participation in AA) and must submit to random alcohol-drug testing.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? The program uses an interlock system manufactured by Guardian Interlock Systems, Inc. of Boulder, Colorado. In order to start the car, the operator must blow into a hand-held device installed in the vehicle. The device is designed to measure the driver's BAC. If the test shows a BAC less than or equal to .05, the vehicle will start; if the BAC is greater than .05 the vehicle cannot be started for 15 minutes.

(The exact "cut off" point for BAC can be adjusted). The vehicle will also indicate a warning condition if the BAC is .02 and less than or equal to .05 (again this can be adjusted). In the warning state, the vehicle will start, but the driver must stop the vehicle and pass a retest after a period of time (20 minutes), otherwise the car's horn will sound continuously. This feature allows a driver whose initial BAC is low to start the car, but verifies that their BAC does not rise to critical levels (e.g., .05) once they are underway.

Questionnaire data from offenders collected by another investigator (see below What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness?) indicated that about 50% were aware of methods for bypassing the device, though none reported using these methods. Discussions we had with several offenders indicated they knew of methods for circumventing the system, and at least one of them had done so occasionally. The methods offenders mentioned were: having more sober person blow into the device and leaving the car idling while drinking in a bar.

Although the Guardian system has a feature which makes it more difficult for another person to provide a "clean" breath sample so an intoxicated offender can drive, Judge Lamson has elected not to activate the feature. (The feature requires that the breath sample be delivered in a series of timed pulses and pauses which may be difficult for a naive user to emulate). The Judge's rationale for omitting the feature is that it makes the car less accessible in an emergency situation. He also feels that it is unlikely that people will be willing to start the vehicle so that an intoxicated offender can drive.

The program is planning to make use of new features designed to defeat other methods for circumventing the interlock as soon as Guardian makes them available. One feature they plan to adopt shuts off the ignition if the car is left idling for a specified period of time.

Program staff feel that the system has been quite reliable. A few units have required replacement, but this has been done quickly and easily.

In one case, an offender was excluded from the program because his wife, who also used the vehicle, could not operate the device successfully. The problem was that she had diminished lung capacity due to illness.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? Every sixty days the equipment is inspected by a Guardian employee to determine if it has been tampered with and if it is properly calibrated.

If the offender is arrested for DWI, tampers with the equipment, or otherwise violates parole (e.g., is arrested for a non-alcohol related offense), he is returned to Judge Lamson who

imposes the jail sentence that was initially suspended when the offender began the program. This has occurred three times since the program began (see below: What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness?).

New legislation has made it easier for police to determine if offenders they may stop for traffic violations are permitted to drive without an interlock device. The legislation provides for color coding of the drivers' licenses to show if the operator is restricted to driving vehicles equipped with an interlock.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? The program is staffed by two probation officers. The offenders involved are part of their regular case load. They estimate that it takes approximately one-half to one hour longer to deal with program offenders than other DWI offenders. This additional time is required to instruct offenders in the use of the equipment, arrange appointments for installation, completed additional paperwork, etc.

Employees of the manufacturer do maintenance and checks at the local installation center.

The manufacturer trained the probation staff and the local installer in use of the equipment.

What does it cost to operate the program? The Probation Department cannot specify the cost for the program. Costs associated with installing and maintaining the equipment are borne by the offender (see next entry).

How is the program funded? The salaries of the two Probation Officers involved in the program are paid by the Probation Department.

The costs of installing and maintaining the IVAT equipment are paid by the offender. As mentioned, the fee is \$570 per year (\$70 of which is a refundable security deposit).

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Approximately 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.

Post-program recidivism data are not available.

A small pilot study of program effectiveness was conducted by Beth Baker, a University of Maryland Graduate student. Questionnaires were distributed to 22 offenders who had been in the program for at least two months. The 15 respondents were

very positive about the program and expressed the view that the interlock had been of help in preventing drinking and driving after drinking.

A study to evaluate program impact is in progress. Also conducted by Ms. Baker, this study will compare program recidivism among 60 program participants and 60 offenders not using the device.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? The two probation officers involved in the program and Judge Lamson feel the program has worked well and has benefited participants.

Judge Lamson reports that all publicity about the program has been favorable and that the program has been endorsed by MADD, the PTA, and treatment agencies. The staff report that members of the offenders' families have indicated that they value the program because it helps keep the offender from drinking and driving.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? The program has experienced no significant problems.

Judge Lamson would like to locate funding to subsidize indigent offenders so they can participate in the program.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

Not applicable.

INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION

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 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, like the San Mateo County program described here, 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 one program, 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.

**COMMUNITY RELEASE PROGRAM
Redwood City, California**

OVERVIEW

In order to alleviate jail overcrowding while simultaneously preparing inmates to return to the community, this program offers eligible offenders an opportunity to be released from jail early. These inmates, about 19% of whom are multiple DWI offenders, are placed under intensive supervision by the County Adult Probation Office. Probation Officers (PO's) monitor them through daily contact. They are allowed to work, and attend treatment and other approved activities, but must otherwise be at home. Alcohol and drug use are prohibited and this is enforced through random visits by probation officers and by testing. Offenders remain in the program an average of 50 days. Funded by the county, the program graduates approximately 95% of the offenders. Information on recidivism is not available.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The Community Release Program is operated by the County of San Mateo, Adult Probation Office.

Program setting Located in Redwood City, California, the program serves all of San Mateo County, which has a population of approximately 588,000.

When and why did the program begin? The program was first conceptualized and proposed by various members of the Probation Department. In March, 1984 a 90-day pilot program began. The pilot program was highly publicized and some opposition to it was expressed in a newspaper editorial and by MADD. At that time, MADD took the position that incarceration may be more appropriate for multiple DWI offenders. By June, the pilot program was considered successful by the County and was funded for continued operation. Since then, community opposition to the program has lessened.

The primary goal of the program is to alleviate jail overcrowding through modification in jail sentences that permit the conditional release of offenders. The program aims to facilitate a smooth transition into society through job counseling and placement, educational and training programs, mental health counseling and various treatment plans. At the same time, the program strives to minimize risks to the community through intensive supervision of the offender.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? For the 52 month period between the start of the program in March 1984 through June, 1988, 20% of the 591 offenders served by the program were DWI offenders, 33% drug offenders, 36% property offenders, and the remaining 11% were convicted for other offenses. Approximately 95% of the DWI offenders are multiple offenders. A large majority of the participants in the program are male (85%).

If they did not participate in the program, offenders would remain in jail for 60 days or more (participation may begin up to 60 days before the inmates would have otherwise been released).

How do offenders become involved in the program? Using computerized records, probation officers screen inmates at the county jail (which has a population of 1000) for eligibility in the program. If the offender has at least a 60 day jail sentence, no infractions in jail, and a relatively good living situation available in the community, he or she is interviewed for participation. No violent offenders are accepted and the inmate must be serving a split sentence (some time to be served in jail, the remainder on probation in the community). If the offender appears willing and enthusiastic to participate, a recommendation is forwarded to the judge, who generally approves the conditional release. Offenders are then required to sign a contract agreeing to abide by program regulations/conditions which include abstention from alcohol and illegal drug use, submission to chemical testing, and waiver of rights of search and seizure. In addition, offenders can leave their home only to attend approved activities (e.g., work, church) and can host only authorized visitors (e.g., visitors with criminal records are not permitted).

An overwhelming majority of eligible inmates choose to participate in the program. According to program spokespeople, the few offenders who choose not to participate probably do not believe they could complete the program without violating regulations.

How many offenders does the program serve? From its inception in March, 1984 through June, 1988, the program has served 591 offenders of all types. An average of 15 participate in the program at any one time, although there has been as few as 5 and as many as 27 participants. At capacity, the program can comfortably accommodate 25 offenders. Thus far, no eligible inmate has been turned away from the program for lack of space.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Offenders have participated in the program for as few as 5 days to as many as

60 days. The average stay is 50 days for multiple DWI offenders. After completing the program, the offender may be put on regular probation for some time.

What are offenders required to do? In addition to complying with the program rules discussed above (see How do offenders become involved in the program), offenders are required to make a minimum of five face-to-face contacts per week with their probation officer (PO). In addition to these contacts, the PO makes unannounced visits to the offender's place of employment and home. POs make an average of 92 contacts with offenders during the 50 days of participation either by telephone (an average of 57 telephone contacts) or face to face (an average of 35 contacts).

During face-to-face contacts, probation officers randomly test for alcohol use with "alco-strips," a device used to detect the presence of alcohol in saliva and to estimate Blood Alcohol Concentration (see next section for details). The alco-strips are administered an average of every 3 days. Urine samples may also be taken if there is a history or indication of drug use.

The offender's home is searched when he or she is first released from jail. Thereafter, a superficial search may be made once a week. If the urine tests indicates drug use, a more thorough search may be undertaken. Due the intrusive nature of the program, family members must be agreeable to its conditions. In addition, the employer must be willing to have the PO make random checks on the offender at work.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? The program uses ALCOSCAN Test Strips to determine the presence of alcohol in saliva and for estimating blood alcohol concentrations by matching the color on a special strip exposed to saliva to an indicator chart. The manufacturer, Lifescan, Inc. of Mountain View, California, describes the strips as "for the Semi-Quantitative Estimation of Ethanol in Siliva." The strips show four levels of BAC: 0, .01, .05 and .10. Offenders in this program are treated as violators at a reading of .05 or higher. Program spokespeople indicates that the alco-strips are less expensive than portable breath testers and have encountered no problems using the device.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? The offender's whereabouts is verified through unannounced telephone calls and visits from probation officers. In addition, random testing is used to help determine if the offender has used alcohol or drugs. If there is a serious violation of the programs rules, a hearing is set, at which time the offender will probably be ordered to serve the remainder of his/her original sentence in jail. Sometimes offenders are given additional jail time for

the violation (the average is 30-90 additional days). For minor violations, such as an unauthorized absence from home, the probation officer may decide to extend community supervision rather than return the offender to jail.

Violations have occurred in 5% of all cases. The following data illustrate the types of violations: 4 offenders absconded (and were subsequently apprehended), 2 had positive alcohol tests, 7 had positive drug tests, 16 left home without permission.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? Two full-time probation officers are responsible for monitoring offenders between 7 am and 12 am. At present, the program lacks the resources to monitor between midnight and 7 am. Four probation officers at the county jail do screening of inmates for eligibility, part-time officers monitor clients on weekends, and the Assistant Division Director oversees the program. Program spokespeople believe that this program, when operating at capacity, requires less staff time than jail.

All probation officers have had previous experience and receive at least 40 hours of training per year. All staff training is done by private providers and includes such issue as stress reduction, laws of arrest, and AIDS.

What does it cost to operate the program? The annual operating cost for fiscal year 1987/88 was \$130,000, not including the cost of the part-time probation officers at the jail. Probation officers average a yearly salary of \$50,000, including benefits.

The program saves the County about \$10 per offender per day as compared to jail costs. Given the number of offenders served by the program the total annual savings is not dramatic. The greater value of the program is that it frees jail space at a time when the County is under court order to keep the jail population under specified levels.

How is the program funded? The county funds the program from property tax revenues.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Only 5% of all offenders failed to complete the program and only 2 clients were sanctioned for alcohol use. The program is evaluated yearly by the program staff for completion rates, types of offenders involved, etc., but no information is collected on recidivism.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program?

Staff are proud of the program and feel confident that they succeed in constraining offenders while giving them a chance to begin anew as members of the community.

The program has the general support of the courts, law enforcement, and the sheriff's office and media attention has been very favorable.

MADD's initial opposition, discussed earlier, has moderated to what program spokespeople characterized as cautious optimism.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? Aside from the initial opposition to the program, the program has enjoyed the support of most agencies and individuals. There are still 3 judges, however, who will not utilize the program, which disqualifies 25% of the jail population. The program would like to gain the support of these judges so it can operate at full capacity.

The program would also like to obtain funding for electronic monitoring equipment so they could institute 24 hour/day monitoring on offenders. Spokespeople also would like to expand the program to include some offenders from the beginning of their sentences.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

The Department of Probation operates many other types of programs: regular probation, diversion programs, parole, work release, a "traditional" counselling and education programs, etc. Multiple DWI offenders are involved in some of these programs as well.

PUBLISHING OFFENDER NAMES

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 publish the names of DWI offenders separately from other offenders (the Providence Journal described below belongs to this minority). 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. (In the case of the Providence Journal, described below, 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 offender 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 offender 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.

NO PROGRAM NAME: Publication of Offender Names
Providence, Rhode Island

OVERVIEW

The Providence Journal is a daily newspaper serving the state of Rhode Island. Since 1982, the Journal has published the names of individuals whose licenses have been suspended for DWI or for refusing to take a chemical test. As part of its normal operating procedures, the Department of Motor Vehicles routinely enters all occurrences of license suspension into a central computer. The Department provides the Journal with a listing of offender names, and the paper publishes them every Monday. Approximately 3,600 names were published last year. The Department of Motor Vehicles hopes that the embarrassment (or the fear of embarrassment) associated with having one's name appear in a local paper helps deter drunk driving. No data exist concerning the program's impact on potential or actual offenders.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? Data for this program is provided by the Department of Transportation, Division of Motor Vehicles, and is published in the Providence Journal.

Program setting The Department of Transportation provides information on DWI offenders for the entire state of Rhode Island. Published in Providence, the Journal is circulated throughout Rhode Island and parts of Massachusetts. Approximately 200,000 copies of the Journal are sold each Monday.

When and why did the program begin? In 1982, Governor Garrahy, who formed the State Drunk Driving Commission, first initiated the program of publishing DWI offender's names. Identifying offenders in this way is intended to be a supplemental sanction for current DWI offenders and to deter potential offenders.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? The Journal publishes the names of all those who have had their licenses suspended for DWI or for refusal to take a chemical test. No information is provided as to whether the person listed is a first or a multiple DWI offender. The listing includes the individual's name, address, date of birth, length of license suspension, and amount of their fine if applicable.

How do offenders become involved in the program? The Department of Motor Vehicles routinely records license suspensions in a computer database. The Providence Journal accesses this information, which is available to the public, and publishes it.

How many offenders does the program serve? The Journal publishes offender names every Monday. A total of approximately 3600 names were published last year.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Offenders names are only listed after their license is suspended.

What are offenders required to do? Not applicable.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? Not applicable.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? No significant additional staff time is necessary beyond the normal operation of the Journal.

What does it cost to operate the program? The cost is included in the normal operating cost of the Journal. Since staff time and necessary materials are insignificant, the cost is negligible.

How is the program funded? The program is part of the normal operating cost of the Journal.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? No data are available on the impact of the program.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? According to The Department of Transportation, there has been no negative feedback on the publications which may be taken as a sign of approval. The program is endorsed by MADD, SADD, and the Office of Highway Safety.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? Initially, there were problems with misrepresentation of the facts in the publication due to incorrect information on the license suspension order. The paper now waits 2-3 weeks before publishing names, in order to give sufficient time for corrections.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

Not applicable.

SPECIAL LICENSE PLATES

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 (described below) 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. He or she 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.

NO PROGRAM NAME: Special License Plates
New Philadelphia, Ohio

OVERVIEW

In this program, all first and multiple DWI offenders whose driving licenses have been suspended are issued special license plates. The plates are issued by the Bureau of Motor Vehicles at the request of the Municipal Court. These plates, which are affixed to the vehicle for the duration of the suspension, alert police that the owner's license has been suspended. The program is intended to make these vehicles more visible to the police and thereby deter offenders from driving with a suspended license. The program's founder believes the program may also deter potential DWI offenders who fear the social disapproval that would come from displaying the plates.

The cost for the program is nominal and consists of the manufacture and distribution of the special license plates. This expense is covered by a \$4.00 plate registration fee paid by the offender. An evaluation study of the program is being conducted by Lawrence Ross of the University of New Mexico, but no evidence is available now to document its impact as a deterrent to the offender or to other drivers.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The New Philadelphia Municipal Court is responsible for ordering the special license plate to be affixed to the offender's car. The plate is issued by the Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

Program setting The court, located in New Philadelphia, Ohio, serves the northern half of Tuscarawas County, with a population of approximately 66,000 people.

When and why did the program begin? In January, 1982, Judge Edward O'Farrell, in conjunction with the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, began issuing the special license plates to all offenders whose licenses had been suspended. This practice was allowed under an Ohio law passed in 1967 which permitted the ready identification of a motor vehicle owned by a person under license suspension.

There were no problems in implementing the program.

The purpose of the special plate is both to deter the offender from unlawfully driving with a suspended license and to allow police authorities to easily identify motor vehicles owned by persons under suspension. Judge O'Farrell believes that most persons wish to avoid the public embarrassment of having the

special license plate and therefore, will avoid actions that could result in their license being suspended.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? All DWI offenders whose license was suspended are issued the special plate. The plates are also issued for other serious traffic violations, such as fleeing and eluding a police officer, leaving the scene of an accident, or use of a vehicle in connection with a felony offense. Approximately 50% of the plates are given to multiple DWI offenders.

How do offenders become involved in the program? At the time of conviction, the Judge impounds the original license plate and refers the DWI or other offender directly to the Bureau of Motor Vehicles where he or she is issued the special plate.

How many offenders does the program serve? Approximately 250-300 offenders (all types) are issued the special plates each year.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? The plates must be attached for the duration of license suspension. This period of time varies from a month or two to a year or more. For a third DWI offense, the license suspension may be as long as ten years.

What are offenders required to do? The offender is not allowed to drive the vehicle at any time during the license suspension. The vehicle may be driven by family members, friends, etc.

Notes that the license plate itself is unlikely to embarrass family members, etc. Police can identify the plates by the use of a special color for the numerals and use of a special range of serial numbers. It seems unlikely, however, that the average citizen would recognize these plates.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? The presence of the special license plate gives the police authority to stop the vehicle without any other probable cause and check to see that the driver is not the offender. If the offender is caught driving, he or she is arrested and required to appear in court. If convicted of driving under suspension, a jail term of 30 days and a fine of \$500.00 is imposed on a first offender. For

multiple offenders, the maximum penalty is six months in jail and a \$1,000.00 fine.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? No additional staff members are needed for distribution of the special license plates. This is part of the normal operating procedure of the Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

What does it cost to operate the program? The only cost involved is the production and distribution of special plates.

How is the program funded? The cost of the program is covered by a \$4.00 registration fee the offender must pay for the special plate.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Although Judge O'Farrell believes that the program is very effective in reducing driving without a license and that it deters non-offenders from drunk driving, there is no confirming evidence about the program's effectiveness. An evaluation study is now being conducted by Professor Lawrence Ross of the University of New Mexico.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? Members of both the criminal justice system and the larger community have been very receptive to the program. Family members of the offenders, who may often be stopped by police when driving the vehicle with the special plate, have tended to endorse the program. According to Judge O'Farrell, the family is often thankful that this sanction has kept the offender from drinking and driving.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? No problems have been encountered in using the special license plates. Overall, Judge O'Farrell is very pleased with the program.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

Not applicable.

VICTIM RESTITUTION

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 (such as Pride, Inc. described below).

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 described below, 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 described below 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.

NO PROGRAM NAME: Victim Restitution
West Palm Beach, Florida

OVERVIEW

Pride, Inc. has been handling victim restitution cases since 1977. The victim restitution program is part of an overall probation program managed by Pride, Inc. which includes intensive probation supervisison and electronic monitoring. Restitution is ordered by the court; Pride sets the amount of restitution to be paid and is responsible for monitoring the offender's compliance. The organization collects monthly payments from offenders and in turn makes restitution payments to the victims. Fifteen percent of offenders fail to complete payments to the victim due to a lack of funds, rearrest, or failure to comply with the obligation. In these cases, the offender is usually returned to jail.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? Victim restitution cases are overseen by Pride, Inc., a private non-profit organization.

Program setting The specific program we studied is located in Pride's headquarters office in West Palm Beach, Florida and serves Palm Beach County. Pride, Inc., also has offices that provide victim restitution and other services in three other Florida counties: Munroe, Datona, and Pasco Counties.

When and why did the program begin? Pride, Inc. has been handling victim restitution cases since 1977. The organization first began as a "Halfway House" in 1970. It later expanded to handle many aspects of probation cases, including victim restitution. The concept was first proposed by a judge who felt traditional probation was an insufficient sanction for some offenders. This judge believed that victim's should be compensated for damages by the offender.

The goal of Pride victim restitution program is to monitor offenders' compliance with the courts' orders to pay restitution to victims. In doing so, Pride believes that they may be rehabilitating the offenders by providing a longterm, periodic reminder that they must bear the responsibility for their acts.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? Seventy to seventy-five percent of the program's participants are drunk-driving offenders. Of these, a majority (at least 60%) are multiple offenders. Offenders are mandated by the court to pay restitution to the victims either as part of their sentence or

as a condition of probation. If victim restitution did not exist, offenders would most likely pay a fine to a general fund and victims would be compensated through insurance, the state, or not at all. The payment of restitution does not exempt offenders from paying traditional fines and fees nor does it shorten the sentence or probation period. Restitution is above and beyond other sanctions imposed by the court.

The program was unable to provide demographic data about DWI offenders involved in victim restitution.

How do offenders become involved in the program? Victim restitution is mandated by the sentencing judge per the recommendation of the State Attorney. The State Attorney is responsible for investigating whether a victim was involved and for setting the amount of restitution. In many cases, however, Pride, Inc. will ultimately decide on the amount of restitution to be paid. This is done by having the victim fill out a mailed form concerning losses and costs of injuries and any relevant compensation by insurance companies. Victims must document their claims and are entitled to losses that were not covered by insurance payments.

Participation in victim restitution is required. However, if an offender refuses to pay or does not have sufficient funds, he or she may be given a longer sentence or higher fines in lieu of restitution. Most offenders agree to pay, unless they cannot afford to make the payments.

How many offenders does the program serve? The number of offenders paying victim restitution ranges from 200 to 300 per year, averaging approximately 250. Pride collects approximately \$150,000 per year in restitution. Since the restitution aspect of probation requires relatively little work from Pride, they can accommodate as many offenders as the court refers.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? Offenders usually have the duration of their probation to pay the restitution. It is usually paid in monthly installments, directly to Pride. On average, offenders pay restitution within one year. The final payment is due 14 days before probation ends.

What are offenders required to do? Offenders make payments during their regular monthly appointment with their probation officer. Victims receive payment in installments according to the payment schedule agreed upon between the offender and the probation officer at Pride. Victims are paid directly by Pride.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how does it operate, how have offenders reacted to it, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? If the offender fails to meet the obligations of his payment agreement, a warrant is issued for the offender's arrest and a bond is usually set at \$500. The offender is then brought to court where the judge will decide on the penalty for noncompliance. If the judge believes that the offender will continue to withhold payment, the offender may be sent to jail immediately. If the judge feels sufficient effort has been undertaken to make payments, the offender may simply be instructed to continue to make payments. If the judge finds that the offender does not have adequate funds, the duration of payment may be extended and the amount of each payment thus reduced. Offenders are brought back to court for nonpayment in approximately 15% of all cases.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? Twelve probation officers collect victim restitution as part of their overall probation duties. Minimal time is required for this task. A Director for Victim Restitution is responsible for collecting all payments from the probation officers, recording and monitoring payments, and issuing restitution checks to victims. The Director spends full-time on victim restitution.

What does it cost to operate the program? No data is available for the victim restitution program alone since (it is tied in with an overall intensive probation supervision program). The most significant cost is the salary of the Director for Victim Restitution.

How is the program funded? The overall Pride organization is funded through offender funds. Each offender on probation pays a fine of \$30 to \$50 per month.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? Fifteen percent of offenders fail to complete restitution for a variety of reasons (i.e., rearrested, lack funds, don't want to pay, etc.). Pride is unable to provide recidivism data specific to offenders paying victim restitution. Overall, however, program spokespersons felt that this aspect of probation has been very successful. Payment collection does not tend to be difficult in a majority of cases, and the victims tend to be very grateful. Program spokespeople also felt that the offender gets a truer sense of the cost of drunk-driving. They feel this approach is better than paying general fines because the victims reap the benefits directly.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? Staff respond very positively to the victim restitution concept. Collection is relatively simple and straightforward. As mentioned, most victims are grateful, but in some cases, the victims are angry because they believe the reward is too small.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed? The only problem identified was that Pride has to determine the amount of restitution to be paid by the offender. Pride would prefer that the State Attorney or sentencing judge would set the restitution amount. The judge is ultimately responsible for the restitution amount and the victim can appeal to the judge if he or she is unsatisfied with the amount set by Pride.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

See description of Electronic Monitoring and Intensive Probation Supervision for more information on services offered by Pride, Inc.

WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

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 is also offered on a voluntary basis 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, he or she 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.

THE WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAM Springfield, Missouri

OVERVIEW

This program is modeled on the weekend intervention program developed by Dr. Harvey Siegal at Wright State University. The objective is to provide intensive counseling to DWI offenders for one weekend. Most clients in this program are multiple DWI offenders, though a minority are first time DWI offenders. The program seeks to have the clients accept that they are alcohol abusers and encourages them to comply with recommendations for future treatment. The program is intended to reduce jail overcrowding and to reduce recidivism by motivating DWI offenders with alcohol problems to seek treatment. Offenders are referred by the courts; sometimes before sentencing and sometimes as a part of probation.

The program serves about 30 offenders per month, approximately 80% of whom are multiple offenders. The total annual operating cost is \$45,600 - \$57,000, which is offset by fees of \$180 per offender. Virtually all offenders complete the short program. No recidivism data are available, though an evaluation study by program staff is now in progress.

BACKGROUND

What organization operates the program? The Weekend Intervention Program (WIP) is operated by Southwest Missouri State University and is modeled on a similar program designed by Dr. Harvey Siegal at Wright State University.

Program setting Eighty to 85% of the clients are referred from two courts within Greene County, where the program is located. The remaining clients are referred from outside of the county but within the state of Missouri. The population of Springfield, home of Southwest Missouri State, is approximately 133,000 residents.

When and why did the program begin? The program was begun in the fall of 1983 by Southwest Missouri State University. Dr. Harvey Siegal of Wright State University, who developed the weekend intervention approach, helped train the staff and implement the program.

When asked why the program was started, program spokespeople gave two reasons: (1) traditional programs such as alcohol education had been ineffective in lowering recidivism rates and changing attitudes toward alcohol abuse, and (2) the program was expected to help reduce jail overcrowding. This program aims to have clients realize that alcohol can cause various problems in their lives. After breaking through the offender's denial, the

program attempts to motivate him or her to initiate some positive change in his/her life, and it refers the individual to a program or agency for treatment.

PROGRAM POPULATION

What types of offenders are served? The Weekend Intervention Program exclusively serves drunk driving offenders. Approximately 80% of these are multiple offenders. Although multiple offenders are the program's target population, the courts sometimes order first-offenders into the program.

The program is primarily designed to serve those charged with DWI who have not yet been sentenced. For the majority of clients, however, attendance in the program constitutes their sentence. Some judges make the treatment recommended by the program a condition of probation. Some judges check to see that the offender is following the aftercare recommendations of the program while others simply want the offender to complete the program itself. If they did not participate in the program, some offenders would be incarcerated. Others, who had already served their jail time, would be placed on probation and/or ordered to pay a fine.

In 1986, 93% of the WIP clients were males; 7% were female. Their average age was 32 and their ages ranged from 17 to 80. Although the program's clients come from every social class, the majority are lower middle class. Ninety-eight percent of the clients were white, 1% black, and 1% "other"; 62% were employed full-time, 11% employed part-time, 13% were unemployed but sought employment in the last 30 days, 11% were unemployed and did not seek employment in the last 30 days, and 3% were full-time students. The average income of 1986 clients was \$13,000. On average, the clients had 12 years of schooling.

How do offenders become involved in the program? As part of the court's judgment, the defendant is ordered to participate in the Weekend Intervention Program. Although WIP has attempted to recommend which criteria the courts should use to select offenders for the program, not all courts adhere to the program's advice.

The WIP applies the following four criteria to determine if an offender is eligible to participate:

1. The offender must pass a medical screening conducted by a nurse. This includes determining whether he or she can handle the stress that the program can produce. As an example, offenders with high blood pressure may be excluded.

2. The offender cannot be intoxicated when admitted. Offenders who arrive drunk are sent to a detoxification program and may return to the WIP after detoxification.
3. The offender's attitude and behavior must be "compatible with the WIP atmosphere" (meaning that the offender is motivated and accepts the program's goals).
4. The offender must pay the fee upon entering the program.

The program reports that "very few" applicants are rejected because of these criteria.

When offenders enter the program, a police officer searches them for weapons and drugs. The directors of the program handle any problems with failure to pay or behavioral problems.

How many offenders does the program serve? Thirty offenders enter the program per month, about 80% of whom are multiple offenders. The program has been able to accommodate all qualified referrals.

PROGRAM OPERATION

How long are offenders involved with the program? The program is run one weekend each month. Participants must stay 3 days (48 consecutive hours) in the program beginning on Friday and ending on Sunday.

What are offenders required to do? The program includes intensive group and individual counseling, extensive alcohol education, participation in an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting, and screening of films about alcohol. Participation in activities begins as early as 6:45 am and continues until 10:30 pm, leaving the offender virtually no free time while in the program. The offenders are housed in a local motel and returned to campus facilities for the program during the day. After completing the program, participants take part in a graduation ceremony. Referral to treatment/assistance resources in the defendant's own community is made as necessary.

On Sundays, the program offers a family group which discusses what took place during the weekend and how family members can help both themselves and the offenders by learning how not to "facilitate" alcohol use. The program is voluntary for family members, and fewer than 10% of families participate.

If the program uses specialized equipment, what type is used, how accurate and reliable is it, and what problems, if any, have been encountered? Not Applicable.

How does the program monitor and enforce the offender's compliance with program rules and procedures? Offenders must

remain throughout the weekend in order to be credited with completing the program. They are closely monitored by counselling staff while the program is operating. When the offenders are returned to the dormitory, they are monitored by security staff. If a participant violates the rules, the sentencing judge determines the sanction to be imposed. The offender may be immediately incarcerated. On the other hand, he may be put in a different program or assessed a fine.

Compliance with all regulations during the program is very close to 100%, according to the spokespeople. However, compliance with aftercare recommendations is only about 30%.

What are the staffing requirements for the program? The staff includes the Director, Operations Director, Administrative Assistant, Operations Coordinator, and counselors. The operational staff consists of 12-15 people, although not all of them work every weekend. There are 1 to 3 groups per weekend, and each requires two counselors. Support staff includes AA speakers, security, secretaries, etc. Since the program is housed within the University, some work-study students are used as staff.

The directors of the program along with veteran counselors train all new staff members. This training ranges from 8-90 hours, depending on the experience of the staff. A candidate for the position of Junior Counselor with no substance abuse counseling experience must participate in 90 hours of on-site training/supervision at the WIP. A candidate for the position of Counselor or Senior Counselor who has at least one year of appropriate substance abuse counseling experience and is a Certified Alcoholism Counselor must attend an 8-hour training and orientation for the WIP and participate in two weekends at the WIP on a probationary basis or participate in three weekends at the WIP on a probationary basis. The Administrative Assistant must complete the WIP Counselor Training Program.

What does it cost to operate the program? The total annual operating cost of this program is \$45,600 to \$57,000. Staff salaries constitute 65% of the annual budget. Supplies are 7% of annual budget, lodging 13%, and 15% of the budget is for food.

It is difficult to compare the costs of this program to the costs of alternative programs due to the fact that the program operates only one weekend per month.

How is the program funded? The program is funded by assessing each offender a fee of \$190.00. Normally this fee covers all costs, including education, counseling, room, board, and security and staff salaries. Occasionally, the program operates at a loss when few offenders are participating. The program is constituted as a non-profit organization.

Some staff time is donated to the program by students from the University. The program also benefits from assistance by offenders who are assigned to the program to perform the community service work to which they were sentenced.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

What evidence is there concerning program effectiveness? No formal evaluation has been completed, though one is now being conducted by the program staff.

Program staff indicated that all but 3 or 4 clients have successfully completed the program and that clients who complete the program report a reduction in alcohol use. The research currently underway will determine the proportion of participants rearrested for DWI after completing the program.

Questionnaires administered at the beginning and conclusion of the weekend indicate that the program has had a positive effect on the clients' knowledge about the effects of alcohol.

How have staff and the wider community reacted to the program? According to spokespeople, morale and satisfaction are very high among the staff. The program has a history of attracting competent, intelligent counselors who are highly committed. Spokespeople also stated that the program pays very competitive wages which attracts many good candidates.

The criminal justice system has reacted very positively to the program. When the administration of the University wanted to end the program for financial reasons (see following section), members of the criminal justice system (judges, lawyers, etc.) wrote letters of protest to keep the program going.

Participants in community traffic safety efforts (MADD, etc.) also protested the proposal to end the program and have generally been very supportive.

Alcoholics anonymous donates time to the program

There has been no community opposition to the program.

Reactions have been very positive by family members who participate in the program. They value the information which is given to them about how to help themselves while helping the offender.

What problems, if any, has the program encountered and how have they been addressed?

There are some problems in communicating with members of the criminal justice system. A program spokesperson indicated that they would like to improve relationships with the courts so that

judges would mandate compliance with the program's aftercare recommendations, judges would only refer multiple offenders, and more judges would refer offenders.

The program has had financial problems for two reasons (1) they sometimes operate at less than capacity and (2) originally, they accepted offenders who were unable to pay the fee. One solution has been to exclude indigent offenders, but program staff would like to find a way for the program to accommodate them in the future.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

As noted earlier, this is one of several Weekend Intervention Programs closely modeled on the program developed by Dr. Harvey Siegal at Wright State University. Although Dr. Siegal provided assistance in starting and implementing the program, it operates independently from the Wright State program. Information on similar programs can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE OF PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

This section of the Guide provides an overview of the 33 programs studied by charting some of their key characteristics, such as how many offenders are served per year, the percentage who are DWI offenders, program cost, and problems reported by program personnel. The reader should keep in mind that this information was reported by program staff and was not verified by us.

Readers can use the table to make comparisons among similar programs, such as the six electronic monitoring programs listed. It can also be used to compare different types of programs, such as electronic monitoring versus intensive probation supervision. The table will also help readers identify programs that best meet their interests and/or existing restrictions. For example, members of probation departments might want to identify which programs are used to enhance traditional probation and which of these cost the least.

Readers can obtain information on how to contact each of the programs in Appendix A. Detailed descriptions for some of the programs in the table appear in the PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS section (pages 13-89). Programs for which there are descriptions can be identified by looking at the last entry for each program on the chart: "Description Available."

The Format and Content of the Table

The programs are grouped alphabetically by 9 types (these types are described in Table 1, on page 3). Within each type, programs are ordered alphabetically by state. The types of programs and the pages of the table on which they begin are:

Dedicated detention.....	96
Diversion.....	102
Electronic monitoring.....	106
Ignition interlock.....	112
Intensive probation supervision.....	114
Publishing offender names.....	118
Special license tags.....	122
Victim restitution.....	124
Weekend intervention.....	128

To help locate information for each type of program, its name appears on the top corner of each page.

The characteristics presented for each program are listed below and, as needed, the meaning of the categories and entries is explained. Two conventions that apply to all the items are the use of "no data" to indicate where information was either unavailable or unclear and "not relevant" to indicate that an item is not applicable to the program (these responses may sometimes be abbreviated as ND and NR).

Type of Organization That Operates Program: This item concerns the primary organization that operates the program. If the program is operated for profit, this is noted here.

Program Start Date.

Number of Offenders Served Per Year: This item applies to all types of offenders. For some programs which could not provide reasonably precise information on the number offenders served per year, the entry contains the program's estimate of the average number of offenders served per month.

Percent Participants Who Are First/Multiple DWI Offenders. Many programs accept offenders involved in fraud, burglary, and other non-violent crimes as well as DWI offenders. This item reports the percentages of first and multiple DWI offenders that the program serves (as compared to all types of offenders). For example, "0% / 25%" indicates that the program serves no first time DWI offenders and that 25% of all the offenders it serves are multiple DWI offenders. If the percentage of first time versus multiple DWI offenders is unknown, but the total percentage of DWI offenders is known, this information will be entered as "% all DWI offenders."

Point of Contact: This item indicates the point(s) in the criminal justice system from which the program takes multiple DWI offenders, e.g., jailed offenders, pre-sentencing, post-sentencing, etc.

Program Duration: The length of time multiple DWI offenders spend in the program. If the time period is not fixed, the chart will indicate a minimum to maximum time spent in the program (e.g., "30 days - 6 mos.") and/or the average length of time offenders remain.

Is Treatment Provided: This item applies to multiple DWI offenders. Responses may be "no," or "yes," or, if the program provides treatment and the type(s) is known, the type(s) is entered, e.g., "AA once per week, counseling daily, abstain from alcohol/drugs."

Staffing: This item reports the number and types of staff serving multiple DWI offenders (though not necessarily only multiple DWI offenders). The abbreviation "FTE" means full-time-equivalent. Other abbreviations used are "FT" for full-time and "PT" for part-time. For some programs using electronic monitoring devices or IVATs, the manufacturer's staff provide services. For example, the manufacturer's staff may oversee offenders placed on electronic monitoring devices. Responses to this item will indicate this, e.g., "staff provided by manufacturer."

Driving Restrictions: This item indicates whether multiple DWI offenders drive while in the program. Possible responses include "yes," "no," and "varies by court ruling," meaning that the program accepts both offenders who the courts allow to drive and those who the courts prohibit from driving.

Annual Cost / Cost Per Offender Per Day: The annual cost indicates the total monies required to operate the program and applies to all offenders unless otherwise noted. The economic efficiency of the program is reflected in the cost per offender per day, a measure frequently used when reporting costs for jail and other sanctions. As a point of reference, in 1983 the daily cost per offender for jail was about \$33 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a).

Funding Sources: In addition to the source (e.g., county government, offender fees), this item reports the percentages contributed by various sources when this information is available.

Program Completion Rate All/DWI: This item reports the percentage of all offenders and/or of multiple DWI offenders who complete the program. When a program serves only DWI offenders, NR (not relevant) is shown for the data concerning "All" offenders.

Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required: Possible responses are "No" or "Recommended" or "Required."

Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI: This item indicates the percentage of all offenders and/or of multiple DWI offenders who complete recommended or required post program requirements. When a program serves only DWI offenders, NR (not relevant) is shown for the data concerning "All" offenders. It is possible for a program to have been in operation for too short a time to permit determination of this completion rate. This is indicated by "Program began too recently."

Recidivism Data Available During/After: Possible responses are "Yes" and "No." "Yes" indicates that data are available concerning the number or proportion of multiple DWI offenders who are rearrested or re-incarcerated for DWI or driving with a suspended/revoked license "During" their participation in the program; and/or "After" they complete the program.

Community Support Reported: This item lists endorsements or approval by community groups and organizations concerning the entire program as reported by program spokespeople.

Problems Reported: This item indicates the problems applicable to serving multiple DWI offenders reported by program spokespeople. The possible responses include: "Varying referral rates" (that the number of offenders enrolled fluctuates causing planning/operational difficulties for the program), "Varying judicial practices" (judges do not utilize or implement the program properly, e.g., they may place inappropriate offenders in the program, refuse to refer offenders, etc.); "Initial community opposition (the program's neighboring community was initially opposed to the program site or procedures, but has since accepted, and in some cases supported, the program); other problems indicated will be self-explanatory.

Special Features: This item concerns multiple DWI offenders and indicates programs features such as: special types of program equipment used (e.g., the type of electronic monitor or IVAT); special procedures to improve security (e.g., random visits to the offender's home, random drug testing, etc.); whether the program is operated for profit; whether an evaluation of program recidivism is in progress or is being planned.

Description Available: This item indicates that a detailed description of the program is available in the PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS section of the report and indicates the page on which it begins.

DEDICATED DETENTION

Dedicated Detention

	PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY DWI FACILITY Upper Marlboro, MD	LONGWOOD TREATMENT CENTER Jamaica Plain, MA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Prince George's County Department of Corrections	State Department of Correction
Program Start Date	August, 1985	March, 1985
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	Average 817	Estimate 500
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	2% / 98%	0% / 100%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Post-sentencing
Program Duration	7 days - 28 days	60 days - 36 mos. average 90 days
Is Treatment Provided	A.A., alcohol education, group and individual counseling; treat- ment tailored to individual needs	A.A., alcohol education, group and individual therapy and counseling
Staffing	1 FTE director, 1 FTE assistant director, 11FTE treatment staff, 14 staff from Dept. of Correc- tions, 13 staff from Health Dept.	4FT administrators 12 FTE counselors 20 correctional officers 11 clerical and maintenance staff
Driving Restrictions	Yes, no driving allowed during program	Yes, no driving allowed during program

Dedicated Detention

	PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY DWI FACILITY Upper Marlboro, MD	LONGWOOD TREATMENT CENTER Jamaica Plain, MA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$144,992 / ND	\$2,255,443 / \$67
Funding Sources	User fees	Fully funded by the State
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / 99%	NR / 86%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Required	Recommended
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / 90%	NR / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	NR / Yes	NR / Yes
Community Support Reported	AA, Narcotics Anonymous, MADD, Chemical Depend- ency Anon & more	AA, Narcotics Anonymous (NA)
Problems Reported	Varying judicial practices, conflicting goals between treatment and corrections staff	Initial community opposition, aftercare not mandated by court
Special Features	All participants are sentenced to one year proba- tion with assign- ment to longterm treatment program	Work release allowed during the third phase of treatment for some offenders; eval. in progress
Description Available	No	Yes, page 16

Dedicated Detention

	RESIDENTIAL ALCOHOL TREATMENT PROGRAM Rutland, MA	SUFFOLK COUNTY DWI ALTERNATIVE FACILITY Yaphank, NY
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Department of Public Health, Rutland Heights Hospital	Suffolk County Sheriff's Dept.
Program Start Date	October, 1982	February, 1987
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	2,600	No Data
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	5% / 95%	0% / 100%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Post-sentencing (first half of split sentence, then probation)
Program Duration	14 days	60 days - 4 mos. average 60 days
Is Treatment Provided	A.A., alcohol education, group and individual counseling, social skills training	A.A., alcohol education, group and individual counseling - very structured treatment plan
Staffing	29 FT staff: Director, Asst. Director, Super- visor, 12 coun- selors, 5 recrea- tional staff, 6 clerical staff, 3 aids; 3PT staff	1FTE coordnator, 1FTE consultant, 2FTE psychiatric social workers, 2FTE probation officers, correctional officers
Driving Restrictions	Yes, no driving allowed during program, confined to program site	Yes, no driving allowed during program, confined to program site

Dedicated Detention

	RESIDENTIAL ALCOHOL TREATMENT PROGRAM Rutland, MA	SUFFOLK COUNTY DWI ALTERNATIVE FACILITY Yaphank, NY
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$2,080,000 / \$57.14	ND / ND
Funding Sources	82% funded by user fees 18% funded by the State	50% DWI fine monies; 50% grant from NY Division of Probation and Correctional Alt.
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / 99%	NR / 100%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Required	Required
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / ND	NR / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	NR / Yes	NR / Yes
Community Support Reported	MADD, District Attorney, Office of Public Safety, police	Dept. of Labor, County Police Dept., Drug Abuse Services, MADD
Problems Reported	Public relations, data collection from courts	Lack sufficient funds; lack of staff cohesion since they are from a number of separate agencies
Special Features	None	Evaluation in progress; intensive proba- tion period follows stay at DWI facility
Description Available	No	No

Dedicated Detention

	DUI DAART PROGRAM Fairfax, VA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Community Services Board
Program Start Date	September, 1987
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	No Data
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	0% / 100%
Point of Contact	post-sentencing following minimum 30 day jail sentence
Program Duration	30 days in facility
Is Treatment Provided	24.5 hours of treatment activ- ities per week during phase 1 (30 days) tailor- ed to individual
Staffing	1PTE director, 1 probation officer 1 clinical supervisor, 4 substance abuse counselors, 1 clerical worker
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling

Dedicated Detention

	DUI DAART PROGRAM Fairfax, VA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / ND
Funding Sources	User fees, county funds
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	ND (program began too recently)
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Required
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / ND (program began too recently)
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No (began too recently)
Community Support Reported	MADD, police, com- monwealth attor- ney's office, de- fence bar, judges
Problems Reported	Varying judicial practices
Special Features	Overall program duration is one year: 30 days at facility, remain- der on probation
Description Available	No

Diversions

	ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING PROGRAM Fresno, CA	FELONY DWI DIVERSION PROGRAM Rochester, NY
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Criminal Justice Alternatives Inc. - for profit	Pretrial Services Corporation - for profit
Program Start Date	1977	1979
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	790	152
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	Of all participants, 5% are multiple DWI	0% / 100%
Point of Contact	Pre-sentencing	Pre-sentencing
Program Duration	No Data	6 months or more, average 6 months
Is Treatment Provided	Possible treatment includes alcohol and drug treatment, etc; tailored to individual needs	alcohol education alcohol abuse training, social skills training, may be outpatient and/or in-patient
Staffing	4.75 FTE staff: 1 director; 2 social workers; 1 administrative assistant; 1 misc. position (3/4 time)	5.25 FTE staff: 5 counselors; 1 director; 2 secretaries; (also, a psychologist is available one day per month)
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Loss of license for one year

Diversion

	ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING PROGRAM Fresno, CA	FELONY DWI DIVERSION PROGRAM Rochester, NY
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$98,000 / ND	\$78,895 / ND
Funding Sources	User fees, fundraising events, donations	County funds, DWI fines surcharges (cover 18% of budget), clients pay for treatment
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	ND / ND	NR / 67%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Recommended	Sometimes required
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	ND / ND	ND / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No	Yes / Yes
Community Support Reported	MADD, SADD, the Optimist Club, various city and county agencies	Rochester Against Intoxicated Drivers (RAID), MADD, SADD
Problems Reported	Varying judicial practices	Varying judicial practices, long treatment waiting lists, no real control over treatment
Special Features	None	None
Description Available	No	Yes, page 24

Diversions

	STOP-DWI Syracuse, NY
Type of Organization that Operates Program	District Attorney's Office
Program Start Date	1978
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	2300 in 1987
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	65% / 35%
Point of Contact	Pre-sentencing
Program Duration	4 weeks to 1 yr. average 6-8 weeks
Is Treatment Provided	Alcohol education AA, ALANON in-patient and out-patient treatment
Staffing	9 FTE staff: 4 District Attnys 3 Asst. D.A.'s 1 Law Associate 1 Program Admin. (also a secret- arial staff)
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling

Diversion

	STOP-DWI Syracuse, NY
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$196,000 / Approx. \$61
Funding Sources	User fees, fund from offenders' fines
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / 80%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Sometimes recommended
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	ND / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / Yes
Community Support Reported	Concerned Citizens Against Drunk Driving
Problems Reported	No control over treatment, lack of treatment facilities
Special Features	None
Description Available	No

Electronic Monitoring

	HOME ARREST PROGRAM Brighton, CO	PRIDE IN-HOUSE ARREST PROGRAM Daytona Beach, FL
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Adams County Sheriff's Dept.	Pride, Inc. - a private non-profit organization
Program Start Date	June, 1987	1982
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	120 in first eleven months	71 in a 5 month period
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND, 88% are DWI offender, majority of these are multiple	18% / 12%
Point of Contact	post-sentencing, usually following partial jail term	pre-release; post-sentencing as a condition of probation
Program Duration	21 days minimum, no maximum, 52 days average	30 days - 1 year,
Is Treatment Provided	AA twice per week other treatment tailored to individual needs	Treatmnt is tailored to conditions of probation
Staffing	1PTE coordinator, additional staff provided under contract with manufacturer	1 FT director; 2 probation officers
Driving Restrictions	Yes, licenses are revoked	Varies by court ruling

Electronic Monitoring

	HOME ARREST PROGRAM Brighton, CO	PRIDE IN-HOUSE ARREST PROGRAM Daytona Beach, FL
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / ND	ND / \$7.00
Funding Sources	User fees cover all costs except coordinator's salary (paid by county)	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	90% / ND	97 / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	Required
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	ND / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No	Yes / No
Community Support Reported	None	Treatment organizations, job services dept., police
Problems Reported	Varying judicial practices	None
Special Features	Guardian Home Confinement System - a continuous monitoring device	Corrections Services continuous monitoring; see PRIDE victim restitution and intensive probation
Description Available	No	Yes, page 35

Electronic Monitoring

	HOUSE ARREST ALTERNATIVE SENTENCE PROGRAM Anne Arundel, MD	CALVERT COUNTY HOME ARREST PROGRAM Prince Fred., MD
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Anne Arundel County Detention Centers	Calvert County Sheriff's Department
Program Start Date	January, 1988	June, 1987
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	18 in first 6 months	100
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	0% / 100%	49% / 21%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Post-sentencing
Program Duration	30 - 180 days, average 60 days	30 - 120 days, average 40 days
Is Treatment Provided	No	No
Staffing	1 FTE coordinator 1 FTE division chief, 8 FTE probation officers	1 FTE Sargent; 2 FTE deputies (duties not exclusively dedicated to electronic moni- toring)
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling

Electronic Monitoring

	HOME ARREST ALTERNATIVE SENTENCE PROGRAM Anne Arundel, MD	CALVERT COUNTY HOME ARREST PROGRAM Prince Fred., MD
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / \$.62 - \$2.05	ND / \$9.00
Funding Sources	User fees	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / 93%	97% / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No (began too recently)	Yes / No
Community Support Reported	None	None
Problems Reported	Program under- utilized; rules too liberal; senior citizens have difficulty using device	None
Special Features	Luma Interactive Monitoring System used in coordina- tion with breath- alyzer - program- med contact	Guardian Home Confinement System - a con- tinuous monitor- ing device
Description Available	No	No

Electronic Monitoring

	HOME DETENTION PROGRAM Upper Marlboro, MD	HAMPDEN COUNTY DAY REPORTING Springfield, MA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	County Probation Department	Hampden County House of Corrections
Program Start Date	April, 1986	October, 1986
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	84	51 in first 9 months
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / 33%	27% of all the offenders are DUI - 100% of these are multiple)
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Pre-release from jail (approx. 4-6 weeks prior to release)
Program Duration	30 days - 6 mos.	4 - 151 days, average 40 days
Is Treatment Provided	A.A. once/week, abstain from alcohol/drugs	Possible treatment includes AA, ALANON, Narcotics Anonymous - tailored to individual needs
Staffing	1 full-time coordinator, 5 part-time special investigators do home visits (1.5 FTE)	1 FT director; 2 FT correctional counselors; 4 FT substance abuse counselors; 1 secretary
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling

Electronic Monitoring

	HOME DETENTION PROGRAM Upper Marlboro, MD	HAMPDEN COUNTY DAY REPORTING Springfield, MA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / \$14 per day per offender	ND / ND
Funding Sources	Fully funded by the County	Department of Corrections; Office of Human Services
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	75% / 90%	81% / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No Data
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	Yes / No
Community Support Reported	None	Unofficial endorsement of numerous state agencies
Problems Reported	Varying referral rates	Initial community opposition
Special Features	Hiteck programmed contact device, urine testing, random visits to home/work	On-Guard programmed contact device; alcohol detection through urinalysis
Description Available	No	No

Ignition Interlock

	NO PROGRAM NAME San Jose, CA	GUARDIAN INTER-LOCK RESPONSIBLE DRIVER PROGRAM Prince Fred., MD
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Santa Clara County Superior Court	Division of Parole and Probation
Program Start Date	May, 1987	June, 1986
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	200	Estimate 65
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	81% / 19%	51% / 49%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Post-sentencing (condition of probation)
Program Duration	1 - 3 years, 3 years usual	1 year with interlock, up to 36 mos. on prob.
Is Treatment Provided	No	Alcohol education and counseling
Staffing	Staff provided under contract with manufacturer	2 parole and probation officers work PT
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	No

Ignition Interlock

	NO PROGRAM NAME San Jose, CA	GUARDIAN INTER- LOCK RESPONSIBLE DRIVER PROGRAM Prince Fred., MD
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / \$1.00 per offender (\$30 monthly fee)	Estimate \$37,050/ \$1.56 per offender (\$570 annual fee paid to Guardian)
Funding Sources	User fees	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	ND (program began too recently)	NR / 87%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No	Yes / No
Community Support Reported	MADD, District Attorney	MADD, PTA, various treatment programs
Problems Reported	Legislative opposition, opposition from criminal justice system	Need to improve communications between Guardian installer/ maintenance and probation off.
Special Features	Autosense Interlock device	Guardian Interlock device; evaluation in progress
Description Available	No	Yes, page 51

Intensive Probation Supervision

	COMMUNITY RELEASE PROGRAM, Redwood City, CA	NO PROGRAM NAME West Palm Beach, Florida
Type of Organization that Operates Program	San Mateo County Adult Probation Department	Pride, Inc. - a private non-profit organization
Program Start Date	March, 1984	1977
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	148	3000
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	1% / 19%	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing following at least 60 days in jail	Post-sentencing, may follow 30 days in jail for third offense
Program Duration	5 - 60 days, average 50 days	3 months - 1 year average 1 year for mult. offense
Is Treatment Provided	Abstain from alcohol/drugs	DUI education, AA, treatment tailored to individual needs
Staffing	2 FT Probation officers	67 employees: 17 FTE probation staff; 5 clerical; 3 administrative; 2 elec. monitoring; 3 pretrial services; remainder miscellaneous
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling

Intensive Probation Supervision

	COMMUNITY RELEASE PROGRAM, Redwood City, CA	NO PROGRAM NAME West Palm Beach Florida
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$130,000 without cost of part-time probation officers at jail / ND	\$2,200,000 for entire operation of organization / ND
Funding Sources	County-funded using property tax revenues	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	98% / ND	60% / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No Data
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	Supported by "many agencies and individuals"	None
Problems Reported	Initial opposition from MADD, lack support from 3 judges (25%), lack funds for electronic monitoring	Varying judicial practices
Special Features	The Probation Department also undertakes diversion, parole and work release programs	See electronic monitoring and victim restitution for more information on PRIDE services
Description Available	Yes, page 60	No

Intensive Probation Supervision

	ALCOHOL INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM Evansville, IN	INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION OF DUII OFFENDERS Portland, OR
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Vanderburgh, IN Circuit Court	Multnomah County, Oregon Probation Services
Program Start Date	January, 1983	September, 1987
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	360	66 in first six months
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND, of all DWI offenders 90% are multiple	14% / 86%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing, sentenced to probation	pre-sentencing; post-sentencing, sentenced to probation
Program Duration	1 - 4 years, average 4 years	1 - 5 years, average 2-3 years
Is Treatment Provided	12 weeks group counseling, then individual counseling; antabuse	Alcohol treatment -clients referred to various treatment agencies depending on individual needs
Staffing	1FT director, 3FT probation off., 3 FT counselors, 2 PT nurses, 1 PT MD, 2 FT secretaries, 16 FT miscellaneous	2FTE correction counselors, 1FTE office assistant, .35FTE correction counselor supervisor
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling, monitored by probation services

Intensive Probation Supervision

	ALCOHOL INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM Evansville, IL	INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION OF DUII OFFENDERS Portland, OR
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND, \$110,000 for staff and supplies / ND	\$146,518 for 10 month period / ND
Funding Sources	User fees	71.4% from 402 federal funds 28.6% from county General Fund
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	90% / ND	NR / NR
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	Yes / NR (began too recently)
Community Support Reported	Sheriff's Off., Police Dept., Bar Assoc., Medical Assoc.	County Commissioner, County DUII Coordinating Committee, media
Problems Reported	Getting clients to take Antabuse, need additional staff	None
Special Features	90 days of house arrest, not electronically monitored.	Evaluation planned
Description Available	No	No

Publishing Offenders' Names

	NO PROGRAM NAME Anchorage, AK	NO PROGRAM NAME Plymouth, MA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	The <u>Anchorage Times</u> -for profit newspaper serving the state of AK	<u>Plymouth Old Col- ony Memorial News paper</u> for profit paper for 8 towns
Program Start Date	No Data	No Data
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	No Data	No Data
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Following charge; following sentencing	Following charge; following convic- tion; following sentencing
Program Duration	Offender's name listed for each point of contact	Offender's name listed for each point of contact
Is Treatment Provided	No	No
Staffing	None, beyond the staff required for normal daily operation of the newspaper (2 staff spend minimal time)	1 PTE - part of normal daily operation of the newspaper
Driving Restrictions	No	No

Publishing Offenders' Names

	NO PROGRAM NAME Anchorage, AK	NO PROGRAM NAME Plymouth, MA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	Costs included in normal operating costs, since time and materials are negligible	Cost included in normal operating costs, since time and materials are negligible
Funding Sources	Newspaper budget	Newspaper budget
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	None	None
Problems Reported	None	None
Special Features	None	None
Description Available	No	No

Publishing Offenders' Names

	NO PROGRAM NAME Syracuse, NY	NO PROGRAM NAME Providence, RI
Type of Organization that Operates Program	<u>The Syracuse Her- ald Journal</u> for profit newspaper serving New York	<u>The Providence Journal</u> -for pro- fit paper serving the state of RI
Program Start Date	1987	1982
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	No Data	3600
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Following charge; also lists felony cases (applies to multiple DWI)	Following license suspension
Program Duration	Offender's name listed for each point of contact	Offender's name listed only once
Is Treatment Provided	No	No
Staffing	None, beyond the staff required for normal daily operation of the newspaper	None, beyond the staff required for normal daily operation of the newspaper
Driving Restrictions	No	No

Publishing Offenders' Names

	NO PROGRAM NAME Syracuse, NY	NO PROGRAM NAME Providence, RI
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	Cost included in normal operating costs, since time and materials are negligible	Cost included in normal operating costs, since time and materials are negligible
Funding Sources	Journal budget	Journal budget
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	None	MADD, SADD, Office of Highway Safety
Problems Reported	None	Initial data collection problems
Special Features	None	None
Description Available	No	Yes, page 67

Special License Tags

	NO PROGRAM NAME St. Paul, MN	NO PROGRAM NAME New Philadelphia, OH
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Department of Public Safety	Municipal Court
Program Start Date	Estimate - 1968	January, 1982
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	145 in 1987	estimate 20 - 25 per month
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND	50% / 50%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing	Post-sentencing
Program Duration	Average 1 year	ND on minimum 10 year maximum
Is Treatment Provided	No	No
Staffing	2 FTE clerical positions for issuing licenses and keeping records	No special staffing required - regular DMV staff distribute special plates
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling

Special License Tags

	NO PROGRAM NAME St. Paul, MN	NO PROGRAM NAME New Philadelphia, Ohio
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND (one time \$25.50 fee for plate) / ND	ND (one time \$4.00 fee for plate) / ND
Funding Sources	User fees	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	95% / ND	NR / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	No	"Favorable" reaction from the community
Problems Reported	None	None
Special Features	Special license plate that begins with the letters "X-W"	Special license plate from a series of plate numbers designat- ed for the cars of DWI offenders
Description Available	No	Yes, page 71

Victim Restitution

	NO PROGRAM NAME West Palm Beach, Florida	NO PROGRAM NAME Atlanta, GA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Pride, Inc. - a private, non- profit organization	Georgia Dept. of Corrections, Probation Division
Program Start Date	1977	Approx. 1950
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	200-300, average 250	22,170
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	30% / 45%	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing, condition of probation	Post-sentencing, condition of probation
Program Duration	Average 1 year	Maximum 4 years
Is Treatment Provided	Treatment may be part of overall probation	Treatment may be part of overall probation
Staffing	12 PTE probation officers, 1 FTE program director for vic- tim restitution	631 probation officers through- out the state, all involved with victim restitu- tion cases
Driving Restrictions	Varies by court ruling as part of overall probation	Varies by court ruling as part of overall probation

Victim Restitution

	NO PROGRAM NAME West Palm Beach, FL	NO PROGRAM NAME Atlanta, GA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	ND / ND	ND / ND
Funding Sources	Offender fines fund overall probation	State
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	85% / ND	ND / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	No / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	None	None
Problems Reported	Would prefer that state attorney set restitution amount	Would prefer that district attorney set restitution amounty
Special Features	See electronic monitoring and intensive proba- tion supervision for more informa- tion on PRIDE	Program is part of overall probation
Description Available	Yes, page 77	No

Victim Restitution

	NO PROGRAM NAME Cedar Rapids, Iowa	EARN-IT PROGRAM Quincy, MA
Type of Organization that Operates Program	State Department of Corrections	District Court
Program Start Date	Estimate 1978	1975
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	No Data	No Data
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	50% of DWI offenders are multiple offenders	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Condition of probation	Condition of probation, split sentence, in lieu of fines
Program Duration	Probation average - 6 months to 1 year, average 1yr	Probation average - 9 months to 1 year
Is Treatment Provided	Treatment may be part of overall probation	Min. 1 AA meeting
Staffing	6 FTE staff (probation agents)	15 FTE staff: 20 prob. officers 10 administrativ assistants
Living Restrictions	Varies by court ruling	Varies by court ruling

Victim Restitution

	NO PROGRAM NAME Cedar Rapids, Iowa	EARN-IT PROGRAM Quincy, MA
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$3,819,632 for probation for 6 counties, not victim res. alone / ND	ND / ND
Funding Sources	90-93% from State Dept. of Correc- tions; remainder from residential facilities fees	Primarily funded by the Probation Department, donations
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	ND / 95%	ND / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	No	No
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / NR	NR / NR
Recidivism Data Available During/After	Yes / No	No / No
Community Support Reported	None	AA, Dept. Youth Services, Sheriff Dept., mental health facilities
Problems Reported	Inefficiency by city to investi- gate victims' claims - addi- tional burden to probation dept.	Initial community opposition
Special Features	Program is part of overall probation program	None
Description Available	No	No

Weekend Intervention Programs

	THE WEEKENDER INTERVENTION PROGRAM Augusta, ME	THE WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAM Springfield, MO
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Office of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Prevention	Southwest MO State University
Program Start Date	October 1, 1987	Fall, 1983
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	1500	estimate average of 30 per month
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	0% / 100%	20% / 80%
Point of Contact	Post-sentencing, condition of probation	Post-sentencing
Program Duration	3 days (one weekend)	3 days (one weekend)
Is Treatment Provided	group and individual counseling, AA, alcohol education	group and individual counseling, AA, alcohol education
Staffing	1 coordinator, 1 senior facilitator/10 clients, 1 junior facilitator/10 clients, 1 nurse, 1 security guard 2 clerical staff	4 administrators, 15-20 operational staff, 2 counselors per group (1-3 groups per weekend) (all staff PT)
Driving Restrictions	No driving allowed during the weekend	No driving allowed during the weekend

Weekend Intervention Programs

	THE WEEKENDER INTERVENTION PROGRAM Augusta, ME	THE WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAM Springfield, MO
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$450,000 / \$300 per offender per weekend (Friday 8:30PM - Sunday 5PM)	\$45,600 - \$57,000 / \$190.00 per offender per weekend (Friday 4PM - Sunday 4PM)
Funding Sources	User fees	User fees
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	NR / 100%	NR / more than 99%
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Recommended	Recommended
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	NR / ND	NR / 30%
Recidivism Data Available During/After	NR / No	NR / No
Community Support Reported	MADD, SADD	MADD and various community traffic safety groups
Problems Reported	None	Varying judicial practices
Special Features	Program based on model developed by Dr. Harvey Siegal at Wright State University	Program based on model developed by Dr. Harvey Siegal at Wright State University
Description Available	No	Yes, page 84

Weekend Intervention Programs

	THE WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAM Cleveland, OH
Type of Organization that Operates Program	Deaconess Hospital
Program Start Date	February, 1985
Number of Offenders Served Per Year	Average 90-116 per month
Percentage Participants Who are First/Multiple DWI Offenders	ND / ND
Point of Contact	Pre-sentencing, post-sentencing
Program Duration	3-4 days (one weekend either 48 or 72 hours)
Is Treatment Provided	Group and individual counseling, alcohol education
Staffing	1 director, 26 counselors (6-8 per weekend) 2 administrative assistants, 2 security guards
Driving Restrictions	No driving allowed during the weekend

Weekend Intervention Programs

	THE WEEKEND INTERVENTION PROGRAM Cleveland, OH
Annual Cost / Cost per Offender per Day	\$108,000 / \$225 (48 hours) - \$245 (72 hours) per offender per weekend
Funding Sources	User fees, court reimburses for indigents at \$178.56 per offender
Program Completion Rate All/DWI	99% / ND
Post-Program Treatment Recommended or Required	Recommended
Completion Rate for Post-Program Treatment All/DWI	ND / ND
Recidivism Data Available During/After	NR / No
Community Support Reported	AA, AlAnon
Problems Reported	None
Special Features	Based on Wright State model; 2 variations of program, one includes defensive driving course
Description Available	No

REFERENCES

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).

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.

Harding, W.M., Apsler, R. and Walsh, W.A., Assessment of Multiple DWI Offender Restrictions: Final Technical Report. U.S. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Washington D.C., in press.

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

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, 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).

**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:

9. Weekend Intervention Programs

Program Name: The Weekender Intervention Program
Organization that operates the program: Office of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Prevention, The Division of Driver Education Evaluation Programs (DEEP)
Spokesperson's name: Nicholas Ruf
Spokesperson's position: Coordinator
Address: 32 Winthrop Street, Augusta, Maine 04330
Telephone: (207) 289-3984
Comments:

Program Name: The Weekend Intervention Program
Organization that operates the program: Southwest Missouri State University
Spokesperson's name: Donald Fischer (1), Lori Bond-Widner (2)
Spokesperson's position: Co-Director (1), Program Coordinator (2)
Address: 901 South National, Springfield, Missouri 65804-0095
Telephone: (417) 836-5802
Comments:

Program Name: Weekend Intervention Program
Organization that operates the program: Deaconess Hospital
Spokesperson's name: George Lucey
Spokesperson's position: Director
Address: 4229 Pearl Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44109
Telephone: (216) 459-6896
Comments: